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## Introduction

The present monograph is dedicated to the in-depth analysis of a single manuscript kept in the manuscript collection of the Austrian National Library (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek) in Vienna under the signature ÖNB Suppl. Gr. $45 .{ }^{1}$ In the major part of the $15^{\text {th }}$-century codex lexicographical content can be found: an extensive Greek-Latin wordlist, a very short thematic list of Greek-Latin tree names and a relatively short Latin-Greek vocabulary.

The importance of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 primarily for the research on the history of the Hungarian humanism lies in the fact that the codex was once possessed by the famous Hungarian humanist poet, Janus Pannonius. Since Janus Pannonius translated several Greek works to Latin, the detailed examination of a Greek-Latin dictionary he presumably also used can offer valuable details for the researchers of Janus's translations and Greek knowledge. Another significant aspect of the manuscript from the viewpoint of the research on the Hungarian humanism is its close connection with King Matthias Corvinus's famous Corvinian Library: after Janus Pannonius's death the codex with all probability landed in King Matthias's book collection, where another humanist, Taddeo Ugoleto, the royal librarian also used the Greek-Latin dictionary in the manuscript to enlarge the vocabulary of his own dictionary. The manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 is also important from a lexicographical point of view. The extensive Greek-Latin dictionary in the codex contains an extremely rich material of marginal notes: in the margins one can find more than a thousand glossary notes written in various languages (Greek, Latin and Italian), having different origins and contents. However, despite the fact that the manuscript proves to be significant from several viewpoints, it has never been analysed and studied thoroughly; only some short papers have been published that either focus on or touch upon the Vienna codex.

In the present book, a complex analysis of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 is presented. The first chapter focuses on the codicological characteristics

[^0]of the codex: its present condition, watermarks, folio and page numbering, binding, book-plates, gatherings and catchwords are described in detail. Special attention is paid to the discussion of the hands transcribing the main text and inserting the glossary notes in the margins. The content of the manuscript is also recorded in meticulous detail. The second chapter explores the provenience of the manuscript: based on internal and external evidence, the history of the codex is presented from Italy through Hungary to Vienna in chronological order. The third chapter deals with the textual history of the extensive Greek-Latin dictionary found in the manuscript. Finally, the fourth chapter focuses on the glossary notes found in the margins of the Greek-Latin dictionary, where their content and sources are explored.

The conclusions and findings presented in this book are the result of several years' research work on the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. During these years, I mainly used high-quality digital images to study the pages of the Vienna manuscript. However, at the end of the year 2010 I also had the possibility to consult the original manuscript in the manuscript collection of the Austrian National Library and I also managed to decipher some hardly visible marginal notes and titles with the help of ultraviolet light used in dark room, which helped the compilation of a more precise and more complete codicological description of the manuscript. For the research on the textual history of the Greek-Latin dictionary and for the thorough mapping of the sources of the glossary notes inserted in its margins the classical method of collation with further manuscripts was applied. Whenever it was possible, I consulted the relevant manuscripts in the original (ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 47 again in Vienna, Cod. Gr. 4 in Budapest and Mon. Gr. 142 and 253 in Munich) to carry out the process of collation, while in the case of other manuscripts I was able to use digital images (Res. 224 and $\Sigma$ I 12 in Madrid) or a black-and-white photocopied version (Vat. Pal. Gr. 194).

## I The Codicological Description of the Codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45

This chapter mainly focuses on the codicological description of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. The actual discussion of the physical characteristics and the content of the codex are preceded by the overview of the relevant literature dealing with the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. It is briefly outlined from which aspects various articles and books (either monographs or manuscript catalogues) discuss or touch upon the Vienna codex an both the Hungarian and international scenes.

After the overview of the relevant literature, the physical characteristics are presented in detail: several codicological features of the manuscript are discussed. The condition of the codex is described together with later restoration works on the manuscript, and the characteristics of the binding are also discussed. The book-plates stuck to the pastedown of the front board are presented in connection with the possessors of the manuscript indicated by the exlibrises. The watermarks characteristic of the paper codex are also dealt with and it is also analysed what kind of information they offer us regarding the dating of the manuscript. Such features as page numbering, gatherings and the use of catchwords related to the inner structuring of the manuscript are also discussed in depth. The handwritings found in the manuscript are also examined in detail. The question of the scribe or scribes is one of the most significant issues in this chapter since it is closely related to the person of the famous humanist poet, Janus Pannonius, who has been regarded as the scribe of the manuscript until recently.

The detailed presentation of the physical characteristics of the manuscript is followed by the description of its content. In the case of all structural units, their layout and place in the whole of the manuscript are discussed. The edited versions of the texts found in the various structural units are also indicated, where it is possible. In the discussion of the physical characteristics and the content of the Vienna codex all available descriptions in manuscript catalogues are contrasted and amended, where it seems necessary in the light of the results of the thorough study of the manuscript.

## 1 The history of studying the manuscript

The history of studying the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 can be outlined relatively briefly. In the Hungarian scene, the study of the manuscript has always been connected with two prominent fields of the research of the Hungarian humanism in the $15^{\text {th }}$ century: the research on Janus Pannonius and his books and that of the Bibliotheca Corviniana, the royal library of King Matthias I Corvinus.

Csaba Csapodi deals with the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 in his paper written about the reconstructed library of Janus Pannonius in Pécs: ${ }^{2}$ he lists the Vienna codex among the extant manuscripts once possessed by Janus Pannonius. Csapodi accepts the widespread assumption that Janus Pannonius was the scribe of the manuscript; he even states that this idea can be confirmed through the comparison of the handwriting in the lexicon with the extremely scant material preserved from Janus's handwriting. ${ }^{3}$ Here, Csapodi also classifies the manuscript as an authentic Corvinian manuscript which was taken to Vienna from Matthias's royal library by Alexander Brassicanus. Moreover, Csapodi also deals with the binding of the codex: he supposes that the blind-stamped binding of the Vienna codex reflects a characteristic binding type in Janus Pannonius's library.

Csapodi also includes the Vienna codex classified as an authentic Corvinian manuscript in his book The Corvinian Library. History and Stock, where he collects and briefly describes the manuscripts which once belonged to the stock of the royal library. ${ }^{4}$ However, in his later collection of the authentic Corvinian manuscripts written in collaboration with his wife, Klára CsapodiGárdonyi, in the Bibliotheca Corviniana published in 1990 the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 is not listed among the Corvinian manuscripts now kept in the Austrian National Library, Vienna. ${ }^{5}$ It is not clear whether the codex was omitted by

[^1]accident or it was left out on purpose since Csapodi had revised his former standpoint about its Corvinian status.

Zsigmond Ritoók was the first to exploit the vocabulary collected in the Greek-Latin dictionary of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 in the study of Janus Pannonius's translations from Greek to Latin. ${ }^{6}$ Ritoók presents numerous examples illustrating the various methods Janus applied in his translations. When dealing with Janus's choice of Latin equivalents for certain Greek words Ritoók often cites the equivalents given in the dictionary of the Vienna manuscript for the sake of comparison. In the majority of the cases, the Latin equivalents used by Janus Pannonius can evidently be traced back to the dictionary he used.

It was István Kapitánffy, who studied the Greek-Latin dictionary in the Vienna manuscript more profoundly. His interest in the lexicon was raised by the widespread assumption that the codex was copied or even compiled by Janus Pannonius. In his first paper on the Greek-Latin dictionary published in 1991,7 Kapitánffy convincingly rejects the idea of Janus's authorship by pointing at the fact that the bilingual lexicon in the Vienna manuscript indirectly goes back to the $8^{\text {th }}$-century codex Harleianus $5792 .{ }^{8}$ Then he also argues against the supposition that Janus Pannonius was the scribe of the Greek-Latin dictionary during his Ferrara years in Guarino Veronese's school. ${ }^{9}$ In his paper published in 1995 in German, ${ }^{10}$ apart from revisiting the questions already discussed in his previous article, Kapitánffy dealt with the largest group of marginal notes quoting scholia to Aristophanic comedies. He proposes that this group of glossary notes was inserted by the hand of Guarino Veronese. ${ }^{11}$

The papers written by István Kapitánffy about the Greek-Latin dictionary of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 inspired László Horváth to apply the vocabulary of the codex in his investigations of Janus Pannonius's translation of the
 work, Janus translates the Greek compound $\pi \circ \lambda \cup \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu о \sigma u ́ v \eta$ with the Latin word negotiositas, which was later replaced by Erasmus's version De curiositate in the title of the Plutarchean work. Horváth argues that Janus's translation

[^2]for the Greek word could have also originated from the Greek-Latin diction-
 equivalent negotior inserted between the two columns of lemmas, although the noun $\pi о \lambda u \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \circ \sigma u ́ v \eta$ itself is missing from the dictionary. ${ }^{13}$
In a paper published in 2009, ${ }^{14}$ Edit Madas revisits the question of the authentic Corvinian manuscripts already discussed in Csaba Csapodi's The Corvinian Library. History and Stock and in the Bibliotheca Corviniana by Csaba Csapodi and Klára Csapodi-Gárdonyi. Mainly on the basis of the volumes mentioned, she compiles a chart containing 221 manuscripts usually considered as "Corvinas," then she classifies the manuscripts in eleven groups. The manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 can be found in group 6 with the title: "Manuscrits grecs n'ayant vraisemblablement pas trouvé place dans la bibliothèque Corviniana, mais peut être conservés à proximité". ${ }^{15}$
Gábor Bolonyai predominantly deals with the glossary notes in the margins of the Greek-Latin dictionary in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 in his paper investigating the sources of the marginal notes which Taddeo Ugoleto, King Matthias's royal librarian inserted in his brand-new Crastonus dictionary by hand. ${ }^{16}$ Through the meticulous comparison of the glossary notes in the two dictionaries, Bolonyai reveals that a considerable amount of marginal notes (more than one thousand items) had been transcribed from the glossary notes of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 into the margins of his Crastonus dictionary by Taddeo Ugoleto, who - as the royal librarian in Buda - had access to a large pool of manuscripts in King Matthias's royal library. ${ }^{17}$ He also analyses Ugoleto's method of selecting glossary notes from the Vienna manuscript for transcription and attempts to find his motivations for the copying of the marginal notes in his own dictionary. From the viewpoint of the research on the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, the article is definitely significant since it successfully identifies a so far unknown user of the manuscript and it indirectly reinforces the assumption that the manuscript had once been part of the stock of the Corvinian library.

Out of the Hungarian scene, in the international specialized literature of the field, the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 is predominantly discussed in

[^3]manuscript catalogues and again in its connection with the humanist poet, Janus Pannonius.

In his book Die Schreiber der Wiener griechischen Handschriften published in 1920, Josef Bick also lists Janus Pannonius among the scribes of the Greek manuscripts kept in Vienna: the transcription of the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 is attributed to the humanist poet. ${ }^{18}$ Bick provides a detailed description of the codex: he deals with its content, the watermarks, binding, possessors etc. ${ }^{19}$

In an exhibition catalogue, ${ }^{20}$ Otto Mazal presents a short description of the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 among other manuscripts and incunabula from the collection of the Austrian National Library in Vienna. Here, the basic data of the manuscript can be found (writing, scribe, binding, provenience), and he emphasizes the significance of the manuscript and similar dictionaries in the humanistic studies and work in the Renaissance. In a paper published almost ten years later, Mazal deals with those items of the manuscript and incunable collection of the Vienna library (Handschriften- und Inkunabelsammlung, ÖNB) which originally belonged to the stock of King Matthias I Corvinus's royal library. ${ }^{21}$ In this context, he also lists the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 among the 42 authentic Corvinian codices kept in Vienna ${ }^{22}$ and he mentions Janus Pannonius as the scribe of this manuscript. ${ }^{23} \mathrm{He}$ also lists ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 among the codices originating from the possession of Alexander Brassicanus and then being part of Johannes Fabri's library. ${ }^{24}$

Currently the most detailed description of the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 can be found in the official manuscript catalogue of the Austrian National

[^4]Library. ${ }^{25}$ In it, Herbert Hunger discusses the content of the manuscript, its present condition, watermarks, scribe, possessors, binding etc. In his description, Hunger also refers to Kapitánffy's paper from 1991, where the Hungarian scholar refutes the supposition that Janus Pannonius was the author or scribe of the Greek-Latin dictionary.
Ernst Gamillscheg gives a short description of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 in the catalogue collecting the items on display at a 1994 exhibition of the manuscript and incunable collection of the Austrian National Library. ${ }^{26}$ Apart from data usually given in the previous descriptions (binding, provenience, writing etc.), Gamillscheg also cites Kapitánffy's argument ${ }^{27}$ against the so far accepted assumption that Janus Pannonius was the scribe of the manuscript.

In a paper published posthumously ${ }^{28}$ in 1996, Peter Thiermann deals with the extant Greek-Latin dictionaries from the medieval times to the Renaissance. ${ }^{29} \mathrm{He}$ collects the humanistic copies of the late antique GreekLatin dictionary attributed to Ps.-Cyrillus which all go back to the codex Harleianus 5792. Among the 16 codices recentiores, he also mentions the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and he names Janus Pannonius as its scribe. ${ }^{30}$
In his recent book, Paul Botley also mentions Janus Pannonius as the scribe of the manuscript: he states that Janus copied the lexicon around 1450, in Ferrara during his Greek studies. ${ }^{31}$

[^5]
## 2 Physical characteristics of the manuscript

The earliest description of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 is found in the codex Ser. nov. 3920, on f. 116 r -v. It was written by the librarian Michael Denis in the $18^{\text {th }}$ century; the codex was listed then with the number CCXVI, and its current signature was added by a later hand in the margin of f . 116r ("nunc Suppl. gr. 45."). Denis describes shortly the physical characteristics of the manuscript, its content and most importantly he mentions the famous note left by Janus Pannonius which is not visible nowadays, but it was due to this remark that the transcription (and sometimes even the compilation) of the lexicon was attributed to Janus Pannonius. ${ }^{32}$
Modern codicological description of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 can be found in five sources which are the following in chronological order according to their dates of publication: J. Bick's Die Schreiber der Wiener Griechischen Handschriften (1920);3 Csapodi's The Corvinian Library. History and Stock (1973);" ${ }^{34}$ Mazal's Byzanz und das Abendland (1981);35 Gamillscheg's Matthias Corvinus und die Bildung der Renaissance (1994) ${ }^{36}$ and Hunger's Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek (Teil 4. Supplementum Graecum; 1994). ${ }^{37}$ Out of the five sources Hunger's description is the most up-to-date and the most detailed one, although it also needs corrections at several points (e.g. the description of the book-plates and the possessors). To the printed descriptions listed above one should also add the online description of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 available at the website of the Austrian National Library: it is less detailed than Hunger's printed description, but it contains more recent information about some aspects of the codex. ${ }^{38}$

[^6]
### 2.1 Basic data of the manuscript and its condition

The size of the paper ${ }^{39}$ codex is $300 / 305 \times 210 \mathrm{~mm}^{40}$ and it comprises 333 folios numbered with Arabic numerals, which are preceded by three folios numbered with Roman numerals.

The codex is in a very bad condition: almost all of the folios are ragged and have been damaged by water and humidity, which makes the decipherment of the written text difficult or even impossible in several cases. The manuscript was restored by J. Bick and R. Beer in 1911. The work took two months (February and March of 1911) and it was recorded on $f$. Ir in a short note: "Dorsum voluminis restauratum foliaque paene omnia miserum in modum lacerata tenuissimis chartis obductis magno cum labore refecta sunt mensibus Februaris et Martis a. 1911. Bick, Beer." Thus, the damaged parts of the pages were replaced or reinforced with thin, delicate sheets, which unfortunately resulted in the loss of a part of the marginal notes.

### 2.2 Watermarks

On the pages of the manuscript, four different watermarks can be detected. For the study of the watermarks, I used three on-line databases, ${ }^{41}$ but the most similar ones can be found in Briquet's collection. ${ }^{42}$

1. Out of the two watermarks depicting a basilisk the standing basilisk figure on ff. 11-100, 105, 106, 111-113, 118-120, 169-298 and 309-328 ${ }^{43}$ resembles the watermark Briquet 2667 ("Basilic") to some extent, although one can find differences, as well (e.g. the curving of the basilisk's tail). ${ }^{44}$ The watermark was used in 1447, in Ferrara.

[^7]2. The other watermark of a flying basilisk on ff. 121-168 and 299-30845 resembles Briquet 2680 ("Basilic") the most, although they are not completely identical. ${ }^{46}$ This watermark originates from Reggio Emilia, 1448.
3. The motif of the lion standing on two feet appears on ff. 1, 4-7, 10, 101-103, 108-110. ${ }^{47}$ In my opinion, it resembles most the watermark Briquet 10501 ("Lion, simple"), which is dated to 1437 and originates from Ferrara. ${ }^{48}$
4. The watermark in the shape of triple mountains occurs on ff. 2, 3, 8, 9, 104, 107, 114-117, $331 .{ }^{49}$ To the middle boss a vertical line is attached which is intersected by a shorter diagonal at its end; in its inner panel two motifs resembling circles can be found. This image seems to resemble two motifs in Briquet's collection: Briquet 11768 ("Monts, style general") and 11769 ("Monts, style general"), although in the latter case the intersecting diagonal runs in a reversed way. The former motif is from Lugo, 1452, while the latter one originates from Ferrara, 1454. ${ }^{50}$ According to both Hunger and Bick, the image in the Vienna codex resembles Briquet $11768 .{ }^{51}$

The folios 329 and 330 do not contain any watermarks. ${ }^{52}$

### 2.3 Folio and page numbering

The manuscript was numbered twice: first the folios, then the pages were numbered. The folio numbers are written in the top right corner of the rectos with Arabic numerals; the blank leaves at the beginning and at the end of the manuscript originally lacked this folio numbering. In some cases, when

[^8]a longer glossary note is found in the upper margin, the folio numbering on the rectos is written under the glossary note in the right margin, or when a glossary note is added in the right margin starting from the top of the page, the page numbering is placed in the upper margin (e.g. 71r; 116r). This phenomenon suggests that the addition of the folio numbering is subsequent not only to the transcription of the main text, but to the insertion of the marginal notes, as well.

The addition of the folio numbering can be attributed to at least two different hands. A characteristic hand added the Arabic numerals to the top right corner of the rectos up to f. 329 r, which is the last leaf containing text: these numbers are of bigger size and are built up of thicker, dynamic lines written in black ink; they might be attributed to the hand of a later librarian. However, the hand skipped some pages by accident in the process of numbering: after f. 148, a folio was omitted which was later numbered by another hand as 148 b and the same happened after f. 165: the originally omitted page was numbered 165 b by the same hand making corrections. This means that the codex comprises more than 333 folios numbered with Arabic numerals than it is indicated in the majority of its descriptions. ${ }^{53}$ It seems that the same hand inserted folio numbering on the rectos left out by the first hand and on the rectos of the blank folios 330-333: these numbers are smaller and of thinner lines. There must have been a larger time span between the numbering activities of the two hands, since the numbers written by the first hand have almost faded away, whereas the numbers of the second hand are clearly visible.

A third, contemporary hand is responsible for complementing the folio numbering to page numbering by adding numbering also in the bottom left corner of the versos. This hand also inserted the Roman numerals on the first three folios (both on the rectos and on the versos) and added Arabic numerals to the bottom left corner of the versos of the subsequent folios. This happened before the codex was digitized in 2010/2011 for the convenience of the users of the digitized pictures; the numbering of the third hand is not visible yet on the microfilm version of the manuscript available in the manuscript collection of the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (MTAK Mf 1196/II).

[^9]
### 2.4 Gatherings and catchwords

The majority of the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 (ff. $1 \mathrm{r}-328 \mathrm{v}^{54}$ ) is built up of gatherings containing ten folia, i.e. five bifolia folded together. The first three folia numbered with Roman numerals (ff. I-III) constitute a single gathering, while at the end of the codex we can find a gathering of three folia (ff. 329-331), and finally a bifolium is attached (ff. 332-333). The end of each gathering is usually indicated with the use of catchwords. These catchwords are placed in the bottom-right corners of the last pages in the gatherings. In the first part of the dictionary, the words tend to have some kind of framing around them: above and under the catchwords and on their left and right we can find a short line with two strokes crossing in the middle and three dots organized in the form of a triangle. In the Greek-Latin dictionary always the first Greek lemma of the next gathering is used as catchword. Sometimes the Greek lemma appears in a shortened form as catchword (e.g. the lemma
 a catchword on f .50 v ). However, this kind of shortening is not a tendency; there are cases where longer Greek lemmas are written as catchwords without any modification (e.g. the lemma $\sigma \beta \varepsilon v v$ v́ $\omega$ кגi $\sigma \beta \varepsilon ́ v v v \mu ı$ on f. 239 r is used in the same form as catchword on f .238 v ). In the Latin-Greek dictionary, we would expect the first Latin lemmas of the new gatherings to be used as catchwords. However, there also the Greek lemma is used as catchword, which suggests that in the Latin-Greek dictionary it was the Greek column which was copied first. ${ }^{55}$ In some cases, no catchword can be found at the end of the gatherings: they might have been accidentally or intentionally (at the endings of structural units in the codex, e.g. on f. 298 v , where the Greek-Latin dictionary ends) omitted or they have become invisible due to the restoration of the damaged paper. The following table outlines the structure of gatherings in the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45:56

[^10]| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Number of folia | Use of catchword |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ff. I-III | 3 | no |
| ff. 1-10 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 11-20 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 21-30 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 31-40 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 41-50 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 51-60 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 61-70 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 71-80 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 81-90 | 10 | ? (perhaps not visible due to restoration) |
| ff. 91-100 | 10 | ? (perhaps not visible due to restoration) |
| ff. 101-110 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 111-120 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 121-130 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 131-140 | 10 | ? (perhaps not visible due to restoration) |
| ff. 141-149 (148 and 148b!) | 10 | yes |
| ff. 150-159 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 160-168 (165 and 165b!) | 10 | yes |
| ff. 169-178 | 10 | ? (perhaps not visible due to restoration) |
| ff. 179-188 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 189-198 | 10 | yes (very faint traces) |
| ff. 199-208 | 10 | yes (very faint traces) |
| ff. 209-218 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 219-228 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 229-238 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 239-248 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 249-258 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 259-268 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 269-278 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 279-288 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 289-298 | 10 | ? (not visible due to restoration or intentionally omitted at the end of the Greek-Latin dictionary) |
| ff. 299-308 | 10 | yes |
| ff. 309-318 | 10 | ? (perhaps not visible due to restoration) |
| ff. 319-328 | 10 | no (end of structural unit) |
| ff. 329-331 | 3 | no |
| ff. 332-333 | 2 | no |

Table 1 Catchwords

### 2.5 Scribes

### 2.5.1 Janus Pannonius as scribe?

Until recently, the transcription of the Vienna manuscript was attributed to Janus Pannonius on the basis of the remark in brackets attached on a slip on f. IIIv (Fig. 10, appendix I Illustrations). ${ }^{57}$ The following can be read on this slip: "Lexicon graeco latinum. Supplement. XVI. (Autogr. Jani Pannonii, vid. schedas sub $n^{\circ}$ CCXVI.)" Instead of Autogr. the same hand wrote first Apogr., which was immediately deleted. A subsequent hand added the modern-day signature on the slip later: S. gr. 45. It was again this hand that indicated that the word schedas in the remark refers to the relevant pages of the codex Ser. nov. 3920. In the codex Ser. nov. 3920, on f. 116 we can find the description of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 (that time having the signature CCXVI) written by the $18^{\text {th }}$-century librarian Michael Denis. Denis made the following observation in describing the codex on f. 116r: "Codex forma folii majoris, chartaceus, foliorum trecentum viginti novem, seculo decimo quinto per duas columnas nitide scriptus hanc Notam praefert: I $\alpha v o \varsigma$ ó $\pi \alpha v v o v ı \varsigma ~ i ̉ ı \alpha ~ \chi \varepsilon ı \rho ı ~ \varepsilon ү \rho \alpha \psi \varepsilon v . ~$ ót $\alpha \nu \tau \alpha \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \eta \nu ı \kappa \alpha \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \mu \alpha \theta \varepsilon ı v$ ह̇ $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon v$. Janus Pannonius propria manu scripsit, quando graecas literas discere cura fuit." ${ }^{58}$ (In English translation: Janus Pannonius wrote with his own hand, when he started to learn the Greek letters. ${ }^{59}$ ) Denis thus concludes that on the basis of this remark Janus Pannonius was the scribe of the manuscript: "Manum igitur habemus elegantissimi Poetae

[^11]et demum Quinqueecclesiensis Episcopi..." Denis even assumed in his description that the poet copied the extensive Greek-Latin dictionary during his studies in Ferrara, in Guarino Veronese's school: "Conditum hoc singularis diligentiae monumentum ab Jano, dum Ferrariae Guarino utriusque linguae magistro uteretur, perspicuum est."

Bick supposes that the Nota observed and copied by Denis was perhaps originally written on a flyleaf which was later damaged and eventually lost. Although even Bick could not find any traces of this remark in the codex, he accepted Denis's opinion based on the Nota and he indicated Janus as the scribe of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 in his description published in 1920. He also accepted Denis's assumption and claimed that Janus must have copied the manuscript between 1447 and 1453 (or 1458), i.e. in the years the poet spent in Guarino's school in Ferrara. ${ }^{60}$ This could be the reason why Janus is present on several lists that contain the names of scribes working during the Renaissance ${ }^{61}$ and in several descriptions of the manuscript Janus is indicated as its scribe. ${ }^{62}$

However, István Kapitánffy contradicted the consensus established in the literature about Janus's role as a scribe in the preparation of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and offered an alternative interpretation of the now lost remark quoted by Denis in his paper published in $1991 .{ }^{63}$ Kapitánffy based his argumentation on his observations regarding the process of the transcription of the Greek-Latin dictionary.

First of all, Kapitánffy observed that the columns had been written with different pens: a soft-pointed pen must have been applied for copying the Latin words; while a hard-pointed one for the Greek items since they consist of uniformly thin lines. ${ }^{64}$ The colour of the ink used for the transcription of the Greek and Latin columns also seems to be different: the Greek columns were copied with a brownish ink that nowadays looks somewhat fainter, whereas the Latin columns were copied with a slightly darker, blackish ink. ${ }^{65}$

[^12]The use of the different inks and different pens for the transcription of the Greek and Latin columns clearly suggests that the Greek lemmas and their Latin equivalents were not transcribed line by line, instead, the Greek column was copied first, the Latin one only after it. This statement concerning the method of the transcription can be proven with several characteristic scribal errors, as well. For instance, the verso of folio 174 can illustrate this phenomenon effectively (Fig. 12, appendix I Illustrations): in line 6 , the scribe of the Latin column wrote the Latin equivalent of the seventh Greek lemma next to the sixth Greek item. It was in line 8 that he finally realized his mistake and attempted to correct it by adding nequid, the Latin equivalent of the Greek word $\mu \eta \tau$ í between the two columns in line 6. Then, by drawing lines, he managed to connect the Greek lemmas with their own Latin equivalents misplaced by one line each. The same scribal error can be observed on several further folios, as well. ${ }^{66}$ As the examination of the catchwords presented above clearly suggests, ${ }^{67}$ even in the Latin-Greek dictionary in the Vienna codex it was the Greek part, i.e. the columns containing the Greek lemmas that was copied first, and the columns of the Latin lemmas were added only afterwards.

Considering the arguments gathered above, we can conclude that it was only after copying the column of the Greek lemmas that the scribe turned to the transcription of the Latin column in the entire lexicographical part of the manuscript (i.e. in the Greek-Latin dictionary, in the Greek-Latin thematic list of tree names and in the Latin-Greek wordlist). This assumption renders the hypothesis that Janus was the scriptor of the manuscript even less probable since a language learner like Janus at that time would have decided to copy the text line by line instead of proceeding by columns so as to improve his vocabulary even in the course of the transcription. ${ }^{68}$ However, at this point, the question arises how the remark cited by Michael Denis can be explained. In Kapitánffy's witty argumentation, Denis was right, but the remark only

[^13]refers to itself, not to the whole of the manuscript as for instance Bick also believed: it was only the sentence "I $1 \alpha v o \varsigma$ ó $\pi \alpha v v o v ı \rho ~ i \delta ı \alpha ~ \chi \varepsilon ı \rho ı ~ \varepsilon ү \rho \alpha \psi \varepsilon v . ~$
 by Janus, sua manu, when he was probably experimenting with his newly acquired Greek knowledge. ${ }^{69}$ Thus, the remark cited by Denis cannot prove that Janus was the scribe of this manuscript.
There is a further argument supporting this conclusion. In quoting the note written by Janus, Denis did not use accents, and aspiration marks are also missing in two cases (I $\alpha v o \varsigma, ~ \varepsilon \gamma \rho \alpha \psi \varepsilon v)$ ). However, in other Greek quotations, he does reproduce these diacritic marks correctly; he only avoids their application if the original manuscript lacks them. Consequently, it must have been Janus, who failed to use accents and aspiration marks correctly. Janus's failure in the application of diacritic marks, together with his semantic and syntactic errors (the mistaking of $\mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \omega$ for $\mu \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \omega$ already noted and the lack of the subjunctive after ót $\alpha v$ ), proves the rudimentary character of his Greek knowledge. Hence the fact that accents are applied throughout the main text seems to rule out the supposition that Janus was the scribe of the manuscript. ${ }^{70}$
In the manuscript descriptions of Hunger and Gamillscheg, Janus's role as the scribe of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 is not presented as an unquestionable fact based on Bick's interpretation of Denis's description; they also cite Kapitánffy's opposing view without taking sides. ${ }^{71}$ The online description of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 at the website of the Austrian National Library categorically refuses Bick's standpoint regarding Janus's role as the scribe of the codex: "Janus Pannonius ist gegen J. Bick nicht Kopist der Handschrift." ${ }^{\text {"2 }}$ However, even in the more up-to-date related literature the view that Janus Pannonius was the scribe of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 still seems to prevail. ${ }^{73}$

[^14]
### 2.5.2 The Greek script of the main text

Regarding the handwriting of the Greek main text in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, three of the manuscript descriptions provide us with very short, concise diagnosis: the Greek lemmas are written with a Greek minuscule script. ${ }^{74}$ The neat, careful, clear-cut formal bookhand in the main text of the GreekLatin dictionary (ff. $1 \mathrm{r}-298 \mathrm{r}$ ) might be best categorized as belonging to the so-called "sober style" (filone sobrio). ${ }^{75}$ The script is slightly slanting to the right. Although it is basically a minuscule script, on the whole it resembles a majuscule script reduced in size. On the one hand, this might be attributed to the fact that the hand tends to use the majuscule version of several letters (e.g. $\Gamma, \Delta, H, T$ ). This practice is also characteristic of the two well-known represantatives of the sober style: Theodorus Gaza (c. 1400-1475/6) uses the majuscule delta, while Manuel Chrysoloras (c. 1350/5-1415) tends to write majuscule alpha, eta and gamma. ${ }^{76}$ On the other hand, since the descenders (e.g. in the case of $\varphi, \rho, \psi$ ) and the ascenders do not project under or above the bilinear frame significantly, one has the general impression that the script is almost bilinear.

Several letters appear in two distinct forms in the Greek script. The letter beta has a wider form, with loops of larger size placed right above each other, while it also has a more prolonged form with significantly smaller loops written at a distance from each other. The letter gamma usually appears in a bilinear majuscule form that is not joined to the subsequent letter with a ligature, but sometimes its minuscule cursive form also occurs forming ligature with the next letter. Regarding the letter delta, one can find its triangle-shaped majuscule form and also its minuscule form with a more rounded loop and a high ascender forming ligature with the subsequent letter. It is even more interesting that one can observe a tendency for the use of the two distinct forms of the letter delta: while in the first two thirds of the manuscript almost exclusively the formal, majuscule form is used, in the last third of the manuscript (starting approximately from f. 223) its cursive form starts to prevail. Such distinct forms can also be found in the

[^15]cases of eta and theta: one can find a more formal, capital version not used in ligatures and a cursive one joined to the subsequent letter - in the case of the letter theta, the cross-bar protrudes from the body to connect with the following letter. The letter tau also has two distinct forms: a bilinear capital tau and a cursive one with a prolonged upright slanting to the right and violating bilinearity and with a short upper stroke protruding almost exclusively to the left and slightly leaning downwards. Iota subscript is usually not indicated (e.g. 3 v 2 ; $5 \mathrm{r} 25 ; 18 \mathrm{r} 25 ; 30 \mathrm{r} 1$ ), but there are exceptions, as well (e.g. 7 r 24 ). Although the script might not be determined as cursive on the whole, it does show cursive tendencies: some of the letters tend to be joined with ligatures. Characteristic ligatures are for instance $\varepsilon \downarrow, \varepsilon v, \varepsilon \cup$, $\varepsilon \xi, \eta \nu, \nu v, \sigma \tau, \sigma \sigma$.

In the Greek script of the main text diacritical marks (accents, aspiration marks and trema) are consequently used. Accents and aspiration marks are generally used correctly, but some errors also occur. Instead of acute accents on the last syllable grave accents are written consequently. Tremas are usually applied in the case of iota (e.g. on ff. 131 v and 132 r ).

In the case of Greek lemmas consisting of two or more words, the words are evenly spaced, no scriptio continua is used (e.g. on ff. 133r 14, 137r 3). However, there is an exception to this tendency: prepositions are usually written together with the noun they belong to without spacing (e.g. on ff. 86r 11; 95v 16-17).

In the Greek main text abbreviations occur relatively rarely. The different declinated forms of the nouns $\alpha \not \approx v \rho \omega \pi \sigma \varsigma$, oủp $\alpha v o ́ \varsigma ~ a n d ~ \theta r o ́ \varsigma ~ c o n s e q u e n t l y ~$ appear in an abbreviated form (e.g. 8v 8, 122r 10, 104v 8). ${ }^{.7}$ Inflectional endings are only occasionally abbreviated. For instance, the plural genitive ending $-\omega v$ tends to be abbreviated with a wavy line above the word (e.g. $61 \mathrm{r} 19,101 \mathrm{r} 25),{ }^{78}$ while the ending -ov can also be found in an abbreviated form (e.g. $71 \mathrm{r} 7,95 \mathrm{r} 21$ ). ${ }^{79}$ The conjunction kג́ has a characteristic abbreviation: it resembles a less rounded capital letter S with a grave accent (e.g. $8 \mathrm{v} 8,135 \mathrm{r} 13$ ).
In the case of several Greek lemmas corrections can also be observed. Mostly single letters or syllables originally left out are inserted: with a small stroke under the word it is indicated exactly from where the letter /(s) is/are

[^16]left out and the missing letters or syllables are inserted above the word (e.g. $20 \mathrm{r} 17,35 \mathrm{v} 11,62 \mathrm{v} 3-4)$. In some cases, however, similar mistakes remained


It is interesting to see that starting from f. 299r a change can be observed in the character of the Greek handwriting of the main text. On f. 299r a new structural unit starts in the manuscript: a Latin-Greek dictionary. ${ }^{80}$ From here onwards one has the overall impression that the Greek handwriting is more fluent, more cursive in its character compared to what one can observe in the previous part of the manuscript (see Fig. 13, appendix I Illustrations). In the case of those letters that tend to occur in two distinct froms (e.g. $\gamma, \delta, \eta, \theta, \tau)$ - usually a more formal capital form and a cursive minuscule version - in the previous part of the codex, the cursive versions seem to prevail starting from f. 299r, although the more formal, capital forms also appear occasionally. However, in the previous part of the manuscript, the opposite tendency can be detected. Starting from f. 299r, ligatures also tend to be used more often, which further promotes the cursive character and the fluency of the Greek handwriting.

On f. 320r, again a new structural unit starts in the manuscript: from here onwards, the layout of two distinct columns - a Latin and a Greek one - appearing on a single page is replaced by continuous Greek text. ${ }^{81}$ The change in the Greek handwriting is apparent: the writing - as opposed to the Greek script in the Greek-Latin dictionary - is not bilinear; the ascenders and descenders project well below and above the line respectively. The script is cursive; subsequent letters are usually joined with ligatures. This script can be observed on f. 320r-v (see Fig. 14, appendix I Illustrations), ${ }^{82}$ while on ff. 321r-329r another hand with a different ductus can be found (see Fig. 15, appendix I Illustrations). ${ }^{83}$ This latter Greek script is again cursive and ligatures are often used, but it differs from the cursive Greek script on f. 320r-v in several letter forms and ligatures. For instance, the k $\alpha$ í is characteristic and in ligature it uses a larger $\varepsilon$ the middle stroke of which is usually joined with the subsequent letter. When letters having descenders (e.g. $\rho, \varphi$ ) are used in ligature, the binding is rather pointed characteristically and not rounded.

[^17]Thus, when one compares the more formal, almost bilinear Greek writing in the Greek-Latin dictionary with the more fluent and dynamic cursive Greek handwritings starting from f. 320 r, the question arises how many Greek hands copied the Greek text in the manuscript. In this issue, only Hunger takes sides in his description of the codex. In his opinion, the Greek text in the manuscript was copied by three hands: the main Greek hand ("Haupthand") copied the Greek text up to f. 319v, then another contemporary hand transcribed the text on f. 320 r -v, and finally a further - again broadly contemporary ("etwa gleichzeitige") - hand copied the text on ff. 321r-329r. ${ }^{84}$ However, despite the apparent differences in the Greek scripts, it is also possible that the Greek main text was copied by two hands instead of three. When scrutinizing the neat, careful formal bookhand of the Greek lemmas in the Greek-Latin dictionary, one has the impression that with the occasional divergences from the generally formal character of the handwriting (e.g. the cursive letter forms, ligatures, occasional violation of bilinearity) the scribe "betrays" himself: perhaps he attempted to imitate the earlier Greek script of the exemplar he used while copying its content in the Greek-Latin dictionary of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, but sometimes he automatically relapsed to his own Greek handwriting in the course of the mechanical transcription. In accordance with this assumption, it is possible that one of the cursive Greek handwritings visible from f. 320 r can be identified as the real, more fluent and cursive Greek handwriting of the scribe. ${ }^{85}$ In this respect, the Greek handwriting on ff. 299r-320r can be regarded as transitory: the cursive tendencies the tacres of which can already be observed in the previous part of the manuscript are increasing there; the hand seems to abandon gradually the use of the earlier Greek script.

### 2.5.3 The Latin script of the main text

The Latin script of the main text (see Fig. 11, appendix I Illustrations) in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 is categorized in two of the manuscript descriptions: it is undoubtedly a cursive humanist script. ${ }^{86}$ The fluent and

[^18]dynamic Latin script - similarly as the Greek one - is slanting to the right. Usually minuscule letters are used, but the starting letters of the Latin lemmas are sometimes written with capital letters - this phenomenon can often be observed in the case of lemmas starting with the letter $i$. The letters are usually rounded, the loops (e.g. in the case of the letters $g, p, b, d$ ) are emphatic. Two different forms of the letter $s$ are used: a longish, protracted one and a rounded one - the latter one tends to occur in word-final position. The mid-stroke of the letter $e$ is characteristically lengthened at the end of words, which lends decorative function to this letter in word-final position. The ascender of the letter $d$ often slants to the left (e.g. 114v 17 and 26). There are several letters that consequently appear in ligature in the Latin script (e.g. ae, ct, st).

In the Latin script the usual contemporary Latin abbreviations are used in high numbers. The liquid consonants ( $m, n, r$ ), distinct syllables (-en-,-em-, -is-, -ti-, -er- etc.) and endings (-us, -rum, -ur etc.) are usually abbreviated. The generally used prefixes (con-, contra-, de-, sub-, pro-, per-, pre-/ prae-, par-, pri- etc.) also appear in an abbreviated form. In the case of words that occur often among the Latin lemmas (e.g. vel, sine, bene, habeo, causa, respondeo, sententia, potestas etc.) again the abbreviated forms tend to prevail. ${ }^{87}$

Regarding punctuation, in the Latin script almost exclusively the centered dot or interpoint is used that has several functions: it introduces and closes the list of Latin equivalents and it also separates the single Latin lemmas within a line.

In the Latin script one can also find corrections. If a letter is mistaken within a word, usually the correct letter is written above the wrong one (e.g. 2r, 13) or the scribe attempts to modify the wrong letter to the right one (e.g. 2 r 13 ; $3 \mathrm{r} 6 ; 11 \mathrm{r} 8$ ). Superfluous letters tend to be deleted (e.g. 62r 24: cereris spiritus captus - the superfluous s at the end of spiritus is deleted with two strokes). If a letter or syllable is accidentally left out from a word, it is corrected by adding the missing letter(s) above the word - often it is indicated with a stroke under the word between which letters the missing part is to be inserted (e.g. $7 \mathrm{r} 23,38 \mathrm{r} 7,42 \mathrm{v} 2$ ), but one can also find examples when it is not indicated explicitly (e.g. 17v 18).

The Latin script is only present in the lexicographical part of the manuscript ending on f. 320r. At this point, the question emerges whether the same hand wrote both the Greek and Latin columns in the Greek-Latin and

[^19]Latin-Greek dictionaries or two scribes were employed for the transcription of the Greek and Latin parts. István Kapitánffy argues ${ }^{88}$ for the latter possibility mainly on the basis of the above mentioned scribal errors revealing the column-by-column method of the transcription ${ }^{89}$ and the difference in the writing tools and inks used for the copying of the Greek and Latin parts. ${ }^{90}$ Strictly speaking, however, these arguments (i.e. the scribal errors and the different writing tools and inks) cannot confirm undoubtedly that two scribes copied the Greek and Latin texts in the dictionaries; they can only prove that the Greek and Latin parts were transcribed column by column and not line by line.

Deciding this question on a palaeographical basis would be difficult, since one should compare two entirely different scripts - a Latin and a Greek one. However, a typical scribal error seems to reveal the Greek handwriting of the Latin hand. It occurs several times in the Greek-Latin dictionary that due to the omission of a Greek lemma in the Greek column a contaminated lemma pair is created in the dictionary that is corrected by the Latin hand. On f. 103v, in line 17 the contaminated word pair $\varepsilon ่ \pi \delta \rho o \mu \eta$ porrectio can be found (Fig. 16, appendix I Illustrations): in the intercolumnium, next to the Greek lemma the Latin hand adds its correct Latin equivalent, while next to the Latin lemma its original Greek equivalent is inserted, thus, two correct word pairs are formed: $\varepsilon \pi \iota \delta \rho o \mu \eta$ incursio and $\varepsilon \pi i ́ \delta o \sigma ı \varsigma ~ p o r r e c t i o ~(C G L ~ I I ~ 19 ~ 307, ~$ 60 and 62). The same can be observed in two subsequent lines on f. 108v (Fig. 17, appendix I Illustrations): in line 23 originally ह̇ாı兀טХஸ́v procurator could be found, which was corrected to $\varepsilon ่ \pi \iota \tau \cup \chi \omega ́ v ~ a d e p t u s ~ a n d ~ \varepsilon ̇ \pi i ́ \tau \rho о \pi о \varsigma ~ p r o c u r a t o r ~$ (CGL II 312, 28 and 30), while in line 24 the contaminated word pair $\varepsilon$ ह̇ $\pi \iota \tau \cup \chi$ ía tutor was corrected to the two distinct word pairs ह̇ँııuxí $\alpha$ impetratio and غ̇ $\pi i ́ \tau \rho \circ \pi о \varsigma$ ó $\rho \varphi \alpha \vee \circ$ ṽ tutor (CGLII 312, 29 and 31). On f. 146 r similar contamination can be found in line 21 (Fig. 18, appendix I Illustrations): $\kappa \alpha \tau \varepsilon \gamma \gamma \cup \eta \mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta$ confractio, which can be attributed to the fact that two lemmas were left out from the Greek column. The Latin hand partly corrects the scribal error: the missing word pairs are added in the right-hand margin ( $\kappa \alpha \tau \varepsilon \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ frango and ка兀єүүणךú́vŋ desponsa; cf. CGL II 345, 22-23), but the Greek equivalent

[^20]of the Latin lemma confractio was not inserted (cf. CGL II 345, 22). In these instances, the Greek lemmas added in correction of the contaminations show the Greek handwriting of the Latin hand: although these Greek words are usually written more hastily, they seem to show similarities with the handwriting of the Greek hand. ${ }^{22}$ Thus, it cannot be excluded that the Greek and Latin parts in the dictionaries were transcribed by a single scribe. ${ }^{93}$

### 2.5.3 The Greek script of the marginalia

In the margins a high number of Greek glossary notes ${ }^{94}$ can be found written by a single hand. The Greek handwriting of the marginalia (see Fig. 20, appendix I Illustrations) seems to be identical with the Greek script on f. 320r-v. ${ }^{95}$ As it has been discussed above, this cursive Greek script is very fluent and dynamic, ligatures are frequently used, and the ascenders and descenders tend to project under the baseline and above the upper line respectively.

Perhaps due to the limited space available in the margins where the glossary notes are inserted, abbreviations appear somewhat more often than in the Greek script of the main text. Usually the case ending -ov is abbreviated with two upper strokes slanting to the right (e.g. 33v 21, 49r 17, 110v 25 ). ${ }^{96}$ Further often abbreviated case endings are the genitive plural - $\omega v$, which is indicated with a waved line resembling a circumflex (e.g. 265r 10, 286r 3 ,

[^21]297v 19) ${ }^{97}$ and the genitive singular -ov, where the $v$ is written above the $o$ in ligature thus forming a monogram of the two letters (e.g. 49v 17, 138v 26, $213 \mathrm{v} 10)^{98} \mathrm{~A}$ few times, other word endings are also abbreviated: for instance -ot with an upper stroke slanting to the left (269r 22) or -als with double apostrophes (e.g. 291r 15).99 One can also find abbreviations of nomina sacra type regularly occurring in the Greek of the main text, as well: óvos with a horizontal line above it for $\alpha$ ơv $\theta \rho \omega \pi \circ \varsigma(249 \mathrm{r} 25) .{ }^{100}$ Finally, although it is not a form of abbreviation strictly speaking, the - $\hat{\omega}$ written above endings of verbs (159r 26) indicates the contracted form of the verbs ending in - $\varepsilon \omega$, - $\alpha \omega$ and -ó $\omega$. It is characteristic of the Greek verbs in the main text, as well.

In the Greek glossary notes one can find corrections in the script from the same hand. In the majority of the cases, the hand simply overwrites the erroneous version with the correct one: very often the glossator corrects erroneous letters (e.g. 13r 26, 33r 26, 62r 12, 120v 26) and seldom erroneous diacritic marks ( $33 \mathrm{r} 26,138 \mathrm{v} 26$ ) in this way. Missing letters or syllables are inserted above the words ( $114 \mathrm{r} 24,120 \mathrm{v} 26,177 \mathrm{r} 10$, 189r 11), but letters written above a word can also indicate alternative (textual?) versions (e.g. 209r 7). However, in some cases, one can find misspellings left uncorrected (e.g. 296r 4, 15r 7, 49r 6), although it cannot be decided whether it was the glossator who was responsible for the error or the glossator simply followed the orthography of the source from where he copied the quotations.

### 2.5.4 The Latin script of the marginalia

Apart from the Greek glossary notes, Latin marginalia can also be observed in the margins of the Greek-Latin dictionary. ${ }^{101}$ It is a problematic question whether the hand adding these marginal notes was identical with the hand copying the Latin lemmas. ${ }^{102}$ It is obvious that the glossary notes (Fig. 21, appendix I Illustrations) were written with a darker ink and with a writing instrument drawing thinner lines compared to the Latin lemmas, which clearly indicates that the marginal notes were added after the transcription of the Latin lemmas was completed. The Latin writing of the marginal notes

[^22]seems to be somewhat smaller with occasional angular tendencies. In the marginalia, the same Latin abbreviations are used, although abbreviations tend to occur somewhat more often than in the Latin lemmas. On the whole, the writing of the marginalia seems to be more dynamic than that of the Latin lemmas. In the writing of the marginalia, one can also observe that some letters tend to be characteristically different from their equivalents in the writing of the Latin lemmas. For instance, one of the most characteristic letters is the minuscule $d$ the ascender of which leans heavily to the left, while d's in the Latin lemmas tend to have upright ascenders. The minuscule $c$ is often angular consisting of an upright and a horizontal stroke, while in the Latin lemmas it tends to be rounded. The letter $l$ in ligature tends to be joined to the following letter with a stroke connected to the upright of the $l$ in an acute angle. The descender of the letter $g$ often lacks the loop; the letter $g$ rather resembles the number nine.

| Letter | Type 1 | Type 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d |  | 6r: damnat) ; dimuto |
| $c$ | $\text { 3r: Judnrate; } 13^{\mathrm{v}} \text { : weworatwo }$ | 5v: rriocmin $; 6^{\mathrm{r}}$ : calpo. |
| $l$ | 4r: hodesf; $14^{\mathrm{r}}$ : oblato | $6^{\mathrm{r}} \text { : Imulmatis ; } 14^{\mathrm{r}} \text { : elero }$ |
| $g$ | 11 ${ }^{\mathrm{v}}$ : gallame: $37^{\mathrm{v}}$ : arago | $3^{\mathrm{r}} \text { : gevt?. } 21^{\mathrm{v}} \text { : glackus }$ |

Table 2 Characteristic letters of the Latin marginalia
In the second column of the table above, the characteristic letters of the marginalia can be found. However, these letters do not appear exclusively in this form in the glossary notes; one can find examples where they are more similar to their equivalents in the handwriting of the Latin lemmas (see the third column of the table). Thus, one should also count with the possibility that the differences in
the handwriting of the marginalia (somewhat smaller size, higher number of abbreviations, different letter forms) are to be simply attributed to the fact that these are marginal notes. Entering additional glossary notes and transcribing the main text of the manuscript are two different writing processes: marginalia are often added hastily, in a more dynamic and less regulated way and the hand needs to exploit the remaining space, thus squeezing longer content into smaller space at times. For the time being, it remains thus an open question whether the marginalia were added by a different hand with a handwriting similar to that of the Latin main text or the differences in the handwriting of the glossary notes are merely the result of the different writing space and context.

### 2.6 Binding

The manuscript has brown blind-tooled leather binding made of calfskin over wooden boards; the binding is not marked with any kind of coat of arms. ${ }^{103}$ The outer frame of the binding is formed by parallel intersecting quintuple fillets and it is filled with palmettes. Inside this frame, a second border is similarly created by parallel intersecting quintuple fillets; this time the inside area of the inner frame is filled with knotwork design. The centre panel is divided into four triangles by two diagonally intersecting quintuple fillets which are doubled thus forming a small rhomboid at the point of intersection. The space framed by the diagonals and the central small rhomboid are filled with small floral tools. In the right-hand side and the left-hand side triangles of the centre panel the same small floral tools can be found, this time organized in a way to form a larger floral pattern. In the upper and lower triangles of the centre panel a rosette is stamped. Clasps and catches are missing now; the binding was restored in 1911 as it is indicated in Bick and Beer's note on f. Ir ("Dorsum voluminis restauratum..."). Pastedowns are attached to the wooden boards inside the manuscript: book-plates can be found on the pastedown attached to the front board, while the pastedown of the back board is blank.

The binding is possibly from the second half of the $15^{\text {th }}$ century and with most probability it is of Hungarian origin. ${ }^{104}$ The blind-tooled decoration of the binding can be best identified as transitory between the Gothic and Renaissance trends in Hungarian book binding: the intersecting diagonals dividing the centre panel into triangles are rather characteristic of the Gothic

[^23]bindings, while the central organization of the decoration (with the small rhomboid containing a floral tool in the point of intersection of the two diagonals) rather anticipates the Renaissance trends. ${ }^{105}$ Mazal dates the binding to the last third of the $15^{\text {th }}$ century and he gives either Hungary or Austria as its origin. ${ }^{106}$ Csapodi assumes that the binding of the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 illustrates the characteristic binding type of Janus Pannonius's library and he locates this binding to Pécs, Hungary. ${ }^{107}$ As a parallel, one can find a manuscript now kept in the university library of Leipzig (Rep. I. 98) which was once part of the stock of Janus Pannonius's library and has similar blindstamped leather binding. ${ }^{108}$ Anyway, the binding of the manuscript Suppl. Gr. 45 definitely differs from the characteristic bindings of the Corvinian manuscripts which were typically bound in silk, velvet or gilt leather. ${ }^{109}$

### 2.7 Book-plates

There are three book-plates stuck on each other attached to the pastedown of the front board. The topmost exlibris indicates the ownership of Johann Fabri (1478-1541), Bishop of Vienna. ${ }^{110} \mathrm{He}$ attached his book-plate on the exlibris of Johann Alexander Brassicanus (1500-1539), who also placed his notation of ownership together with his book-plate. ${ }^{111}$

Up to 2008, only these two book-plates were recognized in the literature. ${ }^{112}$ However, a further exlibris has been revealed under that of Brassicanus. ${ }^{113}$

[^24]It had been damaged by the glue applied for the attachment of the upper exlibris, thus only the lower half of the image and a part of a distich deterring potential thieves are discernible. I managed to identify ${ }^{14}$ it as the exlibris of Johann Cuspinianus (born Spiessheimer), the Viennese humanist and diplomat (1473-1529). ${ }^{115}$ In the bottom right corner of the book-plate preserved in the codex, his characteristic monogram for Cuspinianus Medicus Poeta is also visible. In its first publication, the exlibris was dated about 1520. Later, on the basis of its style, Ankwicz-Kleehoven dated it about 1510. ${ }^{116}$ However, he suggested another date when he discovered that the woodcut known as Cuspinianus's book-plate is based - with some modifications on a portrait of Cuspinianus painted by Lucas Cranach. The portrait of the Viennese humanist together with a matching portrait of his wife, Anna was ordered when the couple got married, thus, not later than 1503. AnkwiczKleehoven assumes that the woodcut dates from soon after the execution of the two portraits, that is, shortly after $1503 .{ }^{117}$ However, Cuspinianus's book-plate occurs very rarely in extant manuscripts since it was usually removed by the subsequent possessors. Ankwicz-Kleehoven managed to find remnants of his exlibris in ÖNB Cod. 2504, where it had been covered by Johann Fabri's book-plate. ${ }^{118}$

[^25]
## 3 The content of the manuscript

### 3.1 Greek-Latin dictionary (ff. 1r-298r)


In the major part of the manuscript an alphabetic Greek-Latin dictionary is found; the edited version of this dictionary is available in the second volume of the series Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum. ${ }^{119}$ The dictionary originally had its own title in the manuscript in the upper margin of f .1 r from which now only extremely faint letters are visible to the naked eye of the careful student of the codex. Hunger, however, failed to find these traces since he writes in his description that the dictionary has no title in the codex ("ohne Titel Cod."). ${ }^{120}$ With the help of ultraviolet light used in a dark room, some fragments of the title can be deciphered: 1.... $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \omega v \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \lambda \eta v i \kappa \hat{\omega} v \lambda \alpha \tau \iota v \kappa \omega ิ \varsigma ~ . . . ~$ 2. кат⿳亠 $\tau$ ò $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \varphi \alpha ́ \beta \eta \tau o v$. The end of the dictionary is indicated with the Greek word $\tau$ ह́ o oc written next to the last Latin lemma on f . 298 r in red ink.

On a page, two columns can be found: the one on the left contains the Greek lemmas, while the other on the right has their Latin equivalents. On average 26 pairs of lemmas can be found per page written in 26 lines, although sometimes Greek lemmas occupying two lines occur as well. The lines and the margins were ruled in ink in advance. In the four margins numerous glossary notes in Greek, Latin and Italian are added. ${ }^{121}$

In the dictionary found in the $8^{\text {th }}$-century Harleian manuscript, ${ }^{122}$ the lemmas tend to be organized in strict alphabetic order: in the majority of the cases, they seem to follow an absolute alphabetic order, which is not usual in the contemporary wordlists. ${ }^{123}$ However, one can also observe deviations from this order. A part of them seems to be motivated or at least explainable: the alphabetic order is not so strict among words of various grammatical categories stemming from the same root, i.e. nouns, adjectives,

[^26]adverbs, verbs that go back to the same root. ${ }^{124}$ Another part of the deviations apparently has no such motivation, although these cases usually occur less frequently. ${ }^{125}$ The alphabetic sections in the Greek-Latin dictionary of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 are clearly separated from each other: they are introduced with a large initial letter written in red ink usually in the margin and then they are closed with a phrase always formulated in the same way and similarly written in red ink which indicates the transition from one letter to another, e.g. " $\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda$ oc $\tau 0 \hat{\mathrm{~B}}$ кגì $\alpha \rho \chi \grave{\eta} \tau 0 \hat{v} \bar{\Gamma}$ " on f. 52 v . Within an alphabetic section, the transition is indicated even on the level of the second letters with a mark resembling a reversed P placed in the margin.

### 3.2 Greek-Latin thematic wordlist (f. 298r-v)

inc. ớ $\tau \iota \circ \varsigma$ pirus; expl. $\sigma \tau \rho o ́ \beta \imath \lambda o \varsigma ~ p i n u s$
A short Greek-Latin thematic wordlist of tree names can be found on one and a half pages; only one marginal note is added to the list in the right-hand margin of f. 298 r. ${ }^{126}$ The items in the list are not organized in alphabetic order. The list is introduced with the following Greek title written in red ink:
 Greek lemma starts with a large initial letter in red ink placed in the margin. The wordlist is closed with the Greek word $\tau \varepsilon \dot{\lambda} \lambda \rho$ again written in red ink. The layout of this short section is the same as in the case of the Greek-Latin wordlist: the lemma pairs are organized in two columns; the lines and the margins were ruled in ink in advance.

[^27]In the thematic wordlists of the hermeneumata published in the third volume of the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum ${ }^{127}$ one can find several collections of tree names usually under the heading $\pi \varepsilon \rho \mathrm{i} ~ \delta \varepsilon ́ v \delta \rho \omega v$ De arboribus. ${ }^{128}$ However, the list of tree names in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 does not agree throughout with any of the versions found in the various hermeneumata: one can find matching lemma pairs in the hermeneumata - sometimes more, sometimes less - but they tend to appear in a different order as the one in the Vienna manuscript and there are often differences regarding the Greek and Latin equivalents (more than one Latin/Greek equivalent is given, either the Latin or the Greek equivalent is different from the version in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 , there are additional Greek/Latin equivalents etc.). ${ }^{129}$ With one exception ( $\dot{\alpha} \mu \gamma \gamma \delta \alpha \lambda \varepsilon$ ќ nux longa, amygdalus on f .298 v 8 ), all of the word pairs in the list of tree names can also be found in the preceding alphabetic Greek-Latin dictionary in the manuscript where they appear in their place according to the alphabetic order, often with minor differences compared to those in the thematic list of tree names (difference in the ending, in orthography, some kind of addition to the lemma - most often it is of explanatory character added to the Greek tree name such as $\tau$ ò $\delta \varepsilon ́ v \delta \rho o v, ~ \varepsilon i ̉ \delta o \varsigma ~ \varphi v \tau o ̂ ̂, ~ o ́ ~ к \alpha \rho \pi o ́ c) . ~$ It is, however, conspicuous that the Greek lemmas of the same tree names in the alphabetic dictionary tend to have the same Latin equivalents as the ones in the thematic wordlist after the alphabetic one.

It seems that exactly the same thematic list of tree names can be found in at least one more manuscript: in the codex $\Sigma$ I $12^{130}$ now kept in the Real

[^28]Biblioteca de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Madrid, on ff. 309v-310r. In Revilla's description of the manuscript ${ }^{131}$ the first two and the last two Greek-Latin lemma pairs are given from this thematic section of plants found in the Madrid manuscript which agree perfectly with the first two and last two lemma pairs in the Vienna manuscript. ${ }^{132}$ Although I did not have the possibility to collate the whole of the thematic section in the Madrid codex with the one in the Vienna manuscript, it is significant that no such agreement can be detected with any of the collections of tree names in the various hermeneumata mainly published in the third volume of the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum. This might suggest that this short thematic list of tree names has its own textual tradition different from the one of the hermeneumata; perhaps from some point it was handed down in a branch of the manuscript tradition together with the longer alphabetic Greek-Latin dictionary.

### 3.3 Latin-Greek dictionary (ff. 299r-320r)

inc. Abitus, -us, -ui $\alpha$ д $\pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \eta \eta_{;}$expl. praesepe $\varphi \alpha ́ \tau v \eta$
The Latin-Greek dictionary is published in the second volume of the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum under the title Idiomata codicis Harleiani. ${ }^{133}$ The dictionary begins with a Latin title the ending of which is now illegible due to the restoration of the paper: Nomina latina per alphabetum posita g[raece translata?]. ${ }^{134}$ The end of the dictionary is indicated with the Greek word

[^29]$\tau \varepsilon$ é o c written in red ink on f . 320 r. On a page, two columns can be found: the column on the left contains the Latin lemmas, while in the column on the right their Greek equivalents can be read. A page usually contains 32 lines, i.e. 32 Latin-Greek word pairs. The folios 299 r to 318 v were ruled in hardpoint, i.e. with blind lines, while from f. 319r onwards the leaves are again ruled in ink.

The Latin-Greek dictionary is not a wordlist simply organized in alphabetical order: it contains a series of alphabetical wordlists grouped according to grammatical considerations. The wordlists can be classified as idiomata generum ${ }^{135}$ where three main groups can be found: 1) masculine Latin words and their Greek equivalents that are of different gender; 2) feminine Latin words and their Greek equivalents of different gender and 3) neuter Latin words and their Greek equivalents again of different gender. These groups can be further divided into subgroups. ${ }^{136}$ The subgroups have their own titles in the Idiomata codicis Harleiani found in the second volume of the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum, while the Vienna manuscript lacks such titles. The transition from a subgroup to another is indicated with a separating mark resembling a reversed $P$ in the right margin, although the beginning of a new alphabetic section is also highlighted in the same way. The beginning of a new major group is more emphatic visually: it is indicated with an empty line. However, in some cases, the beginning of subgroups is also indicated with an empty line in combination with the above mentioned separating mark (see e.g. on f. 308v). Furthermore, new subgroups and new alphabetic sections often start with a Latin lemma the first letter of which is written with majuscule character.
A) 299r-304r: Masculine Latin words
a) 299r-302v: Masculine Latin words that have feminine Greek equivalents (cf. CGL II 487, 1-7. Suntquedam nominaque latine quidem masculino genere efferuntur grecae autem feminino $\varepsilon \iota \sigma ı \tau \tau \downarrow \alpha$ ovo $\mu \alpha \tau \alpha \alpha \tau \iota v \alpha \rho \omega \mu \alpha ı \tau \tau \mu \varepsilon v ~ \alpha \rho \rho \varepsilon v ı \kappa \omega$ $\gamma \varepsilon v \varepsilon \iota \varepsilon \kappa \varphi \varepsilon \rho \circ \nu \tau \alpha \iota \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \eta \nu \iota \sigma \tau \iota \delta \varepsilon \theta \eta \lambda \nu \kappa \omega)$. In this section the Latin lemmas are grouped in accordance with their endings:-us, -or / -er, $-x$, $-s$ and -0 . The Latin lemmas having the same ending are finally organized in alphabetic order.

[^30]b) 302v-304r: Masculine Latin words that have neuter Greek equivalents (cf. CGL II 490, 54-60. Item que latinequidem masculinogenere efferuntur grecae
 ov $\delta \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \rho \omega)$. The Latin lemmas are again organized according to their endings, and the lemmas with the same ending are listed in alphabetic order.

## B) 304r-312r: Feminine Latin words

a) $304 \mathrm{r}-308 \mathrm{v}$ : Feminine Latin words that have masculine Greek equivalents (cf. CGL II 492, 25-30. Item que latinaequidem feminino genere efferuntur
 $\varepsilon \lambda \lambda \eta \nu ⿺ \sigma \tau \iota \delta \varepsilon \alpha \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon \imath \kappa \omega)$. The lemmas are further subdivided in accordance with their endings: $-a,-o /-$ tio, $-s(-i s,-n s,-e s,-x)$, and they are organized in alphabetical order within the same subdivision.
b) $308 \mathrm{v}-312 \mathrm{r}$ : Feminine Latin words that have neuter Greek equivalents (cf. CGL II 496, 13-18. Item quae latine quidem feminino genere efferuntur grece
 ov $\theta \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \rho o v)$. The lemmas are organized in the same way as in the previous subgroup.

## C) 312r-320r: Neuter Latin words

a) 312r-315r: Neuter Latin words that have masculine Greek equivalents (cf. CGL II 499, 35-40. Item quae latine quidem neutro genere efferuntur grece uero
 $\alpha \rho \rho \varepsilon v i \kappa \omega v)$. The subdivision again is made according to the endings of the Latin lemmas: -um, $-r,-e n,-e,-l,-u s$; within the subsections the lemmas are organized in alphabetic order.
b) 315r-320r: Neuter Latin words that have feminine Greek equivalents (cf. CGL II 502, 24-29. Item quae latine quidem neutro genere efferuntur grece uero
 $\theta \eta \lambda u \kappa \omega)$. The lemmas are organized according to the same principle as in the previous subsection.

Occasional deviations from the alphabetic order within subgroups of lemmas sharing the same ending occur several times: the deviation tends to be indicated in a marginal note. ${ }^{137}$ Apart from these glossary notes, the dictionary contains hardly any marginalia. Minor deviations can also be found in the groups containing lemmas with the same ending.

[^31]The Madrid manuscript $\Sigma$ I 12 already mentioned in connection with the thematic list of tree names contains the same idiomata generum on ff. 293v309 v . The first and last lemma pairs of the three main groups (masculine Latin words and their Greek equivalents on ff. 293v-297v, feminine Latin words and their Greek equivalents on ff. 297v-303v and neuter Latin words and their Greek equivalents on ff. $303 \mathrm{v}-309 \mathrm{v}$ ) presented in the manuscript description by Revilla ${ }^{138}$ again show complete agreement with the first and last two items in the three main groups of the Latin-Greek dictionary of the Vienna manuscript. However, the place of the Latin-Greek dictionary is different in the two manuscripts: in the Madrid codex it follows the longer Greek-Latin dictionary and precedes the short thematic wordlist of tree names, while in the Vienna manuscript it follows the short thematic wordlist copied after the Greek-Latin dictionary.

### 3.4 Proverbia e Plutarchi operibus excerpta (f. 320r-v)


The short section does not have a separate title in the manuscript, nor is its ending indicated with the so far usual insertion of the Greek word $\tau$ ह́خoc. It contains some proverbs excerpted from Plutarch's Moralia, often together with a short explanation. In this case, in the margin, the word $\pi \alpha \rho о \mu$ í $\alpha$ is written in the margin sometimes which shows where the new proverb and its short discussion begin. The proverbs are excerpted from various Plutarchean writings collected in the Moralia. On f. 320r, excerpts from the following works can be found: De liberis educandis (2B 2-4; 4A 4-5; 6C 4); ${ }^{139}$ Quomodo quis suos in virtute sentiat profectus (75E 10-75F 3). ${ }^{140} \mathrm{On}$ f. 320v, the proverbs originate from the following writings: De sera numinis vindicta (549D 7-8; 558A 6); ${ }^{141}$ De vitioso pudore (533B 4); ${ }^{142}$ Parallela minora (313A 4-10). ${ }^{143}$

[^32]The excerpts are not precise quotations of the Plutarchean texts; there are modifications compared to the source texts. The Plutarchean locus is given only twice in the manuscript: on f .320 r , at the very beginning of this sec-
 excerpt ( $\pi \lambda$ oú $\tau \alpha \rho \chi \circ \varsigma \dot{\varepsilon} v$ тoîc $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \lambda \lambda \eta ́ \lambda o \iota \varsigma)$.

As for the layout of the text, the lines and frames are again ruled in ink; the text is no more written in two columns in accordance with its content.

### 3.5 Proverbia alphabetice ordinata (ff. 321r-326v) ${ }^{144}$




The section has its own separate title in the manuscript added in the upper margin of f. 321r, which is also visible fairly well in the digital image of

 this unit, Greek proverbs arranged in alphabetical order can be found. The proverbs are followed with short explanations about their meaning and/or origin. The beginning of new alphabetical sections is always indicated with the use of a larger initial letter placed in the margin for the first proverb of the section. Next to the initial letter, the separating mark resembling a reversed $P$ can also be found. In the middle of the margin, the relevant letter is written for the second time, sometimes almost next to the enlarged initial letter. The letters indicating the actual alphabetic section in the middle of the margin are fainter and seem to have been written in red ink, possibly by a different hand. In one case, at the beginning of the epsilon section (on f. 322v), the letter in red ink in the middle of the margin is mistakenly a delta instead of the epsilon. On a page, usually 26 lines are found; the lines and frames were ruled in ink in advance.

The proverbs in this section of the manuscript appear frequently in the Greek literary corpus, in the works of various authors. Most often they can

[^33]be found in the alphabetical collections of the paroemiographi whose works are published in the two-volume corpus Paroemiographi Graeci: Zenobius, Diogenianus, Plutarchus, Gregorius Cyprius, Macarius, Aesopus, Apostolius, Arsenius, and Mantissa proverbiorum. ${ }^{145}$ The proverbs copied in the Vienna manuscript are also present in the Suda lexicon, in the relevant alphabetical sections. Moreover, there is an instance where the proverb and its explanation in the manuscript can only be found in the Suda in the same form. ${ }^{146}$ However, the majority of the proverbs tend to appear in various sources in the same form or at times with minor differences. ${ }^{147}$

On f. 329r, the same explanation is added to four paroemia in the margin; the fact that the same explanation is relevant to all four paroemia is indicated with a bracket joining them together. These four paroemia with the same explanation occur together in three sources with possible minor deviations. ${ }^{148}$

In this section, only one marginal note can be found in the upper margin of f. 326 r : it seems to be an additional proverb with a lengthy explanation which was inserted in accordance with the alphabetical order of proverbs. It cannot be identified with the help of the online Thesaurus Linguae Graecae.

[^34]
### 3.6 Corporis humani partes (ff. 327r-328v)


The section is introduced with a Greek title on f. 327 r : Mép $\eta \tau 0 \hat{\alpha} \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi$ ívov $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu \alpha \tau \circ \varsigma$, while its end is not indicated with the Greek word $\tau \varepsilon ́ \lambda o \varsigma$ usually appearing in this function in the manuscript. The first item of the section starts with an enlarged initial letter placed in the margin. On a page, usually 26 lines are written; the lines and frames were ruled in ink in advance.

In this section, the parts of the human body are listed with short Greek definitions. The edited version of the Greek text can be found in the appendix of the volume collecting the works of the medical writer Rufus of Ephesus. ${ }^{149}$ The textual edition of the text the author of which is unknown was prepared on the basis of two codices: Vat. Pal. 302, on f. 84 r (A in the apparatus criticus of the edition) and Vat. Col. 12 ( $\mathbf{B}$ in the apparatus). ${ }^{150}$ I have collated the version found in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 (represented with the alphabetic letter $\mathbf{C}$ in the collation) with the edited text established on the basis of the two Vatican manuscripts. ${ }^{151}$ ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 does not show perfect agreement with any of the versions found in the Vatican codices. In some instances, it agrees with $\mathbf{A}$ as opposed to $\mathbf{B}$ (e.g. on p. 599, in lines $3,7,16$ ): these are mostly minor differences, while on p .600 , in lines 10-12 a longer addition found in $\mathbf{B}$ is similarly missing from $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{C}$. There are, however, instances where B and C agree as opposed to A (e.g. on p. 599, in lines $2,7,17$; on p. 600, in lines $3,5,9$ and 29). Furthermore, in numerous cases A and B agree as opposed to C (e.g. on p. 599, in lines 9, 16; on p. 600, in lines $3,8,22$ ). It is conspicuous that on $p .600$, in line 15 the text has been corrected by the editor since A and B similarly contain a corrupted version: $\mathbf{C}$, however, contains the same version as the one emendated. In another case (on p. 600, in line 17), all three codices contain the same corrupted version emendated by the editor.

In two instances (on f .327 r ), the text was corrected perhaps by the same hand: in both cases, the word to be replaced is marked with three dots

[^35]forming a triangle, then the dots are repeated in the margin and are followed with the correct words. Apart from these corrections, no glossary notes are added to the Greek text in the margins.

### 3.7 Qui rem metricam invenerint (f. 328v)

 őб $\alpha$ นิิv $\mu \varepsilon ́ \tau \rho \omega v ~ \gamma \varepsilon ́ v \eta$

The section has its own title in the manuscript: oi $\tau \hat{\nu} \mu \varepsilon ́ \tau \rho \omega v ~ \varepsilon u ́ \rho \varepsilon \tau \alpha i ́ . ~$
 it is written right at the end of the Greek text by the same hand, and then it is added again in the inferior margin by another hand that possibly did not notice that the word had already been written at the end of the text. The page was ruled in ink in advance.

The text lists the inventors of the various metres. No edited version of the text is known to me.

### 3.8 Short note (f. 329r)

On f. 329r, a short note can be found about the son of Tarquinius Priscus and the $\beta$ oov $\lambda \lambda \alpha$ in Greek, with some introductory words in Latin. The note is to be conferred with a passage in Plutarch's Aetia Romana (287F 3-288B 27). ${ }^{152}$
3.9 Blank pages (ff. 329v-333v)

[^36]
## 4 Summary

In this chapter first an outline of the literature discussing the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 has been presented. It is the first time that such overview of the literature relevant to the Vienna codex has been given - the necessity of such overview can be justified by the fact that this manuscript occupies a significant position in the research of the history of the Hungarian humanism through its connection with Janus Pannonius.
In the subchapter focusing on the physical features of the manuscript existing descriptions of the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 published in manuscript or exhibition catalogues are contrasted, expanded or corrected, where it seemed necessary on the basis of the thorough study and on-the-spot examination of the manuscript. The description of page numbering and the size of the manuscript have been corrected through the realization of the fact that some pages were skipped accidentally during the process of numbering the leaves of the manuscript. The use of catchwords has been again examined thoroughly, which also helped revisit the structure of the paper codex, i.e. how it is made up of gatherings. Watermarks found in the manuscript have also been re-examined and the related standpoints of the manuscript descriptions have also been contrasted.

In the section focusing on the scribes of the manuscript a further argument is presented confirming István Kapitánffy's standpoint of rejecting the widely accepted assumption that Janus Pannonius was the scribe of the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. In the detailed description of the Greek and Latin scripts in the manuscript the question of the number of the hands is also discussed in details showing that it cannot be excluded that the same hand copied the Greek and Latin lemmas in the lexicographical part of the manuscript, even if Kapitánffy attempted to argue for two scribes: one copying the Greek lemmas and another one copying the Latin ones.
A very significant result presented in the first chapter is undoubtedly the revelation and identification of the third exlibris hiding under the two upper exlibrises of Johann Faber and Alexander Brassicanus. Thus, a so far unknown possessor of the manuscript, Johann Cuspinianus has been revealed, which is an important addition to the history of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and at the same time raises new questions in connection with the provenience of the codex.

The description of the content of the manuscript has been considerably expanded and corrected in this chapter. The introductory title of the GreekLatin dictionary in the codex has been revealed with the help of ultraviolet light - the existence of this title had remained unknown earlier. The short thematic list of Greek-Latin tree names has been examined thoroughly: it has been collated both with the existing hermeneuma tradition and with another manuscript found in Madrid ( $\Sigma$ I 12). The Latin-Greek dictionary found in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 has been described in more details as it can be found in the existing manuscript descriptions and its features characteristic of the idiomata generum have also been highlighted in details. Finally, the so far unknown source of the section Corporis humani partes has also been identified and the version found in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 has been collated with its edition.

# II The Provenience of the Manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 

In this chapter an attempt will be made to reconstruct the provenience of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. $45 .{ }^{153}$ The history of the codex will be discussed in chronological order and will be presented in relation with its three main stages: Italy (Ferrara), Hungary (Pécs and Buda) and Vienna. For the reconstruction of the provenience of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 both external (e.g. watermarks, book-plates) and internal (e.g. Taddeo Ugoleto, the royal librarian's notes) evidence is exploited.

## 1 The manuscript in Italy

On the basis of the watermarks ${ }^{154}$ found in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, the history of the codex definitely starts in Italy since all four watermarks occurring on the leaves of the codex can be located in Italy. ${ }^{155}$ The majority of the watermarks seem to point to the city of Ferrara. Two of the four watermarks (standing basilisk and lion standing on two feet) appearing in the manuscript seem to originate from Ferrara. The third watermark (triple mountains) can either be associated with a similar watermark from Lugo or with another one from Ferrara. The fourth watermark (flying basilisk) seems to originate from Reggio Emilia, which is actually very close to Ferrara. Again on the basis of the watermarks, the manuscript can be dated to the middle of the $15^{\text {th }}$ century, around $1450 .{ }^{156}$

[^37]
# 2 From Italy to Hungary: Janus Pannonius as the possessor of the codex 

The first possessor that can be traced back in the history of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 was the famous Hungarian humanist poet, Janus Pannonius. His possessorship can be proven with the "Nota" that was possibly written on a flyleaf now lost and was observed and described by the $18^{\text {th }}$-century librarian Michael Denis in the codex Ser. nov. 3920, on f. 116r: "Codex (...) hanc Notam
 $\mu \alpha \theta \varepsilon ı v$ ह́ $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon v$. Janus Pannonius propria manu scripsit, quando graecas literas discere cura fuit." Based on Denis's observation, a slip is attached on f . IIIv that also associates the manuscript with Janus Pannonius: "Lexicon graecolatinum. Supplement. XVI. (Autogr. Jani Pannonii, vid. schedas sub $n^{\circ}$ CCXVI.)." ${ }^{157}$

In the light of what has been said so far, we can reconstruct the early history of the codex as follows. In the middle of the $15^{\text {th }}$ century, around 1450 the manuscript was copied in Italy, with all probability in Ferrara as the watermarks suggest. Then the young Janus Pannonius used the wordlist in the manuscript when he was learning Greek during his studies (1447-1454) in Guarino Veronese's school in Ferrara. ${ }^{158}$ Possibly it was in his Ferrara years when he added the remark copied by Denis. On returning to Hungary to occupy the bishopric of Pécs in 1459, he brought along the codex since he needed it to carry on studying Greek texts. As analogy, one can think of two English humanists, Thomas Grey and Robert Fry, who were both Guarino's students. As the reconstruction of the stock in their libraries reveals, both possessed a Greek-Latin dictionary which they brought

[^38]home from Italy. ${ }^{159}$ Janus seems to even have the codex rebound in Hungary, perhaps in Pécs. ${ }^{160}$

In Hungary, Janus Pannonius possibly used the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45: he needed the Greek-Latin dictionary in the codex for the study of Greek texts. In one of his letters he complained that only his Greek books were left in his library since his friends had carried away all his books written in Latin. He writes the following to Galeotto Marzio: "Postremo suades ut libros mittam. An nondum etiam satis misisse videor? Graeci mihi soli restant, Latinos iam omnes abstulistis. Dii melius! quod nemo vestrum Graece scit! Puto et ex Graecis nullum mihi fecissetis reliquum. Quodsi didiceritis, ego mox Iudaicum ediscam; et ex Ebraeis codicibus Bibliothecam inscribam." ${ }^{161}$ In this situation even if it might be partly poetic exaggeration - a dictionary was essential for Janus Pannonius.
Janus seems to have used the Greek-Latin dictionary in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 also for his translations of Greek works into Latin. In his article analysing Janus's translations from Greek, Zsigmond Ritoók observes that in several cases with all probability Janus used the Latin equivalents found in the Greek-Latin dictionary. ${ }^{162}$ László Horváth presents a particular example in connection with Janus Pannonius's translation of Plutarch's
 Latin equivalent negotiositas for the translation of the Greek compound $\pi о \lambda \cup \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu о \sigma ט ́ v \eta$ - the Latin equivalent used by Janus was later replaced with Erasmus's version De curiositate in the title of Plutarch's work. Horváth argues that Janus might have used the dictionary in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 for the translation of the Greek word $\pi \circ \lambda \nu \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \circ \sigma u ́ v \eta$ : although the compound is missing from the dictionary, the verb $\pi \circ \lambda \nu \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \circ v \tilde{\omega}$ on f .219 v also has the Latin equivalent negotior inserted between the two columns. ${ }^{164}$ With all

[^39]probability, the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 remained in the possession of Janus until his death in 1472.

## 3 The manuscript in the stock of the Bibliotheca Corviniana

According to Csaba Csapodi's hypothesis, Janus Pannonius's books were confiscated for King Matthias's royal library after the humanist's fall and death in $1472 .{ }^{165}$ Since Janus's books were not marked with coat of arms nor with notation of ownership, they could mingle in the stock of the Corvinian library without any trace. Csapodi offers several arguments in support of his hypothesis. Firstly, there are three (or perhaps four) among the few books identified as Janus's possession which could only make their appearance abroad after the dissolution of the Corvinian library and which were plausibly possessed by Janus and then by King Matthias. A further argument lies in the high proportion of the Greek codices characteristic of both Janus's and King Matthias's book collections. Possessing a bilingual, Latin and Greek book collection was very unusual in that age. Thus, it is plausible that the confiscation of Janus's bilingual library stimulated the establishment of a similarly bilingual, Latin and Greek royal library. ${ }^{166}$

[^40]Furthermore, apart from Csapodi's arguments, there is indirect evidence suggesting that the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 was once part of the stock of the Corvinian library. It seems that the royal librarian and tutor of Johannes Corvinus, Matthias's illegitimate son, Taddeo Ugoleto (1448-1515) used the manuscript in the Corvinian library. However, Ugoleto had his own GreekLatin dictionary as well: he owned a copy of the first printed Greek-Latin dictionary edited by Johannes Crastonus. It was first published in 1478 in Milan, a second edition was released five years later, on 10 November 1483 in Vicenza. Ugoleto obtained a copy of the second edition sent by his friend, a certain Paulus Romuleus as a present. Now it is preserved in Vienna (ÖNB Ink. X. E. 9). ${ }^{167}$ Originally, the printed dictionary contained about 15000 entries on 520 pages, to which Ugoleto added more than a thousand new items in the margins (missing entries, alternative meanings, grammatical information etc.). He finished his work on the dictionary by 20 June 1484, that is in not more than six months' time as his note at the end of the book informs us: Relectum xx ${ }^{0}$. Iunii mcccclxxxiiiio.

Ugoleto's notes were scrutinized by Gábor Bolonyai, who presented his results in a paper published in 2011. ${ }^{168}$ As he observed, Ugoleto's additions can be divided into four different - sometimes overlapping - groups: single Greek lemmas with their Latin equivalents; Greek explanations or definitions; words or expressions given together with the author's name (sometimes even with the title of the work where they appear) and passages quoted from classical authors. ${ }^{169}$ The entries added by Ugoleto are organized in almost perfect alphabetical order, which suggests that they were copied from an already prearranged text at once. Their layout can further confirm this assumption: the entries generally follow each other with a tendency of slightly slanting to the right. By comparing a part of Ugoleto's additions with the Greek-Latin dictionary in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, Bolonyai managed to prove that Ugoleto copied that wordlist extensively. ${ }^{170}$ Bolonyai also presents statistics showing what kind of additions Ugoleto adopted from

[^41]the Greek-Latin dictionary of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Ugoleto seems to have focused on glosses from the scholia to Aristophanes's Nubes and Plutus. ${ }^{171}$ Regarding prose writers, Ugoleto adopted mostly glosses related to or quoted from Xenophon's works. According to Bolonyai's opinion, if we assume that Ugoleto's selection of glosses found in the margins of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 was the result of deliberate decisions rather than random transcription, his preference of certain authors and works might as well indicate which works he had read before or planned to read in the near future. Thus, perhaps Aristophanes's Nubes was already in Ugoleto's educational schedule at the time of enlarging the material of his own dictionary. ${ }^{172}$

However, it can be demonstrated that Ugoleto also used other glossaries, lexica and presumably literary works apart from the material found in the Greek-Latin dictionary in the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. ${ }^{173}$ These additions also tend to differ in their layout and appearance (different pen and ink, less careful and neat handwriting, additions not organized under each other in a slightly slanting row). ${ }^{174}$ This second layer of additions, which were probabily inserted at a different time compared to the additions taken from ÖNB Suppl. Gr. $45,{ }^{175}$ are also significant since with their help further items can be detected in the stock of the Corvinian library.
From the viewpoint of the provenience of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, however, Ugoleto's additions taken from its Greek-Latin dictionary are more important. Ugoleto's notes can provide indirect evidence for the availability of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 in the royal library between 1483 and 1484. Since no external evidence (e.g. characteristic binding or coat of arms) can be found in the case of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 clearly proving its presence in the stock of the Corvinian library, the internal evidence gained this way can confirm our assumption originating from Csapodi's theory that after Janus Pannonius's death the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 eventually landed in the Corvinian library or at least in its proximity. ${ }^{176}$

[^42]
## 4 From Hungary to Vienna

For reconstructing the later history of the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, the bookplates attached to the pastedown of the front board by its possessors are of invaluable help. There are three book-plates stuck on each other revealing three subsequent possessors of the manuscript. ${ }^{177}$

The undermost exlibris is that of Johann Cuspinianus (born Spiessheimer), the Viennese humanist and diplomat (1443-1529), ${ }^{178}$ which means that this was the first book-plate glued to the pastedown of the front board. ${ }^{179}$ Representing the interests of Emperor Maximilian I, Cuspinianus visited Hungary several times as a diplomat to negotiate with King Wladislas II, the successor of King Matthias Corvinus. Between 1510 and 1515, during his numerous visits to Buda, he could have the opportunity to examine the stock of the Corvinian library and to get hold of some valuable codices as well. In one of his letters Cuspinianus confesses his strong affinity for codices, especially for authentic Corvinian manuscripts with the following words: "Ego ut aperte fateor, heluo sum librorum et undique singulos evolvo angulos. Sic repperi in bibliotheca regia Budae tum multos insignes codices, tum illum praecipue Johannem Monachum... . ${ }^{180}$ Cuspinianus was on friendly terms with Felix Petantius, the librarian of the Corvinian library that time, Ugoleto's successor, whose help the Viennese humanist could exploit for the acquisition of Corvinian manuscrits. ${ }^{181}$ In his monograph about Cuspinianus, Ankwicz-Kleehoven

[^43]lists nine Corvinian manuscripts whose notation of ownership indicates that they were possessed by Cuspinianus. ${ }^{182}$
Cuspinianus could also obtain the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 from the royal library during one of his visits to Buda between 1510 and 1515. He might have needed the Greek-Latin dictionary in the codex for his extensive studies on Greek texts while he was working on his historical work, the Caesares. ${ }^{183}$ In one of his letters he mentions that he read through Zonaras's Epitome historion in two months' time: "Transcurri enim his duobus mensibus totum librum [sc. Zonaras's book]." ${ }^{184}$ Later he writes in the Consules (1553) that he prepared excerpts from parts of Diodorus's Bibliothece: "Sex ego libros graecos a decimo sexto usque vigesimum reperi Budae in bibliotheca regia, cum illic oratorem Caesaris agerem: e quibus paucula pro commodo meo excerpsi. ${ }^{185}$ Both Greek works were available in Corvinian codices he obtained from Buda (now ÖNB Hist. Gr. 16 and Suppl. Gr. 30). It is interesting that both Greek codices finally landed in Brassicanus's book collection just like the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. However, Cuspinianus must have had some kind of Greek-Latin dictionary even before obtaining the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, although one might assume that it was less extensive and of poorer quality.

[^44]It is a further question whether it is possible to determine the precise date when Cuspinianus acquired the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 between 1510 and 1515. Unfortunately, a precise answer cannot be found to this question with the help of Cuspinianus's diary, ${ }^{186}$ since he only outlines his visits to Buda with a few words in the diary: he mentions when he arrived, when he was given audience by the king, when he got (positive) answer from the king and finally when he returned to Vienna. It is striking, however, that while in the years $1510,1511,1512$ and 1515 he met King Wladislas II only once or twice, ${ }^{187}$ in 1513 he visited the king in Buda four times (26 January - 27 February, 13 June -4 July, $8-23$ August and $12-31$ December), ${ }^{188}$ and then in 1514 five times (3-6 January, 7 - 16 February, 13-25 April, 31 August - 25 September and 23 October - 30 November). ${ }^{189}$ Based on these data, we might narrow down the time of the acquisition of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 to the years 1513 and 1514.

After Cuspinianus's death on 19 April 1529 the diplomat's library was inherited by his sons, Sebastian Felix and Nikolaus Chrysostomus, who decided to sell their father's library. The first person who was interested in the business was Bernhard von Cles (1484-1539), Prince-bishop of Trento that time. It was Johann Alexander Brassicanus ( $1500-1539$ ), ${ }^{190}$ who mediated between the sellers and the possible purchaser. However, the Prince-bishop of Trento finally withdrew from the business since he found the price too high. Eventually it was Johannes Fabri, Bishop of Vienna (1478-1541), who purchased the majority of Cuspinianus's library: 636 volumes. ${ }^{191}$

However, in accordance with the three book-plates glued to the pastedown of the front board, the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 could not be among the 636 books purchased by Bishop Fabri, since Cuspinianus's exlibris is followed by Alexander Brassicanus's exlibris together with his notation of ownership. ${ }^{192}$ Consequently, the next possessor of the manuscript after Cuspinianus was Brassicanus. For the time being, it cannot be revealed

[^45]exactly how and when the codex became part of the stock of Brassicanus's library: whether he acquired it in Cuspinianus's lifetime or only after his death. Anyway, from this respect, the history of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 is not exceptional at all: for instance, the Zonaras codex (ÖNB Hist. Gr. 16) first possessed by Cuspinianus was later acquired by Brassicanus and finally became part of Bishop Fabri's book collection. ${ }^{193}$

In a recent article András Németh examined Brassicanus's inventory of bequest (Inventarium bonorum doctoris Jo<ha>n<i>s Alexandri Brassicani) now kept in the Archiv der Universität Wien under the signature Fasc. 49 Nr. $100 .{ }^{194}$ The inventory consisting of 48 folios was compiled in December 1539, shortly after Brassicanus's death, it lists 1369 items the majority of which - with the exception of approximately 50 items - are books. ${ }^{195}$ The importance of the inventory lies in the fact that it contains Brassicanus's properties listed in the order of their placement in Brassicanus's house. Thus, the inventory can show us how, according to which system Brassicanus, the Viennese bibliophile organized his books into groups within his collection. However, the inventory does not provide ample data on the books listed, which makes the identification of the single items on the list more difficult. ${ }^{196}$ In the inventory, on f .27 v , we can find the following item: "Lexicon grecum manuscriptum in arcum" (no. 825). Although the inventory is unfortunately very laconic also about this item, Németh cautiously identifies it with the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. $45 .{ }^{197}$ Not surprisingly, the dictionary was grouped together with Greek authors and Greek grammars in Brassicanus's book collection according to the inventory reflecting the placement of the items listed. ${ }^{198}$

[^46]After his death in 1539 Brassicanus's library was also purchased by Johann Faber: he managed to enlarge his book collection with 1324 new items through this business. ${ }^{199}$ The manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 must have been among these 1324 books purchased by the bishop. In his last will and testament written in 1540 the bishop bequeathed his complete book collection to the Collegium Sancti Nicolai, which he founded in 1531. This act of bequest is recorded in Fabri's exlibris dated to 1 September $1540,{ }^{200}$ which can also be found in the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Eventually Bishop Fabri died on 20 May 1541, his book collection landed in the Collegium Sancti Nicolai that time in accordance with his last will. The extensive collection was relocated from the Collegium to the old Universitätsbibliothek in 1718, and finally the collection landed in the Hofbibliothek in 1756 upon Maria Theresa's request after the Viennese Universitätsbibliothek had been wound up. ${ }^{201}$

[^47]
## 5 Summary

At the end of this chapter, it seems to be appropriate to summarize quickly the phases in the reconstructed history of the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. In the middle of the $15^{\text {th }}$ century, around 1450 the manuscript was copied in Italy, with all probability in Ferrara. Janus Pannonius possibly used it during his studies in Guarino's school and then he brought along the codex when he returned to Hungary in 1459 . After his death in 1472, it was confiscated for the royal library of King Matthias Corvinus together with his other books. Between 1483 and 1484, Taddeo Ugoleto, the royal librarian used the codex for adding notes to his own dictionary. Thus, the codex was presumably still part of the stock of the Corvinian library or at least was in its proximity then.

From the royal library, Johann Cuspinianus obtained the manuscript during one of his visits to Buda between 1510 and 1515. His visits to Hungary were most numerous in 1513 and 1514, thus one might take the risk of narrowing down the possible years for Cuspinianus's acquisition of the codex to 1513 and 1514. After Cuspinianus - in accordance with the order of the book-plates glued on the pastedown of the front board - Brassicanus was the next possessor of the codex, who obtained it after Cuspinianus's death in 1529 at the latest. When Brassicanus died in 1539 , Bishop Fabri purchased his book collection and became possessor of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 as well. He bequeathed it to the Collegium Sancti Nicolai and finally the codex landed in the Hofbibliothek in 1756 after the Viennese Universitätsbibliothek had been wound up.

## III The Textual History of the Manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45

This chapter deals with the textual history of the extensive Greek-Latin dictionary occupying the major part of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. First, a short overview of the relevant literature is provided outlining how and to what extent the issue has been discussed earlier. Then the $8^{\text {th }}$-century codex Harleianus is presented that contains the oldest extant Greek-Latin dictionary counting as the indirect source of the Greek-Latin wordlist in the Vienna manuscript.
The dictionary became widespread in Europe from the $15^{\text {th }}$ century on: numerous manuscripts from the $15^{\text {th }}$ and $16^{\text {th }}$ centuries have been collected in this chapter that well illustrate this process. These codices recentiores also count as possible candidates in our quest of contemporary Greek-Latin dictionaries more closely related to the one found in the Vienna manuscript on the level of textual tradition. Four of the more recent codices that I had the possibility to study and analyse thoroughly are collated with the Greek-Latin dictionary of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, which gives an insight into the the methodology of mapping the textual background of the Vienna manuscript. Moreover, in the process of the collation, a contemporary manuscript has been identified that seems to be related more closely to the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 through the textual tradition of its lexicographical content. The relevant manuscript is presented in details in this chapter and is contrasted to the textual tradition and lexicographical content of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45.

## 1 Literary overview and the codex Harleianus 5792

In the Hungarian specialized literature, Csaba Csapodi boldly assumed that Janus Pannonius was not only the scribe of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 , but he was even the compiler of the extensive Greek-Latin vocabulary list found in the codex. ${ }^{202}$ This supposition was refuted by István Kapitánffy, ${ }^{203}$ who found out that the Greek-Latin dictionary in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 indirectly goes back to the Greek-Latin dictionary found in the codex Harleianus 5792 published in the second volume of the series Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum. ${ }^{204}$ In the international specialized literature discussing or touching upon the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, the assumption that Janus Pannonius was the compiler of the Greek-Latin dictionary does not appear; Janus only tends to be indicated as the scribe of the manuscript in several sources. ${ }^{205}$ In the most up-to-date description of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, the codex Harleianus 5792 as edited in CGL II is given as the indirect source of the Greek-Latin dictionary in the Vienna codex. ${ }^{206}$
The manuscript Harleianus 5792 is a parchment codex now kept at the British Library, in London. The full manuscript has been digitized and it is available online at the website of the British Library for the purposes of studying. ${ }^{207}$ A description of the manuscript can be found in the preface to the second volume of the series Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum. ${ }^{208} \mathrm{~A}$ more

[^48]up-to-date description with a list of relevant bibliography is available again online at the website of the British Library. ${ }^{209}$

The content of the manuscript ${ }^{210}$ can be divided into two groups. The first part of the manuscript (ff. 1v-272r) contains lexicographical texts: an extensive Greek-Latin glossary (ff. 1v-240v) attributed to Cyril and therefore known as Pseudo-Cyril in the literature, ${ }^{211}$ a Latin-Greek wordlist (ff. $241 \mathrm{r}-259 \mathrm{v}$ ) organized as idiomata generum, ${ }^{212}$ a list of Latin synonyms with some Greek equivalents (ff. 260r-267r) attributed to Cicero, then a further list of Latin synonyms (ff. 268v-272r) follows. The second part of the codex (ff. 273r-276v) contains medical texts: a note on the virtues and ingredients of one medicine (f. 273r) and a collection of medical recipes (ff. 273v-276v). The manuscript is dated to the $8^{\text {th }}$ century: the first part is dated after 730, while the second part is dated to the second half of the $8^{\text {th }}$ century. ${ }^{213}$

In Western Europe the manuscript only reappeared in the 1430s, when Nicolaus Cusanus (Nicholas of Cues, 1401-1464) brought it with him to the Council of Basle, which began in $1431 .{ }^{214}$ Then in the $18^{\text {th }}$ century the manuscript became part of the Harley Collection, when the bookseller Nathaniel Noel bought it together with other manuscripts from Cusanus's collection for Edward Harley. Harley's heirs sold the manuscript with the other codices of the Harley Collection to the British nation which formed one of the foundation collections of the British Library. ${ }^{215}$ The binding of the manuscript is a modern "Harleian" binding of gilt-tooled red morocco that can be attributed to Christopher Chapman. ${ }^{216}$

[^49]The Greek-Latin dictionary, that is the indirect ancestor of the Greek-Latin vocabulary list found in the Vienna manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 can be found at the very beginning of the manuscript, on ff. $1 \mathrm{v}-240 \mathrm{v}$. On a page, one can find two columns written in uncial script: the first one contains the Greek lemmas, while the second one has their Latin equivalents. Usually 3438 lines can be found on a page. Unfortunately, we do not know much about the origin and compilation of the extensive dictionary. Dionisotti assumes that it must have had multiple sources difficult to identify due to the efficient technique of editing: the wordlist is alphabetized to six or even more letters, the nouns tend to be indicated in the nominative and verbs in the first person singular present indicative. However, according to Dionisotti, some lemmas seem to reveal that one source of the dictionary was a Latin-Greek wordlist turned inside out mechanically. ${ }^{217}$ Moreover, mistakes seem to suggest that the compiler of the dictionary was not a Latin speaker. Dionisotti concludes that in spite of the supposed Eastern sources of the Greek-Latin dictionary, in its final form it seems to have been compiled for Western users, perhaps in Byzantine Italy. Probably it was also copied in Italy into the earliest known manuscript, the Harleianus $5792 .{ }^{218}$ However, this is all we know about the diffusion of this Greek-Latin dictionary before the $15^{\text {th }}$ century.
There is, actually, another early copy of the dictionary in the manuscript Laudunensis 444 written in the $9^{\text {th }}$ century, in Gaul. The dictionary is found at the beginning of the manuscript, on ff . $5 \mathrm{r}-255 \mathrm{v}$ and has the inscription "Incipit glossarium grecum per ordinem alphabeti." ${ }^{219}$ It has a number of variant readings (both Greek and Latin) that are more correct than in the codex Harleianus. However, Goetz proved that these are rather emendations and cannot be attributed to the use of an independent source. ${ }^{220}$ Thus, a lost intermediary copy is to be assumed between the Harleianus and the Laudunensis codices ${ }^{221}$ they seem to represent different stages of the textual tradition of the Greek-Latin dictionary.

[^50]
## 2 Codices recentiores stemming from the cod. Harleianus 5792

The Greek-Latin dictionary as known in the codex Harleianus 5792 thus reappears in Europe when Nicolaus Cusanus brings the $8^{\text {th }}$-century manuscript to the Council of Basle beginning in 1431. From then onwards, numerous copies of the dictionary were made and the wordlist quickly became widespread throughout Europe. ${ }^{222}$

In the preface to the second volume of the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum, Goetz lists ten codices from the $15^{\text {th }}$ and $16^{\text {th }}$ centuries that contain the GreekLatin dictionary indirectly stemming from the codex Harleianus 5792. ${ }^{223}$ These ten codices are as follows:

1) Cod. Vallicellianus B 31. The $15^{\text {th }}$-century paper codex contains the Greek-Latin dictionary on ff. 144r/a-242r/b. ${ }^{224}$ The Latin-Greek idiomata generum can also be found in the manuscript. ${ }^{225}$
2) Bibliothecae aedilium Flor. eccles. cod. CCXIX. The paper codex from the $15^{\text {th }}$ century contains 265 folios. ${ }^{226}$
3) Cod. Laurent. "acquisti 92." The paper codex from the $15^{\text {th }} / 16^{\text {th }}$ century consists of 158 folios. It is similar to the preceding codex Bibl. aed. Flor. eccles. no. CCXIX to such extent that with all probability this codex was transcribed either directly from that one or from the same source text. ${ }^{227}$ The manuscript was once owned by Francesco da Castiglione. ${ }^{228}$
4) Cod. Laurent. 57, 16. The paper codex from the $15^{\text {th }} / 16^{\text {th }}$ century contains 328 folios. The Greek-Latin dictionary in the manuscript is not complete; it ends with T , with the lemma pair T $\rho i ́ \pi \omega \lambda \alpha$ Trige, pluraliter tantum. ${ }^{229}$

[^51]5) Cod. Escurial $\Sigma$ I 12. The $15^{\text {th }}$-century manuscript contains the GreekLatin dictionary on ff. 91r-293r. ${ }^{230}$
6) Cod. Parisinus lat. 2320 A. The manuscript contains both the Greek-Latin dictionary and the Latin-Greek idiomata generum also found in the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. The lexicographical section on ff. 52-158 was written at the end of the $15^{\text {th }}$ century or in the $16^{\text {th }}$ century. ${ }^{231}$
7) Cod. Parisinus gr. 2627. The parchment codex from the $15^{\text {th }} / 16^{\text {th }}$ century contains 111 folios. The Greek-Latin dictionary is found on ff. 1-102. ${ }^{232}$ According to the manuscript description, the dictionary in the codex starts with the word pair 'A $\beta \alpha \rho \eta{ }^{\prime} \varsigma$ non gravis, ${ }^{233}$ which is the third lemma pair in the Greek-Latin dictionary found in the codex Harleianus 5792 and in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Thus, the original first two lemma pairs are missing in the Greek-Latin dictionary of the codex Parisinus gr. 2627. The manuscript also contains the idiomata generum found in the codex Harleianus 5792, although here the Greek lemmas precede the Latin ones. ${ }^{234}$
8) Cod. Parisinus gr. 2628. The parchment codex from the end of the $15^{\text {th }}$ century contains 395 folios. It was copied by Georgius Hermonymus Spartanus. ${ }^{235}$ According to the short manuscript description, the first lemma pair in the Greek-Latin dictionary is "Aגлtos Intangibilis, innocuus, ${ }^{236}$ which differs from the first lemma pair found in the codex Harleianus 5792 and in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45.
9) Cod. Cantabrigiensis bibliothecae universitatis 979 . Kk V. 12. The paper codex consists of 120 folios. On each page of the Greek-Latin dictionary having the title Glossarium Graeco-Latinum Philoxeni one can find four columns: two columns of Greek lemmas and two other columns containing their Latin equivalents. However, the Latin equivalents are missing after the lemma $\varepsilon \cup \cup \varepsilon \pi i ́ \lambda \eta \pi \tau \circ \varsigma$. The Greek writing can be dated to the beginning of the $16^{\text {th }}$ century, while the Latin part was not written by a single hand; the later of

[^52]the two hands seems to belong to the $17^{\text {th }}$ century. The Greek-Latin dictionary starts with the lemma pair 'A $\beta \alpha \rho \eta^{\prime}$ ' non gravis similarly as in the codex Parisinus gr. 2627. The manuscript also contains the Latin-Greek idiomata generum found in the codex Harleianus 5792. However, the Latin equivalents are again missing in the Cambridge codex. ${ }^{237}$
10) Cod. Neapolitanus II D 34 . Goetz mentions this manuscript very briefly: the only information he provides is that here the Greek and Latin lemmas appear in a reversed order. ${ }^{238}$ A detailed description can be found in a manuscript catalogue by Maria Rosa Formentin. ${ }^{239}$ Here one can learn that the $15^{\text {th }}$-century manuscript contains a Greek-Latin dictionary on ff. 3-318. The wordlist starts with the lemma pair $\dot{\alpha} \beta \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \tau \varepsilon \rho o s ~ i n e p t u s$, stultus. In the codex, several pages are left completely or partly empty; perhaps the scribe intended to add new lemmas there later. According to Formentin, the scribe was also the author of this lexicon. ${ }^{240}$ Formentin's description is thus in contrast to Goetz's statement claiming that this manuscript contains the Greek-Latin dictionary of the Harleian manuscript in a reversed order. In this case, with most probability, Goetz is mistaken: he did not see the original Neapolitan manuscript, only excerpts made by Adolf Holm. ${ }^{241}$ It is thus more probable that Formentin is right and this Neapolitan manuscript contains an uncompleted experiment for an independent dictionary rather than a version of the Greek-Latin dictionary found in the codex Harleianus 5792. ${ }^{242}$ In this case, this manuscript is to be deleted from the list of codices stemming from the $8^{\text {th }}$-century codex Harleianus.

According to Goetz, out of the ten manuscripts he listed the codices Vallicellianus B 31 and Parisinus gr. 2627 are the closest to the codex Harleianus 5792 if one compares the texts of the Greek-Latin dictionaries

[^53]found in these manuscripts, while from this respect the manuscripts Laurent. 57, 16 and Parisinus gr. 2628 are the furthest. The latter two manuscripts contain numerous interpolations and the original order of the lemmas is also often altered. ${ }^{243}$
Apart from the ten $15^{\text {th }} / 16^{\text {th }}$-century codices listed by Goetz, there are several further codices in libraries and manuscript collections worldwide that also contain the Greek-Latin dictionary indirectly stemming from the version found in the codex Harleianus 5792. To start with, the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, the very subject of this book is such a codex that contains the Greek-Latin dictionary but is missing from Goetz's list. In the manuscript collection of the Austrian National Library (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek), a further manuscript, ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 47 also contains the same Greek-Latin dictionary on ff. 3r-94r. ${ }^{244}$
In the manuscript collection of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich one can also find two manuscripts that contain the Greek-Latin dictionary: Mon. gr. 142 and 253 - in the latter one only a part of the complete dictionary can be read. ${ }^{245}$

In Naples, in the Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli, apart from the codex Neapolitanus II D 34 listed by Goetz, a further manuscript, cod. Neap. II D 33 also contains the Greek-Latin dictionary. ${ }^{246}$ The paper codex from the end of the $15^{\text {th }}$ century contains the originally Greek-Latin dictionary on ff. 1-249. However, here the dictionary was reversed to a Latin-Greek wordlist by changing the original order of the Greek and Latin lemmas. The dictionary starts with the lemma pair Non gravis $\dot{\alpha} \beta \alpha \rho \eta ́ \varsigma$, which is the third lemma pair in the Greek-Latin dictionary found in the codex Harleianus 5792. On ff. 249-252v the manuscript also contains Latin-Greek idiomata generum. The Latin and the Greek parts were written by the same hand throughout the codex. ${ }^{247}$

[^54]In Basle, one can also find a manuscript containing the Greek-Latin dictionary attributed to Pseudo-Cyril: the codex Basil. A III 17. ${ }^{248}$ The paper codex from the $15^{\text {th }}$ century contains the Greek-Latin dictionary on ff. 380-512 and according to Dionisotti it is probably a direct copy of the codex Harleianus 5792 made for John of Ragusa. ${ }^{249}$ After his death in Basle in 1443, the Dominicans there inherited the manuscript. ${ }^{250}$ The dictionary is bound together with the works of Cyril, ${ }^{251}$ which were written by a different hand. This manuscript was used for the editio princeps of Stephanus's lexicon in 1573. ${ }^{252}$

In his book published in 2010, Paul Botley lists two further manuscripts that contain the Greek-Latin dictionary attributed to Cyril of Alexandria: at the Yale University Library the codex Beinecke 291 (on ff. 1r-151v) copied by the scribe Phanourios Karabelos for Michael Ialinas in Italy in $1489^{253}$ and in Milan, in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana the codex B. 46 sup. olim T. 211 (gr. 90) possessed by Giorgio Merula. ${ }^{254}$ However, in these two cases Botley seems to be mistaken; ${ }^{255}$ both manuscripts contain a Greek monolingual lexicon attributed to Cyril of Alexandria instead of the bilingual Greek-Latin wordlist according to the manuscript description of the cod. Beinecke $291^{256}$ and that

[^55]of the Milanese codex. ${ }^{257}$ Thus, these two manuscripts cannot be included in the list collecting contemporary manuscripts related to ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45.

It is also possible that some $15^{\text {th }}$-century manuscripts kept at the Topkapi Palace, Istanbul also contain the Greek-Latin dictionary and/or the LatinGreek idiomata generum found in the codex Harleianus 5792. In his earlier writing, Mordtmann lists two Greek-Latin glossaries among the codices kept in the Topkapi Palace, ${ }^{258}$ while in a later paper he mentions a Greek-Latin lexicon and a Latin-Greek vocabulary. ${ }^{29}$ Gaselee mentions two manuscripts that might be of interest regarding the textual tradition of the Greek-Latin dictionary and the Latin-Greek idiomata generum in the Harley manuscript: a "Lexicon Graeco-Latinum" (no. 23, paper codex from the $15^{\text {th }}$ century) and a "Lexicon Latino-Graecum et Graeco-Latinum" (no. 30, paper codex from the $15^{\text {th }}$ century). ${ }^{260}$ In his list, Deissmann also mentions the same manuscripts listed by Gaselee earlier, ${ }^{261}$ but this time Deissmann provides sligthly more information about the manuscripts: for instance, he describes the binding of the two manuscripts, he claims that the two paper codices are in good condition, and he also tells the readers that one of them (no. 30) has several notes added by later hands. However, no information is provided about the dictionaries found in these manuscripts (e.g. incipit, explicit) that would help us to decide whether they are connected to the Greek-Latin dictionary and/or to the Latin-Greek idiomata in the Harley codex through their textual tradition.

Ideally, the thorough examination and collation of all extant manuscripts known from the $15^{\text {th }}$ and $16^{\text {th }}$ centuries that contain the Greek-Latin dictionary of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 would help us to identify the exact place of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 in the textual tradition of the Greek-Latin wordlist and to find the closest relatives of the Vienna manuscript regarding the textual history of the bilingual vocabularium. However, the high number of more recent

[^56]manuscripts containing the same lexicon raises difficulties: Goetz already lists nine related manuscripts ${ }^{262}$ to which five further codices have been added above; these codices recentiores are scattered mainly in the libraries and manuscript collections of Europe. Moreover, with all probability the list could be extended with further manuscripts since the Greek-Latin dictionary was very widespread due to practical reasons.
The detailed analysis and collation of all the 14 codices recentiores collected above is beyond the scope of the present book focusing on the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. In what follows, four manuscripts will be presented and collated with ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45: ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 47 (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek), Mon. gr. 142 and 253 (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek) and $\Sigma$ I 12 (Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo de El Escorial). I had the possibility to study the original manuscripts in Vienna and in Munich, while I used the digitized version of the Greek-Latin dictionary in the Madrid manuscript. Naturally, the examination and collation of these four manuscripts do not provide us with an absolute answer to the question how to place the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 among the other contemporary codices recentiores, but trends can be observed effectively that can also help later research work in this issue.

### 2.1 Collating the Greek-Latin vocabulary lists in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and 47

The parchment ${ }^{263}$ codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 47 from the middle of the $15^{\text {th }}$ century consists of 101 folios. ${ }^{264}$ Its size is $275 / 280 \times 200 / 205 \mathrm{~mm}$ and it has brown blindstamped leather binding with wickerwork pattern ("Flechtwerkmuster") made of calfskin. ${ }^{265}$

On the recto of f. 1, Latin and Hebrew alphabets can be found. The folios 1 v and 2 r are blank. On the verso of f .2 one can find a Greek alphabet (Alfabetum

[^57]grecorum), where variant letter forms (minuscule and majuscule), the corresponding Latin minuscules and the Greek pronunciation in Latin letters are given. The Latin transcription of the Greek pronunciation reflects the contemporary Greek pronunciation (e.g. $\beta=$ vita; $\eta=$ hita; $\sigma=\operatorname{sima} ; v=i p s i l o$ ). This is followed by a section with the title "Diptongi[!] qui scribuntur et non proferuntur:" here the diphthongs ai, ei, oi, ou with their pronunciation (e, $i$, $i$, and $u$ respectively) are given. After this, one can find the declination of the Greek definite article in masculine (Articuli praepositivi masculini generis ${ }^{266}$ ), feminine (femenini[!] generis) and neuter (Neutri generis). At the bottom of the page the handwritten exlibris of Bishop Fabri can be read, which was written by one of the bishop's clergymen, Leonhard Frey. ${ }^{267}$

The Greek-Latin dictionary occupies the major part of the codex, from f . 3 r to 94 r. It has no separate title in the handwriting as opposed to Suppl. Gr.

 Veronese's Erotemata ( $\alpha \pi o ̀ ~ \tau \tilde{\omega} v \pi \rho o \sigma \omega \delta i \omega ̃ v ~ \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \omega \tau \eta \dot{\mu} \mu \tau \alpha$ ) can be read. ${ }^{268}$ This section again ends with a kolophon, ${ }^{269}$ which reveals that the scribe responsible for this part ${ }^{270}$ was Christophoros Persona Romaios (ca. 1416-1485).

[^58]He lived in Rome and he was the prefect of the Bibliotheca Vaticana from $1484 .{ }^{271} \mathrm{He}$ was above all known as the translator of Greek authors (e.g. of the Byzantine historian Agathias). ${ }^{272}$

As the kolophon on f. 101r informs us, the manuscript was copied for an unnamed bishop from Kaffa - in Bick's opinion it was Bishop Jacobus Campora, who was appointed by Pope Eugene IV. ${ }^{273}$ Then the codex was possessed by Johannes Cuspinianus, who left the signature 433 in f. 1r. ${ }^{274}$ Afterwards the manuscript landed in the library of Bishop Fabri, whose exlibris is fixed to the pastedown pasted to the inner side of the front cover. Finally it became part of the stock of the University Library in Vienna.

The first page of the Greek-Latin dictionary (f. 3r) is illuminated. The columns are framed in all four margins with waving creeper-decoration with fanformed ornament. The big initial letter alpha is decorated with fine golden lines. ${ }^{275}$ In the dictionary the word-initial letters of the Greek lemmas are written with red ink, whereas the other letters are light brown. On some of the pages the letters which had become fainter or were less visible due to the particularities of the parchment pages (mostly on hair sides) were later rewritten and strengthened with a much darker brown ink. At the beginning of each letter in the Greek alphabet starting from beta a bigger initial letter in red usually occupying more than a line was intended, but the emphatic red initial letter was only inserted at the beginning of beta (f. 16r). In the case of the other letters one can only see the empty space left for the initial letter.

As for the layout of the dictionary, on a page one can see four columns: the first and the third columns contain the Greek lemmas and the second and the fourth the Latin equivalents respectively. Furthermore, compared

[^59]to the number of lines in a column in Suppl. Gr. 45, in Suppl. Gr. 47 there are more lines, their number ranges from 34 to even 40 or 41 . Thus, there is less space for the lemmas, which inevitably affects the content of the dictionary. The lines are not ruled, only the borders of the four columns are indicated with vertical ruling on each of the pages.
The text in the wordlist was written with small, neat letters. First, the word-initial Greek letters were written down in red ink, the rest of the Greek words were only added afterwards in light brown ink. Aspiration marks are only inserted when the word-initial vowel bears the stress, as well. In this case, aspiration and stress were written in light brown ink. If another vowel bears the stress, then the aspiration mark is missing, it is not inserted later in light brown ink. ${ }^{276}$ The usual abbreviations are used both in the Latin and in the Greek words.
When scrutinizing the dictionary in Suppl. Gr. 47, one can discover a few scribal errors which happened in the course of the transcription. On f. 36r col. II, 4-5 the Latin equivalents of the word pairs $\varepsilon \cup \cup \alpha \varphi \eta \varsigma^{c}$ ingenuitas (CGL II 316, 22) and củyと́veıo tractabilis (CGL II 316, 23) had been accidentally transposed. The error was corrected by the same hand: a small letter $b$ was written before the Latin word ingenuitas and a small letter $a$ was added before tractabilis. Moreover, the Greek lemmas are connected with their matching Latin equivalents with single lines, which is a usual way of correcting such scribal errors in Suppl. Gr. 45. However, in Suppl. Gr. 45 these two word pairs were copied without scribal error, cf. 113v 1-2. On f. 6v in Suppl. Gr. 47 the scribe erroneously copied again the Latin equivalent (inconsultus) of the
 $\dot{\alpha} v \varepsilon \xi i ́ \kappa \alpha \kappa о \varsigma(C G L ~ I I ~ 225, ~ 59) . ~ H e r e, ~ t h e ~ e r r o r ~ r e m a i n e d ~ u n n o t i c e d . ~ S u p p l . ~ G r . ~$ 45 displays no scribal error here, cf. 15v 1-2. However, such scribal errors occur in far less number in Suppl. Gr. 47 than in Suppl. Gr. 45.

I have chosen to collate the lemmas starting with alpha in Suppl. Gr. 45 and 47 basically for two reasons. Firstly, the number of the lemmas starting with alpha (more than 2300) is high enough to provide us with reasonable material to draw conclusions. Secondly, in the codex Harleianus there is an extensive lacuna between the lemmas $\mathrm{A} \lambda_{1} \xi$ hocallex' singularitertantum declinabitur


[^60]loss of a bifolium, ${ }^{277}$ and it is important for the textual tradition to observe how Suppl. Gr. 47 treats this lacuna as compared to Suppl. Gr. 45 , where the lacuna is filled with 121 word pairs ( $12 \mathrm{r} 11-14 \mathrm{v} 1$ ).
The lacuna found in the codex Harleianus is present only partly in Suppl. Gr. 47. First, there is a lacuna between 6 r II, 12 ( $\alpha \lambda \lambda$ д $\tau \varepsilon$ alias) and 13 ( $\alpha v \alpha \beta \alpha i v \omega$ ascendo) in Suppl. Gr. 47, whereas Suppl. Gr. 45 has 45 word pairs between the two lemmas (from 12v 7 to 13r 26). Then a few lemmas later another lacuna starts in Suppl. Gr. 47 between 6r II, 22 ( $\alpha v o ́ \gamma v \omega \sigma \iota$ recitatio) and 23 ( $\alpha v \delta \rho o ́ \kappa \kappa \omega[!] ~ p o r t u l a c a), ~ w h e r e ~ S u p p l . ~ G r . ~ 45 ~ d i s p l a y s ~ 41 ~ w o r d ~ p a i r s ~(f r o m ~ 13 v ~$ 13 to 14 v 2 ). However, a part of the lemmas are not missing from the whole of Suppl. Gr. 47: 19 of them had been inserted between 6v I, 4 ( $\dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\theta} \theta \varepsilon ı \alpha ~ r u d i t a s) ~$ and 6v I, 21 ( $\alpha \mu \varepsilon i ́ ß o \mu \alpha ı ~ a l t e r n o ; ~ a n d ~ 6 v ~ I, ~ 22 ~ \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon i ́ ß \eta ~ غ ̇ \pi ı \sigma \tau о \lambda \eta ́ ~ m u t u a ~ e p i s t o l a), ~$ where they do not fit the alphabetical order.

Apart from the lacunas already mentioned, there is a further lacuna in the
 35 (aîysıpos alnus) in Suppl. Gr. 47, one can find 72 extra lemmas in Suppl. Gr. 45 (between 5 r 18 and 6 v 11 ). A folio might have either been skipped by the scribe in the course of the transcription or been completely missing from the source text, as the number of the missing lemmas would be approximately equivalent to the number of lemmas to be found on two pages.

Suppl. Gr. 47 shares a common lacuna with Suppl. Gr. 45 compared to the codex Harleianus: between 71v 19 ( $\delta$ ıó $\theta \omega \omega \sigma \iota$ correctio, emendatio) and 71 v 20 ( $\delta$ ívypoc humidus) in Suppl. Gr. 45 and between 23v II, 29 ( $\delta$ เó $\theta \omega \sigma$ ся correctio) and 30 ( ('́vypos liquidus) in Suppl. Gr. 47 one can find 38 extra word pairs in the codex Harleianus (CGL II 278, 28 -279, 10). However, in both Vienna manuscripts the missing lemmas are inserted after the Greek lemma סoү $\mu \alpha$ тí $\omega$ ( 72 r 25 in Suppl. Gr. 45, and 24r I,15 in Suppl. Gr. 47), which obviously causes disorder in the alphabetic sequence of the lemmas. After the Greek lemma סoy $\mu \alpha \tau$ ıкó (CGL II 279, 43), the two Vienna codices are again in agreement with the codex Harleianus.

After dealing with the lacunas, I intend to discuss some further differences between the two codices which came out during the collation of the alpha sections in both vocabulary lists. The first and most striking difference is the smaller number of Latin equivalents given in Suppl. Gr. 47. Due to the layout of four columns per page, in most of the cases there is no enough

[^61]space for all of the Latin equivalents listed in Suppl. Gr. 45. For instance, if we compare the lemmas on 1r in Suppl. Gr. 45 with those in Suppl. Gr. 47, we will find that in the case of 10 lemmas (Suppl. Gr. $451 \mathrm{r} 8,9,10,13,16$, $21,23,24,25$ and 26) out of 26 only one Latin equivalent is given in Suppl. Gr. 47, whereas Suppl. Gr. 45 has more than one (Table $1^{278}$ ). This tendency is characteristic of the whole of Suppl. Gr. 47. However, in a few cases, the opposite of this phenomenon can also be observed: Suppl. Gr. 47 has more Latin equivalents, than Suppl. Gr. $45 .{ }^{279}$

Again, due to the lack of space, longer Greek lemmas are often shortened. In most of the cases, where there is a short definition next to the Greek lemma in Suppl. Gr. 45 (and in the codex Harleianus), it is omitted in Suppl. Gr. 47. ${ }^{280}$ This strategy is characteristic even when the insertion of the short definitions is intended to highlight different meanings of the same Greek words. For instance, on 44r, lines $24-25$ we can find the following word
 $\dot{\delta} \mu \grave{\mu} \varphi \theta$ ovôv nulli invidens, sine invidia, where the short definition/synonym highlights the difference in meaning. However, in Suppl. Gr. 47, 15r one can only find the Greek word ${ }^{\circ}$ ¢ $\rho \theta$ ovoc in two consecutive lines. In some cases, the definition added to the Greek lemma is not deleted completely, it is just
 caprile, while we can find a shortened version of the Greek lemma in Suppl. Gr. 47, 4r: גiyஸ́v, ó тóлос caprile. However, in some cases the whole Greek lemma is retained in Suppl. Gr. 47, as well. ${ }^{281}$
In several cases, the Latin equivalents are different in Suppl. Gr. 47 and in Suppl. Gr. $45{ }^{282}$ In these cases, Suppl. Gr. 47 often agrees with the version found in the codex Harleianus as opposed to Suppl. Gr. 45.

Compared to Suppl. Gr. 45 , Suppl. Gr. 47 lacks several lemmas. A part of them is missing from Goetz's edition of the codex Harleianus, ${ }^{283}$ while another part

[^62]is present both in the Harleianus and in Suppl. Gr. $45 .{ }^{284} \mathrm{However}$, in few cases, extra lemmas can be found in Suppl. Gr. 47, although it is quite rare (e.g. after the matching lemmas of Suppl. Gr. $45,5 \mathrm{r} 6 ; 17 \mathrm{r} 3 ; 19 \mathrm{v} 11 ; 30 \mathrm{r} 4 ; 41 \mathrm{r} 15 \mathrm{etc}$.).

In Suppl. Gr. 47 we can rarely find additions written by another hand. For instance, next to the lemma Suppl. Gr. 47,58v II, 17 ö $\lambda \omega \varsigma$ omnino, another hand entered the Latin synonym totaliter with darker ink and with a bit square handwriting. The same hand might have noted intende next to the lemma Suppl. Gr. 47, 72r I, $34 \pi$ рóб $\chi \varepsilon \varsigma$ adverte. The Latin equivalents adverte and intende are both present in Suppl. Gr. 45, 231r 14. One can find only a few additional word pairs entered in the margins (Suppl. Gr. 47, 20r II, 20; 38v I, 20; 92r II, 1-2).

All in all, the major differences in the existence of lacunas even in the alpha section clearly suggest that the two versions of the extensive GreekLatin dictionary in the Vienna codices, Suppl. Gr. 45 and 47 are not related directly. This assumption is further supported by the fact that Suppl. Gr. 47 tends to contain shortened Greek lemmas and a reduced number of Latin equivalents, which often show significant divergence form the ones in Suppl. Gr. 45. Moreover, several individual lemmas present in Suppl. Gr. 45 (and in the codex Harleianus) are missing from Suppl. Gr. 47, which seems to be a further argument against the direct relationship of the two versions of the dictionary.

[^63]
### 2.2 Collating the Greek-Latin dictionaries in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, Mon. Gr. 142 and 253

Two codices now kept in the manuscript collection of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich also contain the same Greek-Latin dictionary as the one found in the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. The two Munich codices are closely connected from several viewpoints: through their material (paper), provenience and numerous common textual characteristics of their GreekLatin dictionaries. The significant connections between the two manuscripts justify their discussion in the same subchapter.

The paper codex Mon. Gr. 142 from about 1435 consists of 221 numbered folios; its size is $292 \times 212 \mathrm{~mm}$. ${ }^{285}$ The other Munich manuscript, Mon. Gr. 253 is again a paper codex from the $15^{\text {th }}$ century (again around 1435?) containing 166 numbered folios. ${ }^{286}$ The manuscripts have the same type of binding: late Gothic wooden boards partly bound in brown leather, ordered by one of their possessors, Hartmann Schedel in the $15^{\text {th }}$ century, in Nuremberg. The bindings are decorated with blind-tooled lines and different single stamps with blind impression: eagle in quadrat and lily in rhomboid were used for the binding of Mon. Gr. 142, and another floral pattern was used for Mon. Gr. 253. On the upper wooden boards of both manuscripts, a small piece of parchment can be found with the Latin indication of the content of the manuscripts (Mon. Gr. 142: Liber grecus cum declaracione latina; Mon. Gr. 253: Diversa erotemata greca? cum vocabulis) and under that, two signatures are present (from the Hörwarth catalogue and that of the Schedel library within the Fugger library; the latter one on Mon. Gr. 142 is only visible in ultraviolet light ${ }^{287}$ ).

[^64]The first part of the manuscript Mon. Gr. 142 contains various lexicographical works and other teaching materials. ${ }^{288}$ The codex starts with the GreekLatin dictionary (ff. $1 \mathrm{r}-102 \mathrm{r}$ ) also present in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45; the dictionary has no separate title in the Munich manuscript. Within the dictionary, on a separate sheet (f. 41Ar), various excerpts from the New Testament are inserted. On ff. 103r-142v, material from the Hermeneumata Monacensia was copied: ${ }^{289}$ an alphabetically organized Greek-Latin word list (ff. 104v-123v), a further Greek-Latin word list organized in thematic groups (ff. 124r-139r) and colloquia (Greek-Latin text for practising; ff. 139v-142v). On ff. 143r160 v , an alphabetic index to the previous hermeneuma material is provided: the Latin words appearing in the alphabetical and thematic word lists and in the colloquia are organized alphabetically so that the readers of the manuscript could also use this part as a Latin-Greek word list. Again, a sheet is inserted in the manuscript after f. 115: on one side (f. 115Ar) parts from the work Canones ex epistulis 53 et 54 by Basilius Caesariensis can be read, while the other side (f. 115Av) has some excerpts from Epistula canonica ad Domnum by Cyrillus Alexandrinus with interlinear translation.

The rest of the manuscript Mon. Gr. 142 contains no more lexicographical works. On ff. 162r-173v, an excerpt from the New Testament can be found: the text is found in Latin on the left-hand side of the pages and in Greek on the right-hand side. Then comes a speech by Demetrius Hyaleas Constantinoplitanus (ff. 174r-185r) addressed to the participants of the Council of Basle, the text also has interlinear Latin translation. The speech on ff. $174 \mathrm{r}, 175 \mathrm{r}-185 \mathrm{r}$ is an autograph written by Demetrius Hyaleas Constantinopolitanus. ${ }^{290}$ It is followed by another short excerpt from the New Testament (194r-195v). On ff. 206r-208r, Emperor John VIII Palaelogus's chrysobullon to the Council of Basle can be read. Then a short anonymous letter (ff. 208v-209r) comes about the preparations for the Council of Florence. The manuscript ends with excerpts from the work De spiritu sancto by Basilius Caesariensis (ff. 210r-211r), again with interlinear Latin translation.

For the description of Mon. Gr. 253, I consulted Hardt's account abundantly expanded with my observations during the checking of the original manuscript in Munich. ${ }^{291}$ The Greek-Latin dictionary stemming from Harleianus

[^65]5792 is to be found on ff. $75 \mathrm{r}-98 \mathrm{v}$. The manuscript does not contain the whole of the dictionary: only the section starting with alpha is complete, the beta section is fragmentary; it ends with the word pair $\beta \rho \alpha \gamma^{\prime}<$ с raucus on f .98 v . However, it is evident from the manuscript that the transcription of the whole dictionary was planned originally: on the top of some sheets, single word pairs or starting letters are written (e.g. f. 128 Br tò poóc lux, $128 \mathrm{Er} \chi \omega \rho \iota \varsigma$ sine, $128 \mathrm{Hr} \omega$ ), which indicates that the space necessary for the copy of the Greek-Latin dictionary was calculated in advance. Then, in the course of the copying, something must have happened; the scribe did not finish the transcription of the dictionary.
Apart from the Greek-Latin dictionary, various other contents also appear in Mon. Gr. 253. The contents are rather heterogeneous: on f. 1r, the manuscript starts with Manuel Moschopulus's Erotemata, then on ff. 68r-73r, an alphabetically organized Latin-Greek dictionary can be found. From 100r onwards, a short excerpt from the Gospel According to John can be found, while on f. 105v a short letter written by Libanius to Eumolpius can be read with interlinear Latin translation. From f. 112 r to 113r, again a short Greek-Latin wordlist can be found, which is followed by an excerpt from the decree of the Council of Chalcedon (chapter 28). From 116r, some psalms of David are visible, whereas on f. 129 r Manuel Chrysoloras's erotemata start. In between, there appear several pages in the manuscript where grammatical practices can be found (e.g. ff. 66r-67r: declension of the personal pronouns, possessive adjectives and other pronouns in Latin; f. 99r: a list of Greek prepositions; f. 100v: various declensions, declension of Greek nouns in Latin transcription).
The two manuscripts are closely connected through their provenience. One of the watermarks (Ochsenkopf; ox's head) appearing in the codex Mon. Gr. 142 (on ff. 162-173, 178, 194-217) is identical with the watermark in Mon. Gr. 253, on ff. 102/107, 127/128J, while similar paper is used in Mon. Gr. 253, ff.I'-IV' as in Mon. Gr. 142, ff. I/II. ${ }^{292}$ Mon. Gr. 142 was most likely written around 1435, at the Council of Basle. ${ }^{293}$ Later, both manuscripts can be found in Hartmann Schedel's library, although it is still unclear how Hartmann Schedel ( $1440-1514$ ) obtained them and what happened to them before that. The fact that the two manuscripts once belonged to Schedel's library is unquestionable since both of the manuscripts have Schedel's characteristic

[^66]autograph exlibris written with red ink (Liber Doctoris Hartmanni Schedel de Nuremberga) on the inner side of the covering wooden board and the binding of the two codices is also typical of the Schedel library. From the contemporary catalogue of the Schedel library, ${ }^{294}$ Mon. Gr. 253 is to be identified with the item "Grammatica greca. Erothimata et alia huius lingue," while Mon. Gr. 142 is with most probability identical with the item "Vocabularius maior in lingua Greca et Latina ac alia." ${ }^{295}$ In 1552 , Schedel's grandson, Melchior sold the Schedel library to Jakob Fugger. Thus, for about 20 years, Mon. Gr. 142 and 253 were parts of the Fugger library in Augsburg. On the parchment pieces attached to the wooden cover of each of the manuscripts even their signature in the Fugger library can be deciphered. On the cover of Mon. Gr. 142, the signature Stat. 3. n. 13. B. can be read - today only with ultraviolet light, while the signature of Mon. Gr. 253 in the Fugger library was Stat. $9 \mathrm{n}^{\circ}$ 28 B. From the signature, it is also clear that the two manuscripts were kept in a separate section where the former stock of the Schedel library was placed. ${ }^{296}$ Finally, in 1571, both manuscripts became parts of the stock of the Münchener Hofbibliothek together with the other items of the Fugger collection. ${ }^{297}$

In the Greek-Latin dictionary in Mon. Gr. 142 (ff. 1r-102r) one can find four columns (two columns with the Greek lemmas and two columns with their Latin equivalents respectively) and on average 40-41 lines of lemmas on each of the pages. Ruling is only applied for indicating or emphasizing the place for the two sets of columns (Greek and Latin); the lines were drawn with red ink. No horizontal ruling can be observed for the allocation of the lines. The establishment of the vertical ruling seems to be posterior compared to the transcription of the wordlist: in some cases, where the Latin equivalents are too long and cannot be squeezed in the space designed for them, the vertical ruling breaks where the Latin words would violate them (e.g on. ff. $2 \mathrm{v}, 5 \mathrm{r}, 6 \mathrm{r}, 7 \mathrm{v}$ )

[^67]or sometimes the ruling is adapted to incorporate word(s) placed for some reason in the margin (e.g. on ff. 70r-v, 82v). If the ruling had been anterior to the copying of the material, the Latin words would have been written over the ruling. Thus, here the function of the vertical ruling is to make the pages more transparent through separating the two connected columns of Greek lemmas and Latin equivalents.

The starting letters of the new alphabetical sections are illuminated and have a more elaborate and larger form. The starting letters of the Greek lemmas are not written one by one in the columns, instead, they are written only once, always above the first Greek word of the column, in red ink. With all probability, all of these illuminated starting letters were added after the transcription of the whole dictionary: at the beginning of each alphabetical section, next to the elaborate, large illuminated letter, a smaller letter in black ink can also be found which indicated the beginning of the new section for the scribe responsible for the additional illumination. Nevertheless, the illumination needed correction e.g. at the beginning of the beta section (on ff. 16r, 17r) where first alpha was written above the Greek columns. Purely decorative illuminations running in the margins or under the columns can be observed on ff. $1 \mathrm{r}, 3 \mathrm{r}$ and 15 v .

The dictionary was obviously copied column by column since there are several instances where the Greek lemmas are not in agreement with the Latin equivalents placed next to them. Usually, these errors are corrected by drawing lines which connect the Greek lemmas with their own Latin equivalents, e.g. on ff. $2 \mathrm{v}, 3 \mathrm{r}, 18 \mathrm{r}, 20 \mathrm{v}, 58 \mathrm{v}$. On ff. 24 r and 67 r , approximately 30 word pairs were left out accidentally by the scribe. The missing lemmas are inserted on a separate sheet (ff. 23A and 66) in both cases. In the main text of the dictionary, a hand with a pointing finger shows the original place of the inserted lemmas. The fact that in both cases approximately 30 lemmas are missing suggests that the Greek-Latin dictionary in Mon. Gr. 142 was copied from a manuscript where 30 word pairs were written on a single page - the scribe of Mon. Gr. 142 might have skipped a whole page in the source text by accident in these cases.

There are also signs showing that the scribe is not always able to decipher the words written in the source text: for instance, on f. 34r, around the end of the first Latin column, the scribe copies only the first two letters of the Latin word (pu...; = CGL II 305, 20), then the whole Latin equivalent was copied afterwards. There are several other additional corrections made
with red ink, as well (e.g. on ff. $34 \mathrm{r}, 42 \mathrm{r}, 96 \mathrm{v}$ ). In some cases, however, the Latin lemmas are completely missing, and they were not added later, either (mainly on ff. 72r-73r). Here, however, it is likely that it was not the scribe who failed to decipher the source text properly and decided to omit these items; the omissions can rather be attributed to lacunas in the source text. In the corresponding section of the Harleianus 5792 codex published in CGL II (on pages 403-407) one can find numerous lacunas in the Latin text: in several cases, only the word endings or the last few letters of the Latin equivalents are preserved or in several instances, lacunas can be found in the middle of the Latin words. Possibly in the course of the transmission most of these incomprehensible fragments of Latin words were completely omitted; the scribe of the Greek-Latin dictionary in Mon. Gr. 142 might have used such an exemplar. ${ }^{298}$

Extensive glossary notes do not appear on the margins of the Greek-Latin dictionary; only corrections and missing lemmas (e.g. 98r) are added there or lemmas that do not fit the available space (e.g. on ff. 70r-v, 82r-v, 89r).

According to Hajdú, the Greek-Latin dictionary in Mon. Gr. 142 was copied by a clumsy schoolboy-like Western hand, perhaps by Giovanni Tortelli. ${ }^{299}$

The layout of the Greek-Latin dictionary in Mon. Gr. 253 (ff. 75r-98v) is very similar to that of the dictionary in Mon. Gr. 142. On a page, one can find four columns: two columns of Greek lemmas and two columns with their Latin equivalents respectively; a column consists of approximately $28-30$ lines. Vertical ruling is used throughout the dictionary which designates the place of the two pairs of columns on each page, while horizontal ruling is only applied on ff. 87r-97r, 98 v . The ruling here seems to be anterior to the copying of the lemmas since the words which cannot be squeezed in their space are written across the ruling, while in Mon. Gr. 142 the ruling breaks in these cases.

The starting letters of the Greek lemmas are written throughout the column on ff. 75 r (only the first Greek column), 96r-98v (the whole of the beta

[^68]section). In the rest of the dictionary, the starting letters are either not indicated at all (on ff. 75r-87r) or are written only in the first few lines of the Greek columns. When it is possible, not only single starting letters are indicated only once at the beginning of the Greek columns, but also longer sequences of the Greek lemmas, e.g. prefixes, diphthongs (on ff. 87r-89v $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0-; 94 \mathrm{r}-\mathrm{v} \alpha \dot{v}-; 94 \mathrm{v}-96 \mathrm{Av}{ }^{300} \dot{\alpha} \varphi-; 96 \mathrm{Br} \dot{\alpha} \chi-, \dot{\alpha} \psi$ - and $\left.\dot{\alpha} \omega-\right)$. At the beginning of the alpha and beta sections, a space of two lines is left obviously for a large initial starting letter: possibly illuminated letters were here planned, just as the case in the Greek-Latin dictionary of Mon. Gr. 142, at the beginning of each alphabetical section.

The question whether the dictionary was copied column by column or line by line from the source text is difficult to decide. On the one hand, the fact that wherever the Latin equivalents do not fit the space available, they are continued in the next line, under the Greek lemma would suggest that the dictionary was copied line by line. However, there is again evidence suggesting the opposite possibility: first, on ff. $87 \mathrm{v}-96 \mathrm{Br}$ the Greek lemmas were copied with brownish ink and the Latin equivalents with blackish ink (at times, though, the Latin equivalents are also written with brownish ink). In the rest of the dictionary, the two columns seem to have been copied with inks of the same colour. Another phenomenon suggesting that the dictionary was copied column by column is that once the Greek lemmas are not in agreement with the Latin words next to them, the matching words are connected with lines afterwards (on f. 88v), although it happens very rarely as compared to what one can observe in Mon. Gr. 142. On the basis of what has been observed so far, two possibilities seem to emerge: 1) the scribe of the dictionary first chose to copy the wordlist line by line, then, at 87 v , he decided to try the other method and started to transcribe the dictionary column by column from then onwards; or 2) the scribe used the method of transcribing the source text column by column (as suggested by the use of inks with different colours), and he used a source text where the longer lists of Latin equivalents were similarly continued right under the Greek lemmas: following his exemplar, the scribe left those lines blank in copying the Greek columns where the Latin equivalents were supposed to continue. This assumption presupposes that in the exemplar roughly similar space was available for the columns as in Mon. Gr. 253. However, the fact that even

[^69]those pages where the Greek and Latin columns were copied with inks of different colours contain lemmas where the Latin equivalents are continued under the Greek lemma (e.g. on ff. $88 \mathrm{v}, 89 \mathrm{r}-\mathrm{v}, 90 \mathrm{r}$ ) renders the second possibility more probable.

In the Greek-Latin dictionary, the Latin equivalents are missing next to the Greek lemmas very often (several examples can be found e.g. on ff. $79 \mathrm{r}-\mathrm{v}$, $80 \mathrm{v}, 81 \mathrm{v})$, even if they are present in the codex Harleianus. In the majority of the cases, the lack of the Latin equivalents is indicated with a colon written next to the Greek lemma. In other cases, only the first few letters of the Latin
 only the first few letters of the Latin equivalent inextricabilis are present: inex-, while Mon. Gr. 142, ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and the codex Harleianus all contain its full form; on f . 79v $\mathrm{a} k \tau \grave{̀}$ tò $\varphi$ utóv sab-, while the other three manuscripts have the full form sambucus). These phenomena might suggest that the scribe had problems in deciphering the Latin text in the exemplar he used. Possibly, it was planned that a corrector would have a look at the dictionary after the copying to add the missing Latin lemmas afterwards. However, this step never took place (just like the additional insertion of large, decorative initials at the beginning of the alphabetical sections) since the transcription of the dictionary was never completed.

To collate the two Munich manuscripts and the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, I chose to compare the first 20 folios of the Greek-Latin dictionary in the Vienna codex with the corresponding parts of the Munich codices. Obviously, one can only choose from a limited material due to the fact that the dictionary in Mon. Gr. 253 abruptly ends with the beta section. Secondly, in the codex Harleianus there is an extensive lacuna between the lemmas $\mathrm{A} \lambda_{1} \xi$ hocallex' singularitertantum declinabitur (CGL II 225, 7) and Avס $\alpha \alpha \chi \vee \eta \varepsilon เ \delta \circ \sigma \lambda \alpha \chi \alpha v o v$ porcacla (CGL II 225,8) due to the loss of a bifolium, and it is important for the textual tradition to observe how the two Munich manuscripts treat this lacuna as compared to Suppl. Gr. 45, where the lacuna is filled with 121 word pairs ( $12 \mathrm{r} 11-14 \mathrm{v} 1$ ). For the purposes of the collation, I did not consider minor orthographical differences since it cannot be decided whether they are the result of the strict adaption of the exemplar's orthography or they might reflect - even only partly - the scribe's orthography.

In the course of the collation, one has the general impression that the dictionaries in the two Munich codices follow more closely the textual tradition
of the cod. Harleianus 5792 published in CGL II than the dictionary in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 does. First and foremost, in the two Munich manuscripts, the extensive lacuna present in the codex Harleianus due to the loss of a bifolium can also be found and it is not filled with a set of 121 word pairs as it can be observed in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. In Mon. Gr. 142, even smaller lacunas of some letters which occur in the Latin equivalents and ultimately take their origin from the codex Harleianus are sometimes preserved, while ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 tends to contain the full forms of the Latin equivalents in these instances. ${ }^{301}$ Then in the majority of the cases, the extra lemmas in the ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, i.e. lemmas that are not present in Harleianus 5792 are also missing from the two Munich codices (see Table 1 in appendix III for examples ${ }^{32}$ ). When lemmas present in the edition of the Harleianus version of the dictionary are missing from ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, they tend to appear in the two Munich manuscripts in the same form and at the same place as in the Harleianus (see Table 2 for examples).
The lemma pairs in the Harleianus 5792 as edited in CGL II are often different from their equivalents in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. However, in these cases, the lemmas in the Munich codices tend to follow those in CGL II rather than the version found in the Vienna codex. If one collates the lemmas in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 with the two Munich codices, on a page containing 26 lemma pairs, one will on average find 8-13 lemma pairs which differ from the corresponding lemma pairs in the Harleianus 5792 and from those in the two Munich codices exactly the same way. The difference can be realized in several ways, e.g. 1) the Greek lemma in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 has more Latin equivalents than in the other three codices or vice versa; 2) the Latin equivalent has a different form/ending/gender; 3) the Greek lemma is slightly different, while its Latin equivalent is the same (for examples see Table 3).

Apart from cases showing that the textual traditions of the two Munich codices are more closely connected to the codex Harleianus 5792 than that of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, there are instances suggesting that the textual traditions of the two Munich manuscripts are closely interrelated. This interrelation seems to be striking right at the beginning of the dictionary in these codices: they share the same incipit ( ${ }^{\prime} \beta \alpha \xi$ abbagus Mon. Gr. 142 f. 1 r; $\alpha \beta \beta \alpha \xi$ Mon. Gr. 253 f .75 r , with the Latin equivalent missing), i.e. they start with

[^70]the same lemma pair, which is actually only the second lemma pair both in the edited version of Harleianus 5792 (CGL II 215, 2) and in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 (f. 1r 2); the Harleianus and the Vienna codices share the same incipit ('Aßáкхєvтoৎ, - $\chi$ عvтоv Imbacchatus, -ti in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 1r 1 and 'A $\beta$ व́кхоvтоц inbauchatus in CGL II 215, 1). There are again several examples showing that the corresponding lemma pairs in the two Munich codices agree precisely, even if they differ from the corresponding lemma pairs in the Harleianus and the Vienna codices (see Table 4). However, one can also find instances where the two Munich codices show differences: Greek lemmas can have different Latin equivalents or the number of Latin equivalents can be different or one of the codices contains a lemma that cannot be found in the other one (see Table 5).

On the basis of the collation the results of which have been briefly described above, it can be concluded that although the Greek-Latin dictionaries in the two Munich codices and in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 indirectly definitely go back to the same text (its oldest version known is in the codex Harleianus), they do not share the same direct ancestor, i.e. they do not form a group of manuscripts sharing common characteristics of textual tradition. In contrast, the two Munich codices seem to be more closely related regarding the textual traditions of their Greek-Latin dictionaries: it can be assumed that they shared the same ancestor in an intermediary phase of the transmission, which would explain why they show obvious agreements contrasted to ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45.

### 2.3 Collating the Greek-Latin vocabulary lists in ÖNB Supp. Gr. 45 and $\Sigma$ I 12

The manuscript $\Sigma$ I 12 is now kept in the Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo de El Escorial near Madrid. ${ }^{303}$ The paper codex consisting of 311 folios ${ }^{304}$ is basically a collection of manuscript fragments with diverse dating, written by different hands and having their own provenience.

The content of the manuscript is heterogeneous. Among others, the manuscript contains parts of Aristotle's Rhetoric with marginal notes (ff. 1-44), a collection of alphabetically organized proverbs (ff. 47-50v), the paraphrase of Aristotle's Physics, Book I (ff. 54-56), Dionysius Halicarnasseus's De Thucydide epistula ad Ammaeum (ff. 57-59), Philopatris attributed to Lucian (ff. 62-66v), Galen's De totius morbi temporibus (ff. 68-70av), four Greek charters connected to the town Monembasia (ff. 71-73), Plutarch's De animae procreatione in Timaeo. In the rest of the manuscript, lexicographical content can be found: an extensive Greek-Latin vocabulary list (ff. 91-293), a LatinGreek lexicon (ff. 293v-309v) and a short list of Greek and Latin plant names (ff. 309v-310). ${ }^{305}$

The different parts of the manuscript were written by different hands. Some of them have been identified; for instance ff. 54-56 were written by Bessarion, ff. 68-70av by Nikolaos Melanchroinos and ff. 75-87 by Georgios Tribizias. ${ }^{306}$ The scribe of the lexicographical unit on ff. 91-310 is so far unknown; it was probably a Western hand. The same hand copied the collection of proverbs on ff. 47-51, which indicates that the two sections belong together. ${ }^{307}$ Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza was the possessor of at least the unit containing Aristotle's writing: his exlibris can be found on f . 1 r in the margin at the bottom of the page. ${ }^{308}$ In the literature no specific information can be found regarding the provenience of the lexicographical

[^71]section on ff. 91-310 and on ff. 47-51. The manuscript has the typical Escorial binding. ${ }^{309}$

The dating of the various sections bound together in the codex is also problematic. Revilla dates the lexicographical section (ff. 47-51 and 91-310) to the $16^{\text {th }}$ century, ${ }^{310}$ while Miller dates the collection of proverbs and the vocabulary lists to the $17^{\text {th }}$ century. ${ }^{311}$ Neither of them provides ground for the dating given. Compared to Revilla and Miller's standpoint, Harlfinger dates the lexicographical section much earlier, at the end of the $14^{\text {th }}$ century, around 1400 on the basis of the watermark (deer) characteristic of this section. ${ }^{312}$ Thiermann, however, argues that this dating must be too early given that the dictionary of Pseudo-Cyril (the codex Harleianus 5792) reappeared only around $1430 .{ }^{313}$

The lexicographical section starting on f. 91r has its own title added in the upper margin: Lexicon graecolatinum. ${ }^{314}$ On each page, two columns can be found: one column containing the Greek lemmas and another one where their Latin equivalents are visible. On a page, usually 40-43 lines are added; the lines are not ruled in advance. In the generous margins and in the intercolumnium a great number of glossary notes ${ }^{315}$ can be found which are sometimes separated physically from the main text with single lines. Whenever a new alphabetic section starts, the starting letter of the first word is written emphatically in the margin: in a larger size and separated from the rest of the starting word (see e.g. on f. 91r, 120v, 125r). ${ }^{316}$

[^72]The Greek-Latin lexicon was with most probability copied column by column: first the Greek column was transcribed, then the other column containing the Latin equivalents was added. This method of transcription can easily be detected through occasional scribal errors. On f.114r, although no scribal error appears, the Latin column slightly diverges from the Greek one, which results in the fact that the Latin lemmas are not placed exactly next to their Greek equivalents, but slightly below them. This divergence was also perceived by the scribe, who marks the related Greek and Latin lemmas in lines 29-32 with symbols consisting of dots or strokes of diverse number. ${ }^{317}$ The same phenomenon can be observed on f. 180v, lines 20-21. Onf. 216r, in line 20, the Latin equivalent of the Greek lemma was accidentally omitted by the scribe. It was later inserted in the Latin column, between lines 19 and 21 by a subsequent hand who again marked the related lemmas in the two columns in lines 19-20 using symbols created from a varying number of dots.

The scribe seems to have encountered difficulties in deciphering and copying his source text, mainly the Latin part: at some places, parts of the Latin lemmas are missing; the missing part is always indicated with underlining or dots. In these cases, a subsequent hand supplements the lemmas with the missing parts. For instance, on f. 107r, in line 28 , the first two letters of the first Latin equivalent of the Greek lemma $\dot{\alpha} \pi o ́ \delta \varepsilon \sigma \mu$ ос are missing; their place is indicated with two dots (..ligamen); on the dots the first two letters (al-) are added by another hand. Sometimes whole Latin equivalents are left out by the scribe and their place is again indicated with dots or underlining (e.g. on f. 107r, lines 24 and 30).

To explore how the Greek-Latin vocabulary lists in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and in $\Sigma$ I 12 are related to each other the Greek and Latin lemmas in the alpha section were collated for two reasons. Firstly, the number of the lemmas starting with alpha (more than 2300) is high enough to provide us with reasonable material to draw conclusions. Secondly, in the codex Harleianus there is an extensive lacuna between the lemmas $A \lambda_{1} \xi$ hocallex' singularitertantum declinabitur (CGL II 225, 7) and Avסן $\alpha \chi v \eta \varepsilon \iota \delta o \sigma \lambda \alpha \chi \alpha v o v ~ p o r c a c l a ~(C G L ~ I I ~ 225, ~$ 8) due to the loss of a bifolium, ${ }^{318}$ and it is important for the textual tradition

[^73]to observe how $\Sigma$ I 12 treats this lacuna as compared to Suppl. Gr. 45 , where the lacuna is filled with 121 word pairs ( $12 \mathrm{r} 11-14 \mathrm{v} 1$ ). For the purposes of the collation, I did not consider minor orthographical differences since it cannot be decided whether they are the result of the strict adaption of the exemplar's orthography or they might reflect - even only partly - the scribe's orthography.

The extensive lacuna found in the alpha section of the codex Harleianus is filled throughout in the manuscript $\Sigma$ I 12 (from f. 97 v , line 39 to f. 99 r, line 33) similarly as in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Among the Greek-Latin dictionaries collated with the Vienna manuscript so far the two Munich codices, Mon. Gr. 142 and 253 contain the lacuna as inherited from the codex Harleianus, ${ }^{319}$ while in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 47 the lacuna is filled only partly. ${ }^{320}$ In the place of the original lacuna of the codex Harleianus the supplemental lemmas in the manuscripts $\Sigma$ I 12 and ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 remarkably agree in the overwhelming majority of the cases. ${ }^{321}$ It is even more striking that wherever ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 lacks the Latin equivalents of the Greek lemma in this section, the same Latin lemmas are also missing from $\Sigma$ I $12 .^{322}$ In a few instances, however, minor differences might occur: for example, $\Sigma$ I 12 diverges from ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 regarding the number of Latin equivalents, i.e. it contains either less ${ }^{323}$ or more ${ }^{324}$ Latin equivalents than the Vienna manuscript.
In the course of the collation of the Greek-Latin lexicon in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and $\Sigma I 12$ two major tendencies seem to emerge. Firstly, the dictionary in $\Sigma I$ 12 tends to agree with the Harleian codex, i.e. with its edited version regarding the number of Latin equivalents. When ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 has more or less Latin equivalents than the edited version of the codex Hareianus, $\Sigma$ I 12 will usually be in agreement with the latter one. ${ }^{325}$ However, in a few cases,

[^74]the opposite of this tendency can also be observed, i.e. the number of Latin equivalents in the manuscript $\Sigma$ I 12 rather agrees with ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 than with the codex Harleianus. ${ }^{326}$ Furthermore, there are also instances where the Latin equivalents of $\Sigma \mathrm{I} 12$ do not show agreement either with ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 or with the edited version of the codex Harleianus. The Madrid manuscript diverges from the other two codices sometimes regarding the number of Latin equivalents, sometimes regarding its form, or even completely different Latin words can appear as Latin equivalents. ${ }^{327}$
The other major tendency can be detected in the vocabulary of the GreekLatin dictionary, i.e. in the presence or complete lack of whole lemma pairs: in this respect, $\Sigma$ I 12 tends to agree with ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 as opposed to the edited version of the codex Harleianus. The additional lemma pairs in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 missing from the codex Harleianus tend to be present in $\Sigma$ I 12, too. When lemma pairs missing from ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 can be found in the codex Harleianus, i.e. the opposite of the previous scenario occurs, the manuscript $\Sigma$ I 12 again follows ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 through the lack of the same lemma pairs. ${ }^{328}$
The two manuscripts also show agreement regarding the way the lemmas are presented in the Greek-Latin dictionary. While the edited version of the codex Harleianus tends to provide only the basic forms of the lemmas (nominative singular for nouns, adjectives, pronouns etc. and the present imperfect form in the indicative, first person singular for verbs) without any additional information about the conjugation or declination, one can find such information both in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and in $\Sigma$ I 12. Next to the Greek lemmas such grammatical information appears consistently in the GreekLatin lexicon of both codices: usually the genitive singular ending is added to nouns, adjectives, pronouns etc., while for the verbs the ending of the second person singular form, present imperfect in the indicative is provided. It is striking that the consistent addition of such grammatical information in the Greek column ends abruptly exactly at the same point in both manuscripts: with the Greek lemma $\alpha$ v $\tau \iota \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \gamma \rho \alpha \varphi \eta$, - $\varphi$ ท̃ऽ (ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 20r $15 ; \Sigma$ I 12103 r 10 ). From then onwards, additional grammatical information

[^75]is provided at random in the Greek columns throughout the dictionary of both manuscripts.

No such consistency can be discovered in the Latin columns: the addition of extra grammatical information seems to be more random in both manuscripts. For nouns, adjectives, pronouns the genitive singular form can be added. For verbs, the Latin columns in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 can add the second person singular form, present imperfect in the indicative, while $\Sigma$ I 12 sometimes provides all forms familiar from modern Latin dictionaries (second person singular present imperfect in the indicative; first person singular present perfect in the indicative and perfect participle neuter singular).

It is even more interesting to observe that the two manuscripts seem to share common textual errors or divergences from the edited version of the codex Harleianus that must have emerged at a certain point and in a certain branch of the transmission and from then onwards they could have been handed down as a part of the textual tradition. For instance, in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 9r, line 25 two lemma pairs ( $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \mu \eta ̀ ~ \sigma \iota \delta \eta ́ \rho o v, ~ \dot{\alpha} \kappa \mu \eta ̀ ~ \eta ̀ \lambda ı к i ́ \alpha \varsigma ~ a c i e s: ~ u t ~$ ferri, flos: ut aetatis) can be found in a single line. In $\Sigma$ I 12, f. 96r, line 18 again the two lemma pairs are inserted in the place of a single entry ( $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \mu \dot{\eta}$
 of the codex Harleianus only the first lemma pair appears (CGL II 222,53). Another illustrative example: the lemma pair $\dot{\alpha} \pi \mathbf{\tau} \varphi$ рí $\sigma \sigma \omega$ abhorreo (CGL II 242,32 ) was originally omitted from the lexicon in both manuscripts, but later, by a subsequent hand it was added in the margin of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 (on f. 33r 26: $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \varphi \rho i ́ \tau \tau \omega$ abhorreo) and in the intercolumnium of $\Sigma$ I 12 (on f. 111v 28: $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \varphi \rho i ́ \tau \tau \omega$ abhorreo).

To sum up, the Greek-Latin lexicon in the manuscript $\Sigma$ I 12 seems to be closely related to the similar dictionary in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Their connection is not only confirmed by the way both of them fill the extensive lacuna of the codex Harleianus in the alpha section with highly similar entries, but it is also supported by the striking agreement in the set of lemma pairs in contrast to the set of entries in the edited version of the codex Harleianus. Furthermore, it is also remarkable how similar additional grammatical information is inserted in both versions of the Greek-Latin dictionary, especially in the Greek columns. The same textual variants occurring in the two manuscripts that diverge from the text of the edited version of the codex Harleianus also suggest that the Greek-Latin lexica in the Vienna and Madrid codices belong to the same branch of the tradition.

However, despite the numerous remarkable agreements described above, the two versions of the Greek-Latin dictionary were definitely not copied from the same exemplar, i.e. they cannot have the same direct source since differences also occur. The most striking divergence is apparent in the number of Latin equivalents: in this respect $\Sigma I 12$ tends to follow the edited version of the codex Harleianus instead of the dictionary in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45.

Apart from the extensive Greek-Latin lexicon, the manuscript $\Sigma$ I 12 also contains a shorter Latin-Greek dictionary (ff. 293v-309v) and a short thematic list of Greek and Latin plant names (ff. $309 \mathrm{v}-310$ ) similarly as ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 does (on ff. 290r-320r and f. 298r-v respectively). ${ }^{329}$ The Latin-Greek lexicon in the two manuscripts seems to be identical: both contain a series of alphabetical wordlists in three groups following grammatical considerations (so-called idiomata generum): 1) masculine Latin words and their Latin equivalents; 2) feminine Latin words and their Latin equivalents and 3) neuter Latin words and their Latin equivalents. ${ }^{330}$ Their vocabulary also seem to agree on the basis of the first two and last two lemma pairs cited from all three grammatical groups in Revilla's description of $\Sigma$ I $12 .{ }^{331}$
The short thematic list containing names of plants, especially those of trees also seems to be identical in the Vienna and Madrid manuscripts based on the collation of the first two and last two lemma pairs which are in complete agreement. ${ }^{332}$ This thematic world list in this form cannot be found in the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum and I did not manage to detect it in any of the more recent, $15^{\text {th }}$-century or $16^{\text {th }}$-century codices containing the extensive Greek-Latin dictionary. Thus, the fact that both ÖNB Suppl.

[^76]Gr. 45 and $\Sigma$ I 12 contain it is even more remarkable, although the placement of the thematic word list is different in the two codices: it precedes the Latin-Greek lexicon in the Vienna manuscript, while their order is the opposite in the Madrid manuscript.

Through the presentation of the results of the collation of the extensive Greek-Latin dictionary in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and $\Sigma$ I 12 it has already been shown that remarkable agreements connect the two manuscripts suggesting that they belong to the same branch of transmission. This connection is further confirmed by the fact that the Greek-Latin lexicon appears together with the same Latin-Greek lexicon and Greek-Latin thematic word list of tree names in both manuscripts. Based on this fact, one might also assume that the Vienna and Madrid manuscripts both belong to the same branch of transmission where all three lexicographical sections (i.e. the Greek-Latin and Latin-Greek lexica and the short thematic word list) were originally handed down together.

## 3 Summary

In this chapter the textual tradition of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 has been explored. After the presentation of its indirect source, the codex Harleianus 5792, the diffusion of the Greek-Latin dictionary in the $15^{\text {th }}$ and $16^{\text {th }}$ centuries has been discussed. Goetz's list of codices recentiores containing the Greek-Latin dictionary has been enlarged with several further items ${ }^{333}$ and the possibility of further copies preserved in the Topkapi Palace, Istanbul has been discussed, as well.

The Greek-Latin dictionary found in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 has been collated with four contemporary manuscripts: ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 47, Mon. gr. 142 and 253 and $\Sigma$ I 12. It has been revealed that ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 47 is not closely related to the other Vienna manuscript regarding the texts of the Greek-Latin dictionaries they contain. On the one hand, ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 47 partly retains the extensive lacuna in the alpha section of the codex Harleianus 5792 and a further lacuna is also found in the alpha section of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 47 which is not present in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. On the other hand, remarkable differences can also be found between the Latin equivalents in the two versions of the same bilingual lexicon.
The manuscripts Mon. gr. 142 and 253, which are clearly interrelated regarding both their provenience and the text of the Greek-Latin dictionaries they contain, are not related closely to ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, either; they belong to different branches of the textual tradition of the Greek-Latin lexicon. The two Munich codices also retain the extensive lacuna in the alpha section, and on the whole their texts seem to be closer to that of the $8^{\text {th }}$-century codex Harleianus than the one found in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. This might be attributed to the fact that Mon. gr. 142 - and presumably also Mon. gr. 253 - was copied around 1435, at the Council of Basle.

From Goetz's list two further codices recentiores can be excluded from the candidates for textually related manuscripts, since the manuscripts Bibliothecae aedilium Flor. eccles. cod. CCXIX and Parisinus gr. 2627 also retain the extensive lacuna found in the Harley manuscript. ${ }^{334}$

[^77]However, the Madrid manuscript $\Sigma$ I 12 seems to be closely related to ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 on several grounds. Firstly, the extensive lacuna found in the alpha section of the Harley codex is also filled with lemma pairs in the Madrid manuscript; the lemma pairs found in the place of the lacuna show striking agreement in the Madrid and Vienna codices. Secondly, the two manuscripts seem to share common textual errors and/or divergences from the edited version of the codex Harleianus regarding the presence or lack of certain lemma pairs. Moreover, it is also remarkable that additional grammatical information is similarly added especially in the Greek columns of the Greek-Latin dictionaries in the two manuscripts.

The codex $\Sigma$ I 12 also contains the Latin-Greek idiomata generum and the short thematic list of tree names also found in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. The fact that the short thematic list of tree names cannot be found in this form in any of the hermeneumata published in the third volume of the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum or - to my knowledge - in any of the codices recentiores containing the Greek-Latin dictionary makes this agreement even more striking. All these observations seem to confirm that the two manuscripts ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and $\Sigma$ I 12 are closely related and belong to the same branch of the textual tradition of the Greek-Latin dictionary appearing first in the codex Harleianus. Moreover, on the basis of the close relationship of the Vienna and Madrid manuscripts, one might also assume that in this branch of the transmission the three lexicographical sections, i.e. the Greek-Latin dictionary, the Latin-Greek idiomata generum and the short thematic list of tree names were originally handed down as a whole, organic lexicographical unit.

# IV Marginal notes in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 

In the Greek-Latin dictionary of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 thousands of glossary notes can be found in the margins and between the two columns containing the Greek and Latin lemmas. Basically, they can be divided into two major groups through analysing the characteristics of the handwriting and through mapping their sources. The main aim of this chapter is to explore the sources of the two major groups of interrelated glossary notes: exploring their sources might also contribute to a better understanding of the textual history of the Greek-Latin dictionary in the Vienna manuscript and of the history of the codex itself.

In this chapter, glossary notes belonging to the two major groups will be analysed thoroughly. First, the layout, i.e. the location of the marginalia within the manuscript and their connection to the main text of the GreekLatin dictionary (either physical connection or connection on the level of meaning) will be discussed. The language use and the content of the glosses will also be subject of the discussions.

Special emphasis will be laid on the exploration of the sources of the marginal notes belonging to the two major groups. On the one hand, where applicable, glossary notes containing quotations from or clear references to Greek literary passages will be collated with their up-to-date textual editions. On the other hand, glossary notes of predominantly Greek literary origin building up one of the major groups will be collated with the marginalia in a Madrid codex ( $\Sigma$ I 12) that contains a Greek-Latin dictionary belonging to the same textual tradition as the one in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 , while the marginalia from the other major group will be collated with the main text of a Greek-Latin dictionary that belongs to a different textual tradition.

## 1 Glossary notes of predominantly Greek literary origin

One of the two major groups of glossary notes predominantly comprises quotations of Greek literary origin and can ultimately be divided into four subgroups. On the basis of the genre of the literary works quoted, one can find two major subgroups within this group of glossary notes that are rather unified regarding their sources: marginal notes quoting Aristophanic scholia and glossary notes of legal origin that can ultimately traced back to the $10^{\text {th }}$ century Byzantine legal text called Synopsis Major Basilicorum, the abridged vesion of the monumental code of law, the Basilika ( $\tau \alpha{ }_{\alpha}$ B $\alpha \sigma 1 \lambda 1 \kappa \alpha ́$ ). The two subgroups of glossary notes quoting Greek literary texts do not only differ regarding the genres of the literary sources, but they are also present in the margins of the manuscript in different quantities. While more than 400 glossary notes take their origin from Aristophanic scholia in the margins of the Greek-Latin dictionary in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, one can find less than a hundred marginal notes quoting Greek legal texts there. Beside these two subgroups, one can identify two further subgroups as well that are more heterogeneous regarding their content and sources: one of them contains quotations from and references to further Greek literary authors (mostly prose writers), while the marginal notes belonging to the other one is rather related to Greek lexicographical sources.

Despite the apparent differences in genre and quantity, however, the four subgroups of glossary notes are clearly connected through the common palaeographical characteristics of Aristophanic scholia, Byzantine legal texts, miscellaneous Greek authors and Greek lexicographical sources quoted in the margins. ${ }^{335}$

### 1.1 Glossary notes quoting Aristophanic scholia

### 1.1.1 General characteristics

In the Greek-Latin dictionary of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 the highest number of glossary notes is quoted from scholia written to two plays of Aristophanes: one can find more than 400 quotations from Aristophanic scholia written in the margins of the dictionary. More than a half of these marginal notes (more than 250 items) are quoted from the scholia written to

[^78]the Aristophanic play Nubes. ${ }^{336}$ The other group contains approximately 160 marginal notes quoted from the play Plutus, ${ }^{337}$ the first play by Aristohanes on the Byzantine curriculum. The predominance of the plays Nubes and Plutus can easily be explained since these two plays formed part of the Byzantine triad of Aristophanic plays (Ranae being the third one) which were transmitted - often together with their scholia - in a far greater number of manuscripts compared to the other plays of the comedy writer. ${ }^{338}$

The origin of the quotations inserted in the margins is indicated in the majority of the cases; only about a tenth of the quotations from Aristophanic scholia lack the indication of the source. However, the source of the quotes is naturally not given in details, only the name of Aristophanes - with a preposition in several cases - is provided in various abbreviated forms either at the beginning or at the end of the quotations. The most frequently used abbreviation for Aristophanes is Ar. (without preposition) in the marginal notes occurring several hundred times, while the second most frequently used form is the same abbreviation with the preposition in, that is, in Ar. for in Aristophane, appearing almost a hundred times. The abbreviations Aristoph., in Aristoph. and in Arist. (the latter two again for in Aristophane) occur almost with the same frequency: approximately ten times each. The abbreviations Arist. and apud Ar. (for apud Aristophanem) appear only a few times. Finally, in a few cases, the name of Aristophanes appears in Greek in a short Greek sentence with which the quotation is introduced. ${ }^{339}$ The different abbreviated forms indicating the source of the quotes show a certain distribution in the Greek-Latin dictionary: in the first part of the dictionary (up to f.33r), the abbreviations in Aristoph., Aristoph., in Arist. and Arist. tend to occur, then in the following part (ff. 33r-93r) the abbreviation in Ar. is characteristic, and finally in the remaining part of the dictionary the abbreviation Ar. is dominating.

[^79]The glossary notes are usually added to the margins of the dictionary: they can be found in the upper (e.g. on f. 14r-v) and lower margins (e.g. on $\mathrm{ff} .13 \mathrm{r}, 18 \mathrm{v}, 28 \mathrm{v}$ ) and also in the side margins - generally in the wider one (e.g. on $\mathrm{ff} .4 \mathrm{v}, 5 \mathrm{r}, 7 \mathrm{r}, 10 \mathrm{r}$ ). One can often find two or even more quotations from Aristophanes inserted under each other (e.g. on f. 204v). In a few cases such quotations are added in the intercolumnium (e.g. on ff. 131v, 147v, 266r); they tend to be relatively shorter in accordance with the space available there. In a few cases, the glossary note is inserted at the place of a missing Latin lemma (e.g. on f. 10r, line 19) or at times the glossary note is even organized as an additional part of the dictionary: the glossed item from Aristophanes is written under the last Greek lemma of the page and the gloss from the scholion is written under the column of the Latin explanations (e.g. on f. 141r). This latter organization shows well that the quotations from the Aristophanic scholia are usually intended as lexicographical additions to the vocabulary of the dictionary.

The glossary notes containing quotations from Aristophanic scholia can be related to the main text of the dictionary on several grounds. To start with, the most straightforward form of relationship between the glossary note and the main text is when the quotation is intended as an explanation, definition for the Greek lemma in the main text (e.g. on ff. 5r 14, 7r 24, $14 \mathrm{r} 1,59 \mathrm{r} 7$ ). In these cases, the lemmas are quoted as they appear in the Aristophanic scholia, that is, not in first person singular indicative present (verbs) or in nominative singular (nouns, adjectives). In other cases, some kind of lexicographical relationship can be discovered between the Greek of the main text and the lemma of the scholion entry. Sometimes the lemma of the scholion belongs to the same word family which appears in the main text. For instance, next to the lemma $\delta$ ঠ́átn $\xi_{l \varsigma}(f$. 68r 15) the scholion explains the verb form $\delta \iota \alpha \tau \eta \mathfrak{\xi} \alpha \varsigma$, or the quotation explains the word ixӨunpoú next to the Greek lemma îx日úc (f. 133r 26). There can be, however, a looser lexicographical relationship between the lemma in the scholion quoted and the Greek lemmas in the main text: very often the quotations are added next to those Greek lemmas in the main text which match alphabetically the lemma highlighted in the scholion. For instance, the scholion giving explanation to $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \rho \eta{ }^{\prime} v \alpha \varsigma$ is inserted next to the Greek lemmas starting with $\dot{\alpha} v \theta \rho \alpha-$ (f. 17r 12). Thus, this group of glossary notes quoting scholia to Aristophanes can also be regarded as addition to the vocabulary of the dictionary. Finally, in some cases, the quotations from Aristophanic scholia are related to other
lexicographical marginal notes from the same hand. For instance, next to the Greek lemma $\dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \mu \tilde{\omega}$ (f. 41r 24) a short marginal note explains the difference between $\dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \mu \tilde{\omega}$ and $\dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$, then it is followed by a quotation from a scholion


On the basis of the content of the quotations, this group of glossary notes might be divided into two subgroups: lexicographical and grammatical notes. Among lexicographical notes, one can often find very short definitions consisting of only one or two words (e.g. ff. $4 \mathrm{v} 6,126 \mathrm{v} 8,128 \mathrm{v} 15$ ) and longer ones, as well (e.g. ff. $50 \mathrm{r} 6,231 \mathrm{v} 7$ ). Another characteristic type of lexicographical notes quoted from Aristophanic scholia is when the glossary note lists Greek synonyms to the lemma (e.g. ff. 5 r $14,134 \mathrm{v} 4,158 \mathrm{r} 22$ ). In some cases, the glossary notes highlight the semantic difference between two similar words. ${ }^{340}$ Sometimes glossary notes quoted from Aristophanic scholia contain "encyclopaedical" information: one can find entries about gods (e.g. on f. 177 r 10 about a mythological story) and other mythological figures (e.g. on f. 213v 10 about Peleus), about dramas, writers and other literary works (e.g. on f. 167v 9 about the drama Marikas) and about places (e.g. on f. 165 Br 1 ). These notes tend to be longer than the ones giving definitions or synonyms (e.g. the marginal note inserted on f .213 v 10 on the Peleus story is remarkably long). A further type of lexicographical notes occurring rarely is when the scholion collects lexicographically related words to the lemma with short explanations. ${ }^{341}$

A high number of glossary notes contain some kind of grammatical information, e.g. different irregular forms of verbs (aorist: f. 140v 9; future: ff. 33v 10, 197v 12; imperative: f. 169r 12), accuracy (f. 221r 24), declension of nouns (f. 291v 13), diminutive form (f. 49r 6), case of the adjunct of the verb (ff. 54r 11, 147r 8), pronunciation (f. 128 v 23 on vowel length). In some cases, the glossator does not quote scholia to clarify a grammatical question, but rather an explanation independent of the Aristophanic scholia is used for the illustration of which Aristophanes's text is exploited (e.g. ff. 277r 19, 298r 1). The glossator often quotes definitions containing an etymological

[^80]explanation, as well (e.g. ff. 49v 17, 96v 8, 122r 19). In other cases, glossary notes contain dialectical characteristics (e.g. ff. 112v 17, 141r 26, 78r 15, $89 \mathrm{v} 18,228 \mathrm{v} 9$ ). The majority of these marginalia naturally highlight Attic features; other dialectal characteristics (e.g. Ionic, Phrygian) appear only sporadically. Apart from scholia of grammatical content, notes with reference on stylistics also appear, they naturally tend to focus on the characteristics of the poetic language (e.g. f. 17r 12).

The glossary notes of lexicographical and grammatical (stylistic) content can usually be interpreted on their own, that is, without their original context, the plays by Aristophanes. They gain a new context through their addition to the Greek-Latin dictionary. However, there are some Aristophanic scholia added in the margins of the dictionary which can hardly be interpreted without their original context (e.g. ff. 18v 26, 36v 7).

The great majority of the marginal notes quote the Aristophanic scholia in their original Greek language without adding Latin translation. However, there are a few marginal notes where the scholia quoted had been translated to Latin with the exception of the Greek lemma explained. Among these glossary notes, one can find shorter definitions (e.g. f. 4v 6) or longer descriptions (e.g. ff. 18v 26, 93v 1), as well. At times, only the closing sentence of the glossary note appears in Latin translation, the previous part of the quotation is added in Greek (e.g. ff. 13v 1, 64v 22). In some cases, a short Latin introduction is provided before the Greek quotation (e.g. ff. 5r 14, 81v 22), or the glossary note presents the Aristophanic scholia in a "mixture" of Greek and Latin (e.g. f. 78r 19): the lexicographical parts remain in Greek, while the explanatory parts are translated to Latin. In other instances, a Latin translation is added to the Greek quotation (e.g. f. 169r 1). The most characteristic use of Latin in the Greek quotations is when two Greek synonyms or synonymous expressions are connected with the Latin preposition pro, which is a frequently appearing phenomenon in the margins of the dictionary (e.g. ff. $11 \mathrm{v} 19,78 \mathrm{v} 22,79 \mathrm{r} 12,80 \mathrm{r} 23,95 \mathrm{r} 1$ ). In the same function, at times, the Latin verb form est is used (e.g. f. 72r 20).

### 1.1.2 The origin of the Aristophanic glossary notes

In the literature on the Vienna manuscript, ${ }^{342}$ it is only István Kapitánffy, who touches upon ${ }^{333}$ the question of the origin and textual tradition of the

[^81]Aristophanic glossary notes, more precisely that of the glossary notes quoting scholia to the play Nubes. ${ }^{344}$ Using the textual editions of the scholia vetera ${ }^{345}$ and scholia recentior ${ }^{346}$ to Nubes, he finds out that the majority of the marginalia quoting scholia to Nubes are taken from Demetrius Triclinius's second redaction of the scholia or are closely related to it at least. He also recognizes that some of these marginalia are quoted from the group called "anonyma recentiora" by Koster in his 1974 edition. From these observations Kapitánffy reaches the conclusion that the person who added these marginalia to the Greek-Latin dictionary must have used a codex containing the two Aristophanic plays, i.e. Nubes and Plutus together with the scholia, and the scholia in this hypothetical codex must have been taken from the second Triclinian edition, although some of the scholia must have had another origin there.

I have attempted to collect and identify all the marginal notes quoting Aristophanic scholia in the Greek-Latin dictionary: these marginal notes can be found in the appendix section. ${ }^{347}$ I also collated these glossary notes with the textual editions of the relevant Aristophanic scholia (Koster 1974 and Holwerda 1977 for Nubes; Chantry 1994 and 1996 for Plutus): the matching scholia are indicated in brackets after each Aristophanic glossary note in the related appendices. In several instances, however, differences can be detected between the marginalia and the related scholia: in these cases the abbreviation cf. (= compare) is used in front of the indication of the scholia in parentheses, which means that the marginal note does not agree with the indicated scholion precisely, but seems to be closely related to it. At the same time, it is important to bear in mind that at times precise collation of the marginal notes and the Aristophanic scholia is not possible, since the glosses do not always reproduce the scholia in direct quotation: this case can be well illustrated with the phenomenon when the Greek scholia appear partly or completely in Latin translation. ${ }^{348}$

[^82]On the basis of the collation of the marginalia and the scholia to Nubes, it can be stated that on the whole István Kapitánffy was right in claiming that the majority of these glossary notes take their origin or are at least closely related to the scholia of the second Triclinian edition, while some of them rather originate from a group of scholia called "anonyma recentiora" by their editor, Koster. The results gained from the thorough collation, might, however, make Kapitánffy's result based on the collation of scholia chosen at random more precise. Approximately $73 \%$ of the glossary notes take their origin from the second Triclinian redaction ${ }^{34}$ of the Nubes scholia. While the second Triclinian edition shows agreement either with the first and/or second Thoman versions ${ }^{350}$ of the Nubes scholia or with the first Triclinian version ${ }^{351}$ several times, a third of these $73 \%$ agrees exclusively with the second Triclinian version, which suggests that the second Triclinian redaction is to be regarded as the ultimate source of these glossary notes within the Thoman-Triclinian corpus of scholia to Nubes. Approximately $22 \%$ of the glossary notes quoting scholia to Nubes can be traced back to the group identified as "anonyma recentiora" in Koster's textual edition. ${ }^{352}$ The marginalia within this group in about half of the cases show remarkable agreement with a single manuscript, cod. Parisinus Gr. 2827, indicated as Par ${ }^{353}$ in the textual edition. Finally, a few of these marginal notes seem to go back to the scholia

[^83]vetera to Nubes (appr. 2.5\%), ,354 while some other marginalia take their origin from the scholia written by Joannes Tzetzes (appr. 2\%). ${ }^{355}$

The majority (approximately $71 \%$ ) of the glossary notes quoting scholia to Plutus can be found in the edition of scholia recentiora to Aristophanes's Plutus by M. Chantry. ${ }^{356}$ these marginalia either show stricter textual agreement or are closely related to the scholia published there. Usually these glossary notes tend to agree with the Thoman-Triclinian corpus, ${ }^{357}$ although in several cases they are rather related to the versions found in other groups of codices containing the scholia: in the so-called "codices mixti," ${ }^{358}$ or in the codices already used for the edition of the scholia vetera ("codices iam ad scholia vetera edenda adhibiti") ${ }^{359}$ or in the codices of the so-called scholia Leidensia. ${ }^{360}$ There are only a few instances (glossary notes added to $34 \mathrm{v} 9 ; 89 \mathrm{v} 18$ and 134r 20) where the glossary notes show agreement exclusively with the versions of the second Triclinian recension. Although the proportion of these glossary notes is much lower than in the case of the glossary notes quoting scholia to Nubes, one might assume on the basis of the analogy of the Aristophanic glossary notes that the marginalia quoting Plutus scholia should also be ultimately traced back to the second Triclinian recension in the same way as the marginalia quoting Nubes scholia. A significant part (approximately 20\%) of the glossary notes quoting Plutus scholia cannot be found among the scholia recentiora edited by Chantry, but are present among the scholia edited earlier by Dübner. ${ }^{361}$ Finally, in a few cases, the marginalia seem to show agreement either with the scholia vetera edited by Chantry ${ }^{362}$ or with Joannes Tzetzes's

[^84]scholia edited by Massa Positano ${ }^{363}$ - the proportion is less than 5\% regarding the scholia vetera and the Tzetzes scholia respectively.

### 1.1.3 Divergences from the Aristophanic scholia

It often occurs that the glossary notes quoting Aristophanic scholia do not agree precisely with their source texts, although their relatedness is straightforward. On collating the glossary notes with the related scholia, one can identify in what ways the scholia tend to differ from their ultimate source texts. Some of the main tendencies have been collected here:

1. In the marginal notes, an abridged version of the scholia appears, some parts are left out. It seems that the lexicographical skeleton of the scholia quoted is usually retained; the explanatory parts (synonyms, further examples etc.) tend to be shortened or completely left out.
For instance, the glossary note added to f. 5r $14^{364}$ illustrates well this phenomenon. The marginal note lists four synonyms ( $\tau$ ò $\varphi \downarrow \lambda о \sigma о \varphi \varepsilon i v, ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi \alpha i ́ \zeta \varepsilon ı v$,
 however, presents examples for all of the four synonyms which had been left out from the marginal note. In the marginal note added to f. 102v $6,{ }^{366}$ again, basically the synonyms were kept and the explanatory part was shortened in the scholion; only its last, conclusion-like part is retained. ${ }^{367}$
2. In the marginal notes the original Greek scholia are sometimes quoted in - usually partial - Latin translation. ${ }^{368}$ One can find both shorter and longer quotations from Aristophanic scholia in Latin translation in the margins.
[^85]The glossary notes added to ff. 4 v 6, ${ }^{369} 18 \mathrm{v} 6^{370}$ or $78 \mathrm{r} 19^{371}$ are good examples. In several instances, the usually short, one-word explanations quoted from Aristophanic scholia are linked with the Latin preposition pro to the lemma to be clarified. ${ }^{372}$
3. In some cases, the scholia quoted are usually rearranged so that the lexicographically more relevant information (synonyms, short definition, or meaning of the lemma) could be emphasized. For instance, in the marginal note to f . 157 r 11 the alternative meaning is given first and then comes the illustrative quotation from Simonides, whereas the scholion presents the quotation first. ${ }^{373}$
4. Some of the quotations are modified so that they would fit the new context of the dictionary: some details (e.g. pronouns) otherwise straightforward in the scholia needed clarification.
For instance in a longer marginal note written to f. 77r 20 the pronoun тoutov found in the scholion is modified to the proper noun $\Sigma \tau \rho \varepsilon \psi 1 \alpha ́ \delta o u$ since the reference would not be clear otherwise in the glossary note. In a short one-word definition added to f. $148 \mathrm{Bv} 20^{374}$ the conjunction $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho-$ being superfluous in the definition - was left out. In the original scholion which is a bit longer it has an explanatory function.
In the marginal note written to f .4 v 6 , in the lemma $\dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi 1 \delta \tilde{\eta}$ and in its definition the nominative is used, although in the scholion they are given in the accusative. However, this kind of transformation (providing the base form of a noun/adjective or a verb instead of the declined/inflected one

[^86]appearing in the scholion) occurs relatively rarely; usually the declined/ inflected forms are retained.
5. At times, various explanations of related expressions/words which appear in two entries at different points of the scholion are combined in a single marginal note. For instance, in the glossary note added to f. 295 r 18 the word $\psi \eta \eta_{\varphi \iota \sigma \mu \alpha}$ appears in two different contexts with similar meaning. ${ }^{375}$
It is even more interesting that within single marginal notes sometimes different versions of the Aristophanic scholia are quoted: in the case of Nubes scholia, for instance, both the text of the Triclinian recension and that of the so-called scholion group "anonyma recentiora" are present side by side. ${ }^{376}$ Through the combination of the two different versions of the scholia, the marginal notes offer a more thorough clarification of the lemmas. From this respect, the glossary note added to f . $33 \mathrm{r} 26^{377}$ is even more instructive: there two different textual variants of the scholion belonging to the group "anonyma recentiora" are quoted after each other; the two variant explanations are connected with the Latin word alibi.

Finally, there are some glossary notes where one can find major differences in comparison to the scholia in the latest editions. For instance, in the marginal note added to f. 48r 21, the first half of the scholion is completely left out, while the second half is reasonably shortened. In the glossary note added to f. 283r 3 only the skeleton of the complete sentence in the scholion is retained: the key words of the scholion are highlighted. ${ }^{378}$ Moreover, one can also find glossary notes indicated as Aristophanic in the margins of the dictionary that are partly or completely missing from the modern editions of scholia to Plutus and Nubes. ${ }^{379}$

All in all, it seems obvious that the glossary notes of Aristophanic origin cannot be related directly to any traditions of Aristophanic scholia known to us. Instead, at this point two possiblilities emerge: 1) The glossator used

[^87]a manuscript which is lost or not known to us today. This supposed exemplar might have contained also scholia slightly diverging from the preserved ones or might have had additional notes in the margins which eventually the glossator used. 2) The second possibility is that it was the glossator who significantly modified the scholia in the marginal notes by combining different textual variants of the scholia and by rephrasing or summarizing them with his own words through lifting the key words and terminology of the scholia adapted, which helps the identification of the sources of these marginal notes. At times, however, the glossator might have even explained the Aristophanic lemmas with his own words, eventually using synonyms not present in the scholia.

### 1.2 Glossary notes of legal source ${ }^{380}$

### 1.2.1 General characteristics

After the discussion of the largest group of glossary notes that can be traced back to Greek literary sources, the second largest group is to be analysed. However, this group of glossary notes differs greatly from the group of Aristophanic marginalia regarding its genre: these marginal notes quote legal texts.

In the margins of the Greek-Latin dictionary in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 4565 glossary notes citing legal sources can be found. ${ }^{381}$ The majority of them are relatively short: the glossator quotes only one or two sentences. However, in some cases, six or seven sentences are cited from legal texts. These glossary notes are almost exclusively written in Greek with no Latin translation added. However, in two cases (cf. glossary notes added to ff. 11r 19 and 65 v 5 ) the Greek quotation is followed by its Latin translation, once (marginal note to f .48 v 13 ) only a part of the Greek marginal note is translated into Latin, while in further two cases (glossary notes to ff. 8 r 16 and 280r 25) a Latin keyword grasping the gist of the quotation is added after the Greek text. Finally, there is a peculiar case (marginal note to 243v 17) where the language of the quotation is exclusively Latin.

The source of these marginal notes is almost always indicated in a similar way as in the case of marginal notes quoting Aristophanic scholia. In the

[^88]first part of the Greek-Latin dictionary, up to 97r one can find the abbreviation $\varepsilon$ ह́к $\tau \tilde{\omega} v v o ́ \mu$. for $\varepsilon$ ह̇к $\tau \tilde{\omega} v v o ́ \mu \omega v$ at the beginning of the marginal notes of legal source. Up to f. $97 r, 23$ legal glossary notes can be found. In 19 of them the abbreviated form of $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \tau \widehat{\omega} v$ vó $\mu \omega v$ indicates the source of the marginal note. In two cases (marginal notes to ff. 19r 17; 69v 16), there is no indication of the source of the quotation. In the glossary note written to f. 65 v 5 , the abbreviation $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} v$ vó $\mu$. is missing, but the Latin expression e legibus preceding the Latin translation of the Greek quotation indicates the source. The glossary note written in the upper margin of f .71 r is dubious in this respect: the damaged part of the leaf had been replaced with a new piece of paper where the abbreviation $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa ~ \tau \hat{\varrho} v$ vó $\mu$. should stand. Here, the marginal note glosses two distinct Greek lemmas of the dictionary. Since the second one is introduced with $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} v$ vó $\mu \omega v$, one might suppose that the legal source of first one was also indicated. Where the Greek lemma is glossed with citations from two different sources, the second one is introduced with the Latin word Item (marginal note to f. 8r 16) or with Item e legibus (marginal note to 93r 24).
Starting from f. 102v, the glossary notes of legal source tend to be indicated with a capital L., which stands for Leges. Out of 42 marginal notes only six (marginal notes to ff. 161v 1; 161v 14; 212r 6; 222v 23; 273v 3; 283r 22) lack this indication.

The majority of the legal quotations are glosses to certain Greek lemmas, although a part of these lemmas are not legal terms strictly speaking (e.g.
 where there is no enough blank space in the margin next to the Greek lemma for its glossary note, the note is inserted on the next page, usually in the upper margin (e.g. ad 71r 1; 151v 1). Sometimes the marginal note glosses a derivative of the Greek lemma: for instance, the glossary note written to the lemma $\mu \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon ́ \gamma \gamma v o \varsigma$ ( 171 r 6 ) explains the term $\mu \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \gamma \gamma v \eta \tau$ ńc.
In four cases, the legal marginal notes gloss the Latin lemma instead of its Greek equivalent. The Latin lemma appears in the marginal note either in the Latin translation of the Greek quotation (marginal notes to ff. 11r 19; 243 v 17 ) or directly in the Greek text in Greek transcription (marginal notes to ff. 104r 6; 198r 26).

Five times the hand makes lexicographical addition to the vocabulary of the dictionary by inserting further Greek words either with the Latin equivalent or with Greek synonyms first, and then he glosses his own addition
with a quotation from legal source (marginal notes to ff. 12v 26; $27 \mathrm{r} 14 ; 69 \mathrm{v}$ 16; 151r 10; 222v 23).

In further four cases, the glossary note is intended as a lexicographical addition to the Greek lemmas in the dictionary, they are inserted in the margins so that the key term explained in them would suit the alphabetical order of the wordlist (marginal notes to ff. 159r $3 ; 161 \mathrm{v} 1 ; 212 \mathrm{r} \mathbf{6} ; 218 \mathrm{r} 14$ ).

### 1.2.2 The origin of the legal glossary notes

Using the online version of the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae ${ }^{382}$ one can identify easily the work from which the quotations - or at least the vast majority of the quotations - ultimately take their origin: the Basilika ( $\left.\tau \alpha{ }_{\alpha} B \alpha \sigma 1 \lambda 1 \kappa \alpha ́\right) .{ }^{383}$ It is a monumental collection of laws consisting of 60 books. Its compilation began under Emperor Basil I (867-886) and was completed in the first part of the reign of Emperor Leo VI (886-911). ${ }^{384}$
The Basilika was compiled mainly from the legal material present in the so-called Corpus Juris Civilis, that is, in the Justinianic law corpus consisting of the Institutes, the Digest, the Codex Justinianus and the Novels of Justinian I. The Latin source texts, especially from the Digest and the Codex Justinianus, were usually presented in Greek translations predominantly of the $6^{\text {th }}$ century. However, the original legal material was significantly altered through the elimination of superfluous parts and through the total rearrangement of the material: each of the 60 books are subdivided into titles (tituli) arranged according to subject, where the related laws from the Latin source texts were gathered. Thus, the Basilika became more practical, more "user-friendly" since - being written in Greek - it was more easily accessible in an empire where Greek was on its way to become dominant over Latin and - having a clear structure organized according to subjects - it made easier to consult the related legal regulations in a certain question. ${ }^{385}$

[^89]The textual tradition of the Basilika is problematic. No extant manuscript contains all of the 60 books of the vast law collection or a significant part of the whole work. Generally, the extant manuscripts present only one or two books; the majority of the books are preserved only in one codex. Fifteen of the 60 books are lost; these are partially reconstructed on the basis of later excerpts, summaries, commentaries etc. such as the Epanagoge aucta, the Synopsis major Basilicorum, the Peira, the Tipoukeitos and the commentary of Balsamon. Pringsheim divides the extant manuscripts into three groups according to their content: 1 ) manuscripts containing only the text of the Basilika; 2) manuscripts where scholia are appended to the main text and 3) manuscripts preserving only fragments from the Basilika. ${ }^{386}$ To provide an overview of the complicated textual tradition of the Basilika, Pringsheim's table is to be presented with some modifications and remarks. ${ }^{387}$

[^90]| Manuscript | Location | Century | Books contained | No. of books | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group 1: mss. containing only the text with no scholia ${ }^{\text {t1 }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cod. Coislinianus 151 | Paris | $14^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c} .{ }^{\text {t2 }}$ | 1-9 | 9 | Bas. libri A I, Praef. V. |
| Cod. Parisinus graecus 1357 | Paris | $\begin{aligned} & 15^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c} . \\ & \text { (copy) } \end{aligned}$ | 46-52 | 7 | Bas. libri A VI, Praef. V-VI. |
| Cod. Venturi | Firenze, Bibl. Riccardiana | $10 / 11^{\text {th }}$ | 53 | 1 | Bas. libri A VII, Praef. XIV-XVIII. |
| Cod. Vaticanus 1656 | Vatican | $11^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$. | 41 | 1 |  |
| Group 2: mss. containing the text with scholia |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subgroup A: text and old scholia |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cod. Escorialiensis Its copies: <br> a) Cod. Scorialensis graecus R II $13^{13}$ b) Cod. Vossianus graecus ${ }^{\text {t4 }}$ | Madrid <br> Madrid <br> Leyden | c. 1100 $1547$ | $7-8$ <br> 8 <br> 8 | 2 | lost; Bas. libri A I, Praef. V-VII. |
| Cod. Parisinus graecus 1349 | Paris | c. 1100 | 45-48 | 4 | Bas. libri A VI, Praef. V. |
| Cod. rescriptus Berolinensis fol. $28^{\text {t5 }}$ | Berlin | c. 1200 | 15-18 | 4 | destroyed, Bas. libri A II, Praef. V-XIII. |
| Cod. Vaticanus Reginensis Pii Secundi graecus $15^{\text {t6 }}$ | Rome | $11^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$. | 58-60 | 3 | Bas. libri A VII, Praef. <br> V-VII; Bas. libri A <br> VIII, Praef. VI-XV. |

[^91]Subgroup B: text with old and new scholia

| Cod. Coislinanus 152 | Paris | $13 / 14^{\text {th }}$ c. | $11-14$ | 4 | Bas. libri A I, Praef. V. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Cod. Parisinus <br> graecus 1350 | Paris | c. 1300 | 60 | 1 | Bas. libri B VIII, <br> Praef. VI-VIII. |
| Cod. Laurentianus <br> plutei LXXX, 11 | Florence | $12^{\text {th }}$ c. | $28-29$ | 2 | Bas. libri A IV, Praef. <br> V-VI. |
| Cod. Parisinus <br> graecus 1345 | Paris | c. 1200 | $38-42$ | 5 | Bas. libri A V, Praef. <br> V. |

Subgroup C: Copies of the mss. from subgroup B

| Cod. Parisinus <br> graecus 1348 | Paris | $13^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$. | $20-30$ | 10 | Bas. libri A III, Praef. <br> V. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Cod. Parisinus <br> graecus 1352 | Paris | $13^{\text {th }}$ c. | $1-18$ | 18 | Bas. libri A I, Praef. V. |
| Cod. Parisinus <br> graecus 1354 | Paris | $16^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$. |  | Pringsheim's <br> remark: Hervetus' <br> copy from Cod. <br> Laur. LXXX,11 and <br> Cod. Par. gr. 1349. |  |


| Mss. containing only fragments |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Cod. Vaticanus <br> graecus 2075 | Rome | $11 / 12^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$. |  |  | Bas. libri A VI, Praef. <br> VII. |
| Cod. Parisinus <br> graecus 1367 | Paris | $12^{\text {th }}$ c. |  |  | Bas. libri A V, Praef. <br> V-VIII. |
| Cod. Medico-Laur. <br> LXXX, 6 | Florence | $15^{\text {th }}$ |  |  |  |
| Cod. Medico-Laur. <br> XL,5 | Florence | $14^{\text {th }}$ |  |  |  |
| Cod. rescriptus <br> Vaticanus graecus $903^{17}$ | Rome | $10^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$. |  |  | Bas. libri A I, Praef. <br> VII-IX. |

Table 3 Overview of the mss. containing parts of the Basilika
The first complete textual edition of the Basilika was published by Karl Wilhelm Ernst Heimbach in five volumes between 1843 and $1850 .{ }^{388}$ The edition was

[^92]definitely a major achievement, since he used new manuscripts from the French National Library and he also collated manuscripts for the first time which were already known but had not been exploited for constituting the text of the Basilika. ${ }^{389}$ Beside the edition of the Greek text, Heimbach also prepared the Latin translation of the monumental work.

Although the significance of Heimbach's contribution to the study of the Basilika with his edition is undoubted, there were several serious problems with this edition. First, it was not the editor himself who collated the manuscripts for the textual edition, but his brother, Gustav Ernst Heimbach. From time to time, the brother made mistakes in transcribing the readings from the manuscripts which were sometimes corrected by Karl Heimbach with a successful conjecture. ${ }^{390}$ Moreover, the editor merely adopted the readings of manuscripts which had already been published without checking the manuscripts again. Furthermore, the editor did not attempt to separate the scholia according to the date of their composition and their author. ${ }^{391}$ Finally, he did not make any effort to reconstruct the lost books of the Basilika with the help of the extant testimonia.

Zachariae von Lingenthal realized these defects in Heimbach's edition. Instead of merely criticizing the textual edition, he intended to show how the edition of the Basilika could be improved. He prepared the edition of some books using a newly discovered manuscript where he attempted to separate the scholia and to restore the text of an incompletely preserved book. This edition was published as a supplement to Heimbach's edition. ${ }^{392}$

In the meantime, new manuscripts were discovered a part of which was published in separate volumes. ${ }^{393}$ Moreover, further research was made on the evolution of the scholia appended to the Basilika. ${ }^{394}$ Thus, several scholars realized that a new edition of such an important legal source was inevitable. ${ }^{395}$

[^93]Finally, it was H.J. Scheltema, N. van der Wal and D. Holwerda, who prepared the new edition of the text of the Basilika in eight volumes and that of the related scholia in nine volumes between 1953 and $1988 .{ }^{396}$

If one examines the quotations of legal source in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 thoroughly, one will realize that the distribution of the quotations from the Basilika is not even. Altogether, definitions, remarks and descriptions are quoted from 28 books of the monumental law collection. The highest number of quotes (19) was taken from the second book, while eight quotations stem from Book 60 . The hand quotes three times from Books 8,53 and 56 and twice from Books 10, 11,35 and 48 . Finally, 19 different books of the Basilika were cited only once.

| Book | Quotations | No. of quotes |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | ad 3v 7; 4v 18; 10v 16; 11r 19; 19r 17; <br> $49 \mathrm{r} \mathrm{14;} \mathrm{70v} \mathrm{10;} \mathrm{93r} \mathrm{24;} \mathrm{151r} \mathrm{22;} \mathrm{151v} \mathrm{1;}$ <br> $161 \mathrm{v} 14 ; 171 \mathrm{r} 6 ; 179 \mathrm{v} 13 ; 182 \mathrm{r} 1 ; 198 \mathrm{r}$ <br> $26 ; 218 \mathrm{r} \mathrm{14;} \mathrm{271v} \mathrm{16;} \mathrm{282v} \mathrm{22;} \mathrm{283r} \mathrm{22}$ | 19 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | ad 71r 1 |  |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | ad 69v 16; 71r 1; 231r 7 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | ad 48v 13; 73r 23 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | ad 65v 5; 253v 10 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | ad 171r 6 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | ad 110v 11 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ | ad 236r 2 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | ad 94r 23 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{2 4}$ | ad 18v 15 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ | ad 93r 24 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{2 6}$ | ad 103v 11 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{2 8}$ | ad 220v 21 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{3 3}$ | ad 116r 2 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{3 4}$ | ad 280r 25 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{3 5}$ | ad 278v 18; 280r 25 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{3 6}$ | ad 159v 3 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{3 9}$ | ad 8r 16 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{4 0}$ | ad 64r 25 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{4 4}$ | ad 161v 1 | 1 |
|  |  | 1 |

[^94]| Book | Quotations | No. of quotes |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4 9}$ | ad 8r 16 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{5 3}$ | ad 27r 14; 97r 15; 115v 9 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{5 4}$ | ad 104v 16 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{5 6}$ | ad 212r 6; 278r 13; 294r 8 | 3 |
| $\mathbf{5 7}$ | ad 32r 4 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{5 8}$ | ad 135v 17; 143r 18 | 2 |
| $\mathbf{5 9}$ | ad 263r 23 | 1 |
| $\mathbf{6 0}$ | ad 66r 21; 78r 6; 104r 6; 176r 24; 197v <br> 21; 222v 23; 251r 21; 273v 3 | 8 |

Table 4 The distribution of the legal quotations in the Basilika

Since the 28 books from where quotations were taken for the Greek-Latin dictionary in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 are usually not neighbouring books, one must suppose that the hand citing the Basilika must have used a manuscript or a series of manuscripts containing the complete legal work. To our present knowledge, there is no such manuscript; moreover, fifteen books have been lost. Naturally, one cannot exclude the possibility that at the time of glossing the dictionary the complete text of the Basilika was available in manuscript.

However, six quotations of legal content (marginal notes to ff. 12v 26; 102v 26; 111r 7; 151r 10; 176r 9; 220v 26) cannot be found in the Basilika, while further five legal glosses ( $104 \mathrm{r} \mathbf{6 ; 1 1 0 v} 11 ; 135 \mathrm{v} 17 ; 161 \mathrm{v} 1 ; 253 \mathrm{v} 10$ ) are taken only partly from the Basilika. In other quotations, striking differences can be discovered between the text quoted in the dictionary and the text transmitted in the Basilika (the most striking being the marginal note to f. 116r 2).

Considering the problems described above, I propose that the glosses of legal content in the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 were not directly taken from the monumental Basilika, but rather from one of its abridged versions, the Synopsis Major Basilicorum. ${ }^{397}$ On the one hand, it seems to me more plausible that the glossator had the compact and "user-friendly" version of the grandiose legal collection. Humanists often used popular handbooks (e.g. Nonius Marcellus, Gellius, Quintilianus) instead of the complete works. ${ }^{398}$ This trend is also apparent in the case of the literary quotations as for instance Lucretius

[^95]is quoted from Nonius Marcellus's De compendiosa doctrina. ${ }^{399}$ Thus, his use of the compact SBM instead of the whole Basilika would suit nicely this tendency. On the other hand, there is firm textual evidence confirming that the glossator exploited the SBM as direct source text.

The original Greek title of the SBM present in manuscripts is the following:
 бтox\&iov. In modern editions, it is called Synopsis Major so that it could be distinguished from the so called Synopsis Minor ( $\tau$ ò $\mu \kappa \rho$ òv ка兀ั̀ $\sigma \tau о \chi \varepsilon \hat{1} 0 \vee$ ), ${ }^{400}$ a compilation of legal regulations from the $13^{\text {th }}$ century partly based on the SBM. The SBM was compiled earlier, probably in the $10^{\text {th }}$ century. ${ }^{401}$ This abridged version contains approximately one-tenth of the legal material found in the Basilika. The material was arranged alphabetically: the author chose certain key words from the headings (tituli) in the Basilika and then he gathered the relevant legal regulations from the Basilika under each heading. The author either gives word-by-word quotations from the Basilika or an abridged version of the original text. Moreover, he adds the locus of the citations. This arrangement suggests that the intention of its author might have been to make the monumental Basilika more easily accessible and even to replace it in certain situations.

The work must have been popular: it is preserved in numerous manuscripts. In its most recent textual edition, fifty manuscripts are listed containing the SBM. ${ }^{402}$ The textual tradition and the manuscripts containing the SBM are described by N. G. Svoronos in most details. ${ }^{403}$ The text of the SBM is in most cases transmitted together with an appendix usually containing imperial novels

[^96]from the $10^{\text {th }}$ century up to the $12^{\text {th }}$ century. ${ }^{404}$ The appendix appears in two different forms. Svoronos in his book focuses on the appendices of the SBM. Consequently, he approaches the manuscripts of the SBM from the viewpoint of its appendices. He establishes three different groups of manuscripts: 1. manuscripts containing the text of the SBM without appendix; 2. manuscripts containing the text of the SBM with the so called appendix A; 3. a) manuscripts containing the text of the SBM with the so called brief appendix $B$ and $b$ ) manuscripts containing the text of the SBM with the so called developed appendix B. ${ }^{405}$ However, these three groups are not to be equated with the textual families of the SBM. Instead, the manuscripts from groups 1 and 2 constitute the family A, while the manuscripts from group 3 constitute the family B. The versions in both families eventually go back to a distant common archetype. ${ }^{406}$

The first edition of the SBM appeared in 1575, where the text was edited by Jo. Leunclajus. ${ }^{407}$ The editor's Latin translation was also presented in the editio princeps. However, Leunclajus did not present the material in the original alphabetical order of the SBM, but he attempted to reconstruct the order of the books and headings as they appear in the Basilika from where the material was taken. After Leunclajus, it was Labbaeus who published a volume of observations and emendations in relation with the work. ${ }^{408}$ The most recent edition was published in 1931. ${ }^{409}$ The editors use only one codex from the University Library of Leipzig, which was originally prepared in 1541 in Venice and which is the copy of an earlier codex. ${ }^{410}$ The text in the codex was collated with Leunclajus's edition and Labbaeus's Observationes. ${ }^{411}$ Thus, strictly speak-

[^97]ing, the modern edition has no apparatus criticus where the variant readings of the codices would be included. Although it seems that the manuscripts all go back to a distant common archetype, ${ }^{412}$ there are obvious differences ${ }^{413}$ which the user of this edition cannot detect.
At the beginning of the textual edition of the SBM, an Index titulorum can be found. In some of the manuscripts, it precedes the SBM, in some it follows the SBM, and there are codices where it is missing. The editors of the SBM suggest that the Index was not compiled by the author of the SBM, but it was added later since there are major differences between the indices preserved in the various manuscripts. ${ }^{414}$

In what follows, I intend to compare the legal quotations in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 with the text of the SBM and that of the Basilika in an attempt to prove that the glossator exploited the abridged version of the Basilika rather than the monumental legal collection itself. ${ }^{415}$

1. Some of the quotations in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 appear only in the SBM, they cannot be found in the Basilika, while all of the quotations which can be read in the Basilika are also present in the SBM.
 غ̇б兀ı סóloc (SBM P I, 85).


 غ̇бұпкю́ (SBM E XLII Index).
ad 176r 9: Leges. $\mu v \eta \sigma \tau \varepsilon i ́ \alpha ~ \varepsilon ̇ \sigma \tau i ́, ~ \mu v \eta ́ \mu \eta ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \varepsilon ̀ \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \lambda i ́ \alpha ~ \tau \omega ิ v ~ \mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda o ́ v \tau \omega v ~ \gamma \alpha ́ \mu \omega v$ (SBM M XV,1).
2. There are some quotations only a part of which can be found in the Basilika. However, the whole of these quotations can be identified in the SBM. In the quotations below the passages that can only be found in the SBM are set in bold.

[^98]



 тô $\begin{gathered}\gamma \kappa \lambda \\ \text { ń }\end{gathered} \alpha \tau \tau \circ$. (SBM K I Index + SBM K I,2; B LX,30,5)



ad 135v 17: Leges. ó каıvoто $\hat{\omega} v, \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \gamma \gamma \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \tau \alpha$. тò $\pi \varepsilon \rho \grave{~ \tau \eta ̂ \varsigma ~ \kappa \alpha ı v o \tau о \mu i ́ a c ~}$

 épyov. (SBM K IX Index + SBM K IX,26; B LVIII,10,1 partim rest.)
 $\tau \eta ̂ \varsigma ~ к \lambda \eta \rho о$ оонíac. (SBM $\Lambda$ I, $1+$ SBM $\Lambda$ I, 31; B XLIV,1,116 rest.)



 + SBM $\Sigma$ VIII,15; B XI,1,67)
3. There are some quotations where one can detect that the glossator used the abridged version of the SBM. The most striking example is the marginal note written to 116 r 2 :













After the word $\mu$ opí $\omega v$ there are two more short sentences in the Basilika which are left out from the SBM. Then the next two sentences in the quota-

 shortened and partly reworded version of what one can find in the Basilika. However, the shortened and rewritten version of the glossary note agrees nicely with the text transmitted in the SBM.

In the other cases, words or shorter expressions present in the Basilika are missing both from the quotations and from the text of the SBM. However, in these instances one must also count with the possibility that the omission of single words or expressions might be the result of possible alterations made by the glossator himself or it might be attributed to the use of a manuscript containing textual variants in comparison with the manuscript used by the modern editors of the SBM. Unfortunately, this question cannot be solved since no valid apparatus criticus is provided in this latest edition. Some examples:





 A XII,4; B XIX,10,17 rest.)


 paıvó $\mu \varepsilon v o v$. (SBM T V,7; B LIX,1,2 partim rest.)





Inversely, one can find quotations in the margins of öNB Suppl. Gr. 45 where extra words or expressions are present which can also be found in the SBM, but are missing from the Basilika.


 B LX,6,37)
عi̧ $\tau$ ò $\delta ı \pi \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \iota o v: ~ o m . ~ B ~$
4. There are numerous cases where one can find minor differences (definite articles, particles or prepositions omitted or added, ${ }^{416}$ orthographical variants, ${ }^{417}$ variant word orders, ${ }^{418}$ variant verb forms, ${ }^{419}$ prefixes, suffixes ${ }^{420}$ etc.) between the text of the glosses and the two legal sources or only one of them in contrast to the other. In these instances it would be impossible to decide whether the glossator changed or misread ${ }^{421}$ something in his source or he used a source containing variant readings or he decided to include scholia appended to the main text.

In some cases, however, one might suspect that it was the glossator who altered his source text when he was preparing the glossary notes. When the glossator quotes from the index section of the SBM, he obviously transforms the $\pi \varepsilon \rho \grave{\imath}+$ genitive constructions so that he would get a definition with the term defined in the nominative. The glossary note written to f. 111r 7 well illustrates this technique. In the Index of the SBM we can find the following:
 غ̇ $\chi$ óv $\tau \omega v$ (SBM E XLII Index), while the glossator transforms this as follows:
 In another marginal note (ad 71r 1), ${ }^{423}$ the glossator does not quote the

[^99]first part of the passage in his source text containing the verbum regens, so he transforms the infinitives to verba finita so that he would get a gloss comprehensible without its context. Finally, the glossator evidently omits or adds the particle $\delta \grave{\varepsilon}$ (or rarely $\gamma \boldsymbol{\alpha} \rho$ ) in accordance with the context of his marginal notes: when he starts with a quotation containing $\delta \grave{\varepsilon}$, he omits it as it is unnecessary at the beginning of the gloss, ${ }^{424}$ and when he joins a quote to another in the same gloss he tends to use the particle $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ to connect the two sentences. ${ }^{425}$
5. Apart from the differences discussed in section 4 , there are three problematic quotations. The gloss written to f. 151r $10^{426}$ cannot be found either in the text of the SBM presented in its latest edition or in that of the Basilika. In the Index of the SBM one can find the heading $\pi \varepsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \kappa \lambda \varepsilon \pi \tau о \tau \varepsilon \lambda \omega v \eta ́ \mu \alpha \tau о \varsigma$ (SBM K XIII), so it might be possible that one or several of the manuscripts contain an extra passage under this heading. Another marginal note written to 220v $26^{427}$ can only be identified in the Epanagoge and in the Procheiros nomos, but I did not manage to find it either in the Basilika or in the SBM. Again, one cannot exclude the possibility that it is present in some manuscripts of the SBM. Finally, in the glossary note written to $10 \mathrm{v} 6,{ }^{428}$ a longer expression agrees with the Basilika, while the edited text of the SBM presents a variant expression. Similarly, the question is whether the variant in the margin of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 is found also in another manuscript of the SBM.

After the textual arguments for the SBM as the source of the legal quotations, it might be useful to present how these quotations are distributed in the SBM.

[^100]| Book | Quotations | No. of quotes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | ad 236r 2; 280r 25 | 2 |
| B | ad 19r 17; 48v 13 | 2 |
| $\Delta$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { ad } 8 \mathrm{r} 16 ; 64 \mathrm{r} 25 ; 65 \mathrm{v} 5 ; 69 \mathrm{v} 16 ; 70 \mathrm{v} 10 ; 71 \mathrm{r} \\ 1 ; 73 \mathrm{r} 23 ; 278 \mathrm{v} 18 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 8 |
| E | ad 93r 24; 94r 23; 102v 26; 103v 11; 110v 11; 111r 7; 116r 2 | 7 |
| K | ad 104r 6; 135v 17; 151r 22; 159v 3; 278v 18 | 5 |
| $\Lambda$ | ad 104v 16; 161v 1 | 2 |
| M | ad 171r 6; 176r 9; 176r 24; 222v 23 | 4 |
| N | ad 27r 14; 97r 15; 115v 9 | 3 |
| $\Pi$ | ad 8r 16; 143r 18; 220v 21 | 3 |
| P | ad $3 \mathrm{v} 7 ; 4 \mathrm{v} 18 ; 10 \mathrm{v} 16 ; 11 \mathrm{r} 19 ; 12 \mathrm{v} 26 ; 49 \mathrm{r}$ <br> 14; 93r 24; 151v 1; 161v 14; 171r 6; 179v 13; <br> 182r 1; 198r 26; 218r 14; 271v 16; 282v 22; <br> 283r 22 | 17 |
| $\Sigma$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ad 32r 4; 71r 1; 197v 21; 231r 7; 251r 21; } \\ & 253 \mathrm{v} 10 \end{aligned}$ | 6 |
| T | ad 212r 6; 263r 23; 294r 8 | 3 |
| Y | ad 66r 21; 78 r 6; 273v 3 | 3 |
| X | ad 18v 15 | 1 |
| $\Omega$ | ad 278r 13 | 1 |

Table 5 The distribution of the legal quotations in the SBM
It is clear from the table that the majority of the glosses are quoted from the P section, more exactly from SBM P I, which has the title Пع $\rho$ ì $\rho \eta \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega v$ $\sigma \eta \mu \alpha \sigma i ́ \alpha c$ (its original Latin title in the Digest is De verborum significatione). ${ }^{429}$ This is a rather lengthy section with its 179 subsections, where basic legal terms are defined briefly and the subsections are organized in the alphabetical order of the legal terms defined in them. The glossator seems to have used this section as a source of quick reference, which can explain the high number of quotes from this section.

All in all, we can definitely rule out the Basilika as the direct source of the legal quotations found in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Starting out from the problematic textual tradition of the Basilika and using paralleling examples, we have shown that its abridged version, the SBM is a more probable candidate due to its wide availability and its compact, user-friendly

[^101]format. Moreover, the textual evidence presented above apparently confirms our assumption that the legal glossary notes in the codex were rather taken from the SBM than from the monumental law collection, the Basilika, although a few of the glossary notes of legal content cannot be detected in the modern edition of the SBM, either.

### 1.3 Other glossary notes of Greek literary origin

In the margins of the Greek-Latin dictionary one can find further glossary notes of literary origin that were added by the same hand that inserted the glosses quoting Aristophanic scholia and the SBM. Compared for instance to the large group of glossary notes containing several hundreds of Aristophanic scholia, this group consists of only approximately a hundred glosses quoting miscellaneous Greek literary sources. ${ }^{430}$

The majority of these glossary notes (approximately one third of them) can be traced back to Xenophon's works, ${ }^{431}$ while approximately 28 glosses quote Plutarch's various works. ${ }^{432}$ Plato's works are also quoted approximately 14 times. ${ }^{433}$ Apart from these three major sources of the miscellaneous literary quotations, one can find marginalia that can be traced back to the works of the following authors: Thucydides (appr. 5), Aristoteles (appr. 4; from the Nicomachean Ethics, Topics and Politics), Lucian of Samosata (appr. 4), Herodotus (appr. 2), Homer (appr. 1; from the Odyssey), Demosthenes (appr. 2) and Plato Comicus, the Athenian comic poet, a contemporary of Aristophanes (appr. 1). ${ }^{434}$ In some cases, however, the Greek authors are quoted or referred to through the text of the Suda lexicon (e.g. in the glosses added to ff. $49 \mathrm{r} 3,50 \mathrm{v} 26,179 \mathrm{r} 18$ ).
In the majority of the cases, the source of the quotation is indicated similarly as in the marginal notes quoting Aristophanic scholia or the SBM. ${ }^{435}$

[^102]However, the indication of the source occurs in various ways: 1) in Greek, either with a preposition ( $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ́$ or $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \dot{\text { ) }}$ ) or without preposition, or sometimes a verb is also used in the introduction of the quotation together with the author's name, e.g. ката̀ $\Pi \lambda \alpha ́ \tau \omega v \alpha(a d ~ 284 v ~ 8), ~ \Xi \varepsilon v o \varphi \tilde{\omega} v(a d ~ 11 v ~ 12), ~$ $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \dot{~ Ө o u k u \delta i ́ \delta n ~(a d ~ 179 r ~ 18), ~ o ́ ~ \Pi \lambda \alpha ́ \alpha \tau \omega v ~ . . . ~ \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon ı ~(a d ~ 7 r ~ 9) ; ~ 2) ~ i n ~ L a t i n, ~ e i t h e r ~}$ with a preposition (apud, in, secundum) or without a preposition, or sometimes the structure author's name + verb introduces the quotation, e.g. apud Platonem (ad 22v 1), in Platone (ad 74r 17), Plato (ad 111v 25), Herodotus vero ait (ad 54 r 14 ); and 3) even in a mixture of Greek and Latin, e.g. ut $\Xi \varepsilon v o \varphi \tilde{\omega} v$ (ad 43v 9), apud Өoukuסí $\eta v$ (ad 210r 10). Furthermore, in several instances not only the name of the author is indicated, but the title of the work, as
 18), П入ó́t $\omega v$ ह̇v $\tau \tilde{\omega}$ Е $\tau \tilde{\tau} v$ По $\lambda \uparrow \tau \varepsilon 1 \omega \tilde{v}$ (ad 270r 24), Xenophon in Oeconomico (ad 275r 5), Plutarchus in Vita Romuli (ad 111r 13).

Similary as in the case of the marginalia quoting Aristophanic scholia, the scholia that can be traced back to other Greek literary sources usually do not contain word-by-word quotations from the authors mentioned above: these scholia rather exploit their source texts in the relation of lexicography. In several cases, the source text appears in a reasonably shortened form in the margins. For instance, in the marginal note added to f .12 v 1 , the different meanings of a verb ( $\dot{\lambda} \lambda$ úvıv) are highlighted, although the examples illustrating the alternative meanings present in Plutarch's original text have been left out from the gloss. In several cases, the original text is used for providing a short definition or a Greek synonym for a Greek lemma (e.g. gloss added to ff. 24v 26, 156v 1, 208r 1).

In numerous instances, the original Greek text appears partly or completely in Latin translation. Sometimes only a Greek word or expression is given together with its Latin translation or definition to illustrate in what meaning a Greek author used that specific word or expression (e.g. glosses added to ff. 22v $1,48 \mathrm{r} 5,74 \mathrm{r} 17,111 \mathrm{v} 25,114 \mathrm{r} 16$; longer Latin defintions can be found in the marginal notes added to ff. $78 \mathrm{r} 11,109 \mathrm{r} 25,148 \mathrm{v} 9$ ). The marginal notes draw the readers' attention to peculiarities of a Greek author's language use or orthographical practice at times: for instance, the glosses added to ff. 123 r 25 and 294r 20 highlight Xenophon's avoidance or application of synaeresis, while in the marginal note added to f. 282v 3 Xenophon's use of a dual form is indicated.

All in all, in the case of the glossary notes that can be traced back to various Greek literary sources, one can reach a conclusion similar to the one regarding the marginalia of Aristophanic origin. The glosses usually do not contain direct quotations from Greek authors; there are significant divergences from the literary texts preserved to us, although the relatedness of the marginalia to the Greek literary loci identified is straightforward. Again, one can count with two possibilities: the marginalia were either taken from some other textual tradition(s) of the Greek authors identified or it was the glossator who modified the original quotations to fit his aims in the marginalia.

### 1.4 Glossary notes of non-literary origin

There is a fourth group of marginal notes in the Greek-Latin dictionary of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 that was entered by the same hand as the one adding the Aristophanic and legal marginalia and the glosses related to miscellaneous Greek literary authors. ${ }^{436}$ The marginal notes belonging to this group cannot be traced back to Greek literary sources: the origin of many of these glossary notes cannot be identified even with the help of the huge database of the online Thesaurus Lingae Graecae, while numerous glosses in this group seem to be related to Greek lexicographical sources, ${ }^{437}$ mainly to the Suda lexicon. However, in these cases the source is not indicated in the marginal notes as opposed to the general practice we could observe in the case of the Aristophanic, legal and other literary glosses. Again, these glossary notes usually do not contain word-by-word quotations from the above mentioned lexicographical sources, although their relatedness is straightforward.

In several aspects, these glossary notes are similar to the marginalia quoting Aristophanic scholia, legal texts and various Greek literary authors. Their length is varied: one can find glosses that are only a few words long (e.g. ad 7 r $15 ; 13 \mathrm{r} 11 ; 136 \mathrm{v} 19 ; 140 \mathrm{v} 17$ ), but one can also find marginalia that are several lines long (e.g. ad 143r 26; 243r 19). Their content is also similar to that of the groups of glossary notes analysed so far. Many of them contain some kind of lexicographical information: for instance synonyms (e.g. ad 75v 17; 160v 19; 234r 1), definitions (e.g. ad 3v 23; 69r 26; 127r 19), etymological explanations (e.g. ad $6 \mathrm{r} 21 ; 18 \mathrm{r} 4$ ) or clarification of the differences between similar words (e.g. ad 1v 20 - the difference between two synonymous verbs, $\varphi \downarrow \lambda \tilde{\omega}$

[^103]and $\alpha \hat{\gamma} \alpha \pi \tilde{\omega}$ is highlighted; ad 6 r 15 - the difference between the masculine form $\tilde{\alpha} \theta \lambda o s$ and the neuter form $\hat{\alpha} \theta \lambda o v$ is clarified), while several glosses from this group provide the users of the dictionary with some grammatical information (e.g. ad 1v 20). Many of the glosses are partly written in Latin (e.g. ad 18r 4; 70v 11; 71v 26; 129r 26) - a phenomenon also familiar from the previous groups of marginalia.

### 1.5 Collation with the marginalia in the Madrid codex $\Sigma$ I 12

So far, the possible identification of the glossator who added the marginalia analysed above (ie. the marginalia quoting Aristophanic scholia, the SBM and other Greek literary and lexicographical sources) has been expected from the thorough mapping of the textual history of these glossary notes mainly within the textual history of the Aristophanic scholia to Plutus and Nubes and that of the Synopsis Major Basilicorum. For instance, István Kapitánffy attempted to identify the glossator with Guarino Veronese on this basis. ${ }^{438}$ However, Kapitánffy did not identify the source of the marginal notes of legal content, thus, in his identification of the glossator he only relied on the marginal notes quoting scholia to Plutus and Nubes and glosses quoting entries from the Suda lexicon, since Guarino possessed manuscripts of Aristophanes's works (including the plays Nubes and Plutus together with the scholia) and a manuscript containing the Suda lexicon. In this identification the glossary notes of legal content originating from the SBM pose a problem: to our knowledge, Guarino did not possess any manuscripts containing the SBM or other legal texts. ${ }^{439}$

However, instead of searching for a new candidate, another humanist in possession of the manuscripts that contain all of the works appearing

[^104]in the marginalia, a new approach is needed in this question since the Greek-Latin dictionary in the Vienna manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 is not the only vocabulary list containing quotations from scholia written to the Aristophanic plays Plutus and Nubes and from the SBM: the manuscript EI 12 now kept in the Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo de El Escorial in Madrid also contains the same quotations in the margins. ${ }^{40}$
This paper codex consisting of 311 folios is basically a collection of manuscript fragments with diverse dating, written by different hands and having their own provenience. The content of the manuscript is heterogeneous. The lexicographical part can be found in the second part of the manuscript: an extensive Greek-Latin vocabulary list (ff. 91-293), a Latin-Greek lexicon (ff. 293v-309v) and a short list of Greek and Latin plant names (ff. 309v-310). ${ }^{441}$ The different parts of the manuscript were written by various hands: the scribe of the lexicographical unit on ff. 91-310 is so far unknown; it was probably a Western hand. ${ }^{.42}$ The same hand copied the collection of proverbs on ff. 47-51, which indicates that the two sections belong together. The dating of the various sections bound together in the codex is also problematic. ${ }^{443}$
The lexicographical section starting on f . 91 r has its own title in the upper margin: Lexicon graecolatinum. The dictionary belongs to the same textual tradition as the vocabulary list in the Vienna manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. On each page, two columns can be found: one column containing the Greek lemmas and another one where their Latin equivalents are visible. On a page, usually 40-43 lines are added; the lines are not ruled in advance. ${ }^{444}$

In the margins, the Greek-Latin dictionary in the Madrid manuscript contains hundreds of glossary notes apparently from two different hands. ${ }^{45}$ One of

[^105]the glossators who seems to be called Benedictus according to one of the glosses ${ }^{46}$ usually enters marginalia from scholia written to the Aristophanic plays Plutus and Nubes, from the SBM and sometimes from other Greek authors (e.g. from Aristotle, Lucian, Homer, Plato, Plutarch and Xenophon) and from Latin authors (Cicero, Isidore), while the other hand usually adds passages from Latin authors (Aulus Gellius, Cicero, Livy, Seneca, Suetonius, Virgil). ${ }^{477}$ The glossary notes inserted by the first hand tend to show striking agreement with the glossary notes entered in the margins of the Vienna manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 even at first sight. For the purposes of a thorough investigation, I have chosen to collate the marginal notes found in the alpha sections of the two manuscripts. Since marginal notes containing Aristophanic, legal and other Greek literary quotations occur in a relatively high number in the whole of the Greek-Latin dictionary of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 , the collation of a single section can provide us with valuable information about the connection of these glossary notes in the Madrid and Vienna manuscripts. ${ }^{488}$
The alpha section of the Vienna codex contains quotations from scholia to Plutus or Nubes. All of these quotations can be found in the marginalia of the Madrid manuscript, as well. The source of the quotations is also indicated with the same abbreviations in the codex $\Sigma$ I 12: Aristoph., in Aristoph., in Arist., in Ar. A part of the quotations show word-by-word agreement in the two dictionaries, particularly in the case of shorter quotations consisting of only a few words. On f. 7 r 24 , for instance, two synonyms are quoted from the scholia to Nubes, ${ }^{449}$ which are also present in the Madrid manuscript in the same form. However, we can also find longer quotations showing word-by-word agreement, e.g. on f. $37 \mathrm{v} 18 .{ }^{450}$ It is even more instructive to see that the marginalia in the two manuscripts sometimes share the same variant

[^106]or even textual error compared to the textual tradition of the Aristophanic scholia. A particularly nice example can be found for this phenomenon if one collates the marginalia quoting a scholion to Nubes 44c: $\dot{\alpha}$ кópŋтоз,
 f. 10 r 7 in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and on f. 96 v in $\Sigma$ I 12): both codices have $\dot{\omega} \rho \tilde{\omega}$ instead of кор $\tilde{\omega}$ which appears in the codices of the Nubes scholia. ${ }^{451}$

In several cases, however, the Vienna manuscript tends to present a modified version of the Aristophanic scholia: they are either shortened or they are partly or completely translated into Latin, ${ }^{452}$ while in the Madrid manuscript longer versions of the marginalia can usually be found. ${ }^{453}$ Shortening in the Vienna manuscript is usually effected in two ways: either by omitting parts of the longer marginalia found in the codex $\Sigma$ I 12 or by giving a summary of them. A good example for shortening the original scholia by leaving out parts of it is offered on f . 5 r 14 . While the Madrid manuscript quotes the full scholion to Nubes, the Vienna manuscript retains only the four different meanings of the verb $\dot{\alpha} \delta 0 \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \chi \tilde{\omega}$ and omits the examples provided as an illustration of the alternative meanings. ${ }^{454}$ The order of the four meanings is different in both codices compared to the scholion: the last two meanings are listed in a reversed order in both of them. The agreement in the order of the meanings nicely shows the relationship of the two marginalia even if one is shortened. For giving a summary of an originally longer marginal note the following gloss might be illustrative in the Vienna manuscript: on f. 11v 10 , only the gist of the longer marginal note in the Madrid codex is found in Latin, i.e. the Greek lemma, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \tau \rho \cup \omega \dot{v}$, can also mean "hen" in the works of Plato, the Athenian comic poet, a contemporary of Aristophanes. The codex $\Sigma$ I 12, however, contains the whole Aristophanic scholion on this question. ${ }^{455}$ Sometimes it also happens that parts of the original Aristophanic scholia

[^107]are translated into Latin in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, while the Madrid manuscript contains the original Greek version in all of these instances. For instance, on f .4 v 6 in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 , ${ }^{456}$ a very short quotation - the explanation of the Greek word $\dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi \iota \delta \tilde{\eta}$ - is translated into Latin. However, relatively longer passages from scholia also appear in Latin translation sometimes in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 (e.g. on f. 18v 26), while the codex $\Sigma$ I 12 retains the original Greek version of these scholia.

In the alpha section of the Vienna manuscript, ten quotations are inserted in the margins from the abridged version of the Basilika, the SBM. All of these quotations can also be found in the margins of the Madrid manuscript, with the same indication of the source, i.e. $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \tau \tilde{\omega} v$ vó $\mu \omega v$. Compared to the marginal notes quoting Aristophanic scholia, it is striking that the quotations from the SBM tend to show word-by-word agreement in the two codices in the overwhelming majority of the cases, although these quotes tend to be longer than the ones from Aristophanic scholia. A good example can be found on f. 18v 15 in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 compared to the matching gloss on f. 102 r in $\Sigma$ I 12. If any, only minor differences can be observed between the quotations in the two manuscripts. For instance, on f. 19 r 17 in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 , the word $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \tau \omega \varsigma$ is left out from the quotation, although it is also present in the textual tradition of the SBM. This might also be a scribal error, since the following word, $\pi \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \alpha$, also has the beginning $\pi \alpha-$ - In the case of the legal quotations, the two manuscripts also share the same textual variants not found elsewhere in the textual tradition of the SBM in several instances. This might be illustrated with the following example: in both the Vienna and Madrid codices, ${ }^{457}$ the quote ends with the words $\pi \alpha{ }^{\alpha} v \tau \alpha$ $\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon ́ v \delta \rho \alpha$, while the manuscripts of the SBM contain the ending $\pi \alpha \dot{v} v \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$ oi к $\alpha \rho \pi$ о̀̀ $\delta \eta \lambda$ ло⿱̃v $\tau \alpha \iota$ instead.

Apart from quotations from Aristophanic scholia and the SBM, other literary quotations also appear in both manuscripts: from Plato, Homer, Plutarch, Xenophon and even a Latin quotation from Nonius's De compendiosa doctrina. In the Vienna manuscript, however, these glossary notes tend to appear in a shortened way again: the full quotations are often omitted and only their lexicographical information is retained. An illustrative example is offered

[^108]on f. 21v 25 in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. $45 .{ }^{458}$ However, one can also find instances where the Vienna manuscript also retains the full quotation (e.g. on f. 11v 18), although this is definitely a rarer phenomenon.

The matching marginal notes in the Vienna and Madrid manuscripts often contain additional lexicographical or grammatical information that can be traced back to lexicographical sources in some of the cases. They are again predominantly written in Greek, although in some instances we can find Latin glosses, as well (e.g. f. 1r 26). Such glosses of lexicographical content either give a short definition (e.g. f. 3v 23) or insert additional Greek-Latin lemma pairs (e.g. f. 13r 7 and 9). These marginalia in the Vienna manuscript are again sometimes shortened or summarized compared to the matching glosses in the Madrid manuscript (e.g. f. 27r 26, 44v 23).

All in all, exploring the source of the - mainly - Aristophanic and legal glossary notes in the Greek-Latin dictionary of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 through a collation with another manuscript kept in Madrid can thus lead us to the following conclusions:1) The high number of the Aristophanic and legal glossary notes seems to indicate that their addition was the result of a systematic and organized process aiming at the conscious enlargement and broadening of the original lexicographical material; 2) This group of glossary notes in the Vienna manuscript seems to originate from or be more closely related to a lexicographical tradition rather than a literary one: the striking agreements of the glossary notes in the Vienna and the Madrid manuscripts suggest that a set of marginal notes containing mainly Aristophanic and legal quotations once made their appearance in the textual tradition of the Greek-Latin lexicon found in the codex Harleianus and then perhaps were handed down as a part of the dictionary in this branch of the tradition. Thus, it does not seem probable that these glossary notes in the Vienna manuscript could offer any valuable information about the person of the glossator either through their textual tradition or through their content as it has been assumed earlier.

[^109]
## 2 A group of marginal notes from another textual tradition ${ }^{459}$

### 2.1 General characteristics

In the Greek-Latin dictionary of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 a group of marginal notes can be found which can apparently be separated both from the main text of the dictionary and from other groups of interrelated glossary notes through analysing the characteristics of the handwriting and through mapping its ultimate source. The glossary notes from this group are usually inserted either after the Latin lemmas of the dictionary in the right margins or in the intercolumnium in a position where they precede the Latin lemmas they belong to. For instance, the recto of f. $4^{460}$ can offer an overall picture of this group of marginal notes; we can find several such additions there. In line 3, next to the Latin lemmas propinquitas and affinitas, appropinquatio and conversatio are inserted. In line 12, next to the Latin lemmas disciplina and educatio further Latin lemmas can be found (vita, diaeta, regula vivendi), which provide us with further possible equivalents of the Greek entry
 lents of the Greek entry $\alpha$ $\gamma \omega \omega$ үós are inserted after the Latin lemma dictus, -us, ui: ducibilis, dux viae, ductor. It is fairly easy to separate these marginal notes from the Latin lemmas of the dictionary after a cursory look even if the glosses are inserted in continuation of the list of the Latin lemmas: although the Latin handwriting is very similar - or perhaps the same as the handwriting of the Latin lemmas - a darker ink and a different writing tool drawing considerably thinner lines were used for the addition of these marginal notes. ${ }^{461}$

It would be difficult to estimate the exact number of glossary notes belonging to this group. Such marginalia appear on almost all of the pages of the Greek-Latin dictionary; most often we can find more than one glossary notes from this group on a single page. Furthermore, there are several pages where they appear in a relatively high number (e.g. f. 2v: 9; f. 9r: 9; f. 13r: 12; f. 44v: 11; f. 56 v : 10). To provide an overall picture of the quantity and

[^110]distribution of these glossary notes in the whole of the dictionary, the first three alphabetic sections (alpha, beta and gamma) were analysed. The three sections are found on ff. $1 \mathrm{r}-58 \mathrm{v}$ in the dictionary comprising 298 folios (ff. $1 \mathrm{r}-298 \mathrm{r}$ ), thus, the three sections examined add up to approximately a fifth of the size of the complete dictionary. In this way, data gained from the analysis of these sections can show us tendencies valid for the whole of the dictionary. The first three alphabetic sections comprise 58 folios, i.e. 116 pages, where such glossary notes are inserted in almost 500 instances. ${ }^{462}$ This means that on average marginal notes belonging to this group are added in four instances on each of the pages. On the basis of this average number, it can easily be calculated that the whole dictionary contains more than 2000 such additions.

Regarding language and content, the marginal notes are not unified in this group. Predominantly Latin marginal notes are inserted. Most often, they give synonyms of the original Latin lemmas or alternative meanings of the Greek entries. ${ }^{463}$ The additional alternative meanings are sometimes joined to the original Latin equivalents with the Latin word vel or aliquando. ${ }^{464}$ In some cases, the marginal notes complement the already given Latin equivalent(s) thus making the lexicographical information in the dictionary more precise. ${ }^{465}$ At times we can find even short Latin definitions in the margins. ${ }^{466}$ Apart from glossary notes of predominantly lexicographical content, grammatical additions can also be found, although they appear less often. In some cases, the grammatical category of the lemma is given. ${ }^{467}$ Grammatical comments can also contain the etymology of the

[^111]Greek lemma ${ }^{468}$ or - in the case of verbs - additional information on the augmentation. ${ }^{469}$
As the grammatical marginalia have already anticipated, in this group of marginalia one can also find glossary notes at least partly written in Greek or relevant to one of the Greek entries. Sometimes an additional Greek lemma related to the Greek entry is inserted with its Latin equivalent. ${ }^{470}$ It also occurs at times that irregular forms of the Greek lemma (irregular verb forms or irregular declinations) are inserted ${ }^{471}$ or one can also find alternative versions of the Greek lemmas in the margin. ${ }^{472}$

However, in some instances, even Italian marginal notes appear inserted in the same manner and with the same ink and writing tool as the Latin and Greek marginalia mentioned so far. The Italian marginal notes provide lexicographical additions: they either translate the Latin lemmas or offer further alternative meanings of the Greek lemma. ${ }^{473}$

### 2.2 The origin of the glossary notes

In the textual tradition of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, I have not found any traces of this group of marginal notes so far. As it has been discussed earlier in details, ${ }^{474}$ the Greek-Latin dictionary in the Vienna manuscript indirectly goes back to the Greek-Latin lexicon in the $8^{\text {th }}$-century Codex Harleianus 5792, on ff. 1 v -272, which is now kept in the British Library and its digitized form is available on the website of the British Library. ${ }^{475}$ The edited

[^112]version of the Greek-Latin dictionary of the Harleianus is available in the second volume of the series Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum. ${ }^{476}$ There are at least 14 further versions of the same Greek-Latin dictionary from the $15^{\text {th }}$ and $16^{\text {th }}$ centuries found in manuscripts in various European libraries: in Munich, in Basel, in Paris, in Cambridge, in Naples, in Vienna etc. ${ }^{477}$ However, the glossary notes now discussed do not appear in the edited version of the codex Harleianus.

Regarding the source of the marginal notes, basically two possibilities emerge: 1) the marginal notes originate from a codex recentior where the same Greek-Latin dictionary was expanded with the additional material of lexicographical and grammatical contents, or 2 ) the marginalia take their origin in a completely different textual tradition of Greek-Latin lexica. Theoretically, as a third possibility, one could also suppose that either the scribe or a subsequent user of the lexicon added these marginal notes using his own ideas and lexicographical knowledge without exploiting any kinds of written sources. However, the high number and the systematic insertion of these marginal notes render this hypothesis implausible and suggest that the glossary notes rather originate from a prearranged written source. I managed to find and study so far three manuscripts containing Greek-Latin dictionaries from a different textual tradition which seems to be a good candidate for the ultimate origin of this specific group of glossary notes in the Vienna manuscript on the basis of the collation of their material with the marginal notes in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. The three codices are as follows: Vat. Pal. Gr. 194, Cod. Gr. 4 (University Library, Budapest) and Res. 224 (Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid).

The Greek-Latin dictionary in the above listed three codices belongs to a different textual tradition compared to the lexicon in the Vienna manuscript. Although naturally they also contain Greek lemmas that are present in the tradition of the codex Harleianus, these lemmas tend to have different Latin equivalents or more Latin equivalents as the ones we can find in the edited version of the Harleian manuscript. The method of alphabetization is also different: the words are usually organized in alphabetic order up to the second letter, then first the vowels are alphabetized in the third letter, and

[^113]they are followed by the consonants in alphabetic order. The alphabetization starts again for the second time in each of the sections: there poetical words, mostly from the Homeric language are listed in similar alphabetic order. The dictionary also contains the irregular forms of the verbs listed where the tempora are indicated with special abbreviations.

The vocabulary from this textual tradition seems to show striking agreements with the first printed Greek dictionary of Johannes Crastonus; and with all probability it belongs to the prehistory of this lexicon. This textual tradition was the main subject of Peter Thiermann's PhD dissertation ${ }^{478}$ and he also planned a critical edition of the text. ${ }^{479}$ In his paper written in 1996, he lists 42 manuscripts from 18 cities that contain a Greek-Latin dictionary of the same textual tradition which according to Thiermann originates from the Greek-Latin dictionary attributed to Guarino Veronese ${ }^{480}$ and published around $1440 .{ }^{481}$ However, further results of Thiermann's research on this textual tradition of Greek-Latin dictionaries are not available. ${ }^{482}$

[^114]One of the three manuscripts studied and collated with the marginalia in the Vienna manuscript is the codex Vat. Pal. Gr. 194. ${ }^{483}$ It is now kept in the Vatican, but before the Thirty Years' War it was originally kept in the Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, where now a black-and-white copy of the manuscript is available - I had the possibility to study this latter copy of the original manuscript. The Greek-Latin dictionary in the paper codex was copied by Johannes Thettalos Scutariotes, one of the most prolific scribes in the $15^{\text {th }}$-century Florence active approximately between 1442 and $1494 .{ }^{484}$ The codex, however, lacks the subscription of the scribe; only the remark $\tau \varepsilon ́ \lambda o c ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ \lambda \varepsilon \xi ı \kappa o v ̂ ~ c a n ~ b e ~ f o u n d ~ a t ~ t h e ~ e n d ~ o f ~ t h e ~ G r e e k-L a t i n ~ d i c t i o n a r y, ~$ which is not a rare phenomenon, Scutariotes signed very few of the manuscripts he copied. With all probability, together with other manuscripts now also in the Palatine collection, the transcription of this lexicon was commissioned by the Florentine humanist, Giannozzo Manetti (1396-1459), who translated some works of Aristotle to Latin. ${ }^{485}$ This means that the date of Manetti's death in 1459 is to be regarded as terminus ante quem for the copying of the Greek-Latin dictionary in Vat. Pal. Gr. 194. ${ }^{486}$

The codex consisting of 218 folios contains two columns on each of the pages: in the first one the Greek lemmas are listed in approximately 45 lines, in the second one their Latin equivalents can be found - in the same way as in the Greek-Latin dictionary of the ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. The dictionary was transcribed column by column as the frequently occurring scribal errors well illustrate. In several cases, the Latin equivalents were misplaced in the process of copying since the scribe accidentally skipped one or more Latin lemmas during the transcription. These errors were partly corrected either by connecting the matching lemmas with dashed lines (see e.g. on f. $34 \mathrm{r} 31-32$; f. 38 v 34 ) or by deleting the mistaken lemmas and inserting the correct ones instead afterwards (see e.g. on f. 34r 13 and 24-28). In several

[^115]instances, the Latin lemmas are missing. For example, on ff. $25 \mathrm{v}-30 \mathrm{v}$ the Latin lemmas were almost completely omitted, while on ff. 31r-34r the Greek and Latin lemmas placed next to each other tend to disagree suggesting that the hand copying the Latin columns worked completely mechanically. ${ }^{487}$ In the transcription of the Latin columns several switches in the hand can be observed (e.g. on f. 31r, 34r).

The second manuscript I consulted is the Cod. Gr. 4 in the University Library, Budapest. It contains a Greek-Latin dictionary from the same textual tradition as the codex Vat. Pal. Gr. 194. The Greek part was also transcribed by Scutariotes and, in contrast to the other codex, it does have a subscription from its scribe on f .174 v , although it does not include the date of the
 signature, the words $\theta \varepsilon ́ \omega ~ \chi \alpha \rho ı \varsigma$ were written by the Latin hand copying the Latin lemmas of the lexicon. One can find parallels to this type of subscription with almost the same wording in Scutariotes's scribal activity, although the date is also provided in the cod. Vindob. suppl. gr. 30 copied on 9 May

 $\left.\varepsilon^{n c}\right)^{489}$ and in Vindob. Hist. Gr. 1 copied on 31 October 1454 (f. 98v: $\varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon ı \omega \theta[\eta]$
 $\delta \tilde{\rho} \rho 0 v$, кגì ì $\omega \alpha ́ v v o$ ũ, ко́тоৎ). ${ }^{490}$

In the Cod. Gr. 4, an extensive lacuna can be found at the very beginning: the dictionary only starts with the word pair $\alpha{ }^{\circ} \lambda o \xi$ sulcus. ${ }^{491}$ On each page,

[^116]two columns can be found: the first one contains the Greek lemmas and the second one has their Latin equivalents. As it has been already mentioned, the Greek and Latin columns were copied by two distinct hands: first the Greek columns were transcribed by Scutariotes and then the Latin columns were also added. Occasional scribal errors occur that is clearly the result of the column-by-column process of the transcription (e.g. on f. 118 v some of the Latin equivalents were originally misplaced, but afterwards the matching lemmas were connected with lines; on f .50 v the misplaced Latin lemmas were deleted and the correct ones were added next to them).

The third manuscript used for the collation is Res. 224 (Cod. 350; formerly $\mathrm{N}-7$ ) in the Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid. ${ }^{42}$ The whole of the codex contains a Greek-Latin lexicon (on ff. 1-267) of the same textual tradition as the ones in Cod. Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 and Cod. Gr. 4. The dictionary was again copied by Johannes Scutariotes ${ }^{493}$ in 1470, probably in Florence for Ludovico Saccano, a Sicilian erudite. ${ }^{944}$ This time the scribe left his signature indicating the date of completing the transcription (13 December 1470) on f. 267r:

 translation of this signature was also added later under the Greek text by Juan de Iriarte. ${ }^{95}$

The dictionary in the Madrid manuscript also contains two columns per page: the Greek lemmas on the left, and the Latin equivalents on the right. The lexicon was transcribed column by column as the occasional scribal errors well illustrate. For instance, right on f. 1r, a Latin equivalent was accidentally omitted, which was soon realized by the scribe and corrected his error by joining the Greek lemmas with their Latin equivalents through drawing lines.

[^117]I have collated the glossary notes in the alpha, beta and gamma sections of the dictionary in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 with the corresponding sections of the manuscripts of different textual tradition:Vat. Pal. Gr. 194, Cod. Gr. 4 in the University Library of Budapest and Res. 224 in Madrid. In these three alphabetic sections approximately 460 glossary notes belonging to the discussed group of marginalia can be found. The results of the collation are presented in four tables in the appendix section: ${ }^{496}$ in the first column, the Greek lemmas with their Latin equivalents from ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 are printed, then the glossary notes are separated with two vertical lines. In the second column, the Latin equivalents of the corresponding Greek lemma from Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 can be found, while the third column contains those of the Cod. Gr. 4 from the University Library Budapest and the fourth one presents those of Res. 224. In the four tables four distinct groups appear: 1) Marginal notes in agreement with all three codices; 2) Marginal notes in agreement with two of the three codices;3) Marginal notes in agreement with one of the three codices and 4) Marginal notes in agreement with none of the three codices. Within groups 1-3, no distinction has been made between partial or complete agreement, although the matching parts of the glossary notes and the entries of the codices are clearly highlighted with grey colouring. The majority of the glossary notes belong to groups 1 and 2 , which means that they mostly tend to agree at least with two of the codices or even with all of them. However, the high number of glossary notes in agreement with two of the codices in group 2 is to be attributed to defects in two of the three codices: the extensive lacuna at the beginning of the alpha section in Cod. Gr. $4^{477}$ and the lacuna in the place of numerous Latin lemmas and the misplacement of a high number of Latin equivalents in the alpha section of cod. Vat. Pal. Gr. $194 .{ }^{498}$ Due to these defects, at several passages only two different versions were available for collation. It is clearly indicated in group 2 in the table when apparently a lacuna or misplacement of the Latin equivalents prevents the collation so that it could be distinguished from instances where a version of the dictionary simply does not contain complete word pairs appearing in other versions which belong to the same textual tradition.

The highest number of glossary notes (approximately 166) belongs to the first group, which means that they agree with all three codices used

[^118]for the purposes of the collation. However, the extent of the agreement is diverse in this group. There are numerous glossary notes that show strict agreement with all three versions appearing in the three codices, although these glossary notes tend to be shorter usually consisting of one or two additional Latin synonyms (e.g. glossary notes added to $18 \mathrm{r} 24,18 \mathrm{v} 20$, 21r 24 , $44 \mathrm{v} 3,46 \mathrm{v} 7$ ). However, sometimes strict agreement can also occur in the case of longer marginal notes (longer sequences of synonyms, short definitions; e.g. $43 \mathrm{r} 13,43 \mathrm{r} 15,45 \mathrm{v} 1,55 \mathrm{v} 25$ ). Still, in the case of more complex, longer marginal notes one can find minor differences more often: one or some of the additional Latin synonyms cannot be found in one of the codices (e.g. 14r 20, $22 \mathrm{r} 15,53 \mathrm{v} 1$ ) or definitions given in the marginal notes can also show minor divergences: usually not in wording, but rather parts of them are missing in some of the codices (e.g. 14r 13, 14r $23 ; 18 \mathrm{r} 4 ; 23 \mathrm{v} 14$ ). If one studies group 1 in the table thoroughly, it can be realized that not only marginalia containing additional Latin synonyms tend to agree with all three codices. One can also find several marginal notes in Greek (mostly irregular verb forms, e.g. $17 \mathrm{v} 8,44 \mathrm{v} 14,49 \mathrm{r} 21$; and grammatical information on augmentation etc., e.g. 18r 4, 44v 6). Marginal notes containing an additional Greek lemma and its Latin equivalent often agree with lemma pairs found in the main text of the dictionaries in all three codices (e.g. 21r 3, 43r 10, 49r 14). Furthermore, several Italian marginal notes also show remarkable agreement with the dictionaries in the three codices where the Italian words and expressions interestingly appear in the place of or next to the Latin equivalents from time to time (e.g. 19v 21, 46v 5, 56v 25). Finally, there is an instructive agreement in group 1 worth highlighting: the original word pair is $\beta \omega \mu \circ \lambda$ ó $\chi$ о phanaticus in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 ( 52 v 21 ), to which the Italian equivalents il buffone, sive scurra were added and the same hand modified the Greek lemma to $\beta \omega \mu$ ó $\lambda \alpha \chi \circ \varsigma$. In all three codices, the Greek lemma appears as $\beta \omega \mu$ ó $\lambda \alpha \chi \circ \varsigma$, and all of them contain both Italian equivalents.

In group 2, the number of glossary notes showing agreement with two of the three codices is just slightly lower (approximately 159 glossary notes) than in group 1. However, one has to bear in mind that in the majority of the instances (approx. 114) the agreement of all three codices is hindered due to defects in two of the codices: in about 85 cases due to the extensive lacuna in Cod. Gr. 4 , while in about 29 cases due to the lacuna in the place of the Latin lemmas or their displacement in Cod. Vat. Pal. Gr. 194. Mainly marginal notes containing additional Latin synonyms agree with two of
the codices with possible minor differences at times (e.g. $2 \mathrm{v} 6,2 \mathrm{v} 15,4 \mathrm{r} 12$, 13r 14). There are also marginal notes with longer definitions which show remarkable agreement with two of the codices (e.g. $3 \mathrm{r} 8,7 \mathrm{r} 3,54 \mathrm{r} 14$ ). Besides, marginal notes in Greek (mainly irregular verb forms; e.g. $7 \mathrm{r} 25,8 \mathrm{r} 3$ ) or in Italian (e.g. 2 r 26 , 13r 19-20) also appear in group 2. Even marginal notes with additional Greek-Latin word pairs show agreement with word pairs in the main text of two of the codices (e.g. $6 \mathrm{r} 15,7 \mathrm{r} 6,13 \mathrm{v} 15$ ).

Group 3 comprises approximately 37 marginal notes that agree partly or completely with one of the three codices. Among the matching marginalia one can find additional Latin synonyms (e.g. 28r 23, 30r 9), longer definitions (e.g. $28 \mathrm{r} 13,41 \mathrm{r} 19$ ), Greek irregular verbs (e.g. 16r 22), Italian equivalents (e.g. $35 \mathrm{v} 7,47 \mathrm{r} 1$ ) etc. similarly as in groups 1 and 2 . In numerous instances (about 28), lacunas or the misplacement of lemmas in Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 and Cod. Gr. 4 also contribute to the lack of agreement.

In group 4 marginal notes (approximately 97) are collected that agree with none of the three codices. The lack of agreement is again to be attributed partly to the defects (lacunas and misplacement of lemmas) in two of the codices that have been described earlier in details. Otherwise the fact that the marginalia in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 do not agree with any of the codices can be explained on several grounds. In some cases, obviously a scribal error led to the disagreement of some of the codices. A very good example illustrates this phenomenon if one looks at the marginal note added to 4 r 19 in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 (ludorum praefectus) and the relevant Latin lemmas in Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 (profectus luctorum) and in Res. 224 (luctatorum praefectus). The divergence of the two codices can be well explained on palaeographical grounds. Furthermore, there are several marginal notes that show agreement partly or completely with a 1497 edition of the Crastonus dictionary ${ }^{499}$ (these marginalia are highlighted in grey in group 4) even if they do not agree with any of the three codices used for the purposes of the collation. As it has been mentioned earlier, the vocabulary of the Crastonus dictionary is predominantly based on the textual tradition also represented by

[^119]Vat. Pal. Gr. 194, Cod. Gr. 4 and Res. 224 according to Peter Thiermann, who collected several other codices containing Greek-Latin dictionaries from the same textual tradition. ${ }^{500}$ Thus, marginalia matching the Latin lemmas of the Crastonus dictionary are likely to originate from the same textual tradition as the vocabulary of the first printed dictionary, but from another branch of the tradition than the one represented by the three codices collated with the glossary notes. Finally, in the case of the marginalia showing agreement neither with the three codices nor with the Crastonus dictionary two explanations seem to be probable: 1) The marginalia have their origin in another branch of the textual tradition that diverges from the one represented by the three codices and that did not make its way to the Crastonus dictionary. Still, they perhaps could be found in other codices containing dictionaries of this textual tradition. 2) These glossary notes have an entirely different origin outside the textual tradition represented by the Crastonus dictionary. At this point, without the investigation of further codices from the same textual tradition, the question cannot be decided.

All in all, the collation of the glossary notes in the Vienna manuscript with Vat. Pal. Gr. 194, Cod. Gr. 4. (Budapest) and Res. 224 (Madrid) can lead us to two conclusions: 1) the high number of significant agreements - even in the cases of Italian glossary notes and Greek ones - seems to prove that this group of additional glossary notes in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 ultimately takes its origin from another textual tradition of Greek-Latin lexica, i.e. the one represented by the three codices used for the purposes of the collation; 2) the occasional differences between the glossary notes of the Vienna manuscript and the corresponding lemmas of the other three codices seem to indicate that none of them can be regarded as the direct source of this group of marginal notes. Still, the agreement of some of the marginalia with the vocabulary of the Crastonus dictionary sharing the same textual tradition as the Vatican, Budapest and Madrid codices also seem to confirm that this group of marginal notes in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 originates from this shared tradition of the Crastonus dictionary and the three codices collated. An analysis of further Greek-Latin dictionaries from the same textual tradition could perhaps help us identify a more direct source of these glossary notes.
The high number of glossary notes in this group suggests that their addition aimed at the conscious enlargement and broadening of the original

[^120]lexicographical material in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 through the exploitation of lexica from another tradition. In this way, the Vienna manuscript presents an interesting combination of two different traditions of Greek-Latin lexica. This is, however, not the only attempt to combine the different vocabularies of the two Greek-Latin lexica originating from different traditions: several examples can be found for similar considerable enlargement of the original lexicographical material in Greek-Latin dictionaries. ${ }^{501}$

[^121]
## 3 Summary

In this chapter, two major groups of glossary notes added in the margins of the Greek-Latin dictionary in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 have been analysed thoroughly. The first major group of glossary notes has been discussed in a division of four subgroups in accordance with their ultimate sources: Aristophanic marginalia, glosses quoting the legal text SBM, glossary notes of miscellaneous Greek literary origin (mainly Xenophon, Plato and Plutarch) and marginal notes connected to lexicographical sources (mainly to the Suda lexicon). The results of the collation of these marginal notes with the modern textual editions of the source texts suggest in the case of all four subgroups that the Greek literary and lexicographical works cannot be regarded as direct sources of the marginalia: the glossary notes are altered in various ways (e.g. Latin translation, summarizing, shortening or rewriting of the original source) compared to the source texts they are obviously related to. In this respect the collation of this major group of marginal notes with a group of the marginal notes found in the Greek-Latin dictionary of the Madrid manuscript $\Sigma$ I 12 has proved to be instructive: the two sets of marginal notes in the two codices show remarkable agreement even at the level of textual errors and variants contrasted to the textual variants found in the modern editions.

The second major group of glossary notes of mainly lexicographical content (synonyms, alternative meanings, short definitions etc.) written predominantly in Latin and occasionally in Greek or in Italian seems to originate from another tradition of Greek-Latin lexica. This can be well illustrated with the results of the collation with three representatives of this tradition found in the manuscripts Vat. Pal. Gr. 194, Cod. Gr. 4 and Res. 224.

The examination of the sources of the two major groups of glossary notes in the Greek-Latin dictionary of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 can thus lead us to the following conclusions: 1) The high number of glossary notes in both groups seems to indicate that their addition was the result of a systematic and organized process aiming at the conscious enlargement and broadening of the original lexicographical material of the dictionary; 2) Both major groups of glossary notes in the Vienna manuscript seem to originate from or be more closely related to a lexicographical tradition rather than a literary one: The second group of glossary notes is ultimately based on an entirely different tradition of Greek-Latin lexica; while the striking
agreements of the glossary notes in the Vienna and the Madrid manuscripts suggest that a set of marginal notes containing mainly Aristophanic and legal quotations once made their appearance in the textual tradition of the Greek-Latin lexicon found in the codex Harleianus and then perhaps were handed down as a part of the dictionary in a branch of the tradition.

The two major groups of glossary notes have never been examined and discussed in such depth earlier in the literature. Thus, the assumption has prevailed for long that the identification and meticulous analysis of the ultimate sources and their textual traditions can help us identify the glossator who added these glosses in the margins of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. However, the final conclusions of this chapter also imply that it is highly improbable that these glossary notes in the Vienna manuscript could offer any valuable information about the person of the glossator either through their textual tradition or through their content since they seem to be rather rooted in the lexicographical tradition of contemporary Greek-Latin lexica than in the literary traditions of the works quoted or referred to in the case of the first major group of glossary notes. The second major group of marginalia with its purely lexicographical origin further confirms this statement.

## V Conclusions

In the present monograph, a complex and thorough analysis of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 has been provided. Since the codex has never been researched and discussed in such depth before, several significant results have been achieved in the course of the research work.
In the first chapter, the existing codicological descriptions of the manuscript have been considerably complemented and corrected at several points: for instance, the sections on folio and page numbering and on gatherings and catchwords also contain some new information gained through the thorough study of the codex. The section on the scribes of the manuscript unequivocally rejects the still quite widespread idea that Janus Pannonius was the scribe of the manuscript; István Kapitánffy's argumentation has been confirmed and justified with further arguments on this issue. Still, some new questions have also been raised regarding the scribes of the manuscript in the course of the in-depth description of the handwritings. The content of the manuscript has been discussed in more details than in the previous descriptions. Furthermore, the so far unknown source of a section (Corporis humani partes, ff. $327 \mathrm{r}-328 \mathrm{v}$ ) has also been identified and the version found in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 has been collated with its edition.

In the second chapter, the revelation and successful identification of the third book-plate hiding under the upper two, already known exlibrises have contributed to a most precise reconstruction of the provenience of the manuscript. The assumption that the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 was once part of the stock of King Matthias Corvinus's royal library has also been confirmed with indirect evidence (Taddeo Ugoleto, the royal librarian's use of the manuscript and Johann Cuspinianus's possessorship).

In the third chapter, Goetz's list of $15^{\text {th }}$ - and $16^{\text {th }}$-century codices recentiores containing the Greek-Latin dictionary has been enlarged with some further items. Through the process of collation with various manuscripts, several further codices (Suppl. Gr. 47 and Mon. Gr. 142 and 253) have been eliminated from the contemporary candidates.

In the fourth chapter, the glossary notes inserted in the margins of the Greek-Latin dictionary in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 have been divided
into groups and then analysed in meticulous detail regarding their content and sources. As for the first major group of marginal notes of predominantly Greek literary origin, Aristophanic glossary notes have been carefully collated with the modern editions of the scholia to Nubes and Plutus, which also helped the identification of their sources. The glossary notes of legal content have never been examined in such depth so far; their thorough study also contributed to the identification of their source, the Synopsis Major Basilicorum.

The collation of the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 with the Madrid manuscript $\Sigma$ I 12 has proved to be extremely productive both for the examination of the textual history and for the mapping of the source of the major group of glossary notes containing mainly Greek literary quotations. Based on the results of this collation, one can risk the assumption that at a certain point of the textual tradition the extensive Greek-Latin dictionary, the Latin-Greek dictionary and the short thematic list of tree names were handed down as a whole, organic lexicographical unit, where the Greek-Latin dictionary was extended and enlarged with a rich material of glossary notes quoting mainly Aristophanic scholia, the SBM and some Greek prose writers. The high number of these glossary notes clearly suggests that their addition was the result of a conscious and deliberate process aiming at the systematic broadening of the original lexicographical material found in the Greek-Latin dictionary. Still, the analysis of further contemporary manuscripts would be necessary to map this assumed branch of the tradition adequately.

A further major result of the research work is the revelation of the fact that the other main group of marginal notes of predominantly lexicographical content written mainly in Latin and at times in Greek or in Italian can ultimately be traced back to another tradition of Greek-Latin lexica. This can be convincingly proved with the results of the collation with three representatives of this alternative tradition found in the manuscripts Vat. Pal. Gr. 194, Cod. Gr. 4 and Res. 224. In this way, the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 contains a Greek-Latin dictionary that effectively combines two different traditions of bilingual lexica, which was not an unusual or unique phenomenon in contemporary manuscripts.
However, the fact that both major groups of glossary notes seem to originate from a purely lexicographical tradition rather than a literary one implies that the identification of the person of the glossator(s) is hardly possible on the basis of the textual tradition or the content of the glossary notes quoted
or referred to in the margins as it had been assumed earlier. Still, the lexicographical material found in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 deserves further attention and is worth exploiting in the study of Janus Pannonius's translations from Greek to Latin and his Greek vocabulary.
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Fig. 1
Watermarks in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45: standing basilisk


Fig. 2
Watermark Briquet No. 2667


Fig. 3
Watermarks in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45: flying basilisk


Fig. 4
Watermark Briquet No. 2680


Fig. 5
Watermarks in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 : lion standing on two feet


Fig. 6
Watermark Briquet No. 10501


Fig. 7

> Watermarks in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45: triple mountains


Fig. 8
Watermark Briquet No. 11768
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F. IIIv (detail)
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F. 171v
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F. 174v (detail)
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F. 320 v
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F. 103v (detail)
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F. 108v (detail)
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F. 146r (detail)
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F. 75v (detail)


Fig. 20
F. 77r
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F. 4r
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Fig. 23
Binding - back


Fig. 24
Binding - side


Fig. 25
Johann Fabri's exlibris in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45


Fig. 26
Alexander Brassicanus's exlibris


Fig. 27
Johann Cuspinianus's exlibris


Fig. 28

# II <br> Corporis humani partes (ff. 327r-328v). Collation 

Ch. Daremberg \& Ch. Émile Ruelle eds., Oeuvres de Rufus d'Éphèse, texte collationné sur les manuscrits, traduit pour la première fois en français, avec une introducion. Amsterdam, 1963. Appendice, Section VI. Premier texte anonyme inédit. Dénominations de la nature de l'homme. 599-600.
p. 599
 о $\omega$ иатоц C .




4. $\beta \rho \varepsilon ́ \gamma \mu \alpha \mathrm{AB}$ (C corr. in marg. dex.). $\beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \mu \mu \alpha \mathrm{C}$
5. $\beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \varphi \alpha \rho \alpha$ A. $\beta \lambda \varepsilon \varphi \alpha \rho i ́ \delta \varepsilon \varsigma ~ B . ~ \beta \lambda \varepsilon \varphi \alpha \rho i ́ \delta \alpha \varsigma ~ C \mid \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ A . ~ o m . ~ B C ~$
6. Súo ү $\omega$ vías AB. סvoү $\omega$ víaç C
 BC

 C| 1 í $\lambda \tau \varepsilon \rho \circ \vee$ C. fort. legend. $\varphi$ í $\lambda \tau \rho \circ \vee$ B. 甲í $\tau \tau . . . \chi \varepsilon i ́ \lambda o u s ~ o m . ~ A ~$
13. $\lambda o$ ßóv $A B$ (C corr. in marg. dex.). ßo $\lambda_{\text {óv }} C$
14. кגì $\gamma v \alpha ́ \theta o v \varsigma, ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \sigma ı \alpha \gamma o ́ v \alpha ৎ ~ B . ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ p r i m u m ~ o m . ~ C . ~ k \alpha i ̀ ~ b i s ~ o m . ~ A ~$
15. k $\alpha$ AB. om. C
 AB. $\lambda \alpha ́ \kappa o u C$.

18. үоичíous AC. үои. ¢ías B
p. 600.
2. $\gamma \lambda \alpha u$ кoví $\alpha v \mathrm{AB}$. $\gamma \lambda \alpha$ ккoví $\alpha$








 $\varepsilon ̇ \varphi \varepsilon \xi \tilde{\eta} \varsigma A B$. тò $\varepsilon ่ \varphi \varepsilon \xi \tilde{n} \varsigma C$.
7. $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha ́ \kappa \alpha \rho \pi о \nu \mathrm{AB} . \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha ́ \kappa \alpha \rho \pi ı \nu \mathrm{C}$.


 C. $\left|\mu \varepsilon \tau^{\prime} \alpha u ́ \tau o u ̀ \varsigma ~ c o r r . ~ e d . ~ \mu \varepsilon \tau^{\prime} \alpha u ̉ \tau \alpha ̀ ̀ ~ B . ~ o m . ~ A . ~ \mu \varepsilon \tau ' ~ \alpha u ̉ \tau o ̀ v ~ C . ~\right| ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ o ̀ ~ \mu ı \kappa \rho o ́ \varsigma ~ A . ~$ $\sigma \varphi \alpha ́ \kappa \varepsilon \lambda \circ \varsigma$, ò ঠغ̀ $\mu \varepsilon \tau^{\prime} \alpha u ̇ \tau o ̀ v ~ \tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \cup \tau \alpha i ̃ o \varsigma ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \mu u ́ \omega \psi ~ B C ~$
10. бкvт $\alpha \lambda i ́ \delta \varepsilon \varsigma ~ A B . ~ \sigma к ı \tau \alpha \lambda i ́ \delta \varepsilon \varsigma ~ C . ~$

 $\alpha{ }_{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \varsigma$. B (ed.: ,,addition de B qui paraît être une variante introduite dans le texte") om. AC
 $\delta \alpha k \tau u ́ \lambda \omega v \mathrm{AB} . \tau \tilde{\omega} v \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega v \delta \alpha k \tau v ́ \lambda \omega v \mathrm{C}$.

 $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \cup \tau \alpha i ̃ o v ~ C . ~ o m . ~ B . ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon v \tau \alpha i ̃ o v ~ \tau \tilde{\eta} \varsigma ~ \rho ́ \alpha ́ \chi \varepsilon \omega \varsigma ~$
16. $\tilde{\eta} \tau \rho \circ v$ corr. ed. $\lambda \tilde{\eta} \tau \rho \circ v$ A. $v \tilde{\eta} \tau \rho \circ v B C$.
 દ̇ $\varphi$ ह́ß $\alpha$ ıo C.
18. к $\alpha \cup \lambda$ òs AB . к $\alpha \cup \lambda$ òv C. | к $\alpha i ̀ ~ \sigma \tau \tilde{\eta} \mu \alpha \mathrm{AB}$. $\sigma \tau \tilde{\eta} \mu \alpha \mathrm{C}$. | $\beta \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha v o v \mathrm{BC}$. „A met partout le nominatif" (ed.)


21-22. $\lambda \eta$ үо́vas AB. $\lambda \alpha$ үóv $\alpha \varsigma$ C.



25. ỉvvó AB . ỉүvónv C .
26. $\tau \alpha ̀ ~ \alpha ̛ ́ k \rho \alpha ~ A B . ~ \tau \alpha ̀ ~ k \alpha ́ \tau \omega ~ \alpha ~ \alpha ́ k \rho \alpha ~ C . ~ \mid ~ к \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \tilde{i ̃ \tau \alpha ı ~ B C . ~ o m . ~ A . ~}$
27. $\mu \tilde{v} \varsigma \mathrm{AB} . \mu \tilde{v} \nu \mathrm{C} . \mid \gamma \alpha \sigma \tau \rho о \kappa \nu \eta ́ \mu \eta \mathrm{AB} . \gamma \alpha \sigma \tau \rho о \kappa \nu \eta ́ \mu \imath \delta \alpha$ C.
28. $\tau \alpha \rho \sigma o ̀ \varsigma ~ A B . ~ \tau \alpha \rho \sigma o ̀ v ~ C .|\pi \lambda \alpha \tau u ̀ ~ \pi \varepsilon \delta i ́ o v ~ A B . ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \pi \lambda \alpha \tau v \pi \varepsilon \delta i ́ o v ~ C . ~| ~ \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha ̀ ~ A B . ~$ tò $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha ̀$ C.
 ajoutés par B.) om. A.

# III <br> The Textual History of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Collations 

## 1 Collation with ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 47

## Table 1

| locus in Suppl. Gr. 45 | Suppl. Gr. 45 | Suppl. Gr. 47 | CGL II |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 r 8 | $\dot{\alpha} \beta \dot{\beta} \beta \alpha ı \frac{}{},-\beta \alpha$ íov infirmus, instabilis, incertus | $\dot{\alpha} \beta$ ćß $\alpha$ оos infirmus | A $\beta \varepsilon \beta \alpha$ oo infirmus, instabilis, incertus |
| 1 r 9 |  instabilitas, infirmitas | גß $\beta$ ßаıо́тпя infirmitas | A $\beta \varepsilon \beta \alpha \ldots \tau \eta \sigma$ infirmitas |
| 1r 10 | ג̀ $\beta \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \tau \varepsilon \rho \circ \varsigma,-\tau \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \circ$ insulsus, absurdus |  | A $\beta$ عхүعрроб insalsus absurdus |
| 1r 13 |  innocuus | $\dot{\alpha} \beta \lambda \alpha \beta$ ńs illesus | A $\beta \lambda \alpha \beta \eta \sigma$ inlesus, innoxius, innocuus, innocens |
| 1r 16 |  infirmus, imbecillis |  | vacat |
| 1r 21 | ג́ßpó¢, -ßpoũ opimus, lautus, delicatus | ג́ßpó¢ opimus | A $\beta$ poo glauer, delicatus |
| 1r 23 |  irrosus | äßp $\omega$ tos irrosus | A $\beta \rho \omega \tau$ tov inrosum inaesum |
| 1r 24 | äßuббos, $-\beta$ ט́ббou abyssus, profundum | äßuббo¢ abyssus | Aßuбоoб hocprofundum, abyssus |
| 1r 25 | ảץ $\alpha$ Өós, - $Ө$ oũ bonus, benignus, honestus | ג̉ $\gamma \alpha$ Oós bonus | Ay $\alpha$ Өoo bonus, benignus |
| 1r 26 | ג̇ү $\alpha$ Oíc, - $\theta$ ídos globus, glomus | ג̇ү $\gamma$ Oís globus | A ${ }^{\alpha} \alpha \theta_{\iota} \sigma$ globus, glomus |

## Table 2

| locus in Suppl．Gr． 45 | Suppl．Gr． 45 | Suppl．Gr． 47 | CGL II |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1v 19 | ${ }^{\alpha} \gamma \alpha$ 人́n $\eta$ ，－$\pi \eta \zeta$ dilectio | 人̇ү ${ }^{\text {cón }}$ dilectio，amor | Aү $\alpha \pi \eta$ dilectio |
| 7 r 24 | $\alpha$ 人ípounaı，$\alpha$ ¢ipñ eligo | ＜îpou $\alpha_{\iota}$ opto，eligo | Aıpou ${ }^{\text {a }}$ opto，eligo |
| 9r 22 |  | ג̇к $\mu \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ vigeo， pubesco | Ак $\mu \zeta \omega$ uigeo， dolesco，pubesco， viresco |

## Table 3

| locus in Suppl．Gr． 45 | Suppl．Gr． 45 | Suppl．Gr． 47 | CGL II |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10r 15－16 | ג̉кроб́í,$-\sigma i ́ \alpha \varsigma ~ i n t e m p e r a n t i a ; ~$ <br>  incontinentia | àkp＜б́í intemperantia； ג̇кробía incontinentia | Ak $\alpha \sigma \sigma 1 \alpha$ intemperantia； Aкр $\alpha \sigma 1 \alpha \eta \alpha \iota \sigma \chi \rho о \tau \eta \sigma$ incontinentia |
| 23v 15 |  incoho |  incoho | A $\pi \alpha \rho \chi$ о $\mu \alpha$ $\pi \rho \alpha ү \mu \alpha \tau о \sigma \eta \varepsilon \rho \gamma о и$ inchoo |
| 29r 3 |  кגì äró $\mu \alpha \chi$ о̧ imbellis | а́ло́лєцоя imbellis | Aтолєцоб inbellis |
| 33r 15 |  סıаı七ทтои̃ hoc arbitratum | àтó $\varnothing \alpha \sigma ı$ ， hoc arbitratum | Атор $\alpha \sigma ı \sigma \mu \varepsilon \sigma \iota \tau о \cup \eta \tau о \imath$ Siaıtntov arbitratum |
| 37v 22－23 |  <br>  | ג̀ $\rho \chi$ ŋ́ exordium； ảpxŋ́ inceptio | Архптотрооциıо hocexordium； <br> Архперүои <br> $\eta \pi р \alpha ү \mu \alpha \tau о \sigma$ <br> inchoatio， <br> hoc nitium，inceptio |
| 44r 24－25 | д̈́ $\varphi$ Өovos，ó то $\lambda \lambda$ 人́s $[!]$ opimus， copiosus；$\alpha$ ̈ $\varphi$ Өovos，ó $\mu \grave{\eta}$ $\varphi \theta$ ovãv nulli invidens，sine invidia | $\alpha ̈ \varphi \varphi$ Өovos opimus； á $\varphi$ Өovos nulli invidens | А $\varphi$ Өо⿱⿱亠䒑日，обото $\lambda$ иб opimus；A $\varphi$ Өоvoбоип $\varphi \theta$ ov $\omega v$ nulliinuidens， sineinuidia |

Table 4

| locus in Suppl．Gr． 45 | Suppl．Gr． 45 | Suppl．Gr． 47 | CGL II |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3r 8 | à $\gamma o \rho \alpha ́, ~-~ a ̃ ̧, ~$ $\dot{\eta} \tau \tilde{\omega} v \omega$ c̉ví $\omega v$ nundinae，－arum | à $\gamma o \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega ̃ v$ ỏví $\omega v[!]$ nundina | Аүора $\uparrow \tau \omega v \omega v i \omega v$ nundina |
| 18 r 25 |  úrép $\theta$ عбıц hae induciae |  indutie |  indutias |
| 22v 5 | $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ ह̇ $\pi i ̀$ $\mu \alpha \forall \eta \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega v$ reddo， memoro | $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \grave{̀}$ $\mu \alpha \forall \eta \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega v$ reddo， memoro | A $\pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \omega \varepsilon \pi \mu \mu \alpha \theta \eta \mu \alpha \tau \omega \nu$ reddo，memoro |
| 26v 18 |  бт $\rho \alpha \tau \varepsilon i ́ \alpha \varsigma ~ e m i s s i o ~$ |  бтратвías emissio | А $\pi о \delta \eta \mu \iota \alpha \varepsilon \pi \imath \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau \varepsilon \iota \alpha \sigma$ exreditio |
| 36r 2 |  |  | Арктобто弓，${ }^{\text {a }}$ ，hicursus |
| 36r 3 | $\alpha{ }_{\alpha} \rho \kappa \tau 0 \varsigma \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} v \tau \tau$ oủpav $\tilde{\sim}$ septentrio |  oủpav（̈ septentrio | Арктобทモv $\omega \omega 0 \cup \rho \alpha v \omega$ hicseptemtrio |
| 39v 22 |  canorus | ब̛́ $\sigma \tau \imath \kappa o ̀ \varsigma ~ o ́ ~ o ̛ ̣ ~ \delta \omega v ~$ canorus |  |
| 39v 23 | ảбтıкòs ó то入ı七ıкós urbanus，civilis | đ̉бтıкò̧ ó то入ı兀ıкós urbanus，civilis | Абтıкобото入ıtıко¢ urbanus |
| 44r 12 | $\dot{\alpha} \varphi \eta$ ク̉ voooũvтos $\pi \rho о \beta \alpha ́ t o v ~ c o n t a g i u m$, contagio，－onis | $\dot{\alpha} \varphi \eta$ ク̉ voбoũvtos трова́тои contagio |  contagium |

## Table 5

| locus in Suppl. Gr. 45 | Suppl. Gr. 45 | Suppl. Gr. 47 | CGL II |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1v 3 | ג̉ $\gamma \alpha \theta_{0 \sigma u ́ v \eta,-\sigma u ́ v \eta \varsigma ~}$ bonitas |  | Aү $\alpha$ Ooбuvๆ bonitas, benignitas |
| 1v 26 |  | $\alpha{ }^{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \bar{\chi} \lambda \lambda \omega$ nuntio | Aүүع $\lambda \lambda \omega$ indiconuntio |
| 3r 22 | ג̉үpıরív $\omega$,-vعı̧ effero, -as |  | AүpıaıEv $\omega$ ferumfacio |
| 7v 7 |  turpiter lucrans | «їбхрокєр $\delta$ ท́s turpilucris | Аıбхроквр $\delta \eta \sigma$ turpilucris |
| 8 v 11 | $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha v \theta \omega \dot{\sigma} \eta \varsigma,-\delta o u \varsigma$ spinosus |  | Aк $\alpha v \theta \omega \delta \eta \sigma$ sentosusspinosus |
| 9r 9 | ג̇кпঠía, --ías pigritia | ג̇кпঠía incuria | Aкп $\delta 1 \alpha$ taedium |
| 11v 2 | $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \lambda \alpha \gamma \mu o ́ \varsigma,-\mu о \tilde{v}$ eiulatus, ululatus | $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \lambda \alpha \gamma \mu$ ós iubilatio | A $\alpha \alpha \lambda \gamma \gamma \mu \sigma \sigma$ iubilatio eiulatio |
| 14v 8 | ๙̉vסpıótns, -ótทтоร virilitas, vigor, virtus | ब̉v $\delta$ ¢ıótn¢ fortitudo | Av $\delta \rho \varepsilon$ єот $\eta$ fortitas, virilitas |
| 16r 14 | ävعv $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \eta \sigma \mu$ о̃ sine procrastinatione | ävรv $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \eta \sigma \mu \circ$ ṽ sine cunctatione | Avร $\partial \mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma \mu \circ 0$ sine procrastinatione |
| 16v 12 |  immansuetus |  | Av $\eta \mu \varepsilon \rho \circ \sigma$ inmitis, inmansuetus |
| 17v 26 | àvónto¢, -ท́tou demens | ג̇vóntoc mente captus | Avoŋtoб ineptus, mente captus |

## 2 Collation with Mon. Gr. 142 and 253

## Table 1

| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. locus | ÖNB. Suppl. Gr. 45. | CGL II | Mon. Gr. 142 | Mon. Gr. 253 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1r 16 |  Infirm(us), Imbecillis | - | - | - |
| 1r 20 | ¢̈ßp $\alpha, \dot{\eta} \theta \varepsilon \rho \alpha ́ \pi \alpha ı v \alpha$ Ancilla | - | - | - |
| 1v 6 |  | - | - | - |
| 1v 16 | ¢̈ $\gamma \alpha \mu \alpha ı$ admiror | - | - | - |
| 2v 4 | ¢̇үкט́入os, -кv ${ }^{\text {dov Unc(us) }}$ | - | - | - |
| 2v 8 | $\alpha \times \gamma \lambda \alpha i ́ \zeta \omega$ clarifico | - | - | - |
| 5v 5 |  dissimile | - | - | - |
| 6r 23 | $\dot{\alpha} \theta \rho \tilde{\omega}, \tau$ tò $\beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \pi \tau \omega$ cerno, $\operatorname{vid}(\mathrm{e}) \mathrm{o}$, aspicio | - | - | - |

## Table 2

| ÖNB Suppl. <br> Gr. 45. locus | ÖNB. Suppl. Gr. 45. | CGL II | Mon. Gr. 142 | Mon. Gr. 253 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| post v 1r 5 | - | A $\beta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha v \tau 0 v$ infascinabile | ' Aß $\alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha ́ v \tau$ то infastinabile | 'A $A \beta \alpha ́ \sigma K \alpha v \tau о v$ infascinabile |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { post v 1r } \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | - | A $\gamma \alpha \theta \eta$ bona benigna | ' A $\gamma \alpha \theta$ ŋ́ bona benigna | ' A $\gamma \alpha \theta$ ŋ́ bona benigna |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { post v } 3 \text { r } \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ | - | Aүрачоv sinescriptura | "Аүрачоv sine scriptura | "Aүрачоv sine scriptura |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { post v } 3 \mathrm{v} \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ | - | Aүхı $\beta \alpha \theta \varepsilon \sigma$ praealtum | ' $A y \chi 1 \beta \alpha \theta \varepsilon ́ \varsigma$ prealtum | ' Aүхíß $\alpha \theta \varepsilon \varsigma$ praealtum |
| post v 5r 5 | - | A $\delta$ ıкоиц $\alpha \iota$ ledor iniuria patior | 'Aסıкои $\mu \alpha 1$ ledor iniuriam patior | 'A $\delta ı$ кои̃ $\mu \alpha ı$ ledor iniuriam pacior |

## Table 3

| ÖNB Suppl． Gr．45．locus | ÖNB．Suppl． Gr． 45. | CGL II | Mon．Gr． 142 | Mon．Gr． 253 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1r 9 |  －тптоя Instabilitas， Infirmitas | A $\beta \varepsilon \beta \alpha \ldots$ ют $\sigma$ infirmitas | ＇Aßعßaíorns infirmitas | ＇$A \beta \varepsilon \beta \alpha$ íoтทя infirmitas |
| 1r 11 | ג̉ßíxotos，－$\alpha$ б́тоu inviolatus | A $\beta_{1} \alpha \sigma$ tov inuiolatum | ＇Aßíaбтоv inviolatum | Aßíaotov inviolatum |
| 1 r 12 | ג̉ßí $\omega$ тоऽ，－тоט sine vita | A $\beta 1 \varepsilon \sigma$ sineuita | ＂ A Зı $¢ ¢$ sine vita | ＇ $\mathrm{A} \beta 1 \varepsilon \varsigma$ sine vita |
| 1 r 13 | д̀ß $\beta \alpha \beta$ そ́s， －ßoũc illaesus， innocuus | $A \beta \lambda \alpha \beta \eta \sigma$ inlesus innoxius innocuus innocens |  illesus innoxius innocuus innocens | ＇$A \beta \lambda \alpha \beta$ र́ $\varsigma$ illesus innoxius innocuus innocens |
| 1 r 18 | ג̀ßou入í $\alpha,-\alpha \varsigma$ In（con）sideratio | A $\beta_{0} \lambda_{1} \alpha$ inconsultum | ＇Aßou入ía inconsultum | ＇Aßou入ía inconsultum |
| 1v 5 | ג̉ $\gamma \alpha$ Өотоо́я， －roooṽ beneficus， b（e）n（e）facto（r） | Аү $\alpha$ Өотоюоб benificus | ＇Aүк日отоо́я benificus | Aү $\alpha$ Өотоо́я beneficus |
| 1v 13 | «̈ $\gamma \alpha \mu$ ос $\gamma \cup v \eta ́$ Innupta，Innuba | Aү $\mu$ оо $\gamma \cup v \eta$ innupta | ＂Аүацос ү $\quad$ vи́ innupta | ＂Аү $\alpha$ оос үиvŋ́ innupta |
| 1v 25 | ä $\gamma ү \varepsilon \lambda о \varsigma,-\gamma \varepsilon ́ \lambda o u$ nuncius | Aүүघ $\lambda$ oo nuntiusnuntiator renuntiator | ＂Аүүعлоs nuncius nunciator renuntiator | ＂Аүүعخоя nuncius nunciator renunciator |
| 2r 7 | व̈ $\gamma \varepsilon ́ \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau о \varsigma$, <br> －$\lambda$ áवтоט <br> InIrrisus， <br> Irrisibilis， <br> Inderisus | АүЕ $\lambda \alpha \sigma \tau о \sigma$ inrisus inrisibilis | ＇Аүモ́ $\lambda \alpha \sigma \tau о \varsigma$ irritus irrisibilis | ＇Aү $\dot{\lambda} \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau о \varsigma$ irrisus irrisibilis |

Table 4

| ÖNB Suppl． Gr．45．locus | ÖNB．Suppl． Gr． 45. | CGL II | Mon．Gr． 142 | Mon．Gr． 253 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1v 23 | ả $\gamma \gamma \varepsilon$ ̃ov，－үعíou vas，fidelia | Aүүعוov haecfideliauas | ＇Aүүعiov vas | ＇Aүүعiov vas |
| 1v 24 | ${ }_{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \lambda i ́ \alpha,-\lambda i ́ \alpha \varsigma$ nunciatio | ${ }_{A}{ }_{\gamma}{ }^{\prime} \lambda_{l} \alpha$ hicnuntius hocnuntium nuntiatio | ＇Aүүع $\lambda_{i ́ \alpha}$ nunciatio | ＇Aүүع $\lambda i ́ \alpha$ nunciacio |
| 2r 10 |  | Ay£ $\lambda \eta$ hic grex | ＇Aүć入n grex | ＇Ayć入n grex |
| 2v 1 | ג̀ $ү \kappa ı \sigma \tau \rho \varepsilon$ ย́ $\omega,-\varepsilon ६ \varsigma$ hamo，－as | Аүкıбт $\rho \varepsilon \cup \omega$ unico | ＇Аүкıбтрعט́ш bucino | ＇Аүкıбт $\rho \varepsilon$ и́ $\omega$ bucino |
| 2v 18 | व̈ $\gamma v ı \sigma \mu \alpha$ ， －биатоऽ castimonia， puritas | Aүvı $\sigma \mu \alpha$ castimonium purificatio | ＂A $\bar{v}$ ı $\sigma \mu \alpha$ lustratio purificatio | ＂A ${ }^{\prime}$ viб $\mu \alpha$ lustratio purificatio |
| 3 r 2 | $\dot{\alpha} \gamma v \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$, ह̇ $\pi i ́ \rho \rho \eta \mu \alpha$ <br> Sincere，caste | Аүvшбєпиррпиц sincere | ＇Aүvल̃¢ sincere | ＇Ayv $\omega$ ¢ sincere |
| 3v 15 | àүpuாvía，－víac lucubratio， vigilia | Aүpurvia $\cdot$ lucubratio excubitum peruigilium｜｜ insomnia uigilia uigilantia | ＇Aүpuтvía lucubratio excubitum pervigilantia viglia insomnia | ＇Aүpuпvía <br> lucubratio excubitum pervigilancia vigilia insomnia |
| 3v 22 | ả Yúvaıos，－vaíou caelebs，s（i）n（e） uxore | Aүuvaıoб celepssineuxore | ＇Aүúvolos sine uxore | ＇Ayúvalos sine uxore |
| 4r 15 | д̉ $\gamma \omega v i ́ \alpha$, －víac sollicitudo | A $\gamma \omega \mathrm{v}$ ı $\alpha$ sollicitudo， trepidatio | ＇A ${ }^{\prime} \omega v{ }^{\prime} \alpha$ sollicitudo | ＇A ${ }^{\prime} \omega v{ }^{\prime} \alpha$ sollicitudo |
| 4 v 1 | д̈ $\delta$ ह́кобтоऽ， －кव́бтou，ò ג̇ס $\omega$ робо́кптоя edecumat（us） | A $\varepsilon$ ккабтоб edecumatus | ＇Aסモ́кабтто， д́ $\delta \omega \rho$ робо́кптоя edecumatus | ＇Aঠ́́кабтоৎ д̀ $\delta \omega$ робо́кптоऽ edecumatus |
| 7 r 4 | $\alpha$ i $\theta \omega$ ，$\alpha$ Vrì тоũ каí $\omega$ ，аîӨzıৎ cremo，comburo | Aı $\theta \omega \alpha v \tau 1 \tau 0 \cup \kappa \alpha ı \omega$ cremo | ＂Aı $\theta \omega$ cremo | ＂${ }^{\text {it }} \theta \omega$ cremo |

## Table 5

| ÖNB Suppl． Gr．45．locus | ÖNB．Suppl． Gr． 45. | CGL II | Mon．Gr． 142 | Mon．Gr． 253 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2v 2 | 㐫үкидйтоия， тoठós poples， －tis | Аүкидппобоб hicpoples | ＇Аүкилотобо́я poples | ＇Аүкидотобо́я hic poples |
| 3r 19 | ӓүрамоऽ， <br> －үра́ $\varphi o u$ indescript（us） | Аүрочоб inscriptus | ＂Аүрачо， incerptus | ＂Аүрачос non scriptus |
| post v 4r 9 | － | － |  certamen | － |
| 4r 10 |  ductor | Аү $\omega ү \varepsilon \cup \sigma$ ducator hocductarium | ＇Ayopzús ductor hoc ductarium | ＇Aүореия ducator |
| 4v 24 |  －بо́ рои p（ro） miscuus | A $\delta ı \alpha \varphi о \rho о \sigma$ promiscuus | ＇Aסıáqopos promistuus | － |
| 5v 19 |  luscinia | A $\dagger \delta \omega v$ luscina | ＇Aŋס＇́v luscina | ＇Anס́́v luscinia phylamica |
| 6v 5 | גiүव́үpıov， －үрíou caprea | Aıүаүpıov haeccapreola | ＇Aıү⿱㇒木үpıov haec capriola | ＇Aıү⿱㇒木үрıov capreola |
| 9r 22 |  vigeo | Ак $\alpha \zeta \omega$ uigeodolesco pubesco uiresco | ๙ $\kappa \mu \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ vigeo viresco oppubesco | $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \mu \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ vigeo pubesco viresco |
| 9v 7 | ג̉ко入кбí, －бí $\varsigma$ impunitas | Ако $\lambda \alpha \sigma$ к $\alpha$ impunitas |  impunitas | － |
| 14v 8 | ảvסpıótns， －ótทros virilitas vigor virtus | Av $\delta \rho \varepsilon ı \frac{\tau}{} \eta \sigma$ fortitas，uirilitas | ג̉vסpıótทS fortitas virilitas | ảv $\delta$ pıótทs fortitudo virilitas |

## 3 Collation with $\Sigma$ I 12

## Table 1: Filling the extensive lacuna found in CGL II

| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | $\Sigma \mathrm{I} 12$ | CGL II |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12r $11 \dot{\alpha} \lambda i \not \zeta \omega$, tò $\sigma u v \alpha \theta$ poí $\omega$ conglomero |  conglomero, -ras | [vacat] |
| 12v 15 ả $\mu$ ¢upó¢ obscurus, opacus | 98 r ¢̉ $\mu \alpha v \rho o ́ ¢ ~ o b s c u r u s, ~ o p a c u s ~$ | [vacat] |
| $12 \mathrm{v} 19 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \lambda \lambda \hat{v} v \omega$ hebeto, -as | 98r $\alpha$ வ̇ $\mu \beta \lambda u ́ v \omega$ hebeto, -tas, -tui | [vacat] |
|  | 98r $\alpha$ ¢ $\mu$ ¢́ $\lambda \varepsilon 1 \propto$ negligentia, incuria | [vacat] |
|  | 98v ${ }_{\text {ả }}$ оүүทrí absque labore | [vacat] |

Table 2: Latin equivalents of $\Sigma$ I 12 in agreement with CGL II

| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | $\Sigma \mathrm{I} 12$ | CGL II |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1v 3 á $\gamma \alpha$ Өooúvn, $-\sigma u ́ v \eta \varsigma$ bonitas | 91r $\alpha \not \gamma \alpha$ Өoбúvn, -oúvņ bonitas <br> -tatis, benignitas -tatis | A $\gamma \alpha \theta$ Oбuv $\eta$ bonitas benignitas (215.31) |
| 1v 13 ä $\gamma \alpha \mu \circ \varsigma$ үuvŋ́ Innupta, Innuba |  -pte | Aү $\alpha \mu о \sigma \gamma \cup v \eta$ innupta $(215.40)$ |
| 3r 7 äyovoc, -óvou sterilis, infecundus | 92r äүovos, -үóvou sterilis infertilis infecundus | Ayovoo sterilis infertilis infecundus (216.58) |
| 4v $7 \dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi$ юко́¢, -кои̃ fraternus, fraternalis | 93r $\alpha$ д́ $\delta \lambda \varphi \varphi$ וкós, -кои̃ fraternus -ni | А $\delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi$ ıкоб fraternus (218. 22) |
| 5v 12 ả Zuyoc, -Zúyou impar, sine iugo | 93v ǎZuyoc, -Zúyou impar sine iugo dispar | A $\cup$ ソүoo inpar sine iugo dispar (219. 20) |
|  caper silvestris |  capri | Aıү $\chi^{\prime}$ |
| 12r 10 वै $\lambda_{\lambda} \xi$, -ko̧ alec, alecis | 97 v वै $\lambda_{1} \xi$,-кoç hoc allex -llecis singulariter tantum declinabitur | A $\lambda_{1} \xi$ hocallex' singulariter tantum declinabitur (225.7) |
|  | $100 \mathrm{v} \dot{\alpha} v \theta \eta \lambda \eta ́,-\lambda \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$ cannas arcina ulva | Av $\theta \eta \lambda \eta$ cannasarcina ulua $(227.22)$ |
| 21 v 11 ơv $\omega$ ¢ $\theta$ v desuper |  | Av $\omega \theta \varepsilon v$ desuper superius (231. 28) |
|  efflagito | 104v $\alpha \not \pi \alpha \iota \tau \omega \tilde{\beta} \beta_{\imath} i^{\omega} \omega \varsigma$ flagito efflagito profligo | A $\pi \alpha ı \tau \omega \beta \leqslant \alpha ı \omega \sigma$ flagito efflagito profligo (232.41) |

Table 3: Latin equivalents of $\Sigma$ I 12 in agreement with ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45

| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | EI 12 | CGL II |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16v 15 ảv $\eta \rho \varepsilon ́ \theta \eta$ ह̇ $\pi i$ $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \mu \alpha \tau o \varsigma ~ s u b l a t a ~ e s t$, interempta est |  $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \mu \alpha \tau о \varsigma$ sublata est, interempta est | Avпр $\varepsilon$ Ө $\eta \varepsilon \pi ı \pi \rho \alpha ү \mu \alpha \tau о \sigma$ sublata est (227.13) |
| 17r 10 d̉vӨpokıơ, -kıó̧ pruna |  | AvӨрокıа ramalis pruna $(227.33)$ |
| 25r 9 ä $\pi \varepsilon u x \eta ́ d$ deprecatio, abominatio | 106r ஷ̉ $\pi \varepsilon v x \eta ́ ~ d e p r e c a t i o ~$ abominatio | A $\pi \varepsilon$ ux $\eta$ habominatio (234. 54) |

Table 4: Latin equivalents of $\Sigma$ I 12 lacking agreement with both ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and CGL II

| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | $\Sigma \mathrm{I} 12$ | CGL II |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1v 21 व̉ץ $\alpha \pi \eta$ тóc, -тоũ amatus, dilectus, carus | 91v $\alpha$ ஷ̉ $\gamma \alpha \pi \eta \tau o ́ \varsigma, ~-\tau o u ̃ ~ a m a t u s, ~$ dilectus, carissimus | Aүorntoo amantissimus dilectissimus carissimus dilectus amans (215. 48) |
| 2v 20 ö $\gamma$ vol $\alpha,-\gamma v o i ́ \alpha \varsigma ~$ ignorantia, inscitia | 92r व̈qvoıo, - $ү$ voíac ignoratio ignorantia inscientia -tiae | Ayvol ignorantia inscientia (216. 46) |
|  agricola | 92v व̉үpoסíaıтos, - -́ítov agricola-ae, ruricola -ae | Aүpoסı๙ıтоб agricula (217. 26) |
|  turpissim(us) | 95 r גї $\sigma$ ро́т $\alpha \tau 0 \varsigma$, -七ótou turpissimus fedissimus | Aıбхротатоৎ foedissimus (221. 12) |
| 10r 20 वै́кратоৎ, - $\rho$ व́tou intemperatus | 96v ớкратоৎ, -кро́тои intemperatus, intempestus | Aкр $\alpha \tau о \sigma$ intemperata intempesta noxintempesta (223.36) |
| 11v $26 \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ vere, re vera | 97v $\alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda \eta \theta \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ re vera, vere, certe |  |
| 18r 3 ăvol $\alpha$, -voí $\alpha$ amentia | 101v ởvolo, -voía̧ dementia -tiae, stulticia, socordia | Avoı $\alpha$ dementia stultitia socordia uecordia insipientia (228.15) |
| 21v 19 ảv $\omega \varphi$ ह́خ $\varepsilon ı \alpha$ incommoditas | $104 \mathrm{r} \alpha$ ảv $\omega \varphi$ ह́ $\lambda \varepsilon ı \alpha$ incommoditas inutilitas | Av $\omega \varphi \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon 1 \alpha$ inmmoditas (231. 28) |
| 24 r 15 व่ $\pi \varepsilon ı \lambda \tilde{\omega}$ minor -aris | 105v minor -aris, minitor | A $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega$ minor minitor intermino mino minito (234.5) |
| 30r 8 ànovo ${ }^{\text {d desipio }}$ | 109v àrovo ${ }^{\text {d dementio -tis, }}$ desipio -pis | Atovow amento (239.26) |

Table 5: Agreement of $\Sigma$ I 12 and ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 regarding vocabulary

Lemmas that can be found in both mss., but are missing from CGL II:

| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | E1 12 | CGL II |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1v 16 ä $\gamma \alpha \mu \alpha{ }^{\text {a }}$ admiror |  | [vacat] |
| 2v $9 \alpha$ 人̉ $\gamma \lambda$ <ós clarus, illustris | 92r $\alpha$ ¢ $\gamma \lambda$ <ós clarus, illustris | [vacat] |
| 6r $20 \dot{\alpha} \theta$ роíбıиоц celeber |  | [vacat] |
| 6r $23 \dot{\alpha} \theta \rho \tilde{\omega}$, тò $\beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \pi \omega$ cerno, $\operatorname{vid}(\mathrm{e})$ o, aspicio | $94 \mathrm{r} \dot{\alpha}{ }^{\theta} \rho \tilde{\omega}$, tò $\beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \omega$ cerno -nis, video | [vacat] |
| 9r 12 áki $\delta v$ óv, tò đ̉ $\sigma \theta \varepsilon v \varepsilon ́ \zeta$ debile, infirmum | 96r $\alpha$ ג̉кı $\delta v o ́ v$, tò đ̉ $\sigma \theta \varepsilon v \varepsilon ́ \zeta ~ d e b i l e ~$ infirmum | [vacat] |
|  inconcussus |  | [vacat] |
| 9v 10 ג̉ко $\alpha \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha i ́ v \omega ~ l a s c i v i o, ~$ luxurio(r) | 96r ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ко $\lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha$ ív $\omega$ lascivio -vis | [vacat] |
|  <br>  [Lat. vacat] |  $\dot{\text { úr } \varepsilon \rho \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \text { [Lat. vacat] }}$ | [vacat] |
|  äкр $\alpha$ тov $\pi i ́ v \omega$ [Lat. vacat] |  <br> [Lat. vacat] | [vacat] |
|  flosculus |  | [vacat] |
| 17v $11 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \iota \mu \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha ı$ haurio, attraho | 101r $\alpha$ 人̇ı $\mu \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha_{1}$ haurio, attraho | [vacat] |
| 29r $6 \dot{\alpha} \pi \mathrm{r} \lambda_{1} \beta \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ debibo |  $\pi о \imath \tilde{\omega}$ ท̂ $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega, \lambda_{1} \beta \tilde{\alpha} \varsigma \gamma_{\alpha} \rho$ delibo -bas | [vacat] |

## Lemmas in CGL II that cannot be found in either of the codices:


19 Aүpıo ferox ferus efferus inmanis; 218. 30 A $\delta \eta \lambda$ ov incertum; 219. 10 Aعıסıov perpetuum; 220.38 Aı $\mu \tau \tau \omega \delta \sigma$ sanguinulentum cruentum; 221.53 Aкаıрعov integrum solidum; 224.26 Akv 227. 6 Av$\eta \kappa \varepsilon ı$ attinet; 228. 20 Avoı $\xi \propto 1$ pandere aperire recludere; 233. 27 A $\pi \alpha \rho v o u \mu \alpha ı$ abnegodenego.

# IV <br> Glossary Notes Quoting Scholia to Nubes 

## Abbreviations:

cf. = The marginal note does not agree with the indicated scholion precisely, but seems to be closely related to it.
$\mathrm{Th}^{1}=$ the first Thoman redaction of Nubes scholia
$\mathrm{Th}^{2}=$ the second Thoman redaction of Nubes scholia
$\mathrm{Tr}^{1}=$ the first Triclinian redaction of Nubes scholia
$\mathrm{Tr}^{2}=$ the second Triclinian redaction of Nubes scholia
AnRec = the group called "anonyma recentiora" in Koster's 1974 textual edition
schol. vet. = scholia vetera to Nubes edited by Holwerda 1977
$\mathrm{Tz}=$ scholia to Nubes by Joannes Tzetzes, edited by Holwerda 1960
Eust. = Nubes scholia attributed to and edited under the name of Eustathius, see Koster 1974: 3-7.
For the abbreviations of single codices within the Thoman and Triclinian versions and within the group "anonyma recentiora" refer to Koster 1974: CXXVI-CXXVII.

## 4v 6

$\dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi \iota \delta \tilde{\eta}$. fratris filia. In Aristophane. (cf. sch. nub. $47 \mathrm{Tr} 1 / 2$ )
5r 14



## 7r 24

$\alpha i \rho o u \mu \varepsilon ́ v o v . ~ \pi \rho о к \rho i ́ v \alpha v \tau \alpha$. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 1042a Th1/2, Tr1(?)/2)

10r 7
 Aristophane. (sch. nub. 44c Tr1/2)

11v 19
$\alpha ̋ \lambda \eta \theta \varepsilon \varsigma$. In Aristophane. pro $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ ironice. (cf. sch. nub. 841a AnRec)

## 13r 17

$\alpha \mu u ́ v \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1, \mu \alpha ́ \chi \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1$. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 1428a Tr2)

## 13r 26

$\alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \varphi о \rho \varepsilon i ̃ \varsigma ~ v \varepsilon ข \eta \sigma \mu \varepsilon ́ v o \imath, \mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha \rho ı \kappa \alpha ̀ ~ \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \omega \rho \varepsilon \cup \mu \varepsilon ́ v \alpha$. In Aristophane (sch. nub. 1203d Th1/2 Tr1/2)

## 14r 1

$\alpha \quad v \alpha \pi \lambda \eta ́ \sigma \varepsilon 1, \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega ́ \sigma \varepsilon 1$. In Aristophane (sch. nub. 995e AnRec)

## 14v 1



## 17r 12


 (sch. nub. 947b Th1/2, Tr1/2)

## 18v 26

$\alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda$ oı $\sigma \varepsilon \lambda \eta ́ v \eta$, inquit Aristophanes (Nub. 754). $\tau \varepsilon \lambda o u \mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta \varsigma, \varphi \eta \sigma i ́, \tau \eta ̃$
 sent scire mensem exactum et repetere usuras. quare si non oriretur amplius, nec ego solverem eas. (cf. sch. nub. 755a Tr2)

## 21v 21

 1299b AnRec)

## 22v 1

$\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha ı o ́ \lambda \eta, \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \tau \eta ́$. In Aristophane (sch. nub. 1150b Tr2)

## 24v 26

ơँ $\pi \varepsilon \rho \rho^{\prime} . \varphi \theta \varepsilon$ í $\rho o v . ~ \alpha ̛ \pi \varepsilon \lambda \theta \varepsilon$. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 783b AnRec; cf. sch. nub. 783b Tr2)

25r 16


## 26r 16

 $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ )

## 28v 26

Aristophanes. $\alpha$ до $\lambda ı \tau \alpha \rho ү \imath \varepsilon \imath \varsigma, ~ \alpha ̉ \pi \varepsilon ́ \lambda \theta \eta \varsigma, ~ \alpha ̉ \pi о \delta \rho \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon ı \varsigma, ~ \alpha ̉ \pi о \sigma к ı \rho \tau \eta ́ \sigma \varepsilon ı \varsigma, ~$ $\lambda ı \tau \alpha \rho \gamma ı \sigma \mu \circ v ̀ \varsigma ~ \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ ع́K $\alpha ́ \lambda o u v \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \sigma K ı \rho \tau \eta ́ \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$. (cf. sch. nub. 1253c-d Tr1/2)

31r 23
 Par) $\tau \tilde{\omega} v \delta_{1} \alpha \lambda o \gamma ı \mu \tilde{\omega} v$ (sch. nub. 743e AnRec Par) $\tau \tilde{\omega} v \delta_{1} \alpha v o l \tilde{\omega} v$ (vacat in


## 31v 22

$\alpha \not \pi о \sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \eta \tau ı \kappa o ́ \varsigma, \delta u v \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu \circ \varsigma \alpha \not \approx \pi о \sigma \tau \rho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha 1$. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 728b AnRec Par)

33r 26
ג̉ $\pi о \varphi \theta \varepsilon ́ \rho \varepsilon ı . \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi \theta \varepsilon i ́ \rho \varepsilon ı$ (sch. nub. 789c AnRec Par). alibi $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha ̀ \alpha \varphi \theta o \rho \tilde{\alpha} \varsigma$ ब́ $\pi \varepsilon ́ \rho \chi \eta$ (cf. sch. nub. 789c AnRec ChisReg; cf. sch. plut. 598d ChisLPar). In Aristophane.

## 33v 21

甲טó $\mu \varepsilon v o v$. (cf. sch. nub. 1007c Tr2)

## 35r 1



## 36v 7





(cf. sch. nub. 730 Th1, Tr1/2)

37v 18

 Th1/2, $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ )

## 41r 24

 $\psi \eta \varphi$ í $\varepsilon$ с $\alpha$. (sch. nub. 1121 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

## 41v 13

 Th2, $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ )

## 44v 20

 ŋंтоı $\mu \alpha ́ \sigma \mu \varepsilon Ө \alpha$. (sch. nub. 607c AnRec ChisRegParb, 607d AnRec Par)

## 48r 21

 In Aristophane. (cf. sch. nub. 398b Tr1/2)

49v 17

 $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha i ́ \delta \omega \nu \varphi \omega v \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$. (cf. sch. nub. 1001d Tr2)

50r 6



50r 17


## 51r 9



 Th1, Tr1/2)

## 52v 21




 910a-b $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ )

## 55v 26





## 56v 1

 nub. 952 Th2, Tr1/2)

## 57r 17

 1179, 1184 Tr and AnRec)

## 57r 23



 In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 758b Th2, Tr1/2)

## 58r 9



## 59r 7

 AnRec Par)

62r 12
$\delta \eta \mu \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma o ̃ v \varsigma^{\prime} . \delta_{10 ı} 0 ̃ v \sigma ı$ tòv $\delta \tilde{\eta} \mu 0 v$. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 1093 Tr2)

## 62v 1

 In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 210b AnRec)

## 64v 22

 qualis est color philosophorum. In Aristophane. (cf. sch. nub. 120 b Tr2)

## 65r 11

 Th2, $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ )

## 65r 14

$\delta 1 \alpha \lambda ı \pi \omega ̉ v$, ȟץouv $\dot{\alpha} \varphi \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\mu} \varepsilon v o \varsigma$. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 496c AnRec Par)

## 68 r 15



## 69v 26

 ¢טбьo入oүíac. In Aristophane (sch. nub. 166 Tr2);
 schol. vet.)

## 70r 26

 nub. 984a Th1/2, Tr1/2)

## 70v 13

In Aristophane. $\tau \alpha i ̃ \varsigma \delta i ́ k \alpha ı \varsigma, \tau \alpha i ̃ \varsigma ~ \delta ı к \alpha ı o ̛ ́ v \alpha ı \varsigma(s c h . ~ n u b . ~ 1040 T h 1 / 2, ~ T r 1(?) / 2) . ~$


## 71r 20



## 72r 20

In Aristophane. $\delta \iota \omega \kappa \alpha \dot{\theta} \theta \omega \alpha$ ủtoùৎ $\gamma \rho \alpha \varphi \eta ̀ v \gamma \rho \alpha \psi \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon v o \varsigma ~ e s t ~ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \gamma о \rho \eta ́ \sigma \omega$
 Th1, $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ )

## 74v 11

In Aristophane. $\delta \rho \omega ́ v \tau \omega v, \pi \rho \alpha \tau \tau \varepsilon ́ \tau \omega \sigma \alpha v$. (cf. sch. nub. 453 Th2, Tr1/2; sch. nub. 453a AnRec)

## 77r 20



 tò $\kappa \alpha \lambda \lambda \cup \pi i ́ \zeta \omega \pi \alpha \rho \eta ́ \chi \theta \eta$. (sch. nub. 48d Tr2)

## 78r 19

$\varepsilon \delta i ́ \delta \alpha \xi \alpha$ docui ipse. sed $\varepsilon \in \delta 1 \delta \alpha ́ \xi \alpha \mu \eta v$ Aristophanes ironice alibi loquens ponit,


## 78v 22

عỉ $\grave{n}$ pro $\gamma v \tilde{\varphi}$. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 1461a Th1/2, Tr1/2)

## 79r 12

$\varepsilon{ }^{\prime \prime} \theta^{\prime} \omega ̈ \omega \varphi \lambda^{\prime}$ pro $\varepsilon$ ぞ $\pi \rho \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon$. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 41b AnRec ChisPar)

## 79v 1


 $\tau \tilde{\omega} v \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \chi \varepsilon \dot{\lambda} \lambda \varepsilon \omega \nu \tau \tilde{\omega} v \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \tilde{\omega} v$ (sch. nub. 559d AnRec ParChalc).
 sch. vet. 559a)

## 80r 23

 Tr1/2)

## 86v 3

 In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 554a-b Th1, Tr1/2)

## 91r 6

$\varepsilon ̇ \mu \pi \rho \varepsilon ́ \pi \omega v$ ，$\delta \iota \alpha \varphi \alpha v \grave{\zeta} \varsigma$ ن́ $\pi \alpha ́ \alpha \rho \chi \omega v$ ．In Aristophane．（sch．nub．605e AnRec Par）

## 91r 21

غ̇ $\mu \varphi \varepsilon \rho \eta ́ \varsigma$ ，ő $\mu о ⿺ 𠃊 \varsigma$. In Aristophane．（sch．nub． 502 Th1）

## 93 r 2

$\varepsilon ̇ v \varepsilon ́ \beta \alpha \psi \varepsilon v$ ，$\dot{\varepsilon} v \varepsilon ́ \beta \alpha \lambda \varepsilon v$ ．In Aristophane．（sch．nub．150a AnRec RegParLbChalc）

## 93r 17

 Tr2）

## 93r 24

 Th2，Tr1／2）

## 93v 1

モ̌v $\eta \downarrow \tau \varepsilon$ кגì $v \varepsilon ́ \alpha \vee$ duobus nominibus．Aristophanes eandem diem per iocum nominat．（cf．sch．nub．1223a Th1／2，Tr1／2）significat primam mensis．dicitur tamen aeolice हैvvŋ．

## 95r 1

 1475 Th $1 / 2, \operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ ）

## 96v 8

 （sch．nub．32b Tr2）

## 96v 12



## 98 r 12

 Aristophanes．（sch．nub．862a－b Tr2）

## 98v 1

ह̇ $\xi \eta(\mu \beta \lambda \omega \kappa \alpha \varsigma$, abortiisti, mordaciter in Socratem dicit Aristophanes nam $\dot{\alpha} \mu \beta \lambda \omega \prime \mu \alpha \tau \alpha, \alpha \not \alpha \mu \beta \omega \theta \rho i ́ \delta ı \alpha, \dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \tau \rho \omega ́ \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ dicuntur abortivi. (cf. sch. nub. 139c $\alpha-\beta$ AnRec)

## 101r 21

Aristophanes. غ̇ $\pi \alpha v \varepsilon v \varepsilon \gamma \kappa \varepsilon \tau ̃ v, ~ \theta \varepsilon ́ \lambda \varepsilon ~ \alpha ̉ v \alpha \beta ı \beta \alpha ́ \sigma \varepsilon ı v ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o v . ~(s c h . ~ n u b . ~ 1080 ~$ Tr2)

## 101v 17

Aristophanes. غ̇ $\pi \alpha \sigma \kappa \tilde{\omega} \nu, \mu \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \rho \chi o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o \varsigma . ~(s c h . ~ n u b . ~ 1025 ~ T h 1 / 2, ~ T r 1 / 2) ~$

## 102v 3

$\varepsilon ่ \pi \varepsilon ́ \sigma \tau \varepsilon ı \lambda \varepsilon, \pi \rho о \sigma \varepsilon ́ \tau \alpha \xi \varepsilon$. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 608c Th1, $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2) ; ~ \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \varepsilon ́ \chi Ө \eta$, $[\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda] \varepsilon ́ \chi \theta \eta$. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 1356b Th1/2, Tr1/2)

## 102v 6




102v 12
غ่ $\ddagger \eta ́ \rho \alpha \tau \varepsilon, \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa i ́ v \eta \sigma \alpha \tau \varepsilon$. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 1457 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

## 104r 2

 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

## 105v 11

Aristophanes. $\varepsilon ่ \pi \iota \mu \varepsilon \iota v \alpha ́ v \tau \omega \nu$, pro $\varepsilon$ ह̇ $\pi \iota \mu \eta \nu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \sigma \alpha \nu$ (sch. nub. 196b AnRec $\left.\mathrm{Ba}\left(\mathrm{m}^{4}\right)\right)$ そ̋ к $\alpha \rho \tau \varepsilon \rho \eta \sigma \alpha ́ \tau \omega \sigma \alpha v$. (sch. nub. 196b AnRec ChisRegParlChalc)

108r 16


## 110v 25




## 112r 15

 vooṽซıv. (sch. nub. 1507b Tr2)

## 112v 17

Aristophanes. attice $\varepsilon$ है $\sigma \chi \omega \nu$ pro $\varepsilon ้ \sigma \chi \imath \sigma \alpha$. a $\sigma \chi \alpha ́ \omega$. unde est $\sigma \chi \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$, ut $\chi \lambda$ o $\tilde{\omega}$ $\chi \lambda 0 \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$, $\chi \vee \circ \tilde{\omega} \chi \vee \circ \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$. (cf. sch. nub. $409 \mathrm{f} \operatorname{Tr} 2$ )

## 112v 26

દ่̇ $\varepsilon$ òv, $\alpha \lambda \eta \forall \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 35b Th2, Tr1/2; 93 Th2, Tr1/2)

## 114r 24

عủӨv́ $\tau 0 \cup ̉ \rho o \pi v \gamma i ́ o v . ~ I n ~ A r i s t o p h a n e . ~(N u b .162) . ~ p r o ~ \varepsilon ̌ \omega \varsigma ~[s u p r a ~ \varepsilon u ̉ Ө u ̀ ~ s c r i p t u m] . ~$ (sch. nub. 162b T2, Tr1/2)

## 116v 18

Aristpohanes. $\varepsilon v ่ \pi \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \omega v, ~ \varepsilon ่ v \delta o ́ \xi \omega v$ (sch. nub. 800a AnRec Par), $\varepsilon u ̉ \gamma \varepsilon v \tilde{\omega} v$ (sch. nub. 800a Th1/2, Tr1/2)

## 117r 4

кגì $\sigma \varepsilon \sigma \eta \mu \mu \varepsilon ́ v o \varsigma . ~ \varepsilon u ̉ \rho o ̀ s ~ \gamma \alpha ̀ \rho ~ o ̀ ~ \sigma \kappa \omega ́ \lambda \eta \xi$. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 44b Tr1/2)

## 117v 1

 (cf. sch. nub. 799c-d)

## 119r 24




119v 12
Aristophanes. غ̇ $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \alpha \dot{\mu} \mu \eta v$, $̇ \delta \alpha v \varepsilon ı \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \eta v$. (sch. nub. 22d AnRec; cf. 22d Th2, Tr1/2)

## 120v 23

 $\pi \varepsilon \rho i ̀ ~ t o ̀ v ~ \mu \eta \rho o ̀ v ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \sigma ' ́ \gamma \mu \alpha ~ к \varepsilon \chi \alpha \rho \alpha ү \mu \varepsilon ́ v o v . ~ I n ~ A r i s t o p h a n e . ~(s c h . ~ n u b . ~ 122 b ~ T r 2) ~(~) ~$

## 120v 26


 Aristophanes.

## 121v 7



## 121v 13

ŋ̀ $\delta$ í pro $\grave{\eta} \delta \varepsilon ́$. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. nub. 212a AnRec)

## 122r 19

 $\beta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha 1$. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 863b Tr2)

124r 8


## 124r 15





## 126r 7

 schol. mss. vacat)

## 126v 8

Aristophanes. $\alpha i$ $\theta \varepsilon ́ \sigma \varepsilon ı \varsigma, ~ \alpha i ~ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \beta o \lambda \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau \tilde{\omega} v ~ \tau o ́ k \omega v . ~(s c h . ~ n u b . ~ 1191 ~ T h 1 / 2, ~$ $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ )

## 127v 5



127v 14
 عűpŋ $\nu \tau \alpha 1$. (sch. nub. 332a Tr2)

## 127v 19

 (sch. nub. 1264b Tr2)

128r 22
Aristophanes. $\theta \rho \cup \alpha \lambda \lambda i ̀ \varsigma ~ к \cup \rho i ́ \omega \varsigma ~ o ̀ ~ \tau о v ̃ ~ \varphi \omega \tau \varepsilon \lambda i ́ o v ~ o \pi ı v \theta \eta ́ \rho . ~ к \alpha \tau \alpha \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau \tau к \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$


## 128v 15



## 129r 26



## 130r 7



## 130r 18

 e Tr2)

## 131v 6



## 132r 19

 Tr2)

## 132r 25



## 133r 22




## 133v 20

 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta ́ \theta o u \sigma \alpha v$. (sch. nub. 1358a-b Tr1/2)

## 134r 25

$\kappa \alpha \theta \varepsilon \iota \mu \varepsilon ́ v o \nu, \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \kappa \varepsilon \chi \alpha \lambda \alpha \sigma \mu \varepsilon ́ v o v$. к $\alpha$ ín $\mu \imath$, тò $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \chi \alpha \lambda \tilde{\omega}$. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 538c AnRec). $\kappa \alpha \theta \varepsilon i ́ \rho \xi \alpha \not \mu ' . ~ к \lambda \varepsilon i ́ \sigma \alpha ı \mu ı . ~ A r i s t o p h a n e s ~(s c h . ~ n u b . ~$ 751a Th2, $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ ). $\kappa \alpha \theta \varepsilon ́ \lambda о \iota \mu ı, ~ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \beta \curlywedge \beta \alpha ́ \sigma \alpha \iota \mu ı$. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 750 $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ )

## 134v 4

 Th1/2, $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ )

## 137r 1




## 138v 1




## 138v 26






 Tr1-c Tr2)

## 140v 9





## 141r 26

 (cf. sch. nub. 694c Tr2)

## 146v 3





## 148Bv 20

кєбт $\rho \varepsilon \dot{v} \varsigma$, ó кદ́ $\varphi \alpha$ оऽ. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 339a Tr2)

## 149r 12

кєХо́ $\rho \varepsilon \cup \tau \alpha 1, \pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \varepsilon \kappa \tau \alpha 1$. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 1510c Th1/2, $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ )

## 149v 2

 Tr1/2)

150r 23
$\tilde{\omega}$ kıvoú $\mu \varepsilon v o ı, \tilde{\omega} \sigma u v o v \sigma ı \zeta$ ̧́ $\mu \varepsilon v o l$. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 1101 Th1/2, $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ )

150v 10


## 151v 4




## 153v 1

 AnRec Par)

## 154v 6

 Tr1/2)

## 155r 1




## 155v 12

 nub. 1073c Tr2)

## 156v 14



## 157r 7

крíveбı $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \varphi \alpha v o i ̃ \varsigma ~ p r o ~ к р i ́ v o ı ̧ . ~ A r i s t o p h a n e s . ~(s c h . ~ n u b . ~ 911 b ~ A n R e c ; ~ c f . ~$ 911b Tr2)

## 157r 11

 ג̉ $\varepsilon$ เкદ́ $\omega \varsigma$. (cf. sch. nub. 1356a Tr2)

157r 23
 (sch. nub. 1070c Tr2)

## 158r 22

 AnRec)

## 159r 26

 448a $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ ).

159v 10
$\kappa \omega \mu \alpha \sigma \tau \eta ์ \varsigma$, ó $\mu \varepsilon ́ \theta v \sigma o \varsigma$. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 606a AnRec ParCrlChalc)

## 159v 12



 52?; vacat mss.)

160v 10
$\lambda \alpha \kappa \kappa o ́ \pi \rho \omega \kappa \tau \varepsilon$ ，عủ $勹$ ú $\rho \omega \kappa \tau \varepsilon$ ．Aristophanes．（sch．nub． 1330 Th1／2， $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ ）

## 163r 2

 بopíov．（cf．sch．nub．327d AnRec）$\lambda \tilde{\eta} \mu \alpha$ ，$\delta$ 文 tò $\varphi \rho o ́ v \eta \mu \alpha$ poetice（e．g．sch． nub．457b Tr2）．

## 163v 6

Aristophanes．$\tau \eta ̀ v \lambda i ́ \theta o v$ ．meridie aestatis ponitur his lapis ad solem et ubi concaluerit radiis，apponitur $\dot{\eta}$ кouv $\tilde{\varsigma} \lambda \varepsilon \gamma 0 \mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta$ ı̋ $\sigma \kappa \alpha$ et sic mirabiliter ignis accenditur．（cf．sch．nub．768d Tr2）

## 165 Br 1







## 165 Br 8

Aristophanes．$\varepsilon \varsigma ~ \lambda о \varphi \varepsilon \tilde{o v} \sigma \tau \rho \circ \gamma \gamma u ́ \lambda o v$（sch．nub． 751 sch．vet．；cf． 751 b AnRec）

## 165Bv 5

$\lambda \cup \sigma \alpha v i ́ \alpha \varsigma, \lambda \cup \tau \eta ́ \rho$. Aristophanes．（sch．nub． 1163 Th1／2，Tr1／2）

## 166r 26

Aristophanes．$\mu \alpha \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1 . ~ \gamma \nu \omega ́ \sigma \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1 .(s c h . n u b .886$ Th1／2，Tr1／2）

## 167v 9

 M $\alpha \rho ı \kappa \tilde{\alpha} \varsigma$ ह̇k $\alpha \lambda$ हĩ兀o．（sch．nub．553a Th1，Tr1／2）

## 173v 11

In Aristophane $\mathfrak{i} \kappa \alpha v \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$（sch．nub． 1510 d Th1／2，Tr1／2）

## 174r 6






## 174r 11

 (sch. nub. 997a Tr1/2)

## 174v 4








 nub. 1131c Th1/2, Tr1-d Tr2) हैv $^{\prime} \tau \varepsilon$ k $\alpha i ̀ ~ v \varepsilon ́ \alpha ~ \alpha ̉ \rho \chi ı \mu \eta v i ́ \alpha ~(s c h . ~ n u b . ~ 1134 c ~$ $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ ).

## 175r 17

 (sch. nub. 1007a Tr2)

## 177r 10








## 178r 16





179v 17
 Th1, $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ )

## 179v 25

vยvó $\mu \iota \sigma \tau 0 . ~ v \varepsilon v o \mu \circ \theta \varepsilon \tau \eta \mu \varepsilon ́ v o v \tilde{\eta} v . ~ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ̀ ~ v o ́ \mu o v \varsigma ~ \varepsilon ่ \pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \tau \tau \tau . ~ A r i s t o p h a n e s . ~(c f . ~$ sch. nub. 962 b Th1/2, $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ )

## 181v 12

vó $\mu \iota \sigma \mu \alpha$, tò vó $\mu \iota \mu \circ$ v है $\theta$ os et moneta. unde ludens Aristophanes introduxit respondentem quendam $\sigma \delta \alpha \rho \varepsilon ́ o r s$. et dixit dorice, $\kappa \omega \mu \omega \delta \tilde{\omega} v$ byzantios. quia vili et minuta moneta utebantur. (cf. sch. nub. 249c AnRec Lb (mrg), 249d AnRec $\mathrm{HoBa}\left(\mathrm{m}^{4}\right)$ )

## 183v 12

そuv

## 183v 15

$\xi \cup \varepsilon ́ \chi \omega$, $\sigma \cup \sigma \varphi^{i} \gamma \gamma \omega$. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. nub. 966b Th1/2, Tr1/2)

## 183v 19


 тoùऽ $\alpha$ ̋ $v \delta \rho \alpha$. (cf. sch. nub. 70c Tr1/2)

## 186r 14

 Aristophanes (cf. sch. nub. 773c Tr1/2)

## 189r 11




 દ̇ $\pi$ í $\theta$ ctov. (sch. nub. 1371c Tr2)

191r 26
Aristophanes. ỏ $\pi o ́ \tau \varepsilon \rho о 1 \pi \lambda \varepsilon$ źous, ò $\pi o i ̃ o l ~ \varepsilon u ̉ \rho u ́ \pi \rho \omega k \tau o ı, ~ ท ้ ~ o v ̉ . ~(s c h . ~ n u b . ~ 1096 ~$ Th1/2, $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ )

## 192r

 $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ )

## 195v 23

oủ $\delta^{\prime}$ ő $\lambda \omega \varsigma$. oủ $\delta^{\prime}$ ó $\tau 10 u ̃ v \alpha ̉ \delta ı k o u \mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta$. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. ran. 527; sch. nub. 733c AnRec; sch. plut. 476; sch. acharn. 543; Plut. 457.)

## 197v 12

Aristophanes. $\mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ ỏ $\varphi \lambda \eta$ ń $\sigma \varepsilon \imath v . ~ \delta o u ̃ v \alpha ı ~ \eta ̄ ~ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \delta ı \kappa \alpha \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} v \alpha ı . ~(c f . ~ s c h . ~ n u b . ~$ 777a AnRec; cf. 777a Tr2)

## 198r 24

 (sch. nub. 983a Th1/2, Tr1/2)

200r 10
 ó $\pi \alpha v \delta \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon ́ \tau ı \circ \varsigma \eta \not \eta \theta 1 \varepsilon$. Aristophanes. (vacat sch. mss.)

200r 23
$\pi \alpha v v \chi_{\chi i ́ \zeta \varepsilon ı v, ~}^{\alpha} \nmid \gamma \rho \cup \pi v o v \delta_{1 \alpha \beta} \beta \alpha ́ \zeta \varepsilon \imath v$. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. $1069 \operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ )

## 201v 22

 456 Th2, Tr1/2)

## 204r 1



 AnRec ChisPar)

204v 16


## 206r 26







## 209r 1

 319 Th2, Tr1/2; cf. 319b AnRec Par)

## 209v 26

Aristophanes. $\pi \varepsilon \rho ı \delta o v ̃ ~ v u ̃ v ~ \varepsilon ̉ \mu o i ́ . ~ \eta ้ \tau o l ~ \sigma u v \theta \eta ́ к \eta v ~ \delta o ́ \varsigma ~ \pi \varepsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \tau o u ́ \tau o v . ~ \varepsilon i ̉ \mu ı ~ o ̋ v \tau \omega \varsigma ~$
 Tr2; cf. 644a AnRec Par)

## 212v 13

 $\pi \varepsilon \rho เ \varphi \rho о v \tilde{\omega}$. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. nub. 225b Th2, Tr1/2; 225b sch.vet.)

## 213r 5

Aristophanes. $\pi \varepsilon \rho \sigma \iota \kappa \eta ́, \varepsilon i ̃ \delta o \varsigma ~ \delta \varepsilon ́ v \delta \rho o v . ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ o ̀ ~ к \alpha \rho \pi o ̀ \varsigma ~ \mu \tilde{\eta} \lambda \alpha \pi \varepsilon \rho \sigma \iota \kappa \alpha ́, \tau \alpha ́ \lambda \varepsilon \gamma o ́ \mu \varepsilon v \alpha$

 nub. 151d AnRec)

## 213v 10











 $\lambda \alpha \beta$ õ̃ $\alpha \pi \varepsilon \rho$ દ́к $\alpha$ เ tò $\theta v \eta \tau o ̀ v ~ \alpha u ̉ \tau \tilde{\omega} v ~ \sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha, \beta$,





## 214v 13

Aristophanes. oi ríouvol, oi $\theta \alpha \rho \rho 0$ ṽvtec. (sch. nub. 949e AnRec)

## 219r 10



## 219r 26

$\pi 0 \lambda \cup \eta ́ \rho \alpha \tau o v, \pi \alpha ́ v v$ ह̇ $\pi \varepsilon ́ \rho \alpha \sigma \tau 0 v$ Aristophanes (sch. nub. 301b Th2, Tr1/2)

## 221r 24




 Tr1/2)

## 222r 19

 $\mathrm{Tz}, 246 \mathrm{a}$ sch. vet.)

## 222v 13

 614a AnRec)

## 222v 15

 Tr1/2; 749b AnRec)

## 223r 18



## 223v 6



## 225r 5

$\pi \rho о \tilde{\kappa} \kappa \alpha$, като̀ $\chi \alpha ́ \rho ı v$. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 1426a Th1/2, Tr1/2)

## 225r 10

$\pi \rho o ı \varepsilon ́ v \alpha 1, \pi \rho o \delta_{1} \delta o ́ v \alpha 1$. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 1214e Tr2)

## 225v 26

$\pi \rho \circ \mu \alpha \theta \varepsilon \tau ̃, \pi \rho o \delta ı \delta \alpha \chi \theta \tilde{\eta} v \alpha 1$. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 966a Th1/2, Tr1/2)

## 229r 4

Aristophanes. kö้v $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \theta \varepsilon i ́ \eta \nu$ (Nub. 1235), кגì $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \theta \varepsilon i ́ \eta \nu$ öv


## 229r 8

 סокะĩৎ (sch. nub. 1277 Th2, Tr1/2)

## 230v 5

 nub. 1433a Th1/2, $\operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ )

## 231v 7





## 231v 12

$\pi \rho o u \tau \varepsilon ́ v \theta \varepsilon v \sigma \alpha v$, ह̇ $\lambda \alpha \mu \mu \alpha ́ \rho \gamma \eta \sigma \alpha v, \pi \rho o u ́ \lambda \alpha \beta o v$. (sch. nub. 1200 Th1)

## 232r 22


nub. 272b AnRec) $\pi \rho \circ \chi \circ \alpha i ̃ \varsigma, ~ ท ̉ \tau o ı ~ \pi \rho o \chi v ́ \sigma \varepsilon \sigma ı v, ~ \alpha ̉ k \tau \alpha i ̃ \varsigma ~(s c h . ~ n u b . ~ 272 a ~ T h 2, ~$
 そ๕のтíoıя. (sch. nub. 272c Tr1)

## 232v 8



## 234v 16

$\pi \cup \rho \pi о \lambda \varepsilon \tilde{\imath}$, каíعı. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 1497 Tr2)

## 235v 22






## 236r 24

 Tz )

## 237r 1

คоі̃ß supra scr.) (cf. sch. nub. 407b AnRec)

## 238r 22

 Tr2)

## 239r 9

 Tr1/2)

## 240r 2

ท้ँо1 $\tau \tilde{\omega} v \tau \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$ คol $\tilde{\alpha} \varsigma \varphi \lambda o l \tilde{\omega} v$ (sch. nub. $881 \mathrm{Th} 1 / 2, \operatorname{Tr} 1 / 2$ ). Aristophanes. к $\alpha k \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu ~ \sigma 1 \delta i ́ \omega \nu ~ \beta \alpha \tau \rho \alpha ́ \chi o u \varsigma . ~(N u b . ~ 881) ~$

240v 10
Aristophanes. $\sigma u v \alpha \mu \omega \rho 0 \cup \mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta, \sigma u v o v \sigma \imath \zeta$ Ø $\mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta$. $\sigma \tilde{i} v o \varsigma ~ \gamma \alpha ̀ \rho ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \alpha i ̉ \delta o i ̃ o v ~(s c h . ~$ nub. 1070a Tr2)

## 243v 26

 (cf. sch. nub. 1500a Tr2)

## 244r 9




## 244r 16





## 244r 23

 (sch. nub. 1285 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

## 246v 9

Aristophanes. $\sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ \mu \varphi \cup \lambda \alpha \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma o v \tau \alpha ı \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \alpha ̉ \pi о \pi \imath \varepsilon ́ \sigma \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \tau \tilde{\omega} v \sigma \tau \alpha \varphi v \lambda \tilde{\omega} \nu$ к $\alpha \grave{\imath} \tau \tilde{\omega} v$ $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \alpha \iota \tilde{\omega} v$ (sch. nub. 45b Th2, Tr1/2)

## 248r 13

Aristophanes. $\sigma \tau 0 \mu \omega ́ \sigma \varepsilon ı \varsigma, \dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi \circ \rho \alpha ̀ ~ \alpha ̉ \pi o ̀ ~ \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \mu \alpha \chi \alpha \iota \rho \tilde{\omega} v$ (sch. nub. 1108a Tr2)

## 248v 19

$\sigma \tau \rho \varepsilon \beta \lambda$ ои̃ $\tau$, ко $\lambda^{\prime} \zeta \eta \tau \varepsilon$. Aristophanes (cf. sch. nub. 620 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

## 248v 25


 sch. nub. 434a AnRec)

## 253v 17




## 261r 6


 nub. 107b-c Tr1/2)

## 261r 9

 sch. nub. 740b Th1/2, Tr1/2; cf. 740c AnRec Par)

## 261v 5






 nub. 830 Tr2)

## 263r 7



## 263v 16


Aristophanes. t $\varepsilon$ Ө́

## 264r 26


 Eust.)

## 265r 10





## 265v 14

$\tau \varepsilon ́ \tau \rho \circ \varphi \alpha \varsigma, \kappa \alpha \tau \varepsilon ́ \varphi \alpha ү \varepsilon \varsigma, \kappa \alpha \tau \varepsilon \delta \alpha \pi \alpha ́ v \eta \sigma \alpha \varsigma$. Aristophanes (cf. sch. nub. 858 Th1, Tr1/2; cf. sch. nub. 858c AnRec Par)

## 266r 26


 $\tau \rho \omega ́ \gamma \omega v$ " " $\pi \alpha v \delta \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$ íous $\gamma v \omega ́ \mu \alpha \varsigma$ " $\varepsilon i ̃ \pi \varepsilon, \delta ı \alpha \beta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega v \alpha u ̉ \tau o ̀ v ~ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \alpha ้ ~ \mu \varphi \omega, ~ \kappa \alpha \grave{~}$
 (sch. nub. 922 Tr2)

## 266v 11

$\tau \eta \rho \circ \frac{1}{\eta} \nu$ है $\chi \omega v, \varphi \cup \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \alpha \iota \mu \iota ~ \kappa \rho \alpha \tau \tilde{\omega} v, ~ \kappa \varepsilon \kappa \tau \eta \mu \varepsilon ́ v o \varsigma$. Aristophanes (cf. sch. nub. 752 Tz ; cf. sch. nub.752c AnRec; cf. 14d AnRec)

## 269r 22




 nub. 50a-d Tz)

## 269r 26

 nub. 862c Tr2)

## 270r 7

Aristophanes. ov̉ $\tau \rho i ́ \beta \omega \nu$, ov̉k $\varepsilon \not ้ \mu \pi \varepsilon ı \rho o \varsigma ~(c f . ~ s c h . ~ n u b . ~ 870 b ~ A n R e c ; ~ s c h . ~ v e s p . ~$

 (sch. nub. 1003c Th1/2, Tr1/2)

## 271r 9



 $\Delta$ lóऽ. દ̇т
 (sch. nub. 989c Tr2)

273r 20



## 275r 26

 nub. 1195b Th1, Tr1/2)

## 276r 4



## 277r 12



## 277r 19

 Aristophanes. (Nub. 226)

## 281r 9

 242b AnRec)

## 281v 19



## 283r 3

 109c Tr2)

## 284r 24



## 286v 3

Aristophanes. $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \mu \iota \kappa \rho o ̀ v ~ \eta ̉ \varphi \alpha v i ́ \sigma \theta \eta v$. $\varphi \rho о \cup \rho \tilde{\alpha} \varsigma$ ợ $\delta \omega v$ ỏ ốүov $\varphi \rho о \tilde{\delta} \delta \circ \varsigma$



 oủk モ̇коцนа̃тo (sch. nub. 721a Tr2)

## 287v 19

$\varphi \omega \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \omega v$, ท̌toו $\kappa \lambda \varepsilon ́ \psi \omega \omega$, $\dot{\varepsilon} \rho \varepsilon u v \eta \eta^{\sigma} \omega v$. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 499b AnRec Par)

## 289v 17




 (sch. nub. 875b Th1/2, Tr1/2)

## 291r 15

 Th2, Tr1/2)

## 291v 13



 1238c Tr2)

## 292v 16






 sch. nub. 241a Th2, Tr1/2)

## 293r 6

 439b sch. vet.; cf. 439a Tz)

## 293r 7

Aristophanes. $\delta \alpha v \varepsilon เ \sigma \tau \tilde{\omega} v ~ \chi \rho \eta ́ \sigma \tau \omega v ~ \tau \varepsilon ~ \delta v б к о \lambda \omega \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega v ~(N u b . ~ 240 ; ~ s c h . ~ n u b . ~$ 240b-c sch. vet.)

## 293r 21



## 294r 16



## 295r 18



 1429 Tr2)

## 296r 1


 nub. 1367a-d Th1/2, Tr1/2)

## 296r 4

 nub. 151a Th2, Tr1/2) $\delta \iota \varepsilon \tau \cup \pi \omega ́ \theta \eta \sigma \alpha v$ (sch. nub. 151b AnRec ChisPar), દ̃̃סoৎ







## 297v 19




298r 1
ท̌toı $\delta ı \kappa \alpha i ́ \omega \varsigma ~ \omega ̉ \varphi \varphi \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega} \sigma^{\prime} \varepsilon ̇ k \tau \omega ̃ v v \delta ı \alpha i ́ \omega v$. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. nub. 1116a Tr2)

# V <br> Glossary Notes Quoting Scholia to Plutus 

## Abbreviations:

cf. = The marginal note does not agree with the indicated scholion precisely, but seems to be closely related to it.
sch. rec. = scholia recentiora to Plutus edited by Chantry 1996
(For the abbreviations of single codices and manuscript families within the group of scholia recentiora refer to Chantry 1996: XI-XII).
$\mathrm{Db}=$ scholia to Plutus edited by Dübner 1883
(For the abbreviations of single codices refer to Dübner 1883: XI-XII.)
sch. vet. = scholia vetera to Plutus edited by Chantry 1994
$\mathrm{Tz}=$ scholia to Plutus by Joannes Tzetzes, edited by Massa Positano 1960
TzGloss = Glossae to Tzetzes's scholia, edited by Massa Positano 1960: 234-269.

```
1r 1
```



1r 12
 $\Theta ; 969 \mathrm{Db} \Theta \mathrm{P}$.)

## 4 r 9

 545 Db )

5 v 26


## 10r 19

 295 Db P.; cf. 295c and $295 f$ sch. rec. thPstr)

## 12r 24

$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$, к $\rho \alpha \tau \eta \theta \varepsilon i ̀ \varsigma$ in Aristophane（sch．in plut．168a Pstr）．$\alpha \lambda \sigma \omega v^{\prime} \delta ı \alpha \sigma \mu \nu \chi \theta \varepsilon i ́ \zeta$ ．


## 13r 25

$\alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \varphi 1 \varepsilon ́ \sigma \omega$, ह̇v $\delta v ́ \sigma \omega$ ．In Aristophane（sch．plut． $936 \mathrm{Db} \Theta$ P．；936a sch．rec． thPstr）

## 13v 1

In Aristophane．$\alpha, v \alpha \beta \alpha ́ \delta \eta v$ ，グүouv $\varepsilon$ ह́ $\kappa \tau \varepsilon \tau \alpha \mu \varepsilon ́ v \omega \varsigma$ ．et pedem habendo super pedem．（sch．plut． 1123 c L， $\mathrm{Barb}^{3} ; 1123 \mathrm{Db}$ P．）$\varepsilon \mathfrak{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} v \alpha \beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \psi \varepsilon ı \alpha \varsigma$ ，グ $\gamma o u v$ $\alpha{ }^{\alpha} v \alpha \beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \psi \varepsilon 15$ ．In Aristophane．（sch．plut．95b sch．rec．Cant ${ }^{\text {m2 }}$ ）

## 13v 17



## 13v 26



## 14r 1

 （cf．sch．plut．507b and d sch．rec．； 507 Db．P．）．

14r 25


## 15r 7

ब̉v $\sigma \not \sigma \pi \alpha \sigma \varepsilon \nu, \sigma \cup v \varepsilon ́ \sigma \tau \varepsilon ı \lambda \varepsilon v$ ．Aristophanes（cf．sch．plut．691e sch．rec．； 691 Db P．，Vict．）

## 20r 4

$\alpha ̋ v \tau \iota k \rho \cup \varsigma, \varphi \alpha v \varepsilon \rho \tilde{\omega} \varsigma \kappa \alpha i ̀ \alpha \lambda \eta \forall \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ ．In Aristophane（cf．sch．plut．328d sch．rec． pl．an．）

## 21v 8


 Vict．； 607 sch．rec．$r \mathrm{~L}, \mathrm{M})$

23r 26
$\alpha \not \approx \alpha \rho \tau i ́, \alpha \not \approx \eta \eta \rho \tau \eta \sigma \mu \varepsilon ́ v \omega \varsigma, \tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon i ́ \omega \varsigma$. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 388a sch. rec. Pstr Mt, rL PaldVi, $\Theta V^{57}$ )

## 25r 14

$\alpha \not \approx \varepsilon \psi \omega \lambda \eta \mu \varepsilon ́ v o l ~ \tau \alpha ̀ \alpha ~ \alpha i \delta o i ̃ \alpha ~ \delta \varepsilon ı \kappa \nu v ́ v \tau \varepsilon \varsigma ~ i n ~ A r i s t o p h a n e ~(s c h . ~ p l u t . ~ 295 b ~ s c h . ~$ rec. thPstr)

## 33r 12

 rec. Par, ${ }^{57}$; cf. sch. rec. 468c Ftr)

33r 26
 (cf. sch. nub. 789c AnRec ChisReg; cf. sch. plut. 598d sch. rec. ChisLPar) in Aristophane.

## 33v 10


 ChisLReg,Barb ${ }^{3}$ )

33v 19
 sch. rec. ChisPar,Rs; 817 Db P.)

## 34v 9

 rec. tr; $546 \mathrm{Db} \Theta, \mathrm{P}$.

37r 19
$\alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau \iota \alpha ́ \zeta \rho \mu \varepsilon v, \tau \dot{\alpha} \alpha \not \alpha \rho \tau \imath \alpha \pi \alpha i ́ \zeta o \mu \varepsilon v$. In Aristophane. (cf. sch. plut. 816d sch. rec. thPsVat; 816 Db P.)

## 43r 7

 1190 Db P.; 1190a sch. rec. Par, N)

## 43r 23

In Aristophane. $\alpha u ̉ \chi \mu o ́ \varsigma, ~ \sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \eta \sigma ı \varsigma, ~ \xi \eta \rho \alpha \sigma i ́ \alpha . ~(s c h . ~ p l u t . ~ 839 a ~ s c h . ~ r e c . ~ t h P s t r ~$ and Mt,ChisLPar,MRs; 839 Db P.)

## 47v 14



## 47v 26

$\beta \delta \varepsilon ́ \omega$, ő $\theta \varepsilon v ~ \beta \delta \varepsilon \lambda u \rho o ̀ s ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \beta \delta \varepsilon \lambda u ́ \tau \tau o \mu \alpha 1 . ~(c f . ~ s c h . ~ p l u t . ~ 693 b ~ s c h . ~ r e c . ~$ ChisLPar,M,Ho; 693 Db P.)

## 49r 6

 P., V)

## 49v 10

In Aristophane. $\beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \varphi \alpha \rho \alpha$ $\alpha i \quad \pi \tau u ́ \chi \varepsilon \varsigma ~ \tau \tilde{\omega} v$ ỏ $\varphi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu \tilde{\omega} v$, ท̄үouv $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ ỏ $\mu \mu \alpha \tau о ́ \varphi \cup \lambda \lambda \alpha$. $\beta \lambda \varepsilon \varphi \alpha \rho i ́ \delta \varepsilon \varsigma ~ \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \alpha i ́ \tau \rho i ́ \chi \varepsilon \varsigma ~ \alpha i ~ \varepsilon ̇ \mu \pi \varepsilon \varphi \cup к \cup i ̃ \alpha ı ~ \tau о i ̃ \varsigma ~ \beta \lambda \varepsilon \varphi \alpha ́ \rho о ı \varsigma . ~$ (sch. plut. 730 Db P.)

50v 8


 plut. 819c sch. rec. Pstr; 819 Db P.)

## 50v 26

 (sch. plut. 493 Tz ; cf. 493 Db )

## 53r 9

$\gamma \alpha \lambda \tilde{\eta} \dot{\eta} \kappa \alpha ́ \tau \alpha . \mu \nu \gamma \alpha \lambda \tilde{\eta} \dot{\eta} \nu \nu \mu \varphi i ́ \tau \zeta \alpha$ In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 693e sch. rec. rL; 693 Db P.)

## 54r 11

$\gamma \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega} \alpha i \tau \iota \alpha \tau \iota \kappa \tilde{n}, \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \gamma \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega} \gamma \varepsilon \nu \iota \kappa \tilde{n}$. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 880d sch. rec. ChisPar; 880 Db P.)

## 56v 1

$\gamma \nu \tilde{\omega} \vee \alpha \iota$ סокєĩ $\gamma \vee \omega \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} v \alpha 1, v o \mu i ́ \zeta \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1$. In Aristophane (sch. plut. 49a-b sch. rec. Par,Rs,BaHo)

## 58v 7

$\delta \alpha \iota \mu \circ v i ́ \omega \varsigma, \delta \varepsilon \xi \imath \tilde{\omega} \varsigma, \varepsilon ̇ \pi \iota \tau \eta \delta \varepsilon i ́ \omega \varsigma, \theta \alpha v \mu \alpha \sigma i ́ \omega \varsigma$. In Aristophane. (cf. sch. plut. 675 c sch. rec. thPstr; cf. $675 \mathrm{Db} \Theta$, P.)

## 60r 8

$\delta \varepsilon ı \lambda \alpha ́ \kappa \rho \alpha, \dot{\alpha} \theta \lambda i ́ \alpha$ (cf. sch. plut. 973 d sch. rec. M; 973 Db .).

69r 15
$\delta_{i \alpha}$ र $\rho o ́ v o v . ~ \eta ̌ \tau o ı ~ \delta i \alpha ̀ ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda o v ̃ . ~ I n ~ A r i s t o p h a n e . ~(s c h . ~ p l u t . ~ 1055 a ~ s c h . ~ r e c . ~$ pCantChisLPar,Barb ${ }^{3}$; 1055 Db P.)

69v 23
 rec. $\mathrm{Cr}^{2}$ LhMt, CangChisLVi, $\Theta$ Barb ${ }^{3}$ )

## 73r 7



## 73v 1

Коũvaı $\lambda$ ó $\gamma o v, \delta \iota \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \chi \theta \tilde{\eta} v \alpha 1$. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 467d sch. rec. thPsVat; $467 \mathrm{Db} \Theta$, Dv., P.)

## 78r 15

 sch. rec. rL, Barb ${ }^{3}$; 685 Db P.)

## 79v 9

モỉ $\eta \mu \mu \varepsilon ́ v \omega$, кยкраєๆ $\mu \varepsilon ́ v \omega$. In Aristophane. (cf. sch. plut. 455 c sch. rec. pl. an.; 455 Db P.)

## 79v 18

 sch. rec.)

## 80r 7

 1054 Db.)

## 81v 22

عĩ $\tau \alpha$ tripliciter sumitur in Aristophane. pro $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha ̀ \alpha \alpha \tilde{v} \tau \alpha$, pro $\tilde{\alpha} \rho \alpha$, et $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \gamma o ́ v$. (cf. sch. plut. 910c sch. rec. rL,Barb ${ }^{3}$; cf. 910. Db P.)

## 85v 4

 981. Db. Paris.)

## 87v 15

 1138d sch. rec. rL,MN; 1138 Db P.)

## 89v 18

 plut. 657b sch. rec. tr; 657 Db Br.)

## 89v 26




## 98r 22

 $\pi o ́ \rho \rho \omega \theta \varepsilon v \theta \varepsilon \alpha \sigma \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon v o l .(s c h . p l u t .837 b$ sch. rec. PsLh + Pstr; 837 Db $\Theta$ )

## 98r 26



## 98v 12

 Db P.)

## 98v 14



## 100r 11

Aristophanes. $\varepsilon \in \xi \omega \mu \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \tau \alpha ı$. $\lambda \varepsilon \lambda \alpha ́ \mu \pi \rho \cup v \tau \alpha ı$ кó $\rho \alpha \varsigma$. ő $\mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ है $\lambda \alpha \beta \varepsilon v$. (sch. plut. 635 Db. P.)

## 101r 25

غ̇ $\pi \alpha v i ́ \sigma \tau \omega$, pro $\varepsilon ่ \pi \alpha v i ́ \sigma \tau \alpha$. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. plut. 539d sch. rec.)

## 102r 5

غ̇ $\pi \varepsilon ү \varepsilon i ́ \rho o v \sigma \alpha 1, \delta_{1 \alpha v ı \sigma \tau \tilde{\omega} \sigma \alpha 1 .}$ Aristophanes. (sch. plut. 539a sch. rec. ChisPar)

## 106r 19

 sch. rec. $r, \mathrm{~N}$ )

109v 23
 sch. rec. ChisL,M + Par)

## 109v 25

 $\varphi \cup \lambda \alpha \kappa \eta ̀ \tau \tilde{\omega} v \alpha ้ \lambda \lambda \omega v \kappa \lambda \varepsilon \pi \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$. (sch. plut. 1153 Db P.)

## 110r 1



## 110r 25



## 113r 15

 cf. $404 \mathrm{Db} \Theta$, P.)

116r 15

 thPsVat)

## 116v 6

عű $\tau 0 \rho \alpha$, عủ $\pi o ́ \rho ı \sigma \tau \alpha$. Aristophanes. (sch. plut. 532b sch. rec. r; 532 Db Paris.)

## 121v 9

 681 Db P)

## 122v 13

$\eta \tilde{\eta} \mu \varepsilon v$ pro $\dot{\tau} \pi \alpha ́ \rho \chi о \mu \varepsilon v$ ท̂ $\pi о \rho \varepsilon v o ́ \mu \varepsilon Ө \alpha$. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 659 b sch. rec. VenPsLh; cf. 659 Db ) Item $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \mu \varepsilon ́ v o v ~ \sigma \varphi \eta \kappa i ́ \sigma \kappa o v, ~ \eta ้ \tau о \imath ~ к \varepsilon \kappa \alpha \cup \mu \varepsilon ́ v o v ~ \pi \alpha ́ \lambda o v . ~(s c h . ~$ plut. 301b-c sch. rec. thPstr; $301 \mathrm{Db} \Theta, \mathrm{Dv}, \mathrm{P}$.

## 122v 17

 sch. plut. 608 sch. vet.; 608 Db. V P.)

## 123v 1

 $\tau u ́ \mu \beta \circ \varsigma$ a similitudine caput dicitur. $\tau u ́ \mu \beta \circ \varsigma \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ ó $\tau \alpha ́ \varphi \rho \varsigma$ ט́ $\pi \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon ́ \chi \omega \nu \tau \tilde{\eta} \varsigma \gamma \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$
 $729 b$ a sch. rec. ChisLPar,Barb³; 729 Db P.)

## 123v 10

Aristophanes. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \tilde{\eta} \nu$ pro $\varepsilon$ ह́б $\tau ı$. nam praeterito attici ut praesenti utuntur. (cf. sch. plut. 750a sch. rec. ChisLBarb ${ }^{3}$ )

## 124r 6

ท̌ค $\pi \alpha \kappa \alpha \varsigma, ~ \kappa \alpha \tau \varepsilon \delta u v \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \varepsilon \cup \sigma \alpha \varsigma$. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 372c sch. rec. ParBarb ${ }^{3}$; 372 Db P.)

## 125r 1

 Db. $\Theta$, Dv, P.)

## 127v 17

 rec. Pald; 545 Db.)

## 127v 23

 rec. Musurus (Pald); 290 Db)

## 128v 23

 $\pi \varepsilon ́ v \eta \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$. et habet v breve. $\theta$ ưós non longum. (cf. sch. plut. 253h sch. rec. PsVat; cf. 253 Db)

## 130r 4




## 131r 1

 383 Db P.)

## 131v 24

ỉ $\pi v o ́ \varsigma, ~ t o ̀ ~ \varphi \alpha v \alpha ́ \rho ı o v . ~ I n ~ A r i s t o p h a n e . ~(s c h . ~ p l u t . ~ 815 a ~ s c h . ~ r e c . ~ t h P s t r ; ~ 815 ~ D b ~ \Theta) . ~$.



132v 5


## 133r 26

 sch. rec. rLBarb $^{3}$; 814 Db P.)

## 134r 20

$\kappa \alpha \theta \varepsilon \delta o u ́ \mu \varepsilon v o v, ~ \kappa \alpha \theta i ́ \zeta o v \tau \alpha$. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. plut. 382d sch. rec. tr; cf. 382 Db P.)

## 135r 12

Aristophanes. $\kappa \alpha \theta \omega \sigma ı \omega ́ \theta \eta, \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon ́ \theta \eta, \dot{\alpha} \varphi ı \varepsilon \rho \omega \dot{\theta} \eta$. (sch. plut. 661a sch. rec. thPstr; $661 \mathrm{Db} \Theta$, P., Vict.)

## 141r 26

$\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \kappa \lambda ı v \varepsilon$ ĩv pro $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \theta$ v́ $\sigma \varepsilon ı v$. Aristophanes (cf. sch. plut. 411a sch. rec. thPstr; cf. $411 \mathrm{Db} \Theta, \mathrm{Dv}, \mathrm{P}$.

## 143v 7

 $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1$. (sch. plut. 717a sch. rec. Pstr)

## 147r 8



 (cf. sch. plut. 917e sch. rec. ChisLReg,Barb³; cf. 917 Db $\Theta$ )

147v 20
$\kappa \alpha \tau \varepsilon \alpha ү o ́ \tau o \varsigma, \sigma u v \tau \varepsilon \theta \lambda \alpha \sigma \mu \varepsilon ́ v o v$. Aristophanes. (sch. plut. 545 Db P.; $545 j$ sch. rec. LPar,NRs)

153v 21
ко入обuртòs, Өó $\cup \beta$ оц. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 536 f sch. rec. thPstr)

## 154r 4



## 155v 3

 thPstr)

## 155v 15

котט́ $\eta$, $\varepsilon \tilde{i} \delta \circ \varsigma ~ \mu \varepsilon ́ \tau \rho o v, ~ o ̈ ~ к \alpha \lambda \varepsilon i ̃ \tau \alpha ı ~ \grave{\eta} \mu i ́ \xi \varepsilon \sigma \tau o v ~(c f . ~ s c h . ~ p l u t . ~ 436 b ~ s c h . ~ r e c . ~$ thPstr)

## 157r 23

 $\tau \zeta \cup \mu \beta \lambda \omega ́ \tau \tau 0 v \tau \varepsilon \varsigma ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ \tau \cup \varphi \lambda \omega ́ \tau o v \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$. (sch. plut. 581 Db P.; 581a and c sch. rec. thPstr)

## 159r 26

 [ $ך$ кр $\eta \mu v o ̀ v ~ o u ̋ \tau \omega ~ \kappa \alpha \lambda o u ́ \mu \varepsilon v o v] . ~ A r i s t o p h a n e s . ~(c f . ~ s c h . ~ p l u t . ~ 606 ~ D b ~ P . ; ~ c f . ~$ 606a sch. rec. thPstr).

## 159v 6


 $\pi \rho о \varphi \varepsilon ́ \rho o v \tau \alpha$. (sch. plut. 1128 Db P.)

## 160r 19

Aristophanes. $\lambda \alpha \theta \varepsilon \tilde{\imath ̃ \nu, ~ \alpha ̉ \pi o ́ k \varepsilon ı \tau \alpha ı, ~} \mu \eta\rangle \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} v \alpha ı$. (sch. plut. 566. Db P.; cf. 566b-c sch. rec. thPstr + LParReg)

## 161r 23



 к $\eta \rho \omega ́ \theta \varepsilon \nu \tau о \varsigma ~ \tau о \tilde{v} ~ \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \mu \mu \alpha \tau о ́ \varsigma ~ \sigma о v, ~ \alpha ̉ \tau \tau \iota \kappa \tilde{\omega} \varsigma . ~(s c h . ~ p l u t . ~ 972 ~ D b ~ P . ; ~ c f . ~ 972 a / ~ \beta ~$ sch. rec. Par)

## 161v 22

 589 Db; cf. 589c sch. rec. Ald(Musurus?))

162v 26


## 166r 1

Aristophanes. $\lambda \omega \pi \circ \delta v \tau \varepsilon \tilde{\imath}, \sigma v \lambda \tilde{\alpha} \tau \grave{\alpha} \mathfrak{\imath} \mu \alpha ́ \tau \imath \alpha . ~(c f . ~ s c h . ~ p l u t . ~ 165 ~ D b ~ P) ~.(~) ~$

## 167r 1



## 169r 1

 (sch. plut. 994 Db P.; 994b sch. rec. rL, Barb ${ }^{3}+$ ChisLPar, Barb ${ }^{3}$ )

## 169r 12


 75 a and $\mathrm{d} / \alpha$ sch. rec. Par)

## 170v 9

Aristophanes. $\mu \varepsilon \mu \mathrm{I} \sigma \tau \cup \lambda \eta \mu \varepsilon ́ v o l, \varepsilon v ̉ \omega \chi \eta \theta \varepsilon ́ v \tau \varepsilon \varsigma .(s c h . p l u t .627$ Db P.)

## 172r 24

 Db P.; 924a sch. rec. ChisPar, Barb ${ }^{3}$ )

175r 22


## 175v 15



## 179r 15

 Db P.; cf. 1142d/ $\beta$ sch. rec. ChisLPar)

## 179v 9

 (sch. plut. 1137 Db P.; 1137 b sch. rec. ChisPar,MBarb ${ }^{3}$ )

180v 26


## 183v 12

 (cf. sch. plut. $508 \mathrm{Db} \Theta, \mathrm{Dv}$; cf. 508e sch. rec. ChisL)

## 184v 19


 $\varphi \varepsilon \rho о \mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta \nu$. (sch. plut. 1020 Db P.)

186r 20
 thPstr)

## 189v 11

Aristophanes. őv $\alpha$ ı. $\omega$ © $\varphi \varepsilon \lambda \eta \forall$ zínऽ (sch. plut. $1062 \mathrm{Db} \Theta$ )

## 191r 25

 plut. Db 719. $\Theta$, P.; 719c sch. rec. thPstr)

## 193v 21

Aristophanes. ő $\rho v ı \varsigma$, $\varepsilon$ víotє $\mathfrak{\eta} k \lambda \eta \delta \grave{\omega} v$ к $\alpha \grave{~ t o ̀ ~} \mu \alpha ́ v \tau \varepsilon \cup \mu \alpha$. auspicium (cf. 63a sch. vet.)

## 195r 13



 П̄кєıऽ. (cf. sch. plut. 896, Db P.; 896c-b sch. rec. rL, Barb ${ }^{3}+$ ChisPar)

## 196v 9

 Db P.; 275c sch. rec. thPstr + trMt,ChisLParVi, $\Theta, H a r l)$

## 197r 18

Aristophanes. ov̉ $\varphi \eta \mu^{\prime} \alpha \not ้ v \lambda v \sigma \iota \tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \tilde{\imath} v \sigma \varphi \omega \tilde{\imath} \nu$ (Plut. 509), ov̉ $\delta \alpha \mu \tilde{\omega} \varsigma \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega$


199r 16
 thPs)

204r 15
 plut. 2b TzGloss; cf. 2 Db )

## 204v 12

 plut. 690 Db P.)

## 204v 13

$\pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon i ́ \eta \nu, \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \varepsilon^{\prime} \psi \alpha \iota \mu$ ı. $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \chi \omega \rho \eta ́ \sigma \alpha \iota \mu ı$ (sch. plut. 331. Db $\Theta$, P.)

## 204v 19

$\pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon \kappa \alpha \tau \tau \cup ́ \varepsilon \tau 0, \sigma u v \varepsilon \tau i ́ \theta \varepsilon$. Aristophanes (sch. plut. $663,11 \mathrm{Db} \Theta, \mathrm{Br} ; \mathrm{cf} .663 \mathrm{c}$ sch. rec. MRs)

207v 15
$\pi \varepsilon ́ \lambda \alpha v o \varsigma, ~ \varepsilon i ̃ \delta o \varsigma ~ o ̉ \sigma \pi \rho$ íov. Aristophanes (sch. plut. $661 \mathrm{Db} . \Theta$, Dv, P.; 661 Tz )

## 209r 7

$\pi \varepsilon \rho \alpha v \tilde{\omega}, \sigma v v \lambda o ү i ́ \zeta o \mu \alpha 1$. Aristophanes. (sch. plut. 563 Db P.; 563c sch. rec.)

## 209r 25

 sch. rec. thPstr)

## 210r 1

 sch. rec. ChisPar,Barb³)

## 210r 8

$\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \varepsilon ́ \psi \eta \sigma \varepsilon v, \pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \varepsilon \kappa \alpha ́ \theta \eta ̣ \rho \varepsilon v$. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 730 Db P.; 730a sch. rec. ChisLPaPar,M,Ho)

## 210r 14

$\pi \varepsilon \rho ı \grave{́ \varepsilon ı, ~ \pi \varepsilon \rho ı ท ́ \rho \chi \varepsilon \tau о . ~ A r i s t o p h a n e s ~(s c h . ~ p l u t . ~} 709$ Db Dv, P.; 709b sch. rec. pl.an.)

## 214r 9

 (sch. plut. 949 Db. P and 103 Tz ; cf. 103e sch. rec. pl. an.)

## 220r 1




 rec. $r, \mathrm{~L}, \mathrm{M})$

## 220v 1

$\pi o ́ \pi \alpha \nu \alpha, \gamma \lambda \nu \kappa \eta ́ \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$. Aristophanes (cf. sch. plut. 660 Db Dv, P.; cf. 660b sch. rec. CantCoisLPar,ChalcPasb)

## 222r 22

$\pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \omega$, $\tau$ ̀̀ $\pi 01 \tilde{\omega}$ k $\alpha i ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \chi \omega$. in Aristophane (sch. plut. 485 Db Dv. Br.; 485 b sch. rec. thPstr)

## 222v 1

$\pi \rho \varepsilon \sigma \beta \cup \tau \imath k o i ̀ ~ \theta \varepsilon o i ̀, ~ o i ~ \pi \alpha \lambda \alpha ı o i ̀ ~ o i ~ \alpha ̉ \rho \chi \alpha i ̃ o l . ~ \omega ́ \varsigma ~ \pi \rho o ̀ \varsigma ~ \Delta l o ́ v v \sigma o v ~ \delta ı ' ~ ' A \pi o ́ \lambda \lambda \omega v ı . ~$ Aristophanes. (cf. sch. plut. 1050 Db P.)

## 225r 1

Aristophanes. $\pi \rho \circ \theta \dot{\mu} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha, \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \pi \rho o ̀ ~ \tau \tilde{\eta} \varsigma ~ Ө v \sigma i ́ \alpha \varsigma ~ \gamma \imath v o ́ \mu \varepsilon v \alpha(s c h . ~ p l u t . ~ 660 \mathrm{Db})$

## 228v 9


 cf. 696b sch. rec. Pstr)

## 229r 2

Aristophanes. $\pi \rho о \sigma i ́ \sigma \chi \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1, \pi \rho о \sigma \kappa о \lambda \lambda \tilde{\alpha} \tau \alpha 1$. (sch. plut. 1096. Db LB, Dv, P.; 1096c sch. rec. thMt,CoisNp ${ }^{1}$ PaldPar,MV ${ }^{57}$,PacPasVah)

## 233v 7

 $\Theta$ Dv P.; 544a-b sch. rec. PsLhMt,LPar, $\Theta$ + thPstr)

## 238r 15

 681c sch. rec. Pstr)

240v 12


## 246r 12

Aristophanes. $\sigma \tau \alpha \tau \tilde{\eta} \rho \sigma$ l, vo $\mu i ́ \sigma \mu \alpha \sigma$ (sch. plut. 816 Db. Dv P.; 816 b sch. rec. Chis)

## 249r 25

Aristophanes. $\sigma \tau \rho о \varphi \alpha i ̃ o \varsigma, ~ o ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̃ \varsigma ~ Ө u ́ \rho \alpha \varsigma ~ \varphi u ́ \lambda \alpha \xi, ~ \alpha ̉ \pi o ̀ ~ \tau о v ̃ ~ \sigma \tau \rho o ́ \varphi \imath \gamma ү о \varsigma . ~$
 кגì oű $\tau \omega \varsigma$ ó $\theta \varepsilon \rho \alpha ́ \pi \omega \nu$ ह̇к $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha ́ v \varepsilon ı$. (cf. sch. plut. 1153 Db$)$

## 253v 1

$\sigma \cup \mu \varphi о \rho \omega ́ \tau \alpha \tau о v, \dot{\alpha} \rho \mu о \delta ı \omega ́ \tau \alpha \tau о v$. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 1162 Db Dv; 1162 TzGloss)

## 260v 9


 $\Sigma \varphi \eta \tau \tau 0$ ĩ $̇$ そ́vยєтo (sch. plut. 720 Db P.; 720e sch. rec. $r$ L,MRs)

## 261r 17

 P.)

265r 19
$\tau \varepsilon \tau \rho \alpha ́ \delta 1 \pi \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \mu \mu \varepsilon ́ v o v . \kappa \alpha \lambda \tilde{\omega} \varsigma \varepsilon$ દ̇ $\zeta \mu \omega \mu \varepsilon ́ v o v$ (cf. sch. plut. 1126 Db Dv$)$

266r 11


266r 26
Aristophanes. $̂ ̀ v ~ \tau \eta \lambda i ́ \alpha ~ \eta ้ \tau о 1 ~ k o \sigma k i ́ v o v ~ ү u ́ \rho o s ~(s c h . ~ p l u t . ~ 1037 ~ D b ~ D v ~ D ~ P ; ~$ 1037b sch. rec. r, Pas)

## 266v 5

 plut. 718 Db .)

## 267r 1



 $\eta$ そ̆ $\kappa \varepsilon \varphi \alpha \lambda \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$. Aristophanes (cf. sch. plut. 480 Db Junt.; cf. 480d/ $\alpha$ sch. rec. thPsVat)

## 268v 12

к $\alpha \tau \alpha ́, \tau o ̀ ~ \pi \rho \tilde{\tau} \tau 0 v . \alpha \cup ̉ \tau 0 v ̃, \tau 0 \pi \iota \kappa o ́ v$. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 468 Db P., C)

## 276r 11

Aristophanes. $\alpha \cup ̉ \tau \eta ̀ v ~ v ́ \pi \varepsilon \pi i ́ \tau \tau o u v . ~ \eta ้ \tau o ı ~ \varepsilon ̉ \pi \varepsilon ́ \rho \alpha ı v o v, ~ દ ̉ \sigma u v o v \sigma ı \zeta o ́ \mu \eta v, ~ દ ̉ \kappa ~$



## 281v 26

 ChisPar,Barb ${ }^{3}$ )

## 283v 26

 rec. ChisPar)

## 285r 9



## 285v 14

ழоıvıкíסı, коккívఱ $\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \lambda \omega$, Aristophanes. (cf. sch. plut. 731 Db $\Theta$ Dv Paris.; 731 bch . rec. thPstr, pl. an.)

## 286r 4

 Db P.; 542a sch. rec. LPar)

## 294v 1

 (cf. sch. plut. 1115 Db P. V (Dv); cf. 1115 TzGloss)

## 297r 21


 cf. 963d sch. rec. LParReg)

## 298r 5

ふ̉x $\rho \alpha ́$, kítpıvo̧. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 422 Db P.; 422 sch. rec. pl. an.)

# VI <br> Glossary Notes of Greek Legal Source 

## 1．ad 3v 7 ＝SBM P I，2；B II，2，25．

 tótos．

2．ad 4v 18 ＝SBM P I，3；B II，2，61．



3．ad 8r 16 ＝SBM $\Delta$ XIX，2；B XXXIX，1，3＋SBM $\Pi$ XI，5；B XLIX，1，1．



 $\alpha i \tau \iota \alpha \theta \tilde{\omega} \sigma ı v$ ．inofficiosum testamentum（cf．Dig．XXXVII， $14,1=$ B XLIX，1，1）



4．ad 10v $16=$ SBM P 1， 28 and 7；B 2，2，227．


 SBM．

5．ad 11r 19 ＝SBM P 1，22；B 2，2，99．

 aut abrogatur．sed？derogatur cum pars detrahitur，abrogatur cum prorsus tollitur．（Dig．L，16，102＝B II，2，99）
$\alpha \dot{\alpha} \varphi \iota \rho \tilde{\eta} \tau \alpha 1: \alpha \dot{\alpha} \varphi \alpha \iota \rho \varepsilon і ̃ \tau \alpha 1$ B

## 6．ad 12v $26=$ SBM P I， 85.

 סó入os．
દ̇бтı סó入oc：סó入os દ̇б兀ív SBM
7. ad 18v 15 = SBM X II Index; B XXIV, 10 Titulus + SBM X II,47; B XXIV,10,28





غ́k $\alpha \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho o v: \dot{\varepsilon} k \alpha \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \omega$ SBM, B

## 8. ad 19r 17 = SBM B IV,6; B II,5,26


 $\varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \omega \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega$.

9. ad 27r 14 = SBM N I,12; B LIII,3,1 rest.


$\pi \lambda$ oĩov: $\tau$ ò $\pi \lambda$ oĩov SBM, B | $\rho \imath \varphi \theta \varepsilon ́ v: ~ \rho \rho ~ ا \varphi \varepsilon ́ v ~ S B M ~$

## 10. ad 32r $4=$ SBM $\Sigma$ IV,10; B LVII,1,7 rest.

દ̇к $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$ vó $\mu \omega \nu$. oi $\pi \rho \circ \delta o ́ \tau \alpha ı ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ o i ~ \alpha u ̉ \tau o ́ \mu o \lambda o l ~ к \varepsilon \varphi \alpha \lambda ı \kappa \tilde{\omega} \varsigma ~ \omega ́ \varsigma ~ \varepsilon ̇ \pi i ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi o \lambda u ̀ ~$


## 11. ad 48v 13 = SBM B VI,1; B X,2,2 + SBM B VI,2; B X,2,12


 IV,2,12 = B X,2,12)


## 12. ad 49r 14 = SBM P I, 29; B II, 2,126



 $\pi \rho о \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \sigma к \varepsilon \cup \eta ́ \tau ı$.



## 13. ad 64r $25=\mathrm{SBM} \Delta$ XXIII,5; B XL, 1,3.

 $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ тои̃ $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \cup \tau \eta ́ \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \circ \varsigma$.


## 14. ad 65v 5 = SBM $\Delta$ XXVII,1; B XI,2,1.

ò $\delta ı \alpha \lambda v o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o \varsigma ~ \dot{\omega} \sigma \alpha v \varepsilon i ̀ ~ \pi \varepsilon \rho i ~ \pi \rho \alpha ́ ү \mu \alpha \tau о \varsigma ~ \alpha ̉ \mu \varphi ı ß o ́ \lambda o v ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \delta i ́ k \eta \varsigma ~ \alpha ́ \delta \eta ́ \lambda o v ~$
 $\alpha \not v \alpha \mu \varphi i ́ ß o \lambda o v ~ \varphi ı \lambda о \tau i ́ \mu \omega \varsigma \sigma \cup \gamma \chi \omega \rho \varepsilon \tilde{i}$. e legibus. Transigit qui de re dubitata et lite incerta nec finita transigit. paciscitur non qui donationis causa rem certam et indubitatam liberaliter dimittit. (cf. Dig. II,15,1 = B XI,2,1)

## 15. ad 66r 21 = SBM Y I,16; B LX,21,25.






## 16. ad 69v 16 = SBM $\Delta$ XXXI Index; B VIII,2,35.




## 17. ad 70v $10=$ SBM $\Delta$ XXXII, 1-2; B II,1,10-11.


 $\dot{\omega} \varsigma ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \varphi ט \sigma ı k o ̀ v ~ v o ́ \mu ı \mu o v . ~ \lambda \varepsilon ́ ү \varepsilon \tau \alpha ı ~ \delta i ́ k \alpha ı o v ~ k \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi \tilde{\alpha} \sigma ı ~ \tau o i ̃ \varsigma ~ \varepsilon ̇ v ~ \tau n ̃ ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \varepsilon ı ~ \eta ך ~$




 عï SBM, B
18. ad 71r 1 [70v 19, 26] = SBM $\Delta$ XXXIII,8; B VII,2,13 + SBM $\Delta$ XXXIII,9; B VII,2,20 + SBM $\Sigma$ X, 4-5; B VIII,1,15.

 દĩv๙ı סık๙бтท́ร.


 тро́ориүоз.



 $\mu ı \theta \tilde{\omega} v: \tau \tilde{v} v \mu \iota \sigma \theta \tilde{\omega} v$ tòv $\delta 1$ кó ${ }^{\prime}$ oyov add. SBM, B

## 19. ad 73r $23=$ SBM $\Delta$ XXXVII,3; B X,3,1.

 غ̇tépou үıvouєvŋ́.


## 20. ad 78r 6 = SBM Y XIV,12; B LX,6,37






 ү $\dot{\alpha} \rho$ SBM, B
21. ad 93r 24 = SBM E XXIV,3; B XXV,1,9 + SBM P I,61; B II,2,229.





22. ad 94r 23 = SBM E XXV,2; B XX,1,65.





## 23. ad 97 r 15 = SBM N I,11; B LIII,2,11 rest.







## 24. ad 102v 26 = SBM E XXXIV Index.





## 25. ad 103v 11 = SBM E XXXV Index; B XXVI,7,58.





## 26. ad 104r 6 = SBM K I Index + SBM K I,2; B LX,30,5.






 סо入í $\omega v \tau \tilde{\omega} v$ SBM | $\pi \rho \alpha \chi \theta غ \grave{v}$ : $\pi \rho \alpha \theta \dot{\varepsilon} v$ SBM | $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi \varepsilon ́ \rho о v \tau \varepsilon \zeta: ~ \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi \varepsilon \rho o ́ v \tau \omega v$,
 B | $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \lambda \lambda_{ı}$ ıvátouc: stelionátus B | $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \tau \tau \varepsilon \tau \alpha \mathrm{l}: \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \varepsilon \tau \alpha \mathrm{~L}$ SB, B

## 27. ad 104v 16 = SBM $\Lambda$ II,7; B LIV,4,10 rest.

 غ̇лıк入ãtal $\lambda \varepsilon ı \tau o u p \gamma i ́ \alpha$.
28. ad 110v 11 = SBM E XLI Index + SBM E XLI,3; B XV,1,39.

 тои̃ દ̇סáquous.


## 29. ad 111r 7 = SBM E XLII Index


 غ̇xóv $\tau \omega v$ SBM

## 30. ad 115v 9 = SBM N I,10; B LIII,2,6 rest.


 oủk ñס́́vavio.
 SBM

## 31. ad 116r 2 = SBM E XLIII,3; B XXXIII,1,59 rest.











 in brevius redactum habet SBM, quam secutus est glossator vocabularii. $\mid \dot{o}$

32. ad 135v 17 = SBM K IX Index + SBM K IX,26; B LVIII,10,1 partim rest.





## 33. ad 143r 18 = SBM П IX,1; B LVIII,24,16 rest.

 v $ઘ$ ŋ
к $\alpha \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \pi \alpha \rho \alpha ́ к \lambda \eta \sigma \tau v: \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \lambda \eta ́ \sigma \varepsilon l$ SBM, B
34. ad 151r $10=? ? ?$
 ย̇mı $\beta$ áveı.
35. ad 151r 22 = SBM K II,85; B II,3,62.
 ยป̃ไยข.
عi̧: ضં દí SBM
36. ad 151v 1 [151r 21] = SBM P I,80-81; B II,2,62 \& 67.

 $\pi \circ \rho \rho \omega \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \omega$ દ่ $\kappa \tau \varepsilon$ Íveน $\alpha$.

37. ad 159v 3 = SBM K XXVIII,1; B XXXVI,1,1 rest.
 $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \pi \lambda \eta \dot{\rho} \rho \omega \sigma 1 \varsigma$.
七oṽ $\delta 1 \alpha \tau 1 \theta \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon ́ v o u ~ S B M, B$
38. ad 161v 1 = SBM $\Lambda$ I, $1+\operatorname{SBM} \Lambda \mathrm{I}, 31$; B XLIV,1,116 rest.
$\lambda \varepsilon ү \alpha ́ \tau o v ~ \varepsilon ̇ \sigma \tau i ̀ ~ \delta \omega \rho \varepsilon ́ \alpha ~ \varepsilon ̇ v ~ \delta ı \alpha \theta \eta ́ \kappa \eta ~ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \lambda \eta \varphi \theta \varepsilon i ̃ \sigma \alpha . ~ \lambda \varepsilon ү \alpha ́ \tau о \nu ~ \varepsilon ̇ \sigma \tau i ̀ ~ \mu \varepsilon i ́ \omega \sigma ı \varsigma ~ \tau \eta ̃ \varsigma ~$ к入проvоцía̧.
$\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \alpha ́ \tau o v: ~ \lambda \eta \gamma \alpha ́ \tau o v ~ B ~$
39. ad 161v 14 = SBM P I,88; B II, 2,29.
 $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \tau \alpha$ : غ̇б $\tau \iota v$ SBM, B | $\mu$ óvov: $\mu$ óvov SBM, B
40. ad 171r 6 = SBM M VII,1-2; B XIII,2,6 \& 17 + SBM P I,94; B II,2,107.






41. ad 176r 9 = SBM M XV,1.

Leges. $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \tau \varepsilon i ́ \alpha ~ \varepsilon ̇ \sigma \tau i ́, ~ \mu \nu \eta ́ \mu \eta ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \varepsilon ̇ \pi \alpha \gamma ү \varepsilon \lambda i ́ \alpha ~ \tau \omega ̃ \nu ~ \mu \varepsilon \lambda \lambda o ́ v \tau \omega \nu \gamma \alpha ́ \mu \omega v$.

## 42. ad 176r 24 = SBM M XVI,3; B LX,37,8.







## 43. ad 179v 13 = SBM P I,99; B II,2,28.




44. ad 182r 1 [181v 25] = SBM P I,101-102; B II,2,98 \& 110.

 $\pi \rho \alpha ́ ү \mu \alpha \tau \iota \lambda \nu \mu \alpha ı v o \mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta$.
 B | (vóбоৎ) $\delta \dot{\text { è }}$ om. SBM, B

## 45. ad 197v 21 = SBM $\Sigma$ II, 4 ; B LX,21,15.









46. ad 198r 26 = SBM P I,146; B II,2,25.





## 47. 212r 6 = SBM T VII,7; B LVI,4,16 rest.



48. ad 218r 14 = SBM P I,131; B II, 2,126. (cf. 12.)

Leges. $\pi \circ \imath \downarrow \eta ́ ~ \varepsilon ̇ \sigma \tau \imath \nu, ~ \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \eta ́ \mu \alpha \tau \circ \varsigma ~ \varepsilon ̇ \kappa \delta ı к \eta \sigma i ́ \varsigma . ~$
49. ad 220v 21 = SBM П XXII,3; B XXVIII,4,13.


 $\sigma \cup \mu \varphi \theta \varepsilon \imath \rho о \mu \varepsilon ́ v \alpha \varsigma: \sigma \cup \mu \varphi \theta \varepsilon \imath \rho о \mu \varepsilon ́ v o ı \varsigma$ SBM
50. ad 220v 26 [221r 1] = Epanagoge 26,5,3; Prochiron vel Procheiros nomos 19,7,4.



51. ad 222v 23 = SBM M XVI,2; B LX,37,4.

 ท̋ $\mu \rho \tau \varepsilon v$.
$\tau \tilde{\omega} \tau \tilde{\omega} v \alpha \not \alpha \delta \delta \rho i ́: \tau \tilde{\omega} \alpha \alpha v \delta \rho i ́ ~ S B M, B$

## 52. ad 231r 7 = SBM $\Sigma$ X,3; B VIII,1,14.

 $\tau \eta ̃ \varsigma ~ \delta i ́ k \eta \varsigma ~ \mu о і ̃ \rho \alpha v ~ \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̀ v ~ \delta i ́ k \eta v ~ \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha ́ v \varepsilon ı v . ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \varepsilon ̉ \pi ı \mu \varepsilon i ́ v \alpha \varsigma ~ \tau о v ̃ ~ \sigma u v \eta ү o \rho \varepsilon i ̃ v, ~$ દ่к $\beta \alpha \lambda \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta \omega$.


## 53. ad 236r 2 = SBM A XII, 4 ; B XIX,10,17 rest.



кupí $\omega \varsigma:$ кupí $\omega \varsigma ~ \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ S B M, ~ B|o ̀ ~ \sigma u v e \chi \tilde{\omega} \varsigma: ~ o ̈ \varsigma ~ \sigma u v e \chi \tilde{\omega} \varsigma ~ S B M, ~ B| \alpha ̉ v \alpha ı \tau i ́ \omega \varsigma: ~ o m . ~$ SBM $\mid \delta \alpha \pi \alpha v \tilde{\omega} v: \pi \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \delta \alpha \pi \alpha v \tilde{\omega} v$ B
54. ad 243v $17=$ Dig. L, 16,177 (= B II,2,171)

Leges. Cavillationis natura quam Graeci бoبıбtzí $\alpha v$ appellant, haec est, ut ab evidenter veris per brevissimas mutationes disputatio ad ea, quae evidenter falsa sunt perducatur.

## 55. ad 251r 21 = SBM $\Sigma$ VI,1; B LX,1,10.











## 56. ad 253v $10=$ SBM $\Sigma$ VIII, $1+$ SBM $\Sigma$ VIII,15; B XI,1,67.




 $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu i ́ \alpha v: ~ \mu \eta \delta \varepsilon \mu i ́ \alpha v$ SBM, B

## 57. ad 263r 23 = SBM T V,7; B LIX,1,2 partim rest.



 $\tau \tilde{n} \tau \alpha \varphi \tilde{n} B$
58. ad 271v 16 = SBM P I,160; B II,2,41.

 тои̃ $\sigma \omega ́ \mu \alpha \tau о \varsigma$ ह̇ $\pi ı \tau \eta ́ \delta \varepsilon ı \alpha$.
そั̃v: 弓ñv tòv ơv $\theta \rho \omega \pi$ ov B

## 59. ad 273v 3 = SBM Y I,1; B LX,21,1.















## 60. ad 278r 13 = SBM $\Omega$ I,2; B LVI,11,12 rest.

Leges. ò úto


## 61. ad 278v 18 = SBM $\Delta$ XXIII,3; B XXXV,19,1 + SBM K XIV,5; B XXXV,9,1 + SBM K XIV,12; B XXXV,10,1. <br>      к $\lambda \eta \rho \circ$ vou 

## 62. ad 280r 25 = SBM A XXXV,3 \& 5; B XXXIV,1,17 \& 19 rest.


 $\tau \tilde{\eta} \varsigma \pi \rho \circ \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \alpha \varsigma ~ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \varepsilon \omega \varsigma ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ \tau \tilde{\omega} v \alpha \dot{\alpha} \varphi \alpha \rho \varepsilon \theta \varepsilon ́ v \tau \omega v \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega v$. ius postlimini (cf. Dig. XLIX,15,17)

63. ad 282v 22 = SBM P I,167; B II,2,227.
 ŋ̀ кккóv.
64. ad 283r $22=$ SBM P I,168; B II,2,226.



65. ad 294r 8 = SBM T VII,18; B LVI,12,6 rest.




## VII <br> Other Greek Literary Quotations in the Margins

The abbreviations of Greek authors and titles usually follow the abbreviations used by Liddell \& Scott; the list of the abbreviations is found in Liddell \& Scott 1968: xvi-xxxviii.

1) Quotations from Plato

## 7r 9

 $\pi \varepsilon \rho i ́ \beta o \lambda o v$. (cf. Lg. 3,681a 1)

## 11v 18





## 22v 1



## 74r 17

putatoria, in Platone (cf. R. 333d 3 and La. 183d 7)
109r 25
 Platone. (Ap. 19d 9)

## 111v 25

Plato. ह̇pعбú $\eta \eta$ est rubigo frumenti. iò $\mathfrak{a e r i s ~ v e l ~ f e r r i . ~} \sigma \eta \pi \varepsilon \delta \omega ̀ v$ lignorum. ỏ $\varphi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu$ í́ malum oculorum. vóбos totius corporis. (R. 609a 2)

## 113r 20




## 114r 16

عủท́ $\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{l}} \alpha$ ס $\varepsilon$, moralitas in Platone. (cf. Phdr. 242e 5; R. 400e 1, 348c 12, 400e 2; Ti. 91e 1)

## 156v 1



## 159v 18

 $\pi \alpha ́ v \tau \varepsilon \varsigma ~ \kappa \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \tilde{v} v$ દí $\omega \alpha \mu \varepsilon \nu$. (Lg. 816e 10)

## 191v 18

 works the inflected forms of the verbs ó $\rho \gamma i ́ \zeta o \mu \alpha ı$ and ó $\rho \gamma i ́ \zeta \omega$ appear several times.)

## 208r 1

$\pi \varepsilon ́ \lambda \tau \eta, \alpha \not \sigma \pi \pi i ́ \varsigma, ~ \tau \varepsilon \tau \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \omega \nu \circ \varsigma ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ o i ~ \tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta ~ \chi \rho \omega ́ \mu \varepsilon v o ı ~ \pi \varepsilon \lambda \tau \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha i ́ ~(c f . ~ s c h . ~ i n ~ P l a t . ~$ Amat. 135e 6)

## 270r 24





## 284v 8

$\varphi \imath \lambda \alpha \pi o ́ \delta \eta \mu \circ \varsigma$, ò $\tau \alpha i ̃ \varsigma ~ \alpha ̉ \pi о \delta \eta \mu i ́ \alpha ı \varsigma ~ \chi \alpha i ́ p \omega v$. $\varphi \imath \lambda о \pi \alpha i ́ \sigma \mu \omega \nu, \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \Pi \lambda \alpha ́ \tau \omega v \alpha \tilde{\omega}$


## 2) Quotations from Xenophon

11r 6


11v 12




13v 17

 (cf. Cyr. 1, 6, 18 and 6, 1, 45)

21v 25
$\alpha \not \xi_{10 \varsigma}$ apud Xenophontem. Carus ut annona cara est. (De vectigalibus 4, 6, 5)

## 24v 26

á $\pi \varepsilon \rho u ́ k \omega$, خò ỏ $\pi \varepsilon \lambda \alpha u ́ v \omega$. Xenophon (Oec. 5, 6; Mem. 2, 9, 2)

## 36r 4




43v 9
et pro dispareo ipse, ut $\Xi \varepsilon \boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{\varphi} \varphi \tilde{\omega} v$ (cf. e.g. $H G 3,3,9$ )

48r 5
$\beta \delta \varepsilon \lambda \nu \gamma \mu i ́ \alpha$ abominatus, fastidium in Xenophonte. (Mem. 3, 11, 13)

## 49r 3



## 53r 18



## 65r 23

$\delta ı \alpha \mu \pi \alpha ́ \xi$ adverbium $\delta \iota o ́ \lambda o v$. in Xenophonte (HG 7, 4, 23)

## 78r 11

 quo albas. in Xenophonte (Oec. 10, 2)

114r 17


123r 25
in accusativo plurali $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu$ íøı $\alpha$, sine synaeresi dicit Xenophon (cf. e.g. Oec. 18, 8; An. 1, 9, 26; Cyr. 8, 3, 10)

## 148v 9

$\kappa \varepsilon \kappa \rho \cup ́ \varphi \propto \lambda$ оऽ. apud Xenophontem pars freni quae imponitur capiti equi. (cf. Eq. 6, 8; Cyn. 6, 8)

149v 12
Xenophon. кŋцòऽ camus, idem capistrum. кŋ $\mu$ oṽv incamare. (cf. $E q .5,3$ )

## 151r 2

 (cf. HG 7, 2, 9)

152r 18
proprie post occasum solis. Xenophon. (An. 4, 5, 9)

## 158r 16


 and 7, 3). кטßıбтท́ $\rho$, ò тоוои̃ $\tau \circ \delta \rho \tilde{\omega} \nu$.

## 180v 26

v $\eta$ rouvé́ impune Xenophon (Hier. 3, 3)

## 187r 3


193r 6
$\Xi \varepsilon v o \varphi \tilde{\omega} v . \pi \varepsilon \mu \psi \alpha ́ v \tau \omega \nu$ ỏ $\pi \tau \tilde{\rho} \rho \alpha \varsigma \tilde{\omega} v \pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau о \mu \varepsilon \nu, \kappa \alpha i ̀ \varphi \rho \alpha \sigma \tau \tilde{\eta} \rho \alpha \varsigma \tilde{\omega} v \varepsilon \rho \omega \tau \tilde{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \nu$. (Cyr. 4, 5, 17)

217r 26



217v 14


## 218v 23



## 233v 2

$\pi \tau \eta ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ oṽ tò $\varphi \circ \beta \tilde{\omega}$, à $\lambda \lambda$ 人̀ $\tau$ ò $\varphi o \beta o v ̃ \mu \alpha 1$. Xenophon (cf. Cyr. 3, 3,18)

## 235v 1

$\rho \alpha \delta ı$ ós procerus, gracilis Xenophon. (Lac. 2, 5)

## 239v 6





## 248r 8

in mari, posset forsan dici etiam de terrestri exercitu, ut Demosthenes: ह̉к $\pi \alpha ́ \sigma \eta \varsigma ~ \tau \eta ̃ \sigma ~ \eta ̇ \pi \varepsilon i ́ \rho o v ~ \sigma \tau o ́ \lambda o v ~ \varepsilon ̇ \lambda Ө o ́ v \tau \alpha ~(E p i t .11,1), ~ X e n o p h o n ~ s i m i l i t e r ~ s a e p e ~$ (cf. e.g. HG 3, 1, 10 and 3, 4, 4; An. 1, 2, 5 and 3, 1, 10)

## 262r 25

$\tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \sigma i ́ \alpha$ lanificium, $\tau \alpha \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \iota \alpha$ है $\rho \gamma \alpha$ opera lanaria, $\tau \alpha \lambda \alpha \sigma \iota \nu \rho \gamma \tilde{\omega}$ lanificor. Xenophon (cf. Oec. 7, 6 and 7, 41 and 9, 9 and 9,7; Mem. 3,9,11,12 and 3,9,12,1)

## 266v 1

 Xenophon (cf. Cyr. 8,1,14 and 8,1,15)

## 268r 26

 (An. 4,2,28)

271v 22

 (cf. Cyr. 2,4,3)

## 275r 5




## 282v 3

in duali potest esse generis masculini. attice nam $\Xi \varepsilon v o \varphi \grave{\omega} v$ dicit $\tau \grave{\omega} \varphi \propto \lambda \alpha ́ \gamma \gamma \varepsilon$ (cf. An. 1,8,17)

## 294r 20

et interrogo, et interficio, Xenophon facit synaeresim eius etiam in $\alpha$ dicens रן $\tilde{\sigma} \theta \alpha$ ı. (cf. e.g. An. 3, 2, 37; Cyr. 5, 3, 22)

## 3) Quotations from Plutarchus

## 11r 3

 563a 4)

## 12v 1

 (Plut. Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat 22e 7)

## 46r 9

 Plutarchum. (cf. De garrulitate 504d 2; Cor. 4,1; De liberis educandis 7b 14; Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat 20b 3; De amicorum multitudine 93d 8; Amatorius 752 b 5 and 759f 5; Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum 1088b 5)

## 49r 7


(Plut. Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat 22e 6)

## 62r 19


$\alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \varepsilon \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \lambda_{\imath} \tilde{\omega} v \pi \rho \circ \sigma \varepsilon v \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \varepsilon 1$. in Plutarcho. (Praecepta gerenda rei publicae 802e 1)

## 62v 2

( $\delta \eta \mu \circ \kappa \eta \delta \grave{\grave{\prime}} \varsigma ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \delta \eta ́ \mu o v ~ . . . ~ p u b l i c o l a) ~ i n ~ P l u t a r c h o ~(P u b l . ~ 10, ~ 9 ; ~ o n l y ~ t h e ~ i n-~$ dication of the author is written in the margin, the other parts are in the main text)

## 76r 6




111r 13
Plutarchus in vita Romuli $(29,2)$. K $\alpha \pi \rho \alpha \tau i ́ v \alpha ı ~ v o ́ v v \alpha ı ~ к \alpha \lambda o u ̃ v \tau \alpha ı ~ \delta ı \alpha ̀ ~ t o ̀ v ~$


## 119v 26



 $\varepsilon ̌ \omega \lambda$ ov in Plutarcho (cf. e.g. Galba 3, 2; De curiositate 519a 4; Septem sapientium convivium 148a 3)

## 127v 2

 adolescens poetas audire debeat 22f 1)

## 132r 4



## 155r 14

$\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ к $\alpha \grave{~} \kappa \cup \rho i ́ \tau \tau \omega$ tò $\kappa \varepsilon \rho \alpha \tau i ́ \zeta \omega$, in Plutarcho. (cf. Crass. 7, 8; Aetia Romana et Graeca 280f 5)

182v 26
 divitiarum 527 f 2)

190r 16
 praecepta 128e 8)

## 196r 26

 $\sigma \chi \eta ́ \mu \alpha \tau \iota \tau \varepsilon \tau \alpha \gamma \mu \varepsilon ́ v \omega \nu$. $($ Lyc. 23, 1)

## 207v 24

 Mar. 5, 9; Cat. Ma. 24, 5)

## 226r 15


 દ̇үxદ́ouolv. (Plut. Praecepta gerendae reipublicae 798b 3)

## 229v 3

$\pi \rho о \sigma \lambda_{\imath} \pi \alpha \rho \tilde{\omega}$, тò $\pi \rho о \sigma \mu \varepsilon ́ v \omega$, ठотıкñ. indulgeo, adhaereo, Plutarchus: $\tau 0 i ̃ \varsigma$


## 235r 14









## 235v 4



## 237v 24


 $\dot{\rho} \omega \pi \circ \pi \omega \lambda \varepsilon$ ĩov. Plutarchus (cf. Dem. 9, 5)

## 238r 26

Plutarchus in vita Romuli: tòv $\rho \circ \mu u ́ \lambda o v ~ \varphi \alpha \sigma i ̀ ~ \delta ı \alpha \varphi \varepsilon \rho o ́ v \tau \omega \varsigma ~ Ө \varepsilon о \sigma \varepsilon \beta \tilde{\eta} ~ ү \varepsilon v \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta \alpha ı ~$



255r 8
Plutarchus. $\sigma v v \delta ı k \tilde{\omega} v \tau \underset{\sim}{~ M o u \rho \rho \eta ́ v \alpha ̣ ~} \pi \alpha \rho \tilde{\eta} \nu$ ó Kıkદ́ $\rho \omega v$ (Cat. Mi. 21,7,2)

## 274v 26

Plutarchus in vita Romuli. tòv T $\alpha \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \iota o v ~ \mu \varepsilon ́ \chi \rho ı ~ \tau o u ̃ ~ v u ̃ v ~ ' P \omega \mu \alpha i ̃ o ı, ~ \grave{\omega ́ \varsigma ~}$


282v 24

 99b 8)

## 288r 5

 Plutarchus (cf. e.g. De curiositate 518c 8; Quaestiones convivales 631a 7)

## 292r 9

 Plutarchus (De capienda ex inimicis utilitate 87f 9)

## 297r 3


 ' $\sigma \iota \omega \pi \tilde{\omega} \nu$ ' $\varepsilon ้ \varphi \eta$., cod. $\sigma \iota \omega \omega \tilde{\omega} \nu, \varphi$ ad $\pi$ correctum esse videtur (De garrulitate 509a 5)

## 4) Quotations from Thucydides

## 50v 26

 Thucydide (cf. sch. in Thuc. 3, 70, 5; Suid. $\beta$ 435)

## 159r 20

Kutíviov $\Delta \omega \rho \imath \kappa o ́ v, \pi o ́ \lambda ı \varsigma ~ \tau i ́ \varsigma, ~ \imath ̉ o \omega \varsigma ~ \eta ̀ ~ v u ̃ v ~ \zeta \eta \tau o u ́ v i o v . ~ I n ~ T h u c y d i d e . ~(c f . ~ H i s t . ~$ 1, 107, 2; 3, 95, 1; 3,102,1)

## 179r 18


 (quoted in Suid.v 45)

## 199r 1


 $\pi \alpha \iota \delta ı \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \tau \varepsilon \omega ̈ ้ \alpha \cup ๋ \tau 0 v ̃$.

210r 10
subligaculum, apud Єovкvסíסŋᅱv $\delta 1 \alpha ́ \zeta \omega \mu \alpha($ Hist. 1,6,5)

## 5) Other quotations

## 5r 5

$\alpha$ 人́סıкov. iniustum quod refertur ad naturalem essentiam. ${ }^{\alpha} \delta i ́ k \eta \mu \alpha$ vero dicitur operatio huius iniusti et actus ipse est iniuria. (cf. Arist. EN 1135a)

181v 12


## 244r 1

 غ̇ $\pi i ̀ ~ \chi \rho \omega \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu$ đò $\varphi \alpha 1 o ́ v$. ut Aristoteles in Topicis (106b)

## 290v 1

 oi $\beta \alpha ́ v \alpha \cup \sigma 01 \tau \varepsilon \chi v i ́ t \alpha ı ~ A r i s t o t e l e s ~(P o l . ~ 1277 a-b) ~(~) ~$

## 5r 26



7r 26
 Homerus (Od.1, 56-57): in Odysseia $\alpha i \delta^{\prime}$ ह̉v $\mu \alpha \lambda \alpha k o i ̃ \sigma ı ~ k \alpha i ̀ ~ \alpha i ̉ \mu \nu \lambda i ́ o l \sigma ı ~[c o r r e c t e ~$





11v 10
apud Platonem comicum et gallina (Dai., fg. 19-20 Kock, line 3; cf. sch. Ar. Nub. 663a)

## 54r 14



## 152r 10

кvãv кגì $\kappa v \alpha i ́ \varepsilon v ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \kappa v \alpha ́ \pi \tau \varepsilon ı v, ~ \tau o ̀ ~ そ u ́ \varepsilon ı v . ~ K v \alpha ́ \varphi o \varsigma ~ a p u d ~ H e r o d o t u m ~ s p i n a ~$ trahens vestimenta (cf. Suid. к 1853; Hist. 1, 92, 9). et quo fullones olim acervo spinarum mundabant vestimenta dicti sunt $\kappa \nu \alpha \varphi \varepsilon i ̃ \varsigma, ~ i l l e ~ a c e r v u s ~ \kappa v \alpha ́ \varphi o \varsigma . ~$

## 150v 6

 10,4 ; cf. sch. in Lucianum 79, 10)

## 178v 1


 $\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \kappa \alpha ́ \theta \eta \tau \alpha 1$. ut in Luciano (cf. sch. in Lucianum 25, 54). Muхoí, tenebrae,


## 187v 19







## 214v 4

 $\tau \rho i ́ \chi \propto \varsigma$. Lucianus (cf. sch. in Lucianum 9,50)

## 220r 23

 ut Demosthenes (cf. e.g. In Midiam 181, 9)

## VIII <br> Non-literary Greek Quotations in the Margins

The abbreviations of Greek authors and titles usually follow the abbreviations used by Liddell \& Scott; the list of the abbreviations is found in Liddell \& Scott 1968: xvi-xxxviii.

## 1v 9




1v 20


## 2v 2


 amento, -as et $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \cup \lambda \dot{\zeta} \zeta \rho \mu \alpha ı$ teneo iaculum paratum in amento. (cf. Suid. $\alpha$ 251)

2v 22
 тıvèऽ סغ̀ tòv $\kappa \omega \lambda u ́ \alpha v \delta \rho o v ~ \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma o u \sigma ı . ~$

3r 10
 $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \tau ı \kappa \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$.

3v 23
 к๙ıvótepov.

6r 15
 Lexicon $\alpha 477$ )

## 6r 21

 Et.Gud. a 33)

## 7r 15



## 9r 14




## 13r 4

 nominum et verborum Atticorum $\alpha 47,3$ )

## 13r 11

gurges, $\lambda \varepsilon \xi_{1 \varsigma}$ ท̀ $\xi \eta \rho \alpha \sigma i ́ \alpha ~ \eta ᄁ ~ \pi \lambda \eta ́ \mu \mu \nu \rho \alpha$ (cf. Suid. $\alpha$ 1656)

## 13v 23




## 18r 4

ab očp 1 quod non est in usu (cf. e.g. Et.Gud, Additamenta, a 149)

19v 21



## 21v 26

 ò vṽv к $\alpha \lambda$ оú $\mu \varepsilon v$ оऽ $\beta \alpha \rho \delta \alpha ́ \rho ı o \varsigma . ~$

## 41r 22



## 47r 26

$\beta \alpha \sigma \imath \lambda \varepsilon$ ú $\omega \sigma 0 v$, tò ó $\rho \chi \omega$. $\beta \alpha \sigma \imath \lambda \varepsilon$ v́ $\omega \sigma \varepsilon, \beta \alpha \sigma \imath \lambda \varepsilon ́ \alpha$ тоı $\tilde{\omega}$. (cf. Suid. $\beta$ 143)

## 52v 6


59v 12
 $\varphi \circ \beta \tilde{\omega}, \alpha i \tau \iota \alpha \tau \iota k \tilde{n}$.

## 60r 12


 Hdn. Epim. 22,7).

69r 26
$\delta_{1} \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \lambda ı$ ıv $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \tau \alpha ı$ tò тoĩৎ $\delta ı \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa 0 \cup \sigma i ́ ~ \tau ı ~ \delta ı \delta o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o v ~ \chi \alpha ́ p ı v ~ \tau \eta ̃ \varsigma ~ \mu \alpha \theta \eta ́ \sigma \varepsilon \omega \varsigma . ~$
70v 11
quasi $\delta i ́ x \alpha ı o v a$ díx $\alpha$

## 71v 17




## 71v 26

 curva in concavo navis per latus

## 74v 12

$\delta \rho \omega \pi \alpha \kappa i ̋ \varepsilon ı v, \chi \rho i ́ \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha ı$ tò $\sigma \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha$, $\pi \rho o ̀ \varsigma ~ \tau i ́ \lambda \omega \sigma ı v ~ \tau \rho ı \chi \tilde{\omega} v$. (cf. Suid. $\delta 1538$; Ps.Zonar. Lexicon $\delta 574,15) \delta \rho \omega \pi \alpha \kappa i ́ \zeta \omega$, $\sigma \cup v \alpha ́ \gamma \omega, \tau \rho \cup \gamma \omega \tilde{\omega}$. $\delta \rho \omega \pi \tau \alpha ̀ \gamma \alpha ̀ \rho \tau \alpha \grave{\alpha} \delta \rho \varepsilon \pi \tau \alpha ̀$, $\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \rho \varepsilon ́ \pi \alpha v \alpha$.
 Zonar. Lexicon $\delta 570,1 ;$ Gennadius Scholarius, Grammatica 2,437,15;Suid. $\delta 1539$ )

## 75v 17

 2665a)

## 76r 1

тои̃ ỏvó $\mu \alpha \tau 0 \varsigma ~ \tau \eta ̃ \varsigma ~ \delta \nu \sigma \omega \pi i ́ \alpha \varsigma ~ o i ~ \pi \varepsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \alpha ̉ \tau \tau ı k \tilde{\eta} \varsigma ~ ү \rho \alpha ́ \psi \alpha v \tau \varepsilon \varsigma ~ \sigma u v \eta \forall \varepsilon i ́ \alpha \varsigma ~ \dot{\omega} \varsigma$



## 76v 25

 $\kappa \alpha \theta i ́ \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \alpha \iota ~ \varepsilon ̇ \gamma \gamma \cup \tau \eta ́ \varsigma ~(c f . ~ L e x . ~ V i n d . ~ \varepsilon ~ 203) . ~$.



## 80r 22

 vıкíav $\pi \rho о \delta о \sigma i ́ \alpha \varsigma . ~ \varphi \alpha ́ \sigma ı \varsigma ~ \delta \varepsilon ́, ~ \grave{~} \psi \imath \lambda \eta ̀ \pi \rho о \sigma \alpha \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \lambda i ́ \alpha$.

## 85v 14

 (cf. Suid. є 562)

## 86r 15

 үعvó $\mu \varepsilon v o v$.


## 93v 20



105r 23



## 106r 22




## 110v 26

 ко́ $\tau \omega[\theta \alpha \lambda \alpha ́ \mu ı 10$.] (cf. Suid. $\theta$ 454)

## 111v 8

 ع 3028)

## 111v 10




## 111v 26



## 121r 23



## 123v 26

 $\theta \varepsilon \rho \alpha \pi \varepsilon i ́ \alpha v$ (cf. Suid. $\eta$ 467)

## 125r 19

 $\omega \dot{\omega} \tau \varepsilon \lambda \omega ́ v \eta \varsigma$, ò $\tau \alpha ̀ ~ \delta \eta \mu o ́ \sigma ı \alpha ~ \tau \varepsilon ́ \lambda \eta ~ \omega ̉ v o u ́ \mu \varepsilon v o \varsigma . ~ o ́ \mu o i ́ \omega \varsigma ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \sigma ı \tau \omega ́ v \eta \varsigma ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~$


## 127r 19



## 129r 1




## 129r 26

ỉ $\alpha \sigma \tau i ́$ Ionice vel $\alpha \not \tau \tau ı \kappa \sigma \tau i ́, ~ \alpha i ̉ o \lambda ı \sigma \tau i ́, ~ \delta \omega \rho ı \tau \tau ́$.

## 131v 1





## 131v 9

 $\dot{\delta} \mu 01 \omega \mu \alpha \tau \alpha, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \kappa o v i ́ \sigma \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$. (cf. Suid. 1371 and 372)

## 132v 26

 1711)

## 136v 19



## 138v 8




## 139r 23




## 140v 17



## 143r 26


 Lexicon $\pi 425,20$; Suid. $\pi 1366$ )

## 147v 18



 к 1128)

## 148Bv 9

 őӨzv кєр $\delta \alpha \lambda \varepsilon o ́ \varphi \rho \omega v$ ó $\delta о \lambda ı o ́ ß o u \lambda o \varsigma ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \kappa \varepsilon \rho \delta o \sigma u ́ v \eta ~ \eta ~ \pi \alpha v o u \rho \gamma i ́ \alpha . ~(c f . ~ S u i d . ~$ к 1383)

## 148Bv 22


 к 1428)

150v 10


## 152r 19



## 152r 25


 vafricia.

## 157r 9

k $\rho \imath \imath \omega \nu \iota \alpha ́$, ó $\tau \tilde{\omega} v$ крív $\omega v \lambda \varepsilon \iota \mu \omega ́ v$ (Suid. к 2431)

157r 26



## 158r 7



158v 16


160v 19

161r 20



## 161v 17

 $\dot{\varepsilon} \varphi \alpha \pi \lambda \tilde{\omega} \sigma \alpha \dot{o} \mu \alpha \lambda \tilde{\omega} \zeta$.

## 162r 4

 (cf. Suid. $\lambda$ 284)

## 162r 21


 $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \sigma \chi \propto 1 .(S u i d . \lambda 309)$

## 163v 1


 510). canorus.

## 165r 9

 úлò $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \theta \varepsilon о \varphi о \rho о \cup \mu \varepsilon ́ v \omega \nu \lambda \varepsilon ү o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o l . ~(S u i d . ~ \lambda ~ 640) ~$

## 165Bv 7


 $\lambda 859)$

## 166r 11

 Suid. $\gamma 73$ and $\mu 2$ ). $\mu \alpha \gamma \gamma \alpha v \varepsilon \cup \tau \eta ̀ \varsigma ~ o ́ ~ \mu \imath \gamma v v ̀ \varsigma ~ \pi \alpha v \tau o \delta \alpha \pi \alpha \grave{~} \pi \rho o ̀ \varsigma ~ \varphi \varepsilon v \alpha k ı \sigma \mu o ́ v ~(c f . ~$


## 166r 23

 عi $\mu \mathrm{l}$. (cf. Lex. Vind. $\mu 10,1$ )

## 167r 6




## 167r 9




## 169v 20


 $\omega ́ \varsigma ~ \tau \alpha ̀ ~ M \varepsilon \lambda ı \tau \alpha i ̃ \alpha ~ \kappa v v i ́ \delta ı \alpha, ~ k \alpha i ̀ ~ M \varepsilon \lambda ı \tau \eta \rho o i ̀ ~ \kappa u ́ v \varepsilon \varsigma ~ o i ̀ ~ \varepsilon ̉ \pi i ̀ ~ \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \pi \psi \varepsilon ı ~ \tau \rho \varepsilon \varphi o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o ı ~$ (Suid. $\mu$ 519)

## 172r 1

 $\tau \rho \alpha \pi \eta ̃ v \alpha ı$ (Suid. $\mu$ 690)

## 172v 14

 $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$, $\alpha \iota \tau \iota \alpha \tau \iota \kappa \tilde{n}$ (Suid. $\mu$ 728)

## 174v 1

$\mu \eta \rho v ́ o \mu \alpha 1$, тò $\sigma \chi o l v i ́ o v ~ \sigma u v \alpha ́ \gamma \omega$ (Lex. Vind. $\mu 26$ )

## 175r 11


 по́ $\delta \alpha \varsigma$ х.

## 175r 26


 loca, in quae rivi diversi confluunt; convallis.

175v 26
 $\mu \varepsilon ́ v o \vee \tau \circ \varsigma \mu \vee \eta ́ \mu \eta$ (cf. Suid. $\mu$ 1155)

176r 15


176v 14
 singularis

## 177r 11





177v 23
 molae, catillus superior. (cf. Suid. $\mu$ 1408)

178r 20

 тò $\delta \varepsilon ̇ ~ \sigma u ́ \mu \pi \tau \omega \mu \alpha \mu \nu \rho \tau 0 \chi \varepsilon$ í $\lambda \eta$. (Suid. $\mu$ 1462)

## 179r 4



## 179r 16


 ŋ̄ $\alpha$ о́ртоऽ $\theta \varepsilon \rho \mu$ òs $\mu \varepsilon \tau^{\prime}$ દ̇ $\lambda \alpha$ ќov. (Suid. v 44)

179r 25
 ह̇ாì $\chi \lambda \varepsilon v \alpha \sigma \mu \tilde{\omega}$. . (Suid. v 100)

## 179v 26






## 180r 3



## 181r 3

$\downarrow \eta \sigma \sigma \alpha ́ p ı v$ anaticula, vv́ $\sigma \sigma \alpha$ $\delta \grave{~} \kappa \alpha \mu \pi \tau \eta ́ \rho, \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \mu \alpha, \beta \alpha \theta \mu i ́ c$. (Suid. v 617)

## 181r 5

 кגì $\mu$ モ́øŋऽ. (Suid. v 11)

## 181r 25





## 184r 11

 סпий́тทр है¢ороц тои̃ Өغ́pouc. (Suid. o 26)

## 185r 8





## 193r 26




196r 10
oũ $\theta \alpha \rho$, tò $\gamma o v \imath \mu \omega ́ \tau \alpha \tau o v ~ \mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda o \varsigma, ~ o u ̋ ~ \theta \alpha \tau \alpha ~ \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ o i ~ \mu \alpha \zeta o i ̀ ~ \tau \omega ̃ v ~ \pi \rho o \beta \alpha ́ \tau \omega v . ~(S u i d . ~$ o 837-838.)

## 198r 7



## 199r 20



## 201r 7

 $\pi$ 264)

201r 12


## 202r 18

$\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \varepsilon \kappa о \mu \mu \varepsilon ́ v \circ \varsigma$, ó $̇ \xi \varepsilon \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \grave{\omega} \varsigma$ к $\alpha \grave{~} \mu \alpha ı \nu o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o \varsigma ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \pi \alpha \rho \alpha ́ \varphi \rho \rho \nu$. (Suid. $\pi$ 358) stupidus, insanus, vecors, excors.

## 202v 1



## 207v 16






## 208r 3



## 210v 21

$\pi \varepsilon \rho i ̀ \lambda u ́ \chi \nu \omega \nu \alpha \not \alpha \varphi \alpha ́ \varsigma$, prima face, tum cum sera rubens accendit L. v.

## 211v 12



## 213r 5



кגì $\pi \rho \circ \pi \varepsilon \tau \eta ́ \varsigma, ~ \kappa \alpha \grave{~ \mu \eta \delta \varepsilon ́ v ~ \sigma u ̀ v ~ \lambda o ү \imath \sigma \mu \tilde{1}} \pi 01 \tilde{\omega} v$. (Suid. $\pi 1365$ and 1366; Phot. Lexicon $\pi 425,20$ )

## 214r 1

 1555)

## 215v 1

$\pi \lambda \alpha i ́ \sigma ı \nu, \tau \varepsilon \tau \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \omega \nu \circ \varsigma ~ \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \sigma ı \varsigma ~ \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau \varepsilon u ́ \mu \alpha \tau \circ \varsigma$ кגì $\tau o ̀ ~ \varepsilon ̇ k ~ \xi u ́ \lambda o v ~ \tau \varepsilon \tau \rho \alpha ү \omega ́ v \omega \nu$ $\pi \tilde{\eta} \gamma \mu \alpha$. (Suid. $\pi 1715$ )

## 215v 18

 $\pi$ 1736)

215v 21


## 217v 1

 Segueriana, Coll. verborum utilium e differentibusrhetoribus et sapientibus multis $\pi 344,16$, ed. Bachmann)

219r 12

219r 14


## 220v 2

$\pi \lambda \alpha \kappa o u ́ v \tau \imath \alpha, \pi \lambda \alpha \tau \varepsilon ́ \alpha, \lambda \varepsilon \pi \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha \grave{~} \pi \varepsilon \rho ı \varphi \varepsilon \rho \tilde{\eta} ?$

## 221r 2



## 222r 1



## 222r 8

$\pi \rho \alpha \nu \varepsilon ́ \varsigma, \tau o ̀ ~ \kappa \alpha ́ \tau \alpha \nu \tau \varepsilon \varsigma ~ \kappa \alpha \grave{~ \pi \rho \alpha v \eta ́ \varsigma, ~ o ̀ ~ к \alpha \tau \omega \varphi \varepsilon \rho \eta ́ \varsigma ~(S u i d . ~ \pi ~ 2208-9) ~}$

## 222r 16



## 223v 8



## 225v 15



## 232v 1





## 234r 1

$\pi u ́ \theta \eta, \mu \alpha ́ \theta \eta \varsigma$, ảkov́бףऽ. (Phot. Lexicon $\pi 472,21$ )

## 239r 13


 $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \tau \alpha ı$ oứ $\omega$ k $\alpha$ ì tò $\beta ı \beta \lambda$ íov. (Suid. б 214)

## 239v 1



## 243r 19









 Lex. Segueriana, Coll. verborum utilium e differentibus rhetoribus et sapientibus multis $\sigma$ 367, 1, ed. Bachmann)

## 249v 6

$\sigma \tau \cup \pi \pi \varepsilon \tilde{o} 0 v$, tò $\tau \eta ̃ \varsigma ~ \varepsilon ̇ \lambda \alpha i ́ \alpha \varsigma ~ o ̉ \sigma \tau o u ̃ v . ~ \sigma \tau u ́ \pi \pi ı o v, ~ o ̋ \theta \varepsilon v ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \lambda i ̃ v o v ~ v \eta ́ \theta \varepsilon \tau \alpha ı . ~(S u i d . ~$


## 260r 26

 $\tau \cup \pi о \tilde{\tau} \alpha \downarrow$, oút $\omega, \tau \tilde{\eta} \sigma \tau \rho \circ \varphi \tilde{n} \tau \tilde{\tau} \varsigma \sigma \varphi \varepsilon v \delta o ́ v \eta \varsigma$ o Г

## 260v 9



## 264v 5




## 272r 6



 (Suid. $\tau$ 1092)

## 275v 1


 v 151), ن́ $\tau \alpha v i ́ \sigma \chi \omega$, tò $\dot{\tau} \pi \alpha v \alpha \tau \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ suborior. $\dot{\pi} \alpha \alpha \rho \kappa \omega ̃$ suppedito.

## 281r 21

 (cf. Ps.-Zonar. Lexicon v 1780, 19). $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma o v \tau \alpha \downarrow ~ \delta \dot{~} \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ o i ~ \gamma ı v o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o l ~ \tau u ́ \lambda o l ~ ह ̉ v ~ \tau \alpha i ̃ \varsigma ~$
 v 650).

## 282r 2



## 282r 19

$\varphi \alpha \theta i ̀ ~ o ̉ \xi v \tau o ́ v \omega \varsigma, ~ \alpha ̉ v \tau i ̀ ~ \tau o v ̃ ~ \varepsilon ̉ \xi o ́ \pi ı \sigma \theta \varepsilon v ~ \omega ́ \omega \varsigma ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \alpha u ̉ \tau o ̀ ~ \varphi \alpha \theta i ̀ ~ \tau o v ̃ ~ \mu o ́ \lambda \omega \mu \varepsilon v ~(S u i d . ~$ $\varphi$ 22)

## 282v 5




## 285v 25



## 286v 13

 үıvou

## 289r 4



## 290v 19


 (Suid. x 245-6)

## 291r 12

$\chi \curlywedge \lambda$ òs $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1 \dot{\eta} \tau \tilde{\omega} v$ ï $\pi \pi \omega \nu \tau \rho \circ \varphi \eta$ bladum.

# IX <br> Marginalia in the mss．ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 and $\Sigma$ I 12．Collation 

## 1 Quotations from Aristophanic scholia

| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | $\Sigma$ I 12 | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br>  |  | sch．plut． 1052 |
|  <br>  | 91r Aristophanes．$\dot{\alpha} \beta i ́ \omega \tau$ tov． <br>  | sch．plut．969a |
|  к $\lambda \tilde{\omega}$ ，ö $\theta \varepsilon v$ к $\alpha \tau \varepsilon \alpha \gamma \omega ́ \varsigma ~$ | 92v $\alpha$ 人ै $ү \omega \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ к $\alpha$ tò $\kappa \lambda \tilde{\omega}$ ， ö $\theta \varepsilon v$ к $\alpha \tau \varepsilon \alpha \gamma \omega َ \varsigma$ | sch．plut．545j |
| 4v $6 \dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi เ \delta o v ̃ \varsigma,-\delta o \tilde{v},-\delta \tilde{\omega}$ $\\| \dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi เ \delta \tilde{\eta}$ ．fratris filia．in Aristophane． | 93r $\alpha \delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi i \delta \tilde{\eta} v, \tau o \tilde{v}$ ả $\delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi \rho \frac{v}{\alpha}$ đủtoũ $Ө u \gamma \alpha \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \alpha$ ．in Aristophane． | sch．nub． 47 |
| 5r $14 \dot{\alpha} \delta 0 \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \chi \tilde{\omega},-\sigma \chi \varepsilon \tilde{c}$｜｜quattuor significat hoc verbum．tò ¢ı入обоبعĩv．tò $\pi \alpha i ́ \zeta \varepsilon ı v . ~ t o ̀ ~ o ̉ \lambda ı \gamma \omega \rho \varepsilon i ̃ v . ~$ <br>  |  <br>  （．．．），tò $\pi \alpha$ í乌हıv，$\dot{\omega} \varsigma ~ \tau o ̀ ~(. .),$. tò ò $\lambda$ rү $\omega \rho \varepsilon$ ĩv，$\dot{\varsigma}$ tò（．．．），tò $\varphi \lambda \cup \alpha \rho \varepsilon i ̃ v, \dot{\omega} \varsigma ~ \tau \grave{~(. . .) . ~}$ | sch．nub．1480e |
|  ä $\lambda \varepsilon u p o v$ غ $\dot{\psi} \eta \mu \varepsilon ́ v o v$ ．Aristophanes |  | sch．plut． 673 |
| 7r 24 גipoũ $\mu \alpha 1,-\alpha i \rho n ̃ ~\| \| ~ \alpha i p o u \mu \varepsilon ́ v o v . ~$ $\pi \rho о к \rho i ́ v \alpha v \tau \alpha$ ．In Aristophane． | 94v $\alpha$ ipou $\mu \varepsilon ́ v o v, \pi \rho о к \rho i ́ v \alpha v \tau \alpha$. <br> In Aristophane． | sch．nub．1042a |
|  <br>  үò̀ tò ह̇пı $\mu \varepsilon \lambda$ oũ $\mu \alpha$ ．in Aristophane |  <br>  $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \mu \varepsilon \lambda о \tilde{u} \mu \alpha 1$. in Aristophane | sch．nub．44c |
|  <br>  ő $\rho \chi \varepsilon ı \varsigma ~ \lambda \varepsilon i ́ x \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$ ．Aristophanes |  $\tau \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \omega v$ ő $\rho \chi \varepsilon ı \varsigma ~ \lambda \varepsilon i ́ \chi \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon$ ．in Aristophane | sch．plut． 295 |
| 11v $10 \dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \tau \rho \cup \omega ́ v,-\omega ̃ v o \varsigma \\|$ $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \tau \rho v ́ \alpha ı v \alpha$ gallina｜apud Platonem comicum et gallina |  <br>  $\Pi \lambda \alpha ́ \tau \omega v ~ \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ ó к $\omega \mu$ кко̧̀ oű $\tau \omega$ $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon ા . ~ \varepsilon ̇ v i ́ o \tau \varepsilon ~ п о \lambda \lambda \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$ <br>  <br>  Aristophane． | Dai．，fg．19－20 Kock，line 3；cf． sch．nub．663a |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | ᄃ I 12 | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11v $19 \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \eta ́ \varsigma,-\theta o v ̃ \varsigma ~\| \| \alpha ̈ \lambda \eta \theta \varepsilon \varsigma$ ．In Aristophane．pro $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ ironice |  $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \tilde{\omega} \varsigma \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \iota \varsigma$. <br> In Arist（ophane）． <br> （．．．）$\kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime}$ हíp $\omega v \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\alpha} \alpha v$ ． | sch．nub．841a |
| 12r $24 \dot{\alpha} \lambda 0 \tilde{\omega},-\tilde{\alpha} \varsigma \\| \dot{\alpha} \lambda \tilde{\omega} \varsigma, \kappa \rho \alpha \tau \eta \theta \varepsilon i \varsigma$, in Aristophane．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \sigma \omega v^{\prime} \delta ı \alpha \sigma \mu v \chi \theta \varepsilon i ́ \varsigma$, $\kappa \alpha \theta \alpha \rho \theta \varepsilon$ íc．đ̈́ $\eta \eta \varsigma,-\eta \tau 0 \varsigma$ عĩ $\delta o \varsigma$ $\pi \lambda \alpha к о$ ũvтоৎ． | 98r $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \tilde{\omega} \varsigma, ~ \kappa \rho \alpha \tau \eta \theta \varepsilon i \varsigma, ~ i n ~$ Aristophane．｜$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \sigma v^{\prime}$ $\delta ı \alpha \sigma \mu v \chi \theta \varepsilon i ́ ¢, ~ \kappa \alpha \theta \alpha \rho \theta \varepsilon i ́ c .(. .$.$) In$ Aristophane．｜（．．．）ท̌youv عĩठos $\pi \lambda \alpha к о и ̃ v \tau о \varsigma ~ \pi \rho o ̀ \varsigma ~ о \tilde{\varsigma} \varsigma$ ह̈ँ $\varepsilon \mu \psi \alpha$ ． | sch．plut．168a； sch．plut． 999 |
|  $\mu \alpha ́ \chi \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1$ ．In Aristophane． | 98 v д́ $\mu$ úvet $\alpha 1$ ，$\mu \alpha ́ \chi \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1$ in Aristophane | sch．nub．1428a |
|  tò ảvtó｜｜$\alpha \mu \varphi \mid \varepsilon ́ \sigma \omega, ~ દ ̉ v \delta u ́ \sigma \omega ~ i n ~$ Aristophane |  Aristophane | sch．plut． 936 |
| 13r $26 \dot{\alpha} \mu \varphi \iota \sigma \beta \eta \tau \tilde{\omega}\|\mid \dot{\alpha} \mu \varphi о \rho \varepsilon \tilde{\iota} \varsigma$ vยvๆбนย́vol，$\mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha \rho ı \kappa \alpha ̀ ~ \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \omega \rho \varepsilon \cup \mu \varepsilon ́ v \alpha ~$ in Aristophane |  $\mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha \rho ı \kappa \alpha ̀ ~ \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \omega \rho \varepsilon \cup \mu \varepsilon ́ v \alpha$ in Aristophane | sch．nub．1203d |
| 13v 1 ảv $\alpha \beta \alpha i ́ v \omega\|\mid$ In Aristophane． <br>  pedem $h(a b e)$ ndo sup（er）pede（m）． દỉ $\alpha v \alpha \beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \psi \varepsilon ı \alpha \varsigma, ~ ク ้ \gamma o u v ~ \alpha ̛ v \alpha \beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \psi \varepsilon ı \varsigma . ~$ In Aristophane．$\alpha \mathfrak{\alpha} \alpha \zeta \omega \pi \nu \rho \omega \tilde{\omega}$ refocillo， $\alpha \dot{\alpha} v \zeta \zeta \omega \pi$ úp $\eta \sigma \iota \varsigma$ refocillatio． |  <br>  $\pi o ́ \delta \alpha$ ．ク̌үouv $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa \tau \varepsilon \tau \alpha \mu \varepsilon ́ v \omega \varsigma$ ．In Aristophane．$\varepsilon i ̉ ̉ \alpha ̉ v \alpha \beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \psi \varepsilon ı \alpha \varsigma$ ， ท้ץouv $\alpha$ v $\alpha \beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \psi \varepsilon ı$ ．In Aristophane．$\alpha$ v $\alpha \zeta \omega \pi \nu \rho \tilde{\omega}$ refocillo，－llas．àva̧んாúp refocillatio． | sch．plut．1123c and 95b |
|  <br>  <br>  $\varphi \omega v \eta ̀ ~ \tau \tilde{\omega} v$ ỏ $\delta u \rho о \mu \varepsilon ́ v \omega v$ каì $\qquad$ <br>  <br>  Xenophon |  （．．．）．｜incruenta victoria $\dot{\eta}$ $\qquad$ <br>  <br>  $\qquad$ $\varphi \omega v \eta ̃ \varsigma ~ \varepsilon ̇ \sigma \tau i v ~ \alpha ̛ ̉ \pi о \mu i ́ \mu \eta \mu \alpha . \dot{\eta}$ <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  غ̇ $\gamma \gamma \cup \omega ̃ \mu \alpha 1$（．．．）recipio． | sch．plut．1028； Xen．Cyr．1，6， 18 and $6,1,45$ |
|  $\dot{\alpha} v \alpha \beta \imath \beta \alpha ́ \sigma \alpha c ̧$ in Aristophane｜$\alpha \nsim \eta, \dot{\eta}$ סрєாávๆ | 98v ơv $\alpha \theta \varepsilon i ́ ¢, ~ \alpha ̉ v \alpha \beta ı \beta \alpha ́ \sigma \alpha \varsigma ~ i n ~$ Aristophane．｜ $99 \mathrm{v} \alpha{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta, \dot{\eta}$ $\delta \rho \varepsilon \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \eta \eta$ falx，falcis | sch．plut．69a |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | $\Sigma \mathrm{I} 12$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br>  $\tau \propto \mathfrak{\alpha} \varsigma ~ \varphi \rho \varepsilon ́ v \alpha c$ ．Aristophanes｜ <br>  <br>  $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \dot{\sigma}$ ．．In Aristophane｜ ब̀v $\alpha \mu \mu \nu$ ท́бко $\mu \alpha ı$ reminiscor，recolo， repeto． $\mid \dot{\alpha} v \alpha \mu \varphi \uparrow \lambda \varepsilon ́ k \tau \omega \varsigma$ ，тóp $\rho \omega$ <br>  |  ن́үı白vદıv，oi кат $\alpha \pi \varepsilon ı \sigma \theta \varepsilon ́ v \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$ $\tau \alpha ̀ \varsigma ~ \varphi \rho \varepsilon ́ v \alpha c$ ．in Aristophane ｜$\dot{\alpha} v \alpha \pi \varepsilon \mu \pi \alpha ́ \zeta \omega ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \alpha ̀ v \alpha \pi о \lambda \tilde{\omega}$ <br>  <br>  $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \dot{\varepsilon} \varepsilon$ ．In Aristophane｜ <br>  －sceris，recolo，－lis，repeto， －petis．｜$\dot{\alpha} v \alpha \mu \varphi \imath$ ı́к $\tau \omega \varsigma$ sine dubio，procul dubio，пópp $\omega$ ג̉ $\mu \varphi$ ßо $\lambda i ́ \alpha c$ ． | sch．plut．507b； sch．nub．995e |
|  غ̇ץعрรี̃．Aristophanes |  Aristophane | sch．plut．453d |
| 14v $1 \dot{\alpha} v \alpha \chi \alpha \cup v \tilde{\omega}\|\mid \dot{\alpha} v \varepsilon \tilde{\tau} \tau \alpha l$ ，$̇ v \delta \varepsilon ́ \delta o \tau \alpha ı ~$ Aristophanes｜$\dot{\alpha} v \varepsilon v \delta o l o ́ \sigma \tau \omega \varsigma$ incunctanter |  Aristophane｜$\dot{\alpha} v \varepsilon v \delta o o \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \omega \varsigma$ incunctanter | sch．nub． 956 |
|  ब̉vย́ $\pi \alpha \sigma \varepsilon v, ~ \sigma u v \varepsilon ́ t \varepsilon 1 \lambda \varepsilon v$［correcte $\sigma \cup v \varepsilon ́ \sigma \tau \varepsilon ı \lambda \varepsilon v]$ Aristophanes | 100r in Aristophane． <br>  | sch．plut．691e |
|  <br>  <br>  $\sigma u \gamma ү \varepsilon v \tilde{\eta} \tau \alpha i ̃ \varsigma ~ \mu \varepsilon \lambda i ́ \sigma \sigma \alpha ı$ ，oi $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ <br>  Aristophane |  <br>  <br>  <br>  $\varphi \alpha \sigma i v$ हĩval $\tau \alpha i ̃ \varsigma ~ \varphi \varphi \eta$ そív．In Aristophane | sch．nub．947b |
| 18v 26 ảv $\tau \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon \rho \omega ́ \tau \eta \sigma ı \varsigma, ~-\sigma \varepsilon \omega \varsigma ~$ $\\| \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \varepsilon \dot{\lambda} \lambda \lambda$ ol $\sigma \varepsilon \lambda \eta$ ŋ́ $v \eta$ ，inquit Aristophanes．т $\tau \lambda$ ou $\mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta \varsigma, ~ \varphi \eta \sigma i ́, ~ \tau \eta ̃ \varsigma ~$ бモ入ク́vns oi tókol סíסovtaı． quae si non oriretur，quomodo oi $\delta \alpha v \varepsilon ı \sigma \tau \alpha i ́ ~ p o s s e n t ~ s c i r e ~ m e n s e m ~$ exactum et repetere usuras．quare si non oriretur amplius，nec ego solverem eas． | 102r ảv $\tau \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda$ ol $\sigma \varepsilon \lambda \eta ́ v \eta$ ， <br>  oi tókol $\delta$ í 0 ovtaı．$\varepsilon$ í ？oủk â $v$ ávacṫ̀ $\lambda \lambda$ ol（．．．in Greek）．In Aristophane． | sch．nub．755a |
|  $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma о ́ \mu \varepsilon v o v$ к $\alpha \lambda \alpha ́ \mu \ldots ้$ тои̃ тоסós． <br>  <br>  | 102v In Aristophane． <br>  $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma o ́ \mu \varepsilon v \alpha$ к $\alpha \lambda \alpha ́ \mu 1 \alpha \alpha \tau \tilde{v} \pi о \delta \tilde{\omega} v$ ． <br>  <br>  | sch．plut． 784 |
|  <br>  Aristophane |  In Aristophane．et alio loco <br>  | sch．plut．328d |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | $\Sigma$ I 12 | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br>  <br>  $\sigma \pi 0 \cup \delta \alpha i ́ \omega \varsigma \beta \alpha \delta i \zeta \omega$ ．In Aristophane | 103v ảvútteıv，ク̌Youv бuvтó $\omega \omega \varsigma$ है $\rho \chi \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha ı$ ．ảvó $\omega$ tò <br>  тои̃ $\sigma \pi о \cup \delta \alpha i ́ \omega \varsigma \beta \alpha \delta i ́ \zeta \omega$ ．In Aristophane | sch．plut． 607 |
|  $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \tilde{\omega} . \kappa o ́ \mu ı \zeta \varepsilon \delta \eta \lambda^{\prime} \varepsilon i ̉ \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \eta$ ，$\sigma 0 \vee \tau \rho i ́ \psi \omega$ ． |  $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \tilde{\omega} . \kappa o ́ \mu l \zeta \varepsilon \delta \eta \lambda$＇$\varepsilon i ̉ \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \mu \eta$ ， бטขтрíq $\omega$ ． | sch．nub．1299b |
| 22v 1 äopvov，ảópvou｜｜$\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \alpha i ̃ o v$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \delta \varepsilon \tilde{\xi} \zeta \alpha 1$ apud Platonem antiquare． ｜$\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \iota o ́ \lambda \eta$ ，$\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \tau \eta$ ŋ́．In Aristophane．｜ $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \gamma \tilde{\eta} \nu \alpha 1, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \lambda \theta \varepsilon i ̃ v . \mid \bar{\xi} \xi \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \tilde{\omega} v$ ỏvúx $\omega v$ a teneris ungiculis． $\mid \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \gamma \tilde{\omega}$ ， <br>  àто入очи́роиак． | 104v antiquare est abolere， obscurare et a memoria tollere． Cicero［quotes from De officiis， De legibus］．$\dot{\varsigma} \varsigma$ ह̇ $\mu$ оі סокєĩ［．．．］ t̀̀v toũ antiquare on $\eta \alpha \sigma$ ó $\alpha v$ ， <br>  quoted］｜$\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha ı o ́ \lambda \eta, \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \tau \eta$ ๆ́．In Aristophane｜$\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \gamma \tilde{\eta} v \alpha 1$ ， $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \lambda \theta \varepsilon \tilde{v} v$ ．In Aristophane． $\mid \dot{\varepsilon} \xi$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \tilde{\omega} v$ óvv́x $\omega v$ ab ungiculis teneris｜$\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \gamma \tilde{\omega}$ ，tò toṽ <br>  д̀то入очи́роиа． | Plat．Ep．320d 6； sch．nub．1150b |
|  intentabilis，inviolabilis．$\alpha \pi \alpha \rho \tau$ í， $\dot{\alpha} \pi \eta \rho \tau \eta \sigma \mu \varepsilon ́ v \omega \varsigma, \tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \omega \varsigma$ ．In Aristophane． |  intentabilis，inviolabilis．｜ <br>  $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon i ́ \omega \varsigma$ In Aristophane． | sch．plut．388a |
| 24v 26 व่̉ $\pi \varepsilon \rho \rho \omega \gamma \omega ́ \varsigma,-\gamma o ́ \tau о \varsigma ~\| \| ~ \alpha ́ \pi \varepsilon \rho \rho ' . ~$ $\varphi \theta \varepsilon i ́ \rho o u, \alpha ̛ ̃ \pi \varepsilon \lambda \theta \varepsilon$ Aristophanes．｜ <br>  | 106r ö́ $\pi \varepsilon \rho \rho^{\prime} . \varphi \theta \varepsilon i ́ \rho o u$, ä $\pi \varepsilon \lambda \theta \varepsilon$ Aristophanes｜$\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \rho u ́ k \omega$ ， tò $\delta \iota \omega ́ \kappa \omega$ кגі̀ à $\pi \varepsilon \lambda \alpha u ́ v \omega$ кגì $\sigma u v \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota ~ \alpha i ́ \tau ı \alpha \tau ı k \tilde{n}$. Ezvopũv［full quote］ | sch．nub．783b； <br> Xen．Oec．5，6； <br> Mem．2，9， 2 |
|  $\alpha i \delta o i ̃ \alpha ~ \delta \varepsilon ı \kappa v o ́ v \tau \varepsilon \varsigma ~ i n ~ A r i s t o p h a n e ~$ |  סعıкvóvtȩ in Aristophane | sch．plut．295b |
|  in Aristophane |  Aristophane | sch．nub． 974 |
| 26r 16 ảr óyıov oxoıvíov｜｜árò үàp ỏ̀ $\lambda o u ̃ \mu \alpha ı$ ，ov̉ $\beta$ oú $\lambda o \mu \alpha ı$ ．In Aristophane |  $\beta$ oú $\lambda$ oucı．In Aristophane | sch．nub． 1440 |
|  ｜｜Aristophanes．$\dot{\alpha} \pi \mathbf{\pi} \lambda ı \tau \alpha \rho \gamma เ \varepsilon ̃ ॅ$, व̈ $\pi \varepsilon ́ \lambda \theta \eta \varsigma, ~ \alpha ̀ \pi о \delta \rho \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon ı \varsigma, ~ \alpha ̀ \pi о \sigma к ı \rho \tau \eta ́ \sigma \varepsilon ı, ~, ~$ <br>  бкıртท́ $\mu \alpha \tau \alpha$. | 108v In Aristophane． <br> $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \lambda ı \alpha \rho \gamma ı \varepsilon i ̃$, á $\pi \varepsilon ́ \lambda \theta \eta \varsigma$. <br>  <br>  <br>  | sch．nub．1253c－d |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | $\Sigma$ I 12 | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br>  $\tau \tilde{\nu} \nu \delta \iota \alpha \lambda \neq \gamma \iota \sigma \mu \tilde{\omega} v, \tau \tilde{\omega} v \delta \iota \alpha v o l \tilde{\omega} v$. Aistophanes, et alibi $\dot{\alpha} \pi$ оopíav हैX $\eta \varsigma$. |  <br>  <br>  $\tau \tilde{v} \delta 1 \alpha v o l \tilde{\omega} v$. in Aistophane | Nub. 743; sch. nub. 743e-f |
| 31v 22 ब̇тобт $\delta \cup v \alpha ́ \mu \varepsilon v o \varsigma ~ \alpha ́ \pi o \sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha 1$. in Aristophane |  $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi о \sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \alpha 1$. in Aristophane | sch. nub. 728b |
|  $\delta 1 \omega \kappa \tau \alpha \tau \tilde{\omega} v \kappa \alpha \kappa \tilde{\omega} v$. |  к $\kappa \tilde{\omega} v$. In Aristophane | sch. plut. 854b |
| 33r $12 \dot{\alpha} \pi о \nu \sigma i ́ \alpha ~\|\mid ~ \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi о \varphi \alpha v \tilde{\omega}$ <br>  Ar (istophane) | 111v $\alpha \dot{\pi} \pi \circ \varphi \underline{1} v \omega, \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \delta \varepsilon i \xi \omega$. in Aristophane | sch. Plut. 210a and 468c |
| 33r $26 \dot{\alpha} \pi \sim \varphi \varphi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \omega\|\mid \dot{\alpha} \pi о \varphi \theta \varepsilon ́ \rho \varepsilon$, $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi \theta \varepsilon$ íp $\varepsilon 1$, alibi $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha ̀ \alpha \theta$ о $\propto \tilde{\alpha} \varsigma$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon ́ \rho \times \eta$. in Aristophane | 111v $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \varphi \theta \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \tilde{1}, \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi \theta \varepsilon i ́ \rho \varepsilon ı$, alibi $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \varphi \theta$ o $\rho \tilde{\alpha} \varsigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon ́ \rho \chi \eta$. in Aristophane | sch. nub. 789c; sch. plut. 598d |
|  <br>  <br>  ט́то́ $\rho \chi$ रov $\alpha$ | 112r In Aristophane. ánóxpך, <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  $\gamma \varepsilon v \eta ́ \sigma \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1$. | sch. plut. 484e |
| 33v 19 वं $\pi о \psi \eta \varphi i ́ \zeta о \mu \alpha ı ~\|\mid ~ \alpha \dot{\alpha} о \psi \omega ́ \mu \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha$, <br>  Aristophane. | 112r $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \psi \omega ́ \mu \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha$, $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \sigma \pi о \gamma \gamma i ́ \zeta \omega \mu \varepsilon v$ tòv $\pi \rho \omega \kappa \tau o ́ v$. In Aristophane. | sch. plut. 817 |
| 33v 21 ब̈ $\pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \circ \sigma u ́ v \eta$ \|| Aristophanes grammaticus, $\tau \grave{v} v \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \circ \sigma u ́ v \eta v$ ழutòv $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon ા ~ \varepsilon ̇ v ~ \alpha ̉ \kappa \alpha \delta \eta \mu u i ́ a ̣ ~ \varphi ט o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o v . ~$ | 112r in Aristophane. <br>  <br>  દ̇v đ̉к $\alpha \delta \eta \mu i ́ \alpha ̣ ~ \varphi ט o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o v . ~$ | sch. nub. 1007c |
| 34v 9 व̃ $\rho \alpha$ \|| ${ }^{\alpha} \rho \alpha \gamma \varepsilon$ то $\lambda \lambda \tilde{\omega} v$, $\sigma \nu \mu \pi \varepsilon ́ \rho \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha$ عip $\omega$ vıкóv. in Aristophane. | 112v $\alpha$ व̈р $\alpha ү \varepsilon ~ \pi о \lambda \lambda \tilde{\omega} v, ~$ $\sigma \cup \mu \pi \varepsilon ́ \rho \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha$ єip $\omega v$ vкóv. in Aristophane. | sch. plut. 546e |
|  |  $\dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \tau \kappa \omega \tilde{c}$. in Aristophane | sch. nub. 170d |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | $\Sigma \mathrm{I} 12$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br> 白рvaкíß $\omega v$ घi $\pi \dot{\omega} v$ à $\pi о \sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \eta \tau i ́ \delta \alpha$, <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  youvápios． | 113v ג̉́pvaкí̧ દ̇đтı tò toũ đ́pvòs <br>  $\gamma v \omega ́ \mu \eta v$ ह̇ $\zeta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho v \alpha \kappa i ́ \delta \omega v$ <br>  $\gamma v \omega \dot{\mu} \eta$ ข $\alpha \pi о \sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \eta ́ \sigma \varepsilon \omega \varsigma ~ к \alpha \grave{~}$ $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \alpha \rho \vee \eta ́ \sigma \varepsilon \omega \varsigma . \ddot{\omega} \varphi \varepsilon ı \lambda \varepsilon \delta \grave{\varepsilon}$ <br>  <br>  $\dot{\alpha} \rho v \alpha \kappa i ́ \delta \omega v, \dot{\omega} \varsigma \not \approx \nu \gamma v \omega \prime \mu \eta v$ <br>  <br>  In Aristophane．｜ó koıv $\tilde{\varsigma}$ $\lambda \varepsilon ү o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o \varsigma ~ y o u v \alpha ́ p ı o \varsigma . ~$ | sch．nub． 730 |
|  $\pi \alpha i ́ \zeta \rho \mu \varepsilon v$ ．in Aristophane． | 114r ஷ́ $\rho \tau \tau \alpha ́ \zeta о \mu \varepsilon v, \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \alpha \not \rho \tau \tau \alpha$ $\pi \alpha i ́ \zeta o \mu \varepsilon v$ ．in Aristophane． | sch．plut．816d |
|  <br>  $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \tau \alpha \theta \varepsilon ́ v \tau \circ \varsigma$ тои̃ $\delta \alpha v \varepsilon$ íou，к $\kappa \varphi$ व́ $\lambda \alpha \alpha$ <br>  | 114v In Aristophane．àp $p \varepsilon \tilde{\alpha} \alpha$ ， <br>  $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \tau \alpha \theta$ ह́vтоц тои̃ $\delta \alpha v \varepsilon$ ह́ou， <br>  <br>  | sch．nub．1156a－b |
|  | 115v In Aristophane．व̀o兀т̧́́ouaı <br>  $\chi \alpha ı \rho \tau i \zeta \omega$ ． | sch．nub．1145c |
| 41r 24 ḋтı $\mu \omega \rho \eta \sigma \dot{\alpha} \alpha$｜｜Aristophanes． <br>  $\dot{\eta} \mu \tilde{\alpha} \varsigma \delta \rho \tilde{\alpha} \mu \alpha$ $\psi \eta \varphi$ í $\sigma \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1$. | 117r In Aristophane．ả $\tau \iota \mu \alpha ́ \sigma \eta$ <br>  $\delta_{\rho} \tilde{\alpha} \mu \alpha \psi \eta \varphi$ í $\sigma \varepsilon \tau \alpha$ ． | sch．nub． 1121 |
| 41v 13 á $\tau \rho \alpha ́ \varphi \alpha \xi \cup \varsigma$ ท้тоı <br>  non trita．$\dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \varepsilon \mu \tilde{\omega}$ каı̀ $\dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \varepsilon \mu i ́ \zeta \omega$ тò <br>  <br>  <br>  |  $\grave{\eta} \mu \grave{\eta} \tau \varepsilon \tau \rho \downharpoonright \mu \mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta$ ．via non trita． <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1$ ．In Aristophane． | sch．nub．76a |
| 43r 23 aủxuò̧ ó pótoc $\\|$ in <br> 乡прабía． |  in Aristophane | sch．plut．839a |
| 44v $20 \dot{\alpha} \varphi \varphi^{\mu} \mu \nu \mu_{1}\| \|$ In Aristophane． $\dot{\alpha} \varphi о \rho \mu \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \theta \alpha ı$ ı $\pi \rho \varepsilon \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \cup \alpha ́ \sigma \mu \varepsilon \theta \alpha$ ，ท゙тоı торєи́єбӨı ท̀тоци́б $\mu \varepsilon Ө \alpha$ ． | 119v $\dot{\alpha} \varphi \rho \rho \mu \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \theta \alpha ı$ $\pi \alpha \rho \varepsilon \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \cup \alpha ́ \sigma \mu \varepsilon \theta \alpha$ ，ท̆тоו <br>  Aristophane | sch．nub． 607 |

## 2 Quotations from the SBM

| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | $\Sigma \mathrm{I} 12$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br>  <br>  | 92v ह̇к $\tau \omega ̃ v$ vó $\mu \omega \mathrm{v}$ ．व̉ץpòs <br>  $\tau \tilde{v}$ оі̉кпиа́́т $\omega v$ тóтоऽ． | SM P I，2；B II，2，25 |
|  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  ह̇兀兀ıv oủ hóvov ó $\mu \grave{\eta}$ <br>  <br>  | SM P I，3；B II，2，61 |
|  $\tau \tilde{\tau} v$ vó $\mu \omega v$ • $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha$ Өŋ́коvó́v <br>  $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon เ v ~ \alpha ̉ \pi o ́ к \lambda \eta \rho \circ v ~ ү \varepsilon v \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta \alpha 1$ ．ŋ̀ $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu v \eta \mu$ óvevtov $\mu$ ท̀ ó $\varphi \varepsilon ́ \lambda \varepsilon เ v$ ．Item． <br>  <br>  <br>  $\alpha u ̉ t o u ̀ \varsigma ~ o ́ ~ \alpha ̛ p \chi \omega v ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \alpha ̛ \pi о \lambda u ́ \varepsilon ı v . ~$ <br>  $\dot{\varepsilon} \alpha ̀ v \geqslant \alpha ́ \lambda_{\imath v} \alpha i \tau \iota \alpha \theta \tilde{\omega} \sigma ı v$. | 95r ह̇к $\tau \omega ̃ v$ vó $\mu \omega v$ ． <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  व̈л $\pi \lambda \varepsilon u ́ \theta \varepsilon \rho \circ$ ו $\pi \rho o ̀ \varsigma ~ \tau o u ̀ \varsigma ~$ $\pi \alpha ́ \tau \rho \omega v \alpha \varsigma ~ \eta ̀ ~ \pi \alpha \tilde{i} \delta \alpha \varsigma \alpha u ̉ \tau \tilde{v}$ ． <br>  <br>  <br>  $\pi \alpha ́ \lambda ı v \alpha i \tau \iota \alpha \theta \tilde{\omega} \sigma ı v$ ． | SM $\triangle$ XIX，2；B XXXIX，1，3＋SM П XI，5；B XLIX，1，1 |
|  vó $\mu \omega v$ ．$\tau \tilde{̣}$ ỏvó $\mu \alpha \tau \imath \tau \eta ̃ \varsigma ~ \beta \alpha \lambda \alpha ́ v o u$ тáv $\tau \varepsilon \zeta$ oi к $\alpha \rho \pi o i ̀ ~ \delta \eta \lambda о и ̃ v \tau \alpha ı . ~ ह ̇ \pi \varepsilon i ̀ ~ к \alpha \grave{~}$ <br>  <br>  |  тท̃ऽ $\beta \alpha \lambda \alpha ́ v o u ~ \pi \alpha ́ v \tau \varepsilon \varsigma ~ o i ~ к \alpha \rho \pi о і ̀ ~$ <br>  <br>  ठ $\varepsilon v \delta \rho \alpha$ ． | SM P 1， 28 and 7； B 2，2，227 |
|  <br>  $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \delta \alpha \pi \alpha v \tilde{\alpha} \tau \alpha 1 . \dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \mu \varepsilon \imath 0 ̃ \tau \alpha 1$ ，ö $\tau \alpha v$ $\mu \varepsilon ́ \rho о \varsigma \dot{\alpha} \varphi \alpha \iota \rho \tilde{\eta} \tau \alpha 1 . \dot{\alpha} \pi \sim \delta \alpha \pi \alpha v \tilde{\alpha} \tau \alpha 1$ ， ö $\tau \alpha \nu \pi \alpha \nu \tau \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ ó vó $\mu$ о $\varsigma$ àv $\alpha \iota \rho \tilde{\eta} \tau \alpha 1$ ． derogatur legi aut abrogatur．sed derogatur cum pars detrahitur， abrogatur cum prorsus tollitur． | 97r đŋนєıот́́ov derogatur legi aut abrogatur．sed derogatur cum pars detrahitur，abrogatur cum prorsus tollitur．غ̇к $\tau \tilde{\omega} v$ <br>  <br>  ö $\tau \alpha \nu \mu \varepsilon ́ \rho \circ \varsigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \varphi \alpha \iota \rho \eta ̃ \tau \alpha 1$ ． $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \delta \alpha \pi \alpha v \tilde{\alpha} \tau \alpha 1$ ，öт $\tau v \pi \alpha v \tau \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ ó vóuos ảvaı $\rho \tilde{\eta} \tau \alpha$ ． | SM P 1，22；B 2，2，99 |
|  $\dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \varepsilon ı \alpha$ negligentia，culpa．غ́k $\tau \tilde{\omega} v$ vó $\mu \omega v$ ．кои̃ $\lambda \pi \alpha$ ह̇бтıv $\dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha ́ \lambda \eta$ <br>  סóخoc． | 97v $\dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega}$ negligo，$\dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \varepsilon ı \alpha$ negligentia，culpa．غ̇к $\tau \tilde{\omega} v$ vó $\mu \omega v$ ．кои̃ $\lambda \pi \alpha$ ह̇ $\sigma \tau \iota v \dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha ́ \lambda \eta$ $\nless \alpha \mu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon i ́ \alpha . \dot{\eta} \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha ́ \lambda \eta ~ \kappa о и ̃ \lambda \pi \alpha$ દ̇oti סó入os． | SM P I， 85 |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | $\Sigma \mathrm{I} 12$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  $\tau \tilde{\omega} v$ vó $\mu \omega v$ ．$\pi \varepsilon \rho \grave{~} \alpha$ àv $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \lambda o ́ \gamma o u$ <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  үع ő $\lambda \omega \varsigma$ к $\kappa \chi \rho \varepsilon \omega ́ \sigma \tau \eta \nu \tau \alpha 1$ tóкоı $\varepsilon$ ह̇ غ̇л $\rho \omega \tau \eta \dot{\sigma} \omega \omega$ ． | 102 r ह̇к $\tau \tilde{\omega} v$ vó $\mu \omega v$ ．$\pi \varepsilon \rho i$ <br>  тท̃ऽ бטүкротои́бทऽ жобо́тทтоя， <br>  кєХрє $\omega \sigma \tau \eta \mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta \varsigma$ ． $\mathfrak{\eta}$ то <br>  <br>  $\alpha \dot{\alpha} v \alpha 1 \rho \varepsilon i ̃ \tau \alpha \downarrow$ દ́к $\alpha \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \omega v \mathfrak{\eta}$ <br>  <br>  <br>  عi $ү \varepsilon$ ő $\lambda \omega \varsigma ~ к \varepsilon \chi \rho \varepsilon \omega ́ \sigma \tau \eta \nu \tau \alpha ı$ <br>  | SM X II Index；B XXIV， 10 Titulus＋ SM X II，47；B XXIV，10，28 |
|  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  غ่ $\rho \rho \omega ́ \sigma \theta \omega$ ． |  <br>  <br>  غ̇х $\varepsilon \tau \omega \pi \alpha ́ v \tau \omega \varsigma \pi \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda_{1 \kappa \eta}$ <br>  $\kappa \alpha \grave{\mu} \mu \eta \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \varsigma ६$ ह́p $\rho \omega \dot{\sigma} \theta \omega$ ． | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SM B IV,6; B } \\ & \text { II,5,26 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  бol đท̀v $\beta \lambda \alpha ́ \beta \eta v$ ，emendo tibi <br>  <br>  <br>  ब̀ $\pi 0 \theta \varepsilon \rho \alpha \pi \varepsilon u ́ \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1$ tò $\rho 1 \varphi \theta \varepsilon ́ v$ ． |  $\tau \eta ̀ v \beta \lambda \alpha ́ \beta \eta v$ ，emendo tibi damnum．$\varepsilon$ ह̇ $\tau \tilde{\omega} v v o ́ \mu \omega v$ ． żàv $\delta \iota$ ̀̀ tò $\kappa 0 \cup \varphi \iota \sigma \theta \tilde{\eta} v \alpha 1$ $\pi \lambda$ оĩov $\alpha \pi \pi \beta \beta \eta \theta \tilde{\omega} \sigma 1$ чортía， $\pi \alpha ́ v \tau \omega v$ бuvel $\sigma \alpha \gamma o ́ v \tau \omega v$ $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \theta \varepsilon \rho \alpha \pi \varepsilon v ́ \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \rho ̀ ~ \rho \varphi \theta \varepsilon ́ v . ~$ | SM N I，12；B LIII，3，1 rest． |
|  vó $\mu \omega v$ ．oi $\pi \rho \circ \delta o ́ \tau \alpha 1$ к $\alpha$ ì oi $\alpha u ̉ \tau o ́ \mu o \lambda o l$ $\kappa \varepsilon \varphi \alpha \lambda_{ı} \kappa \tilde{\varsigma} \varsigma \dot{\omega} \varsigma$ ह̇ $\pi i ̀ ~ t o ̀ ~ \pi o \lambda \grave{u}$ <br>  кגі̀ ко入а́そovтаı． | 110 v દ̉к $\tau \tilde{\omega} v$ vó $\mu \omega v$ ．oi $\pi \rho o \delta o ́ \tau \alpha ı$ кגì oi $\alpha u ́ t o ́ \mu о \lambda o l, ~ к \varepsilon \varphi \alpha \lambda ı к \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ ஸ́ऽ غ̇лì tò $\pi 0 \lambda \grave{u} \tau \iota \mu \omega \rho 0 u ̃ v \tau \alpha$ ． <br>  ко入á̧ovtaı． | SM $\Sigma$ IV，10；B LVII，1，7 rest． |

## 3 Other literary quotations

| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | $\Sigma \mathrm{I} 12$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br>  $\pi \lambda \alpha ́ \tau \omega v \alpha i \mu \alpha \sigma \omega \omega ́ \delta \eta ~ \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon ı ~ \pi \varepsilon \rho i ́ ß o \lambda o v$ | 94v $\alpha i \mu \alpha \sigma ı \alpha ̀ ~ o ́ ~ z ̇ ~ \xi ~ \alpha ̉ \kappa \alpha ́ v \theta \omega v ~$ $\varphi \rho \alpha ү \mu$ óc．sepis，－pis．ő $\theta \varepsilon v$ ó $\pi \lambda \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu \alpha i \mu \alpha \sigma 1 \omega ́ \delta \eta ~ \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon ı$ терíßo入ov． | Plat．Lg．3，681a 1 |
|  <br>  кон廿о́тпс．lepidus et lepos ut Homerus：in Odysseia $\alpha \delta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ ह́v $\mu \alpha \lambda \alpha \kappa о$ ĩ $\sigma$ к кі̀ $\alpha i ̉ \mu \nu \lambda i ́ o l \sigma ı ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o ı \sigma, ~$ <br>  גipetıkò（con）ditionalis，tà <br>  $\tau \eta ̃ \varsigma ~ \alpha i \rho \varepsilon ́ \sigma \varepsilon \omega \varsigma ~ к \varepsilon \chi \rho \varepsilon \omega ́ \sigma \tau \eta \nu \tau \alpha 1$ ．ö $\theta \varepsilon v$ ๐йтє $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi \varepsilon ́ \rho \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \downarrow$ ह่v $\tau \tilde{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \xi \dot{v}$ סóvavtal． |  ккì $\chi \alpha$ рínऽ．к $\alpha i ̀ \alpha i ̉ u \nu \lambda i ́ \alpha ~ \grave{\eta}$ кон廿о́tпs．lepidus et lepos． <br>  $\mu \alpha \lambda \alpha \kappa о$ õol каі̀ $\alpha i \mu \nu \lambda i ́ o l \sigma ı$ <br>  <br>  dicionalis．$\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \alpha$ ipetık $\alpha \lambda \varepsilon \gamma \alpha ́ \tau \alpha$ ， <br>  <br>  $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \varphi \varepsilon ́ \rho \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha l$ ह่v $\tau \tilde{\omega} \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \xi \dot{v}$ סúvaviג1． | Hom．Od．1， 56－57；Michael Attaliates， Пóvทuа vouıкòv ท้тоı бúvo廿ıऽ $\pi \rho \alpha ү \mu \alpha \tau \kappa \eta$ 27， 20．Ed．Zépos \＆ Zépos 1931b |
| 11r 3 ब̊крохо $\delta \delta \alpha ́ v \eta, ~ \grave{~} \mu \nu \rho \mu \eta к і ́ \alpha$ <br>  $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ каì $\varphi \alpha$ коí． | 97r П入ои́тархоৎ．．．．ү $\dot{\alpha} \rho$ ब̉крохорסóvєऽ каі̀ $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ <br>  | Plut．De sera numinis vindicta 563a 4 |
| 11v $12 \dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon$ द́íкакоऽ，－ко́коv｜｜ $\Xi \varepsilon v o \varphi \omega ̃ v . \varepsilon ̇ v \tau \alpha ́ \xi \varepsilon ı 1 \pi \alpha ́ \rho \varepsilon \sigma \mu \varepsilon v$ <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  व̀ $\mu \nu v o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o \varsigma$. |  <br>  $\tau \tilde{T}$ ả $\mu u ́ v \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \mathrm{l}$ ．ő $\theta \varepsilon v$ к $\kappa \grave{1}$ à $\lambda \varepsilon \xi \eta \tau \eta ́ \rho ı o v ~ \lambda . . . ~ \tau o ̀ v ~$ oiovvei đ̉ $\mu \nu v \tau \eta ́ \rho ı o v . ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~$ <br>  ả $\mu v v o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o v . ~(. .). ~ \Xi \varepsilon v o \varphi \tilde{\omega} v$ $\tau 1 . \varepsilon ่ v \tau \alpha ́\} \varepsilon ı 兀 \alpha ́ \rho \varepsilon \sigma \mu \varepsilon v$ <br>  тоוท̃，àv vยu <br>  $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \xi \sigma \tilde{u} \mu \alpha 1$. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Xen. An. 5, 5, } \\ & 21-22 \end{aligned}$ |
| 11v 18 ä $\lambda \varepsilon \cup \rho \circ v,-\lambda \varepsilon$ ú $\rho o u$｜｜Plato in II de re publica．$̇ \kappa ~ \mu \varepsilon ̀ v \tau \tilde{\tau} \nu$ кpı $\theta \tilde{\omega} v$ $\alpha{ }_{\alpha} \lambda \varphi \iota \tau \alpha \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \cup \alpha \zeta o ́ \mu \varepsilon v o l$, ह̇к $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$ $\pi \cup \rho \tilde{\omega} v$ वै $\lambda \varepsilon \cup \rho \alpha, \tau \alpha ̀ \mu \varepsilon ̀ v \pi \varepsilon ́ \psi \alpha v \tau \varepsilon$, ， $\tau \alpha ̀$ ठغ̀ $\mu \alpha ́ \zeta \alpha v \tau \varepsilon \varsigma, \mu \alpha ́ \zeta \alpha \varsigma ~ \gamma \varepsilon v v \alpha i ́ \alpha \varsigma ~ к \alpha \grave{~}$ áptovৎ пою $\omega \mu \varepsilon$ ． | 97v П $\lambda \alpha ́ \tau \omega v o \varsigma ~ દ ̉ v \tau \tilde{\sim} \beta \tau \tilde{\omega} v$ <br>  <br>  $\tau \tilde{\omega} v \pi \nu \rho \tilde{\omega} v \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon u \rho \alpha, \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon ̀ v$ $\pi \varepsilon ́ \psi \alpha \nu \tau \varepsilon \varsigma, \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \delta \grave{\varepsilon} \mu \alpha ́ \zeta \alpha \nu \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$ ， <br>  $\pi о เ \omega \check{\mu \varepsilon v .}$ | Plat．R．372b 3 |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | ¢ I 12 | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  Xenophontem．Carus ut annona cara est． |  <br>  <br>  <br>  $\gamma \varepsilon ́ v \eta \tau \alpha \downarrow \alpha \npreceq \xi ́ \omega v$ őv $\tau \omega v \tau \tilde{\omega} v$ <br>  <br>  yíyvovial． | Xen．De vectigalibus 4，6，5 |
| 36r 4 ג́pктıкóя｜｜Xenophon．vóuıไદ <br>  <br>  таі̃ৎ $\alpha$ ркибл． | 113r［．．．］घỉ tò そॄvoبóvtモıov <br>  voũv．દ̌モદ <br>  <br>  <br>  | Xen．Cyr．2，4， 25 |
|  <br>  haustrum．Lucretius ut fluvios versare rotas atque haustra videmus． $\dot{\alpha} \rho u ́ t \alpha ı v \alpha$ haustorium．$\dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \varepsilon i ̃ o v ~ \tau i ́ ~ \omega ́ \varsigma ~$ $\delta \varepsilon \xi \alpha \mu \varepsilon v \eta$ ut in balneis． | 114 v haustra proprie dicuntur rotarum cadi．ab hauriendo dicti？．Lucretius ut fluvios versare rotas atque haustra videmus．кגì ópútou $\downarrow$ <br>  <br>  $\dot{\omega} \varsigma$ à $\pi$ ò $\delta \varepsilon \xi \alpha \mu \varepsilon v \eta ́ \varsigma ~ \alpha ́ \rho \nu o ́ \mu \varepsilon \theta \alpha . ~$ $\tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha ́ \lambda_{1} \sigma \tau \alpha \chi \rho \tilde{\omega} \nu \tau \alpha 1$ oi $\varepsilon$ हैV $\beta \alpha \lambda \alpha v \varepsilon$ íoı̧ $\lambda$ ооó $\mu \varepsilon$ vol．Latine？ hauritorium． | Lucr．DRN 5，517； quoted by Isid． Orig．20，15，1； Nonius De CD 1，13， 3－5 |
|  סиoчopía |  Ezvopũv．［quote］ | Xen．Cyr．5，5， 6 |
|  <br>  ó úл $\varepsilon \rho \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega v$ кópoc．apud Plutarchum． |  <br>  $\dot{\eta} \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \mu \circ v \eta \eta_{\text {к }} \kappa$ ò ó $\dot{\prime} \pi \varepsilon \rho \beta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega v$ ко́poऽ，$\mu \alpha \rho \tau \cup \rho \varepsilon і ̃ ~ \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \mu о ו \tau \tilde{\imath} \lambda$ о́ү $\omega$ Плои́тархоц．$\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega \nu ~ о и ̆ \tau \omega \varsigma . ~$ ［quote］ | Plut．De garrulitate 504d 3 |

## 4 Other marginalia

| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | $\Sigma$ I 12 | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 白ßव́кıov | 91r кגì útокорıбтıк̃̃ऽ áßóкıov． <br>  हैveotiv．［Then comes a quote from Plutarch．］ |  |
|  panus tramae involucrum quam dimininutive panuclam vocamus． unde tumor inguinum ex formae similitudine sic vocatur． |  tramae involucrum quam dimininutive panuclam vocamus．unde tumor inguinum ex forme similitudine sic vocatur． |  |
| 1v 9 дं $\gamma \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\mu} \alpha 1,-\lambda \lambda \eta,-\lambda \lambda \varepsilon \tau \alpha 1$｜｜ $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \lambda_{0} \alpha_{1}$ к $\alpha$ ì $\alpha \not \gamma \alpha \lambda_{1} \lambda_{1} \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha ı$ tò $\chi \alpha i ́ p \omega$ <br>  <br>  $\alpha{ }^{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \lambda \mu \alpha$ ． |  tò $\chi \alpha i ́ p \omega ~ \alpha ̉ \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha ́ \tau \omega \varsigma . ~$ <br>  $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \tau \iota \kappa \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ ，ö $\theta \varepsilon v$ к кì ${ }^{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \lambda \mu \alpha$ ． |  |
|  <br>  contentor | 91v tò $\varphi \backslash \lambda \tilde{\omega}, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \backslash \tau \iota \alpha \tau \iota \kappa \tilde{n} . \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \pi \tilde{\omega}$ кגі̀ tò đ̉ $\rho к о \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha ı$ סотıкท̣． contentor | Suid．$\alpha 161$ |
|  <br>  <br>  <br>  sed et amentum．unde $\alpha \mathfrak{\gamma} \kappa \cup \lambda о \tilde{u} \mu \alpha$ amento，－as et $\alpha \not \gamma \kappa \nu \lambda i ́ \zeta o \mu \alpha ı$ teneo iaculum paratum in amento． |  үóvatoc．ク̀ тои̃ $\alpha$ үк $\omega$ vos $\dot{\eta}$ <br>  <br>  бкŋทท̃ऽ тои̃ M $\omega \sigma \varepsilon ́ \omega \varsigma$ ．［．．．］ Nomen latine dicitur hoc amentum．verbum amento，－tas． ［further quotes］ | Suid．$\alpha 251$ |
| 2v 22 ápvos，ö $\theta \varepsilon v$ óı $\lambda$ úyou，－vou｜｜ <br>  <br>  <br>  $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma o u \sigma$ ． | 92r äүvoc，甲utóv．ôv kaì 入íyova <br>  ả Yóvous 兀npeĩv．兀ıvȩ̀ סغ̀ tòv $\kappa \omega \lambda u ́ \alpha v \delta \rho o v ~ \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma o u \sigma ı$ ． |  |
|  <br>  <br>  $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \tau \iota \kappa \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ ． |  <br>  кגі̀ tò $\omega v o \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha ı, \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \tau ı \kappa \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ ． ［ + Arist．quote］ |  |
|  $\mu \tilde{v} \sigma \circ \varsigma$ scelus | 92r ${ }^{\text {áyoऽ，to } \mu \text { ũбo¢ scelus }}$ |  |
|  <br>  rusticor，－aris | 92r ảץpعú $\omega$ illicio，－cis， －llexi．व̀ रүр $\alpha \cup \lambda \tilde{\omega}$ tò ह̇ $\pi^{\prime}$ व̀үpoũ <br>  |  |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | SI 12 | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \tau \alpha ı$ ó $\sigma u v \alpha \theta \rho o i ́ \zeta \omega v$ то $\lambda$ 入оѝऽ $\pi \varepsilon \rho i ̀$ غ́ $\alpha \cup \tau o ̀ v ~ \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega v ~ \tau i ́ ~ \eta ̉ ~ \pi o เ \omega ̃ v ~ к \alpha ı v o ́ \tau \varepsilon \rho o v . ~$ |  $\sigma u v \alpha \theta \rho o i ́ \zeta \omega v \pi$ то $\lambda$ 入oùs $\pi \varepsilon \rho i ̀$ <br>  kaıvótepov． |  |
| 4r $16 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega v i ́ \zeta \rho \mu \alpha 1,-\zeta n ~\| \| ~ \alpha ́ \gamma \omega v i ́ \zeta o \mu \alpha ı, ~$ <br>  غ゙тєроv $\mu \alpha \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \tau \iota \kappa \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ ，ク̋үouv к $\alpha \tau \alpha \tau \rho о \pi о и ̃ \mu \alpha 1$. |  кат $\alpha \gamma \omega v i ́ \zeta \rho \mu \alpha ı$ к $\alpha$ 文 $\tau \varepsilon \rho \circ v$ $\mu \alpha \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \tau \kappa \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ ，グүouv кат $\alpha \tau р о \pi о и ̃ \mu \alpha 1$. |  |
|  <br>  | 93r $\alpha \dot{\delta} \eta \mu 0 v \tilde{\omega}$ tò $\alpha \dot{\sigma} \chi \chi \alpha ́ \lambda \omega$ ккì $\delta \cup \sigma \varphi о \rho \tilde{\omega}$ кגі $\lambda \cup \pi о \tilde{u} \mu \alpha$ ． |  |
|  $\dot{\alpha} \delta ı \varepsilon \zeta$ ít $\eta \tau 0 \varsigma$ inexplicabilis | 93r $\mathfrak{\alpha} \delta \iota \varepsilon \zeta$ ítño̧ inexplicabilis |  |
| $5 \mathrm{r} 6 \dot{\alpha} \delta ı \kappa \tilde{\omega}$, －кعĩৎ $\\| \dot{\alpha} \delta ı к о \tilde{\mu} \mu \alpha{ }^{\text { }}$ laedor， iniuriam patior | 93v $\dot{\alpha} \delta$ Łкоũ $\mu \alpha 1,-$ кñ ledor，－deris， iniuriam patior |  |
| 5r 26 д̉ $\delta \omega \rho$ робо́кптоऽ，－ки́тоu｜｜ <br>  $\alpha i \tau 1 \alpha \tau \kappa \kappa \tilde{n}$. |  <br>  |  |
|  $\alpha i ́ \tau \iota \alpha \tau \iota k n ̃$ tò $\dot{\xi} \xi \varepsilon \cup \tau \varepsilon \lambda[i ́ \zeta \omega]$ | 94r $\dot{\alpha} \theta \varepsilon р i ́ \zeta \omega ~ \alpha i ̉ t ı \alpha \tau ı к \tilde{n}$ tò <br>  |  |
| 6r $15 \tilde{\alpha} \theta \lambda o v,-\theta \lambda o u \\| \tilde{\alpha} \theta \lambda o s ~ o ́ \alpha ~ \alpha ́ \gamma \omega ́ v, ~$ <br>  | 94r $\tilde{\alpha} \theta \lambda$ оऽ ó $\alpha \gamma \omega ́ v \dot{\alpha} \rho \sigma \varepsilon v ı \kappa \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$, $\tilde{\alpha} \theta \lambda o v \tau o ̀ ~ そ ゙ \pi \alpha \theta \lambda o v, ~ o u ́ \delta \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \omega \varsigma$ ． | Suid．a 742； Et．Gud．a 32；Phot． Lexicon $\alpha 477$ |
|  <br>  |  кגì тoũ Өpoũৎ | Suid．a 761； <br> Et．Gen．a 143； <br> Et．Gud．$\alpha 33$ |
|  <br>  Indemnis，$\theta \tilde{\omega}$ oc damnatus，$\theta \tilde{\omega}$ y $\alpha \rho$ tò $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \beta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ ，к $\alpha \grave{i} \theta \omega \grave{\eta} \eta \dot{\eta} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \beta 0 \lambda \grave{\eta}$ кхі そпиía | 94r $\dot{\alpha} \theta \tilde{\omega}$ o̧ үívetal $\dot{\alpha} \pi$ ò тoũ $\theta \tilde{\omega}$ <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  tuүxóv $\omega \mathrm{v}$ हैvoxoc． |  |
|  ह̇ $\sigma \tau$ í，tò tò̀ ỏ ó |  ỏסóvtac vapkãv． | Hsych． 1970 |
|  кïбхроррпиоби́v $\eta$ | 95r кגi «i̇бх¢ор¢пиобúvך |  |
|  <br>  pudibunditas | 95r＜ïбuvvזך入ía pudicia？ |  |
|  postulatum | 95r «ǐt $\dagger \mu \alpha$ postulatum |  |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | $\Sigma \mathrm{I} 12$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  $\dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega} v$ |  <br>  $\delta \eta \lambda$ ovótı．［＋Plato quoted］ |  |
|  $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \tau \alpha \iota ~ \mu \varepsilon ̀ v ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \alpha ̉ k \rho o ̀ v ~ \tau о \tilde{v} ~ б \iota \delta \eta ́ \rho o u ~$ $\tau \tilde{\omega} v$ oỉ $\omega v \tilde{\omega} v \beta \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega} v, \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} v \tau \varepsilon \tilde{\theta} \theta \varepsilon v \delta \varepsilon ̀ ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~$ $\pi \alpha ́ v \tau \alpha \tau \alpha ̀ ̀ \lambda \varepsilon \pi \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha \grave{~} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ̀ \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \kappa \rho \alpha$ ỏ $\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{v} \tau \alpha \tau \alpha .}$ |  $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \tau \alpha \imath ~ \mu \varepsilon ̀ v ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \alpha ̛ ́ к \rho o ̀ v ~ \tau о \tilde{v}$ $\sigma 1 \delta \eta ́ \rho o v \tau \tilde{\tau} v$ oi $\omega v \tilde{\omega} v \beta \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega} v$ ， <br>  кג̀̀ $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \alpha ̛ ́ \kappa \rho \alpha ~ o ̉ ~ そ u ́ \tau \alpha \tau \alpha . ~$ |  |
| 10r 22 व̇к $\rho \alpha \tau i ́ \zeta \omega,-\zeta \varepsilon ı \varsigma ~\| \| ~ i d ~ e s t ~ a n t e ~$ prandium aliquid comedo | 96 v significat autem aliquid comedere ante prandium ［belongs to the Latin lemma］ |  |
|  غ̇ँ $\pi$ veotikós |  |  |
| 11r $26 \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \zeta \zeta \tilde{\omega} v,-\zeta \tilde{\omega} v o \varsigma \\| \alpha \dot{\alpha}\langle ́ \mu \alpha v \tau o v$ <br>  àtápoxov． |  <br>  àtápoxov． |  |
| 11v 1 ब̈ $\lambda \alpha 1$｜｜$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \tilde{\alpha} \varsigma, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \tilde{\alpha} v \tau$ тoc lucanica， <br>  <br>  коцí乡 $\omega v$ ．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega$ кגì $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \gamma i ́ \zeta \omega$ poetice тò $\varphi p o v \tau i ́ \zeta \omega$ ．व̀ $\lambda \gamma u ́ v \omega$ ờ tò $\lambda \cup \pi \tilde{\omega}$ ． <br>  |  haec lucanica，－cae．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon ı v o ̀ s ~$ ó $\theta \varepsilon \rho \mu o ́ \varsigma . ~ \dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \alpha ̇ \lambda \varepsilon \gamma i ́ \zeta \omega ~$ <br>  $\alpha i ̈ \tau \iota \alpha \tau ı k \tilde{n}$ tò $\lambda \cup \pi \tilde{\omega} . \alpha$ à $\lambda \varepsilon$ ह́v $\omega$ <br>  <br>  коці́そ $\omega v$ ． |  |
|  $\eta$ そ̀ $\dot{\alpha}$ عí́ piscatus，－tus，piscatura， piscatoria | 97v $\dot{\alpha} \lambda$ ıモUтıкク̀，$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon$ عí piscatus， －tus |  |
|  <br>  <br>  $\pi \varepsilon \rho 1 \varphi \rho \alpha \sigma \tau 1 к \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ |  <br>  $\delta \dot{~}$ oi $\tau \tilde{\omega} v \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega v \pi \alpha \tilde{0} \delta \varepsilon \varsigma$ ，ท้ $\gamma o u v$ oi $\dot{\alpha} \lambda 1 \varepsilon i ̃ \varsigma ~ \pi \varepsilon \rho ı \varphi \rho \alpha \sigma \tau ı к \tilde{c} \varsigma . ~$ |  |
| 12r $21 \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ oт $\rho \stackrel{\omega}{\omega}\|\mid \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ol $\tilde{\omega}$ muto， <br>  $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \lambda$ nтóৎ | $98 \mathrm{r} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ol $\omega$ muto，－tas， $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda о 1 \omega \tau$ tò ó $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \lambda \eta \tau o ́ \varsigma$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ лoí $\omega \sigma \iota \varsigma$ mutatio |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | $\Sigma \mathrm{I} 12$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  غ̇к $\delta \varepsilon \delta ı n \tau \eta \mu \varepsilon ́ v o \varsigma ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \mu \grave{~ \chi ~ \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau \eta ̃ \varsigma ~}$ <br>  <br>  ö $\theta \varepsilon v$ кגì $\alpha$ ảv $\alpha \gamma \omega \gamma$ үía. | 98v ảvá $ү \omega$ үos, ó <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  oiovei $\delta u \sigma \alpha ́ \gamma \omega \gamma o v$. | cf. Hippiatrica Berolinensia 1, 10 |
| 14r $26 \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \alpha \varphi o \iota \tau \tilde{\omega} \\| \dot{\alpha} v \alpha \psi \eta \lambda \alpha \varphi \tilde{\omega}$ retracto \| $\dot{v} v \alpha \sigma к о \lambda о \pi i \zeta \omega$, tò àv $\alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \cup \rho \tilde{\omega} . \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \alpha \sigma u \rho \alpha ́ \zeta \omega ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~$ <br>  | 99r $\alpha \dot{v} \alpha \psi \eta \lambda \alpha \varphi \tilde{\omega}$ retracto àv $\alpha \sigma \kappa о \lambda о \pi i ́ \zeta \omega, \tau$ tò $\alpha v \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \cup \rho \tilde{\omega}$. ảv $\alpha \sigma u \rho \alpha ́ \zeta \omega ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \alpha ̉ v \alpha \chi \alpha ı \tau i ́ \zeta \omega ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~$ àvaкрои́ $\omega$ tòv ǐ̃ ítov. |  |
|  impudenter | 100r ảvepuӨpıáotc impudenter |  |
| 16v 15 ảv $\eta \rho \varepsilon ́ \theta \eta \eta$ ह́лì $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \mu \alpha \tau о \varsigma ~ \\| ~$ $\alpha \dot{\alpha} v \eta \beta \tilde{\omega}$, tò $\alpha v \theta \tilde{\omega} \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \sigma \varphi \rho \imath \gamma \omega \tilde{\omega} \kappa \alpha i$ $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \mu \alpha ́ \zeta \omega \omega$ adolesco, pubesco | $100 \mathrm{v} \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \eta \eta \tilde{\omega}$, tò $\alpha{ }^{\alpha} v \theta \tilde{\omega}$ к $\alpha \grave{̀}$ <br>  pubesco |  |
| 17r 10 ảvӨрокıó, -кıóc \|| a perurendo dicta | 101r pruna vero? a perurendo dicta |  |
|  flamma | 101r carbo quia flamma caret |  |
|  absurdum | 101v ảvoíkॄıov absurdum |  |
|  <br>  redibitoria actio, quam quis tenetur alteri | 103v Redibeo, -bes persimplex d? ex re- et debeo, debes. hinc redibitoria actio quaedam quam quis tenetur alteri restituere. <br>  <br>  <br>  |  |
|  <br>  $\mu \varepsilon ́ \chi \rho ı \pi \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \eta \zeta \kappa \alpha \grave{~} \theta \alpha \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \eta \varsigma ~ \delta ı \eta ́ \kappa \omega v$, ò vũv к $\alpha \lambda$ ои́ $\mu \varepsilon v o \varsigma ~ \beta \alpha \rho \delta \alpha ́ \rho ı o \varsigma . ~$ |  <br>  <br>  vũv ка入оú $\mu \varepsilon v o \varsigma ~ \beta \alpha \rho \delta \alpha ́ p ı o \varsigma . ~$ |  |
|  candor |  |  |
|  <br>  $\tau \omega ̃ v \kappa \alpha \rho \pi \tilde{\omega} v$ |  <br>  <br>  $\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \rho \pi \tilde{\omega} v$ |  |
|  minaciter |  |  |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | $\Sigma \mathrm{I} 12$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  órroos \|| dictum quod instar ignis ab amplo tendit in angustum | 106r pirus est arboris nomen. pirum vero fructus. dicitur vero pirum eo, quod instar ignis ab amplo incipiens. desinit in angustum. |  |
| 25v $26 \dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \beta \alpha i ́ v \omega\|\|\mid \dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \beta \dot{\alpha} \theta \rho \alpha$ dicitur qua conscenditur navis vel ...? |  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  |  |
|  $\dot{\alpha} \pi о ү \varepsilon \gamma \propto \lambda \alpha \kappa \tau \iota \sigma \mu \varepsilon ́ v o \varsigma$ ablactatus |  ablactatus, -ti |  |
|  |  то́тоv $\pi \varepsilon \mu \pi о ́ \mu \varepsilon v o l ~ o i ́ \kappa \tilde{\sigma} \sigma \alpha$. <br>  |  |
|  $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \tau$ ıкผ̃ lasso, -as |  $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \tau \iota \kappa \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ lasso, -ssas |  |
| 31v $\dot{\alpha} \pi о \rho \rho \alpha \pi i ́ \zeta \omega\|\mid \dot{\alpha} \pi о \sigma к \varepsilon \cup \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$, tò <br>  <br>  <br>  navis vel exoneratur. |  tò $\kappa \varepsilon v \tilde{\omega}, ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̀ v ~ o u ̃ ̃ \sigma \alpha \nu$ $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \cup \grave{\eta} v \delta 1 \alpha \lambda u ́ \omega$ ท̂ àrotíӨ $\eta \mu$. [...] toútov ह̉vavtíov, <br>  |  |
|  <br>  |  <br>  ब́ $\pi 0 \sigma \pi \alpha ́ \delta o \varsigma$ |  |
|  <br>  |  <br>  |  |
|  عứ̛́pиобтоৎ кגì $\varepsilon \tilde{̃} \pi \varepsilon \varphi \cup к \omega ́ \varsigma . ~$ | 112v đ̉p $\alpha \rho \omega ́ \varsigma . ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ к \lambda i ́ v \varepsilon \tau \alpha ı ~$ <br>  દ̇ாì $\pi \tilde{\alpha} \sigma ા v ~ \varepsilon u ̃ ̃ ~ \pi \varepsilon \varphi u \kappa \omega ́ \varsigma . ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~$ <br>  quoted] |  |
| 35v 18 ג̇pıбтعрó¢ \|| vel compransor ò $\sigma u v \alpha \rho 1 \sigma \tau \omega ̃ v \delta \eta \lambda \alpha \delta \eta ́$ | 113r compransor ó $\sigma u v \alpha \rho ı \sigma \tau \omega ̃ v$ $\delta \eta \lambda \alpha \delta \dot{n}$ |  |
|  iudex competens |  competens |  |
|  ǹ yovŋ́ |  $\dot{\alpha} \rho \sigma \varepsilon v i \kappa \omega ̃ \varsigma, \dot{\eta} \sigma \pi о \rho \alpha ́, ~ \eta \dot{~} ү ० v \eta ́ . ~ \dot{\omega} \varsigma$ tò $\lambda$ oukióveıov. [quote] |  |
|  Imperiosus, ג̀px<ıoүعvvท́s originarius, $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \varepsilon ́ y o v o \varsigma ~ o r i g i n a l i s . ~$ | 114v ג́pxıкó Imperiosus, ג $\rho \chi \propto 10 \gamma \varepsilon v \vee \eta ́ \varsigma ~ o r i g i n a r i u s, ~$ àp $\chi \varepsilon ́ \gamma o v o \varsigma ~ o r i g i n a l i s . ~$ |  |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | $\Sigma \mathrm{I} 12$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 114v бпиعıотźov бıүvó¢ороৎ |  |
| 39r 4 व̈бк $\alpha \lambda$ оऽ $\\|$ वं $\sigma \kappa \alpha \rho \delta \alpha \mu \cup \kappa \tau i ́$ intentis oculis | 115 v व̇бк $\alpha \rho \delta \alpha \mu \nu \kappa \tau$ í intentis oculis |  |
|  ठعĩлvov quod sine datione symboli <br>  |  <br>  $\pi \rho о$ ĩк $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu i ̃ v ~ \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \tau \imath \theta \varepsilon ́ \mu \varepsilon v o v$. <br>  <br>  $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \varepsilon \tau \alpha_{1}[. .$. |  |
| 40v 15 人̇ $\sigma \chi \eta \mu о \sigma ט ́ v \eta ~\|\mid ~ \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \chi \alpha ́ \lambda \omega$ ，тò $\lambda \cup \pi \frac{\tilde{u} \mu \alpha 1 \text { ．}}{}$ |  |  |
|  $\alpha \not \approx \tau \mu \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ ठغ̀ tò $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \varphi \rho \circ \vee \tilde{\omega}$ ． |  $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \mu \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ ठغ̀ tò $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \varphi \rho \circ \vee \tilde{\omega}$ ． <br>  | Suid．$\alpha 4363$ |
| 42r 20， 21 аủ入ŋ́，$\mu \varepsilon ́ \sigma \alpha u \lambda o v$｜｜$\alpha \cup ̉ \lambda i ́ \delta ı v ~$ atriolum | 117 v aủ $\mathrm{n}^{\text {ń }}$ ¢ov atriolum |  |
|  то́тоऽ $\\|$ 甲а́раүद | 117v бпиعıотદ́ov ¢о́poүү |  |
|  <br>  <br>  | 118r $\alpha$ ű $\xi \omega$ к $\alpha \grave{~ \alpha u ̉ ~}{ }^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} v \omega$ tò $\alpha$ <br>  $\mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \tau \iota \kappa \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ ． |  |
|  | 118r <br> ¢ |  |
|  transfuga，qui per se venit．$\mu o ́ \lambda \omega$ vado． | 118r đủтo $\quad$ ó ${ }^{\prime}$ oc hic transfuga， －gae，perfuga，－gae |  |
|  |  |  |
| 44r $23 \dot{\alpha} \varphi \theta$ oví $\\| \dot{\alpha} \varphi \theta \varepsilon \gamma \xi i ́ \alpha$ infantia， mutitas | 119r $\alpha$ ¢ $\theta \varepsilon \gamma \xi$ ¢́a infantia，mutitas |  |
|  spuma nitri | 119v afronitrum grece．Latine spuma nitri est．colligitur autem in asia．in speluncis distillans．［．．．］ |  |
| 46r 15 ả $\psi i ́ c, ~ \alpha ́ ~ \psi i ́ \delta o \varsigma ~\| \| ~ F o r f i c e s ~ f i l o r u m ~$ sunt，quibus sartores utuntur． forpices pilorum quibus tonsores． forcipes vero fabrorum sunt a capiendo formo，idest calido． | 120v Forfices ．．．etymologia ．．．f ponitur，forfices et sunt sartorum．si a pilo p ut forpices et sunt tonsorum．si a capiendo c ut forcipes quod formum capiant et sunt fabrorum． forum vero antiqui dixere calidum． |  |

## X

## A Group of Marginal Notes from Another Textual Tradition Collation

## 1 Marginal notes in agreement with all three codices (partly or completely)

| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $12^{v} 12 \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha ́ v \omega$ pecco non potior $\\| \mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega v$ $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \eta ́ \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha 1$ \| e(r)ro | $12^{2}$ pecco vel erro non potior $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega v$ ג̀ $\mu \alpha \rho \tau \eta ́ \sigma о \mu \alpha 1$ | $1^{\text {r }}$ pecco, erro non potior $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \eta ́ \sigma \omega$ | $16^{v}$ pecco erro non potior $\mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega v$ <br>  |
| $12^{v} 17$ व̈́ $\mu \alpha \chi{ }^{\circ}$ ऽ inexpugnabilis \|| Imbellis vel | $12^{v}$ inexpugnabilis et imbellis | $1^{r}$ inexpugnabilis inbellis | $16^{v}$ <br> inexpugnabilis imbellis |
| $12^{\vee} 25 \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon$ íßo $\mu \alpha ı$ alterno \|| reddo, retribuo, ad i(n)vice(m) r(espo)nd(e)o | tra(n)seo, remuno(r), par pa(r)i refero | $13^{r}$ retribuo adinvicem respondeo reddo (ả $\mu$ zíßouкı lemma); transeo ambulo permuto reprehendo retribuo ( $\alpha \mu \varepsilon i ́ \beta \omega$ lemma) | $1^{v}$ retribuo ad invicem respondeo reddo | $17^{r}$ retribuo adinvicem respondeo reddo |
| $13^{r} 11$ ä $\mu \pi \omega \tau \iota \varsigma$ redundatio <br>  $\pi \lambda n ́ \mu \mu v \rho \alpha$ | $14^{\mathrm{r}}$ gurges, $\lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \xi_{1} \varsigma \eta{ }^{\eta}$ $\xi \eta \rho \alpha \sigma \dot{\alpha}$ ท̂ $\pi \lambda \eta n_{\mu} \mu \nu \rho \alpha$ | $2^{v}$ gurges, inde ג̀ $\mu \pi \omega \tau i \zeta \omega$ ingurgito | 18r gurges; $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \xi 1 \varsigma$ <br>  $\pi \lambda$ ń $\mu \mu \nu \rho \alpha$ |
| $13^{r} 26 \dot{\alpha} \mu \varphi \iota \sigma \beta \eta \tau \tilde{\omega}$ discepto dubito \|| mihi aliq(uid) ve(n)dico, delib(er)o | $14^{r}$ dubito delibero mihi vendico decreto | $2^{\text {r }}$ dubito, delibero, mihi vendico, decerto simul | $18^{r}$ dubito delibero mihi vendico decreto |
| $13^{v} 14 \dot{\alpha} v \alpha \theta$ opẽ exilio \|| $\mathrm{s}(\mathrm{u})$ bito surgo, prosilio \| $\mathrm{cu}(\mathrm{m}) \mathrm{q}(\mathrm{ui}) \mathrm{scu}(\mathrm{m})$ impetu excitat(ur) | $16^{r}$ subito surgo prosilio cum quis impetu excitatur | $3^{r}$ subito surgo prosilio | $21^{r}$ subito surgo prosilio |
| $14^{r} 1 \dot{\alpha} v \alpha ́ \theta \nexists \eta \mu \alpha$ donarium \|| aedificium publicum | oblatio, res oblata deis et suspensa | $16^{r}$ donaria res oblata diis et suspensa edificium publicum | $3^{r}$ donaria res oblata deis et suspensa hedificium publicum | 20v donaria res oblata diis ac suspensa edificium publicum |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  \|| discutio, recenseo, Indago | $16^{\mathrm{v}}$ discutio recenseo indago interrogo | $3^{r}$ discutio recenseo indago interrogo | $21^{\text {r }}$ discutio recenseo indago interrogo |
| $14^{r} 4$ ब̉v $\alpha \lambda$ í́rk $\omega$ consumo \|| expendo, capio | $16^{v}$ expendo consumo capio | $\begin{aligned} & 3^{r} \text { expenso } \\ & \text { consumo capio } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $21^{v}$ expendo capio consumo |
| $14^{\mathrm{r}} 10 \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \alpha \pi \tau v ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ aperio declaro patefacio \|| Implico, explico, replico | retro applico, exte(n)do, revolvo | $17^{\mathrm{r}}$ aperio implico replico raro aplico exetendo patefacio revolvo | $4^{r}$ implico explico replico aperio applico extendo patefacio revolvo | $22^{r}$ aperio implico replico extendo patefacio revolvo |
| $14^{r} 13 \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \alpha \rho \rho ı \chi \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha{ }^{2}$ surrepo \|| agrappo $\mathrm{ma}(\mathrm{n}) \mathrm{ib}(\mathrm{us})$ ascendendo mu(rum) | $17^{v}$ agrappo manibus scandendo murum | $4^{r}$ aggrappo cum manibus sicut scandedno murum | $22^{\wedge}$ nitor vel ascendum(?) murum |
| $14^{r} 20 \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \alpha \sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ contineo \|| rep(ri)mo, repello, ret(ra)ho $\mid \mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) 1$ remitto, attollo, elevo | $17^{v}$ deprimo repello retraho vel remitto atollo elevo | $\begin{aligned} & 4^{\mathrm{r}} \text { reprimo repello } \\ & \text { retraho remitto } \\ & \text { attollo elevo } \end{aligned}$ | $22^{v}$ deprimo repello elevo retraho remitto |
| $14^{r} 22$ ảvátaбø૮̧ increpatio \|| v(e)l extensio, inge(n)s $\mathrm{co}(\mathrm{m})$ minatio | $18^{\text {r }}$ cominatio ingens | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4^{v} \text { comminatio } \\ & \text { ingens } \end{aligned}$ | $23^{r}$ comminatio ingens |
| $14^{r} 23$ ảv $\alpha \tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \pi \omega$ refello \\|| $\mathrm{s}(\mathrm{u})$ bverto, retroverto \| et mutat $\varepsilon$ in $\alpha$ in ỏopíot $\omega$ $\pi \alpha \theta(\eta \tau \iota \kappa) \tilde{\omega}$ | $18^{r}$ subverto retroverto et mutat è in ā | $4^{\mathrm{v}}$ subverto reverto | $23^{r}$ subverto retroverto |
|  inconsultus \|| Indiscuss(us) | $18^{r}$ supervenio indiscussus | $4^{v}$ indiscussus | $23^{v}$ indiscussus |
| $15^{\circ} 20$ äveबા̧ requies remissio otium \|| dissolutio | $18^{r}$ dissolutio remissio requies | $4^{v}$ dissolutio remissio requies | $23^{v}$ dissolutio remissio requies |
| $16^{v} 8$ ảvŋ́к $\kappa \omega$ pertineo attineo \|| asce(n)do, (con)tingo, (con)ve(n)io | $19^{r}$ contingo convenio | $5^{\mathrm{v}}$ ascendo oportet convenio contingo | $24^{\text {v }}$ ascendo |
| $17^{\vee} 8$ ávín $\mu ı$ relaxo remitto lenem facio \|| <br>  dissolvo, effero \| emitto |  dissolvo effero emitto | $5^{v}$ dissolvo effero emicto, áópiotos ふ் $ท \check{\kappa \alpha ~}$ | $24^{v}$ dissolvo effero emitto; ג́ópıттos $\alpha v \eta ̃ \kappa \alpha ~$ |
| $17^{v} 16$ ảví $\sigma x \omega$ orior II emineo \| oborio(r) | $19^{r}$ emino orior oborior | $5^{\text {v }}$ orior aborior | $24^{r}$ emineo orior oborior |
| $18^{r} 4$ ảvoíy $\omega$ patefacio $\\|$ ab oîץ $\omega$ q(uo)d no(n) e(st) i(n) usu \| recip(i)t $\varepsilon$ in augm(en)tis | $19^{r}$ aperio ab oíy $\omega$ quod non est in usu, recipit e in augmentis | $5^{v}$ aperio ab oǐy $\omega$ quod non est in usu, recipit e in augmentis | $25^{r}$ aperio ab oíy w quod non est in usu |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $18^{r} 24$ ảvox ${ }^{\text {n }}$ laxamentum \|| $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) 1$ toleran(ti)a | $19^{\text {v }}$ tollerantia | $6^{\text {r }}$ tollerantia | $25^{\text {r }}$ tolerantia |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 18^{v} 1 \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \tau \alpha i ́ \rho \omega \\ \text { (contra)elevo rebello \|\| } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $20^{\text {v }}$ contra elevo | $6^{r}$ contra elevo | $26^{r}$ contra elevo |
| $18^{v} 20$ ảv $\tau \varepsilon \xi \varepsilon \tau \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ confero \| comp(ar)o, assimilo | $21^{r}$ comparo assimilo | $6^{\mathrm{v}}$ comparo assimilo | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 26^{v} \text { comparo } \\ \text { assimilo } \end{array}$ |
|  $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) 1$ Innito(r), Inhaereo, àvโยบยрүยтıкó relato(r) b(e)n(e)ficio(rum) | $20^{v}$ immutor inhereo | $6^{v}$ imitor inhereo | $\begin{aligned} & 26^{v} \text { innitor } \\ & \text { inhereo } \end{aligned}$ |
| $19^{v} 21$ àvtíkvク́ulov tibia pedis \|| pars (con)tra sura(m) pedis $\mid$ il fusolo della ga(m)ba | $19^{v}$ pars contra suram il fuso della gamba | $6^{v}$ pars contra suram, fusus? | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 26^{v} \text { pars contra } \\ \text { suram il fuso } \\ \text { della ghamba } \end{array}$ |
| 19² 24 áv $\tau \iota \kappa \rho$ v́ adversus contra \|| pala(m), cora(m) | $22^{\text {v }}$ palam coram | $6^{v}$ ex posito contra palam | $26^{r}$ ex opposito contra palam adverbium |
| $19^{\vee} 25 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \imath \lambda \alpha ́ \mu \beta \alpha v o \mu \alpha ı$ suspicio affecto \|| rep(re)he(n)do, (contra)dico v(e)1 | $20^{\circ}$ reprehendo contradico | $6^{v}$ reprehendo contradico | $26^{v}$ reprehendo contradico |
|  affecto \|| $\alpha$ itı $\alpha \tau \iota \kappa \tilde{n}$ \| үعvikñ att(ri)buo, vendico, a(r)rogo | et rependo | $20^{v}$ vendico adipiscor | $6^{r}$ vendico adipiscor | $26^{r}$ vendico adipiscor |
| $21^{r} 2$ ávtítutov tò íoóturov exemplar \|| $\mathrm{si}(\mathrm{mi})$ lis formae $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) \mathrm{l}$ (contra)riu(m) | $21^{\mathrm{r}}$ similis forme vel contrarium | $6^{v}$ similis forme vel contrarius | $26^{v}$ similis formae vel contrarium |
| $21^{r} 3$ ảv $\tau \iota \tau$ út $\omega$ repercutio <br>  contra signo | $21^{r}$ contrasigno (ảv $\tau \iota \tau \cup \pi \varepsilon ́ \omega$ lemma) | $6^{v}$ contra signo (ảv $\tau \iota \tau \cup \pi \varepsilon ́ \omega$ lemma) | $26^{v}$ contra signo (ảv $\iota \iota \tau \pi \varepsilon ́ \omega$ lemma) |
|  fictus \|| simplex | $19^{v}$ simplex | $6^{r}$ sinplex | ${ }^{25}{ }^{r}$ simplex |
| $21^{v} 13 \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \omega \mu \alpha \lambda$ í $\alpha$ inconstantia inaequalitas \|| irreg(u)laritas | $19^{v}$ inequalitas inregularitas | $6^{r}$ inequalitas irregularitas | $25^{v}$ irregularitas inaequalitas |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $21^{\vee} 23$ à ívn $^{2}$ dolabra \\| accepta v(e)l alius gladius v(e)l | securis, ascia | $23^{r}$ rò $\delta \rho$ ह́t $\alpha$ vov securis bipennis accetta?; l'ascia la mannaia (Gr. lemma twice) | $8^{r}$ dolabrum securis bipennis | $29^{r}$ l'ascia, bipennis la mannaia |
| $22^{r} 15 \dot{\alpha} \xi$ ı $\tilde{\omega}$ dignor $\\|$ dignu(m) puto, dignifico, rogo, peto | $22^{v}$ dignum puto dignifico rogo peto | $7^{v}$ dignum puto dignifico peto rogo | $29^{r}$ dignum puto dignifico |
| $22^{r} 17$ ä́ $\xi \omega \mathrm{\omega}$ axis $\|\mid \mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) 1$ tabella i(n) q(ua) antiq(ui)t (us) scribebat(ur) | $23^{r}$ exis et pro tabella antiquitus scribebatur | $8^{r}$ axis protabella antiquitus sculpebatur | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 29^{r} \text { axis et pro } \\ \text { tabella } \end{array}$ |
| $22^{2} 20$ д̇oí $\delta$ ıиоs memorabilis \|| sempit(er)n(us), celebris, decantat(us) | $23^{r}$ sempiternus celebratus celebris | $8^{r}$ sempiternus celebris | $29^{v}$ sempiternus |
| $22^{\text {r }} 21$ גُо́ккทтоऽ inhabitabilis \|| solitari(us), solitudo | $23^{r}$ inhabitabilis solitarius solitudo | $8^{r}$ inhabitabilis solitarius | $29^{v}$ inhabitabilis solitarius |
|  renuncio \|| p (ro)p(ri)e $\mathrm{i}(\mathrm{n})$ dicen(d)o \| desp(er)o, defatigo(r), recuso $\mid \mathrm{p}$ (ro) hibeo | $23^{v}$ defatigor denego non tollero interdico despero deficio | $8^{r}$ defatigor denego non tollero interdico despero deficio renuo | $30^{r}$ defatigor denego interdico non tolero despero deficio |
| $22^{v} 9 \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha^{\gamma} \gamma \omega$ abduco \|| abigo v(e)l accuso c(ri) $m(i n)$ is | 23 ${ }^{\text {v }}$ adduco vel abigo | $8^{\text {r }}$ adduco abigo | $30^{r}$ abigo abduco |
|  Invict(us) | $23^{v}$ invictus | $8^{v}$ invictus | $30^{\text {r }}$ invictus |
| $22^{\text {¹ }} 16 \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha 1 \delta \varepsilon u \sigma_{i ́ \alpha ~ r u d i t a s ~\| \| ~}^{\text {\|\| }}$ procacitas linguae vel | $23^{\text {r }}$ procacitas linguae | $8^{r}$ procacitas lingue | $29^{\vee}$ procacitas linguae |
| $22^{*} 19$ à $\pi \alpha$ í́óo̧ infaustus \|| Inde(c)ens | ext(erri)bilis | $24^{r}$ infaustum indecens exhorribile (à $\dot{\pi} \alpha i ́ \sigma$ ıov lemma) | $8^{v}$ infaustum indecens exarrabile? ( $\alpha \pi \alpha$ íciov lemma) | $30^{\vee}$ infaustum indecens inexorabile <br>  lemma) |
| $23^{r} 6 \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha v \alpha ı \sigma \chi \cup v \tau \tilde{\omega}$ depudeo \|| inverecu(n)de facio | $23^{v}$ inverecunde facio | $8^{v}$ inverecunde facio | $30^{v}$ inverecunde facio |
| $23^{v} 12 \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \alpha \rho \chi \eta ́$ delibatio incohatio \|| p(ri)mitia | $23^{v}$ primitia la decima | $8^{v}$ primitia la decima | $30^{r}$ primitiae ladecima |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | Vat．Pal．Gr． 194 | EK Cod．Gr． 4 | Res． 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br>  $\pi \rho о \sigma \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \omega \tilde{v}$ delibo imbuo｜｜do p（ri）mitias sacrifico d（e）monibus ut $\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{ri})(\mathrm{us})$ gentiles | $23^{v}$ do primitias sacrifico demonibus ut gentiles | $8^{v}$ do primitias sacrifico demonibus ut solebat antiquitas | $30^{\circ}$ do primitias daemonibus sacrifico |
|  $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) 1 \mathrm{infinit}(\mathrm{us})$ | $24^{v}$ inexpertus， infinitus | $8^{v}$ infinitus | $31^{\text {r }}$ infinitus |
| $24^{r} 25 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon เ \rho о к \alpha \lambda i ́ \alpha ~ \eta \dot{~}$ тои̃ <br>  infrunitas｜｜s（i）n（e） pulchritudi（n）e， （contra）stio re（rum） viliu（m），inutilis indagato（r）， vilitas，inexplebilitas | $24^{v}$ contrastio rerum vilium inutilis indagatio vilitas insolentia | $9^{r}$ sine pulcritudine et quesitio rerum vilium insolentia inutilis indagatio vilitas | $31^{v}$ sine pulchritudine quaesitio rerum vilium insolentia iniutilis indagatio |
| $26^{r} 2 \dot{\alpha} \pi \mathrm{~m} \beta$ 人́á $\lambda \lambda \omega$ depello respuo reiicio｜｜v（e）l amitto，p（er）do | $25^{r}$ depello respuo reiicio perdo | $9^{7}$ perdo（marg． dex．） | $31^{v}$ perdo |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 26^{\mathrm{r}} 7 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \pi \omega \text { aspicio \|\| } \\ \text { ven(er)or } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $24^{\mathrm{V}}$ respicio veneror | $9^{\text {v }}$ respirio veneror | $31^{v}$ respicio veneror |
| $26^{\text {r }} 9$ à $\pi$ oßo入ń iactura repulsa amissio｜｜ depo（s）itio | $24^{v}$ dispositio | $9^{\mathrm{v}}$ depositio | $31^{v}$ dispositio |
| $34^{v} 12 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \rho \alpha \beta \omega ́ v$ arra｜｜ pign（us） | $31^{\text {r }}$ pignus | $13^{v}$ pignus | $39^{\text {r }}$ arra pignus |
| 人́perkos el comprare（n） te／compiace（n）te？， assentato（r） | 30r ápeбtó̧ кגì äргбкоऽ | ${ }^{13}$ r placidus； ג̈ргбкоs | $38^{v}$ placidus； äproкоऽ |
|  p（ri）nceps rei cui（us）－ pia（m），origo｜recto（r） | $31^{r}$ rector auctor princeps rei cuiuspiam | $14^{\mathrm{r}}$ rector auctor princeps origo | 39v dux magistratus princeps |
|  $\mathrm{s}(\mathrm{u})$ bdit（us）su（m）｜pareo | $31^{r}$ incipio subditus sum | $14^{r}$ incipio subditus sum | $39^{v}$ subditus sum inchoor |
| $38^{r} 16$ ä $p \chi \omega$ impero praesum $\\| \mathrm{p}$（ri） $\mathrm{m}(\mathrm{us})$ facio， d（omi）nor，p（ri）ncipor | $31^{r}$ primus facio dominor principior | $14^{r}$ primus facio dominor principor | $39^{v}$ primus facio dominor |
| $41^{r} 11$ ät $\varepsilon \lambda$ ท́ऽ，$\dot{o}$ $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda$ и́p $\omega \tau$ тоц incompletus｜｜ $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e})$ inutilis | $34^{v}$ immunis inutilis | $16^{r}$ immunis inutilis | $43^{v}$ immunis inutilis |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | Vat．Pal．Gr． 194 | EK Cod．Gr． 4 | Res． 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $41^{\vee} 2 \dot{\alpha} \tau \mu i ́ \zeta \omega$ vaporo $\\|$ scateo，exhalo，fumo， coquo | $35^{r}$ scateo exalo fumo coquo vaporo | $16^{v}$ scateo exalo fumo coquo vaporo | $44^{r}$ scateo exalo vaporo fumo |
| $41^{\vee} 22$ àtuxńs infelix｜｜ Impos voti | $34^{v}$ infortunatus impos voti | $16^{\mathrm{r}}$ inpos voti | $44^{r}$ infortunatus impos veri |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 42^{r} 9 \text { aủ } \theta \dot{́ v} v \eta \zeta ~ a u c t o r ~ \\| ~ \\ \text { d(omi)n(u)s } \end{array}$ | $35^{\mathrm{v}}$ dominus auctor | $17^{\text {r }}$ dominus auctor | $45^{r}$ dominus auctor |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 42^{r} 13 \alpha \dot{v} \theta \varepsilon v \tau \tilde{\omega} \text { auctoro \|\| } \\ \text { d(omi)nor } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $35^{\text {v }}$ dominor | $17^{\mathrm{r}}$ dominor | $45^{\text {r }}$ dominor |
| $42^{\mathrm{r}} 17 \alpha \tilde{v}^{\lambda} \lambda \alpha$ sulcus cura ｜｜rivus | $36^{\text {r }}$ sulcus rivus | $17^{\text {r }}$ sulcus rivus | $45^{r}$ sulcus rivus |
| $42^{\vee} 18$ đủtópкทऽ contentus $\\| \mathrm{p}(\mathrm{er})$ se sufficie（ n$)$ s | $36^{\text {r }}$ sufficiens per se | $17^{v}$ sufficiens per se | $45^{v}$ per se sufficiens |
| $43^{r} 1$ aútó $\theta \varepsilon$ v inde de eodem loco｜｜ex se et illi（n）c et huc | $36^{\mathrm{r}}$ ex se et illinc | $17^{v}$ ex se illinc | $45^{v}$ ex se illinc |
|  imperator｜｜q（ui）p（er）se p（otes）t | $36^{\text {r }}$ qui per se potest | $17^{\mathrm{v}}$ qui per se potest | $45^{v}$ qui per se potest |
| $43^{r} 10 \alpha$ ủto $\mu о \lambda \tilde{\omega}$ transfugio ｜｜insalutato hospite recedo ｜वủtó $\mu$ òos transfuga， $q($ ui）p（er）se venit．$\mu o ́ \lambda \omega$ vado． | $36^{r}$ transfugio insalutato hospite recedo； «ủtónoخos transfuga | $17^{v}$ transfugo insalutato hospite recedo； <br>  transfuga | $45^{\vee}$ transfugio inslautato hospite recedo （ $\alpha$ ủtouo入оүદ́ $\omega$ lemma）； «útó $\mu$ о入os transfuga |
|  oculis extemplo｜｜forma d（i）grossata， <br>  | $36^{r}$ forma d（i）grossata， бх£ | $17^{v}$ forma digrossata， бxıঠıáそ $\omega$ digrosso | $45^{\vee}$ forma digrossata； <br>  digrosso |
| $43^{r} 15$ גủtoupyós auctor rei $\\|$ artifex et p（er）se $\mathrm{ip}(\mathrm{su}) \mathrm{m}$ faciens | $36^{r}$ artifex et per seipsum faciens | $17^{v}$ artifex et per se ipsum faciens | $45^{v}$ artifex naturalis per se ipsum faciens |
| $43^{v} 9 \dot{\alpha} \varphi \alpha v_{i ́ \zeta}{ }^{\omega} \omega$ depravo disparere facio｜｜et p （ro）dispareo ip（s）e，ut $\Xi \varepsilon v o \varphi \tilde{v} v \mid$ aufero d（e） re（rum）n（atur）a，deleo | $37^{r}$ aufero de rerum natura non appareo destruo deleo facio disparere | $18^{v}$ aufero de rerum natura non appareo destruo deleo facio disparere | $46^{v}$ aufero de rerum natura non appareo deleo defero？ |
| $43^{v} 18$ д̈ $\varphi \varepsilon \gamma \gamma \eta q^{\prime}$ illuminatus ｜｜s（i）n（e）lumi（n）e | $37^{r}$ sine lumine | $18^{v}$ sine lumine | $47^{r}$ sine lumine |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | Vat．Pal．Gr． 194 | EK Cod．Gr． 4 | Res． 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $44^{r} 6 \dot{\alpha} \varphi \eta \gamma о$ ũ $\mu \propto ı$ enarro｜｜ expono，p（rae）sum，su（m） intent（us） | $37^{r}$ sum intentus narro expono presum | $18^{v}$ sum intentus narro expono | $\begin{array}{\|l} 47^{\mathrm{r}} \text { sum intentus } \\ \text { narro expono } \\ \text { praesum } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $44^{v} 3 \dot{\alpha} \varphi$ íס $\rho \cup \mu \alpha$ delubrum simulacrum｜｜statua，situs | $37^{v}$ statua，situs | $18^{\mathrm{v}}$ statua situs | $47^{\text {r }}$ statua situs |
| $44^{v} 5$ ふ́ $\varphi$ ín $\mu \mathrm{l}$ omitto｜｜ dimitto et admitto | $37^{v}$ demitto dimitto vel amitto | $18^{\mathrm{v}}$ dimicto admicto | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 47^{\mathrm{r}} \text { dimitto } \\ \text { amitto } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $44^{v} 6 \dot{\alpha} \varphi$ เкvои̃ $\mu \propto ı$ pervenio proficiscor｜｜ab グк $\begin{gathered}\text { venio，}\end{gathered}$ $q(u o) d$ in compositione mutat H in I |  | $18^{v}$ advenio ab $\eta ँ \kappa \omega$ venio mutatur $\eta 1$ in compositione | $47^{\mathrm{r}}$ advenio；ทัк $\omega$ venio |
| $\begin{aligned} & 44^{v} 13 \text { ä } \varphi \iota \xi ı \text { ı profectio \\| } \\ & \text { access(us) } \end{aligned}$ | $37^{7}$ accessus | $18^{\text {v }}$ accessus | $47^{\text {r accessus }}$ |
| $44^{\vee} 14 \dot{\alpha} \varphi$ ím $\tau \alpha \mu \alpha ı$ avolo <br>  <br>  |  <br>  ब̊ $\pi \varepsilon \pi \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$ ［Lat．vacat］ | $18^{\vee}$ volo；đ́ópıotos <br>  $\beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \pi \tau \alpha \dot{\mu} \mu \eta v$ | $47^{r}$ áópıotos ब̈лદ́ $\pi \tau \eta \nu$ ， d́ópıotos $\beta$ ג̇ $\pi \varepsilon \pi \tau \alpha ́ \alpha ́ \mu \nu$ ［Lat．vacat］ |
| $44^{\vee} 15$＠̀ $\varphi$ í $\tau \tau \mu \alpha \downarrow$ abscedo obsto｜｜$\dot{\alpha} \varphi i ́ \sigma \tau \eta \mu ı$ descisco， d（e）ficio est rebello，et absum，abscedo｜abstineo | $37^{v}$ rebellans facio et absum（ $\alpha \varphi$ í $\sigma \tau \eta \mu \mathrm{l}$ lemma） | $18^{v}$ rebellare facio absum（à $\varphi$ í $\sigma \tau \eta \mu$ ı lemma） | $47^{r}$ rebellare facio vel absum （ $\dot{\alpha} \varphi$ íotnul lemma） |
| 45r 5 वं $\varphi 0 \sigma 1 \tilde{\omega}$ scelero devoveo｜｜expio | $37^{7}$ expio | $19^{\mathrm{r}}$ expio | $47^{\mathrm{v}}$ expio |
|  Imm（en）s（us），stupor（e） plen（us） $\mid$ v（e）l vast（us） | $38^{\vee}$ vastus immensus stupore plenus | $\begin{array}{\|l} 19^{\mathrm{v}} \text { vastus } \\ \text { immensus stupore } \\ \text { plenus } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 48^{\mathrm{v}} \text { vastus } \\ \text { immensus } \\ \text { stupore plenus } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $45^{v} 11$ á $\chi \lambda$ ús，－$\chi \lambda$ úóc caligo ｜｜nebula | $38^{v}$ caligo nebula | $19^{v}$ caligo nebula | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 48^{v} \text { caligo } \\ \text { nebula } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  spurcus nugator｜｜Inutilis | $38^{v}$ inutilis | $19^{v}$ inutilis | $48^{v}$ inutilis |
| $45^{v} 19$ ӓ $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau о \varsigma$ incommodus｜｜rudis｜ Inutil（is） | $38^{v}$ rudis inutilis et absque usu im．．？ | $19^{\mathrm{v}}$ rudis inutilis inusitatus | $48^{\vee}$ rudis inutilis inusitatus |
| $46^{r} 13 \dot{\alpha} \psi \iota \mu \alpha \chi \tilde{\omega}$ iurgo｜｜ scaramuccio | $38^{v}$ scaramuccio | $20^{r}$ scharamuccio | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 49^{r} \\ \text { scharamuccio } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $46^{r} 14 \dot{\alpha} \psi \iota \mu \alpha$ í $\alpha$ iurgium｜｜ scaramuccia | $39^{\text {r }}$ scaramuccia | 20 ${ }^{\text {r la scharamuccia }}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 49^{r} \\ \text { scharamuccia } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $46^{r} 20$ á $\omega$ pos immaturus intempestivus \|| acerb(us), Indece(n)s, deformis | $39^{r}$ indecens | $20^{r}$ deformis intempestivus | $49^{\text {r }}$ deformis intempestivus; indecens et vel ஹ̉ $\mu$ ó (Gr. lemma twice) |
| $46^{r} 26 \beta \alpha \beta \alpha i ́$ babae, at at \|| $\operatorname{adv}($ erbium ) admirantis, vel papae | $39^{r}$ adverbium admirantis vel? pape | $20^{r}$ adverbium admirandi vel pape | $49^{v}$ adverbium admirantis vel papae |
| $46^{v} 5 \beta \alpha \dot{\theta} \theta \rho o v \mathrm{sca}(\mathrm{m})$ num, $\mathrm{s}(\mathrm{u})$ bselliu( m ) \|| fundam(en)tum, imae sed(e)s |il pie d(e)l desco | $39^{r}$ fundamentis et ime sedes | $20^{r}$ fundamentum et ime sedes gradus el pie del desco | $49^{\mathrm{v}}$ <br> fundamentum et imae sedes elpie del descho |
| $46^{v} 8 \beta \alpha \theta$ úv $\omega$ exalto $\\| p$ (ro) fundu( $m$ ) facio \| exaugeo | $39^{r}$ profundum facio augeo | $20^{r}$ profundo facio augeo | 49 profundum facio augeo |
| $46^{v} 17 \beta \alpha \lambda \alpha v \varepsilon$ v́c balneato(r) \|| custos balnei | $39^{v}$ custos balnei | $20^{v}$ custos balnei | $49^{v}$ custos balnei |
| $46^{v} 20$ ßá ${ }^{2}$ avos glans \|| granu(m) | et v(e)l nux apud nos | $39^{v}$ glans et vel nux apud nos | $20^{v}$ glans et vel nux apud vos | $49^{v}$ glans et vel nux apud nos |
| $46^{\vee} 21 \beta \alpha \lambda \alpha ́ v \tau \tau 10 v$ sacculus \|l tò $\mu \alpha \rho \sigma$ útiov | $39^{\text {v }}$ marsupium | $20^{\vee}$ marsupium tò $\mu \alpha p o u ́ m i o v ~ i d e m ~$ | $49^{v}$ marsupium |
| $47^{r} 2$ ßáv $\alpha$ vooc arrogans \|| ve(n)tosus | mechanic(us), marinal(is) artifex, m(er)cenari(us) | $39^{v}$ marinalis artifix mecanicus? | $20^{\circ}$ navalis artifex meccanicus mercenarius | $49^{v}$ manualis [marinalis] artifex mercenarius |
| $47^{\mathrm{r}} 11$ ßápos moles, gravam(en) \|| pondus onus | $39^{v}$ onus gravitas pondus | $20^{v}$ onus gravitas pondus | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 49^{v} \text { onus } \\ \text { gravitas } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $47^{\text {r }} 20 \beta \alpha \sigma \alpha v i ́ \zeta \omega$ crucio, to(r)q(ue)o, coherceo \|| to(r)me(n)to q(ua)n(do) aliq(ui)d scir(e) volo, p(ro)bo | $39^{\text {v }}$ examino tormento quando aliquid scire volo probo | $20^{\circ}$ examino tormento quando aliquid scire volo probo | $50^{r}$ exanimo tormento probo |
| $47^{r} 23 \beta \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \alpha v o \varsigma q(u a e) s t i o$, cruciat(us) \|| <br> $\exp (e r)$ ien(ti)a, <br> approba(ti)o, Index, il <br> paragone | $39^{v}$ experientia index il paragone tormentum | $20^{v}$ experientia index il paragone tormentum approbatio | $50^{r}$ experientia index approbatio tormentum |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $47^{\vee} 2 \beta \alpha \sigma$ í 1 عıov regia, Imp(er)iu(m) \|| signum regale | $39^{\text {v }}$ regia signum regale | $20^{v}$ regia signum regale | $50^{r}$ regia signum regale |
| $47^{\vee} 12$ ßóøıя \|| basis, gressio, et cant(us) metri | $39^{v}$ basis gressus et cantus metri | $20^{\circ}$ basis gressio et cantus metri | $50^{r}$ basis gressio |
| $47^{v} 13 \beta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha i ́ v \omega$ fascino, Invideo \|| p(er) Invidia(m) auf(er)o | $39^{v}$ fascino odio per invidiam aufero | $20^{\vee}$ fascino odio per invidiam aufero | $50^{r}$ odio fascino per invidiam aufero |
| $47^{\vee} 20$ ßótoç rubus, ruscus \|| s(ignifica)t et(iam), locu(m) facile(m) transitu | vas olei, cad(us), rubetum | $40^{r}$ rubus rubetum tò $\beta$ átıov per diminutionem | $21^{r}$ rubus rubetum tò $\beta$ átıov per diminutionem vas olei cadus | $50^{r}$ rubus rubetum; tò $\beta$ átıov diminutivum |
| $48^{r} 4 \beta \delta \varepsilon \lambda$ uрóৎ facinoros(us), scelestus, obscoen(us) \|| fastidiosus | $40^{r}$ fastidiosus | $21^{\text {r }}$ fastidiosus | $50^{v}$ fastidiosus abominatio abominabilis |
|  abominor \|| fastidio, -is | $40^{r}$ fastidio habeo infastidium abhominor ( $\beta \delta \varepsilon \lambda$ и́ $\pi \tau o \mu \alpha ı$ lemma) | $21^{\mathrm{r}}$ fastidio habeo infastidium abhominor | $50^{v}$ fastidio habeo in fastidium abominor ( $\beta \delta \varepsilon \lambda$ úлтонаı lemma) |
| $48^{r} 25$ ße入óvq acus \|| gen(us) piscis et a(nima)lis | $40^{r}$ acus vel genus piscis animal | $21^{r}$ acus vel genus piscis animal | $50^{\circ}$ acus aut genus piscis aut animal |
|  <br>  altar(e) | $40^{\circ}$ tribunal altare gressus et passus | $21^{v}$ tribunal altare gressus et passus | $51^{r}$ tribunal altare |
| $\begin{aligned} & 48^{\vee} 13 \text { ßí } \alpha \text { Vis, violentia \\| } \\ & \text { potentia } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $40^{\mathrm{v}}$ vis violentia potentia | $21^{v}$ vis violentia et potentia | 51r vis violentia potentia |
| $48^{\nu} 20 \beta_{1} \beta \alpha ́ \zeta \omega\| \|$ duco | $40^{\text {v duco }}$ | $21^{\text {v }}$ duco | $51^{\text {r }}$ duco |
|  \|| depasco(r), (con)sumo, devoro | $40^{v}$ depasco consumo devoro | $21^{v}$ depasco consumo devoro | $51^{\text {r depasco }}$ consumo devoro |
| $49^{\text {r } 6} 6$ Ríoç vita \|| et victus | $40^{\text {v }}$ vita victus | $21^{\text {v }}$ via victus | $51^{\text {r }}$ vita et victus |
| $49^{r} 14 \beta \lambda \alpha ́ \beta \eta$ damnu(m), $\operatorname{det}(\mathrm{ri}) m e n t u(\mathrm{~m}) \\|$ nocum(en)tu(m), tò $\beta \lambda \alpha ́ \beta o \zeta i d(e m)$ | $41^{\text {r }}$ detrimentum; $41^{r} \beta \lambda \alpha ́ \beta o \varsigma-$ nocumentum | $22^{\text {r }}$ nocumentum; $\beta \lambda \alpha ́ \beta o s$ - nocumentum | $51^{v}$ <br> detrimentum; <br> $51^{v} \beta \lambda \alpha ́ \beta o \varsigma-$ <br> nocumentum |
| 49r $16 \beta \lambda \alpha ́ \xi$ Iactans \|| stolid(us), Indiscret(us), mollis, Lascivus | $41^{\text {r }}$ stolidus indiscretus mollis delicatus lascivus | $22^{r}$ stolidus indiscretus mollis delicatus lascivus | $51^{\mathrm{v}}$ stolidus indiscretus mollis delicatus |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 49r $21 \beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha ́ v \omega$ germino, pullulo \|| к $\alpha i$ i $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ \omega$, <br>  nasco(r) | 41r germino; $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ \omega$, dópıotos हैß $\beta \alpha \sigma \tau \circ \vee$ | $22^{r}$ germino; к $\alpha \grave{1} \beta \lambda \alpha \sigma t \varepsilon ́ \omega$, áópıotos हैß $\beta \alpha \sigma \tau$ т | $51^{v}$ germino nascor; k ${ }^{\text {à }}$ $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ \omega$, đópıotos <br>  |
| $49^{v} 5 \beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \varphi \eta \mu \tilde{\omega}$ maledico, (con)tumelia afficio \\| <br> a $\beta \lambda \alpha ́ \pi \tau \tau \omega$ к $\alpha i ̀ ~ \varphi \eta \mu i ́$ | $41^{\text {² }} \beta \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \tau \tau$, blasfemo | 22 blasfemo, a $\beta \lambda \alpha ́ \pi \tau \omega$ к $\alpha i ̀ ~ \varphi \eta \mu i ́ ~$ | 51 blasphemo, $\beta \lambda \alpha ́ \pi \tau \omega$ |
| $49^{\vee} 18 \beta \lambda$ обоирós acerb(us), torvus, trux \|| rigid(us), $g($ ra $)$ vis, teter, t (er) ribilis | $41^{v}$ terribilis | $22^{r}$ rigidus gravis tetrus | $52^{r}$ terribilis |
| $\begin{aligned} & 49^{v} 19 \beta \lambda u ́ \zeta \omega \text { mano, -as \|\| } \\ & \text { scaturio } \end{aligned}$ | $41^{\text {r }}$ scaturio | $22^{\text {r }}$ scaturio | 52r scaturio |
| $50^{r} 6$ ßo $\lambda \beta$ ó , bolbus, g(e) $\mathrm{n}(\mathrm{u}) \mathrm{s}$ cepae $\\|$ porru(m) silvestre | $42^{\text {r }}$ porrum silvestre | $22^{v}$ porrum silvestre | $52^{\text {v }}$ porrum silvestre |
| $50^{r} 14$ ßou $\beta \tilde{\omega}$ strepo $\\|$ $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{er}) \mathrm{bu}(\mathrm{m})$ a sono | $41^{r}$ verbum a sono vocis aculice | $22^{v}$ verbum a sono vocis dictum aculice? | $52^{v}$ verbum a sono vocis idest a culice? dictum |
| 50r 16 ßópßopos coenu(m), idest vorago luti \|| tò Bópßopov каì ó ßорß $\omega$ pos | 42r $\beta$ óp $\beta$ opov ó ßópßopos cenum (two Gr. lemmas, same Lat. equivalent) | $23^{r}$ tò ßópßopov; ó ßорß $\omega$ роя cenum (two Gr. lemmas, same Lat. equivalent) | 52º́óp $\beta$ opov ßорß ẅpos cenum (two Gr. lemmas, same Lat. equivalent) |
|  | 42r ßорźaऽ; <br> ßоррác, - - $\alpha$ borea <br> (two Gr. lemmas, same Lat. equivalent) |  ßорра́ц, - - $\tilde{\alpha}$ borrea (two Gr. lemmas, same Lat. equivalent) | ${ }^{53}{ }^{\text {r }}$ ßор ќacı <br> ßopác, - $-\tilde{\alpha}$ borrea (two Gr. lemmas, same Lat. equivalent) |
| $50^{r} 20$ ßóгкпи $\alpha$ pecus, -coris \|| bestia, o(mn)e a(n)i(m)al v(e)l avis |grex pascuu(m) | $42^{r}$ pecus grex pascuum omne animal | $23^{r}$ grex pascivum omne animal vel avis nascitur bestia | $52^{v}$ pecus grex pascuum omne animal aut avis quae nascitur bestia |
| $50^{v} 7 \beta$ ouß $\omega$ v Inguen \|| inflatu(m) q(uo)d g(ener)at(ur) ex alio malo | femur | $41^{v}$ inguen inflatum quod generatur ex alio malo | $22^{v}$ inguen et inflatum quod generatur ex alio malo femur | inguen et inflatum quod generatur ex alio malo |
| $51^{\text {r }} 2$ ßoú ${ }^{2}$ ou ${ }^{2}$ ı volo, vis \|| $\mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega v$ ßou $\lambda_{n} \sigma \alpha_{\alpha}$ \| et malo | $41^{\top} \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ ßov入ńбo $\mu \alpha 1$ volo | $22^{v} \mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega v$ ßou入ńбoual volo | $52^{r} \mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ ßоидท́бона। volo |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $51^{r} 6$ ßoũ bos \|| ßoóc, ßoí, ßód kaì ßoũv et pellis bovis | 41 $\beta$ oós, ßoí, ßóa bos et pellis bovis | $22^{\circ}$ ßoós, ßoí, ßóo, ßoũv bos et pellis bovis | $52^{\circ}$ ßoós, ßoí, ßóa bos et pellis bovis |
| $51^{\text {r }} 8$ ßpoß $\beta$ ziov bravium \|| p(rae)miu(m) certam(in)is | $42^{v}$ bravium premium certaminis | $23^{r}$ bravium praemium certaminis | $53^{r}$ bravium certaminis premium |
| $51^{\mathrm{r}} 19 \beta \rho \alpha \beta \varepsilon u \tau \eta ́ s \operatorname{Int}(\mathrm{er})$ <br> cessor \|| dispensato(r) | $42^{v}$ dispensator | $23^{\text {r }}$ dispensator | $53^{v}$ dispensator |
| $51^{r} 20 \beta \rho \alpha \beta \varepsilon v ́ \omega \operatorname{Int}($ er $)$ cedo \|| mi(ni)stro, gub(er)no, dispenso, diiudico, ordino | $42^{v}$ ministro guberno dispenso ordino | $23^{r}$ ministro guberno dispenso diiudico ordino transcriptum est prior sum acquiro praemium | $53^{r}$ ministro <br> guberno <br> diiudicio dispenso ordino |
| $51^{\vee} 3 \beta \rho \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ scaturio, -is \|| efferveo | $42^{v}$ efferveo scateo | ferveo scateo | $53^{v}$ efferveo scateo |
| $51^{v} 4 \beta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$, tò $\lambda ı \kappa ı v i ́ \zeta \omega$ Vannio \|| bullio, eff(er)veo, turbo(r) | <br>  غ̇vßpóx $\eta v$, a $\beta \rho \varepsilon ́ x \omega$ non a ßрव́бסш | $42^{v}$ bullio efferveo ( $\beta$ ро́ббow lemma); pluo irrigo madefacio ơópıotos ह̇ßpóxŋข ( $\beta \rho \varepsilon ́ \chi \omega$ lemma) | $23^{v}$ bullio efferveo ( $\beta$ pá $\sigma \sigma \omega$ lemma); pluo irrigo madefacio <br>  ( $\beta \rho$ ह́x $\chi$ lemma) | $53^{v}$ bullio efferveo; pluo irrigo madefacio óópıotos غ́ßpóx ${ }^{2} v$ ( $\beta \rho \varepsilon ́ \chi \omega$ lemma) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 52^{\vee} 5 \text { ßúpo coriu(m) \|\| } \\ & \text { k } \alpha \text { ì } \beta \text { úpon } \end{aligned}$ | $44^{\text {r }}$ Kúpon corium; interv. $\beta$ ú $\rho \sigma \alpha$ | 24 $\beta$ úpon corium; interv. $\beta$ ú $\rho \sigma \alpha$ | $54^{r}$ ßúpon corium; interv. $\beta \dot{\rho} \rho \sigma \alpha$ |
| $52^{v} 21 \beta \omega \mu \circ \lambda$ óxоя [corr. $\beta \omega \mu$ ó $\lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\circ}$ ] phanatic(us) \|| il buffone, sive scurra | $43^{v} \beta \omega \mu$ о́ $\lambda \alpha \chi$ о̧ il buffone sive scurra | $24^{r} \beta \omega \mu$ о́ $\alpha \alpha \chi \circ$ ¢ scurra el buffone | 54" $\beta \omega \mu$ о́ $\alpha \times \chi$ оя scrurra il buffone |
| $53^{r} 16$ ү $\alpha \mu \beta$ pós gener $\\|$ spons(us), marit(us), sorori(us), affinis ex uxor(e) | $43^{v}$ gener sponsus | sponsus | $55^{r}$ maritus sororis affinis ex uxore gener |
| $53^{v} 1$ ү $\alpha \mu \tilde{\omega}$ uxore(m) duco \||-モĩ, ג́ópıotos हैץ $\eta \mu \alpha$ \|| nubo, futuo | $43^{v}$ duco uxorem futuo nubo; <br>  | $24^{v}$ duco uxorem futuo nubeo; <br>  | $55^{r}$ uxorem duco nubo; áóplotos है $\gamma \eta \mu \alpha$ |
| $53^{v} 2$ ү $\alpha v \omega$ ल̃ stagno, -as \|| dulcifico, pulch(rum) et mite (m) reddo |un(de) ganea | $43^{v}$ dulcifico unde ganea scortum | $24^{v}$ ducifico unde үóvea scortum reddo pulcrum et mitem | $55^{r}$ dulcifico mitem et pulchrum reddo |
| $53^{v} 3$ үóvvvu ${ }^{2}$ ı laetor, -aris <br> \|| кגі $\gamma \alpha ́ v v v u$ i | $43^{v}$ letor letitia exulto; үávvouı | $24^{v}$ letor letitia exulto; $\gamma \alpha ́ v v \cos ^{\prime}$ | $55^{\text {r }}$ letor; үóvvupı |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $53^{v} 10$ ү $\alpha \sigma \tau \rho i \zeta \omega$ \|| sagino, <br> -as \| do op(er)am vent(ri) | $44^{r}$ do operam ventri | $24^{\mathrm{v}}$ do operam ventri | $55^{r}$ do operam ventri |
| $53^{v} 11$ ү $\alpha \sigma \tau$ и́ $\rho$ vent(er) \\| тñऽ ү $\alpha \sigma \tau \rho \circ ́ \varsigma ~ v(e) 1-\sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ p o s$ | $43^{v}$ venter; - $\sigma \tau \rho o ́ \varsigma ~$ $-\sigma \tau$ ह́pos | 24v venter; - $\tau \tau \rho o ́ \varsigma ~$ - $\sigma \tau$ ह́pos | $55^{r}$ venter; oтрóৎ - $\sigma \tau$ ह́pos |
| $53^{v} 16$ үqupí́ $\mu \alpha$ exultatio \|l elatio | $43^{v}$ elatio | $24^{\text {v }}$ elatio | $54^{\text {v }}$ elatio |
| $53^{\vee} 17$ ү $\alpha u \rho i \tilde{\omega}$ exulto, gestio \|| elevo(r) in sup(er)bia(m) | $43^{v}$ glorior iacto elevo in superbia | $24^{r}$ glorior iacto elevor in superbiam | $54^{v}$ glorior iacto elevor in superbiam |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 53^{v} 22 ~ \gamma \alpha \tilde{u} \rho o \varsigma ~ l a e t(u s) ~\| \| ~ \\ \text { elat(us), splendid(us) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $43^{v}$ elatus splendidus | $24^{r}$ elatus splendidus | $54^{v}$ splendidus elatus |
| $54^{r} 15$ үعve $\alpha \lambda$ оүí $\alpha$ genealogia, nativitas \|| s(er)mo de g(e)n(er)atio(n)e et origi(n)e | $44^{r}$ sermo de generatione et origine | $25^{r}$ sermo de generatione et origine | $55^{v}$ sermo de generatione et origine |
| $54^{\vee} 4$ ү́́vv$\eta \mu \alpha$ nativitas, g(e)n(er)atio, p(ro)les \|| foet(us) | $44^{\text {r fetus }}$ | $25^{\text {r fetus }}$ | $55^{v}$ foetus |
| $55^{\text {r }} 3$ ү र́pac p(rae)miu(m) \|| mun(us), honor | 44" honor praemium munus | $25^{r}$ honor premium munus | $55^{\circ}$ munus premium honor |
|  ג̀бтíסoৎ $\pi \varepsilon \rho \sigma і к \eta ̃ \varsigma ~ c r a t e s, ~$ -is, gen(us) scuti p(er)sici $\\|$ et gladii | $44^{v}$ genus gladii et scutum persicum | $2^{r}$ genus gladii vel scutum persicum | $55^{v}$ genus gladii et scutum persicum |
| $55^{\text {r }} 16$ ү́́ $\varphi \cup \rho \rho$ pons \|| үєчи́p $\omega \mu \alpha \mathrm{id}(\mathrm{em})$ | 44 pons; үعчúp $\omega \mu \alpha$ pons | $25^{r}$ pons үعழט́p $\omega \mu \alpha \operatorname{id}(\mathrm{em})$ | $56^{r}$ pons үє甲úp $\omega \mu \alpha$ id(em) |
| $55^{\vee} 10$ үпра́бкк senesco \\|| $\mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega v \gamma \eta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \omega$ | $45^{\mathrm{r}} \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega v$ ү $\eta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \omega$ үпрá㇒ $\omega$ senesco | $25^{\vee} \mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \gamma \eta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \omega$ үпрá㇒ $\omega$ senesco | 56 ${ }^{v}$ senesco $\mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega v$ ү $\eta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \omega$ үпра́ $\omega$ |
| $55^{v} 13$ үıv'́ck $\omega$ cognosco, comp(er)tu(m) h(ab) eo \|| sententio?, cogito, delibero | $45^{r}$ cognosco sententio cogito delibero | $25^{v}$ cognosco sententio cogito delibero | $56^{v}$ cognosco cogito delibero |
|  puleiu(m) \\| кגì $\mathfrak{\eta} \gamma \lambda \eta ́ x \omega$ | $45^{v}$ herba; $\gamma \lambda n ́ \chi \omega$ ópíyovov | $26^{r} \dot{\eta} \gamma \lambda \eta ́ \chi \omega$ dicitur etiam ỏpíyovov | $57^{\text {r }}$ et $\dot{\eta} \gamma \lambda \tilde{\prime} \chi \omega$ herba dicitur etiam ópíyovov |
| $55^{\vee} 25 \gamma \lambda$ ńvๆ $\dot{\eta}$ кópŋ тoũ ó $\varphi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu o v ̃$ pupilla, -ae $\\|$ tota p(ar)s oc(u)li int(us) et oculus | $45^{\circ}$ pupilla oculi vel tota pars oculi intus et oculus | $26^{r}$ pupilla oculi et tota pars oculi intus et oculus | $57^{r}$ pupilla oculi vel tota pars oculi intus et oculus |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | Vat．Pal．Gr． 194 | EK Cod．Gr． 4 | Res． 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  strigm（en）tum｜｜sordes | $45^{v}$ sordes | $26^{\text {r }}$ sordes | $57^{\text {r }}$ sordes |
| $56^{r} 11 \gamma \lambda \nu \varphi \eta ́ s$ sculptio｜｜ sculptura | $45^{v}$ sculptura | 26 ${ }^{\text {r }}$ scultura | 57 ${ }^{\text {r }}$ sculptura |
| $56^{v} 2$ үvク́夭ıo̧ sincer（us）， familiaris｜｜Indigena， Ingenuus，legitim（us） | $45^{v}$ indigena legitimus ingenuus germanus | $26^{r}$ indigena legitimus ingenuus germanus | $57^{v}$ indigena <br> legitimus <br> germanus <br> ingenuus |
| $56^{v} 4$ үvó $\varphi o$ ，nimbus｜｜ nebulositas caligo | $46^{r}$ caligo obscurum nebulosum | $26^{r}$ caligo obscurum nebulosum | $57^{v}$ caligo obscurum nebulosum |
| $56^{\vee} 5 \gamma v \omega ́ \mu \eta$ sententia， mens｜｜voluntas | $45^{v}$ sententia voluntas | $26^{r}$ sententia voluntas | $57^{v}$ sententia aut voluntas |
| $56^{v} 7$ үv $\omega$＇$\mu \mathrm{v}$ gruma， index $\\|$ cognito（r） | $46^{r}$ cognitor | $26^{r}$ cognitor | $57^{\mathrm{V}}$ cognitor |
| $56^{v} 20$ үoүүú $\lambda \eta$ rapa $\\|$ v（e）l үoүүи入íc，－סos | $46^{r}$ үоүүи入ís，－入íঠos ［gr．lemma］rapa | $26^{v}$ үoүpu入íc， －$\lambda i$ íos［gr．lemma］ rapa | 57 үoypu入ís， －$\lambda$ í 0 os［gr． lemma］rapa |
| $56^{v} 23$ үóทऽ ó кó $\alpha$ я blandito（r），ambitiosus｜｜ $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{er})$ sutus， $\mathrm{s}(\mathrm{u}) \mathrm{bdol}(\mathrm{us})$ ， fallax | $46^{r}$ versutus prestigiator subdolus （үóos lemma） | $26^{v}$ versutus perstigiator subdolus incantator magus veneficus fallax？ | $57^{v}$ versutus praestigiator subdolus veneficus incantator |
| $56^{\circ} 24$ үoŋтعí人 ह̇лi ко入аккíaç blanditio｜｜ Inca（n）tatio | $46^{\text {r incantatio }}$ | $26^{v}$ incantatio | $57^{\mathrm{v}}$ incantatio |
| $56^{\vee} 25$ үoŋโをט́ $\omega$ ह̇ாì тoũ aủtoũ blandio（r）｜｜Incanto ｜ $\mathrm{a}(\mathrm{m})$ bio，travaglio｜ àmoүoŋгモú $\omega$ （contra）riu（m） | $46^{r}$ incanto travaglio ambio | $26^{v}$ incanto travaglio ambio； <br>  contrarium | $57^{v}$ incanto travaglio ambio |
|  غ̇пíoupos clavus［Lat． lemma vacat］ | $46^{\text {r }}$ clavus il chiovo | $26^{v}$ clavus il chiovo | $58^{\text {r }}$ clavus |
| $57^{r} 12$ үóvo genu｜l yóvvos v（e）l үoúvato̧ | $46^{\text {r }}$ genu；－voos | 26＂toũ yóvuos youvós | 58r genu；－os |
| $57^{\text {r }} 16$ Yoũv saltem｜｜ ig（itur） | $46^{\text {r }}$ saltem et igitur | $26^{v}$ saltem et igitur | $57^{v}$ saltem et igitur |
| $57^{v} 7$ үpaũ̧ anus｜｜үpoòs v（e）l $\begin{array}{r} \\ \text { póćcun }\end{array}$ acc（usa）t（iv）o үpoúv | $46^{v}$ anus；－ós |  acc（usa）t（iv）o $\gamma \rho \alpha ́ v$ anus | $58^{\text {r }}$ anus；－ós |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $57^{v} 9$ үpapzús scriptor \|| pictor et | $46^{v}$ pictor | $27^{\text {r }}$ pictor | $58^{\mathrm{r}}$ scriptor pictor |
| $57^{\vee} 10$ үр $\alpha \varphi$ ท́ scriptura \|| $p$ (ri) vata accusatio $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e})$ l etiam | $46^{v}$ scriptura accusatio pictura imago tabula picta | $26^{v}$ scriptura et privata accusatio pictura ymago tabula picta | $58^{r}$ scriptura accusatio privata pictura imago tabula picta |
|  pictura \|| imago, tabula picta | [see previous line] | [see previous line] | [see previous line] |
| $57^{v} 19$ үрч́́ó obscur(us), scrupulosus \|| et Implicit(us) s(er)mo et rete | $46^{r}$ rete et sermo implicitus | $27^{\mathrm{r}}$ rete et sermo implicitus | $58^{\vee}$ rete et sermo implicitus |
| $58^{r} 8$ үu $10 \alpha \sigma \tau \eta ́ \varsigma ~ e x(e r) ~$ citator \|| үu ex(er)cendi corp(us) | $47^{\text {r }}$ praeceptor exercens pueros; $46^{v}$ үu $\mu \nu \alpha \sigma \tau i k \eta ́ ~ a r s ~$ exercitatoria | $27^{\text {r }}$ preceptum exercituum et exercens pueros; ү $\quad \mu \mathrm{v} \alpha \sigma \tau і к \mathfrak{k}$ ars exercitativa et prebens modum vivendi | 59r exercitiorum praeceptor pueros exercens; $58^{v}$ үupvaбtiки́ ars exercitatoria modum vivendi prebens |

## 2) Marginal notes in agreement with two of the three codices (partly or completely)

| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1^{r} 18 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \beta o u \lambda i ́ \alpha$ inconsideratio $\\| \mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) 1$ malu(m) consiliu(m), tem(er)itas | $1^{\mathrm{r}}$ malum consilium | [lacuna] | $1^{v}$ malum consilium |
|  delecto(r), laeto(r) | $1^{\mathrm{r}}$ letor glorior | [lacuna] | $1^{\mathrm{v}}$ letor glorior |
| $1^{v} 10 \alpha \not \gamma \gamma \alpha \lambda \mu \alpha$ statua simulacrum \|| v(e)1 monu(me)[ntum] | q(uae) lib(et) oblatio | $1^{\text {r }}$ statua dei; $2^{\text {v }}$ aliquando pro monumento | [lacuna] | $1^{\text {v }}$ statua dei; $3^{v}$ aliquando pro monumento |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1^{v} 16$ ä $\gamma \alpha \mu \alpha ı$ admiror $\\|$ invid(e)o, co(m)moveo(r), $\mathrm{cu}(\mathrm{m})$ delectatio(n)e \| moleste fero | $1^{r}$ cum admiratione delector; $3^{v}$ invideo commoveo moleste fero ab ơ $\gamma \alpha v$ | [lacuna] | $1^{v}$ cum <br> admiratione <br> delector; admiror (interv.); $3^{v}$ invideo commoveo, moleste fero, ab ä $\gamma \alpha{ }^{\circ}$ |
| $2^{r} 26$ äүкıбт ${ }^{\text {ánov hamus }}$ <br> \|| e la ritorta del fuso | $\qquad$ del fuso | [lacuna] | $2^{v}$ hamus e la ritorta del fuso |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2^{v} 6 \text { ä } \mathbf{\gamma \kappa \omega v} \text { cubitus \\| } \\ & \text { v(e) loc(us) emine(n)s } \end{aligned}$ | $2^{\text {r }}$ cubitus vel angulus poetice; $3^{r}$ locus eminens | [lacuna] | $2^{v}$ cubitus vel angulus; $4^{r}$ locus eminens |
| $2^{v} 13$ á $\gamma v \varepsilon$ í castitas castimonia \|| pietas | $3^{\mathrm{v}}$ pietas | [lacuna] | $4^{\mathrm{r}}$ pietas |
| $2^{v} 15$ ஷ́ $\gamma v \varepsilon$ v́ $\omega$ castus sum \|| lustro, castu(m) facio | $\begin{aligned} & 2^{v} \text { sum castus, lustro, } \\ & \text { castum facio } \end{aligned}$ | [lacuna] | $2^{v}$ sum castus lustro castum facio |
| $2^{v} 25 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \nu \omega \mu$ 人vẽ fidem rumpo tergiversor \|| ingratus sum | $2^{r}$ ingratus sum, ignoro, disconoscomi | [lacuna] | $2^{v}$ ingratus sum ignoro |
| $2^{v} 26 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma v \omega ́ \mu \omega v$ perfidus fraudulentus \|| ingratus | $2^{v}$ ingratus, invitus | [lacuna] | $2^{v}$ ingratus |
| $3^{r} 7$ ápovos sterilis infecundus \|| v(e)l Ingenit(us) idest non genit(us) | $3^{r}$ ingenitus et sine consanguineis | [lacuna] | $3^{v}$ ingenitus et sine consanguineis |
| $3^{\text {r }} 8$ à $\gamma o \rho \alpha ́$ nundinae $\|\mid$ res venalis \| fo(rum) $\mathrm{m}(\mathrm{er})$ cium et venaliu( m ) re(rum), et p(re)tium rei, et res ve(n)dita; <br> 3r 9 ảyopá̧ $\omega$ emo mercor \| Iudiciale | (con)tio, commeat(us) | $1^{v}$ contio, commeatus, forum mercatus et venalium rerum et pretium rei et res vendita et forum iudiciale | [lacuna] | $2^{r}$ concio commeatus forum mercatum et pretium rei venalis et res vendita |
| $3^{\text {r }} 11$ ảץopoãoc nundinator \|| forensis (con)vent(us) |q(ui) vilia vendit et emit | $1^{v}$ forelis conventus et qui vilia emit et vendit | [lacuna] | $2^{\mathrm{r}}$ conventus forensis et qui vilia emit et vendit |
|  | $2^{\text {r }}$ preda | [lacuna] | $2^{v}$ praeda venatio |
| $3^{r} 22$ àץpıóv $\omega$ effero \\|| instigo, asp(er) sum | $2^{v}$ asper sum, irrito, instigo | [lacuna] | $3^{r}$ asper sum irrito increpo |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $3^{\vee} 3$ ả $\gamma p ı$ ótņ asperitas feritas immanitas \|| rusticitas | $2^{\text {r }}$ acerbitas (ảypıótns lemma); $2^{v}$ rusticitas (ảץpótņ lemma) | [lacuna] | $2^{v}$ rusticitas (ảүро́tท̧ lemma); acerbitas (ả $\mathrm{ypıótns}$ lemma) |
| $3^{v} 13$ ảץpovó $\mu$ сs villicus \|| v(e)l loc(us) u(b)i pascu(n) t (ur) ferae | $3^{v}$ ubi pascuntur fere | [lacuna] | $4^{r}$ ubi fere pascuntur |
| $3^{\mathrm{v}} 21$ á $\gamma$ ט́ $\mu v \alpha \sigma \tau 0 \varsigma$ inexercitatus \|| $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) 1$ $\mathrm{p}($ rae) stigia[tor] | $1^{v}$ prestigiator (ả $\gamma$ үoptikós and áyúprns lemmas) | [lacuna] | $2^{\text {r }}$ inexercitatus; praestigiator (ảүuptıкós lemma) |
| $3^{2} 23$ á $\gamma$ úptns circulator \|| cu(m) deceptio(n)e medicans | (con)gregator, p (rae) stigiator | $1^{v}$ prestigiator et mendicans cum deceptione | [lacuna] | $2^{r}$ praestigiator cum deceptione mendicans |
| $4^{r} 1$ д̉ $\gamma x$ ívoıo sagacitas sollertia \|| Indust(ri)a, subtilitas ingenii | $2^{v}$ industria, prudentia, sollertia | [lacuna] | $3^{\mathrm{r}}$ industria prudentia solertia |
| $4^{r} 3$ á $\gamma x ı \sigma \tau \varepsilon$ zí p propinquitas affinitas \|| app(ro)pinq(ua)tio, (con)v(er)satio | $2^{\mathrm{v}}$ affinitas, propinquatio, conversatio | [lacuna] | $3^{r}$ affintias propinquatio conversatio |
| $4^{r} 9$ ä $\gamma \omega$ duco \|| <br> facio, frango, eo, horto(r), suad(e)o | $2^{\mathrm{v}}$ hortor, suadeo | [lacuna] | $2^{r}$ duco facio frango; suadeo hortor; $3^{r}$ hortor suadeo |
| $4^{r} 12 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \gamma \eta ́$, ह̇лі̀ $\tau \eta ̃ \varsigma$ $\dot{\alpha} v \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma \eta ̃ \varsigma$ disciplina eductaio \|| vita, diaeta, regula viven(d)i | $1^{v}$ vita vel dieta et regula vivendi | [lacuna] | $2^{r}$ vita vel dieta vel regula vivendi |
| $4^{r} 13$ ä $\gamma \omega \gamma$ ós ductus \|| ducibilis, dux viae, ducto(r) | $2^{r}$ ducibilis dux in e ductor | [lacuna] | $2^{r}$ ducibilis ductor |
| $4^{\mathrm{r}} 25$ 炕 $\delta \varepsilon \alpha$ facultas licentia \|| lib(er)tas, securitas | $3^{v}$ licentia, libertas, facultas, securitas | [lacuna] | $4^{4}$ licentia securitas facultas libertas |
| $4^{\mathrm{v}} 6 \dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi \iota \delta o \tilde{c} \varsigma$ fratruelis fraternus fratris filius \|| nepos ex soror(e) $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) \mathrm{l}$ f(rat)re | $3^{v}$ nepos ex sorore vel frater | [lacuna] | $4^{v}$ nepos ex sorore vel frater |
| $4^{\mathrm{v}} 15$ ä $\delta \eta$ ns infernus \|| et pluto | $3^{v}$ et pluton | [lacuna] | $4^{v}$ infernus Pluto |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | Vat．Pal．Gr． 194 | EK Cod．Gr． 4 | Res． 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  indispositus | $4^{r}$ indispositus， intestatus | ［lacuna］ | $5^{r}$ indispositus intestatus |
| $5^{r} 12 \dot{\alpha} \delta o \lambda \varepsilon ́ \sigma x \eta \varsigma$ fabulosus garrulus｜｜（con）templativus， meditativus | $4^{r}$ contemplativus， meditativus | ［lacuna］ | $5^{r}$ <br> contemplativus meditativus |
|  ｜｜（con）templo（r），ex（er）ceor | $4^{r}$ contemplor， exerceor，et multa dico sine fructu | ［lacuna］ | $5^{r}$ contemplor exerceor nugor， philosophor |
| $5^{\text {r }} 16 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta o \xi i ́ \alpha \text { dedecus } \\|$ ignominia | $4^{r}$ ignominia， vituperium | ［lacuna］ | $5^{r}$ ignominia vituperium |
| $5^{r} 19 \propto$ ¿ $\delta \rho \alpha v \eta ́ \varsigma$ segnis iners socors ignavus｜｜imbecillis | $4^{\text {r }}$ imbecillis | ［lacuna］ | $5^{\mathrm{r}}$ inbecillis |
| $5^{v} 15$ án $\delta$ ía tedium $\\|$ Iniocu（n）ditas | $5^{r}$ tristitia， iniucunditas， spiacevoleza | ［lacuna］ | $6^{v}$ tristitia iniocunditas |
| $5^{v} 17$ ản $\eta \eta ́ \varsigma ~ t e d i o s u s ~\|\mid ~$ Iniocund（us） | $5^{\mathrm{r}}$ iniucundus | ［lacuna］ | $6^{v}$ iniocundus |
| $5^{\text {² }} 22$ ảń aer｜｜caligo | $5^{\text {r }}$ caligo，aer | ［lacuna］ | $6^{\mathrm{V}}$ aer；aer caligo （lemma twice） |
| $6^{\text {r }} 5$ 足 $\theta \varepsilon \sigma \mu$ ос illicitus｜｜ insipiens | $5^{v}$ insipiens | ［lacuna］ | $7^{\mathrm{r}}$ insipiens |
| $6^{r} 7 \dot{\alpha} \theta \varepsilon \tau \tilde{\omega}$ reprobo $\\|$ Irritu（m）facio，dimitto， sp（er）no，casso | $5^{\vee}$ reprobo，irritum facio，dimitto，sperno， casso | ［lacuna］ | $7^{\mathrm{r}}$ reprobo irritum facio sperno dimitto |
|  tagliente | $5^{\text {v }}$ tagliente | ［lacuna］ | $7^{\text {r }}$ tagliente |
| $6^{\mathrm{r}} 15 \tilde{\alpha} \theta \lambda^{2}$ ov praemium certaminis｜｜simpl（icite）r p （rae）miu（m）et；significat ó $\alpha{ }^{\alpha} \theta \lambda$ os certam（en） | $5^{v}$ premium certaminis；tò $\alpha$ 人 $\theta$ 入os certam（en） | ［lacuna］ | $7^{r}$ certaminis premium；tò㸚 $\theta$ 入os certam（en） |
| 6 $^{\mathrm{r}} 16$ वै $\theta$ р $\alpha$ ибтоя inconcussus infractus｜｜ Invuln（er）abilis | $5^{v}$ invulnerabilis infractus | ［lacuna］ | $7^{r}$ infractus invulnerabilis |
| $6^{\mathrm{r}} 25 \dot{\alpha} \theta \tilde{\omega}$ oc innocens｜｜ Indemnis，$\theta$ ต̃o̧ damnat（us） | $5^{r}$ insons innocuus indemnis idest expers alicuius mali；$\theta$ wos | ［lacuna］ | $6^{v}$ insons innocuus indemnis |
|  verecundus｜｜venerabilis | $6^{\text {r }}$ venerabilis | ［lacuna］ | $7^{7}$ venerabilis |
|  verecunde | $6^{\text {r }}$ verecunde | ［lacuna］ | $7^{\mathrm{v}}$ verecunde |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $6^{v} 22$ aid $\delta$ ¢ pudor puditia reverentia \|| verecundia | $6^{\text {r }}$ verecundia | [lacuna] | $7^{7}$ verecundia |
| $7^{r} 3$ aî日uı $\alpha$ mergus vel fulica \|| avis Indica et marina q (uae) malu(m) signu(m) est navigantib(us) q(uia) in tempestate appar(et). | $6^{\mathrm{r}}$ avis indica et marina quae malum signum est navigantibus quia in tempestate apparet | [lacuna] | $8^{\mathrm{r}}$ avis indica et marina quae malum est navigantibus signum quia in tempestate apparet |
|  multo \|| v(er)bero, dilac(er)o, disc(er)po; גiкí v(er)bera(ti)o | $6^{\text {r }}$ verbero; גiкía verberatio erumna supplicium | [lacuna] | $8^{r}$ verbero; aikía verberatio erumna supplicium |
| $7^{\text {r }} 23$ גí $\varepsilon \tau \omega ́ \tau \varepsilon \rho o v ~ p o t i u s ~$ elegibilius \|| גipetòs elect(us), eligibilis | $6^{\mathrm{v}}$ גipstós elegibilis | [lacuna] | $8^{\text {r }}$ кipetós eligibilis |
| $7^{\text {r }} 25$ $\alpha i ̂ p \omega$ tollo extollo \|| elevo; $\pi(\alpha \rho \alpha к \varepsilon$ и́ $\mu) \varepsilon v o v$ ท̂ $\rho к \alpha$ | 6v elevo; $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha к \varepsilon ́ ́ \mu \varepsilon v o v ~$ ท̂pка | [lacuna] | $8^{r}$ elevo; $\pi(\alpha р \alpha к \varepsilon ́ \mu) \varepsilon v o v$ ท̂pка |
| $7^{7 v} 3$ ai̋́los prosper secundus \|| decens, fortunatus | $6^{v}$ decens, fecundus | [lacuna] | $8^{\mathrm{v}}$ decens fecundus |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 7^{\mathrm{v}} 13 \text { aioxúvn pudor } \\| \\ \text { confusio } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $6^{v}$ verecundia, pudor, confusio | [lacuna] | $8^{v}$ pudor confusio verecundia |
| $7^{\text {² }} 16$ גioxXúv $\omega$ turpo foedo \|| dedecoro, (con)fundo | $6^{\mathrm{v}}$ confundo, decoro | [lacuna] | $8^{\mathrm{v}}$ dedecoro confundo |
| $7^{7 v} 19$ גitío causa querela titulus questio culpa \|| ratio, aliquando confirmatio | $6^{v}$ causa, accusatio, ratio et aliquando confirmatio | [lacuna] | $8^{\text {v }}$ causa accusatio ratio et aliquando confirmatio |
|  ma(n)cipiu(m), aix_ń cuspis et $\dot{\alpha} \lambda o ́ \omega$ | $6^{v}$ mancepium ab «íx $\mu$ ท̀ кхı̀ $\dot{\alpha} \lambda o ́ \omega$ | [lacuna] | $8^{v}$ mancipium; «íxцท̀ кגì ờó $\omega$ |
| $8^{r} 12 \alpha i \tilde{\omega} \rho \alpha$ gestatio $^{\|l\|}$ deambula(ti)o c(aus)a valitud(in)is | $6^{v}$ deambulatio que fit causa sanitatis | [lacuna] | $7^{v}$ deambulatio quae fit causa sanitatis |
|  Irreq(ui)etus | $7{ }^{\text {v inrequietus }}$ | [lacuna] | $10^{r}$ inrequietus |
| $8^{\vee} 25 \alpha$ ஷ̉ $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma i ́ \alpha$ inconstantia \|| seditio | $7^{v}$ seditio ( ${ }^{\text {к }} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \sigma_{i ́ \alpha ~ l e m m a) ~}^{\text {l }}$ | [lacuna] | $10^{r}$ seditio ( ${ }^{\alpha} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \sigma$ í $\alpha$ lemma) |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  incontinens effrenatus \|| Indetentibilis | $7^{v}$ indetentibilis, effrenatus | [lacuna] | $10^{r}$ indetentibilis effrenatus |
| $9^{r} 7$ д $\kappa \varepsilon ́ \sigma \tau \rho 1 \propto$ ท̌toı к $\alpha \mu о \pi$ í $\tau \tau \rho \_\alpha$ sarcinatrix \|| medicatrix | $8^{r}$ medicatrix | [lacuna] | $10^{\circ}$ medicatrix |
| $9^{r} 11 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \kappa ı \beta \delta \eta ́ \lambda \omega \varsigma$ sedulo \|| Incorrupte | sincere | $8^{r}$ incorrupte | [lacuna] | $10^{v}$ incorrupte |
| ```9r 13 व̈ккíלоиаı то̀```  ```simulo vel blandior \|I effemi(n)or, delitio(r), evanesco``` | $8^{v}$ effeminari, delitiari, evanescere, cum aliquid velis fingere nolle (Gr. lemma in inf.) | [lacuna] | $11^{\mathrm{r}}$ effeminari deliciari evanescere cum aliquid velis fingere nolle (Gr. lemma in inf.) |
|  | $8{ }^{v}$ inops | [lacuna] | $11^{\text {r }}$ inops |
| 9r 22 áкца́孔 $\omega$ vigeo \|| pubesco, ferveo, matur(us) $\mathrm{su}(\mathrm{m})$ | $8^{v}$ sum in vigore vel in pubertate ferveo | [lacuna] | $11^{r}$ sum in vigore vel in pubertate ferveo |
| $9^{r} 24$ áкци́ vigor maturitas \|| acies, flos aetatis, occasio | cuspis et su(m)mum q(ui)n? ult(er)i(us) no(n) p(ossi)t iri. | $8^{\mathrm{v}}$ vigor acies flos etatis vel occasio cuspis et summum quando ulterius non potest iri | [lacuna] | $11^{r}$ vigor acies flos aetatis occasio cuspis et sumum quando ulterius iri non potest |
|  adhuc \|| et rursus | $8^{v}$ rursus et adhuc adverbum | [lacuna] | $11^{\mathrm{r}}$ rursus et adhuc adverbium |
|  Insotiabilis, inco(m)municat(us) \|| egregi(us), sing(u)laris | $8^{r}$ egregius, singularis | [lacuna] | $11^{r}$ egregius singularis |
| $9^{v} 7$ ब̇ко $\lambda \alpha \sigma_{i ́ \alpha ~ i m p u n i t a s ~\| \| ~}^{\text {I }}$ Intemp(er)an(ti)a, p (ro) digalitas | $8^{r}$ intemperantia, prodigalitas | [lacuna] | $10^{v}$ <br> intemperantia prodigalitas |
| $9^{v} 8$ ஷ́ко́ ${ }^{2} \alpha \sigma \tau о \varsigma$ ganeo lascivus \|| Inte(m)p(er)ans, $\mathrm{i}(\mathrm{m})$ modest(us) | $8^{r}$ incastigatus, inmodestus, intemperatus | [lacuna] | $11^{r}$ incastigatus immodestus intemperatus |
| 10r 7 д́коб $\mu i ́ \alpha ~ d e d e c u s ~\|\mid ~$ intemp(er)an(ti)a | $8^{v}$ intemperantia merum id est vinum | [lacuna] | $11^{\mathrm{v}}$ <br> intemperantia merum idest vinum ( $\alpha$ кр $\rho \alpha \tau$ v lemma) |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10r 20 वै́кратоऽ intemperatus \|| mer(us) pur(us) | $8^{8}$ merus purus | [lacuna] | $11^{\mathrm{v}}$ merus purus |
| 10r 21 גُ $\kappa \rho \alpha \tau \eta ́ \varsigma$ incontinens intemperans \|| v(e)l inops | $8^{v}$ incontinens inops | [lacuna] | $11^{v}$ incontinens inops |
| 10r 25 ג́кро́хо入ос vaesanus $\\| \mathrm{s}(\mathrm{u}) \mathrm{bit}(\mathrm{us})$ ad ira(m | $8^{\text {v }}$ subitus ad iram | [lacuna] | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \begin{array}{l} 11^{v} \text { subitus ad } \\ \text { iram } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $10^{v} 1$ व̉́кр $\varepsilon ́ \mu \omega v$ cima corymbus \|| v(e)l $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho \varepsilon \mu \omega ́ v$ g(er)men, ram(us) | $9^{\text {r }}$ germen ramus | [lacuna] | $\begin{aligned} & 12^{r} \text { germen } \\ & \text { ramus } \end{aligned}$ |
| $10^{\circ} 2 \dot{\alpha} \mathrm{k} \rho ı \beta$ 亿́c diligens subtilis \|| Integer | $8^{\text {v }}$ diligens integer | [lacuna] | 11 diligens integer certus? |
| $10^{v} 10$ ä́крıто̧ iniudicatus \| s(ignifica)t et(iam) Indiscretu(m)|s(i)n(e) lege, indemnat(us) || iudicat(us) indicta? causa | $8^{v}$ sine lege iniudicatus vel? indemnatus iudicatus indicta causa | [lacuna] | $11^{v}$ sine lege iniudicatus indemnatus indicta causa... |
| $10^{\text {² }} 24$ व̛́кробтó $\lambda_{\text {lov }}$ fori \|| su(m)mitas seu ext(re)mitas navis | 9r sumitas navis vel? extremitas | [lacuna] | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 12^{r} \text { sumitas } \\ \text { navis extremitas } \\ \text { (ג́кробтó } \lambda \iota \alpha \\ \text { lemma) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $11^{r} 12 \dot{\alpha} \kappa \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \eta \tau \eta \pi \varsigma \theta \alpha \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \eta \varsigma$ acta ora maris littus \|| ripa, littus, nut(ri)mentu(m), donu(m) | $9^{r}$ cibus litus nutrimentum ripa | [lacuna] | $13^{\text {r cibus littus }}$ |
| $11^{\text {r }} 17$ áккироs improprius irritus \|| no(n) authentic(us) abrogat(us) | $9^{r}$ non autenticus abrogatus | [lacuna] | $11^{\mathrm{r}}$ non autenticus abrogatus |
| $11^{r} 25 \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \zeta$ оvعט́ou $\alpha$ insolesco iacto arrogo glorior \|| ululo Insultan(d)o | $10^{r}$ clamo insultando ( $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \lambda \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ lemma) | [lacuna] | $13^{r}$ arrogo superbio; insultando clamo ( $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \lambda \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ lemma) |
| $11^{r} 26 \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \zeta \tilde{\omega} v$ arrogans \|| petulans, sup(er)b(us) | $10^{\text {r }}$ petulans superbus | [lacuna] | $13^{r}$ petulans superbus |
| $11^{\nu} 3 \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \lambda \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ ululo \|| insultan(d)o | $10^{\text {r c clamo insultando }}$ | [lacuna] | $13^{r}$ insultando clamo |
|  palaest(rae) <br> $\mathrm{p}($ rae $)$ cepto(r) $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) 1$ | $10^{r}$ preceptor palestre et pedotrina | [lacuna] | $13^{v}$ palestrae praeceptor pedotrius |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $11^{v} 12 \dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon$ そ́ккккоऽ depulsor $\\|$ malo(rum) defensor, cap(er) p(ro) apolli(n)e | $10^{r}$ adiutor malorum idest defensor pro apolline | [lacuna] | $13^{r}$ malorum adiutor idest defensor pro apolline |
|  <br> $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) 1$ anxietas | $10^{\text {r anxietas erros }}$ | [lacuna] | $13^{\circ}$ anxietas error |
| $12^{r} 11 \dot{\alpha} \lambda i ́ \zeta \omega$, tò $\sigma u v \alpha \theta$ poí $\omega$ conglomero \|| (con)grego | $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{er})$ sor, vago(r), erro | $\begin{aligned} & 10^{v} \text { congrego versor } \\ & \text { erro et insalo } \end{aligned}$ | [lacuna] | $\begin{aligned} & 13^{r} \text { congrego } \\ & \text { versor erro insalo } \end{aligned}$ |
| $12^{\text {r }} 12 \dot{\alpha} \lambda \kappa \eta ́, \dot{\eta}$ ठúv $\alpha \mu ı \varsigma$ robur $\|\mid \mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) \mathrm{l} \mathrm{s}(\mathrm{u})$ bsidiu( m$)$, aliq(ua)n(do) proeliu(m) poetice | $11^{r}$ subsidium potentia fortitudo et aliquando prelium poetice | [lacuna] | $14^{r}$ subsidium potentia fortitudo aliquando prelium |
| $12^{v} 1$ ả $\lambda \hat{\prime} \omega$, tò $\delta \cup \sigma \varphi \circ \rho \tilde{\omega}$ tristor \|| laetor | afficio gaudio v(e)l tristitia | $10^{\mathrm{v}}$ afficio gaudio vel tristitia mereo leto | $1^{\text {r dissolvo }}$ tristor letor | $16^{\text {r dissolvo }}$ tristor |
| $12^{\nu} 6$ аै $\lambda \lambda$ дот $\varepsilon$ alias \|| aliq(ua)n(do), alibi | $11^{\mathrm{r}}$ aliquando alibi | - | $14^{\mathrm{v}}$ aliquando |
| $12^{v} 11 \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha ́ \rho \tau \tau \eta \mu \alpha$ peccatum \|| peccatu(m) v(e)l e(r)ror, ф́ $\mu \alpha$ ртía | $12^{v}$ peccatum ( $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau i ́ \alpha ~ l e m m a) ~$ | - | $16^{\mathrm{v}}$ peccatum ( $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau i ́ \alpha ~ l e m m a) ~$ |
| $12^{\vee} 26$ ả $\mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \varepsilon ı$ proinde denique \|| p (ro)fecto, v(er)bi gr(ati)a, ergo; $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega}$ negligo, $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \dot{\prime} \lambda \varepsilon ı \alpha$ negligen(ti)a, culpa | $13^{r}$ denique profecto vel verbigratia ergo ( $\alpha$ и̇́̇ $\lambda \varepsilon ı$ lemma); negligo non curo (ả $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega \omega$ lemma); | - | $17^{r}$ denique profecto vel verbi gratia ergo; $16^{v}$ negligo non curo (à $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega \omega$ lemma) |
| $13^{r} 12 \dot{\alpha} \mu o$ or $\beta$ रoóv alternatim mutuo vicissim \|| v(e)l successive | $13^{v}$ vicissim et successive | $2^{\mathrm{v}}$ vicissim, permutans | $17^{\mathrm{V}}$ vicissim successive |
| 13r 14 ג̉ $\mu$ úntos indoctus rudis inexpertus <br> \|| Non Initiat(us) ad sacra | $13^{v}$ non initiatus ad sacra | - | $17^{\mathrm{v}}$ non initiatus ad sacra |
| $13^{r} 15 \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\mu} \mu \omega v$ purus ummaculatus \|| irrep(re)hensibilis | $13^{v}$ inreprehensibilis | - | $\begin{aligned} & 17^{\mathrm{v}} \\ & \text { irreprehensibilis } \end{aligned}$ |
| $13^{r} 17$ á $\mu$ v́vo ${ }^{\prime} \alpha_{\iota}$ б́́ ulciscor \|| <br> $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) 1$ repugno | $13^{v}$ repugno ulciscor capio vindictam puneo | $2^{\vee}$ punio et capio vindictam | $17^{v}$ repugno punio ulciscor |
| $13^{r} 19$ á $\mu v ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ lanio lacero \|| sgrafigno | $\begin{aligned} & 13^{v} \text { and } 14^{v} \\ & \text { graffiaturam facio; } \\ & \text { lacero graffio (Gr. } \\ & \text { lemma twice) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | - | $17^{v}$ lanio graffio |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $13^{v} 20$ व̉ $\mu v \chi$ ŋ́ cicatrix superficialis \|| graffiatura | $13^{v}$ laniatio graffiatura | - | $17^{\mathrm{v}}$ laniatio graffiatura |
| $13^{v} 1 \dot{\alpha} v \alpha \beta \alpha$ ív $\omega$ ascendo \|| redeo v(e) | k $\alpha \tau \alpha \beta \alpha i ́ v \omega ~_{\omega}$ recedo $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) 1$ descendo | $15^{v}$ redeo $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \beta$ aív $\omega$ recedo | - | $20^{\text {v }}$ redeo |
| $13^{v} 4 \dot{\alpha} v \alpha \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \mu \alpha ı$ differo \|| sup(er)pono | ricierco sona(n)do | $15^{v}$ differo superpono ricerco sonando | $7^{\text {r facio }}$ preludium omnem sonum | $20^{r}$ differo superpono recedo sonando |
| $13^{v} 6$ ảv $\alpha \beta 0 \lambda \eta$ dilatio \|| mora |genus vestis | $15^{v}$ dilatio mora genus vestis | $7^{\mathrm{r}}$ preludium | $20^{r}$ dilatio mora genus vestis |
| $13^{v} 8 \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \alpha \beta$ ß $\tilde{\omega}$ revivisco $\\|$ | $15^{\vee}$ revivo resuscito | - | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 20^{v} \text { revivo } \\ \text { resuscito } \end{array}$ |
| $13^{v} 13 \alpha$ ảv $\alpha \delta$ v́o $\mu \alpha 1$ differo veto \|| recuso, retraho | $16^{\text {r }}$ recuso retraho | - | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 20^{v} \text { recuso } \\ \text { retraho } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $13^{v} 15 \alpha \mathfrak{\alpha} v \alpha \delta \tilde{\omega}$ corono \|| religo, circumligo | ठ́́ $\omega$ ligo | $16^{r}$ corono religo circumligo; סź㇒ ligo | - | $20^{v}$ corono religo circumligo; $\delta \varepsilon ́ \omega$ ligo |
| $13^{\vee} 24$ ảv $\alpha \delta \varepsilon v \delta \rho \alpha ́ ́ \varsigma ~ a r b u s t u m ~$ \|| coop(er)tio arborum | $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) \mathrm{l} \mathrm{p}(\mathrm{er}) \mathrm{gula}$ | $16^{r}$ coopertio arborum vel per gola | - | $20^{\mathrm{V}}$ coopertio arborum pergula |
| 14r 7 ảv $v \mu i ́ \xi$ mixtim \|| promiscue | $16^{v}$ mixtum promiscue | - | $21^{v}$ mixtim promiscue |
| $14^{r} 14$ áv $\mathrm{empor} \beta \delta \tilde{\omega}$ sorbeo \|| emico | $17^{v}$ emicat (Gr. verb Sing. 3) | - | $\begin{aligned} & 22^{v} \text { emicat (Gr. } \\ & \text { verb Sing. 3) } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 14^{v} 9 \text { ảv } \delta \rho ı \alpha ́ c ~ s t a t u a ~\|\mid ~ \\ \text { p(rae)cipue viri } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $20^{\text {r }}$ staua precipue viri | - | $\begin{array}{\|l} 25^{v} \text { statua } \\ \text { praecipue viri } \end{array}$ |
| $15^{\text {r }} 2$ àveı $\mu$ źvoç laxus solutus remissus \|| et $\mathrm{q}(\mathrm{ua}) \mathrm{n}$ (do)q(ue) venere(us) | $19^{r}$ dissolutus quandoque veneretus | $5^{r}$ dissolutus | $24^{r}$ dissolutus quandoque venereus |
| 15r 13 ảv $v \lambda \varepsilon u ́ \theta \varepsilon \rho o c ̧ ~ i l l i b e r ~ \\| ~\| \| ~$ illiberalis | $18^{r}$ inliberalis | - | ${ }^{23}{ }^{v}$ illiberalis |
| $16^{v} 19 \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \kappa \omega \omega$ retraho \\| Impedio, (con)t(ra) traho | $20^{r}$ impedio contra traho | - | $26^{r}$ impedio contra traho |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 17^{r} 13 \text { } \alpha v \theta \text { í } \tau \tau \mu \alpha \text { ı obsto \|\| } \\ \text { Insurgo } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $20^{r}$ insurgo | - | 26r insurgo |
| 19r 19 ảvtí $\begin{array}{r}\text { pocpov }\end{array}$ rescriptum exemplar \|| et ex(emplu)m, tò $\pi \rho \omega \tau$ т́tuтov | 21r exemplar et exemplum $\pi \rho \omega \tau o ́ t u \pi o v$ | - | $27^{r}$ exemplar et exemplum прото́титор |
|  $\exp (e r) s$ aquae | $19^{v}$ sine aqua inaquosus expers aque | - | $25^{r}$ inaquosus expers aquae |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $22^{\vee} 22 \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \gamma \eta ́$ abitus discessus \|| liberatio | ${ }^{23}$ r liberatio | - | 30r liberatio |
| $24^{r} 5$ à $\pi \varepsilon$ ध́ $1 \propto$ incredulitas \|| (con)tumacia, <br> Inobedien(ti)a, diffiden(ti)a | $24^{\text { }}$ incredulitas inobedientia | - | $31^{v}$ inobedientia contumacia |
|  infrunitus insolens \|| Iacta(n)s, nod(um) i(n) scyrpo (re)q(ui)rens | vilia, aliena, $\operatorname{Imp}(e r)$ tinen(ti)a p(er)vestiga(n)s | $24^{v}$ vilis? insolens? | $9^{\text {r }}$ iactans | $31^{v}$ nodum in scirpo quaerens et vilia et $\qquad$ intemperantia aliena |
| $26^{r} 5 \dot{\alpha} \pi \circ \beta 1 \omega ́ \sigma \alpha \varsigma$ defunctus $\\| \alpha{ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha}{ }^{2} \beta_{1} \beta \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ p(er)duro, deduco, traduco | $25^{r}$ [Lat. vacat] | $9^{v}$ deduco micto in terram trahiiciendo ( $\alpha_{\pi} \beta_{1} \beta \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ lemma) | $31^{v}$ deduco in terram mitto traiiciendo <br>  lemma) |
| $26^{r} 13 \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \gamma \alpha \lambda \alpha \kappa \tau i ́ \zeta \omega$ lacto decipio depello \|| ablacto | ${ }^{25}$ r lacto decipio depello | $9^{v}$ allacto | $32^{\text {r ablacto }}$ |
|  גítıatıkñ v(e)l paro me ad pugna (m) | $25^{r}$ [Lat. vacat] | $9^{\text {r }}$ paro me ad pugnam | $32^{r}$ paro me ad pugnam |
| $28^{\vee} 22 \dot{\alpha} \pi$ о $\lambda \alpha$ ú $\omega$ perfruor \|| augm(en)tum h(abe)ns i(n) $\eta$ ut $\alpha$ ふ́ń $\lambda \alpha u v o v$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26^{\mathrm{r}} \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\prime} \lambda \alpha u v_{v}[\text { Lat. } \\ & \text { vacat] } \end{aligned}$ |  | $33^{r}$ fruor augmentum in $\eta$ vertitur ब̈ $\pi$ ń $\lambda \alpha u v o v$ |
| $30^{r} 23$ а́тотєı $\rho \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha ı$ experior \|| tento, no(n) exp(er)ior, no(n) te(n)to, no(n) cono(r) | $26^{v}$ [Lat. vacat] | $10^{r}$ tento non experior non conor | $33^{v}$ non tempto non experior non conor |
| $31^{r} 13$ ä́ropos egenus indigus \|| $\mathrm{I}(\mathrm{m}) \mathrm{p}(\mathrm{er})$ transibilis \| dubi(us), difficil(is) inventu | Impossibilis | $26^{\text {V }}$ [Lat. vacat] | $10^{r}$ difficilis ad inveniendum indigens impotens dubius inutilis | $34^{r}$ difficilis ad inveniendum indigens impotens dubius inutilis pauper |
|  emanatio \|| loc(us) abrupt(us) rupes | $26^{\text {V }}$ [Lat. vacat] | $10^{\mathrm{r}}$ abruptus rupis | $34^{r}$ abruptus rupis |
| $31^{1} 22$ ä $\pi \circ \rho \omega \tilde{c}$ ह̇ $\pi \grave{~ t o v ̃ ~}$ סıఠт̧́́ovto̧ incertus sum ambigo \|| Indigeo, deficio | $26^{v}$ [Lat. vacat] | $10^{r}$ desino dubito indigeo quod agam nescio ignarus sum | $34^{r}$ deficio dubito indigeo quod agam nescio |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  mitto dirigo \|| $\mathrm{r}(\mathrm{e})$ mitto, dimitto | $27^{\text {r }}$ [Lat. vacat] | $10^{r}$ remicto emicto | $\begin{aligned} & 34^{\mathrm{r}} \text { remitto } \\ & \text { emitto } \end{aligned}$ |
| $32^{r} 2 \dot{\alpha} \pi$ тобтонатí̧ $\omega$ ore profero effor \|| v(e)l os opp(ri)mo | $27^{\text {r }}$ [Lat. vacat] | $10^{\mathrm{v}}$ os opprimo | $34^{\text {v }}$ os opprimo |
| $32^{\text {r }} 7$ árобт $\rho о \varphi \eta$ ń aversatio \|| (con)v(er)sio, odiu(m) | $27^{\text {r }}$ [Lat. vacat] | $10^{v}$ converiso odium | $34^{v}$ conversio vel odium |
|  д̉ $\pi о ү \rho \alpha \varphi \tilde{\varsigma} \varsigma \chi \omega \rho i ́ \omega v$ census \|| v(e)l ei(us) descriptio | $27^{\text {v }}$ [Lat. vacat] | $11^{\mathrm{r}}$ descriptio census | $35^{r}$ descriptio census |
| $32^{v} 14$ árótoبос immanis acerbus crudelis \|| durus | $27^{\text { }}$ [Lat. vacat] | $10^{v}$ violentus durus | $35^{r}$ praeruptus praeceps durus praecisus; durus violentus (lemma 2x) |
| $32^{\vee} 15$ ג̉ォо́тоцоऽ то́тоऽ rigidus asper \|| <br> p(rae)rupt(us), p(rae)ceps | [cf. the previous line] | $10^{v}$ preruptus preceps; $12^{v}$ excisus vel compendiosus | [cf. the previous line] |
|  detestabilis abominandus \|| remediativus, horre(n)dus | $27^{\text {v }}$ [Lat. vacat] | $10^{\text {v }}$ <br> remediativus horrendus | $35^{r}$ remediativus horrendus |
| $33^{r} 14$ đ̈ $\pi$ ó $\varphi \alpha \sigma \iota \varsigma ~ s e n t e n t i a ~$ promulgatio pronunciatio interlocutio \|| nega(ti)o | $27^{\text { }}$ [Lat. vacat] | $11^{r}$ negatio sententia demonstratio | $35^{r}$ negatio sententia demonstratio |
| $33^{r} 20$ ג̇ $\pi$ ó $\varphi \theta \varepsilon \gamma \mu \alpha$ dictum $\|\mid$ $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) \mathrm{l} \mathrm{s}(\mathrm{e}) \mathrm{n}($ tent $) \mathrm{ia}$ | $27^{\text {v }}$ [Lat. vacat] | $11^{\text {r }}$ sententia | $35^{\text {r }}$ sententia |
| $33^{v} 5$ बं $\pi<\chi \alpha \lambda ı \nu \tilde{\omega}$ refreno $\\|$ <br> $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) \mathrm{l}$ frenu(m) exuo | $28^{\text {r }}$ [Lat. vacat] | $11^{\text {r }}$ frenum exuo | $35^{v}$ frenum exuo |
| $33^{\vee} 7$ äroxи́ apocha \|| distan(ti)a, abstinen(ti)a | $28^{\text {r }}$ [Lat. vacat] | $11^{\text {r }}$ distantia abstinentia | $35^{v}$ distantia abstinentia |
| $33^{v} 19$ ब̀̇то $\eta \varphi i ́ \zeta \rho \mu \alpha ı$ abrogo \|| lib(er)o in Iud(ici)o, revoco | $\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{er})$ decretu(m) expello; eq(uan)d(o) non si vince il $\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{ar})$ tito, refrago(r)? | $28^{\text {[ [Lat. vacat] }}$ | $11^{r}$ libero iniudico per decretum expello vel quando non obtinetur pontitus? | $35^{v}$ libero iniudico per decretum expello |
| $\begin{aligned} & 33^{v} 20 \dot{\alpha} \pi o \psi u ́ x \omega \text { derigeo \|\| } \\ & \text { aresco } \end{aligned}$ | 28 r [Lat. vacat] | $11^{\mathrm{r}}$ haresco morior | $35^{v}$ aresco |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | Vat．Pal．Gr． 194 | EK Cod．Gr． 4 | Res． 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $33^{v} 22$ ár $\rho \alpha ́ \gamma \mu \omega \omega$ otiosus｜｜ no（n）cura（n）s d（e）reb（u）s alienis | $28^{\text {r }}$［Lat．vacat］ | $11^{v}$ non curans de rebus alienis | $36^{r}$ aliena non curans |
| $33^{v} 23$ är $\pi$ рккто̧ ignavus otiosus｜｜q（ui）re infecta desistit | $28^{\text {r }}$［Lat．vacat］ | $11^{\text {v }}$ ignavus qui in re infecta desistit | $36^{r}$ ignavus quire infecta destitit |
| $34^{r} 5 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \rho i \xi$ グүouv ó入обхєрడ̧̃ summopere firmissime｜｜tenacit（er）， app（re）hensive，stricte | $28^{\text {r }}$［Lat．vacat］ | $11^{v}$ tenaciter apprehensitive stricte cum tenetur aliquid firmiter | $36^{r}$ tenaciter stricte apprehensive |
| 34¹4 ápoxió rarus｜｜ moll（is），minut（us）， angust（us）， g （ra）cilis | $30^{\text {r }}$［Lat．vacat］ | $13^{r}$ tenuis rarus； $14^{\mathrm{v}}$ rarus mollis minutus angustus gracilis | $38^{r}$ tenuis rarus； $40^{r}$ rarus mollis minutus gracilis angustus |
| $34^{v} 23$ ápóxviov，oủ $\delta \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \omega \varsigma$ tò ú $\varphi \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha$ aranea $\|\mid$ est tela aranei | $30^{\text {r }}$［Lat．vacat］ | $13^{r}$ aranea et tela（ $\alpha$ 人 $\alpha$ र́ $\alpha v ı \alpha$ lemma） | $38^{r}$ aranea tela （ápóx́zıó lemma） |
| $35^{r} 4$ ápyúplov aes pecunia $\\|$ argentu（m）et loc（us）ubi fund（itu）r | $30^{\text {r［ Lat．vacat］}}$ | $13^{r}$ argentum vel locus ubi funditur | $38^{v}$ argentum vel locus ubi funditur |
| 35 r 23 ảpyós piger albus celer｜｜strenuus，pauca agens，otios（us） | 30v［Lat．vacat］ | 13 otiosus vacuus tardus illaboratus | 38 v ociosus vacuus tardus inlaboratus |
| $35^{r} 13 \dot{\alpha} p \gamma \omega \tilde{\omega}$ feriatus cesso｜｜ otio（r），nihil ago | 30\％［Lat．vacat］ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 13^{v} \text { otior nihil } \\ \text { ago } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 38^{v} \text { ocior nihil } \\ \text { ago } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $36^{r} 24 \dot{\alpha} \rho \mu \circ v i ́ \alpha$ ท̀ $\tau \tilde{\eta} \varsigma \kappa 1 \theta \alpha ́ \rho \alpha \propto \varsigma$ harmonia consonantia｜｜ compo（s）itio，pactu（m）， （con）venien（ti）a | $30^{\circ}$［Lat．vacat］ | $13^{v}$ concordia convenientia | $39^{r}$ convenientia concordia |
| $38^{r} 21 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \tilde{\omega} \mu \alpha \iota$ execror maledictis infector｜｜ （con）gruo，p（re）cor，oro， dico | $31^{v}$［equivalents misplaced］ | $14^{r}$ precor congruo oro dico | $39^{v}$ precor congruo oro dico |
|  | $32^{v}$［equivalents misplaced］ | $15^{\text {r innocuus }}$ | $41^{r}$ innocuus |
| $41^{\mathrm{r}} 14$ वै́t $\varepsilon \rho$ praeter absque｜｜ seorsu（m） | $34^{v}$ absque | $16^{r}$ asque； $16^{v}$ seorsum absque | $43^{v}$ absque； $44^{v}$ seorsum absque |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | Vat．Pal．Gr． 194 | EK Cod．Gr． 4 | Res． 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $43^{r} 7$ đủtó $\mu \alpha$ тoç ultroneus iniussus｜｜et casualis｜ fortuit（us） | $36^{r}$ qui facit aliquid per se et casualis ad casum | $17^{v}$ qui facit aliquid per se et ad casum | $45^{\circ}$ casualis ad casum vel？qui per se aliquid facit |
| $43^{r} 20 \alpha$ ủxク̀̀ $\alpha \dot{\alpha} v \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi o u$ к $\alpha \grave{~}$ к入ívetal aủxย́vos cervix｜｜ Iugulus et Iugu（m）et collis | $36^{v}$ collum cervix iugum iugulus et collis | － | $46^{r}$ collum cervix iugum iugulum |
| $43^{\text {r }} 22$ aúxunpó̧ squallidus｜｜ $\operatorname{sicc}(\mathrm{us})$ ，caliginos（us） | $36^{v}$ squalidus siccus caliginosus | － | $46^{r}$ squalidus siccus caliginosus |
|  <br>  | $36^{v}$ iacto，glorior； аủxźo $\mu \alpha 1$ | － | $46^{r}$ iacto glorior； «ủxモ́oua1 |
| $44^{v} 4 \dot{\alpha} \varphi เ \varepsilon \rho \tilde{\omega}$ dedico consecro｜｜v（e）l int（er）ficio | $37^{v}$ sacrifico vel interficio | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 18^{v} \text { sacrifico } \\ \text { interficio } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 47^{\mathrm{r}} \text { sacrifico } \\ \text { macto } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| $44^{v} 21 \dot{\alpha} \varphi \rho \mu о$ í $\omega \mu \alpha$ instar effigies｜｜assimilatio | $37^{\text { }}$ assimilatio | － | $47^{v}$ assimilatio |
|  phan（us），pollut（us）｜｜ $\dot{\alpha} \beta \varepsilon ́ \beta \eta \lambda$ os sac（er） | $40^{v}$ impurus profanus；刘 $\varepsilon$ ß $\eta \lambda$ 入os sacer | $21^{r}$ impurus prophanus | $50^{v}$ impurus profanus； ג́ $\beta$ ह́ß $\eta \lambda$ 入os sacer |
| $\begin{aligned} & 49^{\mathrm{v}} 6 \beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \mu \mu \alpha \text { aspectus \|\| } \\ & \text { кגì } \beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \pi o \mathrm{~S} \end{aligned}$ | $41^{r}$ aspectus acies vel？ visus；$\beta \lambda$ ह́toৎ visus idem | $22^{r}$ aspectus acies idest visus $\beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \pi \circ \zeta$ idem | 51 aspectus acies visus |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 49^{v} 20 \text { ßoń clamo(r) \|\| k } \alpha \grave{1} \\ \text { ßó́ } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 41 ${ }^{\text {v c lamor；}}$ ßoó clamor | $22^{v}$ clamor <br> p （oetice）$\beta$ o $\alpha$ | $52^{\text {r }}$ clamor |
| $53^{r} 7 \gamma \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \alpha ́ \gamma \rho \alpha$ cavea II loc（us）ubi rei carcerant（ur） | $43^{\vee}$ tanquam carcer cavea | $24^{r}$ tamquam carcer cavea locus strictus ubi rei carcerantur | $54^{v}$ tanquam carcer cavea locus strictus ubi rei ．．．？ |
| $53^{r} 23$ ү ́́́ $\mu$ oç co（n）nubiu（m）｜ al（iqua）n（do）p（ro）nupta | $43^{v}$ nuptiae et aliquando pro nupta | $24^{v}$ nuptie et nupta | $55^{\text {r }}$ nuptiae |
| $54^{r} 14$ үعvعव́ıgen（er）atio， progenies｜｜spatiu（m）xxx an（n）o（rum），familia | $44^{\text {r }}$ genus soboles generatio proles | $25^{r}$ genus <br> soboles spatium <br> triginta <br> annorum <br> generatio <br> familia | $55^{v}$ genus soboles spatium xxx annorum generatio familia proles |
| $56^{v} 9$ үv $\omega$ pí ${ }^{\prime} \omega$ cognosco $\\|$ facio cognosce（re） | $45^{v}$ cognosco | $26^{r}$ facio cognoscere | $57^{v}$ facio cognoscere |

## 3) Marginal notes in agreement with one of the three codices

| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $12^{\text {r }} 19{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega \varsigma$ aliter secus $\\|$ alioq(ui)n, aliq(ua)n(do) s(i)n(e) c(aus)a | $11^{r}$ idem [cf. the previous line in the ms.: alioquin idest multo magis] et incassum aliter aliquando sine causa | [lacuna] | $14^{\mathrm{v}}$ aliter temere incassum |
| $12^{\text {v }} 10 \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \mu \tilde{\omega}$ meto \|| divido | $17^{\mathrm{r}}$ divido metor | - | $16^{v}$ meto |
|  patior sustineo \|| $\mathrm{i}(\mathrm{n})$ crem(en)to p(otes)t mutar(i) et(iam) $\alpha \mathrm{i}(\mathrm{n}) \eta$ | $18^{v}$ tollero cum duplici augmento ク่ยعะ̃xovto (ảv ${ }^{\prime} \chi \omega$ lemma) | $4^{v}$ suffero emineo (ảvéxoual lemma); tollero elevo consurgo (ảvéx $\overline{\text { lemma) }}$ | $23^{v}$ suffero emineo (ảvé $\chi o \mu \alpha 1$ lemma); tolero elevo (ảvé $\chi \omega$ lemma) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 24^{r} 15 \dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon ı \lambda \tilde{\omega} \text { minor } \\| \mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) 1 \\ & \text { moveo, Iacto, poetice } \end{aligned}$ | $24^{v}$ minor | $9^{\text {r minor }}$ | $31^{\mathrm{v}}$ minor minitor; $36^{v}$ iacto moveo minor |
| $26^{\vee} 25$ व̇побокцц́́ $\zeta \omega$ reprobo improbo \|| approbo | $25^{\text {r }}$ reprobo improbo | $\begin{aligned} & 9^{\mathrm{v}} \text { reprobo } \\ & \text { approbo } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $32^{\text {r }}$ reprobo |
| $27^{v} 14$ बंток $\alpha \rho \alpha$ бок $\tilde{\omega}$ expecto \|| speculo(r) | $25^{\text {r }}$ [Lat. vacat] | - | $33^{\text {r }}$ speculor |
| $28^{r} 13$ ஷ̈ $\pi$ ќкоıтоৎ discretus lecto \|| adult(er), in p(lur)ib(us) locis cuba(n)s, a кغîual | $25^{\text {v }}$ [Lat. vacat] | - | $32^{\mathrm{v}}$ adulter, idest in pluribus locis cubans |
|  \|| amputo | su(m)moveo, ret...do? | $25^{\text {v }}$ [Lat. vacat] | - | $32^{v}$ amputo |
| $28^{r} 23$ àлокоб $\mu \tilde{\omega}$ deorno \\| spolio | $25^{\text {v }}$ [Lat. vacat] | - | $32^{\mathrm{v}}$ disorno spolio |
|  | 29v [Lat. vacat] | $12^{\text {v }}$ autentico | $33^{\text {r }}$ exauctorizo |
| $30^{r} 9$ á $\pi$ óvoı๙ amentia \|| arrogan(ti)a, soco(r)dia, desp(er)atio | suspi(ci)o, audacia, Insolen(ti)a | $26^{\text {r }}$ [Lat. vacat] | - | $33^{v}$ arrogantia secordia desperatio suspicio audacia insolentia |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  detraho polien(d)o | $26^{v}$ [Lat. vacat] | - | $33^{v}$ poliendo detraho |
| $30^{r} 13 \dot{\alpha} \pi \mathrm{o} \ell \hat{\varepsilon} \omega$, 七ò ג́крıß ${ }^{\omega}$ expolio \|| levit(er) incido v(e)l scalpo | $26^{v}$ [Lat. vacat] | - | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 33^{v} \text { leniter incido } \\ & \text { vel scalpo } \end{aligned}$ |
| $30^{\vee} 10$ ג́ $\pi$ ó $\pi \lambda \eta \kappa \tau o c ̧$ enectus enecatus \|| stolid(us) | $26^{v}$ [Lat. vacat] | - | $34^{\text {r }}$ stolidus |
| $30^{\text {v }} 18$ व̉́ro $\pi v \varepsilon ́ \omega$ aboleo redoleo \|| respiro | expiro | $26^{\text {² }}$ [Lat. vacat] | - | $33^{v}$ respiro |
| $31^{\text {r }} 8$ д̇ $\pi$ ор $\rho \eta \gamma v$ v́́ $\omega$ prorumpo \|| scindo | $26^{*}$ [Lat. vacat] | 10r sorbillo | $34^{\text {r }}$ scindo |
| $32^{\text {r }} 1 \dot{\alpha} \pi$ тобто $\lambda$ ń apostolatus \|| remissio, cu(m) comitatu honorifica d(e)ductio | $27^{\text {r }}$ [Lat. vacat] | - | $34^{\mathrm{v}}$ remissio |
| $32^{\text {v }} 17$ व̈лото́ $\mu \omega \varsigma$ praecise \|| tru(n)catim, duri(us) | $27^{\nu}$ [Lat. vacat] | - | $35^{\text {r }}$ truncatim |
| $34^{r} 22$ ö́ $\pi$ to ${ }^{2} \alpha$ ı tango \|| Iungo, attingo, $\gamma \varepsilon v i \kappa n ̃$ | $28^{\text {v [Lat. vacat] }}$ | - | $36^{r}$ tango iungo |
| $34^{r} 23$ व̈́ $\pi \tau \omega$ accendo \|| suspendo, appendo, a(n)necto | $28^{\text {v }}$ [Lat. vacat] | - | $36^{r}$ suspendo accendo |
| $34^{\vee} 10$ 人́ $\rho \alpha \dot{~ \eta ́ ~} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ́ \rho \alpha \alpha$ execratio maledictio \\| et nocum(en)tum | $30^{\text {r }}$ [Lat. vacat] | $14^{r}$ <br> nocumentum execratio imprecatio | 40r supplicatio |
| $35^{\vee} 7$ ápı 1 нós numerus $\|\mid$ la mostra | $30^{\text {r }}$ numerus | $13^{r}$ numerus la monstra | $38^{\text {r }}$ numerus |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 38^{v} 7 \text { à } \sigma \varepsilon \beta \tilde{\omega} \text { impie facio \|\| } \\ \text { (con)te(m)no } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $32^{v}$ [equivalents misplaced] | $15^{v}$ impie gero | $41^{r}$ contemno impie gero |
| $38^{v} 19 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \varepsilon v \omega$ langueo aegroto \|| neq(ue)o | $33^{r}$ [equivalents misplaced] | - | 41 ${ }^{v}$ egroto imbecillis sum nequeo langueo |
| $39^{r} 28$ व̇бк $\tilde{e}$ excolo meditor exerceo \|| laboro, fabrico, curo | $33^{r}$ [equivalents misplaced] | - | $41^{v}$ exerceo fabricor curo |
| $\begin{aligned} & 39^{r} 19 \tilde{\tilde{\alpha}} \sigma \mu \alpha \text { canticum \|\| } \\ & \text { cantus } \end{aligned}$ | $33^{r}$ [equivalents misplaced] | - | $\begin{aligned} & 42^{\mathrm{r}} \text { cantilena } \\ & \text { cantus } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 39r 23 д̇ $\sigma \pi \alpha ́ \zeta \rho \mu \alpha ı$ saluto amplector \|| amo, congratulo(r) | $3^{r}$ [equivalents misplaced] | - | $42^{\text {r }}$ saluto amo congratulor |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | Vat．Pal．Gr． 194 | EK Cod．Gr． 4 | Res． 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39²4 äбторүoç inamabilis $\\| \mathrm{s}(\mathrm{i}) \mathrm{n}(\mathrm{e})$ affectio（n）e | $33^{v}$［equivalents misplaced］ | － | $42^{v}$ sine affectione |
| $40^{v} 15$ वंбхŋиобо́vn inhonestas｜｜turpitudo | $33^{v}$［equivalents misplaced］ | － | $42^{v}$ inverecunda turpitudo |
| $40^{\vee} 17$ ஷं $\sigma \chi 0$ 人í́ occupatio｜｜ negotiu（ m ） | $33^{v}$［equivalents misplaced］ | － | $42^{v}$ negocium occupatio |
| $\begin{aligned} & 40^{v} 19 \dot{\alpha} \sigma x o \lambda \tilde{\omega} \text { avoco } \\| \\ & \text { ex(er)ceo } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $3^{v}$［equivalents misplaced］ | － | $42^{v}$ exerceo |
| $41^{r} 19$ ätı $\mu$ os inhonorus ingloriosus infamis｜｜ aliq（ua）n（do）s（ignifica）t illu（m）cui（us）nex no（n） deb（et）$m(u)$ ltari | $34^{\vee}$ ignobilis indecens | $16^{r}$ ignobilis indecorus aliquando significat alium？ interfectio［cod． deleted］non debet mulctari | $43^{v}$ indecorus ignobilis |
| $44^{v} 24$ ג́ $\varphi$ ópı $\alpha$ sterilitas｜｜甲opí́ abundan（ti）a | $37^{\vee}$ sterilitas maxime in fructibus | $18^{v}$ sterilitas maxime in fructibus بорí h．．．？ | $47^{v}$ sterilitas maxime？in fruttibus |
| $47^{r} 1 \beta \alpha ́ \mu \mu \mu$ Infectio， tinctura $\\|$ il favor（e） | $40^{\circ}$ tinctura il favore | － | $50^{\text {r }}$ tinctura |
| $57^{\vee} 8$ үрачвĩov stilus， graphiu（m）｜｜ккì үрачві́סıov | $46^{\text {r }}$ pinna stilus | $2^{\text {r }}$ penna hostile； үрачві́ठıov idem | $58^{v}$ penna stilus |

## 4）Marginal notes in agreement with none of the three codices

| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | Vat．Pal．Gr． 194 | EK Cod．Gr． 4 | Res． 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1^{r} 25 \alpha$ ả $\gamma$ 人 $\theta$ ós bonus benignus honestus｜｜fortis |  | ［lacuna］ | － |
| 1v 15 ä $\gamma \alpha v$ nimis｜｜ multu（m） $\mid \operatorname{adv}($ erbium $)$ | $1^{\text {v }}$ nimis valde nimium | ［lacuna］ | $1^{\text {v }}$ nimium valde |
| $1^{v} 18 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha v \alpha \kappa \tau \tilde{\omega}$ excandescor indignor moleste fero｜｜stomacho（r） | $1^{r}$ doleo graviter fero conqueror | ［lacuna］ | $1^{v}$ doleo conqueror graviter fero； indignor（interv．） |


| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | Vat．Pal．Gr． 194 | EK Cod．Gr． 4 | Res． 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1^{v} 20 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \pi \tilde{\omega}$ diligo amo \｜et （con）tent（us）su（m） | $1^{\text {r }}$ amo soleo sat habeo | ［lacuna］ | $1^{\text { }}$ amo soleo sat habeo |
| $2^{\text {v }} 9$ á $\gamma \lambda \alpha o ́ c$ clarus illustris｜｜ lucid（us） | $3^{r}$ splendidus | ［lacuna］ | $4^{r}$ splendidus |
| $2^{\text {v }} 16 \dot{\alpha} \gamma v i ́ \zeta \omega$ purgo purifico ｜｜（con）secro | $2^{r}$ purgo sacrifico purifico | ［lacuna］ | $2^{\text {v }}$ purgo sacrifico purifico；4r purifico |
| $2^{v} 24$ ふ̉ $\gamma v \omega \mu$ ơóvn perfidia fraus fraudatio｜｜Inscitia | $2^{r}$ ingratitudo discognoscentia | ［lacuna］ | $2^{r}$ ingratitudo dischonoscentia |
| $3^{v} 15$ áppo $\quad$ víá lucubratio vigilia｜｜Inso（m）nia | $2^{r}$ vigilia | ［lacuna］ | $2^{\text {v }}$ vigilia |
| $3^{\vee} 26 \alpha$ ̉ $\gamma \chi 1 \beta \alpha \Theta$ ńs prealtus｜｜ p （ro）fundus |  | ［lacuna］ | － |
| $4^{r} 19 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \mathrm{vo}$ 白 $\tau \eta \varsigma$ munerarius｜｜ludo（rum） p （rae）fect（us） | $2^{\text {r }}$ profectus luctorum | ［lacuna］ | $2^{r}$ luctatorum praefectus |
| $4^{\vee} 2 \alpha$ á $\delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi o ́ \varsigma$ frater $\\| q(u) i$ ex ead（em）matre nat（us） | $3^{v}$ frater soror germanus natura | ［lacuna］ | $4^{\vee}$ frater soror germanus natura |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 5^{v} 18 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \eta \delta \tilde{\omega} \varsigma \text { tediose } \\| \\ \text { Iniocund(e) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $5^{\text {r }}$ insipide | ［lacuna］ | $6^{v}$ insipide |
| $6^{v} 21$ ๙ỉסoũu人ı verecundor ｜｜vereo（r） | － | ［lacuna］ | － |
| $7^{\mathrm{V}} 25$ аitc̃ peto postulo $\\|$ et reg（e）？ | $6^{v}$ peto | ［lacuna］ | $8^{\text {v }}$ peto |
| $8^{\text {r }} 10$ גíẃvıoç sempiternus｜｜ $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) 1$ excels（us） | $5^{\text {v }}$ eternus perpetuus | ［lacuna］ | $7^{7}$ perpetuus aeternus |
|  naturus｜｜Ingens | $8^{v}$ maturus vigens | ［lacuna］ | $11^{r}$ maturus vigens |
| 10r 22 वंкр $\alpha \tau i \zeta \omega$ ianto｜｜ id est an（te）prandiu（m） aliq（uid）comedo | － | ［lacuna］ | － |
| $10^{v} 5$ д́крıßо入оү́́к veriloquium｜｜et co（m）－ putan（d）i seu ro（n）cina（n）－ di et（iam） $\mathrm{i}(\mathrm{n})$ minimis diligen（ti）a | － | ［lacuna］ | － |
| $11^{\text {r }} 3$ а́крохор $\delta \alpha ́ v \eta$ ，$\dot{\eta}$ $\mu \nu \rho \mu \eta к i ́ \alpha ~ v e r r u c a ~\|\mid ~ u n(d e) ~$ et verrucosus | － | ［lacuna］ | － |


| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  iugum \|| $\alpha<\rho \omega v \nu x$ í $\alpha$, fere <br>  pozo/pomo? | $9^{r}$ summitas montium cacumen mons ( $\alpha<\rho \omega ́ \rho \varepsilon ı \alpha)$; vertex montis ( $\alpha k \rho \omega v u x i ́ \alpha)$ | [lacuna] | $11^{v}$ sumitas montium mons cacumen |
| $11^{r} 16$ äktıбто̧ inconditus $\\|$ Imfabricat(us) ${ }^{\text {t1 }}$ | $9^{\text {r }}$ non fabricatus | [lacuna] | $12^{\text {r }}$ non fabricatus |
| $11^{\text {v }} 13$ ä $\lambda \varepsilon \varsigma$ sales libus \|| in $(\mathrm{n})$ pl(ural)i | - | [lacuna] | - |
| 11¹ 18 व̈ $\lambda \varepsilon u \rho o v$ farina \|| $\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{ro}) \mathrm{p}(\mathrm{ri})$ e tritici | $10^{r}$ farina | [lacuna] | $13^{v}$ farina |
| $11^{\vee} 23 \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta$ ıvós verax manifestus \|| ver(us) ${ }^{\text {t2 }}$ | - | [lacuna] | - |
| $12^{r} 8{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \mu \mu \mu \alpha$ unguentum \|| unctura | - | [lacuna] | - |
| $12^{\text {r }} 16$ à $\lambda$ óyıбтоs inconsideratus \|| tem(er) ari(us), irrationalis ${ }^{\text {³ }}$ | $10^{v}$ inconsiderabilis | [lacuna] | $14^{r}$ inconsiderabilis |
|  implacabilis \|| asp(er), dur(us) | $13^{\text {r immitis }}$ | $1^{v}$ immitis | $17^{\text {r }}$ immitis |
| 13² 2 á $\mu \eta \tau$ тoc messis \|| v(e)1 $\mathrm{ip}(\mathrm{su}) \mathrm{mt}(\mathrm{em}) \mathrm{p}(\mathrm{u}) \mathrm{s}$ messis | $13^{\text {r }}$ messis | $1^{v}$ messis | $17^{\mathrm{r}}$ messis |
| $13^{r} 4$ d́ $\mu \eta ́ \chi \alpha v o v$ intractabile \|| Impossiblie alicui machinatio(n)i | $13^{r}$ inopinabilis inmensus dubius sine remedio (ả $\mu$ ńxavos lemma) | $1^{v}$ inoppinabilis, immensus, dubius, sine remedio difficilis <br>  lemma) | $17^{r}$ inopinabilis immensus dubius sine remedio difficilis <br>  lemma) |
| $13^{r} 16$ ả $\mu u ́ v \omega$ ooí auxilior opitulor $\\| \mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e})$ l removeo | $13^{\mathrm{v}}$ and $14^{\mathrm{r}}$ vivo; cum $\pi \rho o$ protego defendo $\varepsilon \pi \imath$ adiuvo expello (Gr. lemma twice) | $2^{v}$ iuvo; cum $\pi \rho \omega$ protego defendo, cum $\varepsilon \pi l$ adiuvo, cum $\alpha \pi 0$ expello | $17^{\text {v }}$ iuvo |
|  \|| redico, reco(m)memoro, repeto | - | - | - |

[^122]| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | Vat．Pal．Gr． 194 | EK Cod．Gr． 4 | Res． 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  proportionale｜｜$\alpha v \alpha \lambda$ oyía proportionalitas，id est （con）venien（ti）a dua（rum） proportionu（m）i（n）t（er）se， ut ita h（abe）t se octo ad 4 ut 10 ad 5 ． | $16^{v}$ àv $\alpha \lambda$ oүía proprietas lemma | $3^{v}$ àv $\alpha \lambda$ oyía proprietas lemma | $21^{v} \dot{\alpha} v \alpha \lambda$ oүí $\alpha$ proportio proprietas lemma |
| $14^{\mathrm{r}} 19$ ảv $\mathbf{\alpha} \sigma \pi \tilde{\omega}$ evello｜｜ eximo，lib（er）o | $17^{\text {v }}$ evello extraho | $4^{r}$ evello extraho | $22^{v}$ evello extraho |
| $17^{r} 10 \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \theta$ рккı́́ pruna $\\|$ a <br> p （er）urendo dicta |  lemma） | － | ${ }^{26^{r}}$ pruna <br> （ǎv $\begin{aligned} & \text { рракı̧ lemma）}\end{aligned}$ |
| $17^{r} 11 \alpha \nsim v \theta \rho \alpha \xi$ carbo $\\| q$（uia） $\mathrm{car}(\mathrm{et}) \mathrm{fla}(\mathrm{m}) \mathrm{ma}$ | $20^{\text {r }}$ carbo | － | $26^{\text {r }}$ carbo |
| $\begin{aligned} & 17^{v} 15 \text { áví⿱宀乇 } \alpha \mu \alpha ı \text { resurgo } \\| \\ & \mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) \mathrm{l} \text { attollo } \end{aligned}$ | $19^{\text {r }}$ exurgo | $5^{5}$ exurgo | $24^{\text {r }}$ exurgo |
| $18^{r} 26$ ảv $v \alpha \gamma \omega v 1 \sigma \tau \eta ́ \varsigma$ laxamentum｜｜ $\operatorname{adv(er)}$ sari（us），${ }^{\text {t4 }}$ （con）certator | － | － | － |
| $19^{r} 14 \dot{\alpha} v \tau \iota \beta$ 〇 $\lambda \tilde{\omega}$ oro precor ｜｜v（e）l obvio | $20^{v}$ obvius supplico vel rogo | obvius supplico oro | $26^{v}$ obvius supplico rogo |
| 19r $22 \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \tau \varepsilon ́ \chi \omega$ destino inhibeo prohibeo｜｜retineo， $\dot{\alpha} v \theta \varepsilon \kappa \tau \varepsilon ́ o v$ retin（en）dum （est） | $20^{v}$ contrateneo contrasto | $6^{v}$ contra teneo | $26^{v}$ contra teneo contrasto |
| 19 16 ảv $\tau$ т́кعц $\mu \alpha ı$ obsto officio obsum｜｜obIaceo， oppo（s）it（us）su（m） | － | － | － |
| $21^{v} 16 \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \omega ́ v \nu \mu \circ$ ¢ sine nomine ignobilis｜｜ Inno（m）in n atus | － |  | － |
| $22^{\text {r }} 8 \dot{\alpha} \xi_{\text {ıóo }}{ }^{\alpha}{ }_{1}$ mereor｜｜ supplico，dignu（m）puto | － | － | － |
| $22^{r} 10 \dot{\alpha} \xi \hat{\prime} \omega \mu \alpha$ dignitas honor meritum｜｜vel petitio et $\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{ro}) \mathrm{nu}(\mathrm{n}) \operatorname{ciatu}(\mathrm{m})$ ， p（ro）positio seu or（ati）o | $22^{\text {v }}$ dignitas postulatio | $7^{v}$ dignitas postulatio | $29^{\text {r }}$ postulatio dignitas |
| $22^{r} 11$ d̀ $\xi \omega \mu \alpha \tau \iota \kappa o ́ \varsigma$ honorarius｜｜magnae dignitatis | － |  | － |

[^123]| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $22^{v} 23 \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau 0 \mu \alpha ı$ abeo discedo \|| reli(n)q(u)o, libero(r), ${ }^{\text {t }}$ desino \| abalieno | $23^{r} \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \tau \tau \omega$ absolvo libero | $8^{r} \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \tau \tau \omega$ absolvo libero | $30^{r} \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega$ absolvo libero |
| $23^{r} 14 \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \nu \tau \tilde{\omega}$ obvio occurro \|| aliq(ua)n(do) int(er)su(m) | $23^{\text {r }}$ obvio | - | $30^{r}$ seorsum appendo |
| $23^{r} 17$ व̇ $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha$ ít $\eta$ tos inexcusabilis irrecusabilis \|| Indep(re)cabilis | $23^{v}$ inexcusabilis inexorabilis inevitabilis | $8^{v}$ inexcusabilis inexorabilis inevitabilis | $30^{r}$ inexorabilis inexcusabilis inevitabilis |
| $24^{r} 13$ ג̉ $\pi \varepsilon ı \rho ́ ́_{\alpha}$ imperitia \|| infinitas | $24^{\vee}$ imperitia | $9^{\text {r }}$ inexperientia | $31^{1}$ imperitia inexperientia |
|  tò ả $\pi \mathrm{o} \lambda \alpha \mu \beta$ 人́v $\omega$ recipio \|| $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) 1$ absum, disto ${ }^{\text {to }}$ | - | $8^{\mathrm{v}}$ abstineo sufficio | 30v abstineo |
|  <br>  dictu(m) q(uod) instar ignis ab amplo tend(it) $i(n)$ angustu(m) | - | - | - |
| 25r 26 árıఠтí́ infidelitas incredulitas \|| diffiden(ti)a | $24^{v}$ perfidia | $9^{\text {r }}$ perfidia | $31^{v}$ perfidia |
| $26^{v} 8 \dot{\alpha} \pi \operatorname{co}^{2} \delta \iota \lambda_{1} \tilde{\omega}$ retimesco \|| refo(r)mido | $25^{\text {r }}$ retimesco | $9^{\text {v }}$ timeo | $32^{\text {r }}$ timeo |
| $26^{v} 22 \dot{\alpha} \pi{ }^{2} \delta i ́ \delta \omega \mu \mathrm{l}$ absolvo reddo sartio \|| edo, o(ste)ndo? | $25^{\text {r }}$ absolvo reddo sartio | $9^{\mathrm{v}}$ restituo reddo vendo | $32^{\text {r }}$ restituo reddo |
|  deploro \|| (con)q(ue)ror | $25^{\text {r }}$ defleo deploro | $9^{\text {v }}$ deploro | $32^{\text {r }}$ deploro |
| $27^{\vee} 26$ а́то́крรє $\tau \alpha 1$ repositum est $\\|$ appeto(r)? | [Lat. vacat] | - | - |
| $29^{r} 12 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \mathrm{o} \lambda \lambda$ ú $\omega$ perdo amitto \|| p(er)eo ${ }^{\text {t7 }}$ | $26^{\text {r }}$ [Lat. vacat] | - | $33^{\text {r }}$ perdo destruo |
| $30^{\vee} 19 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \pi v i ́ \gamma \omega$ eneco suffoco \\| $\pi$ ví $\boldsymbol{\omega} \omega \operatorname{id}(\mathrm{em})$ q(uo)d? $\pi v i ́ \gamma \omega$ | $26^{\text {² }}$ [Lat. vacat] | 10r suffoco | $33^{v}$ suffoco |
| $31^{r} 10$ д̀ $\pi$ орí́ inopia penuria \|| dubitatio, ${ }^{\text {t8 }}$ p(er)iculu(m) | $26^{v}$ [Lat. vacat] | $10^{r}$ indigentia | $34^{r}$ indigentia |

[^124]| ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 | Vat. Pal. Gr. 194 | EK Cod. Gr. 4 | Res. 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32 9 ároovu入 $\tilde{\omega}$ expilo \|| dep(o)p(u)lor | - | - | - |
| $32^{r} 21$ ä $\pi о \tau \varepsilon ́ \mu v \omega$ deseco recido \|| sep(ar)o, p(ar)tem a toto divido | $27^{\text {r }}$ [Lat. vacat] | $10^{v}$ abscondo aufero | $34^{v}$ aufero abscindo |
| $34^{v} 26$ д̉ $\rho \gamma \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \alpha \iota \alpha i \quad \sigma \chi o \lambda \alpha i ́$ feriai \|| sing(u)l(ar)i carent | $30^{r}$ [Lat. vacat] | - | - |
| $35^{r} 10 \dot{\alpha} \rho \gamma \cup \rho o u ̃ \varsigma$ argenteus \|| v(e)l splendid(us) | $30^{\circ}$ [Lat. vacat] | $13^{\text {r }}$ argenteus | $38^{v}$ argenteus |
| $35^{r} 23$ ஷ́perท́ industria nobilitas virtus \|| aliq(ua)n (d)o pulchritudo, et $q$ (uae)da(m) p(rae)cipuitas | $30^{\text {r }}$ [Lat. vacat] | $13^{\text {r }}$ virtus | $38^{\text {r }}$ virtus |
| $36^{r} 8 \dot{\alpha} \rho \mu \alpha ́ \mu \alpha \xi \alpha$ <br> carpentum \|| pilentu(m) | $30^{\circ}$ [Lat. vacat] | $13^{v}$ genus currus | $39^{r}$ genus currus |
| $36^{r} 20 \dot{\alpha} \rho \mu o ́ \zeta \omega$ apto accommodo \|| aliq(uid) alicui | et (con)ve(n)io ip(s)e alicui rei | $30^{\circ}$ [Lat. vacat] | $13^{v}$ conglutino coacto guberno | $39^{r}$ conglutino coapto guberno |
| $36^{v} 8$ d̉pveıó¢ agnus \|| aries | 32r [Lat. vacat] | - | - |
| $39^{v} 8$ व̈ठ $\sigma \lambda \alpha \gamma \chi$ vos immisericors \|| pusillanim(us) | - | - | - |
|  <br>  $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{e}) \mathrm{l}$ (con)iunctura ${ }^{\text {t9 }}$ | $33^{v}$ [equivalents misplaced] | - | 43r ludus puerorum genus ludi (astragalois a lemma) |
| $40^{\circ} 2$ व̇ $\sigma u v \eta ́ \theta \eta \varsigma$ insuetus insolens \|| no(n) familia(r)is | - | - | - |
| $40^{v} 16 \dot{\alpha} \sigma x \eta ́ \mu \omega v$ inhonestus \|ld(e)fo(r)mis | $33^{v}$ equivalents misplaced] | - | $42^{v}$ decens |
| $40^{\circ} 20$ व̈́ $\sigma \omega$ тos helluo prodigus ganeo \|| Insatiabil(is) | $32^{v}$ [equivalents misplaced] | - | $42^{v}$ insanabilis prodigus |
| $41^{\text {r }} 16$ át $\tau, ~ \dot{~} \beta \lambda \alpha ́ \beta \eta \tau \eta ̃ \varsigma$ ätทs erumna nocumentum \|| p (er) nicies | $34^{v}$ nocumentum | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 16^{\mathrm{r}} \\ \text { nocumentum } \end{array}$ | $43^{\vee}$ nocumentum |
| $41^{\vee} 26$ «ủyท́ lux \|| fulgor? | $35^{v}$ aurora splendor quando sol oritur | $17^{\mathrm{r}}$ aurora splendor quando sol oritur | $45^{r}$ aurora |

[^125]| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | Vat．Pal．Gr． 194 | EK Cod．Gr． 4 | Res． 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  voluntarius libens｜｜ $p(r o) p$（ri）（us）et spontane（us）homicida ${ }^{\text {t10 }}$ | $35^{v}$ voluntarius qui occidit．．．？ | $17^{\mathrm{r}}$ voluntarius homicida sui | $45^{r}$ voluntarius homicida |
| $42^{r} 23$ аủ入íそou人ı <br>  ब̀v $\alpha \sigma \tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \varphi \rho o \mu \alpha 1$ commoror conversor｜｜alloggio， div（er）to | $36^{r}$ pernocto pono habitaculum castra metor | $17^{r}$ phistulo pernocto pono habitatum castra metor demoror manco tendo | 45r pernocto habitaculum pono castra metor |
| $43^{r} 24$ ๙ủX $\mu \tilde{\mu}$ squalleo｜｜ sordeo | $36^{v}$ squaleo et sordidus sum | － | $46^{r}$ squaleo sordidus sum |
| $43^{\vee} 5 \dot{\alpha} \varphi \alpha \iota \rho o v ̃ \mu \alpha ı$ aufero decido deripio｜｜ p （ri）vo， perdo | － | － | － |
| $43^{v} 8 \dot{\alpha} \varphi \alpha v \eta$ 亿́s ignotus obscurus｜｜dispare（n）s， evanid（us） | $37^{\text {r }}$ non apparens oculos latens | $18^{r}$ non apparens occultus latens | $46^{v}$ occultus non apparens |
| $43^{v} 24 \dot{\alpha} \varphi \varepsilon \varepsilon \delta \omega \tilde{\omega}$ non parco｜｜ үعvıкñ，no（n）sparagno | $37^{\text {r［Lat．vacat］}}$ | $18^{v}$ non parco | $47^{r}$ non parco |
| $44^{r} 23$ d̉ $\varphi \theta$ oví $\alpha$ copia largitas｜｜$\dot{\alpha} \varphi \theta \varepsilon \gamma \xi$ í́ i（n）－ fantia，mutitas | － | － | － |
| $44^{\mathrm{v}} 14 \dot{\alpha} \varphi$ í $\pi \tau \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$ avolo ｜｜$\dot{\alpha} \varphi ı \pi \pi \varepsilon v ́ \omega$ abeq（ui）to， eq（ui）ta（n）s abeo | － | － | － |
| $44^{\vee} 23$ á $\varphi$ орптótns intolerabilitas｜｜ $\dot{\alpha} \varphi \rho \rho$ óvıt $\rho o v$ spuma nitri | － | － | － |
| $45^{r} 6 \dot{\alpha} \varphi$ обเ๐ṽ $\mu \alpha ı$ dissimulo devoto｜｜evito，p（er） relligio（n）em quanda（m） omitto | $37^{v}$ parum tango idest libo abhominor | $18^{v}$ parum tango libo abhominor repudio | 47r abominor repudio libo |
| $45^{\vee} 3$ ä $\chi \alpha \rho ı$ ，ó $\mu \eta$ そ̀ ह́ $\chi \omega v$ xápıv insulsus｜｜ Ingrat（us）${ }^{\text {t11 }}$ | $38^{v}$ non gratus | $19^{v}$ non gratus | $48^{\text {r }}$ non gratus |
|  illepid（us） | $38^{v}$ ingratus | $19^{v}$ ingratus （marg．dex．） | $48^{v}$ ingratus |

[^126]| ÖNB Suppl．Gr． 45 | Vat．Pal．Gr． 194 | EK Cod．Gr． 4 | Res． 224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $46^{\vee} 11 \beta \alpha \kappa \tau \eta \rho i ́ \alpha$ baculus｜｜ maza sceptrum | $39^{\text {r baculus }}$ | $20^{\circ}$ baculum | $49^{\text {v }}$ baculus |
| $47^{r} 3$ 及avouбótņ ท̂ $\beta \alpha v \alpha u \sigma i ́ \alpha ~ a r r o g a n t i a ~$ ｜｜vulgaris，q（uon）dam ventositas | $3^{\text {3r }}$ mechanicheria （ $\beta \alpha v \alpha u \sigma_{i ́ \alpha}^{\alpha}$ lemma） | $20^{v}$ mechanicheria | $49^{v}$ <br> mechanicharia <br> （ $\beta$ 人vouvoí $\alpha$ lemma） |
| 47r 26 ß $\alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \varepsilon$ と́ rex｜｜vel etiam dominus | $3^{39^{\text {r }} \text { rex }}$ | $21^{\text {r }}$ rex | － |
| $47^{\vee} 3 \beta \alpha \sigma$ íheı $\alpha$ regia $\\|$ $\beta \alpha \sigma$ ídeıo̧ regalis｜et regina | $39^{\text {r }}$ regnum | － | － |
| $47^{v} 11$ ßабьı入ıкои̃ $\sigma \omega ́ \mu \alpha$ тоৎ $\varphi$ ט́ $\alpha \kappa$ द satelles｜｜regiae | － | － | － |
| $48^{r} 9 \beta \dot{\varepsilon} \beta \alpha$ ıos cert（us）， rat（us），firm（us），stabilis｜｜ constans | $40^{v}$ certus firmus | $21^{\text {r }}$ firmus | $50^{\vee}$ firmus |
| $49^{r} 13 \beta \lambda \alpha \beta$ عрóv nociuum｜｜ damnosum | － | － | － |
| $52^{\text {r }} 17$ ßpúov alga｜｜faex maris | － | － | － |
| $52^{r} 18$ ßpuxn $\theta$ нós fremit（us） <br> ｜｜кхì $\beta \rho u ́ x \eta \mu \alpha$ | － | － | － |
| $54^{v} 9$ үعvv $\tilde{\omega}$ gigno，p（ro） <br>  | $44^{v}$ genero | $25^{r}$ genero； đópıбтоя غ̇үव́́ $\mu \eta$ | $56^{r}$ genero |
| $54^{\vee} 15$ ү́́voc，tò है $\theta$ vos gens <br> ｜｜natio | － | － | － |
| $57^{\vee} 22$ ү $\quad$ ú $\langle\omega$ mutio $\| \mid \eta$ үрút兀 $\mid$ grunio | $46^{\text {r }}$ lugeo | ${ }^{27}$ lugeo； үри入íそ $\omega$ grunnio sicut faciunt sues （separate lemma） | $58^{\text {v }}$ lugeo； үри $\lambda \lambda i ́ \zeta \omega$ grunnio ut sues faciunt（separate lemma） |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 can be found under the following link on the website of the Austrian National Library: http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AL00159293 (downloaded on 10 August 2014). The manuscript has been fully digitized recently; the digital images are available from the link above by clicking to the option "Digitalisat" on the right.
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    ${ }^{116}$ Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1919: 14f.
    ${ }^{117}$ Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1927: 231-232.
    ${ }^{118}$ Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1919: 14, n. 15.

[^26]:    ${ }^{119}$ Goetz \& Gundermann (ed.) 1888: 215-483.
    ${ }^{120}$ Hunger 1994: 85.
    ${ }^{121}$ In his description, Hunger 1994: 85 only mentions Greek and Latin marginal notes added to the Greek-Latin dictionary.
    ${ }^{122}$ For further information on this manuscript see pages 70-72.
    ${ }^{123}$ Cf. Daly 1967: 69-75 (Reviewed by Alpers 1975: 113-117.)

[^27]:    
     ŋ̇ठótnc. These deviating lemmas are found both in the 8th-century Harleian manuscript and in the 15th-century ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45.
    
     be found in the 8th-century Harleian manuscript; they only appear in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Thus, in these cases the deviation might also be attributed to the fact that some new lexical items were inserted alphabetically incorrectly later. I owe thanks to Dr. Gábor Bolonyai for drawing my attention to the difference between the two sets of examples found in the previous note and in the present one.
    ${ }^{126}$ See Hunger 1994: 85, where the title of the wordlist and its incipit and explicit with the matching loci in CGL II are provided.

[^28]:    ${ }^{127}$ Georgius Goetz ed., Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana: accedunt hermeneumata medicobotanica vetustiora. Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum, vol. III. Leipzig 1892; henceforth abbreviated as CGL III.
    ${ }^{128}$ Such thematic sections can be found in the following hermeneumata published in CGL III: in the Hermeneumata Leidensia (CGL III 25, 59-26, 37); in the Hermeneumata Monacensia (CGL III 191, 28-192, 22); in the Hermeneumata Einsidlensia (CGL III 263, 32-264, 64); in the Hermeneumata Montepessulana (CGL III 300, 30-301, 25); in the Hermeneumata Stephani (CGL III 358, 10-359, 11); in the Fragmentum Bruxellense (CGL III 396, 76-397, 25) and in the Hermeneumata Vaticana (two separate sections: $\pi \varepsilon \rho i ̀ \delta \varepsilon ́ v \delta \rho \omega v$ de arboribus CGL III 427, 39-
     Amploniana also contained a section of tree names (it is indicated with the number XXXV in the contents list in CGL III 82, 42) which has not been preserved.
    ${ }^{129}$ This is also true for the Hermeneumata Celtis: it also contains a section of tree names (ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 43, ff. 41v-42v; not yet published; I owe thanks to Dr. Christian Gastgeber for the digital images of these folios) where one can find several matching items with the list of tree names in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, but there are differences, too (regarding e.g. order, equivalents, gender).
    ${ }^{130}$ This manuscript is important for the analysis of the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 from several

[^29]:    viewpoints. On the one hand, it contains the same alphabetic Greek-Latin dictionary on ff. 91r-293r, which was also collated with the Greek-Latin dictionary of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 - on this issue and for the results of the collation see pp. 96-103 for more details. On the other hand, the examination of a group of marginal notes in the Madrid manuscript also proved to be instructive for the analysis of a major group of marginal notes found in the margins of the Greek-Latin dictionary of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. On this question see pp. 139-144 for further details.
    ${ }^{131}$ Revilla 1936: 256. In the description of the Madrid codex Harlfinger in Moraux et al. 1976: 152 presents only the first and last lemma pairs of this section, while Miller 1966 does not mention this section of thematic plant names at all in his description of the manuscript $\Sigma$ I 12.
    ${ }^{132}$ Accroding to Revilla 1936: 256, the first two items in this section in the manuscript $\Sigma$ I 12 are ởrıos pirus (= ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 298r 10) and $̇ \lambda \lambda$ í́ $_{\alpha}$ olea (= ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 298r 11), and the last two lemma pairs are $\rho$ व́ $\mu v o \varsigma$ ramnus, spina alba (= ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 298v 22) and $\sigma \tau \rho o ́ \beta \iota \lambda$ оц pinus (ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 298v 23).
    ${ }^{133}$ CGL II 487-506.
    ${ }^{134}$ In his description, Hunger 1994: 85 writes that the Latin-Greek dictionary has no title ("ohne Titel Cod.") in the Vienna manuscript. On the digital image of f. 299r, the words per alphabetum posita g[ are clearly visible, while I managed to decipher the first two words of

[^30]:    the title using ultraviolet light in a dark room in the manuscript department of the Austrian National Library.
    ${ }^{135}$ On the so-called idiomata generum see Dionisotti 1988: 15-17.
    ${ }^{136}$ Hunger 1994: 85 does not mention the grammatical subdivision of the Latin-Greek dictionary or does not classify the sections in the Latin-Greek dictionary as idiomata generum.

[^31]:    ${ }^{137}$ E.g. on f. 301v, in the left margin: Ista non stant per ordinem alphabeti; on f. 307r, in the right margin: non sequuntur per ordinem.

[^32]:    ${ }^{138}$ Revilla 1936: 256.
    ${ }^{139}$ Plutarchi Moralia, vol. I. Recensuerunt et emendaverunt W.R. Paton et I. Wegehaupt, praefationem scr. M. Pohlenz, editionem correctiorem curavit Hans Gärtner. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Lipsiae, 1974. 3, 6 and 11.
    ${ }^{140}$ Plutarchi Moralia, vol. I, 151.
    ${ }^{141}$ Plutarchi Moralia, vol. III. Recensuerunt et emendaverunt W. R. Paton, M. Pohlenz, et W. Sieveking. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Lipsiae, 1972.398 and 419.
    ${ }^{142}$ Plutarchi Moralia, vol. III. 357.
    ${ }^{143}$ Plutarchi Moralia, vol. II, fasc. 2. Recensuerunt et emendaverunt W. Nachstädt, W. Sieveking,

[^33]:    et J. B. Titchener. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Lipsiae, 1971. 31 (Nr. 30B).
    ${ }^{144}$ In his description, Hunger 1994: 85-86 treats the two sections of proverbia (proverbs from Plutarch and alphabetically arranged proverbs) as a single unit. Here, I have decided to treat them as two separate units since the second section of proverbs is introduced with a Greek title in the manuscript the function of which is to introduce new structural units throughout the codex.

[^34]:    ${ }^{145}$ Paroemiographi Graeci. Zenobius, Diogenianus, Plutarchus, Gregorius Cyprius cum appendice proverbiorum. Ediderunt E. L. a Leutsch et F. G. Schneidewin. Gottingae, 1839.; Paroemiographi Graeci. Tomus 2. Diogenianus, Gregorius Cyprius, Macarius, Aesopus, Apostolius et Arsenius, Mantissa proverbiorum. Edidit Ernestus Ludov. a Leutsch. Gottingae, 1851.
     каì $\delta \alpha \not \mu о v \iota \omega ́ \delta \varepsilon ı \varsigma ~ \sigma \tau \rho о ß о v ิ \sigma ı$. The proverb with the same explanation can only be found in Suda $\gamma$ 508. Other sources only contain the first half of the explanation ( $\grave{\varepsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \tau \hat{\imath} v \mu \alpha ́ \tau \eta v$ $\pi 0 v o v ́ v \tau \omega v)$ : Diogenianus Cent. II 21; Gregorius Cyprius Cent. II 77 and Appendix proverbiorum Cent. I 89.
    ${ }^{147}$ The incipit and the explicit of this section can well illustrate this phenomenon. The first proverb appears in various sources with possible minor differences: Diogenianus Cent. I 11; Macarius Chrysocephalus Cent. I 20; Michael Apostolius Cent. I. 13; Suda $\alpha$ 281; Eudemus,
     found in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. However, Hunger 1994: 86 identifies the source of the first proverb as Diogenianus I 11, which has a slightly different text variant: $\beta \varepsilon \beta \imath \omega$ кót $\omega$ v instead of $\beta ı 0 \tilde{v} \tau \omega v$. The explicit can be found at the following loci: Gregorius Cyprius Cent. III 36 (Cod. Leid.); Appendix proverbiorum Cent. V 33; Michael Apostolius Cent. XVIII 43; Suda $\chi$ 610. This time, all of these sources have the proverb and its explanation in the same form as it appears in the Vienna manuscript.
    ${ }^{148}$ Zenobius Cent. III 77; Photius $\varepsilon 835$ and Suda $\varepsilon 1154$.

[^35]:    ${ }^{149}$ Daremberg \& Ruelle (ed.) 1963: 599-600; Appendice, Section VI. Premier texte anonyme inédit. Dénominations de la nature de l'homme. Hunger 1994: 86 does not provide this information.
    ${ }^{150}$ Cf. Daremberg \& Ruelle 1963: LIV.
    ${ }^{151}$ The detailed collation can be found in appendix II Corporis humanipartes (ff. 327r-328v). Collation on pp. 199-201.

[^36]:    ${ }^{152}$ Plutarchi Moralia, vol. II, fasc. 1. Recensuerunt et emendaverunt W. Nachstädt, W. Sieveking, J. B. Titchener. Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Lipsiae, 1971. 329 (101).

[^37]:    ${ }^{153}$ The results presented in this chapter were partly published in Ötvös 2009 in Hungarian and in Ötvös 2011 in English.
    ${ }^{154}$ For a detailed analysis of the watermarks see Chapter I on pp. 22-23.
    ${ }^{155}$ István Kapitánffy also located the place of the transcription to Italy on the basis of the Italian words occurring sporadically among the Latin lemmas, see Kapitánffy 1991: 180. However, the presence of the Italian words in the Greek-Latin dictionary does not prove necessarily that the manuscript was copied in Italy since the Italian words are adopted from another tradition of Greek-Latin lexica. For details see pp. 145-157.
    ${ }^{156}$ In the codicological descriptions found in manuscript catalogues the codex is usually also dated to the middle of the $15^{\text {th }}$ century and located to the city of Ferrara, see Bick 1920: 54; Csapodi 1973: 456; Mazal 1981:302;Hunger 1994:85 (only the dating is given) and Gamillscheg

[^38]:    1994:44. In the online description of the manuscript on the website of the Austrian National Library the codex is also dated to the middle of the $15^{\text {th }}$ century, between 1440 and 1460 , cf. http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AL00159293 (downloaded on 26 August 2014).
    ${ }^{157}$ It is another more complex question whether Janus Pannonius was also the scribe of the manuscript as Denis states. For the detailed discussion of this issue see pp. 27-30. From the viewpoint of the provenience of the codex, this question is not relevant now; the only thing Denis's remark proves is that Janus definitely possessed the codex and he did use it, as well.
    ${ }^{158}$ For ample material on Janus Pannonius's Ferrara years see Huszti's biography (Chapters 2-9); on Janus's Greek studies in Guarino's school see Huszti 1931: 22-23. In Guarino's school, a most important method for the instruction of Greek was the preparation of translations from Greek to Latin. In this way two aims could be achieved at the same time: students could come to know the Greek authors and could learn and practise the Greek language simultaneously; see e.g. Sabbadini 1896: 124ff.

[^39]:    ${ }^{159}$ Weiss 1957: 93 and 102.
    ${ }^{160}$ On this question see pp. 40-41 for details.
    ${ }^{161}$ Teleki 1784: 98-99.
    ${ }^{162}$ Ritoók 1975: 405ff.
    ${ }^{163}$ Horváth 2001: 199-215.
    ${ }^{164}$ Horváth 2001: 209. The Latin equivalent negotior cannot be found in the $8^{\text {th }}$-century codex Harleianus 5792, see CGL II 412, 59. It seems to be a later addition from another tradition of Greek-Latin lexica. On this group of glossary notes see pp. 145-157 for details. However, it is possible that the insertion of the Latin equivalent negotior next to the Greek verb $\pi о \lambda \nu \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \circ v \tilde{\omega}$ is mistaken. In one of the representatives of the other tradition of GreekLatin lexica, in the Madrid manuscript Res. 224 (for details on this codex see p.152) we can find the following Latin equivalent next to this Greek verb (f. 202v): in rebus non pertinentibus

[^40]:    implicor. This Latin equivalent was also added in the left margin in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 (with a slight modification: instead of non, nihil can be read there). In the Madrid codex, the Latin equivalent negocior belongs to the Greek verb $\pi$ лоııธv́ $\omega$ (together with civilitor), which directly precedes the verb $\pi \boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda \boldsymbol{\pi} \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \circ v \tilde{\omega}$. Thus, due to the proximity of the two Greek lemmas in the other tradition of Greek-Latin lexica it is also probable that the Latin verb negotior was mistakenly inserted next to the Greek verb $\pi \circ \lambda \cup \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \circ v \tilde{\omega}$. Being unaware of this mistake, Janus then could have used the Latin equivalent negotior trusting his dictionary.
    ${ }^{165}$ Csapodi 1975: 205-206.
    ${ }^{166}$ Csapodi 1973: 456 (No. 1013) lists the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 (referred to as Vocabularium Graecolatinum and Latinograecum) as authentic Corvinian manuscript. However, in his subsequent work, Bibliotheca Corviniana (Budapest 1999) written together with his wife Klára Csapodi-Gárdonyi, he does not include the codex in the catalogue of the Corvinian manuscripts and we cannot find any reference whether this was a conscious decision. In contrast, in his article written in 1990 Otto Mazal lists the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 among the Corvinian manuscripts, see Mazal 1990: 27. So there is no consensus in the literature regarding the Corvinian status of the Vienna manuscript. The codex does not have the typical characteristics of the authentic Corvinian manuscripts (e.g. the coat of arms of the Hunyadi family with the black raven or the typical Corvinian bindings made of silk, velvet or gilt leather; cf. Rozsondai 2004: 195), which makes it more difficult to decide whether the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 can be regarded as an authentic Corvinian codex. In a more recent article, Edit Madas categorized the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 among those manuscripts

[^41]:    that were not kept directly in the Corvinian library, but possibly in its proximity ("Manuscrits grecs n'ayant vraisemblablement pas trouvé place dans la bibliothèque Corviniana, mais peut être conservés à proximité"), cf. Madas 2009: 70 (No. 190).
    ${ }^{167}$ A very brief codicological description of the incunable is available in Csapodi \& CsapodiGárdonyi 1988: 105 (No. 254), where the name of Crastonus is misspelled as Crastonius.
    ${ }^{168}$ Bolonyai 2011: 119-154.
    ${ }^{169}$ Bolonyai 2011: 120.
    ${ }^{170}$ Bolonyai 2011: 122.

[^42]:    ${ }^{171}$ A similar tendency is apparent in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, as well, cf. pp. 108-109.
    ${ }^{172}$ Bolonyai 2011: 123-124.
    ${ }^{173}$ For a detailed analysis of these additions cf. Bolonyai 2011: 127ff.
    ${ }^{174}$ Bolonyai 2011: 128.
    ${ }^{175}$ Bolonyai 2011: 129-130.
    ${ }^{176}$ Cf. Madas's classification of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 on p. 60, n. 166.

[^43]:    ${ }^{177}$ For a detailed description of the three book-plates see pp. 41-42.
    ${ }^{178}$ Hans Ankwicz-Kleehoven studied thoroughly various aspects of Cuspinianus's life and career: he edited Cuspinianus's extensive correspondence (Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1933), he wrote an extensive article about Cuspinianus's book collection (Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1948) and finally he even dedicated a monograph to the Viennese humanist and diplomat (Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1959). Most recently see also Gastgeber \& Klecker 2012 on various aspects of Cuspinianus's works.
    ${ }^{179}$ This book-plate hiding under the two upper book-plates has been revealed only recently and has been unknown in the literature up to its revelation; for further details see pp. 41-42.
    ${ }^{180}$ Cuspinianus's letter addressed to Willibald Pirckheimer written on 18 October 1515 in Vienna; cf. Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1933: 71.
    ${ }^{181}$ Cf. Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1948: 219. Cuspinianus's younger fellow-countrymen like Johannes Gremper, Georg Tannstetter or Joachim Vadian usually also attempted to move the librarian Petantius even with tears and imploration, when they wanted to obtain some Corvinian books. A good example for this dealing is provided by Nikolaus Gerbel, who reports how the manuscript of Philostratus was seized by Gremper, "quimultis ... laboribus, multis precibus, multis denique lachrymis librum hunc a Budensi Bibliotheca extorsit," quoted by Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1948: 219, n. 4.

[^44]:    ${ }^{182}$ The nine codices are the following: Cod. 82,138 , Hist. Gr. 16 and Suppl. Gr. 30 in the Austrian National Library; Cod. Lat. 417 (former ÖNB Cod. 25), Cod. Lat. 423 (former ÖNB Cod. 109), Cod. Lat. 426 (former ÖNB 152) and Cod. Lat. 427 (former ÖNB 1076) in the National Széchényi Library, Budapest; Cod. 458 in the Stiftsbibliothek, Göttweig; Cod. Lat. 175 in the Staatsbibliothek in Munich. See Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1959:124, n. 64, who, however, still lists the four codices found in Hungary in the stock of the National Széchenyi Library since 1934 as ÖNB codices. In Csaba Csapodi's work The Corvinian Library. History and Stock published in 1973 we can find even more codices - precisely thirteen (one of them is problematic from this respect) - which were possessed by Cuspinianus: 70, 106, 164, 369, 394, 417, 478, 481, $503,642(?), 669,708$ and 935 (the numbers here indicate Csapodi's numbering).
    ${ }^{183}$ Cuspinianus's Greek knowledge was well-known and is often referred to in his extensive correspondence. For instance, we can read the following in a letter written by the Swabian humanist Johann Reuchlin to Cuspinianus on 6 April 1512, in Stuttgart: "Nam te graeca quoque legere et intellegere sentio, ut ex tuis amoenissimis litteris accepi," cf. Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1933: 32. In another letter addressed to Provost Augustin Käsembrot dated on 23 February 1511 in Vienna, Cuspinianus complains about the poor quality of contemporary translations from Greek to Latin: "Fecit enim ignorantia litterarum graecarum huiusmodi monstra et interpretum negligentia quottidie parit errores graviores et subinde periculosiores, quos oculati tantum vident et qui lingua utraque sunt instituti...," cf. Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1933: 18.
    ${ }^{184}$ Cuspinianus's letter to Emperor Maximilian I (Vienna, the end of April 1513); cf. AnkwiczKleehoven 1933: 45.
    ${ }^{185}$ Consules, p. 160; cited by Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1948: 220, n. 3.

[^45]:    ${ }^{186}$ Cuspinianus's diary was edited by Theodor Georg von Karajan and was published in 1855, in Vienna.
    ${ }^{187}$ Cf. Karajan 1855: 403-404 and 407-408.
    ${ }^{188}$ Cf. Karajan 1855: 404-406.
    ${ }^{189}$ Cf. Karajan 1855: 406-407.
    ${ }^{190}$ For a short overview of his career see Németh 2013: 282; while Németh 2013: 282, n. 1 provides further bibliography on Brassicanus's life and career.
    ${ }^{191}$ Cf. Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1948: 224-225 and Földesi 2002: 94.
    ${ }^{192}$ For Brassicanus's exlibris see Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1919: 30-32.

[^46]:    ${ }^{193}$ In the margins of the Zonaras codex one can find glossary notes from the hands of both Cuspinianus and Brassicanus; on this question see Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1959: 124, n. 60 and 61. According to Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1959: 124, Brassicanus obtained the Zonaras codex after Cuspinianus's death, which might perhaps offer us an analogy for the acquisition of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 as well and can lead us to the assumption that the Greek-Latin dictionary also became part of Brassicanus's book collection only after Cuspinianus's death.
    ${ }^{194}$ Németh 2013: 282-305.
    ${ }^{195}$ Németh 2013: 285.
    ${ }^{196}$ Németh 2013: 286.
    ${ }^{197}$ Németh 2013: 303.
    ${ }^{198}$ The following items can be found in the neighbourhood of the Greek-Latin dictionary in the inventory on f. 27v: (821) "Libanius Sophista in perg<amen>a scriptus in 4 grece;" (822) "Varia opuscula greca et Selecta scripta in perga<meno> 4;" (823) "Heron Alexandrinus grece scriptus liber;" (824) "Homeri Odyssea grece in pergameno scripta in arcum;" (826) "Xenophontis Ciri pedia grece scripta in perg<amen>o arcus;" (827) Theocritus et Hesiodus

[^47]:    grece ar<cus>;" (828) "Aeschili tragodie cum scholiis grecis manuscriptę 4to;" (829) Sophoclis tragodie tres cum scholiis grecis scriptę 4;" (830) "Grammatica greca Moscopuli scripta 4to;" (831) Georgii Gemisti Pletonis quedam scripta in perg<amen>0;" (832) "Grammatica greca Emanuelis Moschopuli manuscripta;" see Németh 2013: 298. For the identification of these items see Németh 2013: 303-304.
    ${ }^{199}$ Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1948: 226.
    ${ }^{200}$ For details about this exlibris see Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1919: 32-33.
    ${ }^{201}$ Földesi 2002: 95.

[^48]:    ${ }^{202}$ In his monograph written about the textual tradition of Janus Pannonius, Csapodi lists the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 among Janus's works, see Csapodi 1981: 100. In an earlier writing about Janus Pannonius's books and his library in Pécs, Csapodi claims that the importance of the Vienna manuscript partly lies in the fact that it presents to us the basis of Janus's Greek and Latin vocabulary, see Csapodi 1975: 192. This statement again seems to imply that Csapodi regards Janus as the compiler of the vocabulary list. However, in his book The Corvinian Library. History and Stock published in 1973, Janus is only indicated as the scribe and possessor of the manuscript, see Csapodi 1973: 456.
    ${ }^{203}$ Kapitánffy 1991: 179 (in Hungarian) and Kapitánffy 1995: 352 (in German).
    ${ }^{204}$ Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: 215-483.
    ${ }^{205}$ For details see pp. 18-20. For the discussion of the question whether Janus was the scribe of the manuscript see pp. 27-30.
    ${ }^{206}$ Hunger 1994: 85.
    ${ }^{207}$ The manuscript Harley 5792 is available under the following link on the website of the British Library: http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=harley_ms_5792_fs001r (downloaded on 9 May 2014).
    ${ }^{208}$ Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XX-XXVI.

[^49]:    ${ }^{209}$ The description is available under the following link on the website of the British Library: http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/record.asp?MSID=6563\&ColliD=8\& NStart=5792 (downloaded on 9 May 2014).
    ${ }^{210}$ The detailed content of the manuscript is again available online at the website of the British Library:http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Harley_MS_5792 (downloaded on 9 May 2014).
    ${ }^{211}$ Published in CGL II, pp. 215-483.
    ${ }^{212}$ Published in CGL II, pp. 487-506.
    ${ }^{213}$ Cf. http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/record.asp?MSID=6563\&Colli D=8\&NStart=5792 (downloaded on 9 May 2014). Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XX date the manuscript to the $7^{\text {th }}$ century ("saeculo VII scriptus").
    ${ }^{214}$ See the inscription "Nicolai de Cusa" on f. 1r and cf. e.g. Botley 2010: 63.
    ${ }^{215}$ Cf. http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/record.asp?MSID=6563\&ColliD $=8 \& N S t a r t=5792$ (downloaded on 9 May 2014).
    ${ }^{216}$ Cf. http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/record.asp?MSID=6563\&ColliD =8\&NStart=5792 (downloaded on 9 May 2014).

[^50]:    ${ }^{217}$ Dionisotti 1988: 10 and ch. n. 23 in Dionisotti 1988: 36.
    ${ }^{218}$ Dionisotti 1988: 11.
    ${ }^{219}$ For details see Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXVI-XXX and Dionisotti 1988: 12-13.
    ${ }^{220}$ Cf. Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXVII-XXX.
    ${ }^{221}$ Cf. Dionisotti 1988: 12-13.

[^51]:    ${ }^{222}$ About this process a comprehensive overview can be found in Botley 2010: 63.
    ${ }^{223}$ Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXX-XXXI. The codex Laudunensis 444 is not part of the textual tradition of the Greek-Latin dictionary in these codices recentiores according to Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXX: "... ab Harleiano antiquissimo pendentes non intercedente Laudunensi..."
    ${ }^{224}$ Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXX.
    ${ }^{225}$ Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXXIII.
    ${ }^{226}$ Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXX.
    ${ }^{227}$ Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXX.
    ${ }^{228}$ Botley 2010: 63 and 192, n. 131.
    ${ }^{229}$ Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXX; Bandini 2, 1768 (=1961): 357.

[^52]:    ${ }^{230}$ Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXX. The manuscript is discussed in details on pp. 96-98.
    ${ }^{231}$ Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXX; Lauer 1940: 404.
    ${ }^{232}$ Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXX-XXXI.
    ${ }^{233}$ Omont 1888: 15.
    ${ }^{234}$ Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXXIII.
    ${ }^{235}$ Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXXI.
    ${ }^{236}$ Omont 1888: 15.

[^53]:    ${ }^{237}$ A Catalogue... 1863: 685; Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXXI.
    ${ }^{238}$ Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXXI: "latina graecis praeposita."
    ${ }^{239}$ Formentin 1995: 38-39.
    ${ }^{240}$ Formentin 1995: 38: "Scriba unus, qui etiam auctor lexici fuit..."
    ${ }^{241}$ Cf. Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXXI: "ex excerptis ab Holmio benevolenter missis..."
    ${ }^{242}$ For this suggestion I am most grateful to Dr. Gábor Bolonyai. He even suspects that Holm, who prepared the excerpts for Goetz mistakenly wrote the signature cod. Neap. II D 34 instead of 33: cod. Neap. II D 33 in fact cointains a Latin-Greek dictionary that is a reversed version of the Greek-Latin dictionary in the codex Harleianus. For more information on cod. Neap. II D 33 see page 76 .

[^54]:    ${ }^{243}$ Goetz 1888: XXXI.
    ${ }^{244}$ The manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 47 is mentioned by Dionisotti 1984-85: 304, n. 1 among the codices recentiores containing the Greek-Latin dictionary attributed to Pseudo-Cyril. It is also cited by Thiermann 1996: 659, n. 11. For further details on ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 47 and for a collation with ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 see pp. 79-85.
    ${ }^{245}$ The two manuscripts are also mentioned by Dionisotti 1984-85: 304, n. 1 among the codices recentiores containing the Greek-Latin dictionary. For further details on the two codices and for a collation with ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 see pp. 86-95.
    ${ }^{246}$ It is also mentioned by Dionisotti 1984-85: 304, n. 1 among the codices recentiores containing the Greek-Latin dictionary.
    ${ }^{247}$ Cf. the description of the manuscript in Formentin 1995: 37-38.

[^55]:    ${ }^{248}$ It is also mentioned in Dionisotti 1984-85: 304, n. 1 among the codices recentiores containing the Greek-Latin dictionary.
    ${ }^{249}$ Dionisotti 1984-85:314, n. 3. According to Botley 2010: 63, Cardinal John of Ragusa, who took part in the Council of Basle, perhaps copied his own manuscript of Pseudo-Cyril personally from Cusanus's manuscript. However, it is interesting that according to Omont's manuscript description (Omont 1886: 406), the very first lemma pair in cod. Bas. A III 17 is different from the first lemma pair found in cod. Harl. 5792: the Basle manuscript has "Aגлtos Intactus, while the Harley manuscript has $A \beta \alpha \kappa \chi$ оитоৎ inbauchatus. The same Greek lemma can be found as incipit in the Greek-Latin dictionary of cod. Par. gr. 2628 as in the Basle manuscript (cf. p. 74), although the Latin equivalents are already different in the two manuscripts. Beside the first lemma pair, Omont also provides the second and the third lemma pairs and the last two lemma pairs in the Greek-Latin dictionary of the Basle manuscript: these items show agreement with the ones in the codex Harleinanus 5792.
    ${ }^{250}$ Dionisotti 1984-85: 314, n. 3.
    ${ }^{251}$ For a detailed content of the manuscript see Omont 1886: 406.
    ${ }^{252}$ Botley 2010: 192, n. 128; Dionisotti 1984-85: 314, n. 3.
    ${ }^{253}$ Botley 2010: 63 and 192, n. 133.
    ${ }^{254}$ Botley 2010: 63 and 192, n. 130.
    ${ }^{255}$ Again, I express my thanks to Dr. Gábor Bolonyai, who has drawn my attention to Botley's misunderstanding regarding the contents of the Yale and Milan manuscripts.
    ${ }^{256}$ A description of the manuscript Beinecke 291 is available at the website of the Yale University Library, written by Barbara A. Shailor under the following link: http://brbl-net.library.yale. edu/pre1600ms/docs/pre1600.ms291.htm (downloaded on 30 June 2015).

[^56]:    ${ }^{257}$ Cf. Martini \& Bassi 1906: 105-106.
    ${ }^{258}$ Mordtmann 1850: 759: "zwei griechisch-lateinische glossarien" (nos. 4 and 5 among the Greek manuscripts).
    ${ }^{259}$ Mordtmann 1854: 583: "Ein griechisch-lateinisches wörterbuch" (no. 16 among the Greek manuscripts); "Lateinisch-griechisches vocabularium" (no. 37 among the Latin manuscripts).
    ${ }^{260}$ Gaselee 1916: 10.
    ${ }^{261}$ Deissmann 1933: 67: no. 23 "Lexicon Graeco-Latinum" ( $15^{\text {th }}$ c., paper codex) and Deissmann 1933: 70: no. 30 "Lexicon Latino-Graecum und Graeco-Latinum" ( $15^{\text {th }}$ c., paper codex).

[^57]:    ${ }^{262}$ The tenth item (cod. Neap. II D 34) on Goetz's list seems to be unrelated; for more details see page 75 .
    ${ }^{263}$ With the exception of fol. 101, which is paper.
    ${ }^{264}$ The codex is described in Hunger 1994: 89-90. A further description by Ernst Gamillscheg can be found in Gamillscheg \& Mersich 1994: 42-43. One can read a third description of the codex in Schlosser \& Hermann 1932: 135-136 (no. 90). An online description can be read at the website of the Austrian National Library: http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AL00226352 (downloaded on 28 August 2014). The digitalized version of the manuscript is available from the above given link by clicking on the option "Digitalisat."
    ${ }^{265}$ Cf. Bick 1920: 56, n. 1; Hermann 1932: 135 (the most detailed description of the binding); Hunger 1994: 90; Gamillscheg \& Mersich 1994: 42.

[^58]:    ${ }^{266}$ Hunger 1994: 89 transcribes this title as follows: "Articuli propositio masculini generis." However, the abbreviation $p$ with a horizontal stroke above it corresponds to prae/pre instead of pro, see Cappelli 1990: 257 . The end of the word was simply misread.
    ${ }^{267}$ „Liber est Reverendissimi patris et domini doctoris Iohannis Fabri episcopi vienennsis proprÿs et non Episcopatus peccunÿs emptus et post mortem ipsius in bibliothecam collegÿ sui Sancti Nicolai ad usum inhabitantium studentum et studiosorum iuxta suam ordinationem collocandus. Actum 10. ianuarÿ. Anno a Christo nato MDLX. Ex singulari mandato, et ex ore ipsius Reverendissimi Episcopi, Leonhardus Freÿ." Cf. the transcriptions of further written exlibris in Horváth 1900: 362-385 (nos. 19, 20, 28 - none of them were written by Leonhard Frey). In his article dealing with the book-plates of Viennese humanists, Ankwicz-Kleehoven quotes the text of Bishop Fabri's hadwritten exlibris from Ink. 10 A 19 in the Austrian National Library. Here, the adjectives related to the bishop are in the genitive case. See Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1919: 33, n. 87. In the exlibris in Suppl. Gr. 47 the date given by Leonhard Frey (1560) is apparently mistaken for 1540.
    ${ }^{268}$ On this issue see Rollo 2012 most recently.
    
    
    
    ${ }^{270}$ According to Gamillscheg \& Mersich 1994: 42 and Hermann 1932: 136, the whole of the codex was copied by Christophoros Persona Romaios, while Bick 1920:56 and Hunger 1994: $89-90$ assign the transcription of ff. 3r-94r to an unidentified hand from the $15^{\text {th }}$ century and ff. 94r-101r to Christophoros Persona Romaios. Both the presence of the two distinct kolophons and the fact that the more detailed second kolophon talks only about the copying

[^59]:    of Guarino's Erotemata would support Bick and Hunger's assumption. The same standpoint can be found in the online description of the manuscript at the website of the Austrian National Library: http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AL00226352 (downloaded on 28 August 2014).
    ${ }^{271}$ See Bignami Odier 1973: 25 and 37, n. 53 and 54.
    ${ }^{272}$ See Bick 1920: 57. A short biography of Christophoros Persona Romaios is also available in Hoffmann 1924: 9-12. Hoffmann also discusses the two exemplars of his Latin translations of Agathias's De bello Gothorum dedicated to King Matthias and to his Queen, Beatrix.
    ${ }^{273}$ Bick 1920:57, on the basis of Le Quien 1740: 1106. Bick's suggestion is adopted by Hermann 1932: 136, Hunger 1994: 90 and Gamillscheg \& Mersich: 1994: 43.
    ${ }^{274}$ See Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1948: 214, especially n. 6.
    ${ }^{275}$ For more details on the illumination on f. 3r see Hermann 1932: 135.

[^60]:    ${ }^{276}$ I have chosen to use the interpretative transcription regarding the use of diacritic marks when I quote from Suppl. Gr. 47.

[^61]:    ${ }^{277}$ Cf. Goetz, Praefatio, in Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXXI.

[^62]:    ${ }^{278}$ For the tables see appendix III The Textual History of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Collations on pp. 203-206.
    ${ }^{279}$ Cf. e.g. Suppl. Gr. 45 1v 19; 7r 24 and $9 r 22$ with the matching lemmas in Suppl. Gr. 47 (Table 2).
    ${ }^{280}$ Cf. for example Suppl. Gr. $4510 r 15$ and 16 ; 23v 15 ; 29r 3 ; 33 r 15 ; $37 \mathrm{v} 22-23$; $44 \mathrm{r} 24-25$ with the matching lemmas in Suppl. Gr. 47 (Table 3).
    ${ }^{281}$ Cf. e.g. 3r 8; 18r 25; 22v 5; 26v 18; 36r 2-3; 39v 22-23; 44r 12 (Table 4).
    ${ }^{282}$ Some examples from the alpha section: Suppl. Gr. 45 1v 3; 1v 26; 3r 22; 7v 7; 8v 11; 9r 9; 11v 2; 14v 8; 16r 14; 16v 12; 17v 26 (Table 5).
    ${ }^{283}$ E.g. Suppl. Gr. 45 1v 6; 2v 4; 3r 1; 4r 20; 9r 20; 9v 10; 10r 4; 14v 4-5; 15r 5 etc.

[^63]:    ${ }^{284}$ E.g. Suppl. Gr. 45, 2r 6; 3v 20; 4r 12; 7r 7; 8r 16; 9v 18; 11r 13; 15r 21; 21 r 26 etc.

[^64]:    ${ }^{285}$ The most recent description of this codex is in Hajdú 2003: 185-191. An older description can be found in Hardt 1806: 119-121; the volume can be viewed online: http://www.digitalesammlungen.de/~db/bsb00008170/images/index.html. A copy of Hardt's description is glued to fol. IVv in the manuscript. Date of checking the original manuscript in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek: 21 June 2012. Both manuscripts are available online a digitized form at the website http://www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de.
    ${ }^{286}$ An older description can be found in Hardt 1806: 53-55; the volume is available online: http://www.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/bsb00008171/images/index.html. The most recent description of Mon. Gr. 253 is published in Hajdú 2012. It was not yet available to me at the time of the research work on the Munich manuscropt. Date of checking the original manuscript in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek: 18 June 2012.
    ${ }^{287}$ Cf. Hajdú 2003: 190.

[^65]:    ${ }^{288}$ For a detailed description of the contents of Mon. Gr. 142, see Hajdú 2003: 185-188.
    ${ }^{289}$ The edited version can be found in CGL III, on pp. 119-220.
    ${ }^{290}$ Cf. Hajdú 2003: 188.
    ${ }^{291}$ Cf. p. 86, n. 286.

[^66]:    ${ }^{292}$ Cf. Hajdú 2003: 189.
    ${ }^{293}$ Cf. Hajdú 2003: 190.

[^67]:    ${ }^{294}$ An edition of the catalogue can be found in Richard Stauber's writing Die Schedelsche Bibliothek. Studien und Darstellungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte published in 1908. The two Latin titles are listed in the section Libri Grammaticales in utraque lingua, on p. 228. Stauber, however, does not identify Mon. Gr. 142 with the item "Vocabularius maior in lingua greca et latina ac alia." On this question, see Hajdú 2002: 46-47 for details.
    ${ }^{295}$ Cf. Hajdú 2002: 46-47.
    ${ }^{296}$ Cf. Hajdú 2002: 47-48, in more details.
    ${ }^{297}$ In the Hofbibliothek, only cod. Mon. Gr. 253 was first catalogized as a Greek manuscript, while cod. Mon. Gr. 142 was originally catalogized as a Latin manuscript; it was some decades later when the latter manuscript was also catalogized together with the Greek codices. For details, see Hajdú 2002: 48-49 and Hajdú 2003: 190.

[^68]:    ${ }^{298}$ There are, however, instances in Mon. Gr. 142 where the Latin equivalents from the Harleianus 5792 were transmitted in their fragmentary state. E.g. the Greek lemma $\dot{\alpha} \beta \lambda \varepsilon \psi i ́ \alpha$ has the fragmentary Latin equivalent ${ }^{* * *}$ citudo in the Harleianus (CGL II 215, 17; instead of caecitudo) and it appears in Mon. Gr. 142 as cituto (f. 1r; its fragmentary state is not indicated). In ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 , however, we can find the full Latin equivalent caecitas (f. 1 r 15 ), while Mon. Gr. 253 lacks the Latin equivalent here.
    ${ }^{299}$ Hajdú 2003: 189. For Giovanni Tortelli, see Eleuteri \& Canart 1991: 184-186, with an example of his handwriting on p. 185.

[^69]:    ${ }^{300}$ Here, the numbering of the folios is wrong: the number 95 was omitted, while the number 96 appears twice (I refer to the first one as 96A and the second one as 96B).

[^70]:    ${ }^{301}$ For a good example, see p. 91, n. 298.
    ${ }^{302}$ The relevant tables to the collation of Mon. Gr. 142 and 253 can be found in the appendix III The Textual History of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Collations on pp. 207-210.

[^71]:    ${ }^{303}$ The website of the Madrid library can be found here: http://rbme.patrimonionacional.es/.
    ${ }^{304}$ In his description of the manuscript, Miller indicates 310 folios instead; see Miller 1966: 5867. In the codex, one can find 310 numbered folios, while fol. 70a was accidentally omitted from the numbering, cf. Revilla 1936: 252-256.
    ${ }^{305}$ The detailed content of the manuscript can be found in Revilla 1936: 253-256; Miller 1966: 58-67 (it also contains the editio princeps of the four Greek charters on pp. 59-66) and in Moraux et al. 1976: 151-152 (the description is written by D. Harlfinger).
    ${ }^{306}$ Cf. Moraux et al. 1976: 152. Revilla 1936: 253 identifies the scribe of ff. 57-59 with Michael Apostolius, but Harlfinger in Moraux et al. 1976: 152 rejects this idea.
    ${ }^{307}$ Cf. Revilla 1936: 253 and Moraux et al. $1976: 152$.
    ${ }^{308}$ Cf. Revilla 1936: 253 and Moraux et al. $1976: 152$.

[^72]:    ${ }^{309}$ Cf. Moraux et al. 1976: 151.
    ${ }^{310}$ Revilla 1936: 253.
    ${ }^{311}$ Miller 1966: 58 and 67.
    ${ }^{312}$ Cf. Moraux et al. 1976: 150.
    ${ }^{313}$ Thiermann 1996: 659, n. 12. Thiermann also announces here his plan to write about this question of dating in more details in a future study. This plan, however, was never realized due to his early death.
    ${ }^{314}$ Before the title, the letters Di can be read, which were crossed out with a single line: with all probability, the scribe first started to write Diccionarium, then he suddenly changed his mind and wrote Lexicon instead. For a black-and-white image of f. 91r, the first page of the Greek-Latin dictionary in the manuscript $\Sigma$ I 12 see Fig. 28 in the appendix I Illustrations on p. 198.
    ${ }^{315}$ For details about the marginal notes see pp. 139-141.
    ${ }^{316}$ Since I had the possibility to study the Greek-Latin dictionary in the Madrid manuscript using black-and-white images provided by the Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, I cannot determine whether a different ink (e.g. red) was used for the emphatic initial letters.

[^73]:    ${ }^{317}$ This method of using symbols created with a diverse number of dots or strokes to connect the related lemmas is also used by the scribe of the Greek-Latin lexicon in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45; see e.g. f. 78r, lines 2-8.
    ${ }^{318}$ Cf. Goetz, Praefatio, in Goetz \& Gundermann 1888: XXXI.

[^74]:    ${ }^{319}$ See p. 94 for the details.
    ${ }^{320}$ For the details see p. 83.
    ${ }^{321}$ See Table 1 in appendix III The Textual History of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Collations on p. 211 for examples.
    
     vacat].
     Suppl. Gr. 45 12v $12 \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha ́ v \omega$ pecco non potior - $\Sigma$ I $12 \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha ́ v \omega$ pecco, -cas.
    ${ }^{324}$ E.g. ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 12v 22 á $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon 1 \sigma \tau i ́ ~ s i n e ~ m o r a ~-~ \Sigma ~ I ~ 12 ~ 98 r ~ \alpha ̉ \mu ~ \mu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon i \sigma \tau i ́ ~ a b s q u e ~ t a r d i t a t e, ~$ sine mora;
    ${ }^{325}$ See Table 2 in appendix III The Textual History of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Collations on p. 211 for examples.

[^75]:    ${ }^{326}$ See Table 3 in appendix III The Textual History of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Collations on p. 212 for examples.
    ${ }^{327}$ See Table 4 in appendix III The Textual History of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Collations on p. 212 for examples.
    ${ }^{328}$ See Table 5 in appendix III The Textual History of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Collations on p. 213 for examples illustrating both cases.

[^76]:    ${ }^{329}$ The dictionary can also be found in the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum under the title Idiomata codicis Harleiani, see CGL II 487-506.
    ${ }^{330}$ I could not consult the relevant folios of the manuscript $\Sigma$ I 12 either in the original or in the form of digital images. Miller 1966: 67, Moraux et al. 1976: 152 and Revilla 1936: 256 give a description of this section. Miller mentions it very briefly, only giving the first two entries of the dictionary. Both Moraux et al. and Revilla mention the three grammatical groups, but Revilla provides a more detailed description by citing the first and last two lemma pairs from all three grammatical groups.
    ${ }^{331}$ See Revilla 1936: 256.
    ${ }^{332}$ Again, I did not have the possibility to consult the folios containing the thematic wordlist either in the original codex $\Sigma$ I 12 or in the form of digital images. While this section is not mentioned by Miller 1966; Moraux et al. 1976: 152 and Revilla 1936: 256 give a short description of the wordlist. Again, it is Revilla's description that cites the first and last two entries of the wordlist. Cf. p. 46.

[^77]:    ${ }^{333}$ Dionisotti already added six items to Goetz's original list of ten codices from the $15^{\text {th }}$ and the $16^{\text {th }}$ centuries, see Dionisotti 1984-85: 304, n. 1. This enlarged list of sixteen manuscripts was adopted by Thiermann 1996: 659.
    ${ }^{334}$ Goetz 1888: XXXI.

[^78]:    ${ }^{335}$ For a short palaeographical description of these glossary notes see pp. 37-38.

[^79]:    ${ }^{336}$ These marginal notes can be found in the appendix IV Glossary Notes Quoting Scholia to Nubes on pp. 215-243.
    ${ }^{337}$ The marginal notes quoted from the scholia to Plutus can be found in the appendix $V$ Glossary Notes Quoting Scholia to Plutus on pp. 245-262.
    ${ }^{338}$ For a discussion and a list of the manuscripts of Aristophanes with the indication of their contents see White 1906: 1-20 and 255-278. The predominance of the so-called Byzantine triad (Nubes, Plutus and Ranae) in the manuscript tradition becomes apparent even if one only quickly scans the contents of the codices listed. For an account about the use of the Aristophanic plays as school texts during the Renaissance see Botley 2010: 88-91.
     $\kappa \alpha \lambda \varepsilon i ̃ ~ . . . ~(s c h . ~ N u b . ~ 1004 a-b) . ~$

[^80]:    
     ő $\rho v i \theta \varepsilon \varsigma . ~ A r i s t o p h a n e s ~(f o l . ~ 283 r ~ 3 ; ~ s c h . ~ N u b . ~ 109 c) ; ~ i n ~ A r i s t o p h a n e . ~ \beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \varphi \alpha \rho \alpha ~ \alpha i ~ \pi \tau ט ́ x \varepsilon \varsigma ~ \tau \tilde{\omega} v$
     (fol. 49v 10; sch. Plut. 730).
    ${ }^{341}$ E.g. Aristophanes. $\Sigma \varphi \eta \tau \tau o ̀ \varsigma ~ \tau o ́ \pi o \varsigma ~ \varepsilon ̉ v ~ ’ A Ө \eta ́ v \alpha ı \varsigma, ~ o ̋ \theta \varepsilon v ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \Sigma \varphi \eta \tau \tau o i ̃ ~ \grave{\pi i ́ p \rho \eta \mu \alpha, ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ o ̀ ~ \pi о \lambda i ́ t \eta \varsigma, ~}$
     9; sch. Plut. 720).

[^81]:    ${ }^{342}$ For an overview of the literature dealing with the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 see pages 16-20.
    ${ }^{343}$ See Kapitánffy 1995: 355-356.

[^82]:    ${ }^{344}$ Kapitánffy excluded the marginalia quoting scholia to Plutus from his examination of the textual traditon of the Aristophanic scholia since when he prepared his paper published in 1995 the modern editions of the scholia vetera and scholia recentiora to Plutus were still not available to him, cf. Kapitánffy 1995: 355. The edition of the scholia vetera to Plutus was published with the date 1994, while the scholia recentiora were published two years later, in 1996 - both textual editions were edited by Marcel Chantry.
    ${ }^{345}$ Holwerda 1977.
    ${ }^{346}$ Koster 1974.
    ${ }^{347}$ Appendices IV Glossary Notes Quoting Scholia to Nubes and V Glossary Notes Quoting Scholia to Plutus on pp. 215-262.
    ${ }^{348}$ The question of glossary notes containing Aristophanic scholia in partial or complete Latin translation is discussed on p. 112.

[^83]:    ${ }^{349}$ In Koster's 1974 textual edition the second Triclinian redaction $\left(\mathrm{TR}^{2}\right)$ was edited on the basis of the following manuscripts: cod. Vaticanus Gr. 1294 ( $14^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$.), cod. Oxoniensis Bodleyanus Holkhamensis Gr. 88 ( $15^{\text {th }}$ c.), codicis compositi Cantabrigiensis Bibl. Publ. Nn. 3, 15 alter codex ( $15^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$.), cod. Vindobonensis Phil. Gr. 163 ( $14^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$.), cod. Laurentiano-Vaticanus (Laur. 31,22 partim et Vat. Gr. 61 partim; $14^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$.), cod. Ambrosianus L 41 sup. ( $15^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$.), cod. Parisinus Coislinianus 192 ( $14^{\text {th }}$ c.); cf. Koster 1974: XXV-XXXVII (details) and CXXVI (overview).
    ${ }^{350}$ In the 1974 textual edition by Koster the first Thoman version of the Nubes scholia was edited on the basis of the following codex: codicis compositi Cantabrigiensis Bibl. Publ. Nn. 3, 15 prioris codicis pars vetus ( $14^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$.), while for the second Thoman redaction the following codices were used: cod. Venetus Marcianus 472 ( $14^{\text {th }}$ c.), cod. Cremonensis 171 ( $14^{\text {th }}$ c.), cod. Parisinus 2820 ( $14^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$.), cod. Vaticanus 57 ( $14^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$.); cf. Koster 1974: V-XX (details) and CXXVI (overview).
    ${ }^{351}$ In Koster's 1974 textual edition the first Triclinian redaction is based on the cod. Parisinus Suppl. Gr. 463 ( $14^{\text {th }}$ c.); cf. Koster 1974: XX-XXV (details) and CXXVI (overview).
    ${ }^{352}$ The scholia edited as "anonyma recentiora" were based on various groups of codices that are listed under the headings "Mixti et contaminati" and "Scholia Leidensia" in the section Codicum conspectus, cf. Koster 1974: CXXVI-CXXVII. For details on these manuscripts see Koster 1974: XLVIII-XCII.
    ${ }^{353}$ For a description of the manuscript see Koster 1974: LXIII-LXV.

[^84]:    ${ }^{354}$ For a list and description of the codices used for the textual edition of the scholia vetera to Nubes see Holwerda 1977: III-X.
    ${ }^{355}$ The scholia to Nubes by Joannes Tzetzes were edited by Holwerda 1960.
    ${ }^{356}$ Chantry 1996.
    ${ }^{357}$ The list of codices of the Thoman and Triclinian recensions can be found in Chantry 1996: XI; for details on these manuscripts see Chantry 1996: XIII-XIX.
    ${ }^{358}$ The so-called "codices mixti" are listed in Chantry 1996: XI; for details on these manuscripts see Chantry 1996: XIX-XXIII.
    ${ }^{359}$ These manuscripts are listed in Chantry 1996: XI-XII; for details see Chantry 1996: XXIIIXXIV.
    ${ }^{360}$ These codices are listed in Chantry 1996: XII; for details see Chantry 1996: XXIV-XXV.
    ${ }^{361}$ See Dübner 1883: 323-387.
    ${ }^{362}$ For the list of the codices used for the critical edition of the scholia vetera see Chantry 1994: X; for details on the codices see Chantry 1994: XI-XIX. A new edition of the scholia vetera to Plutus is also available in Chantry 2009 together with French translation and commentary.

[^85]:    ${ }^{363}$ For the list of the codices of the Tzetzes scholia see Massa Positano 1960: IX; for details on the codices see Massa Positano 1960: LIII-LXXIX.
     $\varphi \lambda u \alpha \rho \varepsilon i ̃ v$.
    
    
    
    
     عiฮ๘.
    
    
    
    ${ }^{368}$ Cf. p. 112.

[^86]:     Өuүatépa.
     si non oriretur, quomodo oi $\delta \alpha v \varepsilon ı \sigma \tau \alpha i ́ ~ p o s s e n t ~ s c i r e ~ m e n s e m ~ e x a c t u m ~ e t ~ r e p e t e r e ~ u s u r a s . ~$ quare si non oriretur amplius, nec ego solverem eas. Cf. sch. nub. 755a Tr2: 七દ $\lambda \circ \cup \mu \varepsilon ́ v \eta \varsigma, ~$
    
     àroঠoínv toùs tóкouc.
    
    
    
    ${ }^{372}$ Cf. the glossary notes added to ff. 11v $19,78 v 22,79 r 12,95 r 1,105 v 11,127 v 17,129 r 26$ etc.
    
     Kрıòs oũ̃
    

[^87]:    
    
    
    ${ }^{376}$ Cf. e.g. the glossary notes added to ff. 116v 18, 138v 1 or 232 r 22.
     789c AnRec ChisReg; cf. sch. plut. 598d ChisLPar). In Aristophane.
    
    
    ${ }^{379} \mathrm{Cf}$. the glossary notes to ff. $31 \mathrm{r} 23,110 \mathrm{r} 1,126 \mathrm{r} 7,159 \mathrm{v} 12,200 \mathrm{r} 10,232 \mathrm{r} 22$.

[^88]:    ${ }^{380}$ The results of this subchapter were first published in Ötvös 2011; before this publication this group of glossary notes had never been described and analysed - or even mentioned - in the related literature.
    ${ }^{381}$ These glossary notes can be found in appendix VI Glossary Notes of Greek Legal Source on pp. 263-274.

[^89]:    ${ }^{382} \mathrm{http}: / /$ stephanus.tlg.uci.edu.ubproxy.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/inst/fontsel
    ${ }^{383}$ For a quick reference and further bibliography on this work one might consult Kazhdan 1991: 265-266 and Hunger 1978: 455-457.
    ${ }^{384}$ The work was finished between 886 (Leo VI's accession to the throne) and 890 . However, the circumstances of its compilation and the exact date of its completion and publication are debated; on this problem see e.g. Schminck 1989: 90-93, Scheltema 1955: 291-292 and Pringsheim 1956: 1-3. Its most recent edition is H.J. Scheltema, N. van der Wal and D. Holwerda eds., Basilicorum libri LX, Text (Series A), 8 vols., Scholia (Series B), 9 vols. Groningen 1953-1988. When I refer to one of these volumes, I use the abbreviation Bas. libri A or B (depending on the series cited) together with the relevant volume number.
    ${ }^{385}$ From the viewpoint of the history of the Byzantine law, it is an important question whether

[^90]:    the publication of the Basilika annulled the validity and the force of the Justinianic law corpus, i.e. whether the regulations present in the Corpus Juris Civilis, but eliminated from the material of the Basilika were valid or not. On this question, see Scheltema 1955: 287-310.
    ${ }^{386}$ Pringsheim 1956: 28-36.
    ${ }^{387}$ Pringsheim 1956: 34-35. The modifications - if not indicated otherwise - are based on the prefaces in the volumes of Bas. libri ser. A.

[^91]:    ${ }^{\text {t1 }}$ Pringsheim 1956: 34 lists a further codex in this group: the Codex Ambrosianus (cod. Ambrosianus F 106 sup. rescriptus, $10^{\text {th }}$ century), which contains only excerpts from books 16-60 (originally from all 60 books). Pringsheim 1956: 28 quotes Contardo Ferrini's preface (p.V) written to his book Basilicorum supplementum alterum (Lipsiae 1897): "excerpta tantum ex singulis libris in modum eclogae" (cf. p. 125, n. 393). Scheltema and van der Wal list this manuscript among the testimonia using the name Florilegium Ambrosianum ("Exhibet florilegium capitum Basilicorum eodem ordine redactorum quo in Basilicis occurrunt," Bas. libri A I., Praef. IX-X.). As this manuscript does not contain the complete version of the Basilika text, I have also decided to eliminate it from the table.
    ${ }^{\text {t2 }}$ In Pringsheim's table the codex is dated to the $11^{\text {th }}$ century. The origin of this misdating is explained in Scheltema and van der Wal's preface to Bas. libri A I, p. V, n. 2.
    ${ }^{\text {t3 }}$ In Pringsheim's table under the name Cod. Haenel.
    ${ }^{\text {t4 }}$ In Pringsheim's table under the name Cod. Lugduno-Batavus.
    ${ }^{\text {t5 }}$ In Pringsheim's table under the name Cod. Constantinopolitanus.
    ${ }^{\text {t6 }}$ In Pringsheim's table under the name Cod. Vaticanus ineditus 1566.

[^92]:    ${ }^{\text {t7 }}$ In Pringsheim's table under the name Cod. Vaticanus ineditus 903.
    ${ }^{388}$ Basilicorum libri LX. Post Annibalis Fabroti curas ope codd. mss. a Gustavo Ernesto Heimbachio aliisque collatorum integriores cum scholiis edidit, editos denuo recensuit, deperditos restituit, translationem latinam et adnotationem criticam adiecit Carolus Guilielmus Ernestus Heimbach. Vols. I-V. Lipsiae 1843-1850. In 1870 a sixth volume was added to the series: Prolegomena et manuale Basilicorum (Lipsiae 1870). A digital reprint edition was published in Milan between 2002 and 2008 under the direction of Michele A. Fino with a preface by Fausto Goria.

[^93]:    ${ }^{389}$ Cf. Pringsheim 1956: 4.
    ${ }^{390}$ Pringsheim 1956: 4.
    ${ }^{391}$ Cf. Scheltema 1939: 324-346.
    ${ }^{392}$ C. E. Zachariae a Lingenthal, Supplementum editionis Basilicorum heimbachianae lib. XV-XVIII Basilicorum cum scholiis antiquis integros nec non lib. XIX Basilicorum novis auxiliis restitutum continens. Leipzig 1846.
    ${ }^{393}$ E.g. E. C. Ferrini \& J. Mercati, Basilicorum libri, LX vol. VII. Editionis Basilicorum Heimbachianae Supplementum alterum. Reliquias librorum ineditorum ex libro rescripto ambrosiano ediderunt. Lipsiae-Mediolani 1897.
    ${ }^{394}$ Pringsheim 1956: 8-16.
    ${ }^{395}$ Cf. Scheltema 1939 and Pringsheim 1956.

[^94]:    ${ }^{396}$ See p. 121, n. 384.

[^95]:    ${ }^{397}$ Henceforth abbreviated as SBM.
    ${ }^{398}$ On this trend with focus on Janus Pannonius see e.g. Horváth 2001: 202-204.

[^96]:    ${ }^{399}$ E.g.t the marginal note written to f. 37 v 1 quoting Lucretius's De rerum natura $(\mathrm{V}, 517)$ is definitely taken from Nonius Marcellus's De compendiosa doctrina ( $\mathrm{I}, 13,3-5$ ) since its text matches with Nonius's version as compared to the textual tradition of Lucretius's De rerum natura.
    ${ }^{400}$ For quick reference and literature see e.g. Hunger 1978: 474; and Fögen 1991: 1995.
    ${ }^{401}$ For quick reference and literature see e.g. Hunger 1978: 462; and Burgmann 1991: 1995. Its modern edition is J. Zépos \& P. Zépos, Synopsis Basilicorum. Jus Graecoromanum V. Athens 1931.
    ${ }^{402}$ Cf. Prolegomena 7-9, in: Zépos \& Zépos 1931.
    ${ }^{403}$ See Svoronos 1964. In this book the main focus is on the transmission and texts of the appendices added to the SBM. However, the most recent information on the manuscripts of the SBM is to be found in L. Burgmann, M. Th. Fögen, A. Schminck, D. Simon: Repertorium der Handschriften des byzantinischen Rechts. Teil I. Die Handschriften des weltlischen Rechts. (Nr. 1-327). (Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechts I, Band 20). Frankfurt am Main 1995. With the help of its index (Autoren und Werke, pp. 459-460), one can find 46 manuscripts containing the complete SBM, 9 manuscripts containing excerpts from the $S B M$, and there are further manuscripts where shorter passages from the SBM or scholia written to the SBM are preserved.

[^97]:    ${ }^{404}$ In the textual edition of the SBM, the appendices are not published nor are they described in detail.
    ${ }^{405}$ Svoronos 1964: 3-4.
    ${ }^{406}$ Svoronos 1964: 4-5.
    ${ }^{407}$ LX librorum B $\alpha \sigma \iota \lambda ı \kappa \tilde{\omega} v$ i. e. universi juris Romani auctoritate principum Rom. Graecam in linguam traducti. Ecloga sive Synopsis hactenus desiderata, nunc edita per Joan. Leunclajum ex Joan. Sambuci V.C.bibliotheca. Item Novellarum antehac non publicatarum liber. Ajunctae sunt Adnotationes interpretis, quibus multae leges multaque loca juris civilis restituuntur et emendatur. Basileae per Eusebium Episcopum et Nicolai Fr. heredes. MDLXXV.
    ${ }^{408}$ Anno 1606 Parisiis apud Adrianum Beys via Jacobea prodiderunt Caroli Labbaei Observationes et Emendationes in Synopsin B $\alpha \sigma_{\imath} \lambda_{1 k} \tilde{\omega} v$. In quibus multa loca restituuntur, plurimae lacunae replentur, quaedam capita nunc primum in lucem proferuntur: quaedam etiam leges Digestorum et Codicis rationibus illustrantur et interpretatntur... . Ex MSS. codd. Biblioth. Reg.
    ${ }^{409}$ Zépos \& Zépos 1931.
    ${ }^{410}$ Zépos \& Zépos 1931: 8 and 11.
    ${ }^{411}$ Zépos \& Zépos 1931: 11-12.

[^98]:    ${ }^{412}$ Zépos \& Zépos 1931: 9: "In universum tamen ea est textus conformatio in omnibus, ut quod olim suspicatus eram, duas vel tres ejus recensiones a se invicem distinguendas esse, id jam nolim existimare."
    ${ }^{413}$ Zépos \& Zépos 1931: 9: "Reperitur quidem varietas lectionum: nonnunquam verba quaedam, imo integra capita a librariis modo omissa modo addita vel transposita, et $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi о \mu \pi \alpha i ̀$ auctoris aliquando neglectae sunt."
    ${ }^{414}$ Zépos \& Zépos 1931: 12. However, the exact differences are noted in an apparatus in the textual edition.
    ${ }^{415}$ See the appendix VI Glossary Notes of Greek Legal Source on pp. 263-274 for more details on the comparison of the text of the legal quotations in the Greek-Latin dictionary of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and the texts of the SBM and the Basilika.

[^99]:    ${ }^{416}$ E.g. marginal notes to ff. 27r 14; 70v 10; 93r 24; 94r 23; 151r 22.
    ${ }^{417}$ E.g. marginal notes to ff. $11 \mathrm{r} 19 ; 159 \mathrm{v} 3 ; 161 \mathrm{v} 1 ; 197 \mathrm{v} 21$.
    ${ }^{418}$ E.g. marginal notes to ff. $8 \mathrm{r} 16 ; 70 \mathrm{v} 10 ; 71 \mathrm{r} 1$.
    ${ }^{419}$ E.g. marginal notes to ff. 93r 24; 171 r 6.
    ${ }^{420}$ E.g. marginal note to f. 220v 21.
    ${ }^{421}$ The variant $\pi \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \iota \kappa \eta \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \gamma \rho \alpha \varphi \eta$ in the gloss written to f . 19 r 17 in contrast to $\pi \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \alpha$ $\pi \alpha \dot{v} \tau \omega \zeta \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \tau \iota \gamma \rho \alpha \varphi \grave{\eta}$ in both the SBM and the Basilika for instance can be attributed to the misreading of the glossator: the previous passage in both legal sources contains the exp-
     $I I, 5,25$ ), which can easily explain such an error.
    
    
    
    
    
    
     oĩtıvȩ кגì SBM K I Index).
    
    
    
    
    

[^100]:    ${ }^{424}$ See e.g. marginal notes to ff. 69v 16; $102 \mathrm{v} 26 ; 110 \mathrm{v} 11 ; 115 \mathrm{v} 9 ; 135 \mathrm{v} 17 ; 197 \mathrm{v} 21 ; 236 \mathrm{r} 2$.
    ${ }^{425}$ See e.g. marginal notes to ff. 151v $1 ; 182 r 1 ; 197 v 21 ; 280 r 25$.
    
    
     (Epanagoge 26,5,3; Prochiron vel Procheiros nomos 19,7,4.)
    
    
    

[^101]:    ${ }^{429}$ Zépos \& Zépos 1931: 495-507.

[^102]:    ${ }^{430}$ See the appendix VII Other Greek Literary Quotations in the Margins on pp. 275-286.
    ${ }^{431}$ E.g. to the works Anabasis, Hellenica, Cyropaedia, Memorabilia.
    ${ }^{432}$ I.e. various pieces of the Moralia and biographies from the Parallel Lives.
    ${ }^{433}$ E.g. The Republic, Apology, Laches, Timaeus, Phaedrus, Laws.
    ${ }^{434}$ Pirrotta argues that the fragments 19-20 from the play Daidalus in Kock's edition Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta have been wrongly attributed to Plato Comicus. It was based on an Aristophanic scholion (Sch. in Ar. Nub. 663a) where the scholiast probably wrongly attributed the three lines to Plato Comicus; for the details see Pirrotta 2009: 85. From the point of view of the marginalia in the Greek-Latin dictionary of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 it seems plausible then that the marginal note indicating Plato Comicus as its own source is to be rather traced back to the scholion written to Nubes, line 663. Cf. p. 142, n. 455.
    ${ }^{435}$ Occasionally, it also occurs that the source is not indicated, e.g. in the case of the marginal note added to f. 12 v 1.

[^103]:    ${ }^{436}$ See the appendix VIII Non-literary Greek Quotations in the Margins on pp. 287-302. This appendix does not contain all of the marginal notes belonging to this subgroup; it rather presents a collection of such glosses for the sake of illustration.
    ${ }^{437}$ E.g. Hesychius, Zonaras, Etymologicum Magnum, Photius.

[^104]:    ${ }^{438}$ See Kapitánffy 1995: 356.
    ${ }^{439}$ For a list of the Greek manuscripts possessed by Guarino see Omont 1892: 79-81 and more recently Diller 1961: 318-321. According to Diller, Guarino bought his manuscript of the Suda lexicon during a visit to Rhodes; the codex is now lost, but there is possibly another codex (Laur. 55, 1) that is an apograph of Guarino's exemplar, see Diller 1961: 319. Guarino possessed the $14^{\text {th }}$-century manuscript Vat. Pal. gr. 116 containing Aristophanic works; see Diller 1961:319. A further manuscript, Holkham Hall 88 containing eight Aristophanic plays with scholia and interlinear Greek glosses was identified as Guarino's copy by Giannini 1971. According to Giannini 1971: 288, this manuscript could be item no. 43 on the list published by Omont 1892: 80 ("43. Aristophanis comediae octo cum scholiis, et cum quadam Ephestionis appendice de metris, ubi sunt etiam nonnulla de caractere."), which Diller 1961 failed to identify. The SBM or other manuscripts containing legal texts cannot be found either on Omont's or on Diller's list.

[^105]:    ${ }^{440}$ The description of the manuscript is available in Revilla 1936: 252-256; Miller 1966: 58-67 and Moraux et al. 1976: 150-153 (written by Dieter Harlfinger based on his autopsy in April 1967). For a more detailed discussion of this manuscript see pp. 96-98. The results of the collation of the two sets of marginal notes in the Vienna and Madrid manuscripts were first presented in Ötvös 2014: 238-242.
    ${ }^{441}$ The content of the manuscript is described in Revilla 1936: 253-256; Miller 1966: 58-67 and Moraux et al. 1976: 151-152.
    ${ }^{442}$ See Moraux 1976: 152.
    ${ }^{443}$ For a discussion on the various standpoints regarding the dating of the lexicographical section in $\Sigma$ I 12 see p. 97.
    ${ }^{444}$ I had the possibility to study the black-and-white digital images of the Greek-Latin dictionary in the manuscript $\Sigma$ I 12 provided by the Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo de El Escorial in Madrid.
    ${ }^{445}$ Out of the three codex descriptions, only Revilla mentions that the Greek-Latin dictionary

[^106]:    contains glosses from several different Greek authors, see Revilla 1936: 255-256. For illustration, see Fig. 28 in the appendix I Illustrations on p. 198, where the first page (f. 91r) of the Greek-Latin dictionary in the manuscript $\Sigma$ I 12 is reproduced. On the fist page of the bilingual dictionary glossary notes are also visible.
    ${ }^{446}$ Cf. $\Sigma$ I 12, f. 141v: "alibi ita ego benedictus legi..."
    Cf. Thiermann 1996: 659-660.
    ${ }^{448}$ The results of the collation can be found in the appendix IX Marginalia in the mss. ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and $\Sigma$ I 12. Collation on pp. 303-318.
    ${ }^{449}$ Sch. Nub. 1042a: $\alpha$ ípou $\mu \varepsilon ́ v o v ~ \pi \rho o к \rho i ́ v \alpha \nu \tau \alpha . ~ I n ~ A r i s t o p h a n e . ~$
    
    

[^107]:    ${ }^{451}$ See Koster 1974 ad loc.
    ${ }^{452}$ For details about this tendency see p. 112 and pp. 116-117.
    ${ }^{453}$ Such divergences are highlighted with grey colouring in the relevant appendix.
    
    
    
    
    
    ${ }^{455}$ ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 11v 10: apud Platonem comicum et gallina (it refers to the Greek lemma $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \varepsilon \kappa \tau \rho \cup \omega ́ v$ in the main text of the Greek-Latin dictionary; cf. sch. Nub. 663a). $\Sigma$ I 12, f. 97v:
    
    

[^108]:    ${ }^{456}$ ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, 4v 6: $\dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi 1 \delta \tilde{\eta}$. fratris filia in Aristophane. $\Sigma \mathrm{I} 12$, f. $93 \mathrm{r}: \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi 1 \delta \tilde{\eta} v, \tau 0 \tilde{v}$ $\dot{\alpha} \delta \varepsilon \lambda \varphi \rho \tilde{v} \alpha u ̉ \tau o v ̃ ~ \theta u \gamma \alpha \tau \varepsilon ́ p \alpha$. In Aristophane. Cf. sch. Nub. 47.
    ${ }^{457}$ ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 10v 16 and $\Sigma$ I 12, f. 97 r : غ̇к $\tau \tilde{v} v$ vó $\mu \omega v$. $\tau \tilde{\omega}$ ỏvó $\mu \alpha \tau ı \tau \tilde{\varsigma} \varsigma \beta \alpha \lambda \alpha ́ v o v ~ \pi \alpha ́ v \tau \varepsilon \varsigma ~$
    

[^109]:    ${ }^{458}$ ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 21v 25: ${ }^{\text {® }} \xi_{10 \varsigma}$ apud Xenophontem. Carus ut annona cara est. $\Sigma$ I 12, f. 104r: ซŋน
     үípvovtaı. Cf. Xen. De vectigalibus, 4, 6, 5 .

[^110]:    ${ }^{459}$ The results presented in this subchapter were first published in Ötvös 2013.
    ${ }^{460}$ See Fig. 21 in the appendix I Illustrations on p. 191.
    ${ }^{461}$ For a short description of the handwriting see pp. 38-40.

[^111]:    ${ }^{462}$ The distribution of the glossary notes in three alphabetic sections is as follows: in the alpha section (on ff. 1r-46r; 91 pages) cc. 380, in the beta section (on ff. 46r-52v; 14 pages) cc. 60 and in the gamma section (on ff. $52 \mathrm{v}-58 \mathrm{v}$; 13 pages) cc .50 such marginal notes can be found. The average number of glossary notes is four in all three sections.
    ${ }^{463}$ E.g. ad 2v $8 \dot{\alpha} \gamma \lambda \alpha i ́ \zeta \omega$ - clarifico: honoro; ad 2v $15 \dot{\alpha} \gamma v \varepsilon v ́ \omega ~-~ c a s t u s ~ s u m: ~ l u s t r o, ~ c a s t u m ~ f a c i o ; ~$ ad 16v 8 वंv $\mathfrak{k} \kappa \omega$ - pertineo, attineo: ascendo, contingo, convenio; ad 30r 9 ḋ $\pi$ óvoı $\alpha$ - amentia: arrogantia, socordia, desperatio, suspicio, audacia, insolentia.
    ${ }^{464}$ E.g. ad 2v 6 व̈́ $\gamma \kappa \omega v$ - cubitus: vel locus eminens; ad 10r 21 ब̉k $\rho \alpha \tau \eta ́ \varsigma$ - incontinens, intemperans: vel inops; ad 7 v 19 גití́ - causa, querela, titulus, questio, culpa: ratio, aliquando confirmatio; ad 12r $12 \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \kappa \eta$, $\mathfrak{\eta} \delta u ́ v \alpha \mu ı \varsigma$ - robur: vel subsidium, aliquando proelium poetice.
    ${ }^{465}$ E.g. ad 14v 9 ảv $\delta$ pıóc - statua: praecipue viri.
     navigantibus quia in tempestate apparet; ad $13 \mathrm{v} 14 \alpha \mathfrak{\alpha} v \alpha \theta$ op $\tilde{\omega}$ - exilio: cum quis cum impetu excitatur.
    ${ }^{467}$ E.g. ad $46 r 26 \beta \alpha \beta \alpha i ́-$ babae, at at: adverbium admirantis.

[^112]:     ab oîץ $\omega$ quod non est in usu; ad 49v $5 \beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \varphi \eta \mu \hat{\varrho}$ maledico, contumelia afficio a $\beta \lambda \alpha ́ \pi \tau \omega$ к $\alpha \grave{~}$ $\varphi \eta \mu i ́$.
     - tolero patior sustineo: in cremento potest mutari etiam $\alpha$ in $\eta$; ad $18 \mathrm{r} 4 \alpha \dot{\alpha} v o i ́ \gamma \omega$ patefacio: recipit $\varepsilon$ in augmentis.
    ${ }^{470}$ E.g. ad 6 r $15 \tilde{\alpha} \theta \lambda$ ov - praemium certaminis: ó $\alpha \theta \theta$ 人os certamen; ad 6 r $25 \dot{\alpha} \theta \tilde{\omega}$ oऽ - innocens:
    
     ßov̂v; ad 53v $2 \gamma \alpha \mu \hat{\varrho}$ - uxorem duco: dóópıбтos ह̈̌ $\eta \eta \mu$.
     $\beta \lambda \alpha ́ \beta o c \alpha ́ ~ i d e m$.
     il fusolo della gamba; ad 46r $13 \dot{\alpha} \psi \mu \alpha \chi \widehat{\omega}$ - iurgo: scaramuccio; ad 52v $21 \beta \omega \mu о \lambda o ́ \chi o \varsigma$ - phanaticus: il buffone, sive scurra.
    ${ }^{474}$ See pp. 70-72.
    ${ }^{475}$ Link: http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Harley_MS_5792 (downloaded on 3 May 2013). Further details with bibliography on the ms. Harl. 5792 is also available on

[^113]:    the website of the British Library: http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/ record.asp?MSID=6563\&CollID=8\&NStart=5792 (downloaded on 3 May 2013).
    ${ }^{476}$ G. Goetz \& G. Gundermann 1888: 213-483.
    ${ }^{477}$ For details on the codices recentiores from the $15^{\text {th }}$ and $16^{\text {th }}$ centuries containing the GreekLatin dictionary from the same textual tradition see pp. 73-78.

[^114]:    ${ }^{478}$ Peter Thiermann: Das Wörterbuch der Humanisten. Die griechisch-lateinische Lexikographie des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts und das 'Dictionarium Crastoni'’ Hamburg, 1994. The bibliographical data of the PhD dissertation is mentioned in Thiermann 1996: 662, n. 21. The PhD dissertation has never been published, and it is not available for studying. On this issue see p. 20, n. 28 for further details.
    ${ }^{479}$ See Thiermann 1994a: 94-95; and Thiermann 1994b: 384.
    ${ }^{480}$ Thiermann 1996: 662-663. In a book review published in 2008, Paul Botley, who had the possibility to consult Thiermann's unpublished doctoral dissertation (on this see p. 20, n. 28), suggests that one should not accept Thiermann's bold statement about Guarino's authorship and the list of manuscripts containing this Greek-Latin lexicon without criticism:"The evidence presented in the thesis for the date of the compilation, and for its connection with Guarino, is much more tenuous than the bald statement in the published article implies. The notion of 'Guarino's dictionary' cannot be allowed to gain currency until it has been much more firmly established. Similarly, the list of Greek works published in Thiermann's article must be treated with some caution. The method used to discern these works in the lexicon was to be the subject of an article which Thiermann did not live to publish. No doubt some or all of these claims could be substantiated; until such time, the list is merely suggestive," see Botley 2008: 681. In his book published two years later, Botley writes similarly about Thiermann's assumption of Guarino's authorship: "Thiermann assigned this compilation to Guarino Veronese on slender circumstantial evidence (Thiermann, Das Wörterbuch der Humanisten, 149-55). He later repeated this identification without caveats (Thiermann, "I dizionari Greco-latini fra medioevo e umanesimo," 662)," see Botley 2010: 193, n. 138.
    ${ }^{481}$ The earliest dated copy of this Greek-Latin dictionary was completed on 13 September 1441, in Florence by Cristoforo Benna. Cf. Botley 2010: 64.
    ${ }^{482}$ Thiermann was already dead when his conference paper was published in the volume Les manuscrits des lexiques et glossaires de l'antiquité tardive à la fin du Moyen Âge, see there In memoriam P. Thiermann on p. 676; he prohibited the publication of his dissertation in his testament.

[^115]:    ${ }^{483}$ The most recent description of this manuscript is found in the exhibition catalogue Biblioteca Palatina. Katalog zur Ausstellung vom 8. Juli bis 2. November 1986 Heiliggeistkirche Heidelberg. Textband., edited by Elmar Mittler et al. (1986). The description of the manuscript is found on pp. 85-86 (B 13.6) written by Herwig Görgemanns. An earlier description is available in Stevenson 1885: 97.
    ${ }^{484}$ Cf. Görgemanns in Mittler et al. 1986:86, and Stevenson 1885: 97. The codex is also mentioned in several collections listing the works of scribes who were active in the Renaissance under the name of Scutariotes, e.g. Vogel \& Gardthausen 1909: 199; and Biedl 1938: 98.
    ${ }^{485}$ See Görgemanns in Mittler et al. 1986: 83.
    ${ }^{486}$ Botley suggests 1453 as the terminus ante quem, because Scutariotes is known to have worked all his life in Florence, while Manetti left the city in that year. Cf. Botley 2010: 64.

[^116]:    ${ }^{487}$ Cf. Görgemanns in Mittler et al. 1986: 86: "Es kommen einige falsche Zuordnungen von griechischen und lateinischen Wörtern vor, wohl Irrtümer bei der Übernahme aus einer Vorlage."
    ${ }^{488}$ Unfortunately, no up-to-date description of this manuscript is available. An outdated description can be found in Kubinyi 1956: 71, where the codex is dated to the $17^{\text {th }}$ century presumably based on the remark on f. 1r: Collegii Tyrnaviensis Soc. Jesu catalogo inscriptus. Anno 1690; and Scutariotes is not named as the scribe of the Greek part. This might be the reason why this codex does not appear on major lists collecting Scutariotes's scribal works (e.g. Vogel \& Gardthausen 1909: 197-199 and Gamillscheg \& Harlfinger 1981: 108-109, No. 183.). The manuscript is also mentioned very briefly in the more recent exhibition catalogue Prelude to a United Europe. Greek cultural presence in Hungary from the $10^{\text {th }}$ to the $19^{\text {th }}$ century, edited by Tamás Glaser and Péter Tóth (2008), No. 30 , where the codex is dated to the $15^{\text {th }}$ century and Scuatriotes is named as its scribe. A new, up-to-date codicological description of the codex is definitely needed.
    ${ }^{489}$ See in Bick 1920: 71-72 (No. 63).
    ${ }^{490}$ See in Bick 1920: 72 (No. 64).
    ${ }^{491}$ It is also mentioned in Kubinyi 1956: 71: "... initium deest."

[^117]:    ${ }^{492}$ The website of the library is found here: http://www.bne.es/es/Inicio/index.html. The manuscript is described in Andres 1987: 540-541. An older description is available in Iriarte 1769: 24 (No. 7).
    ${ }^{493}$ Apart from the three dictionaries I have consulted for the purposes of the collation, there are two further manuscripts - Rome, Bibl. Angelica, lat. 1094 and BAV, Barb. gr. 585 - copied by Scutariotes that also contain the same Greek-Latin lexicon, cf. Botley 2010: 64 and 193, n. 142.
    ${ }^{494}$ The manuscript is also mentioned among the codices copied by Scutariotes in Vogel \& Gardthausen 1909: 198 and Biedl 1938: 97. Vogel \& Gardthausen give the incorrect date 11 December 1470 instead of 13 December for the completion of the transcription indicated by Scutariotes in his signature.
    ${ }^{495}$ Cf. Andres 1987: 540.

[^118]:    ${ }^{496}$ See appendix X A Group of Marginal Notes from Another Textual Tradition. Collation on pp. 319354.
    ${ }^{497}$ See p. 151 for details.
    ${ }^{498}$ See pp. 150-151 for details.

[^119]:    ${ }^{499}$ The following exemplar was used for the comparison: Johannes Crastonus, Dictionarium graecum cum interpretatione latina. Mit lat. Widmungsbrief an die Studenten und lat. Vorwort zum Index an den Leser von Aldus Manutius. Mit griech. Gedicht von Scipione Fortiguerra und von Marcus Musurus. Mit Privileg. It was published by Aldus Manutius in December 1497. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, signature: 2 Inc.c.a. 3470. The dictionary is available online among the digital collections of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek: http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/ $\sim \mathrm{db} / 0005 / \mathrm{bsb} 00052218 /$ images/index.html?seite=00005\&l=en (downloaded on 10 June 2013).

[^120]:    ${ }^{500}$ See p. 149 for details.

[^121]:    ${ }^{501}$ Some copies of Crastonus's printed lexicon also contain glosses on the early leaves from the lexicon attributed to Pseudo-Cyril that tend to fade out afterwards, see Botley 2010: 65. Botley mentions Constantine Lascaris's and George Hermonymus's copies as examples for this tendency. As a third example, we can also add Taddeo Ugoleto's copy of Crastonus's printed dictionary: according the results of Gábor Bolonyai's research work Ugoleto added several entries and marginalia from the Greek-Latin dictionary found in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 to his copy of Crastonus; see Bolonyai 2011 for details.

[^122]:    
    ${ }^{\text {t2 }}$ Cf. Crastonus 1497 , s.v. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta$ ıvóc: verus verax.
    ${ }^{\text {t3 }}$ Cf. Crastonus 1497, s.v. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda$ ópıotoc: inconsideratus irrationalis.

[^123]:    

[^124]:    ${ }^{t 5}$ Cf. Crastonus 1497, s.v. $\alpha$ à $\tau \lambda \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \tau \tau o \mu \alpha 1:$ discedo liberor.
    ${ }^{\text {t6 }}$ Cf. Crastonus 1497, s.v. ád $\pi$ र́ $\chi \omega$ : disto recipio.
    ${ }^{\text {t7 Cf. Crastonus 1497, s.v. á } \pi \text { ó } \lambda \lambda \omega \text { : pereo perdo destruo. }}$
    ${ }^{\text {t8 }}$ Cf. Crastonus 1497, s.v. à $\pi$ opíc: indigentia dubitatio.

[^125]:    ${ }^{\text {t9 }}$ Cf. Crastonus 1497, s.v. $\alpha$ ỏ $\tau \rho \alpha ́ \gamma \gamma \alpha \lambda$ © ; talus idest ludus calcaneum coniunctura pedis.

[^126]:    ${ }^{\text {t10 }}$ Cf．Crastonus 1497，s．v．$\alpha u ̉ \theta \varepsilon ́ \rho \varepsilon \tau o \varsigma: ~ p e r ~ s e ~ i p s u m ~ e l i g e n s ~ s p o n t a n e u s ~ h o m i c i d a ~ s u i ~ i p s i u s . ~$
    ${ }^{\text {t11 }}$ Cf．Crastonus 1497，s．v．ä $\chi \alpha \rho ı$ ¢：ingratus．

