

The Royal Librarian's Notes

The first printed Greek-Latin dictionary was edited by Johannes Crastonus in 1478 in Milan. Its second edition was released 5 years later on 10 November 1483 in Vicenza. One copy of it was bought by a certain Paulus Romuleus,¹ who sent it as a present to his friend, Taddeo Ugoletto serving at that time as a royal librarian in the distant Buda. Apart from enlarging the library's collection, Ugoletto was also for a while in charge of educating János Corvin, Matthias's illegitimate son. In the king's ambitious view, a proper education for a royal scion and heir (although, for the time being, János was only a secret heir) comprised knowledge of both Latin and Greek languages. Thus, a new printed dictionary must have been doubly welcome for Ugoletto: both for his own research work (perhaps he had already cherished plans of editing printed texts, which were fulfilled later on)² and his teaching obligations. It is no wonder, therefore, that as soon as the Crastonus dictionary had arrived, Ugoletto immediately got down to work on it. He read through the whole book item by item, and added notes *propria manu* on the margins, by inserting missing entries, alternative meanings, and other grammatical information. The original printed dictionary contained about 15 thousand entries (on 520 pages), to which Ugoletto supplied more than one thousand new items. We do not know exactly how much time this meticulously done work took, but certainly not more than six months, because, as his note at the end of the book indicates, by the 20th of June next year he had already finished it: „Relectum xx^o. Iunii mcccclxxxiii^o.”³

¹ Presumably he is identical with the author of an apology written for Giorgio Merula, see KRISTELLER (Paul Oskar), *Iter Italicum. Vol. II. Italy*, Leiden, 1977, 63.

² For his editorial activity see Fortunato RIZZI, Un umanista ignorato Taddeo Ugoletto, *Aurea Parma* 1953, fasc. I-II, 1-17, 79-90; Angelo CIAVARELLA, Un editore e umanista filologo: Taddeo Ugoletto della Rocca, *Archivio storico per le province Parmensi, serie quarta* 9 (1967) 133-173; Vittore BRANCA, Mercanti e librai fra Italia e Ungheria nel Rinascimento, Ed. Vittore BRANCA, Firenze, 1983, 344-345; L. GUARESCHI, Taddeo Ugoletto e l'umanesimo milanese, *Bolletino del bodoniano di Parma* 7 (1993) 279-89; L. GUARESCHI, L'Ungheria e l'umanesimo italiano, Due note su Taddeo Ugoletto. *Bolletino del bodoniano di Parma* 8 (1994) 188-200 (I have not seen the last two articles).

³ On page 264^r. The note continues as follows: „Thadaei Ugoleti: Paulus Romuleus dono dedit.”

Ugoleto's copy with his notes and additions, now preserved in Vienna (ÖNB Ink. X. E. 9.), as far as I know, has never been scrutinized so far.⁴ Actually, it has been completely ignored in discussions about the history of the Corvinian Library. If we take into account the fact that Ugoleto did not leave any writings of his own behind, or at least, apart from a few letters, none have survived, and especially as a Greek scholar he is not more than a shadowy figure, an investigation into these notes hardly needs any further justification. And it is not just Ugoleto's intellectual portrait that is at stake. These marginalia are obviously based on his readings of certain Greek texts. Consequently, the identification of his possible sources may be of special importance in reconstructing the stock of the library. Theoretically, there seem to be three possibilities.

1. Ugoleto may have read *himself* the original works, and made his notes with the help of glossaries and other handbooks. (In this case we should imagine him just like anyone of us reading a book, who looks up unfamiliar words in a dictionary, then makes a list of them for personal use, e.g. learning them by heart afterwards).

The transcription itself can be envisaged in two ways.

1. (a) Either it was still in Italy that he read the original Greek works, *before* arriving in Buda, and what he did in Buda was simply transcribing his previously prepared notes into his Crastonus; or

1. (b) he made his notes when he was already in Buda, perusing the books of the royal library or his own ones.

2. But it may also be the case that Ugoleto simply copied someone else's glosses and private notes *without* reading the original texts themselves in which the words he copied occur. This course of events, of course, could have taken place only in Buda when he was already in possession of the Crastonus dictionary.

So, if there is a strong case for assuming that the actual work of compiling was done on the basis of material available in Buda, then we may obtain a unique piece of *internal* evidence for the availability of a certain number of Greek codices belonging to the royal library at that time. As is well-known, Greek manuscripts of the Corvinian collection are usually impossible to identify by codicological characteristics. They are not decorated, nor marked by coat of arms or any kind of sign indicating their possessor, nor are they bound in a special way. They can be identified generally only by other sorts of external evidence: their being mentioned

⁴ A brief codicological description of this incunabulum is given by Csaba CSAPODI – Klára CSAPODINÉ GÁRDONYI in their *Bibliotheca Hungarica. Kódexek és nyomtatott könyvek Magyarországon 1526 előtt. I. Fönnmaradt kötetek: 1. A-J.*, Budapest, 105 (item 254), with two minor errors: the author's name is indicated mistakenly as "Crastonius", and for the date of publishing the year of 1504 is given. They also refer to the analysis of its binding by Ilse SCHUNKE, who attributes it to a Viennese master, see *Zur Frage der ungarischen Frührenaissanceeinbände, Gutenberg-Jahrbuch*, Band 1965, 396. I am grateful to Ágnes Ritoókné Szalay for drawing my attention to this bibliographical reference.

in later sources, such as letters, book-inventories, prefaces and so forth. As a consequence, the number of the Greek codices identified is still relatively low and their presence is poorly documented. Thus, the importance of Ugoletto's notes lies in the fact that they may offer directly text-based evidence for certain codices being kept and used in the Corvinian Library.

But before starting our Corvina-hunting (an old national game), a brief overall description of Ugoletto's marginalia, I think, would be well in place. Roughly speaking, they can be classified into four different, though sometimes overlapping, types.

1. Most of them are single Greek words with their Latin equivalents: e.g. "ἐνδιόρθωτος emendatus" (99^r).

2. Apart from these simple bilingual glosses, there are slightly more than one hundred items with Greek explanations or definitions such as "κινάβρα κυρίως ἢ τῶν τράγων δυσωδία, ἀπλῶς δὲ καὶ ἡ οἰῶν"

(132^r). Apparently, they come from unilingual dictionaries, commentaries, or grammars.

3. From our perspective it is even more promising that in 84 cases the author's name is inserted in whose writing a given word or expression occurs (sometimes even its title is indicated): e.g. "ὄρίσματα pro moenibus apud Euripidem in Hecuba" (174^v).

4. And finally, in 16 cases even a certain passage from a classical author is quoted where the word in question is used: "θρόνον Theocritus in Pharmaceutria v̄n δὲ λαβοῖσα τὰ θρόνα" (114^r).

The circumstances, therefore, seem quite favourable, especially in the last two cases where we find named authors and direct quotations. Their identification seems to be a simple task: all we have to do is look up these words and passages in dictionaries or databases, and then identify the works themselves where the quotations come from. Then, in the next step, a second question can be raised concerning the manuscripts containing these texts: whether it was in Buda that Ugoletto read them and made notes out of them, or it was in Italy before his arriving in Buda that he studied them.

Let us start our investigation with the assumption that Ugoletto was working from his own readings, and first, have a closer look at two simple cases in which the name of an author using a certain word is added by Ugoletto.

To the entry "γαμέτης maritus" (50^v) Ugoletto adds the following short remark: "in Xenophonte". This word is used only once by Xenophon, namely in *Cyropaedia* 4.6.3, the identification of the reference is, consequently, certain. And since there are two Xenophon-manuscripts containing the *Cyropaedia* considered as authentic (Erlangen UB MS 1226 and ÖNB Suppl. gr. 51), in this particular case the assumption that Ugoletto may have read a Corvina-codex seems rather plausible.

Concerning the entry “ἄλεκτρούων gallus” (14^v) Ugoletto notes as follows: “apud Platonem comicum et gallina”. The identification is again without complication. There is only one passage in which the word ἄλεκτρούων is used with a feminine article referring to hens, and not cocks. This fragment of the comedian Plato (not the philosopher) is preserved by Athenaeus in his *Deipnosophistae*. If we start from the same assumption again, and imagine a scenario in which Ugoletto was using classical texts directly, we cannot draw any other inference from his note than that he had some sort of access to Athenaeus’s monumental work. Since its presence has not been attested so far, a new item on our list of Greek codices seems to make its first appearance.

Turning to quotations, our next examples offer similar, or even more clear-cut, cases for identification. On the entry ἄρۇομαι (38^r) Ugoletto comments as follows: “ἄρۇομαι καὶ ἄρۇτομαι ἄπτικῶς haurio unde haustum. Lucretius ut fluvios versare rotas atque haustra videmus.” This interesting quotation, which comes from *De rerum natura* 5.516, allows to make several observations and assumptions. First, we can raise a question about the way of quoting: whether he does it from memory or from a book. The passage cited contains a striking metaphor in which the stars appearing and moving on the sky are likened to “wheels and waterscoops” (i. e. waterdrawing machines) “turned by rivers”, but it hardly belongs to those memorable passages a Humanist like Ugoletto may be credited with having known by heart. Of course, one can never know, but luckily enough there is more (and more objective) grounds for thinking that the whole line was cited from a book (actually, from a certain book) rather than from memory: it is quoted in the same version which was preserved only by a late grammarian Nonius Marcellus, *De compendiosa doctrina* 13.5. In contrast to the manuscript tradition which offers *ut fluvius* or *in fluvio*, both Nonius and Ugoletto write *ut fluvios*. It is much more probable, therefore, that here Ugoletto quotes Lucretius’ text from Nonius Marcellus and not directly from a Lucretius manuscript.⁵ This assumption can be further supported by the fact that the Corvinian copy of Lucretius (ÖNB Cod. Lat. 170) also contains the reading *ut fluvius*, and not *ut fluvios*, the reading which stands both in Nonius’ and Ugoletto’s text.⁶

This short comment is quite peculiar from other perspectives as well. The Greek part of it, giving the information that besides the version ἄρۇομαι the form ἄρۇτομαι is equally used by Attic authors (“ἄρۇομαι καὶ ἄρۇτομαι ἄπτικῶς”), clearly originates from an ancient lexicon. From which one it is difficult to say,

⁵ On the use of Nonius Marcellus’ *De compendiosa doctrina* as a kind of handbook by humanists and among them Janus Pannonius, see László HORVÁTH, Eine vergessene Übersetzung des Janus Pannonius, *Acta Antiqua Hung.* 41 (2001) 202-204.

⁶ An alternative explanation for the agreement would be that Ugoletto, on the basis of Nonius’ version, emended Lucretius’ text, either independently or dependently on the hand which did the same in the *cod. Laur.* 35,31 – a possible, but much less probable scenario.

however, because this short remark in this form as it stands cannot be found in any of the edited lexica. We should assume, therefore, either a so-far unedited one, or consider it as a kind of summary note based on explanations found in *Suda* (A 4067) and *Lexica Segueriana* (A 148).⁷ To the question what kind of ancient handbook might have been available to Ugoletto, I will return later; what I would like to stress now is the loose and associative character of the rest of his comments. For a potential user of the dictionary (who would like to know more about the usage of ἄρύομαι), Ugoletto's further information does not help, and may be considered as superfluous. His point is that from the Latin verb *haurio* a noun *haustum* can be formed, and it doesn't add anything at all to the meaning of the Greek word ἄρύομαι. This is not to say, of course, that it does not shed any light on Ugoletto's spontaneous associations and his mind at work, but all that he adds is about the usage of a rare Latin word. From the hunter's perspective, the only inference that can be drawn safely on the ground of this note is that one copy of Nonius Marcellus must have been at Ugoletto's close hand.

As for identification, the next comment by Ugoletto is also unambiguous. In his note he adds a new meaning to the entry “πρός (dativo iuncta praterea significat)”. He writes as follows “πρός cum dativo significat penes. Euripides in Hecuba οὐ προσοιστέος ἄλλος πρὸς ἄλλῳ” (204^v). The passage comes, undoubtedly, from lines 394-5 of the tragedy. In the original context the words are said by Odysseus who tells Hecuba that “your daughter's death is enough, another one (that is, your death) is not needed *besides* it”. Ugoletto's note is interesting for at least two reasons. Firstly, the meaning itself he adds: *penes* (“near”, “at”) is correct; the preposition *πρός* may, indeed, also have that sense. In this particular passage, however, it is not used in that sense. Here it means “in addition to”, “besides”. Ugoletto (or anyone who made this observation), therefore, misunderstood Euripides' text. What he suggests does not too have much sense: “another death (?) (the word θάνατος is to be implied from the previous part of the sentence) should not be added in the presence, or house, of someone else (?)”. And this point leads us to the second one: this unambiguously wrong comment is a clear evidence that it was resulted from a direct, and presumably recent, encounter with the original text.⁸ It does not yield, of course, a valuable new interpretation of the passage (and not surprisingly, there is nothing of the like in the scholia), but, what is more important from our perspective, it offers his *own* (mis)understanding. A further implication is that it is much easier to imagine that such a misunderstanding happened through mistranslating the text than memorising it in a rather unclear sense. And as far as

⁷ In contrast to them, Thomas Magister preferred ἄρύτομαι to ἄρύομαι in his *Ecloga* A 13.13.

⁸ Even its slightly untidy written form which stands out from the generally well-ordered style of Ugoletto's handwriting suggests that it was put down subsequently and hastily, as if during or after perusal.

the availability of Euripides's tragedy in the royal library is concerned, the presence of *Hecuba* is pretty well documented (Csapodi, 1973: 242). Thus, it seems quite plausible again that Ugoletto was using just that manuscript (ÖNB Phil. gr. 289).

Because of the shortage of space, we can't examine each case further any more. But if we went along this path of investigation, at the end we might find that among the works Ugoletto refers to there are more than a dozen works that are partly well documented as part of the library, partly unattested ones.

But as I approach to the end of my presentation, I must confess that we have every reason to suppose that things happened slightly differently. That Ugoletto copied a prepared dictionary is obvious from the "layout" of his writing. The entries are put down in an almost perfect alphabetical order, following each other usually in a slightly slanting direction to the right. One immediately gets the impression that such clusters of words must have been written down *in one* from a prearranged text (for a few exceptions, see below). And indeed, there *is* evidence for a certain vocabulary available in Buda: a copy which eleven years before was owned by Janus Pannonius. And even a very brief, one-page comparison of the two texts is just enough to see that Ugoletto copied that glossary.

This may seem at first a negative result cancelling all possible candidates both on Ugoletto's reading list and the shelves of the royal library, but fortunately what he did was not a completely mechanical and one-to-one transcription. On a more careful reading it turns out that Ugoletto made a selection of the glosses and notes, used another glossary and lexicon as well, and there are still a couple of comments – all of them significant from our point of view – which are likely to have been produced by him. In other words, all the three possible ways envisaged in the beginning of this paper of how marginalia got their way into the dictionary are to be seen as realised options.

Janus' handwritten glossary contains lots of marginal explanations quoted by different hands from several ancient scholia and handbooks such as the *Suda*.⁹ About two thirds of these materials come from Aristophanes-scholia written to comedies mostly used at schools, the rest being quite heterogeneous (direct quotations from ancient authors, grammatical observations etc.) (Kapitánffy, 1995: 355). Now, if we compare what is left out and what is added to this material by

⁹ On the grounds that an autograph note of Janus stating his ownership in Greek was written on a slip attached to the verso of the third folio ("Janus Pannonius wrote this when he started to learn Greek"), it was generally thought that the whole codex was written by Janus himself. It was István KAPITÁNFY who recognised that neither the vocabulary, nor the glosses were compiled or written down by the poet himself, except for the short sentence, Aristophanes, Triklinios, Guarino und Janus Pannonius, *Act. Ant. Hung.* 36 (1995) 351-357. In a recent study, Zsuzsanna ÖTVÖS pointed out that there are two Greek hands discernable in the marginalia both of which are different from the Latin one, A Renaissance Vocabulary by Janus Pannonius? (ÖNB Suppl. gr. 45), *Acta Antiqua Hung.* 48 (2008). I owe thanks to Zsuzsanna Ötvös for showing me her paper that was still in press when I finished this article.

Ugoieto, the following observations can be made.¹⁰ For convenience's sake I present a table containing all the 28 entries remaining uncommented or not showing up at all in the *Vocabularium* in connection with which Ugoieto refers to a certain author by his name.

Table 1

Authors cited by name only by Ugoieto

	Entry in Crastonus (Vicenza 1483)		Ugoieto's note	Passage referred to or quoted	Shelfmark of books from the Royal Library
	Greek authors				
1.	κόσις frater	124 _r	soror apud Euripidem in Hecuba	Euripides , <i>Hecuba</i> 361 or 943	Vienna ÖNB Phil. Gr. 289
2.	νόμφη sponsa	163 _v	simpliciter pro muliere apud Euripidem in Hecuba	<i>Hec.</i> 352	
3.	οἰχομαι rec edo etc.	168 _v	οιχόμενος mortuus apud Euripidem in Hecuba	<i>Hec.</i> 138	
4.	after ὀρισμός	174 _v	ὀρίσματα pro moenibus apud Euripidem in Hecuba	<i>Hec.</i> 16	
5.	πρός dativo iuncta praterea significat	204 _v	πρός cum dativo significat penes. Euripides in Hecuba [sc. θάνατος] οὐ προσοιστέος ἄλλος πρὸς ἄλλῳ	<i>Hec.</i> 394-5	
6.	στερός solidus	222 ^r	durus et communis generis apud Euripidem in Hecuba	<i>Hec.</i> 296, 1295	
7.	τιθήνη nutrix	237 ^r	apud Euripidem in Hecuba	<i>Hec.</i> 281	
8.	φροῦδος vanus	254 _v	abolitus, disperditus, mortuus apud Euripidem in Hecuba	<i>Hec.</i> 160, 161 or	

¹⁰ Again, I express my gratitude to Zsuzsanna Ötvös for lending me digital images of the *Vocabularium*, the text of which she is preparing to edit, and also shared her ideas about certain codicological details. Otherwise, I used a not always readable microfilm copy of the codex preserved in the MTA Library (Mf 1196/II).

				335	
9.	after ἄπιος longinquus	30 ^f	ἀπύω poetice vociferor in comoedia, (?) Euripide	<i>Hec.</i> 154 , <i>Or.</i> 1253, <i>Suppl.</i> 76, <i>Tr.</i> 1304, or <i>Bacch.</i> 984	
10.	ἔστια focus	98 ^f	domus apud Euripidem	<i>Hec.</i> 22, 353, 1216, or several other passages	
11.	πλάξ tabula	195 ^f	apud Euripidem pro latitudine campoque	<i>Hec.</i> 8, or several other passages	
12.	πλάτη remu s	195 ^v	pro navigatione apud Euripidem	<i>Hec.</i> 39, <i>Tr.</i> 1155, <i>IT</i> 1445, <i>Hel.</i> 1212, <i>Or.</i> 54, or <i>Rhes.</i> 53	
13.	σχεδία rati s	231 ^f	sed apud Euripidem accipitur pro navi	<i>Hec.</i> 111	
14.	λάζυμοι ca pio	141 ^v	poetice λαζυμεν [diacritics badly readable] apud Euripidem	<i>Phoen.</i> 1660, <i>Herc.</i> 943, <i>IA</i> 622, <i>Ion</i> 1266, 1402, <i>Bacch.</i> 503, <i>Med.</i> 956, or <i>Rhes.</i> 877	

15.	νυμφίος sponsus	163 ^v	vir. apud Euripidem in Orestis [the last word is badly readable]	<i>Or.</i> 1109	
16.	χηλή velox pedibus	258 ^f	ungula apud Euripidem	<i>Phoen.</i> 42, <i>Ion</i> 1102, or <i>Bacch.</i> 619	
17.	θρόνον pigmentum. venenum	114 ^f	Theocritus in Pharmaceutria νῶν δὲ λαβοῖσα <τὰ> θρόνα	Theocritus , <i>Idyllia</i> 2.59	Vienna ÖNB Phil. Gr. 289
18.	after τοί	237 ^v	τοῖσιον [τ' οἷσια GLEA τοί σία PT] herba sine fructu apud Theocritum	<i>Idyllia</i> 5.125 + Scholion <i>ad loc.</i>	
19.	ύσσός venabulum	247 ^v	venabulum romanum. ut apud Appianum in bello celtico	Appianus , <i>De bello Celtico</i> (epitome 1.3)	
			Latin authors		
20.	ἀρύομαι haurio	38 ^f	ἀρύομαι καὶ ἀρύτομαι ἀπτικῶς haurio unde haustum. Lucretius ut fluvios versare rotas atque haustra videmus	<i>Lexicon unidentifid</i> Lucretius , <i>De rerum natura</i> 5.516 = Nonius Marcellus, <i>De compend. doctrina</i> 13.5	Vienna ÖNB Cod. Lat. 170
21.	ἀφέλης simplex. frugalis	43 ^f	ἀφελ[ι]ῶς simpliciter utitur hoc vocabulo. Porphyrio in carminum commentario. in Horati [two unreadable words] posuerit.	Porphyrio , <i>Commentum in Horati Carmina</i> 1.13.4	Milan BT Ms. 818
	λείψανον re	143	Terentus in Eunucho: Abi tu,	Donatus	

22.	liquum	v	cistellam, Pythias, domo affer [ecfer <i>cod.</i>] cum monumentis. Donatus: Monumenta pro quibus Graeci dicunt λείψανα παργονα [σπάργονα S terph.]	s, in <i>Ter.</i> <i>Eun.</i> 753	
23.	τρόφιμος nu tritus	240 ^f	Donatus in Phormionem: <i>Nam</i> <i>herilem filium</i> trophimon dicunt atque haud scio an Latini quoque alumnnum dicere potuerint nisi hoc mallent	Donatu s, in <i>Ter.</i> <i>Phorm.</i> 39	
24.	γλυκύπικρο ς dulcis amarus	53 ^f	epitheton amoris in Orpheo	? [cp. Sappho fr. 132.2 = Heph. <i>Ench.</i> 23.20, Poseidip pos <i>AP</i> 5.134.4, 12.109.3]	
25.	after πάλιν	180 v	παλιμψέστον (sic!) iterum rasa charta Cicero et Catullus hoc vocabulo utuntur	Cicero, <i>Ad fam.</i> 7.18.2	Dresde n SL Dc 115
				Catullu s 22.5	
26.	σκοπός prop ositum	218 v	scopus latine apud Suetonium	Suetoni us, De <i>vita</i> <i>caesaru</i> <i>m,</i> <i>Domitia</i> <i>nus</i> 19.1	Venice BNSM Ms. 3585; Budape st EK Cod. Lat. 13
27.	στορέννομι sterno	223 ^f	στορέα Plin xv.16	Plinius, <i>Naturali</i> <i>s</i> <i>Historia</i> 15.16	Vatican BAV Vat. Lat. 1951
28.	after ψ	262 ^f	ψίαθος teges, storea storeae vocabulo usum Livius et Hirtius	Hirtius (= Caesar), <i>Bellum</i> <i>civile</i>	Budape st EK Cod. Lat. 11

				2.9	
				Livius, <i>Ab urbe</i> <i>condita</i> 30.3	New York PL Sp. C. 27; Verona BC Cod. Lat. CXXX VI. 124

λάζυμαι capio

1. Let us start with what was taken over by Ugoletto. It is striking that he focussed only on two comedies of Aristophanes: the *Nubes* (*Clouds*) and the *Plutus* (*Wealth*).¹¹ In comparison to other ones, references are very few and scanty.¹² A similar tendency can already be observed in Janus' *Vocabularium* where about half of the remarks belong to *Nubes* and one third to *Plutus*,¹³ in this respect Ugoletto appears to be interested in the same area of language as the glossers of Janus' *Vocabularium*.

¹¹ If we take into account all the notes which consist of more than one word (e. g. giving a short explanation in Greek or indicating the author's name where it occurs, etc.) out of the 115 entries 22

(ἀδελφιδή, αἰρούμενον, ἀκόρητος, ἀλεκτρύων, βέκ, ἐδιδασχάμην, θούριον, ἰατταταί, κάχρω, καλάμω λευκῶ, καρκίνος, κοττάβων, κρίνον, ξύστις, ξυνορίσιν, πό<σ>θη, πό<σ>θιον, σάλπιγξ, τραυλίζω, ὕαλος, ὑπερφρονῶ, φασιανοί) clearly belong to *Nubes*, 12 ((ἀβίωτος, ἀθάρα, ἀρτιάζομαι, δειλάκρα, εἴη, ἐξωμμάτῳ, ἐπόπτυσσε, κινάβρα, ξυνοσιασῶται, ὀπόν, στρ οφαῖος, φθοῖ) to *Plutus*, 2 words ((ἄλως and ῥιγεῖν) occur in both comedies, and there are 17 further marginalia which may also be in connection with these two dramas. If we base our statistics only on those marginalia in which the author's name is indicated, out of the 84 cases 31 belong to Aristophanes (always without the title of individual comedies), 16 to Euripides, 10 to Xenophon, 5 to Plutarch, 2 to Demosthenes, Theocritus, Donatus, and Pliny each, 1 to Herodotus, Plato, Lucian, Appian, Thucydides, Lucretius (= Nonius Marcellus), Lucilius (= Nonius Marcellus), Cicero, Catull, Hirtius, Livy, Suetonius and Varro each; a work titled „Orpheus”, in which the word γλυκύπικρος occurs, I cannot identify.

¹² There are only 5 entries (ἄγλιθες, πλίξ, πόρπαξ, τομεῖς, φιληδῶ) which presumably originate from other Aristophanean comedies.

¹³ István KAPITÁNY, *op. cit.*, 355. His estimation is based on the identification of about one fourth of the marginalia.

2. There is a third work which clearly stands in the centre of his attention: Euripides' *Hecuba*.¹⁴ The focal position of this drama is all the more remarkable because, in stark contrast with Ugoletto's notes, Janus' glossary never refers to it. It is also worth noting that all Ugoletto's nine comments in which the title of the drama is also indicated (and even five further ones which presumably refer also to this tragedy of Euripides) seem to be based on his direct encounter with the text, and certainly never taken from the scholia. Apart from the case of *πρός*, all his notes are correct. It is also worth mentioning that usually the *Hecuba* was the first piece in the Byzantine triad of Euripides' tragedies to be read by students; it may not be accidental that Ugoletto, too, began with this play. And considering the fact that his references come from quite different places of the drama (from line 16 to 943), he can be credited with having read through the whole text. The same cannot be stated with similar certainty of the next two plays of the triad. What appears likely, however, is that out of the three remaining marginal remarks (item 14, 15 and 16 in the Table) that come definitely from other tragedies than the *Hecuba* (simply because it does not contain the words in question), one refers to the *Orestes*, two perhaps to the *Phoenissae*.

3. Apart from the *Hecuba*, there are only two classical Greek works from which a passage is quoted by Ugoletto on his own initiative. One of them is Theocritus' idylls. From the second piece he cites a few –not particularly remarkable– words when he arrives at the word *θρόνον* in the Crastonus dictionary ("Theocritus in Pharmaceutriavûv δὲ λαβοῖσα <τὰ> θρόνα"), and from the fifth one he cites the rare word *σίον/οἶσιον* in the impossible form *τοῖσιον* along with a scholiast's explanation¹⁵ ("τοῖσιον herba sine fructu apud Theocritum"). From these two references it cannot be decided how much importance was given to this collection of poems in the prince's curriculum, but their appearance on the margin, however few words they consist of, is perhaps due to the fact that Theocritus' idylls are contained in the same manuscript (the above mentioned ÖNB Phil. gr. 289) which comprises the *Plutus* and the *Hecuba* as well. And if we have a brief look at the content of the whole manuscript, it is immediately conspicuous that what we have before us is a light version of a typical late Byzantine curriculum, containing some of the most favourite school-texts: Hesiod's *Erga* (more accurately, 587 lines of it), the whole triad of Euripides (*Hecuba*, *Orestes*, *Phoenissae*), one piece out of the

¹⁴ As it can be seen from Table 1, there are eight clear-cut cases (1-8) where Ugoletto expressly refers to a passage from the *Hecuba*, and five further possible or likely ones (9-13) in which a word or phrase from this drama could have been on his mind. The three remaining words (14-16) derive perhaps from the *Orestes* and the *Phoenissae*.

¹⁵Ugoletto is more likely to have followed, and altered, the version of GLEA

(τ' οἶσια: ἀνθύλλιά εἰσι παντελῶς ἄκαρπα) than that of PT

(τοι σία: σίον βοτάνη τίς ἐστὶν ἄκαρπος), because he inserted the word after the entry τοί.

Aristophanes-triad (*Plutus*),¹⁶ a selection of Theocritus' idylls, and the *Batrachomyomachia* attributed to Homer. The date and provenance of the manuscript is equally important: according to the closing note, it was written at the end of the 15th century in a haste (!) by a certain Franciscus presumably in Italy.¹⁷ So it is easily conceivable that there is a more direct connection between the origin of this codex and Ugoletto's commission as a royal tutor. It needs, however, further investigation to clarify whether he bought it, or had it copied, or got it some other way for the prince, János Corvin. Anyway, the three dramas must have been given a prominent place in his curriculum. In the high number of these entries, I think, a deliberate intention on Ugoletto's part should be seen to concentrate on his teaching material and prepare for tuition. It deserves stressing, though, that while the *Plutus* is contained in this manuscript generally considered to be authentic, there has been no evidence for the availability of the *Clouds*. It is possible that Ugoletto paid so much attention to this comedy, too, and copied so many of the *Clouds*-scholia as well for the simple reason that he followed the glosses of the *Vocabularium* closely, but an alternative explanation should not be excluded either, namely, that there was an exemplar of it available in the royal library and he used it.

4. The other Greek work that is referred to by Ugoletto (and not found in Janus' glossary) is Appian's *Epitome of the Celtic War*, a piece of writing for whose presence in the library there has been no testimony so far. On the grounds of this reference, it may be possible that it was also on the shelves of the royal library, but since the reference implies only one word it seems more likely that this time Ugoletto recalled the word in question from his memory.

5. As for the handbooks, apart from Janus's glossary Ugoletto clearly had access to at least one unilingual lexicon and another bilingual glossary as well. The entry ἄρῦομαι, to mention one example we already know, does not appear in Janus's glossary. The Greek part of the comment on it originates indirectly from *Suda* or *Lexica Segueriana*, but, on the basis of other entries, it seems more probable that Ugoletto used a derivative collection of a much lesser scale. The case of ἄρῦομαι is not unique at all; the same is true of, e.g. the definition of κινάβρα I mentioned earlier: Ugoletto's wording is similar to, but not identical with, any of the definition other unilingual lexica offers. And apart from the definitions, there are a couple of

¹⁶ Csaba CSAPODI, *op. cit.*, 1973, 242 mistakenly reports that the codex contains Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*; in fact, only a hypothesis of the tragedy is in there.

¹⁷ εγω [sic] φραγκίσκος ὡς τάχιστα γέγραφα ("it was me, Franciscus, who made this copy as fast as possible", fol. 78^v). Jozef BICK, *Die Schreiber der Wiener griechischen Handschriften*, Wien – Prag – Leipzig, 1920, 59-61; Herbert HUNGER, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Teil 1: Codices historici, Codices philosophici et philologici*, Wien, 1961, 387. Alexander TURYN dates it at about 1500 in his *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides*, Urbana, 1957, 163. I have not seen Emma CONDELLO – Giuseppe de GREGORIO, *Scribi e colofoni*, Spoleto, 1995.

words, too, such as ἀσυνειδησία *inconscientia* (39^v), γλώπτω *fullo, polio* (53^v), ἔγκολπος *insinitus* (70^v), δημοπρασία *auctio* (58^v), ἔθναγέννης *indigena* (72^r), ἐκσπλανίζω *eviscero* (76^v), ἔλαιχιον (sic!) (78^r) *titulus*, ἔξοπλισμός (without any Latin rendering, 86^v), which do not occur in Janus' glossary either,¹⁸ yet are inserted by Ugoletto, obviously from somewhere else. The identification of these glossaries as sources requires further investigation; a clue may be given by those lists that were made by Mordtmann and Dethier¹⁹ in the mid-nineteenth century of the Greek codices preserved in the Topkapi Seray; among these there are three glossaries mentioned that are still kept in Istanbul.

6. All the other comments made by Ugoletto himself and not copied from Janus' *Vocabularium* (nine in number) concern Greek words that occur in *Latin* texts.²⁰ The quotation from Lucretius I mentioned above is a characteristic example of these comments: they are a Latin philologist's interesting associations rather than helpful information from an editor of a dictionary. In another respect, however, these notes are not alike. What counts is, again, their length. In the case of a one-word remark one gets the impression that Ugoletto, while inserting the Latin equivalent of a Greek word that is already in the dictionary, works from his memory. What he does is to allow a few thoughts to enter his mind and put them down *currente calamo*. On the other hand, when he quotes a long sentence, especially from a commentary, which it is hard to imagine that he knew by heart, it seems much more probable that he is holding a book or manuscript in his hands and transcribing a particular passage from it, or in the reverse order, after having come across a Greek word that did not occur yet in the dictionary, adds this new item into it. To the former category belong the brief comments on παλιμψήστον, ψίαθος, στορέα, σκοπός,

and γλυκύπικρος, to the latter one those on λείψανον, τρόφιμος, ἀρύομαι, and ἀφελῶς. Accordingly, we have sufficient reason to suppose that he did have at his hand, and actually used, a Terence-edition with Donatus' commentary,²¹ Nonius Marcellus' philological works and Horace'

¹⁸ Neither in Georgius GOETZ (ed.), *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*. Vol. II. Leipzig, 1888.

¹⁹ Johann MORDTMANN, Handschriften in Konstantinopel, *Philologus* 5 (1850) 758-761; Johann MORDTMANN, Verzeichnis der Handschriften in der Bibliothek Sr. Maj. des Sultans, *Philologus* 9 (1854), 582-583 and [Anonymous Editorial Note], A konstantinápolyi Eszki Szerail könyvtárában őrzött nyugoti Codexek, *Magyar Könyvszemle*, 1878, 92-98.

²⁰ It is worth mentioning that in two exceptional cases a note originating from a Latin author is already made by the glosser of Janus' *Vocabularium*. Both come from Nonius Marcellus: the comment on χωρίστρια refers to a fragment of Lucilius (*De proprietate Latini sermonis* 35.31), while the remark relating to ὑποπιασμός contains a passage from Varro (171.3), see also note 5.

²¹ In this particular case we are in a position even to venture the assumption that Ugoletto must have used the *editio princeps* of Terence with Donatus' commentary. For he quotes Donatus' note with the same Greek gibberish (λείψανα παργονα) that appears only in this edition by Conradus Sweynheym and Arnoldus Pannartz in Rome in 1472, but in none of the extant manuscripts, see Paul WESSNER' s criticus apparatus in his edition (Leipzig, 1902).

carmina with Porphyrio's commentary, while we can assert less assuredly that at the moment of quoting he made use of manuscripts containing Cicero's letters, Catullus' poems, Suetonius', Caesar's and Livy's historical writings and Pliny's scholarly works. Certainly, he must have read all of them, no doubt about it, otherwise he could have not cited any word from them, but such spontaneous quotations of him cannot provide us with strong pieces of evidence to prove their availability in Buda.

7. In contrast to his previous lists, Csapodi's last canon of the authentic Corvinian codices did not contain Janus' *Vocabularium* (Csapodi, 1992). Now, considering the heavy dependence of Ugoletto's marginal notes on it, Csapodi's cautiousness appears to be unwarranted. The royal librarian's remarks could not have got their way to the margin of the Crastonus dictionary had not Janus's glossary gone into the king's possession.²²

9. And finally, to satisfy our hunting passion, I would like to register our score numerically. In my judgement, Ugoletto's notes can serve as evidence for the availability of thirteen works in at least six codices and one incunable in Buda:²³

1. *Vocabularium J. Pannonii*; 2. Aristophanes, *Plutus* + Euripides, *Hecuba*, *Orestes* and *Phoenissae* + Theocritus, *Idyllia*; 3. Nonius Marcellus, *De compendiosa doctrina*; 4. Horatius, *Carmina* + Porphyrio, *Commentum in Horati Carmina*; 5. Terentius, *Comoedia* + Donatus, *Commentaria in Terentii comoedias*; 6. Another Greek-Latin Glossary; 7. A monolingual lexicon, out of which three are known and more or less well-documented items (1, 2, 4), four are new ones (3, 5, 6, 7). The notes may also provide, as we saw, a not-too-solid basis for assuming the availability of further 8 works in the royal or his personal library: 1. Aristophanes, *Nubes*; 2. Appianus, *De bello Celtico*; 3. Hirtius, *Bellum civile*; 4. Livius, *Ab urbe condita*; 5. Plinius, *Naturalis Historia*; 6. Suetonius, *Vitae Caesarum*; 7. Cicero, *Ad familiares*; 8. Catullus, *Carmina*, out of which five items are known (3, 4, 5, 6, 7) and three new ones (1, 2, 8).

²² For an analysis of how Janus himself used his vocabulary in his translations, see László HORVÁTH, *op.cit.*, 199-215.

²³ I disregard the question whether the books he used were in Matthias' or his own possession. In a final judgement concerning the stock of the royal library, however, this factor should not be ignored. As far as the Crastonus dictionary is concerned, according to the exlibris on 2^r, it went into the possession of a certain „Bernardinus Magister Canoniacus ecclesiae Cathedralis Viennensis, reliquiarum custos“, custodian canon of the St. Stephens' Cathedral in Vienna. In 1509 Bernardinus gave the book as a present („liberali dono dedit“) to Magister Georgius Rutzerperger (or Ratzenberger).

Selected Bibliography

Aeli Donati Commentum Terenti, accedunt Eugraphi Commentum et Scholia Bembina, ed. WESSNER (Paul), 3 Volumes, Leipzig, 1902.

BICK (Jozef), *Die Schreiber der Wiener griechischen Handschriften*, Wien – Prag – Leipzig, 1920.

BRANCA (Vittore), *Mercanti e librai fra Italia e Ungheria nel Rinascimento*, Ed. Vittore BRANCA, Firenze, 1983.

CIAVARELLA (Angelo), Un editore e umanista filologo: Taddeo Ugoletto della Rocca, *Archivio storico per le province Parmensi, serie quarta* 9 (1967) 133-173.

CONDELLO (Emma) – GREGORIO (Giuseppe de), *Scribi e colofoni*, Spoleto, 1995.

CSAPODI (Csaba), *Bibliotheca Corviniana*, Budapest, 1992.

CSAPODI (Csaba), *The Corvinian Library. History and Stock*, Budapest, 1973.

CSAPODI (Csaba) – CSAPODINÉ GÁRDONYI (Klára), *Bibliotheca Hungarica. Kódexek és nyomtatott könyvek Magyarországon 1526 előtt. I. Fönnmaradt kötetek: 1. A-J.*, Budapest.

GOETZ (Georgius)(ed.), *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*. Vol. II. Leipzig, 1888.

GUARESCHI L., Taddeo Ugoletto e l'umanesimo milanese, *Bolletino del bodoniano di Parma* 7 (1993) 279-89.

GUARESCHI L., L'Ungheria e l'umanesimo italiano, Due note su Taddeo Ugoletto. *Bolletino del bodoniano di Parma* 8 (1994) 188-200.

HORVÁTH (László), Eine vergessene Übersetzung des Janus Pannonius, *Acta Antiqua Hung.* 41 (2001) 202-204.

HUNGER (Herbert), *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Teil 1: Codices historici, Codices philosophici et philologici*, Wien, 1961.

KAPITÁNYFY (István) , Aristophanes, Triklinios, Guarino und Janus Pannonius, *Act. Ant. Hung.* 36 (1995) 351-357.

KRISTELLER (Paul Oskar), *Iter Italicum. Vol. II. Italy*, Leiden, 1977.

MORDTMANN (Johann), Handschriften in Konstantinopel, *Philologus* 5 (1850) 758-761.

MORDTMANN (Johann), Verzeichnis der Handschriften in der Bibliothek Sr. Maj. des Sultans, *Philologus* 9 (1854), 582-583.

ÖTVÖS (Zsuzsanna), A Renaissance Vocabularium by Janus Pannonius? (ÖNB Suppl. gr. 45), *Acta Antiqua Hung.* 48 (2008).

RIZZI (Fortunato), Un umanista ignorato Taddeo Ugoletto, *Aurea Parma* 1953, fasc. I-II, 1-17, 79-90.

SCHUNKE (Ilse), *Zur Frage der ungarischen Frührenaissanceeinbände, Gutenberg-Jahrbuch*, Band 1965.

TURYN (Alexander), *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides*, Urbana, 1957.

[Anonymous Editorial Note], A konstantinápolyi Eszki Szerail könyvtárában őrzött nyugoti Codexek, *Magyar Könyvszemle*, 1878, 92-98.