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INTRODUCTION

The present PhD dissertation 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 majority 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 Ugoletto, 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 dissertation, a complex analysis of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 is presented. The first chapter focuses on the codicological characteristics of the codex: its present condition, watermarks, folio and page numbering, binding, book-plates, gatherings and catchwords are described in details. 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

\(^1\) 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 above attached link by clicking to the option “Digitalisat” on the right.
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 dissertation 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 Σ I 12 in
Madrid) or a black-and-white photocopied version (Vat. Pal. Gr. 194).
I THE CODICIOLOGICAL 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 both in the Hungarian and international scenes.

After the overview of the relevant literature, the physical characteristics are presented in details: 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 exlibris. 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 15th 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: 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. 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. However, in his later collection of the authentic Corvinian manuscripts written in collaboration with his wife, Klára Csapodi-Gárdonyi, 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. It is not clear whether the codex was omitted by accident or it was left out on purpose since Csapodi had revised his former standpoint about its Corvinian status.

---

2 Csapodi 1975: 191-193 (Nr. 3).
3 On the question of Janus Pannonius’s autography, see Csapodi 1981: 46-51. On page 47, Csapodi lists the so far known items displaying Janus’s handwriting, then he also adds a possible new item to the list, a Sevilla manuscript (its signature is 82-4-8). However, his argumentation regarding the so called Sevilla II codex is heavily criticized by Iván Boronkai in his book review (see Boronkai 1982: 293-294) and in another book review by Ferenc Csonka (see Csonka 1984: 634-635).
4 See Csapodi 1973; ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 is described on p. 456, under the number 1013. Vocabularium Graecolatinum et Latinograecum.
5 See Csapodi & Csapodi-Gárdonyi 1990; the Corvinian manuscripts now kept in Vienna are listed on pages 61-68.
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.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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 8th-century codex Harleianus 5792.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{9} In his paper published in 1995 in German,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 Plutarchean work περὶ πολυπραγμοσύνης (Plut. Mor. 515B-523B).\textsuperscript{12} In this work, Janus translates the Greek compound πολυπραγμοσύνη 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 for the Greek word could have also originated from the Greek-Latin dictionary of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, where the verb πολυπραγμονό also has the Latin equivalent negotior inserted between the two columns of lemmas, although the noun πολυπραγμοσύνη itself is missing from the dictionary.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{6} See Ritoók 1975: 403-415.
\textsuperscript{7} Kapitánffy 1991: 178-181.
\textsuperscript{8} Kapitánffy 1991: 179.
\textsuperscript{9} Kapitánffy 1991: 179-181.
\textsuperscript{10} Kapitánffy 1995: 351-357.
\textsuperscript{11} Kapitánffy 1995: 356.
\textsuperscript{12} Horváth 2001: 199-215.
\textsuperscript{13} Horváth 2001: 209.
In a paper published in 2009, 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.”

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 Ugoletto, King Matthias’s royal librarian inserted in his brand-new Crastonus dictionary by hand. 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 Ugoletto, who – as the royal librarian in Buda – had access to a large selection of manuscripts in King Matthias’ royal library. He also analyses Ugoletto’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 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 the Greek manuscripts kept in Vienna: the transcription of the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 is attributed to the humanist poet.

---

14 Madas 2009: 35-78.
15 Madas 2009: 70. (Nr. 190)
17 Bolonyai 2011: 122ff.
18 Bick 1920: 54-55 (Nr. 47) and Tafel XLV.
Bick provides a detailed description of the codex: he deals with its content, the watermarks, binding, possessors etc.\(^\text{19}\)

In an exhibition catalogue,\(^\text{20}\) 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.\(^\text{21}\) In this context, he also lists the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 among the 42 authentic Corvinian codices kept in Vienna\(^\text{22}\) and he mentions Janus Pannonius as the scribe of this manuscript.\(^\text{23}\)

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.\(^\text{24}\)

Currently the most detailed description of the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 can be found in the official manuscript catalogue of the Austrian National Library.\(^\text{25}\) 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.\(^\text{26}\) Apart from data usually given in the previous descriptions (binding, provenience, writing etc.), Gamillscheg also cites Kapitánffy’s

\(^{19}\) Vogel & Gardthausen1909: 479 (in the addenda section; addendum to p. 446) also mention Janus Pannonius as a scribe. However, they attribute the transcription of Vind. Palat. Suppl. Gr. 51 to him instead of Suppl. Gr. 45 due to a possible misunderstanding. They refer to Weinberger 1908: 65, where ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 30 (a Diodorus manuscript, see Hunger 1994: 59-60) is discussed: it was copied by Johannes Thetallas Scoutariotes (see his signature on f. 248r), and possibly it was once possessed by Janus Pannonius (Weinberger 1908: 64-65; also cited by Hunger 1994: 60). On Weinberger 1908: 65, the description of Suppl. Gr. 51 (a Xenophon codex; see Hunger 1994: 95-97) starts as well, but in it Janus Pannonius is not even mentioned.


\(^{22}\) Mazal 1990: 27.

\(^{23}\) Mazal 1990: 37.


\(^{26}\) Gamillscheg & Mersich 1994: 44 (Nr. 3).
argument\textsuperscript{27} against the so far accepted assumption that Janus Pannonius was the scribe of the manuscript.

In a paper published posthumously\textsuperscript{28} in 1996, Peter Thiermann deals with the extant Greek-Latin dictionaries from the medieval times to the Renaissance.\textsuperscript{29} He collects the humanistic copies of the late antique Greek-Latin 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{27} On the basis of Kapitánffy 1991.

\textsuperscript{28} See In Memoriam [Peter Thiermann], in Hamesse (ed.) 1996: 676. His dissertation with the title Das \textit{Wörterbuch der Humanisten. Die griechisch-lateinische Lexikographie des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts und das 'Dictionarium Crastoni.'} is unpublished. However, Botley 2010 cites this dissertation with page numbers frequently, especially on pp. 192-194, in notes 134-157 written to pp. 63-65, which clearly shows that he managed to have access to the unpublished work. According to his account written via e-mail to Dr. László Horváth's inquiry (dated 16 October 2013), he managed to consult Thiermann's dissertation at the Warburg Institute, London, where the work was kept locked in a special cabinet that time. Botley assumes that it was on long term loan that time, but he suspects that that copy is no longer available at the Warburg Institute. I did not manage to track down the unpublished dissertation.

A short research plan by Thiermann can be found in Gnomon 66 (1994), on p. 384 (Arbeitsvorhaben) and a short account of the research can be consulted in the journal \textit{Wolfenbütteler Renaissance Mitteilungen} 18/2 (1994), on pp. 94-95 (Forschungsvorhaben).

\textsuperscript{29} Thiermann 1996: 657-675.

\textsuperscript{30} Thiermann 1996: 660; he cites Mazal 1981 in n. 15.

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. 116r-v. It was written by the librarian Michael Denis in the 18th 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 the dates of publication: J. Bick’s Die Schreiber der Wiener Griechischen Handschriften (1920);33 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

2.1 Basic data of the manuscript and its condition

The size of the paper39 codex is 300/305 × 210 mm40 and it comprises 333 folios numbered with Arabic numerals, which are preceded by three folios numbered with Roman numerals.

32 On this question see pp. 15-18 in details.
33 Bick 1920: 54-56.
36 Gamillscheg 1994: 44.
38 The online description is available under the following link: http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AL00159293 (downloaded on 25 August 2014).
39 According to Bick 1920: 54: “mäßig starkes, wenig geglättetes, enggerippetes Papier mehrerer Arten.”
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, but the most similar ones can be found in Briquet’s collection.

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 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). The watermark was used in 1447, in Ferrara.

2. The other watermark of a flying basilisk on ff. 121-168 and 299-308 resembles Briquet 2680 (“Basilic”) the most, although they are not completely identical. This watermark originates from Reggio Emilia, 1448.

---

40 Hunger 1994: 85 and Mazal 1981: 301 give this data, while Bick 1920: 55 writes c. 207 × 305 mm, Casapodi 1973: 405 has 300 by 210 mm and Gamillscheig writes 305 × 210 mm.
41 WZMA — Wasserzeichen des Mittelalters (http://www.ksbm.oeaw.ac.at/wz/wzma.php); Piccard Online (http://www.piccard-online.de/start.php), Briquet Online (http://www.ksbm.oeaw.ac.at/_scripts/php/BR.php). I had the possibility to study the watermarks on the digital images kindly provided by Dr Christian Gastgeber (Institut für Byzanzforschung, ÖAW).
42 Both Bick 1920: 54-55 and Hunger 1994: 86 find the most similar watermarks to those in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 in the Briquet database.
43 Hunger 1994: 86.
44 See figs. 1-2 in the appendix I Illustrations on p. 148; cf. BO http://www.ksbm.oeaw.ac.at/_scripts/php/loadRepWmark.php?rep=briquet&refnr=2667&lang=fr; last download time: 30 April 2014. Bick 1920: 54 also finds this watermark similar to that of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, while Hunger 1994: 86 finds the watermark Briquet 2669 (Mantua 1459) similar to that in the manuscript.
45 Hunger 1994: 86.
46 See figs. 3-4 in the appendix I Illustrations on p. 149; cf. BO http://www.ksbm.oeaw.ac.at/_scripts/php/loadRepWmark.php?rep=briquet&refnr=2680&lang=fr; last download time: 30 April 2014. Both Hunger 1994: 86 and Bick 1920: 54-55 find this motif the most similar to the watermark in the codex, although Bick calls it griffon (“Griff”) instead of basilisk.
3. The motif of the lion standing on two feet appears on ff. 1, 4-7, 10, 101-103, 108-110.\textsuperscript{47} In my opinion, it resembles most the watermark Briquet 10501 (“Lion, simple”), which is dated to 1437 and originates from Ferrara.\textsuperscript{48}

4. The watermark in the shape of triple mountains occurs on ff. 2, 3, 8, 9, 104, 107, 114-117, 331.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{50} According to both Hunger and Bick, the image in the Vienna codex resembles Briquet 11768.\textsuperscript{51}

The folios 329 and 330 do not contain any watermarks.\textsuperscript{52}

\section*{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 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.

\textsuperscript{47} Hunger 1994: 86.
\textsuperscript{48} See figs. 5-6 in the appendix I Illustrations on p. 150; cf. BO http://www.ksbm.oeaw.ac.at/_scripts/php/loadRepWmark.php?rep=briquet&refnr=10501&lang=fr; last download time: 30 April 2014. Hunger 1994: 86 and Bick 1920: 55 also find this Briquet watermark the closest to the watermark in the Vienna manuscript, although according to Bick it reminds of Briquet 10504 regarding some of its characteristics.
\textsuperscript{49} Hunger 1994: 86.
\textsuperscript{51} Hunger 1994: 86; Bick 1920: 55.
\textsuperscript{52} Hunger 1994: 86.
329r, which is the last leaf containing writing: 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 148b and the same happened after f. 165: the originally omitted page was numbered 165b 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. 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).

2.4 Gatherings and catchwords

The majority of the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 (ff. 1r-328v) 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

53 Mazal 1981: 301, Gamillscheg 1994: 44 and Hunger 1994: 85 give the number 333 for the folios with Arabic numerals. In contrast, Bick 1920: 55 and Csapodi 1973: 405 write 329 folios instead of 333: they either refer to the number of the folios numbered with Arabic numerals which have writing on them since the last leaf containing writing is f. 329r or the last empty folios (ff. 330-333) had not been numbered by the time they compiled their descriptions.

54 Ff. 1r-328v is a unit of 330 folia, although the numbering is disturbing. It is to be attributed to the fact that there are two folia numbered 148 (148 and 148b) and two folia numbered 165 (165 and 165b) due to the above discussed omission of two folia in the course of the numbering of the leaves.
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 βούλιμος ὁ μέγας λιμός at the beginning of f. 51r is shortened to βούλιμος as a catchword on f. 50v). 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 σβεννόω καὶ σβέννομι on f. 239r is used in the same form as catchword on f. 238v). 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.\(^5\) 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. 298v, 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: \(^5\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Number of folia</th>
<th>Use of catchword</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ff. I-III</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff. 1-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff. 11-20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff. 21-30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff. 31-40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff. 41-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff. 51-60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff. 61-70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff. 71-80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) For more details on this question see pp. 16-17.

\(^5\) Hunger 1994: 86 deals with the structure of the gatherings in the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. However, his description does not agree at all with the structure of gathering clearly suggested by the catchwords. It seems that he was not aware of the fact that the page numbering is confusing due to the omission of two leaves after f. 148 and f. 165, which were later numbered as f. 148b and 165b.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ff.</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Visible?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>(perhaps not visible due to restoration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>(perhaps not visible due to restoration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-120</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-130</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131-140</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>(perhaps not visible due to restoration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141-149 (148 and 148b!)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-159</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160-168 (165 and 165b!)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169-178</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>(perhaps not visible due to restoration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179-188</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189-198</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>(very faint traces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199-208</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>(very faint traces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209-218</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219-228</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229-238</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239-248</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249-258</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259-268</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269-278</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279-288</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289-298</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>(not visible due to restoration or intentionally omitted at the end of the Greek-Latin dictionary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299-308</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309-318</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>(perhaps not visible due to restoration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319-328</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>(end of structural unit)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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). The following can be read on this slip: “Lexicon graeco latinum. Supplement. XVI. (Autogr. Jani Pannonii, vid. schedas sub n° 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 18th-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: Ἰανος ὁ παννονιος ιδια χερι εγραψεν, όταν τα ἑλληνικα γραμματα μαθην ἐμελεν. Janus Pannonius propria manu scripsit, quando graecas literas discere cura fuit.” (In English translation: Janus Pannonius wrote with his own hand, when he started to learn the Greek letters.) Denis thus concludes that on the basis of this remark Janus Pannonius was the scribe of the manuscript: “Manum igitur habemus elegantissimi Poetae et demum Quinqueecclesiensis Episcopi...” Denis even assumed in his description that the poet copied the extensive Greek-Latin dictionary during his studies in

Table 1 Catchwords

| ff. 329-331 | 3 | no |
| ff. 332-333 | 2 | no |

57 The question whether Janus Pannonius was the scribe of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 was already discussed in Ötvös 2008: 238-242. Since extremely scant authentic material is preserved that shows Janus’s handwriting, a comparison of the handwriting in the Vienna manuscript with the extant examples of the poet’s handwriting can hardly help us settle this question. On Janus’s handwriting see p. 4, n. 3 for more details and for relevant bibliography.

58 Regarding accents, aspiration marks, spelling and punctuation, I closely follow Denis’ script (ÖNB Cod. Ser. nov. 3920, 116r). I express my thanks to Dr. Christian Gastgeber (Institut für Byzanzforschung, ÖAW), who sent me the digital images of the relevant pages from Denis’s original description.

59 As for the translation, it is to be noted that Denis obviously derived the verb form έμελεν from μέλεω, since he translated it with the expression cura fuit. However, this derivation is objectionable regarding grammar, because this verb tends to occur in expressions constructed with the personal dative case. Consequently, according to István Kapitánfly, the verb form έμελεν rather derives from μέλλω, which fits the sentence both grammatically and semantically. In Janus’s time, no distinction was made in the pronunciation of simple and geminate consonants, the two verbs were pronounced identically. See Kapitánfly 1991: 181.
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.\(^ {65}\)

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

---

\(^{60}\) Bick 1920: 55.

\(^{61}\) E.g. Vogel & Gardthausen 1909: 479.


\(^{63}\) Kapitánffy 1991: 178-181; the arguments presented there are also summarized in German in Kapitánffy 1995: 351-354.

\(^{64}\) Kapitánffy 1991: 179; Kapitánffy 1995: 352. See Fig. 11 in the appendix I Illustrations on p. 153.

\(^{65}\) Kapitánffy only mentions the difference of the inks used for the transcription of the Greek and Latin columns as a possibility (see Kapitánffy 1991: 179-180 and Kapitánffy 1995: 352), which can be attributed to the fact that he could only consult the microfilm version of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 in the manuscript collection of the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (MTAK Mf 1196/II): this microfilm version with its bluish colours does not reproduce the colours of the original codex.
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 μητὶ 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. As the examination of the catchwords presented above clearly suggests, 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. However, at this point, the question arises how the remark by Michael Denis can be explained. In Kapitánffy’s witty argumentation, Denis was right, but the remark only refers to itself, not to the whole of the manuscript as for instance Bick also believed: it was only the sentence “Ἰανος ὁ πάννοιος ἱδια χειρ εγραψεν, ὅταν τα ἔλληνικα γράμματα μαθειν ἔμελεν” that could have been written by Janus, sua manu, when he was probably experimenting with his newly acquired Greek knowledge. 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 (Ἰανος, εγραψεν). 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’ failure in the application of diacritic marks, together with his semantic and

---

66 E.g. on ff. 69v, 78r, 180v, 182v, 207v. On f. 78r, the scribe did not connect the related, but misplaced lemmas through drawing lines, he rather used symbols made up of dots of identical number (one to six dots) and strokes of identical number (two) to show which Greek and Latin lemmas belong together.

67 See p. 13 for details.


syntactic errors (the mistaking of μέλω for μέλλω already noted and the lack of the subjunctive after ὅταν), 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.\footnote{Once again, for drawing my attention to this important point, my grateful acknowledgements are due to Dr Christian Gastgeber, who also examined the way how Denis uses diacritic marks in Greek quotations in his manuscript descriptions.}

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.\footnote{Gamillscheg 1994: 44; Hunger 1994: 86. Hunger refers to BZ 84/85 (1991/1992) 189, where a short German summary of Kapitánffy’s 1991 paper published in Hungarian can be found.} 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.”\footnote{Cf. http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AL00159293 (downloaded on 25 August 2014).} 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.\footnote{Cf. e.g. Thiermann 1996: 660 and Botley 2010: 63.}

### 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.\footnote{Cf. Eleuteri & Canart 1991: 10 and 27-32.} The neat, careful, clear-cut formal bookhand in the main text of the Greek-Latin dictionary (ff. 1r-298r) might be best categorized as belonging to the so-called “sober style” (filone sobrio).\footnote{Cf. Eleuteri & Canart 1991: 10 and 27-32.} 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. Γ, Δ, Η, Τ). This practice is also characteristic of the two well-known representatives 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.\footnote{For a short description of the so-called “filone sobrio” see Eleuteri & Canart 1991: 10-11.} On the other hand, since the descenders (e.g. in the case of
φ, ρ, ψ) 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 forms 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 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. 3v 2; 5r 25; 18r 25; 30r 1), but there are exceptions, as well (e.g. 7r 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 ΙΤ, ΙȞ, Ιυ, Ιȟ, ŞȞ, υȞ, ıIJ, ıı.

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. 131v and 132r).

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 ἄνθρωπος, οὐρανός and θεός consequently appear in an abbreviated form
Inflectional endings are only occasionally abbreviated. For instance, the plural genitive ending –ọw tends to be abbreviated with a wavy line above the word (e.g. 61r 19; 101r 25), while the ending –ọv can also be found in an abbreviated form (e.g. 71r 7; 95r 21). The conjunction καί has a characteristic abbreviation: it resembles a less rounded capital letter S with a grave accent (e.g. 8v 8; 135r 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 left out and the missing letters or syllables are inserted above the word (e.g. 20r 17; 35v 11; 62v 3-4). In some cases, however, similar mistakes remained unnoticed (e.g. 98r 8: ἕξεπίπηδες instead of ἕξεπίτηδες).

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. 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 forms (e.g. γ, δ, η, θ, τ) – 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. 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), while on ff. 321r-329r another hand with a

---

77 Cf. Thompson 1912: pp. 77-78.
80 For further details on this structural unit see pp. 33-35.
81 For further details on this structural unit see pp. 35-36.
82 Hunger 1994: 86 describes this script as follows: “gleichzeitige (Mitte 15. Jh.) Hand von anderem Duktus, mit häufiger Verbindung von Buchstaben und Spiritus mit Akzenten.”
different ductus can be found (see Fig. 15, appendix I Illustrations).\textsuperscript{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 καὶ is characteristic and in ligature it uses a larger ε the middle stroke of which is usually joined with the subsequent letter. When letters having descenders (e.g. ρ, φ) are used in ligature, the binding is rather pointed characteristically and not rounded.

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. 320r, 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. 320r-v, and finally a further – again broadly contemporary (“etwa gleichzeitige”) hand – copied the text on ff. 321r-329r.\textsuperscript{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 together with 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. 320r can be identified as the real, more fluent and cursive Greek handwriting of the scribe.\textsuperscript{85} In this respect, the Greek handwriting on ff. 299r-320r can be regarded as transitory: the cursive tendencies the tarces 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.

\textsuperscript{83} Hunger 1994: 86 writes the following about this hand: “Weitere etwa gleichzeitige Hand mit charakteristischem καὶ.”

\textsuperscript{84} Hunger 1994: 86; regarding the main hand (“Haupthand”) who copied the Greek text up to f. 319v Hunger quotes both Denis’s assumption (i.e. the scribe was Janus Pannonius) and Kapitányf’s contrasting standpoint without taking sides.

\textsuperscript{85} It would be a further question to consider which of the two cursive Greek scripts (the one on f. 320r-v or the other one on ff. 321r-329r) could be identified as the cursive writing of the scribe copying the Greek text up to f. 319v.
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. The fluent and 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, line 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.

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, line 13) or the scribe attempts to modify the wrong letter to the right one (e.g. 2r line 13; 3r line 6; 11r line 8). Superfluous letters tend to be deleted (e.g. 62r line 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. 7r line 23; 38r line 7; 42v 2), but one can also find examples when it is not indicated explicitly (e.g. 17v line 18).

---

87 For the abbreviations mentioned in the passage see Cappelli 1990.
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 Latin-Greek dictionaries or two scribes were employed for the transcription of the Greek and Latin parts. István Kapitánffy argues\(^\text{88}\) for the latter possibility mainly on the basis of the above mentioned scribal errors revealing the column-by-column method of the transcription\(^\text{89}\) and the difference in the writing tools and inks used for the copying of the Greek and Latin parts.\(^\text{90}\) 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 έπιδρομή 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: έπιδρομή incursio and έπιδόσις porrectio (CGL II\(^\text{91}\) 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 έπιτυχών procurator could be found, which was corrected to έπιτυχών adeptus and έπιτροπός procurator (CGL II 312, 28 and 30), while in line 24 the contaminated word pair έπιτυχία tutor was corrected to the two distinct word pairs έπιτυχία impetratio and έπιτροπός ὁρφανοῦ tutor (CGL II 312, 29 and 31). On f. 146r similar contamination can be found in line 21 (Fig. 18, appendix I Illustrations): κατεγγυημένη contractio, 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 (κατεάζω frango and κατεγγυημένη desponsa; cf. CGL II 345, 22-23), but the Greek equivalent of the Latin lemma contractio was not inserted (cf. CGL II 345, 22). In these instances, the Greek lemmas added in correction of the

---


\(^{89}\) See pp. 16-17.

\(^{90}\) See p. 16.

\(^{91}\) The abbreviation CGL II is used for Goetz & Gundermann 1888 throughout the dissertation. For citing the text of the codex Harleianus 5792, I follow Goetz’s transcription throughout this paper.
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. Thus, it cannot be excluded that the Greek and Latin parts in the dictionaries were transcribed by a single scribe.

2.5.3 The Greek script of the marginalia

In the margins a high number of Greek glossary notes 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. As it has been discussed above, this cursive Greek script is very fluent and dynamic, ligatures are frequently used, and the ascenders and descendents 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 -oυ is abbreviated with two upper strokes slanting to the right (e.g. 33v 21, 49r 17, 110v 25). Further often abbreviated case endings are the genitive plural -oυ, which is indicated with a waved line resembling a circumflex (e.g. 265r 10, 286r 3, 297v 19) and the genitive singular -ου, where the ο is written above the ο in ligature thus forming a monogram of the two letters (e.g. 49v 17, 138v 6, 213v 10). A few times, other word endings are also abbreviated: for instance -οι with an upper stroke slanting to the left (269r 22) or -ας with double apostrophes (e.g. 291r 15). One can also find abbreviations of nomina sacra type regularly occurring in the Greek of the main text, as well: òνος with a...
horizontal line above it for ἅνθρωπος (249r 25). Finally, although it is not a form of abbreviation strictly speaking, the -ŏ written above endings of verbs (159r 26) indicates the contracted form of the verbs ending in -έω, -άω and -όω. 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 (33r 26, 138v 26) in this way. Missing letters or syllables are inserted above the words (114r 24, 120v 26, 177r 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. It is a problematic question whether the hand adding these marginal notes was identical with the hand copying the Latin lemmas. 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 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

---

100 Cf. Thompson 1912: 77-78.
101 For details on these marginal notes see Chapter IV on pp. 121-131.
102 On this question nothing can be found in any of the codicological descriptions discussing the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. The outer frame of the binding is

---

103 See Figs. 22-24 in the appendix I Illustrations on pp. 161-163.
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: bookplates 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 15th century and with most probability it is of Hungarian origin. The blind-tooled decoration of the binding can be best identified as transitory between the Gothic and Renaissance trends in the Hungarian book binding: the intersecting diagonals dividing the centre panel into triangles are rather characteristic of the Gothic 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. Mazal dates the binding to the last third of the 15th century and he gives either Hungary or Austria as its origin. 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. 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 blind-stamped leather binding. Anyway, the binding of the manuscript Suppl. Gr. 45 definitely differs from the

104 Cf. Bick 1920: 55. The online description of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 also dates the binding to the second half of the 15th century; cf. the website of the Austrian National Library under the following link: http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AL00159293 (downloaded on 25 August 2014).
107 Csapodi 1975: 193. Hunger 1994 and Gamillscheg 1994 do not give any details about the dating or the origin of the binding of the manuscript. Bick 1920: 55 also proposes the possibility that the binding was prepared in Pécs (“vielleicht in Fünfkirchen”), where Janus Pannonius resided as a bishop.
108 See Csapodi 1975: 193 (Nr. 4) and 208 (photos of the bindings of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and Rep. I. 98 for the sake of comparison).
characteristic bindings of the Corvinian manuscripts which were typically bound in silk, velvet or gilt leather.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{110} 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.\textsuperscript{111}

Up to 2008, only these two book-plates were recognized in the literature.\textsuperscript{112} However, a further exlibris has been revealed under that of Brassicanus.\textsuperscript{113} 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\textsuperscript{114} it as the exlibris of Johann Cuspinianus (born Spiessheimer), the Viennese humanist and diplomat (1473-1529).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{116} However, he suggested another date when he discovered that the woodcut known as Cuspinianus’ book-plate is based — with some modifications — on a portrait of Cuspinianus painted by Lucas Cranach. The portrait of the Viennese humanist


\textsuperscript{110} See Fig. 25 in the appendix I Illustrations on p. 164.

\textsuperscript{111} See Fig. 26 in the appendix I Illustrations on p. 165.

\textsuperscript{112} Kapitányffy 1995: 354 mentions both book-plates being stuck on each other, whereas Hunger 1994: 86 does not deal with Brassicanus’ ownership of the codex probably because he was not aware of the fact that a further exlibris is hidden under Bishop Fabri’s book-plate. Mazal 1981: 302 lists both Brassicanus and Fabri as possessors of the manuscript, although he only mentions Fabri’s exlibris. Csapodi 1973: 456 and Gamillscheg 1994 list both Brassicanus and Fabri as previous owners of the codex, but they do not mention the presence of their bookplates.

\textsuperscript{113} See Fig. 27 in the appendix I Illustrations on p. 166. It was Dr. Christian Gastgeber (Institut für Byzanzforschung, ÖAW), who, studying the codex in the Austrian National Library, Vienna, discovered the third exlibris hidden under the book-plate of Brassicanus. Here, I would like to offer my thanks to him for providing me with the digital images of the three subsequent book-plates attached to the inner side of the front page of the codex.

\textsuperscript{114} This identification was first published in Ötvös 2008: 244-245, then it is presented in the context of the provenience of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 in more details in Ötvös 2010: 103-108. Since the digitalization of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 at the end of 2010 and in the beginning of 2011, the presence of Cuspinianus’s exlibris together with his possession has also been indicated in the online description of the codex at the website of the Austrian National Library, cf. http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AL00159293 (downloaded on 25 August 2014).

\textsuperscript{115} Cuspinianus’ book-plate was first published by Stiebel 1894: 112. There, besides Stiebel’s short description of the exlibris emphasizing its Gothic characteristics, its image is also reproduced.

\textsuperscript{116} Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1919: 14f.
together with a matching portrait of his wife, Anna was ordered when the couple got married, thus, not later than 1503. Ankwicz-Kleehoven assumes that the woodcut dates from soon after the execution of the two portraits, that is, shortly after 1503.\textsuperscript{117} However, Cuspinianus’ 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.\textsuperscript{118}

\textsuperscript{117} Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1927: 231-232.
\textsuperscript{118} Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1919: 14, n. 15.
3 The content of the manuscript

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

inc. [ἄβακχεντος.] - ευτού Imbachatus, -ti; expl. ὁχυρωμένος vallatus

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 series Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum.\(^{119}\) The dictionary originally had its own title in the manuscript in the upper margin of f. 1r 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. ... λέξεων ἐλληνικῶν λατινικῶς ... 2. κατὰ τὸ ἄλφαβητον. The end of the dictionary is indicated with the Greek word τέλος written next to the last Latin lemma on f. 298r 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, the lemmas are organized in a 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.\(^{122}\) 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, adverbs, verbs that go back to the same root.\(^{123}\) Another part of the deviations apparently has no such motivation, although these cases usually occur less frequently.\(^{124}\) The alphabetic sections 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

---


\(^{120}\) Hunger 1994: 85.

\(^{121}\) In his description, Hunger 1994: 85 only mentions Greek and Latin marginal notes added to the Greek-Latin dictionary.

\(^{122}\) Cf. Daly 1967: 69-75. (Reviewed by Alpers 1975: 113-117.)

\(^{123}\) Examples: on f. 53r γαληνός, γαληνότης, γαληνότατος, γαληνάριος; on f. 58v δακτύλιος ὁ τῆς ἔδρας, δακτυλιδίον, δακτυλιαίος, δακτυλίου ἐκτίσμα; on f. 122r ἢδος, ἢδοτερον, ἢδοτα, ἢδοτης.

\(^{124}\) Examples: on f. 53v γαύρος, γαμψώνυχος, γαυρότης, γαμψός, γαυρός; on f. 59r δαπανηρός, δάπεδον τὸ ἔδαφος, δαπανηρότερον.
always formulated in the same way and similarly written in red ink which indicates the transition from one letter to another, e.g. “téloς τοῦ Β καὶ ἀρχὴ τοῦ Γ” on f. 52v. 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. ἀπτος pirus; expl. στρόβιλος pinus

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. 298r. The items in the list are not organized in alphabetic order. The list is introduced with the following Greek title written in red ink: τινὰ τῶν ὀνόματα (sic!) ὀμοίως Λατινικῶς ἐρμηνευθέντα (f. 298r). The first Greek lemma starts with a large initial letter in red ink placed in the margin. The wordlist is closed with the Greek word τέλος 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.

In the thematic wordlists of the hermeneumata published in the third volume of the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum one can find several collections of tree names usually under the heading περὶ δένδρων De arboribus. 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

125 See Hunger 1994: 85, where the title of the wordlist and its incipit and explicit with the matching loci in CGL II are provided.
127 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 Einsidlenia (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; περὶ δένδρων de arboribus CGL III 427, 39-428, 30 and περὶ ὀλέκτων de silvestribus CGL III 428, 31-429, 13). Originally, the Hermeneumata 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.
etc.). With one exception (δυνοκαλέω nux longa, amygdalus on f. 298v 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 τὸ δένδρον, ἔδος φυτοῦ, ὁ καρπός). 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 Σ I 12 now kept in the Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo de El Escorial, Madrid, on ff. 309v-310r. In Revilla’s description of the manuscript 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. 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.

---

128 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).
129 This manuscript is important for the analysis of the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 from several viewpoints. On the one hand, it contains the same alphabetic Greek-Latin dictionary on ff. 91r-293r that was collated with the Greek-Latin dictionary of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 – on this issue and for the results of the collation see pp. 77-83 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. 115-120 for further details.
130 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 Σ I 12.
131 According to Revilla 1936: 256, the first two items in this section in the manuscript Σ I 12 are ὀπτὸς πίρις (= ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 298r 10) and ἐλαία olea (= ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 298r 11), and the last two lemma pairs are ῥάμνος ῥάμνος, spina alba (= ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 298v 22) and στρόβυλος πῖνος (ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 298v 23).
3.3 Latin-Greek dictionary (ff. 299r-320r)

inc. Abitus, -us, -ui ἀπαλλαγή; expl. πραεσερε φάτνη

The Latin-Greek dictionary is published in the second volume of the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum under the title Idiomata codicis Harleiani. 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[aece translata?]. The end of the dictionary is indicated with the Greek word τέλος written in red ink on f. 320r. 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 299r to 318v 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 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. 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.

---

132 CGL II 487-506.
133 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 the title using ultraviolet light in a dark room in the manuscript department of the Austrian National Library.
134 On the so-called idiomata generum see Dionisotti 1988: 15-17.
135 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.
A) 299r-304r Masculine Latin words

a) 299r-302v Masculine Latin words that have feminine Greek equivalents (cf. CGL II 487, 1-7. Sunqtuedam nominaque latine quidem masculino genere efferuntur grecae autem feminine εἰσιν τὰ ονοματα αὐτα ρωμαϊστίμεν αρρενικῳ γενει εκφερονται ελληνιστιδε θηλυκῳ). In this section the Latin lemmas are grouped in accordance with their endings: -us, -or / -er, -x, -s and -o. The Latin lemmas having the same ending are finally organized in alphabetic order.
b) 302v-304r Masculine Latin words that have neuter Greek equivalents (cf. CGL II 490, 54-60. Item que latinequidem masculinogenere efferuntur grece vero neutro ομιος αυτα ρωμαϊστίμεν αρρενικωγενει εκφερονται ελληνιστιδε ουδέτερο). 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) 304r-308v Feminine Latin words that have masculine Greek equivalents (cf. CGL II 492, 25-30. Item que latinaequidem feminino genere efferuntur grece autem masculino ομιος ατινα ρωμαιστι μεν θηλυκῳ γενει εκφερονται ελληνιστιδε αρρενικῳ). The lemmas are further subdivided in accordance with their endings: -a, -o / -tio, -s (-is, -ns, -es, -x), and they are organized in alphabetical order within the same subdivision.
b) 308v-312r Feminine Latin words that have neuter Greek equivalents (cf. CGL II 496, 13-18. Item quae latina quidem feminino genere efferuntur grece uero neutro ομιος ατινα ρωμαιστιμεν θηλυκου γενει εκφερονται ελληνιστιδε ουδετερου). 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 masculino ομιος ατινα ρωμαιστι μεν ουδετερωγενε εκφερονται ελληνιστιδε αρρενικων). The subdivision again is made according to the endings of the Latin lemmas: -um, -r, -en, -e, -l, -us; 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 feminino ομιος ατινα ρωμαιστιμεν ουδετερο γενει εκφερονται ελληνιστιδε θηλυκω). 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. 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.

The Madrid manuscript Σ I 12 already mentioned in connection with the thematic list of tree names also contains the same idiomata generum on ff. 293v-309v. 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. 303v-309v) presented in the manuscript description by Revilla 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 τέλος. It contains some proverbs excerpted from Plutarch’s Moralia, often together with a short explanation. In this case, in the margin, the word παροιμία 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); Quomodo quis suos in virtute sentiat profectus (75E 10-75F 3). On f. 320v, the proverbs originate from the following writings: De sera numinis vindicta (549D 7-8; 558A 6); De vitioso pudore (533B 4); Parallela minora
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. 320r, at the very beginning of this section (πλούταρχος ἐν τῷ περὶ παίδων ἁγωγῆς) and on f. 320v, before the last excerpt (πλούταρχος ἐν τοῖς παραλλήλοις).

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)

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 the page: Παρομιμάτικα ἐλληνικά ἐπὶ κατὰ τὸ ἀλφάβητον. The end of the section is indicated with the Greek remark τέλος τῶν παρομιμών on f. 326v. In 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 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. 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. However, the majority of the proverbs tend to appear in various sources in the same form or at times with minor differences.

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.

In this section, only one marginal note can be found in the upper margin of f. 326r: 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.

3.6 Corporis humani partes (ff. 327r-328v)

The section is introduced with a Greek title on f. 327r: Α Μέρη τοῦ ἄνθρωπου σώματος, while its end is not indicated with the Greek word τέλος 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

---


145 F. 322r: γράφων φράσεις ἐπὶ τῶν μάτιν πονοῦντον. γράφων Ϝ συν κλήν ἐν ἢ τοὺς παρέτους καὶ δαιμονιώδες στροφοῦσ. The proverb with the same explanation can only be found in Suda γ 508. Other sources only contain the first half of the explanation (ἐπὶ τῶν μάτιν πονοῦντον): Diogenianus Cent. II 21; Gregorius Cyprius Cent. II 77 and Appendix proverbiorum Cent. I 89.

146 The incipit and the explicit of this section well illustrate this phenomenon. The first proverb appears in various sources with possible minor differences: Diogenianus Cent. I 11; Macarius Chrysocaphelus Cent. I 20; Michael Apostolius Cent. I 13; Suda α 281; Euthymius, Περὶ λέξεων ῥητορικῶν f. 4, 9. The closest version is that of Michael Apostolius to the one found in ŌNB Suppl. Gr. 45. However, Hunger 1994: 86 identifies the source of the first proverb as Diogenianus Ι 11, which has a slightly different text variant: βεβαιωθοῦν instead of βιοῦντον. 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 χ 610. This time, all of these sources have the proverb and its explanation in the same form as it appears in the Vienna manuscript.

147 Zenobius Cent. III 77; Photius ε 835 and Suda ε 1154.
works of the medical writer Rufus of Ephesus. 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. 84r (A in the apparatus criticus of the edition) and Vat. Col. 12 (B in the apparatus). I have collated the version found in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 (represented with the alphabetic letter C in the collation) with the edited text established on the basis of the two Vatican manuscripts. 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 A as opposed to 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 B is similarly missing from A and 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: 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. 327r), the text was corrected perhaps by the same hand: in both cases, the word to be replaced is marked with three dots 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)

inc. τὸ μὲν ἡρωικὸν ἔξωρος πρῶτον καὶ προήγεικέν ἀπόλλοιον ὁ πύθως; expl. ὅσα τῶν μέτρων γένη

The section has its own title in the manuscript: οἱ τῶν μέτρων εὑρέταί. The end of the section is indicated with the Greek word τέλος twice: once 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.


149 Cf. Daremberg & Ruelle 1963: LIV.

150 The detailed collation can be found in the appendix II Corporis humani partes (ff. 327r-328v). Collation on pp. 168-170.
The text lists the inventors of the various metres. No edited version of the text is available.

3.8 Short note (f. 329r)

On f. 329r, a short note can be found about the son of Tarquinius Priscus and the βούλλα in Greek, with some introductory words in Latin. The note is to be conferred with a passage in Plutarch’s Aelia Romana (287F 3-288B 27).\textsuperscript{151}

3.9 Blank pages (ff. 329v-333v)

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 exlibris 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 Greek-Latin 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 (Σ 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. 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 Ugoletto, the royal librian’s notes) evidence is exploited.

1 The manuscript in Italy

On the basis of the watermarks 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. 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 15th century, around 1450.

---

152 The results presented in this chapter were partly published in Ötvös 2009 in Hungarian and in Ötvös 2011 in English.
153 For a detailed analysis of the watermarks see Chapter I on pp. 10-11.
154 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. 121-131.
155 In the codicological descriptions found in manuscript catalogues the codex is usually also dated to the middle of the 15th 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 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 15th century, between 1440 and 1460, cf. http://data.onb.ac.at/rec/AL00159293 (downloaded on 26 August 2014).
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 18th-century librarian Michael Denis in the codex Ser. nov. 3920, on f. 116r:
“Codex (...) hanc Notam praefert: Ιανος ὁ παννοιος ἰδια χειρι εγραψεν. ὅταν τα ἐλληνικα γραμματα μαθειν ἔμελεν. Janus Pannonius propria manu scrisit, 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 graeco latinum. Supplement. XVI. (Autogr. Jani Pannonii, vid. schedas sub n° CCXVI.).”

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 15th 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. 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 home from Italy. Janus seems to even have the codex rebound in Hungary, perhaps in Pécs.

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:

---

156 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. 15-18. 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.

157 For ample material on Janus Pannonius’s Ferrara years see Huszti’s biography (Chapters 2-9); on Janus’ 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.

158 Weiss 1957: 93 and 102.

159 On this question see pp. 26-28 for details.

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. László Horváth presents a particular example in connection with Janus Pannonius’s translation of Plutarch’s work περὶ πολυπραγμοσύνης (Plut. Mor. 515B-523B). Here Janus uses the Latin equivalent negotiositas for the translation of the Greek compound πολυπραγμοσύνη – 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 πολυπραγμοσύνη: although the compound is missing from the dictionary, the verb πολυπραγμονό in f. 219v also has the Latin equivalent negotior inserted between the two columns. With all probability, the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 remained in the possession of Janus until his death in 1472.

---

161 Ritoók 1975: 405ff.
163 Horváth 2001: 209. The Latin equivalent negotior cannot be found in the 8th-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. 121-131 for details. However, it is possible that the insertion of the Latin equivalent negotior next to the Greek verb πολυπραγμονό is mistaken. In one of the representatives of the other tradition of Greek-Latin lexica, in the Madrid manuscript Res. 224 (for details on this codex see p. 127) we can find the following Latin equivalent next to this Greek verb (f. 202v): in rebus non pertinentibus 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 negotior belongs to the Greek verb ποληττο (together with civilitor), which directly precedes the verb πολυπραγμονό. 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 πολυπραγμονό. Being unaware of this mistake, Janus then could have used the Latin equivalent negotior trusting his dictionary.
According to Csaba Csapodi’s hypothesis, Janus Pannonius’ books were confiscated for King Matthias’s royal library after the humanist’s fall and death in 1472.\textsuperscript{164} 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’ bilingual library stimulated the establishment of a similarly bilingual, Latin and Greek royal library.\textsuperscript{165}

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 Ugoletto (1448-1515) used the manuscript in the Corvinian library. However, Ugoletto had his own Greek-Latin 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. Ugoletto 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).\textsuperscript{166} Originally, the printed dictionary contained about 15000 entries on 520 pages, to which Ugoletto added more than a thousand new items in the margins (missing entries, alternative meanings, grammatical information etc.). He finished

\textsuperscript{164} Csapodi 1975: 205-206.
\textsuperscript{165} 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 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).
\textsuperscript{166} A very brief codicological description of the incunable is available in Csapodi & Csapodi-Gárdonyi 1988: 105 (No. 254), where the name of Crastonus is mis-spelled as Crastonius.
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 xx⁰. Iunii mcccclxxxii⁰.

Ugoleto’s notes were scrutinized by Gábor Bolonyai, who presented his results in a paper published in 2011.¹⁶⁷ 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.¹⁶⁸ 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.¹⁶⁹ Bolonyai also presents statistics showing what kind of additions Ugoleto adopted from 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.¹⁷⁰ 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.¹⁷¹

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. 45.¹⁷² 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).¹⁷³ This second layer of additions, which were probably inserted at a different time compared to the additions taken from ÖNB Suppl. Gr.

¹⁶⁸ Bolonyai 2011: 120.
¹⁶⁹ Bolonyai 2011: 122.
¹⁷⁰ A similar tendency is apparent is ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, as well, cf. pp. 87-88.
¹⁷² For a detailed analysis of these additions cf. Bolonyai 2011: 127ff.
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.\(^\text{175}\)

\(^{174}\) Bolonyai 2011: 129-130.

\(^{175}\) Cf. Madas’s classification of the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 on p. 45, n. 165.
4 From Hungary to Vienna

For reconstructing the later history of the codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, the book-plates 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.¹⁷⁶

The undermost exlibris is that of Johann Cuspinianus (born Spiessheimer), the Viennese humanist and diplomat (1443-1529),¹⁷⁷ which means that this was the first book-plate glued to the pastedown of the front board.¹⁷⁸ 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...”¹⁷⁹ Cuspinianus was on friendly terms with Felix Petantius, the librarian of the Corvinian library that time, Ugolet’s successor, whose help the Viennese humanist could exploit for the acquisition of Corvinian manuscripts.¹⁸⁰ In his monograph about Cuspinianus, Ankwicz-Kleehoven lists nine Corvinian manuscripts whose notation of ownership indicates that they were possessed by Cuspinianus.¹⁸¹

---

¹⁷⁶ For a detailed description of the three book-plates see pp. 28-29.
¹⁷⁷ Hans Ankwicz-Kleehoven studied thoroughly various aspects of Cuspinianus’ 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).
¹⁷⁸ 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. 28-29.
¹⁸⁰ 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, “qui multis ... laboribus, multis precibus, multis denique lachrymis librum hunc a Budensi Bibliotheca extorsit,” quoted by Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1948: 219, n. 4.
¹⁸¹ The nine codices are the following: 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 Széchenyi Library, Budapest; Cod. 458 in the Stiftsbibliothek, Göttingen; 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 codices (one of them is problematic from this respect) –
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.\textsuperscript{182} 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].”\textsuperscript{183} Later he writes in the Consules (1553) that he prepared excerpts from parts of Diodorus’s Bibliotheca: “Sex ego libros graecos a decimo sexto usque vigesimum reperi Budae in bibliotheca regia, cum illic oratorem Caesaris agerem: e quibus paucula pro commode meo excerpsi.”\textsuperscript{184} 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.

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,\textsuperscript{185} 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,\textsuperscript{186} 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),\textsuperscript{187} and then in 1514 five times (3 – 6 January, 7 – 16

\textsuperscript{182} 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. Ankwick-Kleeheoven 1933: 32. In another letter addressed to Propst 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 quiddidie parit errores graviore et subinde periculosiores, quos oculati tantum vident et qui lingua utraque sunt instituti....” cf. Ankwick-Kleeheoven 1933: 18.
\textsuperscript{183} Cuspinianus’ letter to Emperor Maximilian I (Vienna, the end of April 1513); cf. Ankwick-Kleeheoven 1933: 45.
\textsuperscript{184} Consules, p. 160; cited by Ankwick-Kleeheoven 1948: 220, n. 3.
\textsuperscript{185} Cuspinianus’s diary was edited by Theodor Georg von Karajan and was published in 1855, in Vienna.
\textsuperscript{186} Cf. Karajan 1855: 403-404 and 407-408.
\textsuperscript{187} Cf. Karajan 1855: 404-406.
February, 13 – 25 April, 31 August – 25 September and 23 October – 30 November).\(^{188}\) 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),\(^{189}\) 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.\(^{190}\)

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.\(^{191}\) Consequently, the next possessor of the manuscript after Cuspinianus was Brassicanus. For the time being, it cannot be revealed 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.\(^{192}\)

In a recent article András Németh examined Brassicanus’s inventory of bequest (Inventarium bonorum doctoris Jo<ha>n<i>s Alexandri Brassicani) now kept at the Archiv der Universität Wien under the signature Fasc. 49 Nr. 100.\(^{193}\) The inventory consisting of 48 folios was compiled in December 1539, shortly after Brassicanus’s death, it lists 1369 items


\(^{189}\) 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.


\(^{191}\) For Brassicanus’s exlibris see Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1919: 30-32.

\(^{192}\) 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.

\(^{193}\) Németh 2013: 282-305.
the majority of which – with the exception of approximately 50 items – are books. 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. In the inventory, on f. 27v, 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. 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.

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. 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, 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.

---

194 Németh 2013: 285.
195 Németh 2013: 286.
196 Németh 2013: 303.
197 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 grece et Selecta scripta in perg<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 grece ar<cus>;” (828) “Aeschili tragodie cum scholiis grecis manusciptæ 4to;” (829) Sophoclis tragodie tres cum scholiis grecis scriptæ 4;” (830) “Grammatica greca Moscopuli scripta 4to;” (831) Georgii Gemsti Pletonis quedam scripta in perg<amen>o;” (832) “Grammatica greca Emanuelis Moschopuli manusciptæ;” see Németh 2013: 298. For the identification of these items see Németh 2013: 303-304.
199 For details about this exlibris see Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1919: 32-33.
200 Földesi 2002: 95.
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 15th 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, it was confiscated for the royal library of King Matthias Corvinus together with his other books in 1472. Between 1483 and 1484, Taddeo Ugoletto, 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’ 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 8th-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 15th century: numerous manuscripts from the 15th and 16th 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. This supposition was refuted by István Kapitánffy, 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. 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. 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.

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. A description of the manuscript can be found in the preface to the second volume of the series Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum. A more up-to-date description with a list of relevant bibliography is available again online at the website of the British Library.

The content of the manuscript can be divided to two groups. The first part of the manuscript (ff. 1v-272r) contains lexicographical texts: an extensive Greek-Latin glossary (ff. 201-207). 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.


For details see pp. 6-8. For the discussion of the question whether Janus was the scribe of the manuscript see pp. 15-18.


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).

Goetz & Gundermann 1888: XX-XXVI.

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).
1v-240v) attributed to Cyril and therefore known as Pseudo-Cyril in the literature, a Latin-Greek wordlist (ff. 241r-259v) organized as idiomata generum, 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) follow. 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 8th century: the first part is dated after 730, while the second part is dated to the second half of the 8th century.

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. Then in the 18th 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. The binding of the manuscript is a post-1600 “Harleian” binding of gilt-tooled red morocco that can be attributed to Christopher Chapman.

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. 1v-240v. 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 34-38 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. Moreover, mistakes seem to suggest that the compiler of the

210 Published in CGL II, pp. 215-483.
211 Published in CGL II, pp. 487-506.
213 See the inscription “Nicolai de Cusa” on f. 1r and cf. e.g. Botley 2010: 63.
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.\footnote{Dionisotti 1988: 11.} However, this is all what we know about the diffusion of this Greek-Latin dictionary before the 15\textsuperscript{th} century.

There is, actually, another early copy of the dictionary in the manuscript Laudunensis 444 written in the 9\textsuperscript{th} century, in Gaul. The dictionary is found at the beginning of the manuscript, on ff. 5r-255v and has the inscription “Incipit glossarium grecum per ordinem alphabeti.”\footnote{For details see Goetz & Gundermann 1888: XXVI-XXX and Dionisotti 1988: 12-13.} 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.\footnote{Cf. Goetz & Gundermann 1888: XXVII-XXX.} Thus, a lost intermediary copy is to be assumed between the Harleianus and the Laudunensis codices;\footnote{Cf. Dionisotti 1988: 12-13.} they seem to represent different branches of the textual tradition of the Greek-Latin dictionary.
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 8th-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.  

In the preface to the second volume of the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum, Goetz lists ten codices from the 15th and 16th centuries that contain the Greek-Latin dictionary indirectly stemming from the codex Harleianus 5792. These ten codices are as follows:

1) **Cod. Vallicellianus B 31.** The 15th-century paper codex contains the Greek-Latin dictionary on ff. 144r/a-242r/b. The Latin-Greek idiomata generum can also be found in the manuscript.

2) **Bibliothecae aedilium Flor. eccles. cod. CCXIX.** The paper codex from the 15th century contains 265 folios.

3) **Cod. Laurent. “acquisti 92.”** The paper codex from the 15th/16th 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. The manuscript was once owned by Francesco da Castiglione.

4) **Cod. Laurent. 57, 16.** The paper codex from the 15th/16th century contains 328 folios. The Greek-Latin dictionary in the manuscript is not complete; it ends with \( \text{Trige, pluraliter tantum} \).

5) **Cod. Escurial Σ I 12.** The 15th-century manuscript contains the Greek-Latin dictionary on ff. 91r-293r.

---

221 About this process a comprehensive overview can be found in Botley 2010: 63.
222 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 pendentis non intercedente Laudunensi...”
223 Goetz & Gundermann 1888: XXX.
224 Goetz & Gundermann 1888: XXXIII.
225 Goetz & Gundermann 1888: XXX.
226 Goetz & Gundermann 1888: XXX.
227 Botley 2010: 63 and 192, n. 131.
228 Goetz & Gundermann 1888: XXX; Bandini 1961: 357.
229 Goetz & Gundermann 1888: XXX. The manuscript is discussed in details on pp. 77-79.
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 15th century or in the 16th century.230

7) **Cod. Parisinus gr. 2627.** The parchment codex from the 15th/16th century contains 111 folios. The Greek-Latin dictionary is found on ff. 1-102.231 According to the manuscript description, the dictionary in the codex starts with the word pair Ἀβαρῆς non gravis,232 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.233

8) **Cod. Parisinus gr. 2628.** The parchment codex from the end of the 15th century contains 395 folios. It was copied by Georgius Hermonymus Spartanus.234 According to the short manuscript description, the first lemma pair in the Greek-Latin dictionary is Απτος Inlangibilis, innocuous,235 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 εὐπελήπτος. The Greek writing can be dated to the beginning of the 16th century, while the Latin part was not written by a single hand; the later of the two hands seems to belong to the 17th century. The Greek-Latin dictionary starts with the lemma pair Ἀβαρῆς 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.236

---

230 Goetz & Gundermann 1888: XXX; Lauer 1940: 404.
231 Goetz & Gundermann 1888: XXX-XXXI.
232 Omont 1888: 15.
233 Goetz & Gundermann 1888: XXXIII.
234 Goetz & Gundermann 1888: XXXI.
235 Omont 1888: 15.
236 A Catalogue… 1863: 685; Goetz & Gundermann 1888: XXXI.
10) **Cod. Neapolitanus II D 34.** The 15th-century manuscript contains a Greek-Latin dictionary on ff. 3-318. The wordlist starts with the lemma pair ἄβελτρος ineptus, stultus, which is only the tenth lemma pair in the codex Harleianus 5792 and in the Vienna manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. In the codex, several pages are left completely or partly empty; perhaps the scribe intended to add new lemmas there later.²³⁷

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 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.²³⁸

Apart from the ten 15th/16th-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 dissertation is such a codex that contains the Greek-Latin dictionary but it 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.²³⁹

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.²⁴⁰

In Naples, in the Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli, apart from the codex Neapolitanus II D 34 also listed by Goetz, a further manuscript, cod. Neap. II D 33 also contains the Greek-Latin dictionary.²⁴¹ The paper codex from the end of the 15th century contains the originally Greek-Latin dictionary on ff. 1-249. However, here the dictionary was reversed to a Latin-

---

²³⁷ Goetz & Gundermann 1888: XXXI; Formentin 1995: 38-39. Formentin in her manuscript description mistakenly claims that the scribe was the compiler of the dictionary as well, cf. Formentin 1995: 38: “Scriba unus, qui etiam auctor lexici fuit…”

²³⁸ Goetz 1888: XXXI.

²³⁹ 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. 62-67.

²⁴⁰ 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. 68-76.

²⁴¹ It is also mentioned by Dionisotti 1984-85: 304, n. 1 among the codices recentiores containing the Greek-Latin dictionary.
Greek wordlist by changing the original order of the Greek and Latin lemmas. The dictionary starts with the lemma pair Νόν γραβὶς ὀβαρῆς, 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.242

In Basle, one can also find a manuscript containing the Greek-Latin dictionary attributed to Pseudo-Cyril: the codex Basil. A III 17.243 The paper codex from the 15th 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.244 After his death in Basle in 1443, the Dominicans there inherited the manuscript.245 The dictionary is bound together with the works of Cyril,246 which were written by a different hand. This manuscript was used for the editio princeps of Stephanus’s lexicon in 1573.247

At the Yale University Library, a further manuscript is kept that contains the Greek-Latin dictionary attributed to Cyril of Alexandria: the codex Beinecke 291, on ff. 1r-151v. It was copied by the scribe Phanourios Karabelos for Michael Ialinas in Italy in 1489.248

In Milan, in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana, one can also find a 15th-century manuscript containing the Greek-Latin dictionary: the codex B.46 sup. olim T.211 (gr. 90). Since the manuscript has the note “1472 die 11 septb,” the terminus ante quem of the transcription of the dictionary is 1472. The codex was possessed by Giorgio Merula.249

It is also possible that some 15th-century manuscripts kept at the Topkapi Palace, Istanbul also contain the Greek-Latin dictionary and/or the Latin-Greek idiomata generum found in the codex Harleianus 5792. In his earlier writing, Mordtmann lists two Greek-Latin

---

242 Cf. the description of the manuscript in Formentin 1995: 37-38.
243 It is also mentioned in Dionisotti 1984-85: 304, n. 1 among the codices recentiores containing the Greek-Latin dictionary.
244 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 ἀντικροτος Intactus, while the Harley manuscript has Ἀβαχοῦτος 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. 58), 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 Harleianus 5792.
245 Dionisotti 1984-85: 314, n. 3.
246 For a detailed content of the manuscript see Omont 1886: 406.
248 Botley 2010: 63 and 192, n. 133 mentions the Yale manuscript among the Renaissance copies of the Greek-Latin dictionary found in the codex Harleianus 5792. 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 15 May 2014).
249 Botley 2010: 63 and 192, n. 130.
glossaries among the codices kept in the Topkapi Palace, while in a later paper he mentions a Greek-Latin lexicon and a Latin-Greek vocabulary. 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 15th century) and a “Lexicon Latino-Graecum et Graecico-Latinum” (no. 30, paper codex from the 15th century). In his list, Deissmann also mentions the same manuscripts listed by Gaselee earlier, but this time Deissmann provides slightly 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 15th and 16th 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 manuscripts containing the same lexicon raises difficulties: Goetz already lists ten related manuscripts to which seven 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.

Naturally, the detailed analysis and collation of all the 17 codices recentiores collected above is beyond the scope of the present PhD dissertation 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 Σ I 12 (Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo de

250 Mordtmann 1850: 759: “zwei griechisch-lateinische glossarien” (nos. 4 and 5 among the Greek manuscripts).
251 Mordtmann 1854: 583: “Ein griechisch-lateinisches wörterbuch” (no. 16 among the Greek manuscripts); “Lateinisch-griechisches vocabularium” (no. 37 among the Latin manuscripts).
252 Gaselee 1916: 10.
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. Moreover, the collation of the four manuscripts with ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 is also important from the viewpoint of the methodology of how one can place a version of a popular bilingual lexicon among related contemporary texts forming a family that go back to the same ancestor indirectly.

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

The parchment254 codex ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 47 from the middle of the 15th century consists of 101 folios.255 Its size is 275/280 × 200/205 mm and it has brown blind-stamped leather binding with wickerwork pattern (“Flechtwerkmuster”) made of calfskin.256

On the recto of f. 1, Latin and Hebrew alphabets can be found. The folios 1v and 2r are blank. On the verso of f. 2 one can find a Greek alphabet (Alfabetum 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. β = vita; η = hita; σ = sima; υ = ipsilo). 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 praepositi masculini generis257), feminine (femini[t]i generis) and

254 With the exception of fol. 101, which is paper.
255 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.”
256 Cf. Bick 1920: 56, n. 1; Hermann 1932: 135 (the most detailed description of the binding); Hunger 1994: 90; Gamillscheg & Mersich 1994: 42.
257 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.
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.\(^{258}\)

The Greek-Latin dictionary occupies the major part of the codex, from f. 3r to 94r. It has no separate title in the handwriting as opposed to Suppl. Gr. 45, and it ends with a kolophon lacking the name of the scribe: τέλος τῆς βιβλίου ταύτης, θεῷ δὲ διὰ παντὸς δόξα. From f. 94r to 101r parts from Guarino Veronese’s Erotemata (ἀπὸ τῶν προσωπικῶν ἔρωτήματα) can be read. This section again ends with a kolophon,\(^{259}\) which reveals that the scribe responsible for this part\(^{260}\) was Christophoros Persona Romaios (ca. 1416-1485). He lived in Rome and he was the prefect of the Bibliotheca Vaticana from 1484.\(^{261}\) He was above all known as the translator of Greek authors (e.g. of the Byzantine historian Agathias).\(^{262}\)

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.\(^{263}\) Then the codex was possessed by Johannes Cuspinianus, who left the signature 433 in f. 1r.\(^{264}\) 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.

\(^{258}\) “Liber est Revrendissimi patre et domini doctore Iohannis Fabri episcopi viennense proprīs et non Episcopatus peccunīs emptus et post mortem ipsius in bibliothecam collegīi sui Sancti Nicolai ad usum inhabitantium studentum et studiosorum iuxta suam ordinacionem collocabundus. Actum 10. ianuariī. Anno a Christo nato MDLX. Ex singuliari mandato, et ex ore ipsius Revrendissimi Episcopi, Leonhardi Frey.” The words patre, doctore and viennense should have been written in the genitive instead of the ablative, 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 handwritten 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.

\(^{259}\) “τέλος σὺν θεῷ[ς] τῶν ἔρωτήματος! ἐπὶ ὑμῖν γεγραμμένον τῷ Χριστοφόρῳ Περσόνας ‘Ῥαμίαυ καὶ ἐν τῇ[ς] Ρώμης πολέε ὀἰκούντος, ἐγγαμμὸν δὲ πρὸς χάριν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦτρου[ς]! καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων ἐναρέτου ἐπισκόπου τῆς Καψᾶς.”

\(^{260}\) 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 15th 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 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).

\(^{261}\) See Bignami Odier 1973: 25 and 37, n. 53 and 54.

\(^{262}\) 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.


\(^{264}\) See Ankwicz-Kleehoven 1948: 214, especially n. 6.
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 fan-formed ornament. The big initial letter alpha is decorated with fine golden lines. 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 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. 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 ἐνοχή ingenuitas (CGL II 316, 22) and ἐνγενετος 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.

265 For more details on the illumination on f. 3r see Hermann 1932: 135.
266 I have chosen to use the interpretative transcription regarding the use of diacritic marks when I quote from Suppl. Gr. 47.
113v 1-2. On f. 6v in Suppl. Gr. 47 the scribe erroneously copied again the Latin equivalent (inconsultus) of the previous Greek lemma (ἀνεξέταστος, CGL II 225, 58) next to the Greek lemma ἀνεξίκοκκος (CGL II 225, 59). Here, the error remained unnoticed. Suppl. Gr. 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 Ἀλλος hocallex' singularitertantum declinabitur (CGL II 225, 7) and Ἀνδράχνηδοσλαχονος porcacla (CGL II 225, 8) due to the loss of a bifolium, 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 (12r 11-14v 1).

The lacuna found in the codex Harleianus is present only partly in Suppl. Gr. 47. First, there is a lacuna between 6r II, 12 (ἀλλοτε alias) and 13 (ἀναβοίνω 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 (ἀνάγνωσις recitatio) and 23 (ἀνδράκων[!] portulaca), where Suppl. Gr. 45 displays 41 word pairs (from 13v 13 to 14v 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 (ἀμάθετα ruditas) and 6v I, 21 (ἀμείβομαι alterno; and 6v I, 22 ἀμείβῃ ἑπιστολή mutua epistola), where they do not fit the alphabetical order.

Apart from the lacunas already mentioned, there is a further lacuna in the alpha section in Suppl. Gr. 47: between 4r II, 34 (ἀδοξία ἐμβόλλω dedecoro) and 35 (αἰγείροσ alns) in Suppl. Gr. 47, one can find 72 extra lemmas in Suppl. Gr. 45 (between 5r 18 and 6v 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 (διόρθωσις correctio, emendatio) and 71v 20 (δίνγρος humidus)

267 Cf. Goetz, Praefatio, in Goetz & Gundermann 1888: XXXI.
in Suppl. Gr. 45 and between 23v II, 29 (διόρθωσις correctio) and 30 (δίνυρος 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 δογματικός (72r 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 δογματικός (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 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. 45 1r 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 1268). 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. 45.269

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. 47.270 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 pairs in Suppl. Gr. 45: ἀφθονος, ὁ πολλύς[!] opimus, copiosus and ἀφθονος, ὁ μή φθονόν 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 ἀφθονος in two consecutive lines. In some cases, the definition added to the Greek lemma is not deleted completely, it is just shortened. For example, Suppl. Gr. 45, 6v 15 has αἰγῶν, ὁ τόπος ἦτοι ἡ μάνδρα caprile, while we can find a shortened version of the Greek

268 For the tables see appendix III The Textual History of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Collations on pp. 171-173. 
269 Cf. e.g. Suppl. Gr. 45 1v 19; 7r 24 and 9r 22 with the matching lemmas in Suppl. Gr. 47 (Table 2).
270 Cf. for example Suppl. Gr. 45 10r 15 and 16; 23v 15; 29r 3; 33r 15; 37v 22-23; 44r 24-25 with the matching lemmas in Suppl. Gr. 47 (Table 3).
lemma in Suppl. Gr. 47, 4r: αἰγόν, ὁ τόπος caprile. However, in some cases the whole Greek lemma is retained in Suppl. Gr. 47, as well.²⁷¹

In several cases, the Latin equivalents are different in Suppl. Gr. 47 and in Suppl. Gr. 45.²⁷² 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,²⁷³ while another part is present both in the Harleianus and in Suppl. Gr. 45.²⁷⁴ 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 5r 6; 17r 3; 19v 11; 30r 4; 41r 15 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 ὅλως 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 πρὸσχες adverte. The Latin equivalents adverte and intende are both present in Suppl. Gr. 45, 231 r 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 Greek-Latin dictionary in the Vienna codices, Suppl. Gr. 45 and 47 are not related closely, they seem to belong to different branches of the tradition. 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.

²⁷¹ Cf. e.g. 3r 8; 18r 25; 22v 5; 26v 18; 36r 2-3; 39v 22-23; 44r 12 (Table 4).
²⁷² 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).
²⁷³ 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.
²⁷⁴ E.g. Suppl. Gr. 45 2r 6; 3v 20; 4r 12; 7r 7; 8r 16; 9v 18; 11r 13; 15r 21; 21r 26 etc.
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 Greek-Latin 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 x 212 mm. The other Munich manuscript, Mon. Gr. 253 is again a paper codex from the 15th century (again around 1435?) containing 166 numbered folios. 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 15th 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).

The first part of the manuscript Mon. Gr. 142 contains various lexicographical works and other teaching materials. The codex starts with the Greek-Latin dictionary (ff. 1r-102r) 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

275 The most recent description of this codex is in Hajdú 2003: 185-191. An older description can be found in Hardt 1806: 119-121. In Hardt’s description, the manuscript is referred to with the signature Cod. Gr. 142; the volume can be viewed online: http://www.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/bsb00008170/images/index.html. A copy of Hardt’s description is glued to fol. IV in the manuscript. Date of checking the original manuscript in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek: 21 June 2012.

276 For this manuscript, no recent description is available now; for up-to-date information on the progress of the modern cataloguing process see the website of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek: http://www.bsb-muenchen.de/Griechische-Handschriften.1684.0.html. Again, an older description can be found in Hardt 1806: 53-55 (under the signature Cod. Gr. 253); the volume is available online: http://www.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/bsb00008171/images/index.html. Date of checking the original manuscript in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek: 18 June 2012.


278 For a detailed description of the contents of Mon. Gr. 142, see Hajdú 2003: 185-188.
was copied.\textsuperscript{279} 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. 143r-160v, 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 Constantinopolitanus (ff. 174r-185r) addressed to the participants of the Council of Basle, the text also has interlinear Latin translation. The speech on ff. 174r, 175r-185r is an autograph written by Demetrius Hyaleas Constantinopolitanus.\textsuperscript{280} 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.

Unfortunately, no such extensive description about the contents of the manuscript Mon. Gr. 253 is available; one can only consult Hardt’s outdated account.\textsuperscript{281} The Greek-Latin dictionary stemming from Harleianus 5792 is to be found on ff. 75r-98v. 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 βράγχος raucus on f. 98v. 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. 128Br τὸ φοῦς lux, 128Er χωρίς sine, 128HR ω), 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.

\textsuperscript{279} The edited version can be found in CGL III, on pp. 119-220.
\textsuperscript{280} Cf. Hajdú 2003: 188.
\textsuperscript{281} Cf. p. 68, n. 276.
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-74r, 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. 112r 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. 129r another erotemata start (attributed to a certain Frater Antonius de Massa). 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. Mon. Gr. 142 was most likely written around 1435, at the Council of Basle. 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 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, 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.” 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

284 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.
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 n° 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. Finally, in 1571, both manuscripts became parts of the stock of the Münchener Hofbibliothek together with the other items of the Fugger collection.

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 averagely 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. 2v, 5r, 6r, 7v) 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

287 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.
decorative illuminations running in the margins or under the columns can be observed on ff. 1r, 3r and 15v.

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. 2v, 3r, 18r, 20v, 58v. On ff. 24r and 67r, 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. 34r, 42r, 96v). 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.288

288 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 ἀδίστασιά 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. 1r 15), while Mon. Gr. 253 lacks the Latin equivalent here.
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 Hajdu, the Greek-Latin dictionary in Mon. Gr. 142 was copied by a clumsy schoolboy-like Western hand, perhaps by Giovanni Tortelli.289

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, 98v. 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. 75r (only the first Greek column), 96r-98v (the whole of the beta 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 απο-; 94r-ν αυ-; 94v-96Av αφ-; 96Br αχ-, αψ- and αω-). 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. 87v-96Br 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

290 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).
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 87v, 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 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. 88v, 89r-v, 90r) 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. 79r-v, 80v, 81v), even if they are present in the Harleianus codex. 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 lemmas are copied (e.g. on f. 80v next to the Greek lemma ἀνεξερέυνητος 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 ἀκτη τὸ φυτὸν 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 Αλλαξ hocalllex’ singulariter tantum declinabitur (CGL II 225, 7) and Ανδραχνηδοσλαχανου 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 (12r 11-14v 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. 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). 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 form 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;

291 For a good example, see p. 72, n. 288.
292 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. 174-177.
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 (ἥθαξαξ abbagus Mon. Gr. 142 f. 1r; ἥθαξαξ Mon. Gr. 253 f. 75r, with the Latin equivalent missing), i.e. they start with 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 (Ἀβάξαξαξι ξιτου Imbacchatus, -τι in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 1r 1 and Ἀβάξαξαξι ξιναυχατις 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. However, their direct source text is not likely to be the same since they also exhibit differences at times.
2.3 Collating the Greek-Latin vocabulary lists in ÖNB Supp. Gr. 45 and Σ I 12

The manuscript Σ I 12 is now kept in the Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo de El Escorial in Madrid. The 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. 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 Latin-Greek lexicon (ff. 293v-309v) and a short list of Greek and Latin plant names (ff. 309v-310).

The different parts of the manuscript were written by various 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. 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. Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza was the possessor of at least the bottom of the page.

In the literature no specific information can be found regarding the provenience of the lexicographical section on ff. 91-310 and on ff. 47-51. The manuscript has the typical Escorial binding.

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 16th century, while

---

293 The website of the Madrid library can be found here: http://rbme.patrimonionacional.es/.
294 In his description of the manuscript, Miller indicates 310 folios instead; see Miller 1966: 58-67. In the codex, one can find 310 numbered folios, while fol. 70a was accidentally omitted from the numbering, cf. Revilla 1936: 252-256.
295 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).
300 Revilla 1936: 253.
Miller dates the collection of proverbs and the vocabulary lists to the 17th century. 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 14th century, around 1400 on the basis of the watermark (deer) characteristic of this section. Thiernmann, however, argues that this dating must be too early given that the dictionary of Pseudo-Cyril (the codex Harleianus 5792) reappeared only around 1430.

The lexicographical section starting on f. 91r has its own title added in the upper margin: Lexicon graecolatinum. 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 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).

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. The same phenomenon can be observed on f. 180v, lines 20-21. On f. 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

303. Thiernmann 1996: 659, n. 12. Thiernmann 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.
304. 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 Σ I 12 see Fig. 28 in the appendix I Illustrations on p. 167.
305. For details about the marginal notes see pp. 115-117.
306. 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.
307. 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.
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 ἀπόδεσμος 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 Σ 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 Αλλάξ homiclax’ singularitertantum declinabitur (CGL II 225, 7) and Ανδράχνητοσλαχανον porcacla (CGL II 225, 8) due to the loss of a bifolium, and it is important for the textual tradition to observe how Σ I 12 treats this lacuna as compared to Suppl. Gr. 45, where the lacuna is filled with 121 word pairs (12r 11-14v 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 Σ I 12 (from f. 97v, line 39 to f. 99r, 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, while in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 47 the lacuna is filled only partly. In the place of the original lacuna of the codex Harleianus the supplemental lemmas in the manuscripts Σ I 12 and ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 remarkably agree in the overwhelming majority of

---

308 Cf. Goetz, Praefatio, in Goetz & Gundermann 1888: XXXI.
309 See p. 75 for the details.
310 For the details see p. 65.
the cases.\textsuperscript{311} 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 Σ I 12.\textsuperscript{312} In a few instances, however, minor differences might occur: for example, Σ I 12 diverges from ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 regarding the number of Latin equivalents, i.e. it contains either less\textsuperscript{313} or more\textsuperscript{314} Latin equivalents than the Vienna manuscript.

In the course of the collation of the Greek-Latin lexicon in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and Σ I 12 two major tendencies seem to emerge. Firstly, the dictionary in Σ I 12 tends to agree with the Harleianus 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, Σ I 12 will usually be in agreement with the latter one.\textsuperscript{315} However, in a few cases, the opposite of this tendency can also be observed, i.e. the number of Latin equivalents in the manuscript Σ I 12 rather agrees with ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 than with the codex Hareianus.\textsuperscript{316} Furthermore, there are also instances where the Latin equivalents of Σ I 12 do not show agreement either with ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 or with the edited version of the codex Hareianus. 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.\textsuperscript{317}

The other major tendency can be detected in the vocabulary of the Greek-Latin dictionary, i.e. in the presence or complete lack of whole lemma pairs: in this respect, Σ I 12 tends to agree with ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 as opposed to the edited version of the codex Hareianus. The additional lemma pairs in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 missing from the codex Hareianus tend to be present in Σ I 12, too. When lemma pairs missing from ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 can be found in the codex Hareianus, i.e. the opposite of the previous scenario occurs, the manuscript Σ I 12 again follows ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 through the lack of the same lemma pairs.\textsuperscript{318}

\textsuperscript{311} See Table 1 in the appendix \textit{III The Textual History of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Collations} on p. 178 for examples.
\textsuperscript{312} E.g. ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 13r 25 and Σ I 12 98r: άμφιστομος και άμφιθης τό ισοί [Latin vacat]; ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 13v 25 and Σ I 12 99r: άνακοιτησεν επί νησόν, τό έν πέλαγος ήρεμος [Latin vacat].
\textsuperscript{313} E.g. ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 13r 26 άμφιθης δισερτο, δυβίτο - Σ I 12 άμφιθης δισερτο; ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 12v 12 άμφρανος pecco non potior - Σ I 12 άμφρανο pecco, -cas.
\textsuperscript{314} E.g. ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 12v 22 άμφελεστι sine mora – Σ I 12 98r άμψελεστι absque tarditate, sine mora;
\textsuperscript{315} See Table 2 in the appendix \textit{III The Textual History of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Collations} on p. 178 for examples.
\textsuperscript{316} See Table 3 in the appendix \textit{III The Textual History of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Collations} on p. 179 for examples.
\textsuperscript{317} See Table 4 in the appendix \textit{III The Textual History of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Collations} on p. 179 for examples.
\textsuperscript{318} See Table 5 in the appendix \textit{III The Textual History of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Collations} on p. 180 for examples illustrating both cases.
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 Σ I 12. Next to the Greek lemmas such grammatical information appears consistently in the Greek-Latin 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 ἀντιπαραρρέω, -φής (ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 20r 15; Σ I 12 103r 10). From then onwards, additional grammatical information 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. can add the second person singular form, present imperfect in the indicative, while Σ I 12 sometimes provide 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 (ἀκμή σιδήρου, ἀκμή ἥλικιας acies: ut ferri, flos: ut aetatis) can be found in a single line. In Σ I 12, f. 96r, line 18 again the two lemma pairs are inserted in the place of a single entry (ἀκμή σιδήρου, ἀκμή ἥλικιας acies, -ciei, aetatis flos), while in the edited version of the codex Harleianus only the first lemma pair appears (CGL II 222, 53). Another illustrative example: the lemma pair ἀποφρίσσω 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: ἀποφρίττω abhorreo) and in the intercolumnium of Σ I 12 (on f. 111v 28: ἀποφρίττω abhorreo).
To sum up, the Greek-Latin lexicon in the manuscript Σ 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 transmission. 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 Σ 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 Σ I 12 also contains a shorter Latin-Greek dictionary (ff. 293v-309v) and a short thematic list of Greek and Latin plant names (ff. 309v-310) similarly as ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 does (on ff. 290r-320r and f. 298r-v respectively). 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. 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 Σ I 12.

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

319 The dictionary can also be found in the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum under the title Idiomata codicis Harleiani, see CGL II 487-506.
320 I could not consult the relevant folios of the manuscript Σ 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.
321 See Revilla 1936: 256.
and last two lemma pairs which are in complete agreement.\textsuperscript{322} 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\textsuperscript{th}-century or 16\textsuperscript{th}-century codices containing the extensive Greek-Latin dictionary. Thus, the fact that both ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and Σ 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 Σ 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.

\textsuperscript{322} Again, I did not have the possibility to consult the folios containing the thematic wordlist either in the original codex Σ 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. 32.
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 15th and 16th centuries has been discussed. Goetz’s list of ten codices recentiores containing the Greek-Latin dictionary has been enlarged with eight further items323 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 to four contemporary manuscripts: ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 47, Mon. gr. 142 and 253 and Σ 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 8th-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’ 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.324

However, the Madrid manuscript Σ 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

323 Dionisotti already added six items to Goetz’s original list of ten codices from the 15th and the 16th centuries, see Dionisotti 1984-85: 304, n. 1. This enlarged list of sixteen manuscripts was adopted by Thiermann 1996: 659.
324 Goetz 1888: XXXI.
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 Σ 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 Σ 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 Greek-Latin 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 (Σ 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 10th-century Byzantine legal text called Synopsis Major Basilicorum, the abridged version of the monumental code of law, the Basilika (τὰ Βασιλικά). 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.\(^{325}\)

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 the 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 the Aristophanic play Nubes.\(^{326}\) The second biggest group contains approximately 160

\(^{325}\) For a short palaeographical description of these glossary notes see pp. 24-25.

\(^{326}\) These marginal notes can be found in the appendix IV Glossary Notes Quoting Scholia to Nubes on pp. 181-200.
marginal notes quoted from the play Plutus,\textsuperscript{327} the first play by Aristophanes 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.\textsuperscript{328}

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 Arist., 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.\textsuperscript{329} 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. and Aristoph., Arist. and in 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.

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 ff. 13r, 18v, 28v) and also in the side margins – generally in the wider one (e.g. on ff. 4v, 5r, 7r, 10r). 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,

\begin{footnotes}
\item[327] The marginal notes quoted from the scholia to Plutus can be found in the appendix V Glossary Notes Quoting Scholia to Plutus on pp. 201-212.
\item[328] 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.
\item[329] Cf. e.g. the marginal note added to f. 55v 26: γλασοραντίλογελόπιτον ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης καλεῖ... (sch. Nub. 1004a–b).
\end{footnotes}
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, 14r 1, 59r 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 διατηρεῖται (f. 68r 15) the scholion explains the verb form διατηρέως, or the quotation explains the word ἓχθημαι next to the Greek lemma ἑρμιός (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 ἀνθρώπος is inserted next to the Greek lemmas starting with ἀνθρω- (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 ἀμφοῖ (f. 41r 24) a short marginal note explains the difference between ἀμφοῖ and ἀμφότερος, then it is followed by a quotation from a scholion to Nubes, where a form of ἀμφότερος (ἀμφότερη) is highlighted.

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. 4v 6, 126v 8, 128v 15) and longer ones, as well (e.g. ff. 50r 6; 231v 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. 5r 14, 134v 4, 158r 22). In some cases, the glossary
notes highlight the semantic difference between two similar words. Sometimes glossary notes quoted from Aristophanic scholia contain “encyclopaedical” information: one can find entries about gods (e.g. on f. 177r 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. 165Br 1). These notes tend to be longer than the ones giving definitions or synonyms (e.g. the marginal note inserted on f. 213v 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.

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. 128v 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 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, 89v 18, 228v 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

---

330 E.g. ἐδίδαξα docui ipse, sed ἐδίδαξεμιν Aristophanes ironice alibi loquens ponit, ἀντι τοῦ εἰς διδακαλείον ἐπεξεργασία (fol. 78r 19; schol. Nub. 1338b); φασίανοι, ἦτοι τινες, φασίανοικι δέ ὀρνιθες, Aristophanes (Fol. 283r 3; sch. Nub. 109c); in Aristophane. βλεφαρίδες δε ai πτύχες τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, ἦσσαν τὰ ὀμματόφυλλα. βλεφαρίδες δε ai τρίχες ai ἐμφαρκοῦνται τοῖς βλεφάροις (fol. 49v 10; sch. Plut. 730).
331 E.g. Aristophanes. Ψηφιτός τόπος ἐν Αθήναις, οὗτος καὶ Ψηφιτοῦ ἐπάρρημα, καὶ ὁ πολιτες, Ψηφιτος, οἰνος, καὶ Ψηφιτιον ὦς, ὡς διοικε δέ, δρομόταιν δέος Ψηφιτοῦ ἐγίνετο (f. 260v 9; sch. Plut. 720).
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. 11v 19, 78v 22, 79r 12, 80r 23, 95r 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, it is only István Kapitánffy, who touches upon the question of the origin and textual tradition of the Aristophanic glossary notes, more precisely that of the glossary notes quoting scholia to the play Nubes. Using the textual editions of the scholia vetera and scholia recentiora to Nubes, he finds out that the majority of the marginalia quoting scholia to Nubes are taken from Demetrius Triclinius’s second redaction of 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 textual 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

---

332 For an overview of the literature dealing with the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 see pages 4-8.
334 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.
335 Holwerda 1977.
section. I also collated these glossary notes with the textual editions of the relevant Aristophanic scholia (Koster 1974 and Holwerda 1977 for Nubes; and 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 the brackets, 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.

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 of the Nubes scholia. While the second Triclinian edition shows agreement either with the first and/or second Thoman versions of the Nubes scholia or with the first Triclinian version 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

337 Appendixes IV Glossary Notes Quoting Scholia to Nubes and V Glossary Notes Quoting Scholia to Plutus on pp. 180-211.
338 The question of glossary notes containing Aristophanic scholia in partial or complete Latin translation is discussed on pp. 90-91.
340 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 Cantabriensiis Bibl. Publ. Nn. 3, 15 prioris codicis pars vetus (14th c.), while for the second Thoman redaction the following codices were used: cod. Venetus Marcianus 472 (14th c.), cod. Cremonensis 171 (14th c.), cod. Parisinus 2820 (14th c.), cod. Vaticanus 57 (14th c.); cf. Koster 1974: V-XX (details) and CXXVI (overview).
341 In Koster's 1974 textual edition the first Triclinian redaction is based on the cod. Parisinus Suppl. Gr. 463 (14th c.); cf. Koster 1974: XX-XXV (details) and CXXVI (overview).
to the group identified as “anonyma recentiora” in Koster’s textual edition.\textsuperscript{342} 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\textsuperscript{343} in the textual edition. Finally, a few of these marginal notes seem to go back to the scholia vetera to Nubes (appr. 2.5%),\textsuperscript{344} while some other marginalia take their origin from the scholia written by Joannes Tzetzes (appr. 2%).\textsuperscript{345}

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;\textsuperscript{346} 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,\textsuperscript{347} 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,”\textsuperscript{348} or in the codices already used for the edition of the scholia vetera (“codices iam ad scholia vetera edenda adhibiti”)\textsuperscript{349} or in the codices of the so-called scholia Leidensia.\textsuperscript{350} There are only a few instances (glossary notes added to 34v 9; 89v 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.\textsuperscript{351} Finally, in a few cases, the marginalia seem to show agreement

\textsuperscript{342} 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 detail on these manuscripts see Koster 1974: XLVIII-XCII.

\textsuperscript{343} For a description of the manuscript see Koster 1974: LXIII-LXV.

\textsuperscript{344} For a list and description of the codices used for the textual edition of the scholia vetera to Nubes see Holwerda 1977: III-X.

\textsuperscript{345} The scholia to Nubes by Joannes Tzetzes were edited by Holwerda 1960.

\textsuperscript{346} Chantry 1996.

\textsuperscript{347} 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.

\textsuperscript{348} The so-called “codices mixti” are listed in Chantry 1996: XI; for details on these manuscripts see Chantry 1996: XIX-XXIII.

\textsuperscript{349} These manuscripts are listed in Chantry 1996: XI-XII; for details see Chantry 1996: XXIII-XXIV.

\textsuperscript{350} These codices are listed in Chantry 1996: XII; for details see Chantry 1996: XXIV-XXV.

\textsuperscript{351} See Dübner 1883: 323-387.
either with the scholia vetera edited by Chantry or with Joannes Tzetzes’s scholia edited by Massa Positano – 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 illustrates well this phenomenon. The marginal note lists four synonyms (Ǟʑ ǠǓǙǝǙǠǏǐǗ,ambda, Ǟʑ ɝǕǓǍǣǛǏǐǗ,ambda) to the Greek lemma ȡǎǙǕǏǝǡ̅. The scholion, 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, again, basically the synonyms were kept and the explanatory part was shortened in the scholion; only its last, conclusion-like part is retained.

2. In the marginal notes the original Greek scholia are sometimes quoted in – usually partial – Latin translation. One can find both shorter and longer quotations from Aristophanic scholia in Latin translation in the margins. The glossary notes added to ff. 4v, 18v or

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.

For the list of the codices of the Tzetzes scholia see Massa Positano 1960: I X; for details on the codices see Massa Positano 1960: LIII-LXXIX.

Quattuor significat hoc verbum (sc. άδολεσχό). το φιλοσοφεῖν, το παίζειν, το ὄλγωρεῖν, το φλυαρεῖν) to the Greek lemma άδολεσχό. The scholion, 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, again, basically the synonyms were kept and the explanatory part was shortened in the scholion; only its last, conclusion-like part is retained.

2. In the marginal notes the original Greek scholia are sometimes quoted in – usually partial – Latin translation. One can find both shorter and longer quotations from Aristophanic scholia in Latin translation in the margins. The glossary notes added to ff. 4v 6, 18v or
78r 19 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.

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. 157r 11 the alternative meaning is given first and then comes the illustrative quotation from Simonides, whereas the scholion presents the quotation first.

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 τοῦτοῦ found in the scholion is modified to the proper noun Στρεψιάδου since the reference would not be clear otherwise in the glossary note. In a short one-word definition added to f. 148Bv 20 the conjunction γὰρ – 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. 4v 6, in the lemma ἀδελφιδῆ 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 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. 295r 18 the word ψήφισμα appears in two different contexts with similar meaning.
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 “anymna recentiora” are present side by side. 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. 33r 26 is even more instructive: there two different textual variants of the scholion belonging to the group “anymna 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. 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.

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 possibilities emerge: 1) The glossator used 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 scholion 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.

366 Cf. e.g. the glossary notes added to ff. 116v 18, 138v 1 or 232r 22.
367 ἀποφέβεται. μεταφεβεται (sch. nub. 789c AnRec Par). αλιβι μετά φθοράς ἀπέρη (cf. sch. nub. 789c AnRec ChisReg; cf. sch. plut. 598d ChisLPar). In Aristophane.
369 Cf. the glossary notes to ff. 31r 23, 110r 1, 126r 7, 159v 12, 200r 10, 232r 22.
1.2 Glossary notes of legal source

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. 45 65 glossary notes citing legal sources can be found. 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; 65v 5) the Greek quotation is followed by its Latin translation, once (marginal note to f. 48v 13) only a part of the Greek marginal note is translated into Latin, while in further two cases (glossary notes to ff. 8r 16; 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 first part of the Greek-Latin dictionary, up to 97r one can find the abbreviation ἐκ τὸν νόμον at the beginning of the marginal notes of legal source. Up to f. 97r, 23 legal glossary notes can be found. In 19 of them the abbreviated form of ἐκ τὸν νόμον 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. 65v 5, the abbreviation ἐκ τὸν νόμον 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. 71r is dubious in this respect: the damaged part of the leaf had been replaced with a new piece of paper where the abbreviation ἐκ τὸν νόμον should stand. Here, the marginal note glosses two distinct Greek lemmas of the dictionary. Since the second one is introduced with ἐκ τὸν νόμον, 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

370 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.
371 These glossary notes can be found in the appendix VI Glossary Notes of Greek Legal Source on pp. 213-224.
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. 3v 7 ἀγρός; 73r 23 δόλος; 161v 14 λέμμον; 263r 23 τάφος etc.). In some cases, 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 μεσέγγυος (171r 6) explains the term μεσεγγυητής.

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; 243v 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; 27r 14; 69v 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; 161v 1; 212r 6; 218r 14).

1.2.2 The origin of the legal glossary notes

Using the online version of the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae 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 (τὰ Βασιλικά). It is a monumental collection of laws

372 http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu.ubproxy.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/inst/fontsel
373 For a quick reference and further bibliography on this work one might consult Kazhdan 1991: 265-266 and Hunger 1978: 455-457.
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).374

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 6th 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.375

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.376 To provide an overview of the complicated textual tradition of the Basilika, Pringsheim’s table is to be presented with some modifications and remarks.377

374 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.
375 From the viewpoint of the history of the Byzantine law, it is an important question whether 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.
377 Pringsheim 1956: 34-35. The modifications - if not indicated otherwise - are based on the prefaces in the volumes of Bas. libri ser. A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANUSCRIPT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>CENTURY</th>
<th>BOOKS CONTAINED</th>
<th>NO. OF BOOKS</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1: mss. containing only the text with no scholia&lt;sup&gt;378&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod. Coislinianus 151</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c.&lt;sup&gt;379&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bas. libri A I, Praef. V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod. Parisinus graecus 1357</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c. (copy)</td>
<td>46-52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bas. libri A VI, Praef. V-VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod. Venturi</td>
<td>Bibl. Riccardiana</td>
<td>10/11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bas. libri A VII, Praef. XIV-XVIII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod. Vaticanus 1656</td>
<td></td>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: mss. containing the text with scholia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgroup A: text and old scholia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod. Escorialiensis</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>c. 1100</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>lost; Bas. libri A I, Praef. V-VII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its copies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cod. Scorialensis graecus R II 13&lt;sup&gt;380&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cod. Vossianus graecus&lt;sup&gt;381&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyden</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod. Parisinus graecus 1349</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>c. 1100</td>
<td>45-48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bas. libri A VI, Praef. V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod. rescriptus Berolinensis fol. 28&lt;sup&gt;382&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>c. 1200</td>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>destroyed, Bas. libri A II, Praef. V-XIII.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

378 Pringsheim 1956: 34 lists a further codex in this group: the Codex Ambrosianus (cod. Ambrosianus F 106 sup. rescriptus, 10<sup>th</sup> 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” [non vidi]. 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.

379 In Pringsheim’s table the codex is dated to the 11<sup>th</sup> 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.

380 In Pringsheim’s table under the name Cod. Haenel.

381 In Pringsheim’s table under the name Cod. Lugduno-Batavus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cod. Vaticanus Reginensis Pii Secundi graecus 15&lt;sup&gt;383&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Rome</th>
<th>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c.</th>
<th>58-60</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Bas. libri A VII, Praef. V-VII; Bas. libri A VIII, Praef. VI-XV.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cod. Coislinanus 152</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>13/14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c.</td>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bas. libri A I, Praef. V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod. Parisinus graecus 1350</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>c. 1300</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bas. libri B VIII, Praef. VI-VIII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod. Laurentianus plutei LXXX, 11</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; c.</td>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bas. libri A IV, Praef. V-VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cod. Parisinus graecus 1345</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>c. 1200</td>
<td>38-42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bas. libri A V, Praef. V.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subgroup B: text with old and new scholia**

| Cod. Parisinus graecus 1348 | Paris | 13<sup>th</sup> c. | 20-30 | 10 | Bas. libri A III, Praef. V. |
| Cod. Parisinus graecus 1352 | Paris | 13<sup>th</sup> c. | 1-18 | 18 | Bas. libri A I, Praef. V. |

**Subgroup C: Copies of the mss. from subgroup B**

| Cod. Parisinus graecus 2075 | Rome | 11/12<sup>th</sup> c. | | | Bas. libri A VI, Praef. VII. |
| Cod. Parisinus graecus 1367 | Paris | 12<sup>th</sup> c. | | | Bas. libri A V, Praef. V-VIII. |
| Cod. Medico-Laur. LXXX, 6 | Florence | 15<sup>th</sup> | | | |

<sup>382</sup> In Pringsheim’s table under the name Cod. Constantinopolitanus.<br><sup>383</sup> In Pringsheim’s table under the name Cod. Vaticanus ineditus 1566.
The first complete textual edition of the Basilika was published by Karl Wilhelm Ernst Heimbach in five volumes between 1843 and 1850.\footnote{Cf. Pringsheim 1956: 4.} The edition was 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.\footnote{Pringsheim 1956: 4.} Beside the edition of the Greek text, Heimbach also prepared the Latin translation of the monumental work.

Although the significance of Hemibach’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.\footnote{Cf. Scheltema 1939: 324-346.} 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.\footnote{Pringsheim’s table under the name Cod. Vaticanus ineditus 903.} 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cod. Medico-Laur. XL, 5</th>
<th>Florence</th>
<th>14th</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cod. rescriptus Vaticanus graecus 903</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>10th c.</td>
<td>Bas. libri A I, Praef. VII-IX.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Overview of the mss. containing parts of the Basilika
incompletely preserved book. This edition was published as a supplement to Heimbach’s edition. \[389\]

In the meantime, new manuscripts were discovered a part of which was published in separate volumes. \[390\] Moreover, further research was made on the evolution of the scholia appended to the Basilika. \[391\] Thus, several scholars realized that a new edition of such an important legal source was inevitable. \[392\] 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. \[393\]

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Quotations</th>
<th>No. of quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ad 3v 7; 4v 18; 10v 16; 11r 19; 19r 17; 49r 14; 70v 10; 93r 24; 151r 22; 161v 1; 161v 14; 171r 6; 179v 13; 182r 1; 198r 26; 218r 14; 271v 16; 282v 22; 283r 22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ad 71r 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ad 69v 16; 71r 1; 231r 7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ad 48v 13; 73r 23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ad 65v 5; 253v 10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ad 171r 6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>ad 110v 11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\[390\] 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. Leipzig 1897.

\[391\] Pringsheim 1956: 8-16.


\[393\] See p. 99, n. 374.
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 (104r 6; 110v 11; 135v 17; 161v 1; 253v 10) are taken only partly from the Basilika. In other

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ad 236r 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ad 94r 23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ad 18v 15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ad 93r 24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ad 103v 11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ad 220v 21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>ad 116r 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>ad 280r 25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>ad 278v 18; 280r 25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>ad 159v 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>ad 8r 16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>ad 64r 25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>ad 161v 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>ad 8r 16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>ad 27r 14; 97r 15; 115v 9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>ad 104v 16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>ad 212r 6; 278r 13; 294r 8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>ad 32r 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>ad 135v 17; 143r 18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>ad 263r 23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>ad 66r 21; 78r 6; 104r 6; 176r 24; 197v 21; 222v 23; 251r 21; 273v 3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4  The distribution of the legal quotations in the Basilika
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. 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. This trend is also apparent in the case of the literary quotations as for instance Lucretius is quoted from Nonius Marcellus’s De compendiosa doctrina. 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: ἐκλογή καὶ σύνοψις τῶν βασιλικῶν ἑξήκοντα βιβλίων σῶν παρασομπαί κατὰ στοιχεῖον. In modern editions, it is called Synopsis Major so that it could be distinguished from the so called Synopsis Minor (τὸ μικρὸν κατὰ στοιχεῖον), a compilation of legal regulations from the 13th century partly based on the SBM. The SBM was compiled earlier, probably in the 10th century. 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. The textual tradition and the manuscripts containing the SBM are described by N. G. Svoronos in most details. Henceforth abbreviated as SBM.

On this trend with focus on Janus Pannonius see e.g. Horváth 2001: 202-204.
E.g. the marginal note written to f. 37v 1 quoting Lucretius’s De rerum natura (V, 517) is definitely taken from Nonius Marcellus’ De compendiosa doctrina (I, 13, 3-5) since its text matches with Nonius’s version as compared to the textual tradition of Lucretius’s De rerum natura.
For quick reference and literature see e.g. Hunger 1978: 474; and Fögen 1991: 1995.
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,
The text of the SBM is in most cases transmitted together with an appendix usually containing imperial novels from the 10th century up to the 12th century. 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. 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.

The first edition of the SBM appeared in 1575, where the text was edited by Jo. Leunclajus. 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. The most recent edition was published in 1931. 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. The text in the codex was collated with Leunclajus’s edition and Labbaeus’s Observationes. Thus, strictly speaking, the modern edition has no apparatus

M. Th. Fögen, A. Schminck, D. Simon: Repertorium der Handschriften des byzantinischen Rechts. Teil I. Die Handschriften des weltlichen 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 SBM, and there are further manuscripts where shorter passages from the SBM or scholia written to the SBM are preserved.

In the textual edition of the SBM, the appendices are not published nor are they described in details.

Svoronos 1964: 3-4.

Svoronos 1964: 4-5.

LX librorum Βασιλικῶν i. e. universi juris Romani auctoritate principum Rom. Graecam in linguam traducti. Ecloga sive Synopsis haec tenus 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 restituantur et emendatur. Basileae per Eusebium Episcopum et Nicolai Fr. heredes. MDLXXV.


Zépos & Zépos 1931.

Zépos & Zépos 1931: 8 and 11.

Zépos & Zépos 1931: 11-12.
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, there are obvious differences 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.

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.

1. Some of the quotations in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 appear only in the SBM, it cannot be found in the Basilika, while all of the quotations which can be read in the Basilika are also present in the SBM.

ad 12v 26: ἐκ τῶν νόμων. κούλπα ἐστιν ἡ μεγάλη ἀμελεῖα. ἢ δὲ μεγάλη κούλπα ἐστι δόλος. (SBM P I, 85)

ad 102v 26: Leges. ἐπιβολή ἐστιν ἐπίδοσις ἀπόρου κτήσεως πρὸς κληρονόμους ἢ συντελεστάς καὶ ὁμοχώρους καὶ ὀμοκήνσους. (SBM E XXXIV Index)

ad 111r 7: Leges. ἀρμοδίκιος ἐστιν ὁ ἐκ μονομεροῦς εἰςηγήσεως τὴν καταδίκην ἐσχηκός. (SBM E XLII Index)

ad 176r 9: Leges. μνηστεία ἐστὶ, μνήμη καὶ ἐπαγγελία τῶν μελλόντων γάμων. (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.

ad 104r 6: Leges. οἱ κακότροποι ήτοι περίεργοι, οἱ τῷ ἔτερῳ ὑποκείμενον ἢ πραξθὲν ὡς ἵδιον καὶ ἀνεῦθυνον πρὸς ἔτερον μεταφέροντες τῷ στελλομάτως ὑπόκειται ἐγκλήματι ὡς ἀντιβαδιασταῖ. ὑποθέμενος τοὺς πολλοὺς τὰ αὐτὰ πράγματα κατέχεται τῷ στελλομάτως

---

409 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 distinguendus esse, id jam nolim existimare.”


411 Zépos & Zépos 1931: 12. However, the exact differences are noted in an apparatus in the textual edition.

412 See the appendix VI Glossary Notes of Greek Legal Source on pp. 212-223 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.
After the word μορίων there are two more short sentences in the Basilika which are left out from the SBM. Then the next two sentences in the quotation (ό μὲν οὖν καστράτος καὶ οὐλίβια εἰσθειν τίνα οὐ λαμβάνον. ἑπειδὴ οὐδὲ παιδοποιεῖν δύνανται, ὁ δὲ σπάδων λαμβάνει.) are again the partly 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:

ad 198r 26: Leges. ἱππέα ἄργυρίων συνάγεσθαι. τὸ δὲ αὕτῳ καὶ τριβοῦτν λέγεται, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπικλάσθαι τοῖς καταβάλλουσιν, ἢ ἐπιμερίζεσθαι τοῖς στρατιώταις. (SBM P I,146; B II,2,25)

λέγεται: λέγεται τὸ στηρέσιον Β | τριβοῦτν: τριβοῦτν ἦγουν φόρος Β | ad 236r 2: Leges. κυρίως ἰερός ἐστὶν ὁ συνεχὸς ἀνατίως πλανόμενος καὶ τοὺς καρποὺς εἰς ἀνόνητα δασπανόν, βραδέως εἰς τὸν ὄικον ἀναστρέφει. (SBM A XII,4; B XIX,10,17 rest.)

daspanon: πράγματα δασπανον Β
ad 263r 23: Leges. τάφος ἐστίν, ἐν ὧ τὸ σῶμα ἢ ὡστέα ἀπετέθη, οὐ πας ὁ ταφή ἄφορίσθεις, ἀλλ’ ὥσον ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα. μνημεῖον δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ διὰ τὴν μνήμην φαινόμενον. (SBM Τ V,7; B LIX,1,2 partim rest.)

ὡστέα: ὡστεα ἀνθρώπου Β
ad 271v 16: Leges. τῷ τῆς τροφῆς ὄνοματι καὶ τὰ βρώσιμα καὶ τὰ πόσιμα περιέχεται, καὶ τὸ ἔνδυμα, καὶ τὰ πρός τὸ ζήν ἀναγκαία, καὶ τὰ πρός φυλακήν ἢ φροντίδα τοῦ σώματος ἐπιτήδεια. (SBM P I,160; B II,2,41.)

ζήν: ζην τὸν ἀνθρώπον Β

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.

ad 78r 6: ἐκ τῶν νόμων. κατὰ τῶν ἀποφθειρόντων δοῦλον ἢ τοὺς ἁγαθοὺς τρόπους αὐτοῦ. ἀρμόζει ἢ περὶ κλοπῆς εἰς τὸ διπλάσιον ἀγογῆ. οὐ γάρ δεῖ ἀτιμωρήτους εἶναι τὰς τοιαύτας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐχειρήσεις. (SBM Y XIV,12; B LX,6,37)

eis τὸ διπλάσιον: om. B

4. There are numerous cases where one can find minor differences (definite articles, particles or prepositions omitted or added,\(^{413}\) orthographical variants,\(^{414}\) variant word orders,\(^{415}\) variant

\(^{413}\) E.g. marginal notes to ff. 27r 14; 70v 10; 93r 24; 94r 23; 151r 22.

\(^{414}\) E.g. marginal notes to ff. 11r 19; 159v 3; 161v 1; 197v 21.

\(^{415}\) E.g. marginal notes to ff. 8r 16; 70v 10; 71r 1.
verb forms,\textsuperscript{416} prefixes, suffixes\textsuperscript{417} 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\textsuperscript{418} 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 \textit{peri} + 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: \textit{peri} ἐρημοδίκων, touteostō tōn ἐκ μονομερῶς εἰσηγήσεως τῆν καταδίκην ἑχόντων (SBM E XLII Index), while the glossator transforms this as follows: ἐρημοδίκως ἔστιν ὁ ἐκ μονομερῶς εἰσηγήσεως τῆν καταδίκην ἐσχηκός.\textsuperscript{419} In another marginal note (ad 71r 1),\textsuperscript{420} the glossator does not quote the 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 \textit{δὲ} (or rarely \textit{γὰρ}) in accordance with the context of his marginal notes: when he starts with a quotation containing \textit{δὲ}, he omits it as it is unnecessary at the beginning of the gloss,\textsuperscript{421} and when he joins a quote to another in the same gloss he tends to use the particle \textit{δὲ} to connect the two sentences.\textsuperscript{422}

5. Apart from the differences discussed in section 4, there are three problematic quotations. The gloss written to f. 151r 10\textsuperscript{423} cannot be found either in the text of the SBM presented in its

\textsuperscript{416} E.g. marginal notes to ff. 93r 24; 171r 6.
\textsuperscript{417} E.g. marginal note to f. 220v 21.
\textsuperscript{418} The variant πάσα βασιλική ἀντιγραφή in the gloss written to f. 19r 17 in contrast to πάσα πάντως ἀντιγραφή in both the SBM and the Basilaika for instance can be attributed to the misreading of the glossator: the previous passage in both legal sources contains the expression βασιλική ἀντιγραφή (ἀνισχυρος ἐστι βασιλική ἀντιγραφή γερεσία... SBM B IV,5; B II,5,25), which can easily explain such an error.
\textsuperscript{419} Further examples: ad 103v 11, Leges. ἐπίδικον ἔστιν, οὗ ἡ δεσποτεία φιλονεικεῖται (ἐπίδικον ἔστιν, οὗ: περὶ ἐπίδικον, τοιοῦτον ἃν SBM E XXXV Index) and 104r 6, Leges. οἱ κακότροποι ἦτοι περὶέργοι, οἱ τὸ ἐτέρῳ ὑποκείμενον ἢ πραγματικῶς ὡς ίδιον καὶ ἀνευθύνον πρὸς ἐτερὸν μεταφέροντες τὸ στελλονάτους υπόκειται ἐγκλήματι ὡς ἀντιβασιλεῖα, υποθέμενος τοῖς πολλοῖς τὰ αὐτὰ πράγματα κατέχεται τὸ στελλονάτους ἐγκλήματι, ἐπομονὸς δὲ ὅν πάσα καταβάλλει, ἀπάλλαττεται τὸ ἐγκλήματος. (οἱ κακότροποι ἦτοι περὶέργοι, οἱ: περὶ κακότροπων ἦτοι περὶέργοι καὶ δολῶν τῶν SBM K I Index | μεταφέροντες: μεταφέροντες, οἴπερ καὶ SBM K I Index).
\textsuperscript{420} Ad 71r 1: ἐκ τῶν νόμων, μὴ ἔξεσται τὸ δικολόγον λαθρείας ἢ φανερῶς υβρίζειν τὸν ἑαυτὸν διάδικον. ἢν δὲ υβρίζῃ, ἀτμισθία, ἀλλὰ μὴ δύσμερον ἢ συνάλλαγμα πουεῖτο περὶ τῆς δίκης ἢ περὶ τῶν μισθῶν μετὰ τοῦ οἰκείου πρόσφυγος (SBM Σ X, 4-5; B VIII,1,15.) ἔξεσται: ἔξεσται SBM, B | ἀτμισθία: ἀτμισθίαται αὐτὸν SBM, B | πουεῖτο περὶ τῆς δίκης: περὶ τῆς δίκης πουεῖται SBM, B
\textsuperscript{421} See e.g. marginal notes to ff. 69v 16; 102v 26; 110v 11; 115v 9; 135v 17; 197v 21; 236r 2.
\textsuperscript{422} See e.g. marginal notes to ff. 151v 1; 182r 1; 197v 21; 280r 25.
\textsuperscript{423} Ad 151r 10: Leges. τὸ ἐγκλήμα τοῦ κλητοτελεωνήσαντος, καὶ εἰς κληρονόμους ἐπιβαίνει.
latest edition or in that of the Basilika. In the Index of the SBM one can find the heading περὶ κλεπτοτελωνήματος (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 26⁴²⁴ 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 10v 6,⁴²⁵ 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Quotations</th>
<th>No. of quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>ad 236r 2; 280r 25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>ad 19r 17; 48v 13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>ad 8r 16; 64r 25; 65v 5; 69v 16; 70v 10; 71r 1; 73r 23; 278v 18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>ad 93r 24; 94r 23; 102v 26; 103v 11; 110v 11; 111r 7; 116r 2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>ad 104r 6; 135v 17; 151r 22; 159v 3; 278v 18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λ</td>
<td>ad 104v 16; 161v 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ad 171r 6; 176r 9; 176r 24; 222v 23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>ad 27r 14; 97r 15; 115v 9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Π</td>
<td>ad 8r 16; 143r 18; 220v 21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>ad 3v 7; 4v 18; 10v 16; 11r 19; 12v 26; 49r 14; 93r 24; 151v 1; 161v 14; 171r 16; 179v 13; 182r 1; 198r 26; 218r 14; 271v 16; 282v 22; 283r 22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>ad 32r 4; 71r 1; 197v 21; 231r 7; 251r 21; 253v 10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>ad 212r 6; 263r 23; 294r 8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Υ</td>
<td>ad 66r 21; 78r 6; 273v 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χ</td>
<td>ad 18v 15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>ad 278r 13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Περὶ ρημάτων σημασίας (its original Latin title in

---

⁴²⁴ Ad 220v 26: Leges. πόρος ἔστιν ὁ ἀπὸ καμάτου τυπί περιηγομένος. κληρονομία δὲ καὶ λεγατά καὶ δωρεά, οὐ περιέχοντα, οὐ γὰρ δωρεά, ὡς μισθόν τινος ἠγγεγέμονον περιηγόντα ἡμῖν. (Epanagoge 26,5,3; Prochiron vel Procheiros nomos 19,7,4.)

⁴²⁵ Ad 10v 16: ἐκ τῶν νόμων. τῷ ὄνομα τῆς βαλάνου πάντες οἱ καρποὶ δηλοῦνται. ἐπεὶ καὶ τῷ ὄνομα τῶν ἄκρωδρων πάντα τὰ δένδρα. (SBM P 1, 28 and 7; Β 2,2,227.) ἐπεὶ: ἐπαίδη ὁ, om. SBM | πάντα τὰ δένδρα: πάντες οἱ καρποὶ δηλοῦνται SBM
the Digest is De verborum significatione). 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 parallelizing 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 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.

The majority of these glossary notes (approximately one third of them) can be traced back to Xenophon’s works, while approximately 28 glosses quote Plutarch’s various works. Plato’s works are also quoted approximately 14 times. 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

---

427 See the appendix VII Other Greek Literary Quotations in the Margins on pp. 225-232.
428 E.g. to the works Anabasis, Hellenica, Cyropaedia, Memorabilia.
429 I.e. various pieces of the Moralia and biographies from the Parallel Lives.
430 E.g. The Republic, Apology, Laches, Timaeus, Phaedrus, Laws.
Athenian comic poet, a contemporary of Aristophanes (appr. 1). 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. 49r 3, 50v 26, 179r 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. However, the indication of the source occurs in various ways: 1) in Greek, either with a preposition (κατά or παρά) or without preposition, or sometimes a verb is also used in the introduction of the quotation together with the author’s name, e.g. κατά Πλάτωνα (ad 284v 8), Ξενοφόν (ad 11v 12), παρά Θουκυδίδη (ad 179v 18), ὁ Πλάτων ἀλήθεια (ad 7r 9); 2) in Latin, either 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 74v 17), Plato (ad 11v 25), Herodotus vero ait (ad 54v 14); and 3) even in a mixture of Greek and Latin, e.g. ut Ξενοφόν (ad 43v 9), apud Θουκυδίς (ad 210r 10). Furthermore, in several instances not only the name of the author is indicated, but the title of the work, as well, e.g. Plato in II De re publica (ad 11v 18); Πλάτων ξ περὶ Νόμων (ad 159v 18), Πλάτων ἐν τῷ Ε τῶν Πολίτων (ad 270v 24), Xenophon in Oeconomico (ad 275r 5), Plutarchus in Vita Romuli (ad 111r 13).

Similarly 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. 12v 1, the different meanings of a verb (Ἄλλοι) 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.

---

431 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.

432 Occasionally, it also occurs that the source is not indicated, e.g. in the case of the marginal note added to f. 12v 1.
or expression (e.g. glosses added to ff. 22v 1, 48r 5, 74r 17, 111v 25, 114r 16; longer Latin definitions can be found in the marginal notes added to ff. 78r 11, 109r 25, 148v 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. 123r 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. 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, 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 7r 15; 13r 11; 136v 19; 140v 17), but

433 See the appendix VIII Non-literary Greek Quotations in the Margins on pp. 233-243. 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.
434 E.g. Hesychius, Zonaras, Etymologicum Magnum, Photius.
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 6r 21; 18r 4) or clarification of the differences between similar words (e.g. ad 1v 20 – the difference between two synonymous verbs, \( \phi\lambda\omega \) and \( \dot{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\rho\omega \) is highlighted; ad 6r 15 – the difference between the masculine form \( \dot{\alpha}\theta\lambda\omicron\varsigma \) and the neuter form \( \dot{\alpha}\theta\lambda\omicron\nu \) 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 Σ 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.\(^{435}\) 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.\(^{436}\)

---

\(^{435}\) See Kapitánffy 1995: 356.

\(^{436}\) 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\(^{th}\)-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. Aristophanus comediae octo cum scholis, 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.
However, instead of searching for a new candidate, another humanist in possession of the manuscripts that contain all of the works appearing 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 Σ I 12 now kept in the Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo de El Escorial in Madrid also contains the same quotations in the margins.\textsuperscript{437}

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).\textsuperscript{438} 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.\textsuperscript{439} 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.\textsuperscript{440}

The lexicographical section starting on f. 91r 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.\textsuperscript{441}

In the margins, the Greek-Latin dictionary in the Madrid manuscript contains hundreds of glossary notes apparently from two different hands.\textsuperscript{442} One of the glossators who seems to be

\textsuperscript{437} 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. 77-79. The results of the collation of the two sets of marginal notes in the Vienna and Madrid manuscripts were first presented in Ótvös 2014: 238-242.

\textsuperscript{438} The content of the manuscript is described in Revilla 1936: 253-256; Miller 1966: 58-67 and Moraux et al. 1976: 151-152.

\textsuperscript{439} See Moraux 1976: 152.

\textsuperscript{440} For a discussion on the various standpoints regarding the dating of the lexicographical section in Σ I 12 see pp. 77-78.

\textsuperscript{441} I had the possibility to study the black-and-white digital images of the Greek-Latin dictionary in the manuscript Σ I 12 provided by the Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo de El Escorial in Madrid.

\textsuperscript{442} Out of the three codex descriptions, only Revilla mentions that the Greek-Latin dictionary contains glosses from several different Greek authors, see Revilla 1936: 255-256. For illustration, see Fig. 28 in the appendix I
called Benedictus according to one of the glosses 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). 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.

The alpha section of the Vienna codex contains approximately 50 (53) 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 Σ 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. 7r 24, for instance, two synonyms are quoted from the scholia to Nubes, 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. 37v 18. It is even more instructive to see that the marginalia in the two manuscripts sometimes share the same variant 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: ἀκόρητος, ἀνεπιμέλητος, ἀκαλλόπιστος, ὁρῶ γὰρ τὸ ἐπιμελοῦμαι. In Aristophane (on f. 10r 7 in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and on f. 96v in Σ I 12): both codices have ὁρῶ instead of κορῶ which appears in the codices of the Nubes scholia.

Illustrations on p. 167, where the first page (f. 91r) of the Greek-Latin dictionary in the manuscript Σ I 12 is reproduced. On the fist page of the bilingual dictionary glossary notes are also visible.


The results of the collation can be found in the appendix IX Marginalia in the mss. ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and Σ I 12. Collation on pp. 244-257.

See Koster 1974 ad loc.
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,\footnote{For details about this tendency see pp. 94-96.} while in the Madrid manuscript longer versions of the marginalia can usually be found.\footnote{Such divergences are highlighted with grey colouring in the relevant appendix.} Shortening in the Vienna manuscript is usually effected in two ways: either by omitting parts of the longer marginalia found in the codex Σ 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. 5r 14. While the Madrid manuscript quotes the full scholion to Nubes, the Vienna manuscript retains only the four different meanings of the verb ἄδολεσχῶ and omits the examples provided as an illustration of the alternative meanings.\footnote{Sch. Nub. 1480e: τὸ ἄδολεσχὲν τέσσαρα σημαίνει τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν, ὥς τὸ “ὀ δὲ δούλος σου ἡδολέσχει ἐν τοῖς δικαιώμασι σου”, τὸ παῖζειν, ὥς τὸ “ἐξήλθεν ἱκώβ ἄδολεσχῆσαι εἰς τὸ πεδίον”, τὸ φλισαρεῖν, ὥς τὸ “ἀδολεσχέζει, ἄνθροπε”, καὶ τὸ ἄλγορειν, ὥς τὸ “ἡδολέσχεσαι καὶ ἀλγοφύσης τὸ πνεύμα μου”. ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 5r 14: quattuor significat hoc verbum τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν, τὸ παῖζειν, τὸ ἄλγορειν, τὸ φλισαρεῖν.} 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, ἀλέκτρων, can also mean “hen” in the works of Plato, the Athenian comic poet, a contemporary of Aristophanes. The codex Σ I 12, however, contains the whole Aristophanic scholion on this question.\footnote{ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 11v 10: apud Platonem comicum et gallina (it refers to the Greek lemma ἄλεκτρων in the main text of the Greek-Latin dictionary; cf. sch. Nub. 663α). Σ I 12, f. 97v: (…) ἀστικοὶ δὲ καὶ τὰς θηλείας οὐτός ἐκάλουν. Πλάτων γὰρ ο κομικὸς οὐτός λέγει. Εἰσίτε πολλὰ τῶν ἄλεκτρων καὶ ὑπηνέμα τίκτουσιν ὁμ πολλάκις. In Aristophane.} Sometimes it also happens that parts of the original Aristophanic scholia 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. 4v 6 in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45,\footnote{ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, 4v 6: ἄδελφιδῆ, fratris filia in Aristophane. Σ I 12, f. 93r: ἄδελφιδῆν, τοῦ ἄδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ θυγατέρα. In Aristophane. Cf. sch. Nub. 47.} a very short quotation – the explanation of the Greek word ἄδελφιδῆ – 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 Σ I 12 retains the original Greek version of these scholia.

In the alpha section of the Vienna manuscript, 10 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.
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. 102r in Σ I 12. If any, only minor differences can be observed between the quotations in the two manuscripts. For instance, on f. 19r 17 in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, the word πάντως 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, πᾶσα, also has the beginning πα-. 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, the quote ends with the words πάντες οἱ καρποὶ δηλοῦνται 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 on f. 21v 25 in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. 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).

454 ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 10v 16 and Σ I 12, f. 97r: ἐκ τῶν νόμων τῷ ὀνόματι τῆς βαλάνου πάντες οἱ καρποὶ δηλοῦνται. ἐπεὶ καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τῶν ἀκροβάτων πάντα τὰ δένδρα.
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 their content as it has been assumed earlier.
2 A group of marginal notes from another textual tradition

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 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 ἄγογη, ἐπὶ τῆς ἀναγογῆς. In the next line, again, further Latin equivalents of the Greek entry ἄγογός 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.

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. 56v: 10). To provide an overall picture of the quantity and 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. 1r-58v in the dictionary comprising 298 folios (ff. 1r-298r), 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.

456 The results presented in this subchapter were first published in Ötvös 2013.
457 See Fig. 21 in the appendix I Illustrations on p. 160.
458 For a short description of the handwriting see pp. 25-26.
first three alphabetic sections comprise 58 folios, i.e. 116 pages, where such glossary notes are inserted in almost 500 instances.\textsuperscript{459} 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.\textsuperscript{460} The additional alternative meanings are sometimes joined to the original Latin equivalents with the Latin word vel or aliquando.\textsuperscript{461} In some cases, the marginal notes complement the already given Latin equivalent(s) thus making the lexicographical information in the dictionary more precise.\textsuperscript{462} At times we can find even short Latin definitions in the margins.\textsuperscript{463} 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.\textsuperscript{464} Grammatical comments can also contain the etymology of the Greek lemma\textsuperscript{465} or – in the case of verbs – additional information on the augmentation.\textsuperscript{466}

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.\textsuperscript{467} It also occurs at times that irregular forms of the Greek lemma (irregular

---

\textsuperscript{459} 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. 52v-58v; 13 pages) cc. 50 such marginal notes can be found. The average number of glossary notes is four in all three sections.

\textsuperscript{460} E.g. ad 2v 8 ἀγλαίζω – clarifico: honoro; ad 2v 15 ἀγνέυσσα – castus sum: lustro, castum facio; ad 16v 8 ἀνήκω – pertineo, attineo: ascendo, contingo, convenio; ad 30r 9 ἄπόνου – amnesia: arrogancia, soordia, desperatio, suspicio, audacia, insolentia.

\textsuperscript{461} E.g. ad 2v 6 ἐγκον – cubitus: vel locus eminens; ad 10r 21 ὀκρατής – incontinens, intemperans: vel inops; ad 7v 19 αἰτία – causa, querela, titulus, questio, culpa: ratio, aliquando confirmatio; ad 12r 12 ὥλκη, ὢ δύναμις – robur: vel subsidium, aliquando proelium poetice.

\textsuperscript{462} E.g. ad 14v 9 ἀνόρμας – statua: praecipue viri.

\textsuperscript{463} E.g. ad 7r 3 ἄθοου – mergus vel fulica: avis indica et marina quae malum signum est navigantibus quia in tempestate apparreit; ad 13v 14 ἄνοθοροδ – exilio: cum quis cum impetu excitatur.

\textsuperscript{464} E.g. ad 46r 26 βαβαί – babae, at at: adverbium admirantis.

\textsuperscript{465} E.g. ad 8v 3 αἰχμάλωτος – captivus: aicmē cuspis et ἄλδος; ad 18r 4 ἄνοιχος – patefacio: ab ógeo quod non est in usu; ad 49v 5 βλασφημω maledico, contumelias afficio α βλάστη και φημί.

\textsuperscript{466} E.g. ad 14r 23 ἀνατρέπω – refello: et mutat ε in α in ἀνορίστο παθητικοί; ad 16r 22 ἄνεχομαι – tolero patior sustineo: in cimento potest mutari etiam α in η in 18r 4 ἄνοιχος patefacio: recipit ε in augmentis.

\textsuperscript{467} E.g. ad 6r 15 ἄθλον – praemium certamenin: ὀ ἄθλος certamen; ad 6r 25 ἄθλος – innocens: θῶς damnatus; ad 7r 6 ἀκίζομαι σε – affligo multo: siktia verberatio.
verb forms or irregular declinations) are inserted or one can also find alternative versions of the Greek lemmas in the margin.

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.

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, the Greek-Latin dictionary in the Vienna manuscript indirectly goes back to the Greek-Latin lexicon in the 8th-century Codex Harleianus 5792, on ff. 1v-272, which is now kept in the British Library and its digitized form is available on the website of the British Library. The edited version of the Greek-Latin dictionary of the Harleianus is available in the second volume of the series Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum.

There are at least 17 further versions of the same Greek-Latin dictionary from the 15th and 16th centuries found in manuscripts in various European libraries: in Munich, in Basel, in Paris, in Cambridge, in Naples, in Vienna etc. 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

468 E.g. ad 7r 25 ἀβρα – tollo, extollo: παρακείμενον ἥρκα; ad 51r 6 βοῦς – bos: βοός, βοί, βόα καὶ βούν; ad 53v 2 γαμοῦ – uxorem ducō: ἀδρόστος ἔγημα.
469 E.g. ad 43r 36 ἀγαθὸ – gloriur: καὶ ἀγαθάμαι; ad 49r 14 βλάβη – damnnum, detrimentum: τὸ βλάβος idem.
470 E.g. ad 2r 26 ἀγκύστρον – hamus: e la ritorta del fuso; ad 19v 21 ἀντικήνημα – tibia pedis: il fusolo della gamba; ad 46r 13 ἁφαγαζῷ – iurgo: scaramuccio; ad 52v 21 βομβιλόχος – phanaticus: il buffone, sive scurra.
471 See pp. 54-56.
474 For details on the codices recentiores from the 15th and 16th centuries containing the Greek-Latin dictionary from the same textual tradition see pp. 57-61.
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 Harleianus codex, these lemmas tend to have different Latin equivalents or more Latin equivalents as the ones we can find in the edited version of the Harleianus 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 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 and he also planned a critical edition of the text. In his article 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 and published around 1440. However, further results of Thiermann’s research on this textual tradition of Greek-Latin dictionaries are not available.

477 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. 8, 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
One of the three manuscripts studied and collated with the marginalia in the Vienna manuscript is the codex Vat. Pal. Gr. 194.\textsuperscript{480} It is now kept in the Vatican, but before the Thirty Years’ War it was originally kept in the Universitätssbibliothek 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 Thetatalos Scutariotes, one of the most prolific scribes in the 15\textsuperscript{th}-century Florence active approximately between 1442 and 1494.\textsuperscript{481} The codex, however, lacks the subscription of the scribe; only the remark τέλος τοῦ λεξικοῦ can be found at the end of the Greek-Latin dictionary, 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 Aristoteles to Latin.\textsuperscript{482} 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.\textsuperscript{483}

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

---

\textsuperscript{478} The earliest dated copy of this Greek-Latin dictionary was completed on 13 September 1441, in Florence by Cristoforo Benna. Cf. Botley 2010: 64.

\textsuperscript{479} 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.

\textsuperscript{480} 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.

\textsuperscript{481} 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.

\textsuperscript{482} See Görgemanns in Mittler et al. 1986: 83.

\textsuperscript{483} 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.
transcription. These errors were partly corrected either by connecting the matching lemmas with dashed lines (see e.g. on f. 34r 31-32; f. 38v 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 instances, the Latin lemmas are missing. For example, on ff. 25v-30v 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.\footnote{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.”}

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. 174v, although it does not include the date of the transcription: \(\theta(\epsilono)\delta\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\).\footnote{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 17th 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 10th to the 19th century, edited by Tamás Glaser and Péter Tóth (2008), No. 30, where the codex is dated to the 15th century and Scutariotes is named as its scribe. A new, up-to-date codicological description of the codex is definitely needed.} Above Scutariotes’ signature, the words θεό χάρις 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 1442 (f. 248r: \(\theta(\epsilono)\delta\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\)) and in Vindob. Hist. Gr. 1 copied on 31 October 1454 (f. 98v: \(\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\omega\theta[\eta]i\) \(\eta\) \(\pi\alpha\rho\omicron\rho\omicron\sigma\alpha\ \beta\omicron\beta\omicron\omicron\), \(\epsilon\iota\zeta\) \(\tau\alpha\xi\) \(\tau\omicron\delta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\)).\footnote{See in Bick 1920: 71-72 (No. 63).}

In the Cod. Gr. 4, an extensive lacuna can be found at the very beginning: the dictionary only starts with the word pair ἀλοξ̄ sulcus.\footnote{See in Bick 1920: 72 (No. 64).} On each page, 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

\footnote{It is also mentioned in Kubinyi 1956: 71: “… initium deest.”}
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. 118v some of the Latin equivalents were originally misplaced, but afterwards the matching lemmas were connected with lines; on f. 50v 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 N-7) in the Biblioteca Nacional de España, Madrid.\textsuperscript{489} 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\textsuperscript{490} in 1470, probably in Florence for Ludovico Saccano, a Sicilian erudite.\textsuperscript{491} This time the scribe left his signature indicating the date of completing the transcription (13 December 1470) on f. 267r: \textit{ἐτελείωθη διὰ χειρὸς ιω(άνν)ου θετταλοῦ τοῦ σκουταριώτου, ἡμέρα τρίτη εἰς τὰς τ’ δεκεμβρίου μηνός ἐν ἕτη αο ω οο’ ἀπὸ χριστοῦ γενήσεως}. A Latin translation of this signature was also added later under the Greek text by Juan de Iriarte.\textsuperscript{492}

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.

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.\textsuperscript{493} in the first column, the Greek lemmas with their Latin equivalents from ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 are visible, then the glossary notes are separated with

\textsuperscript{489} 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).

\textsuperscript{490} 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.

\textsuperscript{491} 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.

\textsuperscript{492} Cf. Andres 1987: 540.

\textsuperscript{493} See the appendix X A Group of Marginal Notes from Another Textual Tradition. Collation on pp. 258-287.
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\textsuperscript{494} 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.\textsuperscript{495} Due to these defects, at several loci 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 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 18r 24, 18v 20, 21r 24, 44v 3, 46v 7). However, sometimes strict agreement can also occur in the case of longer marginal notes (longer sequences of synonyms, short definitions; e.g. 43r 13, 43r 15, 45v 1, 55v 25). Still, in the case of more complex, longer marginal notes one can more often find minor differences: one or some of the additional Latin synonyms cannot be found in one of the codices (e.g. 14r 20, 22r 15, 53v 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

\textsuperscript{494} See p. 126 for details.
\textsuperscript{495} See pp. 125-126 for details.
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. 17v 8, 44v 14, 49r 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 βωμόλογος phanaticus in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 (52v 21), to which the Italian equivalents il buffone, sive scurra were added and the same hand modified the Greek lemma to βωμόλογος. In all three codices, the Greek lemma appears as βωμόλογος, 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. 2v 6, 2v 15, 4r 12, 13r 14). There are also marginal notes with longer definitions which show remarkable agreement with two of the codices (e.g. 3r 8, 7r 3, 54r 14). Besides, marginal notes in Greek (mainly irregular verb forms; e.g. 7r 25, 8r 3) or in Italian (e.g. 2r 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. 6r 15, 7r 6, 13v 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. 28r 13, 41r 19), Greek irregular verbs (e.g. 16r 22), Italian equivalents (e.g. 35v 7, 47r 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 4r 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 dictionary496 (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 Vat. Pal. Gr. 194, Cod. Gr. 4 and Res. 224 according to Peter Thiemann, who collected several other codices containing Greek-Latin dictionaries from the same textual tradition.497 Thus, marginalia matching with 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.  

496 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://dfg-viewer.de/show/?set%5Bmets%5D=http%3A%2F%2Fdaten.digitale-sammlungen.de%2F~db%2Fmets%2Fbsb00052218_mets.xml (downloaded on 10 June 2013).  

497 See p. 124 for details.
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 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.498

---

498 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 Ugoletto’s copy of Crastonus’s printed dictionary: according the results of Gábor Bolonyai’s research work Ugoletto 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.
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 Σ Ι 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 first 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 related 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 PhD dissertation, 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-dept 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. 327r-328v) 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 bookplate 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 Ugoletto, the royal librarian’s use of the manuscript and Johann Cuspianinus’s possessorship).

In the third chapter, Goetz’s list of ten 15th- or 16th-century codices recentiores containing the Greek-Latin dictionary has been enlarged with eight further items – so far, to my knowledge, no such extensive list has been published. 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 textually related 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 Σ 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 the 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 Synopsis Major Basilicorum 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 dissertation 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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Watermark Briquet No. 2680
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Watermarks in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45: lion standing on two feet
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Watermarks in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45: triple mountains
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Johann Fabri’s exlibris in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45
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Alexander Brassicanus’s exlibris
Fig. 27
Johann Cuspinianus’s exlibris
II
CORPORIS HUMANI PARTES (FF. 327r-328v). COLLATION


p. 599

1. ΟΝΟΜΑΤΟΠΟΙΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ ΦΥΣΕΩΣ AB. Μέρη τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου σώματος C.
2. ἐξογκότερον AB. ἐξογκότερον C | ὀπισθολάκου AB. ὀπισθολάκκου C | ἰνίον BC. ἰνίου A | τὸ ἄνω τῆς κεφαλῆς, κορυφή· τοὺς μηνίγγας, κροτάφους BC. τοὺς μηνίγγας, κροτάφους· τὸ ἄνω τῆς κεφαλῆς, κορυφή A
3. μήνις, ἢ τοῦ ἐγκεφάλου ὑμήν B. om. AC
4. βρέγμα AB(C corr. in marg. dex.). βλέμμα C
5. βλέφαρα A. βλεφαρίδες B. βλεφαρίδας C | δὲ A. om. BC
6. δόο γονίας AB. δυογονίας C
7. μεσάτατον AB. μεσαίτατον C | ἦγουν AC. ὦν B | μετ’ αὐτήν A. μετ’ αὐτοῦ BC
9. τὰ υποκάτω AB. τὰ ὑπὸ κάτω C | ύπωφθάλμα AB ύπωφθάλμα C
12. σφαιρίον AB. σφέριον C | λάκκον AB. λάκον C | ἄνω χείλους AB. ἄνωχείλους C | φίλτρον C. fort. legend. φίλτρον B. φίλτρα... χείλους om. A
13. λοβόν AB(C corr. in marg. dex.). βολόν C
14. καὶ γνάθους, καὶ σιαγόνας B. καὶ primum om. C. καὶ bis om. A
15. καὶ AB. om. C
16. ἦγουν AC. ὦν B | τοῖς AB. ταῖς C | δυσίν corr. ed. δόο AB. om. C | λάκκον AB. λάκον C.
17. πώγονος AB. πώγονος C | ἐμπροσθεν BC. ἐμπροσθίους A.
18. γομφίους AC. γομ.φίας B
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2. γλαυκονίαν AB. γλαυκονία C
2-3. τὸ ἐμπροσθεν, σφαγήν, γλαυκονίαν καὶ ἀντικάρδιον· ἢ κεφαλή, τὸ ἄνω. Ἡ μέση τοῦ βραχίονος, ὁμοῦ· Β. τὸ ἐμπροσθεν, σφαγήν, γλαυκονίαν καὶ ἀντικάρδιον· Ἡ μέση τοῦ βραχίονος, ὁμοῦ· Α. τὸ ἐμπροσθεν, σφαγήν· γλαυκονία καὶ ἀντικάρδιον, ἢ κεφαλή· τὸ ἄνωθεν τοῦ βραχίονος, ὁμοῦ· C.
4. μασχάλη AB. μασχάλην καὶ μάλην C. | ὀξὸ AB. ὀξὸν C.
5. κλινόμενοι BC. om. A. | κύβοιAB. κύβος C.
6. τὸ ἐπικείμενον AB. τὸ δὲ ἐπικείμενον C. | κερκίδα BC. κερκίς A. | τὸ δὲ ἐφεξῆς AB. τὸ ἐφεξῆς C.
7. μετάκαρπον AB. μετάκαρπον C.
8. δάκτυλοι BC. δάκτυλον A. | ἑφεστικός AB. ἑφεστικός C. | ὁ μέγας AB. μέγας καὶ ἀντίχειρ C.
10. σκυταλίδες AB. σκυταλίδες C.
10-12. ὁ μέγιστος πάντων λέγεται ἀντίχειρ καὶ μειώζον ὁ μετ’ αὐτόν λιχανός, ὁ μετ’ αὐτόν μέσος, καὶ ἑπιβάτης, ὁ μετ’ αὐτόν παράμεσος καὶ σφάκελος καὶ ἄλλος, B (ed.: „addition de qui paraît être une variante introduite dans le texte”) om. AC
13. μεγάλου δακτύλου AB. ἀντίχειρος C. | τοῦ λιχανοῦ AB. λιχανοῦ C. | τῶν δακτύλων AB. τῶν ἄλλων δακτύλων C.
14. τὸ κάτωθεν A. κάτω BC | ἐξόπισθεν AB. ὀπισθὲν C.
15. μετάφρενα C (+corr. ed.). μετάφρωνa A. om. B. | τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον A. τὸ τελευταῖον C. om. B. τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον τῆς ῥάχεως
16. ἦτερον corr. ed. ἦτερον A. νήτερον BC.
17. ἐπίσειον corr. ed. πίσιον codd. | καὶ ἦβην AB. ἦβην C. | ἑφήβαιον AB. ἑφήβαιον C.
18. καυλός AB. καυλόν C. | καὶ στήμα AB. στήμα C. | βάλανον BC. „A met partout le nominatif” (ed.)
19. ὀρχὺν AB. ὀρχὺν C. | παιδογόνοι AB. παιδογόνοι C.
21. τὸ ὑπὸ AB. τὰ ὑπὸ C. | πλευραῖς BC. λαθραῖς A.
21-22. ληγόνας AB. λαγόνας C.
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22. τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ΑΒ. τὸ πρῶτον μὲν C. | τὸ δὲ ἄλλο AB. τὸ ἄλλο δὲ C.
23. ἤγουν AB. om. C. | ἐπιγονατὶς AB. ἐπιγονατίδα C.
24. ἐπιμηρίς AB. ἐπιμυλίδα C. | ἐν ὃ καὶ AB. ἐν ὃ C.
25. ἵγνη AB. ἵγνην C.
26. τὰ ἀκρα AB. τὰ κάτω ἀκρα C. | καλεῖται BC. om. A.
27. μῦς AB. μῦν C. | γαστροκνήμη AB. γαστροκνήμιδα C.
28. ταρσός AB. ταρσόν C. | πλατύ πεδίον AB. καὶ πλατυπεδίον C. | μετὰ AB. τὸ μετὰ C.
29. πέλμα δὲ τὸ ὑπὸ κάτω τοῦ ποδός BC (ed.: „Ce mot et les suivants sont ajoutés par B.) om. A.
## III

**The Textual History of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. Collations**

1 Collation with ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 47

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>locus in Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Suppl. Gr. 47</th>
<th>CGL II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r 8</td>
<td>ἀβέβαιος, ἰδιαῖον ἁμαρτανόμενον, ἡμισταθεὶς, ἰκνευρυνόμενον</td>
<td>ἀβέβαιος ἁμαρτάνω, ἡμισταθεῖς, ἰκνευρυνόμενος</td>
<td>ἀβέβαιος ἁμαρτάνω, ἡμισταθεῖς, ἰκνευρυνόμενος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 9</td>
<td>ἀβεβαιότης, ἀκολουθοῦσα ἀμφιβολία, ἁμαρτανόμενον</td>
<td>ἀβεβαιότης ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμαρτανόμενη</td>
<td>ἀβεβαιότης ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμαρτανόμενη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 10</td>
<td>ἀβελτερός, ἰδιαῖος ἀμυνόμενον, ἰκνευρυνόμενον</td>
<td>ἀβελτερός ἀμυνόμενον, ἰκνευρυνόμενον</td>
<td>ἀβελτερός ἀμυνόμενον, ἰκνευρυνόμενον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 13</td>
<td>ἀβλοβῆς, ἰδιαῖος ἀμελημένον, ἰκνευρυνόμενον</td>
<td>ἀβλοβῆς ἀμελημένον, ἰκνευρυνόμενον</td>
<td>ἀβλοβῆς ἀμελημένον, ἰκνευρυνόμενον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 16</td>
<td>ἀβληχρός, ὁ ἀκεφαλής ἁμαρτάνω, ἀκηρυκτικός</td>
<td>ἀβληχρός ἁμαρτάνω, ἀκηρυκτικός</td>
<td>ἀβληχρός ἁμαρτάνω, ἀκηρυκτικός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 21</td>
<td>ἀβρός, ἰδιαῖος ἀμεκεφαλικός, ἀμφισβητούμενον</td>
<td>ἀβρός ἁμαρτάνω, ἀμφισβητούμενον</td>
<td>ἀβρός ἁμαρτάνω, ἀμφισβητούμενον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 23</td>
<td>ἀβρωτός, ἰδιαῖος ἀμεθύσιος, ἀμφισβητούμενον</td>
<td>ἀβρωτός ἁμαρτάνω, ἀμφισβητούμενον</td>
<td>ἀβρωτός ἁμαρτάνω, ἀμφισβητούμενον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 24</td>
<td>ἀβυσσός, ἰδιαῖος ἀμπεδοκήσιος, ἀμφισβητούμενον</td>
<td>ἀβυσσός ἁμαρτάνω, ἀμφισβητούμενον</td>
<td>ἀβυσσός ἁμαρτάνω, ἀμφισβητούμενον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 25</td>
<td>ἀγαθός, ἰδιαῖος ἀμεταφάσιος, ἀμφισβητούμενον</td>
<td>ἀγαθός ἁμαρτάνω, ἀμφισβητούμενον</td>
<td>ἀγαθός ἁμαρτάνω, ἀμφισβητούμενον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 26</td>
<td>ἀγαθικός, ἰδιαῖος ἀμεταφάσιος, ἀμφισβητούμενον</td>
<td>ἀγαθικός ἁμαρτάνω, ἀμφισβητούμενον</td>
<td>ἀγαθικός ἁμαρτάνω, ἀμφισβητούμενον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>locus in Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Suppl. Gr. 47</th>
<th>CGL II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1v 19</td>
<td>ἀγάπη, ἰδιαῖος ἀλυσινόμενον</td>
<td>ἀγάπη ἁμαρτάνω, ἀμφισβητούμενον</td>
<td>ἀγάπη ἁμαρτάνω, ἀμφισβητούμενον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7r 24</td>
<td>αἰρουμαί, αἰρετικός</td>
<td>αἰρουμαί ἁμαρτάνω, ἀλυσινόμενον</td>
<td>αἰρουμαί ἁμαρτάνω, ἀλυσινόμενον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r 22</td>
<td>ἀκμάζω, ἰδιαῖος ἀλυσινόμενον</td>
<td>ἀκμάζω ἁμαρτάνω, ἀλυσινόμενον</td>
<td>ἀκμάζω ἁμαρτάνω, ἀλυσινόμενον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>locus in Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Suppl. Gr. 47</th>
<th>CGL II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suppl. Gr. 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppl. Gr. 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGL II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r</td>
<td>ákrasisia, -sías intemperantia; ákrasisia ή αἰσχρότης incontinentia</td>
<td>ákrasisia intemperantia; ákrasisia incontinentia</td>
<td>Άκραισία intemperantia; Άκραισιαισχρότης incontinentia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23v</td>
<td>ἀπάρχομαι πράγματος ὢ ἔργου incoho</td>
<td>ἀπάρχομαι incoho</td>
<td>Ἀπαρχομαι πραγματοσημείου inchoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29r 3</td>
<td>ἀπόλεμος λέγεται ὢ αὐτὸς καὶ ἀπόριαχος imbellis</td>
<td>ἀπόλεμος imbellis</td>
<td>Ἀπολέμου imbellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33r 15</td>
<td>ἀπόφασις μεσίου[!] ἢ τοῦ διαίτητοῦ hoc arbitratum</td>
<td>ἀπόφασις hoc arbitratum</td>
<td>Ἀποφασισμεσιτουητοῦ διαίτητος arbitratum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37v 22-23</td>
<td>ἀρχή, τὸ προοίμιον exordium; ἀρχή ἐπὶ πράγματος inicium</td>
<td>ἀρχή exordium; ἀρχή inceptio</td>
<td>Ἀρχηπροοιμίον hocexordium; Ἀρχην ἐπι πραγματοσ inchoatio, hoc nitium, inceptio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44r 24-25</td>
<td>ἀφθονος, ὁ πολλύς[!] opimus, copiosus; ἀφθονος, ὁ μὴ φθονῶν nulli invidens, sine invidia</td>
<td>ἀφθονος opimus; ἀφθονος nulli invidens</td>
<td>Ἀφθονοσοπολύς opimus; Ἀφθονοσομή φθονῶν nullinuidens, sineinuidia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>locus in Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Suppl. Gr. 47</th>
<th>CGL II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suppl. Gr. 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppl. Gr. 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGL II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r 8</td>
<td>ἁγορά, -ας, ἢ τῶν ὀνόματος nundinae, -arum</td>
<td>ἁγορά τῶν ὄνων[!] nundina</td>
<td>Ἀγορατονωνωνιον nundina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18r 25</td>
<td>ἁνοχή, ἢ ἐν πολέμῳ ύπερθεσίς hae induciae</td>
<td>ἁνοχή ἐν πολέμῳ inductie</td>
<td>Ἀνοχηνπολεμουπερθεσις indutias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22v 5</td>
<td>ἀπαγγέλλω ἐπὶ μαθημάτων reddo, memoro</td>
<td>ἀπαγγέλλω ἐπὶ μαθημática reddo, memoro</td>
<td>Ἀπαγγέλλωπεμαθηματων reddo, memoro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26v 18</td>
<td>ἀποδήμης ἐπὶ στρατείας emissio</td>
<td>ἀποδήμης ἐπὶ στρατείας emissio</td>
<td>Ἀποδημαεπιστρατειας exreditio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36r 2</td>
<td>ἀρκτος ζῷον ursus</td>
<td>ἀρκτος ζῷον ursus</td>
<td>Ἀρκτοτζων hicursus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36r 3</td>
<td>ἀρκτος ἢ ἐν τῷ ύφραντῳ septentrio</td>
<td>ἀρκτος ἢ ἐν τῷ ύφραντῳ septentrio</td>
<td>Ἀρκτοπνευμουφρανω hicseptentrio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39v 22</td>
<td>ἀστικὸς ὁ ἄδον canorus</td>
<td>ἀστικὸς ὁ ἄδον canorus</td>
<td>Ἀστικοσοαδων canurus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39v 23</td>
<td>ἀστικὸς ὁ πολιτικὸς</td>
<td>ἀστικὸς ὁ πολιτικὸς</td>
<td>Ἀστικοσοπολιτικος urbanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus in Suppl. Gr. 45</td>
<td>Suppl. Gr. 45</td>
<td>Suppl. Gr. 47</td>
<td>CGL II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 3</td>
<td>ἀγαθοσύνη, -σύνης bonitas</td>
<td>ἀγαθοσύνη benignitas</td>
<td>ἀγαθοσύνη bonitas, benignitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 26</td>
<td>ἀγγέλλω, -λείς indico</td>
<td>ἀγγέλλω nuntio</td>
<td>ἀγγέλλω indiconuntio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r 22</td>
<td>ἀγριαῖνοι, -νεῖς effero, -as</td>
<td>ἀγριαῖνοι ferum facio</td>
<td>ἀγριαιεύω ferumfacio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7v 7</td>
<td>αἰσχροκερδῆς, -δοὺς turpiter lucrans</td>
<td>αἰσχροκερδῆς turpilucris</td>
<td>αἰσχροκερδῆς turpilucris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8v 11</td>
<td>ἀκανθώδης, -δους spinosus</td>
<td>ἀκανθώδης sentuosus</td>
<td>ἀκανθώδης sentosusspinosus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r 9</td>
<td>ἀκηδία, -δίς pigritia</td>
<td>ἀκηδία incuria</td>
<td>ἀκηδία taedium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11v 2</td>
<td>ἀλαλαγμός, -μοῦ eiulatus, ululatus</td>
<td>ἀλαλαγμός iubilatio</td>
<td>ἀλαλαγμός iubilatio eiulatio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14v 8</td>
<td>ἀνδριότης, -ότης virilitas, vigor, virtus</td>
<td>ἀνδριότης fortitudo</td>
<td>ἀνδρειότης fortitas, virilitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16r 14</td>
<td>ἄνευ μελησιμοῦ sine procrastinatione</td>
<td>ἄνευ μελησιμοῦ sine cunctatione</td>
<td>ἄνεωμελησιμοῦ sine procrastinatione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16v 12</td>
<td>ἄνήμερος, -μέρου immansuetus</td>
<td>ἄνήμερος immitis</td>
<td>ἄνημερος inimitis, immansuetus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17v 26</td>
<td>ἀνόητος, -ήτου demens</td>
<td>ἀνόητος mente captus</td>
<td>ἀνοητὸς ineptus, mente captus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
2 Collation with Mon. Gr. 142 and 253

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. locus</th>
<th>ÖNB. Suppl. Gr. 45.</th>
<th>CGL II</th>
<th>Mon. Gr. 142</th>
<th>Mon. Gr. 253</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r 16</td>
<td>ἀβληθρός, ὁ ἀσθενής</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infirm(us), Imbecillis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 20</td>
<td>ἀβρα, ἢ θεράπανα</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ancilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 6</td>
<td>ἀγαθοεργίᾳ hoc meritu(m)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 16</td>
<td>ἀγαμαι admiror</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v 4</td>
<td>ἀγκύλος, -κύλου Unc(us)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v 8</td>
<td>ἀγλαίζω clarifico</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5v 5</td>
<td>ἀεικές, τὸ ἀνόμιον dissimile</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6r 23</td>
<td>ἄθροι, τὸ βλέπω cerno, vid(e)o, aspicio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. locus</th>
<th>ÖNB. Suppl. Gr. 45.</th>
<th>CGL II</th>
<th>Mon. Gr. 142</th>
<th>Mon. Gr. 253</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>post v 1r 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ἀβασκαντὸν infascinabile G 215. 6.</td>
<td>Ἀβασκάντον infastinabile</td>
<td>Ἀβασκαντὸν infascinabile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post v 1r 24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ἀγαθὴ bona benigna</td>
<td>Ἀγαθῆ bona benigna</td>
<td>Ἀγαθὴ bona benigna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post v 3r 19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ἀγραφὸν sine scriptura</td>
<td>Ἀγράφον sine scriptura</td>
<td>Ἀγράφον sine scriptura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post v 3v 25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ἀγρίβαθεσ prealtum</td>
<td>Ἀγρίβαθες prealtum</td>
<td>Ἀγρίβαθες prealtum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post v 5r 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ἀδικοῦμαι leor iniuria patior</td>
<td>Ἀδικοῦμα leor iniuriam patiōr</td>
<td>Ἀδικοῦμαι leor iniuriam paciōr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. locus</td>
<td>ÖNB. Suppl. Gr. 45.</td>
<td>CGL II</td>
<td>Mon. Gr. 142</td>
<td>Mon. Gr. 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 9</td>
<td>ἀβεβαιοτης, -τητος</td>
<td>Ἀβεβαιοτης</td>
<td>Ἀβεβαιοτης</td>
<td>Ἀβεβαιοτης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instabilitas,</td>
<td>infirmitas</td>
<td>infirmitas</td>
<td>infirmitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infirmitas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 11</td>
<td>ἀβιαστος, -ἄστου</td>
<td>Ἀβιαστον</td>
<td>Ἀβιαστον</td>
<td>Ἀβιαστον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inviolatus</td>
<td>inviolatum</td>
<td>inviolatum</td>
<td>inviolatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 12</td>
<td>ἀβιωτος, -του</td>
<td>Ἀβιεσ</td>
<td>Ἀβιεσ</td>
<td>Ἀβιεσ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sine vita</td>
<td>sine vita</td>
<td>sine vita</td>
<td>sine vita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 13</td>
<td>ἀβλαβης, -βοῦς</td>
<td>Ἀβλαβης</td>
<td>Ἀβλαβης</td>
<td>Ἀβλαβης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>illaesus,</td>
<td>inlesus</td>
<td>illesus</td>
<td>illesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>innocuos</td>
<td>innoxius</td>
<td>innoxius</td>
<td>innoxius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>innocens</td>
<td>innocens</td>
<td>innocens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 18</td>
<td>ἄβουλια, -ας</td>
<td>Ἄβουλια</td>
<td>Ἄβουλια</td>
<td>Ἄβουλια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In(con)sideratio</td>
<td>inconsultum</td>
<td>inconsultum</td>
<td>inconsultum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 5</td>
<td>ἄγαθοποιος, -ποιοι</td>
<td>Ἀγαθοποιος</td>
<td>Ἀγαθοποιος</td>
<td>Ἀγαθοποιος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beneficus,</td>
<td>benificus</td>
<td>benificus</td>
<td>benificus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b(e)n(e)facto(γ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 13</td>
<td>ἄγαμος γυνη</td>
<td>Ἀγαμος</td>
<td>Ἀγαμος</td>
<td>Ἀγαμος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innupta, Innuba</td>
<td>γυνη</td>
<td>γυνη</td>
<td>γυνη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>innupta</td>
<td>innupta</td>
<td>innupta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 25</td>
<td>ἄγγελος, -γέλου</td>
<td>Ἀγγελος</td>
<td>Ἀγγελος</td>
<td>Ἀγγελος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nuncius</td>
<td>nuntius</td>
<td>nuncius</td>
<td>nuncius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nuntiator renuntiator</td>
<td>nuntiator renuntiator</td>
<td>nuntiator renuntiator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2r 7</td>
<td>ἄγκλαστος, -λάστου</td>
<td>Ἀγκλαστος</td>
<td>Ἀγκλαστος</td>
<td>Ἀγκλαστος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>InIrrisus,</td>
<td>irrexis</td>
<td>irrexis</td>
<td>irrexis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irrisibilis,</td>
<td>irrisibilis</td>
<td>irrisibilis</td>
<td>irrisibilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inderisus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. locus</td>
<td>ÖNB. Suppl. Gr. 45.</td>
<td>CGL II</td>
<td>Mon. Gr. 142</td>
<td>Mon. Gr. 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 23</td>
<td>ἀγγεῖον, -γεῖον vas, fidelia</td>
<td>Ἀγγεῖον haecfideliauas</td>
<td>Ἀγγεῖον vas</td>
<td>Ἀγγεῖον vas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 24</td>
<td>ἀγγελία, -λίας nunciatio</td>
<td>Ἀγγελία hincnuntius</td>
<td>Ἀγγελία nunciatio</td>
<td>Ἀγγελία nunciacio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2r 10</td>
<td>ἄγέλη, -ῆς grex</td>
<td>ἄγέλη hic grex</td>
<td>ἄγέλη grex</td>
<td>ἄγέλη grex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v 1</td>
<td>ἀγκιστρεύω, -εις hamo, -as</td>
<td>ἀγκιστρεύω unico</td>
<td>ἀγκιστρεύω bucino</td>
<td>ἀγκιστρεύω bucino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v 18</td>
<td>ἄγνισμα, -σματος castimonia, puritas</td>
<td>ἄγνισμα castimonium purificatio</td>
<td>ἄγνισμα lustratio purificatio</td>
<td>ἄγνισμα lustratio purificatio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r 2</td>
<td>ἄγνως, ἑπίρρημα Sincere, caste</td>
<td>ἄγνωσεπιρρήμα sincere</td>
<td>ἄγνως sincere</td>
<td>ἄγνως sincere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v 15</td>
<td>ἀγρυπνία, -νίας lucubratio, vigilia</td>
<td>ἀγρυπνία· lucubratio</td>
<td>ἀγρυπνία lucubratio</td>
<td>ἀγρυπνία lucubratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>excubitum peruigilium</td>
<td></td>
<td>insomnie uigilia uigilantia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v 22</td>
<td>ἀγώναιος, -ναίου caelebs, s(i)n(e) uxor</td>
<td>ἀγώναιος celepssineuxore</td>
<td>ἀγώναιος sine uxor</td>
<td>ἀγώναιος sine uxor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r 15</td>
<td>ἀγωνία, -νίας sollicitudo</td>
<td>ἀγωνία sollicitudo, trepidatio</td>
<td>ἀγωνία sollicitudo</td>
<td>ἀγωνία sollicitudo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v 1</td>
<td>ἀδέκαστος, -καστοῦ, ὁ ἀδωροδόκητος edecumatus</td>
<td>ἀδέκαστος edecumatus</td>
<td>ἀδέκαστος ἀδωροδόκητος edecumatus</td>
<td>ἀδέκαστος ἀδωροδόκητος edecumatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7r 4</td>
<td>ἄθω, ἀντὶ τοῦ καίω, ἀθεῖες cremo, comburo</td>
<td>ἄθω διακτυκαῖω cremo</td>
<td>ἄθω cremo</td>
<td>ἄθω cremo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. locus</td>
<td>ÖNB. Suppl. Gr. 45.</td>
<td>CGL II</td>
<td>Mon. Gr. 142</td>
<td>Mon. Gr. 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v 2</td>
<td>ἀγκυλήπτους, ποδός poples, -tis</td>
<td>ἀγκυλήποδος hipoples</td>
<td>ἀγκυλοποδός poples</td>
<td>ἀγκυλοποδός hip poples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r 19</td>
<td>ἀγραφός, -γράφον indescrip(ut)us</td>
<td>ἀγραφός inscriptus</td>
<td>ἀγραφός non scriptus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post v 4r 9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ἀγῶν distiplina certamen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r 10</td>
<td>ἀγωγεύς, -γέως ductor</td>
<td>ἀγωγεύς ducator hocductarium</td>
<td>ἀγωρέῦς ductor hoc ductarium</td>
<td>ἀγωρεύς ducator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v 24</td>
<td>ἀδιάφορος, -φόρου p(ro)miscus</td>
<td>ἀδιάφορος promiscus</td>
<td>ἀδιάφορος promistus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5v 19</td>
<td>ἄηδων, -δόνος lusciana</td>
<td>ἄηδων luscina</td>
<td>ἄηδων luscina</td>
<td>ἄηδων luscinia phylamica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6v 5</td>
<td>αἰγάγριον, -γρίου caprea</td>
<td>αἰγάγριον haec capreola</td>
<td>ἀγάγριον haec capriola</td>
<td>ἀγάγριον capreola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r 22</td>
<td>ἀκμᾶζω, -ζεῖς vigeo</td>
<td>ἀκμᾶζω vigeo uigecodolesco pubesco uiresco</td>
<td>ἀκμᾶζω vigeo viresco oppubesco</td>
<td>ἀκμᾶζω vigeo pubesco viresco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v 7</td>
<td>ἀκολασία, -σίας impunitas</td>
<td>ἀκολασία impunitas</td>
<td>ἀκολασία, -σίας impunitas</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14v 8</td>
<td>ἀνδριότης, -ότης virilitas vigor virtus</td>
<td>ἀνδρειοτής fortitas, uirilitas</td>
<td>ἀνδριότης fortitas virilitas</td>
<td>ἀνδριότης fortitudo virilitas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Collation with Σ I 12

Table 1: Filling the extensive lacuna found in CGL II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ÓNB Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Σ I 12</th>
<th>CGL II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12r 11 ἁλίζω, τὸ συναθροίζον conglomero</td>
<td>97v ἁλίζω, τὸ συναθροίζον conglomero, -ras</td>
<td>[vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12v 15 ἀμαφρός obscurus, opacus</td>
<td>98r ἀμαφρός obscurus, opacus</td>
<td>[vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12v 19 ἀμβλύνω hebetο, -as</td>
<td>98r ἀμβλύνω hebetο, -tas, -tui</td>
<td>[vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12v 23 ἀμέλεια negligentia, incuria</td>
<td>98r ἀμέλεια negligentia, incuria</td>
<td>[vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13r 8 ἀμογητί absque labore</td>
<td>98v ἀμογητί absque labore</td>
<td>[vacat]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Latin equivalents of Σ I 12 in agreement with CGL II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ÓNB Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Σ I 12</th>
<th>CGL II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1v 3 ἁγαθοσύνη, -σύνης bonitas</td>
<td>91r ἁγαθοσύνη, -σύνης bonitas –tatis, benignitas –tatis</td>
<td>Αγαθοσύνη bonitas benignitas (215. 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 13 ἁγαμος γυνη Innupta, Innuba</td>
<td>91r ἁγαμος γυνη hec innupta -pte</td>
<td>Αγαμος γυνη innupta (215. 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r 7 ἁγονος, -όνου sterilis, infecundus</td>
<td>92r ἁγονος, -γόνου sterilis infertilis infecundus</td>
<td>Αγονος sterilis infertilis infecundus (216. 58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v 7 ἀδελφικός, -κοῦ fraternus, fraternalis</td>
<td>93r ἀδελφικός, -κοῦ fraternus –ni</td>
<td>Αδελφικος fraternus (218. 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5v 12 ἁζυγος, -ζογου impar, sine iugo</td>
<td>93v ἁζυγος, -ζόγου impar sine iugo dispar</td>
<td>Αζυγος inpar sine iugo dispar (219. 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6v 6 ἁγαγρος, -γάγρου caper silvestris</td>
<td>94r ἁγαγρος, -γάγρου caper capri</td>
<td>Αγαγρος caper (220. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12r 10 ἁλιξ, -κος alec, alecis</td>
<td>97v ἁλιξ, -κος hoc allec – llec singulariter tantum declinabitur</td>
<td>Άλεξ hocallex’ singulariter tantum declinabitur (225. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16v 24 ἁνθηλη, -λης ulva</td>
<td>100v ἁνθηλη, -λης cannas arcina ulva</td>
<td>Ανθηλη cannascarcina ulva (227. 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21v 11 ἁνωθεν desuper</td>
<td>104r ἁνωθεν desuper superius</td>
<td>Ανωθεν desuper superius (231. 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22v 21 ἁπαιτο βιαῖος efflagito</td>
<td>104v ἁπαιτο βιαῖος flagito efflagito profligo</td>
<td>Απαιτο βιαῖος flagito efflagito profligo (232. 41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Latin equivalents of Σ I 12 in agreement with ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Σ I 12</th>
<th>CGL II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16v 15 ἄνηρέθη ἐπὶ πράγματος sublata est, interempta est</td>
<td>100v ἄνηρέθη ἐπὶ πράγματος sublata est, interempta est</td>
<td>Άνηρέθη επὶ πράγματος sublata est (227. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17r 10 ἀνθρακιά, -κίας pruna</td>
<td>101r ἀνθρακιά, -κίας pruna</td>
<td>ἀνθρακια ῥαμαλι pruna (227. 33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25r 9 ἂπευχή deprecatio, abominatio</td>
<td>106r ἂπευχὴ deprecatio abominatio</td>
<td>ἂπευχὴ habominatio (234. 54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Σ I 12</th>
<th>CGL II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1v 21 ἀγαπητός, -τοῦ amatus, dilectus, carus</td>
<td>91v ἀγαπητός, -τοῦ amatus, dilectus, carissimus</td>
<td>ἀγαπητός amantissimus dilectissimus carissimus dilectus amans (215. 48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v 20 ἄγνοια, -γνοίας ignorantia, scintitia</td>
<td>92v ἄγνοια, -γνοίας ignoratio ignorantia inscientia -tiae</td>
<td>ἄγνοια ignorantia inscientia (216. 46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v 8 ἄγροδιατός, -ατίου agricola</td>
<td>92v ἄγροδιατός, -ατίου agricola –ae, ruricola –ae</td>
<td>ἄγροδιατός agricola (217. 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7v 11 ἀἰσχρότατος, -τᾶτου turpissim(us)</td>
<td>95v ἀἰσχρότατος, -τᾶτου turpissimus fedissimus</td>
<td>ἀἰσχροτάτος foedissimus (221. 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r 20 ἀκρατός, -ράτου intemperatus</td>
<td>96v ἀκρατός, -ράτου intemperatus, intempestus</td>
<td>ἀκρατός intemperata intempesta noxintempesta (223. 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11v 26 ἀληθῶς vere, re vera</td>
<td>97v ἀληθῶς re vera, vere, certe</td>
<td>ἀληθῶς uero certe (224. 63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18r 3 ἁνοια, -νοίας amentia</td>
<td>101v ἁνοια, -νοίας dementia –tiae, stulticia, socordia</td>
<td>ἁνοια dementia stultitia socordia uecordia insipientia (228. 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21v 19 ἀνοφέλεια incommoditas</td>
<td>104v ἀνοφέλεια incommoditas inutilitas</td>
<td>ἀνοφέλεια inmoditias (231. 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24r 15 ἀπειλῶ minor -aris</td>
<td>105v minor –aris, minitor</td>
<td>ἀπειλῶ minor minitor intermino mino minito (234. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30r 8 ἄπονοῳ desipio</td>
<td>109v ἄπονοῳ dementio –tis, desipio –pis</td>
<td>ἄπονοῳ amento (239. 26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Agreement of Σ I 12 and ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 regarding vocabulary

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Σ I 12</th>
<th>CGL II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1v 16 ἀγαμαῖ admiror</td>
<td>91v ἀγαμαῖ admiror –aris</td>
<td>[vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v 9 ἀγλαός clarus, illustris</td>
<td>92r ἀγλαός clarus, illustris</td>
<td>[vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6r 20 ἀθροίσιμος celeber</td>
<td>94r ἀθροίσιμος celeber</td>
<td>[vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6r 23 ἄθρω, τὸ βλέπω cerno, vid(e)ο, aspicio</td>
<td>94r ἄθρω, τὸ βλέπω cerno –nis, video</td>
<td>[vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r 12 ἄκιον, τὸ ἄσθενες debile, infirmum</td>
<td>96r ἄκιον, τὸ ἄσθενες debile infirmum</td>
<td>[vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r 20 ἄκλονητος, -νήτου inconcussus</td>
<td>96r ἄκλονητος inconcussus</td>
<td>[vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v 10 ἀκολασταίνω lascivio, luxurio(r)</td>
<td>96r ἀκολασταίνω lascivio –vis</td>
<td>[vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r 2 ὑπερακοντίζω, ἀπατητικῆ tὸ ὑπερβάλλω [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>96v ὑπερακοντίζω, ἀπατητικῆ tὸ ὑπερβάλλω [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>[vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r 19 ἀκρατίζομαι, τὸ ἀκρατον πίνω [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>96v ἀκρατίζομαι, τὸ ἀκρατον πίνω [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>[vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17r 7 ἄνθος ὑποχοριστικῆς flosculus</td>
<td>101r ἄνθος ὑποχοριστικῆς flosculus</td>
<td>[vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17v 11 ἀνυμῶμαι haurio, attraho</td>
<td>101r ἀνυμῶμαι haurio, attraho</td>
<td>[vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29v 6 ἀπολλυβάζω debibo</td>
<td>108v ἀπολλυβάζω τὸ συντόμος τί ποιῶ ἢ λέγω, λιβάζ γάρ delibo –bas</td>
<td>[vacat]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

215. 45 Αγανάκτει indignatur ringitur; 217. 10 Αγραφὸν sine scriptura; 217. 19 Αίρισ ferox ferus efferus inmanis; 218. 30 Αδηλον incertum; 219. 10 Αειόν perpetuum; 220. 38 Αματοῦδες sanguinulentum cruentum; 221. 53 Ακαίρεον integrum solidum; 224. 26 Ακυρὸν irritum; 225. 16 Ανδρὸν uirile; 227. 6 Ανηκει attinet; 228. 20 Αν αιζει pandere aperire recludere; 233. 27 Απαρνοῦμαι abnegodenego.
Abbreviations:
cf. = The marginal note does not agree with the indicated scholion precisely, but seems to be closely related to it.
Th$^1$ = the first Thoman redaction of Nubes scholia
Th$^2$ = the second Thoman redaction of Nubes scholia
Tr$^1$ = the first Triclinian redaction of Nubes scholia
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
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
ἀδελφιδὴ, fratris filia. In Aristophane. (cf. sch. nub. 47 Tr1/2)

5r 14
quattuor significat hoc verbum. τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν. τὸ παίζειν. τὸ ὀλυμφεῖν. τὸ φλυαρεῖν. (cf. sch. nub. 1480e AnRec)

7r 24
ἀἱρευμένον. προκρίναντα. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 1042a Th1/2, Tr1(?)/2)

10r 7
ἀκόρητος, ἀνεπιμέλητος, ἀκαλλάπιστος. ὥρω γὰρ τὸ ἐπιμελοῦμαι. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 44c Tr1/2)

11v 19
Ἄληθες. In Aristophane. pro Ἄληθῶς ironice. (cf. sch. nub. 841a AnRec)

13r 17
ἄμυνται, μάχεται. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 1428a Tr2)

13r 26
ἀμφορεῖς νενησμένοι, μεγαρικά σεσωρευμένα. In Aristophane (sch. nub. 1203d Th1/2 Tr1/2)

14r 1
ἀναπλήσει, πληρώσει. In Aristophane (sch. nub. 995e AnRec)

14v 1
ἀνείται, ἐνδέδοται. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 956 Th1, Tr1/2)
17r 12
\[\text{άνθρήνας\ pontet\ mēn\ tās\ melīsas\ fasiv. Aristotēlēs\ kai\ ζόωa\ ētera\ syγγενή\ tās\ melīsasias,\ oī\ dē\ ὤμοιa\ fasiv\ ēnai\ tās\ σφηξίν. In\ Aristophane\ (sch.\ nub.\ 947b\ Th1/2,\ Tr1/2)}\]

18v 26
\[\text{ἄντελλοι\ selēnη,\ inquit\ Aristophanes\ (Nub.\ 754).\ telouμένης,\ φησί,\ tīs\ selēnηs\ oī\ tōkoi\ δίδονται.\ quae\ si\ non\ oriretur,\ quomodo\ oī\ δανεισταί\ possent\ scire\ mensem\ exactum\ et\ repetere\ usuras.\ quare\ si\ non\ oriretur\ amplius,\ nec\ ego\ solverem\ eas. (cf.\ sch.\ nub.\ 755a\ Tr2)}\]

21v 21
\[\text{Aristophanes. Δέξεις\ ἐπεὶ\ ὀλὼ.\ κόμιζε\ δήλ'\ εἰ\ dē\ μή,\ συντρίψω. (sch.\ nub.\ 1299b\ AnRec)}\]

22v 1
\[\text{ἀπαιόλη,\ ἀπατή. In\ Aristophane\ (sch.\ nub.\ 1150b\ Tr2)}\]

24v 26
\[\text{ἄπερρ',\ φθείρου. ἀπελθε. Aristophanes\ (sch.\ nub.\ 783b\ AnRec;\ cf.\ sch.\ nub.\ 783b\ Tr2)}\]

25r 16
\[\text{ἀπηνές,\ ἀναίσχυντον. In\ Aristophane\ (sch.\ nub.\ 974\ Th1/2,\ Tr1/2)}\]

26r 16
\[\text{ἀπὸ\ γάρ\ ὀλοῦμαι. ὤν\ βούλομαι. In\ Aristophane. (sch.\ nub.\ 1440\ Th1/2,\ Tr1/2)}\]

28v 26
\[\text{Aristophanes. ἀπολιταργεῖς,\ ἀπέλθης,\ ἀποδράμεις,\ ἀποσκιρτήσεις,\ λιταργισμοῦς\ γάρ\ ἐκάλουν\ τὰ\ σκιρτήματα. (cf.\ sch.\ nub.\ 1253c-d\ Tr1/2)}\]

31r 23
\[\text{Kαῦν\ ἀπορῆς\ tī\ tōn\ νοημάτων\ (Nub.\ 743),\ ἀπορον\ ἔχης\ (sch.\ nub.\ 743f\ AnRec\ Par)\ tōn\ διαλογισμῶν\ (sch.\ nub.\ 743e\ AnRec\ Par)\ tōn\ διανοιῶν\ (vacat\ in\ mss.).\ Aristophanes.\ Idem\ alibi\ ἀπορίαν\ ἔχης\ (sch.\ nub.\ 743f\ AnRec.\ Va)}\]

31v 22
\[\text{ἀποστερητικός,\ δυνάμενος\ ἀποστερῆσαι. In\ Aristophane. (sch.\ nub.\ 728b\ AnRec\ Par)}\]

33r 26
\[\text{ἀποφθέρει,\ μεταφθείρει\ (sch.\ nub.\ 789c\ AnRec\ Par).\ alibi\ μετά\ φθοράς\ ἀπέρχη\ (cf.\ sch.\ nub.\ 789c\ AnRec\ ChisReg;\ cf.\ sch.\ plut.\ 598d\ ChisLPar).\ In\ Aristophane.} \]

33v 21
\[\text{Aristophanes\ grammaticus,\ τήν\ ἀπραγμοσύνην\ φυτὸν\ λέγει\ ἐν\ ἀκαδημία\ φυόμενον. (cf.\ sch.\ nub.\ 1007c\ Tr2)}\]

35r 1
\[\text{ἄργος,\ ἦγουν\ ἄργη. In\ Aristophane\ (cf.\ sch.\ nub.\ 170d\ AnRec)}\]

36v 7
\[\text{παίξει\ ὃ\ Ἀριστοφάνης\ γνώμην\ εξ\ ἄρνακιδῶν\ εἰπὼν\ ἀποστερητίδα,\ ἦγουν\ γνώμην} \]
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ἀποστερήσεως καὶ ἐξαρνήσεως. ὅφειλε δὲ εἰπεῖν, τις ἂν μοι ἐπιβάλλοι καὶ ἐπιθήσοι
σκέπασμα ἐξ ἀρνακίδων, ὡς ἂν γνώμην εὐροιμὶ ἀποστερητικὴν.
(cf. sch. nub. 730 Th1, Tr1/2)

37v 18
In Aristophane. ἀρχεία, κεφάλαια. ὅτι οἱ πρῶτοι τόκοι παραπαθέντος τοῦ δανείου,
κεφάλαια γινόμενοι, τόκους δέχονται ἄλλους. (cf. sch. nub. 1156a-b Th1/2, Tr1/2)

41r 24
Aristophanes. ἀτιμάσθη τίς ἧμᾶς (Nub. 1121). ἠγούν κακὸν καθ’ ἧμᾶς δράμα
ψηφίσται. (sch. nub. 1121 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

41v 13
Aristophanes. ἀτραπὸν, ὄδον, ὁ κοινὸς μονοπάτιον λέγεται. (sch. nubes 76a Th2, Tr1/2)

44v 20
In Aristophane. ἀφορμάσθαι παρεσκευάσμεθα (Nub. 607), ἤτοι πορεύεσθαι
ητομαζέσμεθα. (sch. nub. 607c AnRec ChisRegParb, 607d AnRec Par)

48r 21
βεκ φρυγιστὶ ὁ ἄρτος. ὄθεν βεκκεσέληνος ἀρχαῖος καὶ προσέληνος.
In Aristophane. (cf. sch. nub. 398b Tr1/2)

49v 17
βληττομάζαν Ἀριστοφάνης καλεῖ τῶν μαλακογνώμων καὶ μωρῶν, ἀπὸ τοῦ βλίττου, ὁ
ἐστὶ λάχανον λίων ἐκλυόταν, καὶ τοῦ μαμάν ἀδιάρθρου καὶ μωρᾶς τῶν πάιδων φωνῆς.
(cf. sch. nubes 1001d Tr2)

50r 6
βολῆς τὰ λεγόμενα ὄνο, οὔτινα τὴν /γῆν σκάπτοντες εὐρίσκουσιν/ ἀνθρώποι
ἀντομάτος φυμένα. In Aristophane. (cf. sch. nub. 188b-c Tr2)

50r 17
βολοστάται, δανεισταί. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 1155 Th1, Tr1/2)

51r 9
θυσίν τὸν τινὸς ποτὲ τῶν Διὶ, ἐλθὼν ποθὲν βοῦς. ἀρπάξει πλακοῦντα. καὶ ὁ τὴν
θυσίαν ποιῶν ἀναερεῖ τοῦτον εὐθὺς ἄξινην, ὄθεν γενόμενοι καθ’ ἐκαστὸν ἐτος ἔρητῃ
πολυτελῆς γίνεσθαι τὰ βοσφόνια. In Aristophane (sch. nubes 985c Th1, Tr1/2)

52v 21
κυρίως βασιλολόχοι, οἱ ἄσεβεῖς, ἀπὸ τοῦ λοχείν ἐν τοῖς βασιλείς πρὸς τὸ τί ἀπὸ τῶν
θυμάτων λαβεῖν. καταχρηστικώς δὲ πάντες κακοὶ. βασιλολοχία καὶ τὸ σκοίμα καὶ ἡ
κολακεία καὶ ἡ φλυαρία καὶ ἡ πολυλογία. τινὲς γὰρ ἀντὶ τοῦ τὸ θείον ἐξιλεοῦν ἐν
κολακεία, ἐπολυλογοῦντο ἐν τοῖς βασιλείς. (cf. sch. nub. 910a-b Tr1/2)

55v 26
γλωσσαρτιλογεσπίτριπτον ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης καλεῖ τὸν ὁδικόν, ὁτι γλυσχρός ἐστι ταῖς
ἀντιλογίαις καὶ ἀκατανόητος, καὶ ἐπιτρίβει ἐτέρους, ἡ ἐπιτριβής ἐστιν ἀξίωσ αὐτὸς.
(cf. sch. nub. 1004a-b Th1/2, Tr1/2)
56v 1
gνωμοτύποις συνεταῖς καὶ κατὰ νοῦν τυπουμέναις. In Aristophane (cf. sch. nubes 952 Th2, Tr1/2)

57r 17
γραύς τε καὶ νέα, ἡ ἐνη τοῦ μηνὸς καὶ ἡ λα. In Aristophane. (cf. sch. nub. 1179, 1184 Tr and AnRec)

57r 23
eἰ σοι γράφοιτο (Nub. 58), ἵστέον ὅτι τοῖς δικασταῖς οἱ δανεισταί ἔρχομενοι ἔλεγον ὡς ὁ δείκνυ τοῦτος ὀφείλει. εἶτα ὁ τοῦ δικαστήριου γραμματεύς ἔγραψε τοῦτο καὶ μετὰ ταύτα ὁ ὀφείλων καλούμενος ἀπήτειτο τὸ δάνειον. In Aristophane. (sch. nubes 758b Th2, Tr1/2)

58r 9
γυμνοῦς, ἀπερίττους. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 965d Th1/2, Tr1/2).

59r 7
dανειέται κατὰ δάνειον δίδοται, αὐξάνεται. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 756c AnRec Par)

62r 12
dῆμαγωγοῦς'. διοικοῦσι τὸν δήμον. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 1093 Tr2)

62v 1
dημοτίας καὶ συνδημότης ὁ τοῦ αὐτοῦ δήμου. ἦσαν ὁ κοινῶς συντοπίτης.
In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 210b AnRec)

64v 22
dιακεκναισμένος τὸ χρώμα. ἦσαν βεβλαμμένος ὁχρωμένος ἐφθαρμένος. qualis est color philosophorum. In Aristophane. (cf. sch. nub. 120b Tr2)

65r 11
dιαλέπτου δ’ ὄντος. ἦσαν δι’ ὅλου στενοῦ. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 161 Th2, Tr1/2)

65r 14
dιαλιπῶν, ἦσαν ἀφέμενος. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 496c AnRec Par)

68r 15
dιατήξας, τῷ πυρὶ μαλθάξας. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 149 Th2, Tr1/2)

69v 26
tοῦ διένερεύματος, ἦτοι ἕνεκα τῆς περὶ τοῦ ἐνέρου λεπτολογίας καὶ φυσιολογίας.
In Aristophane (sch. nub. 166 Tr2);
διερρηκόσι, κεχαλασμένοις κεχυνόσι συνεστραμμένοις (sch. nub. 873b schol. vet.)

70r 26
[Διμπολίώδη], ἐστὶ τοῦ διός παλαιοτάτη τὰ διοσπόλια. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 984a Th1/2, Tr1/2)
In Aristophane. ταῖς δίκαιας, ταῖς δικαιοσύναις (sch. nub. 1040 Th1/2, Tr1(?)/2). δικαίοτερος, μικραίς δίκαιας. In Aristophane (sch. nub. 1109 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

dίνων, καυκίνοι τί πήλινον. In Aristophane (sch. nub. 1473 Tr2)

In Aristophane. διωκάθω αὕτους γραφήν γραψάμενος est κατακορήσω κατηγορίαν γραψάμενος αὕτους (cf. Nub. 1481-2; sch. nub. 1481-1482a-b Th1, Tr1/2)

In Aristophane (sch. nub. 1109 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

In Aristophane (sch. nub. 1473 Tr2)

In Aristophane. δρώντων, πραττέτωσαν. (cf. sch. nub. 453 Th2, Tr1/2; sch. nub. 453a AnRec)

(γ)κεκοιμημένην φησίν Ἀριστοφάνης. ἢ κοισύρα γωνή τίς ἢν πάνυ σεμνῶς ἐαυτήν καὶ ποικίλως κοσμοῦσα, ἃς τούς δρώντας ἐκπλήττεσθαι. ἐκ ταύτης οὖν τὸ γένος εἶλκεν ἢ τοῦ στρεψάδου γων. ἀπὸ τῆς κοισύρας δὲ τὸ κοισυρὸ τὸ καλλυπίζω παρῆκθη. (sch. nub. 48d Tr2)

(δ)δίδαξα δοκεῖ ipse. sed διδάξαμην Aristophanes ironice alibi loquens ponit, ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς διδασκαλεῖσθον ἐπεμψα. (cf. sch. nub. 1338a Tr2)

In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 1461a Th1/2, Tr1/2)

In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 41b AnRec ChisPar)

(ε)οθολ' ὀφελ' ἐπερεπε. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 41b AnRec ChisPar)

(ζ)ταῖς εἰκοῖς τῶν ἐγχέλεων τὰς ἐμᾶς (Nub. 559), ἤτοι τὰς ὁμοίωτητας, τοὺς τύπους (sch. nub. 559a Tr2)

(η)τῶν ἐγχέλεων τῶν ἐμῶν (sch. nub. 559d AnRec ParChalc).

(θ)ταῖς εἰκόνας τῶν λέξεων ὡς ἑποίησα εἰς τὰς ἐγχέλεις. In Aristophane. (cf. sch. vet. 559a)

(ι)εἰσάξει δίκην πρὸ εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 782 Th1, Tr1/2)

(ι)ἐκστρέψας τοὺς ἦμετέρους ἱππέας μεταβαλὼν τὸ δράμα σύτω καλούμενον. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 554a-b Th1, Tr1/2)

(ι)ἐμπρέπον, διαφανὸς ὑπάρχων. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 605e AnRec Par)

(ι)ἐμφερθῆς, ὀμοιος. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 502 Th1)
93r 2
ἐνέβαψεν, ἐνέβαλεν. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 150a AnRec RegParLbChalc)

93r 17
ἐνεοττοτροφήθης, ὡσπερ τις νεοτός ἔτραφης. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 999c Tr2)

93r 24
[ἐνεχαράσσα]σθαί, ἐνέχυρον ἕξ ἐμοῦ [λαβεῖν. In Aristophanes] (sch. nub. 35a Th2, Tr1/2)

93v 1
ἐνην τε καὶ νέαν δυοβος νομίνιμος. Aristophanes eandem diem per iocum nominat. (cf. sch. nub. 1223a Th1/2, Tr1/2) significat primam mensis. dicitur tamen aeolice ἐνην.

95r 1
ἐνταῦθα προ εἰς τούτο, ὡτι σύτως ὑπελάμβανες. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 1475 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

96v 8
ἐξαλίσσας, ἐκβαλὼν τῆς ἁμίλλης. ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀλλίζω τὸ συναθροίζω. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 32b Tr2)

96v 12
Aristophanes. ἐξαμαρτε, ἁμαρτίαν ποίησον. (sch. nub. 861a AnRec Chis)

98r 12
ἐξετεί σοι τραυλίσαντι, ἢγουν ἕξ ἐτῶν ὡς τι παρακεκομένως εἰπόντι. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 862a-b Tr2)

98v 1
ἐξημβλωκας, abortiisti, mordaciter in Socratem dicit Aristophanes nam ὁμβλόματα, ἀμβλωθρίδια, εκτρώματα dicuntur abortivi. (cf. sch. nub. 139c α-β AnRec)

101r 21
Aristophanes. ἐπανενεγκεῖν, θέλε ἀναβιβάσειν τὸν λόγον. (sch. nub. 1080 Tr2)

101v 17
Aristophanes. ἐπασκόν, μετερχόμενος. (sch. nub. 1025 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

102v 3
ἐπέστειλε, προσέταξε. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 608c Th1, Tr1/2); ἐπέχθη, ἐπέλεχθη. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 1356b Th1/2, Tr1/2)

102v 6
ἐπέχω, τὸ κολόῳ apud Aristophanem, καὶ τὸ παρέχω, παρὰ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ ταυτοσήμανται εἰσι. (cf. sch. nub. 1382b Th1/2, Tr1/2)

102v 12
ἐπήρατε, παρακίνησατε. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 1457 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

104r 2
Aristophanes. ἐπί μὲν θάτερα, ἦτοι ἐπὶ τὰ ἄριστερά μέρη. (sch. nub. 1108b Th1/2, Tr1/2)
105v 11
Aristophanes. ἐπιμεινάντων, pro ἐπιμηνάτωσαν (sch. nub. 196b AnRec Ba(m'')) ἢ καρτερησάτωσαν. (sch. nub. 196b AnRec ChisRegParlChalc)

108r 16
ἐπιτηδευής, ἦτοι μετέχη. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 1015 Tr2)

110v 25
Aristophanes. ἐρεβοδιώσασιν ὑπὸ τὸν Τάρταρον, ἔρευνόσι καὶ ἐξετάζουσι τὰ ὑπὸ τὸν Τάρταρον, τὸν ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν κατότατον τόπον. (cf. sch. nub. 192a-c Tr2)

112r 15
Aristophanes. ἐσκοπεῖσθε τὴν ἔδραν, τὰς στηρίξεις, οἱ δὲ αἰσχρῶς τούτο νοοῦσιν. (sch. nub. 1507b Tr2)

112v 17
Ar(istophanes). attice ἔσχων p(ro) ἔσχισα. a σχάυ. unde est σχάξω, ut χλωδ χλοάζω, χνωδ χνοάζω. (cf. sch. nub. 409f Tr2)

112v 26
ἐτεὸν, ἀληθῶς. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 35b Th2, Tr1/2; 93 Th2, Tr1/2)

114r 24
ἐὕθο τοὐϕροσυγίου. In Aristophane. (Nub. 162). p(ro) ἔως [supra εὕθο scriptum]. (sch. nub. 162b T2, Tr1/2)

116v 18
Aristophanes. εὐπτάρων, ἑνδόξων (sch. nub. 800a AnRec Par), εὐγενῶν (sch. nub. 800a Th1/2, Tr1/2)

117r 4
καὶ σεσημενός. εὐρὸς γὰρ ὁ σκόληξ. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 44b Tr1/2)

117v 1
Aristophanes. εὐσωματεί, εὖ ἔχει τοῦ σώματος. καὶ σφριγῇ, ἀκμάζει. (cf. sch. nub. 799c-d)

119r 24
Aristophanes. ἔφλα μ. κασπόδει. κάπνιγε κάπετριβεν (Nub. 1376), pro ἐπληττε, ἐν τῇ γῇ ἐκύλιε, ἱφανίζειν, συνέτριβεν. (sch. nub. 1376a-c Tr2)

119v 12
Aristophanes. ἐχρησάμην, ἐδανεισάμην. (sch. nub. 22d AnRec; cf. 22d Th2, Tr1/2)

120v 23
ζυγωτι εἰσὶν οἱ ὑποβαλλόμενοι τῷ τοῦ ἄρματος ζυγῷ ἱπποι. σαπφόρα τε, οἱ ἔχοντες περὶ τὸν μηρόν τὸ σίγμα κεχαραγμένον. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 122b Tr2)
120v 26
ζυγώθρισον, ἐξέτασον, ἐρεύνησον (sch. nub. 745d AnRec ParHo), σκόπησον ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τοῦ ζυγοῦ, (sch. nub. 745 Tr2) ἢ ζυγοστάτησον. (745f AnRec) Aristophanes.

121v 7
ἡ ἢ, ἐπιτιμητικῶν. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 105a AnRec ChisCrHo)

121v 13
ἥδι πρὸ ἡδ. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. nub. 212a AnRec)

122r 19
ἡλιαία τὸ δικαστήριον τοῦτο ὄνομασται διὰ τὸ ύπαίθριον εἶναι καὶ τῷ ἡλίῳ βάλλεσθαι. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 863b Tr2)

124r 8
ἥρωναι πρὸ ἡρωίναι, ἦτοι ἡρωίδες. (sch. nub. 315a Th2, Tr1/2 + cf. CrVt)

124r 15
In Aristophane. ἔγο ἢττον λόγος (Nub. 1038). ὅτι ὁ ἀντιλέγων πρὸς μείζονα αὐτοῦ ἀντιλέγει, μείζον δὲ ὁ νόμος καὶ τὸ δίκαιον τοῦ ἀδίκου. διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως ἢττον ἐκλήθη. (sch. nub. 1038 Tr2)

126r 7
θεοσέπτος, θεῖος ἢ ἀπὸ θεοῦ ὀρμημένος. Aristophanes (cf. Ar. Nub. 292, schol. mss. vacat)

126v 8
Aristophanes. αἱ θέσεις, αἱ καταβολαῖ τῶν τόκων. (sch. nub. 1191 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

127v 5
θεομάτων, παρατέλευτον. In Aristophane (sch. nub. 1103a Tr2)

127v 14
Aristophanes. θουριομάντεις, θουριῶν τόπος, ἐνθα πρῶτον οἱ μάντεις εὑρήθηται. (sch. nub. 332a Tr2)

127v 19
Aristophanes. θαυσαντυγες, αἱ θαυύσασαι τὰ άρματα, ἦτοι ἀπολέσασαι. (sch. nub. 1264b Tr2)

128r 22
Aristophanes. θυαλλίς κυρίως ὁ τοῦ φωτελίου σπινθήρ. καταχρηστικός καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ φωτέλιον. (sch. nub. 59b Th2, Tr1/2)

128v 15
Aristophanes. ὁ θύμβρος, εἴδος βοτάνης. (cf. sch. nub. 421c Th2, Tr1/2)

129r 26
Aristophanes. ἰατταῖα ἰατταία pro φεῖ. (sch. nub. 707 AnRec)

130r 7
ἵέναι, πέμπειν. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 1494 Th2, Tr1/2)
130r 18
ιεροστ χαρείσαι, ἦτοι τόμασιν εὐθραυσθεῖσα. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 274c, ε Tr2)

131v 6
ἲν' ἄν, ὅπου. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 1233a Th2, Tr1/2)

132r 19
Aristophanes. ἰππονώμαν ἤλιον, τόν τούς ἵππους κινοῦντα. (sch. nub. 571 Tr2)

132r 25
Aristophanes. ἱσασιν, γινώσκουσιν. (cf. sch. nub. 1185a Tz)

133r 22
ἐπιτέον, ἕξιον ἐστὶ πορευόμεναι. In Aristophane (sch. nub. 131a Th2, Tr1/2). ἵτος, ὄρμητικός. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 445 Th2, Tr1/2)

133v 20
Aristophanes. κάγχρος γυναίκ' ἀλοῦσαν (Nub. 1358), ἦτοι κριθὰς περφυμένας ἀλήθουσαν. (sch. nub. 1358a-b Tr1/2)

134r 25
καθεσμένον, κατακεχαλασμένον. καθήμεν, τὸ καταχαλό. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 538c AnRec). καθέδραμι. κλείσαιμι. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 751a Th2, Tr1/2). καθέλομεν, καταβαίσαμι. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 750 Tr1/2)

134v 4
Aristophanes. καθηστότων, ἐνισταμένων, πολιτευμένων. (sch. nub. 1400 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

137r 1
Aristophanes.
καλάμῳ λευκῷ [ἵδιον ἢ τὸν Διοσκοῦρον] στεφανοῦσθαι καλάμῳ. [λιτὸς δὲ υπός] ὁ στεφανὸς καὶ ἀπέριττος. (sch. nub. 1006 Tr2)

138v 1
Aristophanes. κάπανηλ' ἦτοι δυνάμενος ἀπατήσει. (sch. nub. 729b AnRec Par). κάπιστήσει, μαθήσῃ. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 991a Th1/2, Tr1/2)

138v 26
Aristophanes. τῶν Καρκίνου τίς δαίμόνων. τινὲς φασίν ὅτι τῶν παίδων ὄψιλεν εἰπεῖν. Καρκίνου γὰρ παῖδες τρεῖς. Ξενοκλῆς. Ξενότιμος καὶ Δημότιμος, καὶ οἱ μὲν ἦσαν χορευταί. Ξενοκλῆς δὲ τραγῳδίας ποιητής. ταῦτα οὖν Ξενοκλέους ἔστιν ἐκ Λικυμίου. ὑπὸ Ἀλκμήνης λεγομένα. [τοῦ Λικυμίου] ὑπὸ τοῦ Τηπολέμου ἀνηρμένου. ὁ Παλλαῖς, δς μ' ἀπόλεσας. [διὸ καὶ ἐπήγα]γε. τί δὲ σε Τηπολέμου ποι' ἀργασταί; (cf. sch. nub. 1261b Tr1-c Tr2)

140v 9
Aristophanes. καταδαρθῆσθαι, κομῆσαι καὶ κυρίος δὲ ἐπὶ δερμάτων κεῖσθαι (cf. sch. nub. 38 Tr1/2). δρό το κομίσαι. ἐς οὔ δρίνθο. ἀρίστος β ἔδραθον, καὶ κατὰ μετάθεσιν ἔδαρθον. (cf. sch. nub. 38c AnRec)
141ρ 26
κατακλιθείς καὶ ἄττικῶς ἦ ἐν ἀδρίστῳ, δευτέρῳ, κατακλινείς. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. nub. 694c Tr2)

146ν 3
tὸ κατ’ ἐνόπλιον εἶδος ἔστὶ ῥυθμοῦ, ὃ ὄργοντο σείοντες τὰ ὀπλα. ἔστι δὲ ὃ ἐν ἡμιολίῳ. ὃ δὲ ῥυθμὸς κροὐσμάτος εἶδος κατὰ δάκτυλον ὃ χρῆνται οἱ αὐλητικοί. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. nub. 651b Tr1/2)

148Βν 20
κεστρεύς, ὁ κέφαλος. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 339a Tr2)

149ρ 12
κεχόρευται, πέπεκται. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 1510c Th1/2, Tr1/2)

149ν 2
Κηκε[δου], οὗτος παλαιός ποιητής διθυραμβοποιός. (sch. nub. 985a Th1/2, Tr1/2)

150ρ 23
ὁ κινούμενοι, ὁ συνουσιαζόμενοι. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 1101 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

150ν 10
cιχλίζειν, ἀτάκτως γελάν. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 983b Th1/2, Tr1/2)

151ν 4
tὴν κλησιν, τὴν ἐγκλητευσιν (sch. nub. 1189 Th1/2, Tr2). Aristophanes. ἢ κλησιν ἢ χαύνωσιν ἀναπειστηριάν. (Nub. 875)

153ν 1
cολετρώσ’ αἰει. κατὰ τοῦ κόλου τύπτουσι. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 552b AnRec Par)

154ν 6
Aristophanes. κοππατίαν ὕππον, ἐν ὧ κεχάρακται τὸ κ. (sch. nub. 23b Tr1/2)

155ρ 1
κόρδας, ἢ ὄρχησις ἢ ὃ γέλως. Aristophanes. κόρδας ἐγκυσθέν, ἦτοι εὐτερπῆ ὄρχησιν εἰσήγαγετο. (cf. sch. nub. 540a-b Th1/2, Tr1/2)

155ν 12
Aristophanes. κοτάβων, παιγνίων τινῶν ἐν συμποσίοις γενομένων (sch. nub. 1073c Tr2)

156ν 14
ἐπειδή, εἰ κρέμαιο γε. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 870b Th1, Tr1/2)

157ρ 7
κρίνεσι στεφανοῦς πρὸ κρίνους. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 911b AnRec; cf. 911b Tr2)

157ρ 11
καὶ παλαιστοῦ αἰγινίτου ὅνομα. In Simonide. unde, ἐπαίξαθ' ὁ Κρῖς οὐκ ἀεικέως. (cf. sch. nub. 1356a Tr2)
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157r 23
Aristophanes. κρόνιππος, μέγας μωρός. ός καὶ ἵπποβίνος, ὁ μέγας πόρνος. (sch. nub. 1070c Tr2)

158r 22
κυδοῦδοπαν, συγχείν. ταράττειν, ἀνατρέπειν. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 616c AnRec)

159r 26
κύρβις. νόμμιος. πολυλόγος. νόμων πλήρης. Aristophanes (cf. sch. nub. 448a Tr1/2).

159v 10
κομαστῆς, ὁ μέθυσσος. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 606a AnRec ParCr Chalc)

159v 12
Aristophanes. κωλιάδος γενετυλλίδος. ἀνήρ τις φθείρας κόρην ἐκ τῶν κόλων ἦτοι τῶν ποδῶν ἐκρεμίσθη, καὶ λυθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἔρθων ἰδρύσατο, κωλιάδος ἀφροδιτῆς ἐπονομάζας. γενετυλλίς ἐκλήθη, ὡς γενέσσεως αἰτία. (sch. nub. 52?: vacat mss.)

160v 10
λακκόπρωκτε, εὐφύπρωκτε. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 1330 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

163r 2
quare? [ἡ με]ιούσα τὸ βλέπειν. (sch. nub. 327d AnRec) ἐστὶ δὲ λα ἐπιτατικὸν μορίων. (cf. sch. nub. 327d AnRec) λήμα, δὲ τὸ φρόνημα poetice (e.g. sch. nub. 457b Tr2).

163v 6
Aristophanes. τὴν λίθον. meridie aestatis ponitur his lapis ad solem et ubi concaluerit radiis, apponitur ὡς κοίνως λεγομένη ἵσκα et sic mirabiliter ignis accenditur. (cf. sch. nub. 768d Tr2)

165Br 1
Aristophanes. ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ ἀνεδόθησαν τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ θερμᾶ ὑδάτα, ἰνα λυθήται. ἐποίησε δὲ ἀναδόθηναι Ἀθηνᾶ δεξιομενή αὐτὸν διὰ τοῦ ἄθλους. ἐκαλοῦντο δὲ Ἡράκλεια θερμὰ. καὶ Πεισανδρὸς τὸ ὅν θερμοπύληθησα θεᾶ γλαυκόπις Ἀθήνη ποιεῖ θερμὰ λουτρᾶ παρὰ ῥημίνι θαλάσσης. (sch. nub. 1051 Tr1/2) θήκη ἄγγειον.

165Br 8
Aristophanes. ἐξ λοφεῖον στρογγύλον (sch. nub. 751 sch. vet.; cf. 751b AnRec)

165Bv 5
λυσανίας, λυσῆρ. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 1163 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

166r 26
Aristophanes. μαθήσεται. γνώσεται. (sch. nub. 886 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

167v 9
Aristophanes. μαρικάν. τὸ δράμα ἐν ὧ τὸν Ἄρψβολον Ἀυπόλεις ἐκομφόδει, Μαρικᾶς ἐκαλέϊτο. (sch. nub. 553a Th1, Tr1/2)

173v 11
In Aristophane ἰκανός (sch. nub. 1510d Th1/2, Tr1/2)
174r 6
Aristophanes. μηλολόνθην χρυσοκάνθαρον. ζωφιών τι ἐστὶ ή μηλολόνθη χρυσίζουν κανθάρῳ ὄμιον. δ ἐδεσμούντες οἱ παιδεῖς λίνῳ εἰς ἀέρα ἐκπεπανύουσιν. λέγεται δὲ δῶτως ἀπὸ τοῦ τήν ὄνθον κατασκευάζειν εἰς σχῆμα μήλου. (sch. nub. 763b, d Tr2) σημαίνει δὲ καὶ εἴδος ἄνθους.

174r 11
Aristophanes. μήλῳ βληθεῖς, ἦτοι ἔρωτι. ἐπεὶ τὸ μῆλον Ἀφροδίτης ἱερὸν. (sch. nub. 997a Tr1/2)

174v 4
οἱ Ἀττικοὶ δῶτο δήρουν τὸν μήνα, λέγοντες πρῶτον ἱσταμένου, δευτέρα ἱσταμένου, μέχρι τὸν δέκα. εἶτα μία ἐπὶ δέκα, δύο ἐπὶ δέκα. μέχρι τῆς ἑννέας καὶ δεκάτης, τὴν δὲ εἰκοστὴν ἔλεγον μεγάλην εἰκάδα. εἶτα ἀναποδίζοντες τὸν ἀριθμὸν, τὴν μὲν εἰκοστὴν α, δεκάτην ἔλεγον φθίνοντος. τὴν κβ, ἑννάτην φθίνοντος. τὴν κγ, όγδόην. καὶ καθεξής δυτῶς, τοῦ φθίνοντος προστιθέντος. ἦτοι ἐβδομή. ἐκτ. πέμπτη. τετάρτη. τρίτη. καὶ δευτέρα ἦτοι κθ. εἶτα τὴν λ ἐννυν καὶ νέαν ἔλεγον. ἐπεὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τέλος τε καὶ ἀρχὴν ὡς τῆς σελήνης ἀριθμοῦμενος μὴν ἐξεῖ. πέμπτη κκ. τετάρτα κκ. τρίτη κκ. δευτέρα κκ. (cf. sch. nub. 1131c Th1/2, Tr1-d Tr2) ἐννυν τε καὶ νέα ἀρχημνια (sch. nub. 1134c Tr1/2).

175r 17
Aristophanes. μύλοκος δζων, βοτάνα οὔτω καλουμένη πρέπουσα στεφάνῳ. (sch. nub. 1007a Tr2)

177r 10
τοῖς ἑλαίοις ἀπέλθης, δράμα. Aristophanes. ὅπω τοῖς μορίας ἀποθρέξεις. ἤτηθεὶς τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς Ποσειδῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἑλαίας ἐπιδιείξει, ἔπεμψε τὸν ὕδων αὐτοῦ, ταῦτιν ἐκτεμεν. ὃ δὲ ἀνατελαὶς τὸν πέλεκου ταύτης μὴν ἱστοχίζῃ. τὸν δὲ πόδα αὐτοῦ πλήξας, ἐτελεύτησε. καὶ οὕτω μορία ἢ ἑλαία ἐκλήθη, ως μόρου παρεκτικ. ἢ δὲ ἢ ἄκαδημία, σχολεῖον τι ἐν Ἀθηναίας, ἑλαίαις καὶ ἄλλοις τισὶ δένδρεσι κατάσκιον. (sch. nub. 1005c Tr2)

178r 16
Aristophanes. μυρρίνη λαβόντα. ἐν ἀισχύλῳ δράματι, εὑρήται τις μυρρινοφόρος δῶον. οἱ δὲ, ὃτι μυρρίνη φέροντες ἕδον τά ἀισχύλου, ὀσπερ τά Ὀμήρου μετὰ δάφνης. (sch. nub. 1364 Tr1/2)

179v 17
νειδὸν, τὸ νειποτείν. νειδόν, τὸ ἀροτριάν. In Aristophane (cf. sch. nub. 1117a Th1, Tr1/2)

179v 25
νενόμιστο. νενομοθετημένον ἦν. κατὰ νόμους ἐπράττετο. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. nub. 962b Th1/2, Tr1/2)

181v 12
νόμισμα, τὸ νόμιμον ἔθος et moneta. unde ludens Aristophanes introductum respondentem quendam σιδαρέους. et dixit doricē, κομιοῦ δούν byzantios q(uia) vili et minuta moneta utebantur. (cf. sch. nub. 249c AnRec Lb (mrg), 249d AnRec HoBa(m4))

183v 12
ξυνοφρήσην, ἦτοι τοῖς ήπποις. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 1302c AnRec Par)

183v 15
ξυέχω, σωφήγην. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. nub. 966b Th1/2, Tr1/2)
183v 19
Aristophanes. ἐςτὶς, -ιδος. εἴδους ἱματίου πορφυροῦ, ἐν ὦ οἱ άθληταὶ διὰ μέσης τῆς πόλεως ἐπόμευεον. ἦ τὸ ἰδιοτικῶς λεγόμενον σωσάνιον, ὡς σοίζον τους ἄνδρας. (cf. sch. nub. 70c Tr1/2)

186r 14
tὸ ὄμοι καὶ ὄμοι ποτὲ μὲν ἐπ’ εὐφροσύνης λέγεται, ποτὲ δὲ ἐπὶ λύπης. Aristophanes (cf. sch. nub. 773c Tr1/2)

189r 11
ἐν Αἰόλῳ δράματι, πεποίηκεν Εὐρυπίδης Μακαρέα τὸν παῖς Αἰόλου, φθείροντα Κανάκην τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ. ἐπί παρ’ Ἀθηναίων ἐξεστὶ γαμεῖν τάς ἕκ πατέρων ἀδελφᾶς, εἰς αὐξήσιν δὲ τοῦ κακοῦ, τὴν ὀμομηχείαν προσέβηκεν. εἶτα εὐφυῶς ἐσχετάσθησαν ἐπάγων τὸν ἀλεξίκακον, ήδιον δὲ Ἰρακλέος, τὸ ἐπίθετον. (sch. nub. 1371c Tr2)

191r 26
Aristophanes. ὄποτεροι πλείος, ὁποῖοι εὐρύπρωκτοι, ἦ οὖ. (sch. nub. 1096 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

192r
ὁρεχθείν, κινηθῆναι πρὸς ὅργην. In Aristophane. (sch. nub. 1368 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

195v 23
οὐδ’ ὅλωσων, οὔδ’ ὄτι οὐ διδακαζόμενη. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. ran. 527; sch. nub. 733c AnRec; sch. plut. 476; sch. acharn. 543; Plut. 457.)

197v 12
Aristophanes. μέλλων ὀφλήσειν. δοῦναι ἢ καταδικασθήναι. (cf. sch. nub. 777a AnRec; cf. 777a Tr2)

198r 24
Aristophanes. ὀψοφαγεῖν, ὄψιν ἐσθίειν καὶ δείπνοις πολυτελέσι χρήσθαι. (sch. nub. 983a Th1/2, Tr1/2)

200r 10
πανδελείοις, ψυχρόποις, κακοῖς. (sch. nub. 924c AnRec ParHo) alibi ὡς ὁ πανδελέτιος ἦσθε. Aristophanes. (vacat sch. mss.)

200r 23
παννυξίζειν, ἀγρυφών διαβιβάζειν. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 1069 Tr1/2)

201v 22
παραθέντων, ἦτοι παρατιθέτωσαν εἰς ἐσθίασιν. Aristophanes (cf. sch. nub. 456 Th2, Tr1/2)

204r 1
παρατεταίται, ἦτοι ἐκτετάται ἐξήλωτα. In Aristophane. ἀντὶ τοῦ στενὴ καὶ ἐπιμήκης ἑστὶ (cf. sch. nub. 212b AnRec ChisRegPar). λαμβάνεται δὲ ἐπὶ ἀνεξήςας τῶν φόρον. παρετάθη, τοῖς τέλεσι δήλωσιν. (sch. nub. 213a AnRec ChisPar)

204v 16
παρεῖλκυσεν. ἔς τοῦ θέατρον παρῆγαγε (cf. sch. nub. 553b Th1/2, Tr1/2)
209r 26
οὐ μόνον τὸ πάσχειν ἐπὶ τῶν πασχόντων τι λέγεται. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ποιοῦντων καὶ γὰρ ὁι ποιοῦντες τρόπον τινα καὶ ἀυτοὶ πᾶσχονται πάθος ἀυτὸ τὸ ποιεῖν. τὰ οὖν κάρδαμα τῆς τῶν παρακείμενων ἀντίκης βοτανῶν ὑγρότητα εἰς ἑαυτὰ ἔλκοντα ἔηρας ἀυτὰς καταλείπει. καὶ ἔστιν τοῦτο ἀυτῶν πάθος (sch. nub. 234 Th2, Tr1/2)

209r 1
πεπόθητα, ἦτοι μετέωρος γέγονε, κούφη γίνεται. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. nub. 319 Th2, Tr1/2; cf. 319b AnRec Par)

209v 26
Aristophanes. περιοδοῦ νῦν ἐμοί. ἦτοι συνθήκην δός περὶ τοῦτον. εἰμὶ ὅτως ἐχει δός πρόστιμον. ἦτοι ὑπόδεικνυ μορφήμου γενόμε. (cf. sch. nub. 644a Tr2; cf. 644a AnRec Par)

212v 13
tὸ περιφρονώ διπλοσήμαντόν ἔστι, καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ περισσοπά, καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ περιφρονώ. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. nub. 225b Tr2, Tr1/2; 225b sch.vet.)

213r 5
Aristophanes. περισκή, εἰδός δένδρου. καὶ ὁ καρπὸς μῆλα περισκά, τὰ λεγόμενα βερήκκοκα. ὅθεν καὶ τὸ περίφροναν ὕθηκεν. ἔστι καὶ εἰδός ὑποδήματος. ὅθεν τὸ ὑπολύσας. ὑπολύσ ὅ, τοὺς πόδας τῶν ὑποδημάτων ἀπογυμνώ. (cf. sch. nub. 151d AnRec)

213v 10
Aristophanes. σώφρον ὁ Πιλέως ἐγένετο καὶ θεοφιλής. Ἀστυδαμείας δὲ τῆς Ἀκάστου θυγατρός ἔρασθέντας αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ δυνηθήτης πείσαι, ἀλλὰ διαβολὴ χρησιμένη ἐκ τοῦτο πρὸς τὸν Ἀκαστὸν, οὕτως μαθὼν εἰς ἐρήμιαν αὐτόν ἄχει. καὶ γυμνόςας παντὸς ὀπλὸ ἀφήκεν εἰσώ, εἰ δικαίους εἰς, σωθήσει. ώς δὲ ἐμελλέν ὑπὸ θηρίων διαφθορῆσαι, μάχαραν αὐτῷ οἱ ἐχαρίσαντο ἡραστότευκτον δὲ Ἐρμοῦ. καὶ οὕτως τὸν κίνδυνον ἔφυγε. δὲ ἦς καὶ τοὺς Λασίθας καταπολέμησαν. ἥξιοτα δὲ δὲ ἀρέτην, θνητὸς ὁν θεα συμμιγνη τῇ Θετίδ. τότε δὲ φασίν ἡράθη αὐτοῦ Ἀστυδαμεία. ὦτ πρὸς θήραν τοῦ καλυδονίου ἐξελέθην κάπρον, τόν Ἐνυφτον ἄκον ἀπέκτεινε. καὶ πρὸς Ἀκαστὸν εἰς Ἡλλοκὸν ἀφίκετο καθαρίζει τοῦ φόνου κατά τὸ ἔθος βουλόμενος. (sch. nub. 1063e Tr2) φασίν ὑπὸ τοὺς γίνομενους οὐκ Πιλέως παῖδας ἡ Θέτας λαχόσας περίσκεια τὸ θνητόν αὐτῶν σῶμα, βουλόμενη ἀθανάτος αὐτῶς ποιεῖν. καὶ πολλοὺς ἔκαυσε. καὶ τὸν Ἀχιλλέα οὖν τεκουσα, ἐπέδηκεν εἰς τὸ πορ. καὶ γνῶς ὁ Πιλέως, ἐπέδηκεν. ἦ δὲ λυπηθέτα, ἐχωρίθη αὐτῷ. ἐναύθα οὖν βουλόμενος διαβάλλειν τὸν Πηλέα διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι αὐτῶν φησιν ύβριστήν, ἀπολυποὺς ὀχέτο. (sch. nub. 1068 Tr2)

214v 13
Aristophanes. οἱ πίσινοι, οἱ ϑαρροῦντες. (sch. nub. 949e AnRec)

219r 10
πολλοῦ, ἐκ πολλοῦ χρόνου. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 915a Tr2)

219r 26
πολυπρατον, πάνω ἐπέραστον Aristophanes (sch. nub. 301b Th2, Tr1/2)

221r 24
Aristophanes. πόσος ὁρίμοις ἔλα τὸ πολεμιστήρια (Nub. 28). δέον οὕτω εἰπεῖν. πόσος ὁρίμοις ἔλανε τὰ ἀμιπητήρια; ἀντὶ τοῦ πόσοι ὁρίμοι εἰσὶ τῆς ἁμύλλης. ὁ δὲ ἐπείδη καθουντος τοῦτ' ἔλαγε, πολεμιστήρια, εἰπεῖν. ὁ γὰρ νοῦς τῶν ὀργάων ἀργοῦντων, τῷ ὄπισθ' εἰκῇ φέρεται. (sch. nub. 28a Th2, Tr1/2)
222r 19
Aristophanes. πράττῃ μ', ἀπαίτεις, [supra scriptum:] pro eic (sch. nub. 246b Tz, 246a sch. vet.)

222v 13
Aristophanes, μὴ πρή, μὴ ἀγόραζε, μὴ ἀγοράς (cf. sch. nub. 614a Tr2; cf. 614a AnRec)

222v 15
Aristophanes. εἶ πριάμνος, εἶ μισθώσας, ἦ ἀγοράς (cf. sch. nub. 749a Th2, Tr1/2; 749b AnRec)

223r 18
Aristophanes. προβαλέσθαι, προτείνειν. (sch. nub. 973b Th1/2, Tr1)

223v 6
πρόβολος ἐμός, φύλαξ δίκην πύργου. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 1161b Tr2)

225r 5
προϊκα, κατὰ χάριν. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 1426a Th1/2, Tr1/2)

225r 10
προενά, προοδόναι. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 1214e Tr2)

225v 26
προμαθεῖν, προοδιαχήναι. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 966a Th1/2, Tr1/2)

229r 4
Aristophanes. κἂν προσκαταθεῖν (Nub. 1235), καὶ προσκαταθεῖν ἂν τριόμβολον, ὡστε ὀμόσα νῇ Δία (sch. nub. 1235 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

229r 8
Aristophanes. προσκεκλήσεσθαι γέ μοι (Nub. 1277). ἐγκαλεθῆσεται γέ μοι δοκεῖσ (sch. nub. 1277 Th2, Tr1/2)

230v 5
Aristophanes. πρὸς ταῦτα, ἦτοι ὅ σοι νῦν περὶ τῶν ἀλεκτρυόνων εἴπον. (sch. nub. 1433a Th1/2, Tr1/2)

231v 7
προτενθαί, οἱ πρὸ καιροῦ τῶν προσφαγίων ἀπογενόμενοι. οίτε προαρπάζοντες καὶ μεταπεράσκοντες πλείονος, οὓς νῦν μεταβόλους καλοῦμεν. (Suda P 2869) apud Aristophanem. οἱ λαίμαργοι (sch. nub. 1198 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

231v 12
προϋνδέθεσαν, ἐλαμαργησαν, προὕλαβον. (sch. nub. 1200 Th1)

232r 22
Aristophanes. προχοῆ, ή τοῦ ὑδατος κίνησις. πρόχοος δὲ τὸ ξεστίον. (sch. nub. 272b AnRec) προχοῆς, ήτοι προχύσεσιν, ἄκταις (sch. nub. 272a Th2, Tr1/2), ὑδάτων, ήτοι ἀπὸ ὑδάτων (vacat sch. mss.). προχύσει, ήτοι ἀγγείος ξεστίος. (sch. nub. 272c Tr1)

232v 8
τὰ πρωτανεία, τὰς ἐκταγάς. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 1136a Tr2)
234v 16
πυρπολεῖ, καὶ ἐστὶ. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 1497 Tr2)

235v 22
ῥαφανιδοθῇ γε, ἢτε μοιχής τις ἐάλω, ἀνασπάμενος ταῖς τε ὑπογαστρίους καὶ τὰς τοῦ πρωκτοῦ τρίχας. τέφραν πυρὶ ξένουσαν ἐπάττετο. εἰσώθουν δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν τοῦ πρωκτοῦ ὀπὴν ἐξὸλον εἰς ῥαφάνην ἐσχηματισμένον δ ὀ μεγίστης ἀτιμίας καὶ αἰσχύνης ἐστίν. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 1083 Tr2)

236r 24
ῥίγειν, ἐπὶ ψυχῆς, ῥίγουν δὲ ἐπὶ σώματος. Aristophanes (cf. sch. nub. 439a Tz)

237r 1
ῥοίβδος, ὁ διὰ πυρὸς καὶ ὑδάτος λεγόμενος ψόφος. Aristophanes. (cod. κτύπος supra scr.) (cf. sch. nub. 407b AnRec)

238r 22
σάμφορα τ(όν) ἵππον λέγει, διὰ τὸ ἔχειν τὸ σ ἐγκεχαραγμένον. (sch. nub. 1298c Tr2)

239r 9
Aristophanes. σειραφόρον, τὸν τοὺς χαλινοῦς φέροντα (sch. nub. 1300 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

240r 2
ἡτοι τὸν τῆς ῥοπῆς φλοιῶν (sch. nub. 881 Th1/2, Tr1/2). Aristophanes. κάκτων σιδίων βατράχους. (Nub. 881)

240v 10
Aristophanes. συναμαρακμένη, συνουσιαζομένη. σίνος γὰρ τὸ ἀλτοῦν (sch. nub. 1070a Tr2)

243v 26
σμήλη λέγεται, δι' οὗ οἱ σκυτεῖς, τὰ σκύτη, καὶ ἢ σμινή, ἢ δίκελλα. Aristophanes (cf. sch. nub. 1500a Tr2)

244r 9
Aristophanes. τοῖς σοροπηγοῖς τὴν μανίαν ἀυτοῦ φράσσω (Nub. 846). ἢτοι τοῖς νεκροθάπταις. θανατὸν γὰρ ἄεια πράττει. (sch. nub. 846 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

244r 16
Aristophanes. τὰ σοφὰ ταῦτα ἢ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔη νοστέον, ἢ δέον εἰπτεῖν, οὔπερ εἰςίν οἱ σοφοὶ ὀψωτοὶ ποιηταί. ὁ δὲ πρὸς οὐδέτερον ἔτρεψεν, ὡσπερ καὶ ἐν Βατράχῳς ποιεῖ λέγων οὐκοῦν ἔτερ' ἐστὶ κειμέλια. (sch. nub. 1370 Tr2)

244r 23
Aristophanes. ἄλλ' εἰ σπανίζεις ἄργυρίουμαι (Nub. 1285). εἰ στέρησιν ἔχεις. (sch. nub. 1285 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

246v 9
Aristophanes. στεμφυλα λέγονται τὰ ἀποπέσματα τῶν σταφυλῶν καὶ τῶν ἐλαίων (sch. nub. 45b Th2, Tr1/2)

196
248r 13
Aristophanes. στομάσεις, ὡς μεταφορὰ ἀπὸ τῶν μαχαιρῶν (sch. nub. 1108a Tr2)

248v 19
στρεβλοῦτε, κολάζητε. Aristophanes (cf. sch. nub. 620 Th1/2, Tr1/2)

248v 25
Aristophanes. άλλοις ἐμαυτῷ στρεφοδικήσαι (Nub. 434). άλλ' ἐκείνων ἐπιθυμῶ δηλονότι, ὡσα λυσιτελήσαι ἐμοὶ πρὸς τὸ διστρέψαι τὰς δίκας. (cf. sch. nub. 434a AnRec)

253v 17
Aristophanes. συμψήσαι, καθομαλίσαι τὴν κόνιν. ἐν ψάμμῳ γὰρ λεπτοτάτη ἐγγυμνάζοντο. (sch. nub. 975 Tr1/2)

261r 6
Aristophanes. σχασάμενος, ἀφείς. καταπαύσας, σχάσαι κυρίως ἔστι, τὸ σχίσαι τὴν κόπην τὸ ὑδρ ἐρέσσουσαν. καὶ Πίνδαρος, κόπαν ἡδὴ μοι σχάσαι. (sch. nub. 107b-c Tr1/2)

261r 9
Aristophanes. καὶ σχάσας τὴν φροντίδα. ἤτοι παύσας, χαλάσας, ἀφείς. (cf. sch. nub. 740b Th1/2, Tr1/2; cf. 740c AnRec Par)

261v 5
Aristophanes. Σωκράτης ὁ μήλικος. παρ’ ὅσον οἱ μήλιοι διεβάλλοντο ως ἄθεοι, ἀπὸ Διαγόρου. ως παρακαταθέμενοι τιν χρήματα καὶ τοῦτων ἀποστερηθεὶς, ὑπὸ λύπης ἐξεμάνη πρὸς ἀθεότητα. ἄλλοι δὲ φασί ως οὗτος ὁ Διαγόρας διδάσκαλος ἦν τοῦ Σωκράτους, ὃς ἐν πανδοχείῳ εὑρηθείς ποτὲ καὶ ξύλα μὴ εὐφόρον ἁγάμω Ὡρακλέους καθελὼν, καὶ εἰς πῦρ ἐμβαλὼν, "ἀγε ὁ Ὡρακλῆς" ἐφε τριακαδέκατον ἡμῖν ἐπιτέλεσον ἀθλον καὶ ἐγνησον τόν φακόν (sch. nub. 830 Tr2)

263r 7
Aristophanes. ἀπὸ ταρροῦ, ἤτοι καλαθίσκου. (sch. nub. 226 Th2, Tr1/2)

263v 16
Aristophanes. τεθνήξῃ, ἤτοι ἀπὸ τοῦ γέλωτος. (sch. nub. 1436a Th1/2, Tr1/2); Aristophanes. τέθριππον, ἄρμα (sch. nub. 1407 Th1/2, Tr1/2).

264r 26
tελῶ λέγεται τὸ πληρῶ, ἄφοι καὶ τέλος καὶ τελευτη ὁ θάνατος. τελῶ καὶ τὸ γένοιμα. τελῶ καὶ τὸ μυοῦμαι καὶ διδάκομαι. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 258 Eust.)

265r 10
Aristophanes. οἱ ἀρχαιότατοι τῶν Ἀθηναίων, τέττιγας χρυσοῦς ἐν τοῖς τῶν τριχῶν πλέγμασιν εἰχον. διότι οἱ τέττιγες μουσικοι ὄντες ἀνάκεινται τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι, ὄς ἦν πατρός τῇ πόλει θεός. (sch. nub. 984b Tr1/2)

265v 14
tέτροφας, κατέφαγες, κατεδαπάνησας. Aristophanes (cf. sch. nub. 858 Th1, Tr1/2; cf. sch. nub. 858c AnRec Par)
266r 26
Aristophanes. δυστυχήσαντα ύστερον πεποίηκε τὸν Τήλεφον Εὐριπίδης ἐν δράματι, πήραν ἔχοντα, καὶ προσαιτοῦντα. ἀντὶ γοῦν τοῦ εἰπόν "ἄρτους τρώγον" "πανδέλετείους γνώμας" εἰπε, διαβάλλον αὐτόν κατὰ ἄμφος, καὶ ός ἄτιμον καὶ ός πανούργον. ἐπὶ γάρ πανουργία διεβεβόθη τὸ Πανδέλετος. (sch. nub. 922 Tr2)

266v 11
tηροῦν ἔχον, φυλάσσαμι κρατὸν, κεκτημένος. Aristophanes (cf. sch. nub. 752 Tz; cf. sch. nub.752c AnRec; cf. 14d AnRec)

269r 22
τρασιάς, ἦτοι σανίδος, ἐν ἧ τὰ σύκα ταριχεῦσι πρὸς τὸν Ἥλιον, ἀπὸ τούτου δὲ τὴν ὑσμὴν δηλοῖ τὴν ἐκ τῶν σύκων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν τῶν τοιοῦτων γινομένην. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 50 Tr2). alibi. τρασία, τόπος ὅπου ψύγεται τὰ σύκα (sch. nub. 50b sch. vet). alibi. τρασιάς, ἦτοι ὑσοδύμας τυρῶν ἐπὶ (cf. sch. nub. 50a-d Tz)

269r 26
τραυλὸς ἐστίν, ὁ τὸ ρό ἄουν καὶ λέγων λ, ἐξ οὔ καὶ τραυλίζω ρῆμα (sch. nub. 862c Tr2)

270r 7
Aristophanes. ύ τρίβων, οὔκ ἔμπειρος (cf. sch. nub. 870b AnRec; sch. vesp. 1429), σὺ τρίβων, τριβόμενον καὶ ἡρανισμένος (sch. nub. 870b AnRec Par), ἢ ἐπιτρήθης ἄξιος. τριβολεκτράπελ' ἀντὶ τοῦ πανουργίας καὶ λόγων στροφάς. (sch. nub. 1003c Th1/2, Tr1/2)

271r 9
Aristophanes. ἢ τριττογένεια, ἐστίν εἶδος ὀρχήσεως ἢ καλεῖται ἐνόπλως. διὰ δὲ τὸ ἐεῖ τὴν Ἁθηνᾶν ταύτην τελείωσαι, Τριττογένεια κέκληται. τριττῷ γάρ ἢ κεφαλῆς παρ'Αἰολευκὴν. ἐγεννήθη δὲ ἢ Ἀθηνᾶ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ Διός. ἐτέλους δὲ ταύτην τὴν ὀρχήσιν, οἱ πρότερον μὲν ὑπολειμένοι καὶ τὴν ἀστίδα ἐν πλαγίῳ φέροντες, οἱ ύστερον δὲ ἐμπρόσθεν τῶν ποδῶν ἔφερον. (sch. nub. 989c Tr2)

273r 20
Aristophanes. ἢ ᾨδος ἢ ᾨδος λέγεται. Ἀμηρὸς δὲ οὔκ οἶδε τοῦνομα τούτο. ἀλλὰ ἑλέκτρος μὲν ἐστὶ παραύτῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀρχαιοῖς. (sch. nub. 768c Tr1/2)

275r 26
ἔσθεν ὑπανύστο, ἦτοι ἐκ πρώιας ὑπὸ τοῦ δικαστηρίου λυποῦντο. (cf. sch. nub. 1195b Th1, Tr1/2)

276r 4
ὑπένερθεν, ὑπὸ κάτω. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 977a Tr2)

277r 12
Aristophanes. ὑπέρτονον, ἱσχυράν, μεγάλην. (sch. nub. 1154f Th1/2, Tr1/2)

277r 19
κοινώς μὲν γενική, Ἀττικὸς δὲ αἰτιατική. ὡς τοὺς θεοὺς ὑπερφορνεῖς. Aristophanes. (Nub. 226)

281r 9
Aristophanes. ὑπόχρεως, ὁ ὑπὸ τὰ χρέα ὄν, ἦτοι ὑφειλέτης. (cf. sch. nub. 242b AnRec)
281v 19
Aristophanes. ὑφελοίατο, λάβοιεν. (sch. nub. 1199d Th1, Trl/2)

283r 3
φασιανοὶ, ἦπιοι τινες, φασιανικοὶ δὲ ὀρνιθές. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. nub. 109c Tr2)

284r 24
Aristophanes. τοῖς ἐμοῖς φύλοις, ήτοι ύμίν τοῖς λόγοις. (sch. nub. 957b Tr2)

286v 3
Aristophanes. παραμικρόν ὁφανίσθην. φρουράς ἄδων ὅλγον φρούδος γεγένησαι (Nub. 722).
παροιμία τὸ ἑρωήρας ἄδων ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγρυπνούντων καὶ φροντιζόντων πάνω λεγομένη. οἱ γὰρ ἐπιτραπέντες ἐν νυκτὶ τινὰ φυλακὴν, ἂνοεύσι, ἦν μῆ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὕπνου μαλακισθέντες, ἐκλίψωσιν ὁ φυλάσσουσιν. εἰκότως δʼ ἐνταῦθα ἡ παροιμία ἑλείφθη καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ κλίνῃ κείμενος, οὐκ ἐκομίστο (sch. nub. 721a Tr2)

287v 19
φωράσων, ήτοι κλέψων, ἄρευνήσων. Aristophanes. (sch. nub. 499b AnRec Par)

289v 17
Aristophanes. ὡςτε χανὼσαι καὶ ἀναπείσαι τοὺς ἀντιδίκους. (875d AnRec Par) χαύνωσιν ἀναπεισθηρίαν λέγει. ὅταν τοῦ ἀντιδίκου προβαλόντος λόγους πιθανοὺς εἰς τούναντιόν τις αὐτούς περιτρέψῃ, καὶ χαύνους καὶ ἀσθενεῖς ποιήσῃ διὰ τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ ἀναπείσας τοὺς δικαστὰς ὡς ἄρ’ ἀληθὴ λέγει (sch. nub. 875b Th1/2, Trl/2)

291r 15
Ar(scitophanes) χιονοβλάτητοι. ὑπὸ χίνον ἀεὶ βαλλομέναι. (sch. nub. 270c Th2, Trl/2)

291v 13
χοᾶς, εἶδος μέτρου οἰνηροῦ. λέγεται καὶ χοῦς. Aristophanes. ἀλλ’ ἐξένεγκαί μοι ταχέως οἶνου κοᾶς. καὶ εἰ μὲν χοᾶς ἀναγινόσκεις, ἐκ τοῦ χοῦ γέγονε. εἰ δὲ χοᾶς, ἐκ τοῦ χοεῦς, -έως, κατὰ ποιητικὴν ἄδειαν, ἀντὶ χοᾶς. (cf. sch. nub. 1238c Tr2)

292v 16
χρηματίζω δοτικὴ, τὸ ἀποκρίνομαι. τὰ χρήματα ἑνεχυράζομαι, ήτοι εἰς ἑνέχυρον αὐτὰ ἀφαιροῦμαι. εἰ γὰρ τὸ ἑνέχυρον ὃ ὁ δανειστὰς παρὰ τῶν δανειεξαμένων λαμβάνωσι, τρόπων τινὰ τὸ ἑνέχυρον αὐτὰ τὰ χρήματα εἰσέπν. ἦ τὸ "χρήματα" μὴ νοῆσῃ τὰ δανεισθέντα, ἀλλὰ ἀπλώς τὴν ἐνυπάρχοσαν αὐτῶν οὐσαίαν. χρήματα γὰρ καὶ τὰ πράγματα. πράγματα δὲ φαμεν, ιμάτα. σκεῦς. καὶ ἄλλα. λέγομεν δὲ καὶ χρήμα λόγον, καὶ χρήμα ἀρετής. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. nub. 241a Th2, Trl/2)

293r 6
Aristophanes. νῦν οὖν χρήσθων, ἦτοι χρήσθωσαν, ἦ ἑξέτωσαν (cf. sch. nub. 439b sch. vet.; cf. 439a Tz)

293r 7
Aristophanes. δανειστῶν χρήστων τε δυσκολωτάτων (Nub. 240; sch. nub. 240b-c sch. vet.)

293r 21
χυτρεοῦν, πύλινων. Aristophanes (sch. nub. 1474 Th1/2, Trl/2)
294r 16
χρωτίζεται, ἢτοι χρωματίζη. Aristophanes (cf. sch. nub. 516a Th1/2, Tr1/2).

295r 18
Aristophanes. ψήφισμα μακρόν, ἢτοι δικοραφίας μεγάλας καὶ ὑποθέσεων κρίσεις καὶ στροφάς. (sch. nub. 1019 Th1/2, Tr1/2) ψηφίσματ' οὐ γράφουσιν (Nub. 1429), ἢτοι οὐκ ἔχουσι δικαστήρια καὶ κρίσεις, ὁσπέρ ἰμείς. (sch. nub. 1429 Tr2)

296r 1
Aristophanes. ψόφου πλέων, ἀσύστατον, στόμφακα κρημνοτοιόν (Nub. 1367). ἢτοι κόμπου καὶ κτύπου πλέων. ἀνίσον, μεγαλορρήμονα, σκληρολέκτην. (sch. nub. 1367a-d Th1/2, Tr1/2)

296r 4
Aristophanes. κατὰ ψυγείση, περιώρυσαν Περσικαί. ἢτοι θανοῦση (sch. nub. 151a Th2, Tr1/2) διευπώθησαν (sch. nub. 151b AnRec ChisPar), εἴδος ὑποδήματος (cf. sch. 151d AnRec), Περσικαί. ἢτοι ἐπηρεάσεις τῇ ψύλλῃ, ἀνεφώνησαν, ἔχασε τῆς ψύλλης. γελοίου χάριν ταύτ' εἰρήται πάντα. παίζων δὲ καὶ τῷ πόδε εἶρηκεν ἐπὶ τίς ψύλλης ἑνωκός. λέγεται γάρ ἐξ ἐχειν πόδας. (cf. sch. nub. 150 Tr1/2)

297v 19
ὅπως μὴ χάριτι δόξη νικᾶν. μηδὲ χάριτι τὴν ψήφιον φέρειν αὐτοὺς, ἀλλὰ ταῖς ἀληθείαις, προσέθηκε τὸ ὠφελεῖν ἐκ τῶν δικαίων (sch. nub. 1116b Tr2)

298r 1
ἡτοὶ δικαίως ὠφελῶ σ' ἐκ τῶν δικαίων. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. nub. 1116a Tr2)
V
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1r 1
ἀ ἐπίρρημα ἐκπλήξεως (sch. plut. 1052a/α sch.vet; 1052 Db Dv)

1r 12
ἀβίωτον. ἦτοι οὗ βιώσεως ἄξιον. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 969a sch. rec. r, Θ; 969 Db Θ P.)

4r 9
ἀγω λέγεται καὶ τὸ κλώ, ὧθεν κατεγὼς (cf. sch. plut. 545j sch. rec.; cf. 545 Db)

5v 26
ἀθάρα, ἀλευρον ἄνημενον. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 673d sch. vet.; 673 Db)

10r 19
ἀκρατείσθε. ἦγουν δύκην τράγων ὤρχεις λείπετε. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 295 Db P.; cf. 295c and 295f sch. rec. thPstr)

12r 24
ἀλός, κρατηθεῖς in Aristophane (sch. in plut. 168a Pstr). ἄλσιν' διασμυχθείς. καθαρθείς. ἀμης, -ητος. εἴδος πλακούντος (sch. plut. 999 Db; 999a sch. vet.)

13r 25
ἀμφιέσω, ἐνδόσω. In Aristophane (sch. plut. 936 Db Θ P.; 936a sch. rec. thPstr)

13v 1
In Aristophane. ἀναβάδθην, ἦγουν ἐκτεταμένως. et pedem habendo super pedem. (sch. plut. 1123c L, Barb3; 1123 Db P.) εἶ ἀναβλέψεις. ἦγουν ἀναβλέψεις. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 95b sch. rec. Cant42)

13v 17
ἀναγκάζομαι, τὸ βιάζομαι (sch. plut. 1028 Db; 1028b/β ChisLPar)

13v 26
ἀναθεῖς, ἀναβλίσας. In Aristophane (sch. plut. 69a sch. rec. CrPstr)
14r 1

14r 25
ἀναστήσισετο. ἑγερθ. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 453d sch. rec. rL; 453 Db P.)

15r 7
ἀνέσπασεν, συνέστειλεν. Aristophanes (cf. sch. plut. 691e sch. rec.; 691 Db P., Vict.)

20r 4
ἀντικρύς, φανερῶς καὶ ἀληθῶς. In Aristophane (cf. sch. plut. 328d sch. rec. pl. an.)

21v 8
καὶ ἀπικός ἀνύτω. τὸ τελειῶ. ἀνύειν, ἤγουν συντόμως ἐρχεσθαι. ἀνύω τὴν ὀδόν, ἀντὶ τοῦ σπουδάιος βαδίζω. In Aristophane (sch. plut. 607 Db Junt., P. Vict.; 607 sch. rec. rL, M)

23r 26
ἀπαρτί, ἀπηρτησμένος, τελείως. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 388a sch. rec. Pstr Mt, rL PaldVi,ΘV57)

25r 14
ἀπευγολημένοι τὰ αἰδοία δεικνύντες in Aristophane (sch. plut. 295b sch. rec. thPstr)

33r 12
ἀποφανὸν καὶ ἀποφήνω, ἀποδείξατο. in Aristophane (cf. sch. plut. 210a sch. rec. Par, V57; cf. sch. rec. 468c Ftr)

33r 26
ἀποφθέρει. μεταφθείρει (sch. nub. 789c AnRec Par) alibi μετὰ φθορὰς ἀπέρχεται. (cf. sch. nub. 789c AnRec ChisReg; cf. sch. plut. 598d sch. rec. ChisLPar) in Aristophane.

33v 10
ἀπόχρη. ἁρκετὸν ἐστι, μέλλων ἀποχρῆσαι. καὶ ἀποχρώσα δίκη, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἁρκετῆ ὑπάρχουσα. (cf. sch. plut. 484e sch. rec. ChisLReg.Barb5)

33v 19
ἀποψιμεσθὰ, ἀποσπογγίζωμεν τῶν πρωκτῶν. In Aristophane (sch. plut. 817b sch. rec. ChisPar,Rs; 817 Db P.)

34v 9
ἀφαγε πολλῶν, συμπέρασμα εἰρωνκών. in Aristophane (sch. plut. 546e sch. rec. tr; 546 Db Θ, P.)

37r 19
ἀρτιάζομεν, τὰ ἄρτια παίζομεν. In Aristophane. (cf. sch. plut. 816d sch. rec. thPsVat; 816 Db P.)
fortuitus. ὁ αὐτοπροσάρτητος, ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτὸς καὶ τοῦ μῶ τὸ ὅρμῳ. (sch. plut. 1190 Db P.; 1190a sch. rec. Par, N)

In Aristophane. αὖχμος, στέρησις, ξηρασία. (sch. plut. 839a sch. rec. thPstr and Mt,ChisLPar,MRs; 839 Db P.)

βάσκανος, ἐχθρά. In Aristophane. (cf. sch. plut. 571d sch. rec. th Ps,Reg)

βδέω, θεν βδελυρός καὶ βδελύττομαι. (cf. sch. plut. 693b sch. rec. ChisLPar,M,Ho; 693 Db P.)

ὑποκοριστικῶς, βιότιον. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 1165 sch. vet.; 1165 Db P., V)

In Aristophane.

τὸ δασιλῶς καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶς θύω, παρὰ τὸ βοῦ ἐπιτατικοῦ μορίου, ἢ κυρίως τὸν βοῦν θύω. ἐκάλουν δὲ τὴν ἐντελῆ θυσίαν ἐκατομβὴν, ἢν δὲ καὶ ἄλλη ἐντελῆς θυσία τριττὸς λεγομένη, ἢ ἐκ συὸς καὶ κριοῦ καὶ τράγου ἦν. (sch. plut. 819c sch. rec. Psr; 819 Db P.)

βούλευσα μὲν τὸ ἱδιον. βούλημα δὲ τοῦ ἱδιοσίου ἢ βουλή. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 493 Tz; cf. 493 Db)

γαλὴ ἢ κάτα. μυγαλὴ ἢ νυμφίτσα In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 693e sch. rec. rL; 693 Db P.)

γελῶ αἰτιατικῇ, καταγελῶ γενικῇ. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 880d sch. rec. ChisPar; 880 Db P.)

γνώναι δοκεῖ γνωσθῆναι, νομίζεται. In Aristophane (sch. plut. 49a-b sch. rec. Par,Rs,BaHo)

δαμονίως, δεξιῶς, ἐπειθεῖως, θαυμασίως. In Aristophane. (cf. sch. plut. 675c sch. rec. thPstr; cf. 675 Db Θ, P.)
60r 8
dειλάκρα, ἀθλία (cf. sch. plut. 973d sch. rec. M; 973 Db P.).

69r 15
dιὰ χρόνου. ἦτοι διὰ πολλοῦ. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 1055a sch. rec. pCantChisLPar,Barb3; 1055 Db P.)

69v 23
dιέξης, ἦτοι μερικὴν τινὰ ζωὴν εἶχες. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 906b sch. rec. Cr2LhMt,CangChisLVi,ΘBarb3)

73r 7
dοιδουξ, τὸ κοχλιάριτον. (sch. plut. 711b sch. rec. pl. an.; 711 Db Dv.)

73v 1
dούναι λόγου, διαλεχθήναι. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 467d sch. rec. thPsVat; 467 Db Θ, Dv., P.)

78r 15
ǞʑȵǍǣǍǏ antlrα,ΝțαȝʊȜȚıIJα,ΝattiἵiΝpὁὀuὀtΝpὄὁΝ. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 685a sch. rec. rL,Barb3; 685 Db P.)

79v 9
eιλημμένω, κεκρατημένω. In Aristophane. (cf. sch. plut. 455c sch. rec. pl. an.; 455 Db P.)

79v 18
eἰῃ ἦττονες, πρὸ ὑπάρχουσι νικώμενοι. In Aristophane. (cf. sch. plut. 363b sch. rec.)

80r 7
eἰρεσιώνην, ἦτοι στέφανον. In Aristophane. (cf. plut. 1054b sch. rec. Pstr; 1054 Db.)

81v 22
ἐίτα tripliçiter sumitur in Aristophane. pro μετὰ ταῦτα, pro ἀρα, et ἀργόν. (cf. sch. plut. 910c sch. rec. rL,Barb3; cf. 910. Db P.)

85v 4
ἐκνομιῶς ύπερβαλλόντως, ύπερφυώς, ύπερ τὸ νενομισμένον. (sch. plut. 981. Db. Paris.)

87v 15
ἄλλʼ ὀὐκ ἐκφορα, ἦτοι οὐ καλὸν ἐκφέρεσθαι ταῦτα. In Aristophane (sch. plut. 1138d sch. rec. rL,MN; 1138 Db P.)

89v 18
ἐλούμεν πρὸ ἐλούμεν κατὰ τὸ συγκοπήν ἄττικῶς. In Aristophane. (cf. sch. plut. 657b sch. rec. tr; 657 Db Br.)

89v 26
ἐμβάς καὶ ἐμβάδιον, τὸ κοινῶς καλύγιον, [εἴδος] ύποδήματος. In Aristophane, ἀπὸ τοῦ [ἐμβαίνειν]. (cf. sch. plut. 759a sch. rec.)
98r 22
Aristophanes. έξετρέποντο, μετεβάλλοντο, ἢ πρὸς ἐτέραν ὄδον ἐτρέποντο πόρρωθεν θεασάμενοι. (sch. plut. 837b sch. rec. PsLh + Pstr; 837 Db Θ)

98r 26
ἐὰν ἑνὸς λόγου, ᾧτοι ὁμοῦ. Aristophanes. (sch. plut. 760 sch. vet.)

98v 12
ἐξή, ὀδεία ὑπάρχει. Aristophanes. (sch. plut. 516b sch. rec. LParReg,Rs; 516 Db P.)

98v 14
ἐξηζάτην, ἐξηλθον. Aristophanes. (sch. plut. 733 Db. RΘDv P.)

100r 11
Aristophanes. ἐξωμιμάτωται. λελάμπρυνται κόρας. ὁμοστα ἔλοβεν. (sch. plut. 635 Db. P.)

101r 25
ἐπανίστω, pro ἐπανίστα. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. plut. 539d sch. rec.)

102r 5
ἐπεγείρουσα, διανιστῶσα. Aristophanes. (sch. plut. 539a sch. rec. ChisPar)

106r 19

109v 23
Aristophanes. ἐπομνύμενον, ψευδόμενον ἐπιορκοῦμενον. (sch. plut. 725b sch. rec. ChisL,M + Par)

109v 25
Aristophanes. ἐπωνυμία ἐστὶ τοῦτο τοῦ θεοῦ παρὰ ταῖς θύραις ἱδρύσθαι. ἦτοι φυλακῆ τῶν ἄλλων κλεπτῶν. (sch. plut. 1153 Db P.)

110r 1
ἐπόππυσεν, ἐσύρισεν. Aristophanes. (sch. plut. 732 Db Θ, P.)

110r 25
ἔρασιχρήματος, ὁ φυλοχρήματος καὶ φυλάργυρος. (sch. plut. 287?; vacat mss.)

113r 15
Aristophanes. οὐκ ἐτὸς ἄπαντες, ἦτοι οὗ μάτην, οὐκ ἄλγως. (cf. Plut. 1166; cf. 404 Db Θ, P.)

116r 15
Aristophanes. εὐπαιδὰ ἀσκητικῶν, ὡς καλλήστους παίδας ἔχοντα, Μαχάονα, Ποδαλείριον, καὶ Ἡασο καὶ Πανάκειαν. (cf. sch. plut. 639d sch. rec. thPsVat)

116v 6
ἐὐπορα, εὐπόριστα. Aristophanes. (sch. plut. 532b sch. rec. r; 532 Db Paris.)
121v 9

ημιζεν, ητοι ιερος επετεθει. Aristophanes. (sch. plut. 681a sch. rec. ParBarb³; 681 Db P)

122v 13

ημεν προ υπαρχομεν η πορευομεθα. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 659b sch. rec. VenPsLh; cf. 659 Db) Item ημμενον σφηκίσκον, ητοι κεκαυμένον πάλον. (sch. plut. 301b-c sch. rec. thPstr; 301 Db Θ, Dv, P.)

122v 17

ημην ομεεις, ορκωμοστικον επιρρημα, αντι του ναι μην. In Aristophane. (cf. sch. plut. 608 sch. vet.; 608 Db V P.)

123v 1

ημιτυμβιον, το εξ ημισειας την κεφαλην καλυπτον, ητοι το φακιλον. nam tυμβος a similitudine caput dicitur. tυμβος γαρ ο ταφος ιππερεχον της γης κατα κυκλον. ώσπερ ηριον το κατα γης και μη περισταμενον. (cf. sch. plut. 729b α sch. rec. ChisLPar,Barb³; 729 Db P.)

123v 10

Aristophanes. αλλην προ ζητη. nam praeterito attici ut prae senti utuntur. (cf. sch. plut. 750a sch. rec. ChisLBarb³)

124r 6

ηρπακας, κατευναστεως. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 372c sch. rec. ParBarb³; 372 Db P.)

125r 1

Aristophanes. ει θασιον ενεχεις, οινον δηλοντι έκρινας. (sch. plut. 1021 Db Θ, Dv, P.)

127v 17

Aristophanes. θρανος προ θρονου. ητοι υποποδιου. (cf. sch. plut. 545d sch. rec. Pald; 545 Db.)

127v 23

In Aristophane. θρεττανεια, τουτο άπηχμα της λυρας. (sch. plut. 290c sch. rec. Musurus (Pald); 290 Db)

128v 23

Aristophanes. θυμος το άγριοκρομμουν, δεν άκραν άποριαν χρονια τις πενητες. et habet u breve. θυμος non longum. (cf. sch. plut. 253h sch. rec. PsVat; cf. 253 Db)

130r 4

ιδρυο, το καθιδρυο, και ναιν ποιω. ιδρυο ναιν, ητοι κτιζω. ιδρυο άγαλμα, αντι του άφιερο. (cf. sch. plut. 1191b sch. rec. ChisLPar,MBarb³N)

131r 1

Aristophanes. ικετηριαν έχοντα, προ κλαδον ικετικην κρατουντα. (sch. plut. 383 Db P.)

131v 24

ιπνος, το φαναριον. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 815a sch. rec. thPstr; 815 Db Θ). In eodem ιππερον, ιππικην επιθυμιαν, έρωτα ιππικον. (sch. nub. 74a AnRec) | το φαινευτιον η το μαγερειον (sch. plut. 815 Db P)
132v 5
 ἵσον, ἔπισης. Aristophanes. (sch. plut. 225b sch. rec.; 225 Db P.)

133r 26
 Aristophanes. ἱχθυηρούς, ἐπιτηδείους εἰς ὑποδοχὴν ἱχθύων. (sch. plut. 814a sch. rec. rLBarb 3; 814 Db P.)

134r 20
 καθεδούμενον, καθίζοντα. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. plut. 382d sch. rec. tr; cf. 382 Db P.)

135r 12
 Aristophanes. καθωσιώθη, ἄνετέθη, ἀφιερώθη. (sch. plut. 661a sch. rec. thPstr; 661 Db Θ, P., Vict.)

141r 26
 κατακλίνειν πρὸ καταθύσειν. Aristophanes (cf. sch. plut. 411a sch. rec. thPstr; cf. 411 Db Θ, Dv, P.)

143v 7
 Aristophanes. κατάπλαστον φάρμακον, τὸ πλασσόμενον. ὁ καὶ πλαστὸν λέγεται. (sch. plut. 717a sch. rec. Pstr)

147r 8
 κατηγορῶ, τὸ κατὰ τινὸς λέγω, αἰτιατικῆ, κατηγορῶ, τὸ καταφάσκω παρὰ φιλοσόφους, γενικῆ, ὁμοίως καὶ κατηγορῶ τὸ ἐφυβρίζω. κατηγορῶ δὲ τὸ παριστῶ αἰτιατικῆ ὡς τὸ κατηγόρησε ή θλύμις μικρόνυχον. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. plut. 917e sch. rec. ChisLReg,Barb 3; cf. 917 Db Θ)

147v 20
 κατεγόροτος, συντεθλασμένον. Aristophanes. (sch. plut. 545 Db P.; 545j sch. rec. LPar,NRs)

153v 21
 κολοσσυρτός, θόρυβος. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 536f sch. rec. thPstr)

154r 4
 κομῆσες, ἐπαρθῆς. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 572. Db P.; 572f sch. rec. thPstr)

155v 3
 κοσμίωτης ἢ εὐταξία. In Aristophane (sch. plut. 564. Db Θ, Dv; 564a sch. rec. thPstr)

155v 15
 κοτύλη, ἐδῶς µέτρου, ὃ καλεῖται ἕµιζεστὸν (cf. sch. plut. 436b sch. rec. thPstr)

157r 23
 Aristophanes. κρονικάς γνώμας ληµώντε. ἦτοι παλαιάς καὶ µεγάλαις τζυµβλίττοντες καὶ τυφλώτοντες. (sch. plut. 581 Db P.; 581a and c sch. rec. thPstr)
159r 26
[kύρωνα ἢ κύρωνα] λέγουσι τιμωρητικῶν ὄργανον. ἢ ἄνδρα πάνυ πένητα, [ἡ κρημνόν οὗτο
καλούμενον]. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. plur. 606 Db P.; cf. 606a sch. rec. thPs tr).

159v 6
Aristophanes. ὦ μοι δὲ κολῆς, κολνονυρίων κόλα τὰ ἐμπρόσθια μέρη τῶν ἱερεῖων. τὰς
ἀγκύλας αἱ ὦστέδες εἰσί. διαβάλλει σοῦ ὡς ὦστέα τοῖς θεοῖς προφέροντα. (sch. plur. 1128 Db
P.)

160r 19
thPs tr + LParReg)

161r 23
Aristophanes. ἀλλ' ὦ λαχοῦσ' ἐπινες. παρ' ὑπόνοιαν. οὔτω γάρ ὀφείλειν εἰπεῖν, ἀρα οὗ
κληροθείσα ἐν τῷ γράμματι εὐδίκαιες. οὗ δὲ τό τῶν γυναικῶν φύλοιον σκόψας, θέλων ἐπινες
φησί. Idem. λαχόν τὸ γράμμα σου, ἦτοι κληρώθεντος τοῦ γράμματός σου, ἀττικώς. (sch. plur.
972 Db P.; cf. 972a/β sch. rec. Par)

161v 22
λείτρα, τὰ ἄνηθ. ὧθεν φονῇ λειρίσεσα, ἦτοι εὐανθής ἢ ἄνθηρά. (cf. sch. plur. 589 Db; cf.
589e sch. rec. Ald(Musurus?))

162v 26
λήκοθοι, τὰ ῥώγα, τὰ ἐλαιοδόχα ἀγγέαια. (sch. plur. 810. Db P.)

166r 1
Aristophanes. λωποδυτεῖ, συλὰ τὰ ἵματια. (cf. sch. plur. 165 Db P.)

167r 1
θεῖα ἐπιμήκης ἐν ἢ μαλάττουσι τὰ ἀλέφρα (sch. plur. 545b Tz)

169r 1
[μεθέστηκον] ἦτοι μεταβέβληται, μεθῆστο, τὸ μετάγω. removeo, amoveo. (sch. plur. 994 Db
P.; 994b sch. rec. ἦ λ. Barb³ + ChisLPar, Barb³)

169r 12
Aristophanes. μέθεσθε, ἐπιλείφθητε. πόρρω γίνεσθε. ἵμι. μέλλων ἰσο, ἀδριστος Β ἢν ὁ
μέσος ἐμνη. ἐσο. Imperativus ἐσο, -σο (sch. plur. 75 Db P.; 75a ἢ d/a sch. rec. Par)

170v 9
Aristophanes. μεμιστυλημένοι, εὐσχηθέντες. (sch. plur. 627 Db P.)

172r 24
Aristophanes. μεταμάθοις, καταλείψας τοῦτο ἔτερον μάθοις. (Sch. plur. 924 Db P.; 924a sch.
rec. ChisPar, Barb³)

175r 22
Aristophanes. μύθος, ὡ κόπρος. (sch. plur. 313 Db; 313b/a sch. vet.)

175v 15
Aristophanes. μισητάς, ἦτοι πορνείας μέξεως. (sch. plur. 989 Db P., Br)

208
179γ 15
ναστός, ὁ κοινός ὀλοβόλος. κοίλος δὲ ὁ ἔχων ἔσω κοιλότητα. (sch. plut. 1142 Db P.; cf. 1142d/β sch. rec. ChisLPar)

179ν 9
νεανικὸν κρέας, ἦτοι νεανία πρέπον. τὸ ἄρκουν νεανία εἰς τῷ χορτάσαι αὐτόν. (sch. plut. 1137 Db P.; 1137b sch. rec. ChisPar, MBarb³)

180ν 26
νῇ τὸ θεό, πρὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 1006 Db Θ)

183ν 12
ξυνθασσόμενοι. οἱ μορφές. οἱ ἁνόητοι. συγχορευταί καὶ κοινονοί. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. plut. 508 Db Θ, Dv; cf. 508e sch. rec. ChisL)

184ν 19
Aristophanes. οὔτω καὶ τῇ χρώσῃ ἤδυ μου, ἐκ τῆς χρώσῃ ὣς μην ἠδύνατο ἀποπέμπεσθαι. ἦτοι ἠδυτατέν εἶναι τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματός μου ὄσμην φερομένην. (sch. plut. 1020 Db P.)

186γ 20
οἰνοῦταν, ἦτοι μουστόπιτταν. (sch. plut. 1121 Db (Θ) LB; 1121b sch. rec. thPsstr)

189ν 11
Aristophanes. ὀνασώ. ὑφεληθείς (sch. plut. 1062 Db Θ)

191ρ 25
Aristophanes. ὅπων, ἦτοι γάλα σκύλης. ἢ τίς βοτάνη θανατηφόρος. (sch. plut. Db 719, Θ, P.; 719c sch. rec. thPstr)

193ν 21
Aristophanes. ὄρνις, ἐνίστη ἡ κληδών καὶ τὸ μάντευμα. auspiciunm (cf. 63a sch. vet.)

195γ 13
Aristophanes. ὀσφραίνομαι, τὸ κοινὸς ὄσμα. ἐξ οὗ καὶ ὀσφραίνεις. ὃ λέγεται καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀσφραντοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀσφραῖνομένου. ἀττικάς ὃ ἐστι τὸ ὀσφράζεσθαι ἤ τὸ ὀσφραίνεσθαι. Ἰβιδεμ. ὀσφραίνει τί, ἦτοι ἐπὶ τὴν ὀσφραίνην ἠκεῖν. (cf. sch. plut. 896, Db P.; 896c-b sch. rec. rL, Barb³ + ChisPar)

196ν 9
οὐπίριπτος, ὃ δύσιος ἐπιτρίπτεις καὶ ἀπολείας. Aristophanes. (sch. plut. 275 Db P.; 275c sch. rec. thPstr + τMt.ChisLParVi,Θ,Harl)

197τ 18
Aristophanes. οὔ φημὶ ἄν λυστελεῖν σφοῖν (Plut. 509), οὐδάμως λέγω χρησιμεύειν καὶ ὄφελεῖν ὑμῖν. (sch. plut. 509 Db P.)

199γ 16
παιώνιος, ἦτοι ἰατροῦ. Aristophanes. (sch. plut. 636 Db Dv; 636a sch. rec. thPs)
204r 15
paraφρονοντος δεσπότου, παρὰ τὸ εἴκος φρονοντος. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 2b TzGloss; cf. 2 Db)
204v 12
Aristophanes. παρείας, εἰδὸς ὄφεως ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπαίρειν τάς παρειάς. (cf. sch. plut. 690 Db P.)
204v 13
παρείην, καταλείψαμι. παραχωρήσαμι (sch. plut. 331. Db Θ, P.)
204v 19
παρέκκαττυετο, συνετίθει. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 663,11 Db Θ, Br; cf. 663c sch. rec. MRs)
207v 15
πέλανος, εἰδὸς ὀσκρίου. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 661 Db. Θ, Dv. P.; 661 Tz)
209r 7
περανῶ, συνυλογίζομαι. Aristophanes. (sch. plut. 563 Db P.; 563c sch. rec.)
209r 25
Aristophanes. περιάγαι, περιθήναι (cf. sch. plut. 590 Db. Θ, Dv. P.; cf. 590c sch. rec. tlpstr)
210r 1
περείξημαι, κατὰ κύκλον ἐλλήφθην. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 934 Db P.; 934a sch. rec. ChisPar.Barb3)
210r 8
περεύπησεν, περιεκάθηρεν. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 730 Db P.; 730a sch. rec. ChisLPaPar,M,Ho)
210r 14
περιήει, περιήρχετο. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 709 Db Dv., P.; 709b sch. rec. pl. an.)
214r 9
Aristophanes. πιθῶν, πείσας. Item. καὶ σὺ ἀντιβολῶ πιθοῦ, ἦτοι πείσθητι. (sch. plut. 949 Db. P and 103 Tz; cf. 103e sch. rec. pl. an.)
220r 1
Aristophanes. πολυφόρω δαίμονι συγκέκραμαι. ἦτοι πολλὰ κακὰ φέροντι ἰνώμαι. πολύφορος γῆ ἢ πολλὴν φοράν καὶ καρπὸν παρέχουσα. τὸ δὲ συγκέκραμαι, μεταφορικός ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴνου. πολύφορος γάρ οἶνος, ὁ πολὺ ὕδωρ ἀπαθόμενος ἐν τῷ μίγνυσθαι τούτῳ. (sch. plut. 853 Db P.; cf. 853b sch. rec. nL.M)
220v 1
πόσπανα, γλυκήματα. Aristophanes (cf. sch. plut. 660 Db Dv., P.; cf. 660b sch. rec. CantCoisLPar,ChalPasb)
222r 22
πράκτο, τὸ ποιῶ καὶ τὸ πάσχω. in Aristophane (sch. plut. 485 Db Dv. Br.; 485b sch. rec. tlpstr)
222ν 1
πρεσβυτικόθεοι, οἱ παλαιοὶ οἱ ἄρχαιοι. ὡς πρὸς Διόνυσον δὲ Ἀπάλλωνι. Aristophanes. (cf. sch. plur. 1050 Db P.)

225ρ 1
Aristophanes. προθύματα, τὰ πρὸ τῆς θυσίας γινόμενα (sch. plur. 660 Db)

228ν 9
Aristophanes. προσήκειν, ἀντὶ τοῦ προσήκει, ἦτοι προσήκλθεν, ἰωνικός, ὡς καὶ παρ᾽ Ὀμήρῳ, ἦςκεν ἠρία καλὸν, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἢσκει. (cf. sch. plur. 696 Db; cf. 696b sch. rec. PsTr)

229ρ 2
Aristophanes, προσίσχεται, προσκολλάται. (sch. plur. 1096. Db LB, Dv, P.; 1096c sch. rec. tLm,CoisNp1,PałdPar,MV57,PacPasVah)

233ν 7
μαλάχης πτόρθους, ἦτοι μαλάχης κλάδους. Aristophanes (sch. plur. 544 Db Θ Dv P.; 544a-b sch. rec. PslMt,LPaR,Θ + tPsTr)

238ρ 15
Aristophanes. εἰς σάκταν τινά, ἦτοι εἰς σάκκον τινά. (sch. plur. 681 Db P.; 681c sch. rec. PsTr)

240ν 12
Aristophanes. ἢ μὲν σιπή, ἢ κοινὸς ἄρκλα. (sch. plur. 807 Db P.)

246ρ 12
Aristophanes. στατῆρισι, νοµίσµασι (sch. plur. 816 Db Dv P.; 816b sch. rec. Chis)

249ρ 25
Aristophanes. στροφαῖος, ὁ τῆς θύρας φύλαξ, ἀπὸ τοῦ στρόφιγγος, καὶ ἀνθρωπος εἰδώς συµπλέκειν καὶ στρέφειν δολίους λόγους καὶ µηχανάς. καὶ οὔτως ὁ θεράπων ἐκλαµβάνει. (cf. sch. plur. 1153 Db)

253ν 1
συµφορώτατον, ἄρµοδιώτατον. Aristophanes (sch. plur. 1162 Db Dv; 1162 TzGloss)

260ν 9
Aristophanes. Σφηττός τόπος ἐν Ἀθήναις, ὧθεν καὶ Σφήττοι ἐπίρρηµα. καὶ ὁ πολύτης Σφήττος, οἶνος. καὶ Σφήττον ἄες. ὡς ἐδείκε δὲ, ἀρµύτατον ἄες Σφήττοι ἐγίνετο (sch. plur. 720 Db P.; 720e sch. rec. rL,MRs)

261ρ 17
Aristophanes. σχῖνος, τὸ δὲδρόν. σχοῖνος δὲ τὸ βρύλον. (sch. plur. 720 Db P.)

265ρ 19
τετράδι πεπεµένου. καλὸς ἐξουµωµένου (cf. sch. plur. 1126 Db Dv)

266ρ 11
πρώην ἡ πρὸ ὀλύγου. Aristophanes (sch. plur. 834 Db P.)
266r 26  
Aristophanes. ὁν τηλία ἦτοι κοσκίνου γύρος (sch. plut. 1037 Db Dv D P.; 1037b sch. rec. r, Pas)

266v 5  
In Aristop. Tήνος νήσος σκοροδοφόρος ἀπό τινος Τήνου ἀνδρός. (sch. plut. 718 Db P.)

267r 1  
tίμημ' ἐπηγάψω τῇ δύσῃ, ἔθος δὲ ἦν πάλαι τοῖς δικαζομένοις γράψειν πρὸ τῆς κρίσεως, ὡς 
tιμωρίαν ἠττηθείς δόῃ. ἐπηγάψας δὲ, ἦτοι ἐπὶ τῇ προτέρᾳ γραφῇ καὶ τούτῳ γράψειν, ὡς καὶ 
tοιανῶς τιμωρήσῃ βίου τυχόν ἀφαίρεσιν ἢ κεφαλής. Aristophanes (cf. sch. plut. 480 Db 
Junt.; cf. 480d/a sch. rec. tLPsVat)

268v 12  
κατά, τὸ πρῶτον. αὐτόῦ, τοπικόν. In Aristophane. (sch. plut. 468 Db P., C)

276r 11  
Aristophanes. αὐτὴν ὑπεπίπτουν. ἦτοι ἐπέραινον, ἐσυνουσίαζόμην, ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τῆς πίσης. ἦν 
νοι δὲ πολλὰ λέξειν λέγουσι τούτῳ γινομένην ἐκ τοῦ κτύπου τοῦ ἀσπασμοῦ. (cf. sch. plut. 
1093 Db)

281v 26  
Aristophanes. ύφήρει, λάθραίως ἔξετείνε (sch. plut. 689 Db P.; 689b sch. rec. ChisPar,Barb³)

283v 26  
Aristophanes. φθοῖς πλακούντας ἡ λαλάγγα (sch. plut. 677 Db P.; 677a sch. rec. ChisPar)

285r 9  
In Aristophane. φλάν, τὸ μετὰ ψόφου ἐσθείειν. (sch. plut. 694 Db)

285v 14  
φοινικόν, κοκκίνῳ πέπλῳ, Aristophanes. (cf. sch. plut. 731 Db Θ Dv Paris.; 731b sch. rec. 
thPstr, pl. an.)

286r 4  
Aristophanes. φορμός, πᾶν πλέγμα εἶτε ψιάθιον, εἶτε ἄλλο τί. (sch. plut. 542 Db P.; 542a sch. 
rec. LPar)

294v 1  
Aristophanes. ψαιστός, πέμμα τί, ἦ εἰδός πλακοῦντος, ἦ τὸ κοινῶς λαλάγγον (cf. sch. plut. 
1115 Db P. V (Dv); cf. 1115 TzGloss)

297r 21  
Aristophanes. πυθάνη ὁρικῶς, νεωτερικῶς, ἦτοι ὡς πυθάνονται αἱ γυναῖκες αἱ ἐν ὀργῇ 
οὐσι, ἦτοι ἐν ἱβή ἡλικίας. (cf. sch. plut. 963 Db P., Vict.; cf. 963d sch. rec. LParReg)

298r 5  
ὀχρά, κίτρινος. Aristophanes (sch. plut. 422 Db P.; 422 sch. rec. pl. an.)
VI
GLOSSARY NOTES OF GREEK LEGAL SOURCE

1. ad 3v 7 = SM P I,2; B II,2,25.
ὲκ τῶν νόμων. ἄγρος λέγεται ὁ χωρὸς τῆς κόμης ἢτοι τῶν οἰκημάτων τόπος.

2. ad 4v 18 = SM P I,3; B II,2,61.
ὲκ τῶν νόμων. ἀδιάθετός ἐστιν οὐ μόνον ὁ μὴ διαθέμενος, ἄλλα καὶ ὁ μὴ κληρονομοῦμενος ἢ ἐκ διαθήκης.

3. ad 8r 16 = SM Δ XIX,2; B XXXIX,1,3 + SM Π XI,5; B XLIX,1,1.
ἐκ τῶν νόμων. ἀκαθήκουσαν τις λέγει διαθήκην ἐν τῷ λέγειν ἀπόκληρον γενέσθαι. ἢ ἀμνημόνευτον μὴ ὄφελεῖν. Item. ἐὰν μόνον ἀκαθήκοντες φανόσιν οἱ ἀπελεύθεροι πρὸς τοὺς πάτρωνάς ἢ παῖδας αὐτῶν. ὄφελεῖ μαστιγοῦν αὐτούς ὁ ἄρχον καὶ ἀπολύειν. ἀπειλῶν σφοδρότεραν ἑπεξέλευσιν ἐὰν πάλιν αἰτιαθῶσιν. inofficiosum testamentum (cf. Dig. XXXVII,14,1 = B XLIX,1,1)
ἀπόκληρον γενέσθαι. ἢ ἀμνημόνευτον μὴ ὄφελεῖν: μὴ ὄφελεῖν ἀπόκληρον γενέσθαι ἢ ἀμνημόνευτον SM, B

4. ad 10v 16 = SM P 1, 28 and 7; B 2,2,227.
ἐκ τῶν νόμων. τῷ ὄνομαί τής βιαλάνου πάντες οἱ καρποὶ δηλοῦνται. ἐπεί καὶ τῷ ὄνομαί τῶν ἄκροδρύων πάντα τὰ δένδρα.
ἐπεὶ: ἐπειδῆ B, om. SM I πάντα τὰ δένδρα: πάντες οἱ καρποὶ δηλοῦνται SM.

5. ad 11r 19 = SM P 1,22; B 2,2,99.
ἐκ τῶν νόμων. ἀπομειεύται νόμου τι ἢ ἀποδαπανάται. ἀπομειεύται, ὅταν μέρος ἥφαισται.
ἀποδαπανάται, ὅταν παντελῶς ὁ νόμος ἄναιρηται. derogatur legi aut abrogatur. sed? derogatur cum pars detrahiritur, abrogatur cum prorsus tollitur. (Dig. L,16,102 = B II,2,99)
ἥφαισται: ἥφαισται B

6. ad 12v 26 = SM P I, 85.
ἐκ τῶν νόμων. κούλπα ἢστιν ἢ μεγάλη ἀμελεία. ἢ δὲ μεγάλη κούλπα ἢστι δόλος.
.hex δόλος; δόλος ἢστιν SM
7. ad 18v 15 = SM Χ II Index; B XXIV, 10 Titulus + SM Χ II,47; B XXIV,10,28
έκ τῶν νόμων. περὶ ἀντελλόγου χρέους, μέχρι τῆς συγκροτούσης ποσότητος τῆς ἑξ ἐκατέρου πλευροῦ κεχρεωστημένης. ἢ τοῦ ἀντελλόγου δύναμις, μίμησιν ἔχει καταβολής. καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνου ἀναφέρεται ἐκατέρου ἢ ἀπάτησις τῶν τόκων. ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ ὑπερβαλλούσῃ ποσότητι, ἔστω ἰσχυρὰ ἢ τῶν τόκων ἀπάτησις. εἰ γε ὅλως κεχρεώστηται τόκοι ἑξ ἐπερωτήσεως.
ἐκατέρου; ἐκατέρῳ SM, B

8. ad 19r 17 = SM B IV,6; B ΠΙ,5,26
(τὸ τῆς ἀντιγραφῆς ὅνομα νομικὸν ἔστι. οὖν καὶ νόμου ἤπειρον διακελεύον.) ἐχέτω πᾶσα βασιλικὴ ἀντιγραφὴ τὸ εἰ ἀληθὴ ἔδιδαξε. καὶ μηδὲ ἄλλος ἐρρώσθω.
πᾶσα βασιλικὴ ἀντιγραφή: πᾶσα πάντως ἀντιγραφή SM, B

9. ad 27r 14 = SM Ν I,12; B ΛΙΙ,3,1 rest.
έκ τῶν νόμων. ἐὰν διὰ τὸ κούφισθηναι πλοῖον ἀποβληθῶσι φορτία, πάντων συνεισαγόντων ἀποθεταπεῖται τὸ ῥυθέν.
πλοῖον: τὸ πλοῖον SM. B | ῥυθέν; ῥυθέν SM

10. ad 32r 4 = SM Σ IV,10; B LVII,1,7 rest.
έκ τῶν νόμων. οἱ προδῶται καὶ οἱ αὐτομολοι κεφαλικῶς ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ τιμωροῦνται καὶ ἀποστρατευόνται καὶ κολάζονται.

11. ad 48v 13 = SM B VI,1; B Χ,2,2 + SM B VI,2; B Χ,2,12
έκ τῶν νόμων. βία ἐστὶ μεγάλου πράγματος ἐπέλευσις, ἢν οὐ δυνατὸν ἀποθεῖσθαι. ἐξεστὶ βία τὴν βίαν ἀπωθεῖσθαι. licet vim vi repellere. (Dig. IV,2,12 = B Χ,2,12)
βία ἐστὶ: βία δὲ ἐστὶ B, δὲ om. SM

12. ad 49r 14 = SM P I, 29; B ΠΙ, 2,126
έκ τῶν νόμων. ἔτερον βλάβος καὶ ἔτερον ποινή. βλάβος μὲν γὰρ δίχα ποινῆς δύναται εἶναι, ποινῆ δὲ δίχα βλάβους οὐ δύναται. ποινῆ ἐστὶν ἀμαρτίματος ἐκδίκησις. βλάβος δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀμάρτημα λέγεται, καὶ ὡσανειλ ποινῆς προπαρασκευὴ τις.
ἔτερον βλάβος; ἔτερον ἔστι βλάβος SM, B | ἔτερον ποινή: ἔτερον ἔστι ποινή B | δύναται εἶναι: εἶναι δύναται B | τὸ ἀμάρτημα: αὐτὸ τὸ ἀμάρτημα B
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13. ad 64r 25 = SM Δ XXIII,5; B XL, 1,3.

ēk tōn νόμων. διακατοχή ἐστι δίκαιον τοῦ ἐξεῖναι κρατεῖν τὴν οὐσίαν ἢ τὰ πράγματα τοῦ
teleutήσαντος.

διακατοχή ἐστι: ἐστιν οὖν διακατοχὴ B | ἐξεῖναι: εἰσίεναι καὶ B | ἢ: ήτοι B

14. ad 65v 5 = SM Δ XXVII,1; B XI,2,1.

ὁ διαλυόμενος ώσανεί περὶ πράγματος ἀμφιβόλου καὶ δίκης ἀδήλου καὶ ἀπληρώτου
dιαλύεται. ὁ δὲ συμφώνον κατὰ δωρεὰν πράγμα δήλου καὶ ἀναμφιβολον φιλοτήμως συγχωρεῖ.
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 = SM Y I,16; B LX,21,25.

ἐκ τῶν νόμων. ὁ κόρην ἁνακνημὸν διαπαρθενεύσας τῷ ἀκουλίῳ ὑπόκειται.

ὁ κόρην ἁνακνημὸν διαπαρθενεύσας τῷ: εἰ δὲ ἠνήβην αὐτήν οὐσαν διαπαρθενεύσει, τῷ SM,
ei δὲ ἁνακμὸν αὐτήν οὐσαν διαπορνεύσει, καὶ τῷ B

16. ad 69v 16 = SM Δ XXXI Index; B VIII,2,35.

διεκδίκειν ἐστί, τὸ τὰ αὐτὰ ποιεῖν ἄπερ καὶ ὁ πρωτότυπος ἢν ἐποίει παρόν.

diêkdoiêin èsì: diêkdoiêin gâr èsì SM, diêkdoiêin dé èsì B | ò: om. SM, B

17. ad 70v 10 = SM Δ XXXII, 1-2; B II,1,10-11.

ἐκ τῶν νόμων. δικαιοσύνη ἐστὶ σταθερᾶς καὶ διηνεκῆς βούλησις ἐκάστῳ τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀπονέμουσα
díkaioûn. diákaioûn lêgetai καὶ τῷ ἀεὶ καλὸν καὶ diákaioûn, ὡς τὸ φυσικὸν νόμων. lêgetai
díkaioûn καὶ τῷ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει ἢ τοῖς πλείοις χρήσιμον ὅν, ὡς τὸ πολιτικὸν diákaioûn.
lêgetai diákaioûn καὶ τῷ ἄρχοντος ψήφος, κἂν εἰπ παράνομος, καὶ ὁ τόπος ἐν ὃ δικαιοδοτεῖ,
σοφομένης τῆς μεγαλείοτητος τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ τοῦ ἔθους τῶν πατέρων.

σταθερᾶς: σταθηρά SM, B | τῇ (πόλει): om. SM | τὸ πολιτικὸν diákaioûn: τῷ diákaioûn πολιτικὸν
SM, τὸ diákaioûn τὸ πολιτικὸν B | εἰπ παράνομος: παράνομος εἰπ SM, B

18. ad 71r 1 [70v 19, 26] = SM Δ XXXIII,8; B VII,2,13 + SM Δ XXXIII,9; B VII,2,20 +

SM Σ X, 4-5; B VIII,1,15.

[ἐκ τῶν νόμων?] αἱρέτος δικαστῆς ἐστὶν ὁ δικαστὸ τάξειν ἀναδεξάμενος.

ὅς κἂν ἐν τῷ ψηφίζεσθαι πλανηθῇ, οὐ διορθοῦται. ψηφισάμενος γὰρ πέπαινε εἶναι δικαστῆς.
ἐκ τῶν νόμων. μὴ ἐξέστω τῷ δικολόγῳ λαθραίως ἤ φανερῶς ὑβρίζειν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ διάδικον. ἕαν δὲ ὑβρίσῃ, ἀτιμᾶσθω. ἀλλὰ μηδὲ σύμφρονον ἢ συνάλλαγμα ποιεῖτο περὶ τῆς δίκης ἢ περὶ τῶν μισθῶν μετὰ τοῦ ὀίκειον πρόσφρογος.


19. ad 73r 23 = SM Δ XXXVII,3; B X,3,1.
ἐκ τῶν νόμων. δόλος, κακός ἐστὶ πανοργία καὶ ἀπάτη πρὸς περιγραφὴν ἐτέρου γινομενῆ. ἀπάτη: ἀπάτη καὶ μηχανὴ SM, B | πρὸς: ἢ πρὸς B

20. ad 78r 6 = SM Y XIV,12; B LX,6,37
ἐκ τῶν νόμων(ων). κατὰ τῶν ἀποφθειρόντων δοῦλον ἢ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς τρόπους αὐτοῦ. ἀρμόζει ἢ περὶ κλοπῆς εἰς τὸ διπλάσιον ἀγωγῆ. οὐ γὰρ δεῖ ἀτιμωρήτους εἶναι τὰς τοιαύτας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἑγχειρήσεις.


21. ad 93r 24 = SM Ε XXIV,3; B XXV,1,9 + SM P I,61; B ΙΙ,2,229.
ἐκ τῶν νόμων. κυρίως ἐνέχυρον λέγομεν τὸ παραδοθέν τῷ δανειστῇ. τὸ δὲ μὴ παραδοθέν ἀλλὰ συμφωνηθὲν, ὑποθήκη ἐστὶν.

Ite(m) e legeb(us). Κυρίως ἐνέχυρον τὸ κινητὸν λέγεται διὰ τὸ ἐν χειρὶ διδόσθαι.

λέγομεν: λέγεται SM, B | ἐν χειρὶ: ἐν τῇ χειρὶ SM, B

22. ad 94r 23 = SM Ε XXV,2; B XX,1,65.
ἐκ τῶν νόμων. ὁ ἐνοικος ἐφ’ ὅσον δίδωσε τῷ μίσθωμα, οὐκ ἑκβάλλεται παρὰ τοῦ δικτότου. εἰ μὴ ἄρα ἢ ἰδίαν χρείαν ἀναγκαίαν δέστε τοῦ οίκου. ἢ ἐπισκευάσαι βούλεται, ἢ ὁ ἐνοικος κακός αὐτῷ κέχρηται.

ἰδίαν χρείαν: εἰς ἰδίαν χρείαν SM, B
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23. ad 97r 15 = SM Ν 1,11; B LIII,2,11 rest.

έκ τῶν νόμων. ἐὰν ἀγοράσω πλοίον μετὰ τῆς ἐξαρτίας, τὴν σκάφην οὔ λαμβάνω. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ ἐξαρτία. ἐκάτερον γὰρ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γένους ἔστιν, τῷ μεγέθει δὲ διαλλάττουσιν. ἄλλου δὲ δεὶ γένους εἶναι τὴν ἐξαρτίαν, καὶ ἄλλου τὸ πρωτότυπον.

οὐδὲ; οὔτε SM, B | τῷ μεγέθει δὲ; τῷ δὲ μεγέθει SM, B

24. ad 102v 26 = SM E XXXIV Index.

Leges. ἐπιβολὴ ἔστιν ἐπίδοσις ἀπόρου κτήσεως πρὸς κληρονόμους ἢ συντελεστᾶς καὶ ὀμοχόρους καὶ ὀμοκίνους.

ἐπιβολὴ ἔστιν: ἕστι δὲ ἐπιβολὴ SM

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

Leges. ἐπιδικόν ἔστιν, οὔ ἢ δεσποτεία φιλονεικεῖται.


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

Leges. οἳ κακότροποι ἦτοι περίεργοι, οἳ τῷ ἔτερῳ ὑποκείμενον ἢ πραχθὲν ὡς ἵδιον καὶ ἀνεύθυνον πρὸς ἔτερον μεταφέροντες τῷ στελλιονάτους ὑπόκεινται ἐγκλήματι ὡς ἀντιβαδιασταί, ὑποθέμενος τοῖς πολλοῖς τὰ αὐτὰ πράγματα κατέχεται τῷ στελλιονάτους ἐγκλήματι, ἔτοιμος δὲ ὁ πᾶς καταβαθάλλειν, ἀπαλλάττεται τοῦ ἐγκλήματος.


27. ad 104v 16 = SM Δ ΠΙ,7; B LIV,4,10 rest.

Leges. τῷ λειτουργοῦντι καὶ τιμῇ ἐπικλάται. οὔ μὴν τῷ πράττοντι τιμῇ ἐπικλάται λειτουργία.

28. ad 110v 11 = SM E XLI Index + SM E XLI,3; B XV,1,39.

Leges. ἑργολάβος ἔστιν ὁ χρήματα δεδοκὼς ἐπὶ τῷ ἐκχωρήθηναι ἀγωγήν. οἳ ἑργολάβοι ιδίαις ἱλαις κτίζοντες ποιοῦσιν αὐτὰς παραχρήμα τοῦ δεσπότου τοῦ ἐδάφους.

ἑργολάβος ἔστιν: ἕστι δὲ ἑργολάβος SM | ἱλαις: χρείας SM
29. ad 111r 7 = SM E XLII Index

L(eges). έρημοδίκιος ἐστὶν ὃ ἐκ μονομεροῦς εἰσηγήσεως τὴν καταδίκην ἐςχηκός. ἐρημοδίκιος ἐστιν: περὶ ἐρημοδίκων, τουτέστι τῶν SM ἐςχηκώς: ἔχοντων SM

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

Leges. εἰ βία τῶν ἀνέμων ἐμπέση πλοῖον εἰς ἀλλοτρίας ἁγκόρας, καὶ κόψωσιν αὐτὰς οἱ ναῦται, οὐκ ἔνεχονται, εἰγέν ἄλλως ἑαυτοὺς εὑλοτόσαι οὐκ ἠδύναντο.
εἰ βία: εἰ δὲ καὶ τῇ βίᾳ SM, B ὁ πλοῖον: τὸ πλοῖον SM, B κόψωσιν: κόψουσιν SM

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

L(eges). ὁ εὐνούχος, ὄνομα [ἔστι?] γενικόν, τέμνεται δὲ εἰς τρία. οἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν εἰσὶν σπάδωνες, οἱ δὲ καστράτοι, οἱ δὲ θλημαί. καὶ σπάδωνές εἰσιν οὔτινες διὰ τι πάθος ἢ ψυχίν ἐνοχλήσασαν τοῖς γονίμοις μορίοις παιδοποιεῖν καλοῦνται. τούτων δὲ ἀπαλαγέντες παιδοποιοῦσι. θλημία δὲ, οὔτινες ὑπὸ τῆς τροφοῦ ἢ τῆς μητρὸς τυχόν ἐκθλην οὖν διδόμοιν ὑπέστησαν. καστράτοι δὲ εἰσίν ἐφ' ὄν γέγονεν ἐκτομή τῶν γεννητικῶν μορίων. οὐ μὴν οὖν καστράτος καὶ θλημίας εἰσθεσίν τινα οὐ λαμβάνουσιν. ἐπειδὴ οὐδὲ παιδοποιεῖν δύνανται. οὐ δὲ σπάδων λαμβάνει. ἐπειδὴ τούτων ἐλπὶς εἰκὸς τοῦ πάθους ἀπαλαγέντα δύνασθαι παιδοποιεῖν.
οἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν: τῶν γὰρ εὐνούχων οἱ μὲν B καὶ σπάδωνες: καὶ σπάδωνες μὲν SM ὑπὸ τῆς τροφοῦ: ὑπὸ τῆς τροφοῦ B Inter ... μορίων et ...λαμβάνει in brevius redactum habet SM, quam secutus est glossator vocabularii. | οὐ μὴν οὖν καστράτος: καὶ ὅτι οὐ μὲν καστράτος SM | εἰσθεσίν: εἰς θέσιν SM

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

Leges. ὁ καινοτόμων, παραγγέλλεται. τὸ περὶ τῆς καινοτομίας παράγγελμα ἐπὶ τοῖς μέλλουσιν ἔργοις ἀρμόζει, ἕν ὁ ἐπὶ καινοτομία παραγγελθείς κτίσῃ χωρίς προτροπής, διὰ νομίμου παραγγελίας καταλύει τὸ ἔργον.
τὸ περὶ: τὸ δὲ περὶ SM, B ἐπὶ καινοτομία: om. SM B

33. ad 143r 18 = SM Π ΙΧ,1; B LVIII,24,16 rest.

L(eges). εἰ δόσω σοι κατὰ παράκλησιν δοῦλον, ἔγῳ μὲν ψυχῇ, σὺ δὲ σώματι νέμη. κατὰ παράκλησιν: παρακλήσει SM, B
34. ad 151r 10 = ???
Leges. τὸ ἐγκλῆμα τοῦ κλέπτοντος, καὶ εἰς κληρονόμους ἐπιβαίνει.

35. ad 151r 22 = SM K Π,85; B Π,3,62.
Leges. κληρονομία ἐστὶν εἰς ὀλόκληρον διαδοχή τοῦ δικαίου ὑπὲρ ὁ διαθεμένος εἶχεν.
εἰς: ἢ εἰς SM

36. ad 151v 1 [151r 21] = SM P Ι,80-81; B Π,2,62 & 67.
Leges. κληρονόμος λέγεται οὕς μόνον ὁ πρώτος, ἄλλα καὶ ὁ τοῦ κληρονόμου κληρονόμος καὶ
οἱ ἐφεξῆς. ἢ δὲ τοῦ κληρονόμου προσηγορία καὶ εἰς τοὺς πορρωτέρους ἑκτείνεται.
ἡ δὲ τοῦ; ἢ τοῦ SM, B

37. ad 159v 3 = SM K XXVIII,1; B XXXVI,1,1 rest.
Leges. κωδικιλλός ἐστὶν ἅλλοις διαθήκης γνώμης διατιθεμένου ἀναπλήρωσις.
κωδικιλλός: Κωδικιλλός SM, B | διαθήκης: ἐν διαθήκη B | διατιθεμένου: τοῦ διατιθεμένου
SM, B

38. ad 161v 1 = SM Α I,1 + SM Δ I, 31; B XLIV,1,116 rest.
λεγάτον ἐστὶ δωρέα ἐν διαθήκη καταληφθεῖσα. λεγάτον ἐστὶ μείωσις τῆς κληρονομίας.
λεγάτον: ληγάτον B

39. ad 161v 14 = SM P Ι,88; B Π,2,29.
λειμών λέγεται, ἐν ὅ εἰς τὸ λαβεῖν καρπὸν, δρεπάνου μόνου ἐστὶ χρεία.
λέγεται: ἐστὶν SM, B | μόνου: μόνον SM, B

40. ad 171r 6 = SM M VII,1-2; B XIII,2,6 & 17 + SM P Ι,94; B Π,2,107.
Leges. μεσεγγυητής ἐστὶ κυρίως, ὅτινες πολλοὶ εἰς ὀλόκληρον παρέθεντο πράγμα, ἐπὶ δὴ λεὼ
ὁρὸ τοῦ φιλάζαι καὶ ἀποδοῦναι. τῷ μεσεγγυητῇ οὐχ εἰς μόνον ἄλλα καὶ πολλοὶ παρατίθενται
φιλανεικίας αὐτῷς γινομένης. καὶ δοκεῖ έκαστος εἰς ὀλόκληρον παρατίθεσθαι. τούναντίον
δὲ ἐπὶ πολλῶν πράγμα κοινὸν παραθεμένων. μεσεγγυητής ἐστὶ, παρὶ τοὺ πολλοὶ ἐπίδικον.
παραθόνται πράγμα.
φιλάζαι: φιλάξασθαι SM | ἄλλα καὶ πολλοὶ: ἄλλα πολλοὶ B
41. ad 176r 9 = SM M XV,1.
Leges. μνηστεία ἐστὶ, μνήμη καὶ ἐπαγγελία τῶν μελλόντων γάμων.

42. ad 176r 24 = SM M XVI,3; B LX,37,8.
Leges. μοιχεία λέγεται μὲν καὶ ἡ πρὸς παρθένον καὶ χήραν φθορά. κυρίως δὲ ἡ τῆς ὑπάνδρου. φθορά δὲ ἡ τῆς παρθένου καὶ χήρας.
μοιχεία λέγεται μὲν: λέγεται μὲν μοιχεία SM, B | καὶ χήραν: ἡ χήραν SM, B | κυρίως δὲ ἡ τῆς... καὶ κυρίως μὲν μοιχεία ἐστὶ ἡ τῆς... SM, κυρίως δὲ μοιχεία μὲν ἐστιν ἡ τῆς... B | ἡ (τῆς παρθένου): om. SM, B

43. ad 179v 13 = SM P I,99; B ΠΙ,2,28.
Leges. νεατή γῆ ἐστίν, ἢ προτιμήθησα ἢ ἐπὶ ἐνιαυτὸν ἀργήσασα. ἤν οἱ γραικοὶ νέασιν καλοῦσιν.
νεατή γῆ: νεατή δὲ γῆ B | γραίκοι: γραίκες SM

44. ad 182r 1 [181v 25] = SM P I,101-102; B ΠΙ,2,98 & 110.
Leges. ἀληθές ἐστι τὸ νόσον εἶναι τὴν πρόσκαιρον τοῦ σώματος ἀσθένειαν. πάθος δὲ ἐστι δυνατής σώματος ἐμπόδιον. νόσος δὲ ὀλεθρία ἐστίν, ἢ ἐκάστω πράγματι λυμαινομένη.
σώματος ἐμπόδιον: τοῦ σώματος ἐμπόδιον SM, ἐμπόδιον τοῦ σώματος B | (νόσος) δὲ: om. SM, B

45. ad 197v 21 = SM Σ ΠΙ,4; B LX,21,15.
Leges. ὄχλαγώγων ἐστὶ πολλῶν τινῶν σύνοδος, ὅτε πολλῶν τινῶν φωναὶ παρὰ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς τῆς πόλεως τρόπους εἰς αὐτῶν συντρέχουσιν, εἰς φθόνον καὶ ἀτιμίαν τινὸς. Καὶ τῷ ἀπόντι δὲ γίνεται ὄχλαγώγων, ὅτε τὶς ἐπέλθη τῷ οἶκῳ αὐτοῦ ἢ τῇ στατίων, ἢ τῷ ἐργαστηρίῳ. ὄχλαγώγων ποιεῖ οὐ μόνον ὁ κράζων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ συγκαλεσάμενος ἄλλους ἢ ὑποβαλὼν ἐπὶ τὸ κράζαι.
46. ad 198r 26 = SM P I,146; B Π,2,25.
Leges. στιπενδίουμ λέγεται, διὰ τὸ ἀπὸ λεπτῶν ἀργυρίων συνάγεσθαι, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ τριβούτον λέγεται, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπικλάθαι τοῖς καταβάλλοσιν, ἢ ἐπιμερίζεσθαι τοῖς στρατιῶταις.
λέγεται: λέγεται τὸ σιτηρέσιον B | τριβούτον: τριβούτον ἦγουν φόρος B |

47. 212r 6 = SM T VII,7; B LVI,4,16 rest.
ὁ περισσοπρακτής τελώνης διηνεκῶς ἐξορίζεται καὶ ἀντικαθίσταται ἔτερος ὑπερθεματισμοῦ ἐπὶ τῷ τέλει γινομένου ἐπὶ ὤψει τοῦ ἄρχοντος.

48. ad 218r 14 = SM P I,131; B Π,2,126. (cf. 12.)
Leges. ποινὴ ἔστιν, ἀμαρτήματος ἐκδίκησις.

49. ad 220v 21 = SM Π XXII,3; B XXVIII,4,13.
Leges. ἡ πορνοβοσκία, οὐκ ἔστιν ἦττων τῆς ἐν φανερῷ ἐπὶ πόρῳ πορνείας. πορνοβοσκός δὲ ἔστιν, ἡ προιστώσια γυναῖκας ἐπὶ μισθῷ τοῖς παρατυχοῦσι συμφθειρομένας. κἂν ἐτέρῳ προσχήματι, τυχὸν δὲ ὑπηρεσίαν ἐν καπηλείῳ.
συμφθειρομένας: συμφθειρομένοι SM

50. ad 220v 26 [221r 1] = Epanagoge 26,5,3; Prochiron vel Procheiros nomos 19,7,4.
Leges. πόρος ἔστιν ὁ ἀπὸ καμάτου τινὶ περιγινόμενος. κληρονομία δὲ καὶ λεγάτα καὶ δωρεά, οὐ περιέχονται. αἱ γὰρ δωρεά, ὡς μισθῶν τινὸς ἠγησιμένον περιγίνονται ἡμῖν.

51. ad 222v 23 = SM Μ XVI,2; B LX,37,4.
(προαγωγεῖς, τὸ μαστροπεῦ, ὅθεν καὶ προαγωγεῖς.) οὐ καλῶς ὁ μοιχὸς ἀντιτίθεσι τῷ τῶν ἀνδρῶν, ὡς αὐτοῦ, προαγωγοῦ γενομένου τὴν μοιχείαν ἠμαρτεν.
τῷ τῶν ἀνδρῶν SM, B

52. ad 231r 7 = SM Σ X,3; B VIII,1,14.
Leges. ὁ δὲ ἀπλήσταιν τῷ οἰκείῳ συνθέμονος πρόσφυγι συνήγορος, φανερὰν τῆς δίκης μοίρας μετὰ τῆν δίκην λαμβάνειν. καὶ ἐπιμείνας τοῦ συνηγορεῖν, ἐκβαλέσθω.
συνήγορος: om. SM, B | νίκην: SM, B | ἐκβαλέσθω: ἐκβαλεός SM, B
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53. ad 236r 2 = SM A XII,4; B XIX,10,17 rest.
Leges. κυρίως ἑμιβὸς ἔστιν ὁ συνεχῶς ἀναιτίως πλανόμενος καὶ τοὺς καιροὺς εἰς ἀνόνητα δαπανῶν, βραδέως εἰς τὸν οἶκον ἀναστρέφει.
κυρίως: κυρίως δὲ SM, B | ὁ συνεχῶς: ὃς συνεχῶς SM, B | ἀναιτίως: om. SM | δαπανῶν: πράγματα δαπανῶν B

54. ad 243v 17 = Dig. L,16,177 (= B II,2,171)
Leges. Cavillationis natura quam Graeci σφοστείαν appellant, haec est, ut ab evidenter veris per brevissimas mutationes disputatio ad ea, quae evidenter falsa sunt perducatur.

55. ad 251r 21 = SM Σ VI,1; B LX,1,10.
Leges. κατὰ τρεῖς τρόπους ἢ συκοφαντία γίνεται καὶ τριπλῶς ἢ ἐπεξέλευσις. ἢ γὰρ συκοφαντεῖ τίς πλαστῶς κατηγορών, ἢ προδότης τῆς ἵδιας ὑποθέσεως γίνεται. καὶ τὰ ἀληθῆ ἐγκλήματα κρύπτων. ἢ φυγοδικεῖ, τελείῳ ἀναχώρον τῆς κατηγορίας. οὐ πάντως δὲ συκοφάντης ἔστιν ὁ μὴ ἄποδεικνύς ὅπερ κατηγόρησεν. ἀλλʼ ἐν τῇ κρίσει τοῦ δίκαιου ἐστὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐλευθερῶσαι τὸν κατηγορούμενον ἐπιθέσαι περὶ τούτου. καὶ εἰ μὲν εἴη ὦκ ἀπεδειξες ἐφέσασται αὐτοῦ. εἰ δὲ εἴη ἐσυκοφάντησας, κατεδίκασεν αὐτόν. κʼ ἐν μηδὲν εἴη περὶ τῆς ποινῆς.
καὶ (τὰ ἀληθῆ); om. SM, B | εἰ μὲν εἴη... εἰ δὲ εἴη... εἰ μὲν εἴη... εἰ δὲ εἴη SM

56. ad 253v 10 = SM Σ VIII,1 + SM Σ VIII,15; B XI,1,67.
Leges. σύμφωνον ἔστι δύο ἢ τριῶν εἰς ταύτων ἢ πλείονων συνέλευσεις εἰς τὸ ἄρεστὸν καὶ συναίνεσις. ὅσα σύμφωνα γένηται ἢ ὑπεναντία νόμων ἢ ὑπεναντία τῶν καλῶν τρόπων, ταῦτα μηδὲ μίαν ἔχειν ἰσχύν ἀναμφιβόλου νομίμου ἔστιν. σύμφωνον ἔστι δύο συναίνεσις καὶ συνέλευσις.
μηδὲ μίαν: μηδεμίαν SM, B

57. ad 263r 23 = SM Τ V,7; B LIX,1,2 partim rest.
Leges. τάφος ἔστιν, ἐν ὦ τὸ σῶμα ἢ ὀστέα ἀπετέθη, οὐ πάς ὁ ταφῆ ἀφορισθεῖς, ἀλλʼ ὅσον ἔστι τὸ σῶμα. μνημείων δὲ ἔστι τὸ διὰ τὴν μνήμην φαινόμενον.
tάφος: τάφος δὲ B | τὸ (σῶμα): om. SM | ὀστέα: ὀστέα ἀνθρώπου B | ταφῆ: τῇ ταφῆ B
58. ad 271v 16 = SM P I,160; B ΠΙ,2,41.
Leges. τῷ τῆς τροφῆς ὄνοματι καὶ τὰ βρόσιμα καὶ τὰ πόσιμα περιέχεται, καὶ τὸ ἕνδυμα, καὶ τὰ πρὸς τὸ ζῆν ἀναγκαία, καὶ τὰ πρὸς φυλακὴν ἢ φροντίδα τοῦ σώματος ἐπιτήδεια.
ζην: ζην τὸν ἄνθρωπον B

59. ad 273v 3 = SM Y I,1; B LX,21,1.
γενικῶς μὲν ἕβρις λέγεται τὸ παράνομον. εἰδικῶς δὲ ἡ περιφρόνησις καὶ ζημία. ώς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀκουλίου, καὶ ἡ ἀδικία, ώς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀδίκου καὶ παρανόμου ψηφισμένου. ἢ ἕβρις ἢ ἔργι π λόγῳ γίνεται καὶ ἡ εἰς σώμα, ἢ εἰς ἄξιαν ἢ εἰς ἄτιμαν. εἰς σώμα, ώς ἐπὶ τοῦ πληγέντος. εἰς ἄξιαν, ώς ὅταν ὁ ἀκολουθῶν τῇ οἰκοδομοῦν άφέλκηται. εἰς ἄτιμαν, ὅταν ἀποπειράται τῇ σοφροσύνης τινός. ὑβρίζεται δὲ τὶς ἢ δὴ ἔαυτος, ἢ δὲ ἔτερον, οἶον δούλων, γυναικὸς, νόμφης. καὶ λεψάνου υβριζόμενον, ὁ κληρόνομος ὑβρίζεται. εἰ δὲ τὶς βουλόμενον τὸν υἱὸν μον πολῆσῃ ἢ υβρίσει, αὐτῷ μὲν οὐκ ἁρμόζει ἢ περὶ ύβρεως ἀγωγή. ύβρις γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν ή γινομένη εἰς τὸν βουλόμενον ἐμοὶ δὲ, ἁρμόζει.

60. ad 278r 13 = SM Ω I,2; B LVI,11,12 rest.
Leges. ὁ υποδέκτης ἢ ὁ ταβουλάριος ἀπαξ ἐλεγχθεὶς περὶ τὴν οἰκείαν ὑπηρεσίαν, μηκέτι μετερχέσθω διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐπιπεδεύματος.

61. ad 278v 18 = SM Δ XXIII,3; B XXXV,19,1 + SM K XIV,5; B XXXV,9,1 + SM K XIV,12; B XXXV,10,1.
Leges. έαν διαμάχονται πρὸς ἀλλήλους. ένστατος καὶ υποκατάστατος. τέως ο ἐνστατος ōρθεῖ εἰναι ἐν τῇ νομῇ. ἐνστασις ἐστίν. τὸ εἰπεῖν. Πέτρος τῆς κληρονομίας μου κύριος ἐστίν. οἰ κληρονόμοι ή ἐνστατοί ή υποκατάστατοι λέγονται. ή δὲ υποκατάστασις ή ἀπλή ἐστίν. ώς τὸ εἰπεῖν. έαν μὴ κληρονομήσῃ Πέτρος, ἐστίν Παῦλος κληρονόμος. ή διπλή, οἶον. εἴτε κληρονομήσει, εἴτε κληρονομήσας ἄνθρωπος ἀποθάνῃ.
eἴτε κληρονομήσει: εἴτε μὴ κληρονομήσει SM, B
62. ad 280r 25 = SM A XXXV,3 & 5; B XXXIV,1,17 & 19 rest.
Leges. οἱ μεθ’ ὅπλων ἤτηθέντες καὶ τοῖς πολεμίοις ἐαυτοὺς ἐκδεδωκότες οὐκ ἔχουσι δίκαιον ὑποστροφής. ὑποστροφής δὲ δίκαιόν ἐστιν. ἐπανάληψις καὶ τῆς προτέρας καταστάσεως καὶ τῶν ἀφαιρεθέντων πραγμάτων. ius postlimini (cf. Dig. XLIX,15,17)
(ὑποστροφής) δὲ: om. SM, B | πραγμάτων: πραγμάτων αὐτοῦ SM, B

63. ad 282v 22 = SM P I,167; B II,2,227.
Leges. τὸν μέσον ἐστὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ φαρμάκου. καὶ δεῖ προστίθεσθαι καλὸν ἢ κακὸν.

64. ad 283r 22 = SM P I,168; B II,2,226.
kυρίως φέρεσθαι λέγομεν τὰ τῶν σώματι ἡμῶν βασταζόμενα. κομίζεσθαι δὲ διὰ τῶν ύποζυγίων, ἀγεσθαι δὲ τὰ ἐμψυχα ὄντα.
διὰ τῶν ύποζυγίων: τὰ διὰ τῶν ύποζυγίων B

65. ad 294r 8 = SM T VII,18; B LVI,12,6 rest.
Leges. ἐν ἑκάστῳ ἐνιαυτῷ, ἐπὶ κεράτη εἰς ἑκαστος ἀνθρώπος χρυσορύκτης παρεχέτω, οὐ μόνον τῆς Ποντικῆς διοικήσεως, ἀλλὰ γὰρ τῆς Ἄσιανῆς.
ἀλλὰ γὰρ: ἀλλὰ καὶ B
VII
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
αἶμαςία ὁ ἐξ ἀκάνθων φραγμός, sepes. ὅθεν ὁ Πλάτων αἵμασιώδη λέγει περίβολον. (cf. Lg. 3,681a 1)

11v 18
Plato in II de re publica. ἐκ μὲν τῶν κριθῶν ἄλφιτα σκευαζόμενοι, ἐκ δὲ τῶν πυρὸν ἀλευρα, τὰ μὲν πέψαντες, τὰ δὲ μάζαντες, μάζας γενναίας καὶ ἁρτους. (372b 3) ποιώμεν.

22v 1
ἀρχαίον ἀποδείξει apud Platonem (Ep. 320d 6) antiquare.

74r 17
putatoria, in Platone (cf. R. 333d 3 and La. 183d 7)

109r 25
τὸ ἐπίχειρον, ὁ μισθός, non solum operis manualis sed cuiuslibet rei. in Platone. (Ap. 19d 9)

111v 25
Plato. ἐρεσύβη est rubigo frumenti. ἱδς aeris vel ferri. σηπεδὸν lignorum. ὀφθαλμία malum oculorum. νόσος totius corporis. (R. 609a 2)

113r 20
εὐσαρχεῖ secundum Platonem, τὸ τὸ θελερὸν ἀντικείμενον. Καὶ οἶον τὸ διανυκτεῖ καὶ καθαρόν καὶ ὑπέρλαμπρον. (cf. Lg. 956a 2; Ep. 312a 2; Ti. 58d 2; Lg. 952a 4)

114r 16
εὐθῆθα δὲ, moralitas in Platone. (cf. Phdr. 242e 5; R. 400e 1, 348c 12, 400e 2; Ti. 91e 1)

156v 1
κραύρον, τὸ ἐξηρόν καὶ νοτίδος ἐστερημένον. In Platone. (Ti. 60d 1 and 74b 1)

159v 18
Πλάτων ζ. περὶ Νόμων. ὃςα δὴ περὶ γέλωτα ἐστὶ παύγνα, ταυτὶ κωμῳδίαν πάντες καλεῖν εἰσόθαμεν. (Lg. 816e 10)

191v 18
ὄργυξομαι πνε, ὀργύζω δὲ ἐξερον. τὸ εἰς ὀργήν διαγείρω in Platone. (In Plato’s works the inflected forms of the verbs ὀργύξομαι and ὀργύζω appear several times.)
208r 1
πέλτην, ἀσπίς, τετράγωνος καὶ οἱ ταύτη χρώμενοι πελτασταί (cf. sch. in Plat. Amat. 135e 6)

270r 24
σημαίνεται περὶ τρικυμίας. Πλάτων ἐν τῷ Ε τῶν Πολιτείων οὐκ οἶσθα ὅτι μόνις μοι τὸ δῶ
κύματε ἔκφυγοντι νῦν τὸ μέγιστον καὶ χαλεπώτατον τῆς τρικυμίας ἐπάγεις (R 472a 3)

284v 8
φιλαπόδημος, ὁ ταῖς ἀποδημίαις χαίρων. φιλοπαίσμων, κατὰ Πλάτωνα ὃ ἀντιδιαπρεῖται ὀ
σπουδαστικὸς (cf. Cfr. 406c 2 and R. 452e 5)

2) QUOTATIONS FROM XENOPHON

11r 6
άκρονυχία, fere idem ab ἄκρος et ἄνυξ un pozo(?) (cf. HG 4, 6, 7; An 3, 4, 37)

11v 12
Εζεφοῦν. ἐν τέξει πάρεσμεν ἐσκευασμένοι ἂν μὲν τις εὗ ποιή, ἀντευποιεῖν, ἂν ἰε κακῶς,
ἀλεξαθῆναι. (An. 5, 5, 21-22) ἀλεξούμαι γὰρ τὸ ἀμύομαι. ὅθεν ἀλεξηπήρος ὁ ἄμυντήρος.
καὶ ἀλεξίκακος ὁ τοὺς κακοὺς ἀμυνόμενος.

13v 17
ἤ ἄναμωτὶ κόπη, incruenta victoria. ἀνακωκύω, φωνῇ τῶν ὀδυρομένων καὶ κλαόντων.
ἀναδέχομαι, recipio, ἕγουν ἐπαγγέλλομαι ἢ ἐγγυόμαι. Xenophon (cf. Cyr. 1, 6, 18 and 6, 1, 45)

21v 25
ἀἶξιος ἀπὸν Xenophontem. Carus ut anonna cara est. (De vectigalibus 4, 6, 5)

24v 26
ἀπερύκω, τὸ ἀπελαύνω. Xenophon (Oec. 5, 6; Mem 2, 9, 2)

36r 4
Xenophon.
νομίζε ὁσπερ ἐν θήρῃ, ἡμᾶς μὲν τοὺς ἐπιζητήσοντας ἐσέσθαι, σὲ δὲ τὸν ἐπί ταῖς ἀρκυ
στ. (Cyr. 2, 4, 25)

43v 9
et pro dispareo ipse, ut Εζεφοῦν (cf. e.g. HG 3, 3, 9)

48r 5
βασιλιγμία abominatus, fastidium in Xenophonte. (Mem. 3, 11, 13)

49r 3
ἀγγείον τι in Xenophonte. (Suid. β 285 quoting An. 1, 9, 25)

53r 18
γαμέτης. -ου, ὁ νύμφιος καὶ ἀνήρ. in Xenophonte. (cf. Cyr. 4,6,3.)

65r 23
διαμπαξί adverbium διόλου. in Xenophonte (HG 7, 4, 23)

226
78r 11
ēγχουσα est sucus quo mulieres se faciunt videri rubicundas, sicut ψήμιθον quo albas. in Xenophonte (Oec. 10, 2)

114r 17
eυήλατος τόπος, ὁ ἵππασμος. In Xenophonte. (cf. HG 7, 2, 12; Cyr. 1, 4, 14)

123r 25
in accusativo plurali ἡμίστια, sine synaeresi dicit Xenophon (cf. e.g. Oec. 18, 8; An. 1, 9, 26; Cyr. 8, 3, 10)

148v 9
ekκερύφαλος. apud Xenophontem pars freni quae imponitur capiti equi. (cf. Eq. 6, 8; Cyn. 6, 8)

149v 12
Xenophon. κημός camus, idem capistrum. κημοῦν incamare. (cf. Eq. 5, 3)

151r 2
κλαυσίγελως, ὁ ὑπὸ χαρᾶς μετὰ δακρύων καὶ κλαυθμοῖ γέλως. Xenophon. (cf. HG 7, 2, 9)

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

158r 16
κυβιστάν, τὸ κολυμβάν καὶ ὑπὸ θάλατταν καλύπτεσθαι ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τοῦτο αὐτὸ ποιεῖν ἐν ὄργῆσθαι in Xenophonte (cf. Oec. 13, 8 and Simp. 2, 14 and 7, 3). κυβιστήρ, ὁ τοιοῦτο δρῶν.

180v 26
νηποινεῖ impune Xenophon (Hier. 3, 3)

187r 3
τὸ περσικὸν ὄρχεῖτο κρούων πέλτας καὶ ὀκλαζέ καὶ ἄνιστατο. (An. 6, 1, 10)

193r 6
Ξενοφῶν. πεμψάντων ὀπτήρας ὧν πράττομεν, καὶ φραστήρας ὧν ἐρωτῶμεν. (Cyr. 4, 5, 17)

217r 26
ποδαπός, cuias, ἦτοι ποιοῦ ἔθνους ἢ ποίας χώρας. Ξενοφῶν ἐρωτῶμενος ὡς ποδαπός εἰ, Πέρσης ἔφη εἶναι. (An 4, 4, 17)

217v 14
ποθοῦμεν, τοὺς ἀπόντας, φιλοῦμεν τοὺς παρόντας. Xenophon (cf. Hier. 3, 2)

218v 23
ὁ Ξενοφῶν καὶ πολιτεύω λέγει (cf. e.g. HG 1, 4, 13; 3, 1, 21; 1, 5, 19)

233v 2
πτήσσω ὡς τὸ φοβώ, ἀλλὰ τὸ φοβοῦμαι. Xenophon (cf. Cyr. 3, 3, 18)
235v 1
φαδινός procerus, gracilis Xenophon. (Lac. 2, 5)

239v 6
σῆθω ἀτιατικῆ, τὸ κοσκινίζω. σηκοὶ λέγονται καὶ ἀί τὸν βουκημάτων ἐπαύλεις, καὶ σηκάζω ῥῆμα. Ἐνοφαῖν. ὄσπερ ἐν αὐλίῳ σηκασθέντες κατηκοντίσθησαν. (HG 3, 2, 4)

248r 8
in mari, posset forsan dici etiam de terrestri exercitu, ut Demosthenes: έκ πάσης τής ἡπείρου στόλον ἐλθόντα (Epit. 11,1), Xenophon similiter saepe (cf. e.g. HG 3, 1, 10 and 3, 4, 4; An. 1, 2, 5 and 3, 1, 10)

262r 25
tαλασία lanificium, ταλάσια έργα opera lanaria, ταλασιουργό 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)

266n 1
τιμελές, τὸ ἐπιμελές καὶ σπουδαῖον καὶ ἀπειμέλητος, ὁ ἀνεπιμέλητος. Xenophon (cf. Cyr. 8,1,14 and 8,1,15)

268r 26
Ἐνοφαῖν. εἶχον δὲ τόξα, ἐγγύς τριπήχ. τὰ δὲ τοξεύματα πλέον ἤ διπήχ (An. 4,2,28)

271v 22
tροχάζειν λέγεται, τὸ μῆτε βάδην προιέναι μῆτε κατακράτος θέειν. ἄλλα τὸ τούτων πως μεταξό. θάττουν μὲν ἢ βάδην, ἤττον δὲ ἢ ὅρομέως. Xenophon (cf. Cyr. 2,4,3)

275r 5
Xenophon in Oeconomica ei μὴ καὶ τὸν ύποκόμιον καλούμενον χρύματα εἴναι φήσωμεν, ύφ'οι οἱ φαγόντες αὐτὸν παραπλήγες γίγνονται. (1,13)

282v 3
in duali potest esse generis masculini. attice nam Ἐνοφαῖν dicit τὸ φαλάγγε (cf. An. 1,8,17)

294r 20
et interrogo, et interficio. Xenophon facit synaeresim eius etiam in a dicens χράθεαι. (cf. e.g. An. 3, 2, 37; Cyr. 5, 3, 22)

3) QUOTATIONS FROM PLUTARCHUS

11r 3
Πλούταρχος. ἀκροχορδόνες καὶ μελάσματα καὶ φακοί. (De sera numinis vindicta 563a 4)

12v 1
ἄλων ποτὲ μὲν τὸ δάκνεσθαι καὶ ἀπορείσθαι, ποτὲ δὲ τὸ γαφρῖν καὶ χαίρειν (Plut. Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat 22e 7)

46r 9
ἀγίκορος καὶ ἀγικορία, ἡ πλησιον καὶ ὁ υπερβάλλων κόρος. apud 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 752b 5 and 759f 5; Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum 1088b 5)

49r 7
biōtos, tò ἔν. ἢ τὰ χρήματα ώς το, βιοτον δὲ μοι ἄλλοι ἔδουσι.(Plut. Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat 22e 6)

62r 19
δημαγωγία, τῇ πειθοί γίνεται. δημοκρατία δὲ τῇ ἀπὸ τῶν χρημάτων καὶ ἀντεπαγγελιῶν προσενέξει. in Plutarcho. (Praecepta gerenda rei publicae 802e 1)

62v 2
(δημοκρατία καὶ δήμον ... publicola) in Plutarcho (Publ. 10, 9; only the indication of the author is written in the margin, the other parts are in the main text)

76r 6
δυσαπομαι δὲ τὸ λίαν ἀισχύνομαι. πλούταρχι ὑπερβολὴ τοῦ αἰσχύνεσθαι ἐστὶ τὸ δυσωπεῖσθαι. (Plut. De virtioso pudore 528e 3)

111r 13
Plutarchus in vita Romuli (29, 2). Καπράτιναι νόνναι καλοῦνται διὰ τὸν ἐρινεόν, καπρίφικον ὑπὸ ῥωμαίων ὄνομαζόμενον.

119v 26
ἐσιλον, τὸ ψυχρόν, τὸ ἀνωφέλες, τὸ μάταιον, καὶ ἀνισχυρον, καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐω λεπόμενον. άθεν ἐσιλοκρασία, τὸ χθιζὸν βρώμα καὶ παρὰ δημιουθεῖ να ματαια πόσις ἢ τοῦ πότου τὰ καταλείμπατα. contrarium est prosofátou τὸ ἔσιλον in Plutarcho (cf. e.g. Galba 3, 2; De curiositate 519a 4; Septem sapientium convivium 148a 3)

127v 2
θαόζειν, τὸ κνεῖσθαι, ἢ τὸ καθέζεσθαι καὶ θαάσειν. (cf. Plut. Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat 22f 1)

132r 4
Plutarchus. ἐν ἵππικοῖς θεάτροις οἱ ῥωμαίοι κήκους καλοῦσιν. (Aem. 32, 2)

155r 14
λέγεται καὶ κυρίττῳ τὸ κερατίζω, in Plutarcho. (cf. Crass. 7, 8; Actia Romana et Graeca 280f 5)

182v 26
ἐνομισοῦσα, γυνῆ, ἢ ἐνόμους προσεταιριζομένη (cf. Plut. De cupiditate divitiarum 527f 2)

190r 16
Plutarchus. ἢ ἁκριῆς καὶ δι᾽ ὄνυχος λεγομένη συζήτησις. (De tuaenda sanitate praecipita 128e 8)

196r 26
Plutarchus ἀσά τὸν ὀυλαμόν εἶναι ἵππον πεντήκοντα πλήθος ἐν τετραγώνῳ σχήματι τεταγμένων. (Ly. 23, 1)
207v 24
πελάτης, in Plutarcho cliens, θηλικός πελάτης (cf. e.g. Cor. 13, 5 and 21, 5; Mar. 5, 9; Cat. Ma. 24, 5)

226r 15
όι προτέρποντες ἐπὶ τί τῶν φιλοσόφων, διδάσκοντες δὲ μηδὲν μήτε ὑποτιθέμενοι, ὁμοίοι εἰς τοῖς τοῖς λόγχους προμύττουσιν, ἔλαιον δὲ οὐκ ἐγχέουσιν. (Plut. Praecepta gerendae reipublicae 798b 3)

229v 3
προσφλιταρό, τὸ προσμένω, δοτική. indulgeo, adhaereo, Plutarch: τοῖς χρήμασιν ὀσπερ κηρίοις μέλλεται προσελπάρουν (Aem. 23, 7)

235r 14
Plutarch in vita Romuli: ἔμπροσθεν τούτου ἐβάδιζον έτεροι βακτηρίας τὸν ὁχλὸν ἀνέφροντες, ὑπεξεργοῦντος ἴμαντες, ὥστε συνδεῖν εὐθύς οὕς προστάζειε. τὸ δὲ δῆσαι Λατίνοι, πάλαι μὲν λιγάρε, νῦν δὲ ἀλλιγάρα καλούσιν. οὗν οἱ τε ῥαβδοῦχοι λικτόρες, αἱ τε ράβδοι βάκιλα καλοῦνται διὰ τὸ χρήσθαι τούτω βακτηρίας. εἰκὸς δὲ λικτόρες ἐνυπάρχοντος τοῦ κάππα νῦν ὄνομαζονται. πρότερον γὰρ λιτόρες, ἑλληνιστὶ δὲ λειτουργοὶ ὄντας λῆτον γὰρ τὸν δήμον ἐτί νῦν Ἡλληναις λαδὸν τὸ πλῆθος ὄνομαζον. (Rom. 26, 3)

235v 4
ῥατίω, τὸ κόπτο. ἀνέρρωσεν, in Plutarcho convaluit (Pomp. 57,1)

237v 24
ῥωπίκος, ὁ οὔδενος ἀξίωσ. ρώπος γὰρ ὁ παντοδαπὸς ἢ καὶ ὁ λεπτὸς φόρτος. ἄλλα καὶ μίγμα χρώματος. ἐξ οὐ καὶ ῥοποπόλης ὁ ταῦτα πιπράσκων καὶ ῥοποπολεῖον. Plutarchus (cf. Dem. 9, 5)

238r 26
Plutarch in vita Romuli: τὸν ῥομίλων φασὶ διαφερόντως θεοσεβὴ γενέσθαι καὶ μαντικὸν καὶ φορεῖν ἐπὶ μαντικῆ τὸ καλούμενον λίτον. ἔστι δὲ καμπύλη ράβδος, ἢ τὰ πλινθία καθεξομένους ἐπὶ οἶοιν διαγράφειν (Rom. 22, 1)

255r 8
Plutarchus. συνόδικον τῷ Μουρρήνα παρῆν ὁ Κικέρον (Cat. Mi. 21,7,2)

274v 26
Plutarch in vita Romuli. τὸν Ταλάσιον μέχρι τοῦ νῦν Ἦρωμαίοι, ὡς Ἡλληνες τὸν ὶμέναιον τοῖς γάμοις ἐπάδουσιν. (cf. 15, 3)

282v 24
φάρμακον, καὶ τὸ χρῶμα. Πλούταρχος. τέλος δὲ ὁ ζωγράφος προσέβαλε τῷ πίνακι τὸν σπόγγον ὀσπερ ἐχεῖτα φαρμάκων ἀνάλογον (cf. De fortuna. 99b 8)

288r 5
χαρεκακία ἢ καὶ ἐπιχαρεκακία λέγεται ἢδονή ἐπ’ ἀλλοτρίους κακοῖς. Plutarchus (cf. e.g. De curiosisate 518c 8; Quaestiones convivales 631a 7)

292r 9
χορδολογῶ ρῆμα, τὸ τὰς χορδὰς διερεύνω καὶ πρὸς ἄλληλας συναρμόζω. Plutarchus (De capienda ex inimicis utilitate 87f 9)
4) QUOTATIONS FROM THUCYDIDES

50v 26

βουλεύσεις ὄνομα καὶ κατὰ συγκοπὴν βουλής, κλίνεται βουλήντος. In Thucydidē (cf. sch. in Thuc. 3, 70, 5; Suid. β 435)

159r 20

Κυτίνον Δωρικόν, πόλες τίς, ἵσως ὡς νῦν ζητούνον. In Thucydidē. (cf. Hist. 1, 107, 2; 3, 95, 1; 3,102.1)

179r 18

ναυάγιον οὐδετέρως παρὰ Θουκυδίδη ὅταν τι τῆς νεώς ἀπολεσθῇ, οἷον πηδάλιον ἢ τι τοιουτόν. ναυαγία δὲ θηλυκός πάσα ἢ τῆς νήπου ἀπώλεια. (quoted in Suid. ν 45)

199r 1

τὰ παιδικὰ, ὀξυτόνως, οὐδετέρως, πληθυντικῶς. τινὲς μὲν ἐπὶ καλὸν ἔρωτος, τινὲς ὡς ἐπὶ αἰσχροῦ ἐξειλήφασι. Θουκυδίδης (Hist. 1, 132, 5): ἀνήρ ἀργύλιος παιδικά ποτὲ ὁν αὐτοῦ.

210r 10

subligaculum. apud Θουκυδίδην διάζωμα (Hist. 1.6.5)

5) OTHER QUOTATIONS

5r 5

ἄδικον. iniuistum quod refertur ad naturealem essentiam. ἀδίκημα vero dicitur operatio huius iniusti et actus ipse est iniuria. (cf. Arist. EN1135a)

181v 12

Ἀριστοτέλης νόμισμα λέγεται ὅτι οὐ φύσει ἀλλὰ νόμῳ ἐστί. (EN1133a)

244r 1

τὸ μεταξὸν λευκοῦ καὶ μέλανος ἐπὶ φωνῆς λέγεται σομφὸν παρά τισιν. ὤπερ ἐπὶ χρωμάτων τὸ φαιόν. ut Aristoteles in Topicis (106b)

290v 1

χειρῶνας, ὃ χειροτέχνης καὶ βάναυσος. οἶκεν καὶ χειρονακτικός. χερνήτες, οἱ βάναυσοι τεχνῖται Aristoteles (Pol. 1277a-b)

5r 26

[αἰδώμαι?] σέβομαι ποιητικὸς, αἰτιατική. (cf. sch. in Aesch. Α. 362b)

7r 26

ἀιμύλιος ὁ κομψός καὶ χορής, καὶ αἰμυλία ἡ κομψότης. lepidus et lepos ut Homerus (Od.1, 56-57): in Odyssea αἰδῆ ἐν μαλακοῖς καὶ αἰμυλίοις [correcte αἰμυλίοια] λόγοις, θέλει ὡς ἀθάκης ἐπιλήσεται. αἱρετικός conditionalis, τὰ αἱρετικὰ λεγάτα μετὰ τὴν ἐκβασιν τῆς
Herodotus vero ait γενεά τρεῖς ἀνδρῶν ἑκατὸν ἑτερ ἐστί (Hist. 2, 142, 2)

152v 10

κνάν καὶ κνάεσ καὶ κνάπτεν, τὸ ἐζύειν. Κνάφος apud Herodotum spina trahens vestimenta (cf. Suid. κ 1853; Hist. 1, 92, 9). et quo fullones olim acervo spinarum mundabant vestimenta dicti sunt κναφεῖς, ille acervus κνάφος.

150v 6

κύσιβιον ἄγχειον τι ποιμενικὸν ἐν ὧ τὸ γάλα ἐγχεῖται. Lucianus (cf. DDeor. 10, 4; cf. sch. in Lucianum 79, 10)

178v 1

μυττωτός, ὑπότριμμά τι ἐκ διαφάροις ἀρτομάτων, ἦ καὶ ἐκ σκορόδων. ἦ ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν κρεῶν ἐν τῷ ζωμῷ γλυκός, ὡς τοῦ ζωμοῦ ἐκλελαυτός τῷ τριβλίῳ περικάθηται. ut in Luciano (cf. sch. in Lucianum 25, 54). Μυχοὶ, tenebrae, recessus. μυχαίος στεναγμός, ὁ ἐκ βάθους ἀναπεμπόμενος.

187v 19

Lucianus ἀμελήσαντες τοῦ ὅλκοῦ τὸ σύφαρ τοῦ θρέως θηρεύειν πειρώμεθα. Idem. μᾶλλον δὲ ὁμοί ποιούμεν ὅσπερ ἐν τῇ ὡς δύον ἐγχέει, ὑπέρον σιδήρῳ πλήττον, πράττειν ἀναγκαίον τι καὶ προθηργου οἰδόμενος. οὕτω εἰδές ότι ἄν ἀποβάλλῃ φασί τοὺς ὁμίους πλήττων, ὑδρω ὁμοί τὸ ὑδρο μένει. προθηργον operae pretium. (Herm. 79, 20)

214v 4

πτερύμα, τὸ δρωπακίζομαι, καὶ μηχανή τινι τάς ἐν τῷ σώματι παρατίλλομαι τρίχας. Lucianus (cf. sch. in Lucianum 9,50)

220r 23

πομπεῖω, ἐνίοτε παρὰ ρήτορι τὸ λοιδορό, καὶ πομπεία, ἦ ὄβρις καὶ λοιδορία. ut Demosthenes (cf. e.g. In Midiam 181, 9)
VIII

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
άγάλλομαι καὶ ἀγαλλιώματι τὸ χαίρω ἀμεταβάτως. ἀγάλλω δὲ τὸ τιμῶ τὸ ἔτερεον μεταβατικῶς, ὅθεν καὶ ἀγαλμα.

1v 20
τὸ φιλῶ ἀιτιατικῆ, ἀγαπῶ δὲ τὸ ἀρκοῦμαι δοτικῆ. contentor. (cf. Suid. a 161)

2v 2
ἀγκύλη τὸ ὄπεσθεν τοῦ γόνατος ἢ τοῦ ἀγκόνος ἢ κάμψης καὶ εἶδος ἀκοντίου. καὶ τί τῶν ἔργων τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ Μοσσέως. sed et amentum. unde ἀγκυλοῦμαι amento, -as et ἀγκυλίζομαι teneo iaculum paratum in amento. (cf. Suid. a 251)

2v 22
ἀγνος, φυτόν, δὲ καὶ λίγονα καλοῦσι παρὰ τὸ τοὺς ἐσθίοντας ἀγόνους τηρεῖν. τινὲς δὲ τὸν κωλύσανδόν λέγουσι.

3r 10
ἀγοράζω ἀμεταβάτως τὸ εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν διατρίβω. ἀγοράζω δὲ τὸ ὄνομα μεταβατικῶς.

3v 23
ἀγύρτης λέγεται ὁ συναθροίζων πολλοὺς περὶ ἕαυτὸν λέγων τί ἢ ποιῶν καινοτερον.

6r 15
ἀθλος ὁ ἀγών, ἀθλὸν τὸ ἐπαθλον (cf. e.g. Suid. a 742; Et.Gud. α 32; Phot. Lexicon a 477)

6r 21
ἀπὸ τοῦ ἅ ἐπιτατικοῦ μορίου καὶ τοῦ θροῦ[ς] (cf. Suid. a 761; Et.Gen. a 143; Et.Gud. a 33)

7r 15
ἀμιῳδεῖν ἔστι, τὸ τοὺς ὀδόντας ναρκάν. (cf. Hsych. α 1970)

9r 14
ἀκίς, -ίδος. λέγεται μὲν τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ σιδήρου τῶν οἰωνῶν βελῶν, ἐντεῦθεν δὲ καὶ πάντα τὰ λεπτὰ καὶ κατὰ τὰ ἅκρα ὄξυτα.

13r 4
ἀμιχανω. ἀπορῶ, μηχανήν οὐχ εὐρίσκω, ἀποτυχάνω (cf. Thom. Mag. Ecloga nominum et verborum Atticorum α 47. 3)

13r 11
gurges, λέξις ἢ ἐξηρασία ἢ πλήμμωρα (cf. Suid. a 1656)
13v 23
ανάγωγος, ὁ ἐκδοξητημένος καὶ μὴ χρηστής δηλονότι τυχόν ἁγώνης. ἢ μὴ πειθήνιος καὶ δυσάγωγος, ὡς ἵππος (cf. Hippiatrica Berolinensia 1, 10)

18v 4
aβ ὁἶγο quod non est in usu (cf. e.g. Et Gud. Additamenta. a 149)

19v 21
τὸ ἰδιωτικὸς λεγόμενον καλάμιον τοῦ ποδὸς. κνήμη γὰρ sura ὡς καὶνή καὶ πλήρης οὖσα ἀἵματος.

21v 26
ἄξιος ποταμὸς διὰ τῆς παιονίας ρέων, καὶ μέχρι πέλλης καὶ θαλάσσης διήκων, ὁ νῦν καλούμενος βαρδάριος.

41r 22
ἀτιμώ. τὸ ἀτιμον ποιῶ. ἀτιμάζω δὲ, τὸ καταφρονῶ (cf. Suid. a 4363)

47r 26
βασιλεύω σου, τὸ ἄρχω, βασιλεύω σε, βασιλέα ποιῶ. (cf. Suid. β 143)

52v 6
βυσσαύχην, ὁ τοὺς ὁμοὺς συνέλκων ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον (Suid. β 595)

59v 12
δεδίττομαι τὸ φοβοῦμαι (cf. e.g. Phot. Lexicon ᾱ 84), παρὰ δημοσθένει καὶ τὸ φοβῶ, αἰτιατική.

60r 12

69r 26
dιδασκάλιον λέγεται τὸ τοῖς διδασκούσι τι διδόμενον χάριν τῆς μαθήσεως.

70v 11
quasi διχαίον α δίχα

71v 17
μηχανικὸν ἦν τεχνούργημα δι᾽ οὗ ἀπηκρίβουν οἱ γεωμέτραι τὴν τῶν ἐπάλξεων ἐκ διαστήματος ἀναμέτρησιν (cf. Suid. δ 1195)

71v 26
διοχετεύω ὑδόρ φαμέν, διόχουσ ὁ ποιηταὶ φασὶν· ἐτεροι δὲ νομέας ligna curva in concavo navis per latus

74v 12
δρωπακίζειν, χρίσθαι τὸ σῶμα, πρὸς τίλωσιν τριχῶν. (cf. Suid. δ 1538; Ps.-Zonar. Lexicon δ 574,15) δρωπακίζω, συνάγω, τρυγώ. δρωπτά γὰρ τὰ δρεπτά, τὰ δρέπανα.
(Suid. δ 1538) δρόμος δὲ οὐ κακόλωπισμένος ἂνήρ, ἢ οὔ καλλιωπιστής. (cf. Ps.-Zonar.
Lexicon δ 570, 1; Gennadius Scholarius, Grammatica 2,437,15; Suid. δ 1539)

75v 17
dυστέκαρτον τὸ δυσεύρετον καὶ δύσηπτον. (cf. Suid. δ 1695; Hsych. δ 2665α)

76r 1
tοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς δυσωπίας οἱ περὶ ἀττικῆς γράψαντες συνθήεος ὡς ἀδοκίμον. τὸ
γὰρ δυσωπεῖσθαι οὐχ ὡς οἱ νέοι ἐπὶ τοῦ αἰδεῖσθαι, ἄλλ᾽ ἐπὶ τοῦ ψφοράσθαι καὶ
δεδέναι ἐκλάμβανται.

76v 25
ἐγγυώμαι τόνδε ἐπὶ γάμου ἐγγύης, ἐγγυώμαι σοι δὲ τόνδε, οἶον ἀντ᾽ αὐτοῦ
καθίσταμαι ἐγγυής (cf. Lex. Vind. ε 203).
alibi ἐγγύω σοι θυγατέρα despondeo.
ἐγγυώμαι σοι, τὸ ύπισχύομαι σοι, ἐγγύη ύπόσχεσις.

80r 22
eἰσαγγελία ἔστιν, ἢ ἐπὶ ρητοῖς ἐγκλήμασιν εἰσαγωγή δίκης. οἶον γράφομαι νικίαν
προδοσίας. φάσις δὲ, ἢ ψιλή προσαγγελία.

85v 14
ἐκπερικῆσαι, τὸ διακράναι, ἐκ μεταφοράς τῶν περδίκων πανούργων ὄντων. (cf. Suid.
ε 562)

86r 15
ἐκπρόθεσιον λέγεται καὶ ὑπερήμερον, τὸ ἔξω τῆς ταχθείσης προθεσμίας γενόμενον.
καὶ τὸν τεταγμένον χρόνον τῆς ἀποτίσεως ἢ καταβολῆς ὑπερβάν.

93v 20
ἐνιαχοῦ καὶ ἑνιαχῆ πρὸ ἔστιν οὗ, ἢ πολλαχοῦ (cf. Suid. ε 1332)

105r 23
ἐπιλλέστα, τὸ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς περιστρόφοις διανεύω. ἢλλος γὰρ ὁ ὀφθαλμός. καὶ
ἐπιλλος ὁ διάστροφός τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς. (cf. Hsych. ε 4946)

106r 22
τὰ ἐπιπλα, τὰ ἔξ ἐπιπολῆς σκεύη. οἶον ἡ ἐπιπόλαιος κτήσις καὶ ὅση δυνατή
πλοίζεσθαι, ἄλλ᾽ οὐκ ἐγγεῖος. (cf. EM 363,9; Suid. ε 2512)

110v 26
τῶν ἐρεττόντων, οἱ μὲν ἄνω θαρα[νίται λέγονται,] οἱ δὲ μέσοι, ζυγήται. οἱ δὲ κάτω [θαλάμου.]
(cf. Suid. θ 454)

111v 8
ἐρμαφρόδιτος ἢ ἀνδρόγυνος, ἢ ὁ αἰσχρὸς καὶ ποιῶν καὶ πᾶσχων. (c.f. Suid. ε 3028)

111v 10
ἐρμώνιος χάρις, ἢ κατὰ ἀνάγκην διδομένη, οὐκ ἐκ διαθέσεως ψυχῆς, ἄλλ᾽ ἐπιπλάστως, καὶ
κατὰ προσποίησιν φύλας οὐ κάτ᾽ ἀλήθειαν. (Suid. ε 3053)
111v 26
έρωμα, ὁ ἀπὸ φύσεως ἐχθρός. ἐρωμὸν χωρίον.

121r 23
τὰ μὲν τῶν ζώων σαρκοφαγεῖ, τὰ δὲ σπερμολογεῖ, τὰ δὲ ριζωρυχεῖ.

123v 26
ήρακλείος ψώρα, ἡ δυσθεράπευτος καὶ ήρακλείων λουτρῶν δεομένη πρὸς θεραπείαν (cf. Suid. η 467)

125r 19
θεατρών, τὸ τόπον ἐν τῷ θέατρῳ ὑνοόμενος, ἂφ οὔ δὲν ἔχοι θεωρεῖν. ὡς τελώνης, ὁ τὰ
dημόσια τέλη ὑνοόμενος. ὁμοίως καὶ σιτάνης καὶ βοώνης ...

127r 19
θίσας, τὸ ἀθροιζόμενον πλήθος ἐπὶ τέλει καὶ τιμὴ θεοῦ (cf. Suid. θ 380)

129r 1
θυραῖος, ὁ ἐκτὸς καὶ ἠλικτή στάσιν. θύραξε δὲ, κίνησιν ἔνδοθεν εἰς τὰ ἔξω. θύραθεν δὲ, ἔξωθεν
e[πί τά]? ἐσω. (cf. Lex. Vind. 0 24)

129r 26
ἰαστὶ Ionice vel ἀττικστι, ἀιολιστι, δωριστι.

131v 1
ιμάν, τὸ ἀντλεῖν καὶ ἀνέλκειν. ὅθεν καὶ ἀνιμᾶν καὶ ἰμαίον ἂσμα, τὸ ἐπὶ τῇ ἀντλήσει ἄδομενον,
ὡς τὸ, καὶ ποι τίς ἂν ἄδαπτης ἰμαίον ἄδει, καὶ ἄκορ ἴμπτων, τὸ ἀντλητόν. (cf. Suid. 1 331, 343 and 355)

131v 9
ἰνδάλληται, καταφαίνεται, ὁμοιοῦται καὶ ἰνδάλματα, τὰ φαντάσματα, τὰ ὁμοιώματα,
ἀπηκονισμάτα. (cf. Suid. 1 371 and 372)

132v 26
πρῶτον διλυθοῦτα, εἶναι φύλης, εἶναι σύκων καὶ τελευταίων ἵσχας (cf. Suid. 1 711)

136v 19
κακόνω, τὸ κακίαν ἐμποιῶ. κακῶ σε, τὸ βλάττω. (cf. Lex. Vind. κ 86)

138v 8
καπνὸς ἀπὸ ἐξόλου. ἀστίμος ἀπὸ ὑδάτος. αἰθάλη ἀπὸ λίθων. λιγνίς ἀπὸ ἐλαίου καὶ κηροῦ.
κνίσα ἀπὸ κρεών.

139r 23
καρύκη, εἴδος βρόματος ἐξ αἵματος καὶ ποικίλων ἀρτουμάτων συντεθειμένων. ὅθεν καρυκεῖα
καὶ καρύκευμα καὶ καρυκεύω ῥήμα.

140v 17
καταδιατιτό σου, τὸ καταψηφίζομαι σου καὶ κατακρίνω σε.
143r 26
περπερεύομαι, τὸ χαριντίζομαι, πέρπερος γὰρ ὁ μετὰ βλακείας ἐπηρμένος, ὁ λάλος καὶ προσετής καὶ μηδὲν μετὰ λογισμοῦ ποιῶν (cf. Suid. κ 964; Phot. Lexicon π 425,20; Suid. π 1366)

147v 18
καττύω, τὸ εὐτρεπίζω καὶ συρράπτω καὶ μετὰ δόλων υφαινώ, κάττυμα ἢ ἀπάτη μεταφορικῶς. καττύματα γὰρ ἐστὶ δέρματα τινὰ ἱσχὺρα καὶ σκληρὰ ἀπερ τοὺς σανδάλιοις καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ὑποδήμασιν ὑποβάλλονται. (cf. Suid. κ 1128)

148Bv 9
κερδαλέος, ὁ ποικίλος καὶ πανούργος. κερδαλέη γὰρ καὶ κερδὸ ἢ ἄλοπης, ὅθεν κερδαλεόφρων ὁ δολιβουλός καὶ κερδοσύνη ἢ πανουργία. (cf. Suid. κ 1383)

148Bv 22
κεστός, ὁ διακεκεντημένος καὶ πεποικίλμενος ἤμας ἢ ἕνδομα Αφροδίτης. καταχρηστικῶς δὲ πάντα τῶν γυναικῶν τὰ φαντασιώδη ἐνδύματα. (cf. Suid. κ 1428)

150v 10
κυλλισμὸς ὁ ἄκολαστος καὶ λεπτὸς γέλως. (cf. Suid. κ 1695)

152r 19
κνησείω τὸ ἐπιθυμητικὸς ἔχω κνάσθαι. (cf. Suid. κ 1868)

152r 25
κόβαλος ὁ ἀνελεύθερος καὶ πανούργος vafer, dicax; κοβαλεία ἡ προσπόιτος μετὰ ἀπάτης παιδεία. Καὶ κόβαλος ὁ ταύτη χρώμενος. (Suid. κ 1896) vafrícia.

157r 9
κρινωνία, ὁ τῶν κρίνων λειμῶν (Suid. κ 2431)

157r 26
κρόβυλος, εἶδος πλέγματος τριχῶν, ἄρ' ἐκατέρων εἰς ὅξι λήγων, καὶ ἐστὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν, τῶν δὲ γυναικῶν κόρυμβος λέγεται, καὶ τῶν παιδίων σκορπίως.

158r 7
κτύλος, ὁ προηγούμενος τῶν προβάτων κριός (Suid. κ 2526)

158ν 16
κύμβαχος, ὁ ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς πεσῶν καὶ ἄνω τοὺς πόδας ἔχων. (Suid. κ 2681)

160v 19
λαμυρός, θρασύς. λαμυρία, ἡ θρασύτης. (cf. Hsych. λ 124)

161r 20
λαφυγός, ὁ ἄδηψαγια καὶ ἡ πρὸς τὰ ἐδέσματα πολυτελεία (Suid. λ 156), καὶ λαφύσω, τὸ ἐκροφῶ ἢ καὶ διασπαράττω.

161v 17
λειοκύμων λέγεται ἡ θάλασσα ὅτε γαληνιὰ καὶ εὐδιός ἐστι, τὰ κύματα ἐφαπλώσα ὀμαλῶς.
162r 4
λεπάς, κοχλίου εἶδος ταῖς πέτραις δυσαποστάτως προσπήγνυται εἰωθότος. (cf. Suid. λ 284)

162r 21
λέσχη η πολλὴ ὁμολία καὶ φλυαρία, ὅθεν καὶ τὸ ἁδολεσχία. ἐλέγοντο δὲ τὸ παλαιὸν αἱ
καθόραι καὶ οἱ τόποι ἐν οἷς εἰσῆλθαν ἄθροιζόμενοι φιλοσοφεῖν, λέσχη. (Suid. λ 309)

163v 1
λιγνός, ἡ ἀνάδοσις τοῦ καπνοῦ (Suid. λ 505). λιγνός καὶ λιγυρός, ὁ ἡδος καὶ ἡζος (Suid. λ 507).
λιγυρόθυγγος καὶ λιγύρωνς, ὁ ἡδοφυός (Suid. λ 509-510). canorus.

165r 9
λόγια ἐστὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ λεγόμενα καταλογάδην. χρησμοὶ δὲ οἱ ἐμετροὶ ὑπὸ τῶν
θεοφορουμένων λεγόμενοι. (Suid. λ 640)

165Bv 7
λυσιένως γυνῆ ἢ ἐνδόρι πλησιάσασα. αἱ γὰρ παρθένοι μέλλουσα πρὸς μίξιν ἔρχεσθαι,
ἀνετίθεσαν τὰς παρθενικὰς αὐτῶν ὄνομα τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι. (Suid. λ 859)

166r 11
οἴνηρον ἄγγειον ἐκ ζύλων κατεσκευασμένον (cf. Ps.-Zonar. Lexicon γ 418, 6; Suid. γ 73 and
μ 2). μαγγανευτής ὁ μιγνός παντοδαπὰ πρὸς φενακισμόν (cf. Suid. μ 3). καὶ μαγγανεία ἡ
γοπεία. (Suid. μ 4)

166r 23
μαθητιῶ, τὸ μαθητῆς γενέσθαι ἐπιθυμῶ. μαθητεύω δὲ σοι, ἀντὶ τοῦ μαθητῆς εἰμι. (cf. Lex.
Vind. μ 10,1)

167r 6
μαλάχα, ὅσα τῶν ἐνόδρον ὑστέα οὐκ ἔχει. οἷον σηπία, πολύπους, ταὐτά δὲ καὶ ἀναμά ἐστι
καὶ ἀπλαγχα. (Suid. μ 98)

167r 9
μαλακοστρακοὶ ἱθύες, ὅσα ἐκδούται. οἷον ἀστρακοί, καριδες, πάγουροι, καρκίνοι. ταὐτά δὲ
μόνα ἐκδούται. (Suid. μ 95)

169v 20
Μελιταίων κυνίδιοι. τῶν γὰρ κυνῶν οἱ μὲν ἰχνευτικοί, οἱ δὲ ὁμόσε τοῖς θηρίοις χωροῦσιν, οἱ
dὲ ἐπὶ φυλακῆ τῶν κτημάτων οἰκουροί, οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τέρψει, ός τα Μελιταία κυνίδια, καὶ
Μελιτηροί κόνες οἱ ἐπὶ τέρψει τρεφόμενοι (Suid. μ 519)

172r 1
μεταδιδάξει dedocere ἢ τὸ τὴν προτεράν ἀφεῖνα βουλήν καὶ ἐπ᾽ ἄλλην τραπήναι (Suid. μ 690)

172v 14
μεταποιοῦμαι, τὸ φροντίζω καὶ προνοοῦμαι γενικῆ, μεταποιῶ δὲ τὸ μεταβάλλω, ἀτιατικῇ
(Suid. μ 728)

174v 1
μηρύμαι, τὸ σχοινὸν συνάγω (Lex. Vind. μ 26)
175r 11
ό παρασάγγησ, μέτρον ὁδού πέρασκον, ἦτοι τριάκοντα στάδιοι. σχοῖνος δὲ ἀγώπτιον, ἐξήκοντα στάδιοι. τὸ μὲν μίλιον, ἔχει στάδια η, τὸ δὲ στάδιον πόδας χ.

175r 26
ὁ ἄγκος vallis. μισγάγκεια καὶ ἐσνάγκεια τότος κοῦλος ἐς ὅν τὰ καταφέρομεν μίσχεται ἀπὸ πλειών ν ὄρων ὑδατα (Suid. μ 1110). Latine conflagres dicuntur loca, in quae rivi diversi confluent; convallis.

175v 26
tοῦ μὲν προσδοκομένου ἐστὶν ἐλπίς. τοῦ δὲ παρόντος αἱσθησίς. τοῦ δὲ κόραντός μνήμη (cf. Suid. μ 1155)

176r 15
μόθος, μάχη, πόλεμος, τάραχος, σφάσις, θόρυβος, φόβος. (Suid. μ 1186)

176v 14
μονίδω ἁγιος, ὡς μεμονωμένος ἡ ἡ μονόλυκος. (Suid. μ 1221) fera singularis

177r 11
μορμολύκεια, καὶ μορμοίνες, τὰ τῶν τραγῳδῶν καὶ ἦμοκριτῶν προσωπεία, ἀ δωρείς γόργια καλούσιν. (Suid. μ 1250) ἰδεῖν τὸ ἐκφροθεία, μορμολύξεσθαι. μορμολύττομαι σε, τὸ φοβώ καὶ eis πτοιαν καὶ ὠρρωδίαν ἄγω.

177v 23
μύλη, τὸ κάτω τοῦ μύλου. τὸ γὰρ ἄνω ὅνος; λέγεται. meta est inferior pars molae, catillus superior. (cf. Suid. μ 1408)

178r 20
μύρτων, τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ γυναικείου αἴδοιου. οὗ τὸ μεταχθείν κλειτορίς, Latine evigium. ἀφ oıy τὸ ἀκολάστος ἐπεσθαι, κλειτορίζεσθαι. τὸ δὲ χείλος ὑποδορίς. τὸ δὲ σύμπτωμα μυρτοχείλη. (Suid. μ 1462)

179r 4
ναζιράς ὁ θῷ κεχαρισμένος καὶ ἄφιερωμένος, ἡ μοναχός. (Suid. v 10)

179r 16
ναστὸν τὸ πυκνὸν καὶ πληρες καὶ μεστὸν καὶ μῆ ἔχον ὑπόκουφον τι. μανὸν δέ, τὸ ἀραίον χαῖνον καὶ ἀνοφερές ὡς φλόξ. ναστὸς ἀρσενίκος ὁ πλακοῦς, ἢ ἄρτος θερμὸς μετ' ἐλαίου. (Suid. v 44)

179r 25
ναυτιῶν, κυρίως τὸ ἐν τῇ νη ἐμεῖ. (Suid. v 81) ναὶ μὰ μήκωνος χλόην. ὄρκος ἐπὶ χλευασμῷ. (Suid. v 100)

179v 26
νεμέσαν καὶ νεμεσίζειν δοτική. τὸ ἐμποδόν ἱστασθαι τοὺς πραττομένοις κατά γνώμην καὶ τὸ ... (Suid. v 154). διαφέρει δὲ νεμεσιτικὸς τοῦ φθόνῳ ὅτι? ὁ μὲν φθόνορδς ἐπὶ ταῖς τῶν καλῶν εὐραγαίας λυπεῖται, ὁ δὲ νεμεσιτικὸς ἐπὶ ταῖς τῶν κακῶν. (Suid. v 157)

180r 3
νεοθηγές ξίφος, τὸ νεωτι ἀκονθηθ. ἢ νέος, ἢ νεοστὶ ἤρτριμένη γῇ.
181r 3
νησόσχιον anaticula, νύσσα δὲ καμπτήρ, τέρμα, βαθμίς. (Suid. v 617)

181r 5
νήτη χορδή λεγομένη ύπό τῶν μουσικῶν πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολήν τῆς ὑπάτης καὶ μέσης. (Suid. v 11)

181r 25
? ὅτι ἡ παιδοποιία παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ τετραχῶς γένεται. γνήσιος ὁ ἐκ νομίμων γάμων. νόθος ὁ ἐκ παλλακίδος. σκότιος ὁ ἐκ λαθραίας μίξεως. παρθένιος ὁ ἐκ τῆς ἔτι νομίζομενης παρθένου γενόμενος. (cf. EM 236. 25)

184r 11
ἄγμος, ὥς κατὰ στήξον ἔφοδος τῶν θεριστῶν. καὶ ἄγμοι σταχῶν. καὶ ἐπόγμος ὀνομάτηρ ἐφορος τοῦ θέου. (Suid. o 26)

185r 8
ἀπειρος ὁ ἀλλογενής καὶ ξένος καὶ ἀλλότριος σοῦ ὁ ἐκ τῆς ἀλλοδαπῆς ἀργυρέας ὡς τινες ὁμοιοί. ἀλλ' ὁ ἄποι πόλεος τῆς αὐτῆς ὁν. καὶ ἀλλος ἐπιτήδειος ποις, οὐ μέντοι κατὰ γένος προσόν. (Suid. o 83-84)

193r 26
όρμεα. τὰ τῶν λαχάνων πάντων ἐκκεκαυληκότα. οἱ δὲ τῆς κράμβης φασὶ τὸ ἐντός κύμα. οἱ δὲ τῶν ἄγριων ἀσπάραγον. (Suid. o 598)

196r 10
οὐθαρ, τὸ γονιμότατον μέλος, οὐθάτα δὲ οἱ μαζὶ τῶν προβάτων. (Suid. o 837-838.)

198r 7
ὁφαρτύτης ὁ μάγευρος. ὁφαρτύτικη ἡ μαγειρική. (Suid. o 1071-1072)

199r 20
παλμβάλης ὁ ἄνατορα πεσὼν ὁ ὑπτιος. (Suid. π 85)

201r 7
πάππος καὶ αἱ ἐπὶ τοῦ κάτω χείλους τρίχες. μύσταξ δὲ αἱ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄνω. (Suid. π 264)

201r 12
παράβυστον, τὸ παρακεκρυμμένον καὶ λάθρα γινόμενον. (Suid. π 301)

202r 18
παρακεκομμένος, ὁ ἐξεσθηκός καὶ μαϊνόμενος καὶ παράφρον. (Suid. π 358) stupidus. insanus. vecors. excors.

202v 1
παρακοίτης ὁ ἀνήρ, παράκοιτις δὲ ἡ γυνή. (Suid. π 377)

207v 16
πέλανοι, πέμματα ἐκ παιπάλῆς ἢ ἐστι λεπτότατον ἄλευρον ἐς θυσίαν ἐπιτήδειον. ἢ οἱ μέλιτι δεδευμένοι καρποί. ἢ θεοὺς ἄπαρχαί τινες. ἢ ὁ περὶ τῷ στόματι πεπηγός ἀφρός. καὶ τὸ
περιπεπηγός ἐξηγημένον ὑπάδες δάκρυν. οἶνον λιβανωτόν καὶ κόμμι, καὶ ὁ τοῦ μάντεως μισθὸς ὅβολός. (Suid. π 928)

208ρ 3
πέμπελος, γέρων καὶ γραύς παρὰ τὸ πέμπεσθαι ἐν τῷ ἁδέ (Suid. π 958)

210ν 21
περὶ λόγχων ἀφάς, prima face, tum cum sera rubens accendit L. v.

211ν 12
περίπυστον, τὸ ἔξακουστὸν καὶ περιβόητον (cf. Suid. π 1272)

213ρ 5
περπερεία, ἢ κολάκεια, καὶ πέρπερος ὁ μετὰ βλακείας ἐπηρμένος. οἶνον λάλος καὶ προπετής, καὶ μὴδὲν σὺν λογισμῷ ποιῶν. (Suid. π 1365 and 1366; Phot. Lexicon π 425, 20)

214ρ 1
πίδαξ, πηγή ἢ σταγών, καὶ Εὐπίδαξ χῶρος, ὃ καλὴν ἔχον πηγήν. (Suid. π 1555)

215ν 1
πλασίσιον, τετράγωνος στάσις στρατεύματος καὶ τὸ ἐκ ξύλων τετραγώνων πῆγμα. (Suid. π 1715)

215ν 18
πλεῖων, -όνος, ὁ ἐνιαυτός, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ πληροῦσθαι τοὺς καιροὺς. (Suid. π 1736)

215ν 21
πλειστοδόκεια. ἢ πλείστη δόκησις. (Suid. π 1739)

217ν 1
ποδοκάκκη, ξύλων εἰς ὁ ἐν εἰρκτῇ τοὺς πόδας ἐμβάλλοντες συνέχουσιν. (Lex. Segueriana, Coll. verborum utilium e differentibus rhetoribus et sapientibus multis π 344.16, ed. Bachmann)

219ρ 12
πολλοστημόριον, τὸ ἔσχατον μέρος οἰνὸν τῆς γῆς. (Suid. π 1924)

219ρ 14
πολλοστόν, τὸ ἔσχατον ἐπὶ τάξεως καὶ μορίου (Suid. π 1925)

220ν 2
πλακούντια, πλατέα, λεπτά καὶ περιφερή?

221ρ 2
πόρπαξ, ὃ τὴν ἀσπίδα κατέχουσιν, ὁ λεγόμενος ὄχανος. (Suid. π 2090)

222ρ 1
Πραγματομαθὲς, οἱ τῶν πραγμάτων εἰδήμονες. (Suid. π 2195)

222ρ 8
πρανές, τὸ κάταντες καὶ πρανῆς, ὁ κατωφερής (Suid. π 2208-9)
222r 16
Πρασιαί, αἱ τοῦ κήπου λαχανίαι (Suid. π 2226)

223v 8
προβοσκίς; ὡς τοῦ ἐλέφαντος προνομαία (Suid. π 2356)

225v 15
προκυλινδεῖσθαι, τὸ ἑπὶ γόνον πεσόντα προσκυνεῖν (Suid. π 2492)

232v 1
πρυτανεῖον ἢν ὀίκος μέγας, ἔνθα αἱ σιτίσεις τοῖς πολιτευομένοις ἐδίδοντο οὗτος λεχθὲν ὀσπερ πυρὸς ταμείων, ἔνθα ἢν ἄββαστος πῦρ καὶ ἱγχοντο, ὡς ἤτι ἐκεῖ ἐκάθηντο οἱ πρυτάνεις οἱ τῶν ὀλῶν πραγμάτων διοικηταί.

234r 1
πύθη, μάθη, ἀκούσης. (Phot. Lexicon π 472, 21)

239r 13
σελλόδον, τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄνωθεν ἄπι τὰ κάτω ἀναγινωσκόμενον, pagina (Suid. σ 209). σελίς, τὸ μέσον τῶν δύο καταβατῶν ἄγγραφον τυγχάνον. ἐνιαχοῦ λέγεται οὕτω καὶ τὸ βιβλίον. (Suid. σ 214)

239v 1
σέριφος γραῦς, ὡς ἐν παρθενίᾳ γεγηρακών (Suid. σ 251 and γ 431)

243r 19
ἤ σκυτάλη ἢν ξύλον στρογγύλον ἐξεσμένον ἐπίμηκες, δῶς δὲ παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίσιος ὑπῆρχον σκυτάλη. καὶ τὴν μὲν μιὰν κατείχον οἱ ἔφοροι. τὴν δὲ ἐτέραν παρέχον τῷ ἐκπεμπόμενῳ στρατηγῷ, ὡπότε δὲ ἐβούλοντο ἐπιστεῖλαι τί αὕτω, φέροντες οἷαν λευκὸν περιεύλουν τὴν σκυτάλην. καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡμάντος ἔγραφον εἰτ' ἀνελίττοντες παρείχον τὸν ἡμάντα τὸ ἀποφέροντι. ὁ δὲ στρατηγὸς λαβὼν τὸν ἡμάντα τῇ ἐκτοῦ σκυτάλη περιέλιπτε, καὶ ἐγίνασκε τὰ ἐπεσταλμένα. ἐποίουν δὲ τοῦθ᾽ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ἵνα μὴ γνῶσιν οἱ ἀποφέροντες, καὶ καθ' οὕς ἣν γίνοντο τὰ ἐγγεγραμμένα; λέγεται δὲ σκυτάλη ἀπὸ τοῦ σκύτου τὸ λόρος καὶ τοῦ εἰλό. (cf. Phot. Lexicon σ 525-526; Lex. Segueriana, Coll. verborum utilium e differentibus rhetoribus et sapientibus multis σ 367, 1. ed. Bachmann)

249v 6
στυππειν, τὸ τῆς ἦλαίας ὡστόν. στυππιον, ὠθεν τὸ λίνον νήθεται. (Suid. σ 1260) στυράκιον λέγεται ὁ σῖδηρος τοῦ ἀκόντιον ἢ τὸ ἥλιον.

260r 26
σφενδόνη καὶ ὡς τοῦ δακτυλίου περιφέρεια ἢ τὸ μέρος καθ' οὐ ἢ σφαγίς τυποῦται, οὕτω, τῇ στροφῇ τῆς σφενδόνης ὁ Γύγης.

260v 9
σφηκώδες, οἱ σκληροὶ καὶ τοῖς σῶμασι κάτισχνοι. (Suid. σ 1733)

264v 5
τενάγη, τὰ πηλώδη πελάγη, ἡ ἤλις, ἐπιπολάζοντος ὕδατος οὐ πολλοῦ, καὶ βοτάνης ἐπιφανομένης τῷ ὕδατi. (Suid. τ 305)
272r 6
τρύγητος, ὁ καιρός, ἐν ὧ δεί τρυγάν καὶ ἄμπτος, ὁ καιρός, ἐν ὧ δεί ἀμάν καὶ θερίζειν, προπαροξυτόνως, τρυγήτος δὲ ὁ τρυγώμενος βότρυς καὶ ἄμπτος, ὁ θεριζόμενος στάθμης, ὄξυτόνως. ὦςπερ ἐμετος καὶ ἐμετός αὐτὸ τὸ πράγμα. (Suid. τ 1092)

275v 1
ὑπαντρος, πέτρα, ἢ ἕπο ἄντρον, ὑπαντίζω, τὸ ὑπαντῶ (cf. pl. Ps.-Zonar. Lexicon v 1781). ὑπαντῶ δοτική ἐπὶ τῆς ὀδοῦ. ἀπαντῶ δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ κριτηρίου (Suid. v 151), ὑπανίζω, τὸ ὑπαντέλλω suborior. ὑπαρκὼ suppedito.

281r 21
ὑπώπια, τὰ ὑπὸ τοὺς όφθαλμοὺς πελλόνωμα ἢ τὰ εξ αὐτῶν έξίοντα πῦα (cf. Ps.-Zonar. Lexicon v 1780, 19), λέγονται δὲ καὶ οἱ γινόμενοι τύλοι ἐν ταῖς χερσί ἄπο τῆς ἐργασίας, καὶ τὰ ἀφοίασθηκότων πληγής τραύματα (Suid. v 650).

282r 2
ὕφομον, ἀπαντῶν καὶ ἐναντιομένων (Suid. v 738)

282r 19
φαθὶ ὀξυτόνως, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐξοπίσθην ὡς τὸ αὐτὸ φαθὶ τοῦ μύλωμεν (Suid. ψ 22)

282v 5
φύλαρα φασὶ τὰς προμετωπίδας, τοὺς ἀσπίδισκους, τὴν κόσμησιν τῶν ἔρωτων τὴν κατὰ μέτωπον (Suid. ψ 42)

285v 25
φορβεία, ἡ ἀυλητική στομίς, λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὁ χειλωτήρ (Suid. ψ 750)

286v 13
φύγων, δαλὸς ξηρός (Suid. ψ 752). φυρκτός, ἡ διὰ τῶν δάδων ἐν πολέμωι γινομένη λαμπάς (Suid. ψ 755)

289r 4
χαρακτήρες λόγων φραστικῶν γ. ύψηλός, ἴσχρός, μέσος. (Suid. χ 94)

290v 19
χιλάε, οἱ ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ πρός θάλασσαν τείχος προβεβλημένοι λίθοι, δηὰ τὴν τῶν κυμάτων βίαν, μὴ τὸ τείχος βλάπτοτο. λέγεται δὲ χιλαὴ καὶ ἡ ὄψις (Suid. χ 245-6)

291r 12
χιλὸς λέγεται ἢ τῶν ἔρωτοι τροφὴ bladum.
### IX

**Marginalia in the MSS. ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 and Σ Ι 12. Collation**

#### 1 Quotations from Aristophanic scholia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Σ Ι 12</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r 1 [Ἀβάκχευτος, ἅχευτον]</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀ ἐπίρρημα ἐκπλῆξεος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 12 ἀβίωτος, -του</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀβίωτον. ἦτοι οὐ βιώσεως ἄξιον. Aristophanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r 9 ἠγιο, -γες</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἠγιο λέγεται καὶ τὸ κλῦ, οἶδεν κατεγαγός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v 6 ἀδελφῷ ὁδεῖ, -δοῦ, -δῶ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀδελφῷ, fratri filia. in Aristophane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5r 14 ἀδόλεσχο, -σχεῖς</td>
<td></td>
<td>quattuor significat hoc verbum, τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν. τὸ παιζεῖν. τὸ ὀλιγωρεῖν. τὸ φιλορεῖν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5v 26 ἀθέατος, ἀτοῦ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀθάρα, ἄλευρον ἔγημενον. Aristophanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7r 24 αἱρούμαι, -αίρῃ</td>
<td></td>
<td>αἱρούμενον. προκρίναντα. In Aristophane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r 7 ἀκοσμία, -μίας</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀκόρητος, ἀνεπιμέλητος, ἀκαλλώπιστος, ὡρὸ γὰρ τὸ ἐπιμελοῦμαι. in Aristophane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r 19 ἀκρατεῖομαι, τὸ ἀκρατοῦν πῖνο</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀκρατεῖον, ἠγ χρίκην τράγον ὄρχες λεῖχε. Aristophanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11r 10 ἀλεκτρυον, -ῶνος</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀλεκτρύανα gallina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11v 19 ἀλληθῆς, -θοῦς</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀλληθείς. In Aristophane. pro ἀλληθῆς ironice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12r 24 ἀλλόω, ἀς</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀλλός, κρατήθεις in Aristophane. ἀλλόν διασιμυχεῖς, καθαρθεῖς. ἀμή, -ης τις εἶδος πλακοῦντος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13r 17 ἁμύνομαι σὲ ἰ ἁμύνεται,</td>
<td>98v ἁμύνεται, μάχεται in</td>
<td>sch. nub. 1428a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 13r 25</td>
<td>Άμφιστομος καὶ Άμφήκης τὸ ἄωτο</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 13r 26</td>
<td>Άμφισβητό</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 13v 1</td>
<td>Άναβαίνου</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 13v 17</td>
<td>Άνακλησις</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 13v 26</td>
<td>Άνατρέχο</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 14r 1</td>
<td>Άνάθημα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 14r 25</td>
<td>Άναφανδὸν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 14v 1</td>
<td>Άναχανῦ III ἀνέιται, ἐνδέδωται Aristophanes</td>
<td>99v ἀνέιται, ἐνδέδωται in Aristophane I ἀνενδοιαστὸς incunctanter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 15r 7</td>
<td>Άνεκλάλητος, -λήτου III ἀνέπασεν, συνέτειλεν [correcte συνέτειλεν] Aristophanes</td>
<td>100r in Aristophane. Ἀνέπασεν, συνέτειλεν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 17r 12</td>
<td>Άνθρακοθήκη, -θήκης</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
possent scire mensem exactum et repetere usuras. quare si non oriretur amplius, nec ego solverem eas.

25r 14 ἀπέχομαι || ἀπεψωλμένοι, τα αἰείσια δεικνύστες in Aristophane
106r ἀπεψωλμένοι, τα αἰείσια δεικνύστες in Aristophane
sch. plut. 295b

25r 16 ἀπηνής || ἀπηνές, ἀναϊσχυρον in Aristophane
106r ἀπηνές, ἀναϊσχυρον in Aristophane
sch. nub. 974

26r 16 ἀπόγονον σχοινίων || ἀπὸ γὰρ ὀλοίμα, οὐ βοῦλομαι. In Aristophane
107r ἀπὸ γὰρ ὀλοίμα, οὐ βοῦλομαι. In Aristophane
sch. nub. 1440

28v 26 ἀπόλειπτο κληρονομίαν || Aristophanes. ἀπολιταργεῖς, ἀπέλθης, ἀποδράμες, ἀποκρητήσας, ἄταφραμοι γὰρ ἐκάλουν τὰ σκιρτήματα. ἀπολιταργεῖς ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀποδράμες, ἀποκρητήσας
108v In Aristophane. ἀπολιταργεῖς, ἀπέλθης, ἄταφραμοι ἐκάλουν τὰ σκιρτήματα. ἀπολιταργεῖς ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀποδράμες, ἀποκρητήσας
sch. nub. 1253c-d

31r 23 ἀποσαλευώ || κἂν ἄπορής τί τῶν νοματῶν, ἄπορον ἔχεις τῶν διαλογισμῶν, τῶν διαλογισμῶν. Aristophanes. et aliī ἄποριαν ἔχεις.
110r alibi ἄποριαν ἔχεις. κἂν ἄπορης τί τῶν νοματῶν, ἄπορον ἔχεις τῶν διαλογισμῶν τῶν διαλογισμῶν. in Aristophane
Nub. 743; sch. nub. 743e-f

31v 22 ἀποστερώ || ἀποστερητικός, δυνάμενος ἀποστερήσας. in Aristophane
110v ἀποστερητικός, δυνάμενος ἀποστερήσας. in Aristophane
sch. nub. 728b

32v 26 ἀποτροπίαζο || ἀποτρόπαιε. διώκτα τῶν κακῶν. in Aristophane
111v ἀποτρόπαιε. διώκτα τῶν κακῶν. In Aristophane
sch. plut. 854b

33r 12 ἀποσία || ἀποφαίνω καὶ ἄπορην, ἀποδείξω. in Aristophane
111v ἀποφήνω, ἀποδείξω. in Aristophane
sch. Plut. 210a and 468c

33r 26 ἀποφράττο || ἀποφθέγμαι, ἀποδείξω, ἀποτροπίαζο in Aristophane
111v ἀποφθέγμαι, ἀποδείξω, ἀποτροπίαζο. in Aristophane
sch. nub. 789c; sch. plut. 598d

33v 10 ἀπόχρησις || ἀπόχρη, ἀρκετὸν ἐστι, μέλλουν ἀποχρησθείς, καὶ ἄποχρωσὶ δίκη ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀρκετῆ ὑπάρχουσα
112v In Aristophane. ἀπόχρη, ἐπὶ ἐνεστῶτος ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀρκετῶν ἐστι. καὶ ἄποχρωσὶ δίκη ἐπὶ θηλυκοῦ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀρκετῆ ὑπάρχουσα. καὶ ἐπὶ μέλλοντος ἀποχρησθεῖ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀρκετῶν γενίσται.
sch. plut. 484e

33v 19 ἀποψηφίζω || ἀποψωμέθονα, ἀποσπογγίζωμεν τὸν προκότων. In Aristophane.
112v ἀποψωμέθονα, ἀποσπογγίζωμεν τὸν προκότων. In Aristophane.
sch. plut. 817

33v 21 ἀπραγμοσύνη || Aristophanes grammaticus, τὴν ἀπραγμοσύνην φυτὸν λέγει ἐν ἀκαδημίᾳ φυώμενον.
112r in Aristophane. Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικός τὴν ἀπραγμοσύνην φυτὸν λέγει ἐν ἀκαδημίᾳ φυώμενον.
sch. nub. 1007c

34v 9 ἁρπα || ἁρπαὶ πολλῶν, ἱμμέραμα εἰρωνεύκον. in Aristophane.
112v ἁρπαὶ πολλῶν, ἱμμέραμα εἰρωνεύκον. in Aristophane.
sch. plut. 546c

35r 1 ἁργεῖο || ἁργῶς ἦγον ἁργῆ in Aristophane.
112v ἁργῶς ἦγον ἁργῆ, ἀττικῶς. in Aristophane.
sch. nub. 170d

36v 7 ἁρινάκης, τὸ προβάτιον δέρμα || παῖζε ὁ ἀριστοφάνης γνώμην ἐξ ἁρινακίδων εἰπὼν ἀποστερητικά, ἦγον γνώμην ἀποστερήσεως καὶ ἐξαρνησίας. ὥσθε χν. ἐπεὶ τοῖς ταῖς
113v ἁρινάκης ἔστι τὸ ἀριστοφάνης δέρμα. παῖζε δὲ ἐνεπάθη γνώμην ἐξ ἁρινακίδων εἰπὼν ἀποστερητικά, ἦγον γνώμην ἀποστερήσεως καὶ ἐξαρνησίας.
sch. nub. 730
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37r 19</td>
<td>ἂν μοι ἐπιβάλλοι καὶ ἐπιθήσοι σκέπασμα εξ ἄρνακίδων, ὡς ἂν γνώμην εὑρομι ἀποστερητικήν. ἦ ὁ κοινῶς λεγόμενος γουνάριος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114r</td>
<td>ὥρθεν δὲ εἰπεῖν, τίς ἂν μοι ἐπιβάλλοι καὶ ἐπιθήσοι σκέπασμα εξ ἄρνακίδων, ὡς ἂν γνώμην εὑρομι ἀποστερητικήν. ὁδὲ παῖζον οὕτως ἐξήγεικεν. In Aristophane. ἦ ὁ κοινῶς λεγόμενος γουνάριος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sch. plut. 816d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37v 18</td>
<td>ἀρχεῖα, κεφάλαια, ὅτι οἱ πρῶτοι τόκοι παραταθέντος τοῦ δανείου, κεφάλαια γινόμενοι, τόκους δέχονται ἄλλους.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114v</td>
<td>In Aristophane. ἀρχεῖα, κεφάλαια, ὅτι οἱ πρῶτοι τόκοι παραταθέντος τοῦ δανείου, κεφάλαια γινόμενοι, τόκους δέχονται ἄλλους.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sch. nub. 1156a-b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39r 23</td>
<td>ἀσπάζομαι τὸ χαιρετίζω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115v</td>
<td>In Aristophane. ἀσπάζομαι λέγεται [...], καὶ τὸ κοινῶς χαιρετίζω.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sch. nub. 1145c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41r 24</td>
<td>ἀτιμωρησία ἢ ἁμαρτία τῆς ἡμᾶς, ἔγον κακὸν καθ’ ἡμᾶς δράμα ψηφίσεται.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117r</td>
<td>In Aristophane. ἀτιμώσεις τῆς ἡμᾶς, ἢ κακὸν καθ’ ἡμᾶς δράμα ψηφίσεται.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sch. nub. 1121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41v 13</td>
<td>ἀτράφαξες ἢ οἱ χρυσολάχανοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117r</td>
<td>σημειοτέτον ἄτριπτος ὀδός, ἢ μὴ τετριμμένη, via non trita. ἄτρεμο καὶ ἄτρεμιξο τὸ ἠρέμω. ὃθεν ἄτρεμα ἑπόρρημα ἀντὶ τοῦ ἠρέμα καὶ ἠρέμχος. ἄτραπον, ὀδὸν, ὁ κοινῶς μονοπάτιον λέγεται. In Aristophane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sch. nub. 76a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43r 23</td>
<td>αὐχμὸς ὁ ῥόπος in Aristophane. αὐχμός, στέρησις, ξηρασία.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118v</td>
<td>αὐχμός, στέρησις, ξηρασία. in Aristophane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sch. plut. 839a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44v 20</td>
<td>ἀφόμνυμι in Aristophane. ἀφομάσθαι παρεσκευάσθη, ἢτοι πορεύεσθι ἤτοιμασθεῖ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119v</td>
<td>ἀφομάσθαι παρεσκευάσθη, ἢτοι πορεύεσθι ἤτοιμασθεῖ. in Aristophane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sch. nub. 607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Quotations from the SMB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONB Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Σ I 12</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3v 7 άγρός, -ροῦ</td>
<td></td>
<td>εκ τῶν νόμων. άγρός λέγεται ὁ χωρίς τῆς κόμης ἦτοι τῶν οἰκήματος τόπος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v 18 αἰδιάθετος, -θέου</td>
<td></td>
<td>εκ τῶν νόμων. αἰδιάθετος ἦτοι ὁ μὴ διαθέμενος, ἄλλα καὶ ὁ μὴ κληρονομοῦμενος ἐκ διαθήκης.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8r 16 ἀκαθήκον, -κοντος</td>
<td></td>
<td>εκ τῶν νόμων: ἀκαθήκουσαν τις λέγει διαθήκην ἐν τῷ λέγειν ἀπόκληρον γενέσθαι. ἢ ἀμημόνευτον μὴ ὑφέλειν. Item, εάν μόνων ἀκαθήκοντες φανόσων οἱ ἀπελεύθεροι πρὸς τοὺς πάρτονας ἢ παῖδας αὐτῶν, ὑφέλει μαστίγον αὐτῶς ὁ ἄρχον καὶ ἀπολύειν. ἀπειλῶν σφοδρότεραν ἐπεξελεύσεται εάν πάλιν αἰτιάθησίν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10v 16 ἀκρόδρυον, -δρύου</td>
<td></td>
<td>εκ τῶν νόμων. τῷ ὑνόμαι τῆς βαλάνου πάντες οἱ καρποὶ διηλούνται. ἐπει καὶ τῷ ὑνόμαι τῶν ἀκρόδρυον πάντα τὰ δἐνδρά.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11v 19 ἀκυρωσία, -σίας</td>
<td></td>
<td>εκ τῶν νόμων. ἀπομειώοται νόμου τι ἢ ἀποδαπανᾶται. ἀπομειώοται, ὅταν μέρος ἀφαιρῆται. ἀποδαπανᾶται, ὅταν παντελῶς ὁ νόμος ἀναιρεῖται. derogatur legi aut abrogatur. sed derogatur cum pars detrahitur, abrogatur cum prorsus tollitur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12v 26 ἁμέλεια</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἁμελῶ negligno, ἁμέλεια neglectitia, culpa. εκ τῶν νόμων. κοῦλα ἐστιν ἢ μεγάλη ἁμελεία. ἢ δὲ μεγάλη κοῦλα ἐστὶ δόλος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18v 15 ἀντέλλογος, -λόγου</td>
<td></td>
<td>εκ τῶν νόμων. περὶ ἀντέλλογος χρέους. μέχρι τῆς συγκροτούσης ποσότητος τῆς ἐξ ἐκάτερος πλευρᾶς κεχρεωστημένης. ἢ τοῦ ἀντέλλογος δύναμις, μύημιν ἔχει καταβολῆς. καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνου ἀναφέρεται ἐκάτερον ἢ ἀπαίτησιν τῶν τόκων. ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Íπερβαλλόμενη ποσότητι, ἦστω ἰσχυρὰ ἢ τῶν τόκων ἀπαίτησις. ἐι γε ὅλως κεχρεώστηται τόκοι ἢ ἐπερημίασις.</td>
<td>Íπερβαλλόμενη ποσότητι, ἦστω ἰσχυρὰ ἢ τῶν τόκων ἀπαίτησις. ἐι γε ὅλως κεχρεώστηται τόκοι ἢ ἐπερημίασις.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19τ 17 ἀντιγραφή, -φής</td>
<td></td>
<td>τὸ τῆς ἀντιγραφῆς ὄνομα νομικόν ἐστι. ὅθεν καὶ νόμου ρητὸν διακελεύον. ἑξέτω πάσα βασιλικὴ ἀντιγραφή τὸ ἐπὶ ἅλθη ἐδίδαξε. καὶ μηδὲ ἄλλως ἔρρωσθα.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27τ 14 ἀπόθετος</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀποθεραπεύοι σοι τὴν βλάβην, emendo tibi damnum. ἐκ τῶν νόμων. ἐὰν διὰ τὸ κοινωθεῖν πλοῖον ἀποβληθῶσι φορτία, πάντων συνεισαγόντων ἀποθεραπεύεται τὸ ῥυθέν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32τ 4 ἀποστρατεύομαι</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἐκ τῶν νόμων. οἱ προδόται καὶ οἱ αὐτόμολοι κεφαλικῶς ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ τιμωροῦνται καὶ ἀποστρατεύονται καὶ κολάζονται.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SM B IV,6; B II,5,26

SM N I,12; B LIII,3,1 rest.

SM Σ IV,10; B LVII,1,7 rest.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 Other literary quotations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ONB Suppl. Gr. 45</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7r 9 άιμα, -ματος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11v 3 ἀκροσοδάναι, ἡ μυρμηκία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11v 12 ἀλεξίκακος, -κάκου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11v 18 ἀλευρων, -λεύρου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21v 25 ἄξιον λόγον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36v 4 ἄρκτικος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπὶ ταῖς ἄρκυσι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37v 1 ἀρτοποιός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45v 12 ἀχόρταστος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46r 9 ἀγενός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4 Other marginalia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONB Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Σ I 12</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r 2 ἀβαξ, -κος</td>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ ύποκοριστικός αβάκιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 26 ἁγαθίς, -θόδος</td>
<td></td>
<td>πηνίον’ panus tramae involucrum quam diminutive panuclam vocamus. unde tumor inguinum ex formae similudine sic vocatur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 9 ἁγάλλομαι, ἄλη, ἄλεται</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἁγάλλομαι καὶ ἁγαλλιᾶμι τὸ χαϊρῳ ἀμεταβάτως. ἁγάλλῳ δὲ τὸ τιμω τὸ ἐτερεῖον μεταβατικός, ὅθεν καὶ ἁγάλμα.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 20 ἀγαπῶ, ἄς</td>
<td></td>
<td>τὸ φιλῶ ἀιτιατικῆ. ἀγαπὸ δὲ τὸ ἄρκούμαι δοτικῇ. contentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v 2 ἀγκυλῆσις, -ποδός</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀγκύλη τὸ ὅπισθεν τοῦ ἄγνατος ἢ τοῦ ἀγκώνος ἢ κάμυς καὶ ἐλὸς ἀκοντίου καὶ τὶ τῶν ἔργων τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ Μωσέως. sed et amentum. unde ἀγκυλοῦμαι amento, -as et ἀγκυλίζωμαι teneo iaculum paratum in amento.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v 22 ἁγνός, ὅθεν ὁ ὅγιον, -ου</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἁγνός, φυτόν, ὅν καὶ ὅγιον καλοῦσι παρὰ τὸ τοὺς ἐσθίοντας ἁγόνους τηρεῖν. τινὲς δὲ τὸν κολλιανδρὸν λέγουσι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r 10 ἄγοραξ, -ζες</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἄγοραξ ἀμεταβάτως τὸ εἰς τὴν ἁγοράν διατήροι. ἄγοραξ δὲ τὸ ὄνομά μεταβατικῶς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r 12 ἄγορανόμοις, -νόμῳ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἄγος, τὸ μύσος scelus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r 17 ἄγρα, -ρας</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἄγρωι illicio, ἄγραυλῳ τὸ ἐπ’ ἄγρῳ ἀυλίζομαι rusticor, -aris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v 23 ἄγριτης, -τοῦ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἄγριτης λέγεται ὁ συναθροίζων πολλοὺς περὶ ἕαυτὸν λέγων τι ἢ ποιῶν καινότερων.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r 16 ἄγονιζομαι, -ζη</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἄγονιζομαι, ἀμεταβάτως. καταγονιζομαι δὲ ἐτερον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ματαβατικός, ἦγον</td>
<td>καταρποῦμαι.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v 17 ἀδορφαγία, -γίας</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀδημονόν τὸ ἄσχαλο καὶ δυσφορό καὶ λυποῦμαι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v 26 ἀδιαχώριστος, -ρίστου</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀδιεξήγητος inexplicabilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5r 6 ἀδικοῦ, -κές</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀδικοῦμαι laedor, iniuriam patior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5r 26 ἀδιοροδόκητος, -κήτος</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀξίζομαι τὸ σέβομαι ποιητικός, αἰτιατική.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6r 4 ἀθέριστος, -ρίστου</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀθερίζω αἰτιατική τὸ ἐξειτελίζω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6r 15 ἄθλον, -θλοῦ</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἄθλος ὁ ἄγων, ἄθλον τὸ ἐπαθλὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6r 21 ἄθροιζα, -ζες</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀπὸ τοῦ τὸ ἐπιτατικὸν μορίου καὶ τοῦ θροῦς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6r 25 ἄθόδος, -θόδου</td>
<td></td>
<td>ὁ ἄχήμιος καὶ καταβολῆς, μὴ τυγχάνον ἔνοχος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7r 15 αἰμορραγῆ, -γες</td>
<td></td>
<td>αἴμωδεῖν ἐστὶ, τὸ τοὺς ὁδόντας ναρκάν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7r 8 αἰσχρολογία, -γίας</td>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ αἰσχρορρημοσύνη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7r 15 αἰσχυντηρός, -ροῦ</td>
<td></td>
<td>αἰσχυντηρία verecundia, pudibunditas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7v 17 αἴτησις, -σεος</td>
<td></td>
<td>αἴτημα postulatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r 9 ἄκηδια, -διὰς</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἄκηδής γὰρ ὁ ἁμελῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r 14 ἄκινδυνος, -δύνον</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἄκις, ἄδος. λέγεται μὲν τὸ ἀκρὸν τοῦ σιδήρου τῶν οἰωνόν βελῶν, ἐντεῦθεν δὲ καὶ πάντα τὰ λεπτὰ καὶ κατὰ τὰ ἄκρα ὀξύτατα.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r 22 ἀκρατίζω, -ζεος</td>
<td></td>
<td>id est ante prandium alicuit comedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10v 19 ἀκρομάσθιον, -σθίου</td>
<td></td>
<td>πάν τὸ ἐπανεστικός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11r 26 ἀλαζον, -ζονος</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀκόμαντον πέλαγος. τὸ γαλληνικ καὶ εὐδιον καὶ ἄταρχον.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11v 1 ālai || ālās, ālāntos lucanica, -ae. āleiviōnōs θερμός. ālēa ή θήρη, -oτίς [supra scr.]. ālēgōs ή ālās koimìon. ālēgō kai āleivığō poetics τό φροντίζω. ālēgōν σὲ τό λυπώ. āleivōν σὲ τό ἐκφεύγω

97v ālās kai klínetai ālāntos haec lucanica, -cae. āleiviōnōs θερμός. ālēgō kai ālegeiē poietice τό φροντίζω. ālēnōw aitiatēk τό λυπώ. āleivō κομίζων τό εκφεύγω. ālēa ή θήρμητη. ālēgōs ή ālās koimìon.

11v 24 āleitēnōs λόγος || āleitētikē ò āleia piscatus, -tus. piscata, piscatoria

97v āleitētikē, āleia piscatus, -tus

12r 6 āleivō, -λειδες || ālās, ālōdos. ākātovn āleitētikōn. ālādai dē oī tōn āleivōn paideis, ūγουν oī āleivōi periefrasticūkōs

97v ālās, ākātovn āleitētikōn, kai klínetai ālūdōs. ālūdai dē oī tōn āleivōn paideis, ūγουν oī āleivōi periefrasticūkōs.

12r 21 ālōtoriē ι̃ άlōioi muto, ālōioisīs mutatioi, ālōioitōs o meta болητός

98r ālōioi muto, -tas, ālōioitōs o meta болητός, ālōioisīs mutatio

13r 7 āmishē ι̃ āmpelouγρος vinitor

98v āmpelouγρος vinitor

13r 9 āmpeχōma || āmpexóhna amictus

98v āmpexóhna amictus

13v 23 āνάγωγος || āνάγωγος, ο ēkēdeiμiēnōs kai mē χρηστής δηλοντι τυχων ἀγωγῆς. ἢ mē πειθήνιος και δυσάγωγος, ὡς ἵππος, ὃν και ἄναγωγά.

98v ānāγωγος, o ekēdeiμiēnōs kai mē χρηστής δηλοντι τυχων ἀγωγῆς. ὃν και ἄναγωγα. ἢ λέγοιτ’ ἂν ἄναγωγος ὃ mē πειθήνιος, ὃς λέγομαι ἵππον ἄναγωγον τὸν οἶνον δυσάγωγον.

14r 26 ānaphēlaiō retracto l ānaskolopitēζω, τό ānastaurō. ānusurάζω και ānachaiμίζω και ānakerou τόν ἵππον.

99r ānaphēlaiō retracto l ānaskolopitēζω, τό ānastaurō. ānusurάζω και ānachaiμίζω και ānakerou τόν ἵππον.

15r 9 ānēktōs, -ktoō || ānēρυθριάτως impudenter

100r ānēρυθριάτως impudenter

16v 15 ānēρῇδε ἐπὶ πράγματος || ānēvō, τὸ ἀνῆδο καὶ σφρηγῆ καὶ ākμάζω adolesco, pubesco

100v āνηβό, τὸ ἀνῆδο καὶ σφρηγῆ καὶ ἀκμάζω adolesco, pubesco

17r 10 āνθρακία, -kiaζ || a peruredo dicta

101r pruna vero? a perurendo dicta

17r 11 āνθραζ, -akos || quia care flamma

101r carbo quia flamma care

17v 26 ānōνtēs, -tou || ānōieion absursum

101v ānōieion absursum

21r 14 āntλητηρίον || āntooφείλo redibeo unde āntooφελετικὴ ἄγωγη redibitoria actio, quam quis tenetur alteri

103v Redibeo. -bes persimplex d? ex re- et debo, debes. hinc redibitoria actio quaedam quam quis tenetur alteri restituere. τοῦτον τὸ μὲν ῥῆμα εἶπομ’ ἂν αὐτῶς, āntooφείλo. τὸ δ’ ὅνομα,
21v 26 άξωμνημόνευτος || άξως
204r 26 οταμόδις δια τῆς παινίνας ρέων, καὶ
204r 26 μέχρι πέλλης καὶ θαλάσσης
205v 26 διήκον, ο νῦν καλούμενος
206v 26 βαρδάριος.
23r 23 ἀπαραχώρητον ||
207v 23 ἀπαύγασμα candor
23v 14 ἀπάρχομαι ἐπὶ θυσιῶν καὶ
206v 14 προσαγωγῶν | ut ἀπάρχομαι τῷ
207v 14 θεῷ τῶν καρπῶν
24r 26 ἀπειρόκαλος || ἀπειλητικῶς
207v 26 minaciter
25r 22 ὡς, ἡ ὀπόρα καὶ κλίνεται ὥς || dicitur quod instar ignis ab
205v 22 ample tendit in angustum
25v 26 ἀποβαίνω || ἀποβάθρα
207v 26 dicitur qua conscenditur navis vel ...
26r 13 ἀπουγαλκτίζω ||
207v 13 ἀπουγαλκτισμένος ablactatus
27r 26 ἄποικος || ἄποικος autem
207v 26 incola
28r ἄποκλύζω || ἄποκαίνω ἔτερον
208v ἄποκαίνω ἔτερον
28v 12 ἄπόσπασμα πλῆθους || ὁ || καὶ
208v ἄποσπας, -άδος
31v ἀπορρητίζω || ἀποσκευάζω, τὸ
210v κενό, καὶ τὴν οὖσαν
211v παρασκευήν
211v διαλύον ἢ ἀποτίθημι. contrarium
212v eius est τὸ ἐπισκευάζω ut cum
212v onerator navis vel exoneratur.
31v 12 ἄποστασμα πλῆθους || ὁ || καὶ
210v ἄμεινον ἀποσπάσ, -άδος
34r 22 ἄποιμαι || ἐπὶ ἄφης | iungo,
211v atingo, γενικῆ | καὶ ἀνάστω πῦρ
34v 17 ἀραίος || ἀραφώς, -ότος, ὁ
212v εὐάρμοστος καὶ εὐ πεφυκώς.
35v 18 ἀριστερὸς || vel compransor
213v ὁ συναριστῶν ὁδηλαδή
36r 16 ἀρμόδιος || ἀρμόδιος
213v δικαστής index competens
36v 17 ἀροτῆρ || ὁ ἀροτος, ἡ ||
214v ἀροτος, ἡ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37v 14</td>
<td>ἀρχαιογονία II ἀρχικός Imperiosus, ἀρχαιογεννής originarius, ἀρχέγονος originalis.</td>
<td>114v ἀρχικός Imperiosus, ἀρχαιογεννής originarius, ἀρχέγονος originalis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37v 26</td>
<td>ἀρχηγὸς ὄχλου II ὁ συγόφορος</td>
<td>114v σημειοτεύου συγόφορος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39r 4</td>
<td>ἀσκάλος II ἀσκαρδαμικτί intents oculis</td>
<td>115v ἀσκαρδαμικτί intents oculis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40r 15</td>
<td>ἀσύμβολος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40v 15</td>
<td>ἀσχημοσύνη II ἀσχάλῳ, τὸ λυποῦμαι.</td>
<td>116v ἀσχάλῳ, τὸ λυποῦμαι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41r 22</td>
<td>ἄτιμο ἢ ἄτινο, τὸ ἄτιμον ποιῶ. ἄτιμάζω δὲ τὸ καταφρονῶ.</td>
<td>117r ἄτιμο, τὸ ἄτιμον ποιῶ. ἄτιμάζω δὲ τὸ καταφρονῶ. ἀμφότερα αἰτιατικῆ. Suid. a 4363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42r 20, 21</td>
<td>αὐλὴ, μέσαυλον II αὐλίδιον atrium</td>
<td>117v αὐλίδιον atrium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42v 3</td>
<td>αὐλῶν, στενῶς καὶ ἐπιμήκης τόπος II φάραγξ</td>
<td>117v σημειοτεύου φάραγξ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42v 11</td>
<td>αὐξῆς II αὐξῶ καὶ αὐξῶν τὸ αὔξησιν λαμβάνω, ἀμεταβάτως. ηὐξησε δὲ τὶς ἔτερον μεταβατικός.</td>
<td>118r αὐξῆς καὶ αὐξῶν τὸ αὔξησιν λαμβάνω, ἀμεταβάτως. ηὐξησε δὲ τὶς ἔτερον μεταβατικός.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42v 26</td>
<td>αὐτοτέχνης II ὁ ἑνιαύσιος</td>
<td>118r σημειοτεύου ἑνιαύσιος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43r 10</td>
<td>αὐτομολός II αὐτομόλος transluga, qui per se venit. μόλω vado.</td>
<td>118r αὐτομόλος hic transluga, - gae, perfuga, -gae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44r 9</td>
<td>ἁφετηρία II ἂγουν δεσμωτήριον</td>
<td>119r σημειοτεύου δεσμωτήριον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44r 23</td>
<td>ἁφθεγξία infantia, mutitas</td>
<td>119r ἁφθεγξία infantia, mutitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44v 23</td>
<td>ἁφροντότης II ἁφρόντιτρον spuma nitri</td>
<td>119v afronitrum grece. Latine spuma nitri est. colligitur autem in asia. in speluncis distillans, [...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 46r 15 | ἁψίς, ἁψίδος II Fortices filorum sunt, quibus sartores utuntur. forpices pilorum quibus tonsores. forcipes vero fabrorum sunt a capiendo formo, idest calido. | 120v Fortices … 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.
A GROUP OF MARGINAL NOTES FROM ANOTHER TEXTUAL TRADITION

COLLATION

1 Marginal notes in agreement with all three codices (partly or completely)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ÒNB Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Vat. Pal. Gr. 194</th>
<th>EK Cod. Gr. 4</th>
<th>Res. 224</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12v 12 ἀμαρτάνω pecco non potior</td>
<td></td>
<td>μέλλον ἀμαρτήσωμαι</td>
<td>1r pecco, erro non potior ἀμαρτήσω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12v 17 ἀμαχος inexpugnabilis</td>
<td></td>
<td>imbellis vel</td>
<td>1r inexpugnabilis et imbellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12v 25 ἀμείβομαι alterno</td>
<td></td>
<td>reddo, retribuo, ad (r)vice(m) respondeo reddo (ἀμείβομαι lemma); transeo redundo retribuo (ἀμείβομαι lemma)</td>
<td>1r retribuo ad invicem respondeo reddo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13r 11 ἁπτωτις redundatio</td>
<td></td>
<td>surges, λέξις η ἑρασία ἢ πλήμμαρα</td>
<td>2v surges, inde ἁπτωτις ingurgito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13r 26 ἀμφισβητῶ discipeto dubito</td>
<td></td>
<td>mihi alicud vel(n)ico, delibero</td>
<td>14r dubito delibero mihi vendico decreto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v 14 ἀναθορῶ exilio</td>
<td></td>
<td>surgo, prosilio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14r 1 ἀνάθημα donarium</td>
<td></td>
<td>edificium publicum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14r 3 ἀνακρίνω percontor</td>
<td></td>
<td>discoctio, recenseo, indago</td>
<td>16v discutio recenseo indago interrogo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14r 4 ἀναλίσκω consumo</td>
<td></td>
<td>expendo, capio</td>
<td>16v experdeo consumo capio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14r 10 ἀναπτύσσω aperio declaro patefacio</td>
<td></td>
<td>implico, explico, replico</td>
<td>17r aperio implico replico raro, aplico extendo patefacio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| 14r 13 | ἀναρρητόμαι | retro applico, exte(n)do, revolve | 17v | agrappo | revolve | 4r | aggrappo cum manibus sicut scandedo murum | 22v | nitor vel ascendum(?) murum |
| 14r 20 | ἀναστέλλω | contineo || rep(ri)mo, repello, ret(ra)ho | 17v | depremo | revello retraho vel remitto atollo elevo | 4r | reprimo repello retraho remitto atollo elevo | 22v | depremo retraho elevo |
| 14r 22 | ἀνάτατος increpatio || v(e)il extensio, inge(n)s cominatio | 18r | cominatio ingens | 4v | cominatio ingens | 23v | cominatio ingens |
| 14r 23 | ἀνατρέπω refello || s(u)bverto, retroverto | 18r | subverto retroverto et mutat e in a | 4v | subverto revertero | 23r | subverto retroverto |
| 15 1 | ἀνεξέταστος insconsultus || Indiscuss(us) | 18r | supernvenio indiscussus | 4v | indiscussus | 23v | indiscussus |
| 15v 20 | ἀνέως requeis remissio otium || dissolutio | 18r | dissolutio remissio requies | 4v | dissolutio remissio requies | 23v | dissolutio remissio requies |
| 16v 8 | ἀνήκω pertineo attineo || asc(n)do, (con)tingo, (con)ve(n)io | 19r | contingo convenio | 5v | ascendo oportet convenio contingo | 24v | ascendo |
| 17v 8 | ἀνήμι relaxo remitto lenem facio || ἀἵρεσις ἀνήκα | dissolvero effero emitto | 19r | ἀἵρεσις ἀνήκα; dissolvero effero emitto | 5v | dissolvero effero emito ἀἵρεσις ἀνήκα | 24v | dissolvero effero emito ἀἵρεσις ἀνήκα |
| 17v 16 | ἀνίσχυο orior || emineo || oborio(r) | 19r | emino orior obior | 5v | orior abhoror obior | 24v | emineo orior obior |
| 18r 4 | ἀνώγω patefacio || ab oýγο quod no(s) est i(n) us(us) recip(i)t e in augmentis | 19r | aperio ab oýγο quod non est in usu, recipit e in augmentis | 5v | aperio ab oýγο quod non est in usu, recipit e in augmentis | 25r | aperio ab oýγο quod non est in usu |
| 18r 17 | ἀνοχή laxamentum || v(e)il tollerantia | 19v | tollerantia | 6r | tollerantia | 25r | tollerantia |
| 18v 1 | ἀνταίρο reble || (contra)elevo | 20v | contra elevo | 6r | contra elevo | 26r | contra elevo |
| 18v 20 | ἀντεξιάζω confero || comp(ar)o; assimilo | 21r | comparo assimilo | 6v | comparo assimilo | 26v | comparo assimilo |
| 19r 6 | ἀνεφεδρό obiicio || v(e)il Innitor(in), inhaereo, ἀνθεργετικός relato(r) b(e)n(e)ficio(rum) | 20v | immutor inhereo | 6v | imitor inhereo | 26v | innitor inhereo |
| 19v 21 | ἀντικήμου tibia pedis || pars (con)tra suram murum pars contra suram fusus ? | 19v | pars contra suram il fuso della gamba | 6v | pars contra suram fusus ? | 26v | pars contra suram il fuso della gamba |
| 19v 24  | ἀντικρό aduersus contra || bala(m), cora(m) | 22v  | palam coram | 6v  | ex posito contra palam | 26r  | ex opposito contra palam adverbium |
| 19v 25  | ἀντιλάβανομαι suspicio affecto || rep(re)he(n)do, (contra)dico v(e) || 20v  | reprehendo contradico | 6v  | reprehendo contradico | 26v  | reprehendo contradico |
| 19v 22  |  | | 20v  | vendico adipiscor | 6r  | vendico adipiscor | 26r  | vendico adipiscor |
| 21v 21  |  | | 21v  | simplex | 19v  | simplex | 6r  | simplex | 25r  | simplex |
| 21v 23  | ἀνουμαλία inconstantia inaequalitas || irreg(u)laritas | 19v  | ineqalitatis irregularitas | 6r  | ineqalitatis irregularitas | 25v  | irregularitas inaequalitas |
| 21v 20  |  | | 23r  | τὸ ἑξάπανον securis bipennis accetta; l’aὅἵia, la mannaia (Gr. lemma twice) | 8r  | dolabrum securis bipennis | 29r  | l’aὅἵia, bipennis la mannaia |
| 22v 17  | ἀξίω axis || tabella i(n) q(ua) antiquit(us) sculpebatur | 23r  | axis et pro tabella antiquitus scribatur | 8r  | axis et pro tabella antiquitus scribatur | 29r  | axis et pro tabella |
| 22v 19  |  | | 23r  | sempiternus celebris | 8r  | sempiternus celebris | 29v  | sempiternus |
| 22v 18  |  | | 23r  | inhabitabilis solitarius | 8r  | inhabitabilis solitarius | 29v  | inhabitabilis solitarius |
| 22v 17  |  | | 23v  | defatigor denego non tollero interdico despero deficio | 8r  | defatigor denego non tollero interdico despero deficio | 30r  | defatigor denego interdico non tolero despero deficio |
| 22v 11  |  | | 23v  | adduco vel abigo | 8r  | adduco abigo | 30r  | abigo abduco |
| 22v 14 ἀπαθῆς impatiens || invict(us) | 23v invictus | 8v invictus | 30r invictus |
| 22v 16 ἀπαιδευσία ruditas || procacitas linguae vel | 23r procacitas linguae | 8r procacitas linguae | 29v procacitas linguae |
| 22v 19 ἀπαίσιος infaustus || indecens || ext(eri)bilis | 24r indecens exhorribile (ἀπαίσιον lemma) | 8v infaustum indecens exarrabile? (ἀπαίσιον lemma) | 30v infaustum indecens inexorabile (ἀπαίσιον lemma) |
| 23r 6 ἀπαινασχυντὸ depudeo || inverecunde || facio | 23v inverecunde facio | 8v inverecunde facio | 30v inverecunde facio |
| 23v 12 ἀπαρχὴ delibatio || primitia la decima | 24v primitia la decima | 8v primitiae la decima |
| 23v 14 ἀπάρχουμαι ἐκ θυσίων καὶ προσαγωγῶν delibo imbue || do primitia sacrifico demonibus ut gentiles | 24v primitias sacrifico demonibus ut gentiles | 8v do primitias sacrifico demonibus ut gentiles |
| 24r 18 ἀπειρος inexpertus || infinitus | 24v infinitus | 8v infinitus | 31r infinitus |
| 24r 25 ἀπειροκαλὰ ἡ τοῦ καλοῦ ἀμετρία insolentia infrunitas || s(i)n(e) pulchritudine et quesito rerum vilium insolentia inutilis indagatio | 24v contrastio rerum vilium inutilis indagatio pulchritudine et quesito rerum vilium insolentia | 9r sine pulcritudine et quesito rerum vilium insolentia inutilis indagatio | 31v sine pulchritudine et quiesce rerum vilium insolentia inutilis indagatio |
| 26r 2 ἀποβάλλω depello respue reicio || v(e)l amitto, perdo | 25r depello respuo reicio perdo | 9v perdo (marg. dex.) | 31v perdo |
| 26r 7 ἀποβλήσω aspio || respicio veneror | 24v respicio veneror | 9v respirio veneror | 31v respicio veneror |
| 26r 9 ἀποβολὴ iactura repulsa amissio || dispositio | 24v dispositio | 9v depositio | 31v dispositio |
| 34v 12 ἀρρηβῶν arra || pign(us) | 31r pignus | 13v pignus | 39r arra pignus |
| 35r 22 ἀρρετός placitus || placidus|| comprare(n)te/compiace(n)te?, assentato(r) | 30r ἀρρετός καὶ placidus; ἀρρετός | 13r placidus; ἀρρετός | 38v placidus; ἀρρετός |
| 37v 25 ἀρχηγὸς auctor || princeps rei cuius spiam | 31r rector auctor princeps rei cuius spiam | 14r rector auctor princeps origo | 39v dux magistratus princeps |
| 38r 14 ἀρχομαι incipio || et s(u)bdi(us) su(m) || pareo | 31r incipio subditus sum | 14r incipio subditus sum | 39v subditus sum inchoor |
| 38r 16 | ἀρχαίo impero praesum | 31r | primus facio dominor principior | 14r | primus facio dominor principior | 39v | primus facio dominor |
| 41r 11 | ἀτελείς, ὁ ἀπλήρωτος incompletus | 34v | immunis inutilis | 16r | immunis inutilis | 43v | immunis inutilis |
| 41v 2 | ἀτμίζω vaporo | 35r | scateo exalo fumo coquo vaporo | 16v | scateo exalo fumo coquo vaporo | 44r | scateo exalo vaporo fumo |
| 41v 22 | ἁτυχής infelix | 34v | infortunatus vaporo | 16r | immunis inutilis | 44r | infortunatus vaporo |
| 42r 9 | aūtēntēs auctor | 35v | dominor | 17r | dominus auctor | 45r | dominus auctor |
| 42r 13 | aūtēntō auctorō | 35v | dominor | 17r | dominus auctor | 45r | dominor |
| 42r 17 | sūlōc inutilis | 36r | sulcus rivus | 17v | sulcus rivus | 45v | sulcus rivus |
| 42v 18 | aūtārkēs contentus | 36r | suffectiens per se | 17v | suffectiens per se | 45v | per se suffectiens |
| 43r 1 | aūūtrācet inde codem loco | 36r | ex se et illinc et huc | 17v | ex se illinc | 45v | ex se illinc |
| 43r 3 | aūūtkrātō imperator | 36r | qui per se potest | 17v | qui per se potest | 45v | qui per se potest |
| 43r 10 | aūtōmōlō transfugio | 36r | transfugio insalutato hospite recedo; aūtōmōlōs transfuga | 17v | transfugio insalutato hospite recedo; aūtōmōlōs transfuga | 45v | transfugio insalutato hospite recedo (aūtōmōlōgēo lemma); aūtōmōlōs transfuga |
| 43r 13 | aūtōscēdvō prae oculis extemplo | 36r | forma digrossata; σχεδίαζω digrosso | 17v | forma digrossata; σχεδίαζω digrosso | 45v | forma digrossata; σχεδίαζω digrosso |
| 43r 15 | aūtōuγρός auctor rei | 36r | artifex et per seipsum faciens | 17v | artifex et per seipsum faciens | 45v | artifex naturalis per seipsum faciens |
| 43v 9 | ἄφαντζω depravo disparare facio et p(ro) dispareo ip(s)e, ut ξενοφόνω | 37r | aufero de rerum natura non appareo destruo | 18v | aufero de rerum natura non appareo destruo | 46v | aufero de rerum natura non appareo deleto defero? |
| 43v 18 | ἀφεγγῆς illuminatus | 37r | sine lumine | 18v | sine lumine | 47r | sine lumine |
| 44r 6 | ἀφηγούμαι enarrō expono prae sum. su(m) intentus | 37r | sum intentus narro expono | 18v | sum intentus narro expono | 47r | sum intentus narro expono praesum |
| 44v 3 | ἀφίδρυμα delubrum simulacrum | 37v | statua, situs | 18v | statua situs | 47r | statua situs |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44v 5 ἀφίημι omissit il</th>
<th>37v demitto</th>
<th>18v dimitto admicto</th>
<th>47r dimitto omissit il</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44v 6 ἀφικνούμεν perveni</td>
<td>37v advenio? ἥκο</td>
<td>18v advenio ab ἥκο venio mutatur ἦ ἦ in compositione</td>
<td>47r advenio; ἥκο venio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44v 13 ἀφέξις p.</td>
<td>37v accessus</td>
<td>18v accessus</td>
<td>47r accessus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44v 14 ἀφίσταμαι avo</td>
<td>37v ἀφίστος ἀπέπτην, ἀφίστος β ἀπεπτάμην.</td>
<td>18v volo; ἀφίστος ἀπέπτης, ἀφίστος β ἀπεπτάμην; [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>47r ἀφίστος ἀπέπτης, ἀφίστος β ἀπεπτάμην; [Lat. vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44v 15 ἀφίσταμαι absced</td>
<td>37v rebellans facio et abs</td>
<td>18v rebellare facio abs (ἀφίστημι lemma)</td>
<td>47r rebellare facio vel abs (ἀφίστημι lemma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45r 5 ἀφίσσιο sceler</td>
<td>37v expio</td>
<td>19r expio</td>
<td>47v expio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45v 1 ἁγνής obmutus il</td>
<td>38v vastus immensus stupore plenus</td>
<td>19v vastus immensus stupore plenus</td>
<td>48v vastus immensus stupore plenus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45v 11 σχίζω, ψήλιος caligo</td>
<td>38v caligo nebula</td>
<td>19v caligo nebula</td>
<td>48v caligo nebula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45v 15 ἁρρεώς nequ</td>
<td>38v inutilis</td>
<td>19v inutilis</td>
<td>48v inutilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45v 19 ἁρρητός incommodus il</td>
<td>38v rudis inutilis et absque usu im..?</td>
<td>19v rudis inutilis insitatus</td>
<td>48v rudis inutilis insitatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46r 13 ἁνμαχῶ iurgo il</td>
<td>38v scaramuccio</td>
<td>20r scharamuccio</td>
<td>49r scharamuccio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46r 14 ἁνμαχία iurgium il</td>
<td>39r scaramuccia</td>
<td>20r la scharamuccia</td>
<td>49r scharamuuccio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46r 20 ἁρμοχ immaturus</td>
<td>39r indecens</td>
<td>20r deformis intempestivus</td>
<td>49r deformis intempestivus; indecens et vel ἐμδός (Gr. lemma twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46r 26 βαβαί babae, at at il adv(erbium) admirantis, vel papa</td>
<td>39r adverbium admirandi vel papa</td>
<td>20r adverbium admirandi vel papa</td>
<td>49v adverbium admirantis vel papa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46v 5 βἀδᾶνον s(c)num, s(s)beliu(m) il</td>
<td>39r fundamentis et ime sedes</td>
<td>20r fundamentum et ime sedes gradus el pie del descho</td>
<td>49v fundamentum et ime sedes el pie del descho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46v 8 βαδῆνον exalt</td>
<td>39r profundum facio augeo</td>
<td>20r profundo facio augeo</td>
<td>49v profundum facio augeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46v 17 βολανεύς balneato(r) il</td>
<td>39v custos balnei</td>
<td>20v custos balnei</td>
<td>49v custos balnei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Text</td>
<td>Plain Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46v 20 βάλανος glans</td>
<td></td>
<td>granum(m)</td>
<td>et vel nux apud nos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46v 21 βαλάντιον saccus</td>
<td></td>
<td>to morsum</td>
<td>39v marsupium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47r 2 βάλανος artogan</td>
<td></td>
<td>ve(n)tosus</td>
<td>mechanic(us)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47r 11 βάρος moles, gravamen</td>
<td></td>
<td>39v onus gravitas pondus</td>
<td>20v onus gravitas pondus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47r 20 βασανίζω crucio, to(r)que, cohereo</td>
<td></td>
<td>to(r)me(n)to q(u)a(n)do</td>
<td>aliq(u)id scire volo, p(ro)bo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47r 23 βάσανος q(uae)sto, cruciat(us)</td>
<td></td>
<td>exp(er)ien(ti)a, approba(ti)o, Index, il paragone</td>
<td>39v experientia index il paragone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47v 2 βασιλέαν regia, Imp(er)i(u)m</td>
<td></td>
<td>signum regale</td>
<td>39v regia signum regale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47v 12 βάσις</td>
<td></td>
<td>basis, gressus et cantus metri</td>
<td>39v basis gressus et cantus metri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47v 13 βασκάνον fascino, Invideo</td>
<td></td>
<td>p(er) Invidia(m) aufero</td>
<td>39v fascino odio per invidiam aufero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47v 20 βάτος rubus, ruscus</td>
<td></td>
<td>s(ignifica)t et(iam), locu(m) facile(m) transitu</td>
<td>vas olei, cad(us), rubetum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48r 4 βδελυρός facinoros(us), scelestus, obsceno(us)</td>
<td></td>
<td>fastidiosus</td>
<td>39v fastidiosus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48r 5 βελόνας ομοι abominor</td>
<td></td>
<td>fastidio,</td>
<td>39v fastidio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48r 25 βελόνας acus</td>
<td></td>
<td>genus piscis et anima(lis)</td>
<td>39v acus vel genus piscis animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48v 6 βήμα ἐπὶ ἄχρονος tribunal</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἡ θέου</td>
<td>40v tribunal altare gressus et passus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48v 13 βία Vis, violentia</td>
<td></td>
<td>potentia</td>
<td>39v vis violentia potentia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48v 20 βιβάζω</td>
<td></td>
<td>duco</td>
<td>40v duco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49r 4 βιβάζοντος κόροδο</td>
<td></td>
<td>depasco(r), (con)sumo, devoro</td>
<td>40v depasco consumo devoro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49r 6 βίος vita</td>
<td></td>
<td>et victus</td>
<td>40v vita victus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49r 14 βλάβη damnu(m), det(ri)mentum</td>
<td></td>
<td>nocumentum(tu)m, τὸ βλάβος - nocumentum</td>
<td>41r detrimentum; 11r βλάβος - nocumentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49r 16 βλάξ lactans</td>
<td></td>
<td>stolid(us), Indiscret(us), mollis, Lascivus</td>
<td>41r stolidus indiscretus mollis delicatus lascivus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49r 21 βλαστάνω germino, pullulo</td>
<td></td>
<td>κατ βλαστέω, ἀόριστος βλαστόν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49v 5 βλασφημίω maledico, (con)tumelia afficio</td>
<td></td>
<td>o βλάσφημο κατ φημή</td>
<td>41v blasphemo, o βλάσφημο κατ φημή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49v 18 βλασφημός acerb(us), torvus, trux</td>
<td></td>
<td>t(er)ribilis, gravis, tetrus, t(er)ribilis</td>
<td>41v terribilis; 11r rigidus gravis tetrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49v 19 βλάζω mano, -as</td>
<td></td>
<td>scaturio</td>
<td>41r scaturio; 11r scaturio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50r 6 βολβός bolbus, g(e)n(u)s cepae</td>
<td></td>
<td>porru(m) silvestre</td>
<td>42r porrum silvestre; 11r porrum silvestre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50r 14 βουβώ strepo</td>
<td></td>
<td>s(er)bu(m) a sono</td>
<td>41r verbum a sono vocis aculice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50r 16 βόρβορος coenu(m), idest vorago luti</td>
<td></td>
<td>το βόρβορον κατ το βορβόρο</td>
<td>42r βορβόρον; ὁ βόρβορος cenum (two Gr. lemmas, same Lat. equivalent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50r 18 βορέας aquilo</td>
<td></td>
<td>βορας, -pà</td>
<td>42r βορέας; βοράς, -pà borea (two Gr. lemmas, same Lat. equivalent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50r 20 βόσκημα pecus, - coris</td>
<td></td>
<td>bestia, o(mn)e ani(m)al vel avis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50v 7 βουβών Inguen</td>
<td></td>
<td>41v inguen</td>
<td>22v inguen et inflatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflatu(m) quo d(ener)at(ur) ex alio malo</td>
<td>Inflatum quod generatur ex alio malo femur</td>
<td>Quod generatur ex alio malo femur</td>
<td>Inflatum quod generatur ex alio malo femur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 r 2 boö³māma volo, vis II</td>
<td>mēllōn boullīsoma</td>
<td>22 v mēllōn boullīsoma</td>
<td>52 r mēllōn boullīsoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>femur</td>
<td>volo</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 r 6 boōc bos II</td>
<td>boōc bos</td>
<td>22 v boōc bos et pellis bovis</td>
<td>52 v boōc bos et pellis bovis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boā kāt boōn et pellīs bovis</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 r 8 βράβεζον bravius II</td>
<td>bravius (rae)iūni(m) certam(i)nis</td>
<td>23 r bravius praemium certaminis</td>
<td>53 r bravius certaminis premium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 r 19 βράβευτῆς Int(er)cessor II</td>
<td>dispensator</td>
<td>23 r dispensator</td>
<td>53 v dispensator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dispensator(i)</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 r 20 βράβεζο Int(er)cædo II</td>
<td>ministri guber(ni) et dispenses, ordinis</td>
<td>dispensatio ordinis</td>
<td>dispenses, ordinis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dispensatio ordinis</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 v 3 βράζω scaturio, -is II</td>
<td>eff(er)veo scateo</td>
<td>42 v eff(er)veo scateo</td>
<td>53 v eff(er)veo scateo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 v 4 βράσσω, tō λακτινία Vannie II</td>
<td>bullio eff(ere)veo, turbo</td>
<td>42 v bullio eff(ere)veo (brāso lemma); pluo irrego madefacio áôrīs tos (et) brēçyzn (brēçyo lemma)</td>
<td>53 v bullio eff(ere)veo; pluo irrego madefacio áôrīs tos (et) brēçyzn (brēçyo lemma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 v 5 βύρσα coriū(m) II</td>
<td>kūt βύρσα</td>
<td>44 r βύρσα coriūm; interv. βύρσα</td>
<td>54 r βύρσα coriūm; interv. βύρσα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coriūm</td>
<td>coriūm</td>
<td>coriūm</td>
<td>coriūm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 v 21 βουμολόχος [coi.</td>
<td>βουμολόχος] planatic(us) II</td>
<td>bullīfone sive scura</td>
<td>43 v βουμολόχος sive sive scura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>femur</td>
<td>sive scura</td>
<td>sive scura</td>
<td>sive scura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 r 7 γαλέαγρα cavea II</td>
<td>tanquam carcer cavea</td>
<td>43 v tanquam carcer cavea</td>
<td>54 v tanquam carcer cavea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc(us) ubi rei carcerant(ur)</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 r 16 γαμηβρός gener II</td>
<td>spons(us), marit(us), sorori(us), affinis ex uxor(e)</td>
<td>43 v gener sponsus</td>
<td>55 r maritus soror is affinis ex uxore gener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 v 1 γαμῶ uxore(m) duco II</td>
<td>-et, áôrīs tos étyma</td>
<td>43 v duco uxorem futuo nuboe, áôrīs tos étyma</td>
<td>55 r uxor et nuboe, áôrīs tos étyma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-et, áôrīs tos étyma</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 v 2 γανῦ stigma, -as II</td>
<td>dulcifico, pulchrum et mite(m) redo</td>
<td>43 v dulcifico undue ganea scortum</td>
<td>55 r dulcifico undue mite(m) redo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dulcifico undue ganea scortum</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 v 3 γάννυμαι laetor, -ar is II</td>
<td>letor letitia exul; -þηνμαι</td>
<td>43 v letor letitia exul; -þηνμαι</td>
<td>55 r letor; -þηνμαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάννυμαι</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
<td>femur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53v 10</td>
<td>γαστρῷ sagino, -us l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44r</td>
<td>do operam ventri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24v</td>
<td>do operam ventri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55r</td>
<td>do operam ventri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53v 11</td>
<td>γαστήρ venter l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43v</td>
<td>venter; -στρός -stéroς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24v</td>
<td>venter; -στρός -stéroς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55r</td>
<td>venter; -στρός -stéroς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53v 16</td>
<td>γαύριμα exultatio l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43v</td>
<td>elatio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24v</td>
<td>elatio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54v</td>
<td>elatio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53v 17</td>
<td>γαύριμο exulto, gestio l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43v</td>
<td>glorior iacto elevor in superbiam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24v</td>
<td>glorior iacto elevor in superbiam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54v</td>
<td>glorior iacto elevor in superbiam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53v 22</td>
<td>γαύριοι laetus, -is, gen(us)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43v</td>
<td>elatus; -splendid(us)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24v</td>
<td>elatus splendidus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55v</td>
<td>splendidus elatus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54r 15</td>
<td>γενεαλογία genealogia, nativitas l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44r</td>
<td>sermo de generatione et origine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25r</td>
<td>sermo de generatione et origine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55v</td>
<td>sermo de generatione et origine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54v 4</td>
<td>γένεσι nativitas, g(e)n(e)ratio, p(ro)les l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44r</td>
<td>fetus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25r</td>
<td>fetus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55v</td>
<td>fetus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55r 3</td>
<td>γέρας praemium munus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44v</td>
<td>honor premium munus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25r</td>
<td>honor premium munus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55v</td>
<td>munus premium honor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55r 10</td>
<td>γέφρον εόδος -speridiós pereickis crates, -is, gen(us) scuti p(ers)ici l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44v</td>
<td>genus gladii et scutum persicum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25r</td>
<td>genus gladii vel scutum persicum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55v</td>
<td>genus gladii et scutum persicum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55v 10</td>
<td>γηράτσκο senesco l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45r</td>
<td>mellon γηράτσκο senesco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25v</td>
<td>mellon γηράτσκο senesco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56v</td>
<td>senesco mellon γηράτσκο γηράτσκο</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55v 13</td>
<td>γυνώσκο cognosco, comp(e)tu(m) h(ab)eo l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45r</td>
<td>cognosco sententio cogito delibero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25v</td>
<td>cognosco sententio cogito delibero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56v</td>
<td>cognosco sententio cogito delibero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55v 24</td>
<td>γλήσθων τό ορήγανον puleiu(m) l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45v</td>
<td>herba; γλήσθων ορήγανον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26r</td>
<td>η γλήσθων dicitur etiam ορήγανον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57r</td>
<td>η γλήσθων dicitur etiam ορήγανον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55v 25</td>
<td>γλήσθη η κόρη τοῦ ορθόμυλο pupilla, -ae l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45v</td>
<td>pupilla oculi vel tota pars oculi intus et oculus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26r</td>
<td>pupilla oculi et tota pars oculi intus et oculus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57r</td>
<td>pupilla oculi vel tota pars oculi intus et oculus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56r 2</td>
<td>γλώσσα sordes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45v</td>
<td>sordes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26r</td>
<td>sordes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57r</td>
<td>sordes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56r 11</td>
<td>γλώσση sculptio l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45v</td>
<td>sculptura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26r</td>
<td>sculptura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57r</td>
<td>sculptura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56v 2</td>
<td>γνήσιος sincer(us), familiaris l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45v</td>
<td>indigena legitimus ingenius germanus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26r</td>
<td>indigena legitimus ingenius germanus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57v</td>
<td>indigena legitimus germanus ingenius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56v 4</td>
<td>γνόφος nimbus l.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46r</td>
<td>caligo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26r</td>
<td>caligo obscurum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57v</td>
<td>caligo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nebulositas caligo</td>
<td>obscurum nebulosum</td>
<td>nebulosum</td>
<td>obscurum nebulosum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56v 5 γνώμη sententia, mens</td>
<td>45v sententia voluntas</td>
<td>26r sententia voluntas</td>
<td>57v sententia aut voluntas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II voluntas</td>
<td>II cognitio(r)</td>
<td>II cognitio(r)</td>
<td>II cognitio(r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56v 7 γνώμων gruma, index</td>
<td>46r cognitor</td>
<td>26r cognitor</td>
<td>57v cognitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II cognitio(r)</td>
<td>II cognitio(r)</td>
<td>II cognitio(r)</td>
<td>II cognitio(r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56v 20 γογγύλη rapa</td>
<td>46r γογγύλης - λίδος</td>
<td>26v γογγύλης - λίδος [gr. lemma] rapa</td>
<td>57v γογγύλης - λίδος [gr. lemma] rapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v(er) subdol(us), fallax</td>
<td>46r versutus prestigiator</td>
<td>26v versutus persstigiator</td>
<td>57v versutus praestigiator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II versutus, s(u)bdol(us), fallax</td>
<td>II subdolus</td>
<td>II subdolus</td>
<td>II subdolus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56v 24 γοητεία ἐπὶ κολακτιῆς blanditio</td>
<td>46r incantatio</td>
<td>26v incantatio</td>
<td>57v incantatio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II blanditio</td>
<td>II blanditio</td>
<td>II blanditio</td>
<td>II blanditio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56v 25 γοητείῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ blanditio(r)</td>
<td>46r incanto travaglio ambio</td>
<td>26v incanto travaglio ambio</td>
<td>57v incanto travaglio ambio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II ambio</td>
<td>II ambio</td>
<td>II ambio</td>
<td>II ambio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57r 3 γόμφος ὁ καλούμενος ἐπίστουρος clavus</td>
<td>46r clavus il chiovo</td>
<td>26v clavus il chiovo</td>
<td>58r clavus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Lat. lemma vacat]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57r 12 γόνον genu</td>
<td>46r genu; -νος</td>
<td>26v τοῦ γόνος γουνός</td>
<td>58r genu; -ς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v(er) γούνατος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57r 16 γούνα saltem</td>
<td>46r saltem et igitur</td>
<td>26v saltem et igitur</td>
<td>57v saltem et igitur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II saltem et igitur</td>
<td>II saltem et igitur</td>
<td>II saltem et igitur</td>
<td>II saltem et igitur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57v 7 γραφὸς anus</td>
<td>46v anus; -ς</td>
<td>27r γραφὸς γραφὸς, in accus(usa)ti(vo) γραφὸς</td>
<td>58r anus; -ς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II γραφος, in acc(usa)ti(vo) γραφος</td>
<td>II γραφος, in acc(usa)ti(vo) γραφος</td>
<td>II γραφος, in acc(usa)ti(vo) γραφος</td>
<td>II γραφος, in acc(usa)ti(vo) γραφος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57v 9 γραφεύς scriptor</td>
<td>46v pictor</td>
<td>27r pictor</td>
<td>58r scriptor pictor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II scriptor pictor</td>
<td>II scriptor pictor</td>
<td>II scriptor pictor</td>
<td>II scriptor pictor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57v 10 γραφὴ scriptura</td>
<td>46v scriptura accusatio pictura</td>
<td>26v scriptura et privata accusatio pictura</td>
<td>58r scriptura accusatio privata pictura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II scriptura pictura i mago tabula picta</td>
<td>II scriptura pictura i mago tabula picta</td>
<td>II scriptura pictura i mago tabula picta</td>
<td>II scriptura pictura i mago tabula picta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57v 11 γραφὴ ἡ ζωγραφία pictura</td>
<td>(see previous line)</td>
<td>(see previous line)</td>
<td>(see previous line)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II i mago, tabula picta</td>
<td>II i mago, tabula picta</td>
<td>II i mago, tabula picta</td>
<td>II i mago, tabula picta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57v 19 γραφὸς obscure(us), scrupulosus</td>
<td>46r rete et sermo implicitus</td>
<td>27r rete et sermo implicitus</td>
<td>58v rete et sermo implicitus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II et implicit(us)</td>
<td>II et implicit(us)</td>
<td>II et implicit(us)</td>
<td>II et implicit(us)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58r 8 γυμναστὴς</td>
<td>47r praeceptor exercens pueros;</td>
<td>27r preceptum exercitum et exercens pueros;</td>
<td>59r exercitiorum praeceptor pueros exercens; 58v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exercens; 58v</td>
<td>46v γυμναστική ars exercitatoria</td>
<td>27r preceptum exercitum et exercens pueros;</td>
<td>γυμναστικὴ ars exercitativa et prebens modum vivendi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exercens; 58v</td>
<td>46v γυμναστικὴ ars exercitatoria</td>
<td>27r preceptum exercitum et exercens pueros;</td>
<td>γυμναστικὴ ars exercitatoria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Marginal notes in agreement with two of the three codices (partly or completely)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Vat. Pal. Gr. 194</th>
<th>EK Cod. Gr. 4</th>
<th>Res. 224</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r 18 ὀδούλια inconsideratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>v(e)I malu(m) consiliu(m); tem(erator)tas</td>
<td>1r malum consilium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 9 ἀγάλλομαι exulto</td>
<td></td>
<td>defecto(r), acto(r)</td>
<td>1r letor glorior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 10 ἀγάλλω statua simulacrum</td>
<td></td>
<td>v(e)i monu(me)ntum; q(uae)lib(et) oblatis</td>
<td>1r statua dei; 2v aliquando pro monumento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 16 ἀγαμαι admiror</td>
<td></td>
<td>invid(e)o, co(m)movero(r), cu(m) delectatio(n)e</td>
<td>1r cum admiratione detector; 3v invideo commoveo moleste fero ab ἄγαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2r 26 ἁγκαστρον hamus</td>
<td></td>
<td>e la ritorta del fuso</td>
<td>2r hamus e la ritorta del fuso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v 6 ἁγκόνον cubitus</td>
<td></td>
<td>v(e)i loc(us) eminens</td>
<td>2r cubitus vel angulus poetice; 3r locus eminens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v 13 ἁγνεῖα castitas castimonia</td>
<td></td>
<td>pietas</td>
<td>3v pietas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v 15 ἁγνεῖα castus sum</td>
<td></td>
<td>justo, castu(m) facio</td>
<td>2v sum castus, justo, castum facio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v 25 ἁγῆομονὸν fidem rumpo tergiversor</td>
<td></td>
<td>ingratus sum</td>
<td>2r ingratus sum, ignoro, disconoscomi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v 26 ἁγῆόμων perfidus fraudulentus</td>
<td></td>
<td>ingratus</td>
<td>2v ingratus, invitus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r 7 ἁγονὸς sterlis infecundus</td>
<td></td>
<td>v(e)i ingenitus id est non genit(us)</td>
<td>3r ingenitus et sine consanguineis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r 8 ἁγορά nundinæ</td>
<td></td>
<td>res venalis I fo(rum) mercatus et venalium rerum et pretium rei et res vendita; 3r 9</td>
<td>1v contio, commeatus forum mercatus et venalium rerum et pretium rei et res</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3r 11</td>
<td>ἀγοράζω</td>
<td>emo mercor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nundinator</td>
<td>frument(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(con)vent(us)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>q(ui) villa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r 17</td>
<td>ἀγρα</td>
<td>venatio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p(rae)da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r 22</td>
<td>ἀγραίνω</td>
<td>efferro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>instigo, asp(er)sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v 3</td>
<td>ἀγριότης</td>
<td>asperitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feritas</td>
<td>immanitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>immanitas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v 13</td>
<td>ἀγρονόμος</td>
<td>villicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>villicis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v(e)l loc(us)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ubi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v 21</td>
<td>ἀγόμναστος</td>
<td>inexcercitatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v 23</td>
<td>ἀγορής</td>
<td>circulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r 1</td>
<td>ἀγόριονα</td>
<td>sagacitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sollicitia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r 3</td>
<td>ἀγοριστεία</td>
<td>propinquitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r 9</td>
<td>ὁγο</td>
<td>duco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r 12</td>
<td>ἀγογῆ, ἐπί τῆς</td>
<td>ἀναγογῆς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disciplina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r 13</td>
<td>ἀγογὸς</td>
<td>ductus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ductor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r 25</td>
<td>ἄδεια</td>
<td>facultas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>licentia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v 6</td>
<td>ἀδελφιδός</td>
<td>fratres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fraternus fratri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>filius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v 15</td>
<td>ὀδός</td>
<td>infernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v 18</td>
<td>ἀδιάθετος</td>
<td>intestatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5r 12</td>
<td>ἀδολεσχήσ</td>
<td>fabulosus garrulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5r 14</td>
<td>ἀδολεσχώ</td>
<td>garrio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5r 16</td>
<td>ἀδόξα</td>
<td>dedecus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5r 19</td>
<td>ἀδόξα</td>
<td>segnis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5v 15</td>
<td>ἀνόητα</td>
<td>tedium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5v 17</td>
<td>ἀνόητα</td>
<td>tediou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5v 22</td>
<td>ἀήρ</td>
<td>aer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6r 5</td>
<td>ἀθέσμος</td>
<td>illicitus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6r 7</td>
<td>ἀθέτω</td>
<td>reprobo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6r 10</td>
<td>ἀθήρ</td>
<td>arista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6r 15</td>
<td>ἀθλον</td>
<td>praemium certaminis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6r 16</td>
<td>ἀθρώπος</td>
<td>inconcussus infractus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6r 25</td>
<td>ἀθυός</td>
<td>innocens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6v 16</td>
<td>ἀιὸς</td>
<td>honestus verecundus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6v 18</td>
<td>ἀἰὸς</td>
<td>pudice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6v 22</td>
<td>ἀἰὸς</td>
<td>pudor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Text</td>
<td>Greek Text</td>
<td>Greek Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7r 3 aīthuia mergus vel fulica</td>
<td></td>
<td>avis Indica et marina q(uae) malu(m) signu(m) est navigantib(us) q(uae) in tempestate appar(et),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7r 6 aīkīçômæ sē: affligo multo</td>
<td></td>
<td>verbero, dilac(er)o, disc(er)o; aīkia v(er)bera(t)iô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7r 23 aīrētōtēron potius elegibilius</td>
<td></td>
<td>aīrētōs elect(us), elegibilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7r 25 aīrō tollo extollo</td>
<td></td>
<td>elevo; π(ορακείμενον) ήρκα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7v 3 aītīs.prosper secundus</td>
<td></td>
<td>decens, fortunatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7v 13 aīgōnē pudor</td>
<td></td>
<td>confusio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7v 16 aīgōnē turпо foedo</td>
<td></td>
<td>dedecoro, (con)fundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7v 19 aītīa causa querela titulos questio culpa</td>
<td></td>
<td>ratio, aliquando confirmatio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8r 3 aīgμαλωτος captivus</td>
<td></td>
<td>ma(n)cipiu(m), aīcμα cuspis et álloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8r 12 aīdōra gestatio</td>
<td></td>
<td>deambula(t)iō c(aus)iā valitud(in)iēs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8v 4 ākāmatoς indefessus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Irreq(ui)etus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8v 25 ākαταστασία inconstans</td>
<td></td>
<td>seditio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8v 26 ākατασχέτος incontinens effrenatus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indententibilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r 7 ākēstria ἤτοι καμοστρατης sarcinatrix</td>
<td></td>
<td>medicatrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r 11 ākivδήλως sedulo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incorrupte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r 13 ākκίζωμαι tō</td>
<td></td>
<td>effeminari                                                                 paradigma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσποιούμαι καὶ δρόμτομαι σιμULO vel blandior</td>
<td></td>
<td>effemi(n)or, delitio(r), evanesco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r 19 ἀκλήρος exors</td>
<td></td>
<td>inops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r 22 ἀκμάζω vigeo</td>
<td></td>
<td>pubesco, ferveo, matur(us) su(m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r 24 ἀκμὴ vigor maturitas</td>
<td></td>
<td>acies, flos aetatis, occasio cuspis et su(m)mum q(ui)n? ult(er)i(us) no(n) p(ossi)t iri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r 26 ἀκμῆ, ἐπίρρημα adhuc</td>
<td></td>
<td>et rursus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v 6 akoinóntos egregius(us), singularis</td>
<td>8r egregius, singularis</td>
<td>[lacuna]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v 7 Intemper(eri)an(ti)a, ἀκόλοασία impunitas</td>
<td></td>
<td>prodigalitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v 8 ἀκόλαστος ganeo lascivus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intemperans, modest(us)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r 7 ἀκοσμία dedecus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intemperan(t)ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r 20 ἄκρατος inconsteratus</td>
<td></td>
<td>mer(us) pur(us)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r 21 ἄκρατης incontinens inconsterans</td>
<td></td>
<td>inops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r 25 ἄκροχόλος vaesanus</td>
<td></td>
<td>s(u)bitus ad iram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10v 1 ἄκριμων cima corymbus</td>
<td></td>
<td>s(u)bitus ad iram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10v 2 ἄκριβης diligens subtilis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Integer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10v 10 ἄκριτος inuidicatus</td>
<td></td>
<td>sine lege inuidicatus vel? indemnatus indemnatus indicta causa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 24</td>
<td>άκροστόλοιον fori su(m)mitas seu extremitas navis</td>
<td>9r sumitas navis vel? extremitas [lacuna] 12r sumitas navis extremitas (άκροστόλοια lemma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1r 12</td>
<td>άκτη ή τῆς θαλάσσης acta ora maris littus ripa, littus nunt(ri)mentu(m), donu(m)</td>
<td>9r cibus litus nutrimentum ripa [lacuna] 13r cibus litus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 26</td>
<td>άλαζόνευμα insolesco iacto arrogo glorior ululo insultando</td>
<td>10r clamo insultando (άλαλάζω lemma) [lacuna] 13r arrogo superbio; insultando clamo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 3</td>
<td>άλαλάζω ululo insultando petulans superbus</td>
<td>10r petulans superbus [lacuna] 13r insultando clamo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 7</td>
<td>άλεωτής unctor palaestrae(p)ecepto(r) v(e)e</td>
<td>10r preceptor palestre et pedotrina [lacuna] 13v palestrae praecceptor pedotrius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 12</td>
<td>άλεζίκακος depulsor malo(rum) de(d)ensor, cap(er) pro apollini(α)</td>
<td>10r adiutor malorum idest defensor pro apolline [lacuna] 13r malorum adiutor idest defensor pro apolline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 1</td>
<td>άλη ή πλάνη error v(e)e anxietae</td>
<td>10r anxietae errores [lacuna] 13v anxietae error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 11</td>
<td>άλικω, τό συνα(ρ)βρο(υ) conglomero</td>
<td>10v congreso versor erro et insalo [lacuna] 13r congreso versor erro insalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 12</td>
<td>άλλη, ή δύναμις robur v(e)e subsidium proeliu(m) poetice</td>
<td>11r subsidium potentia fortitudo et aliquando prileum poetice [lacuna] 14r subsidium potentia fortitudo aliquando prileum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 16</td>
<td>άλιο, τό δυσφορ(ό) tristor v(e)e afficio gaudio vel tristitia mercet</td>
<td>10v afficio gaudio vel tristitia mereo eto 1r dissolvo tristor eto 16r dissolvo tristor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 26</td>
<td>άμέλεια proinde</td>
<td>11r aliquando alibi - 14v aliquando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 26</td>
<td>άμαρτήμα peccatum v(e)e άμαρτε (άμαρτία lemma)</td>
<td>12r peccatum (άμαρτία lemma) - 16v peccatum (άμαρτία lemma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 26</td>
<td>άμέλεια proinde</td>
<td>13r denique - 17r denique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13r 12</td>
<td><em>ἀμοιβαδόν</em> alternatim mutuo vicissim <em>vel</em> successive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v</td>
<td>vicissim et successive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v</td>
<td>vicissim, permutans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17v</td>
<td>vicissim successive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13r 14</td>
<td><em>ἀμύητος</em> inocdotus rudiis inexpertus <em>non</em> initiat(us) ad sacra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v</td>
<td>non initiatus ad sacra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>non initiatus ad sacra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13r 15</td>
<td><em>ἀμύων</em> purus ummaculatus <em>non</em> reprehensibilis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v</td>
<td>reprehensibilis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>reprehensibilis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13r 19</td>
<td><em>ἀμύσαω</em> lanio lacerō <em>vel</em> graffio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v and 14v</td>
<td>repugno ulciscor capio vindictam puneo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v</td>
<td>puneo et capio vindictam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17v</td>
<td>repugno punio ulciscor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v 20</td>
<td><em>ἀμυχῆ</em> cicatrix superficialis <em>vel</em> graffiatura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v</td>
<td>laniatio graffiatura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>laniatio graffiatura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v 1</td>
<td><em>ἀναβαίνω</em> ascendo <em>vel</em> recedo v(e)l <em>sē</em> graffio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15v</td>
<td>redeo <em>vel</em> recedo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>redeo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20v</td>
<td>redeo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v 4</td>
<td><em>ἀναβάλλομαι</em> differo <em>vel</em> superpono ricerco sonando</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15v</td>
<td>differo superpono ricerco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7r</td>
<td>facio preludium omnem sonum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20r</td>
<td>differo superpono recedo sonando</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v 6</td>
<td><em>ἀναβολῆ</em> dilatio <em>vel</em> genus vestis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15v</td>
<td>dilatio mora genus vestis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7r</td>
<td>preludium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20r</td>
<td>dilatio mora genus vestis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v 8</td>
<td><em>ἀναβίω</em> revivisco <em>vel</em> resuscito</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15v</td>
<td>revivo resuscito</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>revivo resuscito</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v 13</td>
<td><em>ἀναδύομαι</em> differo veto <em>vel</em> recuso, retraho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16r</td>
<td>recuso retraho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>recuso retraho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20v</td>
<td>recuso retraho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v 15</td>
<td><em>ἀναδῶ</em> corono <em>vel</em> circumligo, ódeo ligo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16r</td>
<td>corono religo circumligo, ódeo ligo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>corono religo circumligo ódeo ligo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v 24</td>
<td><em>ἀναδενδράς</em> arbustum <em>vel</em> cooper(tio) arborum <em>vel</em> p(er)gula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16r</td>
<td>coopertio arbustum vel per gula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>coopertio arbustum pergula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14r 7</td>
<td><em>ἀναμίξει</em> mixtum <em>vel</em> promiscue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16v</td>
<td>mixtum promiscue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>mixtum promiscue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21v</td>
<td>mixtum promiscue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14r 14</td>
<td><em>ἀναροβῶ</em> sorbeo <em>vel</em> emico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17v</td>
<td>emicat (Gr. verb Sing. 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22v</td>
<td>emicat (Gr. verb Sing. 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14v 9</td>
<td><em>ἀνάρης</em> statua <em>vel</em> praecipue viri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20r</td>
<td>staua precipue viri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>staua precipue viri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25v</td>
<td>staua precipue viri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15r 2 ἀνεμένος laxus</td>
<td>qu(a)n(do)q(ue)</td>
<td>commodo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solitus remissus</td>
<td></td>
<td>venere(us)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15r 13 ἀνελεύθερος</td>
<td>illiber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illiber</td>
<td></td>
<td>illiberalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16v 19 ἀνθέλκῳ retraho</td>
<td>Impedio, (con)tra</td>
<td>nas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>retraho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17r 13 ἀνθίσταμαι obsto</td>
<td>Insurgo</td>
<td>Insurgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insurgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 19 ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
<td>exemplar et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rescriptum exemplar</td>
<td></td>
<td>exemplum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>indigus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>I(m)p(er)transibilis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dub(us)</strong>, <strong>difficil(is)</strong></td>
<td><strong>inventu</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31r 20 <em>ápороφος</em> ή <em>ápороφή</em> emanatio</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>lo(c)us</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>abrupt(us)</strong> rupes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31r 22 <em>άπορο</em> επί τού διστάζοντος incertus sum ambigio</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indiged.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>deficio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31v 21 <em>ἄποστάλλω</em> destino mitto dirigo</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(e)mittre.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dimitto</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32r 2 <em>άποσταμάτικο</em> ore profero effor</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>v(e)lopp(ri)mo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32r 7 <em>άποστροφή</em> aversatio</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(con)v(er)sio.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>odium</strong> odiu(m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32v 2 <em>ἀποτίμησις</em> ἐπί ἀπογραφῆς χωρίων census</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>v(e)lo ci(us)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descrip(tio)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32v 14 <em>ἀπότομος</em> immanis acerbus crudelis</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>durus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32v 15 <em>ἀπότομος</em> τόπος rigidus asper</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>praith(ri)pt(us).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>praith(ri)pt(us).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33r 4 <em>ἀποτρόπαιος</em> detestabilis abominandus</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>remediativus.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>horre(n)dus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33r 14 <em>ἀπόφασις</em> sententia promulgatio pronunciatio interlocutio</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>negatio(ri)a</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interroga(tio)a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33r 20 <em>ἀπόφθεγμα</em> dictum</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>v(e)lo s(e)n(tent)ia</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>s(e)n(tent)ia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33v 5 <em>ἀποδοχή</em> refreno</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>v(e)lo frenu(m) exuo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33v 7 <em>ἀποστή</em> apocha</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>distant(ri)a.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>abstin(ri)a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33v 19 <em>ἀποστησόμαι</em> abrogo</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>lib(e)ro in lud(ici)o.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revoco</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>p(er) decretum expello.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33v 21 <em>ἀποστάλλω</em> destino mitto dirigo</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(e)mittre.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dimitto</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33v 22 <em>ἀπόρο</em> επί τού διστάζοντος incertus sum ambigio</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Indiged.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>deficio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34r 27 [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>10r 26v abruptus rupis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r abruptus rupis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34r abruptus rupis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31v 21 <em>ἀποστάλλω</em> destino mitto dirigo</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(e)mittre.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dimitto</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32r 2 <em>ἀποσταμάτικο</em> ore profero effor</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>v(e)lopp(ri)mo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32r 7 <em>ἀποστροφή</em> aversatio</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(con)v(er)sio.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>odium</strong> odiu(m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32v 2 <em>ἀποτίμησις</em> ἐπί ἀπογραφῆς χωρίων census</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>v(e)lo ci(us)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descrip(tio)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32v 14 <em>ἀπότομος</em> immanis acerbus crudelis</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>durus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32v 15 <em>ἀπότομος</em> τόπος rigidus asper</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>praith(ri)pt(us).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>praith(ri)pt(us).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33r 4 <em>ἀποτρόπαιος</em> detestabilis abominandus</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>remediativus.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>horre(n)dus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33r 14 <em>ἀπόφασις</em> sententia promulgatio pronunciatio interlocutio</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>negatio(ri)a</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interroga(tio)a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33r 20 <em>ἀπόφθεγμα</em> dictum</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>v(e)lo s(e)n(tent)ia</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>s(e)n(tent)ia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33v 5 <em>ἀποδοχή</em> refreno</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>v(e)lo frenu(m) exuo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33v 7 <em>ἀποστή</em> apocha</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>distant(ri)a.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>abstin(ri)a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33v 19 <em>ἀποστησόμαι</em> abrogo</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>lib(e)ro in lud(ici)o.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revoco</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>p(er) decretum expello.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e q(uan)d(o) non si vincet il p(ar)tito, refrago(r)?</td>
<td>28r [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>11r libero inuidico per decretum expello vel quando non obtinetur pontitus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28r [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>11r libero inuidico per decretum expello vel quando non obtinetur pontitus?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35v libero inuidico per decretum expello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33v 20 ápupóxyo derigeo</td>
<td></td>
<td>aresco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33v 22 ápúrgymov oтивus</td>
<td></td>
<td>no(n) cura(n)s d(e) reb(u)s alienis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33v 23 ápúrgymov ignavus oтивus</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ut) re infecta desisti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 5 ápriē Ḏ�ʒov oλόξερος sυμmopere firmissime</td>
<td></td>
<td>tenacit(er), app(re)hensive, stricte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34v 14 áρχιος rarus</td>
<td></td>
<td>moll(is), minut(us), angust(us), g(ra)cilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34v 23 áρχιος, οὐδετέρου τὸ ὑφασμα aranea</td>
<td></td>
<td>est tela araneae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35r 4 áρχιος aer pecunia</td>
<td></td>
<td>argentu(m) et loc(us) ubi fund(itu)r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 24 áρχιoν ἡ τῆς κιθάρας harmonia consonantia</td>
<td></td>
<td>compon(s)itio, pactu(m), (con)veni(eti)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38v 21 áρχωμαι exercror maledictis infector</td>
<td></td>
<td>(con)gruo, p(re)cor, oro, dico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38v 26 ῥαινής sine vitio</td>
<td></td>
<td>Innocuus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r 14 áτερ praeter absque</td>
<td></td>
<td>seorsu(m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43v 7 σπόρομος ultroneus iniuissus</td>
<td></td>
<td>et casualis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43v 20 αὐθήνα ἀνήρ του καὶ κλίνεται αὐξένος cervix</td>
<td></td>
<td>iugulus et iugum cervix et iuguli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43v 22 σιμχηρός squalidus</td>
<td></td>
<td>siccus caliginosus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43v 26 αὐξὸ glorior</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44v 4 ἀριστερὸ dedico consecro</td>
<td></td>
<td>ve(m) inter(ficio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44v 21 ἀριστομούμαι instar</td>
<td>37v assimilatio</td>
<td>47v assimilatio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Marginal Notes</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48v 18</td>
<td>βέβηλος prophan(us), pollut(us)</td>
<td>40v impurus profanus; βέβηλος sacer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49v 6</td>
<td>βέβηλος aspectus</td>
<td>41r aspectus acies vel? visus; βέβηλος visus idem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49v 20</td>
<td>βόη clamor(r)</td>
<td>41v clamor; βόη clamor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53v 23</td>
<td>γάμος</td>
<td>43v nuptiae et aliquando pro nupta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54v 14</td>
<td>γενεά gen(eratoria), progenies</td>
<td>44r genus soboles generatio proles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56v 9</td>
<td>γνωρίζω cognoscere</td>
<td>45v cognoscere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3 Marginal notes in agreement with one of the three codices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ÓNB Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Vat. Pal. Gr. 194</th>
<th>EK Cod. Gr. 4</th>
<th>Res. 224</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12r 19</td>
<td>ἄλλος aliter</td>
<td>11r idem [cf. the previous line in the ms.: alioquin idest multif magis] et incassum alter aliquando sine causa</td>
<td>[lacuna]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12v 10</td>
<td>ἀμύδο meto</td>
<td>17r dividó metor</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16r 22</td>
<td>ἄνεχομαι tolero</td>
<td>18v tollero cum duplici augmento ἄνεχοντο (ἄνεχον lemma)</td>
<td>4v suffero emineo (ἀνέχομαι lemma); tollero elevo consurgo (ἀνέχον lemma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19r 13</td>
<td>ἀπόκαραθωλο deporto improbro</td>
<td>24v minor</td>
<td>9v minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29r 14</td>
<td>ἀποκαραθωλο deporto improbro</td>
<td>25v reprobo improbro</td>
<td>9v reprobo approbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27v</td>
<td>ἀσπασθῶμαι ἄμπορο exp ecto</td>
<td>25v [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28r 13</td>
<td>ἀπόκοπτω praecido</td>
<td>25v [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28r 18</td>
<td>ἀποκόπτω amputo</td>
<td>25v [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28r 23</td>
<td>ἀποκοσμῶ δεόμο</td>
<td>25v [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28v 16</td>
<td>ἀποκυρῶ ἀβρόγο</td>
<td>29v [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>12v autentico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30r 9</td>
<td>ἀπόνου αμενία</td>
<td>26r [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30r 12</td>
<td>ἀποζέω διστρίγο</td>
<td>26v [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30v 10</td>
<td>ἀπόπληκτος enectus enecatus</td>
<td>26v [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30v 18</td>
<td>ἀποτενάδ αβολεό</td>
<td>26v [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31r 8</td>
<td>ἀπορρημανύο προρυμπό</td>
<td>26v [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>10r sorbillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32r 1</td>
<td>ἀποστολή apostolatus</td>
<td>27r [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32v 17</td>
<td>ἀποτόμως πραεσιέ</td>
<td>27v [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34r 22</td>
<td>ἄπτωμα tango</td>
<td>28v [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34r 23</td>
<td>ἄπτω ανάκαμπτο</td>
<td>28v [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34v 10</td>
<td>ἄρα ἢ κατάρα</td>
<td>30r [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>14r nocumentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35r 23</td>
<td>ἄργος πιγερ ἀλβος</td>
<td>30v [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>13r otiosus vacuus tardus illaboratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35r 13</td>
<td>ἄργο καιρίας cesso</td>
<td>30v [Lat. vacat]</td>
<td>13v otior nihil ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35v 7</td>
<td>ἄρμηνος numeros</td>
<td>30r numeros</td>
<td>13r numerus la mostra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38v 7</td>
<td>ἀσέβδοι impie facio</td>
<td>32v [equivalents misplaced]</td>
<td>15v impie gero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38v 19</td>
<td>ἀσθενος αναγερο</td>
<td>33r [equivalents misplaced]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39r 28</td>
<td>ἀσκόδ excolo</td>
<td>33r [equivalents misplaced]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39r 19</td>
<td>ância canticum</td>
<td></td>
<td>cantus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39r 23</td>
<td>ἁσπάζομαι saluto ampler</td>
<td></td>
<td>amo, congratulor(r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39v 24</td>
<td>ἀστοργός inamabilis</td>
<td></td>
<td>st(ro)e affectio(n)e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40v 15</td>
<td>ἁσχημωσύνη inhonestas</td>
<td></td>
<td>turpitudo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40v 17</td>
<td>ἁσχολία occupatio</td>
<td></td>
<td>neogemu(m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40v 19</td>
<td>ἁσχολῶ avoco</td>
<td></td>
<td>ex(er)ceu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41r 19</td>
<td>ἁτμος inhonoribus ingloriosus infamis</td>
<td></td>
<td>aequalia(on) do (significat) illu(m) cui(us) nex no(n) deb(et) m(u)ltari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44v 24</td>
<td>ἀφόρα sterilitas</td>
<td></td>
<td>abruit(ab) abundan(ti)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47r 1</td>
<td>βάμμα Infectio, tinctura</td>
<td></td>
<td>Il favore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57v 8</td>
<td>γραφεῖον stilus, graphiu(m)</td>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ γραφεῖον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4 Marginal notes in agreement with none of the three codices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ÓNB Suppl. Gr. 45</th>
<th>Vat. Pal. Gr. 194</th>
<th>EK Cod. Gr. 4</th>
<th>Res. 224</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r 25</td>
<td>ἀγαθὸς bonus benignus honestus</td>
<td></td>
<td>fortis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 15</td>
<td>ἄγαν nimis</td>
<td></td>
<td>multu(m) l adv(erbium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 18</td>
<td>ἀγανακτῶ excandescor indignor moleste fero</td>
<td></td>
<td>stomacho(r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v 20</td>
<td>ἀγαπῶ diligo amo</td>
<td></td>
<td>et (con)tent(us) su(m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v 9</td>
<td>ἀγλαὸς clarus illustris</td>
<td></td>
<td>lucid(us)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v 16</td>
<td>ἀγνίζῳ purgo purifico</td>
<td></td>
<td>(con)secro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v 24</td>
<td>ἁγνομοσύνη</td>
<td>2r</td>
<td>ingratitudo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v 15</td>
<td>ꞐγϽςνία</td>
<td>lucubratio vigilia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v 26</td>
<td>ꞐղϽβαθής</td>
<td>prealtus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r 19</td>
<td>ꞐγϽϽνθέτης</td>
<td>munerarius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v 2</td>
<td>Ꞑδέλφος</td>
<td>frater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5v 18</td>
<td>Ꞑηδός</td>
<td>tediose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6v 21</td>
<td>αἰδούμαι</td>
<td>vereundor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r 23</td>
<td>Ꞑκμαίος</td>
<td>vegetus naturus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r 22</td>
<td>Ꞑκρατιζω</td>
<td>ianto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10v 5</td>
<td>Ꞑκριβολογία</td>
<td>veriloquium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11r 3</td>
<td>Ꞑκρογορδάνη,</td>
<td>η</td>
<td>μυρμηκία verrica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11r 6</td>
<td>Ꞑκρόρεια</td>
<td>ὅροςς</td>
<td>collis iugum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11r 16</td>
<td>Ꞑκτίστος</td>
<td>inconditus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11v 13</td>
<td>ὄλας</td>
<td>sales libus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11v 18</td>
<td>ὀλευρόν</td>
<td>farina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11v 23</td>
<td>ὀληθινός</td>
<td>verax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2v vigilia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[lacuna]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2r luctatorum praefectus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[lacuna]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6v insipide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8v peto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7v perpetuus aeternus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[lacuna]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11v 11r</td>
<td>maturus vigens</td>
<td>maturus vigens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[lacuna]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r 12r</td>
<td>non fabricatus</td>
<td>non fabricatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[lacuna]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10r farina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v farina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

499 Cf. Crastonus 1497, s.v. ἀκτίστος: infabricatus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12r 8</td>
<td>ἀλεμμα</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[lacuna]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12r 16</td>
<td>ἀλόγιστος</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10v inconsiderabilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13r 1</td>
<td>ἀμήληκτος</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13r inmitis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13r 2</td>
<td>ἀμήτος</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13r messis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13r 4</td>
<td>ἀμήχανον</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13r inopinabilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13r 16</td>
<td>ἀμύνω</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13v and 14r vivo; cum προ protego defendo επι adiuvo expello (Gr. lemma twice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v 21</td>
<td>ἀναλέγομαι</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14r 6</td>
<td>ἀνάλογον</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16v ἀναλογία proprietas lemma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14r 19</td>
<td>ἀνάσπο</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17v evello extraho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17r 10</td>
<td>ἀνθρακίς</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20r pruna (ἀνθρακίς lemma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17r 11</td>
<td>ἀνθραξ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20r carbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17v 15</td>
<td>ἀνάστασις</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19r exurgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18r 26</td>
<td>ἀνταχώνιστής</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

500 Cf. Crastonus 1497, s.v. ἀληθινός: verus verax.
501 Cf. Crastonus 1497, s.v. ἀλόγιστος: inconsideratus irrationalis.
<p>| 19r 14 | ἀντὶβολῶ | oro | prepcer | vel | rogo | 20v | obvius | supplico | oro | 26v | obvius | supplico | oro |
| 19r 22 | ἀντέχῳ | destino | inhibeo | prohibeo | ἀπεκτέον | retin(e)n)dum | (est) | 20v | contrateneo | contrasto | 6v: | contra | teneo | 26v | contra | teneo | contrasto |
| 19v 16 | ἀντίκεμα | obsto | officio | obsum | || 21v 16 | ἀνόνυμος | sine | nomine | ignobilis | || 22r 8 | ἀξίομαι | mereor || 22r 10 | ἀξίωμα | dignitas | honor | meritum | || 22r 11 | ἀξιωματικός | honorarius | || 22v | dignitas | postulatio | 7v: | dignitas | postulatio | 29r | postulatio | dignitas |
| 22v 23 | ἀπαλλάττω | abeo | discedo | || 23r | ἀπαλλάττω | absullo | libero | || 24r 14 | ἀπαντῶ | obvío | occurrro | || 23r | obvius | 20v | obvius | supplico | oro | 26v | obvius | supplico | oro |
| 23r 17 | ἄπαρατητος | inexcusabilis | irrecesabilis | || 23v | inexcusabilis | inesorabilis | inevitabilis | || 24r 13 | ἀπερία | imperitia | infínitás | || 24v | imperitia | 20v | obvius | supplico | oro | 26v | obvius | supplico | oro |
| 25r 15 | ἀπέχω | ἐνεργητικὸς | τὸ | ἀπολαμβάνω | recipió | || 25r 22 | ἀπίς | ἢ | ὑπόρα | καὶ | κλίνεται | ἀπίς | || 25r 22 | ἀπίς | ἢ | ὑπόρα | καὶ | κλίνεται | ἀπίς | || 284 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Text</th>
<th>24r perfidia</th>
<th>9r perfidia</th>
<th>31v perfidia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25r 26 ἁπάστια</td>
<td>25r retimesco</td>
<td>9v timeo</td>
<td>32r timeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infidelitas incredulitas</td>
<td></td>
<td>dictu(m) q(uod)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27r 4 ἀποδόρασις defleo deploro</td>
<td></td>
<td>(con)q(ue)ror</td>
<td>25r defleo deploro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27v 26 ἀπόκρεσι πενία</td>
<td></td>
<td>p(er)cursu est</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29r 12 ἁπολύμα περδο amitto</td>
<td></td>
<td>p(er)eio</td>
<td>26r [Lat. vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30v 19 ἀποσπήνυμεν eneco suffoco</td>
<td></td>
<td>πνύμο id(em) q(uo)d?</td>
<td>26v [Lat. vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31r 10 ἀπορία inopia penuria</td>
<td></td>
<td>indigentia,</td>
<td>26v [Lat. vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(er)iculula(m)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32r 9 ἁποστλοῦ expiño</td>
<td></td>
<td>dep(o)μ(υ)lor</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32v 21 ἁποτέμανα deseco recido</td>
<td></td>
<td>sep(ar)o, p(ar)tem a toto divido</td>
<td>27r [Lat. vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34v 26 ἁργεία αἰ σχολαὶ feriai</td>
<td></td>
<td>sing(u)(ar)i</td>
<td>30r [Lat. vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35r 10 ἁργυρός argenteus</td>
<td></td>
<td>v(e)l splendid(us)</td>
<td>30v [Lat. vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35v 23 ἁρτησὶ industria nobilitas virtus</td>
<td></td>
<td>aliq(ua)n(d)ο</td>
<td>30r [Lat. vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pulchritudo, et q(uae)d(at)m</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36r 8 ἁρμάμαζα carpentum</td>
<td></td>
<td>pilentu(m)</td>
<td>30v [Lat. vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36r 20 ἁρμίσκω apto accommodo</td>
<td></td>
<td>aliq(ua)di</td>
<td>30v [Lat. vacat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodo</td>
<td></td>
<td>alicui</td>
<td>et (con)ve(n)io</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36v 8 ἀρνειός agnus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

505 Cf. Crastonus 1497, s.v. ἀπόλλου: pereo perdo destruo.
506 Cf. Crastonus 1497, s.v. ἀπορία: indigentia dhabitatio.
| aries | 39v 8 ἀσπλαγχνος immisericors || pusillanim(us) | - | - | - |
| 39v 26 ἀστράγαλος εἴόδος παπούς talus || v(e)l conjunctura | 33v [equivalents misplaced] | 43r ludus puerorum genus ludi (astragaloi a lemma) |
| 40v 2 ἀσυνήθης insuetus insolens || no(n) familia(r)is | - | - |
| 40v 16 ἀσχήμων inhumetlus || d(e)fo(r)mis | 33v [equivalents misplaced] | 42v decens |
| 40v 20 άσωτος helluo prodigus ganeo || Insatiabil(is) | 32v [equivalents misplaced] | 42v insanabilis prodigus |
| 41r 16 ἡπιόν, ἡ βλάβη τῆς ἀτροχρόνης erumna nocumetum || p(er)necies | 34v nocumetum | 16r: nocumetum | 43v nocumetum |
| 41v 26 αὐὴ λυξ || fulgor? | 35v aurora splendor quando sol oritur | 17r: aurora splendor quando sol oritur | 45r aurora |
| 42r 7 αὐθαίρετος voluntarius libens || p(ro)p(ri)(us) et spontaneus homicida | 35v voluntarius qui occidit…? | 17r: voluntarius homicida sui | 45r voluntarius homicida |
| 42r 23 αὐξάνει οἱ άνθρώποι, τὸ ἀναστρέφομαι commoror conversor || alloggio, div(er)necies | 36r pernocto pono habitaculum castra metor | 17r: phistulo pernocto pono habitatum castra metor demoror manco tendo | 45r pernocto habitaculum pono castra metor |
| 43r 24 αὐχμῶ squalleo || sordeo | 36v squaleo et sordids sum | 46r squaleo sordids sum |
| 43v 5 ἀφαιροῦμαι aufero decido deripio || p(ro)v(e) perdo | - | - | - |
| 43v 8 ἀφανῆς ignotus obserbus || dispars(e)n, oculos latens | 37r non apparenz oculos latens | 18r: non apparens occultus latens | 46v occultus non apparenz |
| 43v 24 ἀφεάστο non parco || γενικὴ, no(n) sparagno | 37r [Lat. vacat] | 18v: non parco | 47r non parco |
| 44r 23 ἀφθονία copia largitas || ἀφθονία i(n)fantia, mutitas | - | - | - |
| 44v 14 ἀφίππεμαι avelo || ἀφιππεῖο avelo(u)i, eq(u)i ta(n)s abeo | - | - | - |
| 44v 23 ἀφορμήτης intolerabilitas || - | - | - |

507 Cf. Crastonus 1497, s.v. ἀστράγαλος: talus idest ludus calcaneum conjunctura pedis.
508 Cf. Crastonus 1497, s.v. αὐθαίρετος: per se ipsum eligens spontaneus homicida sui ipsius.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\text{ἀφρόνιτρον spuma nitri} )</th>
<th>37v parum tango</th>
<th>18v: parum tango</th>
<th>47v abominor repudio libo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45r 6 ἀφοσίουμαι dissimulo devoto (|) evito, (\text{p(er) religio(n)em quandam(m) o} )mitto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45v 3 ἥξαρις, ὅ (\mu ) hè ἥξαριν χάριν insulæus (|)</td>
<td>38v non gratus</td>
<td>19v: non gratus</td>
<td>48v non gratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45v 4 ἄχριστος ingratus (|) illepīd(us)</td>
<td>38v ingratus</td>
<td>19v: ingratus (marg. dex. utólag pótolva)</td>
<td>48v ingratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46v 11 βασιλεία baculus (|) maza sceptrum</td>
<td>39r baculus</td>
<td>20v baculum</td>
<td>49v baculus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47r 3 βανωσότης ἡ βανωσία arrogantia (|) vulgaris, qu(on)dam ventositas</td>
<td>39r mechanicheria (βανωσία lemma)</td>
<td>20v mechanicheria</td>
<td>49v mechanicharia (βανωσία lemma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47r 26 βασιλεύς rex (|) vel etiam dominus</td>
<td>39r rex</td>
<td>21r rex</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47v 3 βασίλια regia (|) βασιλείας regalis (|) et regina</td>
<td>39r regnum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47v 11 βασιλικοῦ σώματος φύλαξ satelles (|) regiae</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48r 9 βέβαιος cert(us), rat(us), firm(us), stabilis (|) constans</td>
<td>40v certus firmus</td>
<td>21r firmus</td>
<td>50v firmus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49r 13 βλαβερόν nocium (|) dammosum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52r 17 βρίσον alga (|) faex maris</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52r 18 βρυχηθμός fremit(us) (|) και βρύγημα</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54v 9 γεννύ gigno, (\text{p(ρo)creo} |) (\text{ά} ) ὁρίστος (\text{εγ} ) σενήμην</td>
<td>44v genero</td>
<td>25r genero; (\text{ά} ) ὁρίστος (\text{εγ} ) σαῦν</td>
<td>56r genero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54v 15 γένος, τὸ (\text{ἐν} ) νός gens (|) natio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57v 22 γρύζο mutio (|) (\hat{\nu} ) γρύττο (|) grunio</td>
<td>46r lugeo</td>
<td>27r lugeo; γρυλίζω grunnio sicut faciun sues (külön lemma)</td>
<td>58v lugeo; γρυλίζω grunnio ut sues faciunt (külön lemma)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

509 Cf. Crastonus 1497, s.v. ἥξαρις: ingratus.