

Zsuzsanna Ötvös

## Marginal Notes and their Sources in the Manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45\*

In the Greek-Latin dictionary of ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45<sup>1</sup> (ff. 1r–298r) thousands of glossary notes can be found in the margins and between the two columns containing the Greek and Latin lemmas. The manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 is connected to the famous Hungarian humanist poet, Janus Pannonius on several grounds.<sup>2</sup> Until recently, the transcription (or even the compilation) of the Greek-Latin dictionary was attributed to Janus Pannonius, since in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, librarian Michael Denis made the following observation in describing the codex:

codex (...) hanc Notam praefert: *Ἰανος ὁ παννονιος ἰδία χειρὶ ἐγραψεν. ὅταν τα ἑλληνικά γραμματα μαθεῖν ἐμέλεν. Janus Pannonius propria manu scripsit, quando graecas literas discere cura fuit.*<sup>3</sup>

Although this assumption was successfully rejected by István Kapitánffy,<sup>4</sup> the manuscript still seems to be related to the humanist poet: Janus was one of the possessors of the codex<sup>5</sup> and he presumably used this dictionary for

\* This paper has been prepared with the financial help of the research project OTKA NN 104456.

<sup>1</sup> The most up-to-date description of the manuscript is found in HUNGER, H. (unter Mitarbeit von Ch. HANNICK): *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek IV, Supplementum Graecum*. Wien 1994, 85–87. The description, however, needs correction at several points.

<sup>2</sup> For details on this question see ÖTVÖS, Zs.: A Renaissance Vocabulary by Janus Pannonius? (ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45). *Acta Ant. Hung.* 48 (2008) 237–246.

<sup>3</sup> Regarding accents, aspiration marks, spelling and punctuation, I closely follow Denis's script (ÖNB Cod. Ser. n. 3953, 63r).

<sup>4</sup> First in Hungarian in KAPITÁNYFY, I.: Janus Pannonius görög szótára. *IK* 95 (1991) 178–181; then in German in KAPITÁNYFY, I.: Aristophanes, Triklinios, Guarino und Janus Pannonius. *Acta Ant. Hung.* 36 (1995) 351–354.

<sup>5</sup> See ÖTVÖS, Zs.: Some Remarks on a Humanist Vocabulary. In GASTGEBER, Chr. – MITSIOU, E. – POB, I.-A. – POPOVIĆ, P. – PREISER-KAPELER, J. – SIMON, A. (eds.): *Matthias Corvinus und*

translating Greek texts into Latin.<sup>6</sup> Thus, it is tempting to assume that one of the hands entering marginal notes in the margins of the dictionary was Janus's, although this supposition cannot be proven easily, since no considerable example of his handwriting has been preserved.<sup>7</sup> Consequently, mapping and identifying the sources of the marginal notes in ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45 might also help us clarify this question.

Basically, the marginal notes in the Greek-Latin dictionary can be divided into two major groups through analysing the characteristics of the handwriting and through mapping their sources. In this paper, I attempt to outline the sources of these 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, particularly its relationship to Janus Pannonius. First, a group of marginal notes of varied content and written in various languages will be presented briefly, then another group of glossary notes comprising mainly quotations from scholia to Aristophanic plays and from the *Synopsis Major Basilicorum* is to be discussed in more details.

The glossary notes from the first major group are usually inserted either after the Latin lemmas of the dictionary in the margins or in the intercolumnium in a position where they precede the Latin lemmas they belong to. 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. Such marginalia appear on almost all of the pages of the Greek-Latin dictionary.

Regarding language and content, the marginal notes are not unified in this group. Predominantly Latin marginal notes are inserted. Most often, they give

---

*seine Zeit. Europa am Übergang vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit zwischen Wien und Konstantinopel.* Wien 2010, 104–105.

<sup>6</sup> For an illustrative example see HORVÁTH, L.: Eine vergessene Übersetzung des Janus Pannonius. *Acta Ant. Hung.* 41 (2001) 209.

<sup>7</sup> See CSAPODI, Cs.: *A Janus Pannonius-szöveghagyomány.* Budapest 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 BORONKAI, I. in his book review published in the journal *Magyar Könyvszemle* (98) 1982, 293–294 and in another book review by CSONKA, F. published in the journal *Irodalomtörténet* (1984.3) 634–635.

synonyms of the original Latin lemmas or alternative meanings of the Greek entries. Apart from glossary notes of predominantly lexicographical content, grammatical additions can also be found, although they appear less often. 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. 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.

In a previous article,<sup>8</sup> I dealt with the origin of this major group of marginal notes in details. Here, I only intend to summarize the results of that previous research work relevant to the subject of the present paper.

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. The Greek-Latin dictionary in the Vienna manuscript indirectly goes back to the Greek-Latin lexicon in the 8<sup>th</sup>-century codex Harleianus 5792 (ff. 1v-240v) now kept in the British Library.<sup>9</sup> Its edited version is available in the second volume of the series *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*.<sup>10</sup> However, the glossary notes now discussed do not appear in the edited version of the codex Harleianus. 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).<sup>11</sup>

The Greek-Latin dictionary in these three codices belongs to a different textual tradition compared to the lexicon in the Vienna manuscript. The vocabulary

<sup>8</sup> Ötvös, Zs.: A Group of Marginal Notes from Another Textual Tradition. In JUHÁSZ, E. (ed.): *Byzanz und das Abendland: Begegnungen zwischen Ost und West*. Budapest 2013, 71-120.

<sup>9</sup> The digitized version of 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](http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=harley_ms_5792_fs001r) (downloaded on 9 May 2014). A description of the manuscript can be found in the preface to the second volume of the series *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, see Glossae Latinae Graecae et Graecolatinae: accedunt minora utriusque linguae glossaria. In GOETZ, G. – GUNDERMANN, G. (eds.): *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum II*. Leipzig 1888, XX–XXVI. A more up-to-date description with a list of relevant bibliography is available again online at the website of the British Library: <http://www.bl.uk/catalogues/illuminatedmanuscripts/record.asp?MSID=6563&CollID=8&NStart=5792> (downloaded on 9 May 2014).

<sup>10</sup> GOETZ – GUNDERMANN (n. 9) 215–483.

<sup>11</sup> For the description of the three codices see Ötvös (n. 8) 77–79, where ample bibliography on these manuscripts is also provided.

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<sup>12</sup> and he also planned a critical edition of the text.<sup>13</sup> In an article, 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<sup>14</sup> and published around 1440.<sup>15</sup> However, further results of Thiermann's research on this textual tradition of Greek-Latin dictionaries are not available since his PhD dissertation is unpublished.

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 three manuscripts (Vat. Pal. Gr. 194; Cod. Gr. 4, University Library, Budapest and Res. 224, Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid) of different textual tradition. The results of the collation<sup>16</sup> can lead us to two conclusions: 1) the high number of significant agreements – even in the cases of Italian glossary notes

<sup>12</sup> THIERMANN, P.: *Das Wörterbuch der Humanisten. Die griechisch-lateinische Lexikographie des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts und das 'Dictionarium Crastoni.'* Hamburg 1994. The bibliographical data of the PhD dissertation is mentioned in THIERMANN, P.: I dizionari greco-latini fra medioevo e umanesimo. In HAMESSE, J. (ed.): *Les manuscrits des lexiques et glossaires de l'antiquité tardive à la fin du Moyen Âge.* Louvain-la-Neuve 1996, 662, note. 21.

<sup>13</sup> See THIERMANN, P.: Forschungsvorhaben. *Wolfenbütteler Renaissance Mitteilungen* 18 (1994) 94–95 and THIERMANN, P.: Arbeitsvorhaben. *Gnomon* 66 (1994) 384.

<sup>14</sup> THIERMANN (n. 12) 662–663. In a book review published in 2008, Paul Botley, who also had the possibility to consult Thiermann's unpublished doctoral dissertation, suggests that one should not accept Thiermann's bold statement about Guarino's authorship and the list of manuscripts containing this Greek-Latin lexicon without criticism: "The evidence presented in the thesis for the date of the compilation, and for its connection with Guarino, is much more tenuous than the bald statement in the published article implies. The notion of 'Guarino's dictionary' cannot be allowed to gain currency until it has been much more firmly established. Similarly, the list of Greek works published in Thiermann's article must be treated with some caution. The method used to discern these works in the lexicon was to be the subject of an article which Thiermann did not live to publish. No doubt some or all of these claims could be substantiated; until such time, the list is merely suggestive," see BOTLEY, P.: Book Review: Joannis Deligiannis, *Fifteenth-Century Latin Translations of Lucian's Essay on Slander.* (Studia Erudita I. Pisa and Rome, Gruppo Editoriale internazionale, 2006.) *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 15c (2008) 681.

<sup>15</sup> The earliest dated copy of this Greek-Latin dictionary was completed on 13 September 1441, in Florence by Cristoforo Benna. Cf. BOTLEY, P.: *Learning Greek in Western Europe, 1396–1529. Grammars, Lexica, and Classroom Texts.* Philadelphia 2010, 64.

<sup>16</sup> Described in ÖTVÖS (n. 8) 80–84, related comparative tables are presented in ÖTVÖS (n. 8) 85–120 (appendix section).

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.

The second major group of interrelated glossary notes is more unified regarding its language and content: the marginalia are written predominantly in Greek by the same hand and the majority of them ultimately go back to Greek literal sources. The highest number of glossary notes within this group is quoted from scholia written to the plays of Aristophanes: one can find more than 400 (approximately 440) 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*. The second biggest group contains approximately 160 marginal notes quoted from the play *Plutus*, the first play by Aristophanes on the Byzantine curriculum, while the remaining glossary notes (about 20) are quoted from other plays by Aristophanes. 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.<sup>17</sup> The second biggest group of 65 glossary notes differs greatly from the first one regarding its genre: these marginal notes quote legal texts from the abridged version of the *Basilika* called *Synopsis Major Basilicorum*.<sup>18</sup> 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 *Synopsis Major Basilicorum*. Compared for instance to the large group of

<sup>17</sup> For a discussion and a list of the manuscripts of Aristophanes with the indication of their contents see WHITE, J. W.: *The Manuscripts of Aristophanes*. CP 1 (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 (n. 15) 88–91.

<sup>18</sup> For further details on this specific group of marginal notes of legal content see Örvös, Zs.: Glossary notes of legal source in the manuscript ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45. *Acta Ant. Hung.* 51 (2011) 329–344.

glossary notes containing several hundreds of Aristophanic scholia, this group consists of only approximately a hundred glosses quoting miscellaneous Greek literary sources: Xenophon, Plutarch, Plato, Thucydides, Aristoteles, Lucian of Samosata, Herodotus etc. 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 Linguae Graecae*, while numerous glosses in this group seem to be related to Greek lexicographical sources,<sup>19</sup> mainly to the *Suda* lexicon.

So far, the possible identification of the glossator who added the marginalia analysed above (i.e. the marginalia quoting Aristophanic scholia, the *Synopsis Major Basilicorum* 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.<sup>20</sup> 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 *Synopsis Major Basilicorum* pose a problem: to our knowledge, Guarino did not possess any manuscripts containing the *Synopsis Major Basilicorum* or other legal texts.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup> E.g. Hesychius, Zonaras, *Etymologicum Magnum*, Photius.

<sup>20</sup> See KAPITÁNFY 1995 (n. 4) 356.

<sup>21</sup> For a list of the Greek manuscripts possessed by Guarino see OMONTE, H.: Les manuscrits grecs de Guarino de Vérone. *Revue des Bibliothèques* 2 (1892) 79–81; and more recently DILLER, A.: The Greek Codices of Palla Strozzi and Guarino Veronese. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 24 (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 at Diller, 319). Guarino possessed the 14<sup>th</sup>-century manuscript Vat. Pal. gr. 116 containing Aristophanic works (see at Diller, 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, A. M.:

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 *Synopsis Major Basilicorum*: 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.<sup>22</sup>

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. Among others, the manuscript contains parts of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (ff. 1–44), a collection of alphabetically organized proverbs (ff. 47–50v), paraphrase of Aristotle's *Physics*, Book I (ff. 54–56), works from Dionysius Halicarnasseus, Galen or Plutarch. 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).<sup>23</sup>

The different parts of the manuscript were written by various hands. Although some of them have been identified, the scribe of the lexicographical unit on ff. 91–310 is so far unknown; it was probably a Western hand.<sup>24</sup> The same hand copied the collection of proverbs on ff. 47–51, which indicates that the two sections belong together. 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.

---

Holkham Hall 88: Guarino's Aristophanes. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 12 (1971) 287–289. According to Giannini (page 288), this manuscript could be item no. 43 on the list published by Omont (page 80: “43. Aristophanis comediae octo cum scholiis, et cum quadam Ephestionis appendice de metris, ubi sunt etiam nonnulla de caractere.”), which Diller failed to identify. The *Synopsis Major Basilicorum* or other manuscripts containing legal texts cannot be found either on Omont's or on Diller's list.

<sup>22</sup> The description of the manuscript is available in REVILLA, P. A.: *Catálogo de los Códices Griegos de la Biblioteca de el Escorial*, Tomo I. Madrid 1936, 252–256; MILLER, E.: *Catalogue des Manuscrits Grecs de la Bibliothèque de l'Escorial*. Amsterdam 1966, 58–67; and MORAUX, P. et al.: *Aristoteles Graecus. Die griechischen Manuskripte des Aristoteles. I*. Alexandria–London–Berlin–New York 1976, 150–153 (written by Dieter HARLFINGER based on his autopsy in April 1967).

<sup>23</sup> The content of the manuscript is described in REVILLA (n. 22) 253–256; MILLER (n. 22) 58–67 and MORAUX et al. (n. 22) 151–152.

<sup>24</sup> See MORAUX et al. (n. 22) 152.

The dating of the various sections bound together in the codex is also problematic. Revilla dates the lexicographical section (fols. 47–51 and 91–310) to the 16<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>25</sup> while Miller dates the collection of proverbs and the vocabulary lists to the 17<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>26</sup> Neither of them provides ground for the dating given. Compared to Revilla and Miller's standpoint, Harlfinger dates the lexicographical section much earlier, at the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, around 1400 on the basis of the watermark (deer) characteristic of this section.<sup>27</sup> Thiermann, however, argues that this dating must be too early given that the dictionary of Pseudo-Cyril (ms. Harl. 5792) reappeared only around 1330.<sup>28</sup>

The lexicographical section starting on f. 91r has its own title added in the upper margin: *Lexicon graecolatinum*. The dictionary belongs to the same textual tradition as the vocabulary list in the Vienna manuscript. 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.<sup>29</sup>

In the margins, the Greek-Latin dictionary in the Madrid manuscript contains hundreds of glossary notes apparently from two different hands.<sup>30</sup> One of the glossators who seems to be called Benedictus according to one of the glosses<sup>31</sup> usually enters marginalia from scholia written to the Aristophanic plays *Plutus* and *Nubes*, from the *Synopsis Major Basilicorum* 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).<sup>32</sup> 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,

<sup>25</sup> REVILLA (n. 22) 253.

<sup>26</sup> MILLER (n. 22) 67.

<sup>27</sup> MORAUX et al. (n. 22) 150.

<sup>28</sup> THIERMANN (n. 12) 659, note 12.

<sup>29</sup> I had the possibility to study the black-and-white digital images of the Greek-Latin dictionary in the ms. Σ I 12 provided by the Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo de El Escorial in Madrid.

<sup>30</sup> Out of the three codex descriptions, only Revilla mentions that the Greek-Latin dictionary contains glosses from several different Greek authors; see REVILLA (n. 22) 255–256.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Σ I 12, f. 141v: “alibi ita ego benedictus legi...”

<sup>32</sup> Cf. THIERMANN (n. 12) 659–660.



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 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*,<sup>33</sup> 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.<sup>34</sup> 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, ἀκαλλώπιστος. ὠρῶ 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 ὠρῶ instead of κορῶ, which appears in the codices of the *Nubes* scholia.<sup>35</sup>

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, while in the Madrid manuscript longer versions of the marginalia can usually be found. 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 ἀδολεσχῶ and omits the examples provided as an illustration of

<sup>33</sup> *Sch. Nub.* 1042a: αἰρουμένον προκρίναντα. In Aristophane.

<sup>34</sup> *Sch. Nub.* 1156a-b: In Aristophane. ἀρχεῖα, κεφάλαια, ὅτι οἱ πῶτοι τόκοι παραταθέντος τοῦ δανείου, κεφάλαια γινόμενοι, τόκοι δέχονται ἄλλους.

<sup>35</sup> See KOSTER, W. J. W. (ed.): Scholia recentiora in *Nubes*. In KOSTER, W. J. W. (ed.): *Scholia in Aristophanem*. Pars I. Prolegomena de comoedia. Scholia in Acharnenses, Equites, *Nubes*. Fasc. III/2. Groningen 1974, ad loc.

the alternative meanings.<sup>36</sup> 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 of them 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, ἀλεκτρούων 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.<sup>37</sup> 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,<sup>38</sup> a very short quotation – the explanation of the Greek word ἀδελφιδῆ – 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, ten quotations are inserted in the margins from the abridged version of the *Basilika*, the *Synopsis Major Basilicorum*.<sup>39</sup> All of these quotations can also be found in the margins of the Madrid manuscript, with the same indication of the source, i.e. ἐκ τῶν νόμων. Compared to the marginal notes quoting Aristophanic scholia, it is striking that the quotations from the *Synopsis Major Basilicorum* 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

<sup>36</sup> *Sch. Nub.* 1480e: τὸ ἀδολεσχεῖν τέσσαρα σημαίνει. τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν, ὡς τὸ “ὁ δὲ δοῦλος σου ἡδολέσχει ἐν τοῖς δικαίωμασί σου”, τὸ παίζειν, ὡς τὸ “ἐξήλθεν Ἰακῶβ ἀδολεσχήσαι εἰς τὸ πεδίον”, τὸ φλυαρεῖν, ὡς τὸ “ἀδολεσχεῖς, ἀνθρωπε”, καὶ τὸ ὀλιγορεῖν, ὡς τὸ “ἡδολέσχησα καὶ ὀλιγοψύχησα τὸ πνεῦμά μου”. ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 5r 14: quattuor significat hoc verbum τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν, τὸ παίζειν, τὸ ὀλιγορεῖν, τὸ φλυαρεῖν.

<sup>37</sup> ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 11v 10: apud Platonem comicum et gallina (it refers to the Greek lemma ἀλεκτρούων in the main text of the Greek-Latin dictionary; cf. *sch. Nub.* 663a). Σ I 12, f. 97v: (...) ἀττικοὶ δὲ καὶ τὰς θηλείας οὕτως ἐκάλουν. Πλάτων γὰρ ὁ κωμικὸς οὕτω λέγει. ἐνίοτε πολλοὶ τῶν ἀλεκτρούωνων καὶ ὑπηνέμια τίκτουσιν φά πολλάκις. In Aristophane.

<sup>38</sup> ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, 4v 6: ἀδελφιδῆ, fratris filia in Aristophane. Σ I 12, f. 93r: ἀδελφιδῆν, τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ θυγατέρα. In Aristophane. Cf. *sch. Nub.* 47.

<sup>39</sup> The modern textual edition of the work is available in ΖΈΡΟΣ, J. – ΖΈΡΟΣ, P.: *Synopsis Basilicorum*. In ΖΈΡΟΣ, J. – ΖΈΡΟΣ, P. (eds.): *Jus Graecoromanum V*. Athens 1931.

the matching gloss on f. 102r in Σ I 12.<sup>40</sup> 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 *Synopsis Major Basilicorum*.<sup>41</sup> 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 *Synopsis Major Basilicorum* in several instances. This might be illustrated with the following example: in both the Vienna and Madrid codices,<sup>42</sup> the quote ends with the words πάντα τὰ δένδρα, while the manuscripts of the *Synopsis Major Basilicorum* contain the ending πάντες οἱ καρποὶ δηλοῦνται instead.

Apart from quotations from Aristophanic scholia and the *Synopsis Major Basilicorum*, 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.<sup>43</sup> 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

<sup>40</sup> ἐκ τῶν νόμων. περὶ ἀντελλόγου χρέους. μέχρι τῆς συγκροτοῦσης ποσότητος τῆς ἐξ ἐκατέρου πλευροῦ κεχρεωστημένης. ἢ τοῦ ἀντελλόγου δύναμις, μίμησιν ἔχει καταβολῆς. καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνου ἀναίρειται ἐκατέρων ἢ ἀπαίτησις τῶν τόκων. ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ ὑπερβαλλοῦση ποσότητι, ἔστω ἰσχυρὰ ἢ τῶν τόκων ἀπαίτησις. εἰ γε ὄλως κεχρεώσθηται τόκοι ἐξ ἐπερωτήσεως. Cf. *SMB X II Index + SMB X II,47*.

<sup>41</sup> Σ I 12, f. 102r: τὸ τῆς ἀντιγραφῆς ὄνομα νομικόν ἐστίν. ὅθεν καὶ νόμου ῥήτὸν διακελευῖον. ἐχέτω π ἄ ν τ ω ς π ᾶ σ α βασιλικὴ ἀντιγραφή τὸ εἰ ἀληθῆ ἐδίδαξε. καὶ μηδὲ ἄλλως ἐρρώσθω, cf. *SMB B IV,6*. In ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 19r, the underlined word πάντως is left out from the quotation.

<sup>42</sup> ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 10v 16 and Σ I 12, f. 97r: ἐκ τῶν νόμων. τῶ ὀνόματι τῆς βαλάνου πάντες οἱ καρποὶ δηλοῦνται. ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶ ὀνόματι τῶν ἀκροδρύων π ἄ ν τ α τ ἄ δ ἔ ν δ ρ α.

<sup>43</sup> ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 21v 25: ἄξιος λέγομεν ὦνια τὰ πολλοῦ δηλονότι τιμώμενα. Ξενοφῶν. ὅταν γε πολὺς σίτος καὶ οἶνος γένηται ἀξίων ὄντων τῶν καρπῶν, οὐκ ἀλυσιτελεῖς αἱ γεωργίαι γίνονται. Cf. Xen. *De vectigalibus* IV, 6.5.

glosses, as well (e.g. f. 1r 26<sup>44</sup>). Such glosses of lexicographical content either give a short definition (e.g. f. 3v 23<sup>45</sup>) or insert additional Greek-Latin lemma pairs (e.g. f. 13r 7 and 9<sup>46</sup>). 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).

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 paper 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.

<sup>44</sup> ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 1r and Σ I 12, f. 91r: πηνίον ᾿ panus tramae involucrum quam diminutive panuclam vocamus. unde tumor inguinum ex formae similitudine sic vocatur.

<sup>45</sup> ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 3v and Σ I 12, f. 92v: ἀγύρτης λέγεται ὁ συναθροίζων πολλοὺς περὶ ἑαυτὸν λέγων τί ἢ ποιῶν καινότερον.

<sup>46</sup> ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45, f. 13r and Σ I 12, f. 98v: ἀμπελοργός vinitor; ἀμπεχόνη amictus.

There are altogether 34 marginal notes in the manuscript (24 Alanic, 9 Greek, and 1 mixed). In this edition, every note is followed by the Greek heading, to which the note refers, its translation, and a black-and-white photograph. Then, a short outline of the liturgical context is provided, when necessary, followed by paleographic comments and an analysis of the meaning of the note and its linguistic structure. The edition of the notes ends with a discussion of the spelling conventions and the language of the notes and with an appendix on the Alanic text in Tzetzes' Theogonia. The book is further provided with full-color photographs of all pages containing marginal notes.

...more. Get A Copy. Most of the Arabic manuscripts at the Ambrosiana are from Yemen, purchased from a single collector, Giuseppe Caprotti (1869-1919 CE). Many of these share physical and stylistic traits, like similar kinds of handwriting and the convention of using a larger pen for title-headings (more on the topic in the Chroniques du manuscrit au Y  men).   The rest of the page is covered in miscellaneous notes and remedies in an informal handwriting.   But there is also another reason for drawing special attention to this marginal note which regards histories of gender and sexuality in the Islamic world, broadly.   Part of the reason for the siloing of these two fields is the difference in the kinds of sources they draw on, and the ways they analyze them. Also note that Elina Dobrynina is preparing a publication on the Chludov Psalter that uses evidence from the restoration of the manuscript (some of her new findings are included in a relevant article available on Academia.edu). The Illustration of the Ninth-Century Byzantine Marginal Psalters: layers of meaning and their sources Maria Evangelatou Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (History of Art) Courtauld Institute of Art University of London 2002 2 To my father 3 Abstract Three ninth-century Byzantine marginal psalters (Moscow, State Historical Museum, cod.   10 Fig. 45. Paris, Biblioth  que Nationale. Cod. gr.   Christ  s Baptism in the ninth- and eleventh-century Byzantine marginal psalters  ...478 Table 10. Ms. 45, kept in the Cluj branch of the Romanian Academy Library, contains the oldest complete Romanian translation of the Septuagint version of the Old Testament preserved until today, carried out by Nicolae Milescu Sp  ftarul in the second half of the 17th century. The history of this text is only partially deciphered; it is known that the manuscript does not contain the translation as such, but a revised version of it.   This paper aims to study the inventory of marginal notes in two biblical books of the manuscript, namely the Book of Genesis and the Book of Job, trying to establish a typology. This is a first step towards a highly necessary approach, the study of the whole inventory of notes, which could contribute to clarifying aspects of the history of the text that are still insufficiently explored.