GÁBOR BOLONYAI

Taddeo Ugoleto's Marginal Notes
on his Brand-new Crastonus Dictionary*

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

As far as I know, Ugoleto's copy with his notes and additions, now preserved in Vienna (ÖNB Ink. 10.E.9), has never been scrutinized.[4] Actually, it has been completely ignored in discussions about the history of the Corvinian Library. If we take into account the fact that Ugoleto did not leave behind any writings

---

[1] Presumably he is identical with the author of an apology written for Giorgio Merula, the Milanese humanist and Ugoleto's highly revered master (Apologia pro Georgio Merula adversus Cornelium Vitellium. Venezia 1482), see P. O. KRISTELLER, Iter Italicum, Vol. II. Italy. Leiden 1977[3], 63. It should be mentioned that Merula's *Opera* also were available in the royal library (Modena, Est., Cod. Lat. 441).

[2] For his editorial activity see I. AFFÒ, Memorie di Taddeo Ugoleto. Parma 1781; A. DEL PRATO, Librai e biblioteche parmensi del sec. XV. *Archivio storico per le province Parmensi, nuova serie* IV (1904) 1–56; F. RIZZI, Un umanista ignorato Taddeo Ugoleto. *Aurea Parma* (1953, fasc. I–II.) 1–17, and 79–90; A. CIAVARELLA, Un editore e umanista filologo: Taddeo Ugoleto della Rocca, *Archivio storico per le province Parmensi, serie quarta* 9 (1967) 133–173; V. BRANCA, I rapporti con Taddeo Ugoleto, in: V. BRANCA, Poliziano e l'Umanesimo della parola. Torino 1983, 125–133, V. BRANCA, Mercanti e librai fra Italia e Ungheria nel Rinascimento, in: Venezia e Ungheria nel Rinascimento. Atti del I Convegno di Studi italo-ungheresi (ed. V. BRANCA). Firenze 1983, 344–345; L. GUARESCHI, Taddeo Ugoleto e l'umanesimo milanese. *Bolletino del bodoniano di Parma* 7 (1993) 279–289; L. GUARESCHI, L'Ungheria e l'umanesimo italiano, Due note su Taddeo Ugoleto. *Bolletino del bodoniano di Parma* 8 (1994) 188–200. I owe thanks to Ágnes Ritoók-Szalay and Ferenc Földesi for helping me gain access to the last two of these papers.

[3] On page 264^r; the note continues as follows *Thadaei Ugoleti: Paulus Romuleius dono dedit.*

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

of his own, or that at least none of them – apart from a few letters[5] and prefaces – have survived, and especially in view of the fact that very little is known about him as a Greek scholar, an investigation into these notes hardly requires any further justification.[6] It is not just a matter of Ugoleto's intellectual portrait that is in question. These marginalia are obviously based on his readings of certain Greek texts. Consequently, the identification of his possible sources may be of special importance in reconstructing the stock of the library. Theoretically, there seem to be three possibilities.

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

The transcription itself can be envisaged in two ways.

    1(a). Either it was still in Italy that he read the original Greek works, b e f o r e arriving in Buda; while in Buda he simply transcribed his previously prepared notes into his Crastonus; or

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

2. It may also be the case that Ugoleto simply copied someone else's glosses and private notes w i t h - o u t reading the original texts in which the words he copied were found. Of course, this course of events could have taken place only in Buda, when he was already in possession of the Crastonus dictionary.

Thus, if there is a strong case for assuming that the actual work of compiling was done on the basis of material available in Buda, we may obtain a unique piece of i n t e r n a l evidence for the availability of a certain number of Greek codices belonging to the royal library at the time. As is well known, Greek manuscripts of the Corvinian collection are usually impossible to identify by codicological characteristics. They are neither decorated, nor marked by a coat of arms or any kind of sign indicating their owner, nor are they bound in a special way. Generally speaking, they can be identified only through other kinds of external evidence: their being mentioned in later sources such as letters, book inventories, prefaces and so forth. As a consequence, the number of Greek codices identified is still relatively small and their presence is poorly documented. Thus, the importance of Ugoleto's notes lies in the fact that they may directly offer text-based evidence of certain codices being kept and used in the Corvinian Library.

Before beginning our Corvina-hunt (an old national pastime), a brief overall description of Ugoleto's marginalia would be appropriate. Roughly speaking, they can be classified into four different, though sometimes overlapping, types:

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

2. Apart from these simple bilingual glosses, there are slightly more than one hundred items with Greek explanations or defintions, such as κινάβρα κυρίως ἡ τῶν τράγων δυσωδία, ἁπλῶς δὲ καὶ ἡ οἰῶν (132^r). Apparently, they come from unilingual dictionaries, commentaries, or grammars.

3. Fortunately for us, in 108 cases the name of the author in whose writings a given word or expression occurs has been inserted (sometimes even its title is indicated): e.g. ὁρίσματα *pro moenibus ap<ud> Eurip<idem> in Hecuba* (174^v).

4. Finally, in 16 cases a passage from a classical author is quoted in which the word in question is used: θρόνον *Theocritus in Pharmaceutria* νῦν δὲ λαβοῖσα θρόνα (114^r).

The circumstances therefore seem quite favourable, especially in the last two cases, where we find the names of authors and direct quotations. Their identification seems to be a simple task: all we have to do is

---

[5] E. Ábel – S. Hegedüs, Analecta nova ad historiam renascentium in Hungaria litterarum spectantia. Budapest 1903, 458–459 and 478–479.

[6] The loss of his *Ecloga*, mentioned in the preface to his Ausonius-edition of 1499, is particularly regrettable. See Rizzi, Un umanista (s. n. 2), 16.

look up these words and passages in dictionaries or databases, and then identify the works from which the quotations come. Then, in the next step, a second question can be raised concerning the manuscripts containing these texts: whether it was in Buda that Ugoleto read them and made notes of them, or whether this happened in Italy, before he arrived in Buda.

Let us begin our investigation by assuming that Ugoleto was working from his own readings, and by taking a closer look at two simple cases in which Ugoleto has added the name of an author using a certain word.

To the entry γαμέτης *maritus* (50ᵛ) Ugoleto adds the following short remark: *in Xen<ophonte>*. This word is used only once by Xenophon, namely in *Cyropaedia* 4.6.3. Consequently, the identification of the reference is certain. And since there a r e two Xenophon manuscripts containing the *Cyropaedia* that are considered authentic (Erlangen UB MS 1226 and ÖNB Suppl. gr. 51), the assumption that Ugoleto may have read a Corvina codex seems quite plausible in this particular case.

Concerning the entry ἀλεκτρυών *gallus* (14ᵛ), Ugoleto notes the following: *apud Platonem comicum et gallina*. The identification is once again not difficult, since there is only one passage in which the word ἀλεκτρυών is used with a feminine article, thus referring to hens and not cocks. This fragment of the comedian Plato (not the philosopher) is preserved by Athenaeus in his *Deipnosophistae*. If we proceed from the same assumption again and imagine a scenario in which Ugoleto was using classical texts directly, we cannot draw any other inference from his note than that he had some kind of access to Athenaeus' monumental work. Since its presence has not been attested so far, a new item on our list of Greek codices seems to make its first appearance.

Turning to quotations, our next examples offer similar, or even more clear-cut, cases for identification. On the entry ἀρύομαι (38ʳ) Ugoleto comments as follows: ἀρύομαι καὶ ἀρύτομαι ἀττικῶς *haurio unde haustrum. Lucr<etius> ut fluvios versare rotas atque haustra videmus*. This interesting quotation, which comes from *De rerum natura* 5.516, allows us to make several observations and assumptions. First, we can raise a question about his way of quoting: whether he does it from memory or from a book. The passage cited contains a striking metaphor in which the stars appearing and moving in the sky are likened to "wheels and waterscoops" (i. e. water-drawing machines) "turned by rivers". Still, it is unlikely that this is one of the memorable passages that a humanist like Ugoleto might have known by heart. Of course, one can never know, but fortunately there are more (and more objective) grounds for believing that the entire line was cited from a book (actually, from a certain book) rather than from memory: it is quoted in the same version which was preserved only by a late grammarian, Nonius Marcellus, in *De compendiosa doctrina* 13.5. In contrast to the manuscript tradition, which has *ut fluvius* or *in fluvio*, both Nonius and Ugoleto write *ut fluvios*. It is therefore much more probable that Ugoleto quotes Lucretius' text from Nonius Marcellus here, and not directly from a Lucretius manuscript.[7]

As for identification, the next comment by Ugoleto is also unambiguous. In his note, he adds a new meaning to the entry πρός *dativo iuncta praterea significat*. He writes as follows: πρός *cum dativo sig<nifica>t penes. Euripid<es> in Hec<uba>* οὐ προσοιστέος ἄλλος πρὸς ἄλλῳ (204ᵛ, **Fig. 2**). The passage undoubtedly comes from lines 394–395 of the tragedy. In the original context the words are uttered by Odysseus, who tells Hecuba that "your daughter's death is enough, another one (i.e. your death) is not needed *besides* it" (note that the word θάνατος, which is to be implied from the previous part of the sentence, is missing from Ugoleto's quotation). Ugoleto's annotation is interesting for at least two reasons. Firstly, the meaning itself he adds – *penes* ("near", "at") – is correct: the preposition πρός may indeed have this meaning[8] (e. g. πρὸς τῇ θαλάσσῃ means "at the sea", "close to the sea"). In this particular passage, however, it is not used in this sense: here it means "in addition to", "besides" (B.3. in LSJ). Ugoleto (or the person who made this observation) therefore misunderstood Euripides' text. Actually, what he suggests does not make too much sense:

---

7 On the use of Nonius Marcellus' *De compendiosa doctrina* as a kind of handbook by humanists – and among them, by Janus Pannonius – see L. HORVÁTH, Eine vergessene Übersetzung des Janus Pannonius. *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 41 (2001) 202–204.

8 "B.1. it expresses proximity, *hard by, near, at*", A Greek-English Lexicon. With a Suplement. Compiled by H.G. LIDDELL – R. SCOTT – H.S. JONES. Oxford 1968, 1497.

"another one (?) should not be added or brought in the presence of someone else (?)".[9] This leads us to the second interesting point: this obviously muddled comment makes it very probable that it resulted from a direct encounter with the original text, and was not taken from someone else offering a traditional and established form of interpretation.[10] Although it does not yield a valuable new interpretation of the passage (and not surprisingly, there is nothing like it in the scholia), what is more important from our perspective is that it offers his <u>own</u> (mis)understanding. Therefore it is much more probable that this occured through a mistranslation of the text than from his memorizing it in this rather confused sense. Regarding the availability of Euripides' tragedy in the royal library, there is a manuscript containing the *Hecuba* whose presence there is attested to by indirect but relatively strong evidence.[11] Thus, it seems quite plausible again that Ugoleto used precisely this manuscript, which is now kept in Vienna (ÖNB Phil. gr. 289).

Among several dozens of works Ugoleto refers to, some are well documented as having been part of the library, while others are unattested. However, we have every reason to believe that things happened slightly differently. That Ugoleto copied a prepared dictionary is obvious from the "layout" of his writing: the entries are written in almost perfect alphabetical order, usually following each other in a slight slant toward the right (**Fig. 3**). One immediately has the impression that such clusters of words must have been written down a l l a t o n c e from a pre-arranged text (for the few exceptions and explanations of how they are different see below). Indeed, there *is* evidence for a certain vocabulary that was available in Buda, namely a copy which was owned by Janus Pannonius eleven years earlier. Even a very brief, one-page comparison of the two texts is enough to demonstrate that Ugoleto copied this glossary (**Fig. 4**).

At first this may seem to be a negative result that rules out all possible candidates (except for the *Vocabularium*, of course) on both Ugoleto's reading list and the shelves of the royal library, but fortunately what he made was not a completely mechanical, one-to-one transcription. A more careful reading reveals that Ugoleto made a selection of the glosses and notes and also used another glossary and lexicon. There are still several dozens of comments – all of them significant from our standpoint – which are likely to have been written by him.[12] In other words, all three possible ways envisaged at the beginning of this paper of how the marginalia may have found their way into the dictionary should be seen as realised options.

Janus' handwritten glossary contains numerous marginal explanations quoted by different hands; these were taken from several ancient scholia and handbooks such as the *Suda*.[13] About two-thirds of these materials come from Aristophanes-scholia written to comedies mostly used at schools, while the rest are quite het-

---

[9]   Alternatively, we may assume that the two sentences in Ugoleto's comment are in fact separate parts that have nothing to do with each other: while the first part offers a new meaning of προς, the second is meant as an illustration of the meaning of *praeterea*, a category already created by Crastonus. However this assumption, which would rescue Ugoleto from a mistake, is not very probable. This is because the second sentence is written in a continuous manner, without any pause or interruption after the first, and is very far from the printed *praeterea*.

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

[11] The evidence is provided by Tamás Bakócz's possessor's note on 197ʳ: *Thomae Car<dina>lis Strig<oniensis>*. Since he was Cardinal of Strigonium between 1500 and 1521, his signature should be dated to this period. *Pace* Cs. CSAPODI, The Corvinian Library. History and Stock. Budapest 1973, 242, I believe that although it is not entirely safe to infer from the existence of this note that the codex previously belonged to the royal library, it is nevertheless probable. I intend to clarify this question in a more detailed study.

[12] It should be noted that of the examples mentioned above, three notes (on γαμέτης, ἀλεκτρυών, and ἀρύομαι) were taken from the *Vocabularium*'s glossator while the rest were actually made by Ugoleto.

[13] Since – according to the librarian M. DENIS – an autograph note in which Janus declares his ownership in Greek was written on a slip attached to the verso of the third folio (*codex ... hanc Notitiam praefert*: Ἰανος ὁ παννονιος ἰδια χειρι ἐγραψεν ὅταν τὰ ἑλληνικα γραμματα μαθειν ἐμελεν   *Janus Pannonius propria manu scripsit, quando graecas litteras discere cura fuit*), it was generally thought that the entire codex was written by Janus himself. It was István Kapitánffy who recognised that neither the *Vocabularium* nor the glosses were compiled or written down by the poet himself, except for the short sentence on the piece of paper which was later lost (Aristophanes, Triklinios, Guarino und Janus Pannonius. *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 36 [1995] 351–357). In a recent study, Zs. Ötvös pointed out that there are two Greek hands discernable in the marginalia; both of these are different from the Latin one. See her A Renaissance Vocabularium by Janus Pannonius? (ÖNB Suppl. gr. 45). *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 48 (2008) 237–246.

erogeneous (direct quotations from ancient authors, grammatical observations etc.).[14] If we compare what Ugoleto left out and what he added to this material, the following observations can be made.[15]

Let us start with what was adopted by Ugoleto. As mentioned above, he copied more than one thousand items from the *Vocabularium*. If we take into account only those notes which consist o f m o r e t h a n o n e w o r d (e. g. short explanations in Greek or the name of the author who uses the word in question), 22 of the 115 entries clearly belong to *Nubes* (ἀδελφιδή, αἰρούμενον, ἀκόρητος, ἀλεκτρυών, βέκ, ἐδιδαξάμην, θούριον, ἰατταταί, κάχρω, καλάμῳ λευκῷ, καρκίνος, κοττάβων, κρίνον, ξύστις, ξυνωρίσιν, πό<σ>θη, πό<σ>θιον, σάλπιγξ, τραυλίζω, ὕαλος, ὑπερφρονῶ, φασιανοί), 12 to *Plutus* (ἀβίωτος, ἀθάρα, ἀρτιάζομαι, δειλάκρα, εἴη, ἐξωμμάτωται, ἐπόπτυσε, κινάβρα, ξυνθιασῶται, ὀπόν, στροφαῖος, φθοῖς), 2 words (ἅλως and ῥιγεῖν) occur in both comedies, and there are another 17 marginalia which may also be related to these two dramas. The remaining 62 notes are quite heterogeneous in origin. Most of them contain explanations of commonly used words that cannot be connected to one particular author, let alone one particular passage, and some of them are explanations that were taken from from ancient lexica either word by word or in abbreviated form. If we narrow our scope further and base our statistics only on those marginalia in which an a u t h o r ' s n a m e is indicated, we will find that 31 of the 55 cases belong to Aristophanes (always without the title of individual comedies), 10 to Xenophon, 5 to Plutarch, 2 to Demosthenes, and 1 each to Herodotus, Plato (the comedian), Lucian, Thucydides, Lucretius (= Nonius Marcellus), Lucilius (= Nonius Marcellus), and Varro.

Considering these statistics, it is striking that he focused on two comedies of Aristophanes: the *Nubes* and the *Plutus*. By comparison, references to the other comedies are very few and scanty.[16] A similar tendency can already be observed in Janus' *Vocabularium*, in which about one-half of the remarks belong to *Nubes* and one-third to *Plutus*.[17] Ugoleto therefore appears to be interested in the same area of language as the glossers of Janus' *Vocabularium*. Among prosewriters a similar preference for Xenophon can be discerned, although to a much smaller degree. This can be explained by the literary taste or educational concerns of the *Vocabularium*'s glossator. These data are not easy to judge. Theoretically, it may simply have been pure coincidence that they reflect his predelictions, but it may also be the case that Ugoleto's previous readings or teaching plans for the future played a certain role in selecting and writing down particular quotations in the margins with their author's names. However, considering the great amount of energy Ugoleto put into this laborious task of comparing several thousands of lexical items and writing down what was missing from one dictionary into the other, and also taking into account the care with which he executed this job, the second option seems more probable. Nor should we forget that, in contrast to the main body of the vocabulary, not more than 20 percent of the marginal annotations and quotations were transcribed by Ugoleto.[18] His selection was therefore fairly radical, and such a considerable act of elimination may suggest that what did get selected was really important to Ugoleto.[19] If we accept the assumption that his selection was deliberate rather than random, the large number of references to a particular work should be seen as an indication that he had either read it before or intended to read it within a reasonable period of time. Following this logic, it is to a certain

---

[14] I. KAPITÁNFFY, Aristophanes (s. n. 13), 355.

[15] I would like to thank Zsuzsanna Ötvös for lending me digital images of the *Vocabularium*, the text of which she is preparing to edit, and also for sharing her ideas about certain codicological details. Otherwise, I used a microfilm copy of the codex preserved in the MTA Library (Mf 1196/II). Since I began my work on the earlier version of this paper, I have also consulted both the manuscript and the incunable in the original. Having checked all the relevant passages, I have found that apart from one almost invisible gloss (concerning the entry ἀρύομαι *haurio*), which I failed to observe in the digital copy, my attributions of the other notes to Ugoleto were correct. On the other hand, I had to modify my previous findings by adding another 25 annotations of Ugoleto, which I was not able to discover or decipher in the microfilm copy.

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

[17] KAPITÁNFFY, Aristophanes (s. n. 13), 355. His estimation is based on the identification of about one-fourth of the marginalia.

[18] This is a figure based on data from twenty randomly chosen pages.

[19] This process of selection involved neglecting certain authors and giving preference to others. It is striking, for example, that neither a single passage from nor a single reference to Plato's works was adopted by Ugoleto, despite the fact that the philosopher figures quite significantly in the marginalia of the *Vocabularium*. It would be extremely difficult to give an explanation for this neglect. Still, the fact remains that for unknown reasons Ugoleto did not show any interest in his writings.

degree likely that the *Nubes* were in Ugoleto's educational plan or even physically in his hands. The same can be said with slightly less certainty about the *Plutus* and Xenophon's *Anabasis*.

Table 1

Entries in Crastonus' dictionary (Vicenza 1483) with page number		Ugoleto's notes with reference to an author's name and/or the title of a literary work	Passages expressly or probably referred to
		Greek authors	
1. κάσις *frater*	124ʳ	*soror ap<ud> Eurip<idem> in Hecuba*	τὴν ... κάσιν Euripides, *Hecuba* 361 (cf. also 943).
2. κραίνω *perficio*	137ʳ	κραθεῖστος (sic!) *ap<ud> E<uripidem> firmatum*	τὴν κρανθεῖσαν *Hec.* 219. [κρανθεῖσαν] FPaRSa]
3. λάζυμαι *capio*	141ᵛ	*poetice* λαζύμεν<αι> *apud Eurip<idem>*	προσλαζύμεναι *Hec.* 64.
4. νύμφη *sponsa*	163ᵛ	*simpliciter pro muliere ap<ud> Eurip<idem> in Hec<uba>*	νύμφαι τ' ἀρίστων νυμφίων τητώμεναι *Hec.* 324.
5. νυμφίος *sponsus*	163ᵛ	*Vir. ap<ud> Eurip<idem> ibidem*	*Hec.* 324.
6. οἴχομαι *recedo* etc.	168ᵛ	οἰχόμενος *mortuus ap<ud> Euripid<em> in Hec<uba>*	τοῖς οἰχομένοις *Hec.* 138.
7. after ὁρισμός	174ᵛ	ὁρίσματα *pro moenibus ap<ud> Eurip<idem> in Hecuba*	ὁρίσματα *Hec.*16.
8. πρός *dativo iuncta praeterea significat*	204ᵛ	πρός *cum dativo sig<nifica>t penes. Euripid<es> in Hec<uba>* (sc. θάνατος οὐ προσοιστέος ἄλλος πρὸς ἄλλῳ	*Hec.* 394–5.
9. στερ<ρ>ός *solidus*	222ʳ	*durus et com<m>unis g<ener>is ap<ud> Euripid<em> in Hec<uba>]*	στερρὸς ἀνθρώπου φύσις *Hec.* 296.
10. τιθήνη *nutrix*	237ʳ	*ap<ud> Euripid<em> in Hecuba*	τιθήνη *Hec.* 281.
11. φροῦδος *vanus*	254ᵛ	*abolitus, disperditus, mortuus ap<ud> Eurip<idem> in Hec<uba>*	φροῦδος *Hec.*160, cf. also 161 and 335.
12. after ἄπιος *longinquus*	30ʳ	ἀπύω *poet<ice> vociferor in coni<unctivo> Eur<ipide>*	ἀπύσω *Hec.* 154, cf. also *Or.* 1253, *Suppl.* 76, *Tr.* 1304, or *Bacch.* 984.
13. ἑστία *focus*	98ʳ	*domus ap<ud> Eurip<idem>*	ἑστία *Hec.* 22, 353, 1216, etc.
14. πλάξ *tabula*	195ʳ	*ap<ud> Eurip<idem> pro latitudine campoque*	πλάκα *Hec.* 8.
15. πλάτη *remus*	195ᵛ	*pro navigatione ap<ud> Eurip<idem>*	πλάτην *Hec.*39, cp.also *Tr.* 1155, *IT* 1445, *Hel.* 1212, *Or.* 54, or *Rhes.* 53.
16. σχεδία *ratis*	231ʳ	*sed ap<ud> Eurip<idem> accipitur pro navi*	σχεδίας *Hec.*111.
17. φέγγος *lumen*	250ʳ	*dies ap<ud> Eurip<idem>*	φέγγος *Hec.* 32.
18. χηλή *velox pedibus*	258ʳ	*ungula ap<ud> Eurip<idem>*	χαλᾷ *Hec.* 90 [χηλᾷ XXbZ et P]
19. θρόνον *pigmentum. venenum*	114ʳ	*Theocritus in Pharmaceutria* νῦν δὲ λαβοῖσα θρόνα (sic! omitting τὺ τὰ)	νῦν δὲ λαβοῖσα τὺ τὰ θρόνα Theocritus, *Idyllia* 2.59
20. after τοί *tibi*	237ᵛ	τοῖσιον (sic!) *herba sine fructu apud Theocritum*	*Id.* 5.125 [τ' ὀΐσια GLEA τοι σία PT τοῖσια Phil. gr. 289]

Table 1

	Entries in Crastonus' dictionary (Vicenza 1483) with page number		Ugoleto's notes with reference to an author's name and/or the title of a literary work	Passages expressly or probably referred to
21.	κορυδαλλός κόρυδος *corydalus.* *avis genus*	136ʳ	*galerita latine quondam* (marked with an x) *Theocritus* (marked with an x)	*Idy Id.* 7.23; 7.141; 10.50 *galerita appellata quondam* Plinius, *Nat. Hist.* 11.122.2.
22.	ἀποτίνω	34ʳ	*reddo in p<rim>o il<iadis>*	ἀποτίσομεν Homer, *Iliad* 1.128
23.	ἰάπτω *maledico. mitto cum detrimento*	115ᵛ	*in<de> προιάπτω in il<iadis> p<rim>o*	προΐαψεν *Iliad* 1.3
24.	πρίν πρὶν *prius. ante*	202ʳ	*Quotiens aut<em> ponunt<ur> duo p<ri>mum p<ro> ante: secundum p<ro> q<uam> exponemus ut in p<rim>o iliados*	οὐδ' ὅ γε πρὶν ... λοιγὸν ἀπώσει, / πρίν γ' ... δόμεναι. *Iliad* 1.98–99.
25.	ὑσσός *venabulum*	247ᵛ	*venabulum ro<manum>. ut apud Appianum in bello celtico*	ὑσσούς Appianus, *De bello Celtico* (*epitome* 1.3)
26.	αἰτία *ratio causa. accusatio confirmatio.*	10ᵛ	*pro iniquitate genes<i>*	αἰτία *Gen.* 4.13.2 (= *iniquitas Vulg.*)
27.	after γίγαρτον	52ᵛ	*γίγας robustus in genesi*	γίγας *Gen.*10.8.2, 9.1 (= *robustus Vulg.*)
28.	λύπη *tristicia*	147ʳ	*λυπός* (sic!) *pro labore in pr<im>o genes<is>*	λυπῶν *Gen.* 5.29.2 (= *laboribus Vulg.*)
29.	μώλωψ *iubex. cicatrix*	159ʳ	*livor in pr<im>o genes<i>*	εἰς μώλωπα *Gen.* 4.23.5 (= *in livorem Vulg.*)
30.	νοσιά *nidus, mansiuncula*	163ʳ	*in genesi*	νοσσιάς *Gen.* 6.14.2 (= *mansiuncula Vulg.*)
31.	*ad* σφυρήλατος *fabricatus malleo*	231ʳ	*σφυρόκοπος malleator in pr<im>o gen<esis>*	σφυρόκοπος *Gen.* 4.22.2 (= *malleator Vulg.*)
32.	*beside* στενάζω *suspiro*	222ʳ	*στένων vagus in pr<im>o gen<esis>*	στένων *Gen.* 4.12.2 (= *vagus Vulg.*)
33.	τρέμω *tremo*	239ʳ	*τρέμων profugus in pr<im>o gen<esis>*	τρέμων *Gen.* 4.12.2 (= *profugus Vulg.*)
34.	ἐπιθυμία *concupiscentia libido desyderium vaporatio ad deos*	90ᵛ	*pro consilio in pro<verbiis> Salom<onis>*	ἐπιθυμία *Prov. Sal.*10.24.2 (= *desiderium Vulg.*)
35.	ἐπιμέλ[ε]ια *cura, diligentia*	91ᵛ	*ἐπιμέλεια irrigatio in pro<verbiis>*	ἐπιμέλεια *Prov. Sal.*3.8.2 (= *inrigatio Vulg.*)
36.	θησαυρίζω *colloco*	112ᵛ	*custodio in prov<erbiis> sol<omonis>*	θησαυρίζει *Prov. Sal.* 2.7.1 (= *custodiet Vulg.*), θησαυρίζεται 13.22.2 (= *custoditur Vulg.*)
37.	κλοιός κύφων	133ᵛ	*torques interpretatur Hierony<mi> in prov<erbia> sal<omonis>*	κλοιόν *Prov. Sal.* 1.9.2 (= *torques Vulg.*) κλοιόν, *id est, torquem* Hieronymus, *Comm. in Is.* [!] 16.58.10
38.	ταμίειον *promptuarium ubi reponuntur pecuniae domini*	232ᵛ	*cellarium et horreum Hier<onymus> tract<ation>um* (marked with a double dot)	τὰ ταμίεια αὐτῶν πλήρη *Ps.* 143.13 (= *promptuaria eorum plena Vulg.*)

Table 1

Entries in Crastonus' dictionary (Vicenza 1483) with page number		Ugoleto's notes with reference to an author's name and/or the title of a literary work	Passages expressly or probably referred to
			neque cellaria neque horrea Hieronymus, *Tract.* (= *Breviarium*) 59.143.190
39.	θυμός *animus. ira. furor. desyderium* 114ᵛ	*erumna in ecc<lesias>te*	θυμοῦ *Eccl.* 2.23.2 (= *aerumnis Vulg.*)
40.	περιφορά *revolutio. circumlatio* 192ᵛ	*error ec<c>l<esias>te*	περιφοράν *Eccl.* 2.2.2 (= *errorem Vulg.*); περιφοράν 2.12.2 (= *erroresque Vulg.*); περιφοράν 7.26.1 (= *errorem Vulg.*)
41.	προαίρεσις *propositum. voluntas* 202ʳ	*afflictio in ecc<lesias>te*	προαίρεσις *Eccl.* 2.17 (= *adflictionem Vulg.*)
42.	ὑστέρημα *posteratio* 248ʳ	*stultus in ecc<lesias>te*	ὑστέρημα *Eccl.* 1.15.2 (= *stultorum Vulg.*)

Table 2

Entries in Crastonus' dictionary		Latin authors	Passages expressly or probably referred to
43.	ἀφελής *simplex. frugalis* 43ʳ	ἀφελ[ι]ῶς *simp<lici>ter utitur h<o>c vo<cabu>lo Porphyrio p<rim>o carminum com<menta>rio cum Horat<ius> iecur pro corde posuerit.*	*Iecur. Pro corde* ἀφελῶς. *Id est simpliciter.* Porphyrio, *Commentum in Horati Carmina* 1.13.4
44.	λείψανον *reliquum* 143ᵛ	*Ter<entius> in Eun<ucho:> Abi tu, cistellam, Pythias, domo affer [ecfer cod.] cum monumentis. Donat<us:> Monumenta pro quibus Graeci dicunt* λείψανα παργονα (super παργονα signo† scripto	*Haec sunt quae Graeci dicunt* λείψανα παργονα Donatus, *in Ter. Eun.* 753 σπάργανα Vatic. 1673 ***** *pgana* (*peregrina* T) TC ἐσπάργονα V κρεπΒνδια P λείψανα παργονα editio princeps γνώρισματα καὶ σπάργανα Steph]
45.	τρόφιμος *nutritus* 240ʳ	*Don<atus> in Phor<mionem:> Nam herilem filium trophimon dicunt atque haud scio an Latini quoque alumnum dicere potuerint nisi hoc mallent.*	Donatus, *in Ter. Phorm.* 39
46.	γλυκύπικρος *dulcis amarus* 53ʳ	*epith<eton> amoris in Orpheo*	Orph. 361 fr. Kern = M. Ficino, *Commentarium in Convivium Platonis de amore* 2.8
47.	after πάλιν 180ᵛ	παλιμψέστον (sic!) *iterum rasa charta Cic<ero> et Cat<ullus> ho<c> voc<abul>o utuntur*	*in palimpsesto* Cicero, *Ad fam.* 7.18.2 *in palimpsesto* Catullus 22.5 [*palimpsesto* Parm. ed. *palmisepto X* and *O palipsesto* Ven. ed.]
48.	περιοχή *munitio. complexio* 191ᵛ	*argumentum* (~*Voc.* JP) *ut apud Eumen<ium> pr<o restaurandis scholis>*	*argumenta* Eumenius, *Pro restaurandis scholis* 21
49.	σκοπός *propositum* 218ᵛ	*scopus latine apud Suet<onium>*	*pro scopo* Suetonius, *De vita Caesarum, Domitianus* 19.1

Table 2

Entries in Crastonus' dictionary		Latin authors	Passages expressly or probably referred to
			[*scopulo* codices *scopo* Steph]
50.	ἐπινίκιον *praemium. celebritas p. habita victoria quod et latine epinicion dicitur*	92ʳ	*ap<ud>* *<Suetonium?>* (marked with an x)	*epinicia* Suet. *Nero* 43.2.13
51.	under σαρκόω *incarno*	214ᵛ	σάρον *quercus appellatur antiqua gr<a>ecia Pli<nius>*	*sinus Saronicus… ita Graecia antiqua appellante quercum* Plinius, *Naturalis Historia* 4.18.5
52.	στορέννυμι *sterno*	223ʳ	στορέα Plin xv. c. 16 xxxxxix	*stramentis storeis* Plinius, *Naturalis Historia* 15.16.59 [*storeis* vet.ed. *solidis* Mayhoff]
53.	beside ψίθυρος *loquax. stridulus*	262ʳ	ψίαθος *teges, storea storeae voc<abu>lo usum Livius et Hirtius*	*storias* Hirtius (= Caesar), *Bellum civile* 2.9
			storea Livius, *Ab urbe condita* 30.3.9

Regarding Ugoleto's own remarks, we should start again with statistics and a general overview (see **Table 1** and **2**). Of the 53 notes in which either an author's name or a title is specified, 18 refer to Euripides' *Hecuba*, 17 to five different books of the *Septuaginta*, 3 each to Theocritus' idylls, the *Iliad*, and Pliny's *Naturalis Historia*, 2 each to Donatus' commentary on Terence, Suetonius' *Vitae*, and Jerome's exegetical works, and one each to „Orpheus", Appian, Eumenius, Porphyrio, Cicero, Catull, Hirtius and Livy. Thus, the number of works referred to is 58, because in five cases Ugoleto refers to two passages at the same time. To these references we can add 18 further notes (mainly additional definitions) which, although they do not contain any specified references to a certain author or passage, are most probably or even almost certainly identifiable (there are another 15 notes without any references that are difficult or impossible to identify: see Table 4). Of these 18 identifiable notes, 14 belong to the *Hecuba* and one each to the *Iliad*, Plutarch's *Laconic Sayings,* a Plautine comedy, and Vergilius' *Georgica*.

The pre-eminent position of Euripides' *Hecuba* and the *Septuaginta* is immediately evident. But before discussing the details and exploring the question of whether Ugoleto's notes resulted from a direct consultation of the texts or from remembering his previous readings, two comments would be appropriate. One concerns their possible availability in Buda. So far there has been no evidence of the *Septuaginta* having belonged to the royal library, but perhaps one should hardly find it suprising that it did. The situaton is slightly different with *Hecuba*. As mentioned already, there is a codex containing Euripides' drama that is assumed to have belonged to the royal library, although the question of authenticity is still open.[20] As far as its content is concerned, it can be labelled as a 'light version' of a typical late Byzantine collection of school texts used in secondary education. It contains some of the most popular classical works: Hesiod's *Erga* (more accurately, 587 lines of it), the complete triad of Euripides (*Hecuba, Orestes, Phoenissae*), one comedy from the Aristophanes-triad (*Plutus*), a selection of Theocritus' idylls, and the *Batrachomyomachia* attributed to Homer.[21] It can be accurately positioned on the intellectual map of its age: it represents the Moschopoulean

---

[20] E. MADAS has recently classified it among the dubious manuscripts which are not likely to have belonged to the Corvinian library. See his La Bibliotheca Corviniana et les corvinas authentiques, in: Colloque Matthias Corvin. Les bibliothèques princières et la genèse de l'État moderne. 15–17 novembre 2007 (éd. D. NEBBIAI). Paris, IRHT 2008 (Ædilis, Actes, 15). For the time being this is available only online: http://corvin.irht.cnrs.fr/madas.htm.

[21] Cs. CSAPODI, The Corvinian (s. n. 11), 242, mistakenly reports that the codex also contains Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*; in fact, only a hypothesis of the tragedy can be found in it.

branch of tradition, as modified by, and bearing the marks of, Triklinos' philological activity. Most of the literary works in the collection were intensively studied and commented by Moschopoulos, and the texts themselves belong either to the Moschopoulean or Moschopoulean-Triclinian recension.[22]

It should also be stressed that apart from the *Hecuba*, this manuscript contains two more works Ugoleto referred to in his marginalia: Aristophanes' *Plutus* and Theocritus' idylls. Its date and provenance is equally important: according to two closing notes, it was hastily written at the end of the 15th century by a certain Franciscus, presumably in Italy.[23] Thus, on the basis of these circumstances and facts, it is easily conceivable that there is a more direct connection between the origin of this codex and Ugoleto's commission as a royal tutor.

My other comment relates to the written form and appearance of Ugoleto's own comments. Compared to the preceding and subsequent items copied from the *Vocabularium*, these marginal annotations look different. Most of them were written with a less sharp pen in fainter ink, which faded into a greyish or light brownish shade and thus differs from the usual black or dark brown tone of the other letters. They were also put on paper in a less disciplined, less neat and less orderly manner. These secondary remarks never turn up among those entries which were apparently written down in sequence, one after another, usually in a slightly slanting row. Admittedly, not all of them are dissimilar to the transcribed material, and sometimes the differences can be discerned only after a direct and closer inspection; nevertheless, they are definitely there. The note to the entry σχεδία may serve as a good example of how differences in the manner of writing are immediately evident, even in a photocopy (**Fig. 5**).

Their less neat and careful ductus gives the impression that they were put down hastily and individually, as l a t e r a d d i t i o n s to the bulk of the entries previously copied into the margins. Of course, unevenness in itself does not provide sufficient grounds for considering a note a later addition (the handwriting in Ugoleto's transcription basically presents a uniform picture). Nonetheless, this unevenness can signify a later addition, and since there are also several other signs pointing in the same direction, all these indications taken together make it quite likely that these remarks, with their different appearance, were written down subsequently.[24] For example, in the case of σφυρόκοπος *malleator*, we can clearly distinguish two different phases in the process of writing. At first, Ugoleto transcribed the Greek word and its Latin equivalent from the *Vocabularium* with a sharp pen. While doing so, however, he committed a minor fault by omitting the letter σ from the beginning, so what he actually put down was φυρόκοπος *malleator* (**Fig. 5**). After realizing the flaw, he inserted a σ and also overwrote the second letter of σφυρόκοπος – φ – with a much blunter pen. At the same time, however, apart from this correction he also added a title of a work in which the Greek word occurs: *in pr<im>o gen<esis>* (referring in all likelihood to *Gen.* 4.22.2, see below), again with the same blunt pen. The most probable reconstruction of how things may have happened is that during a later reading of the Book of Genesis in Greek (or while reading the *Vulgate* and comparing a certain Latin phrase

---

[22] Hesiod's text is numbered among the Triclinian manuscripts by M.L. WEST, Medieval manuscripts of Works and Days. *CQ* 24 (1974) 184–185; see also M.L. WEST, Hesiod: Works and Days. Oxford 1978, 82–86. A similar judgement is made about the text of *Plutus* by K. v. HOLZINGER, Die Aristophaneshandschriften der Wiener Hofbibliothek. *Sitzungsberichte Wien. Ak. phil.-hist. Klass.* 167/4 (1911) 74–77. Euripides' texts are characterized as Moschopoulean by A. A. TURYN, The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides. Urbana 1957, 163. The *Batrachomyomachia* is classified into family "k", with a similar background, by W. ALLEN, Homeri opera. Tomus V. Oxford 1912, 167. I suppose that the Theocritus text has not been examined thoroughly by editors for two main reasons. Firstly, it is extremely difficult to read (the ink has in some places almost completely faded away); secondly, there is not much to be hoped for from this late apograph.

[23] ἐγω [sic] φραγκίσκος ὡς τάχιστα γέγραφα (it was me, Franciscus, who made this copy as fast as possible, on fol. 78ᵛ, after the argument of the *Phoenissae*) and φραγκίσκος γέγραφα (on fol. 92ʳ, after the end of the same drama). J. BICK, Die Schreiber der Wiener griechischen Handschriften. Wien–Prag–Leipzig 1920, 59–61; H. HUNGER, Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Teil 1: Codices historici, Codices philosophici et philologici. Wien 1961, 387. TURYN dates it at about 1500, see A. TURYN, The Byzantine 163. For the unusual nature of Franciscus' signature, see E. GAMMILSCHEG, Struktur und Aussagen der Subskriptionen griechischer Handschriften, in: Scribi e colofoni (ed. E. CONDELLO – G. DE GREGORIO). Spoleto 1995, 417–421.

[24] On the other hand, not all of his annotations look different from the texts preceding and following it, as if they were later additions. In such cases the most obvious assumption is that they were written simultaneously with the transcription of the *Vocabularium*, being a result of spontaneous association on Ugoleto's part and not of his later reading of a particular text.

or word to its "original" in the *Septuaginta*), he wished to register the locus where he had read it. When he looked up the entry, he noticed that one letter was missing in it. Thus, in addition to recording the title of the work in which he encountered it, he also corrected his previous mistake. Whatever may have happened, there is a significant difference in appearance between the two initial letters σφ and the remark *in pr<im>o gen<esis>*, on the one hand, and the original entry φυρόκοπος *malleator*, on the other – the different pen is a clear sign of a different date.

The case of ἀπύω is also instructive in this respect. This time Ugoleto made an entire entry for it on his own, giving both the Greek word and its Latin equivalent and even adding two pieces of information concerning its stylistic value and occurrence: ἀπύω *poet<ice> vociferor in coni<unctivo> Eur<ipide>*. Then he inserted it after the adjective ἄπιος *longinquus* – in incorrect alphabetical order. Had he looked for it in its own place, he would have found that the entry ἀπύω already existed. But he apparently misunderstood its pronounciation and therefore searched for it in vain in the wrong place. Having failed to find it, he composed a new – and slightly richer – entry. It should be stressed at this point that such a mistake can be imagined much more easily if we suppose that he started from the Euripides passage rather than the other way around. A sequence of events is extremely unlikely to occur in which the word ἄπιος in the dictionary would have made Ugoleto think that the verb ἀπύω (in the form used by Euripides!) was missing from the entries and had to be inserted there. On the contrary, things must have happened in the way suggested above. It must have been while reading Euripides that Ugoleto came upon the word ἀπύω, and after failing to find it in his dictionary (because he was searching in the wrong place), he finally created a new entry. This note, therefore, must have also found its way into the margin on an occasion that was separate from the revision of the dictionary.

There are also a couple of passages where a remark is inserted somewhat farther from the word it belongs to with the help of an identification sign, e. g. a double dot (ταμίειον 232^v, θυμός 114^v), a triple dot above a circle (λείψανον 143^v, see **Fig. 6**) or a mark *x* (ἐπινίκιον 92^r, κορυδαλλός 136^r). Such signs are never used for entries copied from the *Vocabularium*.

Furthermore, Ugoleto's comment on προαίρεσις (*afflictio in ecc<lesias>te*) was apparently squeezed into the printed text, obviously because the space in the margin had already been occupied by items transcribed from the *Vocabularium* (**Fig. 3**).

And finally, something similar happened when Ugoleto created the entry ψίαθος *teges, storea*, accompanied by a comment: *storeae voc<abu>lo usum Livius et Hirtius*. Because the place where these words should have been inserted had already been filled with a group of copied entries, they were written down six or seven lines lower. It is also worth mentioning that the last two words of the group (ψινύθιον and ψιχολογῶ), according to alphabetical order, should have followed ψίαθος; they, however, precede it. Such a disruption of alphabetical order necessarily implies a sequence of events in which Ugoleto did the copying first and made his own notes afterwards. Of course, it is impossible to say how much later this occurred: one minute, one year or one decade. What is beyond any doubt is that a certain interval must be assumed between the writing of the two different kinds of remarks.

What is at hand here is not just a clear separation between the two types of annotations: Ugoleto's own philological achievements and the material taken over from the glossator of the *Vocabularium*. It also concerns questions of chronology and sources. As mentioned above, Ugoleto's final subscription provides us with a piece of unequivocal evidence as to the date when he finished reading through (*relectum*) the Crastonus dictionary: it was on 20 June 1484. (The preposition *re*, used at first sight somewhat strangely in the verb *relegere*, presumably refers to a careful and thorough way of reading, a process involving "re-vision", i.e. a word-by-word, itemized comparison with the material of the *Vocabularium* and the transcription of words missing from the printed dictionary being "revised"). Now if the additions made independently of the *Vocabularium* by Ugoleto had exactly the same appearance as the ones he copied from it, we would have no reason to suppose that they were added later. If there were no signs at all that they had found their way into the margin at a different point in time, we should date them before 20 June 1484. The question of dating may affect another one, namely whether the codex Vindobonensis Phil. gr. 289, which contains three literary works Ugoleto refers to in his marginalia, was actually used by him. This manuscript was certainly not written earlier than 1487, its date having been ascertained through the relatively conclusive evidence provided by

watermarks.[25] A distinction between the two layers of marginalia on the basis of their written form makes it possible that Ugoleto's own observations, written in a less calligraphic and more urgent fashion, were not produced at the same time as the rest of the annotations, but later – and some of them even after 1487. Of course, the separability of two different strata and a possible time interval between their notations does not yield positive proof, but they do represent a necessary precondition for assuming that Ugoleto perused the Phil. gr. 289 while making his own remarks in the margin.

There is also a piece of positive evidence provided by a rare Theocritean word, which occurs in a similar faulty form in both Phil. Gr. 289 and Ugoleto's Crastonus-margins. The word in question is σίον or οἴσιον, which denotes a kind of reed or water parsnip. In his note Ugoleto makes a correct guess about the main characteristic of the plant (*herba sine fructu*). But what is more remarkable is that he refers to it in the non-existing form τοῖσιον, in one word, and with an impossible circumflex accent on the third syllable from the end (**Fig. 7**). Before explaining how this strange word came to existence, we should examine its original context. It is in a song competition that a goatherd named Komatas turns to the river-god Krathis and expresses an unrealistic wish to him: τὰ δέ τοι σία καρπὸν ἐνείκαι (*Id*. 5.125) – 'may the water parsnips bear apples'. Ugoleto, as mentioned above, understood the goatherd's point (the plant in question was normally fruitless). But if the wrong form of the word did not result from his misunderstanding of the text, how did it?

It is important to understand that Ugoleto was not the only reader who was at a loss to identify the word for water parsnip. Both the codices and the scholia have two different forms of the word: οἴσιον (in the branch represented by GLEA), and σίον (in mss PT, accepted by GOW).[26] Accordingly, the two versions with their preceding particles read as follows: either τὰ δὲ τ᾽ οἴσια or τὰ δέ τοι σία, both of which are clearly unlike Ugoleto's τοῖσια (if we suppose that he saw it in the plural – a quite obvious supposition). But again, how could this impossible word have appeared? For a possible answer we should turn to the text of the Viennese manuscript, in which the following – though, due to ink fading, barely legible – version can be discerned: τοισια (*sic*), with the letter α placed above the letter ι, and accompanied by a slash mark indicating that the alpha should be placed after the iota (**Fig. 8**, line 12). Apparently, the scribe did not understand the rare botanical term either and first wrote τοισι, without the final α and, as it seems, in one word (perhaps mistaking it for the more familiar τοῖσι, a poetical dative of the masculine article used by Theocritus several times). Subsequently, however, he realized his mistake, but only after finishing the next word, when there was no longer enough space left between τοισι and καρπόν. So he inserted the missing alpha above the iota with the help of a slash, although he failed to indicate its accent in doing so. There is one more circumstance that might have contributed to the strange accentation. If one looks at the text with the naked eye, a thin, dark, and curly fibre (a hair?) above the diphthong οι can be seen which is similar to a circumflex. The absence of any diacritical sign is not conspicuous and can only be verified through a UV image. It is thus easily imaginable that Ugoleto was also misled by this fibre and took it for an accent sign.

Let us now have a closer look at his comments on the *Hecuba*. By way of introduction, it is worth noting that all of Ugoleto's eight comments indicating the title of the drama (as well as ten others which presumably refer to this Euripidean tragedy) seem to be based on his direct encounter with the text, and were certainly not taken from the scholia or any other secondary sources. As we have already seen concerning the entry πρός, his understanding of the text is not infallible; still, his notes are usually correct and sensitive additions. In most cases, whenever he observed that a given word was used by Euripides in a sense slightly different from that recorded in the dictionary, he would define this particular meaning. The value of these acute philological remarks is enhanced by the fact that the *Hecuba* belonged to the literary texts on which Crastonus based his dictionary.[27] In other words, Ugoleto refined or revised his predecessor's editorial work, mainly by paying attention to the metaphorical or metonymical usage of words. Generally speaking, these observations are not so much astonishingly original discoveries or revelations as minor corrections and modifications.

---

[25] HOLZINGER, Die Aristophaneshandschriften (s. n. 22), 77–78.

[26] A.S.F. GOW, Theocritus. Volume II. Cambridge 1952, 114.

[27] P. THIERMANN, I dizionari greco-latini fra medevio e umanesimo, in: Les manuscrits des lexiques et glossaires de l'Antiquité tardive à la fin du moyen âge. Actes du Colloque international (ed. J. HAMESSE). Louvain-la-Neuve 1996, 665.

Some of them, however, can be justified even by modern standard dictionaries. Let us now examine them one by one.

1. κάσις *frater* (entry in Crastonus' dictionary, 124[r])
Ugoleto's note: *soror ap<ud> Eurip<idem> in Hecuba*
The reference is clearly to the lines:
... ὅστις ἀργύρου μ᾽ ὠνήσεται,
τὴν Ἕκτορός τε **...** κάσιν**.** (*Hec.* 360–361)
'who would buy me for money – me … the sister of Hector'.[28]
An undoubtedly justified addition, though of minor importance; LSJ also refers to this passage as meaning 'sister'.

2. κραίνω *perficio* (137[r])
U: κραθεῖστος (sic!) *ap<ud> E<uripidem> firmatum*
The referred passage is: ψῆφόν τε τὴν κρανθεῖσαν [κραθεῖσαν FPaRSa] (*Hec.* 219) – 'the vote that has been held'.
The sense given is correct. The impossible form κραθεῖστος is perhaps partly due to a misreading of α as ος, an easy mistake if someone read the text in the codex Vindobonensis, in which the scribe of the *Hecuba*[29] has the habit of drawing the right stroke of alpha away from the circular body of the letter. As a result, to the unwary eye the first part of alpha may seem to be an omikron, while the second part might be mistaken for a lunate sigma. However, it should also be added that the Ph. gr. 289 preserves the better reading κρανθεῖσαν (with nu), so this piece of evidence is not so compelling as that offered by τοῖσια.

3. λάζυμαι *capio* (141[v])
U: *poetice* λαζΰμεν<αι> (sic!) *apud Eurip<idem>*
The passage referred to is: γεραιᾶς χειρὸς προσλαζύμεναι (*Hec.* 64) – 'Grasp my aged hand'. A basically correct stylistic remark since the form is indeed epic. It is not clear whether Ugoleto omitted προσ accidentally or considered it as a postposition belonging to χειρός.

4. νύμφη *sponsa* (163[v])
U: *simpliciter pro muliere ap<ud> Eurip<idem> in Hec<uba>*

5. νυμφίος *sponsus* (163[v])
U: *vir. ap<ud> Eurip<idem> ibidem*
The passage referred to is: νύμφαι τ᾽ ἀρίστων νυμφίων τητώμεναι (*Hec.* 324) – 'brides bereft of gallant husbands' (see also τητώμεναι among the notes without references, no. 95 in Table 4).
Taking 'bride' and 'bridegroom' as a simple metonymy for 'wife' and 'husband' seems to be a partly justified, partly simplified interpretation. Odysseus' words may indeed be taken to mean married couples who were separated by the Trojan war. In this case, however, by calling them 'bride' and 'bridegroom' he also emphasizes their young age and the brevity of their marriage. This tragic tension is certainly lost if we simply equate νύμφη and νυμφίος with 'wife' and 'husband'.

6. οἴχομαι *recedo* etc. (168[v])
U: οἰχόμενος *mortuus ap<ud> Euripid<em> in Hec<uba>*
The expression referred to is: τοῖς οἰχομένοις (*Hec.* 138) – 'the dead'.
Ugoleto's addition of this otherwise common usage of the word is fully correct.

---

[28] Translation by E.P. COLERIDGE, in: Euripides. The Complete Greek Drama (edited by W.J. OATES and E. O'NEILL Jr. in two volumes) 1. Hecuba. New York, 1938.
[29] I believe that he is not identical with Franciscus, for reasons I intend to set out elsewhere.

7. after ὁρισμός (174ᵛ)

U: ὁρίσματα *pro moenibus ap<ud> Eurip<idem> in Hecuba*

The reference should be to the line: ἕως μὲν οὖν γῆς ὄρθ’ ἔκειθ’ ὁρίσματα *(Hec.*16) – 'Thus, as long as the bulwarks of our land stood firm'.

His remark is sensible and also in accordance with the Greek scholia (ἀντὶ τοῦ τὰ τείχη Mg). If we take ὄρθα metaphorically as 'secure' or 'safe', ὁρίσματα can be understood to mean 'boundaries' here.[30]

8. πρός *dativo iuncta praeterea significat* (204ᵛ)

U: πρός *cum dativo sig<nifica>t penes. Euripid<es> in Hec<uba>* (sc. θάνατος) οὐ προσοιστέος ἄλλος πρὸς ἄλλῳ

Since Ugoleto quotes five words, the identification is undoubtedly certain: the citation comes from *(Hec.* 394–5) – 'The maiden's death suffices; no need to add a second to the first'.

He clearly misunderstood the passage (see above). The quotation does not seem to be worth memorizing, neither for its content nor for its phrasing. It is unlikely that Ugoleto cites it by heart.

9. στερ<ρ>ός *solidus* (222ʳ)

U: *durus et com<m>unis g<ener>is ap<ud> Euripid<em> in Hec<uba>*

The reference is to οὐκ ἔστιν οὕτω στερρὸς ἀνθρώπου φύσις *(Hec.* 296) – 'Human nature is not so hard-hearted'.

This is a correct remark that brings out the metaphorical sense of the adjective required in the context.

10. τιθήνη *nutrix* (237ʳ)

U: *ap<ud> Euripid<em> in Hecuba*

The passage referred to is: ἥδε *...* ἐστί μοι τιθήνη *(Hec.* 281) – 'she is …my nurse'.

Ugoleto simply registers the occurence of the word, though it is not clear what might have been the point of doing so.

11. φροῦδος *vanus* (254ᵛ)

U: *abolitus, disperditus, mortuus ap<ud> Eurip<idem> in Hec<uba>*

The reference is presumably to φροῦδος πρέσβυς *(Hec.*160, cf. also 161 and 335) – 'Aged Priam is no more'.

A correct observation pointing to a common extended sense of the word.

12. after ἄπιος *longinquus* (30ʳ)

U: ἀπύω *poet<ice> vociferor in coni<unctivo> Eur<ipide>*

The passage referred to should be: τί ποτ’ ἀπύσω *(Hec.* 154, but cf. also *Or.* 1253, *Suppl.* 76, *Tr.* 1304, and *Bacch.* 984) – 'What words …can I utter?'

Ugoleto inserted a word he believed to be missing from the Crastonus dictionary whose meaning he may have inferred from its context. In fact, the verb ἀπύω does appear in the dictionary – in the correct alphabetical position (see above).

13. ἑστία *focus* (98ʳ)

U: *domus ap<ud> Eurip<idem>*

The reference is to the line πατρώϊα θ’ ἑστία κατεσκάφη *(Hec.* 22, cf. also 353, 1216) – 'my father's hearth was annihilated'.

Ugoleto's suggestion to interpret the word metonymically is defensible (obviously the entire house was destroyed), although the more concrete sense 'hearth', which gives vividness to the impious act of destruction, cannot be dispensed with either.

---

[30] C. COLLARD, Euripides' Hecuba. Warminster 1991, 131.

14. πλάξ *tabula* (195ʳ)

U: *ap<ud> Eurip<idem> pro latitudine campoque*

The reference is to Χερσονησίαν πλάκα (*Hec.* 8) – 'plains of Chersonesos'.

A fully justified addition of a figurative usage of the word.

15. πλάτη *remus* (195ᵛ)

U: *pro navigatione ap<ud> Eurip<idem>*

The reference is presumably to πρὸς οἶκον εὐθύνοντας ἐναλίαν πλάτην (*Hec.*39) – 'they were making straight for home across the sea'.

Theoretically, he might also have referred to other passages from different Euripidean tragedies, such as *Tr.* 1155, *IT* 1445, *Hel.* 1212, *Or.* 54, or *Rhes.* 53. Nevertheless, economy of reasoning is against such a hypothesis. Otherwise, the metonymical usage of the word is stressed correctly (in accordance with the scholia MA), but again the literal meaning 'rudder' is also brought into play.

16. σχεδία *ratis* (231ʳ)

U: *sed ap<ud> Eurip<idem> accipitur pro navi*

The reference is to τὰς ποντοπόρους δ' ἔσχε σχεδίας *(Hec.*111) – 'sea-borne ships'.

A correct remark emphasizing the metonymical sense of the noun; by calling the ships 'makeshift rafts', the chorus refer to their poor condition.

17. φέγγος *lumen* (250ʳ)

U: *dies ap<ud> Eurip<idem>*

The reference is to τριταῖον ἤδη φέγγος αἰωρούμενος *(Hec.* 32) – 'keeping my airy station these three days'.

A right observation pointing to the metonymical usage of the word, without which the text is not understandable.

18. χηλή *velox pedibus* (258ʳ)

U: *ungula ap<ud> Eurip<idem>*

The reference is to ἔλαφον λύκου αἵμονι χαλᾷ σφαζομέναν (*Hec.* 90) – 'a dappled deer mangled by a wolf's bloody fangs'.

It is worth mentioning that *Phil. gr.* 289 also belongs to the recension represented by codices XXbZ et Ps, in which χηλᾷ stands in place of the Doric χαλᾷ. Otherwise it is a justified addition, a remark that is to the point and inferred from the context.

In summary, it is clear from the 18 references, along with the 15 short annotations without references (γόος, δαρόν, δίαυλος, ἐπίσημος, θεόδμητος, κομιστήρ, λιάζομαι, νάω, νασμός, νηίς, προπετής, πταίω, τητώμενος, φθίμενος, κραίνω, see Table 4), that Ugoleto read through the first 400 lines of the tragedy in a very careful way. I confirmed this finding by reading through the text with the help of the Crastonus dictionary. While doing this I discovered that Ugoleto had accomplished his work painstakingly: except for four words (σκίπων, ἤλυσις, κόπις, and θωύσσω), only those composite verbs or nouns whose meaning must have been easy to grasp remained unexplained; otherwise one can understand every bit of the text. However, why he stopped reading and annotating is another question. One is tempted to think of a change of circumstances that made teaching Greek to the prince pointless, namely the shattering of János Corvin's hopes for a marriage with Bianca Maria Sforza and for succeeding his father as King of Hungary. In any case, the abrupt end of the reading of *Hecuba* anticipates the later fate of both books: the dictionary was given to someone else as a present by Ugoleto (see below) and the textbook went over to the possession of the future Cardinal Bakócz .

Turning to the Theocritean idylls, Ugoleto's marginalia do not testify to a similarly thorough reading of them. It would be premature to conclude, however, that he did not study the Greek poet's oeuvre in the

original. Although the traces of such a study are admittedly few, we should not forget that Ugoleto showed a special interest in bucolic poetry, and in a few years' time he published an edition of Calpurnius Siculus and Nemesianus.

19. θρόνον *pigmentum. venenum* (114ʳ)
U: *Theocritus in Pharmaceutria* νῦν δὲ λαβοῖσα <τὺ τὰ> θρόνα   - 'and now take the charm herbs'.
The quotation from *Idyllia* 2.59 is defective, although the difficult Doric participle is correct. The Greek word θρόνον is used relatively rarely; presumably this is the reason why he made this annotation.

20. after τοί *tibi* (237ᵛ)
U: τοῖσιον (*sic*!) *herba sine fructu apud Theocritum*
The reference is to *Idyllia* 5.125. Ugoleto's guess about the meaning of the word is right, but he cites the noun οἶσι ν (τ' οἴσια GLEA) or σί ν (τοι σία PT) in the non-existing form τοῖσιον with an impossible 'pro-paraperispomena' accent. This faulty form, as we saw, originates in all likelihood from a scribal error in the codex Phil. gr. 289, and therefore provides strong evidence for Ugoleto's reading the text of this particular manuscript (see above).

21. κορυδαλλός κόρυδος *corydalus. avis genus* (136ʳ)
U: *Galerita latine quondam x Theocritus x*
Since the word occurs three times in the Theocritean corpus, the passages referred to can be either οὐδ' ἐπιτυμβίδιοι κορυδαλλίδες ἠλαίνοντι (7.23) – 'the crested larks go not afield', or 7.141, or 10.50.
The Latin equivalent he offers is fully correct. It should be noted that the additional information he gives (that *alauda* was once called *galerita*) is based on a passage in Plinius, *NH*: *parvae avi, quae, ab illo galerita appellata quondam, postea Gallico vocabulo etiam legioni nomen dederat alaudae* (11.122.2), and is not necessary for an understanding of the Greek text.

As far as the three references to the *Iliad* are concerned, they reveal a certain familiarity with Homer's work, or at least its first book. Ugoleto seems to rely on his memory each time, and we should not suppose that these notes necessarily resulted from a fresh reading of the text (of course, we should not exclude the possibility either).

22. ἀποτίνω (34ʳ)
U: *Reddo in p<rim>o il<iadis>*
In all likelihood, the passage Ugoleto refers to is τριπλῇ τετραπλῇ τ' ἀποτίσομεν (*Iliad* 1.128) – 'we will recompense you threefold and fourfold'.[31]
The Latin equivalent he offers is not quite correct because the Greek word actually means 'to pay back', 'recompense'. In Crastonus' dictionary the Latin definition is missing: it must have been that empty space which invited Ugoleto to fill it in.

23. ἰάπτω *maledico. mitto cum detrimento* (115ᵛ)
U: *in<de>* προιάπτω *in il<iadis> p<rim>o*
The reference is obviously to πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν / ἡρώων (*Iliad* 1.3–4) – '[Wrath] sent down the souls of many valiant warriors to Hades'.
The note, written with a normal pen, is meant to provide supplementary information by pointing to a derivative verb, and is obviously not the result of an attempt to solve an interpretational problem during Ugoleto's reading of the *Iliad*. This is also clear from the fact that he fails to offer a Latin translation of προιάπτω   although it has a meaning that is completely different from what is given by Crastonus for

---

[31] Translation by A.T. Murray in: Homer: Iliad I. (tr. by A.T. Murray, revised by W.F. Wyatt). Cambridge Mass.–London 1999.

ἰάπτω. Thus, everything points to the conclusion that this note was a spontaneous thought elicited by the printed entry.

24. πρίν πρΐν *prius. ante*
U: *Quotiens aut<em> ponunt<ur> duo p<ri>mum p<ro> ante: secundum p<ro> q<uam> exponemus ut in p<rim>o iliados* (see **Fig. 3**)
The reference is clearly to:
οὐδ' ὅ γε πρὶν Δαναοῖσιν ἀεικέα λοιγὸν ἀπώσει,
πρίν γ' ἀπὸ πατρὶ φίλῳ δόμεναι ἑλικώπιδα κούρην. (*Iliad* 1.98–99)
'Nor will he drive off from the Danaans loathsome destruction until we give the bright-eyed maiden back to her father'.
A correct, supplementary grammatical explanation of the adverb's usage that demonstrates a striking and surprising similarity with Moschopulos' commentary on Hesiod, *Erga* 90: ἔστι δ' ὅτε δύο κεῖται πρὶν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, ἔνθα τὸ ἕν ἐστιν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἀντὶ τοῦ πρότερον, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ἀντὶ τοῦ πρὸ τοῦ.
Ugoleto's etymology of ἀρητήρ *sacerdos* from ἀρά (ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρὰς) on 36ᵛ is (no. 64 in Table 4), in all likelihood, connected to *Iliad* 1.11 (see also δίφρος no.70).

The fourth Greek work that is referred to by Ugoleto (and not found in Janus' glossary) is Appian's *Epitome of the Celtic War*, a piece of writing whose presence in the royal library has not yet been attested.

25. ὑσσός *venabulum* (247ᵛ)
U: *venabulum ro<manum>. ut apud Appianum in bello celtico*
The reference is to τὰ δὲ δόρατα ἦν οὐκ ἐοικότα ἀκοντίοις, ἃ Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσιν ὑσσούς (Appianus, *De bello Celtico, epitome* 1.3).
A correct remark. Judging from this reference, it may be possible that it was also on the shelves of the royal library. But since the reference implies only one word, it seems more likely that this time Ugoleto recalled the word in question from memory. Nor should the possibility be ruled out that he had also (or only?) read the text in Latin. In this connection it is worth mentioning that he cites the title as it was translated by Pietro Candido Decembrio, and not as it is found in Niccolò Fonzio's version, which was available in two copies in the royal library (ÖNB Cod. Lat. 133 and Firenze Laur., Plut. 68.19). Decembrio's translation, entitled *De bellis civilibus et de bello celtico*, was made in 1452 and first printed in 1472.

Turning to the *Septuaginta*, it is striking that the Latin equivalents with which Ugoleto renders the Greek words are, with one exception, always identical with what stands for them in the *Vulgate*. He seems to have read the two texts in parallel, perhaps using the latter as a kind of dictionary to understand the former or checking a phrase occasionally in the Greek. His notes reveal a special interest in the book of *Genesis*, *Proverbia* and *Ecclesiastes*. It is also conspicuous that he sometimes consulted Jerome's exegetical works for different possible Latin or Greek translations of a given Hebrew word. Although his remarks are far from being systematic, it would be inappropriate to jump to the conclusion that he did not possess a thorough knowledge of the *Septuaginta*. The special attention he pays to rare words and unclassical usages may be a sign of his familiarity with the basic or less uncommon vocabulary of the *Septuaginta*. His focus on the three books may be connected with his teaching activities. It was perhaps these texts through which, on account of their importance and easy grammar, he introduced the prince to biblical Greek; each of them may have served as an excellent confidence-building text for a student at the intermediate level. It is also worth mentioning that most of the notes cluster around one particular passage or paragraph. This suggests an unsystematic but intensive study of certain parts of the Old Testament. It seems almost certain that he read the story of Cain and Abel as carefully as he did the first 400 lines of the *Hecuba*.

26. αἰτία *ratio causa. accusatio confirmatio* (10ᵛ)
U: *pro iniquitate genes<i>*

The reference is to μείζων ἡ αἰτία μου ἀφεθῆναί με (*Gen*. 4.13.2), *maior est iniquitas mea quam ut veniam merear*, a passage in which Cain confesses his guilt.

An unclassical and uncommon usage of the word.

27. after γίγαρτον (52ᵛ)

U: γίγας *robustus in genesi*

The reference is to οὗτος ἦν γίγας κυνηγὸς ἐναντίον κυρίου (*Gen*.10.8.2), *et erat robustus venator coram Domino* (*Vulg.*)*,* or 10.9.1, where the same rare words are used.

28. λύπη *tristicia* (147ʳ)

U: λυπός (sic!) *pro labore in pr<im>o genes<is>*

The non-existent masculine noun λυπός was clearly inferred from the genitive plural λυπῶν the only case in which the stem vocal α 'disappears', its accent is transferred to the last syllable, and which can be confused with an o stem noun with an ultimate accent (**Fig. 9**). The word occurs eight times in *Genesis* but is rendered as *labor* only twice in the *Vulgate*. In one of the passages it is in the dative plural (ἐν λυπαῖς 3.17.5), in the other in the genitive plural – the very case we would expect on the basis of Ugoleto's incorrect form. Thus, the reference should be none other than: Οὗτος διαναπαύσει ἡμᾶς ... ἀπὸ τῶν λυπῶν τῶν χειρῶν (*Gen*. 5.29.2), *iste consolabitur nos ab operibus et laboribus manuum nostrarum* (*Vulg.*). From our perspective, Ugoleto's double mistake in reconstructing the nominative of λυπῶν is highly significant and telling. While it is easy to imagine that one could commit such a double error while reading, it is unlikely that it could happen by recalling it from memory. But even if we suppose that Ugoleto memorized it incorrectly, there is one more factor that speaks against such a hypothesis: the word λύπη in its correct form had already been there in the printed dictionary. Consequently, if we assume that Ugoleto made this comment while reading the dictionary, it is unclear why he inserted the entry once again – and what is even more baffling – in an incorrect form. However, everything falls into place if we assume a reverse sequence of events. First Ugoleto must have read the Greek text; while doing so, he observed that the Greek text had the surprising equivalent ἀπὸ τῶν λυπῶν for the Latin *a laboribus* (which I guess he knew by heart), so he decided to make a note of it. Then, since his attention was concentrated on inserting this special meaning of the word λύπη into his dictionary, he failed to notice that the entry already existed there. Alternatively, we may assume that he inferred from the genitive plural that the word λυπός existed, which he might have taken as being related to λύπη, meaning *labor*. In any case, this particular flaw of Ugoleto provides a powerful piece of evidence of him reading the Book of Genesis while making his marginal annotations, and consequently of its availability in the royal library.

29. μώλωψ *iubex. cicatrix* (159ʳ)

U: *livor in pr<im>o genes<i>*

In *Genesis* the word occurs only here: ὅτι καὶ νεανίσκον εἰς μώλωπα ἄνδρα ἀπέκτεινα εἰς τραῦμα ἐμοί (*Gen*. 4.23.5), *quoniam occidi virum in vulnus meum et adulescentulum in livorem meum* (*Vulg.*).

This time it is not so much the meaning of the word as the word itself that is rare enough to deserve mention in the margin. Once again, it occurs in the story of Cain and Abel.

30. νοσιά *nidus, mansiuncula* (163ʳ)

U: *in genesi*

The passage referred to is νοσσιάς ποιήσεις τὴν κιβωτόν (*Gen*. 6.14.2), *mansiunculas in arca facies* (*Vulg.*).

Again, this note registers a relatively uncommon word in *Genesis*. Like λυπῶν above, it occurs in the story of Noah.

31. σφυρήλατος *fabricatus malleo* (231ʳ)

U: (a first hand following the entry in the *Vocabularium*) φυρόκοπος *malleator*

(a second hand overwriting the first two letters of σφυρόκοπος with a different pen) σφ

(and adding a title) *in pr<im>o gen<esis>* (see **Fig. 5**)

The reference is to καὶ ἦν σφυρόκοπος χαλκεὺς καὶ σιδήρου (*Gen.* 4.22.2), *qui fuit malleator et faber in cuncta opera aeris et ferri* (*Vulg.*).

For a discussion of the note see above. The word itself occurs in a passage from the story of Cain and Abel.

32. beside στενάζω *suspiro* (222ʳ)
U: στένων *vagus in pr<im>o gen<esis>*

33. τρέμω *tremo* (239ʳ)
U: τρέμων *profugus in pr<im>o gen<esis>*
The two words occur in the same sentence: στένων καὶ τρέμων ἔσῃ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (*Gen.* 4.12.2),
vagus et profugus eris super terram (*Vulg.*).
Neither of these usages are mentioned by Crastonus. The words are spoken to Cain by the Lord.

34. ἐπιθυμία *concupiscentia libido desyderium vaporatio ad deos* (90ᵛ)
U: *pro consilio in pr<overbiis> Salom<onis>*
ἐπιθυμία δὲ δικαίου δεκτή (*Pr. Sal.*10.24.2), *desiderium suum iustis dabitur* (*Vulg.*), or possibly 11.23.1.
This is the only passage where Ugoleto provides a translation different from the *Vulgate*. I have no explanation for this deviation.

35. ἐπιμέλ[ε]ια *cura, diligentia* (91ᵛ)
U: ἐπιμέλεια *irrigatio in pro<verbiis>*
The reference is certainly to ἐπιμέλεια τοῖς ὀστέοις σου (*Prov. Sal.*3.8.2), *irrigatio ossuum tuorum* (*Vulg.*). The word occurs four times in the *Proverbia*, but it is only here in 3.8.2 that it is translated as *irrigatio*, meaning "refreshment" in Latin. The vivid metaphor apparently captured Ugoleto's attention. This time his handwriting does not display any difference with its surroundings, a sign that this reference was possibly a spontaneous association written down during the revising sessions. On the other hand, Ugoleto also wrote down the Greek word ἐπιμέλεια, which was already in the dictionary. Such an exceptional repetition suggests that the existing entry had simply escaped him. It is much easier to imagine that this oversight happened during a later insertion of a new item, when his attention was not primarily directed to the material of the dictionary, than while comparing it with that of the *Vocabularium*. The question cannot be solved at this point.

36. θησαυρίζω *colloco* (112ᵛ)
U: *custodio in prov<erbiis> sol<omonis>*
Two passages may be taken into account as a reference: θησαυρίζει τοῖς κατορθοῦσι σωτηρίαν *Pr. Sal.* 2.7.1, *custodiet rectorum salutem* (*Vulg.*), and θησαυρίζεται δὲ δικαίοις πλοῦτος ἀσεβῶν 13.22.2, *et custoditur iusto substantia peccatoris* (*Vulg.*).
The Greek verb, in contrast to the Latin one, is used in an uncommon, metaphorical way. It must have been this peculiarity that induced Ugoleto to make a note of it.

37. κλοιός κύφων (133ᵛ)
U: *torques interpretatur Hierony<mi> in prov<erbia> sal<omonis>*
The passage referred to in Jerome can be none other than his *Commentaria in Isaeam* 16.58.10: *Verbum Hebraicum MOTA quod in Jeremia torques ferrea interpretatur in praesenti capitulo bis legitur. ... Theodotio κλοιόν, id est, torquem <transtulit>*. Still, Ugoleto is right: Jerome, though commenting on Isaiah, explains a word that indeed occurs in the *Proverbia*. I imagine that it was while studying Jerome's discussion of the different possible renderings of the Hebrew word MOTA, among them the Greek κλοιός and the Latin *torques* (δέξῃ ... κλοιὸν χρύσεον *Prov. Sal.* 1.9.2), that Ugoleto put his note on paper. He does not seem to be aware of the fact that the *Vulgate* also translates it with the same *torques* (*addatur ... torques collo tuo* (*Vulg.*). It is also worth mentioning that Ugoleto copied the definition of the *Vocabularium* (*boia, vinculum*

colli, eculeus) to the right, and wrote his own addition to the left. Such an arrangement can be taken as an indication that they were written down at different times.

38. ταμίειον *promptuarium ubi reponuntur pecuniae domini* (232ᵛ)
U: (marked with a double point) *cellarium et horreum Hier<onymus> tract<ation>um*
The reference is to *neque cellaria neque horrea* (Hieronymus, *Tract.* (= *Breviarium*) 59.143.19), with which Jerome translates τὰ ταμίεια αὐτῶν πλήρη (*Ps.* 143.13). The note reveals an intimate familiarity with both the text of this particular psalm and its possible different translations in the *Vulgate* (*promptuaria eorum plena*) and by Jerome in his commentaries. Unfortunately, we are not in a position to ascertain that he had studied the entire book of *Psalms*. Still, it should be mentioned that a copy of Jerome's commentary on it was made into a magnificient Corvina illuminated by Attavante (Paris, BNL Cod. Lat. 16,839). Once again, Ugoleto copied the definition of the *Vocabularium* (*fiscus*) to the right, and wrote his own addition to the left.

The next and final four notes also register uncommon words or uncommon meanings of a current word:

39. θυμός *animus. ira. furor. desyderium* (114ᵛ)
(marked with a horizontal double dot) *erumna in ecc<lesias>te*
The passage referred to is ἀλγημάτων καὶ θυμοῦ περισπασμὸς αὐτοῦ (*Eccl.* 2.23.2), *cuncti dies eius doloribus et aerumnis pleni sunt* (*Vulg.*).

40. περιφορά *revolutio. circumlatio*
U: *error ec<c>l<esias>te*
In the entire *Septuaginta*, the word in the idiosyncratic sense of "error" is used only in the following three passages of *Eccl.*: τῷ γέλωτι εἶπα περιφοράν *Eccl.* 2.2.2, *risum reputavi errorem* (*Vulg.*);
καὶ ἐπέβλεψα ἐγὼ τοῦ ἰδεῖν σοφίαν καὶ περιφορὰν καὶ ἀφροσύνην (2.12.2), *transivi ad contemplandam sapientiam erroresque et stultitiam* (*Vulg*);
καὶ τοῦ γνῶναι ἀσεβοῦς ἀφροσύνην καὶ σκληρίαν καὶ περιφορὰν (7.26.1), *et ut cognoscerem impietatem stulti et errorem inprudentium* (*Vulg*).

41. προαίρεσις *propositum. voluntas* (202ʳ)
U: *afflictio in ecc<lesias>te*
The passage referred to is ὅτι τὰ πάντα ματαιότης καὶ προαίρεσις πνεύματος (*Eccl.* 2.17),
et cuncta vanitatem atque adflictionem spiritus (*Vulg.*), the only one in which it occurs in *Eccl.*

42. ὑστέρημα *posteratio* (248ʳ)
U: *stultus in ecc<lesias>te*
The passage referred to is καὶ ὑστέρημα οὐ δυνήσεται τοῦ ἀριθμηθῆναι (*Eccl.* 1.15.2),
stultorum infinitus est numerus (*Vulg.*) – once again, the only one in which it appears.

Table 3

	Page number in Crastonus' dictionary	Ugoleto's notes	Possible sources
54.	53ᵛ	γλώπτω *fullo, polio*	*Glossarium Graeco-latinum* (unidentified)
55.	70ᵛ	ἔγκολπος *insinitus*	

As for the handbooks, apart from Janus's *Vocabularium* it is likely that Ugoleto had access to at least one glossary with both unilingual and bilingual entries (or one separate unilingual lexicon and another bilingual glossary, see **Table 3**). There are two words: γλώπτω *fullo, polio* (53ᵛ) and ἔγκολπος *insinitus* (70ᵛ) that do

not appear in Janus' glossary either[32] yet were inserted by Ugoleto, presumably from somewhere else (or perhaps from memory). There is another entry which may be derived, either directly or indirectly, from a Greek lexicon. On the bottom of 92ʳ Ugoleto makes the following etymological remark: ἐπίσημος *p<ropri>e insignatum argentum* ἄσημον *non signatum* παράσημον *dubium adulteratum*. This note, which may have been prompted by the occurrence of these words in *Hec.* 379, has a parallel in Herodianus, *Partitiones* 177.14, where the same three terms are contrasted, though without explanation: Παρὰ τὸ σῆμα οἶον· ἄσημος· ἐπίσημος· παράσημος).

The identification of this glossary or glossaries as sources requires further investigation. A clue in this endeavour may be provided by the lists of the Greek codices preserved in the Topkapi Seray made by MORDTMANN and DETHIER[33] in the mid-nineteenth century. Among these are three glossaries that are still kept in Istanbul.

All the other comments made by Ugoleto himself and not copied from Janus' *Vocabularium* (eleven in number) concern Greek words that occur in <u>Latin</u> texts.[34]

43. ἀφελής *simplex. frugalis* (43ʳ)

U: ἀφελ[ι]ῶς *simp<lici>ter utitur h<o>c vo<cabu>lo Porphyrio p<rim>o carminum com<menta>rio cum Horat<ius> iecur pro corde posuerit* (**Fig. 9**).

The reference is plainly to *Iecur. Pro corde* ἀφελῶς. *Id est simpliciter* (Porphyrio, *Commentum in Horati Carmina* 1.13.4).

Ugoleto's translation clearly originates from the explanation *Id est simpliciter*, which was rejected from the text as a gloss by A. HOLDER in his edition.[35] Considering its accuracy and the different writing style, it seems more probable that Ugoleto quoted this not too memorable passage while he was holding Porphyrio's commentary in his hands.

44. λείψανον *reliquum* (143ᵛ)

U: (the entry in line 8 and the note on the top page are both marked with a circle and a triple point) *Ter<entius> in Eun<ucho:> Abi tu, cistellam, Pythias, domo affer* (*ecfer* cod.) *cum monumentis. Do-nat<us:> Monumenta pro quibus Graeci dicunt* λείψανα παργονα (super παργονα signo† scripto) (**Fig. 6**).

Ugoleto quotes Donatus' text as it stands in the editio princeps, with a minor change in the beginning: *Haec sunt quae Graeci dicunt* λείψανα παργονα (in Ter. Eun. 753).

[σπάργανα Vatic. 1673 ****** *est pgana* (*peregrina* T) TC ἐστπάργονα V κρεπΒνδια (Krepundia) P λείψανα παργονα editio princeps γνώρισματα καὶ σπάργανα Steph][36]

The quotation is lengthy and, as far as the Greek is concerned, precise. It should be noted that not only the same Greek gibberish (λείψανα παργονα), but also the lack of accent are reproduced accurately. At the same time, by adding a cross Ugoleto also indicates that what he transcribed was unintelligibile to him. This sign, along with the textual agreement, can be taken as decisive evidence that the annotation depends directly on the text of the editio princeps with Donatus' commentary, published by Conradus Sweynheym and Arnoldus Pannartz in Rome in 1472.[37]

---

[32] Neither can they be found in G. GOETZ (ed.), Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum, Vol. II. Leipzig 1888.

[33] J. MORDTMANN, Handschriften in Konstantinopel. *Philologus* 5 (1850) 758–761; J. MORDTMANN, Verzeichnis der Handschriften in der Bibliothek Sr. Maj. des Sultans. *Philologus* 9 (1854) 582–583, and [Anonymous Editorial Note], A konstantinápolyi Eszki Szerail könyvtárában őrzött nyugoti Codexek [Western codices kept in the Library of the Topkapi Seray]. *Magyar Könyvszemle* (1878) 92–98.

[34] It is worth mentioning that apart from ἀρύομαι, in two further cases a note originating from a Latin author was made by the glosser of Janus' Vocabularium. Both come from Nonius Marcellus: the comment on χωρίστρια refers to a fragment of Lucilius (*De proprietate Latini sermonis* 35.31), while the remark relating to ὑπωπιασμός contains a passage from Varro (171.3). See also note 7.

[35] Scholia antiqua in Q. Horatium Flaccum, vol. 1. Porphyrio (ed. A. HOLDER). Innsbruck 1894.

[36] P. WESSNER's apparatus criticus in his edition (Aeli Donati quod fertur Commentum Terenti. Leipzig 1902).

[37] The Corvinian Terence-codex (Budapest EK Cod. Lat. 31) does not contain any comment on the passage.

45. τρόφιμος *nutritus* (240ʳ)

U: *Don<atus> in Phor<mionem:>* Nam herilem filium *trophimon dicunt atque haud scio an Latini quoque alumnum dicere potuerint nisi hoc mallent.*

A word-by-word quotation from Donatus, *in Ter. Phorm.* 39. It is highly improbable that he quoted this passage and the commentary on it so accurately by heart.

46. γλυκύπικρος *dulcis amarus* (53ʳ)

U: *epith<eton> amoris in Orpheo*

This time it seems much more probable that Ugoleto recalled Ficino's 'quotation' of Orpheus (Orph. 361 fr. Kern = M. Ficino, *Commentarium in Convivium Platonis de amore* 2.8) than that he had direct access to the Orphic poem. It is important to bear in mind that Ficino is the only witness to this fragment, the authenticity of which I seriously doubt. It may have resulted from the mixing up of two passages by Ficino. Whereas the composite adjective γλυκύπικρος is applied to Eros by other poets (Sappho fr. 132.2 = Heph. *Ench.* 23.20, Poseidippos *AP* 5.134.4, 12.109.3), the two words γλυκύς and πικρός are used as separate adjectives of Physis (πικρὰ μὲν φαύλοισι, γλυκεῖα δὲ πειθομένοισι) in *Orph. hymn.* 10.15. In any case, since Ficino sent a copy of his commentary with a dedication to Janus Pannonius in 1469 (still extant and preserved in Vienna, ÖNB Cod. Lat. 2472), it seems a plausible hypothesis that Ugoleto came across this 'Orphic epitheton' in this particular manuscript, either before or after 1484.

47. after πάλιν (180ᵛ)

U: παλιμψέστον (sic!) *iterum rasa charta Cic<ero> et Cat<ullus> ho<c> voc<abul>o utuntur*

The references are to *quod in palimpsesto, laudo equidem parsimoniam* (Cicero, *Ad fam.* 7.18.2) and *ut fit in palimpsesto* (Catullus 22.5).

From the different, and this time darker, ink used by Ugoleto it is evident that this entry was written in the margin at a point in time different from that of the transcription, presumably while he was reading Cicero or Catull. And since both authors used the Greek word in a Latinized form, Ugoleto had to reconstruct the original word from the transliterations, a task he completed with a minor fault: he wrote an epsilon instead of an eta. As far as Catull's text is concerned, it is not without interest that only Franciscus Puteolanus' (Francesco da Pozzo) edition (published in Parma in 1473) gives the correct form of the word *palimpsesto*, whereas the other offer *palmisepto* (X and O) or *palipsesto* (Venetian first edition). Ugoleto either read Catull in the edition by Puteolanus (who was a professor in Parma – Ugoleto's native town – in the eighties and presumably a personal acquaintance of his), which contained a much improved text in comparison to the *editio princeps* published in the previous year, or he corrected the corrupted text on his own. Although the corruption does not seem to be so extensive that it could not have been cured by two capable Latinists, Ugoleto's casual and faulty way of quoting the Greek original makes it improbable that he also solved the textual riddle of *palmisepto* or *palipsesto.* It is therefore much more probable that he saw it in a copy of Puteolanus' edition, and it may be the case that it was this particular emendation that led him to make his remark in the margin.

48. περιοχή *munitio. complexio* (191ᵛ)

U: *argumentum ut apud Eumen<ium> pr<o restaurandis scholis>*

The reference is to *Ubi fortissimorum imperatorum pulcherrime res gestae per diversa regionum argumenta recolantur* (Eumenius, *Pro restaurandis scholis* 21) – 'Let the most noble accomplishments of the bravest Emperors be remembered here through representations of the separate regions'.[38]

---

[38] Translated by R.A.B. Mynors, in: In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: the Panegyrici Latini (ed. by C.E.V. Nixon and B.S. Rodgers). Berkeley, California 1994, 172.

This is a two-phased remark. Ugoleto first copied the Latin equivalent of περιοχή from the *Vocabularium*, then added (perhaps immediately, because there seems to be no difference in his handwriting) that the word was used by Eumenius. His remark is somewhat baffling. In the referred passage *argumentum* is used in a unique way, denoting 'cartographical representations' (see II. B in *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*). By contrast, περιοχή does not have this meaning. There are two possible ways of explaining Ugoleto's additional remark. It is conceivable that his reference applies only to the Latin word *argumentum*, and has nothing to do with the Greek word. But it may equally be the case that he was also thinking of a certain relation between the two words. Nowadays the general consensus is that περιοχή and *argumentum* overlap in their meaning: 'summary'. Ugoleto might have derived the sense 'cartographical representation' from this common meaning: an *argumentum* on a map is a 'diminished figure' of the actual geographical entities. Although the idea is not correct, it is still reasonable.

As for the availability of Eumenius' work, there is an extant codex containing it (a copy owned and annotated by Johannes Vitéz, now kept in Budapest EK Cod. Lat. 12) which is thought to have belonged to the royal library. It deserves noting, however, that the first printed edition of the *Panegyrici Latini*, in which Eumenius' oration was transmitted, was edited by the same Puteolanus in Milan in 1482. Ugeleto may have had access to the text through this edition as well.

49. σκοπός *propositum* (218ᵛ)
U: *scopus latine apud Suet\<onium\>*
The reference, being a hapax, can be none other than to *nonnumquam in pueri procul stantis praebentisque pro scopo dispansam dexterae manus palmam* (Suetonius, *De vita caesarum*, *Domitianus* 19.1).

The quotation is not without significance for establishing the Suetonius text. *Scopo* is Stephanus' conjecture for the codices' reading *scopulo*. Ugoleto either anticipated the great French humanist's still generally accepted correction (it is impossible to judge whether this was done instinctively or consciously), or had access to a now lost manuscript offering the correct *lectio*. Considering the fact that Ugoleto might have received a clue from the Italian 'scopo', just as he did from the Ciceronian locus, the first alternative seems to be more probable.

50. ἐπινίκιον *praemium. celebritas p. habita victoria quod et latine epinicion dicitur* (92ʳ)
U: *ap\<ud\> \<Suetonium?\> x*
The reference is in all likelihood to *laetum inter laetos cantaturum epinicia* Suet. *Nero* 43.2.13.

Apud definitely requires a name, which I suppose Ugoleto forgot to write down. Since Suetonius is the only classical author who uses the word *epinicion*, it seems likely that it was him who was on Ugoleto's mind. Two possible but unlikely alternatives might be ἐπινίκα *Macch.* 2.8.33 (= epinicia *Vulg.*) or ἐπινίκια *Esdr.* 3.5.4 (= epinicia *Vulg.*). The main problem with these passages is that they cannot be referred to by *apud*. Handwriting cannot help us to decide whether it was a primary 'instant' or a secondary 'reading' note.

51. below σαρκόω *incarno* (214ᵛ)
U: σάρον *quercus appellatur antiqua grecia Pli\<nius\>*
The reference is to *sinus Saronicus, olim querno nemore redimitus, unde nomen, ita Graecia antiqua appellante quercum* (Plinius, *Naturalis Historia* 4.18.5).

Ugoleto expressly refers to Pliny as his source, but apparently only summarizes what was stated by his Latin authority. Perhaps he did this not immediately after reading the text but by relying on his memory. It should also be stressed that the Greek word in the referred passage is not given by Pliny, which raises the question: how could Ugoleto have known it? Did he read it somewhere else or infer it from Pliny's information? By fortunate coincidence, we do know from Hesychius that there was indeed an archaic word formed from the same root, meaning 'pine' (ἐλάτη παλαιά). However, it looked somewhat different – namely σορωνίς or σαρωνίς. Ugoleto's curious σάρον should therefore be considered as mere guesswork, or was perhaps an unconscious invention he made due to a slip of memory, under the illusion that he had seen it in Pliny's text.

52. στορέννυμι *sterno* (223ʳ)

U: στορέα *Plin* xv.59

There is no doubt that Ugoleto refers here to *stramentis storeis paleisve substerni* (Plinius, *Naturalis Historia* 15.16.59).

Ugoleto's remark is exceptional for two reasons. Firstly, it is written in normal ink, so it seems to have been produced during the revision process. Secondly, the exact location of the the word is also given: Ugoleto either had a remarkable memory or checked the passage where the Latin word that came to his mind occured. It should be mentioned that in C. MAYHOFF's edition (Teubner 1967) *stramentis storeis,* the reading Ugoleto must have had before him, is rejected as the *veteres editors'* lectio.

53. beside ψίθυρος *loquax. stridulus* (262ʳ)

U: ψίαθος *teges* (~ *Vocab.* JP) *storea storeae voc<abu>lo usum Livius et Hirtius*

The two references are *storias autem ex funibus ancorariis ... fecerunt* (Hirtius (= Caesar), *Bellum civile* 2.9) and *harundine textis storeaque pars maxima tectis* (Livius, *Ab urbe condita* 30.3.9).

Ugoleto seems to have been particularly concerned about covers and straw mats, and registered two further occurences of the word *storea*. Two points should be noted. Firstly, the entry ψίαθος *teges* was copied from the *Vocabularium,* where the Greek word was written down incorrectly as ψήαθος. This time, therefore, it was Ugoleto who corrected the wrong form, either because he had discovered from its alphabetical position that instead of ψήαθος   only ψίαθος fitted in between ψήχω and ψιθυρίψω, or because he was (also) familiar with this rare word. If the latter case is true, he might have known the word most probably from Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* or a lexicon. Secondly, apart from being a syonym of *teges*, the Latin *storea* has nothing to do with the original Greek word ψίαθος. His comment, apparently written with the same pen, should be taken as a Latin philologist's association rather than as additional information from an editor of a bilingual dictionary.

Generally speaking, the notes with a reference to Latin authors are not alike in this respect. As mentioned earlier, what is important is their appearance and length. In the case of one-word remarks written in the same ink and style, one has the impression that whenever Ugoleto inserts a Latin equivalent or comments on its usage, he relies on his memory. He allows a few thoughts to enter his mind and writes them down *currente calamo*. On the other hand, when he quotes a long sentence (especially from a commentary, which he hardly could have known by heart), even his hand-writing is strikingly different. If he commits a mistake characteristic of a particular recension, it is much more probable that he held a book or a manuscript in his hands and transcribed particular passages from it (or in the reverse order, after coming across a Greek word that was not found in the dictionary, he added this new item to it). To the former category belong the brief comments on γλυκύπικρος, ἐπινίκιον, περιοχή, σάρον, στορέα, σκοπός, and ψίαθος   to the latter – those on ἀφελῶς, λείψανον, and τρόφιμος; παλιμψήστον is a special in-between case. Accordingly, we have sufficient reason to suppose that he did have, and actually used, a Terence-edition with Donatus' commentary, Horace's carmina with Porphyrio's commentary, and the Parma edition of Catullus' poems. We can assert with less surety that when quoting, he made use of manuscripts containing Cicero's letters, Suetonius', Caesar's and Livy's historical writings, Pliny's scholarly works, and Ficino's commentary on Plato's Symposion. Certainly he must have read all of them – there is no doubt about this, otherwise he could not have cited a single word from them. However, such spontaneous quotations of these works by Ugoleto can provide us only with slight or moderately strong evidence of their availability in Buda.

Table 4

	Entries in Crastonus' dictionary		Ugoleto's notes without any reference	Passages which are probably connected with Ugoleto's note
56.	ἀρραβών *pignus*	35ᵛ	*arra latine d<icitu>r*	(probably) *sed nunc 'arrabo' in sordidis verbis haberi coeptus ac multo videtur sordidius 'arra'* Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 17.2.21
57.	ἀρητήρ *sacerdos*	36ᵛ	ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρὰς	(likely) ἀρητῆρα *Iliad* 1.11
58.	(on the right margin standing by itself)	45ʳ	*canis scit si licet*? (or *lux*? badly legible) *ut diabolus*	
59.	γένος *genus*	52ʳ	*stirps suboles generatio germino* .nn (with two strokes above the letters as if denoting numerals)	*Eccl.* 1.4.1?
60.	γόος *luctus*	54ʳ	*Et* κωκυτός *qui cognata (?) qui l. medium est inter* . κ *et* . χ (I am not able to explain the abbreviations)	(presumably) ἥξει τι μέλος γοερὸν γοεραῖς (*Hec.* 84), 'a new strain of sorrow will be added to our woe'.
61.	beside δαρεικός *darius*	56ʳ	δαρόν *diu dicitur et* δηρόν	(presumably) μὴ κρύψῃς δαρόν (*Hec.* 183), longer.
62.	δίαυλος *cursus. certamen*	61ᵛ	*aestus actionis*	(certainly) πολλοῖς διαύλοις κυμάτων φορούμενος (*Hec.* 29), 'salt sea's surge'.
63.	δίφρος *sella curulis. Sedes*	64ᵛ	*atque il palco del carro*	a common word, but in the sense of 'seat' or 'box of a chariot' it is used almost exclusively by Homer, e.g. *Iliad* 3.262 (πὰρ δὲ οἱ Ἀντήνωρ περικαλλέα βήσετο δίφρον).
64.	ἐπίσημος *insignis insignitus sculptus*	92ʳ	(on page bottom) ἐπίσημος *p<ropri>e insignatum argentum* ἄσημον *non signatum* παράσημον *dubium adulteratum*	(probably) δεινὸς χαρακτὴρ κἀπίσημος ἐν βροτοῖς (*Hec.* 379), 'a wondrous mark, most clearly stamped'.
65.	θεόδμητος *a deo aedificatus*	111ʳ	*a* δομέω	(certainly) βωμῷ πρὸς θεοδμήτῳ πίτνει (*Hec.* 23), 'god-built'.
66.	beside ἰξύς *lumbus*	117ᵛ	ἰξίαι *varices*	(used by several medical authors, cf. also Latin medical terminology)
67.	κομίζω *capio* etc.	135ʳ	κομιστήρ *adductor, apportator*	(likely) ἡμᾶς δὲ πομποὺς καὶ κομιστῆρας κόρης τάσσουσιν εἶναι (*Hec.*222), 'they appoint me to take the maid and bring her there'.

Table 4

	Entries in Crastonus' dictionary		Ugoleto's notes without any reference	Passages which are probably connected with Ugoleto's note
68.	κυφών	140ᵛ	*columbar lat<ine>*	(likely) *nam in collumbari collus haud multo post erit*; Plautus, *Rudens* 887; (or, much less likely) *Plautus: 'non ego te novi, navalis scriba, columbar inpudens'*, Festus, *De significatione verborum* 169.7–11.
69.	beside κ	141ʳ	κύω κυέω *praegnans sum et osculor. Inde canis*	own remark?
70.	κώπη *ansa. remus. manubrium*	141ᵛ	*capulus*	used by several of dozens of authors, among them Festus *<Labeo ait cultrum> ... vincto ad ca<pulum argento auroque>* 348.6
71.	λῆμμα (sic!) βουλή φρόνημα	144ᵛ	*poetice*	widely used by dramatists and Ionic prosewriters such as Herodot
72.	λῆψις *captio*	144ᵛ	*perceptio*	too widely used to be identified
73.	λιάζω	144ᵛ	λιάζομαι *poetice fugio*	(certainly) σπουδῇ πρὸς σ' ἐλιάσθην (*Hec.* 98), 'I have hastened away'.
74.	λιγαίω *strideo*	144ᵛ	*poetice* τὸ ὑμνῶ	too widely used to be identified
75.	λοβός fibra. pars inferioris iecoris	145ᵛ	*siliqua (~ Voc. JP) loba lat<ine>*	too widely used to be identified
76.	beside λυκίη *pellis lupina*	147ʳ	λυκοφάντης *est genus virgulti seu fruticis*	(presumably) Plut. *Apophtheg. Lac.* 237 B8 (according to Sɪᴇᴠᴇᴋɪɴɢ's app. crit., this incorrect version of the word λυκοφάνος can only be found in mss Σg)
77.	beside ν (in the margin)	159ʳ	νάω *fluo inde* ναίς (litterae α littera η superscripta)	see νασμός
78.	νασμός *imber deluvium*	159ᵛ	νασμός *etiam sig<nifica>tur torrens et profluvium* νάω fluo *unde naiades*	(likely) δειρῆς νασμῷ μελαναυγεῖ (*Hec.* 153), 'blood spurting in deep dark jets'.
79.	νηίς *nais*	162ʳ	*sup<ra>* νασμός	see νασμός

Table 4

	Entries in Crastonus' dictionary		Ugoleto's notes without any reference	Passages which are probably connected with Ugoleto's note
80.	ξένιον *xenium*	164ᵛ	E (used as an identification mark accompanied by a double dot) *pe<regri>num lat<ine>*	too widely used to be identified
81.	ad πέρθω *populor*	190ʳ	πέρθω *destruo* πορθέω *depopulor*	too widely used to be identified
82.	πληγή plaga.		*in pl<ura>li verbera*	too widely used to be identified (Ugoleto's point is not quite clear: although the word is indeed used in the plural in the given sense, it can also have the same meaning in the singular.)
83.	beside πρακτικός	201ʳ	πρακτήρ *actor*. (~*Voc*. JP) tractator aptus ad agendum	own remark?
84.	προπετής *protervus*	204ᵛ	προπετής *protervus* (~*Voc*. JP) qua… (illegible) *prociduus: a* πίπτω *ut* πέτομαι	(presumably) τύμβῳ προπετῆ φοινισσομένην (*Hec.* 150), 'fall before the tomb', see also νασμός
85.	προσωπεῖον *persona. vultus.*	207ʳ	*oscilla e.*	(certainly) *et te, Bacche, uocant per carmina laeta, tibique oscilla ex alta suspendunt mollia pinu.* Vergilius, *Georgica* 2.389 and Servius' commentary *ad locum.*
86.	πτάω *volo*	208ᵛ	πτάπτω (*sic*! instead of ……) *terreo et exilire facio*	(probably) μ' ὥστ' ὄρνιν … ἐξέπταξας 'scaring' *Hec.* 179
87.	σκεπτόμαι *considero*	217ᵛ	σκοπτέον (*sic*! instead of ……) *ad animadvertendum* (?)	own remark?
88.	τητάω *privo*	236ᵛ	τητώμενος *orbatus*	(certainly) νύμφαι τ' ἀρίστων νυμφίων τητώμεναι bereft of *Hec.* 324, see also his notes on νύμφη and νυμφίος.
89.	φθίνω	251ʳ	φθῖμαι *ut* φθίαμαι *et pro syncopat.* φθίμενος *corrupte*	(presumably) φθιμένων (*Hec.* 137) 'the dead', see also his note on οἴχομαι
90.	χορηγός	259ᵛ	*Dux scenae cui licet ludos exhibere*	own definition? (which differs from what ancient lexica, such as *Et. Gud.* or *Suda,* offer)
91.	χραίνω *polluo*	260ᵛ	κραίνω *perficit*	the confusion of the two verbs is probably related to the following passage: λέχη δὲ τἀμὰ δοῦλος ὠνητὸς πόθεν χρανεῖ (*Hec.* 366), 'taint', cf. also his note on κραίνω

Turning to the notes without any reference (see **Table 4**), four items deserve more detailed examination.

56. ἀρραβών *pignus* (35ᵛ)
U: *arra latine d<icitu>r*
Although the word is used as a legal term in a couple of legal texts, it is perhaps a passage in Gellius' *Noctes Atticae* (17.2.21). Ugoleto may have taken his information from: *sed nunc 'arrabo' in sordidis verbis haberi coeptus ac multo videtur sordidius 'arra', quamquam arra quoque veteres saepe dixerint.*

68. κυφών (140ᵛ)
U: *columbar lat<ine>*
The Latin word *columbar* in this sense is used only twice in the entire extant corpus of classical literature, both times by Plautus. It occurs once in the *Rudens*: *nam in columbari collus haud multo post erit* (887), and once in a passage of a lost play, cited by Festus (*De significatione verborum* 169.7–11): *Plautus: 'non ego te novi , navalis scriba, columbar inpudens.' sive quod columbaria in nave appellantur ea, quibus remi eminent, sive quod columbariorum quaestus temerarius incertusque.* Both works were available in Buda and are still extant: Plautus' comedies in two copies (Budapest OSzK Clmae 241 and ÖNB Cod. Lat. 111), and Festus' dictionary in a manuscript now kept in the University Library Budapest (EK Cod. Lat. 22). Since, however, the extant Festus codex in Budapest is only an abridged version that does not contain this particular Plautus quotation,[39] it seems much more probable that Ugoleto made this note on the basis of the *Rudens*, either while reading it in Buda or after reading it somewhere else.

76. U: λυκοφάντης *est genus virgulti seu fruticis* (147ʳ, see **Fig. 10**)
This word is a hapax in a double sense. It is an incorrect version of the word λυκοφάνος (a hapax in itself) that can be found only in certain manuscripts (marked as g in SIEVEKING's edition)[40] of Plutarch's *Apophthegmata Laconica* (*Instituta*) 237 B8. Since it is written in a strikingly different handwriting, it should be considered as a reading note.

85. προσωπεῖον *persona vultus* (207ʳ)
U: *oscilla e.*
The word used by Virgil is virtually a hapax; all the other occurrences are dependent on this passage:
et te, Bacche, vocant per carmina laeta, tibique
oscilla ex alta suspendunt mollia pinu. (Georgica 2.389)
This seems to be a casual association. Ugoleto's knowledge of it may testify to his intimate familiarity with the *Georgica* (perhaps along with the commentaries by Servius), instead of serving as evidence for the availability of these books at the moment of their quoting. I am not able to decipher the abbreviation *e* after *oscilla.*

---

[39] The assumption of the availability of a complete copy of Festus' dictionary in Matthias' library rests on a famous letter written by Giangaleazzo Sforza to János Corvin in 1488, in which the former asks to make a copy of it. See F. PULSZKY, A Corvina maradványai [Remnants of the Corvinian Library]. *Magyar Könyvszemle* (1877) 149–150. Recently, G. KISS FARKAS suggested that in fact Giangaleazzo asked, in a polite way, for the return of the Festus codex which his grandfather had loaned to Matthias a few decades earlier. See Adalékok a mítoszok reneszánsz újjászületésének történetéhez [Notes on the History of Re-birth of Antique Myths in the Renaissance]. in: Tanulmányok a hetvenéves Ritoók Zsigmond tiszteletére [Festschrift für Zs. Ritoók]. Budapest 1999, 127–135.

[40] W. NACHSTÄDT – W. SIEVEKING, Plutarchi Moralia, Vol. II. Leipzig 1971, 205. The other readings are λυκοφανας Γ, λυκοφῶνας (aut –φῶνας) ΧΦΠ. SIEVEKING accepts GIERIG's emendation of λυκοφάνους, based on Hesychius' testimony.

Table 5

	Number of Ugoleto's references (unspecified but identifiable references are in parentheses)	Sources and works expressly or probably referred to	Shelfmark of books from the Royal Library
1.	12 (+ several dozens), all throughout the *Vocabularium*	Aristophanes, *Plutus*	ÖNB Phil. gr. 289
2.	18 (+ 13)	Euripides, *Hecuba*	
3.	3	Theocritus, *Idyllia*	
4.	(2)	*Glossarium Graeco-latinum*	Unknown (= Topkapi Sarayi Müzesi, Kütüphane, 23?)
5.	1	Horatius, *Carmina* + Porphyrio, *Commentum in Horati Carmina*	Milan BT Ms. 818
6.	16 (+ 1)	*Septuaginta* *Genesis*: 8, *Proverbia Salomonis*: 4, *Ecclesiasticus*: 4, *Psalmi*: (1)	Unknown
7.	2	Terentius, *Comoedia* + Donatus, *Commentaria in Terentii comoedias* (editio princeps)	Unknown
8.	(passim, over one thousand)	*Vocabularium* J. Pannonii	ÖNB Suppl. Gr. 45
9.	over 20 (through *Vocab*. JP)	Aristophanes, *Nubes*	Unknown
10.	1	Catullus, *Carmina*	*Editio Parmensis* unknown so far; or Wien, ÖNB, Cod. Lat. 224?
11.	(1)	*Plautus, Rudens*	Budapest OSzK Clmae 241; ÖNB Cod. Lat. 111
12.	(1)	*Lexicon* (monolingual)	Unknown (probably identical with the previous glossary)
13.	1	Hieronymus, *Commentaria in Isaeam*	Unknown
14.	1	Hieronymus, *Breviarium in Psalmos David*	Paris, BN Cod. Lat. 16, 839
15.	(1)	Plutarch, *Apophthegmata Laconica*	Unknown
16.	2 (+ 1 with Theocritus)	Plinius, *Naturalis Historia*	Vatican BAV Vat. Lat. 1951

Table 5

	Number of Ugoleto's refer-ences (unspecified but iden-tifiable references are in parentheses)	Sources and works expressly or probably referred to	Shelfmark of books from the Royal Library
17.	2	Suetonius, *Vitae Caesarum*	Venice BNSM Ms. 3585; Budapest EK Cod. Lat. 13; Roma, Vatican, Ottob. Lat. 1562
18.	1	Appianus, *De bellis civilibus et de bello celtico.* Tr. by Pietro C. Decembrio (ed. 1472), or	Unknown
		De civilibus Romanorum bellis. Tr. by Niccolò Fonzio (1460–1470), or	ÖNB Cod. Lat. 133; Firenze Laur., Plut. 68.19
		Appianus, *De bello Celtico* (Greek version)	Unknown
19.	1	Cicero, *Ad familiares*	Dresden SL Dc 115
20.	1	Eumenius, *Pro restaurandis scho-lis*	Budapest EK Cod. Lat. 12; or *editio princeps*?
21.	1	Hirtius, *Bellum civile*	Budapest EK Cod. Lat. 11
22.	3 (+ 1)	Homer, *Ilias*	Unknown or perhaps lost (cf. No. 334. CSAPODI 1973, from 'Ippolyto de Aragona's list')
23.	1	Livius, *Ab urbe condita*	New York PL Sp. C. 27; Verona BC Cod. Lat. CXXXVI. 124
24.	1	Orpheus 361 fr. Kern = Ficino, *Commentarium in Convivium Platonis de amore*	ÖNB Cod. Lat. 2472
25.	(1)	Vergilius, *Georgica*	ÖNB Cod. Lat. 92
		Vergilii *Opera* cum commentariis Servii, Donati, Landini	Innsbruck UB Inc. 109. G. 8
26.	6 (through *Voc*. JP)	Xenophon's *Anabasis*	Unknown

Finally, I would like to register our score numerically (**Table 5**). According to their degree of probability, Ugoleto's references and sources can be classified into three groups. The first group contains eight literary works in six manuscripts (No. 1–8); their availability can be considered as certain or almost certain. It is beyond all doubt that the royal librarian used Janus' *Vocabularium* as a handbook.[41] Ugoleto's remarks could not have found their way into the margin of the Crastonus dictionary had Janus' glossary not come into the king's possession.[42] There is a strong likelihood that he also used the manuscript Phil. gr. 289, and it is quite

---

[41] It shows up neither in CSAPODI's last canon of the authentic Corvininan codices compiled in 1992 (in contrast to his previous list made in 1973, Bibliotheca 456), nor in the most recent inventory put together by E. MADAS, who classifies it among the dubious ones, La Bibliotheca. Considering the heavy dependence of Ugoleto's marginal notes on it, their cautiousness appears to be un-warranted.

[42] For an analysis of how Janus himself used his vocabularium in his translations, see L. HORVÁTH, Eine vergessene (s. n. 7), 199–215.

evident that he regularly read certain books of the Septuaginta and had access to another glossary as well. The availability of the two remaining items may be considered as very probable.

As regards the nine referred works that belong to the second group (No. 9–17), it is plausible and reasonable to suppose – but not an inevitable conclusion – that they were actually consulted by Ugoleto and therefore available in the royal or his personal library[43] when he was making his marginal remarks.

The last group comprises nine works (No. 18–26) with which, judging from his notes, Ugoleto was quite familiar. These remarks, however, do not provide strong evidence that these works were physically in his hands in Buda. In these cases it is slightly more probable that Ugoleto spontaneously recalled the passage from memory than that he interpreted a word or an expression while reading a text. Taken by themselves, these references are therefore insufficient grounds for drawing conclusions about the stock of the royal library. Still, they should not be neglected either, especially if they are supported by other pieces of evidence or factors. Of these 26 items, 15 are known and more or less well-documented; 9 are new to scholarship.

EPILOGUE

According to the ex libris on 2[r], Ugoleto's dictionary came into the possession of a certain Bernardinus Magister Caroniacus; whether this happened directly or indirectly, we do not know. He is perhaps identical with Bernardino di Pietro da Carona, an architect and sculptor who was born in 1470, active between 1492 and 1513, and honoured with citizenship in Ascoli, where he took part in designing the Convent of Saint Augustine and the Church of Saint Francis. The town of Ascoli may provide a possible clue about how the dictionary might have returned to Italy. As is well known, Antonio Bonfini was also granted Ascolian citizenship some time between 1450 and 1455, while serving as *magister scholarum* in the town from the 1450s until 1478.[44] Furthermore, Bonfini had a son called Giacomo, who was born in Ascoli in the same year as Bernardinus.[45] And since Giacomo became a painter (an artistic career was not uncommon in the Bonfini family), it would perhaps not be unreasonable to speculate that the two young men of the same age and with kindred professions must have known each other. Antonio Bonfini and Ugoleto were certainly on good terms with each other, and if we accept the supposition that it was the Bonfinis – either the father or his son – through whom the dictionary went into the Ascolian master's possession, it is not difficult to add the missing element to this theory by supposing that Ugoleto, while leaving Buda for Italy, presented the dictionary to Antonio Bonfini, who had already had some experience in both teaching and translating Greek.

But let us end our speculation here. What remains certain is that Bernardino gave the book as a present (*liberali dono dedit*) to Magister Georgius Ratzerperger (or Ratzenberger) in 1509; since then it has never left Vienna. Thus, the dictionary changed hands at least twice during Ugoleto's lifetime. It must not have been long after his royal commission ended that his Greek studies faded into the background of his philological career.

---

[43] I do not examine the question of whether the books he used were in Matthias' or his own possession. In a final judgement concerning the stock of the royal library, however, this factor should not be ignored. DEL PRATO, Librai 1904, 36ff mentions Ugoleto's book inventory as containing 285 items, of which several works in both Greek and Latin may have been owned by his former master. The question of this list also requires further clarification.

[44] G. AMADIO, Antonio Bonfini. Montalto Marche 1930, 29, 70–73, and M. MARTELLINI, Antonio Bonfini, un umanista alla corte di Mattia Corvino. Viterbo 2007, 9, referring to the documents published by M. LEOPARDI, Annali di Recanati con le leggi e i costumi degli antichi recanatesi inoltre Memorie di Loreto opere del Conte Monaldo Leopardi. Varese, 1945 (= Annali di Recanati Loreto e Portorecanati, edited by F. FOSCHI. Recanati 1993, Vol. I. XCII in 1978, 447).

[45] G. AMADIO, Antonio Bonfini e S. Giacomo della Marca. Montalto Marche 1936, 14–15 and 39.