

Willibald Pirckheimer and His Greek Codices from Buda

New data on the manuscripts used for publishing some Greek Church Fathers (Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil the Great, and Nilus of Ancyra)

by András Németh

Willibald Pirckheimer (1470–1530), a distinguished humanist scholar from Nürnberg, is acknowledged, among his various honourable activities, as the editor and translator of a number of Greek authors who became available through his Latin and German translations for a large readership during the first decades of the sixteenth century.¹ His portrait made by Albrecht Dürer in 1524 expresses their close friendship and the artist's gratitude to his patron (see fig.#1). His extensive correspondence reflects an exceptional network which connected him with almost all prominent humanist scholars of his age from Austria, Bavaria, Switzerland, Silesia, and the Netherlands.² Relying on his broad horizon of education and knowledge, W. Pirckheimer possessed a good sense for collecting books and artefacts. After studying law in Italy (Padua and Pavia), he became one of the few collectors in the German speaking countries, who attempted to acquire a copy from each printed Greek edition produced in the printing shop of the famous Venetian printer, Aldus Manutius.³ The “ex-libris”, designed by his friend, Albrecht Dürer, that Pirckheimer pasted onto his printed volumes expressed both his devotion and philological sensitivity by the proverb *Initium sapientiae timor Domini* (“The fear of the Lord is the source of wisdom”) (Prov. 1:7) featuring in Hebrew, Greek and Latin above the coats of arms of W. Pirckheimer and his wife, Crescentia.⁴

Historians studying the provenance of the Arundel collection in British Library maintain the view that W. Pirckheimer managed to acquire a substantial part of the famous humanist library of the Hungarian King,

* This study is the part of the “Corvina Graeca” project (K 75693), supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund, OTKA.

¹ On Willibald Pirckheimer with detailed bibliography, see WILLEHAD PAUL ECKERT, CHRISTOPH VON IMHOF: *Willibald Pirckheimer Dürers Freund im Spiegel seines Lebens seiner Werke und seiner Umwelt*. Köln 1971. NIKLAS HOLZBERG: *Willibald Pirckheimer: Griechischer Humanismus in Deutschland*. München 1981.

² W. Pirckheimer's correspondence was published in seven volumes. *Willibald Pirckheimers Briefwechsel*, Hrsg. EMIL REICKE, ARNOLD REIMANN, HELGA SCHEIBLE, DIETER WUTTKE. München 1940–2009 (henceforth, REICKE = Bd 2, SCHEIBLE–WUTTKE = Bd 3, SCHEIBLE 2004 = Bd 6, SCHEIBLE 2009 = Bd 7).

³ JULIUS SCHÜCK: *Aldus Manutius und seine Zeitgenossen in Italien und Deutschland*, Berlin 1862, p. 57.

⁴ LES GRONBERG: The Cover. In: *The Journal of Library History* (University of Texas Press), 19 (1984), pp. 426–427.

Matthias Corvinus, called the *Corvina library*.⁵ The enigmatic story on Pirckheimer's acquisitions from the Corvina library seems to originate from the eighteenth century,⁶ which developed into a widespread view through a series of inexplicit references.⁷ Despite the common view disseminated in various handbooks, there is not a single manuscript in the Arundel collection that wears traces of an origin from the royal library of Buda.⁸

When W. Pirckheimer died, he did not leave a male heir. Thus, Pirckheimer's possessions went to the hands of his sister, Caritas Pirckheimer and his daughters. First, it was his daughter, Barbara, married to Hans Straub, who acquired Pirckheimer's goods. When she died without children in 1560, Pirckheimer's possessions passed on to

⁵ In 1739 William Maitland described the volumes that were donated to the Royal Society by Henry Arundel. In the description, Maitland mentioned that two thirds of the Corvina Library passed on to Vienna, the left third was acquired by Willibald Pirckheimer. WILLIAM MAITLAND: *The history of London: from its foundation by the Romans, to the present time*. London 1739. On his description, see LINDA LEVY PECK: *Uncovering the Arundel Library at the Royal Society: Changing Meanings of Science and the Fate of the Norfolk Donation*. In: *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London* 52 (1998), pp. 6–8, notes 17, 22, and 23.

⁶ The myth may have originated from Henry Howard himself who visited Hungary where he met Peter Lambeck who showed great interest in the Corvina volumes and had a great experience on this subject due to his activities in the Hofbibliothek in Vienna. On their meeting, see NOÉMI VISKOLCZ: *Peter Lambeck budai utazása a corvinákért 1666-ban* (Peter Lambeck's journey in Buda in quest for the Corvina Library). In: *MKsz* 125 (2009), pp. 159–161.

⁷ *Encyclopedia Britannica*, vol. 14, 1894, s.v. Libraries, p. 516. CHARLES ISAAC ELTON, MARY AUGUSTA ELTON: *The Great Book Collectors*. London 1893, p. 82 (reprint: *The Echo Library* 2009, pp. 44–45). In the context of Pirckheimer and the "Arundel collection", book historians always emphasised the Corvina library.

⁸ It is possible that volumes of Hungarian origin will be identified within the Arundel collection. However, the volumes themselves do not provide physical evidence: none of the volumes is bound in Corvina binding or is furnished with the coat of arms of Matthias Corvinus. The only basis of such a provenance can be Pirckheimer's correspondence or his editions and translations. Such volumes may occur among mss Arundel 516–549. DAVID PAISEY: *Searching for Pirckheimer's books in the remains of the Arundel Library at the Royal Society*. In: *Enea Silvio Piccolomini nördlich der Alpen: Akten des interdisziplinären Symposions vom 18. bis 19. November 2005 an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München*, Hrsg. FRANZ FUCHS, Wiesbaden 2007 (Pirckheimer Jahrbuch für Renaissance und Humanismusforschung 22), pp. 159–218 (on Pirckheimer's activity as a collector and his library, see pp. 161–175). He inherited a Greek manuscript from his father, Johann Pirckheimer who acquired it from Johann Tröster, a city counsellor in Nürnberg (Arundel 526). PAUL LEHMANN: *Dr. Johann Tröster ein humanistisch gesinnter Wohlträter bayerischer Büchersammlungen*. In: *Historisches Jahrbuch* 60 (1940), pp. 662–663. W. Pirckheimer acquired two other Greek manuscripts also in Nürnberg from Johannes Löffelholz (Arundel 517, 525). T. S. PATIE, SCOT MCKENDRICK: *Summary Catalogue of Greek manuscripts in the British Library*. London 1999, pp. 4–5, 8–9.

the hands of Willibald Imhoff, the son of her sister, Felicitas.⁹ By Willibald Imhoff's death in 1580, some items of the art collection were transported to the imperial court of Prague. However, the entire book collection remained in Nürnberg. From among this rich collection, 14 printed volumes (11 incunabula and 3 sixteenth-century prints) were sold to a Dutch antiquarian, Matthaëus van Overbeck in 1634.¹⁰ It was Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel (1585–1646) who purchased the majority of W. Pirckheimer's books in 1636 in Nürnberg.¹¹ His grandson, Henry Howard, Duke of Norfolk (1628–1684) enriched the collection inherited from his grandfather. After returning from his European tour, Henry Howard finally donated his entire book collection to the Royal Society in 1667.¹² On the one hand, the Royal Society sold the manuscripts in Western languages in 1830–32 and the Eastern manuscripts in 1835 to the British Library that created the "Arundel collection" from these acquisitions. Some of W. Pirckheimer's manuscripts, however, must have left the collection rather early and drifted through different channels of owners. On the other hand, Pirckheimer's printed books remained at the *Royal Society* that sold some of these volumes to Bernard Quaritch, antiquarian in London, in 1873; the majority of the rest was sold at Sotheby's in London in 1925.¹³

Despite the lack of manuscripts and printed volumes of Buda origin in the "Arundel collection", it stands clear that Pirckheimer was well informed on the Greek holdings of the royal library at Buda. Scholars studying the Corvina library used to mention W. Pirckheimer in the context of four Greek codices. (1) It was through the secretary Jacobus Banissius in 1514 that Emperor Maximilian I (1459–1519) send his request to W. Pirckheimer, asking him to translate the Greek *World Chronicle* by Joannes Monachus (Zonaras) in Latin, which was transported by Johannes Cuspinianus from Buda in 1513.¹⁴ First,

⁹ PATTIE–MCKENDRICK (see note 8), pp. 1–25. and PAISEY (ibid.), p. 163.

¹⁰ ERWIN ROSENTHAL: Dürers Buchmalereien für Pirckheimers Bibliothek. In: *Jahrbuch der Preussischen Kunstsammlungen* 49 (1928), pp. 2–3. EMIL

OFFENBACHER: La Bibliothèque de Wilibald Pirckheimer. In: *La Bibliofilia. Rivista de storia del libro e delle arti grafiche di bibliografia ed erudizione* 40 (1938), pp. 241–263.

¹¹ On Hans Heronymus Imhoff's 1636 sale to Thomas Howard, see ROSENTHAL, (see note 10), pp. 51–52.

¹² On the volumes donated by Henry Howard, see *Bibliotheca Norfolciana, sive, Catalogus libb. manuscriptorum & impressorum in omni arte & lingua quos illustriss princeps Henricus Dux Norfolciae, &c.; Regiae societati Londinens pro scientia naturali promovenda donavit*. London 1681.

¹³ On the volumes returned to Germany, see ROSENTHAL, (see note 10), p. 4. On a considerable part, which remained at Royal Society, London (Carlton House Terrace), see PAISEY, (see note 8), pp. 160, 185–218.

¹⁴ The Zonaras manuscript is now in Vienna, ÖNB, hist. gr. 16. See Emperor

Pirckheimer refused the imperial request, being obliged by his other duties.¹⁵ Later on, J. Cuspinianus ceased to deliver the valuable Zonaras manuscript.¹⁶ (2) The other volume Pirckheimer was well informed about was a valuable humanist copy of the *Geography* by Ptolemy, frequently referred to by humanist scholars visiting the Buda court since the end of the fifteenth century.¹⁷ The German humanist, Ulrich von Hutten provided valuable data on the variant readings of the Buda *Geography* manuscript in 1518 to Pirckheimer who was preparing a Ptolemy edition that time.¹⁸

This study strives to explore the other two manuscripts (3–4), which the scholars of the Corvina manuscripts regard as lost Corvinas. It is only their relationship with Pirckheimer that preserved data manifesting that these two manuscripts were transported from Buda.¹⁹ More importantly, these manuscripts proved influential on the thought of the early Reformation by providing material for printed editions. Thus, it

Formázott: Kiemelt

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG1]: nem érhető

Formázott: Kiemelt

Maximilian's letter to W. Pirckheimer through his secretary Jacobus Banissius (Gmuden, 20.08.1514) in REICKE, (see note 2), no. 328, pp. 454–456.

¹⁵ See the letter by Beatus Rhenanus to W. Pirckheimer after July 1515 in REICKE, (see note 1), no. 364, pp. 560–562.

¹⁶ In a letter (dated to 16.05.1515), W. Pirckheimer asked J. Cuspinianus to send him the Zonaras codex. *Johann Cuspinians Briefwechsel*, Hrsg. HANS ANKWICZ-KLEEHOVEN. München 1933, no. 31, pp. 67–68. In a letter (dated to 18.10.1518), J. Cuspinianus excused himself for not sending the manuscript. REICKE, (see note 2), no. 372, pp. 577–578.

¹⁷ ÖNB, hist. gr. 1. See its description in JULIUS HERMANN: *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der illuminierten Handschriften in Österreich. VI. Die Handschriften und Inkunabeln der italienischen Renaissance. 3. Mittelitalien: Toskana, Umbrien, Rom.* Leipzig 1932, no. 11, pp. 19–21, table IV; *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften. Bd. 1.*, Hrsg. HERBERT HUNGER, v. 1, p. 1. ERNST GAMILLSCHEG, BRIGITTE MERSICH: *Matthias Corvinus und die Bildung der Renaissance.* Wien 1994, Cat. no. 29, pp. 69–70. Conrad Celtis ordered a copy for himself. This direct copy, made in 1482 in Buda, is now in Oxfordban, Bodleian Library, Seld. 40 (B 45). On f. 1r, the scribe wrote: [[ὁ Ἰωαννης Ἀθεσινος δουλός ποιητής Κονραδα Κελτις Γερμανου γεγραφα ἐν ἐτει απβ']], *In Buda inferioris Pannoniae*. At the end of the copied text (f. 176v, lower margin), the scribe repeated the colophon of the Vienna Ptolemy (ÖNB, hist. gr. 1, f. 98v). H. O. COXE: *Bodleian Library, Quarto Catalogues, I. Greek manuscripts.* Oxford 1853, p. 603. On Celtis's correspondence on this copy of Ptolemy's *Geography*, see CSABA CSAPODI: *The Corvinian Library: History and Stock.* Budapest 1973, no. 554.

¹⁸ Pirckheimer's edition of the Latin translation of Ptolemy's *Geography* came to light in Straßburg in 1525 (VD16 P 5211). Ulrich von Hutten mentioned in his letter (Augsburg, 25.10.1518.) that Sigmund von Herberstein, an envoy from Vienna to Moscow, visited Buda and consulted a Greek Ptolemy manuscripts, which can be identified with the Vienna Ptolemy. SCHEIBLE–WUTTKE, (see note 2), No. 561, 400–425 (especially p. 420, lines 714–716).

¹⁹ CSAPODI, (see note 17), no. 306: the codex with more than 50 works by Gregory of Nazianzus; no. 107: the codex with the epistles by Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil the Great, both as lost Corvinas. PECK, (see note 5), p. 17 and VISKOLCZ, (see note 6), p. 161.

seems equally **constructive** for a deeper understanding of the role the Greek Church fathers played in the formation of King Matthias' library and for the identification of these manuscripts to analyse the various contexts which correlates these two codices with Pirckheimer. Concerning one of the two codices, I will provide **additional** arguments that it is to be identified with ms Oxford, Corpus Christi College (henceforth, CCC), 284. **This discovery**, **suggested** almost one hundred years ago, has remained unknown for the scholars of the Corvina Library. As a main contribution of this study, solid arguments will be provided, for the first time, that the other manuscript, which has been regarded as a "lost Corvina", is to be identified with Vienna, ÖNB, suppl. gr. 177. In order to **complement** each reference mentioning the origin from Buda royal library, I followed the **entire series of references** to the same manuscripts. Finally, the findings collected in such a way **were controlled** with the manuscripts and the various editions and Latin translations of the early sixteenth century. **This methodology**, not applied so far to study the Corvina library, brought about adequate results.

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG2]: kinek az érveit?

Megjegyzés [BG3]: az előző mondatból nem derül ki, mi ez a felfedezés

Formázott: Kiemelt

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG4]: nem világos, milyen hivatkozássorról van szó, és mi a „követés”

Megjegyzés [BG5]: miért váltasz át múlt időre?

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG6]: inkább konkrétan, de tömören kellene

A new authentic Corvina: the archetype of Pirckheimer's translation of the homilies by Gregory of Nazianzus

One of the data, mentioning the origin from Buda, was drawn from Pirckheimer's letter (15 May, 1529) written to Georg Spalatin (1484–1545)²⁰, a Lutheran theologian. In this letter, Pirckheimer referred to a Greek manuscript obtained from the booty of Hungary.²¹

“And I am sending you the homily by Gregory of Nazianzus «On the bishop's duty» [or.2] as well, in order to show it to you how I can heal gout. In addition, a Greek codex by the same Gregory came to my hands, from the booty of Hungary, which contains more than fifty works by this very Saint and learned man. If God permits, I will make more among these works speak in Latin although I am almost always sick.”

The codex mentioned here was registered on the list of the lost Corvina volumes; neither the scholars studying the Corvina library,²² nor those

²⁰ IRMGARD HÖSS: *Georg Spalatin, 1484–1545: ein Leben in der Zeit des Humanismus und der Reformation*. Weimar 1989.

²¹ SCHEIBLE 2009, (see note 2), no. 1227, pp. 210–212 (W. Pirckheimer's letter to Georg Spalatin: Nürnberg, 15.05.1529) (lines 34–40) *Interim mitto orationem Nazianzeni De officio episcopi* [oration 2, VD16 G 3073: Nürnberg, 1529], *ut videas, quemadmodum podagram meam consoler. Nactus praetera sum codicem graecum eiusdem Gregorii ex Ungariae spoliis ultra quinquaginta opuscula eiusdem sanctissimi et doctissimi viri continentem. Ex quibus, si deus voluerit, pleraque latine eloqui incipiam, licet assidue fere aegrotem.*

²² CSAPODI, (see note 17), nos. 306 and 307 as lost Corvinas.

constructing Pirckheimer's biography²³ managed to identify the manuscript.

Another letter by Pirckheimer reveals that it was Johannes Heß (1490–1547),²⁴ a humanist theologian in Wrocław who sent Pirckheimer the substantial Gregory codex between 4 April and 15 May, 1529 in order to help him complete the translations of some homilies by Gregory of Nazianzus he published during the previous years. The edition comprising Pirckheimer's new translations based on Heß's manuscript only came out in print in 1531 after Pirckheimer's death.²⁵

“I am sending to you, my great patron, a register, which seems an inventory of treasures rather than a register of the contents of a book. I wish you shared my pleasures and expressed the gratitude to God for that he secured these gifts from the middle of Greece into our hands and rescued this ancient Gregory of Nazianzus volume as if only for our eyes. The volume is not intact (it has lost some parchment leaves) (...) This huge volume is with me today (an exceptional gem of my magnificent library) (...) When observing the volume, some people insist that the book was copied in the times of its author [i. e. Gregory of Nazianzus].”

After receiving the codex, Pirckheimer seems to have kept it with him in Nürnberg at least until mid-October 1530.²⁶ However, it must have been returned to Heß as Melancton mentioned in his letter to Heß that Joachim Camerarius was using ~~the~~ Heß's volume in 1543.²⁷

²³ HOLZBERG (see note 1), 352–353, 358–359 (!), notes 405–406.

²⁴ JULIUS KÖSTLIN: Johann Heß, der Breslauer Reformator. In: *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Geschichte und Alterthum Schlesiens* 6 (1864), pp. 97–131, 181–265; ADOLF HENSCHEL: *Dr. Johannes Heß der Breslauer Reformator*. Halle 1901; GEORG KRETSCHMAR: Johann Heß. In: *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, vol. 9, pp. 7–8.

²⁵ SCHEIBLE 2009, (see note 2), No. 1219, 190–192 (Johannes Heß' letter to W. Pirckheimer: Wrocław, 04.04.1529) *S<alutem>. Indicem thesauri verius quam libri ideo ad te opt<imum> patronum misi, ut mecum gauderes graciasque ageres deo nostro, quod haec dona ex media Grecia nobis largitus est et Nazianzenum vetustiss<imum> servavit utcunque et nostris oculis, licet non omni ex parte integrum (desunt enim aliquae membranae). (...) Magnum hoc volumen vel hodie mecum est (est enim vel precipium ornamentum ornatissimae meae bibliothecae). (...) Sunt qui iurarent viso volumine vel ipsa etate auctoris librum scriptum.*

²⁶ SCHEIBLE 2009, (see note 2), no. 1324, pp. 419–420 (Johannes Heß's letter to Pirckheimer: Wrocław, 13.10.1530) (lines 4–11) *Tacui itaque ad aliquot menses, ut nihil litterarum ad tuam mag.<am> darem. Nunc autem nacta oportunitate rupto silencio cogor esse sollicitus pro meo Nazianzeno, quem indes expecto non solum grece sed et latine loquentem. Hanc enim spem meam nuper auxit epistola Uldarici Zasii doctissimi viri ad tuam mag.<am> scripta, in qua gracias agit pro translatione Nazianzeni.*

²⁷ On Johannes Heß's library, see PAUL LEHMANN: Aus der Bibliothek des Reformators Johannes Hessius. In: *Aus der Welt des Buches: Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag von Georg Leyh*. Leipzig 1950, pp. 100–124 (on the lost codex comprising the works by Gregory of Nazianzus, see p. 105). *Tuus codex Nazianzeni*

In the context of the codex sent to Pirckheimer, Heß mentioned that he obtained the outstanding manuscript from the middle of Greece (*ex media Grecia*). This statement seems to parallel another one Pirckheimer wrote when describing the provenance of the other manuscript credited with an origin from Buda (*qui e miseranda Graecia*),²⁸ and with the phrasing Johannes Alexander Brassicanus used in the impressive description of his astonishing encounter with the royal library at Buda court (*ex media Graecia*).²⁹ Based on the similarity of these phrases and their contexts, the term “*ex media Grecia*” does not seem to report on the provenance of the manuscripts in concern. It rather seems to have emphasised that these codices were not brand new Italian copies but old ones manufactured in the Greek speaking world, i.e., in the Byzantine Empire.³⁰ Thus, Heß’s statement on the “Greek origin” of the Gregory of Nazianzus manuscript does not necessarily exclude Pirckheimer’s implicit statement of the Hungarian provenance of the same manuscript. Keeping this interpretation in mind, the careful inspection of Pirckheimer’s extensive correspondence led to the successful identification of the codex with the manuscript in Vienna, ÖNB, suppl. gr. 177. In addition to Pirckheimer’s letters, material traces were discovered demonstrating that the codex was in fact in Buda in the 1480s. The method which has confirmed Pirckheimer’s information may also help complete the scarce evidence concerning some other manuscripts, which have proved insufficient to define their nature of their relationship with the Buda royal library.

Formázott: Kiemelt

Formázott: Kiemelt

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG7]: direct provenance? complete pr?

Megjegyzés [BG8]: a közvetítésre kellene a hangsúlyt tenni

Megjegyzés [BG9]: itt használj első személyt, és sztem a múlt idő sem jó itt

Megjegyzés [BG10]: ez így nem világos, mit jelent megmondani, mi lett az eredmény

The method for identification

est penes Camerarium, ut opinor. Nam Basileae habent similem, et ut audio, locupletiozem. Perspexi totum, et quamquam monumentum est dignum bibliothecis, propter controversiam de trinitate, tamen praeter eam causam, non multa continet διδασκαλικά. PH. MELANCHTON: *Epistolae*. In: *Corpus Reformatorum*, Hrsg. CAROLUS GOTTLIEB BRETSCHEIDER, vol. 5, no. 2655, coll. 56–57.

²⁸ In the preface to the translation of St Nilus’ sentences, Pirckheimer mentioned the provenance of the source manuscripts. As will be demonstrated below, this manuscript seems to have passed through Buda, Pirckheimer yet emphasises an origin from Greece. REICKE, (see note 2), no. 377, pp. 596–598 (W. Pirckheimer’s letter to Clara Pirckheimer: Nürnberg, 29.12.1515): *codicem pervetustum, qui e miseranda Graecia elapsus captivitatis iugum evaserat (...)*

²⁹ *Tantum erat hic antiquorum, graecorum simul & hebraicorum voluminum, quae Matthias ille rex capta iam Constantinopoli, eversisque multis amplissimis Graeciae urbibus, ex media Graecia inaestimandis sumptibus coemerat, ac tanquam mancipia ex barbarorum castatis atque compedibus receperat.* A surprisingly similar phrasing appear in the preface to the edition of Byalvianus by Alexander Brassicanus (Basle, 1530).

³⁰ This is why I cannot accept the views of basic handbooks, based on Brassicanus’ statement, which says that king Matthias acquired Greek manuscripts from Greece. If such acquisitions took place, Brassicanus could not know about them.

Pirckheimer's biographer, Holzberg already noticed that a list, comprising the contents of a Gregory of Nazianzus manuscript, is **invaluable** for the identification of the "lost Greek manuscript", frequently alluded to in Pirckheimer's correspondence. He regarded this list as **the one Heß referred to in his letter (4 April, 1529)**.³¹ However, Holzberg **could not link** an extant manuscript to the register of its contents.³² **The However, if we carefully** comparison of this list with the contents of **all the extant codices**³³ **carrying containing** the homilies by Gregory of Nazianzus **it will turn out that helped to spot** a tenth-century codex, now in Vienna (ÖNB, suppl. gr. 177) **which** embraces Gregory's more than fifty works **exactly** in the same sequence as summarised in the register preserved **among Pirckheimer's documents mentioned above**.³⁴ In addition to the content identical with the register, **a careful study of the various short works** preserved in ÖNB suppl. gr. 177 **has also verified** Holzberg's view that the exemplar behind the register, namely ms ÖNB, suppl. gr. 177 was used by Pirckheimer for his Latin translations from Gregory of Nazianzus (37 homilies, 4 epistles, and one poem).³⁵ These texts were published in Froben's printing shop in Basle in 1531, under the **auspices** of Pirckheimer's son-in-law, Hans Straub.³⁶

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG11]: nem világos, melyik szóhoz tartozik

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG12]: nem értem a megfogalmazást: lehet másképpen is érteni? Nem egyszerűen erről van szó: This list can be found in a letter sent by Hess to him?

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG13]: a múlt idő megint zavaró

Megjegyzés [BG14]: első blikkre, a táblázat szerint sok eltérés is van; nem kéne árnyaltabban fogalmazni?

Megjegyzés [BG15]: nem világos, milyen művekről van szó: „which are also contained in ÖNB s.gr. 177”?

Formázott: Kiemelt

Formázott: Kiemelt

³¹HOLZBERG (see note 1), p. 358. London, British Library, Arundel, 175. ff. 37r–38r (see its description in PAUL OSKAR KRISTELLER: *Iter Italicum*, vol. 4. London 1989, p. 128). SCHEIBLE 2009, (see note 1), no. 1219, pp. 190–192 (Johannes Heß' letter to Pirckheimer: Wrocław, 04.04.1529) *Indicem thesauri verius quam libri ideo ad te opt.<um> patronum misi*.

³²HOLZBERG, (see note 1), p. 91 did not find any notes by Pirckheimer in ms London, British Library, Arundel 549 (245 folia), which contains the homilies by Gregory of Nazianzus. This volume is half of the size compared to the volume with more than 50 works by Gregory. At the same time, the sequence of these works is different from that of the list preserved in Pirckheimer bequest. For these two reasons, ms Arundel 549 cannot be the manuscript Pirckheimer used.

³³I.R.H.T, Pinakes: <http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr>.

³⁴See the descriptions of the manuscript in HERBERT HUNGER, CHRISTIAN HANNICK: *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek*, vol. 4. *Supplementum Graecum*. Wien 1994, no. 177, pp. 304–310; MARIA LUISA AGATI: *La minuscula "bouletée"*. Città del Vaticano 1992, vol. 1, pp. 147–148, plate: vol. 2, p. 100; EDUARD GOLLOB: Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften in Österreich ausserhalb Wiens mit 11 Tafeln. In: *Sitzungsberichte Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philologisch Historische Klasse* 146 (1903), pp. 81–86; *Bibliothek Fürst Dietrichstein Schloss Nikolsburg, Versteigerung am 21. und 22. November 1933, Luzern*, Hrsg. H. GILHOFER & H. RANSCHBURG Aktiengesellschaft. 1933, no. 407, p. 82. On the position of the codex in the manuscript transmission, see XAVIER LEQUEUX (ed): *Gregorii Presbyteri Vita Sancti Gregorii Theologii*, (CCSG 41). Turnhout 2001, pp. 84–85; VÉRONIQUE SOMERS: *Histoire des collections complètes des Discours de Grégoire de Nazianzianze*. Louvain-la-Neuve 1997, pp. 77, 368–374 (it is marked as siglum X7, with a detailed description) p. 129.

³⁵HOLZBERG (see note 1), pp. 356–358.

³⁶VD16 G 3082.

The table #1 summarises how Pirckheimer's translation (Basle 1531) depended on ms ÖNB, suppl. gr. 177. Straub **only** omitted the homilies Pirckheimer had already translated and published (1521, 1528, and 1529)³⁷ or had been accessible in the translation by Petrus Mosellanus. In addition, Straub appended the homilies of Gregory, published in 1521 and 1528 in Pirckheimer's translation, subsequent to the new corpus of translations (pp. 1–126).³⁸ Moreover, Straub inserted Pirckheimer's translation of the *Life of Gregory of Nazianzus* by Gregorius Presbyter which was also based on the text **featuring** in ÖNB suppl. gr. 177 (ff. 512r–530r= pp. 1–23).³⁹ It is **only** Homily 1 that was omitted in a way which needs explanation because it was not accessible in earlier translations. It is the physical state of the Vienna codex, a phenomenon also hinted at by Heß in the passage quoted above, that provides an answer. The fact that the first two folios (ff. 5–6), carrying Homily 1, is mutilated clarifies why Pirckheimer could not translate this homily in Latin.

Megjegyzés [BG16]: én itt az elején pontokba szedném az eltéréseket (mert ahogy látom, elég sok van belőlük), és úgy magyaráznám meg őket

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG17]: és mi a helyzet a 8., 6., 23 etc helyével?

The sequence of the homilies in the first third of the 1531 edition **does not follow** that of the Vienna codex; some clusters still demonstrate their direct **interdependence**. The differences in terms of sequence of the homilies might be explained by the hypothesis that the manuscripts returned to Heß before Straub started to organise Pirckheimer's manuscripts (he may have neglected the register sent by Heß). In the two-thirds of the 1531 edition, however, the translated homilies are arranged in an identical sequence (pp. 163–304) with the Vienna codex (ff. 179r–497v); **only the homilies were omitted which had already been published**.⁴⁰ The content of the Vienna codex sheds light to such surprising phenomena that a poem, numbered as Homily xxix, and four letters (ep. 101, 102, 202, and 243), not labelled with numbers, were surprisingly inserted among the translated homilies.

Megjegyzés [BG18]: az előző egyértelmű fogalmazás után ez nagyon váratlan

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG19]: itt vm nem stimmel a mondattal, és emiatt a hipotézis sem világos

Megjegyzés [BG20]: nem erről van szó az előző bekezdésben? viszont vannak más eltérések is, ha jól látom

Megjegyzés [BG21R20]:

In addition to the identical sequences of the texts in the 1531 edition and the Vienna codex, the fact that Johannes Heß was the possessor of

³⁷ 1521 (VD16 G 3038): *or.* 38–41, 44, 45; 1528 (VD16 G 3081): *or.* 4–5; 1529 (VD16 G 3073): *or.* 2. On these editions, see HOLZBERG (see note 1), pp. 287–298, 343–351, 352–362.

³⁸ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or.* 27–41.

³⁹ SCHEIBLE 2009, (see note 2), no. 1288: Pirckheimer's letter (29.04.1530).

Pirckheimer send his translation of *the Life of Gregory* to G. Spalatin. HOLZBERG, (see note 1), pp. 355–362, cf. SCHEIBLE 2009, (see note 2), No. 1176.

⁴⁰ The foliation of ÖNB suppl. gr. 177 appears in brackets: VD16 G 3082, pp. 1–23 (ff. 512r–530r), pp. 23–25 (ff. 39v–41v), pp. 25–30 (ff. 82v–87v), pp. 30–33 (ff. 80r–82v), pp. 30–33 (ff. 80r–82v), pp. 33–35 (ff. 88r–90v), pp. 36–43 (ff. 123v–130v), pp. 43–56 (ff. 41v–53r), pp. 56–94 (ff. 138r–179r), pp. 94–119 (ff. 53v–79v), pp. 119–126 (ff. 356r–363r), pp. 126–157 (ff. 91r–123r), pp. 157–162 (ff. 131r–136v), pp. 163–304 (ff. 179r–500r).

the manuscript ÖNB suppl. gr. 177 also supports the identification. As discussed above, it was the same humanist who sent the codex to Pirckheimer. The centres of the upper and lower covers hold Johannes Heß's coat of arms (see fig.#2.). At the top of the upper cover, the date of binding (1528) appears with the inscription *G. NAZIANZENUS GRECE AN MDXXVIII*. ~~It appears from t~~These data ~~demonstrate~~ that the Vienna Gregory was bound in its present binding two years after the disastrous battle of Mohács and one year before Johannes Heß delivered the manuscript to Pirckheimer in the "restored form". **As an important detail**, it is in the **context** of the homily *On the bishop's office* that Pirckheimer mentioned the Hungarian provenance of the Gregory codex in a letter to his friend, Georg Spalatin **as a supplementary piece of information**. As will be demonstrated, this **translation also?** relied on a manuscript which Vincent Opsopoeus regarded as a former holding of the royal library of Buda. **In my view, nothing else but Pirckheimer's ~~notion-knowledge?~~ of the Hungarian provenance of the other manuscript can sufficiently explain why he ~~inserted-mentioned its~~the Hungarian provenance, being of secondary importance for theological discussions he focused on, in his letter to Georg Spalatin.**

Megjegyzés [BG22]: ez fontos érv, már korábban jó lenne előkészíteni, h a sorrendi egyezések mellett létezik ez a tulajdonosi kapcsolat is

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG23]: in connection with ?

Formázott: Kiemelt

Formázott: Kiemelt

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG24]: a levélben szerepel a praeterea szó, vagyis a homiliák egy másik kódexben voltak

Megjegyzés [BG25]: ez nem igazán megjegyző; Gergely személye sokkal kézenfekvőbb módon köti össze a két információt; magában a szövegben semmi nem sugallja azt, h a közös budai eredet miatt tér ráaz egyikről a másikra

Oxford, Corpus Christi College, Ms 284

In the Hagenau printing shop of Johannes Setzer,⁴¹ Vincent Opsopoeus published the first Greek edition of the letters by Cappadocian fathers, Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus in 1528. As a preface to the edition, a letter was inserted which Opsopoeus wrote to W. Pirckheimer in April 1528. In this letter, Opsopoeus described the provenance of the exemplar he used for the edition and clearly stated that it was a two-hundred-years-old codex, originating from the royal library of Buda.⁴²

"To Thou, most glorious lord, Bilibald Pirckheimer, patrician in Nürnberg, Vincent Opsopoeus [is sending his] greetings. These days Georg Leutius transferred to study the codex comprising the

⁴¹ K. STEIFF: Johannes Setzer (Secerius), der gelehrte Buchdrucker in Hagenau. In: *ZfBW* 9 (1892), pp. 297–317.

⁴² The letter by Vintentius Opsopoeus to W. Pirckheimer is attached as a preface to this edition: *Basilii Magni et Gregorii Nazianzeni, Theologorum, Epistolae Graecae, nunquam antea editae*. Hagenau: Johann Setzer, 1528. (VD16 B 688). See the critical edition of the letter, in SCHEIBLE 2009, (see note 2), no. 1159, 36–43. The cited passage is as follows: *Clarissimo viro domino Bilibalde Pырckheimero, Patritie Norimbergensi, Vintentius Opsopoeus Sal<utem>. Cum nuper inspiciendum mihi obtulisset ex bibliotheca tua, Bilibalde clariss<ime>, Georgius Leutius codicem epistolarum Basilii et Gregorii, quem cum ob litterarum characteras, tum ob vetustatem vehemeter videre cupiebam – est enim, ut mihi coniecturam facienti visum est, ante ducentos aut amplius annos descriptus inque regis Ungariae bibliothecam repositus – in eo ergo cum avidissime versarer, coepi epistolas quoque aliquot excutere, (...)*

letters by Basil and Gregory to me from your library, most glorious Pirckheimer. I was excited to see it as much for the characters of the letters as for the old age of the volume,— because it was copied, as far as I can judge, at least two hundred years ago or even earlier, and was kept in the library of the Hungarian king—, and when I got avidly engaged in reading the volume, I started to copy a few letters (...).”

As the scholars studying the Corvina library could not reach beyond Opsopoeus’ statement on the Hungarian provenance of the exemplar used for the edition, Csaba Csapodi registered the volume among the lost Corvinas in his 1973 repertory under the names of “Basilius Magnus” and “Gregorius Nazianzenus”.⁴³ This opinion persists even today in the scholarly literature on the Corvina library.⁴⁴

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG26]: itt nem a nézet változatlanágát kéne hangsúlyozni, hanem azt, h az azonosítás dolgában nem történt előrelépés

However, scholars studying the textual tradition of the two Church fathers already suggested in the 1910s that the codex mentioned in Opsopoeus’ letter is to be identified with the fourteenth-century manuscript kept in Oxford, Corpus Christi College, ms 284.⁴⁵ A number of arguments such as the sequence of the letters, the age of the manuscript as well as the variant readings lead to the conclusion that among the extant manuscripts of letters of Basil and Gregory it is only ms 284 in Oxford, CCC that meets the criteria defined by Opsopoeus’ description.⁴⁶ In addition to the letters of the two Church fathers, some other texts copied in ms Oxford, CCC, 284 also demonstrate its

Formázott: Kiemelt

⁴³ CSAPODI, (see note 17), nos. 107 and 307. On a possible identification of ms Munich, BSB cod. gr. 497, see HENRY SIMONSFELD: Einige kunst- und literaturgeschichtliche Funde. In: *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-philologischen und der historischen Classe der k. b. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, Jg. 1902, p. 550. WEINBERGER refused Simonfeld’s suggestion based on the fact that cod. gr. 497 was purchased by the city council of Augsburg in 1545 from Antonius Eparchus in Venice. WILHELM WEINBERGER: Beiträge zur Handschriftenkunde. I. (Die Bibliotheca Corvina). In: *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien Philosophisch-Historische Klasse* 159,6 (1908), 41.

⁴⁴ ISTVÁN MONOK: La Bibliotheca Corviniana et les imprimés. In: *Mathias Corvin, les bibliothèques princières et la genèse de l’État moderne*, ed. JEAN-FRANÇOIS MAILLARD, ISTVÁN MONOK, DONATELLA NEBBIAI. Budapest 2009, p. 170.

⁴⁵ See its more detailed description – with a focus on the decoration – in IRMGARD HUTTER: *Corpus der byzantinischen Miniaturhandschriften*, vol. 5. 1. *Oxford College Libraries*. Stuttgart 1997, no. 9, pp. 20–22.

⁴⁶ GUSTAV PRZYCHOCKI: De Gregorii Nazianzeni epistularum codicibus Britannicis, qui Londinii, Oxoniae, Cantabrigiae asservantur. In: *Rozprawy Akademii Umiejętności Wydział Filologiczny* 3,5 (1913), p. 240; STIG Y. RUDBERG: Études sur la tradition manuscrite de Saint Basil. Uppsala 1953, pp. 48–52. GALLAY concluded that a manuscript close to the Oxford one was the basis of the edition. PAUL GALLAY: *Les manuscrits des lettres de Saint Grégoire de Nazianze*. Paris 1957, pp. 105–109 (especially p. 106), pp. 50–51; see also PAUL JONATHAN FEDWICK: *Bibliotheca Basiliana Universalis: A Study of the manuscript tradition of the Works of Basil of Caesarea*. Turnhout 1993, pp. 34–35 (siglum Eb5), pp. 203–207.

possession by Pirckheimer.

In the manuscript, however, there **is not any evidence left for its history before** the turn of the eighteenth century when Christopher Wase donated it to the Corpus Christi College.⁴⁷ Wase enrolled in the college in 1677 and became a *scholar* in 1690. His father, also named as Christopher Wase (1625?–1690) was a famous classical scholar and credited with English translations of several authors such as Sophocles' *Electra* and Phaedrus' *Fables*). He was the *architypographus* of Oxford University Press for some time and also bequeathed manuscripts to Corpus Christi College. Wase may have acquired the volume in England as Thomas Howard, as shown above, purchased Pirckheimer's manuscripts and brought to England in 1636. Shortly after Henry Howard donated his books to the Royal Society, Oxford University initiated negotiations with the earl to consent with the exchange of some manuscripts donated to the Royal Society.⁴⁸ Thus, it could easily be in the 1670s or '80s, when negotiations took place with Oxford University, that the elder Wase obtained this manuscript with an origin from Pirckheimer's library.

Formázott: Kiemelt

Quite recently, Carmelo Crimi **demonstrated** with strong evidence that Opsopoeus referred to ms Oxford, CCC, 284. Despite his convincing arguments, however, finally Crimi refuted the hypothesis that the codex originates from the royal library at Buda because the codex does not **display the criteria** distinctive of the Corvina codices: the coat of arms of King Matthias Corvinus on the title page and any kind of the Corvina bindings.⁴⁹ **In order to demonstrate the provenance from Buda,** Crimi emphasised that the sequence of the letters of the two Church fathers in ms 284 is basically identical with that of the *editio princeps* by Opsopoeus. In addition, Crimi used a passage in Pirckheimer's early biography by Konrad Rittershausen⁵⁰ as a further argument. **This**

Megjegyzés [BG27]: másként kéne fogalmazni, mert az azonosítást már mások bizonyították előtte

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG28]: 1. Crimi mégis a budai eredetet vallja? 2. ezt az érvet használta már Hutter is a 284-as kódex és az ed. pr. azonosítására

⁴⁷ I owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Julian Reid, archivist of Corpus Christi College for assisting me. It was Christopher Wase (†1711) who donated the volume to Corpus Christi College (see f. Ir: *ex dono Christophori Wase*). THOMAS FOWLER: *The History of Corpus Christi College with Lists of Its Members*. Oxford 1893, pp. 401–402.

⁴⁸ PAISEY (see note 8), pp. 173–174.

⁴⁹ CARMELO CRIMI: «Editiones principes» dell'Epistolario di Basilio di Cesarea. In: *«Editiones principes» delle opere dei padri greci e latini, Atti del Convegno di studi della Società Internazionale per lo Studio del Medioevo Latino (SISMEL), Certosa del Galluzzo Firenze, 24–25 ottobre 2003*, ed. MARIAROSA CORTESI. Florence 2006, pp. 313–354 (347).

⁵⁰ *Sibi comparavit ex graecis [auctoribus] Epistolas sanctorum Patrum atque episcoporum, Basilii Magni, et Gregorii Nazianzeni, quibuscum etiam Nili capita gnostica: Item Iohannis Damasceni quaedam, ex Maximi Confessoris: Quae omnia ante aliquot centenos annos in ipsa Graecia scripta sunt, nec unquam viderant lucem, quam ab ipso fuissent edita.* KONRAD RITTERSHAUSEN, Goldast MELCHIOR, V. *Illvstris Bilibaldi Pirckheimeri... Opera Politica, Historica, Philologica Et Epistolica; Opera*

section provides a list of Pirckheimer's translations: sentences by St Nilus of Ancyra (fifth–sixth centuries), extracts from St John Damascene (seventh–eighth c.), and a treatise by St Maximus (sixth–seventh c.).

Nevertheless, the statement by Rittershausen can be understood in a different way. I do not think that Pirckheimer's biographer had any information of the exemplars Pirckheimer used for his translations. This sentence seems to have been compiled exclusively based on the editions easily accessible for the biographer. Thus, Rittershausen's statement of Pirckheimer's translations cannot be used as a proof of the hypothesis suggested by Holzberg and accepted by Crimi that all derive from a single manuscript. For the identification of the exemplars used by Pirckheimer, the letters and St Nilus' sentences seem to provide solid grounds by the sequence of the short literary pieces that were arranged in a distinctive way in both cases while the distortion generated by the translation makes this task rather difficult in longer texts such as the treatise by St Maximus.

Pirckheimer translated the sentences by St Nilus both in Latin and German in December 1515.⁵¹ As a clear sign of its popularity, Pirckheimer found four different publishers who printed his translation in the subsequent year (1516). (1) The edition, dedicated to Georg Spalatin, was published in Johann Rhau-Grunenberg's printing shop in Wittenberg.⁵² (2) Pirckheimer's Latin translation of St Nilus's sentences was also published in the printing shop of Friedrich Peypus in Nürnberg and (3) in a third edition in that of Matthias Schürer in Straßburg (VD16 N 1759 and 1761) and in a fourth one (4) by Lotter Melchior in Leipzig (VD 16 N 1758). In addition to St Nilus' sentences, the latter three editions contain Pirckheimer's Latin translation of a set of short extracts from the homilies by St John Damascene (VD16 J 525–529). Later, Pirckheimer translated both texts in German as well,⁵³ and his Latin translation came out in a number of

Megjegyzés [BG29]: ebből nem derül ki, mi az az érv, amit erre a listára alapoz Crimi + még arról sem volt szó, az oxfordi kódexben ezek a művek is szerepelnek, emiatt nem látni, hogy tartozik ide ez a levél

Megjegyzés [BG30]: előbb Crimi értelmezését ki kellene fejteni

Megjegyzés [BG31]: róla idáig nem volt szó!

Megjegyzés [BG32]: ez lenne a further argument?

Megjegyzés [BG33]: ez nagyon bonyolult mondat önmagában is, + a második felében olyan dolgokra hivatkozik, amikről még nem esett szó

politica historica, philologica et epistolica, Frankfurt, 1610, 49–50. Cited by ECKERT – VON IMHOF (see note 1), p. 289; HOLZBERG (see note 1), pp. 90, 223 and 226–230, CRIMI (see note 49), p. 343, n. 105. HOLZBERG (see note 1, p. 227, n. 313) did not manage to identify the manuscript used for the edition.

⁵¹ On this translation (CPG 6583) and its significance, see PAOLO BETTILOLO: *Le Sententiae di Nilo: patristica ed umanesimo nel XVI secolo*. In: *Cristianesimo nella Storia, Ricerche Storiche Esecutive Teologiche Bologna* 1,1 (1980), pp. 165–168.

⁵² VD16 N 1762: the dedication is dated on 11.03.1516. On this edition, see CRIMI (see note 49), p. 344, n. 106.

⁵³ HOLZBERG, (see note 1), pp. 232–236. London, Arundel 503, ff. 1r–17r (sentences by St Nilus), ff. 17v–20r (extracts from St John Damascene), described by KRISTELLER (see note 31) p. 131. Pirckheimer's German translation of St John Damascene has not yet been edited in print. The German translation of the sentences

subsequent editions.⁵⁴ As a preface to the translation, the expanded edition is preceded by a letter W. Pirckheimer wrote to his sister. Both prefaces, one inserted in front of the shorter edition, which is dedicated to Georg Spalatin, the other in front of the expanded editions, narrated the acquisition of the exemplar used to the editions in the same phrases as cited here:⁵⁵

“Jacobus Banissius, the counsellor and secretary of his imperial majesty, dean of Trident, send us through our common friend, the imperial historian and prominent mathematician Johannes Stabius, a rather old codex which escaped the yoke of slavery by being rescued from a miserable Greece. I was running over it and reading bits and pieces, when I suddenly arrived at the wise sentences by Father Nilus, saint bishop and Christ’s confessor.”

The sentences by St Nilus (ff. 66v–78v) were copied subsequent to an extract from St John Damascene (ff. 56r–66v) in ms Oxford, CCC, 284. The careful comparison of the Greek text with Latin translation of the sentences by St Nilus has decisively confirmed the hypothesis that Pirckheimer used ms 284, CCC. Except for three sentences among the more than two hundred, Pirckheimer’s translation faithfully follows the sequence of the sentences as transmitted in ms Oxford, CCC, 284 (see tab.#2).⁵⁶ All of the three cases can be regarded as Pirckheimer’s slips of attention; he recognised one of them as his correction manifests.⁵⁷ However, the extracts from the homilies of St John Damascene derive

Megjegyzés [BG34]: ezt az összehasonlítást ki végezte el? oda kellene írni

Megjegyzés [BG35]: ez hol van? nem találtam

by St Nilus was published in Nürnberg in 1536 (VD 16 ZV 25849).

⁵⁴ HOLZBERG, (see note 1), p. 232. Pirckheimer sent the small volume to many of his friends. REICKE (see note 2), no. 377, pp. 596–598 and SCHEIBLE– WUTTKE (ibid.), no. 380, pp. 2–3. Both translations were published in a number of later editions: 1517, Leipzig: VD 16 ZV 11740; 1517, Basle: VD 16 ZV 11741 (without St John Damascene); 1518, Basle: VD 16 ZV 11742; 1519, Straßburg: VD 16 ZV 11743; 1520, Cologne: VD 16 ZV 11739; 1540, Augsburg: VD 16 N 1763; 1542, Augsburg: VD 16 N 1764; 1556, Ingolstadt: VD 16 N 1765; and 1568, Ingolstadt: VD 16 N 1766.

⁵⁵ REICKE (see note 2), no. 377, pp. 596–598 (W. Pirckheimer’s letter to Clara Pirckheimemek, Nürnberg, 29.12.1515): *Jacobus Banissius, Caesareae maiestatis a consiliis et secretis, decanus Tridentinus, codicem pervetustum, qui e miseranda Graecia elapsus captivitatis iugum evaserat, per communem amicum Joannem Stabium, imperialem historiographum et mathematicum insignem, ad me misisset egoque levi transcurso illum delibassem, sorte quadam in beatissimi patris Nili, episcopi et martiris Christi, sententiosa incidi dicta*. This phrase also features in the preface to the edition by Johann Rhau-Grunenberg, which was dedicated to Georg Spalatin: VD16 N 1762, f. A ii^r, see CRIMI (see note 49), p. 344, n. 107.

⁵⁶ See also the table in HOLZBERG, (see note 1), p. 228, who did not know the Oxford manuscript.

⁵⁷ Pirckheimer omitted three sentences: Oxford, Corpus Christi College, Ms 284, f. 76r, lines 1–4; 76v, lines 16–19 (the latter one is inserted on p. B2r lines 13–15); f. 78v, lines 3–5. There is no evidence for such sentences that Pirckheimer translated and do not feature in the Oxford codex.

from a selection different from the one in ms Oxford, CCC, 284.⁵⁸ Thus, in this particular case the exemplar used by Pirckheimer must have been another manuscript contrary to Crimi's and Holzberg's views.

Formázott: Kiemelt

In the preface preceding the expanded edition (a letter to Clara Pirckheimer), W. Pirckheimer did not mention the extract from St John Damascene. Among the manuscripts that can be traced as a part of Pirckheimer's bequest, the identical selection of extracts from St John Damascene does appear but in a single manuscript: London, BL, Arundel 528, ff. 107v–110v. This manuscript once formed a substantial volume together with Arundel 527 and seems to have been transferred from Joannes Gremper's (†1519) possession (cf. f. 193: *Jo. Gremperij Memor Sis*) to W. Pirckheimer. As far as the date of Pirckheimer's edition allows a precision, he translated it before the end of the year 1515.⁵⁹ This volume could easily have been acquired in Hungary, perhaps in Buda by Gremper who visited the court of Buda in 1514 and acquired a number of volumes from the royal library.⁶⁰ It could be through Jacobus Banissius and Johannes Stabius that the exemplar was transferred to Pirckheimer because in January 1516 Pirckheimer expresses his gratitude for more than one volumes and stated that he had translated more works by referring to the name of Banissius as it stands in the preface to the edition of the sentences by St Nilus, which

Megjegyzés [BG36]: ez most már egy harmadik görög kódex lenne? és mi a kapcsolat e között és az oxfordi kódex Damaskénos-része között?

⁵⁸ Subsequent to the Nilus sentences, there is a short section excerpted from St John Damascene: PG 95, 83B–86C: (*Octo sunt Passiones...*), CPG 8110 and 3975. MIGNE published this redaction from Pirckheimer's translation without the Greek original. The CCC, ms 284 contains a redaction CPG 8111 (PG 95, 85–96) different from Pirckheimer's translation, which refutes the hypothesis that Konrad Rittershausen referred to a single manuscript.

⁵⁹ Most of ms Arundel 528 was copied by Makarios, bishop of Halicz, metropolitan of Serbia in the third quarter of the fifteenth century. PATTIE–MCKENDRICK (see note 8), pp. 9–12. HANS ANKWICZ-KLEEHOVEN: Magister Johannes Gremper aus Rheinfeld, ein Wiener Humanist und Bibliophile des XVI. Jahrhunderts. In: *ZfBw* 30 (1913), pp. 212–213. RGK I 244. Makarios who was contemporary with king Matthias possessed the manuscript. PLP 7, no. 16192.

⁶⁰ Vienna, ÖNB Cod. Lat. 138 (Marcellinus comes Illyricus, Gennadius Massiliensis, Isidorus Hispalensis, Ildefonsus Toletanus), 218 (*In perversionem problematum Aristotelis*), 977 (*Dialogus S. Iohannis Chrysostomi et [Pseudo-] Sancti Basilii...*) and Budapest, OSZK, Cod. Lat. 417 (Philostratus), CSAPODI (see note 17), nos. 418, 669, 170, 478, and 503. In addition to these volumes, Gremper's interest in theology is also manifested by his annotations in Bessarion's three theological works in Latin, later rebound in a Corvina binding in Buda (today Budapest, OSZK, Cod. Lat. 438) and, presumably in Vienna, copied the entire manuscript comprising the Latin translation of two works by Basil the Great (*De divinitate filii et spiritus sancti* and *Adversus Eunomium*) from a Corvina manuscript today kept in Budapest (OSZK, Cod. Lat. 415). His apograph is kept in Wolfenbüttel (4.7. Aug. 4^o). ANKWICZ-KLEEHOVEN (see note 59), pp. 213–215.

was expanded with the excerpts from St John Damascene.⁶¹

The 59 epistles by Basil the Great and the 80 ones by Gregory of Nazianzus are mixed up in a unique way in ms 284 CCC, Oxford. Table #3 shows the sequence of the epistles in ms Oxford, CCC, 284 (columns 5–6) with references to its foliation (column 1), to the Greek numbers labelling the epistles in the manuscript (column 2), the page numbers in Opsopoeus' edition (Hagenau, 1528) (column 3), and the pagination of the edition by Erasmus of Rotterdam (Basle, 1532: column 4).⁶² The sequence of the epistles in ms Oxford, CCC, 284 almost exactly follows the order found in the editions by Opsopoeus and Erasmus. There are only minor differences.

On the one hand, Opsopoeus mistakenly omitted Epistle 8 by Basil. In addition, preceding Epistle 61 by Gregory, he jumped exactly ten leaves (ff. 276r–286r) with sixteen epistles on them; subsequent to Gregory, Epistle 61, Opsopoeus also ~~ceased~~ failed to copy the last seven epistles in the codex (ff. 287v–292v). At the end of his edition, Opsopoeus published Basil, Epistle 8 that seems to have been omitted before (ff. Y₄r–Z₇v) compared to ms Oxford, CCC, 284. From the edition by Aldus Manutius (Venice, 1499), Opsopoeus inserted only one epistle by Basil (no. 151). However, Opsopoeus did not omit the four epistles (nos. 2, 19, 14, and 20) that Aldus Manutius published in 1499,⁶³ and collated them with ms Oxford, CCC, 284.⁶⁴ Compared to

Megjegyzés [BG37]: itt megint kellene vmllyen összekötő és bevezető szöveg, nem világos, hogyan és miért ugrunk át az előző témáról erre a témára

Megjegyzés [BG38]: nekem nem érthető a C, B és egyéb betűk jelentése

Megjegyzés [BG39]: azt is jó volna tisztázni, ez milyen számozás szerint 8-as (ha jól értem, Aldus szerint)

⁶¹ SCHEIBLE–WUTTKE (see note 2), no. 379, pp. 1–2: W. Pirckheimer's letter to Jacobus Banissius (Nürnberg, January 1516) *Interim vero, cum Stabius noster libellos quosdam graecos a dominatione tua attulisset, quaedam ex illis convertimus ac in publicum non sine nominis tui, ut decet, praeconio edidimus*. Pirckheimer sent his friend twenty copies from his translation of Nilus sentences.

⁶² Table #2 is based on CRIMI's summary (see note 49), pp. 350–354 and is supplied with references to the foliation of the Oxford manuscript (CCC, ms 284) and the editions by Opsopoeus and Erasmus, respectively.

⁶³ By the 1528 edition, Opsopoeus wanted to complete the previous edition by Manutius (Venice, 1499): (lines 29–39) *Eas vel hoc nomine diligentius transscripsi, partim quod antea nunquam editas compererim, partim quod sperare studiosis et candidis lectoribus me non vulgariter gratificaturum, si nostra opera tanti ac tam rari thesauri potirentur. Promiserat quidem Aldus ille optime de literis meritis in epistolio ad Codrum Urceum, quod secundo libro Graecarum Epistolarum praefixum est, eas aliquando se editurum. Verum quid eius voluntatem ab edendo retraxerit, parum compertum habeo. Paucas saltem Basilii ad Libanium sophistam et alios nonnullos in secundo volumine edidit, quas nos in hoc libello consulto praetermisimus*. SCHEIBLE 2009, (see note 2), no. 1159. On the 1499 edition by Aldus, see FEDWICK (see note 46), 199–201. On ff. α_1 r– β_7 v, there are 44 letters by Basil the Great.

The location of the letters in the Aldina edition: no. 151: ff.9v–10r, no. 20: f. 11r–v, no. 14: ff. 15r–16r, no. 2: 16r–20r, no. 19: 20v. The other thirty-nine letters were inserted by Erasmus of Rotterdam.

⁶⁴ CRIMI (see note 49), pp. 325–327. In n. 45, CRIMI provided instances when

the latter one, the single peculiarity in Opsopoeus' edition is the fact that he inserted Epistle 151 by Basil in his own copy from Aldus Manutius' edition although it is absent in the Oxford manuscript that seems to have been the exemplar he used. This oddity might be explained by the addressee (*Eustathios archiitros*) of Epistle 151, identical with that of Epistle 189 after which it was inserted. Thus, the act of inserting an item from Manutius' edition can be regarded as an editorial attempt to complete the deficiency of the exemplar. As a further explanation, it is worth observing that Epistles 151, 244, and 20 feature in the sequence identical both in the Aldina and Opsopoeus' edition, the editor might have used the printed edition when he was transcribing this part of Pirckheimer's manuscript (ff. 9v–11v).

On the other hand, it is well known that Erasmus asked Pirckheimer for the manuscript that Opsopoeus employed when preparing a more complete edition of the two Church fathers (Basil and Gregory).⁶⁵ After comparing Opsopoeus' edition with Pirckheimer's manuscript, Erasmus complained on the inaccuracy Opsopoeus imposed in the Hagenau edition.⁶⁶ Erasmus pointed out that Opsopoeus omitted almost one third of the epistles featuring in Pirckheimer's manuscript. In order to correct these shortcomings, Erasmus promised that he would include the absent epistles in his new edition. Erasmus' edition that came out in Basle in 1532 demonstrates that he kept his promises. His edition contains the 23 epistles that Opsopoeus omitted and in a sequence

Formázott: Kiemelt

Opsopoeus followed Aldus' edition. However, the variant readings of the Oxford codex as well as the editions by Opsopoeus and Erasmus demonstrate that the latter two was primarily based on the Oxford codex (CCC, ms 284). The differences from it can be explained as editorial corrections or conjectures. CRIMI (see note 49), pp. 336–343.

⁶⁵ SCHEIBLE 2009 (note 2), no. 1174 (28.05.1528); no. 1190, pp. 125–126 (25.08.1528): *Existimo tibi redditae litteras, quibus rogabam, ut codicem calamo descriptum epistolarum Basilii et Nazianzeni ad me mitteres. Vehementer enim hoc cupio nec levius de causis et fiet absque de tuo detrimento. Sed expecto his nundinis scripta tua* (cf. no. 1176)

⁶⁶ SCHEIBLE 2009 (note 2), no. 1242, 241–242 (also edited by Allen, no. 2214, vol. 8, pp. 276–277) Erasmus sent his edition of the letters to W. Pirckheimer through Hieronymus Froben (Freiburg i. Br., 07.09.1529) with a letter: (...) *De codice graeco ignoscat tua humanitas mihi, quod non praesto fidem. Sub nundinas coepimus conferre. Quo sumus ingressi altius opus, hoc plus offendimus portentorum. Interdum toti versus omissi sunt, multa mutata studio, ut videtur. Quin et epistolae multae omissae. Postremo plusquam tertia pars voluminis abest. Collatio peracta est; sed coepimus, quod nobis deest, describere. De codice ne sis sollicitus; erit domino suo incolumis. Fortasse curabimus excudendum exemplar nostrum.*

SCHEIBLE 2009 note 2), no. 1254, pp. 266–269 (Johannes Baptista Egnatius' letter to W. Pirckheimer: Venice, 13.11.1529). The letter mentions a codex comprising Gregory of Nazianzus from which Pirckheimer made the sections copied for him, which were missing in his manuscript. This copy was sent to Pirckheimer from Venice through a merchant, Jakob Wesler.

identical with ms Oxford, CCC, 284.⁶⁷ As a single difference, Epistle 61 by Gregory and Epistle 8 by Basil are arranged according to Opsopoeus' edition. Subsequent to the epistles that appear in the Oxford manuscript, Erasmus inserted the correspondence between Basil and Libanius (39 epistles) from the 1499 edition by Aldus Manutius (ff. 1r–15r, 20v), which Opsopoeus did not want to include as being available in an alternative edition.

In addition to the epistles of the two Cappadocian Fathers, Pirckheimer translated two other works from ms Oxford, CCC, 284. One of them is the *Liber Asceticus* by St Maximus the Confessor (CPG 7692), which was published in 1530.⁶⁸ This work does not feature in any manuscripts of the “Arundel collection” in the British Library, a reservoir of Pirckheimer's bequest, and copies preceding the year 1530 are considerably scarce, almost not attested in the West. Thereafter, ms Oxford, CCC, 284 seems an acceptable candidate to be regarded as the exemplar Pirckheimer used (ff. 293v–324). Regrettably, there is not a preface preceding the edition which would inform on the provenance of exemplar. The other work is *De officio episcopi (or.2)* by Gregory of Nazianzus, a homily that Pirckheimer already decided to translate in 1528 when published his translations of two other homilies by Gregory.⁶⁹ Pirckheimer's translation of Homily 2 came out in print at the beginning of 1529.⁷⁰ As was shown above, it is in the context of this 1529 edition of Homily 2 that Heß expressed his debt of gratitude to Pirckheimer for sending a copy. It was the same letter to which Heß appended the index of contents of ÖNB suppl. gr. 177. Because of this chronology, Pirckheimer must have used a manuscript other than the one sent by Heß; thus it could be easily ms Oxford, CCC, 284.

The two manuscripts were mentioned again and in the context of the books acquired as booty from Hungary. It is also the 1529 edition of Homily 2 by Gregory that Pirckheimer shares with Georg Spalatin the knowledge that the codex Heß lent to Pirckheimer originated from the booty of Hungary. This piece of information seems to appear rather suddenly and without an adequate context. Pirckheimer seems to have

⁶⁷ Basle, VD16 B 338 and VD G 3040. Erasmus' edition of the letters of the two Cappadocian Fathers was appended to Froben's edition of Basil's homilies (*En amice lector...*, Basle, 1532, pp. 504–674). See its digitalised copy at http://archive.thulb.uni-jena.de/hisbest/receive/HisBest_cbu_00006127. On this edition, see FEDWICK (see note 46), pp. 208–217.

⁶⁸ VD16 1664. HOLZBERG, (see note 1), pp. 351–352.

⁶⁹ SCHEIBLE 2009 (see note 2), no. 1176, p. 97: *et si deus annuerit, bervi alia quoque theologi huius – ita enim a Graecis appellatur – scripta in publicum exire videbis, precipue vero orationem elegantissimam de munere episcopali, quam me tunc in manibus habere vidisti*. See the edition as VD16 G 3081.

⁷⁰ VD16 G 3073: HOLZBERG (see note 1), pp. 348–351.

Megjegyzés [BG40]: nem lehetne összehasonlítani a két szöveget, mint ahogy Crimi csinálta?

Megjegyzés [BG41]: itt is

Megjegyzés [BG42]: melyik?

more reasons to refer to the substantial unique codex he received from Heß. The Latin translation of the homily (*de officio episcopi*) Pirckheimer was sending to Georg Spalatin featured in both codices, in Heß's manuscript it was the first complete work subsequent to the truncated Homily 1. The additional information that Heß's codex originated from Hungary cannot be explained but through the origin shared by the exemplar Pirckheimer used for the 1529 edition which, as we postulated, was ms Oxford, CCC, 284. To support this hypothesis with additional arguments, it is worth a reminder that Pirckheimer addressed the letter to Georg Spalatin, the identical person to whom he dedicated the Wittenberg edition of the sentences by St Nilus in 1516, which he edited from ms Oxford, CCC, 284 as demonstrated above (see tab.#2). In addition, Pirckheimer must have been informed on the provenance of both manuscripts. On the one hand, Opsopoeus is likely to have learned from Pirckheimer that the codex comprising the epistles of the two Cappadocian Fathers was housed once in the royal library in Buda.⁷¹ On the other hand, Pirckheimer seems to have come to know on the provenance of the old volume comprising more than 50 works by Gregory of Nazianzus from Heß. Regrettably, neither of the two sources survives. Relying on this possibly channel of information, I would suggest that Pirckheimer, by referring to the codex he received from Heß, acknowledged that the exemplar Pirckheimer used for the translation of Homily 2 shares the provenance of the other manuscript, which is from Hungary and Buda. By providing an authentication by Pirckheimer, this line of arguments may corroborate Opsopoeus' statement that scholars used to set into question. As far as Pirckheimer's reliability is concerned, the careful study of ms ÖNB suppl. gr. 177 demonstrates with material evidence that the huge codex he received from Heß originates from the Corvina library.

ÖNB suppl. gr. 177: a new authentic Corvina

As a decisive evidence for a provenance from Buda, there are Arabic numerals that were copied in the Corvina binding workshop. Both kinds of these numerals, distinguished according their functions, belong to the hand identical with the one that copied Arabic numerals in three other Corvina manuscripts in the same functional positions.

⁷¹ Opsopoeus mentioned that Pirckheimer was willing to lend his Greek manuscript containing the letters of Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus to Opsopoeus when he asked him through Andreas Rüttel. SCHEIBLE 2009, (see note 2), no. 1159: *Itaque ego hoc tuo iam liberali responso sum non mediocriter erectus et exhilaratus tuaeque cohortationi non illibenter obsequutus*. Opsopoeus clearly said that he copied the sections which were not edited by Aldus Manutius. Although both Opsopoeus' request and Pirckheimer's reply were lost, it is clear that Opsopoeus worked from his copy where he combined Aldus' edition with the letters found in Pirckheimer's manuscript.

Megjegyzés [BG43]: ez egyáltalán nem tűnik szükségszerűnek – sztem ezt az érvet mellőzni kellene

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG44]: miért? nem egészen értem

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG45]: rosszul van megfogalmazva: az, h arab számok vannak a kódexekben, önmagában biztosan nem döntő érv amellet, h korvinák

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG46]: mindkét típus? melyik a másik? (később kiderül, mire gondolsz, de itt érthetetlen)

First, (a) the recto side of the first folium of each quire is marked with an Arabic numeral in the upper right corner of the page by a humanist hand. Second, (b) Arabic numerals ~~of the identical hand~~ were also copied by the same hand in the outer corner of the lower margin. In addition to these numerals, all facilitating exclusively the binder's job, (c) there are humanist parchment double leaves which were inserted in the front and the back of the re-bound codices and truncated leaves were complemented with the same type of fine Italian parchment. **Without the Corvina binding preserved, these three elements may yet be regarded** as adequate evidence supporting Pirckheimer's information on the provenance from Buda.

Formázott: Kiemelt

(a) There are Arabic quire numbers in ÖNB suppl. gr. 177, ff. 5r–173r in the upper right corner. In addition, in the outer corner of the lower margin there are quire signatures which could be ascribed to Johannes Heß's binder: ff. 5r–173r: lower case Gothic letters from b–z; ff. 151r–352r: also lower case Gothic letters from a–z; finally ff. 360r–528r: upper case Gothic letters from A–Y. The Corvina binder did not number the first truncated quire but Heß's binder did so. The vast codex was originally bound in two volumes; the second part begins on f. 264r. In the second part, the Greek quire numbers are well visible. This is why the Corvina binder did not find necessary to apply his own system in this part.⁷²

(b) The same hand numbered the first four leaves of each quire in the entire codex, occasionally jumping several numbers between subsequent leaves, which demonstrates that the binder numbered the folia in rush in order to facilitate his job of reassembling the double leaves in the correct order when rebinding the vast volume. The fact that the double-leaf numbers in the identical hand appear in the truncated initial and final quires in other Corvina codices leads to the conclusion that the Gregory of Nazianzus codex arrived at the Buda court in a loose binding.⁷³ The double-leaf numbers demonstrates that the Gregory of Nazianzus codex was disbound between the mid-fifteenth-century and 1528 with the purpose of rebinding. It is unknown how far the process of rebinding continued. In 1528, Heß's binder deprived the manuscript of all evidence necessary to answer this

Megjegyzés [BG47]: sztem nem a sietség, hanem az ökonomia miatt nem írta le mindig a számokat, csak ott, ahol a kőtót irányítani kellett

⁷² See the Corvina binder's numerals and those of Heß's binder in brackets: (in the humanist complement of the truncated leaf) 1 (b); f. 13r: 2 (c); f. 21r: 3 (d); f. 29r: 4 (e); f. 37r: 5 (f); f. 45r: 6 (g); f. 53r: 7 (h); f. 61r: 8 (i); f. 69r: 9 (k); f. 77r: 10 (l); f. 85r: 11 (m); f. 93r: 12 (n); f. 101r: 13 (o); f. 109r: 14 (p); f. 117r: 15 (q); f. 125r: 16 (r); f. 133r: 17 (s); f. 141r: 18 (t? washed); f. 149r: 1<9> (trimmed) (v); f. 157r: 20 (x); f. 165r: 2<1> (y); f. 173r: <22> (z).

⁷³ See numerals in the identical hand and function in mss Vienna, ÖNB hist. gr. 16, f. 473r: a1; f. 474r: a2; f. 475: a3; f. 476r: a4 and ÖNB, suppl. gr. 4, f. 328r: 1 and f. 329r: 2.

question.

(c) The state of preservation must have been also damaged because several truncated leaves were completed with fine Italian parchment.⁷⁴ In addition to the humanist quire numbers, the insertion of the fifteenth-century fine parchment leaves might also be ascribed to the Corvina binder. Similarly to ff. 532–533, ff. 1, 4 could have functioned as flyleaves before the codex was rebound for Heß as examples of nos. 2–3 would imply. It could have been Heß's binder who transferred the double leaf of ff. 1, 4 in order to protect ff. 2–3 that comprise the table of contents of the volume. As a remarkable evidence of how the old Greek volumes were approached as objects, the heavily truncated leaves (ff. 5–6) were complemented in the fifteenth century because the quire number 1 on f. 5r was copied in the newly complemented part and belongs to the Corvina binder's quire system.⁷⁵ The flyleaves (ff. I and 534) carrying legal texts from the thirteenth century might have been inserted only by Heß's binder.

Megjegyzés [BG48]: ezt a közös vonást egy kicsit gyengébbnek érzem, szerintem fogalmazz óvatosabban: a 15. sz. végi beavatkozás az nyilván tény, de hogy pont a korvínák könyvkötője avatkozott be, ez inkább csak a számok miatt valószínű, nem önmagában véve

The several hundreds of Arabic numerals copied in suppl. gr. 177 seem to characterise a single hand with regard to the ductus of all the ten numerals. Among the ten numerals, especially no. 3 and no. 5 seem the most distinctive but the ductus of nos. 2, 4, and 9 appear identical with the numerals, copied by the binder of three Corvina manuscripts. Two of them still preserves the *alla greca* type gilded leather Corvina bindings that were made in Buda in the 1480s by a binder of Italian origin, who left the Hungarian royal court with his characteristic binding stamps when king Matthias died in 1490.

Formázott: Kiemelt

Megjegyzés [BG49]: ez azt sugallja, mintha a 3-as és 5-ös nem egyezne meg a másik három korvina 3-asaival és 5-öseivel; mind a 4 kódex számairól kellene egy összehasonlító ábrásorozatot!

One of them is the single completely extant manuscript of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus' *De cerimoniis* (Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, Rep. I. 17: 325×235 mm), which was copied in the 960s in Constantinople for the Byzantine imperial library,⁷⁶ still preserves its *alla greca* type gilded leather Corvina binding.⁷⁷ The title of the volume appears in Latin at the bottom of the upper cover: <DE> *REGALIBUS INSTITUTIONIBUS*. The binder's characteristic quire

⁷⁴ See a similar attempt in ms Leipzig, Univ. Rep. I. 17, f. 91 where the lower margin (38 mm) was completed in Buda as the gilded edges of the fine Italian parchment, used for the completeion, demonstrates.

⁷⁵ The insertion of the central double leaf (ff. 402–404: no. 404 appears on f. 403v) could easily take place in Buda.

⁷⁶ See its detailed description in J. M. FEATHERSTONE: Preliminary Remarks on the Leipzig Manuscript of *De Cerimoniis*. In: *BZ* 95 (2002), pp. 457–479.

⁷⁷ See the photo of the upper cover in CSABA CSAPODI, KLÁRA CSAPODINÉ GÁRDONYI: *Bibliotheca Corviniana*. Budapest 1990, no. 88; EDIT MADAS: *La Bibliotheca Corviniana et les Corvina «Authentiques»*. In: *Mathias Corvin, les bibliothèques princières et la genèse de l'État moderne*, ed. JEAN-FRANÇOIS MAILLARD, ISTVÁN MONOK, DONATELLA NEBBIAI (Supplementum Corvianum II). Budapest 2009, p. 39.

numbers feature can be found in the upper right margin of the recto side of the first leaf of each quire (see fig.#3).⁷⁸ In 1480s, four more leaves seem to have been preserved preceding f. I (see fig. #5). There are more data supporting this hypothesis. First of all, the humanist hand of the quire numbers numbered f. 1 as if the first leaf of the second quire by writing no. 2 on it. Second, a sixteenth-century hand foliated f. I as 5, and a later hand continued the foliation as 6 on f. 1r. Interestingly enough, the surface of f. 1r, which was formerly used as pastedown and was detached with force later, remained on the inside of the wooden upper board as a mirror print. The violent removal of the former pastedown (now flyleaf: f. I) may explain the two types of mirror prints: the text from right to left is the mirror print of f. 1r and the text leading normally from left to right is the double reflection of the verso side of the leaf formerly preceding f. 1. In this way, the inside of the upper wooden board could preserve the exact copy of the otherwise lost text. These two sections constitute the consecutive end of the table of contents to book 1 of *De cerimoniis*.⁷⁹ It would be difficult to find another explanation for how tenth-century ink could have been otherwise copied on the fifteenth-century wooden board.⁸⁰ All these data lead to the conclusion that the first four leaves of the volume were lost after the 1490s. The similar loss of the tenth-century leaves subsequent to f. 265 (see fig. #5) cannot be dated with such a precision.

The other Corvina, supplied with the same quire numbers,⁸¹ is the

⁷⁸ In the upper right margin of the recto page of the first leaf of each quire, quire numbers characteristic of the Corvina binding workshop occur: f. 1r: 2; f. 9r: 3; f. 17r: 4; f. 25r: 5; f. 33r: 6; f. 41r: 7; f. 43r: 8; f. 51r: 9; f. 59r: 10; f. 67r: 11; f. 75r: 12; f. 83r: 13; f. 91r: 14; f. 99r: 15; f. 107r: 16; f. 115r: 17; f. 123r: 18; f. 131r: 19; f. 139r: 20; f. 147r: 21 (trimmed upper part); f. 155r: not visible; f. 163r: 23 (trimmed upper part); f. 171r: leaf lost after binding; f. 179r: not visible; f. 187r: not visible, f. 195r: not visible; f. 203r: leaf lost after binding; f. 211r: <2>9 (trimmed upper part); f. 222r: 31 (trimmed upper part); f. 230r: 32; f. 238r: 33; f. 246r: 3<4>; f. 254r: not visible; f. 262r: not visible.

⁷⁹ On the table of contents, see FEATHERSTONE (see note 76), pp. 466–468.

⁸⁰ The suggestion by FEATHERSTONE that the Corvina binder preserved the Byzantine wooden board has been rejected by specialists. J. M. FEATHERSTONE: Further Remarks on the *De cerimoniis*. In: *BZ* 97 (2004), p. 113, n. 2. The circumstances that the first four leaves seem to have been lost after 1490 and the careful application of the wooden board to the *alla greca* type Corvina binding rather support the hypothesis that the wooden board was manufactured in 1480s in Buda and the text on it is a double reflection. The fact that the mirror reflection of the former f. (4)v appears on the flyleaf (f. 1r) also corroborates this hypothesis.

⁸¹ The Arabic numbers in the upper right corner of the recto side of first leaf of each quire appear in the following leaves: f. 1r: 1; f. 3r: 2; f. 6r: 3; f. 14r: 4; f. 22r: 5; f. 30r: 6; f. 39r: 7; f. 48r: 8; f. 56r: 9; f. 64r: 10; f. 72r: 11; f. 80r: 12; f. 88r: 13; f. 96r: 14; f. 104r: 15; f. 112r: 16; f. 120r: 17; f. 128r: 18; f. 136r: 19 crossed out by the hand that foliated the volume; f. 144r: 20; f. 152r: 21; f. 160r: 22; f. 168r: 23; f. 177r: number is

eleventh-century ms ÖNB, suppl. gr. 4 which contains the homilies on Matthew's gospel by St John Chrysostom and is furnished with a gilded leather Corvina binding (355×255×95 mm). Similarly to the Leipzig codex, the title duly occurs in Latin at the bottom of the upper cover: *CHRYSOSTOMUS SUPER EVĀGELIA*.⁸² Preceding the front and subsequent to the back of the volume, leaves were installed symmetrically, in a way reflecting humanist taste, from another manuscript (see fig. #6), namely from an eleventh-century copy of the Life of Ioannikos (†846) (BHG 937) from a *menologion*⁸³ (a Byzantine collection of Saints' lives arranged according to the liturgical calendar). In this case, the similar appearance of the script counted for the binder who could not read the Greek content of the recycled leaves. In addition to the symmetrical arrangement, the difference between the Byzantine⁸⁴ and the Corvina binder's humanist quire numbers corroborates the hypothesis that it was the Corvina binder who installed the eleventh century double leaves in Buda. It is possible that these two double leaves had been purchased as binding support. However, it is also likely that they originate from a Greek fragment collected in Buda and was recycled in this form with the purpose of preservation.⁸⁵ The St J. Chrysostom codex preserves the fine Italian flyleaves (ff. 334–335) that were inserted in Buda.

missing; f. 184r: 25, f. 192r: 26; f. 200r: 27; f. 208: 28; f. 216r: 29; f. 224r: 30; f. 232r: 31; f. 240r: 32; f. 248r: 33; f. 256r: 34; f. 264r: 35; f. 272r: 36; f. 280r: 37; f. 288r: 38; f. 296r: 39; f. 304r: 40; f. 312r: 41; f. 320r: 42; f. 328r: 43; f. 330r: 44. The double leaves of the last quires were numbered in the lower margin by the Corvina binder: f. 328r: 1, f. 329r: 2.

⁸² See the description in HUNGER–HANNICK (see note 84), no. 4, pp. 9–11. The photo of the upper cover was published in CSAPODI–GÁRDONYI (see note 77), no. 221.

⁸³ For the reconstruction of its former quire, see Vienna, ÖNB, suppl. gr. 4, f. 1ra incipit: [[<συγγε>νόμενος ἐπὶ τὴν φύλην]] = PG 116, 44A line 6, f. 1vb explicit: [[ὁ γὰρ καὶ ὕστερον ἐξεβη· καθὰ καὶ περὶ]]? = PG 116, 45A line 13; on f. 332ra: [[καταπλαγέντες]] = PG 116, 48 B2, f. 332vb explicit [[ὄφιν οὖν τινα φοινικοειδὴ μέγιστον ἐκ ταύτης ὑπο<φαινόμενον>]] = PG 116, 49 B5, f. 333ra incipit: [[<ὄπο>φαινόμενον ἰδὼν]] = PG 116, 49 B5, f. 333vb explicit: [[ἔστρεφον καὶ ὄπως]] = PG 116, 52 B8, f. 2ra incipit: [[δράσας· τῷ τε τοῦ ἡθους]] = PG 116, 53 B8, f. 2bv explicit: [[τοῦ κλησιν εἰς αὐτὸν μετα<βαίνουσαν>]] = PG 116, 56 B8.

⁸⁴ The ff. 3–5 in the Chrysostom codex (ÖNB suppl. gr. 4) is in a bad state of preservation in contrary to the bifolium preceding these damaged leaves.

The Greek numbers in the upper right corner are often not visible because 3–4 mm was trimmed off when the codex was rebound in Buda together with these numbers: f. 30r: [[δ']] (4); f. 88r: [[ια']] (11); f. 208r: [[κ']] (26); f. 224r: [[κ<η>']] (28); f. 296r: [[λ<ζ>']] (37); f. 304r: [[λ<η>']] (38). The Greek quire numbers do not embrace ff. 3–5, containing the table of contents of the codex, which was inserted after finishing the body of the text of the original Greek codex. These leaves have the same ruling type as the leaves containing Chrysostom's homilies and the content of the codex is copied by the same scribe who copied the saint's homilies.

⁸⁵ On Greek fragments collected in Buda, see ANDRÁS NÉMETH: A Mynas-kódex és a Corvina Könyvtár (The Mynas codex and the Corvina Library). In: MKsz 126 (2010), pp. 158–192.

The Zonaras codex (Vienna, ÖNB, hist. gr. 16: 315×235 mm), also supplied with the same quire numbers of a size larger than the three other manuscripts,⁸⁶ still preserves the fifteenth-century flyleaves that are now well discernible as ff. iv–v and f. 479 (see fig.#7). They seem to have been installed by the Corvina binder preceding the front and subsequent to the back of a fourteenth-century copy of the chronicle of the Byzantine historian, Zonaras. The pastedown of the lower board (now flyleaf: f. 479) had already been detached in 1520 when Philip Gundel copied a note saying that he translated an extensive section of the volume.⁸⁷ It might be illustrative for the binding of the volume that Johannes Cuspinianus who acquired the Zonaras codex in 1513 in Buda and kept it with him for long was afraid of the manuscript being transported to Nürnberg to W. Pirckheimer because of the risks concerning its preservation.⁸⁸ The manuscript catalogue of the Hofbibliothek in Vienna, compiled in 1576, describes the codex as being gilded from outside with a likely reference to its gilded edges.⁸⁹ The codex was rebound in 1754 in Vienna, the rosette motives that appear enclosed within diagonal squares in the gilded edges of this codex seem to have been remade on the basis of other Corvina manuscripts with well visible edges, which were accessible in Vienna.

The Arabic numerals of an identical humanist hand (a–b) and the fine Italian parchment used for completing truncated leaves and as flyleaves (c) must belong to the Corvina binder’s activity in Buda in the 1480s.

⁸⁶ The quire numbers of the Corvina binder are sometimes discernible only with UV lamp. When the codex was rebound, the upper parts of these numbers were occasionally trimmed. However, the reading of numbers here was ascertained in the original manuscript. ÖNB hist. gr. 16, f. 17r: 3; f. 25r: 4; f. 33r: 5; f. 41r: 6; f. 49r: 7; f. 57r: 8; f. 65r: 9; f. 73r: 10; f. 81r: 11; f. 89r: 12; f. 97r: 13; f. 105r: 14; f. 114r: not visible; f. 121r: 16; f. 129r: 17; f. 137r: not visible; f. 145r: 19; f. 153r: 20; f. 161r: not visible; f. 169r: <2>2; f. 177r: <2>3; f. 185r: not visible; f. 193r: 25; f. 201r: 2<6>; f. 209r: <2>7; f. 217r: not visible; f. 225r: 29; f. 233r: 30; f. 241r: 31; f. 249r: 32; f. 257r: 33; f. 265r: 34; f. 273r: 35; f. 281r: 36; f. 289r: 37; f. 297r: not visible; f. 305r: 39; f. 313r: 4<0>; f. 321r: not visible; f. 329r: not visible; f. 337r: 43; f. 345r: not visible; f. 353r: 45; f. 361r, f. 369r and f. 377r: not visible; f. 385r: <4>9; f. 393r: not visible; f. 401r: 5<1>; f. 409r: 5<2>; f. 417r: <5>3; f. 425: 54; f. 433r: 55; f. 441r: 56; f. 449r: 57; f. 457r: 58; f. 465r: 59. The double leaves of the last quires were numbered in the lower margin by the Corvina binder: f. 473r: a1; f. 474r: a2; f. 475: a3; f. 476r: a4.

⁸⁷ ÖNB hist. gr. 16, f. 479v: [[μετάφραζον ἔγω Φίλιππος ὁ Γουοδελῖος εἰς τὸ ρωμαϊκὸν ἀπὸ μιχαήλ τοῦ ἀργυροπύλου εἰς τὸ τέλος ἔτους α,φκ.]]

⁸⁸ See notes 14–16 above.

⁸⁹ See the catalogue compiled by Hugo Blotius in 1576, f. 81r (E 1550): *manuscripta in charta pergamena et extrinsecus deauratus*. H. MENHARDT: Das älteste Handschriftenverzeichnis der Wiener Hofbibliothek von Hugo Blotius 1576, Kritische Ausgabe der Hanschrift Series Nova 4451 von Jahre 1597 mit vier Anhängen. Wien 1957. S. 98.

Unlike the three codices presented above (figs. #5–7), the codex of Gregory of Nazianzus left Buda only after 1526, reached Johannes Heß in Wrocław, was transported to Pirckheimer in 1529, returned to Heß in 1530, and arrived at Nikolsburg, the Dietrichstein collection. It did not turn up in Vienna before 1936 so that the numerals could not have been copied there in the early sixteenth century.⁹⁰ In such a way, the information Pirckheimer shared with Georg Spalatin on the provenance of the Gregory codex from the booty from Hungary has been confirmed with clear evidence for its presence in Buda. Thus, the list of the few authentic Corvina manuscripts has been **expanded** with a new item, one of the oldest and most splendid Greek manuscripts of the Corvina library.⁹¹ At the same time, this identification confirms Opsopoeus' statement that could also have derived from W. Pirckheimer.

Formázott: Kiemelt

The two codices and the Corvina library

The scholars who described ms Oxford, CCC, 284 (Hutter and Nigel Wilson)⁹² rejected Opsopoeus' report on its provenance from the Hungarian royal library, which might have come from Pirckheimer, for two major reasons: because (1) the coat of arms of Matthias Corvinus is absent from the manuscript, and (2) there are not marks in the margins that were introduced in Hagenau in Setzer's printing shop when Opsopoeus edited the epistles of Basil and Gregory. The characteristics of the other Greek manuscripts that were certainly available at Buda for a couple of decades refute the first objection, as none of them is furnished with the coat of arms of the king on the title pages. In addition, Opsopoeus stated in the preface to his edition that the edition is based on his own selection he transcribed from Pirckheimer's manuscript.⁹³ Opsopoeus did so in his other editions as

⁹⁰ The Vienna National Library purchased the Gregory of Nazianzus codex together with the other Greek manuscripts of the Dietrichstein library.

⁹¹ The codex ÖNB suppl. gr. 177 is dated to the second half of the tenth century. The Leipzig Corvina (University Library, Rep. I. 17) and the Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* (Erlangen, University Library, A1) is roughly contemporary with it. HANS THURN: Die erlanger Handschrift von Xenophons Kyropädie, ihre Fehldatierung und deren Folgen. In: *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* N.F. 2 (1976), pp. 75–83. Somewhat earlier is the central part of ms Par. suppl. gr. 607. See NÉMETH (see note 85), pp. 177–185.

⁹² HUTTER (see note 45), no. 9, pp. 20–22; CRIMI (see note 49), p. 347. I owe a debt of gratitude to Prof. Nigel Wilson for providing me with his notes on the provenance of ms Oxford, CCC, 284.

⁹³ SCHEIBLE 2009 (see note 2), no. 1159, (lines 15–23): *Sed enim cum animadverterem huius tam rari codicis pretium nulla iam invidia premi, cum alias tuae instructissimae bibliothecae utriusque liguae auctores studiosis a te flagitantibus candidiss<ime> et libentiss<ime> utendos dare soleas, sed potius librarii penuria hactenus in obscuro delituisse, cepi te per Andream Rutellium familiarem tuum interpellare (...) me describendi laborem et taedium libentii animo suscipere et devorare velle (...)* (lines 29–33) *Eas vel hoc nomine diligentius transscripsi, partim*

well. For example, the *editio princeps* of Heliodorus was based on ms Munich, cod. gr. 157, ff. 124r–167v. Instead of the precious parchment manuscript itself, however, there is a copy in Opsopoeus’ hands (Leiden, University Library, BPG. 61a) which was directly used for the edition (Basle, 1534: DV 16 H 1673) as marked with the editorial marks introduced in the printing shop.⁹⁴ The same ~~attitude-procedure~~ can be observed in Erasmus’ edition (Basle, 1532) who also worked from an apograph because he handled the old Greek codex, lent from Pirckheimer, with care and avoided writing in the manuscript.⁹⁵ Thus, neither of the two editions was based directly on Pirckheimer’s codex: Opsopoeus worked from his apograph and Erasmus from his notes, which have not been identified so far. There is no reason to distrust the information deriving from Pirckheimer and Opsopoeus.⁹⁶ The quire signatures in ms ÖNB suppl. gr. 177 demonstrate that his knowledge on the origin of the Gregory-codex was correct.

The framework of this study does not allow me to locate these two manuscripts within the Corvina library. Their acquisition fits the increasing interest in the Greek fathers, which received a major impetus in the Council of Florence in 1438–39 when the theological debates with the eastern Churches highlighted the significance of the old Greek codices of the Fathers, especially the Cappadocian Fathers. This interest continued after the council. In this context, such a complete selection of the homilies by Gregory of Nazianzus, especially in an early manuscript as recognised and emphasised by J. Heß’ theologian friends in Wrocław (see the citation above), must have been of a great value and appreciation. Both codices mainly contained writings that were not accessible in Latin. At the same time, the homilies and epistles by Basil and Gregory were viewed valuable both for their rhetorical and theological merits, which became accessible in Greek

quod antea nunquam editas [compared to the edition (1499) by Aldus Manutius] *compererim, partim quod spererem studiosis et candidis lectoribus me non vulgariter grati caturum, si nostra opera tanti ac tam rari thesauri potirentur.* He omitted the epistles edited by Aldus Manutius (Venice, 1499): (lines 37–39) *Paucas saltem Basilii ad Libanium Sophistam et alios in secundo volumine edidit, quas nos in hoc libello consulto praetermisimus.*

⁹⁴ K. A. DE MEYER, E. HULSHOFF POL: *Codices bibliothecae publicae Graeci*, vol. viii. Leiden 1965. pp. 90–91. On the collation of both manuscripts with Opsopoeus’ edition, see the literature in KERSTIN HAJDU: *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Byarische Staatsbibliothek*. Bd. 3. *Codices Graeci Monacenses 110–180*. München 2003. S. 258.

⁹⁵ SCHEIBLE 2009 (see note 2), 1242, pp. 241–242. *De codice ne sis sollicitus; erit domino suo incolumis.*

⁹⁶ As shown above (see notes 14–18), Pirckheimer was well informed on other manuscripts of the royal library in Buda and also in the news from Hungary such as, e.g., on the Hungarians’ preparations against the Turks. SCHEIBLE 2004 (see note 2), no. 1028 (Vienna, 26.04.1526), pp. 138–142.

and Latin. This process was fostered by the increasing interest of audience from the early sixteenth century, a period of the expanding activity of printing shops in the territory of the early Reformation. Opsopoeus described the Arrianism, a heresy in the times of the Cappadocian Fathers, Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus as paralleled with the heresy of his own age exemplified in the teachings of Thomas Müntzer, Oecolampadius and Martin Luther.⁹⁷ It was also in these years that J. A. Brassicanus primarily saw the works of the Greek Fathers as being worth editing from his own manuscripts, which would bring him fame and fortune.⁹⁸

The humanist scholars active in Matthias' court discovered the value of the Greek manuscripts rather early. Like the Medicis, the Hungarian king collected paper manuscripts, fragments of codices in the form of unbound gatherings,⁹⁹ primarily for the value of the texts not for their beauty.¹⁰⁰ Most of these works have not been translated into Latin, or were accessible in alternative Latin translations competing for acknowledgment, for which the Greek original must have served as a decisive basis. It stands clear from ms ÖNB suppl. gr. 177 how much respect the Greek codices received as objects: in the procedure of rebinding, the damaged leaves were treated with care and the truncated leaves were complemented. Interestingly enough, only considerably old large folio size parchment manuscripts received *alla greca* type gilded leather Corvina binding. Thus, it is the dis-binding and re-binding of the aged volumes, which left quire signatures in the manuscripts, that

⁹⁷ SCHEIBLE 2009 (see note 2), no. 1159, (lines 55–60): *Vixerunt enim eo tempore in Caesarea Cappadotiae quidem Basilius, Constantinopoli autem Gregorius, quo vehementissime viguit arriana haeresis (...)* (lines 75–80) *Neque enim minore multorum ruina et offendiculo iam furiant haeretici munzerani et omnium maxime oecolampadiani, qui olim insaniebant Arriani...*

⁹⁸ See the passage in the *editio princeps* of Salvianus by J. Alexander Brasicanus, Basle, 1530 (VD 16 S 1511), ff. B^{iiiv}–B^{iiiv}. On the manuscripts Brassicanus saw in the royal library in 1525 he said: *Vidimus grandem librum apostolicorum canonum, opus incomparabile; vidimus Theodoretum Cyrensem in Psalterium integrum. Vidimus Chrysostomi, Athanasii, Cyrilli, Nazianzeni, Basilii Magni, Gregorii Nysseni, Theophanis, Dorothei infinita opera. Vidimus Marcum monachum, cognomento Anachoritam.* Subsequent to this list, Brassicanus enumerated some of his manuscripts he planned to publish in print, among which appear Philo's eleventh-century manuscript (Vienna, ÖNB, suppl. gr. 50), a number of works by Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil the Great, 14 homilies by Severianus of Gabbala, and the commentary on Genesis by Gregory of Nyssa.

⁹⁹ NÉMETH (see note 85), pp. 160–163.

¹⁰⁰ E. PICCOLOMINI, III. Inventario della libreria medicea privata compilato nel 1495. In: *Archivio storico italiano* 20 (1875), pp. 51–94. See *capsae* nos. 1, 3–4 and 8–9. In the Medici collection, the Greek manuscripts were mainly paper codices, while the Latin ones parchment codices. The inventory registered separate cases which contained the unbound paper and parchment gatherings (p. 79). King Matthias' collection must have shown a similar picture.

may provide an opportunity to expand the scarce knowledge provided in the correspondence of humanist scholars.

Abbreviations

ADB = *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*

BHG = *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca*

BZ = *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*

CCSG = *Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca*

CPG = Maurice GEERARD, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, I–IV, Turnhout: Brepols, 1974–83.

MKsz = *Magyar Könyvszemle* (Hungarian Book Review)

PG = *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*

PLP = *Prosopographisches Lexikon des Palaiologenzeit*

RGK = *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten, 800–1600*, Hrsg.

ERNST GAMILLSCHEG, DIETER HARLFINGER.

VD16 = *Verzeichnis der im Deutschen Sprachbereich erschienenen Drucke des 16. Jahrhunderts*

Captions for tables

Tab.1. Vienna, ÖNB suppl. gr. 177 and the homilies by Gregory of Nazianzus in W. Pirckheimer's translation (Basle 1531)

Tab.2. Nilus' sentences in ms Oxford, CCC, 284 and in Pirckheimer's translation (*editio princeps* 1516)

Tab.3. Basil's and Gregory's epistles in ms Oxford, CCC, 284 and the editions by Opsopoeus (Hagenau 1528) and Erasmus (Basle 1532)

Captions for figures

Fig.1. Willibald Pirckheimer, engraving by Albrecht Dürer 1524 (182×114 mm)

Fig.2. ÖNB suppl. gr. 177, upper binding (Johannes Heß, 1528)

Fig.3. Arabic numerals of the Corvina binder (Buda, 1480s)

Fig.4. Vienna, ÖNB, suppl. gr. 177, implements by the Corvina binder (Buda, 1480s) and Heß' binder (Wrocław, 1528)

Fig.5. Leipzig, University Library, Rep. I. 17 (Constantine VII: *De cerimoniis*)

Fig.6. Vienna, ÖNB, suppl. gr. 4, implements by the Corvina binder (Buda, 1480s)

Fig.7. Vienna, ÖNB, hist. gr. 16, implements by the Corvina binder (Buda, 1480s) and Gerard van Swieten (Vienna, 1754)