

The Carmen Miserabile: some issues concerning the transmission of the text

TIBOR ALMÁSI



Since the beginning of the twentieth century, Hungarian historians have been inclined to believe that there is no surviving manuscript of the *Carmen Miserabile*, a work of history about the Mongol Invasion of Hungary by Rogerius. We owe even the survival of the text itself to a stroke of luck, to the fact that, in March 1488, it was published as an appendix to János Thuróczy's Chronicle, printed in Brno, and this saved the text from being irretrievably lost, but we know very little about the conditions of its publication and, for this reason, much about the publication of Rogerius's text is not quite clear to us even today. There is no satisfactory answer to the question, how, under what circumstances the press in Brno managed to obtain the text which seems to have been lost during the previous 250 years, how it was found or where it came from, and no more is known, either, of the text itself on which the edition was based. We must admit that, at least for the time being, we cannot expect to find satisfactory answers to these questions. All we can do is to follow a hypothetical train of thought in search of a solution to this intriguing problem.¹ However, it did not always seem so hopeless to solve

¹ In Vince Bunyitay's opinion the codex containing the manuscript version of Rogerius's text was in the possession of the Catholic Church and kept in Nagyvárad, and the bishop of Várad, who was of Moravian origin, born in Brno and was also the founder of the printing press in Brno, may have given the *Carmen Miserabile*, without the author's permission or even without his knowledge, to the press to attach it to Thuróczy's Chronicle as an appendix. V. Bunyitay, *A váradai püspökség története*. 3 vols. Nagyvárad 1883–1884. Vol. 1, *A váradai püspökök a püspökség alapításától az 1566. évig* [A history of the Diocese of Várad. Vol. I. The bishops of Várad from the foundation of the Diocese to the end of 1566]. This opinion was taken up again by József Fitz, who stated categorically that the bishop of Várad added Rogerius's work to the Chronicle without asking for the author's permission. (F. József, *A magyar nyomdászat, a könyvkiadás és a könyvkereskedelem története*. [A history of printing, publishing and the book trade in Hungary.

the problem of the transmission of the text of the *Carmen Miserabile*, as we feel it to be today, because earlier the possibility of the existence of a manuscript had been suggested from time to time, by various scholars. As all these suggestions proved to be unfounded, László Juhász, in his preface to the critical edition of the *Carmen Miserabile*,² which has been the hitherto most detailed and exhaustive examination of the problem, stated quite clearly, as a fact, that there was no manuscript at all. He had good reason for his doubts, because none of the authors of these suggestions could actually find a manuscript. In his above-mentioned preface he referred to two cases in point. He chose his first example, Bongarsius, from a long past age. Bongarsius stated in his edition of 1600, published in Frankfurt, that the edition was based, on the one hand, on the printed text of the Augsburg edition of Thuróczy's Chronicle, and, on the other, on a manuscript of the work, owned by the publisher.³ Having compared the various texts, László Juhász came to the conclusion that the Frankfurt edition was only a version of the Augsburg edition, "revised" by Bongarsius, because the differences between the two texts led him to infer the existence of a manuscript (for the Frankfurt edition) that was more closely connected with the Augsburg edition than with the original edition printed in Brno, therefore in his opinion the manuscript used by Bongarsius could not have been any other than a copy of the Augsburg edition.⁴ But he did

Vol. 1, Budapest 1959, 149–150; *Idem*, *A magyar könyv története 1711-ig*. [A history of the Hungarian book to 1711]. Budapest 1959, 61–69.) Elemér Mályusz did not accept the suggestion that the manuscript of the *Carmen Miserabile* may have survived in Várad for 250 years quite unknown to the world. E. Mályusz, *A Thuróczy-krónika és forrásai*. [The Chronicle of Thuróczy and its sources] Budapest 1967, 157, n. 45. In another work – adopting another approach to the problem, and taking the age of Rogerius as his starting point, and not that of Thuróczy, when the text came to light again, – he came to the conclusion that a copy of the *Carmen Miserabile* had found its way to the royal court of Hungary, in the middle of the thirteenth century. E. Mályusz, *Az V. István-korigesta*. [The Gesta written under István V]. Budapest 1971, 14–15, 58.

² *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum tempore ducum regumque stirpis Arpadianae gestarum*. ed. E. Szentpétery, 2 vols. Budapestini 1937–1938. (henceforth: SRH) 2: 543–588.

³ *Rerum Hungaricarum scriptores varii historici et geographici*. ed. I. Bongarsius, Francofurti 1600, 6a. Actually it was not only in connection with Rogerius that Bongarsius referred to a manuscript, because he listed the contents of the entire volume, and mentioned Thuróczy and Küküllei, too, by name, and then he made the following remark: "*Hos edimus ex manuscripto nostro, et veteri editione Augustana, quae prodit Anno 1483.*" This remark leads us to the conclusion that the manuscript accessible to Bongarsius was not a manuscript of a separate work, containing only Rogerius's *Carmen Miserabile*, but had to be in some way connected with Thuróczy's Chronicle. This is worth mentioning, because the critical edition of Rogerius's work did not refer to this possibility.

⁴ SRH 2: 549, "*quia autem textu collato apparuit editionem F [i.e. the Frankfurt edition – T. A.] non esse aliam, ac editionem A [the Augsburg edition – T. A.] a Bongarsio correctam, et quia differentia quae inter editiones A et F est, non e manu scripto editioni B [the Brno edition – T. A.] sed editioni A propinquo exstare potuit – editor enim editionis B codice usus est et editio A sola editione B multis locis correctis nititur, – manu scriptum a Bongarsio usitatum aliud esse not potuit, ac descriptio editionis A*".

not altogether reject another idea, either, namely that no manuscript was actually available to Bongarsius, and his aim in mentioning a manuscript was to augment the prestige of his edition, and to legitimate his corrections which – seemingly based on a manuscript – could more easily be accepted and seem obvious and correct.⁵ The second example mentioned by László Juhász in his preface to the critical edition of the *Carmen Miserabile* was Henrik Marczali, who claimed to have found, in a monastery in Ghent, the traces of a codex, which was mentioned in the records, but when he tried to find the book itself it could not be found where it should have been.⁶ In the end of his investigations, László Juhász came to the conclusion that it was unlikely that a manuscript of the *Carmen Miserabile* should have survived from the period falling between the writing of the original manuscript in the thirteenth century and the printing of the text in 1488, and it was not to be expected that the original manuscript or a version closely related to it or the manuscript serving for the basis of the Brno edition of 1488 may turn up.⁷

Besides the above examples, we can find in the literature of the subject another suggestion, too, according to which it was Italy where the manuscript of Rogerius's work was preserved. In Vol. 2 of the history of the Benedictines of Pannonhalma, Irén Zoltvány and Rudolf Gyulai, who surveyed the European collections where important *hungarica* materials are kept, implied that Italy should be considered concerning Rogerius.⁸ Their opinion passed unnoticed in Hungary. In this paper my aim is to examine, whether the above-mentioned suppositions concerning the survival of a manuscript or manuscripts of Rogerius's work in Italy have any foundation in facts, or if they have not, what lead the authors to accept it, and what may have caused the misunderstandings or errors.

Up to now, we made a survey of the problems encountered in the course of our investigations of how the text of the *Carmen Miserabile* came down to us. We can distinguish three groups of problems, and will try to give a satisfactory answer to each. Of the three problems that of the Italian manuscript mentioned in the history of the Benedictine order has proved to be the most thorny one, and we must admit, that it could not be solved to our satisfaction. The reason why it is difficult to find the answer to this particular problem is that the assumed place of provenance was not specified by the authors⁹ and they did not cite the source on

⁵ SRH 2: 549, n. 3, "*Fieri potest, ut Bongarsius re vera manuscriptum non habens ideo scripserit se codice usum esse, ut editio melior haberetur et correctiones suas, quasi e manu scripto promptas, legitimas iustasque ostenderet demonstraretque*".

⁶ SRH 2: 547, n. 1, "*Vestigium cuiusdam codicis Marczali (Enchiridion, 151.) in monasterio civitatis Gent invenit, codicem autem ipsum ibidem frustra quaestivit ...*".

⁷ SRH 2: 547, n. 2, "*Inter opus manu scriptum Rogerii vel ei propius accedens et codicem fundamento editioni primae (B) positum alios codices exstitisse non credimus*".

⁸ *A Pannonhalmi Szent-Benedek-rend története* [The History of the Benedictine Order of Pannonhalma]. Vol. 2, Budapest 1903, 208.

⁹ We cannot dismiss the possibility, either, that this statement did not originate with Gyulai and Zoltvány, because, at the beginning of the chapter mentioned above (207,

which their opinion about the existence of a Rogerius manuscript kept in Italy was based. They prepared a bibliography of the sources of Hungarian history for the history of the Benedictine abbey of Pannonhalma, but they cited only one secondary source for their work, János Pauer's monograph, *Az egyházi rend érdeme Magyarország történetében* (The credit due to the clergy, the first Estate of the Realm, for their contribution to Hungarian history).¹⁰ It cannot be conclusively decided, either, whether the authors based their statements about the historical sources – and about the *Carmen Miserabile*, among others – on Pauer's monograph alone, or they used other works, too, which they did not mention in their bibliography. As to Pauer, he mentions the *Carmen Miserabile* twice. The first relevant mention is the following: "... It was Italy that first brought to light the Attila of Kalan and Roger's history about the devastation of Hungary by the Tartars ...", then, after a few pages, we can find the name of Rogerius mentioned a second time: "Rogerius's work was published in 1483, and there were other editions, too, later on."¹¹ However, it is still impossible to decide, whether Zoltvány and Gyulai's opinion in the history of the Benedictine order about the Italian edition of Rogerius can be traced back directly to the above-cited text or not. The fact that Pauer – unlike the History of the Benedictine Order – mentions not a manuscript, but a printed edition seems to contradict the direct connection between the two. Still, Zoltvány and Gyulai may have supposed that this "first, Italian edition of 1483" was based on a manuscript which survived in an Italian ecclesiastical library.

The problem in its wider context, that an Italian edition of a Hungarian chronicle was printed in the 1480s, has connections with Thuróczy's Chronicle, too. Hungarian bibliographers and historians held for a long time the opinion that an edition of Thuróczy's Chronicle had been published in Venice, before 1488. The fact that this edition existed was accepted by several Hungarian and foreign scholars, but they could not agree about the exact date of publication. Ferenc Toldy, a Hungarian literary scholar was the first who tried to solve the complex and tangled problem of the Venetian edition.¹² In the end, he came to the conclusion that Thuróczy's Chronicle had in fact an edition published without date, but this came out before 1485. Anyway, this shows, that the Venice edition had a long-established tradition in Hungarian scholarship. Despite the fact that

note 1) we are told that some parts of the volume were written by the editor of this volume, Pongrácz Sörös.

¹⁰ J. Pauer, *Az egyházi rend érdeme Magyarország történetében Az Árpádok időszakától korunkig*. [The credit due to the clergy, the first Estate of the Realm, for their contribution to Hungarian history. From the age of the Árpád Dynasty to the present]. Székesfehérvár 1947. Another edition of this work originated from 1855. On comparing the two editions, it seems that the two editions are actually the same edition: in 1855 a new title page was provided for the volumes left over from the 1847 edition, in order to sell it as a new one.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 146 and 153.

¹² F. Toldy, „Turóczy krónikája' különféle kiadásai,” [The various editions of Thuróczy's Chronicle], *Új Magyar Múzeum* 1–2 (1850–1851), 386–393.

Pauer mentioned only an edition of Rogerius's work, and did not say anything about Thuróczy, we cannot entirely discard the idea that he also belonged to the group attached to this chronicle tradition, because he gave 1483 as the date of the first edition of Rogerius's work.¹³ It is only a suggestion, too, that Irén Zoltvány and Rudolf Gyulai may also have taken as their starting point some element of the rich tradition surrounding the "Venetian" edition of Thuróczy's Chronicle – perhaps in addition to Pauer's work or to other unknown sources. It must be admitted, however, that this suggestion is based on rather shaky foundations, as the tradition mentioned Thuróczy's work alone, on each occasion, without referring to Rogerius, and was quite clear about the fact that this was a printed edition and not a manuscript. The authors of the History of the Benedictine Order may have thought that when the first, "Venetian" edition of Thuróczy's Chronicle was printed, someone appended Rogerius's *Carmen Miserabile* to it, and the manuscript remained somewhere in an Italian collection, survived there, and could still be found. All this of course is mere guesswork, but no more could be found out about the background of the recurring statements concerning the Italian edition of Rogerius's work, or about their eventual "firm" basis. On the other hand, it is well known that modern historical research refused to accept the opinion that a pre-1485 printed edition of Thuróczy's Chronicle should be regarded as the first edition,¹⁴ therefore if the above-cited statements made by the authors of the History of the Benedictine Order in Hungary were in fact influenced by this tradition, then the foundations on which they based their theses could be considered as refuted, and with good reason. On the other hand, if our exploration of the

¹³ Though Toldy did not mention the year when the edition of Venice was supposed to be published, Pauer's opinion referring to 1483 as the appropriate date was supported by other statements and data, these can be found in the professional literature of his day. It was Bongarsius whose work mentioned the date 1483 in connection with the Augsburg edition. (See above, Note 3). As Toldy, in his above-mentioned article, made it clear that the printer of the Augsburg edition of 1488 was Ratdolt, who had worked in Venice between 1477 and 1487, Pauer may have concluded from this chronological succession that Italy had been the place of the first edition. Apart from this, another mention of a Hungarian chronicle published in Venice in 1483 can be found later, quite independently of the other opinions. It was Miklós Vértessy, who disclosed that the following entry could be found, (under signature J2 of the Manuscript Department), in the catalogue of the University Library [of Budapest], (the listing of the manuscripts began in 1690): "*Hungarorum Cronica. Typo Veteri. Venetiis 1483*". Of course, we cannot tell, which chronicle was described by this entry, we cannot even be sure, whether such a chronicle existed at all. Thuróczy's Chronicle, however – as Vértessy found out – can also be found in this catalogue, but it is under the letter T. M. Vértessy, "Egy 1483-ban kiadott magyar krónika," [A Hungarian chronicle published in 1483] *Magyar Könyvszemle* 80 (1964), 74.

¹⁴ The convincing arguments against this opinion came from Elemér Varjú and have continued to be accepted ever since, as still valid. E. Varjú, "A Thuróczy-krónika kiadásai és a Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum könyvtárában őrzött példányai," [The successive editions of Thuróczy's Chronicle and the copies kept in the Library of the Hungarian National Museum] *Magyar Könyvszemle* n.s. 10 (1902), 362–402.

background of their opinions was based on a mistaken view or a misinterpretation of their conception, then we should come to the conclusion that they strayed too far away from solid facts, and they either failed to present their views clearly, or did not cite their sources at all. Therefore we have to declare that the statements by the authors of the History of the Benedictine Order of Pannonhalma concerning the Rogerius "manuscript" are either mistaken, or cannot be adequately confirmed by facts.

Let us turn to our second problem. Is it true that Bongarsius had a manuscript in his possession, or did the erudite author only want to make others believe that he had used a manuscript for his editorial work, because he wanted to raise the prestige of his edition? Luckily this question can be answered to our satisfaction and we are glad to be able to acquit Bongarsius of the insinuations against him and give him his due: he did have a manuscript to start from. Hungarian scholarly sources around the turn of the century mentioned on several occasions that in Bongarsius's library, in Berne, there was a codex originating from the end of the fifteenth century, it was a copy of the Augsburg edition of Thuróczy's Chronicle. This fact has a particular interest for us, because this book was shown at the exhibition organised by the Municipal Library of Berne in Budapest, in 1882, and could be seen and examined by Hungarian scholars in Hungary. The guide to the exhibition included a description of the book under item 119 followed by the note: "This is the copy used by Bongarsius for his edition of Thuróczy's Chronicle."¹⁵ József Kaszák, in his treatise on Thuróczy's life and work also mentioned this copy, kept in Berne, and he also made a reference to the guide compiled for the book exhibition organised in Budapest.¹⁶ He completed the information published in the exhibition catalogue by adding that "[in his opinion] the manuscript was a copy of the incomplete Augsburg edition." This codex was mentioned next by Gyula Gábor, who had the opportunity to examine the codex in Berne, together with the abridged edition of Thuróczy's Chronicle printed in Augsburg, which had been in Bongarsius's possession.¹⁷ An examination of these books led him to make rather startling remark that Bongarsius's edition was based not on the manuscript, but on the printed edition issued in Augsburg. For this reason, his short communication gave particular attention to the incunabula. He also remarked that in his opinion the press marks to be found in the volume referred to two different editions. In Bongarsius's copy of the Augsburg edition which served as the composer's guide when preparing the text, because there was no manuscript, two sets of proofmarks could be distinguished – one set originated from Bongarsius, and was made for the Frankfurt edition of 1600, but another set of proofmarks could be seen in it, too, which – in Gábor's

¹⁵ *Könyvkiállítási emlék* [Souvenir of a book exposition] The 2. augm. edition of the Guide to the Book Exhibition, Budapest 1992, 38–39.

¹⁶ J. Kaszák, *Thuróczy János élete és krónikája*. [János Thuróczy's life and his Chronicle.] Budapest 1906, 22.

¹⁷ Gy. Gábor, "Egy ismeretlen Thuróczy-kiadás (?)," [An unknown edition of Thuróczy's Chronicle (?)] *Magyar Könyvszemle* n.s. 20 (1912), 302–308.

opinion – belonged to an unknown edition from the first quarter of the sixteenth century. To the best of our knowledge, this intriguing and puzzling communication found no response whatsoever in the Hungarian world of learning. It has not been refuted nor confirmed by those who should have an opinion about it. It must be admitted, however, that no such edition is known to us. Gábor mentioned the manuscript discussed in this paper, too, and in his opinion it was a copy of the abbreviated Augsburg edition, made in the late fifteenth century. He also gave its signature: Ms. 279.¹⁸ When all is said and done, we can come to the conclusion that László Juhász's opinion, based on the comparison between the Augsburg and Frankfurt editions of Thuróczy's Chronicle, and leading him to suppose that, even if Bongarsius had a manuscript text, it must have been a copy of the printed text of the Augsburg edition, proved to be true. The manuscript exists, that is beyond question by now, but it is the full text of János Thuróczy's Chronicle as published in the Augsburg edition, and it is only a spin-off of the printed text, which may have its uses, but is certainly not the independent manuscript version of Rogerius's original work, Rogerius scholars has been hoping to find.

And now let us take a closer look at our third problem. The inquiry after the Rogerius manuscript in Ghent, the existence of which had been discovered by Henrik Marczali, but its whereabouts remained to be detected, raised more problems than the two other lines of investigation. Marczali's communication of 1901 was extremely laconic: "The manuscript [of Rogerius's work, the *Carmen Miserabile* – T. A.] has not survived; the only copy known to scholars was in Ghent, in Belgium, but it has been lost from the library of the cathedral chapter of Ghent by now".¹⁹ Unfortunately, Marczali failed to indicate the secondary sources of this piece of information, the references to scholars who "were aware of the existence" of this codex were lacking. It seems that Marczali was the only Hungarian scholar who mentioned the name of Ghent in connection with the manuscript of the *Carmen Miserabile*. It is not clear, how he managed to find out that a Rogerius manuscript was kept in the library of the cathedral chapter in Ghent, we can only make guesses. Lothar von Heinemann published the *Carmen Miserabile* by Rogerius in 1892, in a volume of the series *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*.²⁰ It seems that Hungarian scholars did not pay much attention to this edition, because no reference or mention was made by them to this work. The literature listed in the much-cited (Hungarian) critical edition did not contain any mention of it, either, when giving an overview of the previous editions. The *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*'s introduction to Rogerius's text states that the only surviving manuscript of the *Carmen Miserabile* was kept in the library of the cathedral chapter of Ghent. The editors of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*

¹⁸ *Ibid.* 303.

¹⁹ M. Henrik, *A magyar történet kútforrásainak kézikönyve*. [A handbook of the sources of Hungarian history] Budapest 1901, 151.

²⁰ *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (henceforth: MGH). *Scriptores XXIX*. Hannover 1892, 547–567.

would have liked to examine the manuscript, when they prepared the critical edition of the text, but unfortunately it was impossible for them, because Henri Pirenne, the famous Belgian historian who had been requested to study the text, could not find it in the library. We do not know it for certain, but it is quite probable that Henrik Marczali, as the only Hungarian scholar whose attention was attracted by the statement published in the prestigious German series, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, began to search on his own for the codex in Ghent, but he also failed to find it. But we must admit that we also have doubts because, when we tried to reconstruct Marczali's starting point, we realised that the German text edition was disclosing more information than we have cited above, was more informative, and the information was of a kind, which may have influenced Marczali's decision. The editor of the MGH added to the mention of the Codex in Ghent – as a source containing the only manuscript of the text of the *Carmen Miserabile* known to us today – the following note: "*Auct. Ant. V. p.*" LXIX. *ut in editione principe Iohannis de Thurócz Chronica Hungarorum in hoc codice carmini praecedit.*"²¹ This statement is clear enough for us to understand that the codex in Ghent does not contain an independent text we are looking for, but a text dependent on another, the text published as the appendix to Thuróczy's Chronicle. German historians may not have stated it quite clearly, but Marczali must have been aware of the fact that the connection between the two texts could no longer be regarded as accidental, because the two editions where these texts were connected to each other were quite independent of each other, and the connection between the texts continued even in a new medium, and was transposed from manuscript to printed text or rather the other way round. There must have been a reason for this, and it may have had something to do with the lack of an original Rogerius manuscript. In the *Enchiridion* Marczali does not seem to be aware of the connection between Rogerius's text kept in Ghent and Thuróczy's Chronicle. Still, whether we were right or not in our findings when we tried to follow Marczali's statement about the Rogerius manuscript back to its sources, in the literature of the subject, the manuscript in Ghent is worth studying anyway, because it may help us to find more information about this interesting problem than the few facts recorded in the *Enchiridion*.

The above-cited note appended to the preface in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* referred to Vol. 5 of a subseries of the famous source edition, *Auctores Antiquissimi*. Theodor Mommsen published his edition of the *Getica* by Iordanes in this series, in 1882.²² In the preface to his edition Mommsen listed one by one the codices containing texts by Jordanes, among others a codex printed in the fifteenth century and kept in Ghent. This codex in Ghent was examined for Mommsen, at his request, by another German historian, Ludwig Bethmann. Luckily for us, in addition to his remarks concerning Jordanes, Mommsen listed the full contents of the volume, and that is why he came to mention, among others,

²¹ *Ibid.* 548, n. 7.

²² MGH *Auctores Antiquissimi V. I. Iordanis Romana et Getica*. Hg. Th. Mommsen, Berolini 1882 (Nd. München 1982.) lxxix.

Thuróczy's *Chronica Hungarorum* and Rogerius's *Carmen Miserabile* about the devastation of Hungary by the Tartars.²³ The first possessor of the codex was Raphael de Marcatellis, a famous book collector. Several volumes of his collection are still extant and known to us, though they are scattered in various library collections all over Europe. The codex containing Thuróczy's Chronicle and the *Carmen Miserabile* remained in Ghent. It was also mentioned by Antoine Sanders, another famous Belgian book collector, in his catalogue, published in 1641, this is the earliest published catalogue of the manuscript collections in Belgium. The catalogue contains the description of two collections from Ghent: that of the cathedral and of a Benedictine monastery. The list of manuscripts of the cathedral consists of 33 items, and the seventeenth item is recorded as *Chronica Hungarorum*,²⁴ which is likely to refer to the above-mentioned codex. Mommsen published the *Getica* of Jordanes in 1882, and while the edition was being prepared, Bethmann had the occasion to examine at first hand the codex in Ghent. In the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* the preface to Rogerius is dated to 1888, this is the date we can see at the end. At this time or perhaps somewhat earlier Henri Pirenne was no longer able to find this volume in Ghent, nor could Marczali find it between 1892 (the date of publication of Vol. XXIX of the MGH) and 1901 (the date of publication of the *Enchiridion*). We do not know what happened to the manuscript during that time, where it had been and when and why it surfaced again. Because it turned up again and can be found. Professor Albert Delorez discussed the subject of Raphael de Marcatellis's book collection in a monograph, in 1979,²⁵ and it is quite clear from what he writes that the codex we have been looking for can be found in the library of the Cathedral at present, under signature Ms. 15.²⁶ According to Delorez's opinion, the manuscript is a copy of the Augsburg edition of Thuróczy's (printed) Chronicle. The microfilm copy accessible to us in the University Library of Szeged gave us an opportunity to examine the manuscript, and we agree with him. Besides the introduction about Abbot Raphael, his life and book collection shows us quite clearly that the abbot was one of those wealthy book

²³ *Ibid.* "Gandavensis capituli membranaceus fol. Saec. XV. exeuntis, cui in fine adscriptis idem librarius haec: "hoc volumen comparavit Rapahel de Marcatellis dei gratia episcopus Rosensis abbas S. Bavonis iuxta Gandavum a.d. 1492.; continet historiam naturalem animalium con figuris, Iordanis Getica, Iohannis de Thurocz chronicon Hungariae, Rogeri carmen de destructione Hungariae, Aeneae Silvii historiam Bohemicam ..." Incidentally, Mommsen did not use the text of the codex of Ghent for his edition of Jordanes, because he found it to be "inutilis".

²⁴ *Bibliotheca Belgica manuscripta. Coll. et ed. Sanderus, Antonius.* Insulis (Lille) Anno MDCXLI. [Bruxelles 1972] 335-336. Libri manuscripti in ecclesia cathedrali S.Bavonis Gandavensis.

²⁵ A. Delorez, *The library of Raphael de Marcatellis Abbot of St Bavon's, Ghent 1437-1508.* Gent 1979. Item 29. Ms. 15. A., Bestiary, Orientalia, pp. 168-180; B., The second section ... Jordanes, *De origine actibusque getarum* ... (Ms. 15/2), Johhanes de Thwroc, *Chronica Hungarorum* ... (p.174.) (Ms. 15/3.). Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, *Historia Bohemica* ... (Ms. 15/4.).

²⁶ A microfilm copy can be found in the Central Library of the University of Szeged.

collectors and bibliophiles who would not content with printed books, because they found them too modest and plain to look at, and for this reason they had special – often hand-written – copies made, to decorate them with miniatures and rich bindings, and they put in their collection these more ornate copies. Raphael de Marcatellis's collection contains several of these copies made of printed books. Thus we conclude that no Rogerius text independent of Thuróczy's Chronicle can be found in Ghent, either.²⁷

At the end of our investigation we are led to the conclusion that no pre-1488 manuscript of the *Carmen Miserabile* is known to us. The opinions which seemed to support the existence of these early manuscripts proved to be based on misunderstandings or errors. By now it is quite clear that two manuscript versions are still extant, yet these manuscripts are not independent copies of Rogerius's work, but are copies based on a printed text, the Augsburg edition of Thuróczy's Chronicle, which means that they cannot tell us anything new concerning the text and its transmission. László Juhász's opinion and findings concerning Rogerius's text are still valid on all essential points. However, when all is said and done, we still feel that the above investigation was by no means useless, because it helped us to shed light on matters which had not been suitably settled before, as they were sometimes based on muddled, contradictory, unfounded or seemingly groundless statements. We managed to clear up most of the muddle. It is true that we still have not found any original manuscript text of the *Carmen Miserabile*. But by now we have two printed texts of both the Thuróczy Chronicle and the *Carmen Miserabile*, and we have renewed our acquaintance with facts which were slowly falling into oblivion, e.g. the existence of the Codices of Berne and Ghent. The two codices might have little value from the point of view of the transmission of such texts as those of the *Carmen Miserabile* and of Thuróczy's Chronicle, but they are shedding valuable light on the later life of the two texts connected to each other by their long-standing coexistence within the same volume through the ages.

²⁷ I wish to express my thanks to (the late) Béla Karácsonyi, Terézia Olajos and Samu Szádecky-Kardoss, for their valuable and generous help in tracking down the Ghent codex.