

## More Evidence of the Earliest Translation of Menander Rhetor on the Monody

*Pernille Harsting\**

In no. 67 (1997) of the present journal I presented and edited two Latin translations from the 15th and 16th centuries of the chapter on the monody (a variety of the funeral speech) belonging to the second of the two late-classical Greek treatises on epideictic rhetoric which are traditionally attributed to Menander Rhetor of Laodicea.<sup>1</sup> In the introduction I stated that the earliest of the two translations can be dated to before 13 September 1423. This is the date of the oldest extant copy of the translation, made by a notary by the name of Ditaiutus de Vitaliis of Osimo, and now to be found in the Vatican Library. Another copy of the earliest Latin translation belongs to the Biblioteca Comunale Augusta in Perugia. However, the text found in the Perugia manuscript is in itself a copy at least twice removed from the earliest translation: As appears from the context, it is a copy of a copy made by one otherwise unknown

---

\* I am grateful to Sten Ebbesen for his comments on this article; to Russell L. Friedman for his comments and for correcting my English; to Fabio Stok for kindly introducing me to Marco Buonocore; and to Marco Buonocore for generously and with no delay making the Vatican incunabulum as well as his below-mentioned bibliographical study on the book available to me. — The Carlsbergfondet and the Danish Research Council for the Humanities made it possible for me to work at the Vatican Library as well as at the Bibliothèque nationale de France in Paris, and thus get access to the material presented in this article and in my former studies of Menander Rhetor's work. I wish to extend my gratitude to these foundations.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Pernille Harsting, "Two Renaissance Translations of Menander Rhetor on the Monody. Edited with a Note on the Introduction of the Genre in the Latin West", *op.cit.*, pp. 13-32. — The modern standard edition of Menander Rhetor's Greek treatises is D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson (edd.), *Menander Rhetor, edited with Translation and Commentary* (Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1981), hereafter referred to as R&W. The chapter *περὶ μονωδίας* is found in R&W 434,10-437,4.

Aurelius Romanus. Unfortunately we do not know the date of Aurelius' transcription; the copy of this in the Perugia manuscript, on the other hand, dates from the late 15th or early 16th century. The few variant readings presented in my edition of the Vatican and the Perugia copies in *CIMAGL 67* indicate that the copy made by Ditaiutus de Vitaliis is closer to the original translation than the one made by Aurelius Romanus.

The fact that Ditaiutus' and Aurelius' texts are both apographs, and that the text in the Perugia manuscript is merely a copy of another copy, presupposes the existence of other texts, including the original translation, and suggests the possibility that some of these texts might still be extant. However, in my search for material on the *fortuna* of this earliest translation of a part of Menander Rhetor's treatises, I had only come across the two above mentioned copies.

It is therefore exciting to be able now to report the finding of yet another copy of the earliest translation of the prescriptions on the monody, and thus yet another witness to the dissemination of Menander Rhetor's epideictic treatises in the 15th century.

The new copy of the Latin translation of Menander Rhetor on the monody was discovered by Marco Buonocore and mentioned in the article, "Fogli di guardia manoscritti referenti autori classici in incunaboli vaticani. Un primo censimento" (*Scriptorium* 51 (1997), pp. 151-156); more specifically in the section on "Chirius Fortunatianus, Aurelius Augustinus, Menander Rhetor" (pp. 155-156).

The new translation mentioned by Buonocore is found on the recto of the back endpaper of the incunabulum Inc. II. 658 which belongs to the Vatican Library. The book was printed in Venice on March 5, 1485 at the press of Andreas Torresanus de Asula and Bartholomaeus de

Blavis de Alexandria, and contains a series of mainly classical rhetorical texts by Cicero, Aeschines, and Demosthenes.<sup>2</sup>

In addition to these printed rhetorical works, on the verso of the last printed page and on the following last page of the incunabulum, are found two manuscript texts: (a) Chirius Fortunatianus, *De memoria* and *De pronuntiatione* (i.e. C. F., *De rhetorica* III, 13-23); and (b) [Aurelius Augustinus], *De officio oratoris* and *De fine oratoris* (i.e. A. A., *De rhetorica* 1-3).<sup>3</sup> Immediately after these two excerpts, on the recto of the back endpaper of the book, there follows yet another manuscript copy of the earliest Latin translation of Menander Rhetor's prescriptions on the monody, entitled: *Ex Menandro Rhetore in secundo diuisionis demonstratiui generis caput de oratione funebri caput xiiii*.<sup>4</sup> The verso of the back endpaper is blank.

As Buonocore notes, both the front and the back endpaper of the incunabulum are watermarked. Buonocore identifies the two watermarks with Briquet no. 7312, a fleur-de-lis found in a Venetian stamp of 1479.<sup>5</sup> However, when inspecting the endpapers, I noticed that the two watermarks vary somewhat from the Briquet type. First of all, in both watermarks, the diameter of the circle in which the fleur-de-lis is

---

<sup>2</sup> I.e.: (1) eight works by Cicero: *De oratore*, *Orator*, *Epistula (Fam.)* 7.19, *Topica*, *Partiitiones oratoriae*, *Brutus*, *De petitione consulatus*, and *De optimo genere oratorum*; (2) Leonardo Aretino's Latin translations of Aeschines' *Contra Ctesiphontem* and Demosthenes' *De corona*; (3) a Latin translation of Pseudo-Aeschines' *Epistula* 12; and (4) Omnibonus Leonicens' *Oratio de laudibus eloquentiae*. — The Vatican Library holds two copies of this book, cf. Marco Buonocore, op.cit., p. 155, n. 24. I have also had access to the copy in the Royal Library, Copenhagen, registered as no. 1188 in Victor Madsen, *Katalog over Det Kongelige Biblioteks Inkunabler* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1935-1963).

<sup>3</sup> On these works see M. Buonocore; op.cit., p. 155-156 and notes 25-26.

<sup>4</sup> The title agrees with that of the Vatican and the Perugia copies of the translation, cf. P. Harsting, op.cit. (n. 1 above), p. 22.

<sup>5</sup> See M. Buonocore, op.cit., p. 156. Cf. also C. M. Briquet, *Les filigranes* (Leipzig: 1923<sup>2</sup>), vol. 2, "Fleur de Lis".

inscribed, is smaller than the one found in Briquet no. 7312; moreover, the two watermarks show a triple flower bud or stamen, and not a single one as in the Briquet type.<sup>6</sup>

All Briquet's examples of fleur-de-lis inscribed in a circle are Italian. This is undoubtedly also the case with the watermarks on the endpapers of the Vatican Inc. II. 658. Briquet's examples (no. 7311-7320) date from 1390 to 1592; and no. 7312, which clearly comes closest to the watermarks of the incunabulum endpapers, dates from 1479. It is probable that the incunabulum endpapers with the watermarks were produced at about this time.

Yet, the very occurrence of the fleur-de-lis watermark on both the front and the back endpapers of the incunabulum makes it possible to argue, as I shall do in what follows, that the manuscript copy of the Menander Rhetor translation, found on the recto of the back endpaper, was probably made after the book was printed in Venice in 1485.

The rhetorical texts by Chirius Fortunatianus and Aurelius Augustinus were copied by one and the same hand onto the verso of the last printed page and continued on the following last page of the incunabulum. The copy of the Menander Rhetor translation, however, was made by another hand and written on the recto of the very last, inserted page of the book. This page was not inserted at random. On the contrary, it corresponds to a similar page at the very beginning of the book: both pages are made of the same kind of paper and display an identical type of watermark. The two pages were undoubtedly inserted at one and the same time, namely when the book was bound, to serve as front and back endpages respectively. Thus, there is no reason to believe that the copy of the Menander Rhetor translation was written upon a

---

<sup>6</sup> For the 'triple flower bud' type, see C. M. Briquet, *op.cit.*, e.g. nos. 7309 and 7315.

loose manuscript page, only to be inserted later and by chance into the incunabulum.

Conversely, the Menander Rhetor translation, along with the texts from Fortunatianus and Augustinus, appears to have been copied directly into the book some time after it had been bound. The “new” copy of the Menander Rhetor translation can therefore be dated to after 1485.

The “new” copy of Menander Rhetor on the monody in the Vatican incunabulum (Inc. II. 658 = Inc.V) evinces some significant differences from the two other extant copies of the translation (in the ms. Ross. 442 (= V) of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, and in the ms. C 61 (= P) of the Biblioteca Augusta in Perugia ).

In what follows I will analyse the variant readings, including some minor variations of spelling and abbreviation, in order to determine the relationship of the “incunabulum copy” (Inc.V) to the Vatican and the Perugia copies of the earliest Latin Menander Rhetor translation.

---

In the following list of variant readings,

- (a) line numbers refer to my edition of the copies of the translation in V and P in *CIMAGL* 67, pp. 22-24.
- (b) [?] indicates that the reading is uncertain;
- (c) readings *ante* and *post correctionem* are separated by an oblique stroke, e.g. “spetiens [?] / spetiem”;
- (d) the sign “^” represents the nasal stroke, i.e. undefined “m” or “n”;
- (e) the allographs “e caudata” and “ae” are uniformly rendered as “ae”.

## LIST OF VARIANT READINGS

	<u>Inc. II. 658 (Inc.V)</u>	<u>MS. Ross. 442 (V)</u>		<u>MS. C. 61 (P)</u>
1	demonstratiui	demostratiui	(l. 2)	DEMONSTRATIVI
2	spetiens [?] / spetiem	spetiem	(l. 3)	spetiem
3	heccubae	hecubae	(l. 4)	Hecubae
4	sumere	sumere	(l. 6)	summere
5	funebri sermo	funebri sermo	(l. 8)	sermo funebri
6	e.niscere [?] / cômiscere	cômiscere	(l. 10)	conmiscere
7	adsidue	assidue	(l. 10)	assidue
8	caussa	causa	(l. 11)	causa
9	ciuitatis / ciuitati	ciuitati	(l. 15)	ciuitati
10	igneniosus	ingeniosus	(l. 20)	ingeniosus
11	exibuit	exhibuit	(l. 20)	exhibuit
12	aegreferre	aegre ferre	(l. 25)	aegre ferre
13	ad deos parcas / ad deos et parcas	ad deos et parcas	(l. 25)	ad Deos et Parcas
14	orationenque	orationêque	(l. 28)	orationemque
15	felix	faelix	(l. 33)	felix
16	aditu	auditu	(l. 35)	auditu
17	adolescentes	adoloscentes	(l. 36)	adolescentes
18	eiicisti / eiecisti	eiecisti	(l. 41)	eiecisti
19	matre et patre / patre et matre	patre et matre	(l. 41)	patre et matre
20	luctunque	luctumque	(l. 42)	luctumque
21	qualenque	qualenque	(l. 44)	qualêque
22	gubernabant / gubernabant	gubernabant	(l. 45)	gubernabant
23	in futuro	in futuro	(l. 47)	in futurum
24	ciuium	ciuum	(l. 49)	ciuum
25	thalamum	talamum	(l. 50)	Thalamum
26	omnis	omnes	(l. 51)	omnes

27	lingua nunc contracta est	lingua contracta est	(l. 53)	lingua contracta est
28	adiuuenibus / adiuuenes	adiuuenes	(l. 56)	ad iuuenes
29	tolerant	tollerant	(l. 61)	tolerant
30	[?] / uoce	uoce	(l. 61)	uoce
31	conquestis [?] / conquestu [?]	conquestum	(l. 61)	conquestum
32	lachrymas / lacrymas / lachrymas	lachrimas	(l. 62)	lachrimas / lachrymas
33	harmoniam	armoniam	(l. 63)	harmoniam
34	arboribus	harboribus	(l. 63)	arboribus
35	otia	ocia	(l. 65)	otia
36	existentes ... ualent	existentes ... ualent	(l. 65)	existens ... ualet
37	FINIS.	Finis.	(l. 67)	<i>om.</i>

---

Of the eight instances in the list above, in which Inc.V agrees with V against P, three regard niceties of spelling or the use of abbreviations on the one hand and expansion of abbreviations on the other (4: *sumere*; 6: *cômiscere*; 21: *qualenque*), and one on a missing division of the word (28: *adiuuenes*), whereas the remaining four instances of agreement imply a significant choice of wording (5: *funeris sermo*; 23: *in futuro*; 36: *existentes ... ualent*; and (to a lesser degree) 37: *FINIS*).

As regards the eight instances in which Inc.V agrees with P against V, five of these involve trivial variations of spelling (1: *demonstratiui*; 25: *thalamum*; 29: *tolerant*; 33: *harmoniam*; and 34: *arboribus*),<sup>7</sup> one is an easily corrigible error in V (17: *adoloscentes*),

---

<sup>7</sup> On the “grecisms” of the Vatican copy, see P. Harsting, “The Golden Method of Menander Rhetor. The Translations and the Reception of the *περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν* in the Italian Renaissance”, *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 20 (Rome, 1992), pp. 139-157: 142.

whereas the remaining two are merely allographs (15: *felix vs. faelix*; and 35: *otia vs. ocia*).

To sum up, Inc.V shares significant variants with V against P, and only shares with P against V what can be characterised as unimportant normalisations. These normalisations do not necessitate any dependency between Inc.V and P, but are rather a sign of a greater mastery of the neo-classical orthography in these two texts compared to that of V. The agreement of word order, however, between Inc.V and V as opposed to P (5: *funeris sermo vs. sermo funeris*), of case (23: *in futuro vs. in futurum*), and of number (36: *existentes ... valent vs. existens ... valet*), clearly indicate that Inc.V is closely related to V.

In addition to this, the list of variants includes 19 cases in which Inc.V does not agree with either V or P. Seven of these are spelling errors or variations (3: *heccubae*; 7: *adsidue*; 8: *caussa*<sup>8</sup>; 10: *igneniosus*; 11: *exibuit*; 12: *aegreferre*; 20: *luctunque*). Nine cases involve erroneous readings, omissions, inversion of word order, and dittography, all *ante correctionem* (2: *spetiens* [?]; 6. *e.niscere* [?], 9: *ciuitatis*; 13: *ad deos parcas*; 18: *eiicisti*; 19: *matre et patre*; 22: *gubernabantbant*; 28: *adiuuenibus*; 31: *conquestis* [?]). All of these textual corruptions were emended by the copyist himself, and all agree *post correctionem* with V.

The three remaining cases of disagreement between Inc.V on the one hand and V and P on the other, are nos. 16, 24, and 27. Of these cases, no. 24 (“*ciuium*”) merely represents a normalisation compared to the corrupt readings found in V (“*ciuum*”) and P (“*ciuum*”). Nos. 16 and 27, however, are the most interesting of all the variant readings.

---

<sup>8</sup> It should be noted, however, that the spelling “*caussa*” is not characteristic of Inc.V which likewise displays the usual spelling of the word: “*haec omnia reddere causas luctuum*”, cf. l. 24 in my edition in *CIMAGL* 67, p. 23.



As for no. 16, “aditu” (Inc.V) vs. “auditu” (V and P), the Greek original has: ὅπως ὀμιλητικός (cf. R&W 435.26). V and P give the translation: “quod facilis auditu” (“that he was most attentive”), whereas Inc.V has: “quod facilis aditu” (“that he was most approachable”). Both “facilis auditu” and “facilis aditu” are acceptable translations of ὀμιλητικός, although I believe that the reading of Inc.V: “aditu” comes closest to the Greek. The different readings could be explained by a mistaking of “a” for “au” (or conversely) in the exemplar text — if not by an emendation of that text.

As for variant no. 27, the Greek original text has: οἷα γλῶττα συνέσταλται (cf. R&W 436.17). V and P translate: “qualis lingua contracta est”, whereas Inc.V has: “qualis lingua nunc contracta est”. In fact, the latter translation offers a better rendition of the Greek verbal form, a perfect indicative in the middle voice. The Latin verbal form “contracta est” can both be read as *praeteritum simplex*: “it became silent (then)” or “it was (then) silenced”, and as *praesens perfectum*: “it is (at this point) silent”. By adding the adverb “nunc”, the present tense of the Latin *praesens perfectum* “contracta est” is stressed, and the phrase can only be interpreted: “it is now silent”.

There can be no doubt that the copy of the Menander Rhetor translation found in the Vatican incunabulum, Inc. II. 658, is closely related to the copy found in the Vatican ms. Ross. 442. Moreover, both of these copies, along with the copy in the Perugian ms. C 61, are all dependent on, if not direct apographs of, the original translation from before 13 September 1423. Yet, as appears from the analysis of the variants, in a few cases the incunabulum copy seems to rely on another authority than the common exemplar translation.

The text of the incunabulum copy, including the corrections and improvements to this very text, were all written by one and the same

hand. It is clear that the copyist had an excellent command of Latin grammar and style. However, this does not sufficiently account for what appears, on the basis of the other known copies of the translation, to be emendations of their common manuscript exemplar. In fact, two of the examples of disagreement between Inc.V and mss. V and P (nos. 16 and 27 above) indicate that the Vatican incunabulum copy which dates from the late 15th century is more closely related to the original Greek text than the Vatican manuscript copy which was made in the first quarter of the 15th century. How can this be explained?

We know that the Greek text of Menander Rhetor's epideictic treatises was copied assiduously in Italy from the middle of the 15th well into the 16th century.<sup>9</sup> It is therefore possible that the copyist had access to both a copy of the original Greek text *περὶ μονωδίας* and a copy of the pre-1423 Latin translation *De oratione funebri*. This would explain what seems to be signs in the incunabulum copy of a contamination of the Greek and the Latin tradition of Menander Rhetor's text in the late 15th century.

---

<sup>9</sup> I am preparing a list of these Greek manuscript copies, which are found mainly in the Vatican Library, in the Florentine libraries, and in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, to be published in connection with my work on Menander Rhetor for the *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum*.