

ANALECTA ROMANA

INSTITUTI DANICI

EDENDA CURAVERUNT

OTTO STEEN DUE
KAREN ASCANI JESPER CARLSEN

XX

“L'ERMA” DI BRETSCHNEIDER

ROMAE MCMXCII

Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| F. O. HVIDBERG–HANSEN: Osservazioni su <i>Sardus Pater</i> in Sardegna | 7 |
| ZACCARIA MARI: Una cava romana all'Acquoria (Tivoli) | 31 |
| ITTAI GRADEL: <i>Mamia's Dedication: Emperor and Genius.</i> The Imperial Cult in Italy and the <i>Genius Coloniae</i> in Pompeii | 43 |
| JESPER CARLSEN: <i>Magister Pecoris.</i> The Nomenclature and Qualifications of the Chief Herdsman in Roman Pasturage..... | 59 |
| ANDREA MONETI: Nuovi sostegni all'ipotesi di una grande sala cupolata alla "Piazza d'Oro" di Villa Adriana | 67 |
| LUCOS COZZA: Mura di Roma dalla Porta Flaminia alla Pinciana | 93 |
| PERNILLE HARSTING: The golden Method of Menander Rhetor. The Translations and the Reception of the <i>περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν</i> in the Italian Renaissance..... | 139 |
| ELSEBETH AASTED: What the Corsini Scenari can tell us about the <i>Commedia dell'arte</i> | 159 |
| NIELS W. BRUUN: Zu einem neuen Niels Stensen–Brief..... | 183 |
| MOGENS NYKJÆR <i>La morte di Giacinto</i> di Giambattista Tiepolo: metamorfosi di un motivo ovidiano | 185 |

The Golden Method of Menander Rhetor

The Translations and the Reception of the περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν in the Italian Renaissance

by PERNILLE HARSTING

The numerous European works of epideictic poetry and rhetoric from the 15th and 16th centuries bear witness to the social and literary practice of the period as well as the vigour of a long social and literary tradition.

In the *clientela* society of antiquity as well as in that of the Renaissance, the epideictic poems and orations primarily defined and displayed the relationship between author and addressee. In the Renaissance, rules for literary clothing of this social behaviour were sought in classical rhetoric. However, the works of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian offered a psychological and descriptive, rather than normative, study of epideictics. Moreover, these authors all presuppose in the aspiring orator an extensive sense of *decorum*, the knowledge of *quid dicat et quo quidque loco et quo modo*.¹ When wishing to imitate, in actual practice, the classical theory, the Renaissance orator or poet therefore would have lacked a manual of epideictic *præcepta* as well as an introduction to the content of the classical concept of *decorum*.

A detailed presentation of epideictic practice could be found in the late classical works by Menander Rhetor and Pseudo-Dionysius of Halicarnassus (3rd–4th century AD). In the *περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν* and in the *Ars Rhetorica*, Menander Rhetor and Pseudo-Dionysius exemplify literary *decorum* in relation to specific social *decorum*. Here Renaissance humanists were offered concrete models for imitation.

In the following I wish to demonstrate not only that these models were available in the Renaissance but also that they aroused interest to a degree hitherto unsuspected. While the occasional literature of the medieval West seems uninfluenced by Menandrian and Pseudo-Dionysian precepts, Renaissance occasional

literature, like that of Byzantium,² appears strongly dependent on the precepts of these rhetoricians from late antiquity.³

But how and in what form were the treatises of Menander Rhetor and Pseudo-Dionysius available? I have elsewhere argued that Menander Rhetor had a major impact on Julius Caesar Scaliger's renowned *Poetices Libri Septem*. Based in part on Aldus' *editio princeps* of Menander Rhetor's two treatises in *Rhetores Graeci I* (Venice 1508), if not on a manuscript source⁴, Scaliger's *Poetices Libri Septem* (Lyon 1561) had a decisive influence on late Renaissance poetics and, even more, on Baroque poetics.⁵

The Aldine *editio princeps* doubtlessly contributed to knowledge of the treatises among the few who had a command of the Greek language, and thus also to a certain extent to the spreading of the epideictic precepts. But in my view the reason for the wide diffusion of Menandrian and Pseudo-Dionysian precepts, even long before the appearance of Scaliger's *Poetices Libri Septem* and the Greek *editio princeps*, should be sought elsewhere, namely in translations of the texts dating back to the beginning of the 15th century.

The present article forms part of a comprehensive study of the function of the prescriptions of Menander Rhetor and Pseudo-Dionysius as patterns of imitation for Renaissance epideictics.⁶ As a preliminary I wish here to discuss a number of 15th and 16th century translations of Menander Rhetor's *περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν*: (I) Two manuscript Latin translations of the precepts on the monody, (II) a printed Italian translation of the precepts on the βασιλικὸς λόγος, and (III) Natale Conti's Latin translation of the entire work.

These translations have not previously been examined together. In fact, the manuscript versions have not been subject to any examination at all. Both of these are *inedita* and the earliest is not recorded in Paul Oskar Kristeller's *Iter Italicum*.⁷

As for the printed versions, the Italian translation has not been properly examined either. The book is very rare and is recorded in only a few bibliographies.⁸

The Latin translation by Natale Conti is recorded in the standard catalogues,⁹ as well as in more recent studies.¹⁰ However, no thorough discussion of Conti's translation is available. In his work on Menander Rhetor's prescriptions on the funeral oration, Joachim Soffel offers no more than a very brief presentation of it.¹¹

Moreover, Soffel maintains that the Renaissance produced only two translations of Menander Rhetor's work, namely the printed Italian and Latin versions, both from the 16th century, and supposes the Italian translation (which he has not had access to) to be the earliest of all.¹² This is not so. In fact, the first of the translations that I wish to present predates 13 September 1423 and deals with the very part of Menander Rhetor's second treatise that was the subject of Soffel's studies.

Neither, unfortunately, is there help to be found in James J. Murphy's otherwise useful *A Short-Title Catalogue of Works on Rhetorical Theory* from 1981. By inadvertence Murphy lists the vernacular translation by Andrea Londano as a work of one Leandro Dondano,¹³ Natale Conti's translation of the entire work of Menander Rhetor is not registered at all in the catalogue.

A discussion of the Menander Rhetor translations therefore seems in order. While presenting the material in chronological order I shall attempt to shed light on the reception of Menander Rhetor's work in the Italian Renaissance through an examination of the possible sources for the translations and the evidence of the colophons and of the dedicatory letters.

Part of the material for chapter I of this article was first presented as a paper at the *Congresso Internazionale di Studi Umanistici* at Sassoferrato, 20–24th June 1990.¹⁴ The results of my

further examination of the Menander Rhetor manuscripts and translations have made it necessary to revise my hypothesis concerning the manuscript source for the pre-13 September 1423 translation.

References to Menander Rhetor's two treatises are to the editions of Walz, *Rhetores Graeci IX* (Tübingen 1836) (RG), pp. 127–330, Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci III* (Leipzig 1856) (RG), pp. 329–446, and D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson (Oxford 1981) (R&W).

I. THE EARLIEST TRANSLATION

The part of Menander Rhetor's treatises on epideictic rhetoric that was first translated into Latin seems to have been the chapter on the monody, *περὶ μονωδίας* (R&W 434.10–437.4). I have found the translation in two manuscripts only, one of which is the MS Rossiano 442 in the Vatican Library, the other the MS C 61 in the Biblioteca Augusta in Perugia.

The MS Rossiano 442 from the Vatican Library is a parchment manuscript, which consists of a copy of the *Ad Herennium* (fols 1–57v) and, in appendix to this, written by a different hand, the Latin translation of Menander Rhetor's precepts on the monody (fols 58–59v).¹⁵ The translation is entitled: *Ex Menandro Rhetore in secundo divisionis demof[n]strativi generis Capite de oratione Funebri Caput xiiij*. On fol. 58, 1–4, the title and the initial *H*(omerus) are rubricated. So is the colophon on fol. 59v, 2–5. On fol. 58v, a scholium, also rubricated, has been inserted in the margin: *hic thesaurus et dicitur hoc thesaurum*, referring to (*qualem*) *thesaurum*, fol. 58v, 25. The MS is registered in *Bibliothecae Rossianae Inventarium* (handwritten catalogue, undated), Plut. IX 1–141, Codd. 311–451, fol. 205r. It measures 24,8 x 17,2 cm and contains 60 fols, of which the last one is blank. Each page is divided into 28 lines.

There can be no doubt that the Vatican manuscript contains a copy, and not the original translation of the prescriptions on the monody. In the colophon (cf. Appendix 1), the copyist, Ditaiutus de Vitaliis from Osimo (in the province of Ancona in the Marche), writes that the text was sent (to Osimo) *ex urbe*, i. e., probably from Rome, and that he had made the

copy (*transcripti*) on the 13th September 1423. The Latin term *transcribere* only implies copying, not translating.¹⁶ Moreover, the scholium on the grammatical gender of the Latin word *thesaurus*, which was probably a translator's note (the Greek word is *χειμήλιον*, R&W 436, 1-2), has been rubricated on a level with the title of the translation and the initial *H*. This indicates that it was meticulously copied from an exemplar. I have not been able to find any additional information on the copyist, apart from the fact that Ditaiutus is the name of a noble Osiman family, records of which can be traced back as far as the beginning of the 14th century.¹⁷

The MS C 61 from the Biblioteca Augusta in Perugia was written by several hands at the end of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th centuries. This paper manuscript contains a collection of various works by humanist authors: poems (by e.g. Poliziano and Pontano), Roman inscriptions, letters (from e.g. Antiquario), inventories of poets and warriors, and a few Latin translations of Greek texts. The translation of the precepts on the monody was written on fols 121v–123v and entitled: *Ex Menandro Rhetore in secundo divisionis demonstrativi generis capite: de oratione funebri caput XIII*. The title and the initial word of the translation, *HOMERUS*, are rubricated, and a rubricated capital *B* has been inserted between the *E* and the *R* in *FUNERI* in the title, fol. 121v, 13. The manuscript is described in G. Mazzatinti, *Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia V* (Forlì 1895), pp. 96–97, and in P. O. Kristeller, *Iter Italicum II* (London 1967), pp. 54b–55a. It measures 29 x 17,5 cm and used to contain 137 fols, some of which are now missing. Each page is divided into 28 lines.

At the end of the translation, on fol. 123v, follows, as postscript, a letter from one Aurelius Romanus (hereafter AR) to another Aurelius (cf. Appendix 2). AR's letter is dated from Rome, 5th December, without indication of the year in question. It appears from the letter that the addressee, Aurelius, had for some time been asking AR and their mutual friend, Master Angelus, for this translation. Difficulties that are only hinted at as *mea fortuna* and *haec nubilosa tempora* had thus far prevented AR, so he claims, from sending the translation to Aurelius, and

only a certain (unspecified) diligence shown by Master Angelus had made it possible by then. In the last paragraph of the letter to Aurelius, AR commends himself to the brother of Aurelius, but strangely declares that he is not concerned about the father (*de patre non curo*). Possibly this suggests that AR's difficulties may have been of a private rather than political nature.

The relationship between the writer and the addressee seems to have been one of *amicitia* rather than a client–patron relationship. This is supported by the reference to a mutual friend, Master Angelus, and by the apostrophe *Aureli mi carissime*. AR appears to have been a kind of book agent for Aurelius. In this capacity he is now providing Aurelius with the translation and promises to look out for more material in the future.

As regards the transmission, the text that has been preserved in the Perugian manuscript certainly must be an apograph of AR's writings. This I conclude from the fact that the translation and AR's letter have not been preserved as a separate document inserted in a composite volume. On the contrary, they form part of a florilegium in which they were entered on fol. 121v, line 9ff., following the last four distichs of a Latin monodiac poem. The first part of the translation thus constitutes the last two thirds of the verso of fol. 121.

As to the previous stages of the transmission, P. O. Kristeller in his description of the MS C 61 states that Aurelius Romanus was responsible for the Latin translation: '119v–121v. ¹⁸ Ex Menandro rhetore in secundo divisionis demonstrativi ..., a partial translation, ..., with an epilogue of the translator (inc. Habes Aureli mi carissime, signed Aurelius tuus Romanus)' (op.cit., p. 55). In fact, it does not appear from internal evidence whether the translation provided by AR represents the first translation proper of the Greek text or an apograph of such a translation. AR merely writes in his letter to Aurelius that he has hesitated to forward *hanc traductionem* to him. This may indeed mean: the translation that AR composed himself. On the other hand, the translation that AR sent to Aurelius is paralleled in the letter by the material of interest to Aurelius, which AR might find (*siqua in manus venerint*) and send to him in more peace-

ful times. Probably this process of 'coming by something' did not include translating and only refers to AR's finding texts and translations and passing this material on to Aurelius. However, a comparison of the Perugian translation with that in the Vatican manuscript will shed more light on this question.

The two manuscript translations are certainly closely related. The few variants are shown in the following table:

As regards the Latin spelling, (1) (2) and (3), both manuscript translations display examples of faulty consonant gemination (1). In the Perugian manuscript, the remaining misspellings or variants have been meticulously corrected either by the copyist himself or by a later hand.¹⁹

The misspellings in the translation in the Vatican manuscript, on the contrary, have not been corrected. These concern the use of aspirates (2) and perhaps also of nasals (3) (although the missing *n* in *demonstrativi* may have resulted from a coincidental omission of the nasal stroke). From this we may infer that both the translator (a Greek?) and the copyist, Ditaiutus, were probably unfamiliar with the niceties of Latin spelling.

The variants *funeris sermo* vs. *sermo funeris* (4) both render the ἡ μωνωδία of the Greek text (cf. R&W 434.18). However, the inversion, *funeris sermo*, in the Vatican manuscript reflects the Greek rather than the Latin word order. Likewise, *in futuro* in the Vatican manuscript (5), appears a Grecism, a word for word translation of the Greek ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι (cf. R&W 436.9). The plural construction, *existentes non valent* (6) in the Vatican manuscript, is a direct rendering of the Greek plural, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἀνέχεσθαι τοὺς πενθοῦντας μακρᾶς σχολῆς (cf. R&W 437.2-3).

The evidence of the variants indicates that the wording of the translation in the Vatican manuscript is closer to the Greek original than that of the translation in the Perugian manuscript. Thus, the Vatican copy probably supplies us with a reliable picture of the original translation of the Greek text. The Perugian copy, on the other hand, appears to derive if not directly from the translation in the Vatican manuscript, then at least from the stage of the transmission represented by this manuscript.

Table I. Variant Readings

| | MS Ross. 442 Vatican Library | MS C 61 Perugia |
|-----|--|--|
| (1) | <i>sumere</i> (fol. 58, 9) <i>tollerant</i> (59, 22) | <i>summere</i> (fol. 121v, 21) <i>tolerant</i> (123, 25) |
| (2) | <i>talamum</i> (59, 8) <i>armoniam</i> (59, 24) <i>in harboribus</i> (59, 25) | <i>Thalamum</i> (123, 6) <i>harmoniam</i> (123v, 1) <i>in arboribus</i> (123v, 2) |
| (3) | <i>demonstrativi</i> (58, 2) | <i>demonstrativi</i> (121v, 10-11) |
| (4) | <i>funeris sermo</i> (58, 11) | <i>sermo funeris</i> (121v, 23-24) |
| (5) | <i>in futuro</i> (59, 4-5) | <i>in futurum</i> (123, 1) |
| (6) | <i>existentes ... non valent</i> (59, 26-27) | <i>existens ... non valet</i> (123v, 5) |

It is noteworthy that in both copies of the translation, the prescriptions on the monody are specifically presented as chapter 14 of Menander Rhetor's second book on the division of epideictic rhetoric. The precise indication of the chapter probably reflects a numbered chapter division in the manuscript that served as a source for the translation. In all the manuscripts which I have consulted,²⁰ only the MS Par.Gr. 2423 (s. XIII 3/4) contains chapter numeration (cf. below). This manuscript breaks off at R&W 390.30, but renders the extant chapters in the same order as the MS Par.Gr. 1741 (s. X) and seems, in fact, to be a twin of this manuscript (cf. also R&W, p. xli). In the MS Par.Gr. 1741 the chapters are not numbered, but the περί μωνωδίας actually forms the 14th chapter of Treatise II. In the twin manuscript, on the other hand, the prescriptions would probably have formed the 13th chapter, had all of the text been preserved, since the prescriptions on the βασιλικὸς λόγος and on the περί τῶν πράξεων in the MS Par.Gr. 2423 are rendered together as one single chapter, whereas they form two separate chapters in the MS Par.Gr. 1741 (cf. below). The MSS Par.Gr. 1741 and 2423 belong to the first of the three branches of the

Menander Rhetor tradition.²¹ In the two other branches, the chapter on the monody, as well as the other chapters of Treatise II, are presented in quite a different order.²² Moreover, the two copies of the translation render the passage R&W 435.22–23: *A conventu etiam adstantium: quandoquidem non ad felix theatrum* (οὐκ εἰς θέατρον εὐδαμον) *convenerunt.* (MS Ross. 442, Vat., 58v, 15–16; MS C 61, Per., 122v, 6–8), thus omitting the Greek, οὐκ εἰς θέαν εὐκταίαν (R&W 435.23). This was also omitted in the MS Par.Gr. 1741, as, presumably, it would have been in the twin manuscript, the MS Par.Gr. 2423.

From this we may infer that the source for the translation of the monody seems to have been a manuscript belonging to this first branch of the tradition. Neither the MS Par.Gr. 1741, in which the chapters are not numbered, nor the MS Par.Gr. 2423, in which the chapter on the monody probably would have been chapter 13, present a simple explanation of the precise indication of the chapter on the monody. It is possible, however, that the copyist may simply have counted up (and perhaps made a mistake in counting up) the chapters of Treatise II, and, accordingly, that either one of the above manuscripts might have served as a source for the translation. A thorough discussion of the MS Par.Gr. 2423 is not available, whereas the MS Par.Gr. 1741 and the date of the appearance of this manuscript in Italy have been discussed by Dieter Harlfinger and Diether Reinsch.²³ In their article, Harlfinger and Reinsch argue that the manuscript could still be found in Constantinople in 1427 (p.35). Only later in the 15th century, when it was referred to in a letter by Cardinal Bessarion, is the MS Par.Gr. 1741 known to have come to Italy (*ibidem*).

Neither Ditaiutus' brief notice regarding the date and the circumstances of his copying the translation, nor Aurelius Romanus' apologetic letter to Aurelius, gives much explicit information about the specific interest taken by them in the text. The very fact that the precepts on the monody were translated into Latin and that this translation is extant in more than one copy proves that Menander Rhetor, or at least one chapter of his work, aroused interest in Italy in the early 15th century. Both the exemplar of Ditaiutus' copy and ARs text can be traced

back to Rome: Ditaiutus received his exemplar, he writes, *ex urbe* and AR sent his writings to Aurelius from Rome, as appears from the dating of his letter. The original translation of the Greek text could apparently be found in Rome by September 1423, when Ditaiutus received and copied the translation. Thus this date is our *terminus ante quem* for the composition of the translation proper of the Greek text. Accordingly, a manuscript copy of the prescriptions on the monody, designated as chapter 14 of Menander Rhetor's Treatise II and belonging to the first branch of the manuscript tradition, was known in Italy even earlier than the suspected date for the introduction into Italy of the MS Par.Gr. 1741.

II. THE TRANSLATION BY ANDREA LONDANO, 1553

The edition and the source for the translation

The next translation of parts of Menander Rhetor's treatises, which was the first to be printed, and also the first in Italian, did not appear until 1553. On the frontispiece of this edition it is presented as *L'aureo methodo del famosissimo Menandro Rettore. Qual Insegna far orationi a' principi et imperatori sopra loro creationi. Novamente tradotto dal greco in lingua italiana per l'ecce[n]te D.M. Andrea Londano Gentilhuomo Napoletano*, 'The famous Menander Rhetor's Golden Method on how to make orations in honour of princes and emperors on their designation. Recently translated from the Greek into the Italian language by the excellent Master Andrea Londano, Gentleman of Naples'.

This printed edition consists of 6 fols (A2, B2, C2, also numbered 1–6; A2: 20 lines; A2v: 11 l.; B1: 36 l.; B1v–C1v: 38 l.; C2: 13 l.). (Fol. A1 is the frontispiece and fol. A1v is blank). On fol. A2 is printed, as preface, a letter from Luigi Leopardi, the editor of the text, addressed to the translator, Andrea Londano, and dated 'in Padua, 14th of June, 1553'. The translation is printed on fols B1–C2. There is no colophon to indicate where and when the book was printed; probably it was in Padua or in Venice, in 1553 (cf. below). The book has been preserved in very few copies. It is not represented in the collec-

tions of e.g. the Vatican Library and the British Library.²⁴

As indicated on the frontispiece, this is a translation of Menander Rhetor's method on imperial orations, i. e., the βασιλικὸς λόγος. The translation actually includes both the βασιλικὸς λόγος (R&W 368–372.13), describing the ἐπιτηδεύματα, 'accomplishments' (R&W's translation), of the emperor, and the περὶ τῶν πράξεων (R&W 372.14–377.30), a description of the πράξεις, the emperor's 'actions' (R&W's translation). The translator, Andrea Londano, renders the two sections of precepts as one chapter, the περὶ τῶν πράξεων beginning immediately after the last paragraph of the βασιλικὸς λόγος (the end of which I have marked with // in the following quotation): *Aristide fece il simigliante nel suo Panathenaico la Città è piatosa (indigando ciò come instituto) perciocche riceve volentieri ogni huomo che à se, si ritira, dietro à gl' instituti seguita il favellare sopra le operationi, // la onde ti bisogna saphere, Et sempre osservar il precetto ...* (fol. B2, 23–27).

D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson follow Spengel's example²⁵ of editing the two chapters as one: ἀκολουθεῖ τοίνυν τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασι λοιπὸν ὁ περὶ τῶν πράξεων λόγος. (New line:) Χρῆ δὲ γιγνώσκειν καὶ φυλάττειν τὸ παράγγελμα (R&W 372.12–14). In their commentary ad locum, Russell and Wilson explain that 'The section on πράξεις forms a separate chapter in manuscripts and editions before Spengel. This is inconsistent with the practice (which seems natural for Treatise II) of making each speech the subject of a single separate chapter.'²⁶

The first part of this statement is incorrect. Of the three Parisian manuscripts, mentioned by R&W pp. xl, xli and xliii and in the apparatus criticus, only the MS Par.Gr. 1741 renders the βασιλικὸς λόγος separated from the περὶ τῶν πράξεων. In this manuscript, the chapter on the βασιλικὸς λόγος was not given its appropriate heading, but was written under the main title of Treatise II, Μενάνδρου ῥήτορος περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν (fol. 51v). The end of the chapter is marked with the phrase, λοιπὸν ὁ περὶ τῶν πράξεων λόγος, and, after a short lacuna, follows the title of the next chapter, περὶ πράξεων (fol. 52v, 26), which begins after a change of line (fol. 52v, 27). At the end of the chapter the copy-

ist wrote: ... τῷ γένει: — διαίρεσις βασιλικῶν (space) (fol. 54v, 11) and, in the next line, the title of the following chapter, περὶ ἐπιβατηρίου (fol. 54v, 12). The concluding note, διαίρεσις βασιλικῶν, ends and unites what was apparently thought of as two sections of precepts for the same epideictic subgenre.

However, both in the MS Par.Gr. 2423 and in the MS Par.Gr. 1874, the two sections are written as one chapter:

As stated above, the MS Par.Gr. 2423 is the only one of the three Parisian pre-15th century manuscripts which has numbered chapters. The manuscript, however, is mutilated; it has been preserved from Treatise I, in what corresponds to chapter 6 (in fact, the following chapter is numbered ζ (= 7)), from R&W 338.16: // σχεδὸν ἀκήχοας, and breaks off in Treatise II, chapter Κβ (= 22), at R&W 390.30: τὰς Μούσας //.²⁷ The first chapter of Treatise II, entitled περὶ βασιλικῶν, is marked Κ (= 20) (fol. 67v, 11), the second chapter, περὶ ἐπιβατηρίου, is marked Κα (= 21) (fol. 69v, 29). In the first chapter of Treatise II there is no change of line or any lacuna between the end of the first section of the βασιλικὸς λόγος, and the beginning of the second, the περὶ τῶν πράξεων (fol. 68v, 10). In other words, the βασιλικὸς λόγος, including the περὶ τῶν πράξεων, in the MS Par.Gr. 2423 forms one single chapter, the first of Treatise II.

In the MS Par.Gr. 1874 (s. XII), which contains only Treatise II, the chapters are not numbered, but, also in this manuscript, the chapter on the περὶ βασιλικῶν (fol. 158v–160v, 6) contains both sections of prescriptions. In fact, the beginning of the section on the περὶ τῶν πράξεων (fol. 159, 23) is indicated by an oblique stroke in the manuscript, but this separation of the two sections was marked by a later hand using another type of ink.

Likewise, with the exception of the MS Vindob. 60 (s. XV), which is related to the MS Par.Gr. 1741 (cf. below), the two sections of the περὶ βασιλικῶν are rendered as one single chapter in all the main manuscripts which I have consulted.²⁸

As regards the editions before Spengel, it is true that in the Aldine the two sections of the βασιλικὸς λόγος are separated into two chapters. This is due to the dependence of the Al-

dine on the tradition of the MS Par.Gr. 1741. The Aldine edition of the *περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν* actually seems to have been based on the MS Vindob. 60, a manuscript related to the MS Par.Gr. 1741.²⁹ Thus, in the Aldine *editio princeps* the chapter on the βασιλικὸς λόγος is rendered, as is the case in the two manuscripts, under the main title of Treatise II, Μενάνδρου ῥήτορος περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν (p. 612), and followed (p. 614) by the chapter *περὶ πράξεων*. The next chapter (p. 616) was faultily entitled *διάρσεις βασιλικῶν* instead of *περὶ ἐπιβατηρίου*. Thus the *editio princeps* conforms to the tradition of the MS Par.Gr. 1741, but, like the MS Vindob. 60, renders only half of the intermediary text between chapters 2 and 3 in the MS Par.Gr. 1741, thus omitting the title of chapter 3.³⁰

In his edition of the two treatises of Menander Rhetor (RG IX, 1836), Walz also rendered the two chapters separate. This was commented on by C. E. Finckh, whose *Epistola critica* Walz includes as an appendix to this volume. In the *Epistola* Finckh argues that the *περὶ τῶν πράξεων* should not be separated from the βασιλικὸς λόγος, as it belongs to this chapter, 'and [Joseph] Rhakendytes did not separate them'.³¹ Finckh hereby refers to the rhetorical compendium, *Synopsis rhetorica*, by Joseph Rhakendytes (or Joseph the Philosopher) from the 14th century.³² R&W also refer to Joseph Rhakendytes and the rhetorical compendium,³³ but overlook the fact that the text of the compendium is yet another example of the βασιλικὸς λόγος and the *περὶ τῶν πράξεων* rendered as one chapter. The *Synopsis rhetorica* is the first part of 'eine zusammenhängende encyclopädische Übersicht der theoretischen Wissenschaften'.³⁴ It is found in several manuscripts³⁵ and was first edited by Walz in 1834.³⁶ After an exposition of the judicial and the deliberative genre, the demonstrative genre is presented by Joseph Rhakendytes as follows: 'Ἰκανῶς οὖν περὶ τοῦ δικανικοῦ καὶ συμβουλευτικοῦ διαλαβόντες λόγου λέγωμεν ἥδη καὶ περὶ τοῦ πανηγυρικοῦ εἶδους. ἔστω γοῦν εἰς παράδειγμα λόγος βασιλικός· ὁ τοίνυν βασιλικὸς λόγος ἐγκώμιόν ἐστι βασιλέως.³⁷ Thus, with an introductory τοίνυν and without indication of the authorship of Menander Rhetor, there then follow the precepts on the βα-

σιλικὸς λόγος and the *περὶ τῶν πράξεων*, formed as one single chapter.

In short: contrary to the statement of R&W quoted above, the section on the *περὶ τῶν πράξεων* forms a separate chapter only in the MSS Par.Gr. 1741 and Vindob. 60, of all the main manuscripts which are extant. In all these manuscripts, as well as in the *Synopsis rhetorica* compiled by Joseph Rhakendytes, the *περὶ τῶν πράξεων* forms part of the βασιλικὸς λόγος. The rendering of the two sections as one chapter in the translation by Londano thus conforms to the general practice in the manuscript tradition.

Whereas the ante-13 September 1423 translator probably had access to only one chapter of a Menander Rhetor manuscript in Italy, the translator in 1553 could have availed himself of several manuscripts.³⁸ After 1508, when vol. I of the *editio princeps* of *Rhetores Graeci* was printed by Aldus in Venice, he even had a printed edition of Menander Rhetor's two treatises at his disposal.

In several cases, the translation by Londano agrees with readings which distinguish the three Parisian MSS 1741, 1874, and 2423 from the rest of the tradition. An example of this is Londano's translation, *e nel fine delle operationi, ovvero dopo esso fine* (fol. 5, 6-7) which corresponds to R&W 374.25-26, *μετὰ τὸ τέλος τῶν πράξεων // ἢ καὶ πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῶν πράξεων*. The last part of the text (from //) is omitted in all the other manuscripts. Likewise, Londano's *come è quella de Galati, e de Peoni* (fol. 3v, 3-4) appears to be based on the reading *ὡς τὸ τῶν Γαλατῶν καὶ Παιόνων* (R&W 369.31) found in the three Parisian manuscripts, the other manuscripts having *Παιόνων καὶ Γαλατῶν*. Without consulting Londano's translation, J. Soffel presumed that both this and the translation by Natale Conti (see below) relied on Aldus' *editio princeps* of Menander Rhetor's two treatises.³⁹ Yet, it is clear that Andrea Londano cannot have used either the Aldine, or the MS Par.Gr. 1741 (or a copy of this manuscript) as an exemplar for his work. For instance, the passage *καὶ παρὰ Θεοπόμπῳ ἐν τοῖς Φιλιππικοῖς* (R&W 373.30-1), translated by Londano as: *Thucidide trattando quella del Peloponesso, Et Theopompo quella di Philipppo* (fol. 4v, 24-25), is omitted in both the manuscript and the *editio princeps*. This is

Table II. Collated Readings.

- (1) Londano: *E proemi anchora ricevono grandezza incredibile* (3, 16-17)
MS 1874: ἀπίστως (R&W 368.22)
(om. cett.)
- (2) Londano: *che potevimo di quella favellare* (3v, 17)
MS 1874: εἶχομεν (R&W 370.15-16)
MS 2423: εἶχον μὲν
- (3) Londano: *giusto, ovvero temperato* (4, 21)
MS 1874: ἦ (R&W 372.6)
MS 2423: ὅτι
- (4) Londano: *se haverai de Imperatori Romani* (4, 35)
MS 1874: ἐὰν (R&W 372.24)
MS 2423: οἶον
- (5) Londano: *di statuirle over nò* (5, 35)
MS 1874: νομοθετεῖν ἢ μή (R&W 376.1)
(om. cett.)
- (6) Londano: *per cagione d'Imperatori* (5v, 1)
MS 1874: διὰ τοὺς βασιλέας (R&W 376.4-5)
MS 2423: διὰ βασιλέα

also the case with another passage, καθάπερ οἱ Ἀσκληπιάδαι σώζουσι τοὺς ἀρρωστοῦντας, ἢ ..., (R&W 375.14-15), which Londano translates from his source: *come allegeriscono i medici gli oppressi dal male, et ...* (fol. 5, 21).

In fact, the cases of correspondence between the translation by Londano and the MSS Par.Gr. 1874 and 2423 are even more numerous. In order to determine Londano's source, I have therefore compared some of the distinctive variant readings of these two manuscripts with the Italian translation (cf. Table II):

Londano translates words and passages which are only transmitted in the MS Par.Gr. 1874, (1) and (5). Moreover his translation agrees with the readings of this manuscript where they differ from those in the MS Par.Gr. 2423; thus Londano agrees with 1874 as regards plural forms vs singular forms, (2) and (6), as well as conjunctions, (3) and (4). Accordingly, there can be no doubt that Londano based his translation of the βασιλικὸς λόγος on the Greek text of the MS Par.Gr. 1874 or a copy of this manuscript from the third branch of the manuscript tradition.

The Golden Method of Menander Rhetor

The prescriptions of Menander Rhetor are presented as a *methodo*, a system of teaching (*qual insegna far orationi*), on the frontispiece of the printed edition of 1553. As D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson point out, it is difficult to determine the difference between the terms μέθοδος and τέχνη in rhetorical literature.⁴⁰ The translation by Londano, however, offers an interpretation of these terms as well as an insight into the reception and the evaluation of Menander Rhetor's precepts in the Renaissance.

The term *methodo* is used twice in the Italian text: in the translation of the passage ἐὰν μὲν ἔχωμεν μεθόδω τινὶ κρύψαι τὸ ἄδοζον (R&W 370.31-2) on fol. B1v, 29: *se col Methodo tu poi cellar la bassezza*, and, probably adapted from this passage, in the very announcement of the text on the frontispiece. In both instances the noun is rendered with the definite article, *L'aureo methodo*, *col Methodo*, and with the same significance, namely the prescriptions that were taught by Menander Rhetor.

Russell and Wilson translate the Greek passage: 'if we find ourselves able to conceal lack of repute by some technical device', thus using the term μέθοδος to describe an operation within the field of the τέχνη, the art of the rhetorician. In Aristotelian terms such an operation is called ἔντεχνον, i. e., that which requires mastering of the τέχνη.⁴¹

The antonym ἄτεχνον is used by Menander in R&W 377.1, ἄτεχνον γάρ, translated by R&W as 'that is bad craftsmanship', and by Londano: *che cotesto non sarebbe dell'arte* (fol. C1v, 25). Londano and Russell & Wilson agree on the implications of ἄτεχνον, as referring (negatively) to the τέχνη, the 'craftmanship' of the orator, i. e., the whole art of the orator, but they are at variance as regards the significance of the term μέθοδος in the former passage (R&W 370.31).

While following the Greek text, Russell and Wilson correctly maintain the indefinite pronoun, τινι, and translate 'some technical device'. Londano, on the other hand, replaces the indefinite article with the definite and translates: *che se col Methodo*, i. e., the prescriptions according to Menander Rhetor, *tu poi cellar la bassezza come parlando de la famiglia dicemmo ...*,

referring to part of these prescriptions already presented.

In their translation of these passages, Londano and Russell and Wilson build up a hierarchic system around the terms τέχνη, and μέθοδος, with τέχνη referring to the general idea of rhetorical craftsmanship at the top of the system. But whereas Russell and Wilson place μέθοδος (R&W 370.31) lowest in the hierarchy, as an example of the orator's practical skill, Londano in this passage gives the term a central position in the hierarchic system, as one specific presentation of the general rules of the art of rhetoric.

Μέθοδος in Londano's interpretation of the passage R&W 370.31–32 is rendered as an auto-reference by Menander Rhetor to his own text, thus indicating — alas, without evidence in the Greek text! — the supremacy of this method, *l'aureo methodo*, as it is announced on the frontispiece.

Princes and emperors

When presenting Menander Rhetor as *[i]l famosissimo Menandro Rettore*, the editor, Luigi Leopardi, wants the reader to know that this is an authoritative (*aureo*) instruction on how to compose speeches for princes and emperors. Menander Rhetor, of course, wrote about βασιλεῖς, emperors. Leopardi's context was different: writing the preface and editing the translation in the sphere of the Venetian republic, he wisely adds *principi*, 'princes', thus pragmatically satisfying the intended readership.

In the translation, however, there is no attempt to conceal the fact that Menander wrote for an audience in quite a different political environment, more like Ferrara or Florence than the Venetian republic of 1553. Only twice does the word *principe* occur in Londano's text, namely as the translation of the Greek word στρατηγός: *se haverai de Imperatori Romani, & de principi Grechi* (fol. B2, 35; R&W 372.24–25) and *egli Principe Tribuno* (fol. C1, 6; R&W 374.25).⁴²

A translator hired by a patron might be expected to adjust his translation to the political environment of its recipient,⁴³ but, unlike the editor's presentation of it, nothing in Londano's translation appears to be addressed specifically to a Venetian audience. Note for instance the

passage on the deification of the emperor (*Così è anco il nostro Imperatore, loquale è disceso dalli cieli veramente*, fol. B1v, 23–24) or on the hereditary empire (*e quivi sopra cio farai una deprecazione a Dio che conservi l'impero per molti secoli, alli figliuoli alla famiglia.*, fol. C2, 9–13). (This could hardly be expected to accord with Venetian antimonarchical ideas!) Why then, when not ordered by or adapted to a Venetian patron, should Menander Rhetor's prescriptions meet a special need or a special interest in Venice? This is explained in Leopardi's introductory letter (cf. Appendix 3).

In this apologetic, rather than dedicatory letter, Luigi Leopardi informs the translator, Andrea Londano, of his initiative of printing the translation of the *Methodo*, which he has received as a gift from Londano. Leopardi gives four reasons for his action: 1) public utility, 2) the singularity of the work (*opera rara*), 3) its being indispensable to the learned (*alli studiosi delle buone lettere*), and 4) particularly to those wishing to write panegyrics in honour of the new Doge of Venice. Leopardi is worried, though, that he might displease Londano by publishing his translation. In fact he admits not having asked Londano for his permission to do so, because, as he argues, this seemed unnecessary, *conoscendo la natura dell'animo vostro, esser simile a quella de l'Eccellente mio compare, vostro fratello, la qual è tanto inchinata alle fatiche, à fine che gli occhi di chi tanto non vedde, d'indi prendano lume*. With this reference to his intimacy with Londano's brother, Leopardi expresses his wish that Londano might be gratified by the publication of his work, which is now made accessible to a larger public. If this, against his expectations, should turn out otherwise, he will ask Londano to forgive his offence.

The presentation of Londano probably reflects the *topos* of the modest author, reluctant to have his work published. Anyhow, whether expressing topical or genuine concern about the reactions of Londano, it was important to Leopardi, it seems, to publish the translation, and not only, I believe, for the above quoted reasons. As an editor, if not as a printer (I have not been able to find any information on Luigi Leopardi), he might have been able to market the translation, promoting it as one capable of fill-

ing the gap of instruction for all those who were at that very moment striving to praise the newly appointed Doge of Venice. That Leopardi was indeed right in arguing that *tutti si sforzano* towards this end, and that my presumption of his specific interests in the text and motive for having it printed might be correct, are supported by the sheer quantity of speeches that were actually presented to the Doge, Marco Antonio Trevisano, who in 1553 succeeded Francesco Donato (1545–1553), as the highest official in Venice. Some of these speeches were recorded by Cicogna in his *Saggio di bibliografia Veneziana*.⁴⁴ Cicogna refers to two gratulatory speeches, one from the community of Pirano, the other by Agostino Sostegni Fregoso,⁴⁵ and then comments: *Molte altre sono le Orazioni fatte da ambasciatori di varie Comunità a questo doge nella sua creazione, e fra gli autori di esse si annoverano*: here follows a list of 11 names and a reference to the sources of these and many more speeches.

In other words, Menander Rhetor's prescriptions on the βασιλικὸς λόγος, might have been supposed to meet a need, and were, probably correctly, reckoned by the editor an *opera molto necessaria* in the present situation. If Leopardi did not consult the translator, Londano, before editing the text, this would have been due to his wish to make haste and exploit the opportunity as it presented itself to him.

The interest of the translator, Andrea Londano, in Menander Rhetor's text appears to have been a less lucrative or a less opportunistic one. Like his brother, he is presented as a man of learning, cultivating this interest for the sake of informing others. This is, we are told, his first work of the kind, his first translation into Italian (*nella volgar lingua*). The sparse biographical material on Andrea Londano does not add any information to this and seems, in fact, to be drawn from the evidence presented by Leopardi's edition of the translation.⁴⁶ Londano's scholarly activities, however, are confirmed by the occurrence of a Greek epigram from his pen, printed in 1563 in an exposition of the τετραστιχα of Gregory of Nazianzus, and presented as a work of 'the noble Lord, statesman and philosopher, Andrea Londano'.⁴⁷ As regards the relation between Londano and Leom-

pardi and the possible reason for Londano to present Leopardi with the translation, we are only informed that the two men are related through Londano's brother. If, in fact, Leopardi was, and this we cannot say, an editor or a book printer, Londano must have been aware of the possibility that Leopardi might have wished to edit or print the translation.

The topicality of the appointment of Marco Antonio Trevisano as the Doge of Venice (*per la sua nova creazione*) that impelled Leopardi to edit the translation, and the date of the prefatory letter, in Padova, the 14th of June 1553, indicate that the first Italian translation of Menander Rhetor's authoritative *methodo* on the imperial oration was printed in Padua or in Venice in the summer of 1553.

III. THE TRANSLATION BY NATALE CONTI, 1558

The Latin translation by Natale Conti of both Menander Rhetor's treatises was printed in Venice by Pietro Boselli⁴⁸ in 1558. The translation is presented on the frontispiece as follows: *Menandri acutissimi ac sapientiss[imi] rhetoris de genere Demonstrativo libri duo, A Natale de Comitibus Veneto nunc primum e Græco in Latinum ad omnium utilitatem translati, et multis in locis partim erroribus purgati, partim ubi fuerant corrupti, in integrum restituti*, 'The acute and wise Menander Rhetor's two books on the demonstrative genre, translated for the first time from Greek into Latin by Natale Conti for the benefit of all. Errors have been corrected in many passages, and, wherever the text was corrupt, it has been restored to its original state'.

The book consists of 72 fols, of which the first 64 fols were numbered Aviii–Iviii and 1–64. Each page is divided into 29 lines. The frontispiece is printed on fol. 1r. Fol. 1v is blank; on fol. 2ff is printed, as preface, a dedicatory letter from Natale Conti to Francesco Gonzaga (fols 2–3v) and likewise a letter to Tommaso Filologo from Ravenna (fols 4–5r). Fol. 5v is blank. On fol. 6 follows the table of contents of the translation. The translation of Treatise I is printed on fols 7–30r, the translation of Treatise II on fols 30v–66v. On fol. 67r follow *errata sic corrigito*. The rest of

the book (fols 68–72) is dedicated to five poems by Natale Conti, three of which were written in Latin and two in Greek. The book is available in nearly all major libraries in Italy as well as in most of the European national libraries. I have used a copy from the Vatican Library.⁴⁹

The work of Natale Conti comprises a complete translation of Menander Rhetor's two treatises, with the exception of the chapters on the κατευναστικός and on the προσφωνητικός. These chapters were also omitted in the manuscripts belonging to the first branch of the tradition. Likewise, Conti's translation of the second book observes the order of chapters which has already proved to be characteristic of this branch of manuscripts. Moreover, the Alexander interpolation⁵⁰ follows at R&W 367.8, as is the case in these manuscripts. Conti's translation, thus, follows the first branch of the manuscript tradition, i. e., the branch to which the MS Par.Gr. 1741 and the MS Par.Gr. 2423 belong.

In spite of his explicit resolution to amend the text of his source, Conti faithfully reproduces its lacunae and wordings thus making it possible and even easy for us to identify this source as the Aldine *editio princeps*.⁵¹ For instance, Conti's translation, *illud inquit Homericum; * donum arva gaudens terra patria* (fol. 43v, 8) is a word-for-word rendering of the Aldine, καὶ τὸ Ὀμηρικὸν ἐπιφωνήσεις [lacuna] δῶρον ἄρουραν χαίρων γαίη πατρωήϊς (p. 623.17). Exactly the same corrupt wording and the same lacuna, which Conti marks with an asterisk, is found in MS Vindob. 60, as are almost all the corrupt readings of the Aldine, thus revealing this manuscript as the source for the *editio princeps*.⁵² Evidently the text of this manuscript derives from the tradition of the MS Par.Gr. 1741, which transmits the correct reading καὶ τὸ Ὀμηρικὸν ἐπιφωνήσεις "χύσε δὲ ζείδωρον ἄρουραν, χαίρων ἢ γαίη πατρώη" (cf. R&W 391.31–392.2).

Another example of the relation between the translation of Conti, the Aldine and the tradition of the MS Par.Gr. 1741 is exemplified in the passage *et quo pacto nullus alius res administraret* (fol. 34v, 3). This renders the Aldine text: πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἂν τις ἄγοιτο τῶν ἔργων; (p. 615, 33–34). The ἄγοιτο is only found in the MS Par.Gr. 1741 and its descendants, thus also in the MS Vindob. 60, whereas the other manuscripts

transmit the correct reading ἀγάσαιτο (R&W 375.13).⁵³ Since Conti relies completely on the Aldine *editio princeps* without consulting any manuscript source, just as the editor of the Aldine, Demetrios Doukas, appears to have relied on the MS Vindob. 60 while refraining from any textual emendations, the process of textual corruption infallibly continues in the Latin translation.

Natale Conti's translation of the βασιλικὸς λόγος and of the περὶ μονωδίας are totally different from the translations presented above. Even if Conti had known — and probably he had not — one or both of the previous translations of these chapters, his translation is original, and he is fully justified in announcing that this is the first complete translation into Latin of both Menander Rhetor's two treatises.

On the frontispiece, the translation is presented as having been produced 'to the benefit of all', *ad omnium utilitatem*. This assessment of the general utility of Menander Rhetor's works of course does not prevent Conti from dedicating the translation to a specific addressee.

In what follows I wish to discuss in some detail the dedicatory letter to Francesco Gonzaga; but first a few initial comments on the letter addressed to 'the acute and experienced investigator of nature, Tommaso Filologo of Ravenna'.⁵⁴

Both prefatory letters were dated Venice, 1st October, without indication of the year in question. However, the date of the letter to Tommaso Filologo may be inferred from the context.

Tommaso Filologo, also known as Rangone, was born c. 1493 and died c. 1577. He probably taught mathematics and astronomy in Padua and later worked as a doctor in Venice, where he had several books published⁵⁵ and received various honours from the senate.⁵⁶ In his letter to Rangone, Natale Conti enumerates his various important patrons, one of whom was Lorenzo Priuli, then the Doge of Venice.⁵⁷ Priuli occupied this office from 1556–1559. Consequently, the letter was written between 1556 and 1558, the year in which it was printed.

Natale Conti's addressee, Tommaso Filologo, was a distinguished Venetian citizen and thus on a level with the notabilities whom Conti enumerates as his *patroni*, if he were not one of these pat-

rons himself. This seems to be indicated by the concluding remark that Rangone had spared no pains or expenses in his endeavour to support learned men.⁵⁸ The letter to Rangone, disguised as a defence of the study of letters, actually seems to serve as an excuse for Conti to enumerate the honours bestowed upon him by his various patrons, though Conti expresses this in a different manner: 'I did not write this to you in order to boast, my learned Tommaso, (for who would be able to hide what is known all over?), but rather to inspire the young to study and to strengthen the determination of those who have already been inspired'.⁵⁹ The zeal of studying is supported by the prospects of receiving the favour and patronage of important men.

How patronage might be obtained is exemplified in the first of the prefatory letters, the dedicatory letter to Francesco Gonzaga (cf. Appendix 4). Francesco Gonzaga was born in Palermo in 1538, the son of Ferrante Gonzaga of Mantua and Isabella da Capua. In 1558 he was assigned the archpresbytery of Guastalla. Later, after having served Pius IV as apostolic protonotary, he was made a Cardinal in 1561 and Bishop of Mantua in 1565. Francesco Gonzaga died in Rome in 1566.⁶⁰ Belonging to an influential family, his father having served Charles V, Francesco Gonzaga, already in 1558, represented a source of patronage most desirable to Natale Conti.

Born in 1520, Conti was by 1558 a practised writer and encomiast. Between 1547 and 1558 he had already had several books published. Among these is the first Latin translation of the *Deipnosophistai* by Athenaios, which was printed in Venice in 1556 and reprinted in Basel in 1556 and in Lyon in 1556 and 1583.⁶¹ The dedicatory letter to Francesco Gonzaga proves that Conti knew how to employ the epideictic and encomiastic precepts of Menander Rhetor, which he himself had translated.

The letter is divided into three parts. The first is an exposition of man's need to search for eternal renown. This could be secured by two inseparable factors, Conti states, namely memorable feats and the faculty of writing about these feats.

The second part of the letter is an encomium of Francesco Gonzaga in which Conti applies

Menander Rhetor's precepts on the βασιλικὸς λόγος. The two most important *topoi* in speeches of this kind, so Menander Rhetor teaches (R&W 368–377.30), are the ἐπιτηδεύματα, 'accomplishments', and the πράξεις, 'actions'. As Francesco Gonzaga is a young man with no experience of warfare, Conti has Ferrante Gonzaga, the father of Francesco, represent this obligatory part of the βασιλικὸς λόγος, the description of actions in war and peace (R&W 372.25–31). As to 'accomplishments', or rather both 'actions' and 'accomplishments', Conti adds, both are represented in Francesco. He is certain to show courage and wisdom in military affairs, and in times of peace his studies will make him the most learned and educated among princes (cf. R&W 371.25–32). In his person, so we are to understand, Francesco thus combines the two inseparable means of securing eternal renown.

At this point, in the third part of the letter, Conti introduces the work of Menander Rhetor, which, in being the best exposition of epideictics, would be a perfect guide to the studies of Francesco. The letter is concluded with a eulogy of Francesco Gonzaga and an appeal to him to recognize Conti among his *familiares*.

Thus, we are first presented with the object of securing eternal renown and with the necessary means of reaching this end, namely feats and their memorials. Secondly, the person is introduced in whom both the possibilities of action and of commemoration are incarnated. And, thirdly, the tools are set forth by which the acting person would be able to accomplish and perfect this supreme aim of life. All this is formulated within the framework of the precepts of Menander Rhetor. In this highly elegant manner, Menander Rhetor's work, and consequently that of his translator, are presented as indispensable both to Francesco Gonzaga's studies and to the fulfilment of the true aim of life, i. e., the quest for pagan immortality.

CONCLUSION

In this article I have wished to present some hitherto unnoticed evidence of the influence of Menander Rhetor's περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν on Renaissance epideictics. The existence of two translations of parts of Treatise II (one of them in two

copies) as well as a translation of the entire work by Menander Rhetor together with the information contained in the colophons and letters preserved in the manuscripts and the printed books prove the interest in and demand for the Menandrian precepts in the Italian Renaissance.

It is significant, I believe, that the earliest of the translations, the Latin version of the *περὶ μονωδίας*, predates 13 September 1423 and was probably composed in Rome. The translation thus belongs to the very beginning of the Renaissance rediscovery of Greek texts as well as to the beginning of the vast undertaking to translate these into Latin. The appearance of a Menander Rhetor translation at a date as early as this is an argument in favour of the importance of the work of Menander Rhetor for the foundation and codification of Renaissance epideictics.

While presenting the translations I have examined why and under what circumstances the three translations were composed. These are questions concerning the translator's, the copyist's and the editor's interests and intentions rather than an examination of the actual effects of the work. Thus I have drawn a picture of the immediate, detectable reception of the translations of Menander Rhetor's work.

The examination of the possible sources for the three translations proves it necessary to reassess the importance of the MS Par.Gr. 1741 in the Renaissance. It can be shown at any rate that this manuscript did not serve as a source for more than one, if any of the three Menander Rhetor translations: the source for the first translation might as well have been a twin manuscript of the MS Par.Gr. 1741 which belongs to the first branch of the manuscript tradition; the Italian version from 1553 was based on a manuscript belonging to the third branch of the tradition; and although the translation by Conti from 1558 was certainly based on the Aldine *editio princeps*, evidently the source for this edition was not the MS Par.Gr. 1741. D. A. Russel and N. G. Wilson found it 'probable that all [15th and 16th century manuscripts of Menander Rhetor's treatises] derive directly or indirectly from Parisinus graecus 1741'.⁶² A registration and an examination of these younger manuscripts will reveal if this is the case. The material already examined

by me suggests a more complex route of transmission.

The earliest translation of Menander Rhetor's precepts on the monody probably met a practical need. In the Perugian manuscript the translation of these precepts was inserted in a florilegium immediately after a monodiac poem: the results of epideictic practice were preserved together with an exposition of epideictic theory.

The precepts on the βασιλικὸς λόγος were explicitly meant to serve as an instruction for speeches celebrating the newly appointed Doge of Venice. The many speeches actually composed on that occasion prove the activity of the panegyrists and the importance of epideictics. An examination of the extant speeches might reveal the actual influence of the Italian translation of the Menandrian precepts.

The connection between late classical and Renaissance epideictics is confirmed by studies of Renaissance poetical and rhetorical theory. In 1550, Menander Rhetor and Pseudo-Dionysius were recognized on a par with Aristotle as authorities on certain fields of the theory of poetics. Thus, in Vincenzo Maggi and Bartholomeo Lombardi's *In Aristotelis librum de poetica communes explanationes*, the work of the two rhetoricians (in the Aldine edition of *Rhetores Graeci*) is referred to on the subject of dithyrambs: *Ex Dionysio itidem Halicarnasseo, et Demetrio Phalereo, ac Menandro in volumine Rhetorum Graecorum nonnulla ad dithyrambicorum intelligentiam sumi possunt*.⁶³

With manifest proofs of the interest in and possible access to the treatises of Menander Rhetor (and Pseudo-Dionysius) in the Renaissance, the identification of late classical epideictic theory in Renaissance epideictic practice should by now become recognized as signs of an actual, and not just potential, influence of the late classical epideictic treatises on Renaissance occasional poetry and oratory.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1.

Particulam superscriptam ex urbe missam transcripsi Ego Ditaiutus de Vitaliis Auximas inter iure Consultos minimus anno a nativitate Salvatoris M.cccc xxij idibus septembris.

I, Ditaiutus de Vitaliis, the youngest of those learned in the law, in Osimo, have, on the 13th September in the year of our Lord 1423, transcribed the short passage above, which was forwarded [to me] from Rome.

Appendix 2.

Habes Aureli mi carissime quod summopere et a me et per dominum Angelum communem amicum efflagitasti. Nollem inde propterea quod hucusque ad te hanc traductionem mittere moratus fuerim me contumacem existimares; potes enim et quia antea non habueris minime mihi, sed meæ Fortunæ imputare; et quia nunc habes Domini Angeli diligentia adscribere. Sed fiet post haec nubilosa tempora cum clarior illuxerit Dies ut siqua in manus venerint, ad te mittere velim. Permodo te mihi haud iratum sciverim. Vale! Commenda me fratri tuo de patre non curo. Romæ Nonis Decembris. Aurelius tuus Romanus.

Here, my dear Aurelius, is what you have anxiously solicited me for, directly as well as through our mutual friend, Master Angelus. I should like to think that you do not consider me contumacious for having hesitated thus far about sending this translation to you. The fact of your not having received the translation earlier is not ascribable to me, but to my fate; and the fact that you have now received it may be accredited to the diligence of Master Angelus. When, after these overclouded times, a day more bright and shining follows, I shall be sure to send you what might come to hand. I should only like to believe that you are not angry with me. Farewell. Remember me to your brother; I am not concerned about your father. Rome, 5th December. Your Aurelius Romanus.

Appendix 3.

A Messer Andrea Londano Luigi Leopardi. Eccellente Signor mio! Sospinto d'un desiderio c'ho, nel giovare l'altrui, ho fatto stampar il *Methodo* de Menandro Rettore, qual appò me era don, unico vostro, et primo frutto delle fatiche fatte per voi, nella volgar lingua, si per esser opera rara, come anco alli studiosi delle buone lettere molto necessaria, alliquali pareami far gran torto tenendo nel

scuro le sue alte bellezze, ma maggiormente mi pareva ad hora, perciò che tutti si sforzano dir laudi con belle et ornate Orationi, alla Serenita del Principe di Vinegia, per la sua nova creatione, Onde eglino acconciatamente quello potran fare, se quanto in esso *Methodo* c'insegna Menandro, da loro sera osservato, à cui ne aggiugner si potrebbe, ne menovare alcuna cosa, tanto è ottimo e perfetto. Si che non mi credero mai che tal ardir mio a voi sia per dispiacere, quantunque egli sia stato, senza lo havervi prima ricercato, che certo parevami soverchio, conoscendo la natura dell' animo vostro, esser simile a quella de l'Eccellente mio compare, vostro fratello, la qual è tanto inchinata alle fatiche, à fine che gli occhi di chi tanto non vedde, d'indi prendano lume, Se ciò adunque (come penso) vi foragratofarete che con effetti mi sia scoperto, ma se altrimenti fusse (perche dir forse potresti, che dovendosi stampare s'haveria limato meglio) Mostriate col'haverme per iscusato, ch una picciol' offesa mia non v'haggia turbato. Et a V. S. quanto piu posso mi raccomando.

In Padova, alli XIII. di Giugno, M.D.LIII.

To Andrea Londano, Esq. from Luigi Leopardi.

My esteemed Sir,

Impelled by a desire to make myself useful to others, I have had Menander Rhetor's *Methodo*, which you gave me, printed - the unique and first fruit of your efforts in the vernacular. It is an unusual work, quite indispensable to the learned men of letters. It seems to me that a great injustice would have been done to them by withholding this magnificent piece of work, and particularly now that all men are doing their utmost to deliver beautiful and ornate speeches in praise of His Serene Highness, the Doge of Venice, who recently received his appointment. This they will be able to do by carefully observing Menander Rhetor's instructions in his *Methodo*, which is a work so excellent and perfect that nothing could be added to, nor removed from it. I am most certain that this bold initiative of mine will not displease you, although I have acted without consulting you beforehand. It did seem unnecessary to me, knowing your character and being aware that you, like your

brother, my estimable godfather, have a mind which is so very prepared for exertions in order that the eyes of he who has not seen much may obtain light therefrom. If this seems acceptable to you, as I trust it will, please let me know. If you should happen to think otherwise (you might say the translation should have been polished up before being printed) please forgive me by showing me that this minor offence on my part has not affected you. I commend myself to you. Padua, 14th June, 1553.

Appendix 4.

Illustrissimo atque amplissimo Francisco Gonzagæ Domino humanissimo Natalis de Comitibus S[alutem dicit].

Præclarum quidpiam sanèac non mediocri laude dignum facere illi mihi dudum visi sunt Francisce Illustrissime, qui vel per præstantiam erectarum pyramidum, vel per ædificiorum magnificentiam, vel per suas pictas ab eximijs artificibus imagines, vel per extructorum sepulchrorum amplitudinem, perpetuam sui nominis oblivionem effugere conabantur. Verùm ubi rem altius inspexi, cognovique vel celeberrimos montes in tumulos Regum antiquorum extructos, ne dum reliqua, aut solo fuisse æquatos, aut memoriam Regum prorsus amisisse; omnem eorum conatum inanem & irritum esse putavi. Quis enim ostenderit nunc insignem tumulum, quem in amicæ memoriam universa Lydia Gyge Lydorum Rege imperante cumulavit, qui vel universis Lydiæ incolis erat conspicuus? Iacent, infractæ sunt, & contusæ Aegyptiorum Regum pyramides; effossa sunt, funditusque eversa magnificentissima Romanorum, Græcorumque ædificia; abolitæ sunt Polygnoti, Parrhasij, aliorumque insignium pictorum tabellæ: Quid horum est enim per Deos immortales, quod possit nominis perpetuitatem nobis comparare? Ego tamen stupidum illum prorsus, attonitum, nihilque à belluarum ingenio differentem esse contenderim, & animam vere terrenam terreno corpori inclusam & alligatam, qui cùm videat ita angustum vitæ terminum datum esse hominibus, non enitatur aliqua saltem ex parte, si possit, suam vitam propagare, abolitionemque sempiternam refugere. Quòd si immortalitatis desiderium ex animis nostris deleatur, quid est amplius obsecro, cur ad æquitatem,

fortitudinem've excitemur? Qui fieri potest, ut omnes virtutes non ab acerrimis voluptatibus captivæ in triumphum trahantur? Quid nisi cædes, furta, rapinæ pro cuiusque libidine in hac miserrima hominum vita relinquatur? certe vel hoc desiderium in animis ingenuis & excelsis inesse necesse est; vel si non sit, neque animos quidem ingenuos esse, & excelsos. Quo igitur pacto hanc nominis perpetuitatem quæramus? Duæ sunt res meo quidem iudicio, quæ solæ id consequi possunt; res gestæ memoria dignæ, & earum conscribendarum idonea facultas: quorum alterum sine alterius adminiculo vel exolescit, vel certe brevi labefactatur. Quantum ad nominis diuturnitatem conferat literarum cognitio, scribendique peritia, si explicare velim, non dubito quin vel lucem soli, vel undas Oceano inferre videar. Horum alterius, rerum feliciter, prudenterque gestarum scilicet copiosa est & ampla seges in vestra familia: siquidem vir clarissimus pater tuus Ferrandus ita ob eximiam rei militaris peritiam, summamque in rebus publicis, cum multis præfuerit civitatibus & imperijs, æquitatem, ac clementiam fuit illustris, ut neminem neque Regum, neque cæterorum Principum, neque privatorum quidem latuerit: ita ut illud poetæ dictum huic meritò conveniret; Quæ regio in terris nostri non plena laboris? Neque enim is fuit qui per otium ac desidiam intra domesticos parietes, amplissimasque divitias consenuerit, sed qui tanquam Hercules suis laboribus à multis provincijs iniurias, incendia, ruinas, bella iniquè illata propulsaverit: quæ quidem omnia & amplos, & copiosos commentarios complere possent. Alterum verò in te, vel utrunque potius conspicitur: nam cum summa de te spes in re militari, si res ita tulerit, ab omnibus sit concepta, tum non mediocre in historias, sapientumque scripta cognoscenda adhibes industriam: quare efficitur ut inter tumultus bellicos fortissimus & prudentissimus, inter principes pacis tempore sapientissimus ac disertissimus mox videare. Cùm verò pars ea eloquentiæ, quæ ad laudem, vituperationemque pro rebus gestis singulorum spectat, plurimum sibi tum in historijs, tum in cæteris etiam scriptionibus vendicavit, neque ullus copiosius & uberius ea de re scripserit, quàm Menander, putavi mihi faciendum esse, ut eum in Latinum verterem, & ad amplitudinem tuam

pro mea summa in te observantia, & pro singulari præstantia ingenii tui, mitterem. Hinc enim permulta hauries, si voles, tanquam ex plenissimo fonte, dicendi in eo genere præcepta. Neque cum me nuper ad te salutandum, cum esses Venetiis, intercessore Antonio Ianotto spectatissimo viro, tuæque amplitudinis familiari contulerim, nuper etiam in tuorum familiarium numerum sum referendus; quoniam omnem meam industriam iamdiu, si qua in re amplitudini tuæ gratificari possem, dicaveram. Nunc quod reliquum est, nostrum hoc exiguum munus, vel nostrum potius tibi obtemperandi studiosissimum animum pro singulari tua humanitate læto animo complectare. Venetijs. Calen. Octobris.

To the illustrious and noble Francesco Gonzaga, his learned and gentle master, from Natale Conti.

For a long time it seemed to me, illustrious Francesco, that those men who had pyramids or edifices built, who had their portraits painted by eminent artists, and who had ample sepulchral monuments erected, were doing something truly brilliant and not a little laudable by trying, in this manner, to prevent their names from falling into perpetual oblivion. But having inquired into the matter, I realized that the celebrated tumuli that were once erected on the graves of the ancient kings, let alone the other things, had either been levelled with the ground or simply no longer commemorated the kings. I then discovered that all their attempts were inane and futile. For who will now be able to show the famous tumulus which all Lydia by order of Gyges, king of the Lydians, had erected in honour of his mistress, and which was visible to all inhabitants of Lydia? The pyramids of the Egyptian kings remain shattered and in ruins. The magnificent

edifices of the Romans and Greeks were unearthed and entirely destroyed. The pictures by Polygnotus, Parrhasius, and other eminent painters were ruined. By the immortals, what of all this can gain us perpetual fame? I contend that he, who does not at least to some extent endeavour to prolong his life and avoid eternal extinction - when realizing that man was only given a life so short - is simply stupid and be-

wildered, that he has as little sense as the animals, and that his worldly soul is confined and tied to his worldly body. For if the desire for immortality be extinguished in our minds, what else is there, I beseech you, to incite us to equity and fortitude? How can we then prevent all virtues from being enslaved and triumphantly defeated by voluptuous desires? What will remain in this miserable human life other than manslaughter, brigandage, and plundering at anyone's pleasure? The fact of the matter is certainly that this desire either necessarily exists in free and noble souls, or else, if it does not, these souls are certainly neither free nor noble. So how shall we strive for perpetual fame? To my mind there are only two factors capable of bringing this about, namely memorable feats and a sufficient faculty for committing these to writing. Of these two factors, one will either be useless without the support of the other, or at least it will be caused to waver within a short time. If I should want to explain to what extent erudition and experience in writing contribute to lasting fame, I would doubtlessly seem to be carrying light to the sun and pouring water into the sea. The first of these factors, namely the successfully and prudently performed feats, is abundantly represented in your family. As we know, your most distinguished father, Ferrante, was so famous due to his unusual experience in military and state affairs, and due to the equity and clemency he displayed when at the head of many states and empires, that he was not unknown either to the kings or to the other princes or to ordinary men. It is to such an extent that the words of Vergil, *Quæ regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?* [Aen. I,460], would deservedly apply to him. For he was not the one to grow old in idleness and inactivity at home, no, just as Hercules, so did he, through his labours, avert injustice, conflagration, ruin, and unlawfully inflicted wars from many provinces. All this could fill thick and bulky books. But the second of these factors, or rather, both of them are clearly visible in you. For it is a fact that all men pin their absolute faith on you as regards military affairs, should that situation ever arise, and equally a fact that you diligently apply yourself to getting acquainted with historical writing and the writings of the wise men. Therefore, in the

tumult of battle, you will soon be considered the bravest and most prudent of men, and, in times of peace, the wisest and most learned among princes. But that part of eloquence which deals with praise and vituperation of individual feats has largely come to prevail not just in historical writing, but also in other parts of literature, and no one ever wrote more elaborately or copiously on that matter than Menander. Therefore I felt I ought to translate his work into Latin and send this translation to your Highness as a token of my deepest respect for you as well as for your exceptional and outstanding abilities. From this, just as from the source that abounds

in water, if you like, you can draw so very many precepts for speeches of that genre. Although I only recently went to salute you, when you were in Venice and I was introduced to you by the widely respected Antonio Gianotti, an acquaintance of your Highness, I should think that I, not only just recently, ought to be considered among your acquaintances, as I, for quite some time, have dedicated all my industrious efforts to serving your Highness in some way or other. Lastly, please graciously accept my humble gift, or rather my mind, which is so anxious to obey you because of your learned and gentle presence. Venice, 1st October.

NOTES

This article was completed with the help of a grant from the Dronning Ingrid's Romerske Fond, which enabled me to work for a period in Rome and to complete my research at the Vatican Library. I am indebted to Ivan Boserup, Wouter Bracke, Hugo Ibsen, Minna Skafte Jensen, Patrick Kragelund, and Sesto Prete for critical comments on earlier drafts of this article. My work has been made possible by the assistance of efficient and helpful librarians at the various libraries I have visited; I am especially grateful to the director, Dottore Mario Roncetti, and the staff of the manuscript department at the Biblioteca Augusta in Perugia for facilitating my access to indispensable material.

1. Cf. Cicero, *Orator*, 43.

2. For the impact of the treatises of Menander Rhetor on Byzantine epideictics, see Herbert Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner I* (München 1978), pp. 88-89 and passim.

3. Cf. John M. McManamon, *Funeral oratory and the cultural ideals of Italian humanism* (Chapel Hill 1989), p. 22: 'Direct contact with the technical tradition of Byzantine rhetoric also contributed, in all likelihood, to the progress of epideictic oratory in Quattrocento Italy' (cf. also pp. 7 and 23). I am positive this is so; cf. also my gold medal thesis (xerox, University of Copenhagen 1988; to be published in 1992), *Latinske bryllupsdigte i Danmark i det 16. århundrede*, 'Latin wedding poems in Denmark in the 16th century'. The thesis gives an exposition of the extant Danish wedding poems from the Renaissance. It also comprises a discussion of the poetical and rhetorical *exempla* and *praecepta* of the epithalamium as an epideictic sub-genre. See also n. 5 below.

4. Scaliger's sojourn in Venice in 1508 (cf. Kristian Jensen, *Rhetorical Philosophy and Philosophical Grammar. Julius Caesar Scaliger's Theory of Language* (München 1990), p. 17) is an argument in favour of the former possibility.

5. Cf. my paper (xerox, Institute of Classical Philology, University of Copenhagen 1986) *Fra Menander Rhetor til Søren Jespersen Albipræteus — En undersøgelse af en række*

danske nylatinske propemptikon-digte fra det 16. århundrede. This paper on Danish Neo-Latin 16th century *propemptika* and the history of this epideictic sub-genre was also read at the Nordisk Forskerkursus in Røros, Norway, June 1987. I now see that F. Cairns, 'The *Poetices Libri Septem* of Julius Caesar Scaliger: An Unexplored Source', *Res Publica Litterarum* IX (1986), 49-57, likewise bases the identification of Menander Rhetor as a source of part of Scaliger's *Poetices Libri Septem* on an examination of the precepts on the Προπεμπτικά λαλία, for which the only (late) classical source is Menander Rhetor.

6. I am currently engaged in a similar study of the reception and the translations of the *Ars Rhetorica* by Pseudo-Dionysius in the 15th and 16th centuries. The present study also forms part of my research concerning the article on Menander Rhetor for the *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum*.

7. In his op.cit., n. 3, John M. McManamon refers to the *Iler Italicum* for the recorded translation of the monody (cf. below) and briefly mentions the printed translation by Natale Conti (pp. 22-23 with n. 63) without further examination of the material.

8. Cf. S. F. W. Hoffmann, *Bibliographisches Lexicon der gesammten Literatur der Griechen II* (Leipzig 1839), 593. Likewise J. J. Murphy (NY and London 1981), cf. n. 13 below. The translation is also recorded in the National Union Catalogue (vol. 375, p. 441) with the commentary, 'Probably a translation of De encomiis'.

9. Cf. J. G. T. Graesse, *Trésor de livres rares et précieux* IV, p. 484, and J.-C. Brunet, *Manuel du libraire* III, col. 1619.

10. Namely by J. Soffel and J. J. Murphy, see below n. 11 and n. 13, and by R. Ricciardi in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* 28 (Roma 1983), p. 455a, s.v. 'Natale Conti'.

11. Cf. J. Soffel, *Die Regeln Menanders für die Leichenrede*, *Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* 57 (Meisenheim am Glan 1974), p. 121.

12. Cf. Soffel, op.cit. (n. 11 above), *ibidem*.

13. Cf. J. J. Murphy, *Renaissance Rhetoric. A Short-Title Catalogue of Works on Rhetorical Theory from the Beginning of Printing to A.D. 1700, with Special Attention to the Holdings of the Bodleian Library, Oxford* (NY and London 1981), no. 579.
14. Cf. P. Harsting, 'The Work of Menander Rhetor in Italy in the Renaissance: The First Translation?', now published in *Res Publica Litterarum* XIV (1991), 69–73.
15. I disagree with the commentary in the handwritten catalogue (cf. below): *Qui scripsit (Cic., Rhet. ad Her. Ars nova), scribat et fol. 58a 'Ex Men. ...'*
16. Cf. Silvia Rizzo, *Il lessico filologico degli umanisti* (Roma 1973), pp. 171–184 and passim.
17. Numerous references to the family in *Memorie Istorico-critiche della chiesa, e de' vescovi di Osimo* III (Roma 1782). The earliest concerns *dominus Deutajute* (p. 45; record of the year 1306).
18. The correct indication of page numbers is 121v–123v.
19. The examples are *funeri*, corrected to *funerBri* (in the heading, fol. 121v, 13), *lachrymas* corrected to *lachrimas* (fol. 123, 27), *hirendo* corrected to *hirundo* (fol. 123, 28), and probably *futurrus* to *futurus* (fol. 122v, 23).
20. I.e. the MSS Par.Gr. 1741, Par.Gr. 1874, Par.Gr. 2423; Laur. 56.1, Laur. 59.11, Laur. 81.8; Vat.Gr. 108, Vat.Gr. 165, Vat.Gr. 306, Vat.Gr. 728, [Vat.Gr. 899] (see n. 33 below); Riccardianus 68, Riccardianus 15; Vindob. phil.gr. 60. Except for the MS Vat.Gr. 728 which cannot be regarded as a main manuscript, these manuscripts are all listed in R&W p.xlvii, *Sigla*.
21. Cf. R&W, p. xl ff.
22. See the table presenting the order of chapters in treatise II in R&W, p. xlv; cf. also n.30 below.
23. Harlfinger and Reinsch, 'Die Aristotelica des Paris. Gr. 1741', *Philologus* 114 (1970), 28–50.
24. I have used a copy from the Biblioteca Augusta in Perugia and have also inspected copies of Londano's translation at the Royal Library, Copenhagen, and at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.
25. Cf. Spengel *RG* III (1856), pp. 331–446.
26. R&W, p. 277, ad 372.14ff.
27. Though apparently using the current system of notation, the copyist of the MS Par.Gr. 2423 left out the number ις', thus marking the 16th chapter ιζ'. i. e., no. 17. Accordingly, the 19th chapter (the first of Treatise II) is marked K, i. e., no. 20.
28. Cf. n. 20 above. Except for the MS Laur. 56.1, the chapter on the βασιλικὸς λόγος is included in all the above mentioned manuscripts.
29. The Aldine incorporates the same (as well as other) lacunae as the MS Par.Gr. 1741, transmits the same errors in most places, and the chapters are given in the same order as in this manuscript. Still, the Aldine differs from the manuscript to such a degree that it has been considered a hasty work of the editor, Demetrios Doucas (cf. Soffel, op. cit., p. 113). However, the divergences would be explained by the editor having used as his source not the Par.Gr. 1741 itself, but a descendant of it. Soffel (op.cit., pp. 110 and 112) briefly and very guardedly refers to the MS Vindob. 60 as the main source of the *editio princeps* of the two Menandrian treatises, preferred by the editor to the MS Par.Gr. 1741. After having compared the Aldine with the Viennese manuscript I am convinced that this was the sole source for the Menandrian text of the *editio princeps*, cf. chapter III below.
30. The Aldine does, in fact, (as does the MS Vindob. 60), have the same chapters of Treatise II in the same order as in the MS Par.Gr. 1741. This is not indicated in the πίναξ, p.3 in the Aldine, and does not appear from the synoptic table in R&W (p. xlv) listing the titles of the chapters in Treatise II in various manuscripts and editions. This was also remarked by F. Cairns, art.cit. (1986) (n. 5 above), 51 with n. 17; likewise F. Cairns, 'A Note on the *Editio Princeps* of Menander Rhetor', *Eranos* 85 (1987), 138–139.
31. C. E. Finckh, *Epistola Critica* in Walz, *RG* IX (1836), p. 755 ad P. 221, I. Cap. II. περί πράξεων. *Hoc caput pertinet ad τὸν βασιλικὸν λόγον. Quare non erat a priori sejungendum, neque sejunxit Rhacend.*
32. On Joseph Rhakendytes, see M.Treu, 'Der Philosoph Joseph', *BZ* 8 (1899), 1–64.
33. R&W, p. xlv; R&W have not collated the MS Vat.Gr. 899 for their edition, but on the basis of an excerpt from the manuscript in A. Turyn, *Codices Graeci Vaticani* (Rome 1964), they regard it as evidence of the second branch of the manuscript tradition and note some cases of agreement between this manuscript and the text of Joseph Rhakendytes (R&W, p. xliii). Yet, what Turyn describes as *verba MENANDRI RHETORIS* (p. 171) and belonging to a collection of *opera rhetorica* (p. 171) is merely a copy of Menander Rhetor's chapter on the βασιλικὸς λόγος, which forms part of the anonymous *Rhetorica Marciana* (on this work and its relation to the work of Joseph Rhakendytes, see Herbert Hunger, op.cit., n. 2 above, p. 85). The MS Vat.Gr. 899 thus belongs only indirectly to the tradition of the Menander Rhetor manuscripts and should not be listed as one of these.
34. Treu, art.cit. (n. 32 above), 45; cf. also L. Previale, 'Teoria e prassi del panegirico bizantino', *Eremita* XVII (1949), 74 with n. 1, in which Previale states the influence of Menander Rhetor on a long sequence of works by Byzantine rhetoricians, concluding with Joseph Rhakendytes.
35. For a list of the manuscripts, see Nicola Terzaghi, 'Sulla composizione dell'enciclopedia del filosofo Giuseppe', *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* X (Firenze 1902).
36. Walz, *RG* III (1834), pp. 465–569.
37. 'We have by now sufficiently discussed the definition of the judicial and deliberative speeches. Let us now speak of the panegyric genre. The imperial oration will serve as an example. So, the imperial oration ...', op.cit., p. 547.
38. The three branches of the manuscript tradition up to the 15th century are described in R&W, pp. xl ff. This chapter also contains a select bibliography. The many manuscripts from the 15th and 16th century which bear witness to the interest of the Renaissance scholars in the Menandrian texts have not yet been collated.

39. 'Von den beiden Werken Menanders gibt es nur zwei Übersetzungen, die ein halbes Jahrhundert nach der editio princeps entstanden sind und sicherlich auf diesem Text beruhen', op. cit. (n. 11 above), p. 121.
40. R&W, p. xxxv.
41. Cf. Rhet. 1355b. In this very passage, τέχνη and μέθοδος are hardly discernable: ἐντεχνα δὲ ὅσα διὰ τῆς μέθοδος καὶ δι' ἡμῶν κατασκευασθῆναι δυνατόν.
42. οἷον 'Ρωμαίων βασιλέων καὶ στρατηγῶν καὶ 'Ελλήνων ἐνδοξοτάτων (R&W 372.24–25). The Greek text distinguishes between 'Ρωμαίων βασιλέων καὶ στρατηγῶν on the one hand and 'Ελλήνων ἐνδοξοτάτων on the other, not, as Londano has it, between Roman emperors and Greek strategoi. The other passage has (as part of an enumeration of the virtues of the emperor) ἀριστεύς, στρατηγός, δημηγόρος (R&W 374.25).
43. On the consequences for art and literature of the relation between patrons and clients, see P. Burke, *The Italian Renaissance – Culture and Society in Italy* (Oxford 1986), esp. ch. 4.
44. E. A. Cicogna, *Saggio...* (Venice 1847), cf. *Serie dei dogi in particolare* (pp. 329–330; record of the years 1553–1554).
45. Cicogna, op.cit. (n. 44 above), p. 329: 2329. *Oratione delli Oratori della fedelissima Communità di Pirano al serenissimo prencipe Trivisano nella sua felice creatione. Vinigia, 1553, in 8.*, and p. 330: 2330. *Oratione di Agostino Sostegni Fregoso al doge Marc' Antonio Trivisano. Venezia, Giolito, 1553, in 4.*
46. Cf. C. Minieri Riccio, *Memorie storiche degli scrittori nati nel regno di Napoli* (Napoli 1844), p. 182: LONDANO (Andrea), *nacque a Napoli e fiorì verso la metà del XIV secolo, fu purgatissimo scrittore greco, latino ed italiano. Di lui abbiamo un' opera tradotta dal greco in italiano*, and G. B. Tafuri, *Istoria degli scrittori nati nel regno di Napoli* (Napoli 1752), pp. 28–29, who is more verbose, but gives no additional information besides quoting the title of the present translation, and referring wrongly to the letter of Luigi Leopardi, not as a preface, but *Evvì però nella fine del libro una lettera da Luigi Leopardi ad esso Londano*.
47. Τοῦ εὐγενεστάτου κυρίου Ἀνδρέου Λονδάνου, πολιτικοῦ φιλοσόφου, ἐπίγραμμα; cf. E. Legrand, *Bibliographie Hellenique (XVe et XVIe siècles)* I (Paris 1885), p. 316.
48. In Ester Pastorello, *Tipografi, editori, librai a Venezia nel secolo XVI* (Firenze 1924), Pietro Boselli is mentioned on p. 17, no. 80, as the editor of seven books in the period 1552–1558.
49. The Vatican copy previously belonged to one Simeon Valguarnera, whose signature is found on the frontispiece, and then to the Barberini family.
50. On the Alexander interpolation which also occurs in the other branches of the tradition, see R&W pp. xxiv–xxv, and Walz, *Prolegomena to RG IX* (1836), pp. xvi ff.
51. R. Ricciardi, art.cit. (n. 10 above), p. 455a, refers to the Aldine as Conti's source. I have not been able to find in the bibliography of Ricciardi any discussion nor any development of this statement. J. Soffel, op.cit. (n. 11 above), p. 121, only very briefly states that Conti's is an *Interlinearversion* of the Aldine.
52. See also chapter II with n. 29 above.
53. In their apparatus criticus ad locum, R&W do not give the corrupt reading ἄγορτο of the MS Par.Gr. 1741 which is decisive in my analysis of Conti's translation.
54. *Acutissimo ac peritissimo naturæ investigatori Thomæ Philologo Ravennati Natalis de Comitibus* (fol. 4, 1–3).
55. In 1556 Tommaso Filologo dedicated the book *Come l'huomo può vivere più de CXX anni Alla serenissima signora Gilia Priula, duchessa di Venetia*, the wife of the Doge of Venice, cf. below. For this book and the Latin original, see E. A. Cicogna, op.cit. (n. 44 above), p. 729, no. 5379 with a commentary.
56. On Tommaso Filologo, or Rangone, cf. M. E. Cosenza, *Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists IV* (Boston 1962) 2998a and G. Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana IV* (Milano 1833), pp. 559–561.
57. Cf. fol. 4v, 10–11 and 14–18: *duorum tantum præstantissimorum [beneficia] commemorabo ... Atque id primum; quod a summa humanitate Laurentii Priuli Serenissimi Venetiarum principis ... profectum est.*
58. *Hæc pauca ... conscribere volui ... ut admirabilem istam tuam in omnes studiosos benevolentiam confirmarem, qui nulli vel labori, vel sumptui parces, ut pro tuis viribus omnia commoda literatis impertias.* (fol. 5, 13–22).
59. *Hæc pauca ad te, non mei quidem falso iactandi gratia doctissime Thoma, (quis enim quæ publica sunt confinxerit?) sed potius ad inflammandos iuvenes ad ipsa studia, vel ad inflammatos iam animos corroborandos conscribere volui* (fol. 5r, 13–18).
60. Cf. Pompeo Litta: *Famiglie celebri di Italia III* (Milano 1833), Fasc. XXXIII, s.v. 'Gonzaga di Mantova'.
61. On the translation of the *Deipnosophistai*, see R. Ricciardi, art.cit. (n. 10 above), pp. 454–457a, s.v. 'Natale Conti'.
62. Cf. R&W, p. xl.
63. Vincentii Madii Brixiani et Bartholomæi Lombardi Veronensis *In Aristotelis librum de poetica communes explanationes*, Venetiis, in officina Erasmiana Vincentij Valgrisiij (1550), p. 35.