

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TRIESTE

FORME DI ACCESSO AL SAPERE  
IN ETÀ TARDOANTICA E ALTOMEDIEVALE

VI

A cura di Lucio Cristante e Vanni Veronesi

Raccolta delle relazioni discusse nell'incontro internazionale di Trieste,  
Biblioteca statale, 24-25 settembre 2015

Edizioni Università di Trieste  
2016



FILIPPO BOGNINI

Classical Characters in the First Commentary on the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*:  
Unpublished Glosses from MS. München, BSB, Clm 29220.12'

*lacrima nihil citius arescit*

The history of the enormous 'Fortleben' of classical rhetoric known throughout the centuries thanks to the many commentaries on the topic encompasses among other things a little, but intriguing chapter, which would perhaps deserve an entire book: that is to say, the mention of classical figures within the explanation, produced by commentators in order to make more lively and concrete the rhetorical rules they were illustrating, which often did not have any example<sup>1</sup>. This habit is visible *in nuce* in some Ciceronian passages<sup>2</sup>, but it particularly stands out and considerably increases in medieval commentaries on standard rhetorical handbooks, such as Cicero's *De inv.* and pseudo-ciceronian *Rhetorica ad Herennium*: so Terence's plays, Sallust's speeches or Vergilian characters could provide excellent instances for the Ciceronian rules, whose bare contents were thus both explained and pleasantly enlivened<sup>3</sup>.

With regard to this subject, it is furthermore relevant to point out that to the same 'Ciceronian' tradition is to be credited the creation of a really unique piece in the wide panorama of the 'paratextual' apparatus the *auctores* were surrounded by, the so called *Si tam agentis*: a long gloss to Cic. *inv.* I 17,24 (the core of teaching about rhetorical *insinuatio*)<sup>4</sup> which especially focuses on classical figures such as Verres – here fictitiously, and quite oddly, winner of a war against the Dacians – and Marius, seen as models of

---

<sup>1</sup> I publish here a revised version of the paper I presented in Trieste in September 2015. I warmly thank Marjorie Curry Woods for reading the English text and improving it through precious suggestions.

<sup>2</sup> Bognini 2012, 2014 and 2015; Fredborg 1988, 115, 2-13; 120, 65-77; 230-231, 72-74; 235, 90-100; 284, 92-95; 358, 95-100; Cox - Ward 2006, 430-445; Woods 2002, 2009a, 2009b and 2015 (and for the *Poetria nova*: Woods 2010, 59-60).

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. Cic. *inv.* I 19,27 (*narratio*); 23,33 (*partitio*), both provided with quotations from Terence's plays.

<sup>4</sup> See literature quoted here (n. 1).

<sup>5</sup> Namely how to open a speech in defense of a defendant who seems particularly hated by judges (see also *rhet. Her.* I 6,9 - I 7,11). Which was very different from the *insinuatio* taught by the *ars dictaminis* (that is to say, the *insinuatio rerum*: the introduction of the topic by the sender), heir of the classical *narratio*: see Bognini 2008a, 82-83.

the guilty who nevertheless should be absolved by judges for their good deeds<sup>5</sup>. It originally belonged to an innovative 'catena' commentary (now readable only in MS. Trier, Bistumsarchiv, Abt. 95, Nr. 18, c. XII<sup>2</sup>, Germany, from Hildesheim, St. Michael), and then circulated independently in roughly 25 MSS. written all around Europe between the 12<sup>th</sup> and the 15<sup>th</sup> centuries<sup>6</sup>: which testifies to the large success of this exegetical praxis in the schools of rhetoric between the Middle Ages and the beginning of the Early Modern.

Yet this interesting chapter about classical characters in rhetorical commentaries is to be continued, since the bulk of them are still unpublished<sup>7</sup>, and research work about catalogues, and consequently about newly found MSS., can still yield some surprises, and allow us to write new paragraphs of the chapter: the last one, concerning the first commentary ever on the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, I will try to draw up in the next few pages.

One of the most important outcomes of cataloguing is, as everyone knows, the rescue of fragmentary texts which were often used for the binding of other volumes and thus remained unknown, or not examined, for centuries; once discovered, they can significantly contribute to a better knowledge of mediaeval literature and culture. In the field of studies about classical tradition, which particularly concerns us here, it is quite easy to verify that this is precisely one of the great results of Birger Munk Olsen's impressive catalogue of extant classical MSS. from 9<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> century<sup>8</sup>, whose detailed census brought to light many (complete or fragmentary) MSS. which had been earlier totally disregarded by scholars – and that wait now for thorough inspection to weigh the exact extent and the nature of the contents labelled by Munk Olsen as «commentaire», «gloses», «gloses abondantes»: a vast and exhausting task to which attends the *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum* started (and formerly directed) by Paul Oskar Kristeller<sup>9</sup>.

The most recent *trouvaille* within this large *corpus* affects rhetorical glosses, and seems to be not secondary, since the discovery displays the first commentary on one of the basic handbooks for rhetorical education in medieval schools: the *Rhetorica ad*

<sup>5</sup> See especially Cox - Ward 2006, 430-445 (who quote Courcelle 1955), together with Bognini 2008c, 338-339 and n. 5; Bognini 2015.

<sup>6</sup> I am preparing the critical (and commented) edition, which is forthcoming; see in the meantime literature quoted here (n. 5).

<sup>7</sup> For the new commentaries of 11th-12th centuries it is now necessary Ward 2006. We have today only 2 critical editions of this large group of 'modern' masters: Fredborg 1988 (Thierry of Chartres *in Cic. rhet.; in rhet. Her.*) and Bognini 2015 (Menegaldus *in Cic. rhet.*).

<sup>8</sup> Munk Olsen 1982-1985, 1987, 1989, 2009 and 2014. See also the updates provided by the author as 'Chronique des manuscrits latins' in the «Revue d'histoire des textes» since 1991.

<sup>9</sup> CTC 1960- (so far 10 volumes have been published).

*Herennium* – or *Rhetorica nova*, so usually called because the text, lacking of an ancient commentary, entered the scholastic *curricula* many centuries after Cicero's *De inventione* (the *Rhetorica vetus*, whose reading was in contrast supported by the commentaries of Victorinus and Grillius)<sup>10</sup>; and preciousely helped the teaching of *figurae* through the rich collection of book IV, which could superbly offer examples to medieval students about the flourishes of *elocutio*, not included, as everyone knows, in the *De inventione*.

This is what we can see in the MS. M = München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 29220.12, c. XII<sup>1</sup>, Germany (from Tegernsee)<sup>11</sup>: a shelfmark which, in fact, labels a series of unbound parchment sheets, once part of other books. The feature is typical of such Munich shelfmarks, generally employed today for the so called *fragmenta Latina* of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, now recovered and catalogued<sup>12</sup>, and significant for the tradition of other *auctores* too – as we can observe *e.g.* in the MSS. Clm 29216.1-6; 11; 15; 18: all Virgilian *fragmenta* written in 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> c., mostly in southwestern Germany, and bearing signs of interpretation<sup>13</sup>.

Manuscript M, so far not examined in detail in print<sup>14</sup>, deservedly claims a real *place d'honneur* in the history of reception and transmission of classical rhetoric, since its 11 extant sheets preserve *excerpta* of the two rhetorical commentaries that master Menegaldus – probably the first 'modern' master in the wide series of 11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> c., *modernorum magister magistrorum* – left us of his teaching career, allegedly devoted to an ecclesiastical *capitulum*, probably in the second half of 11<sup>th</sup> century, and surely having included, among other things, commentaries on Hor. *ars* and Ov. *met.* too<sup>15</sup>.

The *glose* conserved by these parchment scraps are intermittent and sometimes no longer readable (because of humidity and cropped edges), but nevertheless absolutely outstanding, because they respectively belong to the first medieval commentary on Cic. *inv.* (M, ff. 1r-8v) and to the first commentary hitherto known on the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (M, ff. 9r-11v)<sup>16</sup>. These *fragmenta Monacensia* appear more precisely as follows:

<sup>10</sup> See Bognini 2008b and Bognini 2015, both with previous literature; and now Ward 2015.

<sup>11</sup> See the *ex libris* at f. 11v, *marg. inf.* (upside down): *Tegernsee attinet*.

<sup>12</sup> Hauke 1994 (see VII-XI for the whole history of these fragments), 2001; Hauke - Ikas 2013.

<sup>13</sup> The only interesting fragment among them is the Nr. 15 (Hauke 1994, 33-34), as I will point out in the general entry about glosses to Virgil between 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries, forthcoming in the *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum*. For the other classical fragments: Hauke 1994, 3-61.

<sup>14</sup> See the precious though quick notices by Ward 1995, 136 (and n. 273), 137-8 (and nn. 281, 284), 223; Ward 2001, 184 n. 33; Ward 2006, 71 (Nr. V-VI) and n. 344-5; and now Bognini 2015, *passim*. The MS. is catalogued in Munk Olsen 1989, 253 and Hauke 1994, 42; and mentioned in Munk Olsen 2009, 66 too.

<sup>15</sup> See the most recent overview, with literature, in the Bognini 2015 (*Introduzione*).

<sup>16</sup> For this evidence see Bognini 2015, XX-XXIV.

- ff. 1r-8v: <Menegaldi> in *Cic. inv.* II 11,36 – II 15,48; II 21,62 – II 28,83; II 38,113 – II 58,175
- ff. 9r-11v: <Menegaldi> in *rhet. Her.* I 12,22 – I 17,27; II 1,1 – II 4,6; II 30,47 – III 2,2; III 2,3 – III 4,7; III 21,34 – IV 1,2; IV 2,3 – IV 3,5

Menegaldus' commentary on *Cic. inv.* has been recently edited (with very precious readings from M included)<sup>17</sup>, whereas the commentary on *rhet. Her.* remains still unpublished<sup>18</sup> and thus lacking a proper survey: which starts here through the examination of one of the most relevant Menegaldus' habits, that is to say exactly the quotation of classical characters.

### 1. *Begging for mercy: Chremes, Myrrhina and Coroebus*

A passage which could strongly pray for commentator's enlargements and exemplifications was undoubtedly *rhet. Her.* II 31,50 *Misericordia commouebitur auditoribus [...]*<sup>19</sup>: the second, wide section of the *conclusio* (sixth and last part of the rhetorical speech), which was divided into the *amplificatio adaugendi criminis causa* (*loci* for the prosecutor: *rhet. Her.* II 30, 47-49) and the *misericordia* (*loci* for the defense), described by the classical handbook at the end of book II (= *Cic. inv.* I 53,100 – I 56,109: *indignatio* and *conquestio*). The many and varied *loci* were not provided, neither in *rhet. Her.* nor in *Cic. inv.*, with specific examples, calling thus for a more detailed and lively explanation in Menegaldus' impressive commentary about *Cic. inv.*, *ad l.*, where the late ancient Victorinus' *auctoritas* – here actually meagre indeed – is completely overtaken by the amazing accumulation of roughly 20 original quotations from Sallust (above all), Virgil, Lucan, Terence, Ovid and Statius, almost all involving classical characters, mostly caught in the act of supporting their own cause, often through a rhetorical speech<sup>20</sup>. But Menegaldus shows his 'penchant' for classical characters in the commentary on *rhet. Her.* too, as we easily begin to see in the glosses on II 31,50 *Misericordia commouebitur auditoribus si uariam fortunarum commutationem dicemus: [...]* *si, quae nobis futura sint, nisi causam optinuerimus, enumerabimus et ostendemus: [...]* *si nostrum fatum aut fortunam conqueremur: si animum nostrum fortem, patientem incommodorum ostendemus futurum* (M, f. 10r)<sup>21</sup>:

<sup>17</sup> Bognini 2015, CXXV-CXXVII.

<sup>18</sup> I am preparing the critical edition of these *glose*.

<sup>19</sup> For the text of *rhet. Her.* I generally follow here Marx 1894, with some corrections where it seems necessary to make the text more readable.

<sup>20</sup> Bognini 2012, 2014; 2015, *ad l.*

<sup>21</sup> I transcribe here texts which are unpublished with modern punctuation ("..." are used for the commented *lemmata*, «...» for quotations) and capital letters; and with correction of evi-

“Misericordia”, et cetera. Hic de <conquestione agit><sup>22</sup>, de qua etiam sufficienter quia supra [*scil. apud inv. I 55, 106 – I 56, 109*] dixit, pauca ponit. “Si que nobis futura sunt”, et cetera, ut «† <me> a domo excutiam» [Ter. *Phorm.* 586]. “Si nostrum fatum aut fortunam”, ut «quo me vertam?» [Ter. *Hec.* 516], et “<animum> nostrum”, ut de Corebo legitur in Stacio [*Theb.* I 638-666].

We learn here that, according to the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, a hint of the *varia fortunarum commutatio* to which someone is subjected can be a good strategy for persuading people who must judge him/her; and this reference makes immediately Menegaldus think about the events which come in succession in Terence’s plays<sup>23</sup>. Thus, the classical *locus* about the troubles that could affect someone who loses in a trial becomes, in the mind of Menegaldus, the anguished thought of Chremes at the beginning of *Phormio*’s act IV (*Phorm.* 567-590): if his wife would know that he had a daughter from another woman, he should run away from his house - and this complaint immediately gains the attention of his brother Demipho (588: *scio ita esse, et istaec mihi res sollicitudinist*)<sup>24</sup>. We can see the same with the second *locus*, which suggests that one commiserates with his own destiny in order to move the audience to pity: this time it’s Myrrhina’s turn to talk (at the beginning of *Hecyra*, act IV: v. 516ff.), complaining about her future destiny (*quo me vertam?*), for her daughter, Philumena, just gave birth to a child she conceived with a stranger - who then will be identified with Panfilus, her husband, bringing so the comedy to the usual happy end.

In contrast, the third and last classical *lemma* leads M’s attention to a tragic moment of Adrastus’ digression in Statius’ *Thebais*, book I (especially v. 638-666)<sup>25</sup>. Here Coroebus accepts being sacrificed in order to save his people (devastated by a plague coming from Apollo), showing his strength and patience, and thus deserving, after a long and fervent speech, to be spared by the god (who had sent the plague against Coroebus’ people, the *Argivi*, because he dared kill a *monstrum* incited by the god himself). The hero consequently becomes in Menegaldus a perfect example of someone who can obtain mercy by presenting himself ready to face every misfortune (as

---

dent mistakes and (if possible) integration of the many gaps of the Munich MS. (see above). The sign † replaces, as usual, parts which are no more to recover.

<sup>22</sup> This integration depends on the exact repetition master William made of Menegaldus’ words: see below within the text.

<sup>23</sup> Donatus’ commentary on these passages does not display anything relevant for our purpose: see Wessner 1905, 463; 281-282. For the wide success of Terence it is enough here the mention of the ‘classical’, basic work of Villa 1984.

<sup>24</sup> For the quotations from Terence I follow Kauer - Lindsay 1926.

<sup>25</sup> For the success of *Thebais* in medieval schools see de Angelis 1997 (= de Angelis 2011, 151-212).

explained in the related passage of *rhet. Her.*: *si animum nostrum fortem, patientem incommodorum ostendemus futurum*).

Furthermore this exegetical praxis can find significant correspondences in Menegaldus' glosses on Cic. *inv.*, where Terence seems to be one of the favourite authors, because the alternate *fortuna* of many among his characters (taken here from *Andria* and *Adelphoe*) is for Menegaldus the best way to explain the many partitions of the rhetorical *narratio* (Cic. *inv.* I 19,27)<sup>26</sup>; and above all we can read, always within the section about *conquestio*, the same, although enlarged, reference to Coroebus (Menegaldi in Cic. *inv.* I 56,109 *sextus decimus, per quem animum nostrum in alios misericordem esse ostendimus et tamen amplum et excelsum et patientem incommodorum esse et futurum esse, si quid acciderit, demonstramus*)<sup>27</sup>:

<sup>26</sup>Sextus decimus est per quem demonstramus "animum nostrum esse misericordem" erga alios; et quamvis multa simus passi causa aliorum, tamen demonstramus animum adhuc esse "amplum" in multis aliis faciendis "et excelsum" in gravibus faciendis, et hoc esse in presenti et etiam in futuro, si quid evenerit [...] <sup>27</sup>Velut in Statio de Corebo quodam legitur, qui monstrum quoddam ab Apolline immisum interfecit, propter quod Apollo magnam cladem in cunctum populum immisit; tandem ab oraculo responsum est ut si ille, qui monstrum interfecerat, ad supplicium daretur, clades cessaret. Corebus, hoc audito, patienti animo propter salutem omnium supplicium subire paratus fuit. Quam magnificentiam animi Phebus videns, iuveni indulxit. <sup>28</sup>Materia est ab habitu [...]

In the presence of such relevant and innovative quotations - which show once more in Menegaldus a real, modern awareness of possible 'intertextual' links between two different *auctores* - one could wonder whether he gained resonance among his followers within the *lectura Ciceronis*, or not. Our knowledge is certainly limited by the lack of editions; but there is something new we can definitely tell.

Unfortunately we must here set printed editions aside<sup>28</sup>, and start once again to look up in the MSS. So far it is possible to determine that among the voices which at that time read the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* - the first commentators ever of the *Rhetorica nova*, so successful in the Middle Ages - master William (of Champeaux?), the first and more accurate of Menegaldus' followers, surely repeats the quotation of Coroebus in the

<sup>26</sup>Bognini 2015, 61-62.

<sup>27</sup>Bognini 2015, 154-155. Quotations from Cic. *inv.* follow here Stroebel 1915.

<sup>28</sup>Since in this passage the commentary by Thierry of Chartres (roughly 1130) is no longer readable: Fredborg 1988, 272; and 171, where it's evident that no classical quotations are used nor in Thierry's glosses to Cicero's treatment of *conquestio* (*inv.* I 56,109), which seem really poor and below Menegaldus' lesson.



commentary on Cic. *inv.*, *ad l.* (very briefly: *sicut de Corebo legitur*)<sup>29</sup>, but in the (short) explanation of *rhet. Her.* II 31,50 does not say a word about Chremes, Myrrhina, or Coroebus<sup>30</sup>; nor does master Odalricus of Reims (end 11<sup>th</sup> – beginning 12<sup>th</sup> c.)<sup>31</sup>.

Only the still anonymous, and equally unpublished, commentary now kept in the above mentioned MS. Trier, Bistumsarchiv, Abt. 95, Nr. 18, c. XII<sup>2</sup>, focus, with many details, on Corebus (f. 137va)<sup>32</sup>:

“Si ostendemus animum nostrum fortem” id est intimidum contra adversa, “patientem futurum” omnium “incommodorum”, quecumque possint evenire. Sicut ille iuvenis in Statio, scilicet Chorebus, assistens in templo Phebi dixit “si minor tibi iactura <de> <Ina>chiis [quam] hominibus quam de monstris [nostris T], o Phebe, ecce adsum”. Ecce per hoc quod ille dedit se et ostendit intimidum et fortem, bene commovet Phebum ad misericordiam: id est, statim condonavit ei Phebus quicquid contra eum peccaverat. Locus est ab habitu per hoc quod dicit “fortem, impatientem incommodorum”.

The explanation is here clearly more developed than the quick hint in Menegaldus *ad l.* (= Munich MS.), but no doubt totally different from the description of Menegaldus’ glosses on *De invention.* The latter text seems written in a different, more elegant style (with *e.g.* dependent conditional clause), while Trier MS. appears to be paratactic and simple, using the direct speech and features as *ecce* (both quite uncommon in Menegaldus)<sup>33</sup>. Yet the ‘Trier master’ claims attention, since he has correct awareness of Statius’ context: of which he reports the image of Coroebus who seats in Apollo’s temple (*Theb.* I 641-642 *Cirrhæi in limine templi / constitit*)<sup>34</sup> and speaks directly to the god (*Theb.* I 643-644 *non missus, Thymbraee, tuos supplexve penates / advenio*), the precise term *iactura* in the sense of ‘loss’ of men (*Theb.* I 648-650 *quod si monstra effera magnis / cara adeo superis, iacturaque vilior orbi / mors hominum [...]*), and the reference to the

<sup>29</sup> See MSS. V = Città del Vaticano, BAV, Borgh. lat. 57, f. 78vb, and Y = York, Minster Library, XVI.M.7, f. 28rb; previously see Dickey 1968, 12 and Ward 1995, 139 and n. 286. About William see Bognini 2015, with literature; and Ward 2015.

<sup>30</sup> It is enough here the mention of MS. Y = York, Minster Library, XVI.M.7, f. 57bisva: “*Misericordia*”. *Hic agit de conquestione, de qua quia sufficienter supra dixit, pauca ponit [...]*, without other relevant comparisons with Menegaldus’ glosses in MS. M.

<sup>31</sup> Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 1032 / 32 8°, sec. XII, f. 157r-171v (here f. 163, end of page, where only *Misericordia commovebitur* is glossed); the commentary stops at *rhet. Her.* IV 54,67 *salsamentarii* (f. 171v). For literature about Odalricus and this MS. see below (§ 2).

<sup>32</sup> About the whole, complicated question related to the rhetorical commentaries kept by this MS. see now Bognini 2015, *passim*. For transcription standards see above, n. 21.

<sup>33</sup> About other differences between Menegaldus and Trier MS. see again Bognini 2015, XCIIIf.

<sup>34</sup> I read *Thebaid’s* text in the edition of Klotz–Klennert 1973.

Argives as *Inachii* (*Theb.* I 660-661 *pallidus Inachiis qui desuper imminet Argis / dum morior, dispelle globum*), although in the strange (trivialized?) reading *Chii* instead of *Inachii* (as one can see above, the whole passage, spoiled by many errors, is to correct).

Careful and complete research has still to be undertaken about the relationships between Menegaldus and the information we find in Trier MS.; but in any case we are now discovering how the story of the young and brave Coroebus, hitherto lacking a proper *narratio* in literature, had between 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> c. a remarkable flourishing within the rhetorical teaching of *conquestio* - not to mention two additional witnesses from 12<sup>th</sup> c. (both without rhetorical implications): the large glosses on Statius' passage attributed to the brilliant Hilarius of Orléans<sup>35</sup> and the work of his pupil Arnulf on the *Bellum civile*, who, commenting Lucan. V 110-111 *resolvit / aera tabificum* (general hint to the heavenly power to heal a pestilence), quotes exactly Coroebus as example of human sacrifice used to stop an outbreak of plague<sup>36</sup>.

It is difficult at this point to identify who was at the origin of the link between Coroebus and commentaries on classical rhetoric: perhaps Menegaldus, whose lesson was surely followed by William, and could have inspired the overall re-reading of Trier anonymous too. Nevertheless we'll be able to try answering only after a more detailed survey on the latter and generally on these first 'modern' rhetorical commentaries.

## 2. Skills in deceiving: Sinon and Sulla (and Volux)

The other passage which deeply interests memories about classical characters comes from *rhet. Her.* III 2,3: the treatment of the *utilitas* within the rhetorical speeches, divided into *tuta* and *honestas*, the former of which includes might (*vis*) and craft (*dolus*). Here is the commentary of Menegaldus in *rhet. Her.* III 2,3 *Dolus consumitur in pecunia, pollicitatione, dissimulatione, maturatione, mentitione et ceteris rebus de quibus magis idoneo tempore loquimur, si quando de re militari aut de administratione rei publicae scribere velimus* (M, f. 10v):

[...] "maturationes", ut quando incautos preoccupare <festinamus?><sup>37</sup>; "<mentiti>ones", ut Sinon, qui per mendatia sua Troianos decepit [Verg. *Aen.* II 57-104]; vel

<sup>35</sup> See MS. Berlin, SB, lat. fol. 34, f. 91r-va; for the *iactura* at v. 649 see f. 91va: "*iactura vi(lior) or(bi)*" *id est si est vilius dampnum in orbe mori homines quam monstrum; vel "orbi" id est diis, qui sunt dignior pars orbis, vel quia habent sperica corpora*. About this MS. and Hilarius' glosses on Statius: de Angelis 1997 (= de Angelis 2011, 151-212) and Invernizzi 2012. Nor Lactantius Placidus *ad l.* shows any connection between Coroebus and rhetorical *conquestio*: Sweeney 1997, 77-80.

<sup>36</sup> Marti 1958, 264. For Lucan's text: Shackleton Bailey 1988.

<sup>37</sup> See below the parallel passage in master Odalricus, who could suggest this integration.

“mentiti<ones>”, <ut quando fortiter f>acta<sup>38</sup> et in quibus prospere cessit commemoramus, quod Silla apud Salustium <fecit>, <cum milites> trepidarent filio Bochi adventante [*Jug.* 105-107].

The mention of Sinon as liar who can build a proper rhetorical speech for his own *utilitas* surely comes from late ancient commentaries. So Servius in *Aen.* II 79-80, who charges Sinon with a mocking way of talk (*oratio diasyrtica*)<sup>39</sup>; and likewise Grillius in his commentary on the *De inventione*: where Cicero deals with the *insinuatio*, he creates an explanation made up of a real ‘collage’ of parts taken from Sinon’s speech (Grill. *rhet.* I 15,20 *insinuatio est oratio cum quadam dissimulatione aut circuitione*)<sup>40</sup>.

Sallust’s memory is instead really original and at first glimpse not so easy to understand, for in fact in the classical text we don’t see anything about Sulla’s lies; and moreover in Sallust the convincing speech of Sulla to his scared soldiers is placed not during the messy attack of Volux, Bochi’s son (*Jug.* 105, 3-5), as Menegaldus seems to tell us, but after a sudden raid of the terrible Iugurtha (*Jug.* 106, 5-6; 107, 1)<sup>41</sup>:

105. [...] 3. Sed in itinere quinto denique die Volux, filius Bocchi, repente in campis patentibus cum mille non amplius equitibus sese ostendit, qui temere et effuse euntes Sullae aliisque omnibus et numerum ampliorem vero et hostilem metum efficiebant. 4. Igitur se quisque expedire, arma atque tela temptare, intendere; timor aliquantus, sed spes amplior, quippe victoribus et advorsum eos, quos saepe vicerant. 5. Interim equites exploratum praemissi rem, uti erat, quietam nuntiant. [...] 106. [...] 5. Iamque nocturno itinere fessis omnibus Sulla pariter cum ortu solis castra metabatur, quom equites Mauri nuntiant Iugurtham circiter duum milium intervallo ante consedissee. 6. Quod postquam auditum est, tum vero ingens metus nostros invadit; credere se proditos a Voluce et insidiis circumventos. Ac fuere qui dicerent manu vindicandum neque apud illum tantum scelus inultum relinquendum.

107. At Sulla, quamquam eadem existumabat, tamen ab iniuriam Maurum prohibet. Suos hortatur, uti fortem animum gererent: saepe antea a paucis strenuis advorsum multitudinem bene pugnatum; quanto sibi in proelio minus pepercissent, tanto tutiores fore; [...]

We have thus to conclude that, according to Menegaldus, this could have been a particular kind of *mentitio*: namely the fact that Sulla calms his soldiers by telling them

<sup>38</sup> See n. 37.

<sup>39</sup> [...] *notandum quia omnis Sinon’s oratio diasyrtica est: nam et negotium exprimit, et Troianorum insultat stultitiae, ut hoc loco*: ed. Thilo - Hagen 1881-1887, vol. I, 320.

<sup>40</sup> Ed. Jakobi 2002, 88-90; for Grillius’ transmission see also: Jakobi 2005.

<sup>41</sup> Text according to Kurfess 1972. Literature about Sallust’s *Fortleben* in Bognini 2012.

that they had already won against the people of Mauretania. Certainly in that moment it was not so true that Romans could be better than Mauri: it was only the *utilitas* of Sulla, who wanted them to be quiet and face the enemies in the best possible way. If we trust this interpretation, Menegaldus' *ut quando fortiter facta et in quibus prospere cessit commemoramus* could recall Sallust's *saepe antea a paucis strenuis advorsum multitudinem bene pugnatum*.

It is moreover worth noticing that both quotations have been perhaps stimulated in Menegaldus by the pseudo-ciceronian context itself, who makes explicit allusion to situations *de re militari*, exactly as we see in the Trojan or Jugurthine war, respectively illustrated by Virgil and Sallust.

Here too, we find relevant comparisons with Menegaldus' glosses on Cic. *inv.*: whose deep passion for Sallust and his characters (by far the most quoted classical feature in the whole commentary) has been demonstrated - and can now see Sulla and Volux join the long gallery where Catilina and Lentulus, Caesar and Cato, Atherbal and Bomilcar are already depicted<sup>42</sup>. As for Sinon, nor here does Menegaldus forget about him, as we see in the glosses on Cic. *inv.* II 58,176 *Affectio est quaedam ex tempore aut ex negotiorum eventu aut administratione [...] commutatio rerum [...] ut ad hostes transire turpe videatur esse, at non illo animo quo Ulixes transiit*<sup>43</sup>:

[...] <sup>3</sup>Quod fit "ex tempore", "ex eventu negotiorum", "ex administratione" et "ex studio hominum": "ex tempore", veluti patrimonium vendere turpe est <et> inutile, sed non si quis tempore maxime famis hoc faciat, ut familiam pascat; "ex eventu negotiorum", veluti inutile et turpe est magnam pecuniam negligere, sed non eo animo, id est ea affectione, qua Aristippus, qui propter socios liberandos ut navim alleviaret totum aurum, quod in ea habuit, in mare proiecit [Hor. *sat.* II 3,100-102]; "ex administratione", veluti de Sinone apud Virgilium, qui administravit ut ligaretur, et quasi ad suspendium pararetur: que omnia libero viro essent inhonesta, nisi ea affectione faceret, ut patrie prodesset.

Yet this gloss diverges from many others about Sinon, since it places him in a different, perhaps more favourable light, for the Greek traitor, together with Ulysses and Aristippus<sup>44</sup>, is here introduced as example of *affectio*: namely one of the *attributa personis* within the *confirmatio*, fourth part of the rhetorical speech. Consequently we have to see here a more human side of Sinon: the attachment to his homeland, who brings him to lie and to face trouble in order to be decisive for the Greeks against the Trojans.

<sup>42</sup> Bognini 2012 (for wide commentary); Bognini 2015 (for the critical edition).

<sup>43</sup> Bognini 2015, 268.

<sup>44</sup> Conversely Thierry of Chartres *ad l.* will oddly keep Menegaldus' references to Ulysses and Aristippus, omitting the mention of Sinon: Fredborg 1988, 215, ll. 24-29.

For reactions to Sinon and Sulla too, we can find intriguing comparisons with other masters of that time. The most astonishing stands out in the commentary of Odalricus of Reims to the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, for his gloss *ad l.* is particularly similar to the one left by Menegaldus, as proves evidence in MS. TR = Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 1082 / 32, 8<sup>o</sup>-IV, XII c., Germany (f. 163v)<sup>45</sup>:

[...] “maturationes”, quando festinant incautos preoccupare; “mentitiones”, ut Sinon [Symon TR], qui Troianis adeo mentitus est; vel rationes (?), quia fortiter ante facta † et in quibus feliciter accidit commemorant, ut Silla apud Salustium, cum Volux filius Bochi adventaret et milites admodum trepidarent, fecit.

The likeness of the two commentaries is amazing here, as we can better appreciate in the following comparison, which shows how much the conjectures in Menegaldus’ text owe to Odalricus:

Menegaldi <i>in rhet. Her.</i> III 2,3	Odalrici Remensis <i>ad l.</i>
[...] “maturationes”, ut quando incautos preoccupare <festinamus?>; “<mentiti>ones”, ut Sinon, qui per mendacia sua Troianos decepit, vel “mentiti<ones>”, <ut quando fortiter f>acta et in quibus prospere cessit commemoramus, quod Silla apud Salustium <fecit>, <cum milites> trepidarent filio Bochi adventante.	[...] “maturationes”, quando festinant incautos preoccupare; “mentitiones”, ut Sinon [Symon TR], qui Troianis adeo mentitus est; vel rationes (?), quia fortiter ante facta † et in quibus feliciter accidit commemorant, ut Silla apud Salustium, cum Volux filius Bochi adventaret et milites admodum trepidarent, fecit.

I cannot, at the moment, go beyond this, for Odalricus of Reims was active at the end of 11<sup>th</sup> - beginning of the 12<sup>th</sup> c.<sup>46</sup>; and thus the two masters are really near, at least chronologically. Only a critical edition of both commentaries, together with a proper comparison, will be perhaps able to go on unravelling the relationships between these real pioneers in the field of rhetorical studies.

Other commentaries I could consult are by far less interesting: master William as usual only repeats the mention of Sinon in both commentaries<sup>47</sup>, whereas Thierry of Chartres does not show classical quotations *ad l.*<sup>48</sup>. As for the glosses of MS. Trier, Bistumsarchiv,

<sup>45</sup> The MS. is an interesting *recueil factice* with 3 *ex libris* coming from Koblenz (f. 77v and 114r; 156v); our commentary builds the fourth section of MS. (f. 157r-171v): see Munk Olsen 1982-1985, vol. I, 329. About Odalricus: Ward 2015, 31-32; Ward 2006, 72; and Ward 1995, 137, 165-166, 184, 220-223.

<sup>46</sup> On the studies about *trivium* at the Reims school: Williams 1954.

<sup>47</sup> See e.g. MS. Y = York, Minster Library, XVI.M.7, f. 51ra; 58ra.

<sup>48</sup> But he keeps a place for Sinon in the commentary on Cic. *inv.* I 17,24 (as ‘usual’ example of *dissimulation*: Fredborg 1988, 277, 32-42 and 115, 7-13, where Sinon appears among the cases of

Abt. 95, Nr. 18, they do not recall by name either Sinon or Sulla, illustrating through a quite different exposition and yet showing affinities with both Menegaldus and Odalricus (f. 138va):

“Mentitione” pro mendatio, id est mentimur [metamur T] nos esse amicos eorum,  
et hac astutia, quia putabunt nos esse eorum, capiemus eos; vel “menti<ti>one”<sup>49</sup>  
pro memoria, ut dicamus commemorando quod, cum <cum> paucis quondam  
vicimus illos et illos, tum multo facilius cum plures habeamus vicemus istos.

The first part of the gloss could be an echo of the episode of Sinon; and the second part of the gloss could as well be a memory of the teaching we see in Menegaldus and Odalricus: not only in the repetition of verb *commemorare*, but also – and especially – in the description of the military strategy, who could be a general echo of the more specific Sallust’s context we outlined above. But here too (as we underlined above for Coroebus), the problem of the relationships between the ‘Trier master’ and other commentaries deserves further investigations, because the words we read in the Trier MS. (last sentence: <cum> *paucis quondam vicimus illos et illos*) are not so far from Sallust’s *saepe antea a paucis strenuis adversum multitudinem bene pugnatum* in Sulla’s speech to soldiers (*Iug.* 107, 1; see above).

### Conclusion

To sum up, it is possible to conclude that the glosses published here for the first time and in detail commented could contribute to the enhancement of research in many directions: first of all by offering scholars a glance at the dawn of the long-lasting *lectura* on the *Rhetorica nova* – hitherto dark indeed; then by the providing classical tradition with new episodes of many characters’ success; and finally, on a wider scale, by proposing new textual evidence about the scholastic roots of what we usually call the ‘renaissance of the 12<sup>th</sup> century’ – about which we still have so much to read.

---

*insinuatio* (*insinuatio benivolentiae a nostra persona*, since he deceives enemies while telling them something they find right): *Deinde dissimulatione defensionis velut Sinon apud Vergilium defensionem suam dissimulat et tamen, postquam vidit auditores mitigatos, coepit pedetemptim dicere ‘mortem meam volet Ulixes’. Dicit etiam idem Sinon facta Graecorum, quae Troianis displicebant, sibi quoque indigna videri, id est displicere. Et haec dissimulatio est insinuatio benivolentiae a nostra persona.* Which could come from Grillius, who had quoted Sinon exactly within the treatment of *insinuatio* (see above).

<sup>49</sup> In fact one should accept *mentione*, which belongs to the tradition of the *rhet.* *Her.*: see Marx 1894, 257, in *app.*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

de Angelis 1997

V.de Angelis, *I commenti medievali alla Tebaide di Stazio: Anselmo di Laon, Goffredo Babione, Ilario d'Orléans*, in N.Mann – B.Munk Olsen (ed.), *Medieval and Renaissance Scholarship*. «Proceedings of the Second European Science Foundation. Workshop on the Classical Tradition in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance (London, The Warburg Institute, 27-28 November 1992)», Leiden 1997, 75-136.

de Angelis 2011

V.de Angelis, *Scritti di filologia medievale e umanistica*, a cura di F.Bognini – M.P.Bologna, Napoli 2011.

Bognini 2008a

Alberico di Montecassino, *Breviarium de dictamine*, ed. F.Bognini, Firenze 2008.

Bognini 2008b

F. Bognini, *La Rhetorica ad Herennium nel Breviarium di Alberico di Montecassino*, in G.Zanetto – S.Martinelli Tempesta – M.Ornaghi (ed.), *Nova vestigia antiquitatis*, Milano 2008, 3-26.

Bognini 2008c

F.Bognini, *Un ignoto frammento ortografico dell'ars conservata nel ms. Bergamo, Biblioteca Civica, MA 144*, «Acme» LXI/1 (2008), 337-349.

Bognini 2012

F.Bognini, *Luoghi sallustiani a chiosa del De inventione nel commento del magister Menegaldus (sec. XI)*, in M.P.Bologna – M.Ornaghi (ed.), *Novissima studia. Dieci anni di antichistica milanese*. «Atti dei Seminari di Dipartimento 2011», Milano 2012, 223-247.

Bognini 2014

F.Bognini, *Per il commento al De inventione del magister Menegaldus*, in E.D'Angelo – J.Ziolkowski (ed.), *Auctor et auctoritas in Medii Aevi Latinis litteris*. «Atti del VI Convegno dell'Internationales Mittellateinerkomitee (Napoli-Benevento, 10-14 novembre 2010)», Firenze 2014, 101-117.

Bognini 2015

Menegaldi in *Ciceronis Rhetorica glose*, ed. F.Bognini, Firenze 2015.

Courcelle 1955

P.Courcelle, *Pages inédites de Grilius sur le De inventione*, «Revue de philologie» XXIX (1955), 34-38.

Cox – Ward 2006

V.Cox – J.O. Ward (ed.), *The Rhetoric of Cicero in Its Medieval and Early Renaissance Commentary Tradition*, Leiden-Boston 2006.

CTC 1960-

*Catalogus translationum et commentariorum. Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Trans-*

- lations and Commentaries. Annotated Lists and Guides*, Washington 1960-2011; Toronto 2014-
- Dickey 1968  
M.Dickey, *Some Commentaries on the De inventione and Ad Herennium of the Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries*, «Medieval and Renaissance Studies» VI (1968), 1-41.
- Donavin – Stodola 2015  
G.Donavin – D.Stodola (ed.), *Public Declamations. Essays on Medieval Rhetoric, Education and Letters in Honor of Martin Camargo*, Turnhout 2015.
- Fredborg 1988  
*The Latin Rhetorical Commentaries by Thierry of Chartres*, ed. by K.M.Fredborg, Toronto 1988.
- Hauke 1994  
H.Hauke, *Katalog der lateinischen Fragmente der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München*. I. *Clm* 29202-29311, Wiesbaden 1994.
- Hauke 2001  
H.Hauke, *Katalog der lateinischen Fragmente der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München*. II. *Clm* 29315-29520, Wiesbaden 2001.
- Hauke – Ikas 2013  
H.Hauke – W.V.Ikas, *Katalog der lateinischen Fragmente der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München*. III. *Clm* 29550-29990, Wiesbaden 2013.
- Invernizzi 2012  
S.Invernizzi, *Presenze ovidiane nelle 'glose' alla Tebaide ascritte a Ilario d'Orléans*, in F.Bognini (ed.), *Meminisse iuvat. Studi in memoria di Violetta de Angelis*, Pisa 2012, 473-494.
- Jakobi 2002  
Grillius, *Commentum in Ciceronis Rhetorica*, ed. R.Jakobi, Monachii et Lipsiae 2002.
- Jakobi 2005  
R.Jakobi, *Grillius: Überlieferung und Kommentar*, Berlin-New York 2005.
- Kauer – Lindsay 1926  
P.Terenti Afri *Comoediae*, rec. R.Kauer – W.M. Lindsay, Oxonii 1926.
- Klotz – Klinnert 1973  
P.Papini Stati *Thebais*, ed. A.Klotz, ed. correctiorem curavit T.C.Klinnert, Leipzig 1973.
- Kurfess 1972  
C.Sallusti Crispi *Catilina. Iugurtha. Fragmenta ampliora*, ed. A.Kurfess, Leipzig 1972<sup>3</sup>.
- Marti 1958  
Arnulfi Aurelianensis *Glosule super Lucanum*, ed. B.M.Marti, Roma 1958.
- Marx 1894  
*Incerti auctoris de ratione dicendi ad C. Herennium libri IV*, ed. F.Marx, Lipsiae 1894.



Munk Olsen 1982-1985

B.Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, I-II. *Catalogue des manuscrits classiques latins copiés du IX<sup>e</sup> au XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, Paris 1982-1985.

Munk Olsen 1987

B.Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, III.1. *Les classiques dans les bibliothèques médiévales*, Paris 1987.

Munk Olsen 1989

B.Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, III.2. *Addenda et corrigenda. Tables*, Paris 1989.

Munk Olsen 2009

B.Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, IV.1. *La réception de la littérature classique: travaux philologiques*, Paris 2009.

Munk Olsen 2014

B.Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, IV.2. *La réception de la littérature classique: manuscrits et textes*, Paris 2014.

Shackleton Bailey 1988

M.Annaei Lucani *De bello civili libri X*, ed. D.R.Shackleton Bailey, Stutgardiae 1988.

Stroebebel 1915

M.Tulli Ciceronis *scripta quae manserunt omnia*, II. *Rhetorici libri duo qui vocantur de inventione*, rec. E. Stroebebel, Stutgardiae 1915.

Sweeney 1997

Lactantii Placidi *in Statii Thebaida commentum*, I, rec. R.D.Sweeney, Stutgardiae et Lipsiae 1997.

Thilo – Hagen 1881-1887

Servii grammatici *qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, rec. G.Thilo – H.Hagen, Lipsiae 1881-1887.

Villa 1984

C.Villa, *La 'lectura Terentii'*, I. *Da Ildemaro a Francesco Petrarca*, Padova 1984.

Ward 1995

J.O.Ward, *Ciceronian Rhetoric in Treatise, Scholion and Commentary*, Turnhout 1995.

Ward 2001

J.O.Ward, *Rhetorical Theory and the Rise and Decline of "Dictamen" in the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance*, «Rhetorica» XIX (2001), 175-223.

Ward 2006

J.O.Ward, *The Medieval and Early Renaissance Study of Cicero's De inventione and the Rhetorica ad Herennium: Commentaries and Contexts*, in Cox – Ward 2006, 3-75.

Ward 2015

J.O.Ward, *Master William of Champeaux and Some Other Early Commentators on the Pseudo-Ciceronian Rhetorica ad Herennium*, in Donavin – Stodola 2015, 21-44.

Wessner 1905

Aeli Donati *Commentum Terenti*, II, rec. P.Wessner, Stutgardiae 1905.

Williams 1954

J.R.Williams, *The Cathedral School of Rheims in the Eleventh Century*, «Speculum» XXIX (1954), 661-77.

Woods 2002

M.C.Woods, *Weeping for Dido. Epilogue on a Premodern Rhetorical Exercise in the Postmodern Classroom*, in C.D.Lanham (ed.), *Latin Grammar and Rhetoric. From Classical Theory to Medieval Practice*, London-New York 2002, 284-294.

Woods 2009a

M.C.Woods, *Rhetoric, Gender, and the Literary Arts: Classical Speeches in the Schoolroom*, «New Medieval Literatures» XI (2009), 113-132.

Woods 2009b

M.C.Woods, *The Classroom as Courtroom: Cicero's Attributes of Persons and the Interpretation of Classical Literary Characters in the Renaissance*, in *Cicerone e il diritto nella storia d'Europa*. «Atti del XIII Colloquium Tullianum (Milano, 27-29 marzo 2008)», «Ciceroniana» XIII (2009), 203-216.

Woods 2010

M.C.Woods, *Classroom Commentaries. Teaching the Poetria nova across Medieval and Renaissance Europe*, Columbus (Ohio) 2010.

Woods 2015

M.C.Woods, *Performing Dido*, in Donavin – Stodola 2015, 253-265.