Roman Theories of Translation

Surpassing the Source

Siobhán McElduff

ROUTLEDGE MONOGRAPHS IN CLASSICAL STUDIES

Roman Theories of Translation

For all that Cicero is often seen as the father of translation theory, his and other Roman comments on translation are often divorced from the complicated environments that produced them. The first book-length study in English of its kind, *Roman Theories of Translation: Surpassing the Source* explores translation as it occurred in Rome and presents a complete, culturally integrated discourse on its theories from 240 BCE to the second century CE. Author Siobhán McElduff analyzes Roman methods of translation, connects specific events and controversies in the Roman Empire to larger cultural discussions about translation, and delves into the histories of various Roman translators, examining how their circumstances influenced their experience of translation.

This book illustrates that as a translating culture, a culture reckoning with the consequences of building its own literature upon that of a conquered nation, and one with an enormous impact upon the West, Rome's translators and their theories of translation deserve to be treated and discussed as a complex and sophisticated phenomenon. *Roman Theories of Translation* enables Roman writers on translation to take their rightful place in the history of translation and translation theory.

Siobhán McElduff is assistant professor of Latin at the University of British Columbia. She is the translator of *Cicero: In Defence of the Republic* (Penguin Classics, 2011), a selection of Cicero's political speeches, and co-editor of *Complicating the History of Western Translation: The Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective* (St. Jerome, 2011).

Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies

1 **The Roman Garden**
Katharine T. von Stackelberg

2 **The Eunuch in Byzantine History and Society**
Shaun Tougher

3 **Actors and Audience in the Roman Courtroom**
Leanne Bablitz

4 **Life and Letters in the Ancient Greek World**
John Muir

5 **Utopia Antiqua**
Rhiannon Evans

6 **Greek Magic**
John Petropoulos

7 **Between Rome and Persia**
Peter Edwell

8 **Passions and Moral Progress in Greco-Roman Thought**
John T. Fitzgerald

9 **Dacia**
Ioana A. Oltean

10 **Rome in the Pyrenees**
Simon Esmonde-Cleary

11 **Virgil's Homeric Lens**
Edan Dekel

12 **Plato's Dialectic on Woman**
Equal, Therefore Inferior
Elena Blair

13 **Roman Literature, Gender, and Reception**
Domina Illustris
Donald Lateiner, Barbara K. Gold and Judith Perkins

14 **Roman Theories of Translation**
Surpassing the Source
Siobhán McElduff

Roman Theories of Translation

Surpassing the Source

Siobhán McElduff

ROUTLEDGE
Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

First published 2013
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Simultaneously published in the UK
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group,
an informa business*

© 2013 Taylor & Francis

The right of Siobhàn McElduff to be identified as the author of the editorial material has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark Notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

McElduff, Siobhan.
Roman theories of translation : surpassing the source / by Siobhan McElduff.
pages cm. — (Routledge monographs in classical studies)
1. Translating and interpreting—Rome. 2. Greek literature—Translations. 3. Greek language—Translating. I. Title. II. Series: Routledge monographs in classical studies.
PA3010.M38 2013
478'.0281—dc23
2012046954

ISBN: 978-0-415-81676-2 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-0-203-58861-1 (ebk)

Typeset in Sabon
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

For Audrey Kaufman and Danny McElduff

Page Intentionally Left Blank

Contents

Acknowledgments ix

Introduction: Situating Roman Translation 1

1 **Language, Interpreters, and Official Translations in the Roman World** 17

2 **Livius Andronicus, Ennius, and the Beginnings of Epic and Translation in Rome** 39

3 **Making a Show of the Greeks: Translation and Drama in Third- and Second-Century Rome** 61

4 **Cicero's Impossible Translation: *On the Best Type of Orator* and Beyond** 96

5 **Late Republican and Augustan Poets on Translation: Catullus, Horace, Lucretius, and Germanicus Caesar** 122

6 **The Post-Ciceronian Landscape of Roman Translation Theory** 157

Conclusion: A Roman Theory of Translation? 187

Appendix: Roman Terminology for Translation 189
Notes 197
Bibliography 237
Index 263

Page Intentionally Left Blank

Acknowledgments

Writing this book has been a long process; it would certainly never have been completed without the help and patience of many, many people and organizations (none of them, of course, are responsible for any of its failings). First I owe enormous thanks to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for providing aid in bringing the book to the final stages for the press; without their assistance this would have taken even longer to produce. I cannot thank enough Liz Young, who nobly read the entire book in manuscript and provided many valuable suggestions and criticisms along the way, for her help and encouragement; Enrica Sciarrino has been there from almost the beginning, and collaborating with her on other projects has added so much this work. Tom Habinek not only chaired my thesis committee and endured far too many rough drafts, but has also been a source of immense help and insightful advice since then; Lisa Bitel and Tony Boyle made certain that it got off to a good start. Amy Richlin not only constantly cheer led and motivated, but also generously offered her time and criticism on portions of the work. Diana Spencer has never failed in her friendship or in her brilliance—here's to Caesar and his missing subconscious! Dania Sheldon labored mightily to correct my errors and grammar issues; Emi Brown provided a keen set of eyes for the Latin and the bibliography. Susanna Braund, Lisa Cooper, Leanne Bablitz, Carla Nappi, and many others at UBC listened to ideas and provided considerable support and encouragement along the way; audiences at UBC, the University of Southern California, the University of Canterbury, New Zealand, and elsewhere listened to various versions of chapters, and their questions and suggestions were invaluable throughout. Paul Chenier suffered through the rough initial stages of my writing; my sister, Louise Lesovitch, has had to hear far too much moaning about the book at it progressed; both stoically have never complained. Thanks are due also to Niall McElduff for phone conversations about Cicero. My gratitude is due to the editors at Routledge for their help and for believing in this project. I would also like to thank *Ramus* and *Translation Studies* for permission to use adapted portions of "More Than Menander's Acolyte: Terence on Translation" and "Living at the Level of the Word: Cicero and the Interpreter in Ancient Rome" in Chapters 3 and 4, respectively. All translations throughout are my own, unless otherwise noted.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

Introduction
Situating Roman Translation

> Roman antiquity itself: how violently and yet naively it laid its hand on everything good and lofty in the older Greek antiquity! How they translated things into the Roman present! . . . as poets, they did not accept these utterly personal things and names and all those things that act as the mask and costume of a city, coast, century. Rather they quickly replaced them with what was contemporary and Roman . . . They did not know the pleasure of a sense of history; what was past and alien was embarrassing to them; and as Romans, they saw it as an incentive for a Roman conquest. In fact at that time one conquered by translating—not merely by leaving out the historical, but also by adding allusions to the present and, above all, crossing out the name of the poet and replacing it with one's own—not with any sense of theft but with the very best conscience of the *imperium Romanum*. (Nietzsche 2001, 82–83)

The Romans translated. This is not a controversial statement, as the evidence is everywhere throughout their literature and the remains of Rome itself. They built an entire literature and more based upon the translation of Greek culture, the culture of a people they conquered over the course of the third to first centuries BCE.[1] They even celebrated this in the Augustan poet Horace's (65–8 BCE) much-quoted dictum that "captive Greece captured her wild victor and brought the arts to rural Latium."[2] (What captive Greece felt about the enterprise is not noted by Horace.) The Romans even went one step further and made knowledge of Greek a foundational element for elite male identity. Speaking, reading, and translating Greek were all ways to show you were a member of the Roman elite.

THE AIMS AND SCOPE OF THIS BOOK

But what does it mean to say *translate* in a Roman context? What is a Roman translation? Who were the translations' audiences? Why did the Romans

translate so much Greek literature if they could understand it in the original? How were "correct" forms of translation supposed to function? How could translation be used to show that one belonged to the elite? How did authors use translation to fight their literary and other battles? How much did Roman forms of translation differ from our own? How did the Romans theorize translation?

This book aims to answer those questions and show the yawning gap between modern Western understandings of translation and ancient Roman understandings of the same. Perhaps counter-intuitively, this does not mean that this is primarily a book about Roman translations (though it certainly discusses some along the way). Rather, it is a book about Roman writing about translation. It focuses on what Tejaswini Niranjana called the "outworks" of translation (1992, 13), that is, on the prologues, prefaces, and comments on the aim and function of translation that are found throughout Roman literature. My intention here is to show how these comments, widely scattered as they are, enable us to understand how the Romans formulated their own concept of translation, how translation functioned in Rome, and to understand it on Roman terms, not on modern ones. Taken together, I believe these comments show us Roman translation as something fundamentally other to our own concepts and understandings of translation, and Roman thinking about translation as rich and nuanced.

On the whole, Roman authors did not write neat translators' prefaces (the Republican orator Cicero [106–43 BCE] is one exception, which is why he looms so large in discussions of Roman translation and in this book). This does not mean translation was not something Romans puzzled over and discussed from generation to generation, or something about which they failed to theorize. To see the scattered nature of their discussion as a sign that they never developed any consistent theorization of translation would be a mistake. The very fact that Roman writing about translation is scattered so widely across so many genres (oratorical and educational treatises, letters, lyric and epic poetry, and philosophy, to name but a few) shows how much it was bound up in all elements of Roman culture. While there is no one Roman theory of translation and no single place we can go to find it neatly laid out, it is not right to say that "the conceptualization of the activity, to judge from the extant sources, lagged very far behind practice" (Possanza 2004, 62; see also Nicolas 1996, 53–54).

As a result of the wide-ranging places we find discussions of translation, this book ranges across many literary genres. It also covers a long period, starting with Livius Andronicus (a prisoner of war from Tarentum, a Greek city in the south of Italy) in 240 BCE and ending with Aulus Gellius in the second century CE. During those centuries Rome went from a regional power to a world one, from a republic to an empire, from the rich linguistic mix of Italy (itself complicated enough)[3] to that of the entire Mediterranean basin, most of Europe, and swathes of the Near East. These were all

enormous shifts for Rome's citizens, rulers, and ruled to experience, and translators felt these shifts as much as anyone.

Because such changes in Roman society and culture were reflected in translation and in thinking about translation as much as they were in other literary spheres, my aim here is twofold: to show both overall tendencies in Roman theorizing about translation, and how Roman ideas about translation shift in tune with individual needs and circumstances. My major interest in this book is literary translation from Greek; as the book progresses, the reader will note that more and more of the discussion centers around elite translation, since as Roman literary translation progressed it became increasingly an elite practice. (There are some exceptions to this rule, but their traces are very faint in our extant sources.)[4] I begin with a chapter on nonliterary translation, as a background and to alert the reader to the wider world of translation in the Roman Empire. What we have of Roman literary translation is but the tip of a very large iceberg, and the same goes for theorizations of translation.

After Chapter 1, the book primarily follows a chronological track. This is not just for the ease of readers who may not be familiar with Rome's history and literature, but because many of those who discuss translation are replying to earlier discussions and translators. Prose and poetic discussions of translation are generally divided up into different chapters not because I believe that they are separate spheres, but for the convenience of the reader and ease of discussion.

PAST APPROACHES TO ROMAN TRANSLATION

The primary approach to Roman translation in the field of Classics has been a comparative and philological one, involving comparison of source and translation, although frequently we have only one of the two. Two examples of this are Scevola Mariotti's pioneering *Livio Andronico e la traduzione artistica* (1952) and Alfonso Traina's *Vortit Barbare* (1970). Both are landmark studies of translation in Rome and have much that is extremely valuable to say on how Roman translation worked; however, both are primarily philological approaches to Latin texts and their manipulation of Greek literature, and rarely integrate the translations they discuss into their cultural moment. Both also stop short of presenting a full picture of Roman translation: Mariotti is concerned with early translators and Traina ends with Cicero. A more recent book, Astrid Seele's *Römische Übersetzer, Nöte, Freiheiten, Absichten* (1995) discusses translation and styles of translation without differentiating between the particular historical circumstances affecting someone like Cicero, struggling to retain his authority amid the collapse of the Roman Republic and under attack by a rival school of orators, the Atticists, and those facing Aulus Gellius (born c. 125 CE), writing two centuries later and in a vastly different world. Thorsten Fögen's *Patrii*

sermonis egestas (2000), which surveys the theme of the poverty (*egestas*) of Latin and its relationship to translation, deals with translation purely in relation to linguistic issues, as something largely divorced from other elements in Roman society and culture. Mark Possanza's *Translating the Heavens* (2004), a nuanced discussion of the poetics of Latin translation and specifically Germanicus Caesar's translation of a Greek astronomical text, is extremely rich and rewarding, but of necessity, given its subject matter, also stops short of presenting a complete picture of Roman thinking about translation.

It is, of course, perfectly legitimate to compare source text (the original, hereafter ST) and target text (the translation, hereafter TT) in discussing translation; seeing the gaps between these allows us to see how translators work and provides us with a window into styles and strategies of translation. I have learned a great deal from all of the above works, and they have made my understanding of issues in Roman translation, particularly linguistic issues, richer and deeper. However, normally even where other elements outside the question of language are considered—such as Romanization, which involves Latin TTs using Roman gods instead of Greek ones, inserting Roman offices in comedies based on Greek New Comedy, and so forth—they tend to quickly become subsidiary to the process of comparing ST and TT, and pointing out the differences between them. Such an approach is only partial and can only be better informed by understanding how Roman discussion of the practice and theory of translation is linked to other cultural events, and how translation is not an issue of philology alone. That said, recent collections of essays, such as Dupont and Valette-Cagnac's *Façons de parler grec à Rome* (2005), Bortolussi and Keller's *Traduire, transposer, transmettre dans l'Antiquité gréco-romaine* (2009), and McElduff and Sciarrino's *Complicating the History of Western Translation: the Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective* (2011), have begun to swing toward seeing Roman translators as culturally embedded individuals, and re-evaluating what Roman translation is and how it works.

Another major approach in Classics to understanding how the Romans consumed Greek texts has been intertexuality, which seeks to find the traces of Greek texts in Roman ones, and examines how those traces are used by their Latin authors or affect their interpretation. (Intertextuality is not just confined to seeking snippets of Greek texts in Latin ones, however, but also looks at patterns of allusion to earlier Latin texts.) Seeking to understand networks of relationships between texts and how those relationships affect readings of texts, intertextuality rose to dominance in the 1980s and 1990s.[5] It is certainly true that Latin texts were relational in nature and constantly looked toward other Greek and Latin texts. It is also true that their Roman audiences were attuned to reading and listening for how texts quoted, manipulated, and reworked older ones, in much the same way that moviegoers recognize traces of older movies in newer ones, or music aficionados can recognize the sampling of one song in another. One benefit of intertextuality

is that it has enabled relational readings of Latin texts, which see their reworking of Greek sources as something vital rather than a parasitic growth on the purity of Greek literature. In relation to translation, the intertextual nature of Roman poetry helps us to see that the Romans tended to translate in portions, carving out sections of STs and scattering them throughout their work, and readers expected to encounter these dismembered portions among larger works.

However, Latin translations must be read as products of their particular historical and cultural moments and not just of their literary genealogies. In his *Republic/De republica*, Cicero translates portions of Plato and other Greek philosophers, integrating them with new material, giving the resulting dialogue a Roman setting, speakers, and focus. Written in 54–53 BCE, Cicero's *Republic* is very much a relational text, with multiple connections to a number of Greek sources. It is also a work written to shore up its author's authority, as well as a response to the particular situation in which he found himself after his return from exile in 57 BCE. By "setting up the Roman ancestral constitution as a model that is far superior to any other constitution, he sought to show the Romans how they might save the state from its present disintegration into self-seeking factions" (Asmis 2005, 414). If Romans will not follow Cicero's advice in the Senate, then through this work—and through translation—he can try to ensure that they follow the *Republic*'s advice and bolster his authority in this way. When in 44 BCE Cicero decided to translate two speeches by Aeschines and Demosthenes and wrote a preface to that translation, now known as *On the Best Type of Orator/De optimo genere oratorum*, he did so as part of his battle against a new oratorical style, Atticism, and in the face of attacks on his oratory. His comment that he translated "not as an interpreter but as an orator" (*On the Best Type of Orator,* 14) is deeply implicated in that debate, as well as reflecting issues with class and education, and is only secondarily a statement about literal versus free translation. In *Epistle* 58, Seneca the Younger (c. 4 BCE–64 CE) reuses a phrase on the poverty of Latin, first seen in the Late Republican poet Lucretius. He claims that this poverty meant he and his friends could not discuss Plato in Latin. But read more closely, Seneca's comment appears to be not so much about the dearth of philosophical terms in Latin as it is a way to attack Cicero, Latin's most prominent translator of philosophy, and a serious textual rival whom Seneca wants to put to rest. These three examples show how discussions of translation have to be read as deeply connected to current issues as well as part of a timeless network of texts.

The rewards to be reaped from a more culturally and historically integrated reading of Latin translation mean that it is extremely unfortunate that within histories of translation, the Romans have tended to be folded into larger historical time periods, usually as a quick preface to the main interest of a work. In his classic *After Babel* (1975), George Steiner identified the entire period from Cicero to Alexander Tytler as the first of four periods

of literature on the theory, practice, and history of translation (236). Other scholars, such as Frederick Rener (1989), likewise begin with Cicero and fold him into later periods, where he often sits ill. A rare and notable exception to this is Rita Copeland's marvellous *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages* (1991), wherein Roman translation theory is read both on its own terms and for how it feeds into later traditions.

The tendency in some scholarship in Translation Studies to see Roman writing on translation as a primitive period, chiefly to be quoted before moving onto the Middle Ages, or as part of a unit marked "Western Translation Theory," has created distortions such as the following:

> In Western tradition most statements about translation that date before the demise of positivism are relatively useless for current theorizing about translation, because most are limited by the dominant ideological perspective of their time . . . The result is a narrow-minded declamation that is supposed to address translations of all times and everywhere, but that is surely circumscribed by a cultural moment. The restricted perspectives of Western pronouncements about translation before World War I are not always apparent because of the positivist, generalized and prescriptive discourses that frame them. Yet some of the boundaries of Western thinking about translation in these statements should be patently obvious: the fact that most views have been formulated with reference to sacred texts, including both religious scripture and canonical literary works, for example. (Tymoczko 2006, 13–14)

Naturally, translations and thinking about translation are limited by the dominant ideological concerns of their time and are circumscribed by their cultural moment; we may be more self-conscious about this than the Romans were, but we are not immune, no matter how expansive our statements. The Romans articulated translation in ways that worked for them and as a response to their own needs. When Horace tells translators in his *Art of Poetry* not to translate like a "faithful interpreter" (*fidus interpres*, 133–34), this is not necessarily a timeless comment,[6] although it has been made so by the frequency with which Western translators have invoked it. The fact that Horace includes not just advice on translation but a sample translation for the aristocratic addressees of the *Art of Poetry* shows how advice on how to translate was part and parcel of other advice about how to present the ideal elite, Roman literary self. (I should also point out that Roman theorizations of translation were not generally formulated with reference to canonical texts, because many of these texts were not canonical when they were translated: Catullus [c. 84 BCE–c. 54 BCE] and Horace translated Greek lyric and in the process made it canonical.[7] Canonical literature is not born, but made so, and translation is one of the ways that this occurs [the papers in Lianeri and Zajko (2008) offer good studies on this].)

Translation mattered in Rome, and it could matter at remarkably high levels of society: Germanicus Caesar (15/16 BCE–19 CE), the heir to the imperial throne, wrote a very free translation of a Greek astronomical work. Rome's reliance on various forms of translation to construct its culture affords us a chance to see how complex premodern thinking about translation can be, and how one premodern culture negotiated the meaning and function of translation time and time again in accordance with different needs and pressures. It also allows us to see new models for translation, ones that may allow us to rethink what exactly "Western translation" is, and posit alternative ways that it could have developed and may still develop. But we can only do that if we understand Roman translations as *Roman* and resist folding them into a premodern or early modern Western tradition. Doing so ignores the radical changes that occurred in thinking about translation in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages.[8] Even more problematically, it results in attempts to bring back "a cultural other as the same" (Venuti 1995, 18) by mapping Roman translation practices and theory as though they were rough precursors of our own. Roman translation practices were so vastly different from ours that we make huge errors in trying to make them cruder, less thoughtful ancestors of modern or early modern translation.

WHAT IS A ROMAN TRANSLATION?

To understand Roman translation, it is first necessary to understand Roman reading practices.[9] If we imagine a literary translator at work, we probably imagine someone at a desk or table; they have a computer or some electronic device before them, or they may be writing in longhand. The original is present to be consulted, as are dictionaries and other lexical aids. Searching and revising for our modern translator is relatively easy: if she is using paper, she can flip through loose or bound pages to find the passages she wants, and the same is true with her ST; if she is using a computer, she can search for a text string or a word, or jump to a page. When we think of a translator, we probably do not visualize someone sitting and balancing paper or a wax tablet on their lap, perhaps without even a ST in front of them but instead using their memory, and perhaps employing a native speaker standing by them as their dictionary. We do not imagine a literary translator reading the ST and reeling off a translation to a secretary (probably because few translators could afford a secretary). We do not imagine our translator as a U.S. senator writing up a translation on her holidays and returning to share it with a group of other senators, all capable of reading the ST, as part of a social event designed to display her social status and to show that she spent her holiday in fruitful occupations.

When we think about Roman translators, we need to radically rethink our vision of the translator at work, and to understand the impact that ancient working methods had on the practice and theory of translation.

We also need to rethink how translation was shared and how sharing it could function as a way to negotiate elite status and identity. For the period under consideration for this book, the codex—the book format we are familiar with today—was not the primary way to read. Instead, Romans, like Greeks, used the book scroll, an extremely unwieldy piece of technology.[10] A scroll took skill even to keep open where you wanted (Small 1997, 12). It was rolled up by one hand as you read, while the other hand unrolled or took notes, usually on wax or wooden tablets (Small 1997, 150; in *Institutes of Oratory/Institutio oratoria* 10.7.11, Quintilian [c. 35–90s CE] talks about the knack of keeping the hand scribbling while you read). All this meant that there was no easy way to jump around if you wanted to check on an earlier portion of text, and even if you were taking notes on a tablet, your source would most likely be in scroll format.

All this was done without writing desks to hold ink, paper, and other writing tools, as writing desks were not common until the eighth or ninth century CE (Small 1997, 155).[11] Romans either wrote directly on tablets or, if they were writing on a scroll, they laid it on their legs (Ovid, *Heroides* 11.3–4; Small 1997, 152). It was hard to work with two parallel texts, and a scribe kept "small chunks in short-term memory just for the transfer of the text from the source on a reading stand to that on his knee. It is also possible that the scribe would memorize the passage from the roll or tablets he held, put down that set, pick up the new roll or tablets, write the text, put down the second writing medium, and begin the process all over again. The last possibility for the second method would have the scribe memorize whole passages permanently in long-term memory before recording them" (Small 1997, 170). Dictation could also be employed (Small 1997, 171),[12] but if you were translating orally, it was still hard to go back and compare ST and TT. If you edited your TT for errors in translation, you were doing so from memory or notes.

Aside from problems with the scroll format, texts themselves were not easy to read or navigate, as words were not separated and all letters were the same height. There were no section headings, no table of contents[13] or index. Even within a poetry collection, individual poems were not broken out, so that it was not immediately obvious where one poem ended and another began. Readers were presented with a block of solid text, and it was up to each person to make sense of and sometimes punctuate it. The unit of the sentence was not naturally obvious, and even words as units were not all that noticeable, as "antiquity knew the concept of the word as a unit of speech, but did not consider the concept of the written word as a visual unity to be important" (Small 1997, 23). When we read Cicero or other Romans talking about translating "word for word," they do not mean words in quite the same way that we do. In fact, Romans often focused on the syllable as a unit rather than the word; this leads to etymologies such as M. Terentius Varro (116–27 BCE), for example, proposed for *vis*/force, which he connected with *vita*/life, because they shared the same initial syllable (*On the Latin Language/De lingua latina* 5.63).[14]

Translating was also frequently a shared experience, even if our sources generally do not mention helpers, and present the Roman translator as solitarily facing down Greek texts on their own terms. If translators needed help with understanding a particular Greek word, they called upon someone for assistance—perhaps a slave specially purchased for the job, perhaps a friend; they did not thumb through a dictionary, because there were no handy dictionaries available. (Lexicons were used for official translations and in some schools, however.) Even if they understood a word, they might have to consult someone for its particular meaning in this context. Given the difficulty of managing two scrolls at the same time, translators either dictated a translation as they read the ST, translated from memory (something advised by Pliny the Younger in *Epistle* 7.9), or worked from notes rather than the text itself. Translation from memory or notes was probably more common than we would imagine—it helped that elite Romans worked hard to train their memories. Quintilian advised reading out loud when trying to memorize something (*Institutes of Oratory* 11.2.33), while others relied on memory maps or other mnemonic methods.[15] There were other solutions, such as that found by Calvisius Sabinus, a man of almost no memory at all, who bought slaves to fill up the gap: one knew all of Homer; one all of Hesiod; another the nine canonical Greek lyric poets. Sabinus believed that whatever one of his slaves knew, he knew (Seneca, *Epistles* 27.6–7). However, for someone like Cicero, who was a practicing orator and lawyer, a good memory was crucial; as a result, he could carry what we would consider phenomenal amounts of textual information in his head. Even so, he made mistakes: in the no longer extant *On Glory/De gloria*, he swapped out Ajax for Hector as a speaker in a quotation from *Iliad* 7.89 (Gellius, *Attic Nights* 1.7.1).

An alternative was to write up or have written up a summary of a text's contents and work from that: Cicero had one drawn up for Posidonius's *On Duty* while he was getting ready to write his own *On Duty/De officiis* (*Letters to Atticus* 2.6.1). Epitomizing and excerpting were common practices: Pliny the Elder left his nephew and adopted son, Pliny the Younger, some 160 books of excerpted passages (Pliny the Younger, *Epistles* 3.5.17). Such practices help explain why literary translations were generally extremely free and frequently involved translating passages here and there rather than an entire text. Proofing a translation (or any text, for that matter) was not an easy thing: one had to proof each copy or proof a master and hope that if you had duplicates made and sent out, the copyist did not insert errors.[16] Comparing a translation and its source would be difficult, even if one were interested in doing so, and we never hear of a translator doing it. That does not mean that no one ever compared the two, however. The best-known extant example of such a comparison (called *synkrisis*) is probably Gellius's comparison of the comic poets Menander and Caecilius Statius (*Attic Nights* 2.23), but he also did this elsewhere; for example, he paired Virgil's description of Aetna with Pindar's (*Attic Nights* 17.10).[17] Virgil attracted a number

of such comparisons: Perellius Faustus collected all of his "thefts," and Q. Octavius Avitus wrote eight volumes on his borrowings, aligning Virgil's verses with their STs, a monumental undertaking (Donatus, *Life of Virgil* 45).

If the circumstances of production were very different to ours, so too were translations. A usual Western translation is one ST to one TT: in other words, a translator normally takes a text in one language and turns it into one in another language, usually trying to be as faithful as possible to the ST. Translators do not, as a general rule, take the first chapter, a few in the middle, and maybe something from the end, dropping the rest, then combine this material with a different text (perhaps not even by the same author), add in their own material, give the text a new setting, and send it out into the world. Roman translators, however, felt entirely comfortable taking such an attitude to their STs; these were not sacrosanct units to be respected, but raw material to be broken up and used. Even the first translation we know of in Rome, Livius Andronicus's mid-third-century BCE *Odussia*, chopped the twenty-four books of its original (Homer's *Odyssey*) down to one. The second-century BCE comic poet Terence, sometimes argued to be a more faithful translator than the earlier Plautus, combined two Greek comedies to make a single Roman one (see Chapter 3). Even seemingly direct translations turn out to be not so: Germanicus Caesar (15/16 BCE–19 CE) produced a free translation of Aratus's *Phaenomena*, a Greek work on the constellations, but also added an entirely new section at the end, while Catullus's translation of Sappho's Poem 31 also added a new, original stanza. Detaching portions of larger texts and translating them on their own was also common; Catullus, translating Callimachus's *Lock of Berenice*, detached a single episode from a much longer poem (the *Aitia*) to send as a gift to a friend.

Roman literary translation, as a general rule, dismembered a Greek text and scattered it within a larger work. As a result, in Rome there was rarely anything we would call faithful translation. The overriding concern of Roman translation was not fidelity or free translation, but control. Roman translators were supposed to be able to dominate and manage their Greek sources, and translate them in ways that showed that control and enabled their own voice to be heard through their new text. You competed with the source text and tried to improve on it and, as Pliny the Younger said, you should feel ashamed if your translation was not sometimes better than the original (*Epistle* 7.9). This is not necessarily a sign of contempt for the source: the Romans were not an ancient version of Edward Fitzgerald, the "translator" of the *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*, who wrote that "it is an amusement to take what liberties I like with these Persians, who . . . are not poets enough to frighten one from such excursions, and who really do want a little art to shape them" (cited in Lefevere 1992, 1). Romans continually inverted the modern norm that "the higher the prestige of the text, the more 'grammatical and logical' the translation is likely to be" (Lefevere 1992, 50). Cicero valued Plato highly, but still avoided literally translating him,

because that would have meant losing his own voice (*On the Laws/De legibus* 2.17). Catullus found Sappho a powerful model for his poetry, but still added a verse to one of her poems, perhaps *because* she was so powerful and overwhelming as a poetic model.

Romans manipulated their STs so extensively in part because they could: elites frequently translated for other elites who could read the original in Greek if they so wished. In fact, part of the pleasure of reading a translation was seeing what changes had been made and how skillfully they had been done. Translation also served to connect the elite, becoming part of aristocratic gift exchange (Catullus's translations of Sappho and Callimachus were both gifts to nobles), as well as being a way to show they had spent time fruitfully in temporary retirement (Pliny, *Epistles* 7.9). Some thought that you could only really translate for those who already knew Greek (see Varro's comments in Cicero's *Academica* 1.4–5 and Gellius's *Attic Nights* 11.16, and my discussion of these in Chapters 4 and 6). This cannot, however, fully explain why Roman translators took the approach they did, as some of these practices were common among early translators, many of whom were not just non-elite, but were writing for a popular audience. We also need to seek answers in the complicated relationship Rome had with Greece; since I will touch on this subject below, I leave it aside for the moment.

THE UNNATURALNESS OF ROMAN TRANSLATION

The success of Roman translation should not lead us to ignore how *unnatural* it was in many ways. They were certainly not the first empire in the Mediterranean region to translate; there is ample evidence from the Babylonian empire for translating gods' names, for lists correlating Sumerian and Akkadian words, and for the official position of interpreters within the administration (Assman 1996, 25–28); the same is true for other Near Eastern empires.[18] But while their decision to translate was certainly not unique in the ancient world, the Romans appear to have been the first to theorize about translation. And, in relation to Greece, translating *was* an unusual choice; Greek authors generally eschewed translation, creating a remarkable gap between translating and translated culture:[19] "there must be few [cultures] indeed that can compare with ancient Greek for the relative absence of translations, or with ancient Latin for their relative ubiquity" (Most 2003, 385). The lack of a Greek model of translation meant that the Romans had nothing in their sources they could translate on the subject; instead, they had to formulate a new language and new ideas to discuss translation. (I should say that it is not that the Greeks never translated: they certainly did. However, it was not something they appear to have discussed or theorized about except in literature after their conquest by the Romans, and even those discussions were rare.)[20]

Roman translation was also unnatural, because it repeatedly imported into the Roman cultural and literary system genres and concepts that had had no role there before. Epic is a good example of this: when Livius Andronicus made the decision to translate Homer's *Odyssey* into Latin, he brought to Rome a genre that had not previously existed there. This does not mean that the Romans had no knowledge of epic before Livius, but that he had to create a cultural space and an audience for a *Latin* epic. He could not copy a Greek model for translation because one did not exist.

TRANSLATION STUDIES

I now turn from the old to the new, from the world of the Romans to that of Translation Studies. Translation Studies is a relatively new discipline (especially when compared to Classics),[21] and one that has increasingly moved away from seeing translation as purely something that is done with texts and as primarily a philological or linguistic issue, to looking at the ways that translations are affected by the cultural and social background of translators, and by the needs and demands of their target audience. Sometimes called the "cultural turn" in Translation Studies, this shift gained momentum in the 1990s, but saw its origins in the Tel Aviv school of Translation Studies and polysystems theory. In this approach, translation is viewed as an integral part of a culture's literary system or poetics and as a form of manipulated literature, or as Theo Hermans wrote:

> The theory of the polysystem sees literary translation as one element among many in the constant struggle for domination between the system's various layers and subdivisions. In a given literature, translations may at certain times constitute a separate subsystem, with its own characteristics and models, or be more or less fully integrated into the indigenous system; they may form part of the system's prestigious centre or remain a peripheral phenomenon; they may be used as "primary" polemical weapons to challenge the dominant poetics, or they may shore up and reinforce the prevailing conventions. From the point of view of the target literature, all translation implies a degree of manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose. (1985, 11–12)

Allied to this approach have been ideas of translation as a form of rewriting (to use André Lefevere's phrase) which, accompanied by other forms of rewriting such as anthologizing and literary criticism, controls where and how texts become situated in literary systems. Lefevere argued that translation is an influential form of such rewriting:

> Rewritings, mainly translations, deeply affect the interpenetration of literary systems, not just by projecting the image of one writer or work in

> another literature or by failing to do so . . . but also by introducing new devices into the inventory component of a poetics and paving the way to changes in its functional component. (1992, 38)

Lefevere points to the arrival of the ode in French literature and how hexameter was introduced into German by the Homeric translations of Johann Heinrich Voss as examples of the ways in which translation has enabled literary devices to enter literary systems. Such approaches allow us new ways to see, for example, Livius Andronicus's decision to use native Saturnian rather than the Greek hexameter in his translation of the *Odyssey* as one of a canny translator trying to ensure epic poetry would gain traction in Rome, rather than that of a crude precursor of later Latin poets.

The cultural turn in Translation Studies has been complemented by the sociological turn, which sees translators as "bound up in social networks which allow them to be viewed as socially constructed and constructing subjects" (Wolf 2007, 3). This approach is heavily indebted to the work of Daniel Siméoni, and particularly his 1998 essay "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's *Habitus*." Siméoni argued that every translator is unavoidably affected by his or her "personalized social and cultural history" (1998, 32). This does not mean that a translator is nothing more than a passive tool of the literary, cultural, and political systems that he or she inhabits; each translator can make individual choices, affect the literary system as much as it affects them. But no matter what they strive for, no matter what they aim for, they will unavoidably be affected by that history.

Their translations will also be affected by the fact that the success of any translation is constrained by what its receiving society will accept. In other words, to be successful, a translation usually has to work within the constraints imposed by the target audience. For example, in North America and Europe, audiences prefer translations that are domesticating, that hide the process of translation, and that "bring back a cultural other as the same, the recognizable, even the familiar" (Venuti 1995, 18). Translations that do not read like translations, but present a translation as if it were the product of the reading culture, will be more popular and less likely to be rejected. Voices have been raised in opposition to this tendency (most noticeably Laurence Venuti's),[22] and foreignizing translations have been produced, but never to recent popular success.[23] The point still stands: a working translator is inevitably affected by what an audience expects a translation to look like, as well as by his or her own desires and wants. Thinking about Roman translators as socially constructed individuals with personalized social and cultural histories allows us to think of them as both heirs to previous approaches to translation and writers who will seek to manipulate that tradition to gain their own goals. It moves translation from something that is solely a linguistic issue to something that is deeply intertwined with cultural, political, and historical concerns on an individual and societal level.

TRANSLATION AND POWER

Translation Studies has drawn attention to the frequent connections between colonialism, imperialism, and translation; it is no accident that translators frequently follow alongside or close upon the footsteps of conquering armies. While I have no intention of shoving Roman translation into a box marked "imperialism," where it would not fit terribly well, it is still useful to understand the complications in thinking about translation in historical periods where one nation is translating and adapting the texts of a people it has just conquered. One cannot dismiss these issues with a simple repetition of Horace's comment that conquered Greece conquered Rome, or by inverting the normal reading and situating Rome as the culturally inferior, culturally colonized nation. Rome's translation of Greek literature—and of other cultural goods from Greece—was made possible by her conquest of Greece and the Hellenistic kingdoms. Texts in the form of the wholesale movement of libraries, slaves who could aid in the reading of Greek texts, the wealth to allow one to purchase libraries or to travel and perfect one's understanding of Greek, were all made possible by the enormous expansion of Roman power that occurred over the period this book covers.

At the same time, Rome allows us a chance to step outside traditional thinking about translation and power, and assumptions that cultures tend not to translate from less powerful cultures "because they believe in the dominance of their culture and expect that weaker cultures will undertake the translation if they want access to information and cultural goods" (Prunč 2003, 45). The Romans translated enormous amounts from conquered Greece, a process that created its own problems. Ideas about the need of a Latin translation to be superior were not just a function of ideas about literary rivalry and *aemulatio* (though that certainly played a role), but of the need for Roman culture to be careful in handling a resource drawn from a subject nation. Translation as a Roman enterprise and ideas about translation were formed in connection with Roman domination of Greek territory: "in the Roman Republic, as it appropriates natural and cultural resources in the Mediterranean world, and establishes its masterfully imitative relation to Greek culture, thinking about imitation can generate something more like the question: 'How can a culture express its power?' 'Imitation!' " (Connors 2004, 182). If we replace "imitation" with "translation," we have another critical component for understanding how the Romans view and discuss translation and why in Rome, translation becomes a chance to impose your identity on a text, rather than to respect its integrity.

All translation is implicated in issues of power; this is clearest when a translation is the result of patronage on the part of a state or an individual (the case of the Roman Senate's commissioning of a Latin translation of the Carthaginian Mago's farming manual comes to mind), but the situation is rarely so obvious. All translations carry within themselves an inherent desire to claim authority and status, even at the expense of the original or at

the risk of displacing it. To put it bluntly, there is little point in producing a translation that is not read, that never makes its audience pick it up instead of the original work. Many of us now read translations because we cannot read the original, making that task of displacement easier. But in Rome, literary translations were frequently produced for those who were (nominally at least) able to read the ST; those who read Cicero's *Republic* or Germanicus Caesar's *Phaenomena* could also read the original. A Roman reader is frequently not reading a translation as a way to get to the source; he or she is reading it to see what a Cicero or Germanicus has done with it and how he has manipulated the ST. Because of this, the traces that the translator leaves on the material become increasingly important: Cicero needs to show through his translations—no matter how he might declare at times that he is translating the words of his original closely—because, otherwise, what is the point of producing them?

CONCLUSION

In all of the above, I have not defined exactly what a Roman translation is. In this I am in good company, as even in Translation Studies there "is currently no agreement on how it [translation] can be defined, except perhaps that the best way to define translation is to undefine it" (Tahir-Gürçaĝlar and Şehnaz 2002, 45). The tendency has been to use terms such as "re-writing" (Lefevere's preferred term), which connect translation with other forms of receiving and manipulating literature, or to use a term like "assumed translation," which leaves the definition of a translation up to the target culture (see Toury 1982). Perhaps that is the best approach to Roman translation, as it enables us to widen our understanding to encompass texts that we would not define as translations. For example, although there is no way that Virgil's *Aeneid* would be described as a translation in modern terms, we have already seen that Gellius took a portion of it and discussed how it translated Pindar. He did the same with Caecilius Statius's version of Menander's *Plocium* (*Attic Nights* 2.23), a text most scholars would have no problem calling a translation. Gellius, however, approaches both texts in exactly the same way and, although he is far more disparaging about Caecilius's work, does not distinguish between translating entire works and segments of works which are then distributed within a larger whole.

Mapping our own thoughts about translation, or about original and copy or free and literal,[24] onto Roman translation distorts it beyond recognition. In looking at Rome, we must abandon our "metaphors of translation as likeness, replica, duplicate, copy, portrait, reflection, reproduction, imitation, mimesis, mirror image or transparent pane of glass" (Hermans 2002b, 10). As I say this, I am also aware that "when we study translation as it occurs in other cultures, we have no option but to translate into our terms those practices and concepts of 'translation.' In describing translation

we are also translating translation . . . we translate according to our concept of translation, and *into* our concept of translation, in a manner which draws in differential voices and is filtered through local values" (Hermans 2002b, 19). Throughout this introduction and this book, I have used "translation" to describe practices that sometimes resemble our notions of translation and sometimes have almost nothing in common with it. I have used "translate" to translate a wide range of Latin words used for translation, even though they have a wide semantic spectrum that does not always match the English verb (on which see the Appendix). I have done so because it is clear that the Romans have a field that they define as translation, and a range of semantic terms to describe this field, even if it differs from our own. What Roman translation is, how vastly different it is from our idea of the same, remains to be fully explored. My aim here is to help in that process of exploration and to open up the world of Roman translation as something radically different from our own, with its own concerns and debates.

1 Language, Interpreters, and Official Translations in the Roman World

> It was found highly dangerous to employ the natives as interpreters, upon whose fidelity they could not depend.
>
> —William Jones, *Grammar of the Persian Language*

One problem with nonliterary translation in the Roman world resides not so much in acknowledging that it took place, but in deciding how to understand and place it within a larger context. For while all translation, even the humblest and most fumbling efforts of the barely linguistically competent, occupies a place in the spectrum of communication, it is hard to understand how these places intersect and affect each other. We encounter problems in understanding the intersections between interpreters and other forms of translation because we, like the Romans, frequently privilege literary translation, and consider it more worthy of comment and more complex than much of the work of interpreters or official translators, especially when this work takes a humble form. (It should also be noted that the subjects discussed in this chapter cover a vast category of language use in the ancient world, and I certainly do not claim this chapter to be anything close to an exhaustive study of linguistic identity, language policy, bilingualism, or the role of interpreters in the Roman Empire. My primary intent is to map out the forms of nonliterary translation that existed in Rome and to point to some ways that these intersect with and complicate Roman ideas about literary translation.)

Frequently, though, more depends upon the work of an interpreter in the field than upon literary translations: one example of how much depended on nonliterary translation can be found in the writings of the Greek historian Polybius (c. 200–118 BCE) and the Roman historian Livy (59 BCE–17 CE), both of whom recount the disastrous consequences in 191 BCE for the Aetolians when they mistranslated Latin *fides* as Greek *pistis*.[1] While both words can be translated as trust or faith,[2] the Latin term had a very specific meaning in this context. Surrendering *in fidem* meant that one had unconditionally surrendered all one's goods and territory (on *fides* and *in fidem* as terms, see Hölkeskamp 2000). The Aetolians, unfortunately, managed to miss this crucial meaning and were horrified when the Roman general,

M' Acilius Glabrio, dictated harsh terms at their first audience. When they protested, Glabrio told them to stop acting Greek about the matter or he would throw them in chains.[3]

LATIN, GREEK, AND ROMAN LANGUAGE POLICY

Despite the multiplicity of languages in the Roman Empire, it is difficult to discuss linguistic matters there without straying into a binary discussion of Latin and Greek, with a few references to Punic or some other nonclassical language. This is a legacy of our literary sources,[4] where the issues under debate revolved around speaking or writing correct Greek or Latin, both of which were critical to elite identity; these sources ignore other languages unless they cause exceptional problems or the author wants to make a point. Such is the situation when Polybius (1.67.2–7) discusses the polylingualism of the Carthaginian army, arguing that its linguistic plurality made plotting easier and aided dissension among various groups. This is contrasted with the monolingualism of the Roman army, in the Romans' favor.[5]

Additionally, Romans tended to be interested in, and hence write about, the customs and cultures of non-Greek peoples, rather than their languages, although this did not mean they were unaware of languages outside Greek and Latin (Rochette 1997b, 52). A rare reference to the literature of a barbaric people is the geographer Strabo's allusion to the literature and laws of a Spanish tribe (the Turdetani), 6,000 of whose laws were in meter (3.2.15). However, for most of our sources, despite the poet Ovid's unwilling adventures in Getic,[6] "*les deux seules véritables langues du monde étaient le latin et le grec*" (Rochette 1997b, 55). Because Greek became such a vital component of elite Roman identity, something I shall return to repeatedly over the course of this book, it overshadows all other languages in our sources, creating a deceptive image of the Roman world as one in which only Greek and Latin mattered or, indeed, were written down: "the dominance of Latin and Greek in the western and eastern spheres of the Mediterranean cultural zone hides an enormous linguistic diversity" (Adams and Swain 2002, 11). Languages such as Phrygian, for which we have about a hundred inscriptions (mainly funerary) in Greek script from the third century CE, are not even referred to in literary sources until the sixth century (Millar 1968, 1).[7]

Although the Romans certainly privileged two languages at the expense of all others, and used Latin as their official language in the Western Empire (they employed Greek in the East, although officials used Latin in critical situations, legal cases were pled in Latin, and the language of the army was Latin), the Romans appear to have had no official linguistic policy *per se*, even regarding languages for which they must have had little respect, such as the various Celtic tongues. This may have been because, like other empires, they assumed that such a policy was largely unnecessary, as "a common

practice . . . from quite remote to fairly recent times, was a benign linguistic neglect on the part of rulers, coupled with a belief that their own language was, in any event, superior and would naturally be adopted by anyone of sense" (Edwards 1994, 131).

Given the social and economic advantages to learning Latin in the West, and in the East under certain circumstances, Rome could frequently rely on its subjects learning Latin for pragmatic reasons.[8] Although dealing with the empire required either Latin or Greek, or an interpreter who spoke one of those languages, provincial languages survived and continued to be used for everyday speech and even for literary works. Syriac, Coptic, Punic, and Celtic tongues, in particular, continued to be important in the empire and used for inscriptions and literary works (MacMullen 1966, 1). Ulpian, a jurist of the third century CE, acknowledged the continued relevance of such languages when he wrote that *fideicommissum* (a testamentary gift of property) could be given in any tongue, including Punic or Gallic, as well as Latin and Greek (*Digest* 32.11 pr.; cf. also 45.1.1.6). Punic, in particular, was still spoken at the highest levels, even to the exclusion of Latin and Greek: the Emperor Septimius Severus's (145–211 CE) sister's supposed fluency in Punic and inability to speak Latin shows its continuing vibrancy even at a high social level (*Augustan History/Historiae Augustae, Septimius Severus* 15.7). Even if the story was not true, it was something people could believe to be *possibly* true of a member of the elite.

That said, Roman sources mention a few incidents that might be taken as signs of a language policy. In the 70s BCE, the Roman general Sertorius sent the children of the Spanish aristocracy to Osca to be educated in Greek and Latin, even paying their fees; we are told that it delighted their parents to see them in their togas (Plutarch, *Sertorius* 14.2). However, this was an action taken by an individual, not the Roman state; in fact, Sertorius was at that point in open rebellion. One has to jump forward to the empire, to Agricola's time as governor of Britain (77–84 CE), to find something similar:

> [Agricola began] to educate the sons of the [British] chiefs in the liberal arts, and to prefer the inborn talent of the British to the learning acquired by the Gauls: the result was that those who only recently rejected the Roman language desired its eloquence. Then followed respect for our dress and frequent wearing of the toga. Little by little they moved towards the enticements of vices, to the colonnades, baths, and the elegancies of feasts. These ignorant people called it refinement, although it formed part of their slavery. (Tacitus, *Agricola* 21)
>
> *Iam vero principum filios liberalibus artibus erudire, et ingenia Britannorum studiis Gallorum anteferre, ut qui modo linguam Romanam abnuebant, eloquentiam concupiscerent. Inde etiam habitus nostri honor et frequens toga; paulatimque discessum ad delenimenta vitiorum, porticus et balnea et conviviorum elegantiam. Idque apud imperitos humanitas vocabatur, cum pars servitutis esset.*

However, while individuals might pay for educating a generation or endow a school in the provinces, the state relied on other means to spread Latin, and there was never an imperial push to spread Latin via educational institutions. Saint Augustine, though, felt that there was little difference; reflecting back on the role of language in the empire, he wrote that "the imperial city has worked hard to impose on conquered peoples not just her yoke but her language: the result has been that there has not been a lack, but a flood of interpreters."[9] In the long run, the absence of an official policy on the part of the state did not matter:[10] Latin won out in the Western Empire and held on in the East with a more lasting grip than did Greek.

The lack of a formal language policy encouraging the spread of Latin, and the elite's training in Greek, did not mean that Roman identity was unconnected to Latin. Cicero's easy slippage from Greek to Latin in his private letters was not necessarily indicative of how other Romans, or even the rest of the Roman world, viewed the relationship between the two languages.[11] Several metaphors describing language shifts show an awareness of disjuncture between the languages. Apuleius in the *Golden Ass/Metamorphoses* used the metaphor of leaping from horse to horse to discuss movement from Greek to Latin (1.1; see Dubuisson 2000 on this passage). A more common expression was that of changing clothing, switching the *pallium* (a Greek cloak) for the Roman toga. In his last days, the Emperor Augustus amused himself by making Greeks dress in togas and Romans in *pallia*, and then speak the relevant language (Suetonius, *Augustus* 98–99).[12] (He also once forbade those not wearing the toga from entering the Roman Forum, quoting a line from Virgil about the Romans as the togaed race [Suetonius, *Augustus* 40]). Seneca the Elder (c. 50 BCE–after 40 CE) reports that Argentarius, a Greek declaimer, found this habit of matching language to dress, and the speed with which such a shift could be achieved, a little perplexing:

> He was always astonished at those who, not content with eloquence in one language, when they had declaimed in Latin, put aside the toga and took up the *pallium* and returned, and, as if that had changed their *persona*, declaimed in Greek. (*Controversia* 9.3.13)[13]
>
> *et illos semper admiraretur qui, non [fuerunt] contenti unius linguae eloquentia, cum Latine declamaverant, toga posita sumpto pallio quasi persona mutata rediebant et Graece declamabant.*

This habit of donning a different national costume to match the language one would speak indicates that, while the close connection between language and national identity may primarily be a manifestation of nineteenth-century nation building, this issue was not entirely absent from the Roman world. If to don the toga was to play the Roman, then to speak Latin was to some degree to perform Romanness, and was best done in the appropriate costume.[14]

In the sixth century CE, John Lydus, who worked in the imperial administration of Constantinople, referred to an oracle of Romulus who told

the Romans that if they ever forgot their mother tongue, fortune would abandon them.[15] He also wrote of the dire circumstances that attended upon Cyrus, who had abandoned the ancient practice of publishing decrees exclusively in Latin while administering the city prefecture (*On the Magistrates* 3.42). A different (and considerably earlier) piece of evidence about the connection between identity and language is also provided by the poet Ennius (239–169 BCE), who said that he had a heart for each of the three languages he spoke (Greek, Latin, and Oscan).[16] Latin mattered to the Romans; speaking it was the mark of a Roman, even if Greek was also a vital component of elite Roman identity. Language choice mattered, and the use of a particular language (Latin in the Senate, for example—see below) was not always an unconsidered decision, a fact that especially needs to be considered when discussing the Roman use of interpreters to speak through in Greece.[17]

BILINGUALISM AND POLYLINGUALISM[18]

During the period discussed in this book, elite and educated Roman men were increasingly bilingual in Greek and Latin (for a somewhat skeptical view of the extent of their bilingualism, see Horsfall 1979).[19] This fact sometimes results in a tendency to see bilingualism in Rome purely in terms of the elite and of Latin and Greek. In fact, elite Romans were bilingual in a very particular form of Greek (Attic, the language of Athens), rather than in the various Greek dialects spoken throughout the Greek world, or in *koiné*, the Greek of the East; the Greek they spoke does not tell us what other Romans spoke or even what Greeks in Rome spoke. And even Roman Attic Greek did not necessarily match what Greeks of Athens were speaking during the same historical period.[20]

However, bilingualism, even Greek–Latin bilingualism, and polylingualism were obviously not just an elite Roman phenomenon, although we need to remember that "expanded linguistic competence is usually driven by necessity but it has also historically reflected and supported upper-class boundaries. There is a distinction, in other words, between elite and folk bilingualism" (Edwards 1994, 83). We know that bilingualism in Greek, to take our best-documented language, was not just a feature of the Roman elite; in the second century BCE, the Roman comic poet Plautus's versions of Greek comedies contained an enormous number of Grecisms. A socially mixed audience was supposed to understand these and find them amusing,[21] and such evidence of knowledge of Greek among the broader Roman population is supported by epigraphic evidence.[22]

However, outside of inscriptions, it still must be said that most of our knowledge of bilingualism in Rome comes from the elite (Campanile 1991, 20) and relates to the acquisition of Greek (and in a few cases, Latin) among their ranks. The rhetorician Quintilian (c. 35–90s CE) provides a guide to the ideal way for Romans to acquire a fluent mastery of Greek, in the first

book of his *Institutes of Oratory*. He recommends surrounding the child with Greek-speaking slaves from the start, selecting a nurse who speaks good Greek, having the child learn Greek before Latin, and so forth (1.12–13). This carefully plotted process of language acquisition cannot have represented the experiences of many residents of the empire, most of whom acquired extra languages in a much more haphazard fashion. And sometimes, despite considerable training and devotion to the task, members of the Roman elite might not be entirely fluent or comfortable in Greek (such was the case with Augustus; see below). The plea of the Neopythagorian holy man Apollonius to the Emperor Vespasian, that he should only send out to govern Greek provinces men who could speak Greek properly, suggests that the imperial administration might dispatch men who did not understand Greek to Eastern provinces (Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius* 5.36; the story is of very dubious authenticity but it does suggest some issues with governors). There may also have been issues with Romans not able to understand and speak Greek to the high standard expected by the Greek elite. Lucian (ethnically Syrian, although he wrote in Greek and was adept in the language) wrote an essay dealing with the fallout from greeting his patron with the wrong word, a slip his critics eagerly seized on.[23] The Emperor Augustus would not rely on his own Greek, even after long instruction, as "he would never risk speaking or writing something in that language off the cuff; for, if he ever had to use it, he sketched it out in Latin and gave it to someone else to translate (*vertendum*)."[24] Augustus's Greek was probably not particularly poor; his caution may just have arisen from "the necessity of producing a text which would live up to the exacting standards of grammar and vocabulary expected of public pronouncements in the Greek world" (Millar 1992, 226). There was always the embarrassing memory of the fate of the Roman ambassador to Tarentum in 282 BCE, who was mocked and then pelted with filth because of his poor Greek, to recall when one was about to venture publicly in the Greek language (Dionysius of Halicarnassus 19.5; Appian, *Samnite Wars* 7.2).

Even those who were recognized masters of Greek in our ancient sources appear to have had some issues with that language. Plutarch described the Republican general Gaius Flamininus as a Greek in both voice and language (*Flamininus* 5.5), but an inscription of a letter he wrote in c. 192 BCE to the Greek city of Chyretiae nonetheless shows several errors in Greek (cf. Sherk 1969, 199; but for a spirited defense of Flamininus's Greek, see Armstrong and Walsh 1986). If the letter was translated into Greek from his original Latin, the errors could be due to the translator, but still, either Flamininus did not or could not be bothered to catch the errors. (A third option is that he deliberately sent out the letter with errors as a way to show the Roman origin of the text.)

What about languages other than Greek? As stated at the start of this chapter, the Roman Empire was filled with a multiplicity of languages. How did these come into play? Officially, they did not: the Roman state appears

not to have translated official pronouncements into languages other than Greek. However, when circumstances demanded flexibility, the reality on the ground was different. One example shows this clearly: when he was creating the most famous trilingual inscription of them all, Pontius Pilate did not think twice about ordering the message above Jesus's cross to be written in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew. Even if this is not exactly an official inscription in the same manner as the *senatus consulta* (decrees of the Senate) posted around the provinces (though it was one placed above a symbol of Roman power to punish non-Roman subjects of the empire), it does show that local officials would issue an official message in a way that would be understood by more than those literate in Greek or Latin.

We have other evidence of local flexibility by governors. In April of 29 BCE, the first prefect of Egypt, C. Cornelius Gallus, created a trilingual inscription in Latin, Greek, and hieroglyphics detailing his achievements, which was posted on the island of Philae (*Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae* 8995).[25] The three texts are all different, with the unfortunately fragmentary hieroglyphic text deviating widely from the Greek and Latin ones (Myers 2008, 113–14). The Greek and Latin inscriptions are roughly similar in content (although not in style),[26] each telling of Gallus's defeat of Rome's enemies in the Thebaid, but they also have significant differences. For example, the Latin text does not mention Augustus Caesar as the person who appointed Gallus (Judge 2008, 73), although the Greek does;[27] the Latin mentions that Gallus brought his armies into a region never before penetrated by the Roman people or the kings of Egypt (referring here to the Ptolemies), while the Greek states that the region was previously impenetrable to the kings' armies. The Latin inscription thus positioned Gallus's conquest as one which spread the reach of Roman power and went one better than the kings of Egypt. The hieroglyphic text, on the other hand, downplayed Gallus's achievements in comparison to the Greek and Latin inscriptions (his name may not even appear on the inscription, although there is reference to a "prince of Egypt").[28] This may have been the decision of the translator, who perhaps took advantage of the fact that Gallus and his staff could not read the text. However, Gallus might have employed hieroglyphics primarily for their connection to power in an Egyptian audience's mind, and not have been too worried about the translation's exact contents (Myers 2008, 112). His inscription shows that Romans were aware of and willing to tap into the symbolic power of languages other than Greek.

The literary sources contain very few accounts of official dealings in languages other than Greek. Cicero assumes that Punic and Spanish ambassadors would use interpreters in the Senate, but it is completely unknown who provided such interpreters (*On Divination* 2.131.6). One rare official recognition by the Roman Senate of a nonclassical language was their decision to translate the Carthaginian Mago's farming manual into Greek after the final conquest of Carthage in 146 BCE.[29] Although the translation is no longer extant,[30] we know it was translated by the senator D. Junius Silanus along

with a board of senators, testifying to knowledge of Punic at an elite level. The decision to translate this lone work of Punic scholarship was in stark contrast to the decision to give the rest of the Carthaginian library to the Numidian kings (Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 18.22), and the translation was commissioned despite the fact that, as Pliny notes, Cato the Elder's *On Farming* was already in circulation. The undertaking must have been a major one, as the work covered twenty-eight books, and successful, as the text was used by a range of later Roman authors writing on agriculture, such as Varro and Columella. Its importance meant that it was also translated in an abbreviated form by Dionysius of Utica into Greek in 88 BCE (Varro, *On Farming* 1.1.10);[31] there was another Greek translation by Diophanes of Nicaea not much more than twenty years later (both translations are also lost).

Translating Mago may have been a practical move by the Romans, a way to increase efficiency in Roman agriculture, but it may also have been a decision on the part of an anti-Catonian party to defy Cato's strictures that Carthage should be entirely destroyed (Heurgon 1976, 145–47); the translation could thus be a political statement. The Senate seems to have taken special care to retain control over the transference of the text by appointing a group to oversee the translation, rather than simply allowing Silanus a free hand (we have no other example of such a situation). We have at least one other record of a translation from a Punic text, in this case a private translation: the historian Sallust (c. 86–35 BCE) had the geographic works of Hiempsal[32] translated and used them when writing his history of the Roman war against the Numidian king Jugurtha (*Jugurtha* 17.7). Whether the Romans used different strategies in translating Punic literature than Greek cannot be known, as none of the translations, let alone the source texts, survive. Sallust uses *interpretor*, a verb that his contemporary Cicero used for referring to literal translation, to describe the translation, but we cannot draw any conclusions from this, as he does not use the verb elsewhere in his extant works (he does refer once to *interpretes*, interpreters; see below).

INTERPRETERS[33]

The Latin for interpreter is *interpres* (plural: *interpretes*); the verb is *interpretor* (the Greek equivalents are *hermeneus* and *hermeneuein*). Isidorus of Seville (c. 600–638 CE) explained the meaning of *interpres*:

> An interpreter is [called so] because he is the middle point between two languages, while he translates. But he who interprets and reveals divine mysteries is also called an interpreter, because he translates them.[34] (*Etymology* 10.123)
>
> *Interpres, quod inter partes medius sit duarum linguarum, dum transferet. Sed et qui Deum [quem] interpretatur et hominum quibus divina indicat mysteria, interpres vocatur [quia inter eam quam transferet].*

Isidorus, a Christian bishop, linked religious and linguistic translators, though this was not solely a Christian tendency: in the ancient world, others also saw connections between the interpreter of divine matters and the interpreter of earthly languages. Both represented a vessel through which language was poured and filtered until it became clear.[35] There were a multitude of *interpretes* in the Roman world; some people interpreted laws, others dreams or omens sent by the gods, still others languages, and all these figures can be jumbled in our sources. Cicero referred to the *interpretes* of the Sibylline Books, even though these books were not translated into Latin, at *On Divination* 1.4.5, and then at 1.34.17 paralleled interpreters of the future with the grammarians who interpreted the poets.

Another problem with tracking linguistic interpreters is that they tend to be as invisible in ancient sources as they often are in modern ones.[36] A few examples will serve to show this. In his *Gallic War*, Julius Caesar refers to sending away his "usual interpreters" (*cotidianis interpretibus*, 1.19) so that he can have a confidential conversation with Diviciacus, a noble of the Aedui, a Gallic tribe. But for the rest of his narrative he regularly elides these individuals, except when he wants to make a point. For example, he refers to using C. Valerius Procillus, a friend and Romanized Gaul and the interpreter for his meeting with Diviciacus, to negotiate with King Ariovistus of the Suebians (*Gallic War* 1.46); Procillus and Ariovistus communicated through Gallic, although that was not Ariovistus's first language. Unfortunately, Ariovistus did not trust Procillus or Marcus Metius, who accompanied him, and had them both put in chains; they were later rescued by Caesar after the king's defeat (*Gallic War* 1.52). However, the point of the narrative is not to tout Procillus's linguistic skills or to give a window into how Caesar negotiated with local tribes and kings, but to make clear to his Roman audience the untrustworthiness of Ariovistus as a man who did not even respect diplomats, who were supposed to be sacrosanct.

Interpreters appear and disappear in other sources and for similar reasons: in his *Jugurthine War*, Sallust mentions interpreters being used between the Roman general Sulla and the Numidian general Bocchus (109.4), but Sulla and Bocchus also speak in an earlier chapter (102.12), without interpreters being mentioned. It is highly unlikely that Bocchus forgot a prior knowledge of Latin in the space of a few chapters, so clearly interpreters must also have been present in the first meeting. Presumably, the only reason they get mentioned at all in the second meeting is that Sallust wanted to stress its secrecy (he informs us that only the most trustworthy interpreters are allowed to be present), and also to make a neat comparison between Bocchus's "more than Punic treachery" (108.3) and the ironic presence of faithful interpreters (Rochette 1996, 84).

Inscriptional evidence is our main source of information for the role of interpreters in the military: the sarcophagus of Marcus Ulpius Celerinus lists his office as "interpreter of the Dacians" (*interprex Dacorum*; Kurz 1986, 217), referring to an official military position, and one he was proud of.

Our earliest inscriptional evidence of a legionary who was also an *interpres* comes from an inscription for Q. Atilius Primus in Carnuntum (a Roman army camp located in what is now lower Austria).[37] Most of our evidence for military interpreters comes, not surprisingly, from the frontiers of the Roman Empire (Adams 2003, 277–78; Balsdon 1979, 143), where negotiations could not take place in Latin or Greek. How such interpreters were trained is not known and will almost certainly never be known, given the state of our sources (Mairs 2011, 17); some soldiers may have learned it from their native partners, others may have been native speakers, and so forth. No specific training for such interpreters is ever mentioned. Pay was as for other ranks of the army, although some might earn double allowances of food in addition to their pay; Celerinus also received a *salarium* that covered his expenses (Peretz 2006, 453). As the empire progressed, the status of interpreters in the army rose, with interpreters becoming subordinate officials in the provincial governor's staff (Peretz 2006, 458).

Outside the army, arrangements for selecting an interpreter—especially in the Republic, where interpreters were picked by the governor of the province rather than by a central imperial administration—were informal. Bad governors might pick bad interpreters deliberately or because like attracted like, something Cicero raised in his speeches against Verres, the execrable governor of Sicily from 73–71 BCE. In his attacks, Cicero made good use of the supposed etymology of *interpres*, playing off the idea of the interpreter as someone who stood not only *inter partes* but also *inter pretium*—that is, between you and the prize.[38] In his *Second Speech Against Verres* (never delivered in court), Cicero played on the double meaning of *interpres* (as translator and as go-between), stating that "there is in Sicily an interpreter called Aulus Valentius, whom Verres was accustomed to employ as an interpreter, not for help with Greek, but with his thefts and outrages. This unimportant, needy interpreter suddenly became a tax collector."[39] Cicero deliberately stressed the commercial nature of the interpreter over his other functions (Rochette 1997b, 94). Valentius is, ironically, the ideal interpreter for someone as untrustworthy and vile as Verres,[40] who, not being interested in issues of culture beyond acquiring cultural artifacts to haul back to Rome, uses his *interpres* not in matters of language but in questionable thefts. In doing so, Verres raises him to a new status, one for which he is not fit. Here, using an interpreter is all about getting the *pretium*, the object of value, *not* about enabling communication between *partes*, which represents for Cicero, at least, a travesty of the office. What also irks Cicero is that this interpreter is being raised to a status for which he is not socially fit.

Cicero speaks far more highly of M. Marcilius, the son of one of his own interpreters who was also a friend, at *Letters to his Friends* 13.54. This letter thanks Q. Minucius Thermus, the governor of Asia, for treating the younger Marcilius well and taking him on in response to Cicero's recommendation. The terms that Cicero uses to describe Marcilius senior suggest that it was eminently possible to end up having to use other, less trustworthy,

interpreters: he is described as *exceptionally* and almost *incredibly* faithful, self-restrained, and unassuming. Cicero's letter also shows that at this period, Roman governors relied on recommendations from acquaintances and friends to find interpreters rather than on an official network or corps. Under the empire, provincial staff tended to be more stable and posted permanently to provinces (Jones 1960b, 163–64); provincial civil servants were also supplemented by staff drawn from the military, an increasing practice over the course of the second and third centuries CE (Jones 1960b), which means that interpreters might come from the ranks of the army as well as the civil service. Even in the Republic, reliable interpreters were used repeatedly by various administrators: in his *Defense Speech for Balbus/Pro Balbo*, Cicero mentions Cn. Publicius Menander, a freedman whom Roman ambassadors of the past had taken with them on several embassies to Greece (11.28). Given that there were many other individuals in this period who were capable of performing this function, it seems likely that what recommended Menander to so many embassies was as much his trustworthiness as his linguistic ability. That they took him despite the fact that some of them certainly spoke fluent Greek speaks to the use of interpreters as blocking devices as well as for linguistic aid.[41]

Shifty and unreliable interpreters were as possible in ancient Rome as now: the poet Ovid says that he had the misfortune to encounter bad interpreters after he was exiled to Tomis on the Black Sea in 8 CE (*Letters from Pontus/Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.14.39–43). However, on the whole, one-sided loyalty or outright treachery was not necessarily in the long-term interest of the interpreter (incompetence is another matter altogether). As Anthony Pym has pointed out, "the translator's long-term interests are . . . incompatible with unilateral allegiance" (1995, 7); in other words, an interpreter depends on being seen as a trustworthy party by both sides in order for his or her work to be acceptable, and this will tend to prevent him or her from catering entirely to one side over the long haul. Take, for example, the case of the Aetolians and the mistranslation of *fides* mentioned at the start of this chapter. If an interpreter made a deliberate choice to not enlighten them about the full meaning of *fides* and the consequences of surrendering *in fidem*, he or she might have initially been rewarded by Glabrio, who had much to gain from an unconditional surrender. But there was little chance that the same interpreter would ever be trusted again by the Aetolians or anyone else who ever heard the story. So, the interpreter's effectiveness for the Romans and the Aetolians would vanish once the mistranslation was revealed. The failure of the Jewish historian Josephus as an interpreter for Vespasian and Titus at the siege of Jerusalem in 70 CE also points to the truth of Pym's statement in a classical context. Josephus, who had been a general for the Jewish side before being captured and going wholeheartedly over to the Romans, was entirely identified with the Roman army and its generals. As a result, he was rejected as a valid spokesperson by those who were being besieged (*On the Jewish War* 5.360–75, 6.96–98).

The Romans were well attuned to how the use of interpreters could send political and cultural messages to various audiences. Valerius Maximus (his dates are uncertain, but he wrote under the Emperor Tiberius) wrote that in the past, Roman magistrates spoke through interpreters to maintain the dignity of the Roman people:

> Long ago our magistrates acted to maintain the greatness of the Roman people; we can see this in how—along with other examples of how they preserved their dignified status—they guarded with great diligence the tradition of never giving responses to the Greeks in anything other than Latin. In fact, they even forced the Greeks to speak through an interpreter not just in Rome, but even in Greece and Asia, stripping them of those glib tongues through which they are powerful. This certainly spread an increased sense of the dignity of Latin through every race. These magistrates were learned [i.e., in Greek], but they thought that the toga should not be subject to the pallium in any area, and judged it was inappropriate that the importance and commands of empire should be handed over to the sweet nothings of literature. (2.2.2)
>
> *magistratus vero prisci quantopere suam populique Romani maiestatem retinentes se gesserint. hinc cognosci potest quod inter cetera obtinendae gravitatis indicia illud quoque magna cum perseverantia custodiebant, ne Graecis umquam nisi Latine responsa darent. Quin etiam ipsos, linguae volubilitate qua plurimum valent excussa, per interpretem loqui cogebant, non in urbe tantum nostra sed etiam in Graecia et Asia, quo scilicet Latinae vocis honos per omnes gentes venerabilior diffunderetur. Nec illis deerant studia doctrinae, sed nulla non in re pallium togae subici debere arbitrabantur, indignum esse existimantes illecebris et suavitati litterarum imperii pondus et auctoritatem donari.*[42]

While there is much disagreement about the validity of Valerius Maximus's statement—Kaimio, for example, argues that he is projecting backwards contemporary anxieties about Greek creeping into Latin official life (1979, 94–96)—there is a nugget of truth to his point, even if it was often the case that Roman conquerors were only too happy to give in to "the sweet allurement" of Greek, and Maximus is oversimplifying a complicated linguistic issue (Wallace-Hadrill 2011, 80).[43]

Maximus stresses that Latin is used not only to maintain the dignity of the Roman Senate, people, and magistrates, but also to break the power of Greek rhetoric. (In a similar vein, Plutarch says that the exiled Greek general Themistocles asked the Persian King Xerxes for time to learn Persian, because language was like an embroidered tapestry; to use an interpreter was to see the underside, but to speak without one was to show the finished, embroidered side [*Themistocles* 28.1]). On a practical level, this had to be true, as it is hard to concentrate on two speakers at once. If simultaneous interpretation of a Greek speech took place, then it would be hard for even

those who were following the Greek to appreciate it, given that the original speaker would have to pause frequently to allow the interpreter to present his translation, thus breaking up the flow of rhetoric.[44] Interpreters might be used not just to maintain the status of the Senate but also because some senators did not understand Greek well enough to follow a speech: Cicero tells us that there was always someone who called for an interpreter when Greek-speaking embassies came to plead their causes (*On Moral Ends* 5.89).[45]

Romans abroad might use interpreters to maintain status or to make a political or military point: Cato the Elder used an interpreter when he addressed the Athenian assembly in Latin while a military tribune, supposedly causing the Athenians to admire the brevity of Latin compared to Greek (Plutarch, *Cato the Elder* 12). Admittedly, Cato is a special case, and his actions cannot be regarded as normative; if ever a man had an agenda in regard to Greek culture, it was he. Indeed, the use of interpreters in the Roman Senate for a Greek philosophical embassy in 155 BCE may have been spurred not just by traditional practice, or even by some senators' ignorance of Greek, but by Cato's presence (Campanile 1991, 17). The interpreter in that case was a senator by the name of Gaius Acilius (Gellius, *Attic Nights* 6.14.9; Plutarch, *Cato the Elder* 22.4).

The presence of an interpreter could be used also to create distance between speaker and audience or to display arrogance. After his triumph over the Romans at the battle of Cannae in 216 BCE, the Carthaginian general Hannibal would not allow any of his countrymen into his camp and would only communicate through an interpreter; "it would appear that by interposing this barrier, the general felt that he removed to a greater distance the person addressing him" (Gehman 1914, 21). In less triumphant days, Hannibal and the Roman general he was facing, Scipio Africanus, used interpreters in their discussions before the battle of Zama in 202 BCE (Polybius 15.6, Livy 30.30). As both understood Greek, and Hannibal knew Latin, even if he spoke it with a thick and confusing accent (Cornelius Nepos, *Hannibal* 13.2), and hence they could have used a mutual language, it seems that the presence of an interpreter was intended to preserve the distance between the two generals and signal their standing as representatives of two great non-Hellenistic states. At the very least, Scipio indicated the status of Latin as the language of Roman power and the Roman state by not speaking in Greek, as did Hannibal for Punic and its use by the Carthaginian state. One last example to close out the examples: the general Aemilius Paullus, who was fluent in Greek, used his praetor Gnaeus Octavius to interpret for him when speaking to the defeated Greek army after his victory at the battle of Pydna in 168 BCE. This battle ended the Third Macedonian War, finally broke the power of the Macedonian kings, and ensured Rome gained total control over Greece; Paullus clearly wanted to make a point about dominance by speaking Latin rather than Greek.[46]

As can be seen from the above, the use of interpreters in Rome was complicated, and the Romans were not always entirely consistent, even in the

good old days spoken of by Valerius Maximus. However, in all of these instances, no matter what the status of the interpreter, the important factor was not the interpreter but the act of using one: even in the case of Paullus and his praetor, the focus is not on Octavius, but on Paullus and his decision not to speak Greek. The interpreter was a tool like any other, used to maintain status, create distance, or make a political point.[47] All of this is well worth remembering when reading Cicero's comment that he translated not as an interpreter but as an orator (*On the Best Type of Orator* 14).

LATIN AND GREEK IN THE ROMAN SENATE

The Roman Senate was not a monolithic institution that stayed constant over time; although its outer framework remained the same even as it lost power under the emperors (the extent to which the Senate held power during the imperial period is complicated and not relevant here), its internal makeup changed considerably over the same period. The Senate of the Mid-Republic was not the Senate of Cicero nor that of Tiberius; the Roman elite was not good at replacing itself, and each generation saw a new influx into the Senate (something particularly magnified in the Late Republic as various civil wars took their toll). Although texts such as Valerius Maximus's are keen to link the ancient magistrates and Senate with that of their own eras, they should not be taken at face value. However, Latin was supposed to be the language of the Senate, even when it was drawing new members from Roman citizens in Spain, Gaul, and even further afield: although Cicero might make frequent use of Greek in his letters and even address the Syracusan Senate in Greek, he avoided it in speeches to the Senate and to the Roman people (Wallace-Hadrill 2011, 84).[48]

While the Emperor Tiberius felt he had to clamp down on Greek being used in the Senate, and even rejected a Greek word in a senatorial decree, recommending instead the use of one Latin word or the employment of periphrasis to get around the lack of an equivalent Latin term (Suetonius, *Tiberius* 71), others felt differently. Claudius spoke Greek there in response to a Greek embassy (Suetonius, *Claudius* 42), and also allowed Agrippa I, the Palestinian tetrarch, to thank the Senate in Greek (Cassius Dio 60.17.4).[49] However, he also stripped someone from Greece of their right to sit on a jury because they knew no Latin (Suetonius, *Claudius* 16), and struck from citizen rolls an individual from Lycia who did not understand Latin (Cassius Dio 60.17.4). The usage of Greek in the Senate clearly fluctuated across time and according to circumstance; the Romans were never so wedded to Latin that they could not see advantages in employing Greek even there—and indeed, the ability of elite Romans to speak in Greek, while so many Greeks could not speak Latin, could serve to reinforce their power and status as much as using an interpreter (Wallace-Hadrill 2011, 81–86, drawing upon Momigliano 1971, 38). But at the same time, they were not above making

a point by clamping down on the use of Greek by senators when performing their official duties, and the use of Greek in the Senate appears to have been on a case-by-case basis, which left control firmly in the hands of the Romans.

OFFICIAL TRANSLATIONS AND TRANSLATORS

Roman flexibility in matters of language—or rather, in using Greek in the eastern portion of their empire—can be seen in their willingness to translate *senatus consulta* and other official documents into Greek.[50] Pragmatism, as much as a respect for Greek, must be taken into account here: Greek was the lingua franca of the Greek East, thanks to the various Hellenistic kings that had ruled Asia and Egypt before the Romans gained control. That these documents were translated rather than being simultaneously composed in Greek, even though the emperors had both Greek and Latin secretariats,[51] is clear from their frequent Latinisms.[52] The inscriptions were nearly always monolingual, with the Greek translation alone posted; out of the inscriptions gathered in Sherk (1969), only three have Latin as well as Greek. Although the Roman government clearly had a system for translating senatorial decrees into Greek, it was not automatic that such decrees would be posted in the provinces, and their posting was usually left to individual governors or to local elites who might want a permanent record of a decree and would bear the cost of the inscription. There are two notable exceptions to this practice and both relate to Germanicus Caesar, the heir of Emperor Tiberius. The first was a record of the honors voted to Germanicus after his death (found on both the *tabula Siarensis* and *tabula Hebana*); the second, the *senatus consultum de Gn. Pisone*, dealt with Gnaeus Piso, the senator who had poisoned Germanicus.[53] Both texts testify to a moment when "the central state was concerned to diffuse an image of the ruling house to constituencies across the empire" (Rowe 2002, 8); both are atypical in their distribution.

Translations were probably performed by an official corps of translators, rather than by various governors and officials in the provinces:

> the very existence of a large number of complex official documents, frequently dealing with fairly obscure points of the Roman constitution, and the *relatively* few problems that arise from them, point to the existence of a generally accepted system of translations. (Mason 1970, 150 footnote 1; cf. Rochette 1997b, 86)

The remarkable uniformity of the Greek translations of the *senatus consulta* found throughout the Roman Empire over a span of centuries also points to the existence of this corps:

> if one examines all the extant Greek copies of *senatus consulta* from the viewpoint of the language employed and the details of translation, he will

> soon discover a remarkable consistency in phraseology and vocabulary. The texts span a period of two hundred years, yet one sometimes feels that a single individual has done them all . . . the texts have been found in widely separated areas of Greece, Asia Minor, and even in Italy. If that translation had been made in the countries in which they were found, we should expect a variety of expressions and vocabulary reflecting the linguistic habits of a number of minds working independently of one another. But such was not the case. (Sherk 1969, 13)

Translators presumably used a handbook or word list which kept terminology fixed, but of it we have no trace.[54] However, either central translations were not always the case or, if they were, they were liable to revision, as we have two slightly different Greek translations of one law on piracy from 100/99 BCE, the *Lex de provinciis praetoriis*.[55]

Regarding the *senatus consulta*, there are strong indications that Latin was the first language of those doing the translating, such as the tendency to omit the definite article (Greek has one; Latin does not) and the use of Greek *kai* and *te* as exact replacements for Latin *et* and *que* (Sherk 1969, 18). On a practical level, it made sense for the Roman state to maintain control over these translations: the possibilities for abuse could have been almost limitless in the hands of a devious translator or his or her employer.[56] Unfortunately, we have no knowledge of the translators, how they were trained, or who they were. We do not even know where the originals were translated, but it is likely that this took place in the *aerarium Saturnii*, where the original senatorial decrees were received.[57] The social status of the translators cannot be known, though it is likely that they belonged to one of the subclerical grades, and were presumably slaves and freedmen, like most of the Roman civil service under the emperors.[58]

The translations are not, in general, items of linguistic beauty and purity, or even beacons of clarity, as "the Roman Senate, intent upon the preservation of traditional legal formulae, was not particularly concerned whether its decrees were so couched as to be completely understood by the Greeks" (Trahmann 1951, 52). Leofranc Holford-Strevens takes this one step further, arguing that the Greek of the official inscriptions was deliberately unidiomatic to remind the Greeks reading it of their subject status. He cites the *senatus consultum de Sarapeo Deli insulae* (c. 164 BCE) 2.15–37: "the Greeks to whom it was addressed surely saw, in the torture of their language, the heart-breaking brand of their enslavement far more clearly than they could ever discern the meaning" (1993, 207). Another less cynical interpretation is that Greek translations of official texts were not meant to be unpardonably bad or unreadable, but were still translated in unidiomatic ways to "produce a conspicuously peculiar Greek, which may have been meant to impress by its Romanness" (Adams 2003, 12).

Although these translations were stable, they show some changes over time. The Latin word *princeps*, which became an imperial title although

originally it was used for the leading member of the Senate, was initially translated as *hegemon* (leader, general), but at some point before 100 CE, the term *autokrator* (sole ruler) replaced it. Its final translation, which only appears in official documents of the Byzantine era, is *basileus*, king (Mason 1974, 120). Presumably, the state resisted using *basileus* in official inscriptions, thus avoiding Hellenistic terminology of kingship, because of the negative connotations of the Latin term for king (*rex*) for Romans. The slow evolution of terminology suggests that whatever handbook translators used could be altered over a long period of time, but this was done with sensitivity and with an eye to *Roman* concerns.

AUGUSTUS'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY: THE TRANSLATION OF THE *RES GESTAE*[59]

The most famous Roman text translated into and inscribed in Greek is the *Res gestae*. Not only does this represent the most (literally) monumental record of translation in the Roman world, but it also provides us with a rare opportunity to compare original and translation, and to see how translation was handled for such an extensive and politically significant text. It would be hard to imagine a text more politically significant than this: in the *Res gestae*, Augustus gave a first-person account of all of his achievements over his long life; the narrative begins in his nineteenth and ends in his seventy-sixth year, a year before his death in 14 CE. This text functioned as his funeral *elogia*, comparable to the *elogia* inscribed on tombs of famous Romans and statues in the Roman Forum (Luce 1990, 127; Papaioannou 2011, 62–63). As such, it was clearly a fraught ST to translate.

After Augustus's death in 14 CE, his will instructed that the Latin version be engraved on bronze and placed on pillars before his mausoleum at Rome (the Latin copy at Ancyra refers to this placement). The mausoleum still stands, but the bronze copy is no longer extant, as the material proved too valuable and was melted down over the course of time. We do, however, have three copies in Latin and Greek from the Roman province of Galatia, with another possible fragment in Greek from Sardis, a city in the province of Asia.[60] In Ancyra, the text was posted in both Latin and Greek:[61] the Latin was on the two interior walls of the *pronaos* of the temple of Augustus, [62] the Greek on nineteen columns of its exterior wall, a less prestigious but much more visible location; the text was picked out in crimson, which added to its visibility and impact. Antioch (in Pisidia, not its more famous namesake) had another Latin copy, and one in Greek was located in Apollonia; both towns were near Ancyra (modern Ankara). In Antioch and Apollonia, the inscriptions were also attached to temples of Augustus. The text in Apollonia was inscribed on a base that supported statues of Augustus, his wife Livia, and his adopted son and heir, Tiberius. In Antioch, which was a Latin *colonia*, the Latin inscription was located before another temple of Augustus and in

the vicinity of a triumphal arch or gateway showing barbarians defeated and bound, along with winged victories and symbols of peace.[63] The context of each inscription and whether or not it was exhibited in Greek translation, Latin original, or in both, clearly affected how the text was read and understood. In Ancyra, the remarkable nature of this massive inscription was reinforced by the fact that the temple was the only classical style building in the city for several years (Cooley 2009, 12). (The temple also held other inscriptions, including a list of the names of the annually appointed priests of Rome and Augustus, names that included members of the one-time royal families of the Galatian tribes [Cooley 2009, 12]. This inscription also included the benefactions of these priests for the people, thus linking their smaller benefactions with the greater ones of Rome and Augustus.) We know nothing about where the inscription from Sardis was displayed; the Temple of Augustus seems a likely location, but this was destroyed in an earthquake in 17 CE (which would explain the loss of the inscription [Thonemann 2012, 288]).

As a translation project, the Galatian inscriptions relied on both language and location to generate meaning, and that meaning shifted with time and with the differing audiences that read it. Even when the audience could not read Latin or Greek, or were illiterate, the inscription still sent a message by virtue of its very existence.[64] The recent identification of a fragment of an inscription from Sardis as belonging to the *Res gestae* suggests that the inscription was also posted in several provinces, perhaps in slightly different versions. However, no other provinces have yielded fragments; this may be the result of chance, though one would expect such a massive inscription to leave some traces if it were posted widely. It may be that the extent to which the inscription was displayed in Galatia (in no less than three locations) was not paralleled elsewhere. And, even if the *Res gestae* was posted elsewhere, we still have to ask why it was posted in Galatia. Why such an elaborate and expensive translation project in a remote, barely Hellenized, let alone Romanized, recent province?

Posting the inscription once would have been an expensive and complicated undertaking; doing so three times was obviously even more so. It may have been posted to such an extent because the governor of the province had personal motives to be grateful to either Augustus or Tiberius (Gordon 1968, 129), or because there was a special connection between Augustus and the province (he had made it a Roman province [Gagé 1977 23]). Galatia's very remoteness and recent annexation may have also been a factor. The shining marble of the inscription and the visible power of the Roman state to inscribe and erect it functioned as a means to draw this remote region closer to the heart of the empire and to show that empire's reach and resources. Each "beholder was every day brought into contact with the larger reality of the empire of which he was a part, and was linked with its founder, whom he had probably never seen and had little prospect of ever seeing" (Güven 1998, 400).

THE TRANSLATOR(S)

Unfortunately, we cannot be sure where or when the *Res gestae* was translated into Greek, or even who commissioned the translations. Was it the new Emperor Tiberius? The Senate as a memorializing gesture? Local governors? Looking at Galatia, the fact that there the inscriptions were located on or in the vicinity of temples of Augustus suggests a province-wide plan for their placement (though their locations might have been as much common sense as anything else: where else would one place such an inscription?), but little else about who decided to translate it and how translation decisions were made. The fact that the two Greek versions in Galatia clearly derive from the same prototype, complete with common errors,[65] suggests that that translation was done centrally. The fragment from Sardis is brief, with no sign of a Latin version, and we can only draw limited conclusions from it; however, it appears to deviate in one word from the Galatian translations (Thonemann 2012, 286–87). This suggests that local variations were possible, perhaps, in the Sardian case, to improve on what was a not very satisfactory translation in the first case (Thonemann 2012, 286–87). This still leaves the question of whether these were deviations from a centrally issued translation or a more locally generated one. Bruno Rochette argues that the *Res gestae* was most likely translated at Rome, under the auspices of the emperor himself (1997b, 99, cf. Kaimio 1979, 76). Others have made similar arguments based on the number of Latinisms in the translations.[66] Jean Gagé argued for a translation made in Galatia but commissioned in Rome (1977, 13); this now seems unlikely, given the Sardian version of the inscription, as it makes little sense for the larger and more established province of Asia to have relied on Galatia to generate its translation.

Wherever it was done, and whoever produced the translation, it seems improbable that the end product was not vetted at some point by the imperial administration—for if Tiberius was interested enough in the issue of proper translation to protest the use of a Greek word in a Latin translation of a treaty, it is unlikely that his officials were happy to let such a significant document as the *Res gestae* be posted in several locations around the province of Galatia without first checking it. But how far the translator was guided and controlled is impossible to know.

THE TRANSLATION

The translation shares some features with other official translations, such as the omission of the Greek definite article and the use of a grammatical construction called the dative absolute to translate Latin's ablative absolute construction (this is used to render fifteen of forty ablative absolutes, each time for a dating phrase containing the word consul).[67] Such deviations from normal Greek style may be errors or intentional choices. David Wigtil

argued that the Latinate style of the translation and its use of non-Greek grammatical forms is an attempt to show the translator's reverence for the Roman Empire, its administration, and emperor (1982a, 628–29). However, Edwin Ramage insisted that "the whole thing [the use of the dative absolute] is nothing more than a dating technique used in a perfectly normal way. The fact that it appears only in Greek inscriptions under Roman administration does not mitigate this" (1987, 129).

According to the second opinion, the translator was doing no more than following an accepted formula, rather than indulging in a creative way to honor the Roman state. Some deviations from the Latin may have arisen from challenges of translating "a document that is simultaneously a government text, conforming to epigraphic norms, and an intensely personal and distinctive statement" (Mason 1974, 14). Any translator, whether in Rome or in the provinces, handling the words of the emperor written in his own voice would have faced a unique challenge for which the *senatus consulta* could not provide adequate guidance.

The Greek text is largely faithful to the Latin original and "observes in the translation the style of the Latin original and the feeling of a Latin reading" (Papaioannou 2011, 63); it is certainly far more faithful to its source than most literary translations are to theirs. However, although the Latin text is clearly aimed at a Roman audience, not a provincial one, the Greek text makes considerable efforts to adapt Augustus's text for an audience many, many miles from Rome (Cooley 2009, 19), making changes throughout either to render the text more understandable to its new non-Roman audience, to promote a certain image of Augustus as a monarch in the manner of Hellenistic kings,[68] or to simply get rid of some of the problematic (from a provincial perspective) elements in the original. A good example of this can be found in the superscription of the Latin text (the only portion which is not in the voice of Augustus), which reads:

> The achievements of the divine Augustus, by which he laid the whole world under the imperial power (*imperio*) of the Roman people, and of the money he spent for the Republic and the people of Rome are laid out below in a copy (*exemplar*) of the text which is inscribed on two bronze pillars which are located in Rome.
>
> *Rerum gestarum divi Augusti, quibus orbem terrarum imperio populi Romani subiecit, et inpensarum, quas in rem publicam populumque Romanum fecit, incisarum in duabus aheneis pilis, quae sunt Romae positae, exemplar subiectum.*

The Greek version:

> Translated and inscribed below are the achievements and gifts of the god Augustus, which he left engraved in Rome upon two bronze tablets. (Cooley's translation)

The superscriptions were in larger letters than the rest of the inscription, and hence would have been the most noticeable sections. They are also radically different. The Greek text translates roughly one line of the Latin: the notice that this is the record of the achievements of the divine Augustus. What vanishes are the imperialist overtones (the subjection of the world is omitted), the specifics of the gifts Augustus made, and to whom they were made. The result of this omission is to ensure that "the services described in the Latin as of value to Rome and the Romans are represented in the Greek as general services" (King 1952, 220). The translator intervenes in other instances besides the superscription to moderate the imperialist tone of the original, cutting out references to two Augustan triumphs (15.3; 21.3; Wigtil 1982a, 634) and a reference to peace that came after victories (13.5; Cooley 2009, 29; Vanotti 1975, 313).

Unlike the translations of the senatorial decrees, which used fixed terminology throughout, the *Res gestae*'s translator had considerably more freedom and showed more flexibility in translation of certain key Latin terms, such as *res publica*, a word that had no Greek equivalent and which, as a result, gave translators problems.[69] The normal translation for this period was *demosia pragmata* (citizen's/state affairs); the *Res gestae* uses this term but adds *koina pragmata* (public affairs, 1.1) and *patris* (fatherland, 2), and also subsumes it into other phrases where the translator felt it unnecessary to explicitly translate the word (34.1). The Greek translations are not random: fatherland is carefully selected to raise the emotional level of the inscription, as it occurs in the section describing Augustus's struggle against Brutus and Cassius, two of the assassins of Julius Caesar, his adoptive father. Other specifically Roman terms are translated in similarly flexible ways: the loaded Latin word *imperium* is translated by *rhabdoi*/rods (1.2), *hegemonia*/political supremacy (26.1, 27.1, 30.1), and *prostagmata*/commands (30.2). In the first instance, the reference is to the fasces, the rods that symbolized the power of the higher Roman magistracies; this translation occurs when Augustus is talking about the recognition the Senate gave to him in 43 BCE when he was just 19 years old. By using *rhabdoi*, the translator makes it clear to the Greek audience that the Senate gave Augustus outward signs of power and thus status, something that might have been lost in a more literal translation.

Such nuances in translation speak of someone who was at least somewhat familiar with Augustan ideology and the purport of the text, and was sensitive to that in their translation—or at least had access to someone willing to explain the nuances of the Latin. (Though the translator was not always well guided or knowledgeable, as he or she also made a handful of errors.)[70] The translator was willing to intervene to ensure that the text stayed intelligible to its new audience: the Roman names of the gods and goddesses are replaced with their Greek equivalents or explained where there was no equivalent;[71] the Vestal Virgins, an all-female priesthood that had no Greek equivalent, are simply called the "priestesses" (11.1); explanations are given for events such as the *ludi saeculares*/secular games (22.2), games

only given every one hundred years, and so forth.[72] Clear effort is made to ensure that this text is as open as possible to its new readers (Papaioannou 2011, 67), and to elide particular instances in the original that might require too much knowledge of Rome or Roman life to understand. However, the interventions are never explicit and the translator or translators are invisible throughout, never explaining their changes.

CONCLUSION

What conclusions can we draw from the wide range of information, texts, and individuals presented in this chapter? First: the Romans understood the power of language and the power of translation and translators. Elite Romans aimed for careers that saw them posted around the empire, increasing their exposure to foreign languages, though they appear to have paid little attention to any that were not Greek. Language use was complicated and fraught in Rome, and this was even the case with the use of a language like Greek, which was essential to Roman elite identity. Second: the elite employed interpreters not just as conveniences but also as tools who could be used to put distance between the speaker and the person he was addressing, or to avoid speaking Greek when Latin was more appropriate. In other words, conscious decisions were made by members of the elite about when to use a translator, even when dealing with Greeks. Third: many translators in Rome were controlled. This is certainly true of official translators, and presumably to some degree of translators who were hired to translate technical literature, such as Pompey's freedman Lenaeus, who translated medical literature from Mithridates's library (Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 25.3.7). It was also true of the translation of Mago's farming manual by a member of the Senate: the presence of a committee suggests a desire to have some check on the final version. Neither the official translator nor the interpreter on the ground was an independent entity free to play with the words and meaning in a translation, as a Cicero or even a Livius Andronicus could enjoy doing. As such, it is useful to think of real-life interpreters both as real figures and as straw men who could be used by Cicero, Horace, and others to mark out the wrong sort of (nonelite) translation. It is also important to realize that the type of translation activity this book discusses was only a very tiny part of the world of translation that took place around the Roman Empire every minute of every day.

2 Livius Andronicus, Ennius, and the Beginnings of Epic and Translation in Rome

It is a very pretty poem, Mr. Pope, but you must not call it Homer.

—Richard Bentley

THE BEGINNINGS OF TRANSLATION IN ROME

Roman literature is one of the few literary traditions to have not only a definitive starting date—240 BCE—but also an inventor: Livius Andronicus, a Greek prisoner of war from the southern Italian town of Tarentum, who translated Greek drama and epic. As is usually the case with such definitive beginnings, almost everything about this story is controversial. However, since Roman historical and literary tradition has been so kind as to give us an originating name, it is with Livius that I will start. Livius translated Homer's *Odyssey* into a new, Roman version, the *Odussia* (I say version because it appears he cut the 24 books of the *Odyssey* down to one, which precludes direct translation of much of the original).[1] He translated using a native Italic meter, the Saturnian, rather than the dactylic hexameter of Greek epic. It is to a slightly later author, Ennius (239–169 BCE), that we must look for the translation of dactylic hexameter into the Latin poetic system. His *Annales*, an 18-book narrative of Roman deeds from the fall of Troy to his own day, recast Latin poetics with his radical metrical change.

Although both Livius and Ennius translated other Greek literature, including comedy and tragedy, in this chapter I shall focus on both men as epic poets, and particularly on issues relating to the translation of Greek hexameter (the meter of epic poetry), arguing that early debates in Rome over the correct way to translate crystallized over debates about meter and metrical translation.

APPROACHING ARCHAIC LATIN LITERATURE

Archaic Latin literature is a catchall term that covers a diverse range of authors from Livius to the comic poet Terence (fl. 160s BCE), not all of whom have a great deal in common except that they wrote before the Late Republic.

Though far less frequently than previously, scholarship on archaic Latin literature still sometimes presents a picture of intellectually overwhelmed Romans realizing their cultural inadequacy in one horrified moment in the mid-third century BCE, and then desperately translating whatever they could lay their hands on in a feverish attempt to shore up their cultural image:

> The Romans recognized themselves from the beginning as latecomers in the highly competitive cultural market-place of the Hellenistic Mediterranean, and seem to have decided early on that a program of intensive translation was the best strategy for catching up; . . . in the absence of a Ministry of Culture, the decisions involved were individual, unsystematic, and largely the work of poets. (Most 2003, 88)

Some have described the Roman adoption of Greek modes of literature and culture as akin to colonization, so powerful was the call of the Greek cultural center. Martin Hose sees Ennius and his one-time patron Cato the Elder as striving to emancipate Rome from the grip of "the 'colonial power' of Greek literature" (Hose 1999, 322).

Whether intentionally or not, such descriptions usually present translation as a quick fix for a culture that has no literature of its own, and as, on the whole, an unreflective practice or a natural result of the quality of Greek literature. In contrast, in this chapter I will stress the difficulty of translation, and the need for reflection and new poetic strategies that the Roman adoption of translation created. Translation is never an easy project, not even when a culture adopts it as thoroughly and enthusiastically as Rome did. Translation in Rome was also deeply connected with other cultural and historical movements and events: in the mid-third century BCE, the time of Livius's invention of Latin literature, Rome was a city-state expanding its power throughout Italy and flexing its international muscles, and its elite were becoming acutely aware of how literature and culture could be used to promote personal and familial status. Views such as Most's and Hose's occlude the complicated internal pressures that led to the enthusiastic adoption of Romanized Hellenistic literature by the Roman elite, preferring to see Latin literature as rising mainly from the glamor of Greek literature, rather than the complicated internal pressures of an expanding city-state with an increasingly wealthy elite. Certainly, Greek literature had considerable glamor for the Romans and a wide circulation and appeal throughout the Mediterranean, but nonetheless, translation from Greek literature was a problematic and complicated issue, and as such required multiple interventions from different authors over many years.

GREEK MODELS FOR ROMAN TRANSLATION?

None of Rome's initial translators were native to Rome: Livius Andronicus came from Tarentum (Cicero, *Brutus* 72, Livy 27.37.7), and Ennius from

Rudiae (Cicero, *In Defense of Archias the Poet/Pro Archia* 22).[2] They faced two difficult processes: translating between two dissimilar languages, and transferring entire genres—such as epic—that had no native forms in the target culture. Additionally, they all were at least partially affiliated to and educated in a Greek culture that either resisted or suppressed the idea of translation. In other words, they came from a literary system that did not just relegate translation to a secondary status, but denied it existence, despite being part of a cosmopolitan region that held other literate cultures.

However, such is the perception of Latin as a derivative literary system that, in the absence of Greek interlingual models for translation (that is, models drawn from translating from one language to another), it has been suggested that Livius and other early translators built upon intralingual ones, drawing their ideas of translation from those who had adapted Greek plays into new Greek versions. The scripts of the Dionysiac guilds of actors have been suggested as one possible model. These guilds, active in Southern Italy,[3] where most early Latin authors came from, circulated from city to city and constantly reworked the Greek tragedies they performed. One can see similarities between their adaptive strategies and early translators', as "like the Greek actor-interpolators, the Roman poets kept the great part of the original text, but also cut, expanded and altered many scenes of the play" (Brooks 1981, 171). It may well have been that the original Greek texts used by Roman dramatists were these guilds' copies (interpolations and all) rather than the texts that we now possess (Traina 1970, 114; Gentili 1979, 18; Slater 1992b, 89).[4] These could have pointed the way forward for Latin dramatists, though one does not need a formal script for this: traveling performers have always understood the need to adapt their material for new audiences. Experience would tell them that what played well in one town might not play as well in another, and Italy was a country filled with people of varied ethnicities with different expectations and interests.

It was against this background that Latin dramatists experimented and employed devices like *contaminatio* (literally, contamination, generally referring to mixing various STs into one TT; see Chapter 3), and it has been suggested that the use of such devices by early writers and translators like Naevius (who also wrote an epic and translated Greek drama) "is not to be considered as an innovation of Naevius nor even as a typical feature of the Roman theatre, but rather as one of the forms in which Hellenistic theatre developed" (Gentili 1979, 35). If this is the case, then such models affected early translators' activity in nondramatic genres; for example, one fragment of Livius's *Odussia* (frag. 12 Büchner) combines *Odyssey* 4.513 and *Iliad* 5.721.[5] But it is important to note that these could not be comprehensive models for the Romans, because the Dionysiac guilds did not have to deal with the issue of language:

> In spite of these similarities [between the work of the Dionysiac guilds in Southern Italy and the work of Ennius] there remains the fundamental

> problem, not encountered by the Greek poets or producers, of the passage from one language to another. The Roman poets were compelled to reinterpret every word and image of the original; in responding to this necessity they created the art of translation, but in a far wider sense than the word appears today. (Brooks 1981, 4)

The Romans had to develop new strategies for dealing with new situations. While an interpolated text might provide some precedents, it did so on an intralingual level, not on an interlingual one; clearly, Livius was not so much building on or altering previous work as radically shifting material from one cultural and linguistic set of connections to another. Here it is useful to reflect upon Rita Copeland's description of imitation within a language as a "patriarchal pattern of transmission through kinship and legacy, through proximity or contiguity, rather than through difference" (1991, 26). Even as they altered the original texts, the *technitai* were still working with the same language and tradition; Roman translators, on the other hand, were working within and for a culture that was not directly linked to and descended from Greek forebears.[6]

This is not to say that archaic Rome was completely different from Greece;[7] it had long had dealings with and been influenced by the culture of the Greek cities in the South of Italy. However, Rome was part of a different cultural and linguistic tradition than were those cities. While both interlingual and intralingual translation and imitation involve ideas of rivalry with the model that imbue ancient literary tradition in both Greece and Rome, interlingual translation and imitation also involves the impulse to rival not only the model but the very literary culture that the model represents, whereas in intralingual imitation "such rivalry exercises itself within the larger framework of consanguinity and hence of continuity. Interlingual imitation, on the other hand, may yearn for continuity, but it must also recognize cultural disjunction" (Copeland 1991, 28). The *technitai* of Dionysius were adapting and competing within their own cultural and linguistic traditions, while Livius and his successors were adapting and competing with a tradition that stood outside their target culture, Rome.

In Roman literature, the notion of radical change and disjunction was expressed not only explicitly through discussion of the difficulties of translation and the need to rival the Greeks, but implicitly by the terminology employed to describe the act. Roman terms for translation all carry with them not just the notion of physical movement, but of force and sometimes complete alteration: *(con)verto* and *exprimo*, two common words for translation, are not simply about turning something but about changing it. Look at *verto* in an agricultural context, where the turning or plowing of land not only moves the earth, but allows something new to grow there. The verb can also mean to knock down (Virgil, *Aeneid* 2.625), to change the course of something in a new direction (Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8.412), or even to change ownership of something (OLD 16). In the Oxford Latin Dictionary,

only at the end of a very long list of meanings does one hit a definition that specifically refers to translation. *Converto*, its compound form, likewise refers to a set of physical movements and alterations as well as to translation. *Exprimo*, as I discuss more fully in the next chapter, also refers to crushing and squeezing an object. Seen as a group, then, Roman terms for translation reflect a sense of disjuncture and radical change.

Unease or issues with translation may perhaps be part of what lies behind some glosses in archaic Latin authors, which occur even within dramatic texts, occasionally to the annoyance of later critics. In Cicero's dialogue *On the Nature of the Gods/De natura deorum* 2.91, one of the speakers, Balbus, complains that Pacuvius wrote that "this which we call *caelum*, the Greeks call *aethera*." Balbus is irritated because the character who says this was Greek, not Roman, and thus should not provide handy lexical help to his audience. (Ennius, Pacuvius's uncle, was also particularly fond of such glosses in the *Annales* [Skutsch 1985, 296; see below].) Such glosses may be there to help audiences with unfamiliar terms, but they also reflect early translators' sense of the linguistic gap they were bridging.

LIVIUS ANDRONICUS AND HIS MODEL TRANSLATION

With no Greek tradition to draw on, no handbook of translation, not even a pool of preexisting Latin translations to dip into for exemplars, it is remarkable that from Livius onwards, Roman literary translators *all translate in the same way*. I do not mean that they all produce stylistically identical translations (there is a vast difference in style between the comic poets Plautus and Terence, for example), but that, as far as we can judge from extant remains, all Roman *literary* translators follow the pattern of translation we see in Livius Andronicus's *Odussia*. This translation: (i) was free (despite some closely translated lines, he had to cut huge amounts from his original to get a 24-book poem down to one book); (ii) incorporated elements from Roman culture; (iii) contained Romanized gods (Hera is called "Saturn's daughter" [*Saturni filia*, frag. 12 Büchner]); (iv) appealed in the opening line to a Camena, a Roman nymph, not to a Muse; and (v) included material from more than one Greek source. Rather than literally translate his source, Livius transformed it. In doing so, he produced the first example of a style of translation to which the Romans clung steadfastly long after they had abandoned his epic. Of course, we cannot say that all later translators were following a model created by Livius—his translation may have crystallized how other Romans were translating or how Romans felt translation should operate—but nonetheless, the adhesion of Roman translators to the translation strategies shown in the *Odussia* is remarkable.

It could be argued that Livius's success was as accidental, artless, and rude as he was, especially when compared to Ennius's more sophisticated, Hellenized, and explicitly self-conscious poetic persona.[8] But as Stephen Hinds

pointed out, if Livius's fate has been to be read as hoary, archaic, and rugged (1998, 59), that is only because Ennius and others have managed to constitute him as such; like Hinds, I read Livius as "a translator self-conscious about his art" (Hinds 1998, 61). And it is important to realize that Livius's text was an authoritative one even for Augustan poets such as Horace, who not only read him at school, but identified Livius as the first poet/writer of Rome (*Epistle* 2.161–62; see further Sciarrino 2006, 456–57). Later authors might not have liked Livius's work, but they knew it.

INTRODUCING THE *ODUSSIA*

Very little remains of early translation, and Livius's is no exception; so scanty are his remains that Erich Segal once described him as "some lines and a legend" (1968, 5). The biographical record of all Latin poets is fraught at the best of times, and for the early poets it is even more problematic than usual. He was traditionally believed to have been a Greek slave from Tarentum, a city famed for its mania for drama and, on the linguistic front, for pelting the unfortunate consular L. Postumius Megellus with filth in 282 BCE when he spoke poor Greek (Dionysius of Halicarnassus 19.5; Appian, *Samnite Wars* 7). A tough crowd, indeed. According to tradition, Livius was acquired as a slave by M. Livius Salinator, who freed him for his excellent work in teaching his children.[9] After this he continued his teaching and literary work,[10] finally being honored by the Senate with the granting of a *Collegium Poetarum*[11] for writers and scribes, for writing a state hymn in 207 BCE. However, even for the Romans of the Late Republic, his dates were a subject of contention; the dramatist and literary historian Accius (b. 170 BCE) made him a slave taken by Fabius Maximus during the capture of Tarentum in 209 BCE, and placed his first play in 198 BCE, an impossibly late date. Cicero, following his friend Atticus's *Liber Annalis*,[12] placed his arrival in Rome much earlier and had him producing his first play by 240 BCE (*Brutus* 72). The date of 240 is the one most generally accepted by the Romans (Gellius, *Attic Nights* 17.21.42 and 43), though Cassiodorus shifted the date to 239.[13]

It is a sparse biography, which leaves many questions unanswered. When did Livius learn Latin and was it before or after coming to Rome? Where was he educated? Did he translate epic or tragedy first?[14] Why did he translate? We cannot even be sure of his hometown or his association with Salinator: it may be that his connection with the Livii and Tarentum comes from a combination of his *praenomen* Livius, and the connection of Salinator with the fictive *Ludi Saeculares* (Secular Games) of 236 BCE (Livingston 2004, xiii). However, we know that his translation was quite successful, being reworked into hexameters after the success of Ennius's *Annales*[15] and remaining on the curriculum long enough to burden the poet Horace at school.[16] Remaining on any school curriculum for two hundred years shows considerable staying power and

some degree of lasting appeal, albeit an appeal that rather perplexed writers of the Late Republic. In any case, he remained in circulation long after the Romans had access to a body of later literature and translations—Cicero had read the *Odussia*, even if he described it as resembling a sculpture of Daedalus and not meriting a second read.[17]

However, while Livius gets the credit for creating Latin literature and inventing translation at Rome,[18] it is possible to overstress the novelty of his work: presumably the Romans were happily translating Greek long before he entered the scene, if for no nobler reason than to ensure that all of their communication with Southern Italy and the Mediterranean world did not have to be conducted on the level of grunts and gestures. Some may even have dabbled in literary translation before; for generations, Romans at all levels of life had been in contact with Greeks and Greek culture, and to think that at least one person would not have attempted to see what a Latin version of a Greek text might look like suggests a lack of intellectual curiosity which seems unrepresentative of the Romans, especially as they were also importing Greek religion and other cultural items long before the 240s.[19] Surely in a period of increasing Hellenization and interaction (interaction sometimes being a nice word for conquest) with Greece and Southern Italy, we should assume something of this sort was occurring before Livius's first play in Rome.

THE CONTEXT FOR LIVIUS'S TRANSLATIONS

The difference in the performance contexts in which Livius's dramatic and epic translations appeared explains, I believe, the two radically different translation strategies he used, and hence it is to those contexts I now turn. First, here is the historian Livy's account of the birth of the *ludi scaenici*[20] in 364 BCE and the development of drama, including a description of Livius's innovations:[21]

> In this year and the next, in the consulship of C. Sulpicius Peticus and C. Licinius Stolo, there was a plague. In that year, nothing worthy of mention happened except that to appease the gods they held a *lectisternium*, the third one since the city had been founded. We are told that since neither human strategies nor divine relief blunted the force of the disease, they established the *ludi scaenici*, along with some other measures to appease divine wrath; this was something new for a warlike people, who had only seen circuses before then. As with nearly all first steps, it started off small; it was also foreign. Some players (*ludiones*) summoned from Etruria gave a suitable performance in the Tuscan way, dancing to the rhythm played by a flute without a song (*carmine*) and without imitating the action in songs. Then young men (*iuventus*) imitated them and at the same time hurled jokes in rough verse at each other . . .

After a passage of time, it was Livius who first dared leave *satura* and weave a story with a plot. Like everyone else then, he acted out his own songs (*carminum*), but it is said that because he was often called back to the stage his voice became weak; he then asked the favor of having a boy stand before the flute player and sing while he acted with even more energy because he was not slowed down by having to use his voice. After that, singing was done with gestures accompanying it and the actors only spoke the dialogue portions. When such rules diverted plays from [simple] laughter and haphazard joking and translated (*verterat*) them little by little into an art, the young men left acting in plays to these actors (*histrionibus*) and began to exchange jokes woven in the old way among themselves. This is the source of what were afterwards called *exodia*, something especially connected with Atellan farces. This sort of play came from the Oscans and the young men held on to it and didn't allow actors (*histrionibus*) to pollute it. From then it has been the rule that performers (*actores*) in Atellans are not barred from voting and serving in the army, unlike other stage professionals. I thought it good to set out the small beginnings of plays, while doing the same for other beginnings, so that it will be clear how they have moved from such a sane start to a form of insanity which even wealthy kingdoms could barely endure. (*From the Founding of the City* 7.2)

Et hoc et insequenti anno C. Sulpicio Petico C. Licinio Stolone consulibus pestilentia fuit. Eo nihil dignum memoria actum, nisi quod pacis deum exposcendae causa tertio tum post conditam urbem lectisternium fuit. Et cum vis morbi nec humanis consiliis nec ope diuina levaretur, victis superstitione animis ludi quoque scenici—nova res bellicoso populo, nam circi modo spectaculum fuerat—inter alia caelestis irae placamina instituti dicuntur; ceterum parva quoque, ut ferme principia omnia, et ea ipsa peregrina res fuit. Sine carmine ullo, sine imitandorum carminum actu ludiones ex Etruria acciti, ad tibicinis modos saltantes, haud indecoros motus more Tusco dabant. Imitari deinde eos iuuentus, simul inconditis inter se iocularia fundentes versibus, coepere; nec absoni a voce motus erant. . . .

Livius post aliquot annis, qui ab saturis ausus est primus argumento fabulam serere, idem scilicet—id quod omnes tum erant—suorum carminum actor, dicitur, cum saepius revocatus vocem obtudisset, venia petita puerum ad canendum ante tibicinem cum statuisset, canticum egisse aliquanto magis vigente motu quia nihil vocis usus impediebat. Inde ad manum cantari histrionibus coeptum diverbiaque tantum ipsorum voci relicta. Postquam lege hac fabularum ab risu ac soluto ioco res avocabatur et ludus in artem paulatim verterat, iuventus histrionibus fabellarum actu relicto ipsa inter se more antiquo ridicula intexta versibus iactitare coepit; unde exodia postea appellata consertaque fabellis potissimum Atellanis sunt; quod genus ludorum ab Oscis acceptum tenuit iuventus nec ab histrionibus pollui passa est; eo institutum manet, ut actores

> *Atellanarum nec tribu moveantur et stipendia, tamquam expertes artis ludicrae, faciant. inter aliarum parva principia rerum ludorum quoque prima origo ponenda visa est, ut appareret quam ab sano initio res in hanc vix opulentis regnis tolerabilem insaniam venerit.*

Ignoring the moralizing, what Livy imagines in this passage is a gradual replacing of a simpler form of entertainment brought in from Etruria (itself a form of translation, even if there are no words involved) with a narrative form of drama, which, incidentally, helps destroy Rome's traditional *mores*. Livy's passage is certainly problematic, especially in its suspicious resemblance to the description of the development of Greek comedy in Aristotle, but there is no reason to doubt either the date or the Etruscan influence on the games (Oakley 1998, 51), or even the involvement of young Roman men (Oakley 1998, 52). What I am particularly interested in here, however, is that Livy presents drama being created and performed at Rome within the confines of civic religious festivals, and places Livius in that setting. In Livy's scheme, drama arises from a pull from inside Rome, rather than a push from outside, and he, quite remarkably, does not mention Greek influence at all (Oakley 1998, 54), focusing on native Italian origins, though surely this is a prime site to raise issues of language and foreign influence. Although the "translation" of drama is problematic because of its adverse influence on Rome, issues of translation from Greek to Latin are ignored or, rather, obscured in this account: Livius's Greek sources and the fact that he was producing translated drama is never mentioned. Instead, Livy focuses on the difference between the young men of Rome and outside actors, the *histriones*. While this might be the effect of Livy's Greek models—if he was recreating the history of Roman drama on a Greek model then the issue of translation would be irrelevant—he still has not totally omitted translation: we are told that play is "translated" (*verterat*) little by little into art, at which point the Roman youth excuse themselves from the scene and leave this space open for foreign actors and excess. In this scheme, translation takes place even before Livius arrives, and his work is seen as part of a nexus of incorporation of other performance traditions, including Etruscan ones. The *prima origo* of translation of drama is pushed earlier, and even though Livius is important because he is the first named poet and the first true professional actor, his literary work is ignored in favor of his popularity (he is called back so much that he loses his voice) and his innovations in acting. Livy's outline seems to reflect Cato the Elder's comments on the rise of professional poets in Rome, whose arrival he claimed meant that in his own day, praise was no longer generated by aristocrats singing *carmina* at the *convivium* (an Italian version of the Greek *symposium*), but by those outside aristocratic groups.[22]

If we accept a date for the creation of the *ludi scaenici* at any point before 240, the traditional date for Livius's first drama, then drama had a cultural and civic place that it slotted into and that preexisted Livius. He did not have to create a cultural space at Rome for his plays; they were presented to

the people as part of rituals that celebrated the gods and the city of Rome. Even a limited past of dramatic performances in Rome, no matter what form those performances took, explains an important difference in Livius's translation of drama and epic in Rome: the dramatic switch of meter from the hexameter of his original to Saturnian in his *Odussia*, although he retained Greek meters (with differences from his models) in his dramas. While audiences watched Livius's other translations as parts of a Roman festival in Rome, surrounded by other Romans, when he presented his *Odussia* it was not clear what context it fitted into or what cultural space it could occupy, as epic had no past in Rome. To put it slightly differently, while Livius's dramas came primed for integration into the cultural system of Rome, his epic did not, and that presented a particular problem, which he solved via the use of Saturnian meter, a native Italic verse form.

THE *CARMINA CONVIVALIA* AND THE LACK OF A ROMAN EPIC TRADITION

Romans prior to Livius had no tradition of epic, and sorting out what they had as a poetic or song tradition before then is, to put it mildly, a vexed question. According to a fragment preserved in Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations*, Cato the Elder's *Origines*[23] said that before his day, "our ancestors had a custom of singing the praises and courage of notable men to the tune of a pipe as they reclined."[24] Cato was reporting on a practice no longer in use in his day, so even his information was second-hand, and Cicero does not cite any examples of these songs, the so-called *carmina convivalia*, songs of the *convivium*. Thus, reconstructing their form, purpose, quality, and quantity is extremely problematic (some scholars have doubted their existence). In a controversial but important 1991 article on archaic poetic forms in Rome, Nevio Zorzetti placed these songs in an aristocratic and sympotic context and argued for a thriving culture of *mousike* in Rome before professional poets like Livius appeared. Others have critiqued his arguments, not least for not reflecting on how much our evidence is tailored by sources like Cicero, who have their own archaizing agenda (Cole 1991, 377),[25] but it is still reasonable to assume that the Romans had some form of aristocratic praise and communal poetry before Livius appeared on the scene, as "songs praising the deeds of famous ancestors would certainly seem appropriate in early Rome or in any Indo-European culture" (Freeman 1998, 79). These aristocratic songs may have resembled Greek *skolia*, drinking songs sung at banquets (Cole 1991, 379–80), more than an encomiastic tradition, but whatever was produced at banquets, it certainly was not epic poetry,[26] and I would argue that this had an impact on Livius's translation strategy.

Epic poetry could not be easily mapped onto an existing Roman social context or contained and encompassed to the same degree as drama, which was presented in the context of civic festivals overseen by a magistrate or the

state.[27] Before Livius, epic had no social or literary place in Rome, and he needed to create one for it that would not upset, alienate, or bore his audience. He also had to create an audience for his translation; we cannot assume that there was a preexisting audience clamoring for a Latin epic. Whereas "locked into civic rituals orchestrated by those who engineered Rome's territorial expansion, poetic drama came to serve as a ceremonial accessory that expanded the religious celebration of Rome's successes and her rulers" (Sciarrino 2006, 452), epic's place was not so clear. To solve this problem, Livius opted to translate Homer not into dactylic hexameter, but into Saturnian, choosing a meter that would locate his poem within the bones, buildings, and traditions of the city.

WHY SATURNIAN? METER AND ITS MEANING IN THE CITY OF ROME

Saturnian meter was certainly not an obvious choice for someone from the Greek tradition, as there was an overwhelming association between epic poetry and hexameter. In the *Poetics,* Aristotle tells us that

> [t]he suitability of the heroic hexameter was discovered by experience. Should anyone attempt to write narrative poetry in any other meter or combination of meters, the result would appear incongruous. The heroic meter is the most steady and weighty of all . . . No one has, therefore, written a long poetic narrative in any other meter than the heroic meter. As we said before, nature herself teaches us to choose the appropriate meter. (1459b–1460a)[28]

Livius's shift in meter was not accidental or casual; as someone educated in a Greek tradition, he knew full well that

> [f]orms have meanings. They often indicate fixed meanings: An epic contains certain structures which form the content according to particular rules, and the same applies to the lyric, drama, etc. The form itself produces expectations that are reflected in the content. Certain forms demand content of certain kinds and exclude others. Changes in these demands are possible, and indeed most often epochal, because conventions in literary forms reflect the symbolic and social order of their time. (Kristmannsson 2005, 21)

Hexameter was *the* heroic meter: while not all hexameter was epic (Ennius wrote a hexameter poem on fish, the *Hedyphagetica*), all epic was in hexameter. It was called the heroic meter by Roman grammarians from Caesius Bassus (first century CE) through to Fortunatianus in the fourth century. When the grammarian Diomedes (fourth century CE) called Ennius the

first author of epic in Rome worthy of the name, it was because he used hexameter (*Grammatici Latini* 1.484.2–3). Even if one considers the arguments about Livius's learning to be overstated (Goldberg 1995, 48; see *contra* Mariotti 1952, 21–24), it is hard to believe that Livius was unaware of the tight connection between epic and hexameter. Livius did not opt out of hexameter because he had found a native epic meter; we cannot even be sure whether the *carmina convivalia*, whatever they were, were in Saturnian, though it does seem likely.[29] Answering the question "why Saturnian" is key to understanding Livius as a translator: what did he think Romans would hear when they heard Saturnian that made such a move worthwhile?

1 Nativity

Saturnian was considered a native Italian meter (its actual origins are a matter of fierce debate, as is everything else about it—we are not even sure of how it was scanned). Although some later Romans suggested a Greek origin, they clearly did so in opposition to received opinion. Caesius Bassus begins his discussion of it with the comment that "we must now talk about Saturnian; our ancestors thought that it derived from Italy, but they were mistaken,"[30] before arguing for a Greek origin. Even when later scholars like Festus ascribe a Greek origin, they stress the ancient quality of Saturnian in Italy (432.13–15).[31] It was so old that it was thought to have been used during the god Saturn's reign in Italy, hence its name (Porphyrio on Horace, *Epistle* 2.1.157).[32]

For his first audience, Livius's Odysseus not only spoke Latin, but spoke it like a native; this meter allowed the Roman audience to appropriate a Greek text without (to use Antoine Berman's phrase) having to "experience the foreign" up close.[33] It gave his audience Homer, but Homer through a clearly Latin filter, and one that worked admirably for the Latin of Livius's period, despite the poor reputation Saturnian later acquired; later, with the shift in Latin accentuation seen in Plautus's comedies, Saturnian no longer fit with the new prosodic structure of Latin, rendering the meter unintelligible (Parsons 1999, 135). This should be no surprise, as languages (at least initially) fall into meters that are the easiest and most natural to them, and "we should expect to find native rhythmic features in a language's meters" (Parsons 1999, 123). Saturnian worked for Latin because it developed as a stylization of Latin's native prosodic structure; we might say that it sounded natural to a Roman ear because it was a natural development within the language—in a way that hexameter was not.[34] In other words, the meter was an added layer of Romanness that presented this foreign text as already integrated into the culture and rhythm of Roman speech and song.

2 Connection to the City of Rome

Saturnian was more than a native Latin meter, however: it was one that the Romans associated with the city of Rome. First, this association was suggested

by the link of Saturnian to Saturn;[35] the city he founded after being deposed by Jupiter was believed to have been the original site of Rome (Virgil, *Aeneid* 8.355–58), a site later inhabited by the Greek Evander and by Romulus. A temple of Saturn stood in the *forum Romanum* as a reminder of this ancient association. As Varro pointed out, Saturn's city was centered on no less a place than the Capitoline hill:

> We are told that this hill used to be called "Saturnian"—this is why Latium was called the Saturnian land, as Ennius also describes it. It is written that an ancient town called Saturnia was located here. There are still three traces of this: a shrine of Saturn on the entrance to the hill; a Saturnian gate that Junius writes was there (people now call it Pandana); and that behind the temple of Saturn, in the laws for private residences, back walls are described as "Saturnian walls."[36] (*On the Latin Language* 5.47)
>
> *Hunc antea montem Saturnium appellatum prodiderunt et ab eo Latium Saturniam terram, ut etiam Ennius appellat. Antiquum oppidum in hoc fuisse Saturniam scribitur. Eius vestigia etiam nunc manent tria, quod Saturni fanum in faucibus, quod Saturnia Porta quam Iunius scribit ibi, quam nunc vocant Pandanam, quod post aedem Saturni in aedificiorum legibus privatis parietes postici muri Saturnii sunt scripti.*

Saturn was associated with more than Rome—he was also associated with the wider region of Latium—but his presence in Italy centered on the city.[37]

The connection of Saturnian meter with Rome was helped by several developments in Livius's day. As he was producing his *Odussia*, Saturnians were being used on inscriptions, including those of the important *gens* of the Scipios, and those recording military triumphs.[38] Rome was increasingly becoming a city of anonymous[39] stone Saturnians speaking in the voices of dead or triumphant aristocrats (as well as dead *and* triumphant ones). At least after 240, the date of the first Scipionic inscription, Saturnian was the meter of Roman power and conquest.[40] Given this, whenever and wherever the *Odussia* was recited, it found powerful echoes within the city of Rome. Roman Saturnian was literally monumental poetry, and with this choice of meter Livius connected his new poem to a nexus of elite connotations, connotations visible to the naked eye as well as to the ear.

The first line of the *Odussia* reinforces the poem's connection to Rome: "tell me, Camena, of the clever man."[41] The *Camenae* were more than Italic goddesses: like Saturnian, they were connected with the landscape of Rome, associated with a spring just outside Rome's Porta Capena.[42] (Egeria, the most famous Camena, came to that gate to whisper sweet nothings and the laws of Rome to King Numa.) The Porta Capena and the Camenae were linked, with Camena being given as an alternate name of the gate (Servius, *On the Aeneid* 7.697). The Camenae's associations were not just Italian but *Roman*; Livius did not simply provide his audience with a Latin nymph

instead of a Greek Muse, but gave them a goddess associated with the physical landscape around the city.

Cleverly, although Saturnian connects the peripatetic Odysseus and the *Odyssey* with the city of Rome, the *Odussia* still has the ability to be a moveable cultural object. Its subject matter—the travels of a Greek hero—did not run the risk of praising one aristocratic clan over another and thereby hazarding rejection by a clan that felt slighted by insufficient praise. While it was linked to the city through metrical choice, the poem could not help but look outwards, to the Mediterranean where Odysseus travelled. Its hero, too, also had connections with Rome; some claimed that Odysseus was a founder of Rome along with Aeneas (Hellanicus, *Fragments of the Greek Historians* 4F 84; Ronconi 1973, 17; Gentili 1979, 100; Gruen 1990, 85; Goldberg 1995, 50–51). Another tradition claimed that the sons of Odysseus and Circe founded Rome, along with several other Italian cities (Dionysius Halicarnassus 1.72.2 and 1.72.5). Thus, the poem was simultaneously native and cosmopolitan—not unlike Ennius's *Annales*, which opened outside Rome with an invocation to the Muses on Olympus but quickly circled back to the city via Aeneas's travels, and closed with Fulvius Nobilior's dedication of a temple within Rome to the Muses and Hercules.

The connections that Saturnian brought the *Odussia* were crucial to making it successful in a culture that had no preexisting cultural or civic space into which it could comfortably slot. As I said above, epic was free-floating, without an obvious audience, and potentially problematic as an unknown *Latin* poetic form. Given the widespread valence of epic within Greek pedagogy and culture, some Romans had encountered the *Odyssey* before Livius, but always as a foreign object. They were not primed to receive it in a Latin version that would be recited before them and taught to their children, though certainly some familiarity with it and the high status of Greek literature would have aided in its acceptance. Livius took a poem about a man floating around the Mediterranean, and managed, through his choice of Saturnian, to nail it down to the space of Rome. When his successor Naevius used Saturnian to write his historical epic, the *Punic War*, the connection between Saturnian and Romanness surely can only have gotten stronger.

THE *ODUSSIA* AS TRANSLATION

Let us return to the first line of Livius's work: "tell me, Camena, of the clever man," a translation of Homer's "tell me (*ennepe*), Muse, of Odysseus of the winding ways." Scevola Mariotti has noted that this is a very accurate translation, even adhering to Homer's word order (1952, 36–37; Possanza 2004, 50). He also points out that *insece* is a good translation for Homeric *ennepe*, because it accurately replicates the *en* of the Greek with *in*. Based on this line and such arguments, we could assert that Livius

believed in literal translation as an ideal. However, it is equally possible to argue that this is not a very accurate translation at all: the Latin line is considerably shorter than the line that opens the Odyssey (Kytzler 1989, 43; the brevity of the line is a feature of Saturnian meter), and *insece* has a range of meanings that do not map on Greek *ennepe*. *Insector* attracted lively debate in antiquity (Hinds 1998, 71), with Gellius (*Attic Nights* 18.9.3) glossing it with "go on to tell" (*perge dicere*) and "track" or "follow up" (*insequere*); a similar debate over the orthography and meaning of the term appears in Festus 99. The Latin word has the connotation of "following after," either physically or with words, a meaning that the Greek does not. The Latin word's extended meaning renders it an apt word for a Roman translation: perhaps we are to imagine Livius taking an appropriative attitude toward the original and running it to ground on Roman terms. The ambiguity of the term makes it even more appropriate, as translation frequently teeters between being a hostile or benign act—Horace himself plays on the hostile meaning of the word when he comments on Livius's writing at *Epistle* 2.171 (Hinds 1998, 71).

A similar case could be made for Livius's use of the word *versutum* to translate Homer's *polutropon* ("winding ways"). Mariotti and Sander Goldberg discuss the Latin word solely as an admirably accurate translation of the Greek;[43] but it is possible to read it also as a comment by Livius on his own work, on his *Odussia* as a "turning" of the Greek story and poem, and on himself as a "translated man," as *verto* was by the time of Plautus an established term for translation from Greek: "Here in this programmatically loaded context our poet introduces a Ulysses in whom the very linguistic switch to which he owes his textual existence has been made part of his proverbial versatility" (Hinds 1998, 61). *Versutum* packs a punch that "clever" or even "translated" cannot render: something turned no longer exists in its previous position, having been physically shifted to a new location. The first line of Livius's work can thus be read both as a translation (accurate or not) and as a comment by the poet on his intentions and goals as a translator. Perhaps this line should also be read as "pursue for me, Camena, the translated man," a meaning hovering below the surface, and a meaning that haunts Livius's text. In fact, if by choosing *versutus* Livius " 'troped' his linguistic versatility into Odysseus's polutropon, it is also true that he 'troped' Odysseus's mythological cunning back onto himself" (Sciarrino 2006, 457).

THE AUDIENCE FOR THE *ODUSSIA*

Who read the *Odussia,* if epic had no obvious audience in Rome, or at least not one to match the audience for drama? It has been suggested that translating the Odyssey provided Livius with something to teach in his school.[44] However, while the poem ended up in schools, we have no ancient testimony

that it was written for this purpose (Livingston 2004, xiii). And even if it were a school text, it is not as if schools exist in a vacuum, removed from the values of society; rather, they are reflections on and enforcers of society's values, and the "coincidence of pedagogical and creative endeavors is worth reflecting on" (Habinek 1998, 115). As a school text, this translation ensured that Roman children could be taught a Greek text on the proper terms, without using that Greek text itself (this is true even though many elite Romans would also learn Greek from a young age and read Homer's epics in the original). In fact, it showed them the proper relationship to a Greek text better than any lecture could have: absorb such texts, but on Roman terms and in a way that *sounds* Roman. This epic could be used again and again and in multiple contexts; it was not tied to one particular family, nor did it run the risk of offending anyone by praising others too much or ignoring them, as it might if it had been a historical epic. Livius gave the Romans a text that, although foreign in its origin, *sounded* Roman, ignoring the metrical structure of Greek epic to fit within a Roman poetic scheme. In its hybridity it signaled an appropriate way to translate Greek material by imprinting Romanness over the Greek text.

Domesticating translations like those of Livius tend to have a bad reputation in translation theory because, reusing Lawrence Venuti's words, they seek "to bring back a cultural other as the same, the recognizable, even the familiar" (1995, 18). In this scheme, domesticating translations are seen as a concealed form of ethnocentric violence, performed on texts rather than people or a culture. Certainly, the use of Saturnian naturalized Greek epic and helped ensure the audience did not have to think about the fact that what they were listening to or reading was the product of an alien culture, whose territory they were gradually absorbing. At the same time, however, the shifts and alterations made by Livius ensured that the Romans would make use of Greek epic as they had made use of Greek drama, and that this critical part of the Greek literary system also became part of the Roman literary system.

Saturnian continued as a poetic meter after Livius, but not for long. His epic successor, Naevius, wrote an epic in Saturnians on the Punic War, making the extra step of linking literary Saturnian with a narrative of Roman deeds. With such a connection, one might think the Romans would have continued on writing epic in Saturnian. However, Naevius's biography indicates that there might have been struggles over who got to use Saturnian. In response to a comment by Naevius that in Rome, members of the Metellan *gens* became consuls by fate, the Metelli responded, "The Metelli will do harm to Naevius the poet."[45] This verse is cited by grammarian after grammarian as representing the most typical line of that stubbornly unclassifiable meter. [46] Only the elite, it would seem, can in the end generate the ideal Saturnian. Perhaps there was a struggle over Saturnian and writing in Saturnian between elites and poets, a struggle now lost in the mists of the third century; this might (very) partially explain why Ennius moved to hexameter.

However, its fate lies outside the remit of this book, and I now turn to an epic in hexameter meter, Ennius's *Annales*.

ENNIUS

Ennius came from Rudiae, a town in Campania whose location is no longer known. He started off life as a client of Cato the Elder, but later transferred to a new patron, Fulvius Nobilior (consul 189), who granted him Roman citizenship in 184.[47] Nobilior took him on campaign in Aetolia (which irked Cato, a man who could have gold-medalled in being irked, enormously);[48] Ennius obligingly celebrated his patron's achievements, in a *praetexta* called *Ambracia*[49] and the *Annales*.[50] In its first redaction, this poem contained 15 books, the final book ending with Nobilior's triumphant return to Rome and his dedication of a new temple to Hercules and the Muses, a temple adorned with statues he had looted from Greece.[51] These 15 books were later augmented by three more written in the last years of Ennius's life. While Ennius was attached to all elements of his identity—Greek, Roman, and Oscan—claiming that he had a different heart for each of the three languages he spoke (Gellius, *Attic Nights* 17.17.1), he is seen by our sources as a *Roman* poet. Many Roman sources refer to him as *noster Ennius*, *our* Ennius.[52] He also pointed out his new Roman status, writing in the *Annales* that "we who were Rudians are now Romans."[53]

In what follows below, I will almost exclusively focus on the *Annales*, and on that solely in relation to meter and issues of translation; those seeking a wider knowledge of Ennius and epic will find the 2006 issue of *Arethusa* (volume 39), dedicated to Ennius and the introduction of epic at Rome, an excellent starting place.

THE *ANNALES* AND THE TRANSLATION OF HOMER

The *Annales* now only exists in fragments, though in larger amounts than Livius's epic, as we have some 600 full or partial lines. It has been reconstructed in various ways, but the basic format appears to have followed this outline: Books One through Six covered the period from Aeneas's flight from the fallen Troy to Italy, up to the retreat of Greek King Pyrrhus from Italy in 275 BCE; Book Seven began the tale of more recent history, ending with Nobilior's dedication of the temple of Hercules and the Muses.

Fortunately, one of our extant fragments is part of the proem, and is an invocation to the "Muses who beat great Olympus with your feet (*pedibus*)."[54] (I shall return to this line below.) Ennius next describes a dream of poetic inspiration, wherein Homer appears and informs him that Ennius is his reincarnation.[55] Unfortunately, this section is fragmentary, and some of it is reported second-hand, but here are the relevant fragments:

I was bound by soft and gentle sleep (2)
somno leni placidoque revinctus
. . .

The poet Homer appeared there (3)
visus Homerus adesse poeta
. . .

Ennius laid out, speaking in eternal verses, that there are temples of the underworld that neither our souls nor our bodies make it to; but there are some representations of us there, astonishingly pale. He recounts that the ghost of the evergreen poet Homer rose from there and began to pour out salt tears and as he spoke laid to him the nature of things. (3)[56]
. . .

etsi praeterea tamen esse Acherusia templa
Ennius aeternis exponit versibus edens,
quo neque permanent animae neque corpora nostra,
sed quaedam simulacra modis pallentia miris
unde sibi exortam semper florentis Homeri
commemorat speciem lacrumas effundere salsas
coepisse et rerum naturam expandere dictis

Such dreams were familiar in the ancient world from poems such as Hesiod's *Theogony* and Callimachus's *Aetia*.[57] Although Hesiod's and Callimachus's dreams involved the Muses, Homer's centrality to Greek literature and pedagogy makes his substitution for the Muses by Ennius understandable. Ennius's decision may also have been motivated by rivalry with Callimachus, who had argued against writing epic poetry:[58] invoking the figure of Homer could thus be both an act of one-upmanship and a declaration of difference from Callimachus. More pertinent to the subject at hand, by invoking Homer, Ennius responds to Livius's translation. Where Livius asked a Camena to help him speak of a "translated" man, Ennius said that he was a translation of a man—in this case, Homer—making himself in one move both Livius's successor and ancestor. (One later commentator even referred to Ennius as a *translatam* form of Homer [Scholiast on Persius 6.11]).

Seen thus, the *Annales* can be read as a record of perfect and physical translation, presenting Ennius as Homer reincarnated into a new, Romanized body. Homer even weeps for joy at the sight of Ennius, his future self.[59] Greek literature, in the form of its greatest author, eagerly welcomes the sight of its new Roman vessel—and master. Homer even invokes *pietas*, that most Roman of virtues, in his address to Ennius.[60] Where he has spent the 600-odd years before he entered Ennius's body is not said in our fragments, though we know he informed Ennius that he had spent some time in

a peacock's body (*Annales* 11). But why a peacock? They do not have pleasing voices, even if they are lovely (something pointed out by Tertullian at *On the Soul/De anima* 33.8). The easiest explanation is that adopted by Otto Skutsch: it was chosen as a symbol of immortality (1985, 164); Skutsch suggests that Ennius adopted the notion of a soul-housing peacock from a now no longer extant southern Italian story in which the soul of Euphorbus resided in a peacock before it moved on to the philosopher Pythagoras. Pushing the text further helps us see the peacock as both a symbol of immortality and an even more complex symbol for poetry and translation. According to Pliny the Elder, the peacock was also a bird that was displayed *and* displayed itself when praised (Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 10.22.43). However, despite the peacock's understanding of praise, it cannot speak: thus, although the peacock provides a brilliant display for those who admire and praise it (not unlike poets), Homer's soul can only speak once more when it comes to Rome via Ennius. It has been trapped in the worst of all possible vessels for a poet, a vessel that can only scream in incoherent and unpleasing language. Only when Homer is translated into Ennius, when his Greek voice is translated into a Latin one, when his Greek meter is translated to Rome, can he speak once more.

Critically, there is no intervening (Greek or Roman) *human* life that precedes Ennius in the possession of Homer's soul. Ennius *is* Homer, unaltered and undiluted; the intervening lives (even the peacock) kept the characteristics of the first incarnation intact as the soul passed through them (Grilli 1965, 49). Thus, the opening of the *Annales* shows Ennius authorizing himself to write poetry, representing himself as simultaneously the founder of two poetic traditions: as Homer, he stands at the originating moment of Greek identity and poetry; as Ennius, he is the only true epic poet in Roman history. Of course, this move elides the work of earlier Latin poets, but that was rather his point. This opening suggests that the *Annales*, although not in our sense a translation,[61] insisted from the first that it should be read as a translation; after all, this is what Homer *would* say if he spoke in Latin. Where, though, does that leave Livius, one of Ennius's epic predecessors and rivals? Well, it suggests to a Roman audience that Livius's text, while purporting to be a translation, is not actually Homeric in any sense that matters: it may have some of the plot of Homer, some familiar lines, but it is not Homer—because Ennius is.

By employing the figure of Homer in its proem, the *Annales* also represents a peculiar example of ring composition and translation: it started with the Romans (or, more accurately, a semi-Roman) gaining possession of the most admired and inspired Greek poet, and ended with them seizing control of the goddesses of poetry, as the poem initially closed with the dedication of the temple of Hercules and the Muses, adorned with their statues "translated" (that is, looted) from Greece. In other words, the poem gave its audience a closed circle of Roman dominance and translation that opened with one form of physical translation and ended with another.[62]

Where Livius had substituted his Latin text for Homer's Greek one, Ennius substitutes himself for Homer and his poem for Livius's translation. While Ennius also aims his poetic rivalry at Naevius's *Punic War*, as the most obvious competitor of the *Annales* (both poems covered some of the same material), he is also conscious of Livius as a rival. Glimpses of this can be seen not only in Ennius's use of Homer, but also in the opening of Book Ten. There, Ennius issues a command to the Muse: "follow (*insece*), Muse, the leader of the Romans, and what every man achieved in the war against King Philip."[63] The choice of *insece*, especially when used right beside the Muse's name, is surely not accidental, particularly as it was already an archaic verb when Livius used it, and Ennius usually avoids such extreme archaisms (Skutsch 1985, 499). It invites the reader to think of the opening line of the *Odussia* and to note the changes: *insece* has been altered from a command to sing, to one to follow, and the Camena has been changed to a Muse (Sciarrino 2006, 464)—a Muse who follows in the train of a Roman general waging war on a Greek king.

THE TRANSLATED MUSES

What of the Muses, who beat Olympus with their feet, according to the opening of the *Annales*? In his first line, not only did Ennius replace Livius's Roman Camena, but he also alluded to his new verse form, the hexameter, as *pedibus* can refer to metrical as well as physical feet. The conjunction of Muses dancing in a new metrical system and the vision that Ennius presents of himself as a new Homer ensures that his audience sees this as a package deal: one cannot have Homer without hexameter.

In a later fragment, the Muses explicitly position themselves as the new name of the Camenae: "those whom they call[64] (*memorant*) Muses, know that we are the Camenae."[65] In the Latin line, Muses is the first word, while the Camenae close it out; the structure of the line suggests the two are interconvertible, but that obscures the shift that Ennius is making:

> Inasmuch as the Muses are the addressees of the opening of the poem and the Camenae largely vanish from the literary and historical record, the passage is surely to be understood as announcing not just interconvertibility but also, and more importantly, substitution: the Camenae have become the Muses, have taken up residence in their abode, much as the soul of Homer has taken up residence in Ennius. Invoking the Muses or the Camenae is not simply a matter of choice in the way that referring to a rainbow as either *arcus* or Iris might be: the Camenae are no longer productive cultural agents any more than Homer is. (Habinek 2006, 476)

Ennius claims Livius's Camenae, who can no longer speak through poets—a role allocated to the Muses. This parallels Ennius's patron Nobilior, who

placed the shrine to the Camenae built by King Numa in his new temple to Hercules and the Muses. Previously located in the Temple of Honos and Virtus, it would now be enfolded within a temple that honored Nobilior and Rome's prowess in conquest as much as it did the gods it hosted. This matched not just Ennius's strategy with Homer, but also his strategy with his Roman predecessors: Ennius is now the first poet, the first translator, and in the process obscures what came before.

VATES AND FAUNS: TRANSLATION AND THE TRANSFERENCE OF CULTURAL MATERIAL TO ROME

Similar strategies are seen elsewhere in the *Annales*, and perhaps nowhere as obviously as Ennius's comment that "others have written of this subject in verses which long ago fauns and prophets (*vates*) sang in."[66] The subject is the early history of Rome and the primary target is Naevius (Cicero, *Brutus* 75–76). But it seems likely that Livius was a target as well. For if we are to think of Ennius as a reincarnated Homer, then all he writes is Homeric, and thus all previous pseudo-Homeric material in Latin will be replaced by his poetry. Where others poets were *vates* (a difficult term to translate, because it refers to all those who speak divinely inspired speech, prophets as well as poets), Ennius was a *poeta*, a Greek loanword, which marked his position as the harbinger of a new form of verse in Rome. The *vates* and fauns were linked by Ennius and Varro (our source for this line), connecting earlier poetry, and those who spoke it, to a nonurban, nonurbane culture.[67]

The word *vates* may also have been problematic for its connection with the controls that figures like Cato the Elder wanted to place upon the transmission of Greek literature to Rome.[68] Cato once issued advice to his son as a *vates*:

> Marcus, my son, I will tell you at the right point what I dug up on those Greeks in Athens: it is a good thing to browse their literature, not learn it off by heart. I will win my case (*vincam*) that they are a worthless and unteachable people. Consider me a prophet (*vates*) in the following: as soon as that tribe hands over its literature, it will corrupt everything. (Cato, *To his son Marcus/Ad filium Marcus* 1).
>
> *de istis Graecis suo loco, M. fili, quid Athensis exquisitum habeam et quid bonum sit illorum litteras inspicere, non perdiscere, vincam nequissimum et indocile esse genus illorum, et hoc puta vatem dixisse: quandoque ista gens suas litteras dabit, omnia conrumpet.*

The idea of Cato as a pure, untainted representative of traditional values, rejecting and ignoring Greek literature, has long been discarded. Rather, he is now seen as consciously manipulating debates over cultural influence to suit his own agenda, and this situation is no different.[69] Cato sells his

advice as worthy because it is linked with Roman tradition, Ennius his as worthy because it is linked with a different tradition, one for which he gets to speak. In Cato, the issue is not that culture will not be transmitted from Greece to Rome (after all, he wants Marcus to read Greek literature, and we know from elsewhere that he employed a Greek tutor in his home);[70] but "the critical issue with respect to Greek culture was not the possibility of its influence, but the control and management of its influence by the appropriate members of Roman society" (Habinek 1998, 60).

"Knowledge is power . . . those who control access to the knowledge on which a system depends control the distribution of power in that system" (Wallace-Hadrill 1988, 224). Translation and its restrictions (Cato is imagining Marcus reading Greek literature in Greek, not in translation) was a locus around which issues of control and access revolved in Rome. Greek culture should not be allowed unfiltered access to Rome and to young elite Romans: for Cato, Marcus should learn primarily from the advice and wisdom of his father and only scan Greek literature without being tainted by it. The paternal model of influence within a language is to be preferred over that of translation between languages. In contrast, early translators and transmitters of Greek literature offered a model of transmission that moved outside blood-kin, outside the paternal sphere—and even when these translators became Romans, they were not members of the elite.

CONCLUSION

The *Annales* was massively successful: the preface to Book Sixteen, "in which the poet spoke of renewing his labors in old age (*Annales* 401–6), indirectly attests to the success of whatever was the original design: only an appreciative audience demands an encore (Goldberg 2006, 436)."[71] However, Ennius's success should not mean we forget the potency of Livius's translation as a cultural model for Roman translation and as a work that created a cultural space for epic. Once inserted in the literary system of Rome, in a form that was linked to previous styles of poetry by using the indigenous Saturnian meter, epic was able to grow into a new shape, into poetry like the *Annales*. Livius did more than translate: he created an audience for epic translation and he positioned himself as a translator from the first lines of his poem. But both he and Ennius negotiated ways to ensure that translation could take place, even when it was of generic forms that might have had initially little traction in Rome, and even when it faced hostility from those such as Cato the Elder.

3 Making a Show of the Greeks
Translation and Drama in Third- and Second-Century Rome

"Upon my word," said Nicholas, taking the manager aside, "I don't think I can be ready by Monday."

"Pooh, pooh," replied Mr. Crummles.

"But really I can't," returned Nicholas; "my invention is not accustomed to these demands, or possibly I might produce—"

"Invention! what the devil's that got to do with it!" cried the manager hastily.

"Everything, my dear sir."

"Nothing, my dear sir," retorted the manager, with evident impatience. "Do you understand French?"

"Perfectly well."

"Very good," said the manager, opening the table-drawer, and giving a roll of paper from it to Nicholas. "There! Just turn that into English, and put your name on the title-page. Damn me," said Mr. Crummles, angrily, "if I haven't often said that I wouldn't have a man or woman in my company that wasn't master of the language, so that they might learn it from the original, and play it in English, and save all this trouble and expense."

Charles Dickens, *Nicholas Nickleby*

In *Nicholas Nickleby*, Mr. Crummles presents translation as a quick fix for a pressing problem. However, the unfortunate Nicholas soon finds out that he has to do more than just turn French into English and slap his name on the title page; translating a play and producing something that will be satisfactory to an entire theater company *and* a provincial audience turn out not to be the same things at all. He quickly finds himself compelled to add a dance for a child star (kept suitably small and childlike through the administration of copious amounts of gin), comic songs, tragic scenes, stage fights—whatever will lure crowds into the theater without offending any of the company. One can easily imagine a similar scene in Rome: the comic writer Plautus, beset with demands from stage-managers and actors, under considerable pressure to add elements that will appeal to a rowdy Roman audience, grabs feverishly at

a Greek play, adds some extra material for one of the more prominent actors of his troupe, throws in a few songs, and hands the result over at the end of a long and exhausting weekend. I do not want to insist that this is how Roman comedy was written or to argue that early dramatic production at Rome can be neatly paralleled to Dickensian England and its travelling players, but this episode in Dickens's novel does point to how even a fairly simple attempt at using translation to create a "new" play is complicated by many varying, immediate demands on the translator. Translating drama is not simply a matter of linguistic replacement (itself a complicated endeavor), but of adapting a play so that it appeals to a new audience, often one with a different set of demands and expectations.

DRAMA AND ITS PERFORMANCE IN THE ERA OF PLAUTUS AND TERENCE

Scripted drama in Rome was either commissioned or selected by the state through the *aediles*, elected officials, for state-sponsored games (*ludi*),[1] or by individuals for special events such as triumphs or funerals. It was produced in the midst of a society undergoing massive, rapid social and political shifts, for an audience filled with people of different classes, expectations, and ethnicities, and for a city that was acquiring more and more power over the Greeks, whose literature it was absorbing and transmuting. The plays I will discuss in this chapter, the *comoedia/fabula palliata* ("plays in a Greek cloak"), were not the only dramatic shows in town: they shared the stage with tragedies adapted from Greek sources, tragedies on subjects drawn from Roman history and myth (*fabula praetexta*), and, later, original comedies set in Italy (*comoedia/fabula togata*).[2] There were also on offer so-called subliterary performance genres such as mime and Atellan farce,[3] and unscripted forms of entertainment such as the tightrope walkers and boxers that Terence blamed for the initial failure of the first performance of his comedy *The Mother in Law/Hecyra* in 165 BCE.[4] A dense and complicated world of entertainment and drama, which is now almost entirely lost to us,[5] forms the backdrop to the translations of Plautus and Terence, as much as does Rome's increasing domination of the Mediterranean and growing control over the Greek world.

PLAUTUS AND TERENCE

The prologues of Plautus (fl. c. 205–184 BCE) and Terence (fl. 160s BCE) contain the first explicit, albeit brief, discussions of translation in Rome. This chapter will focus on these prologues, along with other places in their comedies where they comment on translation or linguistic issues, rather than on examining the process and details of how they changed Greek New Comedy

into Roman Comedy.[6] While much valuable information about the amount of adapting and Romanizing[7] each author did can be obtained by looking at how much they altered or conserved the original Greek play, such comparison lies outside the scope of this project. A comparative approach to Greek and Roman drama is also severely hampered by the disappearance of most of the originals for the extant Roman comedies. In fact, as we do not even know the title of the sources of some of Plautus's plays, it has been suggested that some may have lacked Greek originals, although they were presented as translations.[8] Where we do have extensive portions of the Greek text, as is the case for Plautus's *The Two Bacchises/Bacchides*[9] and Menander's *Dis Expaton/The Man Who Deceives Twice*, we can see that while Plautus's version sometimes adheres very closely to the Greek source, it can also deviate wildly. For example, lines 494–99 of the Plautine play are close translations of the meaning (though not the style) of lines 11–17 of Menander's play, but lines 534–60 of the Latin version expand eight lines of the original to 27 (Barsby 1986, 143). Plautus is also clearly willing to omit sections of the original and either bring in material from another play (Barsby 1986, 144) or add his own while altering names and meters.[10] This massive variation in fidelity to the original is typical of Roman translators before and after Plautus, including Livius Andronicus and Cicero.[11] It seems clear that Plautus lies within the main tradition of Roman translation practice in having a fluctuating relationship of fidelity to the ST,[12] and scholarship on Plautus has increasingly been open to seeing great amounts of invention and alteration of the original on his part.

THE BIOGRAPHICAL TRADITIONS OF PLAUTUS AND TERENCE, AND THEIR *CORPORA*

Titus Macc(i)us Plautus's 21 comedies are the first complete extant literary texts in Latin (20 are complete; one, *The Suitcase/Vidularia,* is incomplete).[13] The earliest which can be securely dated is the *Stichus* (200 BCE), although references to the imprisonment of a poet, probably Naevius, in *The Swaggering Soldier/Miles Gloriosus* 211–12 have been used to date that play to 206/5 (Hammond 1963, 96).[14] The last securely datable drama is *Casina*, which refers to the suppression of the Bacchanalia in 186 (*Casina* 979–80). As Plautus's death is securely attributed to 184 BCE,[15] *Casina* probably dates to 185, with a later revival taking place in 150. Apart from those fixed dates for his drama, we know little about the historical Plautus, and much of our information about him comes from authors who lived considerably later. One source (*Paulus ex Festo* 275L) tells us that he came from Sarsina, a small town in Umbria; Gellius adds some extra color taken from Varro, and tells us that Plautus wrote several plays while working in a mill after losing his money in trade (*Attic Nights* 3.3.14). However, as the type of mill work that Gellius describes was backbreaking labor of the type normally

reserved for slaves, it seems unlikely that even a comic genius would have had much energy left over for writing or translating comedy of any sort. Even Plautus's *tria nomina*[16] give us little indication of his origins; as A. S. Gratwick convincingly argued, although these ought to tell us at least his *gens*, all of his names have suspiciously "clownish associations" (1973, 82): Titus Macc(i)us Plautus can be translated as "Phallus, son of Clown the Mime Actor" (Gratwick 1973, 83), hardly likely to indicate anything except a past as an actor. (It does not even indicate an impressive degree of confidence in parts of his anatomy, as the phallus was part of the costume of ancient comic actors.)

While we possess an ancient biography of Publius Terentius Afer, usually referred to as Terence, the facts of his life are just as suspect, and we certainly have no way to check their authenticity. Our primary source is a biography by the first-century CE biographer Suetonius,[17] which is partially preserved by Donatus,[18] a fourth-century CE commentator on the plays. According to this, Terence was born in Carthage and came to Rome as the slave of the senator Terentius Lucanus, who quickly freed him and from whom, like all freed Roman slaves, he took his name.[19] The life also tells us that he was patronized by the important and powerful Scipionic *gens*, and his last play, *The Brothers/Adelphoe*, was commissioned by P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus and his brother for funeral games for their father. So close was the perceived relationship that it was rumored that some of his plays were written by Scipio and other aristocratic figures, a charge Terence rebuts in the prologue to the *Adelphoe*. He died in 159 BCE while on a trip to Greece; according to one tradition, he was returning from there with more than a hundred plays translated (*conversis*) from Menander (*Life of Terence* 5). Even a prolific translator would struggle to translate 100 plays: given that Terence only produced six plays in his life, the number is improbably huge.

The other major survivals among the comic dramatists are the extensive fragments of Caecilius Statius, cited by Gellius (see discussion in Chapter 6). The extent of our loss is perhaps clearest when we consider that of the comedies of seven authors whom Volcacius Sedigitus cited as being among the top 10 comic poets in Rome,[20] we have nothing but scrappy remnants; in fact, some prolific and successful authors are represented only by a single title and one fragment.

PERFORMANCE OF AND AUDIENCE FOR COMEDY

Plautus, Terence, and all the comic authors wrote their plays for various *ludi scaenici* (games with stage performances) that were held as part of annual public festivals, or for special *ludi* vowed for particular occasions, such as triumphs, funerals, or dedications of temples. In this period, the regular games with theatrical performances as a component were:[21] *ludi Romani*;[22]

ludi plebii;[23] *ludi Apollinares*;[24] *ludi Megalenses*;[25] and *ludi florales*.[26] Unlike many later Roman translators, Plautus and Terence wrote for direct pay, as opposed to indirect benefits and patronage, and they wrote for a competitive marketplace and a varied audience. This meant they were faced with practical and economic concerns that affected their work as translators; how they adapted their sources had as much to do with what they felt would appeal to a heterogeneous group as it had to with their artistic taste: "all levels of society were present at Roman comedy, with no apparent restrictions based on finances, sex, age, or social position" (Marshall 2006, 76; for more on the mixed nature of the audience, see Marshall 2006, 75–77).[27] That also extends to their comments about translation: if Terence chose to use his prologue as a place to bash Luscius Lanuvinus, a rival comic poet who had accused him of plagiarism, and to indulge in "arcane literary polemics" (Goldberg 1986, 32), it was because, as Goldberg also points out, he thought it would appeal to his audience—much as Lanuvinus obviously thought it would appeal to *his* audience to attack another poet.[28] Otherwise, we have to assume that Terence was willing to risk losing his audience by boring them right at the start of his play.

THE *FABULA PALLIATA* AS A UNITY

While Plautus and Terence are our main sources for Roman comedy, they were, as I noted above, not its only or first authors. The inventor of the genre was apparently Livius Andronicus, although as a comic playwright he does not appear to have been lastingly popular; when Terence mentions his predecessors as a defense for his manner of adapting Roman comedies,[29] Andronicus does not get a mention—nor does he appear in Sedigitus's list of comic playwrights. His immediate successor, Naevius, appears to have been more successful; we have titles for 30 plays, and about 130 fragments, suggesting a reasonable demand. Ennius also wrote comedies, though he was more famed as an epic and tragic poet. While these authors and many of the other comic poets are only extant in extremely fragmented remnants, it appears clear that there was a stylistic unity to plays adapted from Greek sources, if one excludes Terence. John Wright's *Dancing in Chains* carefully illustrates how even the limited fragments from Livius Andronicus show linguistic practices later reflected in Plautus, such as fondness for alliteration, rhyming, polysyndeton, listing, and even the use of comic formulae like *responde mihi* at certain positions in the line (1974, 17–19).[30] Common to all authors of comedies is a huge expansion of sung and recitative portions of their dramas, when compared to their STs.[31]

By the time that Plautus's dramas were staged, there were generic expectations about the style of translation audiences would see, expectations to which Plautus and other authors adhered, no matter what their source. In

other words, a Roman comic playwright translated a play by Menander in the same way as he translated one from any other comic author. It is tempting to trace these expectations back to an ur-translation or even an influential literary figure such as Andronicus or Naevius: Wright suggests that the *Collegium Poetarum*, the guild of writers, actors, and scribes established (or formalized) by the Senate in honor of Livius Andronicus's hymn to Juno in 207 BCE,[32] was a major force in creating, developing, and maintaining Roman comic style (1974, 185). However, instead of thinking of some enforced template for translation that ensured comedy remained true to generic expectations, we should think of generations of Roman poets continuing to present to their audiences what had previously worked onstage, and that pressure on translation styles came from within a Roman tradition, rather than from attempts to reflect the nature of individual Greek comedies.

PLAUTUS'S PROLOGUES AND *VORTIT BARBARE*

Before I talk about Plautus's prologues, a little background on prologues for Roman comedies will be helpful. Not every comedy needed or even had a prologue; several of Plautus's plays lack them,[33] and we do not necessarily need to speculate that all of these have been lost (Marshall 2006, 194). When prologues do exist, their most basic function is informational: they tell the audience the title of the play and the basic features of the plot, and presumably aim at giving the audience time to settle down or at grabbing their attention. The remnants of other prologues outside Plautus and Terence suggest that they could also (not surprisingly) get in a little bit of self-aggrandizement in the process. In the prologue to his *Speared/Acontizomenos*, Naevius named the play and then touted it as good stuff (*prime proba*, frag. 1 Ribbeck).

One other tantalizing Naevian comic fragment, from *The Little Girl from Tarentum/Tarentilla*, would suggest the use of the prologue to either engage in political controversy or promote the author's ability, if the fragment could be securely assigned to the prologue. Naevius wrote that "something which I have proved by my applause in this theater, something no king dares to shatter, is by how much this slavery beats this freedom" (frag. 1, 72–74 Ribbeck).[34] While I am skeptical of arguments that assign a political reading to this fragment, it is interesting that it references the earlier success of the author, success that was granted by *spectators* through their applause.

To look for extensive comments on translation practice in Plautus's prologues is to court disappointment, as direct comments do not extend much beyond *Maccus* (or *Plautus*) *vortit barbare* ("Plautus turned it barbarian"), a phrase which is uncharacteristic of the volubility of Plautine language. I cite here every time Plautus's prologues refer to Greek originals and authors;

as the chronology of his plays is extremely problematic, I list the dramas by alphabetical order:

> The Greek name of this play is *Onagos*; Demophilus[35] wrote it, Maccus turned it barbarian. He wishes it to be now *The Donkey* if you will allow it. (*The Donkey/Asinaria* 10–13)
>
> . . .
>
> *huic nomen graece Onagost fabulae;*
> *Demophilus scripsit, Maccus vortit barbare;*
> *Asinariam volt esse, si per vos licet.*
>
> . . .
>
> I wish to give you the name of the comedy. It is called *Clerumenoe* in Greek, in Latin *Sortientes*. Diphilus wrote it in Greek, but afterwards Plautus with the yapping name made it Latin. (*Casina* 30–34)[36]
>
> . . .
>
> *Comoediai nomen dare vobis volo.*
> *Clerumenoe vocatur haec comoedia*
> *Graece, latine Sortientes. Diphilus*
> *Hanc graece scripsit, post idrursum denuo*
> *Latine Plautus cum latranti nomine.*
>
> . . .
>
> In Greek this is called the *Emporos* of Philemon, the same play in Latin is the *Merchant* of Maccus Titus. (*The Merchant/Mercator* 9–10)
>
> . . .
>
> *graece haec vocatur Emporos Philemonis,*
> *eadem Latine Mercator Macci Titi.*
>
> . . .
>
> The name of this comedy in Greek is *Alazon*; we call it *Gloriosus* in Latin. (*The Swaggering Soldier/Miles Gloriosus* 86–87)
>
> . . .
>
> *Alazon Graece huic nomen est comoediae,*
> *id nos Latine gloriosum dicimus.*
>
> . . .
>
> This comedy is called *Carchedonius* in Greek; in Latin Plautus calls it *Pultiphagonides*.[37] You now have the name. (*The Little Carthaginian/Poenulus* 53h–55)
>
> . . .

Carchedonius vocatur haec comoedia;
latine Plautus Patruus Pultiphagonides.
nomen iam habetis.
. . .

Philemon wrote it, Plautus turned it into barbarian, made its name *Trinummus*, now he asks that you allow it to have this name. (*Three-Coin Day/Trinummus* 19–21)[38]

. . .

Philemo scripsit, Plautus vortit barbare,
nomen Trinummo fecit, nunc hoc vos rogat
ut liceat possidere hanc nomen fabulam.

These are not extensive comments, and most of what is said appears on first glance to be simply information: this is a Roman play, here is the name of the Greek original. However, the terminology deliberately draws the audience's attention. While Plautus, or later presenters of the plays, do not exclusively use "he turned it barbarian" to describe a work as a translation, it certainly is a striking and problematic phrase because of the negative connotations of the term "barbarian." This was as true for the Romans as for the Greeks, as Cato the Elder's grumpy comment to his son about the Greek tendency to call the Romans barbarians shows: "They also call us barbarian, and—a step beyond how they treat others—they even smear us with the name Opics" (*To Marcus his Son*, preserved in Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 29.14).[39] Barbarian was a loaded word for the Romans, who knew well when they were being insulted, and it certainly would have had an easily anticipated impact on Plautus's audience.

Explanations for why Plautus refers to turning plays into barbarian tend to fall into three categories. The first is that Plautus is seriously acknowledging the cultural inferiority of the Romans; see, for example, Hose 1999 and Desbordes 1989, who argue that Plautus is simply reflecting the point of view of the Greeks—after all, the Romans *were* barbarians in Greek eyes. A second category of explanation is an intriguing variation on the first, and argues that Plautus is taking up the Greek perspective on the Romans, either for humor or to transport the audience away from Rome. Catherine Connors (2004, 182–83) convincingly argues that Plautus is adopting a Hellenocentric viewpoint and preempting Greek scorn, on his own terms: in Greek eyes, the assumption that they even cared about what barbarians did in their own language denotes a degree of cultural arrogance that Plautus exploits for humorous purposes. The third explanation is that Plautus is setting up a contrast between his work as derivative and the Greek work as original, as an informational service to the audience; Bruno Gentili (1979, 98–99) sees this as behind the balancing of the phrase at *Trinummus* 1.19.

I believe that all of these suggestions are problematic to some degree, and by digging a little deeper we can gain both a richer understanding of what

Plautus meant and the impact of his statement on his audience. That Plautus is straightforwardly admitting that his product or Rome is culturally inferior to the Greeks can surely be dismissed. Why or how—at a performance of a comedy for a *Roman* festival, in a city that was rapidly smashing Greek power to pieces throughout the Mediterranean and in the process was becoming more and more crowded with looted Greek art and Greek artists and writers—could or would Plautus make this statement with a straight face?

It is worthwhile turning to the Roman absorption of another Greek cultural prize, sculpture, as a parallel that allows us to understand Plautus's comments. From 211 (the capture of Syracuse) to 146 BCE (the capture and destruction of Corinth), a rapidly increasing amount of Greek statuary flooded Rome as the spoils of war (Edwards 2003, 49). While some art made its way into private ownership, much ended up adorning temples around Rome (such as the statues of the Muses that Fulvius Nobilior used to adorn the temple of Hercules and the Muses). Statues dedicated for this purpose carried inscriptions telling Romans where they had come from and the process by which they had arrived in their new home—not unlike Plautus's comments about the origins of his plays.[40] Such trophies displaying Rome's power and her ability to absorb and "translate" Greek art into new settings might easily form the backdrop to comic performances, as these could be staged in front of the temples[41] the statues now adorned. In such instances, statues with their inscriptions would both create a backdrop that made clear that, culturally inferior or not, the Romans were gradually gaining more and more control over Greek cultural resources, *and* form a visual doublet for Plautus's own record of where his drama came from and who had brought it to Rome. Plautus presents his work as translator as potentially equivalent to that of a general who brings glory and art back to Rome, and humorously elevates his achievements, even as this setting gives his use of "barbarian" a powerful sting, since the barbarians have clearly won. The connection of drama with Roman military triumph is rendered more potent at *ludi*, where the magistrate overseeing the games wore the garment of a triumphing general (Beard 2003, 41; Versnel 1970, 130–31).[42] Reading Plautus's comic prologues as related to their setting and performance strengthens arguments that "playwrights who parade the Greek origin of their plots are the literary equivalent of triumphing generals who parade their foreign spoils" (Connors 2004, 204). By invoking his barbarian translation as a pendant for his comedy, Plautus simultaneously can make fun of the Greeks (something the Romans always appreciated), raise his work to the level of a successful military campaign, *and* manage to point out the increasing ability of Rome to consume Greek cultural goods.

We should also notice in what *persona* Plautus tells us that he turned Greek into barbarian; that of *Maccus* and *Plautus* of the yapping name. Karlhans Abel argues that when Plautus says this he is making a joke on his own name, as Maccus is a stock buffoon character in Atellan farce. In other words, his approach to his original is playful (and maybe even a little

mocking), rather than deferential.[43] It is as if Plautus is saying "a Greek wrote this, but a character from Atellan farce translated it," and deliberately connecting himself with a non-Greek model even as he acknowledges the Greek original. (Atellan farce was not indigenous to Rome, so Plautus is not saying a Roman character wrote it, but a Greek would hardly notice that distinction.) In the *Casina* we are provided with an extra touch in his comment that they were translated by "Plautus with the yapping name." Here, "the confidently self-deprecating tone of *barbare* appears again, this time through a punning association of the poet's own name with the barking of a dog," as Plautus was a term used of a dog with soft, flat ears (Connors 2004, 182, referring to Festus 289.1–2). The "echo of *latine* in the sound of the word for 'barking' (*latranti*) seems to suggest that Latin itself might be a kind of barbarous barking" (Connors 2004, 182), which would align with Greek beliefs about barbarian language being a jumble of meaningless sound. However, the fact that after making this comment, Plautus presents to his audience a drama that contains meaning and humor they understand, points to the falsity of those very same Greek beliefs. Plautus's plays may be meaningless to the Greeks, but for this audience (which also very likely included some Greeks), it means something, just as the "barbarian" writing below Greek statues does.

The second argument, that Plautus uses the term as a device to make the audience believe that they are now magically a Greek audience watching a Greek play, or even just to remove them from the real world of Rome, is partially true but not a complete answer. This is the argument, for example, of Gilula 1989b, which states that the point of mentioning the adjective *barbarus*, as Plautus does at other locations in his plays (cf. *Stichus* 193[44] and *Captivi* 884), was to create the dramatic illusion for the Roman audience that they had been transformed into Greek spectators by means of an appeal to Greek prejudices (1989b, 104). It is certainly true, as Erich Segal (1968) pointed out in *Roman Laughter*, that the Greek setting allowed for characters in comedy to act in ways that a Roman would never be allowed,[45] with the play permitting Romans to flee "from restraint to release, from censorship to sensuality, from Rome to Athens" (41).[46] However, this is obviously more an effect of the plays' settings—in the Greek world, outside of Rome—than of Plautus's comments about translation. In fact, by mentioning that he turned a Greek play into Latin, Plautus risks destroying any illusion that the audience has been magically changed (translated?) into Greeks.

The third answer for why Plautus sets up his play as a translation, contrasting it with the original as a derivative work, is that the audience needed or wanted to know what Greek original was being translated. However, it is likely that the audience already knew the title of the play (as Terence says they did, in the prologue of the *Heautontimoroumenos/Self-Tormenter*),[47] and there may well be a different reason that comic authors informed the audience of the name of the Greek author and play:

> From the point of view of the audience, there can hardly have been much doubt from the start that they were to see a Latin version of a Greek play, and possibly, as has been suggested, the naming of a Greek author and title is, as much as anything, a reminder that the goods are genuine. (Handley 1975, 119)

By this reckoning, the mentioning of the Greek original behind Plautus's version is an authenticating force that adds validity to the performance (cf. Abel 1955, 11). What is frequently assumed is that the most important element in Plautus's brief announcement was his mentioning of the Greek original; hence, H.D. Jocelyn believed that the Greek element was so important that tragedies and comedies "were regularly advertised to second-century Roman audiences with the names of their Greek composers rather than those of the Latin adapters" (1969a, 103).[48]

However, it is reasonable to believe that the audience was as much interested in the name of the adapter as of the original author. Plautus's name was good box office, and the massive number of plays that were filed under his name (although his authorship was dubious) is telling: at some point, the name "Plautus" was seen as bringing success.[49] Evidence comes from a speaker in a revival of the *Casina*, who says that he is bringing back Plautus due to popular demand (11–20) and *then* mentions that the play was a translation from Diphilus's *Clerumenoe* (31–33).[50] It seems a little odd that in a revival based upon the popular appeal of a Latin author, the presenter would acknowledge the inferiority of the Latin version or feel the need to authenticate his play by reference to a Greek original. In this case, perhaps it is more appropriate to say that "surely the Roman audience did not care whether what they heard was copied or concocted, as long as it made them laugh" (Segal 1968, 6)—and, here, that it was *Plautus*. It is hard to argue from anything Plautus himself wrote that he felt himself in a position of dependence upon or inferiority to the Greek original and was signaling that in his prologues. As I argue below, a great deal suggests he was willing to assert that he was capable of going beyond the original, teaching the Greeks how comedy should be written.[51] Perhaps what motivates views that see Plautus as willingly acknowledging his inferiority, and a Roman audience as accepting that inferiority, is the low status of translators and translation in our own period and culture, and a lingering image of Roman culture as derivative of and inferior to that of Greece, more than evidence from the texts themselves.

This is not to say that the entire audience of the Roman theater was completely uninterested in the original, especially as that audience was a fairly heterogeneous group. Some spectators might have already seen the play in its Greek form in Greece, Southern Italy, or Rome itself.[52] Eric Handley (1975, 121) cites this line from *The Little Ghost/Mostellaria*, where the slave Tranio taunts his master, as proof of the audience's knowledge of New Comedy:

> If you are a friend of Diphilus or Philemon, tell them how your slave has cheated you: you'll find you make the sort of deceptions for comedies. (1149–51)[53]
>
> . . .
>
> *si amicus Diphilo aut Philemoni es*
> *dicito is quo pacto tuo te servos ludificaverit*
> *optumas frustrationes dederis in comoediis*

This suggests that the audience knew who the playwrights were and that their plays involved cunning slaves. (Though that in itself does not indicate a deep knowledge of any particular Greek play.) But this passage does more than highlight knowledge of Greek comedy among the audience. William Anderson has argued that in this passage, the role of the slave Tranio and the playwright are fused, so that both triumph over their respective masters.[54] Given that Plautus frequently likes to present the cunning slave as a type of master stage-director who manipulates other characters to perform,[55] then I would argue this is how he wants us to see him as a translator. Plautus presents himself as willing to manhandle the words of the original text, as the slave does other actors in the play without much worry about upsetting the sensibilities or pride of the Greeks.

However, what Plautus is saying in the *Mostellaria* goes beyond presenting his own triumph over the "masters" of Greek literature, and moves into suggesting a circular model of translation rather than the linear one we usually think of. Normally, commentators see the flow of information in the Roman adaptations of Greek comedies as one-sided, with the Romans taking from the Greeks via translation—indeed, that is the way that translation is often read.[56] But here Plautus suggests the possibility that his translation could circle around and transmit information back to the Greeks, an act that would give them more material for plays, which perhaps we are to imagine Plautus might adapt in turn. In this scheme, material performed at Roman *ludi* could provide inspiration for Greek plays.[57]

But why does Plautus mention the original at all, if my suggestion is correct and he was so self-confident in his own abilities and so very popular? Why not just do as Mr. Crummles told Nicholas to do: translate the play, toss in a comic song or two, and stick his name on the ancient equivalent of a title page? Answering this relies on understanding the impact that *verto* (*vorto* is the archaic form found in Plautus) has in Latin and particularly in Plautus.

VORTO AND TRANSFORMATION IN PLAUTUS

Vorto, one of Plautus's primary terms for translation, does not have the same linguistic register as our term "translation," as it can be used for a vastly different array of actions and is complicated by its multiple semiotic registers.

Eduard Fraenkel (2007, 27–28) notes several instances where Plautus plays with the idea of transformation; I want to examine two of those, both from *Rudens*, which use *vorto* and its compound *convorto*:

> I believe that men are changed, each into a different beast; I believe that pimp is translated (*vortitur*) into a dove. (886–87)
>
> *credo alium in aliam beluam hominem vortier/illic in columbum,*[58] *credo, leno vortitur.*[59]

> By Hercules, I think you are going to change (*convortes*) yourself twice into a suitcase, unless you're careful; your skin will become red and after that black. (999–1000)
>
> *tu hercule, opino, in vidulum te bis convortes, nisi caves: fiet tibi puniceum corium, postea atrum denuo.*

There are similar instances elsewhere: in the opening of *Amphytruo*, Mercury, the speaker of the prologue, talks about Jupiter "translating" (*vortit*, 121) himself into the shape (*imaginem*) of Amphytruo to steal a night with his wife.[60] In these instances, *vorto* is used not of texts but of people, much as Shakespeare uses "translated" to describe Bottom's transformation into a half-donkey in *A Midsummer's Night's Dream*. In light of this, Plautus's comment on his "turning" of a play from Greek to Latin might be seen as a comment on his power to transform the Greek into something new—as different from the original as a pimp is from a dove or a god from a human, presenting himself as the one who is capable of bridging an immense gap and turning it into something new and different.

GREECE ONSTAGE: REPRESENTING THE GREEKS

To properly understand Plautus on translation and transforming Greek material into Roman, it is useful to expand the discussion to other places where he refers to transformation, though not to translation as it is often understood. In the prologue to the *Menaechmi*, Plautus mocks failed transformations while discussing how unnamed *poetae* insist on presenting their plays as the real deal because they are set in Athens. He, however, is above all such trumpery:

> Poets do this in comedies: they make everything happen in Athens so that it may seem more Greek to you. I will tell you where events are said to have occurred. And though this plot is very Greek, it is not Attic, but Sicilian. (7–12)
>
> . . .
>
> *atque hoc poetae faciunt in comoediis:*
> *omnis res gestas esse Athenis autumant,*

> *quo íllud vobis graecum videatur magis;*
> *ego nusquam dicam nisi ubi factum dicitur.*
> *atque adeo hoc argumentum graecissat, tamen*
> *non atticissat, verum sicilicissitat.*[61]

Part of the joke here is that the play, though involving Sicilians, is set in Epidamnus, which cannot even by the most charitable interpretation be considered a Sicilian city. Plautus reveals the fictitious nature of all theatrical geography;[62] all the towns of comedy exist in some nebulous territory that is theatrical Greece, and the only reason to set something in Athens is to give your plot an air of authentic Greekness. And even when Plautus invokes the presence of Athens onstage, the audience is made aware that events are not unfolding there, but in a small space of land temporarily given over to the theater. Everything onstage is only a representation of reality, after all, no matter how convincing poets may attempt to be.[63]

Who are the *poetae* who feel the need to authenticate their comedies by the use of what is the Greekest of all Greek locations, Athens? Are they Roman or Greek? It seems natural to assume Roman authors alone are referred to here, but other possibilities should also be considered. As we have seen above with his comments on Philemon and Diphilus, Plautus was willing to broadcast to his audience his confidence in his ability to improve upon his sources. Further, given that it is usually at this place in Plautus's prologues that we encounter references to his Greek originals, it is not unreasonable to consider that here he might be setting up a model whereby he criticizes both Greek and Roman comedians who feel compelled to authenticate their own comedies through setting them in Athens, something he has no need to do.[64] In fact, as with his cunning slave Tranio, he can teach them a thing or two; he can out-Greek the Greeks[65] and he doesn't need Athens to do it (that he can also out-Greek his direct Roman competitors at the same time is an added bonus).[66]

Plautus insists elsewhere that he is very capable of transforming or translating the Roman stage into Athens with a few words and willing spectators. In the prologue to the *Truculentus*, he claims to be able to represent Athens at Rome if the audience is willing to allow him this liberty: "Plautus asks for a tiny place in your great and charming city, to which he can transfer Athens without need of builders" (1–3).[67] Not only is it possible to represent Athens within the walls of Rome, but all you need is a small plot of land: the smallness of Athens is compared with the greatness of Rome, a greatness that can comfortably encompass this foreign city and then dismantle it as soon as the comedy is over.[68] The theatrical city of Athens is encompassed, seen, and ultimately discarded by the audience on their departure from the performance, and it is the audience who has the power to grant both its presence and its absence. However, this temporary transfer of Athens to Rome is dependent upon Plautus's verbal translation, which represents the Greek city so well in Latin that it magically appears before a Roman audience

(with their permission) and leaves when the drama is over. Translation and drama merge together: as translation moves a play into Latin from Greek, so Plautus moves Athens to Rome.

To fully understand the impact of this, it is important to reflect on what it means when Plautus claims to be able to represent (and then de-represent) the Greeks onstage. In one sense, he is only pointing out a certain truth that lies behind all translation: every work of translation is a representation of an original; it can never be the original, because the original will always exist in its own right (even, paradoxically, when it is lost to us), nor is it in any true sense a copy, because a copy implies replication, and no translation ever has been or will be capable of being a replication of the original. The translator cannot help but betray his or her original, even if he or she seeks to be faithful (as the Italian expression *traduttore traditore* neatly expresses), and those who seek for complete equivalence between ST and TT are doomed to failure. This may seem an obvious and even trivial point; so what if translation is a representation—after all, it is not as if Plautus is claiming that he is writing original plays. However, the issue is complicated by Rome's own history and political and military expansion. Translation and its claim to representation can be a strategy of containment that goes hand in hand with desires to encompass, explain, and conquer cultures, as well as a mechanism to generate new plays or new forms of literature, as in Rome.

Looking at modern examples does not necessarily give us a parallel to Rome, but it does allow us to understand more comprehensively how translation can operate in this way. The clearest modern example of this is perhaps British India; the moment the English gained control over India, they began a process of translating the indigenous literary tradition, a process that was touted as a means to save it from unreliable interpretations by those whose ancestors had written them in the first place (Niranjana 1992, 13–32). The British took upon themselves the task of representing Indian history and law on paper, just as they and other colonial nations represented their colonies in physical forms through the media of exhibitions and museums. So, for example, at the 1889 Exposition Universelle (World's Fair) in Paris, the French devoted one section to various representations of their colonies, laid out side by side (Celik and Kinney 1990, 37); one part of this was given over to an "authentic" recreation of a Cairo street—complete with donkeys and their drivers imported directly from Egypt,[69] and pastries said to taste the same as if one had bought them at a Cairo street corner. By reproducing a street from one of its colonial possessions, France did more than create a Disneyland-by-the-Nile experience for nineteenth-century tourists; it showed that France had the economic, military, and political power to represent its colonies in the center of Paris. Before this, the Dutch had shown the way at the 1883 World Exhibition in Amsterdam by recreating a kampong, an Indonesian village, filled with people and products drawn from throughout the Dutch East Indies, a strategy they replicated at the 1889 exposition in Paris.[70] By representing the East, the West not only

showed its military and economic power, but also rendered an external culture as an object to be seen,[71] viewed, and known.[72] (Such representations also functioned as a way for states to compete with each other; this impelled the Dutch in 1883, who were still smarting from what they felt were embarrassingly paltry shows at exhibitions in 1851 and 1878.)

I do not wish to make the error of insisting that one can see Roman imperialism and nineteenth-century colonialism as parallel and identical processes, or to jam the complex and complicated relationship Rome had with Greece and Greek culture into a neat box marked "representation" or "colonial appropriation." One important difference is, of course, that Hellenism became an integral and profoundly valued part of elite Roman identity to a degree that surpassed any flirtations figures like Lord Leighton had with Arabic culture in nineteenth-century Europe. However, this does not mean that we should not reflect upon what happens when one culture in a growing position of military and political strength represents another on its stage. What does it mean for the Romans to make a show of the Greeks, even as they are gradually conquering Hellenic peoples and territories? What does it mean for Plautus to be able to claim "this is Athens" before a Roman audience and suggest that not only can he represent the Greeks through and through, but he can do it so well as to surpass the authors whose works he is adapting? To say "this is Athens" in the context of Rome's expanding power over Greece and Greek territory has a different impact than saying the same words at a performance of a play in *Magna Graecia*, and does more than create a theatrical illusion (though it also does that, as well). Rome was a force that dismantled not only stage representations of Greek cities, but also real cities like Corinth, which it burned to the ground in 146 BCE. While Plautus's and Terence's comedies cannot simply be read as expressions of the process of Roman imperialism and absorption of Greece and Greek culture, they are necessarily associated with it. The Roman state's ability to pay for these productions showed its growing economic and military power, much as later its ability to present in the arena animals and slaves drawn from all quarters of the empire would also reveal the extent of Rome's reach to citizens, subjects, and others.

The most obvious example of Roman power being enacted in a performance occurs not in Plautus or Terence but at L. Anicius Gallus's victory games of 167 BCE. A horrified Polybius (30.22.1–12) reports that Anicius took the best Greek actors and flautists (as opposed to Romans playing Greeks) and humiliated them onstage by directing them to perform as he wished (which was not how they normally performed at all), and by sending on boxers, dancers, and trumpeters to share the stage at the end of the performance. In his discussion of this event, Erich Gruen, anxious to rescue Anicius from charges of cultural illiteracy, points out that it was stage-managed to appeal to a Roman audience and show their power over Greek cultural forms:

> Anicius manipulated and distorted a Hellenic performance to demonstrate Roman control of the dramatic genre, and Terence adapted the

> Hellenic form to advance the genre itself. Both endeavors brought Greek scenic entertainment under more intense scrutiny by the Roman public. (1992, 218)

Anicius's games as reported by Polybius resemble a bizarre version of a play, one where the Roman people get to demand that Greek performers behave in ways that amuse them, an extreme and immediate version of what Roman dramatists were doing. The playwrights altered Greek material to fit Roman tastes; in the games of 167, the Greek performers instead had to react instantaneously to the Roman audience's wishes. While this performance does not fit under the traditional rubric of translation, it is still a type of translated performance, with the Roman audience demanding (and getting) a complete alteration of Greek practice for a Latin stage. In Anicius's games, the Greek performers substituted for the Illyrians whom the Roman general had just conquered;[73] the audience's humiliation of the performers replicated Anicius's humiliation of Macedonia's allies.

In Anicius's triumphal parade, spectators might have seen elaborate tableaux showing scenes from his victorious campaign, along with performers accompanying the triumph. The historian Appian tells us that at Scipio Africanus's triumph in 201 BCE, dancers and musicians accompanied the parade; one of these mimed a victory dance while dressed in purple and adorned with bracelets and necklaces of gold (*Punic War* 66; on this, see Beard 2003, 33–34).[74] While we have no information about such an action in Anicius's triumph, it is not impossible that something similar occurred. In addition, triumphant generals might also present their victories in dramatic form, through a *fabula praetexta*, a drama showing events from their campaign.[75] None of these are exact parallels for translation of Greek drama, of course, and it would be a crude and foolish statement to say that what Plautus represents is nothing more than a plotted enactment of Roman power over Greece. However, his ability to manipulate Greek sources, to represent the Greeks onstage, is part of a continuum with other representations of Greek culture in Rome, and a claim to authenticity is part of his appeal. It is important to place claims to authentic representation ("this is Athens") within the context of a culture that represented its own victories over Greek kingdoms by parading through its streets their cultural objects and reproductions of their defeats.

In Plautus we get reminders that not only are these translations of Greek plays, but the characters the audience sees really are "authentic" Greeks. As evidence of this, one can point to his use of words like *pergraecari* and *congraecari*;[76] Erich Segal (1968) memorably translated these as "Greeking it up" (33), but I prefer the translation "to be Greek through and through," which conveys the force of the intensifying *per* more strongly. Plautus's use of these verbs is a claim for the truth of his representation, a statement that this above all else was an authentic representation of the Greeks—after all, why would the Greek original lie?

However, the value of being able to represent the Greeks lay not just in presenting them as a rather feckless bunch of individuals, more obsessed with getting the girl than anything else. Even in positive presentations of the Greeks, such as those in the *Captivi* (trying to get one's son back from the enemy being a considerably more noble act than trying to pick up his girlfriend, as occurs in the *Casina*), the same claim to representation, to being able to stage the Greeks, is still at work. I would like to suggest that at least one of the functions of Roman comedy was to explain, to enclose the Greeks on a stage and make them knowable, to present a stereotype of Greekness that would fix the colonial subject as a category within Rome.[77] To see the Greeks was to know the Greeks, but not necessarily to love them; putting the Greeks on the stage in a Roman comedy could reduce them to an assemblage of facts that seemed mainly to revolve around an extreme fondness for love affairs. The conquest of Greek forms of drama via translation, which made those forms and their authors more known to the Roman people, paralleled Roman conquest of Greece itself, which resulted in greater knowledge of and control over Greece. This idea of translation as a form of conquest or as a continuum of conquest is certainly familiar to later authors such as Cicero and Jerome. Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations* opens by discussing Roman triumphs in other spheres and claiming that it was easy for the Greeks to hold the edge in literary matters while the Romans were not fighting back (1.2 and 4.1–2); but now that the Romans control the Mediterranean, it is time for them to conquer literature.

GREECE OFFSTAGE: THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF CONTAINMENT

So far, I have been presenting a deliberately simplified view of Rome and the Roman audience, one that assumes a stable entity of "Roman" and a fixed and homogenous Roman audience. However, this is as problematic as taking at face value Plautus's claim to be able to contain Athens onstage and dismantle it as soon as the audience had departed. As Plautus's own language and plays make clear, Greek culture was not so easily contained, and stereotypes are never unproblematic, even for the cultures that produce them: "the stereotype is a complex and ambivalent, contradictory mode of representation, as anxious as it is assertive" (Bhabha 1994, 70). The ever-present existence of hybridity and hybrid forms within societies will always ensure that attempts at containment or arguments for the purity of a culture will fail, even as cultures consistently represent and re-represent the same stereotypes of the Other. The hybridity of Roman society ensured the failure of any processes of containment that the *comoedia palliata* may have aimed at, and the very language of Plautine comedy could not but unravel any argument that tried to keep Athens safely onstage.

Even Plautus's representation of Greece is problematic, although he claims he can create and dismantle it at will. This is

> a Greece displaced to the Roman stage and all the more constructed, all the more hyperbolically Greek for that. It is therefore a Greece which invites constant reflection on what it is to be a Roman, just as, in the world outside the theatre, the ever-increasing influence of Greek culture on Rome makes the task of defining true, undefiled Romanity all the more urgent. (Leigh 2004, 54)

As noted above, the language of Plautus's comedies makes defining pure Romanity problematic, as it is littered with Greek words, words that permeated the Latin language and were part of everyday speech. It may be that we see within the plays an attempt to confine Greek to a particular status by using it as "a mark of servile status or of frivolity" (Shipp 1953, 112),[78] but even that attempt was doomed to failure in a period when the Roman elite were increasingly and enthusiastically molding themselves on a Greek model.[79] What could one do to restrain Greek influence in a society where the playwright Titinius could joke that even "now the hicks are Greek through and through"?[80]

Within Plautus, problems in separating the two cultures go well beyond the issue of using Greek words. *Curculio* makes clear that the cloaked Greeks whom the audience is watching onstage are also there on the streets of Rome; while Curculio is performing a running slave routine, he looks forward to running into some specimens of the educated Greek slave class:

> Then those cloaked Greeks who wander around with their heads hidden, who strut around while stuffed out like sausages with books, with little baskets, who stand around together, those runaway slaves talking amongst themselves, who stand in the way, get in the way, wander around with their catch-phrases, whom you see always drinking in coffee shops when they've ripped something off—they drink hot drinks with their heads covered, and wander about drunk and depressed—if I bang into one of those, I'll knock their wind out of them. (288–95)
>
> . . .
>
> *tum isti Graeci palliati, capite operto qui ambulant,*
> *qui incedunt suffarcinati cum libris, cum sportulis,*
> *constant, conferunt sermones inter sese drapetae,*
> *opstant, opsistunt, incedunt cum suis sententiis,*
> *quos semper videas bibentes esse in thermopolio*
> *ubi quid surrupuere: operto capitulo calidum bibunt,*
> *tristes atque ebrioli incedunt: eos ego si offendero,*
> *ex unoquoque eorum crepitum exciam polentarium.*

Intriguing here are the sheer numbers of cloaked Greeks[81] that Curculio visualizes thronging the streets of Rome, a comic exaggeration certainly,

but a comic exaggeration with some connection to reality: the Romans *were* importing vast numbers of Greek slaves in this period. The Greeks are not just onstage; they're standing on street corners with their books, providing a literary culture for the elite to absorb, even as Plautus provides another form of culture onstage. Of course, from the audience's perspective, the Greeks both on- and offstage are cloaked Greeks; Plautus deliberately makes it hard to identify the dividing line between fiction and reality.

Another problematic factor for any strategy that sought to contain outside influence safely within the space of the play lay in the author's background. Plautus was not a Roman and did not hide his non-Roman origins: as we saw, his name, Maccus, indicated a character from Atellan farce. The representation of the Greeks, the production of stereotypes about the Greeks, was in its most popular form not actually in the hands of Romans, but of non-Romans.[82] The intermediate status of Plautus, who stands between the Roman audience and the Greek original, ensures that the audience's access is limited and controlled by someone who writes for them but is not of them, and who is willing to at least play with that distance through the names he uses.

THE *POENULUS* AND LYING INTERPRETERS

I close this discussion of Plautus by looking at issues of language and translation in a play about not Greeks but about Carthaginians, *The Little Carthaginian/Poenulus*. *Poenulus* is a comedy that toys with audience expectations from the start; as Niall Slater notes, it starts out rather disconcertingly with an allusion to tragedy (1992a, 133): "I feel like studying the *Achilles* of Aristarchus: from there I will seize my opening" (1–2).[83] The author, presumably to his audience's horror—as they had, after all, turned up for a comedy—suggests for an instant that they will see a tragedy. But the play that Plautus is referring to here is not Aristarchus's original, but rather Ennius's adaptation of that tragedy. Why, then, is the Roman author elided from the picture? The reason may be partially related to Plautus's promotion of himself as someone who could out-Greek the Greeks: if he wanted, he could seize his beginning from the Greek tragedy, but he doesn't need to. Instead, he will capture another Greek original more appropriate for his purposes as a comic author; all the literature of Greece is laid out like spoils for him to take as he pleases. The term Plautus uses for beginning, *principium*, can be used in a military context for the headquarters of a camp or a roll call of soldiers (OLD 10).[84] Likewise, his use of the verb I have translated as studying, *commentari*, is suggestive, as it can also be used to describe literary editing and preparation for giving a speech.[85] There may be a hint that Plautus could not just translate, but also edit the originals in a Hellenistic manner (perhaps even like one of those Greeks with their books in the *Curculio*) or use them to create a specimen of Roman oratory. *Commentari* also evokes the *commentarius*, the term used for the military

memoirs produced by generals and the records kept by public magistrates; here, Plautus' language suggests that his act is a type of public duty, making known to a Roman audience the deeds of the Greeks—or, in this case, the Carthaginians. Additionally, by omitting Ennius's name, Plautus dismisses his version from consideration and implies that he could go back to the original play—*if* he could be bothered.

The *Poenulus* is in many ways a traditional *palliata*: there are mistaken identities, kidnapped girls (being searched for by their father, Hanno, the "little Carthaginian" of the title), a lovelorn youth, prostitutes, and a cunning slave; the untraditional element is the ethnicity of the main characters, who are Carthaginian, not Greek. Hanno does not appear until late in the play (line 930), but it is with his arrival and his character that I will start my discussion. The bilingual Hanno can be read in part as a sly commentary by Plautus on his own work as a translator and as a stand-in for the figure of the poet himself, as his "linguistic dexterity is as much as anything a mirror for that of Plautus himself, who translated from Greek into Latin, and, for good measure, throws in an extended passage of what may well be genuine Punic, but is no less comical for that" (Leigh 2000, 8). His entrance is marked by a long speech in Punic and then by a much shorter speech in Latin,[86] which is presented as a translation of the Punic speech. However, while it is certainly possible that there might have been a Carthaginian or two in the audience at the play's original performance, the vast majority of the audience would have had no clue about what Hanno had actually said in Punic.[87] They had, instead, to rely on Hanno as a reliable self-translator, a problematic position, given the Roman penchant for seeing Carthaginians as especially slippery and prone to lying.

When he first appears, Hanno refuses to reveal his ability in Latin,[88] instead stating:

> I will approach these and I will talk in Punic. If they reply, I will continue to speak in Punic. If not, then I will turn (*vortero*) my tongue to their habits. (982–84)
>
> . . .
>
> *Adibo hosce atque appellabo Punice.*
> *Si respondebunt, Punice pergam loqui;*
> *Si non, tum ad horum mores linguam vortero.*

The key term here (especially considering that it is Plautus's preferred term for translation) is *vortero*; *ad horum mores linguam vortero* could also be translated as, "I will translate my language to their ways." But it is also significant that in this context Hanno uses *mores* rather than any other term for language. *Mos* (the singular of *mores*) is a loaded term in Latin: although it can simply mean custom, it can also refer to ancestral customs, especially those of the *maiores*/ancestors, and Plautus uses the term *mores pristini* (ancient customs) in the prologue to the *Truculentus* in this way.[89] Here,

there is something slightly disturbing with Hanno (a Carthaginian, no less) saying he can alter his language so that it is infused with Roman *mores*. This might be no more than a statement that aligns with a Roman belief in the general slipperiness of Carthaginians, but it could show a belief that in shifting languages, one does something much more than perform a series of linguistic exchanges—that in speaking a different tongue, one is infused with the weight of its ancestral tradition. Would a Roman who learned Punic in some sense become Punic when he spoke that language? That would be a disturbing thought indeed to the Roman who translated Mago's farming manual in the service of the Senate.

Hanno's entrance is followed by an encounter with the slave Milphio and his master, Agorastocles (who turns out to be Hanno's nephew, kidnapped while young from Carthage). What follows is a scene of hilarious misinterpretation, with Milphio insisting he can translate from Punic (he can't) and being forced into wilder and wilder assertions about what Hanno is saying.[90] All that Milphio can do is turn Punic words into words that sound like them in Latin. When Hanno says *Miluulic hianna* (1010), Milphio says that he has come to give African *mures* (mice, 1011) to the officials for the parade before the games; when Hanno says *lech lachanna nilimniichto* (1012), Milphio tells his master that Hanno has come selling *ligulas* (uncertain meaning, though it is reused as a term of abuse at 1309), *canalis* (gutters? spouts?), and *nuces* (nuts). The deception, however, cannot be unmasked until Hanno himself speaks up in Latin and berates the slave for his lies, much to Milphio's disgust.

What follows is a recognition scene between Agorastocles and Hanno that involves further play upon linguistic matters and translation; Agorastocles is finally recognized as also being a Carthaginian because of a small scar he got while playing (*ludenti*) with a monkey as a child (1073–74). Connors argues that "the small monkey bite scar at the center of Agorastocles' recognition scene is a metaphor for comedy's own compressed and distorted imitations of life" (2004, 194), as it is the comic version of the recognition scene from Homer's *Odyssey* where Odysseus is recognized by his nurse by means of his (far more noble) scar from a boar.[91] "In its capacity to invite us to measure comedy against tragedy and epic, then, the monkey bite expresses Plautine poetics: it embodies Plautus' creative project in a metaliterary way. A long-ago scene of a boy playing (*ludenti*) with a monkey is the crucial center of the plot Plautus stages at the *ludi*. When the monkey left its mark on Agorastocles, he was only doing what Plautus himself is doing, leaving his mark on Greek models" (Connors 2004, 194).

Poenulus's own ambivalence about translation is unsettling and provoking. Translation is funny but only because it manifestly *lies*—and makes us not really care about the lies, because we're having too much fun. And false translation can only be uncovered because Hanno (the source text, if you like) is capable of speaking for himself in Latin, something not possible for the Greek ST, which can only speak through Plautus's Latin. It is not just a

question of what mark Plautus is leaving on his Greek models, but of how he shows that he does not rely on what those models actually say to amuse his audience. What if this were not really a Greek play turned into Latin, but Plautus's own creation? Or if it were a Greek play, but Plautus's translation tricked it out and altered it until it bore as little relationship to the original as Milphio's translation to Hanno's initial speech? At the moment of reception, that is not our consideration: we care whether Plautus, like Milphio, can manipulate, parade, and perhaps mistranslate a comedy so that it will amuse us. In the end, *Poenulus* suggests that translation is funniest when it lies, and lies convincingly, and that we must rely on Hanno–Plautus to tell us whether nor not something is a "true" translation, not on our own knowledge.

FROM PLAUTUS TO TERENCE

For those writing on Roman comedy, Plautus and Terence necessarily stand as opposed bookends to a tradition, although we know that a vast array of comic authors flourished between them.[92] Terence's prologues give the impression of a vibrant contemporary comedic tradition with its own hard-fought debates and controversies. Our knowledge of the comedies produced during the period from Plautus's death in 184 BCE to the start of Terence's productions in 166 is slight, but what we do know suggests that the *comoedia palliata* retained its unity in language and style, a unity from which Terence's comedies deviated. The political and military power of Rome continued to grow, with Rome expanding its dominance over Greece and the Mediterranean. The consumption of Greek culture also proceeded apace: two years before the production of Terence's first play, Aemilius Paullus won the battle of Pydna, ending Macedonian control over Greece. Besides massive quantities of other booty (the paintings and sculpture alone filled 250 wagons), Paullus also brought back the Macedonian royal library (which was used to educate his sons, who were later linked to Terence and rumored to be the true authors of his comedies), as well as several thousand elite hostages, including the Greek historian Polybius. Terence's plays must also be set against a background of increasing Roman hegemony and ransacking of Greek cultural resources.

Although Terence's comments on translation come, like Plautus's, in his prologues, they are very different, a function of the specific issues he is dealing with. His comments are set against a background of literary controversy—specifically, accusations of plagiarism. I will start by talking briefly about what we know of the context for these accusations before moving on to discussing the prologues in detail. Terence himself sometimes refers to his accusers as multiple, although he focuses on one old poet as the source of the criticism. We have a little information beyond the prologues, which comes from a fourth-century CE commentary by the grammarian Aelius Donatus.[93] Donatus tells us that the accusations originated with another comic poet, Luscius Lanuvinus (*On Andria* 6), who is now almost entirely

lost (we have only one two-line fragment).[94] He appears in Sedigitus's list of comic poets, ranking second to last, although before writing him off entirely we should remember that Terence himself only places seventh on that list. In the introduction to the most recent Loeb translation, John Barsby argues that "Luscius himself stood outside the 'Romanising' tradition established by Naevius and Plautus; he believed that Roman writers should instead present a faithful translation of their Greek originals" (Barsby 1999, 16; 2001, 15).

It has also been argued that the comic poet Caecilius, with whom Terence was sometimes linked in antiquity, was more faithful to the Greek text than other Roman comic poets and presented a more refined version of comedy, which may have been influential on Terence (Beacham 1991, 43–44; Duckworth 1952, 47–48). However, any Caecilius–Terence connection rests on very weak evidence: there is an anecdote in the *Life of Terence* that says after Terence brought his first play to the *aediles* who were in charge of buying plays for *ludi*, they told him to take it to Caecilius. When Terence arrived, Caecilius was dining and Terence was relegated to a lower table because of his poor clothing; however, he was given an opportunity to read several lines from his comedy. Impressed, Caecilius immediately requested that he join him and read the entire play out to him. Problematically for such a charming anecdote, Caecilius died in 168 BCE and Terence's *Andria* was only performed in 166; this means that it was performed at games that were under the auspices of an entirely different set of *aediles* and, for this anecdote to work, Terence would have to have spent at least two years trying to sell it, rather than writing another comedy. Arguments for Caecilius's fondness for faithful translation are also quite weak and rest upon "first, the large proportion of Greek titles in the surviving part of his work; second, the lack of Roman allusions in his plays; third, his alleged establishment of the rule against *contaminatio*; fourth, the apparent historical fact that he, like Terence, initially had difficulty in getting his work accepted by the Roman audience; and finally, his heavy dependence on Menander" (Wright 1974, 89). However, there is no good reason to believe that a Greek title necessarily means a faithful translation (Wright 1974, 92), or that our titles are the ones the authors chose (Wright 1974, 93–96). For the amount of his work that survives, Caecilius has a reasonable number of Roman allusions, with five in 190 surviving lines (Plautus has 84 in a far, far greater number of lines [Wright 1974, 97]).[95] Finally, Gellius, who had far more access than we to both original and translation, considered that Caecilius had altered one original extensively, and the passages he quotes bear out his opinion (*Attic Nights* 2.23; see further Chapter 6).

A recent introduction to ancient comedy straddles these two approaches, arguing that:

> Terence's theatre was a product of the world of the 160s, and responded to the Hellenizing vogue in aristocratic culture by drastically reconstructing the relationship between Latin comedy and its Greek models as one of assimilation rather than appropriation. Where Plautus had gleefully

> asserted his creative dominance over the dramatic and ethical values of his Greek material, Terence was obsessed with trying to make the qualities of Menandrean comedy speak meaningfully to a Roman popular audience, while still exercising his own creative freedom to improve liberally on the texts in the process of adaptation. Though no more faithful to the letter of the text than Plautus had been, Terence nevertheless worked hard at making the text feel like a Greek play—in plot, in characterization, in ethics, and above all in language, where he forged an extraordinarily beautiful, well-spoken conversational Latin that would ensure his classic status in schoolrooms right through the middle ages. No wonder Luscius felt threatened by the forces of patronage lined up behind this enigmatic young revolutionary *arriviste*. (Lowe 2008 118)

This teleological model plots an evolution from the unsophisticated slapstick of Plautus to the more sophisticated-but-still-like-Plautus-Caecilius to sophisticated and urbane Terence, and resembles the evolutionary model that was traditionally posited for the early development of Latin epic. It is, I would argue, also partially generated by Terence himself, who is careful to characterize his opponent as old (*vetus*). According to such a model, Terence, like Ennius, brings a new world of sophistication to a Roman audience which "became more demanding and more sophisticated in their expectations . . . [so that playwrights] were compelled not only to select their models with great care, but also to consider how to handle those originals, particularly whether translation was to be freer or more literal" (Martin 1976, 6). However, this conveniently forgets that the "increasingly sophisticated" audience of Rome had, one year before Terence's first production, made Greek musicians in Anicius's triumphal games engage in a fistfight for their amusement. More importantly, we must acknowledge that we have no way to say whether Terence's innovative style of Latin was the entire source of his problems (it certainly is not what he is primarily concerned with responding to—he is far more concerned with charges of plagiarism). The prologues refer to problems that Caecilius had with getting an audience (*Hecyra* 14–15), and Caecilius's style belonged within the larger tradition of the *palliata*.[96] Some adjustment in this teleological model is necessary, and we need to acknowledge that in the complicated world of Roman theater, many factors may have contributed to Terence's problems.

As the best way to tackle such a complicated problem is through Terence himself, I quote here the prologues. Much of their background is controversial and unclear, and the language is often problematic: where these controversies are relevant to a discussion of translation, I will try to briefly discuss them, otherwise they lie outside the scope of this work. Here is the prologue of Terence's first play, the *Andria* (166 BCE):

> When this poet steered his mind toward writing he believed that his only business was to see that the plays he had written pleased the people.

> But now he understands that it is much different, for he wastes his energy writing prologues not to tell you the plot but to reply to the insults of a malicious old poet. Please now pay attention to the basis for their fault-finding. Menander wrote *Andria* and *Perinthia*; whoever knows one knows both, as they are not much different in plot although they are different in speech and style. He admits that he transferred (*transtulisse*) what was suitable from the *Perinthia* into the *Andria* and used that for his own. They hiss at him for that and argue that it is not appropriate to contaminate plays like this. But don't they show with this "understanding" that they do not understand? When they accuse him, they accuse Naevius, Plautus, Ennius—writers whom he holds as models, longing to rival these men's carelessness rather than *their* obscure carefulness. I warn them now to be quiet and to cease their abuse or they will become acquainted with their own abuses. Favor us, give us a fair hearing, and judge the case . . . (1–24)

. . .

Poeta quom primum animum ad scribendum adpulit,
id sibi negoti credidit solum dari,
populo ut placerent quas fecisset fabulas.
verum aliter evenire multo intellegit;
nam in prologis scribundis operam abutitur,
non qui argumentum narret sed qui malevoli
veteris poetae maledictis respondeat.
nunc quam rem vitio dent quaeso animum adtendite.
Menander fecit Andriam et Perinthiam.
qui utramvis recte norit ambas noverit:
non ita dissimili sunt argumento, et tamen
dissimili oratione sunt factae ac stilo.
quae convenere in Andriam ex Perinthia
fatetur transtulisse atque usum pro suis.
id isti vituperant factum atque in eo disputant
contaminari non decere fabulas.
faciuntne intellegendo ut nil intellegant?
qui quom hunc accusant, Naevium Plautum Ennium
accusant quos hic noster auctores habet,
quorum aemulari exoptat neglegentiam
potius quam istorum obscuram diligentiam.
dehinc ut quiescant porro moneo et desinant
male dicere, malefacta ne noscant sua.
favete, adeste aequo animo et rem cognoscite

Speaking in the third person,[97] Terence, who appears to have walked right into controversy his first time out of the gate, produces a highly polished and

rhetorically adept defense of his work.[98] That defense is superficially very simple: Terence says he has been attacked, admits that he transferred material from one Greek play to another "for his own" (*pro suis*), and falls back on the *exemplum* of earlier authors to support his approach. In actuality, however, this is a very sophisticated piece of rhetoric with parallels in contemporary oratory, and one that renegotiates translation on Terence's own terms.

Unlike Plautus, Terence does not "turn" plays, he "writes" them (*ad scribendam*) (Cicu 1978, 89). Instead of having a name derived from farce, he is a *poeta* who "makes" (*fecisset*) plays, just as his source Menander made them (*fecit*, 9). But he is better than his source: Menander may make plays, but Terence both writes *and* makes them, a two-for-one deal, if you will. Given some beliefs about Terence's respect for his Greek sources, his dismissive attitude toward Menander is a little surprising. Certainly his comment on Menander's *Andria* and *Perinthia*, that "if you know one, you know both" (10), seems more than a little irreverent. Slater wryly notes that "for a poet with such apparently high regard for Menander, Terence refers to his predecessor's plays in a remarkably cavalier manner: line 10 comes perilously close to saying that if you've seen one Menander play you've seen them all" (1992b, 88).[99] Even more disrespectfully, Terence suggests that where Menander, the original poet, imitates his own plots (both *Andria* and *Perinthia* use the same one), Terence makes and writes one superior plot from two—if the new plot were not superior, why would Terence present it?

Terence's terminology is carefully selected; while *transtulisse* is the perfect of *transfero*, the verb that will ultimately give us our word "translate," he avoids Plautine terminology for translation, despite invoking him. In using *transtulisse*, Terence picks a verb that has the same primary meaning of physical movement of objects and people as *(con)vorto* and can also refer to total transformation of an object (OLD 8), but without presenting his translation as Plautine. In literary terms, Terence gets to have his cake and eat it: he invokes other writers as authorizing figures, while using subtly different language to describe his own work. He thus differentiates his own process of translation from what has preceded him, without separating himself from Roman comic tradition entirely. He also stresses his own powers of judgment; he only transferred what was suitable (*convenere*), not everything. The Greek text may be a valuable commodity that he "transferred and used as his own," but that doesn't mean he takes what doesn't work. We should note that this represents translation as incurring a change in ownership of the text: Terence takes the ST and uses it for his *own*; the Greek text's function is to provide property for a Roman translator, as it will be in Horace's *Art of Poetry*.

THE CHARGE OF *CONTAMINATIO*

According to his prologue, Terence's style of translation—that is, using two different Greek plays to make one Latin play—incurred a charge of

contaminatio. This was once argued to refer to the process of combining two Greek plays, with Luscius representing an anti-*contaminatio* perspective that went back to Caecilius, but there is little proof.[100] One of our major problems is that we are not actually sure what *contaminatio* means in this context, or whether it reflects the initial charge correctly. In an influential article on *contaminatio*, William Beare (1959) argued that it meant in Terence's prologues what it meant in all other contexts: to spoil or sully.[101] It is an incredibly strong term—much stronger than English "contaminate"—much closer in meaning to pollute, defile, or infect, and only made stronger by the additional sexual connotations the verb can hold (OLD 5). In other words, Terence hasn't just been charged with contaminating his sources, but making them *filthy.* In his discussion of the prologues, Goldberg saw this as part of the rhetorical strategy of the prologues, whose point

> [w]as neither to report the controversy accurately nor even to win it for their author. . . . The prologues have a more immediate purpose: to capture the attention of the Roman crowd and secure its good will. The matter at hand for Terence's *orator* is not one of literary theory, but of practical dramaturgy. The audience must be summoned to order and convinced that the forthcoming play is worth seeing. The quarrel with Luscius is used as a device to pique their interest. (1986, 59)

Contaminari "is deliberately chosen to inflate and obscure the nature of his [Terence's] deed. It is as colorful and hyperbolic a verb as Terence can find to mean 'spoil,' and he uses it to ridicule his opposition. Having inflated their accusation to the point of parody, he then proceeds to evade it" (Goldberg 1986, 50). He evades the accusation by invoking the authority of older authors, in a triad neatly wedged between two *accussants*, and given emphasis by its position in the line and the rhythmic sound the repetition of the names produces. Terence claims that by following their example, he raises his work above the obscure pedantry (*obscuram diligentiam*) of his accuser. This has been considered a counterattack on pedantic overliteral translation.[102] However—and this is an important however—we have absolutely no evidence that Terence's problems came about because he was too free a translator, or (more importantly) that Luscius himself either was a literal translator or advocated literal translation as a practice. *Diligentia* is certainly never used in such a sense; what it means is carefulness, usually in a positive sense.[103] I would suggest that here Terence is referring to "thriftiness" (OLD 2) rather than literal translation; given that the economics of Roman comedy invert normative Roman ideas of thriftiness and generally celebrate expenditure, one could probably translate it here as "cheap." Terence is distinguishing his openhandedness as a writer (he gives you not one but *two* Greek plays) from the cheapness of his opponents, who are not exploiting this cultural resource as they should—or are being miserly with it, in a manner not befitting comedy. In contrast, Terence longs for (*exoptat*)[104] the carelessness

(*neglentia*) of his predecessors and knows how to treat his audience. Rather than articulating an adherence to literal or nonliteral translation (something that is very much more a modern concern than a Roman one), he is talking about cheapness or generosity with an imported cultural resource.

FRESH DRAMA OR SPOILED CARCASSES: *INTEGER* AND *NOVUS* IN TERENCE

At the performance of his next successfully produced play, *The Self-Tormenter/ Heautontimoroumenos* (163 BCE),[105] Terence was still having problems with the same accusers, prompting more defense speeches:

> Today I am about to act in the *Heautontimoroumenos*, an untouched (*integram*) comedy from an untouched (*integra*) Greek play, a comedy made double from a single plot.[106] I have shown you it is new and what it is; I'd tell you now who wrote it and whose Greek comedy it is if I didn't think that most of you knew. I will give you the reason why I've learned this part; [Terence] wished me to be an orator, not a prologue: he's made you the judges, me the lawyer . . .
>
> Evil-wishers have spread rumors that he has spoiled many Greek comedies, while he makes few Latin ones: he does not deny this was done and he's not unhappy about it. Finally, he says that he will do it again. He has the example of good [writers] and because of their example he thinks that he is allowed to do what they did. As for the fact that the ill-wishing old poet keeps saying that he suddenly applied himself to poetry and relies on the talent of his friends, not his own powers, your judgment, your evaluation (*existumatio*), will rule.[107] [The prologue continues with an attack on plays of Luscius.] (4–12 and 16–26)
>
> *ex integra Graeca integram comoediam*
> *hodie sum acturus Heautontimoroumenon,*
> *duplex quae ex argumento facta est simplici.*
> *novam esse ostendi et quae esset: nunc qui scripserit*
> *et quoia Graeca sit, ni partem maxumam*
> *existumarem scire vostrum, id dicerem.*
> *nunc quam ob rem has partis didicerim paucis dabo.*
> *oratorem esse voluit me, non prologum:*
> *vostrum iudicium fecit; me actorem dedit.*
>
> ****
>
> *nam quod rumores distulerunt malevoli*
> *multas contaminasse Graecas, dum facit*
> *paucas Latinas: factum id esse hic non negat*

> *neque se pigere et deinde facturum autumat.*
> *habet bonorum exemplum quo exemplo sibi*
> *licere [id] facere quod illi fecerunt putat.*
> *tum quod malevolu' vetu' poeta dictitat*
> *repente ad studium hunc se adplicasse musicum,*
> *amicum ingenio fretum, haud natura sua:*
> *arbitrium vostrum, vostra existumatio*
> *valebit.*

Terence reuses terminology from the *Andria—contaminisse* (17) and *scripserit* (7)—to describe his work (*facit*, makes, is what other people say). Although Terence invokes previous authors (*bonorum*, 20) as an *exemplum* for his work, presumably referring again to Plautus, Naevius, and Ennius, he does not name them. He also introduces a new term, *integram* (untouched), claiming that he composed an untouched Latin comedy from an untouched Greek one. Discussing this passage, Sander Goldberg argued that *integram* meant untouched in the sense of untouched by a previous translator (1986, 135), and thus a play it was acceptable to translate. This is problematic, both because the Romans clearly did not have problems with producing multiple translations of the same works (Euripides's *Medea* and Aratus's *Phaenomena* spring to mind),[108] and because Terence describes both original and translation as equally untouched. A.J. Brothers (1988, 161) argued that *integram* should be translated as fresh, pointing as support to Terence's claim in line seven that this play was new (*novam*). "Fresh" again would mean that the Greek play had not previously been used by a Latin poet; this makes sense in the context of the accusations of literary theft Terence had to deal with. However, one of the advantages of *integer* (the masculine, nominative form of the adjective) is that Terence can play with its multiple semiotic registers. *Integer* can mean undecided, open-minded (OLD 2), which the audience should be until the end of Terence's defense; it can also be used to describe something not affected by or diminished by war (OLD 6).[109] The last is more than a little ironic, given that the Greek play got to Rome through a process of expansion and conquest, and is emphatically not *integer* in that sense. Terence gently mocks the Greek original's lack of integrity, while suggesting that his play can protect itself through his vigorous rhetoric. *Novam* may also not just be "new" in the sense of new to the Roman stage, but "new" as in novel and original, which Terence's style certainly was in contrast to the old poet of line 22. It is also new because he has doubled the original Greek play, multiplying it in an act of translation generosity (perhaps because the original is too thin to satisfy the Roman audience?). Thus, this is not just "an adaptation really quite different from the Greek original in some parts" (Gratwick 1993, 179, on the use of the word in *Adelphoe* 12), but a new style of comic drama.

As for the next charge, that Terence only produces a few plays while spoiling many Greek ones (17–18), he first shrugs it off by again referring to his predecessors. But he then cites the case of an unnamed playwright

(presumably Luscius) who recently showed in one of his plays the *populus* yielding to a running slave, a breach of the social order (cf. Habinek 1998, 57). In this case, the point of Terence's example is not just to accuse Luscius of poor taste, but also to suggest that his error was in translating a scene that did not belong on the Roman stage; occasionally, you need to be selective in translating or incorporating scenes if you are not to insult your audience. This might be why you need many Greek plays to make a few (good) Latin ones: only certain scenes are worthy of being incorporated into a Roman drama. The translator's judgment is critical to ensure that the source material is reused properly; you don't just bring everything over—unless, perhaps, you are Luscius. (Or Plautus, who was quite happy showing slaves shoving free people about—but that is a separate topic.)

TRANSLATING WELL AND WRITING POORLY

In the prologue to his next play, the *Eunuchus* (his most successful play and the one closest in style to the *palliata* tradition), Terence continued the good fight. He began by saying he was only responding to further provocation, and that Luscius, "by translating well but writing poorly" (*bene vortendo et easdem scribendo male*, 7), "made bad Latin plays from good Greek ones" (*ex Graecis bonis Latinas fecit non bonas*, 8) and destroyed (*perdidit*, 9) a play of Menander's in the process. Both Barsby and Brothers take this as equivalent to "translating faithfully" (Barsby 1999, 83; Brothers 2000, 159 has "accurate translation"); but that only works if Terence meant translation in our sense, and if good translating for him implied literal or close translation. When Plautus talked about translating his plays, he was clearly not referring to a literal translation; why then should Terence be doing so here? Luscius might have made radical changes in translating and still have written a bad play, destroyed his ST by altering it poorly through literal translation, or by not translating faithfully but still translating scenes that should not have been brought to the Roman stage. We could regard this as faithful in some sense—at least he would have been including all scenes from the original—but this does not imply that the finished version would necessarily have borne that much relation to the original, as scenes could be reduced or expanded (as with Plautus) while still being translated. Given that we know of *no* literal or even particularly close translation of an entire Greek comedy in Rome, this seems more likely than assuming a revolutionary commitment to a new style of faithful translation on Luscius's part.

Terence represented Luscius's charges as relating not to translation but to plagiarism. When he had an opportunity to see the play presented to the *aediles*,

> [h]e cried out that a thief had put on the play, not a poet, but he hadn't fooled anyone, that there was a *Colax* by Naevius and an old play by

> Plautus, and from these the character of the parasite and the soldier had been lifted. *If* that's a sin, then it's a sin of oversight from the poet, not one of overeager thievery. You can judge this case for yourselves: there is a *Colax* by Menander: in that there is a parasite called Colax and a swaggering soldier; he does not deny that he transferred (*transtulisse*) these characters into his *Eunuch* from the Greek play, but he strongly denies that he knew that those Latin plays had been made before. But if it is not permitted to use the same characters, how is it more permissible to write a "running slave," to portray "good wives," "wicked courtesans," a "greedy parasite," "swaggering soldier," "baby swapping," "the deception of an old man by a slave," or love, hatred, and suspicion? To sum up: nothing is now said which has not been said before. (23–41)

. . .

exclamat furem non poetam fabulam
dedisse et nil dedisse verborum tamen:
Colacem esse Naevi et Plauti veterem fabulam;
parasiti personam inde ablatam et militis.
si id est peccatum, peccatum inprudentiast
poetae, non quo furtum facere studuerit.
id ita esse vos iam iudicare poteritis.
Colax Menandrist: in east parasitus Colax
et miles gloriosus: eas se non negat
personas transtulisse in Eunuchum suam
ex Graeca; sed eas fabulas factas prius
Latinas scisse sese id vero pernegat.
quod si personis isdem huic uti non licet:
qui mage licet currentem servom scribere,
bonas matronas facere, meretrices malas,
parasitum edacem, gloriosum militem,
puerum supponi, falli per servom senem,
amare odisse suspicari? denique
nullumst iam dictum quod non dictum sit prius.

Here, the defense centers on the essential interchangeability of all Greek New Comedy, where the characters stay the same, even as the title or plot changes, and upon the interchangeability between Greek and Roman comedy *and* within Roman comedy. *Everyone* has at least one of these characters, and Terence does not assign these characters to one linguistic tradition, because they are actually spread across both. However, while taking from a Roman author is theft, translating (*transtulisse*) from Greek is nothing of the sort: this new comedy is now *his*, not Menander's.

I come now to Terence's final prologue in his *Brothers/Adelphoe*, probably his most famous formulation of his translation practice:

Synapothnescontes is a comedy by Diphilus; Plautus made that his play *Partners in Death*. At the start of the Greek play there is a youth who takes a courtesan from her pimp. Plautus left this untouched; [Terence] has taken that part and squeezed it out word from word (*verbum de verbo expressum*). We are now about to act out a new play: think deeply about whether you judge the work a theft or the recapture of something overlooked because of carelessness. [The prologue then deals with further accusations of help, from unnamed *nobile*s.] (6–14)

. . .

Synapothnescontes Diphili comoediast:
eam Commorientes Plautus fecit fabulam.
in Graeca adulescens est, qui lenoni ieripit
meretricem in prima tabula: eum Plautus locum
reliquit integrum. eum nunc hic sumpsit sibi
in Adelphos, verbum de verbo expressum extulit.
eam nos acturi sumus novam: pernoscite
furtumne factum existumetis an locum
reprehensum, qui praeteritus neglegentiast.

Here, Terence repeats some words and issues (*neglentia*, *integrum*, use of more than one source) and introduces a new phrase: "squeezed it out word from word" (11). Alfonso Traina, among others, has argued that this refers to either literal translation or close fidelity to the text, and this is the usual interpretation of Terence's phrase.[110] But this is not actually what Terence is saying, and examining the full range of meanings of *exprimo*, the verb of which *expressum* is the perfect passive participle, is instructive here. Plautus used this verb to describe the process of imprinting an image on wax (*Pseudolus* 56), while elsewhere it is often applied to the process of modeling images, and the sphere of the plastic arts. It could have violent connotations, describing the squeezing out of olive oil or any liquid from a press (Robinson 1992a, 26); Terence uses it to describe a whore forcing out a single tear, in the *Eunuch* (68). At the very least, *expressum* gives us the translator "not as neutral transfer machine; rather as the artist who mediates between two forms of being, two modes of understanding, natural and plastic, material and verbal, matter and manner, SL [source language] and TL [target language]" (Robinson 1992a, 27). I would like to take this one step further and suggest, drawing on the usages listed above, that in Terence, *expressum* means more than not translating literally, and suggests either that the original Greek words are wax, upon which a) Terence stamps his own form and image as he draws them from Menander into a new context (and possibly also that the original is then wiped smooth and clean for repressing), or b) (more likely given the syntax) that he was describing himself as crushing out meaning from the Greek, milking the text—by force if necessary—for

what it was worth. Word is squeezed out from word to give the audience what they want—unlike the *old* Luscius, who has no idea of how to treat the Greek text, flinging inappropriate material upon the stage without thinking of his audience.[111]

At the end of Terence's career, the audience had been allowed to become spectators of a bitter poetic fight not once, but *five* times (and more, if Luscius used his own prologues to respond). Matthew Leigh points out that the prologues of Terence invite the audience to become part of a cultural "in" group which gets to judge the value of literary work. That was one point of Terence repeatedly bringing up the debate with the malevolent old poet: it made his audience feel as if they too got to evaluate the merits of literary productions (2000, 25; for a discussion of flattery in the *Hecyra*'s prologue, see also Lada-Richards 2004, 61–62). Prior to Leigh, Thomas Habinek argued that by employing the verb *existimatio* at key points like the prologue to the *Heautontimoroumenos*, Terence invited the audience to stand with him against his slanderer, "implying that the playwright and the audience constitute a mutual admiration society, or artistic economy, exchanging positive evaluation for positive evaluation" (1998, 55). Terence hands over to the audience the right to make his play a success or a failure, grants them the right to judge his translation, a right that his enemy tries to usurp by contriving to see the play in rehearsal or at a preview for the *aediles* in charge of the games, as with the *Eunuch*. Terence suggests that Luscius has overreached his authority by trying to take away the right to judge from the audience, who, as Terence points out, are capable of evaluating his "theft" for themselves (*Eunuchus* 29).

THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL BACKGROUND: WHY TRANSLATION MATTERS

Why, however, would the audience care? Again, we must return to the social and political environment in which Terence wrote. Rome was a city undergoing massive social shifts as it absorbed wealth and cultural resources from Greek territory. This was not purely an elite issue, however: as we have seen, ordinary Romans lived in the midst of a city that was being transformed by the arrival of Greek art and Greek slaves. They sat surrounded by art looted from Greece as they listened to plays whose translation and production was made possible by Rome's growing economic power and under the auspices of an increasingly Hellenized elite. In such a situation, translation *mattered*. It mattered how you transferred this resource, it mattered how you presented it to the Roman people, and your relationship to your ST was significant. But for the Romans, the relationship to the source text was not primarily articulated in modern terms of literal versus free translation, but in terms of using a cultural resource so that it both yielded the proper relationship (a Roman in charge) and showed your control over it. Terence was not interested in

producing Menandrean plays any more than was Plautus, but in creating a new Latin style that partook of Roman comedy's traditional relationship to the original at the same time as it formulated a new Roman poetics. And that new poetics was in some ways a more Roman one: Terence stripped away much of the hybridity that characterized Plautus's language, with the latter's mélange of Greek and Latin.[112] Out of a medley of Greek authors, Terence forged a "pure" Latin, which translated all of his Greek sources in the same way. This may have been an attempt to create a Menandrean style in Latin, but Terence does not express himself in those terms. Instead, when he focuses on his work, he states his right to do what he wants with his ST, to take from it as he will, much as Rome was doing with Greece itself.

4 Cicero's Impossible Translation

On the Best Type of Orator and Beyond

Marcus Tullius Cicero (106–43 BCE) was Rome's greatest orator, as well as a prodigious translator of Greek thought and texts into Latin. He was also Rome's most famous writer on translation.[1] It is a rare introduction to the history of translation in the West that does not cite his comment that he translated "not as an interpreter but as an orator" (*On the Best Type of Orator* 14).[2] Therein lies part of the problem: as Frederick Rener pointed out, the endless repetition of this formula tends to have a soporific effect on those who encounter it (1989, 2). Familiarity has bred not so much contempt as a tendency to switch off. As a result, Cicero's comments on translation are rarely situated within the context of his other works, his literary and political aims, his personal circumstances, and the cultural moment he inhabited and helped shape. His translation theory needs to be seen as part of a larger cultural debate, not as a set of sound bites isolated from the world of the Late Republic.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Cicero was born in the town of Arpinum to a well-connected Roman equestrian family.[3] Although only provincial nobility, the Ciceros had close ties to Rome and several members of the Roman elite. In 90s BCE, his father moved him and his brother Quintus to Rome to study and further their careers on the national stage: Cicero more than exceeded any parental expectations, running for and being elected to every successive political office in the *cursus honorum* (literally, the course of offices) at the youngest possible age, capping his success with a consulship in 63 BCE. This was a remarkable feat for a relative outsider to the Roman political system and a "new man" (*novus homo*), someone without any ancestors who had held the consulship or, in Cicero's case, any higher political office in Rome.[4] His career after 63 had considerable ups and downs (more downs than ups), generated by his controversial actions during his consulship (he executed, without trial, Roman citizens involved in a conspiracy to overthrow the Roman state) and by the increasing concentration of power in the triumvirate of Julius Caesar,

Pompey the Great, and M. Licinius Crassus. Exiled in 58 to the outer reaches of the Roman Empire, he made a triumphant return in 57, only to find himself increasingly politically impotent. Cicero responded by withdrawing from public life and writing philosophy and works on oratorical history and theory. As the Roman Republic grew increasingly unstable, with elites squabbling between themselves over the spoils of empire, the chaos culminated in civil war between Julius Caesar and the senatorial conservatives under the leadership of Pompey. Caesar's victory over Pompey at the battle of Pharsalus in 48 BCE and his subsequent victories over the Pompeians meant that he completely controlled the political landscape, leaving little room for oratory such as Cicero's.

As the Republic crumbled and Cicero's political career lay in tatters, his personal life suffered,[5] and during the 50s his oratorical style, a major source of his political success, came under increasing attack from followers of a plain and Attic style of rhetoric; these orators felt his style was too florid and Asiatic (both terms are explained in more detail below). Cicero resisted being called Asiatic and claimed to be the one true Atticist in Rome,[6] and much of his oratorical writing was designed to tilt the debate in his favor. What may appear to be only a stylistic debate had serious ramifications in a society where oratory was valued not just for its persuasive power but as a pivotal means to represent the elite, male self.[7] Cicero was particularly vulnerable to such attacks because of his partial outsider status; despite his distinguished reputation as an orator and author, he had not been born to inner elite circles and, thus, always faced potential exclusion. As a result, he jealously guarded not just his political reputation, but also his literary[8] one, and desired to be seen, above all, as the apex of Latin oratory.[9] All of Cicero's writings, and his discussions of translation interwoven into those writings, must be seen as part of his efforts to shore up his image and to represent his vision of what the Roman Republic should be, even as it collapsed around him. He was remarkably well placed to do this, even among well-educated bilingual[10] Romans of his time, as he was exceptional for his remarkable ability in Greek and Latin, and his education[11] included considerable time studying rhetoric and philosophy in Greece and Rhodes.[12] His command of Greek was perfect, so perfect, in fact, that it supposedly reduced his teacher of rhetoric in Rhodes to tears because he had outstripped the Greeks even in Greek, leaving them nothing (Plutarch, *Life of Cicero* 4.6–7).

THE ORATOR AS TRANSLATOR

Cicero's first foray into discussing the orator as translator came in an early work, *On Invention/De inventione*;[13] there the orator is the original, the perfect, the only possible translator—of men. In the opening section, Cicero describes the first orator's appearance and his conversion of primitive man:

> At this time someone—who was surely great and wise—understood what material (*materia*) lay in men's minds and that it was capable of achieving great things if someone could entice it out (*elicere*) and use their instruction to render (*reddere*) it into something better. By some system he drove together and gathered into one place men who had been scattered in the fields and buried in woodland homes, leading them into a useful and honorable state. Although at first they protested because of this situation's unfamiliarity, they later listened more enthusiastically because of reason and oratory, and he rendered (*reddidit*) them gentle and tame although they were a wild and savage people. But I do not think it possible that a silent wisdom without richness in speech could have converted (*converteret*) men suddenly from their familiar ways and turned them towards different ways of living. (1.2–3)
>
> *Quo tempore quidam magnus videlicet vir et sapiens cognovit quae materia esset et quanta ad maximas res opportunitas in animis inesset hominum, si quis posset elicere et praecipiendo meliorem reddere; qui dispersos homines in agros et in tectis silvestribus abditos ratione quadam compulit unum in locum et congregavit et eos in unam quamque rem inducens utilem atque honestam primo propter insolentiam reclamantes, deinde propter rationem atque orationem studiosius audientes ex feris et immanibus mites reddidit et mansuetos. Ac mihi quidem hoc nec tacita videtur nec inops dicendi sapientia perficere potuisse ut homines a consuetudine subito converteret et ad diversas rationes vitae traduceret.*

Cicero's argument here is not new—the orator as the original civilizing force had long been a feature of Hellenistic thought—but what is notable is the language he uses to describe the orator's actions. For Cicero, the first orator does not merely persuade people, but renders (*reddere*, *reddidit*) and converts (*converteret*) them (Cheyfitz 1991, 115–17), terms that Cicero will later use to describe his own work as a translator. This is a "scene of translation" (Cheyfitz 1991, 117), where human beings, rather than texts, are controlled and translated by the power of the orator. The orator alone is capable of seeing below the surface of things (men in this situation, texts in others) in order to change them from one status to another. Cicero's use of *materia* to describe the raw potential of primitive man's mind points to both possibilities, as it means both literary material and what gives mankind its abilities. By enticing this out (notice the use of *elicere* and *inducens*), the orator marks, shapes, and transfers people across the dividing line that separates wild men from citizens of a unified society. The language Cicero uses notes the transformative power of the orator: conversion involves radical alteration on a ST made up of savage people, as does rendering. We should also note that it does not matter what this ST wants: the orator can succeed in translating even initially recalcitrant and rebellious material.

In Cicero's later, mature dialogue *On the Orator/De oratore* (55 BCE),[14] the orator L. Licinius Crassus uses similar language to comment approvingly

on the ability of the orator to alter opinion, asking "what could be as powerful, as magnificent, as the rhetoric of one person converting (*converti*) the impulses of the people, the principles of jurors, and the authority of the Senate (1.31)?"[15] Here, oratory converts not just those of inferior status to the orator (the people), but also those of equal status: jurors and the Senate. The orator's power to translate others operates in all three arenas of Roman oratory: in speaking before the people at an assembly; in the courts; and in the Senate. If in *On Invention* Cicero offers a "vision of primordial social development in which rhetoric activated a wisdom that was mute and socially inoperative" (Copeland 1991, 12) using a form of translation, in Rome the (good) orator can translate anyone he wants into an active supporter.

Besides translating or converting in this extended sense, the Ciceronian orator also translates languages. So how and why does he do this? Or, to put the question slightly differently, what does translation do for the orator and what does he do to the text? *On the Orator* tells us this as well; in the first of the dialogue's three books, Crassus describes how he used translation as a liberating device while he was in the process of seeking his own style (Robinson 1992a, 27–28). At first, Crassus, like his rival Gaius Carbo, read poetry and speeches in Latin and then tried to paraphrase them, but found this strategy problematic:

> But I realized my method had the following fault, that the words which were most appropriate, the most ornate, and the best for each subject had either been seized (*occupasset*) by Ennius if I was working out with his verses, or by Gracchus if I had by chance set myself a speech of his. So, if I used the same words, I got no benefit at all—and if I used different ones, it was an obstacle, because I got into the habit of using less appropriate words. After this I decided (something I did when I was a youth) that I would translate (*explicarem*) the Greek orations of the very best orators. When I followed this method I found that when I was reading these in Greek and rendering (*redderem*) them into Latin, not only would I use the best words (still they were ones in use), but even that I was forming by analogy words (provided that they were appropriate) which would be new to us. (1.154–55)
>
> *sed post animadverti hoc esse in hoc viti, quod ea verba, quae maxime cuiusque rei propria quaeque essent ornatissima atque optima, occupasset aut Ennius, si ad eius versus me exercerem, aut Gracchus, si eius orationem mihi forte proposuissem: ita, si eisdem verbis uterer, nihil prodesse; si aliis, etiam obesse, cum minus idoneis uti consuescerem. Postea mihi placuit, eoque sum usus adulescens, ut summorum oratorum Graecas orationes explicarem, quibus lectis hoc adsequebar, ut, cum ea, quae legeram Graece, Latine redderem, non solum optimis verbis uterer et tamen usitatis, sed etiam exprimerem quaedam verba imitando, quae nova nostris essent, dum modo essent idonea.*

This transfers Cicero's own approach to translation back a generation, giving his method the blessing of custom, and provides a moment where his reasons for translating Greek texts are legitimated by being placed in the mouth of a conveniently dead man; both he and Crassus feed off the original for their own increase. However, although these *are* Cicero's words in Crassus's mouth, surely some previous orator used translation as a pedagogical tool. While Cicero "is . . . the first to articulate [translation] for pedagogical practice, and as such is the 'father' or 'authority' of pedagogical/rhetorical translation theory, the 'source' to which all later writers refer" (Robinson 1992a, 20), he was surely not the first to attempt to do so, even if we may doubt that the historical Crassus so neatly fell into the Ciceronian model of translation.[16] While he was censor, Crassus, along with his co-censor Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, issued an edict expressing their disapproval of schools that taught rhetoric through Latin;[17] he might well have stressed going to the Greek text directly instead of using a Latin author as an intermediary or for oratorical training.

Returning to Crassus's comments on translating, we can see that even though he translates "the Greek orations of the very best orators" (which would include both Demosthenes and Aeschines),[18] he neither mentions faithfulness to the source text as a consideration nor articulates any sort of obligation or responsibility to it. The Greek text is important not so much for itself but for what it can do for *Crassus*. Again, we are not operating with modern concepts of faithful versus free translation, but with a concern for translation as training. Translation is a type of self-instruction, which frees at the same time it teaches, while the use of Latin authors binds as much as it instructs. Why is using a Latin author considered more constricting than using a Greek author? Only part of the answer lies in the question of language; after all, Crassus says that when he translates, he initially uses words that are in current usage in Rome and only then coins those that are suitable. For Cicero, translation undoes restrictions and too close a dependent relationship with a text (Robinson 1992a, 28); but while the Greek text frees, the Latin text hinders, overwhelming the budding orator's voice.

In addition to this, in Crassus's view, translation not only provides the orator with an advantage (he no longer sounds like someone else, and a poor version of someone else at that), but also adds to the body of words that can be used in Latin, enriching both individual oratory and the entire language at the same time. The translator's gain is also Rome's: translation is a personally *and* socially useful act. In this scheme, one can only have an evolutionary model that allows for growth by going outside the Latin tradition, but here the Greek tradition is important not for itself but insofar as it helps *Latin* style. We should also note that here Crassus seems uninterested in the end product of translation: it is the process that interests him and is valuable. (Cicero's perspective shifts in his later work *On the Best Type of Orator*, which emphasizes the pedagogical value of the translation, or rather, the pedagogical value of a *Ciceronian* translation.)

THE PROBLEM OF GREEK CULTURE

Crassus presents translation from Greek as unproblematic, especially compared to translation within Latin. A Roman sits down and translates a Greek text—alone. Translation is presented as *self*-instruction; Crassus erases the role of the middleman in his description of his translation process. The Roman statesman relies on his own abilities, rather than using a Greek to help guide him through the text. There is no mention of aid with difficulties of grammar, vocabulary, or meaning, though in reality a Roman would have turned to an educated Greek for aid (critical in a culture without Greek–Latin dictionaries or grammars). Without these aids, even well-educated Romans would have faltered when faced with a complex Greek text,[19] and translation surely took place in a considerably more interactive environment than Crassus's words suggest.

Why does Crassus simplify the process of translation? The answer lies in the problematic nature of Greek culture for the Romans. Unlike other colonizing powers that insisted that those they conquered militarily were also culturally inferior, the Romans acknowledged Greece's political inferiority at the same time as they admitted the anteriority and superiority of Greek literature. Efforts such as Cicero's to create a body of philosophical material in Latin via translation (with a Roman flavor, of course), were based in part upon an urge to improve Latin so that it could take its place as a peer of Greek. This created an intellectual conundrum: while Latin must be improved and Greek can help with that, by the very act of translation, the act of reliance on a foreign tradition, the translator reveals that the Greek tradition is superior at this moment (even if Romans can improve it) or (even worse) *necessary*. As Rita Copeland comments:

> In *De Finibus*, Cicero expresses his ambivalence [about translation from Greek] in terms of a deep contradiction: Latin must be made a fitting linguistic instrument for the transmission of Greek philosophical texts and thought, so that it can rival the suppleness of the Greek language; yet the purpose of such refinements is to render Latin adequate to serve the Greek texts which it will carry over to Roman literary culture. Even in this express aim of linguistic rivalry, the idea of service to a superior culture is implicit. (1991, 11)[20]

Copeland refers to Cicero's dialogue *On Moral Ends* (45 BCE), and specifically to two passages, both of which complain about those who prefer to read philosophy in Greek rather than in Latin. Below are some selections from those passages:

> It is harder to satisfy those who say they despise Latin writings. In the first place, I am astonished by why these do not enjoy their native language (*patrius sermo*) when it is dealing with serious subjects,

although they are willing to read Latin plays translated (*expressas*) to the word (*ad verbum*) from Greek. Is there anyone who hates the name of Roman so much that he would scornfully reject the *Medea* of Ennius or the *Antiope* of Pacuvius, saying that because he enjoys the plays of Euripides, he hates Latin literature? "Am I" (he says) "to read the *Synephebos* of Caecilius or the *Andria* of Terence rather than both of those by Menander?". . . I do not think that those who are ignorant of our literature can look like educated men. Surely we who read "I wish that in that wood no . . . " [the opening of Ennius's *Medea*] as happily as we read the same [line] in Greek, will enjoy having what Plato wrote dialogues about on living well translated (*explicari*) into Latin? What? If I do not perform the office (*munere*)[21] of an interpreter, but preserve those things which were said by those I approve of, and add my own judgment and write them in a new arrangement, how can they come up with an argument for why they prefer the Greek writings to those which are told splendidly and not converted (*conversa*) from the Greek? (1.4–6)

Iis igitur est difficilius satisfacere, qui se Latina scripta dicunt contemnere. In quibus hoc primum est in quo admirer, cur in gravissimis rebus non delectet eos sermo patrius, cum idem fabellas Latinas ad verbum e Graecis expressas non inviti legant. Quis enim tam inimicus paene nomini Romano est, qui Enni Medeam aut Antiopam Pacuvi spernat aut reiciat quod se isdem Euripidis fabulis delectari dicat, Latinas litteras oderit? Synephebos ego, inquit, potius Caecili aut Andriam Terenti quam utramque Menandri legam? . . . mihi quidem nulli satis eruditi videntur quibus nostra ignota sunt. An 'Utinam ne in nemore . . . ' nihilo minus legimus quam hoc idem Graecum, quae autem de bene beateque vivendo a Platone disputata sunt, haec explicari non placebit Latine? Quid? Si nos non interpretum fungimur munere, sed tuemur ea quae dicta sunt ab iis quos probamus, eisque nostrum iudicium et nostrum scribendi ordinem adiungimus, quid habent cur Graeca anteponant iis quae et splendide dicta sint neque sint conversa de Graecis?

Just as I with public labors, efforts, and in the middle of dangers did not desert my position as a protector—a position where the Roman people placed me—*I* should certainly do everything that I can to labor to make my fellow citizens more learned with my laborious efforts. And I do not have to fight it out with those who prefer to read Greek literature, provided that they actually read it and are not lying. I serve those who either wish for literature in both languages, or, if they have texts in their own, do not care about reading it in the other one. (1.10)

Ego vero, quoniam forensibus operis, laboribus, periculis non deseruisse mihi videar praesidium, in quo a populo Romano locatus sum, debeo profecto, quantumcumque possum, in eo quoque elaborare, ut

> *sint opera, studio, labore meo doctiores cives mei, nec cum istis tantopere pugnare qui Graeca legere malint, modo legant illa ipsa, ne simulent, et iis servire qui vel utrisque litteris uti velint vel, si suas habeant, illas non magnopere desiderent.*

Translation is presented as a civic duty to fellow citizens—one paralleled to Cicero's political struggles during and after his consulship—who will rely on these texts to become more learned.[22] However, Cicero does not write for those without Greek: although he veers close to suggesting as much (he will make them wiser), he closes by saying he writes for those who prefer to read in Greek *and* Latin, or just in Latin, if they are given a choice between the two languages. Cicero is clearly aware of the potent nature of these Greek texts, especially in a culture where knowledge of Greek was a vital component of elite identity; hence, his insistence that he is doing more than what we would consider translation: he does not conserve the text as is, but adds something to it. What is more, he is performing a careful process of selection, as he does not translate every author, just those he approves of.

Greek culture is a cultural resource to be used,[23] and "like the Greek population and Greek material wealth, [is] a colonial resource to be exploited and expropriated" (Habinek 1998, 34) for Rome and for Cicero. Thus, it is not a surprise that Cicero here and elsewhere represents the work of transferring Greek literature as a struggle with the Greeks,[24] a struggle the Greeks have only won thus far because of Rome's late entry into the battlefield of literature. This point appears in the *Tusculan Disputations* (45 BCE), where he states that, "the learning of the Greeks overcame us in every type of literature—and it was easy for them to conquer since no one was fighting back" (1.3).[25] Competition with Greek philosophy (represented for Cicero above all by his text—see *Tusculan Disputations* 1.5–6) is framed and expressed in the language of warfare and competition; notice the use of "conquer," which stresses how inappropriate the situation is: Romans should be conquerors, Greeks the conquered.

TRANSLATION AS CULTURAL OBLIGATION

By using military language and insisting on literary translation as a necessary follow-up to military conquest, Cicero infuses translation with imperial meaning and expands it from a personal pursuit into a cultural obligation on the part of the properly educated elite:

> I encourage all those who are capable to rip from the now weak Greece the praise that follows this type of study and translate (*transferant*) it into this city, just as [our ancestors] translated (*transtulerunt*) with their energy and hard work all the rest (*reliquas*)[26] they desired . . . But if

> these studies are translated (*traducta erunt)* to us, we shall even have no need of Greek libraries, in which there is an endless number of books due to the number of those who have written, for the same things have been said by many men since the day they were crammed by books, something which will even happen to us if a large number flood to these pursuits. (*Tusculan Disputations* 2.5–6)
>
> *Quam ob rem hortor omnes qui facere id possunt, ut huius quoque generis laudem iam languenti Graeciae eripiant et transferant in hanc urbem, sicut reliquas omnes, quae quidem erant expetendae studio atque industria sua maiores nostri transtulerunt . . . Quodsi haec studia traducta erunt ad nostros, ne bibliothecis quidem Graecis egebimus, in quibus multitudo infinita librorum propter eorum est multitudinem, qui scripserunt. eadem enim dicuntur a multis, ex quo libris omnia referserunt. quod accidet etiam nostris, si ad haec studia plures confluxerint.*

By *traducta erunt* Cicero means more than a scroll-moving project (though, given his mania for collecting, he would have approved of that too); what he imagines here is a process of translation, following his lead, of Greek material. However, what is startling, especially coming from one so widely read in Greek literature, is that, like some literary cuckoo, the Latin end product is supposed to displace and replace the Greek material. In the end there will be no need for the Greek libraries that provided the source material.[27] A reader of Crassus's advice in *On the Orator* might wonder what would happen to those who sought to turn to Greek literature to develop their own style. Would this path be blocked by the Latin texts taking up space in Roman libraries? Would they be forced into replicating the style of the Latin texts that have replaced Greek texts? As this is an issue that will return in its most problematic and complete form in *On the Best Type of Orator*, let us for the moment dismiss the possibility of such a library as mere fantasy, as what Cicero suggests is almost unthinkable: Roman elite education was founded upon a basis of Greek pedagogy and to be an educated man was to be educated in both traditions, or at least, to pretend to be. And it is clear from Cicero's writings that he faced a battle convincing some Romans that this project was worth undertaking, or that the end result would be capable of replacing the Greek original.

In the *Academica* (45 BCE), the polymath Varro represents the type of Roman that Cicero's projected mass translation needs to convince. Here, Varro is speaking of why he does *not* translate philosophy:

> "I have often deliberated and thought about the topic you are asking about," Varro said. "So I will not hesitate to reply but say what comes to me readily, because—as I have said—I have thought for a long time about that very question. When I saw that Greek literature had thoroughly covered (*explicatum*) philosophy, I judged that if any Roman

were caught by an interest in the subject they would rather read Greek if they had been educated in Greek learning. But if they were holding themselves back from Greek science and literature, they would not care for this philosophy since it cannot be understood without Greek learning. So I was not willing to write what the uneducated would not understand and the educated would not care to read. You yourself can see this—for you know that it is not possible [for us] to be like Amafinius and Rabirius, who discuss things that are obvious without any art and using everyday language." (1.4–5)

Tum ille: Rem a me saepe deliberatam et multum agitatam requiris. Itaque non haesitans respondebo, sed ea dicam quae mihi sunt in promptu, quod ista ipsa de re multum ut dixi et diu cogitavi. Nam cum philosophiam viderem diligentissime Graecis litteris explicatam, existimavi si qui de nostris eius studio tenerentur, si essent Graecis doctrinis eruditi, Graeca potius quam nostra lecturos, sin a Graecorum artibus et disciplinis abhorrerent, ne haec quidem curaturos, quae sine eruditione Graeca intellegi non possunt. Itaque ea nolui scribere quae nec indocti intellegere possent nec docti legere curarent. Vides autem eadem ipse; didicisti enim non posse nos Amafinii aut Rabirii similes esse, qui nulla arte adhibita de rebus ante oculos positis vulgari sermone disputant.

What is a little ironic here is that Varro *did* write a Latin text on philosophy, the now nonextant *On Philosophy/De philosophia*, which classified its various schools and talked about the nature of philosophy, and he, as a character in a philosophical dialogue, will go on to discuss philosophy in Latin, albeit in a Ciceronian and not a Varronian text. Still, according to Varro, the preexistence of Greek texts ensures that they will stay the premier source for philosophy, no matter how sophisticated their replacements. Additionally, in Varro's scheme, translation really only can be done properly for those who know Greek, as they alone will know to what the novel terms in Latin are referring. The problem is (according to Varro) that this audience is not interested. The secondary, and to us most obvious, audience for translation, the person without Greek who reads Rabirius and Amafinius, translators of Epicurean philosophical texts, is incapable of understanding anything that is arranged or written with any art (i.e., that would be a proper translation at the literary and intellectual level of the Greek original) and, as such, is dismissed. Varro follows this up with the comment that *he* tells people to go to the sources of Greek literature, and rather smugly caps his speech by pointing out that his version of the Greek author Menippus was an imitation, not an interpretation (*Academica* 1.8).[28] However, Varro's own presence in Cicero's artfully written Latin version of Greek philosophy undercuts his own point: as the dedicatee of the *Academica*, presumably he had to read it, and what more sophisticated reader could one imagine than Varro? Even while invoking the possibility that it will go to waste and be unread, Cicero's text generates its own audience.

RIVAL TRANSLATIONS AND TRANSLATORS: EPICUREANS AND ATTICISTS

Varro mentions two translators who explain things in "everyday language" (*vulgari sermone*), the Epicureans Amafinius and Rabirius. Both authors make other appearances in Cicero, usually as translating bugbears who are quickly dismissed for their lack of art and their appeal to the general populace, something also indicated by Varro's use of *vulgari* to describe their language.[29] Given their frequent appearances, it is not right to say that "to speak about Cicero and Greek philosophy is to speak about Cicero and philosophy, period. Philosophy, for the Romans of Cicero's age, was a Greek thing, and there was no other philosophy around" (Striker 1995, 53). It seems clear from Cicero that there was plenty of other philosophy around, but as far he was concerned it wasn't the right sort or aimed at the right people.[30] In the passage above from the *Tusculan Disputations*, Cicero is careful to say that "those who are *capable*" (2.5) should translate, not everyone. He does not simply mean those with Greek skills,[31] but the right sort of people—such as Varro.

Much as we shall see that Cicero's oratorical rivals haunt the text of *On the Right Type of Orator*, so, too, Epicurean translators haunt his philosophical texts. As almost all our information on these comes via Cicero, it is difficult to assess the quality of their work, since he certainly has no intention of praising them, but it is clear that Cicero was translating in a highly competitive marketplace of ideas. It is Cicero himself who tells us that Epicurean translations are popular and widespread: at *Tusculan Disputations* 4.6–7, he compares the lack of literary works in Latin from the Academic school with the volume of works published by Amafinius and his ilk. The problem, according to Cicero, is that these appeal to a vast number of unlearned people (*multitudo*), who easily understand them,[32] and Amafinius's success has generated a set of imitators who have seized (*occupaverunt*, *Tusculan Disputations* 4.7) all Italy.

Thus, Cicero's versions of Greek philosophy compete against two sets of opponents: Greeks *and* internal, Latin rivals, who threaten Latin's status as a language suitable for communication of sophisticated thought.[33] In the preface to the first *Tusculan*, he holds back to a certain degree, merely stating, "I must now exert myself all the more [in philosophy], because there are now said to be a number of Latin books written by those who are in fact of the best sort, but not educated enough."[34] His attack at *On Moral Ends* 1.8 is far more pointed: "But I believe that some people shudder at Latin literature because they have fallen in (*inciderint*) with some crude and rough texts, writings taken from bad Greek books in worse Latin versions."[35] Cicero identifies multiple problems, then, with the Epicurean translations:[36] they are crudely written (*inculta . . . horrida*), are of bad texts in everyday language, circulate without control and with dangerous results (notice how people have "fallen in" with them), and deplete Latin's status as a literary language. Unlike Crassus's translations in *On the Orator*, they do not add to the body of

Latin, but detract from it. Something is very amiss with how Greek texts are being transferred to Rome, a situation Cicero owes it to the Romans and the Latin language to correct. It is possible that Cicero was being sincere about his motivations, as he was certainly no fan of Epicureanism. However, given how Cicero's philosophy served his own political ends and his need for a lasting legacy as his political career collapsed along with the Roman Republic, it would be foolish to imagine that this is all he was doing. Cicero was creating an audience for his translations, articulating the necessity for his own work. In his scheme, Rome needs his translations; translation was a public duty that Cicero performed, one to be set alongside his other public duties.

Naturally, if it is so important that Greek learning be transferred to Rome, then it is crucial that only the right sort of people translate and that they translate in the right way. What is the point of taking bad Greek books in the first place and then making them worse? Romans are supposed to improve, not ruin. At the very least, one should, as with Crassus, have a net gain for Latin, not a loss, as is occurring here. As Cicero says, "it has always been my judgment that our people have shown more wisdom everywhere than the Greeks, either in making discoveries for themselves, or else in improving (*elaborarent*)[37] what they considered worthy of devoting care to";[38] naturally, the same should be true for translation. Even before translation begins, then, it must involve a process of judgment and assessment based on moral and literary grounds.

Outside the translators mentioned above, there is one important translator of Epicurean philosophy whom Cicero does not mention in his philosophical writings (although he mentions him favorably in a letter to his brother): Lucretius. As I will deal with Lucretius as a translator in the next chapter, I will not speak extensively of him here, beyond pointing out that it would be easier to take Cicero at his word and dismiss his rivals as a bunch of stylistic quasi-illiterates if *On the Nature of Things* were not extant. Whatever flaws Lucretius may have, he is not a gross abuser of the Latin language. Given that Roman Epicureanism produced Lucretius, it is possible that some of the other Latin Epicureans had at least a modicum of talent and ability, although as Cassius, an Epicurean himself, referred to "all those Catii and Amafinii, those dreadful interpreters of words,"[39] it is also possible that some of them were truly appalling.[40] But without their translations, it is impossible to say. It would be a mistake, however, to think of Cicero's criticism of their writings as simply a quarrel about style: these are rivals, who must be challenged to create space for his philosophical writings. Again, it is important to realize the stakes at play here. Cicero's philosophical writings and translations sit within a critical nexus of cultural struggle, political crisis, and personal loss. As the power of Julius Caesar dominated the political sphere, philosophy remained one arena in which Cicero could still fight and leave a permanent legacy. Given the stakes at play, it is critical that he put his own imprint on his translations and drive out of the arena competitors who do not belong within his framework.

CICERO AS TRANSLATOR: SPEAKING IN THE PROPER VOICE

As far as Cicero is concerned, he is the correct person to transfer Greek philosophy to Rome, because he can add a certain dash of himself into the mix—for a dash of Cicero added to any Greek text is a very good thing and makes a Latin philosophical text worth reading. Unlike the Epicurean translators, Cicero is no *interpres*, someone who is spoken *through*; instead, he speaks for himself. In *On the Laws* (53–50 BCE),[41] a dialogue imitating Plato's *Laws*, Cicero's brother Quintus makes the comment that Cicero only seems to wish to imitate Plato in style (*orationis genus*).[42] Cicero replies:

> I may wish it—who is able or ever will be able to imitate him stylistically? For it is easy to literally translate (*interpretari*) thoughts; that I could do if I did not wish to be myself. For what effort (*negotium*) is there in speaking the same thoughts translated (*conversa*) in almost the same words?
>
> Quintus: I completely agree. But as you said just now, I would prefer you to be yourself.[43]
>
> *Velle fortasse: quis enim id potest aut umquam poterit imitari? Nam sententias interpretari perfacile est, quod quidem ego facerem, nisi plane esse vellem meus. Quid enim negotii est eadem prope verbis isdem conversa dicere?*
>
> *Quintus: Prorsus adsentior. Verum ut modo tute dixisti, te esse malo tuum.*

It is an odd exchange. For one, anyone who knew anything about Latin would raise eyebrows at Cicero's claim that there is no *negotium* (a curious word for such a project, in any case, though replicating Cicero's mercantile language of translation in other contexts) in literally translating Plato into Latin. In fact, a literal translation would probably be harder than an adaptation, especially as Cicero had scrambled to find or create Latin words to translate Greek concepts previously unexpressed in Latin.[44] Cicero takes a great deal of effort to stress that in his scheme, Plato is a model, admirable but not to be *closely* imitated for fear of losing oneself, a risk we saw Crassus warn about in *On the Orator*. Note the excess words for "you" and "yourself" in Quintus's reply: Cicero did not just speak as "you" (*te*) but as the heavily emphatic *tute*, emphasizing that this is Cicero's voice we hear, *not* Plato's. The myself of Cicero is something to be imposed on the source text, an act of which Quintus approves.

Literal translation (*interpretari*) is dangerous because it removes personality from the translator and does not allow for freedom to obviously and creatively manipulate the Greek original.[45] Too close a translation brings about too close an influence from the original text, the very thing that Crassus's use of translation was supposed to avoid. One does not translate literally, not just because literal translation makes for poor Latin style, but because literal translation makes you a slave to the original text, suppresses your own literary

personality in favor of another's. Despite Crassus's words in *On the Orator*, the Greek text carries dangers, but only if by translating too closely you allow its voice to overwhelm yours. And you always, always want to be yourself when translating, no matter how good the model. It is not because Plato is a bad author that Cicero uses his judgment, but because Cicero is *Cicero*.

At *On the Laws* 1.14.9, Cicero had dismissed interpretation in another context, criticizing elites who wasted their time on interpretation of laws: "In our community there have been great men who have spent their time in interpreting for the people and answering questions, but although they claimed great achievements, [they] have been occupied with minor ones."[46] Elites who waste their time on simple interpretation ignore larger questions about the law by focusing on details rather than on the concept of universal law. Cicero bristles, and states immediately after this that were he to follow their example, instead of producing *On the Laws* he would have produced a work on how to draw up contracts, or some other similarly limited subject. Interpreters and interpretation are linked with insufficient intellectual imagination and with work that does not belong in the elite sphere.

Cicero distinguishes himself from the *interpres* not only by style of translation, but also by his critical abilities. He says at *On Moral Ends* 1.6 that *he* is not merely translating literally from Greek but using his own judgment (*iudicium*)[47] and adding new arrangements of style, and hence should be read. Discussing Cicero's *Orator*, John Dugan comments that "Cicero's insistence upon being a judge (*iudex*) or an evaluator (*aestimator*) places himself in the more prestigious and important role of doing work of broad cultural importance, and not merely delivering lessons like some Graeculus *doctor*" (2005, 259); something similar is behind Cicero's stressing his *iudicium* in his philosophical works as well. In highlighting this element, Cicero plays up his own importance as gatekeeper to Greek literature: you gain access to it via his guidance (again, like Crassus in *On the Orator*, this elides the role of any Greek middleman). Cicero's judgment is deployed not to serve the Greek text, but to maintain his authorial voice, as can be seen from the following passage:

> So I will mainly follow the Stoics at this time and in this debate not as an interpreter; instead, I will draw (as is my habit) from those sources using my own personal judgment in whatever way seems good to me. (*On Moral Duties/De officiis* 1.6)
>
> *Sequimur igitur hoc quidem tempore et hac in quaestione potissimum Stoicos, non ut interpretes, sed, ut solemus. e fontibus eorum iudicio arbitrioque nostro, quantum quoque modo videbitur, hauriemus.*

Cicero's control over his sources is absolute—he takes what he wants, as he wants. And that is the point of having Cicero translate, after all: you get the value of his taste and literary ability. If that doesn't interest you, then you might as well pick up a text translated by Rabirius or Amafinius.

ON THE BEST TYPE OF ORATOR AND TRANSLATING LIKE AN ORATOR

If this is the case with philosophical translation, then what of oratorical translation and translators? I started with *On Invention* and Crassus's discussion of translation in *On the Orator*; I now move to Cicero's later oratorical writings and what they have to say on translation. In Translation Studies, his most famous work is probably *On the Best Type of Orator*, which claims to be a preface to a translation of Aeschines and Demosthenes, two Athenian/Attic orators (the translation was probably never completed or, if it was completed, was never circulated). As befits a preface, it is a relatively short work—only seven pages in the Oxford Classical Texts series. However, its extent as a Ciceronian preface is highly unusual and blurs the line between a preface and a treatise. The amount of care bestowed in this particular case is instructive, given that we know Cicero was often careless in his use of prefaces, writing them in advance and placing them in a volume for later attachment to a dialogue—and even, on one embarrassing occasion, providing one he had already used; his care here shows how seriously he took the projected work.[48] Although this piece is often quoted from in discussions of translation, its larger structure is rarely discussed; and too rarely do people discuss it alongside the other rhetorical treatises Cicero produced, the literary controversy it was dealing with, or its political and historical context.

Only a very small portion of this preface addresses translation directly, as the majority of the text is devoted to a discussion of the ideal orator and true Atticism. Like *Brutus* and *Orator*, both written in the same year (46 BCE), it was composed against a background of controversy over rhetorical style, the Atticism vs. Asianism debate. Atticism is a complicated and not entirely understood phenomenon, and in the following I only provide a broad outline.[49] Headed by the orator Calvus (82–c. 47 BCE), it was a movement that seems to have been particularly vibrant in the 50s BCE, privileging a simple and "pure" Latin style modeled on authors (not just orators) from Athens, hence the name "Attic"; it also eschewed the use of prose rhythm (of which Cicero was a master).[50] Although I have described it as a movement, we ought not to think of something organized with a particular set of ideas to which all those who claimed to be Atticists had to adhere; rather, it was "a movement in the sense of a fashion or a trend with a set of only more or less coherent ideas that is shared by a number of people" (Wisse 1995, 70–71). Thus, although many Atticists used the Athenian orators Lysias and Hyperides as their models, they could and did turn to other authors.[51] However, oratory from c. 300 BCE up to Cicero's day was rejected as a model for its perceived failure to retain the purity of pre-Hellenistic Athens.[52]

Asianism, although sometimes deployed as a term of abuse, was still a respectable enough style in the 40s to be used to describe the oratory of Hortensius (*Brutus* 325, with discussion of the style; but see 326–27 for

some critical reactions to Hortensius's oratory). It was thought to derive from the Greek cities of Asia Minor, hence the name; however, for the Romans, it was used "without much geographical or historical precision . . . as a term designed to denigrate oratory they deemed bloated and excessively emotional" (Dugan 2001, 406). The Atticists considered it florid, excessive, and effeminate. The bodily metaphors used for style are not accidental, as debates over oratory frequently devolved into attacks on the inappropriate use of the body, and the insults tossed around in the 50s were no exception.[53] We know from a later work on oratory by the historian Tacitus (c. 56–118 CE) that Calvus called Cicero's oratory "loose and limp" (*solutum et enervem*), while Brutus termed it "effeminate and askew" (*fractum atque elumbem*, *A Dialogue on Oratory/Dialogus* 18.5); the sexual insults are obvious and intentional. In response, Cicero called Calvus "bloodless and dried out" (*exsanguem et aridum*), and Brutus "lazy and disjointed" (*otiosum atque diiunctum*, *A Dialogue on Oratory/Dialogus* 18.5)—at least, he did in the letters Tacitus preserves; in his published writings, Cicero was more restrained. In *Brutus* 283, he complimented Calvus's learning before saying that "he completely lost his true vitality" (*verum sanguinem deperdebat*) due to a process of excessive self-examination and fear of making mistakes. "In the *Brutus* Cicero . . . presented the Atticist movement with a long-range historical narrative of weakening health. Cicero traces Atticism's genealogy from its birth in Athens to its self-proclaimed heirs as one of a decline from Athenian robustness to Roman anorexia" (Dugan 2005, 217; see also Dugan 2001, 407–9). According to Cicero, Atticism—or rather, a misunderstood form of Atticism—enervates and takes away vital force. Similar criticism reoccurs in *On the Best Type of Orator*, which "repeats the bodily-figured criticism of Calvus and applies it broadly to the Atticist movement as a whole. He grants that the Atticists are 'healthy and dry,' but their soundness is like those of amateur athletes, not Olympic champions" (Dugan 2005, 217).

Energy, vitality, and force were all words that played a significant role in what was a hard-fought debate; it should come as no surprise that force (*vis*) is one of the key phrases used in *On the Best Type of Orator*[54] when discussing translation. Cicero works his way slowly towards the topic of *vis*, choosing to open obliquely by saying "the types of orators are said to be like those of poets: that is wrong, as the latter has many varieties."[55] He then moves into a description of the various types of poetry and poets before claiming that, "I do not divide the orator into types: for I am looking for the perfect example. There is only one type of perfect orator, and those who are not like him do not belong to a different type as Terence differs from Accius, but, although inferior, are of the same type" (3).[56] He then outlines what the perfect orator does: instructs, delights, and moves his listeners through speaking in "good Latin" (*Latine*), that is to say, without faults, smoothly, and elegantly, and with excellent memory and delivery (*actio*). The most perfect example of an orator is Demosthenes,[57] *the* model to emulate: "there is no orator who does not wish that he was like Demosthenes, but Menander

did not wish to resemble Homer; for he was writing a different type [of poetry]" (6).[58] (In *Orator* 7–8, Cicero takes this one step farther and searches for an orator so perfect that he has perhaps never existed.)

If it seems a little odd that, given Cicero is talking about speaking *Latine*, he does not mention an equivalent Latin model, it is. Throughout *On the Best Type of Orator*, Cicero *never* mentions or quotes from *any* Latin oratorical text. What he does say is that Atticism has been misunderstood by rival orators, such as Calvus, and Attic is not just a simple, unadorned style such as that of Greek orator Lysias (9). Faux Roman Atticists have misunderstood this, because "they judge the forcefulness (*vim*) of eloquence by their own ability, not by its nature" (13).[59] Here we come finally to the issue of *vis*, so integral to understanding Cicero's dispute with the Atticists. According to Cicero, these pseudo-Atticists could never be real translators of anything truly Attic in any sense, because they cannot see the *vis* of a word or a text (if they could, then their oratory would reproduce that quality). This is why they fail to transfer the power of Demosthenes, one of whose primary qualities, according to Cicero, was his *vis* (*On the Orator* 1.89, 2.60, 3.28). That Atticists, or at least the Atticists under attack here, actually did not use Demosthenes as their primary model, but preferred Lysias, is beside the point. As a master orator, Cicero has no trouble shifting the grounds of the argument to his advantage.

This criticism of those who have taken the wrong pedagogical lessons from their readings of Attic orators by translating their style in inappropriate ways is not confined to *On the Best Type of Orator*, but appears in the other rhetorical treatises and in his philosophical works.[60] Witness, for example, his exasperated comment at *Tusculan Disputations* 2.3 about those who, faced with the richness of Attic style and models, retreated into a barren and famished model that was dry and useless in the courts. (Incidentally, this suggests that to improve their style, others were doing much as Cicero's Crassus said he had done, but they failed because of their inability to correctly handle the Greek texts they had chosen to imitate; not all orators are capable of correctly managing their sources, hence the need for Cicero to translate oratorical texts as well as philosophy.)

Here we arrive at *On the Best Type of Orator* 14 and its famous discussion of translation:

> I translated (*converti*) the most famous orations of the two most eloquent orators from Attica, Aeschines and Demosthenes, orations which were ranged on opposite sides; I did not translate (*converti*) them as an interpreter, but as an orator, with the same ideas, forms and, as it were, shape, and with language fitted to our usage. In this I did not think it necessary to render (*reddere*) word for word, but instead preserved every category and the force (*vim*) of the words. For I did not think that I should dole them out piece by piece to the reader, but rather, shall we say, pay them out by weight. This work of mine will bring this about:

> our people will know what to ask from those who wish to be Atticists and to what—just as if it were a pattern (*formulam*) for speech—they ought to call them back.
>
> *Converti enim ex Atticis duorum eloquentissimorum nobilissimas orationes inter seque contrarias, Aeschini et Demostheni; nec converti ut interpres, sed ut orator, sententiis isdem et earum formis tamquam figuris, verbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis. In quibus non verbum pro verbo necesse habui reddere, sed genus omne verborum vimque servavi. Non enim ea me adnumerare lectori putavi oportere, sed tamquam appendere. Hic labor meus hoc adsequetur, ut nostri homines quid ab illis exigant, qui se Atticos volunt, et ad quam eos quasi formulam dicendi revocent intellegant.*

This passage is often read as describing a binary opposition between two types of existing translators: the interpreter (literal translator) and the orator (free translator). For example, one introduction to Translation Studies states that:

> the "interpreter" of the first line is the literal ("word-for-word") translator, while the "orator" tried to produce a speech that moved the listeners. In Roman times, "word-for-word" translation was exactly what it said: the replacement of each individual word of the ST (invariably Greek) with its closest grammatical equivalent in Latin. This is because the Romans would read the TTs side by side with the Greek STs. (Munday 2001, 19)

Unfortunately, almost all of this statement is incorrect: literal translations of literary texts in Rome are more talked about than actual; the Romans in at least one instance translated a non-Greek text (Mago's farming manual); Cicero never actually says that his translation is intended to move his listeners; and the cumbersome nature of ancient scrolls would make side-by-side reading difficult. Cicero himself produced translations without a source text open in front of him, relying on his memory rather than on the written word, a process that produced errors such as the misattribution of a Homeric speech at *On Divination* 2.63.[61] As I have argued, it is likely that in reading a complicated Greek literary text for the first time, a Roman would have had another party present, an educated Greek (free or slave), as a guide. What arguments such as Jeremy Munday's above do is to reformulate Cicero and other Roman theorizations of translation according to modern concerns of responsibility to STs and how that responsibility is best expressed. However, these are not appropriate categories for discussing Cicero and most Roman writers on translation, who swing along a different axis, one concerned primarily with how they can make the Greek text work for themselves, the Roman translators.

At *On the Best Type of Orator* 14, Cicero is not just claiming the power of preserving the *vis* of his ST, but is asserting that he knows how to manage the economy of linguistic exchange that occurs in translation. By using

the terms *adnumerare* and *appendere*, Cicero "suggests that the source text, once transferred into the system of Latin currency, takes on a new value of its own" (Copeland 1991, 34),[62] and at a price he has fixed. The numerical element is also present in *reddere*; as in this verb, "the translational sense of rendering is overshadowed by the pecuniary sense of repaying a debt, rendering back to the owner what one has borrowed" (Robinson 1992a, 25). But *reddo*, especially when coupled with *accipio*, is part of the language of aristocratic exchange;[63] here, the exchange is textual, and it is subsumed into the aristocratic economy that operates in terms not of money, but of prestige.[64] For Cicero, proper translation is an exchange between elites and, hence, excludes the interpreter.

By the repeated use of the language of monetary exchange and correct (aristocratic) payment of debts, Cicero argues that there are proper and improper ways to introduce this piece of cultural capital to Rome. By describing the interpreter's process of translation as resembling an individual counting out of coins, Cicero implies that he or she has control of the text only on a piecemeal and limited basis. Cicero, or the figure of the orator, alone understands how to weigh the works of Demosthenes and Aeschines in their entirety, because he has access to a larger knowledge and does not engage in petty commerce. Rather like Jupiter with his scales, overseeing and judging the human world, the orator stands above and over the text and judges its true value. In addition, Cicero presents himself as the new owner of the Greek text, the one who pays out its words properly to its discerning Roman buyers. But Cicero is no petty merchant clinking coins together; unlike the fumbling *interpres*, he works in a large-scale economy and knows that the true debt must be paid out in a grand manner, not coin by coin.

Cicero will take the texts of Demosthenes and Aeschines out of the cultural economy of Greek literature and insert them into the Roman one on his own terms; the new translation "will bring this about: our people will know what to ask from those who wish to be Atticists and to what—just as if it were a pattern (*formulam*) for speech—they ought to refer them back." Cicero's translation is once more presented as a public service, but one that will box the Atticists in with a *formula*, a rule.[65] If Cicero elsewhere talks about using his judgment when translating, his use of *formula* here also invokes processes of judging and legal adjudication, as a *formula* is also a set form of words, a specimen plea in the praetor's *album*, serving as a model for the wording of the next. That this might run the risk of turning Cicero's imitators into the type of person he criticized at *On the Orator* 1.236 for mindlessly parroting legal patterns, the singer of *formulae* (*cantor formularum*), is an issue he does not raise here, for obvious reasons.

Cicero continually stresses that his translation is a rigid pattern that must be followed, saying in the concluding lines to *On the Best Type of Orator* that his new version, rather than the Greek text, "will be a rule (*regula*), by which the speeches of those who wish to speak in the Attic fashion may be regulated" (*dirigantur*, 23).[66] In other words, "Cicero has arrogated for his

texts a seminal status for future students, so that his translations will replace and hence displace the Greek speeches as reference points for Atticist style in Latin oratory" (Copeland 1991, 33). All is this is heavily emphasized by Cicero's choice of language: by using *regula* and *dirigantur*, he is firmly insisting that this pattern will not allow one to color outside the lines. Both words aim at holding people to clear and precise standards. *Regula*'s first meaning is ruler, a rod that one uses to measure or to draw straight lines (OLD 1); its secondary meaning, which grows from the first, is a basic principle in conduct, language, or thought (OLD 2). It is, by definition, emphatically inflexible. This translation will attempt to box the budding orator into reproducing Atticism along Ciceronian lines, something stressed by the additional use of *dirigantur*, a verb whose basic meaning is arrangement and straightness, with additional meanings of guiding and directing. Through translation, Cicero directs and guides one to proper understanding, unlike the faux Atticists, who fixate on one limited orator, import unsuitable models such as Thucydides into oratory, or produce flabby, impotent translations. There is the one final line of *On the Best Type of Orator* that I shall return to, but first we must look at the unwritten but potential translation, the one that Cicero attacks: that of the interpreter.

TRANSLATING AS AN INTERPRETER

Cicero rejects the interpreter as translator elsewhere in his writings, as at *On Moral Ends* 3.15:

> It is not necessary to squeeze out [a translation] word by word, as ineloquent interpreters do, when there is a more familiar word conveying the same meaning. Indeed, I usually use several words to expose what is expressed in Greek by one, if I am unable to do anything else.
>
> *nec tamen exprimi verbum e verbo necesse erit, ut interpretes indiserti solent, cum sit verbum quod idem declaret magis usitatum; equidem soleo etiam quod uno Graeci, si aliter non possum, idem pluribus verbis exponere.*

How does an interpreter translate? And outside of his or her inability to pay out a text to the Roman reader properly, what else is wrong with an interpreter's translation? This passage provides an answer to that question, an answer that is connected to the nature of Roman education. Here, the *interpres* is also described as ineloquent (*indisertus*). We might consider this an oxymoron, for what would be the point of an ineloquent interpreter? However, when Cicero uses *indisertus,* he is doing more than simply suggesting that the interpreter cannot speak fluidly and fluently. *Indisertus* means ineloquent in a particular sense, namely, uneducated in rhetoric, the final stage in a Roman education.[67] Thus, in *On the Nature of the Gods*, one

speaker says he would not be afraid to argue with a pupil of the Academy who was *indisertum* (2.1), though he fears his current interlocutors, who are masters of rhetoric. The positive form of the adjective (*disertus*) can be used as a substantive for *orator* (as at *Orator* 13), implying a wealth of education and training achieved over a lengthy study of Greek and Latin oratory. To be *disertus* was bound up in the very nature of the orator, who was a fully educated, adult male, capable of taking his place in the battlegrounds of the courts or the Senate; to be its opposite implies not just lack of eloquence, but lack of all those qualities.

It is this aspect (or rather, the lack of it in the *indisertus* individual) that is, as Copeland points out (1991, 16–30), pivotal for understanding many of Cicero's problems with the interpreter as translator, as it links the interpreter and interpretation with limited education. Education of any sort was an expensive undertaking in the Roman and Greek worlds, and certain types of education were not just expensive but out of reach for those who could not tap into a social network that would enable them to become fully finished orators. It was divided (though the divisions were not absolute or fixed) into three stages: the *ludus litterarius*, *schola grammatici*, and *rhetoris schola*, with the rhetorician/orator representing the final stage in an elite education.[68] In Cicero's period, while the aspiring orator would spend time studying with a Greek orator (as Cicero himself did) as part of this finishing process, he also needed to spend time in apprenticeship to another Roman who had mastered the art of rhetoric, in the *tirocinium fori* (Richlin 1997, 92–93; Stroup 2010, 141–44). This process was meant to ensure that the upper ranks of orators (the elite) remained a closed social and ethnic circle, albeit one that had to be constantly policed against encroachers, as it ensured that successful orators had to gain access to a small circle of older, elite, Roman men, who would take them on as informal pupils before they could launch their careers in court.

This second stage of education, the school of the grammarian, is explicitly linked with *interpretatio* in several of our sources. Grammarians in antiquity were concerned with more than matters of grammar (i.e., the technical study of language), and the grammarian's role was more complicated than simply that of being a pedantic guide through a poetic text,[69] but this early stage of education did involve a considerable degree of what we might see as obsessively close reading. As Robert Kaster points out, among the grammarians, study of the ancient poets involved "line-by-line and word-by-word progress through the text," concentrating on "weighing individual words, phrases, and verses" (1997, 12–13).

That the grammarian and Cicero's interpreter are related is suggested also by *On the Orator* 1.118. There Cicero described one of the roles of the *grammaticus* as the interpretation of words (*verborum interpretatio*),[70] as well as their proper pronunciation, while the orator taught invention, style, arrangement, memory, and delivery; the inclusion of *interpretatio* as part of the grammarian's sphere rather than the orator's is significant. Other

sources also suggest a link between the *grammaticus* and the *interpres*. The Roman biographer and historian Cornelius Nepos (100–24 BCE) called the grammarians *interpretes* of poetry,[71] and the biographer Suetonius rated the early translators of Greek literature into Latin as lower than the grammarians because, although they taught, and thus preceded the grammarians as teachers in Rome, "they did nothing more than interpret (or literally translate?) the Greeks, or, if they had composed in Latin, read from it" (*On the Grammarians* 1.1).[72]

EDUCATION AND LITERAL TRANSLATIONS

Casting a wider eye over education in the Roman Empire, there is some evidence that certain types of education might make a student a more literal translator, especially if she or he overused lexicons, as did some students in Egyptian schools, where glossaries were used to teach Latin (Morgan 1998, 167).[73] These schools and teachers seem to have constantly employed (and at times overemployed) these lexicons without much regard for contextualized gradations in meaning (Fisher 1982; Rochette 1997b, 190); in other words, students always used the same Latin word to translate the same Greek word, and vice versa, regardless of the context. Glossaries as sources of translations may have been used elsewhere: in Rome, there may have been specialized dictionaries for various scientific and other subjects which were employed for the purposes of translation (Horsfall 1979; on scientific translations, see Fögen 2005), but, as I have pointed out, elite Romans usually relied on memory or a handy Greek for lexical information. It is possible that if a translator only had an education that involved close reading and a deep interest in explicating words on an individual level, and never moved beyond that, he might be inclined towards literal translation. In other words, a system that privileged the individual word—even if it did not teach translation directly—might produce someone with a tendency towards word-for-word translation, especially if one never progressed beyond this stage.

Thus, it is possible that Cicero's criticism was aimed at a real issue with a class of translations. However, there is one large problem with speculating about a mass of literal translators with limited educations: while we have evidence of word-for-word translation in nonliterary contexts, especially for official inscriptions, there is very little indication of it in literary contexts. We have plenty of very free translations of parts of Greek texts (many of them coming from emphatically nonelite sources like Plautus), but beyond a line or two, we have *no* extant literal literary translation. We only have one line of an infamously literal (*verbum e verbo*) translation of the *Iliad* by Attius Labeo (first century CE), not enough to judge anything, beyond that this one line is both a fairly close rendition of the Greek and at the same time extremely free, as it uses nonepic and nonelite language (Courtney 2003, 350) to translate a text that was "high" literature. It is possible this is evidence

for literal translation at Rome at a nonelite level, and for translations aimed at those who could not afford the time and money to learn Greek, but it is also possible that Labeo was attempting a radically different type of translation by shifting the linguistic register of the original in his version. The only textual example we have of someone using a Latin translation of Homer's *Iliad* as a crutch to help them through the Greek is the freed slave Trimalchio in Petronius's *Satyricon*; whatever translation we are to imagine him as reading was certainly not literal, given that he believes that Agamemnon ran off with Helen and the Trojan war took place between Troy and Tarentum (on Labeo, Trimalchio, and translations of Homer, see further Chapter 6). Based on our extant evidence, the existence of a body of translators who translated literary texts literally is highly dubious.

However, while we should read Cicero's comments about the way he translates as being part of a larger cultural debate over who controls different aspects of education, it is not necessary to tie the figure of the *interpres* solely to the figure of the grammarian to do this. Cicero uses this term for a wide range of figures: the interpreter in the Senate, the interpreter of dreams, the interpreter of the law, and so forth;[74] but he also uses the term to refer to those who are interpreters in a more literal sense.[75] And perhaps Cicero's comments about not translating as an interpreter should also be read literally, as referring to an oral translator, a figure that Cicero and other Roman officials used in the provinces and within the Senate. An interpreter is not only the mouthpiece of another (Boutin 2005, 170), but produces an oral translation that vanishes as soon as he or she ceases to speak. Additionally, as seen in Chapter 1, interpreters were also used to put distance between Romans and those they were addressing. Further, interpreters could be used to break up the charm of Greek rhetoric (Valerius Maximus 2.2.2). But Cicero does not want to be seen as someone who stands between the reader and the text, or who breaks up the flow of its rhetoric: he wants to *be* the text, the Aeschines or Demosthenes that Romans use as their model for Attic style. Additionally, while interpreters might have appeared eloquent, they used borrowed speech and were not supposed to be creative translators. All of these were problematic connotations for a translator who positioned himself as Cicero had.

In identifying and rejecting the figure of the interpreter, Cicero is not attempting to perform a service to the ST; Cicero translates the way he does out of regard for his own status as an elite orator/translator rather than out of concern for rendering the meaning of the Greek. There was nothing worse than becoming the parrot of another writer (as the interpreter was of a speaker). After all, as Crassus said in *On the Orator*, the whole point was to use translation to try to avoid becoming too overly influenced by another text. The reader of *On the Best Type of Orator* is thus invited to sail between the Scylla of the faux Atticists and the Charybdis of the interpreter to arrive at the correct translation—Cicero's. This translation will be the pattern by which you judge your own and others' Atticism. But we

should note how radically this alters what Crassus said in *On the Orator* and how much it contrasts with everything else we know about translation as a component in Roman pedagogy. As an orator, you did not translate with the aim of producing a translated text that others necessarily read; you translated so that your other writing and speaking abilities improved and became more individualized, thus making you more effective as a speaker. Cicero appears to be the inventor and, apart from the poet Horace, the only Roman practitioner of teaching style through a *translation* rather than through *translating*.

Crucially, in *On the Best Type of Orator*, Cicero never gives guidelines or advice on how to write in the Attic style; he says that other people do not write or speak Atticly enough, but that is another thing altogether. What he gives you is his translation, which aims at removing the ability to return to the source text. *This* text—not the original Greek texts—will be a rule to understand what true Atticism is. According to its final, startling line, the text speaks in the voices of Aeschines and Demosthenes, as Cicero concludes by writing "enough of myself; now let us hear Aeschines himself speaking in Latin."[76] This is a remarkable statement: not only is Aeschines figured as speaking through the text, through Cicero, but he also has an almost physical presence. It is a startling case of *prosopopeia*, where Cicero animates the ghosts of the Greek orators and speaks for them. He performs Aeschines and Demosthenes, remaking them into his own literary ancestors (Spencer 2011, 103–104) and silencing them (or attempting to, at any rate) with his own *Latin* voice. This would clash with the pedagogical model of translating from Greek that Cicero has Crassus give in *On the Orator*; even if you were then to try to create your own style of Attic speech, it would surely be irredeemably influenced by Cicero's style. Instead of being liberating, this translation would be constricting.

Writing of *Orator* and *Brutus*, John Dugan notes how both are "finely attuned to the question of how texts can provide adequate representations of the speech, self, and intentions of its author" (2005, 297). In animating Aeschines and Demosthenes, Cicero is not just content to have the text represent him, the author—though it certainly does that—but goes one step further by making the translation a representation of both himself and a new, Latin-speaking Aeschines and Demosthenes. He hijacks the Greek original and layers his own voice over it to create a Ciceronian Atticism that has the advantage of seeming to be authorized by him *and* the original author. In other words, Cicero's text becomes the *persona* of Aeschines in Rome. If the *Brutus* tailors the history of Roman oratory to lead towards Cicero, then in *On the Best Type of Orator* he slyly inserts his version of Atticism into the past. In effect, Cicero becomes the past and the future of Roman oratory: everywhere you go there is Cicero.

Where does this leave the Greek text? To answer that we should look back to *Tusculan Disputations* 2.5–6, the passage where Cicero asked others to take up translating so that there would be no more need of Greek

libraries. Cicero's translation is meant to operate in the same way: somehow it becomes the rule for Atticism, rather than the original Greek text. One reads (surely) Cicero's text rather than the original. In fact, in *On the Nature of the Gods*, Cicero suggests that his translation of Aratus's *Phaenomena,* a third-century BCE didactic poem on the stars and weather signs, has actually managed to replace the original, by inserting within the dialogue his own appreciative audience. One interlocutor, Balbus, mentions that he has enjoyed Cicero's version of Aratus so much that he has memorized it.[77] He then proceeds to recite pieces of the translation in preference to the original (2.104); so extensive are the quotations that it almost seems like an advertisement for Cicero's ability to translate poetry as well as prose.[78] Presumably, Cicero also hoped that future generations of orators would learn Aeschines off by heart not in Greek, but in Latin, in a version fixed and authorized by Cicero.

THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF CICERONIAN TRANSLATION THEORY

On the Best Type of Orator is part of a three-pronged attack or a triptych of works, intended to work in tandem with *Brutus* and *Orator*. And it is hard not to be dazzled by the brilliance and completeness of Cicero's project to answer the attacks of the Atticists: in *Brutus* he wrote the history of Roman oratory to suit his own model;[79] in the *Orator* he gave rules; and with *On the Best Type of Orator* he attempted to stop the Atticists from going back to the Greek model by providing himself as Aeschines. The problem is that if, as Erik Gunderson says, "the ancient orator becomes the self he performs,"[80] what happens to the person of Cicero once he performs the words of Aeschines or Demosthenes? Is he no longer himself once he becomes Aeschines? Does he actually become an *interpres*, one who speaks in the shadow of another, despite all of his determination not to translate as one?

In this question, we see the paradox that the final line of *On the Best Type of Orator* presents, a paradox that within the Ciceronian scheme of translation is irresolvable. For if Cicero translates so that he is good enough to become the text he translates, to become Aeschines, then the Atticists may take him up. However, Cicero can only manage this if his translation is so effective that *it seems almost exactly the same as the original.* In short, he loses that which he argues elsewhere makes his philosophical translations worth reading in Latin: himself. By saying "enough of myself" and dismissing his own voice from the translation in favor of that of Demosthenes and Aeschines, he suggests that he has allowed the original texts and the original authors to overcome him, to swamp his voice. The more Cicero could convince people that his translation was so like Aeschines and Demosthenes that it could be taken as a pattern of their style in Latin, the less of himself that the translation would appear to hold (no matter how Ciceronian it actually was), and, thus, Cicero would not get the credit for influencing Latin Attic style. It was an unattractive prospect for someone so keen

on being recognized as the pinnacle of Roman oratory; ultimately, surely, Cicero would have backed away from handing over such authority to the Greek original, or else risk losing (or being seen to lose) the voice on which he had relied for so long. Hence, I suspect, the abandonment of this translation project and the unfinished nature of the preface: Cicero looked into the abyss of self-erasure he had potentially created and quickly retreated.

This perhaps explains the legacy of this use of a translation to teach style. Later authors such as Pliny and Quintilian were happy to take up the pedagogical model of translation and to see translation as a process of competition with the original text; however, almost no one was willing to attempt to present a model of style through translation. Or rather, I should say almost no one: one poet, Horace, took up the challenge, as we shall see in the next chapter.

5 Late Republican and Augustan Poets on Translation

Catullus, Horace, Lucretius, and Germanicus Caesar

While Cicero was writing about proper forms of translation and undertaking his massive project of translating Greek philosophy into Latin, a host of poets were also translating and formulating their own ideas about the function and practice of translation. This chapter will focus on four poets of the Late Republican and Augustan periods. Two wrote lyric poetry (Catullus and Horace) and two wrote didactic epic (Lucretius and Germanicus Caesar). Two of the four can perhaps only be called translators in a broader sense: Lucretius took Greek philosophy (Epicureanism) and translated it into Latin verse; Horace translated Greek meters into Latin.[1] Catullus, however, left us two seemingly straight translations, one of Sappho's Poem 31 and one of Callimachus's *Lock of Berenice*. Finally, as Cicero had done a generation before, Germanicus Caesar translated Aratus's *Phaenomena*. Although these poets occupy their own chapter, this does not mean that they operated in a separate sphere from Cicero and his circles. There was considerable overlap in social circles and interests, particularly between Cicero and Catullus.[2] Cicero certainly knew of neoteric poets such as Catullus (the term "neoteric" comes from his letters), even if he was not fond of their style.[3]

PARTHENIUS OF NICAEA AND TRANSLATING GREEK MYTHOLOGY TO ROME

I begin not with a Roman, but a Greek: Parthenius of Nicaea.[4] Parthenius came to Rome in the late 70s or early 60s BCE; his arrival was not voluntary, as he was brought there as a slave by the Roman general Cinna. According to the *Suda*, a medieval Byzantine dictionary compiled around 1000 CE, "he was among the spoils taken by Cinna, when the Romans defeated Mithridates. Then he was freed on account of his education, and lived until the time of Tiberius Caesar" (*Suda* Π 664; Lightfoot's translation).[5] When precisely the capture happened is not entirely clear, and we cannot be sure which Cinna was responsible, the poet or his father.[6]

Parthenius was primarily famous in antiquity as a poet, but almost all of his poetry is now lost to us. I include him here because of his one surviving

complete text, which is fascinating for what it can tell us about Greek help in facilitating and enabling poetic translation. This text is the *Erotica Pathemata/Sufferings of Love* (hereafter *EP*), a prose treatise in Greek that recounts 36 myths, all centering around unhappy loves. It was dedicated to the poet and politician Cornelius Gallus, the same Gallus who erected the trilingual monument at Philae.[7] Although Parthenius was not a translator in a linguistic sense (we have no evidence he ever wrote anything in Latin), the *EP* is a form of translation that also seeks to enable Roman translation of Greek myth. For all of our losses, and for all the questions we cannot answer about him, Parthenius still provides us with a unique opportunity to see how a Greek writes about translation and prepares something for translation.

Despite our lack of knowledge about Parthenius and the fact that we have barely any of his work, a great deal has been claimed for his influence on Latin poetry. Although no contemporary poet mentions Parthenius, Macrobius (a fifth-century source) claimed he was a *grammaticus* to Virgil in Greek (*Saturnalia* 5.17.18). Based on little direct information on Parthenius from Roman sources, scholars have claimed variously that: he brought expert knowledge of Callimachus to Rome and in the process revolutionized Latin poetry (Clausen 1964); he brought epyllion, miniature epic, to Rome and inspired Cinna's *Zmyrna* (Crowther 1976, 69 and 71); and he inspired other new poets such as Calvus, and guided Gallus's poetry (Ross 1975, 31). Some have found such claims too strong, especially as by the time Parthenius was dragged to Rome, the Romans had been aware of Hellenistic poetry for some time (Lightfoot 1999, 52). In the end, given our loss of Parthenius's own works and that of most neoteric poets he might have influenced, there is no way to be sure. What we can say is that based on extant Latin poetry, the stories in the *EP* made little impact on Parthenius's Roman contemporaries, as very few of the tales made their way into Latin verse. However, the *EP* is still worthwhile examining as a translation project, especially as we know that works like those of Parthenius, which summarized material for Roman authors, were drawn upon by authors like Cicero, even if those summaries do not survive.[8]

Now to the *EP* and how it frames itself as a collection for translation. Parthenius's dedication is short and to the point:

> Thinking, Cornelius Gallus, that the collection of sufferings in love was very appropriate to you, I have selected them and sent them to you in as brief a form as possible. For those among the present collection that occur in certain poets, where they are not narrated in their own right, you will find out for the most part from what follows. You, too, will be able to render the most suitable of them into hexameters and elegiacs. Think none the worse of them because they lack that quality of refined elaboration which you pursue. For I have collected them after the fashion of a little notebook, and they will, I trust, serve you in the same way.

Parthenius explicitly positions his work as something usable for producing Roman poetry, a Greek collection that will work in Latin. In this we could see a link with Macrobius's comment that Parthenius was also Virgil's *grammaticus*. While a *grammaticus* might simply act as a teacher in the early stages of education, he could also offer aid to those who had moved far beyond the schoolroom, either helping with difficult Greek texts or with writing up a handy epitome:[9]

> Practicing writers employed *grammatici* for three main purposes, for help in research, in reading, and for stylistic advice. The most important research function was the making of epitomes, which were often used as scenarios for composition. Books were expensive, often hard to find, and difficult physically to consult. So epitomes were a common, if under-reported, convenience. (Francese 1999, 65)

Parthenius's introductory lines and his entire work:

> presuppose numerous types of translation, only the most basic of which is interlingual; others include: verse into prose and back into verse; non-amatory into amatory; and epic into elegy. But a more fundamental type of translation is implicit—that Greek myth will work in Latin, and that these Greek myths will be the "same" myths even in a Latin context. Parthenius sees no difficulty in his taking myths from Greek poetry, turning them into Greek prose and, then, having Gallus turn them into Latin poetry. (Fletcher 2011, 14)

In other words, what we have in the opening lines of the *EP* is a translation preface and a *pre*translation preface at one and the same time: the stories have already been translated by being taken from their original sources (where, however, they were only touched upon) and arranged so they can be translated by Gallus from prose into poetry and from Greek into Latin. What Parthenius doesn't say is as instructive as what he does: beyond the reference to hexameters (actually to epic, though epyllion is surely meant) and elegiacs, there is no guidance for what Gallus should do with the text.[10] The only guidance that Parthenius provides is the example of himself and his own work, because he notes that he, too, draws on this source, and ends the preface with the hope that Gallus will use the stories in a similar way. Whether Parthenius actually thought this would be as uncomplicated a practice as his preface suggests is not recoverable (in fact, one of the stories, that of Daphne and Apollo, does present a problem in translation; see below); however, the preface insists that translation is possible and even desirable, for only via translation can these stories receive the "refined elaboration" typical of Gallus's work.

The preface allows us for a moment to recover the silent Greek middleman whom Cicero elides in *On Oratory*, and who is similarly elided in Catullus

and other Latin authors. Parthenius articulates a world where two poets—a Greek and a Roman—access the same stories simultaneously, and the same (obscure) material is a treasure store for two linguistic traditions. He reinforces the connection between himself and Gallus through the repeated use of "you" in his preface (Lightfoot 1999, 371), creating an intimacy that fits well with his gift and obscures any tension arising from Parthenius's social inferiority (this is presented as a gift from an equal). He also does not mention any language difference; read on its own, we might assume from this that both Parthenius and Gallus wrote in Greek. He offers these texts up willingly and in a preselected form. Noticeably, although Parthenius says this is a selection, he does not say what principles guided his choices, beyond that the stories have not been fully told by another author: Gallus and his other readers must take him on trust that this will work and that the stories are the best *and* extremely obscure. The selection of the stories, however, is where Parthenius's care in preparing the collection as a translatable object shows. Comparing the *EP* with other mythographers' texts, we find that Parthenius includes a higher percentage of myths that are connected to Italy and the West and far fewer aetiologies and cult details. In other words, he "offers little material that is culturally specific" (Fletcher 2011, 15). His focus is also different from other mythographers, being largely concentrated on the human rather than the divine plane (Fletcher 2011); the only divine love-affair to receive an extensive treatment is that of Apollo and Daphne (*EP* 15).[11] He also strips away any moral framework that might have once housed these stories: "these myths are here as raw materials, removed from their original contexts, to be used in a new context" (Fletcher 2011, 160).

What are we to make of Parthenius as an enabler and encourager of translation? Like *graecia capta*, the captive Greece of Horace's imagination, he brings art to Latium, though in this case not to a wild and savage Latium, but to an urban and urbane culture. He presents translation as an uncomplicated process, with the same material capable of being simultaneously used by both Greek and Latin poets. He also to some degree obscures his own work as a translator, as someone who has stripped these stories of details that connected them with specific (Greek) places or of their moral meaning, while turning them into poetic raw material. The details that Parthenius removes, obscures, or chooses not to emphasize are not easily obtainable elsewhere: he himself points out that these are only stories alluded to by poets, not narrated, and in an age before public libraries were established in Rome and before certain poetic texts were easily available, Gallus would have had to trust Parthenius.

However, although Parthenius may erase some features of these stories, he does not erase himself from the mix. Although Gallus may use these obscure stories, Parthenius also claims to use them: Greek and Latin authors dip into the same Greek pool, and can, apparently, do so simultaneously. If in Cicero we see a call to Romans to translate so that there will be no more need for Greek libraries, in Parthenius's *EP* we see a Greek culture that keeps composing new works in tandem with Roman authors, meaning

that the process of translation from Greek will never be ended. Parthenius critically reminds us of the physical presence of Greeks who facilitated the act of translation, but who are frequently elided from our narratives or Roman discussions of translation. He and the *EP* are a "testament to the ongoing mediation by Roman poets and how to use Greek myth, as well as a reminder that Romans needed help in understanding what was—despite our tendency to blur Greek and Roman into 'the classical'—a foreign culture" (Fletcher 2011, 24). Parthenius also makes one move as an enabler of translation that is often skipped by those who translate in Rome: he gives his sources, and even sometimes quotes from them. This element of his—or of any similar—collection was not a feature of Roman poetic translation.

CATULLUS

Born to provincial nobility in Verona, Catullus was sent as a youth to Rome by his family, presumably in the hope that he would carve out a political career. Although he did serve on the staff of Gaius Memmius while Memmius was governor of Bithynia in 57–56 BCE, he seems to have held no other office: instead of politics, he took up poetry.[12] Catullus left a collection of poems in various meters on a range of topics, from tender love poems to vicious and graphic invectives to highly learned miniature epic; he is best known for the love poetry and for being the founder of the Roman genre of love elegy.[13] Much of Catullus's love poetry revolves around his relationship with a woman he calls Lesbia, but who is usually identified with Clodia Metelli, the wife of Metellus Celer, consul in 60 BCE, and the sister of one of Cicero's greatest enemies, Publius Clodius. (Clodia was socially far above Catullus.)

Here I will focus on four of Catullus's poems: his translations of Sappho poem 31 (Catullus 51—Catullus poems are known by their number in the collection) and of Callimachus's *Lock of Berenice* (Catullus 66), along with the poems that immediately precede them. Before turning to those translations, however, it will be useful to understand a little about Catullus's Greek influences and the style of and setting for his poetry. Sappho exerted a powerful influence over all of Catullus's writing, although I will focus on her presence in poem 51 only. The pseudonym Lesbia was a compliment to her, as it translates as "the woman from Lesbos"—Sappho's home. When Catullus uses the name Lesbia, he can be seen not just to speak of his love for his mistress, but also simultaneously to invoke the figure of Sappho (Greene 2007, 133). Sappho's influence runs through the collection and is evident not only in poem 51 but also in poem 11 (the only other one in Sapphic stanzas), and in poems 5 and 7 (Greene 2007, 133–36), both of which celebrate his love for Lesbia.[14]

Catullus was a master of learned allusion, very much in the style of Alexandrian poetry, and clearly had read a wide corpus of Greek poets besides Sappho and other lyric poets. However, it is also important to realize that while it draws heavily on Greek sources, his poetry also sits within

a very specific Roman context: a culture of *sodales*, male friends,[15] and a homosocial and convivial world. Many of the poems are addressed to male friends (I shall talk about two such below) and are aimed at policing conduct at the *convivium* or celebrating male conviviality (on the *convivium*, see Habinek 2005, 35–44). Finally, it is important to understand that Catullus wrote for performance: these translations may exist on the printed page, but they were meant to be spoken, and spoken within a *Roman* context.

TRANSLATING SAPPHO: OBSESSIVE LOVE AND THE GAZE OF THE TRANSLATOR

All editions of Catullus descend from a single, corrupt, and now lost manuscript, discovered in Verona just before 1300. The collection appears to have been organized according to meter: the first 60 poems are in lyric and iambic meters; poems 61–68 are longer and in different meters; poems 65–116 are all in elegiac meter and are sometimes read as a collection (for one such reading, see Skinner 2003). Unfortunately, we have no idea whether the order in the manuscript is what Catullus intended; debates on this issue have raged for a long time and will doubtless continue to rage for even longer.[16] Whatever we may think the order of the collection as a whole may have been, a connection can certainly be seen between 50 and 51, that is, between Catullus's translation of Sappho 31 and the poem that precedes it. I shall discuss this connection further below, but for the moment here are both poems:

Poem 50

> Yesterday, Licinius, we were at leisure (*otiosi*)[17] and played a great deal on my writing tablets, as it suited us to be decadent (*delicatos*). We both played, writing dainty little verse, now in one meter, now in another, returning like for like amongst the jokes and wine. I left so fired up by your charm and wit that even food did not aid me (poor me!), nor did sleep cover my eyes, but raging with passion I was tossed all over the bed, yearning to see the light of morning when I could see and talk with you. But when my half-dead body was lying exhausted by its labors on my little couch, I made this poem for you, you sweet thing, so you would understand my suffering from it. Now, you who are my eyes! Do not be too bold and be careful not to reject my prayer—otherwise Nemesis will ask for a penalty from you. She is a vicious goddess: be careful not to offend her.

Hesterno, Licini, die otiose
multum lusimus in meis tabellis,
ut convenerat esse delicatos:
scribens versiculos uterque nostrum

ludebat numero modo hoc modo illoc,
reddens mutua per iocum atque vinum.
atque illinc abii tuo lepore
incensus, Licini, facetiisque,
ut nec me miserum cibus iuvaret
nec somnus tegeret quiete ocellos,
sed toto indomitus furore lecto
versarer, cupiens videre lucem,
ut tecum loquerer simulque ut essem.
at defessa labore membra postquam
semimortua lectulo iacebant,
hoc, iucunde, tibi poema feci,
ex quo perspiceres meum dolorem.
nunc audax cave sis, precesque nostras,
oramus, cave despuas, ocelle,
ne poenas Nemesis reposcat a te.
est vemens dea: laedere hanc caveto.

Poem 51

That man seems to be a god; he, if it is not blasphemy to say, seems to be more than a god, he who sits opposite to you and hears and sees you sweetly laughing again and again. I am a poor thing (*misero*), because all my senses have abandoned me, for the moment I look at you, Lesbia,[18] nothing is left to me: my tongue hangs heavy in my mouth; a flame rages throughout my limbs; both my ears are deafened and my eyes are covered in darkness. Empty time (*otium*), Catullus, is destructive to you; you rejoice in empty time (*otio*), and you spend too much time in it. Empty time (*otium*) has destroyed kings and happy cities before now.

Ille mi par esse deo videtur,[19]
ille, si fas est, superare divos,
qui sedens adversus identidem te
spectat et audit
dulce ridentem, misero quod omnis
eripit sensus mihi: nam simul te,
Lesbia, aspexi, nihil est super mi

* * *

lingua sed torpet, tenuis sub artus
flamma demanat, sonitu suopte
tintinant aures gemina, teguntur
lumina nocte.

> *otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est:*
> *otio exsultas nimiumque gestis:*
> *otium et reges prius et beatas*
> *perdidit urbes.*

In poem 50, Catullus and his friend Licinius Calvus (the same Calvus that Cicero fought with over oratorical style) play at poetry, a play that is loaded with sexual references and imagery.[20] They are alone: no one else intrudes upon this intimate evening between two young Roman aristocrats; certainly there is no Greek visible, in either human or textual form. (The only text mentioned is the one produced on Catullus's writing tablets.) Their poetry ranges across a number of meters, showing their poetical dexterity, and writing it leaves Catullus in a state of near demented arousal. He cannot sleep or eat, but only desires to see Calvus again, though in the end he does not, sending a poem to speak in his stead. But what poem? Poem 50? Or poems 50 *and* 51? In 50, Catullus says he made a poem (*poema . . . feci*); although *facio* is not usually used of translation, it certainly can be—we have seen Terence use it to describe his adaption of Greek comedies (*Andria* 3). The Latin word also plays with translation in another way: Latin *facio* was the equivalent for Greek *poio*, the ultimate origin of the word *poema*, poem:

> The bilingual etymological figure in *poema . . . feci*, if it refers to Catullus' Latin version of Sappho's Greek, does more than take on special appropriateness in this context. It flashes off the page as a moment of performative wit throwing a foregrounding spotlight onto the virtuoso performance about to come in the form of the Sapphic rendition. This demonstrative pronoun within a prelude poem referring to the subsequent poem . . . has an exact parallel in the covering letter to the only other full-scale translation within the corpus [Poem 66]. (Wray 2001, 98–99)

We can connect poems 50 and 51 through situation and language. In both, Catullus is reduced to a wretched condition by an overpowering desire, unable to live a normal, manly, Roman life, although the object of desire is different in each poem and no third party is present in poem 50. The language echoes between both, not only through references to *otium* and being *otiosi*, but through words like *miserum* (50.9) and *misero* (51.5; *misero* is Catullus's addition to Sappho's original). The two poems match each other in their erotic overtones and the emotions that both Calvus and Lesbia invoke in Catullus, although these emotions provoke different responses. In poem 51, Catullus is silenced by the force of his passion; in poem 50, on the other hand, his erotic exhaustion does not prevent Catullus from making a poem and sending it to Calvus.[21]

If we take poem 50 as a translation preface, then Catullus's translation is introduced as a product of aristocratic play and of *otium*, idle time not

devoted to public affairs or obligations, and as a pendant to an intimate description of male friendship. In other words, rather than being primarily introduced as focused on Lesbia or even Sappho's original, poem 51 is presented as a gift exchange between two Roman aristocrats.[22] Sappho's poem is detached from the context where Catullus would have found it—a collection of her lyric poetry—and presented instead in a new, Roman context, where it is now part of a collection of *Catullus*'s lyric poetry and the product of Roman *otium*. The Greek sympotic context that originally framed Sappho's—and all lyric's—composition is switched to a Roman convivial context, and to a particularly intimate version of such a convivial context.

What of Sappho's original? Here is David Campbell's translation of the Sapphic poem that Catullus 51 translates:

> He seems as fortunate as the gods to me, the man who sits opposite to you and listens nearby to your sweet voice and lovely laughter. Truly that sets my heart trembling in my breast. For when I look at you for a moment, then it is no longer possible for me to speak; my tongue has snapped, at once a subtle fire has stolen beneath my flesh, I see nothing, sweat pours from me, a trembling seizes me all over, I am greener than grass, and it seems to me that I am little short of dying. But all can be endured since . . . even a poor man.[23] (Sappho 31 [= Longinus *On Sublimity* 10.1–3])

The first thing that strikes anyone who compares Catullus 51 and Sappho 31 is that the first three stanzas of Catullus 51 are quite a close version of Sappho's poem, though not an exact replication—Catullus has, for example, added in a phrase (*si fas est*)[24] and omitted some of the symptoms of passion in the third stanza of the ST.[25] Up until the final stanza, however, Catullus 51 is demonstrably a translation. In the final stanza, however, the poem takes a startling direction, a direction at odds with the ST. Because of this stanza, some scholars have argued that it originally belonged elsewhere and its current attachment to Poem 51 is an accident of transmission.[26] However, where else the stanza could belong is unclear as there is no other poem in the corpus to which it can be easily attached. And the startling turn at the end of poem 51 matches the startling end of poem 50, with its reference to Nemesis and her vicious ways (Finamore 1984, 12).

But if we take the final stanza as a translator's afterword, a form of closure necessitated by the dangerous connotations of lyric poetry and the anxieties it provoked in Rome, it appears less problematic. Elizabeth Young (2011) sets Catullus's Sapphic translation within the context of Roman anxieties over the contamination that could arise from a particularly close relationship with a Greek text, a relationship that was made more fraught by the particularly intimate nature of translation. This was especially problematic when dealing with Greek lyric, which was written in the first person, forcing translators to "take on the voice of the original speaker, letting foreign

postures infuse their self-presentation and allowing another's words to flow from his or her tongue" (Young 2011, 28). In the last chapter, we saw the efforts Cicero made to speak as himself in his translations; it is not surprising that Catullus would also struggle with similar issues, especially in the fraught setting of the Late Republic, where issues of masculinity and proper male behavior were very much to the fore.[27]

At the close of the translation, rather than leave us with Sappho, Catullus adds a new verse, a verse that is a commentary on the previous stanzas, a translator's afterword. He reveals himself as the speaker of the previous stanzas and in the process displaces "Sappho from her own strophes" (Young 2011, 31). Catullus now is seen exerting control over the Greek text and his own work, speaking in his own voice. And that voice, no less than Cicero's, is the voice of a Roman man, who may imitate Sappho but ultimately reserves the right to control her text and to make that control part of his poem. Catullus approaches the Greek text closely, hints at being consumed by it, as he is by Lesbia, but then retreats, choosing finally to perform Sappho's text as *Catullus*.[28] The final stanza stands as a comment on issues of translation: too close a connection with an original text consumes one utterly; hence translation as an act requires obvious, open intervention from the poet to ensure containment.

In the final stanza, in an effort to harness the power Sappho's original grants to *eros*, blame is shifted from love to another source, empty time, *otium*; however, *otium* was more than that, it was the "time and space the Romans gave over to Hellenizing pursuits: philosophizing, art-collecting, convivial dining and, of course, translating" (Young 2011, 32). It was also supposed to be carefully demarcated, the time left over from familial, social, and public obligations (Cicero refers to his philosophical and literary works as the products of his *otium*, forestalling complaints that he had wasted valuable public time on them; see, for example, *Philippic* 2.20.) Catullus's decision to invoke *otium* directs the reader also backwards to poem 50 (Finamore 1984, 11), ensuring that Sappho's verse is neatly contained at both start and end. Or at least, that is the aim. However, although the translation "harnesses the Greek image of a permeating eros to metaphorically explore Roman fears about the invasive intimacy of a translation" (Young 2011, 30), it can never quite master the invasive and potentially dominating power of Greek verse. Sappho, after all, lurks throughout the collection through the figure of Lesbia. And such was her power that Catullus at least toys with the idea of allowing her female, *Greek* voice to overcome his, much as Lesbia overcomes him with her presence. The gaze of the translator becomes a double of the erotic gaze of the lover (Young 2011, 31), consuming and enfeebling, until Catullus catches himself and speaks no longer as Sappho, but as himself; and the initial dialogue between Catullus-Sappho-Roman Audience is replaced with Catullus-Roman Audience. In some sense, then, Catullus manages what Cicero could not with his projected translation in *On the Best Type of Orator*: he speaks both as a Greek and as a Roman, as Sappho *and* as Catullus, and gets the best of the bargain:

In translating Sappho 31, Catullus was not unique among poets of the Late Republic; two fragments exist from Valerius Aedituus[29] and Lutatius Catulus, and even Lucretius (*On the Nature of Things* 3.152–58) adapts a section of Sappho 31, though his translation is "directed to the unromantic end of illustrating the physiological effects of fear" (Gale 2008, 69). Thus, Catullus' translation should be situated in a cultural environment dedicated to reworking Greek lyric poetry. (Some Romans did not approve of this: Cicero once said that even if he had twice a normal lifespan, he would not have time to read the Greek lyric poets [Seneca the Younger, *Epistles* 49.5].) However, each translation that survives fractured different parts of Sappho 31 off and reconstituted them in a new whole. In contrast, Catullus' version appeared to make the text whole, but then superseded Sappho's version by replacing her final stanza with an extra coda, a coda which tried to write Catullus and Rome back into Sappho's original. This was, of course, an impossible feat, as Sappho's time had been and long gone by Catullus' day, and she was now one of the canonical nine Greek lyric poets, a canon created a few hundred years earlier.[30]

TRANSLATING CALLIMACHUS

In poem 65, Catullus writes to Hortalus,[31] telling him he is too distraught over the death of his brother to write poetry:

> Although, Hortalus, I am worn out with endless care and my grief pulls me from the learned maidens (= the Muses), and my mind is unable to give birth to the Muses' sweet children, as it is tossed on the seas of so many woes, for just now the flowing wave washed the pale foot of my brother with its deathly stream—my brother torn from my sight, whom the Trojan land weighs down by the Rhoetean shore.
>
> Will I never see you again, brother, more beloved than life? For I surely will always love you. I will always sing sad songs because of your death, songs such as the nightingale pours out under the dense branches of trees, mourning the death of stolen Itylus—but still in the middle of these great woes, Hortalus, I send you these translated (*expressa*) lines of Battiades [= Callimachus],[32] in case you might think that by some accident your words had flowed from my mind, and were entrusted to the wandering winds, as an apple sent as a secret gift (*munere*) from her fiancé falls headlong from the chaste bosom of a maiden, a gift she, poor thing, forgot was placed under her clothing and is shaken loose when she jumps up at the arrival of her mother and it falls, driven in a headlong descent, and a guilty blush spreads over her saddened face.

Etsi me assiduo confectum cura dolore
sevocat a doctis, Ortale, virginibus,

nec potis est dulcis Musarum expromere fetus
mens animi, tantis fluctuat ipsa malis—
namque mei nuper Lethaeo gurgite fratris
pallidulum manans alluit unda pedem,
Troia Rhoeteo quem subter litore tellus
ereptum nostris obterit ex oculis.
numquam ego te, vita frater amabilior,
aspiciam posthac? at certe semper amabo,
semper maesta tua carmina morte canam,
qualia sub densis ramorum concinit umbris
Daulias, absumpti fata gemens Ityli—
sed tamen in tantis maeroribus, Ortale, mitto
haec expressa tibi carmina Battiadae,
ne tua dicta vagis nequiquam credita ventis
effluxisse meo forte putes animo,
ut missum sponsi furtivo munere malum
procurrit casto virginis e gremio,
quod miserae oblitae molli sub veste locatum,
dum adventu matris prosilit, excutitur,
atque illud prono praeceps agitur decursu,
huic manat tristi conscius ore rubor.

The translated lines are Callimachus's *Lock of Berenice*, known in Greek as the *Plokamos*. This poem was one episode in his *Aitia*, or *Origins*, a long poem of some 4,000–6,000 lines, with shorter segments focused around the theme of origins.[33] Berenice was the wife of Ptolemy III Euergetes. Shortly after taking the throne in 247 BCE and marrying her, he departed for war in Syria, and Berenice dedicated a lock of hair for his safe return. The lock of hair disappeared from the temple where it had been dedicated, but Conon, the royal astronomer, identified it with a new constellation; Callimachus's poem covers these events, including a section where the lock mopes about being cut off from its fellow locks.

Unlike poem 50, poem 65 is very clearly a translation preface; in fact, it is the only place where Catullus advertises his poetry as derivative of a Greek poet (Feldherr 2007, 106). Like poem 50, it revolves around male friendship, although clearly a far less impassioned friendship than the one Catullus had with Calvus. For all that, the fact that Hortalus was a close enough friend to not only write to Catullus with a request for a poem, but to also have that request honored in the midst of Catullus's grief, marks the two as closely connected (Tatum 1997, 489). It is, however, not a very straightforward translation preface, as it quickly wanders from its ostensible topic, Hortalus's request for a poem, to Catullus's grief over his brother, only returning to Hortalus on line 15. Even the final address to Hortalus is not uncomplicated, but shifts quickly into a simile that compares either Hortalus's request (*tua dicta*) or Catullus's poetry (the

grammar allows for both readings) to an apple from a lover, tucked into a girl's bosom. If the apple is the translation, then it tumbles out onto the world, with Catullus "as embarrassed as the girl at its untimely appearance" (Quinn 1970, 354). Such slowness to approach the topic, that is, the translation and the sending of the translation, shows not just Catullus's grief—he cannot face writing, even as he writes—but also the value of the gift he now sends. The use of *expressa* as his verb for translation further stresses that the poem has been squeezed out under tremendous pressure.

What 65 does is place the following translation in a very different setting from the original. Callimachus's poem was a product of a royal court, while Catullus is implicated in a nexus of male social obligations that drive him to produce something to send to Hortalus.[34] The exchange takes on erotic overtones: whatever the apple represents, it is the gift of a lover and has been kept in the intimate setting of a girl's breasts; whether or not he is imitating a Callimachean scene does not change the fact that Catullus ratchets up the level of intimacy by using this simile. The fact that Callimachus's elaborate court poem is now figured as a lover's token (apples were a typical lover's gift in Greece and Rome)[35] creates a massive disjuncture between the original's positioning and Catullus's new version, which now "fulfills Catullus' social obligations" (Feldherr 2007, 106) and becomes, like his version of Sappho 31, a gift exchange between Roman aristocrats. Like Parthenius with his stories of horrible sufferings in love, Catullus in his preface assumes that Callimachus's original can be detached and translated and transmitted completely free of its original context and still work.

Why the *Plokamos*? One does not normally think of poems about shorn locks while grieving over the death of a beloved sibling. However, "the *Plokamos* is itself a tale of the death of a brother—it is the lock of hair 'cut off' from its brother-locks that gives voice to the poet's words—and so Catullus' promise never to stop singing of his brother's death is reified in his choice of translation" (Stroup 2010, 205). Thus, just as Catullus's Sapphic translation looked back to its preface and vice versa, so too here, the translation preface and translation share commonalities. More importantly, the fate of the lock mirrors what Catullus hopes will happen to his translation: although it was content and happy being part of Berenice's hair and regrets being shorn from its original setting, the lock of hair gains greater glory when separated from its original context, no matter how painful that separation may be. Separation is what made it a constellation, after all. Given the frequently competitive nature of Roman translation practices, it seems likely that Catullus also hopes that his translation—cut off from its moorings in Callimachus's *Aitia* and its original Ptolemaic context—will gain a similar individual glory. If Catullus's promise to never stop singing of his brother's death is reified in his translation, then that singing and that grief also aim at and gain their own glory.

POEM 116: ON *NOT* SENDING TRANSLATIONS

Poems 50 and 65 are followed by translations; I would like to close my discussion of Catullus and translation by discussing a short poem where Catullus refers to potential translations of Callimachus, although no translations follow it.[36] This is a much less elaborate poem than either of the two we have previously looked at:

> I often look into my eager, hunting mind to see how I could send you some poems of Battiades, so that I could soften you up and you would not try to throw hostile missiles at my head. I see that my work was done for nothing, Gellius, nor have my prayers achieved this. I will evade the missiles you have flung at me; but transfixed by mine, you will be punished.

> *Saepe tibi studioso animo venante requires*
> *carmina uti possem mittere Battiadae,*
> *qui te lenirem nobis, neu conarere*
> *tela infesta <meum> mittere in usque caput,*
> *hunc video mihi nunc frustra sumptum esse laborem,*
> *Gelli, nec nostras hic valuisse preces.*
> *contra nos tela ista tua evitabimus acta*
> *at fixus nostris tu dabis supplicium.*

Given that Catullus accuses Gellius of fucking his uncle's wife (poem 74), being an eager fellator of men (80), committing incest with his sister (84) and his mother (89, 90), and seducing Lesbia herself (91), it is hard to imagine that any translation could have made amends.[37] (It is also hard to imagine that Gellius would have had time to actually read anything, with such a busy sexual life.) But here, too, translations are part of a potential poetic currency and show translation's role in connecting Roman men: translation is a social process and its denial is part of ensuring that Gellius knows he does not belong. All of this is deeply ironic if we identify Gellius with Lucius Gellius Publicola, the consul of 36 BCE, who emphatically belonged to the nobility and was, in fact, someone who belonged there far more than did Catullus.

Poem 116 invites comparison with 65: in both cases, a Roman aristocrat is addressed; in both cases, the poet draws our attention to the effort that producing a translation of Callimachus would be; and in both cases, we have a form of *recusatio*, a refusal to write poetry, which was a feature of Rome verse (Skinner 2003, 21). If 65–116 form their own collection, then we have a case of ring composition (Skinner 2003, 22). Poem 116 thus functions as a pseudopreface, closing the run of elegiac poems as poem 65 opened it, hinting at connectivity denied through nontranslation, and in the process shows the multifunctionality of translation, which can operate either as a gift or, when denied, as an insult.

HORACE

We know a surprising amount about Quintus Horatius Flaccus, to give him his full name, thanks to the survival of an ancient biography by Suetonius and numerous biographical details he supplied in his poetry.[38] He was born in Venusia, Apulia, in 65 BCE, the son of a freedman father, who sent him to Rome and later to Athens for education (an expensive undertaking, which indicates that the family had serious financial resources). While in Athens, Horace joined the army of Brutus,[39] one of Caesar's assassins; when the Republican side lost against Octavian (the future Augustus) and Mark Antony at the battle of Philippi in 42, Horace's fortunes and those of his family took a nosedive. Some remnants of the family fortune must have survived, however, because he was able to buy a position as a scribe (*scriba quaestorius*) in the Roman civil service, a high-status position and one with a decent income. Thanks to friendships with poets such as Virgil, he was introduced to Maecenas, Augustus's chief minister and a formidable patron of the arts. This patronage and Horace's literary connections led to a dazzling career and array of poetic compositions: *Epodes* (also called *Iambi*; 17 poems in total); *Satires* (two books); *Odes* (Latin *carmina*, three books initially; a fourth was added after he wrote the *Carmen Saeculare* in 17 BCE); and *Epistles*. The last consists of two books, the second of which traditionally includes the *Art of Poetry*, although that is not transmitted along with the *Epistles* in the manuscript tradition, and circulated separately.[40]

Like that of Catullus, all of Horace's verse was heavily influenced by Greek poetry, particularly Greek lyric,[41] and he weaves translated sections of Greek poetry and allusions throughout his corpus. Here I cannot pretend to do justice to his range of allusions to Greek literature, or even to all the times he references his models or translation. What I aim for is much less ambitious: to show how Horace situated himself as a translator of Greek lyric and Greek lyric meters (of which he was a formidable master), and to examine some of his discussion of translation, particularly in reference to the *Art of Poetry*.[42]

EPISTLES 1.19: TRANSLATING METER

Horace's *Epistles* is a collection of verse letters with a variety of addressees, including Augustus. *Epistle* 1.19 is addressed to Horace's patron Maecenas, and deals with accusations that Horace followed his models too closely. The first 18 lines of the poem discuss the difference between *ars*, represented by poets who drink only water, and innate talent, *ingenium*, represented by poets who drink wine often and deeply.[43] Horace claims that since he said that the sober should lead a life in business, poets have been happily drinking heavily, even though, as Horace points out, imitating Horace does not make you him.

> O, copycats—you flock of slaves—how often has their noise stirred my anger—or my jokes! I, the first, placed free footsteps through emptiness; I did not press down my foot on another's tracks. Whoever has faith in himself will rule the crowd like a general. *I* was the first who displayed Parian iambics[44] to Latium, and I followed the meters and courage of Archilochus, not his subject matter or his words which hounded Lycambes. And in case you would honor me with a smaller wreath because I feared to change (*mutare*) the meters and the art (*artem*) of his verse, masculine Sappho moderates[45] the muse of Archilochus with her metrics; Alcaeus did the same, although with different themes and arrangement . . . I, a Latin lyre player, made him [Alcaeus]—never before spoken by another tongue—known.[46] There is joy in bringing things as yet untold to be read and held by noble hands.[47] (19.19–34)
>
> *O imitatores, servum pecus, ut mihi saepe*
> *bilem, saepe iocum vestri movere tumultus!*
> *Libera per vacuum posui vestigia princeps*
> *non aliena meo pressi pede. qui sibi fidet.*
> *dux reget examen. Parios ego primus iambos*
> *ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus*
> *Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben*
> *ac ne me foliis ideo brevioribus ornes,*
> *quod timui mutare modos et carminis artem:*
> *temperat Archilochi Musam pede mascula Sappho,*
> *temperat Alcaeus, sed rebus et ordine dispar*
>
> * * *
>
> *Hunc ego, non alio dictum prius ore, Latinus*
> *vulgavi fidicen; iuvat inmemorata ferentem*
> *ingenuis oculisque legi manibusque teneri.*

Horace covers a lot of space in this notoriously difficult passage, which displays a remarkable amount of slippage between literary traditions, history, and language, making it sometimes hard to sort out whether he is in Greece or Rome. Even before this passage, the poem moved easily from Homer to Ennius and from Cato the Younger to the contemporary Greek rhetor and historian Timagenes and his contest with Iarbitas.[48] But this particular section collapses linguistic categories in an even more remarkable way. Horace claims that he followed Greek authors but only in a limited fashion, before comparing that with how Sappho and Alcaeus imitated the meters of Archilochus.[49] He does not mention that either of these poets were Greek, imitating another lyric poet in Greece. (Admittedly, his audience would have known that both of these poets composed Greek poetry, but that still does not make Horace's elision of matters of language less remarkable; only in

line 32 are we reminded that he was writing in Latin.) Nor does he mention the time gap between himself and the Greek lyric poets (there were a good 600 years between Horace and the earliest Greek lyric poet he imitated [Alcman] and 400 between him and the latest [Pindar]). Horace erases the Hellenistic tradition through whose eyes he would have approached these poets (Feeney 1993, 44); in fact, everything between Horace and his exemplars vanishes. Further, like Ennius speaking as Homer, Catullus speaking for Sappho, and Cicero speaking for Greek orators, "we observe here a remarkably advanced fantasy of reenactment: Sappho and Alcaeus are represented as early Horaces at the same moment that Horace introduces himself as a later incarnation of them" (Peponi 2002, 41).

It is also at this point that Horace refers to the aristocratic audience he writes for, but throughout the poem Horace employs language that connects his work with the activities of the social and political elite of Rome. In response to critics who have attacked him because he did not change (*mutare*)[50] his model's meters, he claims to be truly free, while they are a flock of slaves (it is important to remember the impact of such a slur in a slave-owning society, especially coming from one who was himself the son of a freedman).[51] But Horace goes one step further by characterizing himself both as *princeps* (21) and as *dux* (23). By using *princeps,* Horace temporarily sidesteps issues of lyric primacy (it means chief, rather than first [Putnam 2006, 2]); he also utilizes a word that evokes Augustus.[52] The sidestepping does not continue for long: he claims primacy in line 23 by using *primus*, first, and reinforces this claim by prefacing *primus* with the emphatic *ego*, I.

Horace also describes himself as striding with his free foot through empty space. Of course, the space that Horace trod through was not really empty: it was occupied by Greeks, for one,[53] and by Latin poets such as Catullus, for another.[54] The way that Horace describes this space is also unnerving: *vacuum* is legal terminology for property with no owner (Mayer 1994, 263) and for unproductive money (*vacua pecunia*, Digest 19.5.24, 16.3.28). Horace hints that he has not just taken possession of Greek poetry, but returned it to productivity as his own property (a topic which will reappear in the *Art of Poetry*). He may be attracted by "a sense of returning to the roots of his own literary tradition" (Clay 2010, 128), but there is still something unnerving in how he approaches and phrases his return.

Also remarkable is that Horace, knowing full well that his audience could read these authors in Greek if they wished, claims that they were in fact *inmemorata*, untold, before he spoke them. Cicero might not have liked the lyric poets, but Sappho didn't get to be and stay the tenth muse by being *inmemorata*. Alcaeus was hardly languishing in obscurity, either. So why make such an absurd claim? First, it enables him to suggest that to not be spoken of in a Latin poem is really not to be spoken of at all. Just as Homer needed Ennius to speak for him after his time as a peacock, Alcaeus needs Horace. Horace also marks what he does as the correct way to translate for the right audience:

> Horace is also keen to point out that his translation task is not actually about transforming Alcaeus' (or Sappho's, or Pindar's) Greek into a direct word-for-word Latin equivalent. That's what the ill-educated and incompetent take him to be doing, and thus they "do" Sappho by "doing" (down) Horace. Horace's point is that a "translation" is only valuable, ethically worthwhile and culturally enriching for those who already know and can understand (and "translate") the source-text. (Spencer 2011, 113–14)

Although his detractors claim that he fails at translation by being timid in his changes, Horace instead claims that what he does is real translation and, paradoxically, backs up that claim by referring to Greek poets imitating other Greek poets, placing himself in their tradition as much as the Latin one, all the while writing in Latin. He does not bother with translating the *verba* (words, 25) of Archilochus, and even goes one further than Cicero by claiming that he does not translate the subject matter (*res*, 25); and yet this is shown as proof that he has followed his STs correctly, unlike his imitators, who can't even manage to follow Horace properly. This is why they could never show (*ostendi*, 25) Parian iambics to Latium, as Horace did. (Horace's use of *ostendi* here contrasts with *deduco*,[55] his preferred term to describe his work in bringing Greek meters and poetic models to Rome.) *Epistle* 19 is a good example of how Horace describes his approach to translation, and how he situates himself as the only person to now speak for his Greek models in Latin and as the one who belongs alongside them, striding through the poetic landscape.

Horace also takes good advantage of the "I" of lyric poetry to push his point. His audience, who would most likely read his work out loud, did so in Horace's voice, repeating his claims as they did so. Denis Feeney argued that "in a poem like *Epistles* 1.19, Horace does not say 'I am the Roman Archilochus or the Roman Alcaeus'; he says 'I am carrying on a tradition and recreating it just as they did.' He claims to be like them, obviously, in important respects; but he is not their incarnation, or their equivalent or counterpart" (Feeney 2002, 12). This is true: Horace cannot carry on the Greek lyric tradition, because that tradition was long dead by his own day, with its premier authors long fixed in a canon.[56] But Horace still claims to walk alongside the canonical nine, pressing down his foot on "empty" territory. And he makes his audience complicit in that claim.

I now turn to the earlier *Ode* 1.1 (also addressed to Maecenas), which describes various ways of seeking glory, from competing in the Olympics to farming to soldiering. Horace concludes by saying:

> Ivy, the reward given to learned [poets'] brows, puts *me* in the company of the gods above; the cool grove and the graceful chorus of nymphs and satyrs separates *me* from the crowd—if Euterpe doesn't withhold her pipes and Polyhymnia[57] doesn't run from setting up (*tendere*) the lyre of Lesbos. But if *you* place me among the lyric poets

(*vates*) of Greece, raised up, I shall pierce the stars with my head. (1.29–36)

Me doctarum hederae praemia frontium
dis miscent superis, me gelidum nemus
Nympharumque leves cum Satyris chori
secernunt populo, si neque tibias
Euterpe cohibet nec Polyhymnia
Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton.
Quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres,
sublimi feriam sidera vertice.

Besides being a programmatic statement for the entire collection, this ode begins the "Parade Odes," a series of nine poems that parades Horace's ability to write Latin verse in an array of Greek meters, as he uses a different meter for each ode.[58] (A second type of parade appears in *Odes* 1.12–18, where Horace alludes to a different lyric poet in each ode [Lowrie 1995].) It promises that Horace will show himself a match for his sources and, more shockingly, belongs alongside them, perhaps in Augustus's newly established library on the Palatine, which had one section for Greek poets and another for Latin ones, segregating them according to language.[59] The verb that Horace uses in line 35, *inseres*, deliberately invokes an image of rows of book scrolls set along a shelf, and "the implied image is of a set of rolls being placed alongside those of the canonical lyricists" (Tarrant 2007, 65; cf. Feeney 1993, 41).[60] In using this verb and in claiming that all he needs is Maecenas' helping hand to belong alongside the Greek canon, Horace again erases language difference and even the act of translation, by suggesting that he is worthy to be laid alongside the nine great *Greek* lyric poets:[61] "The audacity is marvelous. Greek works and Latin works may be catalogued separately in every library in the Roman world, but Horace will vault across that divide to become number ten in a Greek list of poets organized by the criteria of Greek scholarship" (Feeney 1993, 41–42).

But how will Horace get to be part of the Greek canon? Through Maecenas's approval, not that of the Alexandrian critics who first created it: if Horace is reverse canonized as a lyric poet, so too Maecenas is reverse canonized as a Hellenistic critic, taking the role of judge once held by Aristophanes at the Alexandrian library (Eidinow 2009, 82). And this occurs through performance: as I said above, Greek lyric was in the first person, and when one spoke it, one enacted the I of the poet. Reciting Horace's poetry, with its Greek meters (now Latin) and its infusion of Greek lyric themes and fragments of Greek lyric, meant reciting a combined form, one that fused Greek and Latin, but in favor of Latin (it was, after all, in Latin) and of Horace. In other words, every time one recited a Horatian ode, one recited Horace *and* the Greek poems he had cannibalized, and yoked him and the Greek tradition. This is how " 'Horace' can sit on the shelf, just

as if he were joining the *imagines* (ancestral death masks) in Maecenas' atrium" (Spencer 2011, 108). The word placement in this ode stresses this: placing *lyrici* and *vatibus* side by side in line 35 stresses how much Horace bridges both traditions, and cannot be classified as totally Roman or Greek. Although Cicero used *lyricus* as a *Greek* word (*Orator* 183; Barchiesi 2007, 146), Horace places it alongside *vates*, the archaic Latin word for poet, interweaving Greek and Roman tradition and language.

We can see a similarly complicated layering of Latin and Greek texts and sources in *Odes* 1.32:

> We are called upon. Lyre, come! If in an empty moment I ever played with you while sitting in shade, producing something that may live for this year and beyond, sing now a Latin song—[lyre] that was first tuned by the citizen Lesbian, who, although he was brave in war, always sang of Bacchus, the Muses, and Venus and her boy who always clings, and gorgeous Lycus with his black eyes and black hair, even when he was in arms, or his ship was moored on the watery shore. Oh glory of Apollo! Tortoiseshell always welcomed at the feasts of Jupiter the highest! Sweet and soothing medicine of labors, hail from one correctly calling upon you.

> *Poscimur. Si quid vacui sub umbra*
> *lusimus tecum, quod et hunc in annum*
> *vivat et pluris, age dic Latinum,*
> *barbite, carmen,*
>
> *Lesbio primum modulate civi,* 5
> *qui ferox bello, tamen inter arma,*
> *siue iactatam religarat udo*
> *litore navim,*
>
> *Liberum et Musas Veneremque et illi*
> *semper haerentem puerum canebat* 10
> *et Lycum nigris oculis nigroque*
> *crine decorum.*
>
> *O decus Phoebi et dapibus supreme*
> *grata testudo Iovis, o laborum*
> *dulce lenimen, mihi cumque salve* 15
> *rite vocanti.*

Although the *barbiton*, the word translated above as lyre, was an instrument particularly identified with Sappho, and the word does not occur in the extant Alcaeus (Woodman 2002, 54), Horace claims him as his inspiration (he is the citizen of Lesbos referred to at line 5), and that in a poem

written in Sapphic meter. Horace appears to collapse all the poets of Lesbos into one category, a troubling sign for a reader who had not charted Horace's complicated relationship with Alcaeus. Even more troubling is that this Greek lyre is now made explicitly to sing a Latin song. How, then, can this be the lyre that was tuned by Alcaeus, that sang of Lycus? Of course, it can't be, and Horace and his audience know that. Even if it speaks fragments of Alcaeus—and fragments of Alcaeus litter Horace's poetry—it speaks them now in Latin and in *Horace's* collection. In making this move, Horace manages to have his cake and eat it: he draws attention to his own work in translating these poets to Rome, while simultaneously erasing his own act of translation by eliding the linguistic difference between himself and his STs. To put this slightly differently, Horace makes himself visible as a translator, only to then insist he is not a translator, but the author of a new original and a new member of the *Greek* canon, even as he writes in Latin.

THE *ART OF POETRY* AND FAITHFUL TRANSLATORS

So far, I have not touched on Horace's most famous comments on translation, in the *Art of Poetry*; it is to that I now turn. The *Art of Poetry* is a wide-ranging treatise on poetry, addressed to the Pisos (it is sometimes known as the *Epistle to the Pisos*). A date of c. 10 BCE has been suggested for its composition (Rudd 1989, 19–21; Armstrong 1993, 199–202), which would place it among Horace's last works (and make it probably his last work).[62] We are uncertain which Pisos it addresses, but whoever they were, they were clearly young aristocrats and Horace's advice was relevant to their status. Ellen Oliensis has convincingly argued that the *Ars Poetica* has the wider social function of "teaching the Piso brothers how to fashion their selves" (1998, 198), as well as providing aesthetic advice. It both describes and enforces how the Pisos are to present themselves as members of the elite; as such, Horace's advice is bound up in ideals of elite self-fashioning and needs to be understood in that context. It takes the Republican tradition of informal tutelage such as the *tirocinium fori* and extends it to cover poetry (Armstrong 1993, 202). Horace teaches you not just how to live but how to write, and knowing how to translate is part of his instruction.

The advice to translators falls within the first half of the poem, within a section on the choice and presentation of material (119–52).[63]

> It is difficult to treat in your own way what is communal property. You are more correct to unfurl a song of the *Iliad* in acts than offering up for the first time unknown and unsung topics. Public material will become private property if you do not delay on the common, beaten track, nor spend time rendering (*reddere*) word for word as a faithful interpreter, and if as an imitator you do not jump into a narrow space from which your lack of confidence or poetic law cannot rescue you. (128–36)

Difficile est proprie communia dicere; tuque
rectius Iliacum carmen deducis in actus
quam si proferres ignota indictaque primus.
publica materies privati iuris erit, si
non circa vilem patulumque morarberis orbem,
Nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus
interpres, nec desilies imitator in artum
unde pedem proferre pudor vetet aut operis lex.

Here, Horace does not present an empty space for translation, but instead shows how crowded the field is. The goal is to take material from that crowded field—material that would be known to many, many people—and turn it into one's own private property. Horace stresses the common nature of this material by using both *communia*—things held in common—and *publica*, that which belongs to the *populus* (Cicero, *Republic* 1.39).[64] Two things are necessary to turn this public property into private: not keeping what was common knowledge on literary highways and byways, and translating in a way that is opposite to the faithful interpreter. Horace even provides his own translations, to show how the trick is done:

> You will not begin like that old cyclic writer:[65] "I will sing the fortune of Priam and the celebrated war." With such a flapping mouth what will the promisor offer that is worthy? Mountains will go into labor—and their offspring is a ridiculous mouse! How much more correct is the famous individual who toils ineptly at nothing: "Tell me, Muse, of the man who, after Troy was taken, saw the customs (*mores*) of many men and cities." (136–42)

Nec sic incipies, ut scriptor cyclicus olim:
"Fortunam Priami cantabo et nobile bellum."
Quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor hiatu?
Parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.
Quanto rectius hic qui nil molitur inepte:
"Dic mihi, Musa, virum, captae post tempora Troiae
qui mores hominum multorum vidit et urbes."

Horace shows his command of Latin by coining *promissor* to describe an overreaching poet, before moving on to celebrate Homer ("that famous individual"). Horace presents these translations as if they were the originals, as if they were the words of both poets. The quotations are incorporated smoothly and easily, much as Horace previously presented himself slipping between Latin and Greek traditions without disjuncture. Horace has been careful to use the most famous and best known sections of each poem, the opening line. (Ancient poems were referred to by their first lines, which meant that they were very well known, and even if a Roman had a bare

education in Greek, he could not escape knowing that first line of the *Odyssey*, though he might never have read a cyclic poet.) Horace also uses the rarely invoked epic "I" (unlike lyric poetry, ancient epics are characterized by their anonymous narrators, who rarely speak in their own voice, with opening invocations being an exception). These translations stand as representatives of how to make common material private: through the appropriate form of translation and through the proper selection of a *famous* model. One should skip the imitators and go right for the cream of the crop: Homer.

While showing how to translate, Horace takes one of the two best known Greek texts in Rome (the other was the *Iliad*, and the cyclic poet showed how to mangle treating the Trojan War) and puts his own spin on it by collapsing the first three lines of the *Odyssey* into two Latin ones. (A closer translation would be: "Muse, tell me of the many-minded man, who travelled many miles, after he sacked the holy citadel of Troy. He came to know the cities and minds of many men.") In his translation, Horace ignores Homer's *polutropon*/many-minded, the adjective that Livius Andronicus translated as *versutus* in his *Odussia*. Horace thus corrects Livius's translation as well as showing the Pisos the way to appropriate a Greek text as their own property, even when it has already a famous Latin version. The Latin also turns the Greek's *nous*, mind or ways of thinking, into *mores*, customs or ways of doing things, subtly Romanizing the line even as it retains Homer's Muse over Livius Andronicus's Camena.[66]

Horace's versatility in translation is underlined by the fact that this is the second time he has translated these lines, as he had already produced a version of the opening of the *Odyssey* in *Epistles* 1.2:

> The man who was the conqueror of Troy and foreseeing [or circumspect] saw the cities and customs (*mores*) of many men far and wide over the sea, all the while he planned his and his comrades' return and endured many hardships, but could not be sunk by the opposing waves of events. (19–22)

> *qui domitor Troiae multorum providus urbes,*
> *et mores hominum inspexit, latumque per aequor,*
> *dum sibi, dum sociis reditum parat, aspera multa*
> *pertulit, adversis rerum immersabilis undis.*

The gap between these two translations, and the fact that Horace follows each translation with two completely different plot summaries of the *Odyssey*, shows his control over the material and his ability to take something common and spin it in as many different directions as he wishes. In *Epistles* 1.2.23–31, the plot summary takes nine lines,[67] while in the *Ars Poetica* he gets it down to one, a bravura performance: "Antiphates, Scylla, Charybdis, along with the Cyclops" (*Epistles* 1.2.23–31 mentions instead the Sirens, Circe, and Penelope's suitors). The fact that there is little commonality to

the translations shows the flexible and enterprising translator how to be creative and selective and make the text work for him, rather than the other way around.

If this is how translation should be done, what of the problematic translation, that of the faithful interpreter, the *fidus interpre*s? Horace's phrase has for a long time invited comparison with Cicero's comment that he translated not as an "interpreter but as an orator."[68] However, although Horace is almost certainly riffing off some such Ciceronian formulation, we should also consider other sources for his phrase. It is tempting to see the combination of *fides* and *interpres* (as opposed to Cicero's *indisertus interpres*) as a joke, recalling the fact that one of the more costly misinterpretations of a word in Roman history was the misinterpretation of *fides* by the Aetolians, discussed in Chapter 1. The *fides* of the close translator in this line "is *fides* wrongly shown" (Brink 1963, 211), while the right type of trust is the trust you have in yourself to perform translation in a way that benefits you and shows your control over Greek material. The consequence of mistranslation by the Aetolians was their accidental unconditional surrender, with their complaints dismissed by the Roman general they faced; the consequence of mistranslation by the *fidus interpres* is that he closes himself into a narrow space from which he also cannot escape. Both these forms of translation are traps for the unwary.

This, however, does not mean that the Ciceronian *interpres* does not also lie behind Horace's formulation. As in Cicero, the *interpres* is figured as someone with a limited understanding, who doles out his translation word by word, and thus cannot escape from the common path; faithfulness in translation equals sterility of thought, lack of progression. For Horace here, close "translation is merely conservation (the aim of the *fidus interpres*), a debased form of imitation, perhaps recalling grammatical exercises in close paraphrase" (Copeland 1991, 29). The use of *verbo verbum*, a recasting of Cicero's *verbum pro verbo* (which also recalls Terence), and *reddere* invoke Cicero, as does the use of legal language (*iuris, lex*). There is no way to know whether Horace had *On the Best Type of Orator* in mind when writing these lines—a better-known Ciceronian text would seem a stronger candidate. And yet it is hard not to think that *On the Best Type of Orator* lies behind Horace's comments, because after he advises people not to translate like an *interpres*, Horace does what Cicero said he would do in his preface: teach through producing a translation. However, Horace suggests that a two-line translation of Homer will show the way and as a bonus even includes a line that shows how not to translate. Horace's text acts as a corrective and supplement to Ciceronian ideas of translation.

Let me close my discussion of Horace by looking at his advice to writers in the second half of the *Art of Poetry*, where he orders the Pisos: "You! Turn (*versate*) Greek examples over at night, turn them over during the day!"[69] Here Horace uses a word, *versate*, that is not the correct word for turning a roll (Brink 1963, 307), although it does have the meanings "to ponder" and "to handle" (Rudd 1989, 195). Perhaps Horace uses it because it suggests

verto, and translation, not just because of the phonetic echo, but also because both verbs have the primary meaning of twisting and turning. The Pisos are encouraged not just to handle these texts but to engage in an active relationship with them, not sit passively reading them (as we shall see in the next chapter with Pliny the Younger, there was nothing that the Romans thought eradicated the danger of passive reading as much as translation). Why was this so important? Because, as with Cicero, translation and transforming Greek texts into Roman ones was a cultural duty and one that brought glory. Paradoxically, this appeared most clearly in a section of the *Art of Poetry* where Horace encouraged Roman poets to go beyond imitation into innovation:

> Our poets have left nothing untried, nor have they earned less honor by daring to leave the tracks of the Greeks and celebrate our own deeds here at home, whether they have presented praetextae or comedies in togas. It would not be the case that Latium is more famous through courage and more powerful in arms than in her language, if the labor and delay of revision were not offensive to each and every one of her poets. (285–91)

> *Nil intemptatum nostri liquere poetae,*
> *nec minimum meruere decus vestigia Graeca*
> *ausi deserere et celebrare domestica facta,*
> *vel qui praetextas vel qui docuere togatas*
> *Nec virtute foret clarisque potentius armis*
> *quam lingua Latium, si non offenderet unum*
> *quemque poetarum limae labor et mora.*

"The Greeks, *exemplaria Graecia* a few verses earlier, are now *externi* as it were" (Brink 1963, 319). They are rivals as much as examples, and in Rome rivals must be surpassed. The sort of labor that is involved in reading and understanding Greek poetry is not enough: you must also produce and take care with your Latin text. Only that way will Latin gain the fame that has accrued to Rome's armies. This is a poetic version of the reasoning that Cicero used to call Romans to the task of translation: the Romans now have the time to conquer the Greeks in literature as they had in warfare, but this has to be done properly and with care.

Horace's writing on translation takes from Ciceronian ideas about translation, but it is also affected by his own particular circumstances. Working on translating Greek meters to Latin and making them not just Latin but his own property, Horace takes advantage of Greek lyric and its use of the poetic I. As we have seen, Greek lyric carried dangers because it seemed to invite the Roman speaking it to become too infused with Greekness and the concerns of lyric, which were not always respectable Roman ones. But where Catullus struggled against this, Horace embraced the I of lyric that allowed him as translator not to be spoken *through*, but to speak *for* the Greek tradition.

LUCRETIUS (C. 98–55 BCE)

I now leave behind the lyric tradition at Rome for epic, and specifically didactic epic.[70] Two poets of vastly different rank close out this chapter: one was an heir to the imperial throne (Germanicus Caesar), the other a shadowy figure of whom we know little. Titus Lucretius Carus, the shadowy figure I shall discuss first, wrote a didactic epic called *On the Nature of Things* (*De rerum natura*; hereafter *DRN*), addressed to Memmius.[71] This poem was an adaptation of Epicurean philosophy into Latin in six books of hexameters, and was by far the longest didactic poem of antiquity. We are not certain whether the poem was completed or not, since it breaks off with a lengthy description of a plague in fifth-century Athens, which is a translation from the Greek historian Thucydides.[72] Cicero never mentioned the *DRN* in his philosophical works, although in a letter to his brother he complimented the poem as being full of art (*Letters to Quintus* 2.9.4); he then mentioned an *Empedoclea* by Sallustius, probably a translation or imitation of Empedocles' works (Sedley 1998, 1), which he thought unreadable. According to St. Jerome, Cicero edited Lucretius' work after his death; given Cicero's dislike of Epicurean philosophy, this seems a highly unlikely occurrence. The *DRN*'s relationship to the Epicurean texts Cicero attacked is unknown, as are any ties Lucretius had to those authors or to Philodemus, the Epicurean philosopher employed by Caesar's father-in-law, Gnaeus Piso. Lucretius never mentions the other translators of Epicureanism that we hear of in Cicero, nor does he mention Cicero, although he drew on Cicero's translation of the *Phaenomena* (Kenney 2007, 95). As far as one can tell from Lucretius's poem, he was working entirely alone, blazing new paths in splendid isolation.

Lucretius's poem was an attempt to bring the philosophy of Epicurus to a Roman audience, and to a Roman audience living in the death-throes of the Republic, an audience ripe for the message of retreat from political life, which was one of Epicureanism's tenets. His aim was not just to clarify what could be crabbed and difficult Greek texts, though that was of deep concern, but to use poetry to make Epicureanism appealing: his verse was meant to be like honey on the side of a cup that meant Romans would drink the bitter medicine of Epicureanism (*DRN* 1.936–95, 4.11–25). This was to be achieved through a translation of Epicurus's ideas into Latin *and* of his (not particularly stylish) prose into verse.[73] Lucretius "is a translator not in the sense of merely rendering an original Greek text into Latin. Rather, he introduces, packages and explains Greek thought for a new audience and culture and time" (Warren 2007, 19). We do not know which Epicurean text underlies the *DRN* or even whether there is a single text behind it.[74] In fact, in his use of texts Lucretius is, like other Roman poets, an omnivorous translator. He translates not just Thucydides, but poets such as Homer, Callimachus, Sappho, and Euripides, along with a range of Greek philosophers, weaving them all into his epic.[75] This is not to say that Lucretius

is an unthinking sampler of Greek literature and philosophy; instead, "he acts as a filter of Greek thought, admitting and translating only those ideas which are conducive to the goal of understanding the universe correctly and passing over or disparaging those mistaken Greek ideas which might put obstacles in the reader's path" (Warren 2007, 19). Lucretius himself makes a clear distinction at *DRN* 1.639–40 between frivolous (*inanis*) Greeks and serious (*gravis*) ones (Warren 2007, 19); Epicurus may be the great illuminator, the glory of the Greek race (3.1–3), but that is not true of all Greeks. Like Cicero, Lucretius believes that filtering of Greek material is critical: the translator does not just translate everything before him or her, but picks and chooses.

Lucretius opens the poem with a prayer to Venus which stretches on for some 25 lines before he mentions the project at hand and his dedicatee: "I am eager for you to be my ally in writing verses, verses which I shall strive to construct [*pangere*] about the nature of things for our Memmius."[76] The most explicit positioning of the text as an imitation or translation comes in Book Three, with its address to Epicurus:

> You, who in the middle of such great black shadows were the first to raise so brilliant a light, illuminating the good things in life, I follow you, Glory of the Greek Race, and now I press my own steps on the marks left by your feet, not because I am eager to contend with you, but because I crave to imitate you, for how can a swallow contend with swans? How can a kid with its shaky legs match the force (*vis*) of a powerful horse in a race? You are the father, you the one who discovered these things, you supply us with a father's precepts, and from your pages, celebrated man . . . (3.1–10)

> *E tenebris tantis tam clarum extollere lumen*
> *qui primus potuisti inlustrans commoda vitae,*
> *te sequor, o Graiae gentis decus, inque tuis nunc*
> *ficta pedum pono pressis vestigia signis,*
> *non ita certandi cupidus quam propter amorem*
> *quod te imitari aveo; quid enim contendat hirundo*
> *cycnis, aut quid nam tremulis facere artubus haedi*
> *consimile in cursu possint et fortis equi vis?*
> *tu, pater, es rerum inventor, tu patria nobis*
> *suppeditas praecepta, tuisque ex, inclute, chartis . . .*

The trope of imitation as a pressing of one's footsteps down on the marks left by another is one we have already seen in Horace, though qualified.[77] Lucretius expressly moves himself out of the usual Roman model of translation as contention, into one that pictures him as a kid chasing vainly after the forceful power of the racehorse.[78] Not only does Lucretius not seek to contend with his source, but he also presents Epicurus as a Roman *paterfamilias* giving a "father's precepts" to his children (Baile, 1947, I, 16). As

a Greek, Epicurus could be no one's *paterfamilias*; nonetheless, Lucretius refigures him as such in a bold linkage that, like Horace's presentation of the Greek lyric poets as his ancestors, presents Epicurus as Lucretius's—and the Roman student's—father. In doing so, Lucretius taps into something powerful, presenting Epicurus as fixed within a nexus of blood and kinship to Lucretius and the Romans he hopes to inform; Epicurus is no longer the Greek man of 1.66, but is a Roman *pater.* Lucretius obscures the linguistic and ethnic gap between himself and his model, placing Epicurean philosophy within the framework of traditional Roman education as something handed down from father to son. He no longer fails to contend with a Greek rival, but is someone who respects a paternal figure.

THE POVERTY OF LATIN

This is not to say that Lucretius always attempts to obscure the translational nature of his work. In Book One, he reflects on translation in a famous formulation on the deficiencies of Latin's vocabulary:

> I am not unaware how difficult it is light up the obscure[79] discoveries of the Greeks with Latin verses, especially when a great deal must be written of in new words because of the poverty of [our] language and the newness of the topic. (1.136–40)

> *Nec me animi fallit Graiorum obscura reperta*
> *difficile inlustrare Latinis versibus esse,*
> *multa novis verbis praesertim cum sit agendum*
> *propter egestatem linguae et rerum novitatem*

Although Lucretius's attitude about the poverty of the Latin language was rejected by Cicero,[80] there are similar opinions in Seneca the Younger (*Epistles* 58.1) and Pliny the Younger (*Epistles* 4.18), among others.[81] However, those statements all ultimately derive from Lucretius and cannot tell us much about how he himself viewed translation, or whether his formulation was meant as a factual statement or intended to guide the reader to an understanding of his process of translation. Given Lucretius's translation strategy—translation and coining new words rather than transliteration of technical terms—his task was surely difficult, especially as Latin did not have a native technical philosophical vocabulary. However, despite the linguistic difficulties he certainly encountered, this is more than a complaint about Latin's lexical deficiencies. There is a certain degree of self-aggrandizement here and it is remarkable that, given the poverty of Latin, Lucretius was nevertheless able to write a hexameter poem of several thousand lines on the topic using words that were employed in Latin at the time (Bailey 1947, 623); it might have been a difficult task, but he achieved it. Lucretius's "often-quoted aversions on the 'poverty of our language,' *egestas*

linguae (1.139) and the 'poverty of our ancestral speech,' *patrii sermonis egestas* (1.832; 3.260) should be read in this context, not as an apology but as an implicit boast" (Kenney 2007, 97).[82]

Lucretius also selects an unusual verb to describe his aims: *inlustrare*, light up (a verb used also by Cicero of his work in translating Greek philosophy, at *Academica* 1.3 and *Tusculan Disputations* 1.5, both of which postdate the *DRN*). Lucretius only uses this verb one other time (*DRN* 3.2), where it describes Epicurus as illuminating the world like the sun. The use of *inlustrare* "likens the accomplishments of master and disciple. The word should be read with its full force, not simply as a term for translation" (Tatum 1984, 181–82). Through translation, through tackling this difficult task, Lucretius will light up the world with the aid of Epicurus, who, alas, now currently languishes in the darkness of Greek obscurity. To come into his own, he needs the assistance of Latin's clarity. Although there is no doubt that Lucretius felt a deep reverence for Epicurus and his philosophy—just as Cicero did for Plato and Platonism—he cannot help, I think, being influenced by Roman ideas of translation as a competitive act even as he struggles against them.

The lines that follow this first statement of Latin's poverty also show Lucretius within another Roman model of translation, that of translation as a gift exchange between two elite Romans:

> But still your manliness (*virtus*) and the longed for pleasure of your sweet friendship (*amicitiae*) persuaded me to carry out any labor, and led me to spend serene nights awake looking for the words and the poetry with which I can finally spread clear lights before your mind, with which you can examine thoroughly the depths of secret matters. (1.140–5)

> *sed tua me virtus tamen et sperata voluptas*
> *suavis amicitiae quemvis efferre laborem*
> *suadet et inducit noctes vigilare serenas*
> *quaerentem dictis quibus et quo carmine demum*
> *clara tuae possim praepandere lumina menti,*
> *res quibus occultas penitus convisere possis.*

The you of line 140 is Memmius, the dedicatee of the poem. While I doubt that Lucretius wants us to imagine him and Memmius hanging out in the same way that Catullus and Calvus did, his work in translation is still offered up within a context of male friendship and in words that have erotic connotations (*voluptas*, *suavis*). Lucretius's struggles with Latin's vocabulary are framed as a labor undertaken in male friendship.

The second use of *egestas* occurs toward of the close of Book One:

> Now let us examine what the Greeks call the *homoeomeria* of Anaxagoras, which the poverty of our ancestral speech does not allow us

> to say in our language, although the subject itself is easy to expose (*exponere*) with words. (1.829–33)[83]

> *Nunc et Anaxagorae scrutemur homoeomerian*
> *quam Grai memorant nec nostra dicere lingua*
> *concedit nobis patrii sermonis egestas,*
> *sed tamen ipsam rem facilest exponere verbis.*[84]

Certainly "it would have been hard to form a Latin word to express [*homoeomeria*] and it was fortunate for Lucretius that the Greek word would scan" (Bailey 1947, II, 745). But Lucretius is not just confessing that he failed to find a translation for a Greek word and had to fall back on transliteration. In commenting on this passage, Joseph Farrell writes:

> The beauty of these Greek words [*Anaxagorae* and *homoeomeria*] lies beyond the frontier of poor Latinity; but the idea (*ipsam rem*) is perfectly easy to express in words (*verbis*). This quite interesting expression seems to suggest that *homoeomeria* actually is not a word, or that Greek words are not really words, or that *verba*—i.e. Latin words—are the only ones that count. (2001, 48)

The presence of the Greek word, a rare transliteration in Lucretius,[85] draws our attention, pauses the readers, and reminds them that this is, in part, a translation. The effect is to cause readers to admire Lucretius's skill in then expressing the meaning of any Greek philosophical idea in a language as deficient as Latin. However, the transliteration is not just there to remind us that this is a translation of Greek ideas, as a self-insert by the translator. It also creates distance between the Roman reader and Anaxagoras's ideas (of which Lucretius did not approve) and "marks the alien nature of this particular philosophical concept: it cannot be rendered naturally in Latin, let alone comprehended or accepted by Lucretius' audience" (Warren 2007, 28). As a foreignizing element, it is meant not so much as a reminder that this is a translation, but as a sign that we should reject this alien and problematic idea.

I will conclude by looking at one final passage from Book Five where Lucretius states that "it is only just now that the nature and organization of things was discovered—and *I* have myself have been discovered, first among the first, someone who can translate (*vertere*) this into the language of our fathers" (5.335–36).[86] Here we have a shift from Book Three: Epicurus's paternal precepts must still be turned into Latin, the language of the fathers. Only then can they become fully Roman and fully absorbed; only then will the Roman people grasp the benefit of Epicureanism, a benefit they need as the Republic reels from crisis to crisis. No less than with Cicero's philosophical works, we should see the background for Lucretius's translation as a period of internal crisis. But Lucretius tries to draw Epicurus into the Roman *familia* and translates Epicureanism for slightly different reasons and with different stresses. Cicero's translations of philosophy not only

aimed at creating a Latin version of Greek philosophy but also were a means to leave as his legacy a vision of what the Republic should be; they aimed at solidifying his literary authority as he lost political authority. Lucretius, on the other hand, translated to ensure that Epicureanism spread; he had no personal political authority to safeguard. However, there are still similarities as both sought to ensure that their philosophical beliefs also became those of the Roman people through a process of translation and filtering; neither translated a single text directly, but they reformulated a number of texts into a single Latin whole. Like Cicero, Lucretius did not translate for those who could not read Epicurus in Greek. He wrote for those who may have approached Epicurus and found his ideas startling or his style problematic; his poetry was not about providing a way for the Greekless to gain access to Greek philosophy but aimed to make the original's ideas palatable. As such, his "translation" required a massive amount of intervention, intervention he was willing and eager to provide.

GERMANICUS CAESAR'S CELESTIAL AIMS (15 BCE–19 CE)[87]

I close this chapter with a brief discussion of Germanicus Caesar's translation of Aratus's *Phaenomena*.[88] While the original may now seem a tremendously obscure and crabbed work, it was extremely popular in Rome. In fact, we know there were at least six Latin translations, by: Cicero (when he was around 20 years old);[89] Varro of Atax (b. 82 BCE);[90] Ovid; Germanicus Caesar; Avienius (fourth-century CE); and an eighth-century CE anonymous writer (whose version is called the *Aratus Latinus*). Around the same period as Germanicus was working on his translation, another poet, Manilius, translated portions of the *Phaenomena* in his *Astronomica* (on which see Volk 2009, 182–97). Germanicus's poem entered a crowded field, something he does not mention.

If we accept the attribution of the poem to Germanicus, we can date its publication to within a few years; although dedicated to Augustus, it must have been completed after his death in 14 CE, as it refers to his catasterism. As Ovid's *Fasti* (1.21–24) mentions Germanicus as a didactic poet, his translation must have been published before Ovid died in 17 CE. We have most of the work, although the last section exists only in fragments:[91] lines 1–725 are a very free translation of the original and an additional 222 lines are tacked on the end. These last lines, which may indicate a much longer total, discuss astronomy, astrology, and meteorology, and seem to have replaced lines 758–1154 of the ST, which dealt with the signs of good and bad weather. (A comparison of the structure of Aratus's original and Germanicus's and Cicero's versions can be found at Toohey 1996, 186–87.) Germanicus pulled from various sources besides Aratus, including a commentary on the poem by Hipparchus (second century BCE) and Cicero's translation, and added in elements from Virgil and Ovid to boot.[92]

THE *ARATEA*

> Aratus took his start (*deduxit*) from great Jupiter, but for my poetry, you, sire, are the greatest source (*auctor*). I revere you and I bring sacred gifts, the first shoots of my learned labor, to you. The ruler and begetter of the gods himself approves. For what strength could be in the sure signs of the year, the one with which the swift Sun circles the burning Crab, and with which he cuts the facing turning posts of icy Capricorn, or that with which Aries and Libra level out the divisions of daylight, if the gaining of peace under your leadership had not allowed ships to sail the level sea, the farmer to till the land, and the sound of arms to recede into distant silence? At last there is an opportunity to lift our gaze boldly to the sky and learn of the celestial bodies and their different movements and discover what the sailor and the canny ploughman should avoid, when the sailor should entrust his ship to the winds and the ploughman his seed to the soil. May your presence and the peace you have won aid your son; grant your divine power to favor me as I attempt to speak of these with Latin Muses. (Lines 1–16; adaptation of Gain's translation)

Ab Iove principium magno deduxit Aratus.
Carminis at nobis, genitor, tu maximus auctor,
te veneror tibi sacra fero doctique laboris
primitias. Probat ipse deum rectorque satorque.
Quantum etenim possent anni certissima signa
qua Sol ardentem Cancrum rapidissimus ambit
diversasque secat metas gelidi Capricorni
quave Aries et Libra aequant divortia lucis
si non parta quies te praeside puppibus aequor
cultorique daret terras, procul arma silerent?
Nunc vacat audacis ad caelum tollere vultus
sideraque et mundi varios cognoscere motus,
navita quid caveat, quid scitus vitet arator,
quando ratem ventis aut credat semina terris.
Haec ego dum Latiis conor praedicere Musis,
pax tua tuque adsis nato numenque secundes.

Thus begins Germanicus's *Aratea*; Aratus's proem is very different:[93]

> Let us begin with Zeus, whom we men never leave unspoken (*arreton*). Filled with Zeus are all highways and all meeting-places of people, filled are the sea and harbours; in all circumstances we are all dependent on Zeus. For we are also his children, and he benignly gives helpful signs to men, and rouses people to work, reminding them of their livelihood, tells when the soil is best for oxen and mattocks, and tells when the

> seasons are right both for planting trees and for sowing every kind of seed. For it was Zeus himself who fixed the signs in the sky, making them into distinct constellations, and organised stars for the year to give the most clearly defined signs of the season round to men, so that everything may grow without fail. That is why men always pay homage to him first and last. Hail, Father, great wonder, great boon to men, yourself and the earlier race! And hail, Muses, all most gracious! In answer to my prayer to tell of the star in so far as I may, guide my singing. (1–18; all translations of Aratus are by Kidd)

In his first three words, Germanicus feints a literal translation of his ST, only to explicitly abandon it in the next three. To show that this is not a literal translation, he even references Aratus's reception in Rome with his use of *deduxit*, a verb which "had become in Augustan poetics a term that designated composition in that 'refined style' for which Aratus himself was praised" (Possanza 2004, 107).[94] As ancient poems were known by their first lines, Aratus's opening line was familiar to Germanicus's audience, and his move away from his source immediately recognizable; Germanicus doubles that effect by making his shift explicit, making certain his version can only be read as something that deliberately deviates from its ST.

Where Aratus gave his audience Zeus, Germanicus replaces him, or rather translates him into Augustus, who now guarantees the environment necessary for poetic production. (Jupiter, crucially, stands on the sidelines and approves of his replacement.) Augustus is the *auctor*: not just the source, but Germanicus's father or ancestor, and potentially a co-author, as the word allows for all three meanings. By invoking Augustus as his ideal audience, Germanicus seems to strip his translation of any didactic intent: after all, a god even greater than Jupiter would hardly need a poem about weather signs, even one that goes a step farther than Aratus and deals with planets, a topic he refused to touch on. As the general thrust of Aratus's work was "to demonstrate the role of Zeus in material creation" (Toohey 1996, 57)—something which would have been clear by the extent of his proem—Germanicus's shift was dramatic, and reorientated the entire poem. Augustus also slips into replacing Aratus as well as Jupiter, because he is described as the source for Germanicus's poetry. There can be no doubt that this will be *Augustan* poetry, not a replication of a Greek poem. Noticeably, for Germanicus's changes to work he requires an audience that doesn't need his translation but is familiar with the original text, as only then can replacing Jupiter with Augustus have full impact. In reworking Aratus's proem, Germanicus deliberately recalls it to replace it. His use of Aratus's name in line 1 recalls the start of his ST's second line, where Aratus punned off his name by using *arreton*/unspoken. In using Aratus's name, Germanicus ensures "Aratus, like Zeus himself, does not go unmentioned" (Possanza 2004, 107).

Germanicus closes his proem by appealing to Augustus's *numen*, divine power, as he struggles to speak of (*praedicere*) weather signs in Latin. These lines signal his intent to add to Aratus's poem, since his reference to

"celestial bodies and their different movements" and to weather forcecasting (13–15) indicates that he will deal with the planets, a subject with which Aratus had explicitly said he would not deal (460–61; Possanza 2004, 110). With this shift and addition, "Germanicus is free to embark on a program of rewriting that puts the reader not in a world order presided over by a providential deity, but rather in a world order presided over by the Emperor Augustus" (Pozzanza 2003, 111). Germanicus will, thus, explicitly go beyond and supplement his model, even as he substitutes a Roman emperor for a Greek god. The changes that Germanicus made in the opening stand out even further when we recall how rarely Aratus speaks in his own person during his epic (Volk 2002, 56). In fact, he only speaks in his own voice in the proem (1–18) and at 178–79, 460–61, 607–8, and 1036–37. This is not a lot of authorial interjection in a poem of 1,154 lines, especially in a didactic poem. Germanicus does not just rewrite the proem; he rewrites the most personal part of the ST in a very explicit and obvious way.

Germanicus's interventions are much less overt in the rest of the poem, even as he reworks his original dramatically. There are several points, however, where he explicitly marks the difference between his text and the Greek source. In lines 24–31 he describes the Bears (Ursa Major and Minor), a translation of *Phaenomena* 26–30. However, where the ST talks of the two Bears called the Wagon,[95] Germanicus's version mentions their Greek name (Arctoe) and then goes on to supplement that by talking about their Roman names Ursae or Plaustrae (the Wagons), using the term *cognomen*. "The combination of Greek and Latin names, *Arctoe* and *Ursae* in the same line, and the specific mention of the translator's language . . . are ways in which the poet incorporates the translation process into his poem" (Possanza 2004, 118). This translator's interjection does more than that: it offers up a supplement to the original's two names, by adding the Latin beside the Greek. The use of *cognomen*, the third name of Roman citizens, reminds us that we are in a Roman world. And if Rome can add to the stars, as with Augustus's catasterism, then it can also grant citizenship, through naming, to Greek stars (only Roman citizens had a cognomen). This remains the last point at which Germanicus mentions language or Romanness explicitly, but it is enough: by radically rewriting Aratus's proem, he has signaled his independence from his source enough for his audience, who will remain attuned to see the many places his translation deviates from the ST.

One last place allows us to see how Germanicus plays with translation, in the context of Orion's attempted rape of Artemis (Roman Diana). In lines 646–47 Germanicus writes, "May you be kind to a poet (*vati*), I pray, Virgin Daughter of Leto; I was not the first to sing this—ancient poets (*poetae*) did it also."[96] The ST has "may Artemis be gracious! This is a tale of the ancients, who said . . . " (637). Unlike Aratus, Germanicus speaks in the first person (Possanza 2004, 194), drawing attention to himself as a translator and using translation as a convenient excuse for repeating something that might offend the goddess. He even takes advantage of the Greek loan word

poeta to contrast himself as a *vates*, a Roman poet, with foreign *poetae* who tell this type of shocking story.

CONCLUSION

The four poets here show the complexity and issues involved in translating Greek poetry in Rome. The first, Catullus, wrestled with the dangers of translating Greek lyric poetry, while the second, Horace, took full advantage of the personal voice of that poetry to overwrite Greek lyric voices with his own. Lucretius struggled in a deliberately visible way to forge a new technical language for Epicureanism, even as he ignored other Epicurean translators. Germanicus translated a text that had already been translated by Cicero, also without ever mentioning him, even as he drew on Cicero's translation. In all four poets we can see a complicated nexus where translation had multiple functions. It could be a mechanism to claim authority, or a means to promote philosophical ideas or deal with an almost overwhelming poetic influence; it could also function as a part of aristocratic gift exchange. Noticeably, none of the four Latin poets discussed in this chapter seems to have been particularly concerned with what claims the original author or ST might have had, as they delved into them for their own needs.

6 The Post-Ciceronian Landscape of Roman Translation Theory

People who teach interpretation never get paid a lot.
numquam magnas mercedes accepisse eos qui hermeneumata docerent.

—Seneca the Elder, *Controversia* 9.3.14

PROSE TRANSLATION THEORY AFTER CICERO: A FRAGMENTED LANDSCAPE

Cicero's discussion of translation is uniquely rich and complex in the Roman tradition. This may be a distortion due to a combination of literary quality, his significance for later generations of Romans, and accidents of survival—if we had more of the scholar and polymath Varro's enormous output, including all of his monumental *On the Latin Language*,[1] along with material from Cicero's Atticist and Epicurean rivals, our perspective might be very different. But what we still possess outside of Cicero is certainly rich enough to show us the diverse ways that translation functioned and was dealt with by post-Ciceronian prose authors. This chapter discusses a range of such authors, beginning with Seneca the Elder, whose life spanned the Late Republic and the Augustan age, and closing with Aulus Gellius in the second century. To argue that these authors had a unified theory or concept of translation would be mendacious; each discussion of translation took place in a different nexus of personal, political, and cultural concerns, and I have no intention of thrusting each author into the same procrustean bed.

However, as we shall see, there *are* a number of themes common to these authors. Many were also connected by an interest in pedagogy, which may be either explicit (Seneca the Elder, Quintilian) or more oblique (Seneca the Younger, Aulus Gellius). Lastly, all were interested in presenting themselves as ideal *Roman* men, for whom Greek language and literature was a valuable cultural resource; showing that one had proper control of its linguistic and literary store remained an important factor in constructing elite identity or, in the case of Gellius, laying claim to a higher status than one might otherwise be entitled to.

SENECA THE ELDER

Seneca the Elder's life began in the Late Republic, but he was very much a man of the empire. Born a Roman citizen around 50 BCE in the Roman colony that is now Cordoba, Spain, ambition and an interest in rhetoric brought him to Rome. A young man when Cicero was speaking in the Forum (that he never heard him speak because the civil wars impeded traveling was one of his greatest regrets), he seems never to have had a political career but to have spent his time on the study of rhetoric. (He was, however, the father of one phenomenally successful politician and philosopher, Seneca the Younger.)[2] Despite the clear pedagogical intent of his work, he does not appear to have ever taught rhetoric, although it is evident that he was a dedicated student of the subject and had an acquaintance with leading oratorical lights and teachers over the course of his long life.[3]

Seneca owes his literary reputation to his history of declamation,[4] which covers famous and infamous declaimers, and includes many sample *controversiae* (speeches based on fictional cases, often very unlikely and involving pirates and virgin priestesses, sometimes at the same time) and *suasoriae* (advice to historical characters such as Alexander the Great and Cicero).[5] The history was nominally addressed to his three sons, but clearly aimed at a wider audience (McGill 2005, 343); it positioned itself as a gift emanating from the marvelous memory of an old man looking back over the many declaimers he had seen over a long life. Because it is presented as the product of personal memory and not as a work of oratorical history proper, while it covers a very wide range of orators and declaimers (Romans and Greek),[6] it is not interested in pre-Ciceronian oratory—or historiography, philosophy, or archaic literature (Fairweather 1981, 305–19). The type of oratory Seneca discusses, declamation, was a key part of Roman education, and pitted students against each other on various sides of a fictional court case (or advisory positions, in the case of *suasoriae*). This was intended to be practice for the courtroom, though many Romans criticized such training because they felt it did not prepare students for the cut and thrust of real court cases.[7] It was, however, ideal for an era in which one could not battle it out freely in the rhetorical arenas of the courts and Senate as Cicero had. And by allowing students to perform identities not their own, allowing them to speak for and as women, slaves, and social inferiors, declamation also prepared them for their role as elite males and provided "a training in social distinction and in the linguistic skills suited for the fashioning of governors" (Bloomer 1997b, 64). In other words, training in declamation, and hence Seneca's work, was deeply involved in training and ensuring the replication of the Roman elite, and his discussions of translation were bound up in concerns about the right ways to act and represent oneself as a member of that elite.

Imitation, Translation, and Plagiarism

Seneca's fragmented discussion of translation should be situated alongside his concerns for appropriate forms of imitation, concerns that permeate his text. These concerns take two forms. The first is the need for multiple models of imitation, because, as he says in the preface to his first book of *controversiae*:

> [w]e should not imitate only one person, no matter how exceptional they may be, because the imitator is not equal to the source. This is the nature of things: the representation (*similitudo*) is always less than the actual thing. (*Controversia* 1, *preface* 6)
>
> *non est unus, quamvis praecipuus sit, imitandus, quia numquam par fit imitator auctori. haec rei natura est: semper citra veritatem est similitudo.*

Imitation and translation are connected because translation is a specific type of imitation, one that involves movement between the two languages as well as improvement of one's source, and improvement and innovation were of critical importance to success in declamation.[8] Although *controversiae* were often on old, trite (if bizarre) topics, emphasis was laid on originality, especially in *sententiae* (epigrammatic or pithy statements that were much appreciated and applauded by audiences). Points were gained by riffing off previous speeches and phrases—as long as one took them in original directions. Older authors, both Greek and Roman, were magnets for plagiarists (McGill 2010, 115), who hoped to get away with passing off others' clever phrases as their own. Plagiarism (a major concern for Seneca; see McGill 2010 and 2005) could occur via translation as well as via theft within a language, but "the matter [of whether something was a legitimate use or plagiarism] was never reduced to a mechanical arithmetic of linguistic change" (McGill 2010, 125). Such concerns arise at *Controversia* 9.1.13, where Seneca relates comments from the declaimer Fuscus,[9] who translated an epigram of the Greek lyric poet Adaeus:[10]

> I remember that when Fuscus was challenged with this *sententia* of Adaeus he did not deny that he had brought it into (*transtulisse*) Latin; he also said he did not do it to recommend[11] himself or as a theft but for exercise. "I work to compete with the best *sententia*," he said, "and I try not to pervert (*corrumpere*), but to conquer (*vincere*) them. There are many Roman orators, historians, and poets who have not stolen, but challenged, the sayings of the Greeks."
>
> *Memini deinde Fuscum, cum haec Adaei sententia obiceretur, non infitiari transtulisse se eam in Latinam; et aiebat non commendationis id se aut furti, sed exercitationis causa facere. Do, inquit, operam ut cum optimis sententiis certem, nec illas corrumpere conor sed vincere. Multa*

> *oratores, historici poetae Romani a Graecis dicta non subripuerunt sed provocaverunt.*

There is much that is familiar *and* unfamiliar in this passage. Fuscus's claim that translation is a form of *exercitatio*, training for the orator that improves rhetorical skill, is something we have seen in Cicero, and will see again in Quintilian and Pliny the Younger. Fuscus also employs the language of conquest (*vincere, provocaverunt*) to describe his translation and carefully notes that he has many Roman *exempla* for his strategy. However, at the same time, he shows shifts in the language he uses. First, *transtulisse* (the perfect infinitive of *transfero*, Seneca's preferred verb for translation):[12] we could take his use of this verb as representative of a shift in attitude toward translation, especially when compared to (*con*)*verto*, as the former's root meaning is "to carry across." This could be seen as indicating a less aggressive attitude toward the original, a desire to transfer meaning, more in tune with the source's intent. However, like (*con*)*verto*, *transfero* can be used to refer to complete change (as at the opening of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, where he talks of bodies being *translata*/transformed). But more significant for understanding how Fuscus sees translation is how he qualifies *transtulisse* in the very next sentence by describing his desire to conquer the Greek *sententia*. This, combined with his use of *corrumpere*, suggests that for Fuscus, at least, it is not possible "to bring across" a source: one can only make it worse or improve it; equivalence is not a possibility. *Corrumpere* (which, as we will see, is also used by Pliny the Younger) implies wastage, adulteration, and spoilage of the original. It also has extended meanings in terms of language and speech, where it can refer to mutilated language (Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory* 1.5.68) or to pronouncing something in a mutilated manner (Gellius, *Attic Nights* 13.30.9); it can even be used of seduction. As a whole package, this verb invokes images of spoiling and corruption of the text that recall Terence (as does the use of *furti*). Fuscus stresses the dangers of changing texts in translation: to do this wrongly *will* change the original text, but negatively, and (as with any spoiled object) the original is then contaminated and potentially unusable by others—or even unhealthy. However, to translate a text correctly will make you its victor, so the risk is worth undertaking.

Fuscus then provides us with an example of the right way to transfer between languages, citing a *sententia* of Thucydides that the Roman historian Sallust had translated. Both Fuscus and Seneca the Elder consider this to have conquered its model in brevity:[13] "although Thucydides is noted for his quality of brevity, Sallust conquered him in that—and did it right in his camp."[14] At the risk of stating the obvious: for Fuscus, translation done correctly allows one to sack the Greeks right in their very strongholds (presumably this is also Seneca's view, as he does not offer a correcting opinion, as he does elsewhere). It is not a case of making a truce and exchanging meaning: there can only be winners and losers when translation is performed.

This is why translation can function as an excellent form of exercise; one can train for contending in declamation or in the courtroom by wrestling with an opponent in the Greek language.

SENECA THE YOUNGER

Seneca's son, Seneca the Younger (c. 4 BCE–64 CE), has a literary reputation that rightfully far exceeds his father's. He wrote in a truly staggering range of genres: tragedy (his tragedies had an immense vogue in the Renaissance); philosophical letters addressed to a young disciple, Lucilius; and a range of consolations and philosophical treatises on topics from clemency to anger. His long career was marked by a series of dramatic ups and downs, as he was exiled by Caligula only to be recalled by the Emperor Claudius to teach his adopted son, Nero. Under Nero he first wielded immense influence, only to fall into disgrace and be forced to commit suicide in 65 CE.

Philosophical Translation after Cicero

As a Stoic philosopher writing in Latin, Seneca could not help but be interested in questions of translating Greek philosophy into Latin, and it is there that I shall start. In *On the Tranquility of Mind* (a dialogue dating probably from the early 60s), he discusses the correct translation of the Greek word *euthumia* (the well-being of the soul):

> This steadiness of mind which the Greeks call *euthumia*—the work on this by Democritus is exceptional—*I* call *tranquillitas* (calmness). For it is not necessary to imitate or transfer the form (*formam*) of words; the thing itself, which is the topic of discussion, must be designated by some name which should have the force (*vim*), not the appearance (*faciem*), of the Greek term. (2.3)
>
> *Hanc stabilem animi sedem Graeci euthumian vocant, de qua Democriti volumen egregium est, ego tranquillitatem voco; nec enim imitari et transferre verba ad illorum formam necesse est: res ipsa, de qua agitur aliquo signanda nomine est, quod appellationis Graecae vim debet habere, non faciem.*

Like Cicero, Seneca weighs in against transliterating Greek, and invokes the *vis* of the original as a more important factor in translation. However, here we are far away from Atticism and Asianism and Cicero's use of *vis*, and Seneca was well aware of that. Besides invoking Cicero's textual ghost, Seneca is having a little fun with terminology by using *vis*, force or violence, a Stoic evil that should be eliminated from the tranquil mind. Such playfulness should not, however, blind us to the fact that Seneca also stresses that this is *his* choice—note the use of the emphatic *ego*/I to describe his decision

to use *tranquillitas*; this word is not necessary in Latin, and is carefully deployed to emphasize that this is *Seneca's* word choice, not one inherited or borrowed. In fact, by using *vis*, a word that invokes Cicero, Seneca subtly shows the difference between their two formulas; right at the end of the passage, we are led to expect a variation on the Ciceronian formula but we are denied, as Seneca replaces *verbum* with *faciem*. In fact, this short section of Latin is very carefully structured and balanced for maximum effect: there are, for example, two naming terms (*nomine* and *appellatis*) and two terms for appearance (*faciem* and *formam*). All this frames and highlights Seneca's careful word choice, and the importance of not building a word on a Greek model.[15]

A slightly later text, *Epistle* 58, is helpful for showing the wider context of Seneca's textual and philosophical struggles with Cicero. At the start of this letter, he complains of the extreme poverty of Latin's vocabulary, echoing Lucretius before mentioning Cicero by name:

> I never understood our linguistic poverty—no, our complete destitution—more than today. A thousand topics came up when we happened to be talking about Plato, topics which we lacked words for or which we have lost the words for through being too fastidious. What to make of such fastidiousness in the middle of destitution! (58.1)
>
> *Quanta verborum nobis paupertas, immo egestas sit, numquam magis quam hodierno die intellexi. Mille res inciderunt, cum forte de Platone loqueremur, quae nomina desiderarent nec haberent, quaedam vero quae cum habuissent fastidio nostro perdidissent. Quis autem ferat in egestate fastidium?*

[V]erborum nobis paupertas, immo egestas, a formula which expands on and doubles Lucretius's phrasing, is a powerful opening, and it is followed by the equally powerful claim that the complete destitution of Latin ended a discussion about Plato. But then Seneca turns in an unexpected direction: where we might expect him to immediately bring up a list of philosophical terms that Latin lacks, as support for his statement, he does not. His examples of the linguistic poverty of Latin are, in the context of a philosophical discussion, bizarre. They include *asilus* (horsefly; now in use is *oestrus*, a Greek word), the phrase *cernere . . . inter se* (*decernere* is now used), and the use of *iusso* instead of *iussero* in conditional clauses (2–5), all of which he says have dropped out of proper speech. Seneca argues that these are all perfectly good words, and that they have the authority of Virgil to back them up, before he moves on to Cicero:

> You ask yourself: what does he intend with that preamble? What's his point? I will not hide my intent from you. I want, if it is possible to do so, to use the word *essentia* before a sympathetic audience—and if I don't do this introduction, it will be an annoyed one. I have Cicero's

> authority for *essentia*, and I think his is a good one. If you are looking for a more recent authority, there is Fabianus, elegant and learned even for our ultrafastidious taste. What else is to be done, my Lucilius? How else can we express *ousia*, that is, something essential, something that is the natural foundation of everything? I ask you then to allow me to use this word *essentia*. And even with that I shall work hard to use the permission you have given me as sparingly as I can. In fact, maybe I shall just be content to have been given permission. But what will your good nature do for me, if I cannot at all express (*exprimere*) in Latin the very word which made me criticize our tongue? You will condemn our Roman deficiency even more when you find out that there is a word of one syllable which I cannot translate (*mutare*). "What is this?" you ask. It is *to on*. Now you think I am a person of slow intelligence: surely it is right there before me that I can translate (*transferri*) this word with "what is." But I see a great difference between the two words: there I am forced to lay down (*ponere*) a noun for a verb. But if I must do so, I shall replace it (*ponam*) with "what is." (6–8)
>
> *"Quid sibi" inquis "ista praeparatio vult? quo spectat?" Non celabo te: cupio, si fieri potest, propitiis auribus tuis "essentiam" dicere; si minus, dicam et iratis. Ciceronem auctorem huius verbi habeo, puto locupletem; si recentiorem quaeris, Fabianum, disertum et elegantem, orationis etiam ad nostrum fastidium nitidae. Quid enim fiet, mi Lucili? quomodo dicetur "ousia", res necessaria, natura continens fundamentum omnium? Rogo itaque permittas mihi hoc verbo uti. Nihilominus dabo operam ut ius a te datum parcissime exerceam; fortasse contentus ero mihi licere. Quid proderit facilitas tua, cum ecce id nullo modo Latine exprimere possim propter quod linguae nostrae convicium feci? Magis damnabis angustias Romanas, si scieris unam syllabam esse quam mutare non possum. Quae sit haec quaeris? "to on". Duri tibi videor ingenii: in medio positum, posse sic transferri ut dicam "quod est". Sed multum interesse video: cogor verbum pro vocabulo ponere; sed si ita necesse est, ponam "quod est".*

Clearly, Seneca knows, and even points out, that his examples are strikingly irrelevant to the question at hand, which is the lack of a Latin equivalent for the Greek word *ousia*. Then, instead of coining a word (which would be the most obvious proof that Latin was deficient in philosophical terminology), he uses the existing word *essentia*, for which he erroneously claims Cicero's authority.[16] But this is only used as a springboard to lament *essentia*'s deficiency—notice how he makes certain his audience knows that the educated Lucilius will not be happy with it and will need a lot of convincing. And that is only another springboard to announce that Latin lacks a translation for *to on* (being), which he translates reluctantly with *quod est* (what is).

Why this extended discussion, which still ends with Seneca having to translate in his own name, albeit unhappily? I suspect the answer is that

Seneca is trying to shuffle out from under the heavy shadow of Cicero. This may seem strange, given his initial praise for Cicero's authority, but nonetheless this section functions as a clever attack on that authority. First, it makes the claim that language changes—not always for the better, but it changes; change is inevitable—which means that it is acceptable and natural to change it; in other words, Seneca is not stuck with the philosophical vocabulary that Cicero created. More significantly, it claims that Seneca and his peers found it *impossible to discuss Plato with existing Latin.* That's a damning claim, given the amount of time and effort we have seen that Cicero put into translating Plato for a Roman audience, forging a new philosophical language in the process. But according to Seneca, either the words necessary for discussing Plato do not exist in Latin or they have been lost: it is as if Cicero's translation project never happened or was rejected by the Romans. If any reader points this out, Seneca has a way to deal with him: *essentia*, the word that is ascribed erroneously to Cicero, is deliberately marked as problematic, the type of language for which a translator has to do some extensive pleading to make an educated audience accept it.

In this letter, Seneca creates the need and audience (complete with responses) for his translations, a need that might not otherwise be obvious to a Roman audience. Cicero is shown to not be the last word in Latin philosophy but is an authority who needs to be corrected, and his language amplified and augmented. In doing this, Seneca shores up his own glory and linguistic legacy.[17] He also employs a dazzling array of verbs to describe his work in translation: *exprimo*, *muto*, *transfero*, ending with *pono*, a verb that does not have a translational sense, but rather one of placing, setting, or laying. Seneca's clear comfort with such an extensive array of verbs to describe translation displays his range as a translator. (It also marks his difference from Cicero, who never employs such a varied run of translation verbs.)

POLYBIUS'S CHILDISH TRANSLATIONS: *CONSOLATION TO POLYBIUS*

Seneca did not just discuss philosophical translation, however; he also commented on two translations by Polybius, the Emperor Claudius's powerful freedman. These appear in a consolation he sent to Polybius after the death of his brother, a consolation that clearly aimed at currying favor and encouraging Seneca's recall from exile. In this, he invites Polybius several times to turn to his translations of Homer (into Latin) and Virgil (into Greek) for comfort in his time of grief:[18]

> Bury yourself in Homer and Virgil, who are owed by all humanity as much as they—and everyone—owe you because you wished them to be known by more than those for whom they wrote. (8.2)

Tunc Homerus et Vergilius tam bene de humano genere meriti quam tu et de illis et de omnibus meruisti, quos pluribus notos esse voluisti quam scripserant, multum tecum morentur.

Then take up the poems of each author, poems which are famous (*celebrata sunt*) because of the great labor of your genius, which you so set free that although their arrangement (*structura*) has disappeared, their charm still remains—for you translated each one into another tongue, that all their qualities (*virtutes*) followed them into a new (*alienum*) language, which is the hardest thing to do. (11.5)

Agedum illa quae multo ingenii tui labore celebrata sunt in manus sume utriuslibet auctoris carmina, quae tu ita resolvisti, ut quamvis structura illorum recesserit, permaneat tamen gratia—sic enim illa ex alia lingua in aliam transtulisti, ut, quod difficillimum erat, omnes virtutes in alienam te orationem secutae sint.

"Setting free" the two works from their forms, as Polybius is said to have done, presumably means that he translated each author into prose (Duff 1915, 201). Unfortunately, this meaning is unique to this passage and is complicated by the other meanings *of resolvo,* whose primary sense is to unbind, unravel, set free, or open (as with scrolls or veins). It also has a wide range of highly negative meanings: to reduce to a pulp (OLD 3c); to make less disciplined (OLD 5); to put an end to (OLD 7). Elsewhere, Seneca uses it in the sense of "enfeeble" (*Epistle* 36.1). The choice of this verb subtly suggests the problematic nature of Polybius's translation project and its effect on both texts.

Throughout these passages, there are other suggestions that Seneca's praise is not entirely wholehearted. First, we have the comment that Polybius has made these two poems famous (*celebrata*), setting them free to wander among new audiences in Greek and Latin. An educated person, used to the centrality of Virgil and Homer to Roman education, and Homer to Greek education, would wonder whether they could benefit that much from translation, given that everyone who should know these authors had presumably already read them. Additionally, *celebrata* suggests the thronging of crowds; as a Stoic, Seneca advised avoiding the crowd and would have been suspicious of popular appeal. Perhaps Seneca is hinting that setting free these authors is not such a good thing after all, especially if all they can do now is wander among the uneducated hordes.

Seneca next suggests that Polybius should now turn to translating Aesop's fables, a task that he insists has not yet been done at Rome (8.2). Aside from the fact that the fables had already been translated by Phaedrus in the period of Tiberius,[19] there is something strange about suggesting this task as the next logical step for Polybius, because it seems an inappropriate literary task to suggest to an adult. Translating Aesop was normally a task assigned to young children; in fact, according to Quintilian, one of the first things a young student should do is read and translate Aesop:

> Then students should learn to speak in pure speech and the fables of Aesop (but without puffing them up), which closely resemble their nurses' fables, and demand the same simplicity from their writing. First they should break up the verses, then closely translate (*interpretari*) them with different (*mutatis*) words, and then translate (*vertere*) in a bolder paraphrase—in this they can shorten and extend, if they can do it and still keep the meaning of the poet. This task, which is difficult for the most accomplished teacher, will lay a foundation in learning for the one who handles it properly. (*Institutes of Oratory* 1.9.2–3)
>
> *Igitur Aesopi fabellas, quae fabulis nutricularum proxime succedunt, narrare sermone puro et nihil se supra modum extollente, deinde eandem gracilitatem stilo exigere condiscant. Versus primo solvere, mox mutatis verbis interpretari, tum paraphrasi audacius vertere, qua et breviare quaedam et exornere salvo modo poetae sensu permittitur. Quod opus, etiam consummatis professoribus difficile, qui commode tractaverit cuicumque discendo suffciet.*

If Aesop was the type of author one would suggest as suitable for a child to tackle (albeit a talented child), it is hard to imagine an adult would be gratified by the suggestion that he turn his hand to translating Aesop's fables—especially as after he had tackled the highest form of poetry (epic), fables would be a distinct step down in terms of genre.

ASIDE: TRANSLATION AS DISMEMBERMENT

Seneca states that the appeal of both authors in their new form rests upon Polybius's ability to render their original virtues into a new language, even as he has altered their shape; their popularity in no way is represented as relying on the translations being close or even retaining the overall shape of the STs. Noticeably, neither Seneca nor Quintilian show much concern for preserving the form of the original; neither worries about altering the physical shape of an original text (say, from poetry to prose) or breaking it down into dismembered segments and then reconstructing them in a new, totally altered form. For both of these authors, the point is to dissolve the text into its constituent parts, breaking it down so one can fully possess it and then reform it into something new, something that is one's own. According to Seneca, the important element of the originals that Polybius has transferred is neither primarily textual nor literary but moral: as long as he has transferred these qualities of the original, then his translation can be deemed satisfactory. In fact, Seneca emphasizes the disjunction between Greek and Latin even as he praises Polybius for overcoming that gap; note the careful balancing of *illa ex alia lingua in aliam* ("each one into another tongue") and the use of *alienam orationem* ("foreign language") in 11.5, and compare that with the usual way that Latin and Greek are mentioned side by

side as *utraque lingua*, a phrase that suggests a closer conjunction between the two languages, almost as two sides of the same coin. In Seneca what connects source and target text is primarily moral,[20] not linguistic. And thus, we move smoothly to the point that Seneca wants to make next: Polybius should use both the original texts of these poets and his translations (11.6) as a source of comfort and strength in his period of mourning, reading for moral fortitude, not for literary beauty. Such an attitude toward originals was surely shaped by the pedagogic process, as "school practice with fables taught the student to compose by joining, augmenting, and elaborating discrete smaller blocks and parts. Good writing then required a technique of appropriate subordination and recombination of learned forms" (Bloomer 2011, 137). Ultimately one passed beyond this step into higher forms of composition, but I suspect a great deal of that early practice could stay with translators. The fact that Polybius may not have reassembled these poems appropriately, or for the right audience, does not affect the fact that this was a traditional approach to translation, one probably made instinctive through early practice in the schoolroom.

LATIN TRANSLATIONS OF HOMER

Petronius's *Satyricon*

There are other grounds to believe that translations of Homer's epics, such as that undertaken by Polybius, were somewhat problematic for the Roman elite. Very few references to people using such translations exist, and they are nearly all negative. The first I will look at is found in Petronius's novel the *Satyricon*.[21] This translation was apparently used by the obnoxious, *nouveau riche* freedman Trimalchio, and was clearly the work of someone who believed that fidelity to the original was very much not a virtue.

> "My dearest Agamemnon," Trimalchio said, "tell me whether you know the twelve labors of Hercules, or the story about Ulysses, that is, the one about how the Cyclops twisted Ulysses' thumb with a ring? I used to read these in Homer as a boy.
>
> *"Rogo," inquit, "Agamemnon mihi carissime, numquid duodecim aerumnas Herculis tenes, aut de Ulixe fabulam, quemadmodum illi Cyclops pollicem poricino extorsit? Solebam haec ego puer apud Homerum legere."*

> Trimalchio himself sat on a cushion and, while the *Homeristae*[22] chanted their Greek verses in an over-the-top way (their usual practice), he read a Latin book in a singsong voice. As soon as there was silence he asked, "Do you know what this story is? Diomedes and Ganymede were two brothers and their sister was Helen. Agamemnon ran off with her and killed a stag belonging to [the goddess] Diana. So now the *Homeristae*

are speaking of the war between Troy and Tarentum. He won and gave his daughter Iphigenia to Achilles as a wife. This made Ajax go mad, and this man will explain the plot right now." (59)

Ipse Trimalchio in pulvino consedit, et cum Homeristae Graecis versibus colloquerentur, ut insolenter solent, ille canora voce Latine legebat librum. Mox silentio facto: "Scitis," inquit, "quam fabulam agant? Diomedes et Ganymedes duo fratres fuerunt. Horum soror erat Helena. Agamemnon illam rapuit et Dianae cervam subiecit. Ita nunc Homeros dicit quemadmodum inter se pugnent Troiani et Tarentini. Vicit scilicet, et Iphigeniam, filiam suam, Achilli dedit uxorem. Ob eam rem Aiax insanit et statim argumentum explicabit."

Trimalchio owns a Greek library along with a Latin one (48.2), but it seems clear that he cannot read Greek or speak anything close to an elite version of Greek. The telltale Latin book in the second passage is surely a translation of what the Homeristae are acting out, as it is like Trimalchio's vainglorious nature to try and upstage any show, even one he put on, and this upstaging comes with a textual prop. Clearly, whatever translation of Homer Trimalchio is reading from, or encountered in the past, was impressively creative, to say the least, if he believes all he says.[23] His description of the Trojan War has little to do with Homer and a great deal to do with a wide range of other sources, perhaps including burlesques and mimes of the Iliadic and Odyssean tales (Smith 1975, 131). In the *Odyssey*, no one's thumb is twisted off, but Odysseus does twist a sharpened stake in the Cyclops' eye; after Achilles's death, Ajax does go mad, though as a result of not being awarded the armor of Achilles, and this scene does not occur in Homer; Helen runs off with Paris, not her brother-in-law, Agamemnon, which would have made her elopement even more disastrous; and so forth.

It is improbable (though not impossible) that anyone ever passed off such a concatenation of nonsense as Homeric, but clearly, Petronius thought that it would ring a bell with his elite audience, who were predisposed to think that such a level of knowledge would be right for a jumped-up freedman like Trimalchio.[24] Trimalchio's issues with myth and education are far more complex than merely reading a terrible translation of Homer,[25] but Petronius's linkage of the reading from Trimalchio's Latin book and the effusion of nonsense that spills from his lips suggests anxieties about and mockery of the type of knowledge that those outside the elite might access in such translations.

Attius Labeo

None of Polybius's translations of Homer survives, but two lines are extant from one particularly infamous translation, that of Attius Labeo; both lines come from a scholiast on the satirist Persius (34–62 CE). In his first, programmatic satire, Persius imagines himself being interrupted by a heckler who wonders who will read his poetry; Persius shrugs and asks whether

he should actually fear that Polydamas and the Trojan ladies[26] will prefer Labeo to him. The scholiast in this poem then tells us that "Labeo absurdly translated the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* word for word."[27] At lines 50–51, Persius scores a further blow against Labeo's *Iliad*, saying it is drunk with hellebore, a plant that was taken as an antidote to madness or to aid with inspiration. The scholiast comments that, "Attius Labeo was an unlearned poet of those days, who composed a very disgraceful verse [translation] of Homer's *Iliad*" (*Scholiast on Persius* 1.50). Unfortunately, very little of the translation survives, and certainly not enough to work out whether it actually was a literal translation or was instead the sort of wild version that a Trimalchio might have read. Our one extant line is a translation of *Iliad* 4.35 and expresses the wish "that you might eat Priam and the children of Priam raw."[28] This does, admittedly, at first sight seem extremely literal as a translation. Mark Possanza comments that

> Labeo's literalism extends not only to word-for-word equivalence, including the enclitics—*que* and *te*, but also to word order and syntax, and even to the alliterative pattern of the Greek found in the succession of three p-sounds in the second half of the line: the Latin replicates the Greek like a strand of DNA. The price of such literalism is high: *manduces* and *pisinnos* are intolerable offences against the lofty decorum of Latin epic diction. Whatever advantage is obtained through faithfulness to the wording of the source text is immediately undermined by this breach in decorum. Labeo's literalism does reproduce semantic content and word order, but at the expense of epic grandeur. (2004, 31)

Possanza, however, also comments that this one line may not be representative of the translation as a whole (2004, 31); and whether the whole translation was as close as this fragment is impossible to say. It may be that in this particular line, Labeo is keen to closely imitate the sound pattern of the Greek because it matches traditional alliterative patterns of Latin poetry, rather than because of a dogged belief in literalism as a principle of translation. But even if the translation was literal on one level, on another it was very much not so, as it replaced epic diction with subliterary Latin. Examine the two words that Possanza calls offenses against Latin epic diction: *pisinnos* is, as Edward Courtney points out, far below literary level (2003, 350), and *manduco* is a verb not found in high poetry. Such language suggests a translation that played with using nonelite language and perhaps was intended to appeal to those more familiar with nonliterary than high literary language.

The Ilias Latina

There is one oddity of the Neronian Age that remains to be mentioned: the *Ilias Latina*, a summary of the *Iliad* in 1070 lines by Baebius Italicus.[29] It is an uneven epitome, focusing on the great action scenes of the *Iliad* rather

than trying to provide a balanced summary. (It takes the first 685 lines to summarize the first nine books, while the remaining lines cover the next 15 books; one book gets only three lines, while Book Five has 149 lines devoted to it.) As the author praises the Julio-Claudians in fulsome terms (899–903), the poem has to be dated to before 68 CE and the fall of Nero, the last emperor from that dynasty. The poem shows influence from Virgil and Ovid, and is perhaps best described as of uneven quality (others have been more critical, including Scaffai in his edition of the work [1982] and Broccia [1992]). Unfortunately, we have no idea of its intended readership and all of our information on its use is from Late Antiquity or the Middle Ages, when it became the only version of the *Iliad* that Western readers could access. Reading this would certainly give one a distorted view of the ST, especially as it is so focused on relating battle scenes, to the occlusion of large swathes of the narrative; the author also moves material around from one book to another, perhaps because he was relying on memory (Kennedy 1998, 11). This epitome would, however, not give one as erroneous a view of the original as Trimalchio had. Although the poem is written in high diction and draws from Latin epic, it is in relatively simple Latin; but if this poem was aimed at the Greekless reader, we have no way to tell (it may have been a school exercise, not intended for wider distribution). The fact that it is ignored by critics, even those who, like Gellius, mention other translators of Homer, suggests that it had little appeal until the Late Antique period. Its free attitude toward its ST shows that it stood within the main track of Roman translation.

POLYBIUS'S THUNDERING

Thus, the (very) limited evidence we have on contemporary Latin translations of Homer suggests that they were not highly esteemed and were seen as problematic. Although a Roman would translate portions of Homer and work them into the texture of his work, as Virgil did in the *Aeneid*, a one-on-one translation, especially a popular one, seems to have been problematic, and that is telling for understanding Seneca's reaction to Polybius's translations. To turn the knife a little further, Seneca concludes his comments on these translations by suggesting Polybius is the ideal audience for his own translations: "read, with what spirit you have thundered in massive words: you will instantly be ashamed to desert and retreat from such magnificent language" (11.6).[30] I do not think that this was meant to be a compliment.

QUINTILIAN: PEDAGOGY AND TRANSLATION

Quintilian's *Institutes of Oratory* is one of our most important sources for Roman education, covering the training of the orator from birth to maturity.

A respected teacher of rhetoric, who was the first such to be paid directly out of the imperial purse, Quintilian was immensely successful in his profession, numbering luminaries such as Pliny the Younger among his pupils. We have already seen his discussion of translating in the early years of a child's education; I now turn to his later discussion of translation. Book Ten of the *Institutes* starts with a quick survey of past contributions to rhetoric from Greek and Roman authors before moving on to the question of who to imitate, how to do so properly, and how to write and emend one's writing properly. Translation is included as one form of training in composition and introduced as a traditional practice, with Quintilian commenting that "past Latin orators considered that turning (*vertere*) Greek into Latin was the best exercise" (10.5.2).[31] He then cites as examples Crassus (in Cicero), Cicero's translations of Plato and Xenophon, Messalla's translations of the Greek orator Hyperides's defense of the courtesan Phryne and other unnamed Greek speeches. Quintilian ends by arguing that the copiousness of Greek and its distinctiveness as a language from Latin pushes the translator towards innovation:

> The reason for this form of exercise (*exercitationis*) is clear: the resources (*copia*) of Greek authors are overflowing (*abundant*) and they have great eloquence in this art. In translating (*transferentibus*) we can use the best language, for what we use is all ours. But as for their figures, which are the special ornaments of oratory, we must carefully think through their varied and great range, because many of these are very different in Greek and Latin.
>
> *Et manifesta est exercitationis huiusce ratio. Nam et rerum copia Graeci auctores abundant et plurimum artis in eloquentiam intulerunt et hos transferentibus verbis uti optimis licet: omnibus enim utimur nostris. Figuras vero, quibus maxime ornatur oratio, multas ac varias excogitandi etiam necessitas quaedam est, quia plerumque a Graecis Romana dissentiunt.*

Translation again creates ownership of the Greek text, although Quintilian here does not refer to the entire text but to words. Here we see the influence of Cicero's *On the Orator*, where Crassus also talked about translation producing a new range of vocabulary, rather than any tendency toward literal or word-for-word translation (1.154–55). In fact, Quintilian assumes that you are not going to produce a one-on-one translation, but rather do something like Cicero did to Plato, not claiming the entire text as your new property but extracting from it the linguistic richness that will be helpful and become your property.

Quintilian quickly moves from this to discussing paraphrase within Latin, for which he claims a similar value in enabling the orator to "achieve expression independent of the original" (Fantham 1978b, 109). He writes that, "I do not want paraphrase to be a literal interpretation (*interpretationem*), but

to strive with and rival the expression of the same thoughts" (10.5.5).[32] He deliberately uses *interpretationem* as a sign of a limited and deficient way of paraphrasing, mimicking the way in which Cicero had used the term for defective, that is literal, translation. He continues borrowing the language of translation:

> And so I disagree with those who forbid students to change (*vertere*) Latin orations because the best phrases have been taken and to speak otherwise is necessarily to speak worse. For we should not always despair of being able to find something better to say than the original, nor has nature made eloquence so thin and poor a thing that it is only possible to speak well on the same topic once. (10.5.5–7)
>
> *Ideoque ab illis dissentio qui vertere orationes Latinas vetant quia optimis occupatis quidquid aliter dixerimus necesse sit esse deterius. Nam neque semper est desperandum aliquid illis quae dicta sunt melius posse reperiri, neque adeo ieiunam ac pauperam natura eloquentiam fecit ut una de re bene dici nisi semel non possit.*

Quintilian boldly extends *verto* to cover intralingual paraphrase, and the length of time that he spends justifying the practice of paraphrase as a creative exercise in its own right suggests that his argument was somewhat controversial. In fact, he seems to be wrestling with the legacy of Cicero and the general Roman trend of privileging translation from Greek as a creative and freeing exercise in comparison with reworking Latin models. Notice, for example, that Quintilian starts his discussion of paraphrase by dismissing anxieties that the student who paraphrases Latin may become a mere interpreter, overwhelmed by the Latin text. In his attempt to promote the creative nature of paraphrase, Quintilian borrows language from discussions of translation to argue that paraphrase can be an original endeavor. However, he does not state that it gives you ownership over the text or even the words, as that is the result of translation alone: such thinking is a product of an appropriative culture that sees the Greek text and Greek itself as less forceful, less able to imprint its own identity on the adaptor.[33]

PLINY THE YOUNGER: TRANSLATION AS HOLIDAY EXERCISE

The letters of Pliny the Younger (c. 61–112 CE) allow us to see how translation could be used to show oneself as an ideal member of the elite and reintegrate into social and literary circles. Pliny belonged to the highest ranks of Roman society; the nephew and adopted son of Pliny the Elder, like his adoptive father he was a consul and a friend of the emperor. His letters, which cover a wide range of topics and issues, are intended to represent Pliny as an ideal Roman gentleman and construct a world with a set

of idealized "models, habits and valuation, and modes of interaction that define how Pliny wishes the elite to behave" (Johnson 2010, 35). Every topic in the collection, from letters of recommendation to obituaries to literary discussions, promotes this end. In other words, Pliny's discussions of literary activity, including translation, should be set within the context of this project of constructing a set of ideal behaviors. The importance of literary activity to Pliny can be seen in how he depicts his circle of intimates, the ideal elite circle, largely in terms of literary culture (Johnson 2010, 36).

Pliny's first mention of translation occurs in *Epistle* 4.18 to Arrius Antoninus, but as *Epistle* 4.3 introduces Arrius, I touch on that text first. In 4.3, Pliny makes clear his addressee's high status by informing us that Arrius was twice a consul and had served as a provincial governor as well, before Pliny lavishly praises his Greek mimes and epigrams—the very epigrams that he will mention translating in 4.18. Pliny adds the comment that Arrius's poems are more Greek than the Greeks', culminating in rhetorically asking whether Athena could be more truly Attic; 4.3 closes by saying that Arrius's expertise in Greek proves that he can express himself "in his own ancestral tongue" (*sermone patrio exprimere*), that is Latin, deliberately concluding with language that he will use in 4.18.

In 4.18, Pliny introduces translation as a medium of aristocratic exchange and friendship:

> How else could I show how much I admire you than that I have tried to rival (*aemulari*) and translate (*exprimere*) into Latin some of your Greek epigrams? I have made them worse, firstly because of the weakness of my talent and secondly because of the deficiency, or rather what Lucretius called the "poverty of our native tongue." But if these—in Latin and mine—seem to have some charm to you, you can understand how much pleasing material is in your versions, which are both by you and in Greek.
>
> *Quemadmodum magis adprobare tibi possum, quanto opere mirer epigrammata tua Graeca, quam quod quaedam aemulari Latine et exprimere temptavi? In deterius tamen. Accidit hoc primum imbecillitate ingenii mei, deinde inopia ac potius, ut Lucretius ait, egestate patrii sermonis. Quodsi haec, quae sunt et Latina et mea, habere tibi aliquid venustatis videbuntur, quantam putas inesse iis gratiae, quae et a te et Graece proferuntur.*

Translation is not just an elegant compliment to Arrius's writing, but forges a link that connects Pliny and him in an intimate literary exchange. Pliny's translations charm because they are in Latin and *his* (*mea*), the originals because they were by Arrius and in Greek. Pliny's effort and care in this project is shown by referring first to the *inopia* and then, with quick self-correction, the poverty of Latin, a reference anchored by the authority of

Lucretius. Pliny's reference to Latin's poverty may be sincere, but here it also functions as a neat way to point out the hard work involved: Pliny translates not to toss some lines off quickly, but because he cares for Arrius's poetry and, by inference, Arrius himself. Like other forms of literary activity, translation connects, but it connects in a particularly intimate way; in this case, translation can connect across distance, replicating the literary activities and discussions that appear again and again as subjects in Pliny's letters. If Pliny cannot have Arrius there to take part in his literary circle, he can engage with and translate his poetry.

His next and more famous comments on translation occur within the context of a discussion of appropriate forms of literary activity in times of *otium*, a common enough theme in the letters.[34] In reply to a letter from Fuscus Salinator asking what activity he should perform during a long in retirement at one of his villas, Pliny answers: translation, followed by self-revision.

> The most useful activity and one which many people suggest is to translate (*vertere*) from Greek into Latin or from Latin into Greek. This form of exercise produces ownership (*proprietas*) and brilliance in language—*and* by imitating the best writers you gain a like ability for invention. And also, what has escaped someone who is only reading cannot flee the grasp (*fugere*) of someone translating. In this way understanding and judgment is acquired. It doesn't harm, after you have read through something sufficiently to keep its main argument in your mind, to write as if in competition with it, and then compare your efforts with the original and consider carefully where your version is better or worse. There will be great congratulations (*gratulatio*) if you are sometimes better—and great shame (*pudor*) if the original is always better. You can sometimes pick out a very well known passage and try to compete with it. This is bold, but not shameless (*improba*), since it will be a private struggle. And yet we see that many men have gained much praise for themselves in these sorts of competitions and have overcome those they merely thought to pursue—provided that they did not give up hope. (7.9.3–5)
>
> *Utile in primis, et multi praecipiunt, vel ex Graeco in Latinum vel ex Latino vertere in Graecum. Quo genere exercitationis proprietas splendorque verborum, copia figurarum, vis explicandi, praeterea imitatione optimorum similia inveniendi facultas paratur; simul quae legentem fefellissent, transferentem fugere non possunt. Intellegentia ex hoc et iudicium adquiritur. Nihil offuerit quae legeris hactenus, ut rem argumentumque teneas, quasi aemulam scribere lectisque conferre, ac sedulo pensitare, quid tu quid ille commodius. Magna gratulatio si non nulla tu, magnus pudor si cuncta ille melius. Licebit interdum et notissima eligere et certare cum electis. Audax haec, non tamen improba, quia*

> *secreta contentio: quamquam multos videmus eius modi certamina sibi cum multa laude sumpsisse, quosque subsequi satis habebant, dum non desperant, antecessisse.*

Translation is introduced as eminently useful and as possessing the sanction of custom and popularity: many people translate while in temporary retirement on their country estates. The stress on the utility of the activity is shown by the careful placement of *utile* at the start of its sentence; this is not a waste of valuable *otium*. Pliny's advice is positioned as functional and normative; even in his retreat, Fuscus can be sure that what he is doing fits within accepted patterns of elite behavior (Pliny was nothing if not unexceptional in his habits). Translation is next described as an acquisitive act as Pliny employs words such as *proprietas* and *adquiritur* to describe it; both verbs can refer to ownership, and the second also means "to add to one's own possessions." (Of course, this is no ordinary mercantile form of acquisition; an aristocrat does not retire to the countryside to add to his moneybags.) If Fuscus were simply to read these texts, a productive relationship might well not occur; translating, however, erases any chance that he might waste his time in unproductive, passive reading. In other words, Pliny, and presumably the *multi* who also translate, play the same game of acquisition we saw in Cicero and Quintilian, with Pliny pushing the idea that a careful translator can personally benefit by bringing these texts into the elite economy.

Translation is also used to encourage Fuscus to rejoin the elite community. We are told that Fuscus has been long in retirement, and the term Pliny uses (*in secessu*) can imply that he has not just physically withdrawn to the country, but retired to private life. Translation will help him return to the fold, will show him the way back to Rome and the elite community as it progresses, ideally, from a private activity to a public one that can garner praise. At the end of this passage, Pliny holds out to Fuscus the chance to be celebrated by the community; translation can function as a way to perform among his peer group and to reintegrate himself. Pliny stresses that this is a game that can, and should, be played for high stakes—he is not suggesting presenting a translation to a peer group because it is *easy*. He wants Fuscus to take famous passages—that is, passages that everyone in the audience would know, and know well—and present them to those who can judge how well he has dealt with the ST and gone one better than it. Pliny then suggests that, after he has finished with translation, Fuscus revise his own speeches, contending with and altering his own Latin compositions, becoming a paraphraser of himself.[35] The skills that Fuscus acquired through the *contentio* of translation will help him with the *contentio* of elite life, whether that *contentio* is in literary groups or elsewhere.

We should also note Pliny's remarkable casualness about the ST's position in all of what he advises (Robinson 1992a, 37); his moral terminology—the shame if one fails in the act of translation—is less about doing the original

credit and more about not letting oneself down. Pliny doesn't specify the type of text that Fuscus should translate, suggesting that there is only one way to translate, no matter what source text one uses. Translation is also presented as *self*-improvement; the process of translation refines without the need of a Greek middleman or a tutor, who might divert the reader's attention from Fuscus as he stares down his sources. As a one-on-one relationship with the text, translation gives one time to mature into full confidence; in the end, it is only "if you have the self-confidence to overcome your inbred timidity, your feelings of inferiority before a text widely recognized as brilliant, Pliny suggests . . . [that you] can gradually begin to transform 'following' an author into 'outstripping' that author, and thereby yourself become the kind of writer or orator that others imitate" (Robinson 1992a, 37). *Epistle* 7.9 allows us the opportunity to see the multifunctional ways that translation could work, all of which were only possible because of the basic Roman premise that literary translation was a form of competition, and that competing with a Greek text was a valid and creative exercise for elite males, even if their audiences did not need the translation.

AULUS GELLIUS: TRANSLATION IN ANTONINE ROME

If Pliny theorizes translation as a mechanism for Fuscus to reintegrate himself into the elite literary community in Rome, the Antonine writer Aulus Gellius[36] (125–28 to after 180 CE) is likewise interested in translation (or at least its evaluation) as a communal event for the elite. The Antonine age "saw a reversion to the past" (Holford-Strevens 2005, 3), led by the Emperor Hadrian's fondness for early Latin authors: in Greek, Atticism was cherished again, but an Atticism of the dim and distant past, and in Rome, Ennius and Cato became even greater literary and cultural heroes than Cicero and Virgil (Holford-Strevens 2005). The *Attic Nights* (c. 180 CE) is, hence, populated with archaic authors, both Greek and Roman, far more than with Cicero and his successors: Cicero is one voice on translation with whom Gellius will not have to contend openly.

We know little of Gellius's origins; he was clearly well educated and wealthy, able to afford to study in Rome and Athens. He owned a villa at Praeneste (11.3.1) and was a friend of Cornelius Fronto, Marcus Aurelius's tutor and friend. Gellius's miscellany, the *Attic Nights*, carefully presents himself in conversation and intellectual debate with the elite literati of his age, including Fronto, the rhetorician Favorinus, Herodes Atticus, and others, and he clearly had access to the best circles. But access is not the same thing as belonging. Although Gellius is deeply concerned with negotiating his own status and authority,[37] it is clear that he did not belong to the top tier of society. Throughout the *Attic Nights*, Gellius constantly negotiates and emphasizes his authority and is shown (along with others) rebuking those who are arrogant enough to try to force themselves and their limited

intellectualism on the inner circle to which he belongs. A scene repeated several times in the *Attic Nights* shows "an arrogant figure claiming to be an expert in some field fail[ing] to answer a question put to him by one of the interlocutors."[38] The unfortunate interloper is inevitably humiliated by Gellius or someone in his circle.

Gellius has particular contempt for professional teachers—the grammarians—although his dislike of such "experts" is not confined to that class.[39] While Gellius is a product of the grammarians, he is determined to mark them as far beneath himself socially and intellectually (with a few exceptions for his own teachers). His critical attitude focuses on what he considers the grammarians' "blind dependence on dogmatic rules" (Vardi 2001, 44), the overspecialization of grammatical experts (ibid. 46), class prejudices against paid professionals, whose status was rising in this period (Kaster 1997, 50; Vardi 2001, 50), and the tendency of the professional to make the ordinary inquirer into knowledge feel completely ignorant (Kaster 1997, 52). Gellius aims to position himself and other members of the Roman elite as the only true experts on intellectual matters. All of this is important in understanding why translation as a topic occurs so frequently in Gellius and why he discusses and theorizes it as he does; like Cicero seeing off the *interpres*, what we have here again is the struggle between the rhetorician and his products and the grammarian. Naturally this will play into the issue of translation, as the ability to evaluate both Greek and Latin is critical in this game of one-upmanship.

As a miscellany, the *Attic Nights* deliberately covers a wide range of topics in a series of self-contained discussions and anecdotes in 20 books (all are extant except for Book Eight, for which we have only the chapter titles, and the end of Book Twenty).[40] The appeal of the text was intended to lie in its variety and apparently random construction, and in the number of obscure and archaic authors it takes great care to mention (although Gellius claims to have consulted ancient manuscripts of these authors, it is most likely that he often relied on prior collections of extracts).[41] As for the discussions he claims to be reporting on, although Gellius was certainly present for some, it is unlikely that he is always reporting their actual content.[42]

The preface to the *Attic Nights* is incomplete and opens in the middle of a sentence, but enough remains to situate the work and Gellius's aims. He claims first that his aim is to provide entertaining reading for his children; much like Seneca the Elder's comment that he wrote *his* work for the use of his three sons, this should not blind us to the volume's desire for a wider audience (it was a literary cliché to say you were writing for one's children). The work is framed as deliberately unorganized on any grand scheme; Gellius claims that its form is based on the order of his own reading notes (preface 2), a claim we should no more believe than the one that it is written for his children. However, here I am not interested in Gellius's organizational scheme;[43] what interests me is how Gellius articulates his ideal audience. In the preface to the work, he defines those for whom he does *not* write:

> This work will not suit those who have never found, enjoyed, or worked hard at reading, questioning, writing, and studying, who have never passed a sleepless night at this work, nor ever cultivated their intelligence by competing and debating with rivals of their Muse, but spend all their time in disquieting business.
>
> *Erit autem id longe optimum, ut qui in lectitando, percontando, scribendo, commentando, numquam voluptates, numquam labores ceperunt, nullas hoc genus vigilias vigilarunt neque ullis inter eiusdem Musae aemulos certationibus disceptationibusque elimati sunt, sed intemperiarum negotiorumque pleni sunt . . .*

To point out the blindingly obvious: Gellius writes as a member of the elite, writing to the elite (not just the rich; if you have to work for your money, you fall outside his ideal audience). This is the same audience as Pliny's, but unlike Pliny, he does not aim to educate or reform—he writes for the educated, for the reformed (Johnson 2010, 101).

TRANSLATION IN GELLIUS

Gellius's elitism plays out in how he approaches translation; one particularly interesting example of this occurs at 11.16. The topic of this chapter is "that the translation (*mutatio*) of some Greek words (as is the case with what is called *polupragmosune* in Greek) is very difficult."[44] Gellius is sitting reading a Greek work by Plutarch, minding his own business, when he is approached by a stranger who, crucially, knows no Greek (he is called an *opicus*, which by this time had acquired this meaning [Swain 2004, 38–39]), and is asked what his scroll is about. Finding himself unable to give a simple answer (one suspects a simple list of the contents would have done the job), he comes up with and rejects *De negotiositate* (*On being busy with business*), despairs of a literal translation, ponders coining a new word, and then informs his questioner that he will have to translate using a phrase rather than a word. He end by telling us, "I said 'undertaking many things and being busy with them is called in Greek *polupragmosune*, and the title shows that this is the subject of the book" (11.16.7). The reaction to his translation is rather unsatisfying, as upon being offered this explanation, his questioner misunderstands and thinks this indicates a virtue. Gellius finally despairs and takes the blame for his failure. End of story: one could neatly include this with all the other places where Gellius complains about Latin's inability to translate Greek, and about his own failings in translating Plato or Favorinus (see, for example, Fögen 2000, 210–11).[45] But this is to miss the moral of this anecdote, which is to stress not Gellius's failure to translate, but the fact that his interlocutor has no ability to understand the translation because he does not share an intellectual background with Gellius and his readers. Because he does not know Greek, this *opicus* has no

conceptual space in which to interpret the title, no ability to understand that the critical element for understanding the contents of this work is not obtaining a Latin version of the title, but having a larger understanding of the morality or virtuousness of certain concepts in Greece and Rome. In fact, Plutarch's title cannot be translated by Gellius except by invoking the Greek word, like some magic talisman that fills out his Latin explanation. What Gellius is pointing out here is not his own inadequacy as a translator, but the folly of translating Greek for one who does not actually understand Greek literature: it is a signal waste of time. Just as translation in Pliny can allow one to engage with an elite literary group, in Gellius, needing a translation marks you as an outsider to such groups.

COMPARING TRANSLATIONS, AND THE FAILURE OF CAECILIUS STATIUS

In chapter 2.23, an extended comparison of original and translation involving the comic poet Caecilius Statius (fl. 179 BCE) with Menander, Gellius shows us how discussion of translation should go.[46] He opens in the first person, carefully situating the discussion in a personal setting before he moves on to working in his immediate and extended circles (in the passage below I omit extended quotations from Caecilius and from Menander and other Greek poets):

> I frequently read comedies our poets have taken from the Greek poets Menander, Posidippus, Apollodorus, Alexis, along with others. When I am reading them I find them pleasing enough. No—I ought to say that they even look like they have been written with charming wit and that nothing could actually be written better. But if you take them and pair them off against the Greek they came from, and you examine single passages and fit them together and set them against each other (*committas*) by reading them alternatively and in close conjunction with each other, the Latin comedies begin to appear defeated and grubby. And they tarnish the wit and brilliance of the Greek comedies they failed to rival. I recently had such an experience. We were reading Caecilius' *Plocium*, which I, and the rest of those who were there, were enjoying. Then, at a whim, we read Menander's *Plocium*, from which Caecilius had translated (*verterat*) his comedy. But, by the gods, from the moment we picked up Menander, Caecilius appeared to be slow and dead and to have changed (*mutare*) a great deal of what was in Menander. By Hercules, it was like comparing the value of the armor of Diomedes and Glaucus![47] The reading had reached the passage where the old married man was complaining about his rich, ugly wife as she had made him sell his slave-maid, a girl of very elegant appearance who knew her job, because she suspected her of being his mistress. I will say nothing of how

much the two texts differed but I ordered both passages to be excerpted and brought together for judgment. (1–8)

[Here Gellius cites both passages]

In addition to the completely unequal charm of the subject and language found in the two books, I keep on noticing this: Caecilius did not even try to give (*enarrare*) what Menander wrote exceptionally well, pointedly, and charmingly, even when he could have. Instead, he skipped over those elements as if he didn't approve of it much and shoved in (gods know why) other mime-like material. And—again gods know why—he left out the simple, true, and delightful material that Menander took from daily life . . . (11)

In the Greek comedy all these emotions and feelings are wonderfully vivid and clear, but in Caecilius they are all dull and without any grace or dignity of expression. Afterwards, when the same slave by questioning has found out what happened, in Menander he makes this lament . . . And as I said above, when I read Caecilius on his own, I don't think these passages are dull and unpleasing, but then when I compare them and set them (*contendo*) against the Greek, I think that Caecilius should not have followed an author he could not overtake. (19–22)

Comoedias lectitamus nostrorum poetarum sumptas ac versas de Graecis Menandro aut Posidippo aut Apollodoro aut Alexide et quibusdam item aliis comicis. Neque, cum legimus eas, nimium sane displicent, quin lepide quoque et venuste scriptae videntur, prorsus ut melius posse fieri nihil censeas. Sed enim si conferas et componas Graeca ipsa, unde illa venerunt, ac singula considerate atque apte iunctis et alternis lectionibus committas, oppido quam iacere atque sordere incipiunt quae Latina sunt; ita Graecarum, quas aemulari nequiverunt, facetiis atque luminibus obsolescunt. Nuper adeo usus huius rei nobis venit. Caecili Plocium legebamus; hautquaquam mihi et qui aderant, displicebat. Libitum et Menandri quoque Plocium legere, a quo istam comoediam verterat. Sed enim postquam in manus Menander venit, a principio statim, di boni, quantum stupere atque frigere quantumque mutare a Menandro Caecilius visus est! Diomedis hercle arma et Glauci non dispari magis pretio existimata sunt. Accesserat dehinc lectio ad eum locum, in quo maritus senex super uxore divite atque deformi querebatur, quod ancillam suam, non inscito puellam ministerio et facie haut inliberali, coactus erat venundare suspectam uxori quasi paelicem. Nihil dicam ego, quantum differat; versus utrimque eximi iussi et aliis ad iudicium faciundum exponi . . .

Praeter venustatem autem rerum atque verborum in duobus libris nequaquam parem in hoc equidem soleo animum attendere, quod, quae Menander praeclare et apposite et facete scripsit, ea Caecilius, ne qua potuit quidem, conatus est enarrare, sed quasi minime probanda praetermisit et alia nescio qua mimica inculcavit et illud Menandri de vita

hominum media sumptum, simplex et verum et delectabile, nescio quo pacto omisit . . .

Itaque, ut supra dixi, cum haec Caecilii seorsum lego, neutiquam videntur ingrata ignavaque, cum autem Graeca comparo et contendo, non puto Caecilium sequi debuisse, quod adsequi nequiret.

First, Gellius establishes himself as a man who regularly reads these prized authors on his own and then moves into the wider group, all of whom are unnamed and unspeaking; Gellius is the voice of authority, and his anonymous audience agrees with his critical judgment. He is shown as someone who has easily to hand prized copies of rare, archaic authors such as Caecilius Statius, and who is connected to other scholars outside this immediate group, for he also tells us that he sent some of the passages off to others for their opinion. That we hear of no response disagreeing with him or a dissenting voice in his current circle ensures that we are primed to agree with him.

Whether or not Gellius ever read Menander in the original or took this discussion from another text does not matter here.[48] Gellius is keen to provide his audience with an example of the type of discussion that plays out in a convivial setting. The fact that this desire to compare the two authors is a whim[49] establishes Gellius's circle as individuals who find such abstruse discussion a delicious relaxation and not work, and who assume that members of their group will naturally own rare texts. While this convivial setting is a literary conceit, it is meant to ring true; as with Pliny the Younger, we see that translation—or rather, here, its criticism—is an important and suitable literary activity for literary circles. And it is a particularly useful activity to represent oneself and members of one's group performing, as it shows that all are gentlemen, since they can understand both Greek and Latin (and archaic Latin at that).

What interests Gellius in terms of translation? Well, he is not very interested in the fact that Caecilius might have changed Menander to meet Roman stage expectations, as for him both of these works are texts alone, not performance pieces (Gamberale 1969, 43; Gellius was also not the sort of person who thought appealing to the crowd was a good thing).[50] He is not very interested in which is funnier, either; he sniffily comments at 2.23.13 that, "Caecilius was in this place more concerned with being silly than with being appropriate and suitable to the character he was drawing."[51] Lastly, he seems less concerned with the changes that Caecilius made than with the fact that they betray the tone and essence of Menander's play, for if he were interested in just the changes he would surely comment on the fact that the passages that he quotes barely align, beyond picking up on the *topos* of the misery of marrying a rich wife, a very common theme in Greek and Roman comedy. Certainly, the Latin passages do not really seem to operate as translations;[52] in fact, one can barely recognize the original in the translation. (The radical disjuncture between ST and TT is one of the first things that strikes

a modern reader of this passage.) For all that Gellius criticizes Caecilius for changing and omitting so much, his major criticism revolves not around his changes *qua* changes, but that they are changes for the worse. Caecilius has perverted (*corrupit*, 2.23.13) the original because he was keen on getting a cheap laugh, rather than from any inherent incapacity of Latin to translate Greek. What have dropped out in the translation are the qualities of the original text, omitted by the Roman comic in his attempt at broad humor; it is this that troubles Gellius. It is not that Gellius doubts that Caecilius was successful in getting a Roman audience to laugh, but that Caecilius did not respect the characterization of the original (2.23.13). In addition, compared to the original, Caecilius is dull and feeble; the passage is littered with terms that stress this (*stupere*, *pigra*, 2.23.19). In the end, Gellius claims that Caecilius failed because he chose to imitate too grand a model; he only followed and did not overtake. In other words, Caecilius has committed the cardinal sin of Roman translation: he has not surpassed his source.

In chapter 9.9, Gellius approaches the subject of translation from a more general and positive view.[53] The topic of this chapter is that not everything should be translated literally and Virgil was sensible to recognize this:

> Whenever we have to translate (*vertandae*) and imitate famous passages from Greek poets, people always say that we should not try to translate every single word in the original. Many works lose their charm if they are transferred too violently, like unwilling and reluctant [texts?]. So Virgil when he refashioned (*effingeret*) passages from Homer, Hesiod, Apollonius, Parthenius, Callimachus, and other poets was clever and thoughtful when he left some sections and translated others (*effingeret*).
>
> The other day, when the *Buccolics* of Theocritus and Virgil were being read together during a meal, we noticed that Virgil had dropped something marvelously pleasing in the Greek but which neither could nor should have been translated. And what he replaced this omission with was more delightfully charming. (1–5)
>
> *Quando ex poematis Graecis vertendae imitandaeque sunt insignes sententiae, non semper aiunt enitendum ut omnia omnino verba in eum, in quem dicta sunt, modum vertamus. Perdunt enim gratiam pleraque, si quasi invita et recusantia violentius transferantur. Scite ergo et considerate Vergilius, cum aut Homeri aut Hesiodi aut Apollonii aut Parthenii aut Callimachi aut Theocriti aut quorundam aliorum locos effingeret, partem reliquit, alia expressit. Sicuti nuperrime aput mensam cum legerentur utraque simul Bucolica Theocriti et Vergilii, animadvertimus reliquisse Vergilium, quod Graecum quidem mire quam suave est, verti autem neque debuit neque potuit. Sed enim, quod substituit pro eo, quod omiserat, non abest, quin iucundius lepidiusque sit.*

Here, Gellius starts from a general assertion ("they say"), linking his opinion with that of other unnamed authorities, before moving into a situation

similar to 2.23, with both authors being read alongside each other in a convivial setting. He then moves into specifics, working on the level of the phrases, phrases that Gellius says are untranslatable. While Gellius begins by discussing Virgil's translation of Theocritus on what we would view as aesthetic grounds (Virgil carefully selects what can be pleasingly translated into Latin), he soon moves from aesthetic criteria into a discussion of appropriateness, focusing on Virgil's translation of *Odyssey* 6.102–9. This passage, which compares Princess Nausicaa with Artemis roaming the mountains surrounded by her nymphs, is contrasted with *Aeneid* 1.497–506, which compares Dido with Diana. But here the criticism is voiced not by Gellius but by Probus, who has a problem with Dido walking through a city being compared with Diana roaming in the wilderness. He then says that Virgil has shown Leto's joy in Diana as something "dull, trivial, slow, as if it were skimming the heart" (9.9.15),[54] because he used a verb Probus did not approve of. The criticism is remarkable both for how silly it is (though similar silliness is often still seen in modern reviews of translations), and for the fact that Probus never mentions that these are a few translated lines in a very long epic—and an epic that is not a translation, even if it contains passages translated from Greek. There is no attempt to contextualize the translation or even gesture to the rest of poem: Probus slices off his portion of the text and is content with that. He is also not concerned with the *why* of the changes or the multiple influences and models feeding into the *Aeneid* and into this one passage (while the Virgilian passage is inspired by the Homeric one that Gellius cites, it also pulled from divergent poetical descriptions of Artemis in various sources, both Greek and Latin, besides being adapted to fit into the overall purpose of the *Aeneid*). Within his discussion of literary influence and translation, Probus has little room for an understanding of multiple influences. For someone who has read their Seneca the Elder or their Quintilian, both of which recommend using multiple sources to prevent being too overly influenced by one, this is a little startling.

There are other shifts that are equally startling in this passage. In 9.9, Gellius's comment that one should not translate "every single word" (*omnia omnino verba*) still suggests that one should translate as many words as one can, especially as *omnia omnino verba* is a highly emphatic phrase. Gellius could have just written *omnia verba* and gotten the same point across. In fact, he is far more comfortable with the idea of literal or word-for-word translation than any other Roman writer on translation: in 11.4, which compares Ennius and Euripides, the success of Ennius's translation is eventually doubted because he does not adequately translate individual words from Euripides's *Hecuba*. In 13.6, we see again an interest in translation on the level of the individual word in a discussion of which words the archaic authors used to translate *prosoidias* (tones). Anxiety about individual words and their translations in Latin also explains why he argues in favor of transliteration for numerical terms taken from Greek, a rare case where transliteration is actually seen as appropriate in a translation (18.14; Romans

transliterated Greek words all the time, it just wasn't considered a respectable translation strategy except in the cases of words which already had a long history in Latin). These examples show that although Gellius repeats some older views about translation (literal translation is bad), this conflicts with his impulse to be far more respectful to the Greek ST and his considerable interest in the right way to use individual words. (Ironically, the latter links Gellius with the concerns of grammarians, a connection he would probably not have appreciated.)

Gellius's opinions "differ from the traditional view in that they do not regard divergence from the original as a requirement which furnishes the imitator with the opportunity to exhibit his own achievement, but rather as a concession to the difficulty (and at times impossibility) of full correspondence to the original" (Vardi 1996, 505–6; cf. Fögen 2000, 197). Gellius expresses anxiety about treating the Greek text as if it were like any other piece of war booty to be fought over and dragged back to Rome; texts can be damaged in translation if they are too unwilling, or if they are treated too aggressively, as happened with Caecilius and Menander. (Of course, for Gellius, the days of Greek art being freshly looted war booty are long gone.) The problem is in working out whether Gellius spoke for himself alone and his comments signal a radical shift in thinking about translation in an age of Hellenophilia, or whether he was pulling from older sources a strand of Roman thinking about translation that existed all along but has left little trace.

However, even Gellius does not completely abandon the idea of translation as competition; a good example is his supposedly modest attempt in 17.20 to translate Plato. In this chapter, Plato's *Symposium* is being read at the house of the philosopher Taurus (one of Gellius's teachers) in Athens; as the reader reaches the passage where Pausanias praises love, Gellius is so entranced by this section that he commits it to memory, quoting a portion of it in Greek for the reader. Taurus then asks Gellius in Latin whether any Roman rhetorician could match this passage, stating that the rhythm of the Platonic passage is a critical part of its charm.

> Taurus' warning about Plato's style not only did not restrain me but it gave me the push to take possession of the elegance of the Greek in Latin words. And as small, lowly animals, which out of impudence imitate what they have heard or seen, I dared not to rival what I had admired in Plato's language, but to make a dim outline of them. (7–8)
>
> *Haec admonitio Tauri de orationis Platonicae modulis non modo non repressit, sed instrinxit etiam nos ad elegantiam Graecae orationis verbis Latinis affectandam; atque uti quaedam animalium parva et vilia ad imitandum sunt, quas res cumque audierint viderintve, petulantia, proinde nos ea, quae in Platonis oratione demiramur, non aemulari quidem, sed lineas umbrasque facere ausi sumus.*

Gellius is certainly modest about his abilities, but just as Fuscus Salinator was advised to do by Pliny, he selects a well-known passage to work on

and shares it back with the community (including his readers), thus gaining glory in the process. And despite his modesty, "Gellius could not resist the temptation to 'improve' upon Plato's composition. In sum, the atmosphere of the chapter is one of courteous rivalry, not only between Gellius and Plato, but also between rhetoric and philosophy and between Latin and Greek" (Beall 1997, 219).

CONCLUSION

A huge gap separates Seneca the Elder, who began this chapter, and Gellius, who closed it; while perhaps not a gap as enormous as that which separated those living under the emperors from those struggling with the collapse of the Roman Republic, it is still significant. It is no surprise then that we see an enormous shift in thinking about translation occurring between Seneca (and even Pliny) and Gellius. Gellius lies outside the main thrust of Roman thinking about translation up until his period and displays a respect for the claims of the Greek ST that is missing from earlier discussions. Yet, at the same time, while ideas about translation shift, some central thinking stays the same, and translation remains an important place to prove oneself as a Roman aristocrat. Like earlier authors, Gellius uses the need for translation as a way to mark others off as nonelite and the discussion of translations as a means to mark himself and his peers as aristocrats. Even as Roman translation theory shows signs of shifting to what we might consider a more modern, Western ideal, translation still functions in ways that are particularly Roman and are bound to their own needs and history. Jamming it into a box that seeks to make it an earlier, cruder precursor of ours does it no justice, even when, as with Gellius, it begins to look like something we might think of as close to our own understanding of the subject.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

Conclusion
A Roman Theory of Translation?

The Romans were not us, and their ideas and forms of translation were not ours, even though from time to time some overlap exists. At the same time, the Romans were not a monolithic culture and various forms of translation coexisted throughout the periods discussed in this book. Latin authors approached translation in various ways, with each author struggling to make translation work for him. However, translation strategies and theory in Rome were born out of the complications of translating literature from a culture it increasingly dominated, Greece. They were also born out of the increasing importance of knowledge of (Attic) Greek among the Roman elite. Working through these factors took the Romans some time and required interventions by many different authors.

One factor, however, remained constant: up until we encounter Gellius's *Attic Nights*, the Romans had little regard for the integrity of the ST in literary translation. Works were sampled, abbreviated, added to, and scattered across different genres. Cicero, for example, translated Plato as well as other Greek philosophers and authors, and integrated them into the same philosophical dialogues while adding his own framework and thought. Even relatively "straight" translations such as that of Germanicus add to and alter their ST. Such an approach did not arise from a lack of regard for the source—far from it, as many translators highly respected the authors they translated even as they reshaped them. It arose from a lack of interest in one of the prevailing concerns of modern translation: whether one should translate closely or freely, and how one should respect the ST and best transfer it into a new language and culture. Roman concerns centered on a desire to be seen to control the ST, not to be controlled by it; the more translation became an important facet of elite literary production, the more critical it was that authors imposed their identity upon its products. Because translation worked as a form of self-presentation, it *mattered* and was of critical importance; how to translate was not just a matter of linguistics but of social and cultural pressures. Roman translation theory, in all of its complexity, was born out of a need to deal with those pressures and turn them to the Romans' advantage.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

Appendix: Roman Terminology for Translation

The Romans had no dedicated word for "translation" and instead used a number of verbs that had many other meanings (however, the translational meaning was never the primary one). Below, I list the verbs used for translation by the authors discussed in this book. All are listed in the form used by Latin dictionaries:

1. first person present active indicative singular
2. present active infinitive
3. first person perfect active indicative singular
4. perfect passive participle

Verbs with a first principal part ending in -or are deponent verbs, which lack a perfect passive participle and will, thus, only have three forms listed. All numbers after definitions are their entry numbers in the Oxford Latin Dictionary (OLD); if no translational definition is given, none is supplied there. These definitions are not exhaustive and anyone wishing to see the full semantic range of these verbs should consult the OLD.

Aemulor, aemulari, aemulatus sum and aemulo, aemulare, aemulavi, aemulatum: to vie with, rival (1.a); imitate the actions of (1.b); take (a literary or an artistic work) as a model or copy (4). *Aemulor* carries clear connotations of rivalry and improving upon a source, whether that source is in Greek or Latin. It can also be used to describe a very close replica of an artistic object (Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 34.47). It is not a primary verb for translation, and instead is used in conjunction with other verbs or to fill out discussion, as in the passages from Pliny the Younger and Gellius below.

Pliny the Younger:

How else could I show how much I admire you than that I have tried to rival (*aemulari*) and translate (*exprimere*) into Latin some of your Greek epigrams? *Epistles* 4.18

Gellius

And they (Roman translations) tarnish the wit and brilliance of the Greek comedies they failed to rival (*aemulari*). *Attic Nights* 2.23

Some other uses of this verb in Gellius: 2.18.7, describing Varro rivaling Menippus; 11.4.3, used in tandem with *verto* to describe Ennius's translation of Euripides's *Hecuba*; 13.27.2, on Virgil's imitation of a line from Parthenius at *Georgics* 1.437.

Converto, convertere, converti, conversum (archaic form convorto): to cause to revolve, rotate (1); turn upside down (2); turn backwards (3); move from one place to another, transfer (7); translate (9). *Converto* is a compounded form of *verto*; compounding a verb in Latin means that the verb is intensified. Like many other Latin verbs, this has many military uses also, and is often employed to describe the movements of armies (see, for example, Julius Caesar, *Gallic Wars* 1.46, 2.26). Along with *verto*, this is one of the most common verbs for translation, and is a favorite of Cicero.

Anonymous, first century BCE

I have translated (*convertimus*) the Greek names for these subjects. *Rhetoric for Herenius* 4.7.10

Cicero

a. What effort is there in speaking the same thoughts translated (*conversa*) in almost the same words? *On the Laws* 2.17

b. I translated (*converti*) the most famous orations of the two most eloquent orators from Attica, Aeschines and Demosthenes, orations which were ranged on opposite sides; I did not translate (*converti*) them as an interpreter, but as an orator, with the same ideas, forms and, as it were, shape, and with language fitted to our usage. *On the Best Type of Orator* 14

See also: *On Moral Ends* 1.5, 1.6; *Tusculan Disputations* 3.29; *On the Nature of the Gods* 2.104; *On Moral Duties* 2.87; and lines preserved in Suetonius, *Life of Terence* (30), on Terence's translations of Menander, where it is used in conjunction with *exprimo*.

Suetonius

a. Terence was lost at sea returning from Greece with one hundred and eight plays translated (*conversis*) from Menander. *Life of Terence* 5

b. Lines of Euripides, which he (Julius Caesar) had translated (*convertit*). *Julius Caesar* 30

Seneca the Elder

He [Cestius Pius] elegantly translated (*conversae sunt*) Greek myths into Latin. *Suasoriae* 7.12

See also: Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory* 1.5.58; Columella, *On Farming* 1.113; Fronto, *Letters to Caesar* 11.1; Augustine, *City of God* 13.24; Servius, *On the Georgics* 3.150

Expono, ponere, poni, positum: to bring out into the open (1); expose a child (2); put on show, display (4); describe, relate (6); publish a book (6.b). See page 232, footnote 84 for discussion.

Lucretius

Which the poverty of our ancestral speech does not allow us to say in our language, but the subject itself is easy to expose (*exponere*) with words. *DRN*, 1.829–33

Cicero

I usually use several words to expose (*exponere*) what is expressed in Greek by one, if am unable to do anything else. *On Moral Ends* 3.15.10

Effingo, effingere, effinxi, effictum: to shape, mold, to form a shape (1); to portray in words (2); to reproduce, copy, imitate (3); to wipe clean or away (4).

Gellius

When Virgil refashioned (*effingeret*) passages from Homer, Hesiod, Apollonius, Parthenius, Callimachus, and other poets, he was clever and thoughtful when he left some sections and translated others. *Attic Nights* 9.9.4

Explico, explicare, explicavi, explicatum: to free from folds, unfold, straighten (1); to disentangle a difficulty or uncertainty (3); to extend, expand (5); to make known or set out in words, unfold (7).

Cicero

a. That I would translate (*explicarem*) the Greek orations of the very best orators. *On the Orator* 1.154

b. [They] will enjoy having what Plato wrote dialogues about on living well translated (*explicari*) into Latin. *On Moral Ends* 1.5

Exprimo, exprimere, expressi, expressum: to squeeze or press (1.a); elicit, extort, extract (4); make a likeness of, reproduce (6); reproduce in another language, translate (7). See discussion on pages 42–3 and 93–4.

Terence

[Terence] has taken that part and squeezed it out (*expressum*) word from word. *Adelphoe* 11

Catullus

I send you these translated (*expressa*) verses of Battiades. Poem 64.15

Cicero

a. Although they are willing to read Latin plays translated (*expressas*) to the word (*ad verbum*) from Greek. *On Moral Ends* 1.4

b. It is not necessary to squeeze out (*exprimi*) [a translation] word by word, as ineloquent interpreters do, when there is a more familiar word conveying the same meaning. *On Moral Ends* 3.15

See also: *On the Orator* 1.155; *Tusculan Disputations* 3.44

Seneca the Younger

But what will your good nature do for me, if I cannot at all express (*exprimere*) in Latin the very word which made me criticize our tongue? *Epistle* 58.5

Pliny the Younger

How else could I show how much I admire you than that I have tried to rival and translate (*exprimere*) into Latin some of your Greek epigrams? *Epistle* 4.18; see also *Epistle* 4.3.5

See also: Valerius Maximus 7.4; Seneca the Younger, *Epistle* 9.4; Gaius, *Institutes* 3.93; Gellius, *Attic Nights* 1.20.9 and 4.5.7; Jerome, *Epistle* 57.5.8

Interpretor, interpretari, interpretatus sum: to give an account of, explain (1); to understand (2); to expound in another language, translate (6). Used both of oral translation and of close translation, and in the latter case especially by Cicero, but see also the passage from Quintilian at page 289, where he suggests moving from this to freer translation.

Cicero

For it is easy to literally translate (*interpretari*) thoughts. *On the Laws* 2.17

Quintilian

Then closely translate (*interpretari*) them with different words. *Institutes of Oratory* 1.9.2

Suetonius

[The early poets] did nothing more than interpret (*interpretabantur*) the Greeks, or, if they had composed in Latin, read from it. *On the Grammarians* 1.1

Muto, mutare, mutavi, mutatum: to give and receive, exchange (1); substitute (for) (2); change, replace (3); change in quality, make different, modify (7); turn into something different (i.e., via metamorphosis) (12); convert into another language, translate (12.c). The noun is *mutatio* (Gellius, *Attic Nights* 11.16).

Horace

Because I feared to change (*mutare*) the meters. *Epistles* 19.27

Seneca the Younger

There is a word of one syllable I cannot translate (*mutare*). *Epistle* 58.1

pono, ponere, posui, positum: to place, set (1); to expend, lay out time, effort, or money (14); to state in speech or writing (18); to depict or express in art (19). Rarely used of translation; Seneca the Younger is an exception.

Seneca the Younger

[In translating a Greek term] I am forced to lay down (*ponere*) a noun for a verb. But if I must do so, I shall replace it (*ponam*) with "what is." *Epistle* 58.7–8

Reddo, reddere, reddidi, redditum: to give back, restore (1); bring into existence or into view again (3); reflect (5); say in reply (6); reproduce, repeat (7); pay money due, discharge or pay a debt (8 & 9); deliver an account of (13); bring about an effect or condition (16). See discussion on pages 113–4.

Lucretius

Although I am longing to translate (*reddere*) under what compact these are mixed with each other. *DRN* 3.258–59

Cicero

a. I found that when I was reading these in Greek and rendering (*redderem*) them into Latin. *On the Orator* 1.155

b. In this I did not think it necessary to render (*reddere*) word for word, but instead preserved every category and the force of the words. *On the Best Type of Orator* 14

Horace

Nor spend time rendering (*reddere*) as a faithful interpreter. *Art of Poetry* 133–34

Traduco, traducere, traduxi, traductum: to bring over or across (1); cause to cross over (2); lead or carry past in a parade, especially captives and booty (3); exhibit (4); convert something from one condition to another (7). The display connotations of this verb cross over with *ostendo* (show), which Horace uses to describe his work in bringing Greek meters to Latin.

Cicero

But if these studies are translated (*traducta erunt*) to us, we shall even have no need of Greek libraries. *Tusculan Disputations* 2.5

Gellius

An ancient Greek word which had been brought (*traductum*) into the Roman language. *Attic Nights* 1.18.1. See also 17.2.1.

Transfero, transferre, transtuli, translatum: to carry from one place to another (1); change the location of, transfer (2); transfer something abstract from one person to another (3); translate into another language (6); change or transform (8). See discussion on a pages 87 and 160.

Terence

a. He admits that he transferred (*transtulisse*) what was suitable from the *Perinthia* into the *Andria* and used that for his own. *Andria* 13–14

b. There is a *Colax* by Menander: in that, there is a parasite Colax and a swaggering soldier; he does not deny that he transferred (*transtulisse*) these. *Eunuch* 30–32

Cicero

I encourage all those who are capable to rip from the now weak Greece the praise that follows this type of study and translate (*transferant*) it

into this city . . . *Tusculan Disputations* 2.5. See also *Letters to Atticus* 6.2.3; *On Moral Ends* 1.3.7

Seneca the Elder

He did not deny that he had brought (*transtulisse*) it into Latin. *Controversia* 9.1.13

Seneca the Younger

a. It is not necessary to imitate or transfer (*transferre*) the form of words. *On the Tranquility of the Soul* 2.3

b. Surely it is right there before me that I can translate (*transferri*) this word with "what is." *Epistle* 58.7

c. You translated (*transtulisti*) each author [Homer and Virgil] into another tongue. *Consolation to Polybius* 11.5.

Quintilian

In translating (*transferentibus*) we can use the best language. *Institutes of Oratory* 10.5.2.

See also Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 25.3.7.

Verto, vertere, verti, versum (archaic form vorto): cause to spin, revolve (1; see also 8, 10); turn over ground by digging (4); overturn, knock down (5; see also 6); change a course to another direction (11); transfer or bring over to another party or cause (15); practice substitution of, change (23); translate (24a); paraphrase (24b). See discussion on pages 7–8 and 134–35. This appears to be the oldest Latin term for translation, especially if we track its use as such to Livius Andronicus (see discussion on pages 42–43 and 72–73).

Plautus

a. Demophilus wrote it, Maccus turned (*vortit*) it into barbarian. *Asinaria* 12

b. Philemon wrote it, Plautus turned (*vortit*) it into barbarian. *Trinummus* 19

Lucretius

I have myself have been discovered, first among the first, someone who can translate (*vertere*) this into the language of our fathers. *DRN* 5.336

Cicero

a. If I translate Plato as our poets have translated plays. *On Moral Ends* 1.3.7

b. For I translated much from the Greeks. *Tusculan Disputations* 2.11.26

Livy

He [Claudius Quadrigarius?] translated Acilius's *Annales* from Greek into Latin. *From the Founding of the City* 25.39.12

Quintilian

Previous Latin orators considered that turning [*vertere*] Greek into Latin was the best exercise. *Institutes of Oratory* 10.5.2; see 1.9.2 and 10.5.5 for *verto* as paraphrase.

See also *Institutes of Oratory* 10.5.5–7.

Pliny the Younger

The most useful activity and one which many people suggest is to translate (*vertere*) from Greek into Latin or from Latin into Greek. *Epistles* 7.9.3

Gellius

Whenever one has to translate (*vertandae*). *Attic Nights* 9.9

Notes

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

1. See Richter (1938, 42–68) for a list of all Roman translations from the third century BCE through the seventh century CE.
2. *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artes/intulit agresti Latio* (*Epistles* 2.1.156–57).
3. Languages spoken included: Latin, Oscan, and Umbrian (Central and Southern Italy); Greek (Southern Italy); Etruscan; Ligurian (North-West Italy); and various Celtic languages (in the North).
4. Such translations include the Epicurean translations discussed in Chapter 4 and the Homeric translations discussed in Chapter 6. The early translators discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 were also not members of the elite.
5. See Edmunds (2001) and Hinds (1998) for two different approaches to Latin literature using intertextuality as an analytical frame.
6. It may well be a joke at the expense of the Aetolians, a Greek people, who made a spectacular error in translating *fides*, the Latin word for faith, in 191 BCE (see Chapters 1 and 5).
7. The process of canonization had certainly started with the Alexandrians, but that does not mean that these texts were canonical for Romans. Cicero, for one, thought that Greek lyric was not worth reading even if one had two lifetimes (Seneca the Younger, *Epistles* 49.5).
8. On this change, see Robinson (1992b) and Copeland (1991).
9. The best account of reading in antiquity and its effects on memory is Small (1997); in what follows, I draw heavily on her work, particularly the section on ancient books and scrolls (11–25). Kenney (1982) is also an accessible introduction to the topic; for a discussion of reading culture in the later empire, see Johnson 2010.
10. Unusual materials might also be used for some texts; in the Late Republic, the poet Cinna gave a copy of a Greek didactic work, Aratus's *Phaenomena,* written on mallow bark as a gift (frag. 11, Courtney 2003, 221).
11. Even libraries probably did not have tables to lay material on (Small 1997, 163–65). Readers either took or dictated notes as they read or committed passages to memory.
12. In *Epistles* 3.5.10–15, Pliny the Younger (c. 61–112 CE) describes how his uncle, Pliny the Elder, took notes using a secretary or reader; either he was read to and took notes or he read and dictated notes.
13. There are a few exceptions to this, such as the table of contents provided by Pliny the Elder for his monumental *Natural History*, but in that specific case it was added so that the Emperor Titus, its dedicatee, would not have to read

the entire work. Pliny also did not say where in his work (in what section of a scroll, for example) you could find an item, so you still had to scroll through to find it. Gellius also provided a table of contents for the *Attic Nights*, but the same issues with finding particular items applied.

14. Not only were texts hard to navigate, but they could also be hard to obtain. If translators wanted to translate a particular text or to compare one work with another, they might not find it that easily available, especially in the earlier periods that this books covers. Cicero, for example, had three libraries at three villas and on one occasion was left a library in a will (*Letters to Atticus/Epistulae ad Atticum* 2.1), all of which means that he was extremely well supplied with reading material. However, he still had to ask friends, or friends of friends, for books or have one of his slaves make a copy in someone else's library. Cicero exchanged copies of books with his brother, Quintus, to fill out their libraries (*Letters to Quintus/Epistulae ad Quintum* 3.4.5), and he wrote to his friend Atticus to ask him to bring a copy of a work by the Greek philosopher Theophrastus (*Letters to Atticus* 2.3).
15. On techniques of memorization in antiquity, see Small (1997, 81–123).
16. Suetonius (born c. 70 CE) refers to Valerius Probus gathering many copies for editing purposes, in *On the Grammarians/De grammaticis et rhetoribus* 24, but this is very unlikely to mean that he collated manuscripts (Kaster 1995, 260). The first-century CE Greek geographer Strabo complained that people did not bother to collate manuscripts of Aristotle (13.1.54).
17. It is unlikely that Gellius came up with these comparisons himself; see Chapter 6.
18. On translation in Egypt, see Schneider (2011); on Hittite translators, see Campbell (2011).
19. Why the Greeks did not make translation a facet of their culture or even theorize on the subject is a puzzle that can be only partially explained by ethnocentric biases; they certainly came extremely close to doing so, as Douglas Robinson (1992a) points out: "there are passages in the *Cratylus*, the *Phaedrus*, in the *Sophist*, in the *Republic*, that could easily have gravitated toward a discussion of translation. Plato's treatment of the art of the rhapsode in the *Ion* could well be read as a displaced account of translation: the translator as mediator between the muse and the public. We might imagine a Platonic theory of translation, revolving around the determinacy of meaning across linguistic barriers (*Cratylus*), or around the inferior status of the translation as a mere copy of the original, and thus as a copy of a copy of a copy (*Phaedrus*, *Sophist*, *Republic*), or around the dangers of letting translation be guided by emotion rather than knowledge (*Ion*)" (15).
20. The Greek historians Herodotus and Ctesias, who translated Eastern culture for the Greeks, are two exceptions; on these, see Stronk (2011).
21. Most connect the emergence of Translation Studies as a discipline with James Holmes's 1972 paper "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies," wherein he identified and outlined it as a separate field. (The paper is available in Holmes [1988].)
22. See his *The Translator's Invisibility* (1995) and *The Scandals of Translation* (1998). A debate over this topic and related issues between Venuti, Tim Parks, and Luise von Flotow can be found in the Iowa Review Forum on Literature and Translation (2012): http://iowareview.uiowa.edu/?q=page/towards_a_translation_culture&page=0,0; http://iowareview.uiowa.edu/?q=page/mysteries_of_the_metatask&page=0,0; http://iowareview.uiowa.edu/?q=page/upgrading_the_downgraded.
23. One example of a foreignizing translation is Louis and Celia Zukofsky's 1969 translations of Catullus, where they attempted to match not just the meaning but the sound of Catullus.

24. We have no extant literary translation that is literal, and accusations of literal translation are frequently bound up with issues of class and status (see discussion of Cicero and the figure of the *interpres* in Chapter 4 and of Attius Labeo's translation of the *Iliad* in Chapter 6). Literal translation appears to be largely a straw man rather than a real practice. There are places where Romans translate their Greek ST very closely, but perplexingly some of these close translations are labeled as free and their free translations as close. Cicero claims that a translation at *On the Laws* 2.45 is a close one, but it is not (see also *On Divination* 1.60–61; see Jones 1959, 31). Cicero will also claim to have stopped translating while still continuing to do so: see *Republic* 1.68, where the speaker (Scipio) says he will return to his own speech, but still continues to translate a Greek text (in this case a Platonic dialogue).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1. Polybius 20.9–10; Livy 36.28.
2. L. Cornelius Scipio's letter to the town of Heraclea appears to have used *pistis* as a translation of *fides* (Sherk 1969, 200).
3. Most accept that this was a case of mistranslation and misunderstanding (see, for example, Dubuisson 1985, 100–105), but some argue that this was instead an instance of Glabrio overreaching himself and acting in a characteristically arrogant fashion by misapplying the Roman notion of *fides* (Gruen 1982). Either way, Glabrio had to rely on there being slippage between the Greek and Latin terms.
4. Cf. Fergus Millar's comment: "with local languages, in particular, we are inevitably driven back to questions both about the role of Latin or Greek in the area, and about the status of any evidence in Latin and Greek emanating from it" (1968, 126).
5. On linguistic issues in the Roman army, see Peretz (2006, 455–57).
6. The Emperor Augustus exiled Ovid to Tomis on the Black Sea; Ovid claimed not only to have learned Getic (one of the local languages—Greek was also spoken), but also to have composed poetry in it (*Epistles from Pontus* 4.13.17–30).
7. There is, unfortunately, no space here to discuss inscriptions and translation beyond official translations of Roman senatorial decrees (*senatus consulta*) and the translation of the *Res gestae* of Augustus. However, there was an enormous range and quantity of bilingual (and pseudo-bilingual) inscriptions outside of these categories. There is a large bibliography on this fascinating subject, of which the following is only a small selection: Larson (2011; an excellent introduction to the subject, which also includes discussion of the *Res gestae*); Adams 2003 (unparalleled in clarity and coverage); Cooley and Burnett (2002; covers a wide variety of epigraphic texts in the Western half of the empire); Kaizer (2002, 27–37 and passim; inscriptions in Palmyra); Leiwo (2002; Greek-Latin inscriptions in Italy); Kearsley and Evans (2001; Asia); Horbury and Noy (1992; Jewish inscriptions in Greco-Roman Egypt); and Fraser (1970; Greek-Phoenician inscriptions at Rhodes).
8. A good, brief discussion of the pragmatic and other reasons which produce both translation and language acquisition can be found in Pym (1995).
9. *at enim opera data est ut imperiosa civitas non solum iugum, verum etiam linguam suam domitis gentibus per pacem societatis inponeret, per quam non deesset, immo et abundaret etaim interpretum copia* (*City of God/De Civitate Dei* 19.7).
10. The lack of official translations or of interaction on the part of the provincial administration in languages other than Latin and Greek was actually

a fairly efficient and inexpensive state policy in terms of native elites. One had to learn Greek or Latin to interact with the Roman administrators and administration on one's own terms, a significant motivation to learn one or both of these languages.

11. Cicero uses little Greek in his letters to prominent public figures and in his public speeches (Swain 2002, 150; Jocelyn 1973, 61).
12. Valerius Licinianus, a senator and orator exiled under the Emperor Domitian, played with the association of the *pallium* with Greek; while teaching in Sicily, he proceeded to enter his first lecture dressed in the *pallium*, but made a point of announcing his intention to declaim in Latin (Pliny the Younger, *Epistle* 4.11.3). He thus subverted the norm and pointed out the inappropriateness of a Roman senator being forced into teaching for economic rewards.
13. One such person was Clodius Sabinus who, unusually, declaimed in Latin and Greek on the same day; when certain people felt he should have been paid more because he taught two languages, someone commented that "those who teach interpretation never get paid a lot" (*numquam magnas mercedes accepisse eos qui hermeneumata docerent* [Seneca the Elder, *Controversia* 9.3.14]).
14. For more on the symbolic power of the toga and *pallia*, see most recently Wallace-Hadrill (2008, 38–57). See Chapter 3 for discussion on the *commedia palliata*, Latin translations of Greek comedies.
15. *On the Magistrates* 2.12. Lydus had specific reasons to promote Latin, as he was extremely proud of his ability in that tongue (cf. *On the Magistrates* 3.27), but his testimony suggests that the Romans tied their imperial achievements to the retention of Latin in official matters.
16. Gellius, *Attic Nights* 17.17.1; on Ennius as a translator, see Chapter 2.
17. Cf. Adams and Swain: "language choice is often bound up with the identity which a particular person is seeking to project on a particular occasion" (2002, 2).
18. The following survey has no pretensions to exhaustively covering this topic. Those interested in ancient bilingualism, polylingualism, and Latin should begin with Adams (2003) and the papers in Adams, Janse, and Swain (2002).
19. See also Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 5.116: "very few of us know Greek or the Greeks Latin. Therefore we are deaf to each others' speech, and we are also deaf to all those innumerable languages which we do not understand" (*nostri Graece fere nesciunt, nec Graeci Latine. Ergo hi in illorum, et illi in horum sermone surdi, omnesque item nos in iis linguis quas non intelligimus, quae sunt innumerabiles, surdi profecto sumus*).
20. Valette-Cagnac (2005) is an excellent discussion of precisely what type of Greek the Roman elite may have spoken. Horrocks (2010, 79–122) provides a good introduction to the rise of *koiné* and its distribution throughout the Greek East and under the Roman Empire.
21. Campanile (1991, 16); on Greek in Plautus, see also Jocelyn (1999), Shipp (1953), and Hough (1934), along with the discussion in Chapter 3.
22. Some of our inscriptional evidence from Rome itself shows that many individuals never became Romanized even there, that they often still clung to their ancestral languages despite being in the heart of the empire, showing the living power of provincial languages and traditional customs even when faced with considerable odds (see, for example, MacMullen [1993]; on Greek inscriptions in Rome, see Kajanto [1963]).
23. *A Slip of the Tongue in Greeting/Pro lapsu inter salutandum*. Lucian's dates: born 120 CE, died after 180.
24. *non tamen ut aut loqueretur expedite aut componere aliquid auderet; nam et si quid res exigeret, Latine formabat vertendumque alii dabat* (Suetonius, *Augustus* 89.2).

25. On the inscription, see Judge (2008); Adams (2003, 533–34 and 637–39); Hauben (1976); and Bernand (1969, volume II, 36–37). Adams and Bernand provide complete texts of and commentary on the Greek and Latin versions.
26. The Latin text is far more stylish than the Greek and was perhaps written by Gallus himself (Adams 2003, 640); it also has stylistic similarities to Augustus's *Res gestae*.
27. Gallus fell into disgrace (probably from this and similar acts of self-aggrandizement) and was forced to commit suicide in 27/26 BCE.
28. Unfortunately, the condition of the hieroglyphic version is such that we cannot always be sure of its exact contents; Bresciani (1989) argues that one of his names—Cornelius—can be found on the inscription.
29. Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 18.22; Varro, *On Farming/De re rustica* 1.1.10; Columella 1.1.13. On Mago's text and its translators, see Heurgon (1976).
30. We have some fragments in Latin but it is impossible to know which version they came from; they might be taken directly from Silanus's version, revised from his translation, or Latinizations of Greek translations of Mago that other Roman authors consulted. If Silanus used Punic assistants (presumably prisoners of war), we do not hear of them.
31. This was not a straight translation: it took eight books from Mago and interwove them with material from Greek writers on farming; the entire work was dedicated to a Sextilius, probably the praetor of 89 or 88 (Heurgon 1976, 44).
32. Hiempsal is probably to be identified with Hiempsal II, who ruled over Numidia until 60 BCE.
33. What follows can only be a summary of the use of interpreters; for a larger picture, see: Wiotte-Franz (2001); Rochette (1996); Hermann (1956); Gehman (1914, with an extremely useful appendix of sources); Peretz (2006) discusses military interpreters in Rome, while Kurz (1986) discusses two Roman inscriptions of military interpreters. See also Mairs (2011) on the "interpreter as traitor" trope and its applicability to ancient perceptions of interpreters.
34. A commentator on a passage of Hyginus discussing the myth of the separation of languages explains that the Greek name for Mercury (Hermes) arose from the god's linguistically creative activity as a *hermeneus* (a somewhat similar etymology of the name is offered by Socrates at *Cratylus* 408b). However, the opposite was true: an interpreter/translator was one who acted for Hermes, and hence derived his name from him (Hermann 1956, 35); Hermann argues that while for both the Greeks and Romans there was a common element, in that the role of the interpreter as a mediator gave him a touch of the divine, in the Greek model, the intellectual element came to the fore, while for the Romans the practical situation of the interpreter was paramount.
35. The metaphor is drawn from Strabo's discussion of Alexander the Great's encounter with a Brahmin priest. To speak with him, Alexander had to employ three interpreters in three different languages, with each one consecutively translating to the next. The Brahmin, not surprisingly, felt that this was no way to learn philosophy and suggested that expecting wisdom through this procedure had about as much point as expecting pure water to flow through mud (15.1.64).
36. Rochette (1996, 87–89), provides all the literary references to the specific usage of interpreters of languages in Rome; the list is not very long.
37. On this inscription, see Kolnik (1978).
38. For *interpres* as combining *inter* and *pres* (from *pretium*), see Ernout and Meillet (1959, 320). The origins of the word suggest that interpreters arose in Rome initially to deal with matters of commerce; the Greek term, *hermeneus*, suggests

that the term was originally used to describe those who interpreted messages from the gods, rather than commercial transactions (Rochette 1996, 79–81).

39. *A. Valentius est in Sicilia interpres, quo iste interprete non ad linguam Graecam, sed ad furta et flagitia uti solebat. Fit hic interpres, homo levis atque egens, repente decumanus* (2.3.84). At *Against Verres* 2.2.54 he refers to Verres's other agents as *interpretes*. For another rather morally dubious individual who acts as a go-between, see Plautus's *Miles Gloriosus*, where Palaestrio refers to himself as an *interpres* (798, 910) while arranging a rendezvous for the titular braggart soldier with his neighbor's "wife."
40. Whom he describes as being ignorant of Greek, which might suggest an unhealthy dependence on interpreters and other intermediaries—unlike Cicero, who could, if he wished, abandon their use, as he did when addressing the Sicilian assembly in Greek (2.4.126–27; 2.3.84; for criticism of Cicero for this speech, see *Against Verres* 4.147).
41. Jorma Kaimio suggests that Menander was a translator of Asiatic languages rather than Greek (1969, 112), because it was unlikely that a Roman aristocrat would need an interpreter for Greek. This seems an unnecessary conjecture, especially given some of the circumstances for which one might want an interpreter handy (to put distance between oneself and another person speaking Greek, for instance). A Roman fluent in Attic Greek might also still need help with those who spoke another Greek dialect.
42. On this passage, see also most recently Rochette (2011, 550) and Wallace-Hadrill (2011). Valerius Maximus tells us that the first Greek to address the Senate without an interpreter was Apollonius Molon of Rhodes in 81 BCE (2.2.3); he claims this was a special honor granted to Molon as Cicero's teacher of rhetoric.
43. Tiberius Gracchus gave a speech in Greek to the people of Rhodes, for example (Cicero, *Brutus* 79); during his mission to Asia in 131 BCE, Crassus Mucianus spoke in all five Greek dialects (Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory* 11.2.50; Valerius Maximus 8.7.6). The general Gaius Marius's disdainful attitude to Greek education was, obviously, very much the exception (for Marius's disdain for Greek, see Valerius Maximus 2.2.3 and Plutarch, *Marius* 2).
44. For simultaneous interpretation in a Christian context, see *Egeria* 47.3–4 (the languages involved are Greek and Aramaic). Augustus's speech to the Alexandrians after his victory over Antony and Cleopatra was probably also translated simultaneously into Greek (Cassius Dio 51.16.3).
45. It is possible that these interpreters were called only for explanations of difficult terms (Rochette 1996, 81), but I think it likely that there were senators who either needed help with Greek, especially dialects, despite a strong education in Attic Greek, or who wanted to make a political point by using an interpreter.
46. Livy 45.29.1–3. Paullus talked to the defeated King Perseus in Greek during their meeting in his tent (Livy 45.8); he also brought the Macedonian royal library to Rome—and retained it, although he turned all the other spoils over to the Roman state.
47. On the interpreter as a distancing mechanism, see also Pliny, *Panegyricus* 18.19.4, where he celebrates that many in Trajan's army are lucky enough to have their loyalty and efforts recognized by Trajan without the interference of interpreters and go-betweens.
48. Senators were drawn from the Western provinces long before they were drawn from the Greek-speaking East. Eastern senators only appear in large numbers in the late first century CE (Garnsey and Saller 1987, 9; Hammond 1957 is a good introduction to the topic of the membership of the Senate and its problems with internal replication).

49. Claudius also wrote his Etruscan history and history of Carthage in Greek (*Claudius* 41); in the latter case, it might have seemed in bad taste to write in Latin. He also wrote many works in Latin, including histories, an autobiography, and a defense of Cicero against Asinius Gallus.
50. Seventy-eight of these decrees are gathered in Sherk (1969), which also provides commentary and is based on Viereck (1888). For the Greek terminology of the inscriptions, see Mason (1974). Most were found in the Greek-speaking East; one exception is the bilingual *senatus consultum de Asclepiade Clazomenio sociisque* of 78 BCE (CIL I2 588; for edition and commentary, see Raggi 2001). This decree granted immunity from taxes to three Greeks who had fought on the Roman side during the Social War (91–87 BCE). However, while the translation was the product of official translators, the posting of the inscription on the Capitol was almost certainly done by the Greeks it thanked (Raggi 2001, 88).
51. The existence of this office (called *ap epistulis Graecis*) suggests that official translations under the empire were done at Rome (Rochette 1997b, 301). Problematically, we cannot be sure what this office entailed in detail: "as for their precise functions, we can do no better than the alternatives presented by the *Notitia Dignitatum*—dictating Greek letters (to express an imperial decision) or translating letters already written in Latin" (Millar 1992, 227). Possibly the duties shifted as the social status of those who held the office became higher and higher (Millar 1992, 88). This office is first mentioned under Nero (Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 20.138).
52. See Lewis 1986, which discusses communications issued on papyri, also monolingual. It provides a case study of a document originally drafted in Latin but found in a Greek translation; sent from the prefect of Egypt, Q. Aemilius Saturninus, to the *strategoi* of the province, it dates from 198/9 CE and deals with divination and fortune tellers (Lewis 1986, 136–37).
53. Germanicus died in 19 CE; the *senatus consultum* dates from 20. On these decrees, see Rowe (2002), especially 2–40.
54. We see something similar at work in the school translations of Roman authors, preserved in papyri from Egypt, which seem to have constantly employed (and over-employed) lexicons. Students translated the same Latin word with the same Greek words over and over, regardless of context or shifts in meaning (Rochette 1997b, 190).
55. On the law, see De Souza (1999, 108–14); the inscription along with commentary can be found in Crawford and Cloud (1996, 231–37); it was clearly translated by Latin speakers.
56. We have seen that Gallus's inscription at Philae, which was not sanctioned by Rome or Augustus, shows considerable differences between its three versions. In a legal text, although the Latin text would be paramount, a problematic translation could still cause headaches the Roman state did not need.
57. The urban quaestors were in charge of this archive and received the decrees, which were drawn up by a senatorial committee; this building also held copies of laws and other public documents and operated as a state treasury (on the *aerarium* and its staff, see Jones 1960a and Millar 1964).
58. On the grades of the Roman civil service, see Jones (1960b); under the empire, many members of the civil service were drawn from the slaves and freedmen of the emperors. In the second and third centuries, many positions were hereditary, as slaves begat other slaves before they were freed (Jones 1960b, 159–60).
59. The most recent edition of the *Res gestae* is Cooley (2009), which includes the Greek and Latin texts, provides an English translation, and has an excellent commentary. This edition should be the first stop for anyone wishing to know more about the text, its location, or any of the controversies regarding it over the years.

60. Galatia covered the highlands of Anatolia, a region that had only been annexed as a province in 25 BCE; it was left to Augustus in the will of the final Galatian king. It was an imperial province, that is, its governors were directly appointed by the emperor himself. The province Sardis was part of, Asia, was a senatorial province with its governors appointed by the Senate (albeit with the emperor's tacit approval). It was also a far more longstanding part of the Roman Empire and had become a province in 133 BCE. All we have from the Sardian inscription is one extremely brief and disjointed fragment (very recently published in Thonemann 2012).
61. This version is often referred to as the *monumentum Ancyranum*.
62. Cooley (2009, 11). This was the most prestigious position (Larson 2011, 58); the positioning of the Latin was high enough to make it ostentatious—and rather difficult to read (Bowie 1970, 206).
63. Antioch was a colony for veterans of the fifth and seventh legions; these veterans, who were of Italian origin, formed the community's elite (Cooley 2009, 13). Antioch had seven hills—like Rome—and named some of its districts after landmarks in Rome: "the setting up of the *Res gestae* here, therefore, is symptomatic of a desire to imitate Rome, and to forge close ties to the capital" (Cooley 2009, 14). This explains why the Latin text alone was posted.
64. On the presentation of the inscriptions and their effect on their original audiences, see Güven (1998).
65. For a comparison of the Greek versions, see Scheid (2007, lxviii–lxxx).
66. The most succinct discussion of the varying opinions on this issue is Ramage (1987, 122–25). Meuwese (1926) argued that some of these Latinisms were, in fact, features of *koiné* in general, rather than necessarily signs of the nationalism or first language of the translator (cf. also Regard 1924); however, even if we could identify the translator's first language, it would not necessarily help in identifying the location of the translation: a translator in Rome could have Greek as his first language, and a translator in Galatia who had come over with the administration could have Latin as his first language.
67. Rome dated each year by the names of the two consuls for that year.
68. As the Galatians had previously been ruled by one such king, they would find this image familiar.
69. Ando (1999, 15). The term literally means "the affairs/matters of the people"; however, it referred not to just any body of people, but to one bound together by a common interest or concern (Cicero, *Republic* 1.39.1). Despite problems with translating it into Greek, there are only six variants in official translations over several centuries (Mason 1974, 202).
70. There are five outright errors in total, three of which suggest that the person who made them was not a native Roman (Papaioannou 2011, 68). To take one example, at 9.1, the Latin refers to the four major colleges of priests in Rome; the translator renders this as the "college of the four priests"; this is not a mistake a native Roman would make.
71. The *lares*, household gods, are described as heroes (19.2), the *penates* are called household gods (19.2).
72. See further Papaioannou (2011, 67–74) and Cooley (2009, 26–30).

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1. No source ever refers to multiple books when they quote him, unlike references to other contemporary texts such as Naevius's *Punic War*; see Suerbuam (1992) and Goldberg (1995, 46).

2. Naevius, who translated several dramas from Greek to Latin and also wrote an epic in Saturnian on the Punic Wars, was from Campania (Gellius, *Attic Nights* 1.2; for a full discussion of the evidence for Naevius's Campanian origins, see Marmorale 1953, 15–17). Pacuvius, Ennius's nephew and another translator of tragedies, came from Brundisium.
3. We hear of them performing on at least two occasions in Rome at different *ludi* celebrated by Fulvius Nobilior and Lucius Scipio in 186 BCE (Livy 39.22.2; 39.2.10). Erich Gruen argues that Livius drew his actors from these groups (1990, 87; cf. Horsfall 1976, 81). However, it seems more likely that Livius drew his actors for his initial performances from those already acting in other forms of drama in Rome; I find it doubtful that actors from the guilds had much reason or motivation to learn Latin by this period, given that they had ample performance opportunities in the Greek communities of Southern Italy.
4. Scripts could consist of extracts from dramas by various authors or by a single author (Euripides was especially popular), various choral lyrics, or sections of dialogue or other selections from different tragedies centered around a shared main theme.
5. Such *contaminatio* is also seen in other authors: in Naevius's *Punic War*, Jupiter prophesies to Venus the glorious future of the Roman people (Frags. 13, 14, 15 Büchner), in a scene which is a compound of *Odyssey* 1.44–79 and 5.7–42 (Feeney 1991, 111).
6. Even if some might claim that Latin was a dialect of Greek (a theory called Aeolism). On Aeolism, see Stevens (2006).
7. One can reconstruct a cultural picture of archaic Rome that resembles that of Greece, as Zorzetti (1990, 1991) does; for a contrasting (though in many ways complementary) description of archaic Roman cultural production in non-Greek terms, see Habinek (2005).
8. R. A. Brooks, for example, argues that Ennius was the first poet to be fully conscious of his role as intermediary between Greece and Rome (1981, 2 and 31).
9. Our only source for this is Jerome (*Chronicle* 148.2), whose source was probably Suetonius's now almost entirely lost *On the Poets/De poetis*.
10. Suetonius's *On the Grammarians* 1.2 informs us that he and Ennius taught Latin and Greek and gave readings from their Latin works.
11. The "poets' guild." A *collegium* here refers to a private association of those working at the same craft (on this *collegium*, see Horsfall 1976).
12. This work, a chronological table of Roman and world history, is represented now by only eight fragments; it was in circulation by 46 BCE, when Cicero mentions it in *Brutus*.
13. For a fuller discussion of the dating issue, see Beare (1940); Michael Weiss, in the introduction to Livingston (2004), also gives an excellent overview of the evidence and controversies about the "facts" of Livius's life.
14. Precisely at what stage of his literary career Livius translated the *Odyssey* is a matter of debate: W. R. Hardie suggests that it was written before he wrote his plays (1920, 198); Kaimio, on the other hand, argues that it was written after them (1979, 212). No certainty is possible.
15. Some of our fragments are Saturnian, some hexameter; either we posit that Livius translated using a combination of both, which seems unlikely given that no later authors mentions his work as using anything but Saturnian, or that the poem was later reworked into hexameter to bring it more in line with post-Ennian poetic tastes.
16. "I do not demand (*insector*) that the *carmina* of Livius be destroyed, which I remember Orbilius the beater reciting to me when I was young" (*Non equidem insector delendaque carmina Livi/esse reor, memini quae plagosum mihi*

parvo/Orbilium dictare [*Epistle* 2.1.69–70]). *Insector* plays with Livius's use of *insece* in the first line of the *Odussia* (Sciarrino 2006, 453; Hinds 1998, 71).

17. *Brutus* 18.71; I see no reason to doubt that Cicero had read the poem, given his interest in archaic Latin literature; it must have been available if it was in circulation as a school text.
18. Some citations for Livius being the first:

    Theater: Horace, *Epistle* 2.1.62 with the scholiast on the line; Livy 7.2.8–10; Gellius, *Attic Nights* 17.21; Valerius Maximus 2.4.4; Diomedes, *Grammatici Latini* 1.489.7; Evanthius, *On Comedy* 4.3
    Poet: Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory* 10.2.7.

19. Rome had been importing Greek religion for a long time, including the cult of Castor and Pollux in 484 BCE (Feeney 1998, 26), and Greek myth (Feeney 1998, 50), although it kept clear demarcations between Roman and Greek forms of ritual (Feeney 1998, 27).
20. "Stage games"; although *ludi* translates literally as games, such a translation is misleading because it covers events as widely different as funeral games (later including gladiator shows), plays, and games held to celebrate a variety of religious festivals or to honor political and military achievements, all with different expectations and celebrations.
21. The passage is, to say the least, deeply problematic because of its close similarities to ancient accounts of the development of Greek drama; as a result, and because of its importance to understanding the origins and development of drama in Rome, it has amassed an enormous bibliography. The best summary of the scholarship and discussion of Livy's sources is Oakley (1998, 40–72).
22. *Carmen de moribus* frag. 2 Jordan; see below for discussion of the problematic *carmina convivalia*.
23 This, the first work of history in Latin, was begun in 168 and still in progress at the time of his death in 149; it covered the history of Rome from its foundation until Cato's own day; on this see most recently, Sciarrino (2011).
24. *morem apud maiores hunc epularum fuisse, ut deinceps qui accubarent canerent ad tibiam clarorum virorum laudes atque virtutes* (*Tusculan Disputations* 4.3).
25. See in particular Cole (1991) and Phillips (1991), which are direct responses to Zorzetti's article.
26. Zorzetti (1990, 299–300) suggests that the *carmina* may have driven out an Indo-European epic tradition, but it is impossible to know.
27. Thomas Wiseman is right to say that we cannot be sure that the performance of early epic in Rome was so very different from that in Greece, and that we ought to consider at least the possibility that Ennius's and Naevius's poems could have been performed in settings like the *ludi Romani* (2006, 514). However, we have to acknowledge that while we have some evidence for early dramatic performances, we have absolutely no hints of public performance of Livius's translation, nor of the performance of epic in Rome before him.
28. Translation Grube (1965). Horace repeats this at *Art of Poetry* 74.
29. If Zorzetti (1991, 312) is right, and we should see all the types of *carmina* that Cicero mentions at *Tusculan Disputations* 4.3 as connected and forming part of a continuum or an early poetic stratum still found in later sources, then we could infer from the Saturnian meter of the gnomic statements of Appius Claudius Caecus (fourth to third century BCE) and the Scipionic inscriptions that the *carmina convivalia* were in Saturnian.

30. *De saturnio versu dicendum est, quem nostri existimaverunt proprium esse Italicae regionis, sed falluntur* (*Grammatici Latini* 6.265.7–8).
31. Sextus Pompeius Festus (late second century CE) summarized Verrius Flaccus's first-century CE *On the Meaning of Words/De significatu verborum*; his work was in turn epitomized by Paulus; hence, the work is sometimes called *Paulus ex Festo*, *Paulus from Festus*. On Festus and his work, see Glinister, North, and Woods (2007) and Glinister (2007); all references are to Lindsay's edition (1913).
32. For a full discussion, with citations, of Roman debates over the nativity of Saturnian, see Luiselli (1976, 15–26).
33. See *The Experience of the Foreign: Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany* (1982).
34. The fact that it sounded more natural than, say, hexameter, does not mean that it was a replica of natural speech. The rhythm may have derived from spoken Latin, but it was stylized enough to be distinguished from it (unless the Romans of the Mid-Republic spoke all their lines with a caesura in the middle). Nor does it mean that it lacked weight or elite connotations; as I discuss below, it was used, among other things, for inscriptions on the tombs of the elite.
35. Luiselli (1967, 26); he also suggests a date of the third century BCE for the forging of the connection between the verse and Saturn (28).
36. On Rome as the Saturnian land, see also Festus 430.30–34, Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1.7.19, Tertullian, *Apology* 10.7; see Luiselli (1967, 26–30) for discussion.
37. Grammarians such as Atilius Fortunatianus linked Saturn, Saturnian, and the site of Rome (*Grammatici Latini* 6.283.12–14 and 6.293.25–26).
38. The first extant use of Saturnian in a Scipionic epitaph was for the consul of 259 BCE; the first use of another meter on tombs honors the praetor of 139 BCE. There are Saturnians on other records of elite self-promotion, such the dedicatory inscription of a temple to Hercules Victor by Lucius Mummius (CIL 626), and the *tabulae triumphales* of Acilius Glabrio and L. Aemilius Regillus (CIL 6.265.29). It was also the meter of noninscriptional elite utterances, such as Appius Claudius's *sententiae* (see Goldberg 1993, 21, on the wide range of uses for Saturnian).
39. John Van Sickle suggested that the poets themselves produced the epitaphs of Rome (1987, passim); however, even if Livius or Naevius or other poets wrote the Scipios's epitaphs, they did not sign them, which meant the voice speaking from the tomb was anonymous and the professional poet's work (if such it was) was elided. Saturnian was not only used on elite tombs: the dedicatory inscription of the guild of the cooks was in Saturnians and is not that far removed from popular verse (Beare 1957, 179).
40. This is not to say that we do not also see Greek influence in these inscriptions: Van Sickle (1987, 49) argues that they show influence from Greek epigrams, for they have a length of six lines as epigrams do, although one can have Saturnians in any combination of line numbers.
41. *virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum*, frag. 1, Büchner.
42. We do not know how close the two were, but close enough for the distance to be easily covered; see van der Kraan 2001 for a good, brief discussion of the issues and one possible location.
43. Mariotti (1952, 37–38); Goldberg (1995, 72); see also Conte (1986, 83); all argue that Livius chose the word because it was composed from the Latin *verto*, the equivalent of *trepo*, but ignore the fact that Homer is using a compound of *trepo* (Ronconi 1973, 14).

44. On evidence pointing solely to their use in schools, see Erasmi (1980, 136); see also Marrou (1956, 336), who argues that Livius wrote it so he could expound on it as though it were a Greek classic.
45. *Malum dabunt Metelli Naevio poetae*. Gruen dismisses this as evidence for the Metelli actually intending any real harm, insisting that this is a "droll" comment in the style of Roman comedy (1990, 100; see also Jocelyn 1969b and Mattingly 1960). It is worth remembering that a droll comment wishing one harm from a powerful family is not the same as a droll comment in a comedy. For my purposes, it does not matter whether Naevius really ended up in jail because of the Metelli's ill will or not (for the imprisonment see: Plautus, *Miles Gloriosus* 209–12; Gellius, *Attic Nights* 3.3.13; Jerome, *Chronicle* 144.3). Here, what interests me is the idea that the elite are the perfect masters of the Saturnian, the only ones who can create a model line that lasts for generations.
46. Caesius Bassus, *Grammatici Latini* 6.266.5–6; Terentius, *Grammatici Latini* 6.399.2515–19; Atilius Fortunatianus, *Grammatici Latini* 6.2943.
47. At *In Defense of Archias the Poet* 22, Cicero tells us that Ennius praised Cato to the skies, so the break may not have been absolute. Gruen (1990, 115–16) argues that there was no breach between Cato and Ennius, just an argument between Cato and Fulvius Nobilior over the issue of bringing poets on campaign.
48. Cornelius Nepos, *Cato* 1.4; he met him when Cato was on campaign in Calabria in 204 during his (Ennius's) service in the Roman army. Another, much later, source says, however, that Ennius taught Cato Greek in Sardinia while Cato was there as praetor in 198 (Aurelius Victor, *On Famous Men/de Viris illustribus* 47.1). Because of this, some, like Ernst Badian (1971, 158), have doubted whether Cato and Ennius met in Calabria; such skepticism is probably unnecessary (Goldberg 2006, 44).
49. *Praetextae* are historical dramas written to celebrate great achievements or important historical events in Rome's past. They could be commissioned by generals returning home from campaign and presented at the games to celebrate their triumphs. *Ambracia*, which is only extant in fragments, celebrated Nobilior's victory at the siege of Ambracia, a Greek town, a topic also covered in the *Annales*.
50. Ennius also translated a number of comedies and tragedies, including a considerable number of Euripides's tragedies, with his adaptation of the *Medea* being particularly popular. All of Ennius's literary remains can be found with an English translation in the Loeb Classical Library's *Remains of Old Latin, Volume I* (trans. Warrington).
51. The temple also contained a sacred shrine that King Numa had made for the *Camenae* (Servius, *On the Aeneid* 1.8).
52. See Cicero, *On Old Age* 1, 10, 14, 16, 50, 73, and *In Defense of Archias* 9, 22, and Lucretius, *On the Nature of Things* 1.117; the last is also one of our sources for the dream of Ennius (1.117–26).
53. *Annales* 525; we cannot be sure that this was spoken in Ennius's voice, but it seems likely.
54. *Musae, quae pedibus magnum pulsatis Olympum*, frag. 1 Skutsch (I follow his line numbering throughout). It seems likely that this was the opening line of the poem, though no certainty is possible (Skutsch 1985, 145).
55. The dream has been the subject of much scholarship: see especially Aicher (1989) and Skutsch (1985, 146–67) (the latter providing a good summary of earlier scholarship). Brink (1972) discusses the dream in connection with Hellenistic worship of Homer.
56. A range of other Latin authors attest to the dream, including: Lucilius 1189; Cicero, *Republic* 6.10; Horace, *Epistle* 2.1.50–53 (see also Porphyrio on these lines); Propertius 3.3.11–4. See further Skutsch (1985, 150–52).

57. Hesiod: c. 700 BCE; Callimachus: third century BCE. On Callimachus, see further Chapter 5 on Catullus's translation of his *Lock of Berenice*. The tragedian Aeschylus also had a similar dream, wherein Dionysus commanded him to write a tragedy (Pausanias 1.12.2).
58. Wendell Clausen argues that this dream is anti-Callimachean and a "cryptic literary polemic" against his style of writing (1964, 186; cf. Skutsch 1985, 148). Whether or not Callimachus's views held much credence in Rome during this period is hard to say. As far as we can tell, neither Livius nor Naevius apologized for writing epic poetry; however, increasing Hellenism in Rome and an awareness of Hellenistic strictures on styles of poetry could have forced Ennius to justify his project. The best introduction to Callimachus is Cameron (1995); on Callimachus in Rome, see 26–27; on the contrast between Ennius's epic and the interests of Hellenistic epic and Callimachus, see 287–88.
59. *Pace* Skutsch (1985, 156), who argues that these are tears of sorrow.
60. O loyal soul (*O pietas animi*, frag. 4).
61. The poem is, however, heavily influenced by the Homeric epics and contains several scenes imitated from them—including some close translations (see Goldberg 1995, 86–90).
62. Jerome's succinct comment on Ennius's transposition to Rome in 240 BCE (*Chronicle* 240 BCE) is interesting in this context: "he was translated (*translata*) by Cato, who was then quaestor."
63. *insece Musa manu romanorum induperator/quod quisque in bello gessit cum rege Philippo* (322–23). The reference is to the Second Macedonian War, which started in 200 BCE.
64. *Memorant*, the verb translated as "call" here, is a little more complicated than the English word. It means to speak of, call to mind, and remember. It is not that the Muses are just named—they are remembered and spoken of as well.
65. *Musas quas memorant nosce nos esse Camenas* (487).
66. *Scripsere alii rem/vorsibus quos olim Faunei vatesque canebant* (206).
67. Cf. Luiselli (1967, 42). Varro tells us that fauns spoke in Saturnians (*On the Latin Language* 7.36).
68. The most famous vatic literature—the Sibylline books—was not translated from Greek; they were consulted only by the Senate, who thus effectively controlled their translation and dissemination.
69. See most recently Sciarrino (2011); see also Bloomer (1997a, 18–22); Astin (1978, 157–81); Gruen (1992, 52–83).
70. Plutarch, *Cato* 20.3.
71. The poem received public performances before large audiences (Suetonius, *On the Grammarians* 2.3–4) and was immensely influential upon the *Aeneid*, among other poems.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1. State-sponsored means that plays were performed under the auspices of state officials—who, however, bore most of the performance costs.
2. *Togatae* appear in the age of Terence, apparently developing from the *palliatae*, though that is a problematic issue. One interesting model for understanding the *togatae* was postulated by Pierre Grimal and further discussed by André Daviault in his edition of the fragments of the *togatae*; Grimal compared the *togatae* to spaghetti westerns, which attempted to adapt a

foreign cinematic genre to the tastes of an Italian audience (of course, those were so successful in their adaptation of the genre that their products were exported back to American audiences [Daviault 1981, 16)]). Elaine Fantham (1993, 260) argues convincingly that it was in the mime of the Late Republic that Greek and Roman elements completely fused, as mime could be set in either the Greek or the Roman world. For mime, the sole dramatic genre that was performed without masks and could have female actors, we have fragments from the Roman equestrian Decimus Laberius and the freedman Publius Syrus, both of whom postdate Plautus and Terence.

3. Atellan farce, which began as an unscripted form of drama performed in Oscan, an Italic dialect, began to acquire scripts from Lucius Pomponius and Novius in the 90s BCE. Despite our lack of sources, Atellan farce has been seen as one of the primary influences on the development of Roman comedy, especially by the Freiburg school (see *Plautus Barbarus* [1991] for a good sample of their approach to Plautus).
4. Because more than one translation is often used for the titles of Roman comedy, I will use their Latin titles, providing a translation only for the first time I mention a comedy; if no translation is provided, then the comedy is named after a character.
5. Manuwald (2011) is a good starting point for an overview of the world of Republican theater; see in particular pages 187–278.
6. There has been intense interest in investigating how both Plautus and Terence altered their Greek models, despite the loss of those originals in many cases; this search for sources (often termed *Quellenforschung*) might described unkindly as "a kind of philological shadowboxing in which the text of Plautus is matched against the text of a play which no longer exists" (Owens 1994, 381)—often, it should be said, to the detriment of the Roman original. There is a vast bibliography on the subject, of which the following is a very selective sample from English-language scholarship: Zagagi (1980, 2004); Arnott (1964, 1985, 2001); Damen (1992); O'Bryhim (1989); Lowe (1983); Katsouris (1977); Ludwig (1968); Fantham (1965, 1968); Handley (1968).
7. Plautus is extremely willing to add Roman elements, such as references to Roman law and institutions, into his plays; Terence is much more sparing.
8. Stärk (1989) and Lefèvre (1985, 693–98), argue that there was no Greek original for Plautus's *Menaechmi*; Goldberg (1978) argues similarly for the *Epidicus*; Vogt-Spira (1991) argues the same for the *Asinaria* (despite its claim to be a translation). While claims that Plautus was influenced by performance traditions outside New Comedy are convincing, I am less convinced that this means these plays were received by their audiences as dramas without any Greek original: see further discussion later in this chapter.
9. John Barsby's edition of the *Bacchides* (1986, 139–45) talks in depth about the alterations, and provides a text and translation of the fragments of the *Dis Expaton* for comparison; see also Handley (1968, 8–18).
10. Menander's title refers to two deceptions; as Plautus's play has three, it is reasonable to deduce that he added one. Whether you consider this third deception his own work or something taken from another play, it still means significant alteration of and addition to the ST. Owens (1994) summarizes the arguments for originality or adoption from another play, concluding by arguing for this third deception being a Plautine original.
11. Nick Lowe's (2008, 88) recent introduction to ancient comedy argues for the reverse, however, that translation "loosened up" after the period of Livius Andronicus; this depends on an assumption that he translated the entirety of

Homer's *Odyssey*. Significantly, out of all the many criticisms that Livius's poem received, it was never accused of being literal, although that was a frequent attack on other disliked translations.

12. This, as we will see, is also the case with Terence, even though in most other ways he lies outside the main tradition of Roman comedy.
13. In antiquity, far more plays were attributed to him: Gellius mentions 130 plays in circulation under his name, although he also notes that the critic Lucius Aelius Stilo (b. 150 BCE) established a canon of 25 plays as authentically Plautine (*Attic Nights* 3.3).
14. Ancient dramas are sometimes transmitted along with *didascaliae*, records of performance giving the names of the magistrates who commissioned the plays, along with other information, which allows us to fix the date. For Plautus, only two of these survive: for the *Stichus* (see above) and the *Pseudolus*, which can hence be dated to 191 BCE.
15. Cicero, *Brutus* 60. Cicero also informs us (*On Old Age* 50) that Plautus wrote two plays while an old man, the *Truculentus* and *Pseudolus*, but does not give details of how old.
16. The *tria nomina* of freeborn male Roman citizens consisted of the *praenomen*, normally only used within the family or by close friends, the *nomen*, the name of the *gens* or clan to which he belonged, and the *cognomen*, which indicated his branch of the *gens*.
17. On the life, see Beare (1940) and Tenney (1933). Fantham (2004, 20–24) provides an excellent overview of the evidence for Terence's life, including the various problems associated with our information.
18. While we cannot be sure what changes or edits Donatus made, it seems likely that he did not abridge much (Naumann 1979). The life itself may be based on information from the plays rather than external information (see Beare [1940] for this in relation to the controversies over authorship of the plays).
19. In the epitaph for Terence in the *Latin Anthology*, Terence is described as *bellica praeda*, war spoils (487.2). However, it is clear that the dates do not work for Terence to have been captured in war, though that does not preclude him having become a slave by other violent means.
20. The list dates to approximately 100 BCE; the last living author it mentions is Turpilius, who died in 103 BCE. It is cited at Gellius, *Attic Nights* 15.24, and runs thus (from best to worst): Caecilius Statius, Plautus, Naevius, Licinius Imbrex, Atilius, Terence, Turpilius, Trabea, Luscius, and Ennius. Fragments of these authors are collected in Ribbeck 1898, Vol. 2, which includes authors not on Sedigitus's list (Aquilius, Quintipor Clodius, Fundanius, Aristius Fuscus, Iuventius, Livius Andronicus, M. Pomponius Bassulus, Vatronius, and Vergilius Romanus).
21. The best account of the opportunities available to Plautus and Terence is still Taylor (1937), from whom the following information is largely drawn; Manuwald (2011, 41–49) also provides a good overview. More extensive discussion, particularly on the development of the *ludi* given by the state, can be found in Bernstein (1998).
22. In honor of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. The *ludi scaenici* were added to this festival in 364 BCE, and by 214 they covered four days (Livy 24.43.7); it was here that Livius Andronicus presented the first recorded play at Rome.
23. Instituted in 220; Livy 26.30 mentions these games as a regular festival, in his discussion of the year 216 BCE. Plautus's *Stichus* was performed at these games in 200.
24. First celebrated in 212 as votive games; they became annual games in 208 (Livy 25.12; 26.23.3; 27.23.5–7).

25. First celebrated in 204 with the coming of the *Magna Mater* (Livy 29.14.14), it became an annual festival in 194. Plautus's *Pseudolus* was performed here in 191; four plays of Terence were also performed here (Taylor 1937, 291).
26. This became a regular festival in 173; the drama performed here appear to have been mimes rather than other forms of drama (Taylor [1937, 291]; see also Marshall [2007, 17], who provides an excellent summary of the timeline for the production of dramas for the various *ludi*, and the attendant pressures on rehearsal times [20–4]).
27. However, as he warns, one should be wary of thinking of the audience as necessarily a cross-section of Roman society (Marshall 2006, 80).
28. The prologue to the *Hecyra* indicates that the practice of attacking other writers was in vogue long before Terence ever appeared on stage; there, Ambivius Turpio mentions Caecilius Statius having similar problems with opponents at his first performances (14–27); it is possible that this type of bickering was part of what people expected and enjoyed hearing.
29. *Andria* 18; he mentions Naevius, Plautus, and Ennius.
30. See also Karakasis (2005, 145–204), on the *comoedia palliata* as a whole, and 198–99 on Livius Andronicus specifically.
31. In contrast to the spoken verse that predominates in Menander (30–16%), only about 38 percent of Plautus's lines are made up of spoken verse; the rest is either recitative (48%) or song (14%) (Barsby 1999, 28). Terence, however, has 52 percent spoken and 48 percent recitative verse, with only three short passages of song (*Andria* 481–86, 625–28, and *Adelphoe* 610–17).
32. Wright (1974, 183); the source is Festus 446.32–448.1–4; Valerius Maximus 3.7.11 shows that the *collegium* was still active in the first century BCE.
33. *Curculio*, *Epidicus*, *Mostellaria*, *Persia*, and *Stichus*. The most complete study of Plautus's prologues is Abel (1955).
34. *quae ego in theatro hic meis probavi plausibus/Ea non audere quemquem regem rumpere/Quanto libertatem hanc hic superat servitus*. E. H. Warmington (1935), in the Loeb *Remains of Old Latin II*, assigns it to the prologue, but Suerbaum (1968, 29–31) argues that it was spoken by a slave character in the drama, an argument which Wright also strongly supports (1972, 240; 1974, 45). The condition of the play does not admit of certainty either way.
35. Demophilus is otherwise unattested; he was probably as little known to the Roman audience as he is to us; what mattered was the attestation that this was an adaptation of a Greek play (Bertini 1968, 27).
36. Although part of the prologue belongs to a revival after Plautus's death, it is likely that this section is Plautine (MacCary and Willcock 1976, 97).
37. *Uncle Porridge Eater*; the title is a little problematic, as we are not quite sure what the word means in Latin. At *Mostellaria* 828, Plautus refers to a *pultiphagus opifex . . . barbarus*/porridge-eating barbarian (i.e., Roman) workman (Segal 1987, 36; Sonnenschein 1907, 127).
38. One last prologue, to *The Rope/Rudens*, does not refer to translation but gives us the author of the original play. There, the prologue speaker, the star Arcturus, tells us, "Diphilus wanted the name of this city to be Cyrene" (*primumdum huic esse nomen urbi Diphilus/Cyrenas voluit*, 32–33). Marx (1959, 62) suggests that these lines were translated literally from the source; however, as Lefèvre points out (2006, 17), the play is problematically set in a port—the opening scene alludes to a key plot point that requires being near to the sea—and the real Cyrene was some 15 kilometers from the sea. As Cyrene was an important Greek city, it is hard to imagine that Greek writers were unaware of this; Lefèvre suggests that Diphilus's play was in fact set in Athens, and Plautus set it in Cyrene (Lefèvre 2006, 18), in which case "Diphilus wished this city to be Cyrene" would be said very much tongue in cheek.

39. *nos quoque dictitant barbaros et spurcius nos quam alios opicon appellatione foedant*: Opic was the Greek name for Oscans, which for the Romans "was tantamount to 'simpletons' " (Henrichs 1995, 247). Cato's advice to his son occurs in the context of warning him away from Greek doctors, whom Cato swears have taken an oath to kill all barbarians (i.e., Romans).
40. Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* (34.33) tells us of three inscriptions that appeared below the statue of Hercules *tunicatus* near the rostra (speaker's platform) in the Forum: the first gave the name of the man who brought it to Rome as the spoils of war (Lucius Lucullus); the second gave that of his son, who dedicated it; and the third gave that of the *aedile* who had restored it from private to public ownership. For more on Greek statuary in Rome in this period, see Edwards (2003, passim).
41. Until Pompey's theater was opened in 55 BCE, there was no permanent theater in Rome, despite several attempts to build one: the censors Cassius Longinus and Valerius Messalla almost completed a stone theater in 154 BCE, but work was halted by a senatorial decree and it was later demolished. Wooden theaters were built for various *ludi*, but plays could also use the precincts of the temple belonging to the god in whose honor a festival was being held. For example, the *ludi Megalenses* in honor of the *Magna Mater* sometimes used the precinct of her temple on the Palatine (Cicero, *On the Responses of the Haruspices* 24; Goldberg 1998, 3). Plautus's *Pseudolus* was performed at the dedication of this temple in 191 BCE—probably right before the temple itself. (For more on this and on the performance space, see Goldberg [1998]; for the performance space and the effects that this had on rehearsals and performance, see Marshall [2008, 20–56]). Even after stone theaters were built, the situation regarding statuary did not automatically change: Pompey's theater was lavishly adorned with Greek art, including a section with portraits of Greek authoresses. These were displayed on a building dedicated to Rome by a Roman general who had destroyed the power of one of the last Hellenistic monarchs, and formed part of a dialogue with Roman imperial power; the "combination of these elements celebrates the worth of the female, of civilization, of Hellenism, but such categories are also shown to depend on a masculine Roman *virtus* on whose ordering and loving *cura* they depend for sustenance" (Kuttner 1999, 349). The theater of Pompey was opened with, among other things, a lavish revival of Accius's *Agamemnon/Clytemnestra*, the spoils captured by Pompey playing the part of Agamemnon's Trojan spoils; Cicero's contemptuous comments notwithstanding (*Letters to his Friends* 7.12), in this performance a Latin translation of a Greek drama allowed a Roman to enact the translation of other forms of Greek cultural goods in dramatic fashion and have it redound to his glory (on Pompey being reflected as *triumphator* within the play, see Erasmo [2004, 89–91]).
42. The presiding official (a praetor) wore this at the *ludi Apollinares* (Juvenal, *Satires* 10.36; Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 34.20); later, we hear of tribunes of the plebs doing the same at the *ludi Augustales* (Tacitus, *Annales* 1.15). If lower offices were allowed to dress as a *triumphator*, the higher offices who oversaw *ludi* such as the *ludi Romani* were probably also dressed in this way (Versnel 1970, 130), and they may even have driven a triumphal chariot (Versnel 1970, 131)
43. Abel (1955, 10–11); Paolo Frassinetti points to this as showing the vitality of Atellan farce as a dramatic form in the age of Plautus (1953, 92).
44. The mentioning of barbarian customs in the *Stichus* is somewhat undercut by the wild ending of the slaves' *symposium*, where Greek customs are shown to be more "barbarian" than anything in Rome could ever be.
45. The most notable aspect of this is the role of the cunning slave, who is shown tricking his master into parting with his money (usually, however, to help the

master's son, who needs it for amatory purposes). Similarly un-Roman are sons who emphatically do not show the Roman quality of *pietas* towards their parents, and who will happily cross and deceive them in the course of the play, or even wish them dead so that they can achieve their desires. Donatus tells us that slaves in *fabulae togatae* were never allowed to be smarter than their masters, although they could be in *palliatae* (*On The Eunuch* 57).

46. For Segal, the adjective *barbarus* refers to both "Roman" and "unfestive" things (1987, 36).
47. 7–9: "I would tell you who wrote this play and what the title is in Greek, if I did not think most of you knew it" (*Nunc qui scripserit/et quoia Graeca sit, ni partem maxumam/existumarem scire vostrum, id dicerem*).
48. At *Rudens* 86, Sceparnio describes a storm as not a "wind, but Euripides," but he is referring to a tragedy in Latin which the audience has just seen, not to the Greek original (Jocelyn 1969b, 103). Likewise, at the start of the *Poenulus* the speaker of the prologue says, "I feel like studying the *Achilles* of Aristarchus"; again, the reference is to a Latin translation by Ennius, not to the Greek original (Abel 1955, 95; Slater 1992a, 136). On the other hand, the fact that Plautus did not mention the Latin author does not mean the magistrate who bought the tragedy in the first place did not advertise it with his name; there would be little point in handing over good money for an Ennian translation and not bothering to advertise he had written it.
49. Ancient evidence on using Plautus's name as a catchall for various plays: Varro, *On the Latin Language* 6.89; Gellius, *Attic Nights* 3.3. Some disagree with this: Holt Parker argues that Terence was equally—if not more—popular than Plautus and that so many plays were attributed to Plautus not because of his astounding popularity, but because there were no early editions of his works to stabilize the tradition (1996, 590). H. D. Jocelyn suggests that the uncertainty about the authorship of some plays attributed to Plautus may be due to bad recordkeeping by early magistrates (1967, 6). But neither of these arguments answers why the name of the original author was dropped from the text in the first place and replaced with that of Plautus specifically.
50. Although these lines probably come from the original Plautine prologue, the fact that the later revival had no problem with mentioning the Greek author, even though clearly the draw was that this was a play of *Plautus* rather than the Greek original, shows that for this later audience the Greek author was secondary: they weren't here to hear a revival of a Greek play, after all.
51. Of course, there is a separate issue of how later Romans viewed the success of the early dramatists and how they viewed the relationship of Latin adaptation and Greek original. The problem is that one cannot take, for example, Gellius's comments on the failure of Latin authors in the field of translation as representative of how Romans in the time of Plautus felt about his plays.
52. On the Greek population in Rome, see Kaimio (1979, 22–25), which argues for a primarily servile population during this period, and Noy (2000, 223–25). For performances in Greek in Rome during the Late Republic, see Cicero, *Letters to His Friends* 7.1.
53. At *Bacchides* 649–50, Chrysalus makes fun of the slave characters in Greek plays who are inferior to him: "I don't like those Parmenons and Syruses/ who rip off two or three minas from their masters" (*non mihi isti placent Parmenones, Syri,/qui duas aut tris minas auferunt eris*). Parmenon and Syrus, along with Davos and Geta, are standard slave names in Menander (and later in Terence; Barsby 1986, 153). The joke is particularly pointed because Chrysalus's name in the Menandrean original was Syros, so Plautus is making an in-joke about rejecting the pedestrian names and qualities of the original's slave character.

54. "Speaking through the mouth of the triumphant slave, who taunts his furious and helpless master, Plautus offers to give 'lessons' to his dead predecessors" (1993, 33); however, Sonnenschein (1901, 144) in his edition argues that these lines were taken by Plautus directly from his Greek original. Clearly, as we lack the Greek original there is no way to prove who came up with the joke in the first place. Surely, though, it hardly matters: Plautus is telling the Roman audience that he could teach Greek comic poets a thing or two about how to write cunning slaves—these are Plautus's words, not those of the Greek original.
55. The best example of this (among many) is the *Miles Gloriosus*, where Palaestrio sets up not one but two playlets to deceive Pyrgopolynices, the *miles*, soldier, of the title. In the first, he transforms a courtesan into a respectable married woman, in the second, a respectable young man into a raffish sea captain. Palaestrio goes so far as to describe himself as an interpreter (*interpres*, 798, 910), which may suggest that he is to be seen as a stand-in for the author, who is presenting a translation of a Greek play transformed for Roman tastes.
56. There are exceptions to this view of translation as a sort of parasitic entity which never gives back to its host; most notable is Derrida's "Les Tours des Babel" (1985), which argues for a reciprocal relationship between translation and original, where the translation is a natural and desirable outgrowth of the original, and adds rather than takes.
57. That, of course, the Greeks would never do anything so demeaning as to translate from a jumped up Latin comic poet of dubious nationality and background is beside the point.
58. The pun is on the similarity of the Latin words for *columbus* and *columbar* (a type of chain mentioned at 887).
59. Cf. also *Epidicus* 179, *Mostellaria* 639, *Poenulus* 886. *Columbum* is the reading of the Oxford Classical Text; Marx and Sonnenschein have *piscem*.
60. For similar uses of the verb to refer to complete physical transformation (or the desire for it), see *Mostellaria* 238 and *Epidicus* 187. Cicero also uses it to refer to physical transformation (*Tusculan Disputations* 3.63, on Hecuba's transformation into a dog).
61. A.S. Gratwick in his 1993 edition of *Menaechmi* shifts lines 72–74 to between 10 and 11. This would insert the following lines: "this city is Epidamnus while this play is being performed; when another is being performed it will become another town, just like households [within plays?] are familiar with being changed (*mutarier*)" (*haec urbs Epidamnus est, dum haec agitur fabula:/quando alia agetur, aliud fiet oppidum;/sicut familiae quoque solent mutarier*). *Mutarier* (from *muto*) is also a translation verb (see Appendix).
62. Timothy Moore comments that "the jingling made-up verbs . . . reinforce this reminder that the Greek setting is a falsehood" (1998, 57; see also Segal 1987, 37), and that this prologue makes it clear that "Epidamnus is restricted to the stage. Like the characters, it is an arbitrary creation of the playwright and the theatrical company. A large portion of the prologue is thus a discourse on the theatricality of the Greek setting" (Moore 1998, 58).
63. Moore (1998, 50–66) provides an excellent discussion of the complicated ways in which Plautus's use of Greek settings deliberately reminds his audience that this is theater.
64. Obviously, not all New Comedy was set in Athens; this can be seen from the varied locations of Plautus's adaptations, which are set all around the Mediterranean. That does not, however, prevent him from insisting here that this is the overall tendency of New Comedy in Rome and Greece.
65. Not only can he out-Greek the Greeks, but he also can give the audience the inside scoop on Athenian life. Occasionally, like a knowing travel guide, he informs the audience of what really happens in Athens (rarely good): at

Stichus 448, the eponymous hero says of his forthcoming elaborate slave feast that "this is permitted at Athens." The aim here is twofold: (1) to relieve the audience's anxieties about slaves stepping out of place, by locating their behavior firmly in another locale (cf. Segal 1987, 33, who points out that this scene evokes the Roman *Saturnalia*, all the more reason, as he says, to reassure the audience that this is going on elsewhere) and (2) to give the audience an inside knowledge, something that those who didn't attend the performance wouldn't know: how Athenians *really* behave.

66. Two other examples of Plautus insisting that his comedies are better than any other are *Casina* 860–61 and *Pseudolus* 1239–41.
67. *Perparvam partem postulat Plautus loci/de vostris magnis atque amoenis moenibus/Athenas quo sine architectis conferat.*
68. *Truculentus* 9–10 reminds the audience that this change only lasts until the end of the comedy, then they get their city back.
69. Mitchell (1989, 217). Despite this claim, Egyptian visitors to the exhibition were disgusted when one of the buildings dressed up to look like a mosque instead proved to be a façade, hiding a coffee house complete with dancing girls. In this case, the realness of the representation faltered when faced with natives. Most of the "Arabs" in the Parisian exhibition were French people dressed up for the part.
70. On Dutch entries at the world exhibitions, see Bloembergen (2006).
71. So great was this claim—not only in the exhibition but also in other forms of representation such as maps, operas, travel books, and images—that visitors to places like Egypt frequently were disappointed with what the actual place had to offer (Mitchell 1989, 231–32).
72. Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* (1991, 163–85) is the *locus classicus* for discussion of how colonial governments used censuses, maps, and museums as mechanisms to legitimate colonial control.
73. Anicius sent word to the flautists to direct them to be more agonistic; they, having no idea what he meant, had to be instructed by his lictors how they should engage in battle (the word Polybius uses is the Greek word for battle, *mache* [30.22.6]). It was when one of the dancers got into a fistfight with the flautists that the Roman audience began to really enjoy the spectacle.
74. In the *pompa circensis*, a parade held before *ludi* (Dionysius Halicarnassus 7.72), there was clear overlap with the triumph, as dancers performed war dances and the magistrate who led this procession dressed in the same insignia as the *triumphator* (Versnel 1970, 130–31).
75. Whether *fabulae praetextae* were performed at triumphs is a vexed question; other sites, such as dedications of temples and funeral games, have been suggested as alternatives (see Flower [1995] for discussion).
76. *Pergraecari* used at: *Bacchides* 813; *Mostellaria* 22, 64, 960; *Poenulus* 603; *Truculentus* 88. *Congraecari* used at *Bacchides* 743.
77. And not just the Greeks; it could also do the same for the Carthaginians as well; witness the *Poenulus*.
78. See also Hough (1947, 20). Even Jocelyn (1999), who is arguing against this view, has to acknowledge that "a consensus has been established that any use of Greek in a Latin adaptation of an Attic comedy is connected either with the low status of the user or with some kind of behaviour on the part of the user unbefitting his high status" (172).
79. In much the same way, the satirist Gaius Lucilius's (c. 180–102/1 BCE) mockery of the praetor Albucius's habit of greeting everyone he encountered in Greek is undercut by the sheer number of Greek words Lucilius himself uses. Lucilius's mockery is preserved in Cicero, *On Moral Ends* 1.3.8; Horace said of him that "he achieved (*fecit)* much because he mixed Greek with Latin words" (*Satires* 1.10.20).

80. *nunc ruri pergraecatur*, frag. 170 Daviault. Titinius, who was roughly contemporaneous with Terence, wrote *fabulae togatae*, not *palliatae*. The slippage in terminology (*pergraecari* is only found in Plautus and Titinius) across genres of comedy, and the presence of Greekness even within a play on ostensibly Roman themes, is telling for how far Greek culture permeated across all literary categories.
81. And Greek words: they are described as *drapetae* (runaway slaves) who drink in *thermipolio* (translated above as coffee shops, but more accurately as places to buy warm drinks), both of which are direct borrowings from Greek only found in Plautus.
82. Popular here is a relative term: Goldberg (1998) makes a convincing case that the audiences for each performance were small, 2,000 at most. Although plays were performed more than once and could be revived, we are still talking about attendances in the thousands rather than the tens of thousands.
83. *Achillem Aristarchi mihi commentari lubet/inde mihi principium capiam, ex ea tragoedia.*
84. Perhaps, as Seneca the Elder later described Sallust's translation of Thucydides (*Controversiae* 9.1.13), we are to imagine Plautus storming the Greek author in his camp.
85. It is used by Suetonius within the context of Crates of Mallus's enforced stay at Rome (*On the Grammarians* 2): according to Suetonius, Crates inspired his listeners to read and comment on the works of Latin authors like Naevius.
86. The brevity of the Latin compared with the Greek suggests the story that Plutarch relates of Cato the Elder's speech before the Athenian *boule*. There, the shortness of his speech compared with the Greek translation greatly impressed the Athenians (*Cato the Elder* 12).
87. Copley (1970) suggests that at lines 53–55, Plautus makes a bilingual Latin-Punic joke in translating *Charchedonios* by *Pultiphagonides*; this depends on Plautus believing that Punic had a word *karch*, which meant chickpea or porridge. One suspects the joke (if such it was) was lost on the audience. But you do not need to understand the Punic to get what is going on in this scene or to get the humor of a later scene where Milphio feverishly pretends to translate for his Punic (Gratwick 1971).
88. Obviously, he is, for the purposes of dramatic illusion, hiding his ability in Greek, which in the play is his ability in Latin. Even Plautus has problems keeping track of this and actually ends up having Hanno say that he will speak in Latin (1029).
89. In *Truculentus*, the phrase appears in conjunction with the tendency of the Roman people to be happy about people plundering public property, but to get very cheap when it comes to their own personal wealth. This may be an allusion to the moral debates of figures such as Cato the Elder, debates which Plautus parodies not only by taking one of their high-minded phrases and putting it onstage to be made fun of, but also by connecting it with a desire to protect private rather than public property (Abel 1955, 29). In Plautus's presentation, the rhetoric of some factions of the nobility is less a glorious desire to maintain the standing of the Roman people than it is an attempt to protect their own personal worth.
90. Franko (1996, 432) argues that Milphio actually manages some translations, like the greeting *avo*, but working out that a greeting is a greeting is not exactly a sign of capable translation, especially when it resembles *ave*, a Latin greeting.
91. Henderson (1999, 34), where he also notes that this scene sends up tragic recognition scenes as well.
92. Despite the claim in Plautus's epitaph that after his death, comedy mourned and the stage was abandoned (Gellius, *Attic Nights* 1.24).

93. The commentary is not entirely extant; it is missing for one play (*Heautontimoroumenos*) and was reconstituted at some point from several sources.
94. Wright (1974) comments that "in view of the fragmentary and contradictory nature of the surviving evidence, a judicial application of the *ars nescendi* seems the best method to follow—although the most disappointing" (79).
95. On Roman allusions in Plautus, see Hough (1940).
96. These attacks were not confined to Terence, either, and continued to be part of the dramatic scene after he was gone. Lucius Afranius's (b. 150), in his *Compitalia*, used the prologue to defend himself against accusations that he was taking too much from Menander and Terence:

    I confess it, I have not just taken what I believed I could not write better from that person [Menander], but from whoever seemed to have something suitable, even from a Latin [author] . . . and now they say I am similar to Terence?

    fateor, sumpsi non ab illo modo,
    Sed ut quisque habuit conveniret quod mihi,
    Quod me non posse melius facere credidi,
    Etiam a Latino . . .

    * * *

    Terenti numne similem dicent quempiam? (Frgs. 27–31 Davauilt)

    Although Afranius's play was a *fabula togata*, a drama ostensibly without a Greek original, he freely admits to taking material from both a Greek and a Latin author, suggesting that between the genres based on the translation of Greek material and those which were not, the lines were often blurred.
97. "The 'I' of the text did not represent him, but was the 'I' of the actor" (Gilula 1989a, 98); while we do not know the name of the actor in this case, the *didascaliae* and Donatus tell us that the actor who spoke the prologue in *Heautontimoroumenos* and *Hecyra* was Ambivius Turpio, head of the company that performed all of Terence's plays. Unlike Plautus, there is no suggestion that Terence ever acted.
98. The prologues are heavily influenced by contemporary rhetorical practice; in a discussion of the parallels between the prologue of the *Hecyra* and Cato the Elder's *On False Battles/De falsis pugnis*, Goldberg (1986, 50) describes how carefully Terence implies that his opponents are the ones forcing him to waste time on this issue, and how he inflates their charges to make them ridiculous. On the rhetorical nature of the prologues, see Barsby (2007); Anderson (2004); Arnott (1985); Goldberg (1983); and Gelhaus (1972).
99. In the *Eunuchus*, Terence talks about the essential interchangeability of all characters from New and Roman Comedy; even as the plots change, the characters stay the same (34–41).
100. The argument regarding *contaminatio* goes back to Leo (1912, 100).
101. A. J. Brothers argues that the idea of *contaminatio* may have been invented by Luscius to attack Terence (1980, 98); however, it is equally possible that Terence twisted some milder attack into the full-blown charge of *contaminatio* to make Luscius seem ridiculous, as Goldberg (above) argues.
102. The Loeb, for example, footnotes this as a reference to "over-literal translation," as it does with *Eunuchus* 6–7 (Barsby 2001, Volume I, 52). Martin's (1976) edition of *Adelphoe* asserts that "after Plautus' death there had clearly been a definite move towards a theory of greater fidelity to the Greek original" (8), a move championed by Luscius. However, as *none* of the evidence we have of

Roman comedy points toward anyone literally translating, it seems unlikely not only that Luscius bucked this trend but that, if he did, no one remarked on it.

103. Terence's other use of *diligentia* is at *Hecyra* 257, where it means "care" and is paired with "kindness."
104. The verb humorously suggests that Terence is like a comic lover, longing for a partner or money (Plautus, *Bacchides* 502; *Truculentus* 514; *Asinaria* 724). Terence also uses it to mean very strong desire for anything (*Hecyra* 490, 579).
105. *Hecyra* had a failed production in 165 BCE; we have the prologues for the second (also a failure) and third in 160 BCE.
106. The two plots are so intertwined that it is hard to see how Terence added the second onto the first so thoroughly without almost totally rewriting the ST, unless it also had a double plot.
107. This last charge relates to the accusation that Terence did not write his own plays, but that they were the work of aristocratic friends (*Life of Terence* 3).
108. For this reason, I find it hard to agree with Goldberg (1986, 95) that Luscius's problem with Terence was that he was unfairly reducing the store of Greek plays available for adoption, by running through many source texts but producing few target ones.
109. *Integer*'s additional meaning of fresh responds to *contaminare*, with Terence implying is that this is not just a work that is the equal of its Greek counterpart, but also one that is fresh and new, not reeking of plagiarism and shoddy work, as his critics had alleged.
110. 1970, 62; many translations of Terence imply this: see, for example, Martin (1976, 102) and Barsby's Loeb translation (2001, 255).
111. On *exprimo* in Terence, see further McElduff (2004).
112. There are 457 occurrences of 93 Greek or Greek-based loan words in Terence (Maltby 1985, 112); however, Terence uses no pure Greek, and most of the words he uses were already used by Plautus.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

1. I discuss here Cicero's writing on translation, rather than his translations, the latter being an enormous topic and outside the scope of this work. Some bibliography on the topic can be found in the following. For his translation method in general, see Seele (1995 24–41, 53–65, 69–76) and Jones (1959). On his philosophical translations specifically, see: Long (1995); Powell (1995b); Puelma (1980); Zoll (1962); Poncelet (1957); and Degraff (1940). For those interested in Cicero's translation of the *Timaeus*, a topic I do not discuss here, see Levy (2003) and Lambardi (1982). (*Timaeus* is Cicero's only "straight"—that is, one-to-one—philosophical translation; it was produced in 45 BCE and his final intention was probably to take sections and work them into another work, perhaps one on physics, as Levy suggests.)
2. *nec converti ut interpres, sed ut orator*. It is a little ironic that the work's authenticity has been disputed, most notably by Dihle (1955), who rejected it because of its rough nature and un-Ciceronian prose rhythm. However, Berry's (1996) analysis of the prose rhythm found it in accordance with other Ciceronian texts; Hendrickson 1926a argued that the roughness of its style was due to it being a draft abandoned in favor of *Orator.* I argue that this was an abandoned project, originally intended to form part of a triptych with *Brutus* and *Orator*.
3. Arpinum was about seventy miles outside Rome; although he was a Roman citizen, the fact that Cicero was born so far from the city provided fodder

for his many political enemies, who liked to characterize him as an outsider or immigrant to Rome (Sallust, *Catiline* 31).

4. On the massive advantage, when running for consul, of having an ancestor who had held the position, see Badian (1990).
5. One major personal loss, the death of his daughter, Tullia, in 45 BCE, was accompanied by a frenzied bout of philosophical writing and translation; on Cicero's translations as personal therapy, see Baltussen (2011).
6. Although Cicero's style became less exuberant and more restrained in the last phase of his oratory, it could never be called plain (Johnson 1971, 59).
7. Richlin (1997) and Connolly (2007b) are good, accessible introductions to the larger topic of gender and Roman rhetoric (although neither exclusively discusses the Late Republic). On masculinity and voice in Cicero, see Gleason (1995, 105–8); although most of Gleason's work discusses masculinity in a later period, she still provides a window into issues of gender and deportment that are relevant to Ciceronian rhetoric. For Cicero on the proper masculine presentation of the body of the orator, see *Orator* 56–60.
8. In Rome, there was considerable "interconvertability of what to us are different categories of resources" between political and literary spheres (Habinek 1998, 7; see also Lowrie 2002, 239 fn. 12). Power in the literary realm could be converted into other forms of power, and literature became a place where generals and politicians competed for glory. Important political figures staked out public positions on subjects such as grammar and the correct use of language; Julius Caesar wrote a work on Latin grammar (*On analogy/De analogia*), which he dedicated to Cicero.
9. Thus, his history of Roman oratory, *Brutus*, figures himself "as the *telos* or end of that history, the destination towards which the whole of Rome's oratory, through its various periods and stages, was directed" (Dugan 2005, 172; see also Goldberg 1995, 5–12).
10. What sort of Greek the Roman elite actually spoke is a problematic subject; Valette-Cagnac (2005, 40–43) discusses whether the Romans spoke a variety of Greek that was distinctively Roman as a way to distinguish themselves from native speakers of Greek.
11. Cicero's early education is covered briefly but well by Corbeill (2002); see also Clark (1968). For good introductions to Cicero's complicated attitudes toward the Greeks and Greek culture (a massive topic), see Zetzel (2003) and Guite (1962).
12. Cicero was an adherent of the Sceptical Academy, headed by Philo of Larissa, scholarch of the academy from 110–83 BCE (the best account of Philo is Brittain 2001, but see also Tarrant 1985). He also studied under Philo's successor, Antiochus of Ascalon, who "reformed" the academy, leading it away from sceptical views; Cicero dealt most fully with Philo's views, sometimes critically, in the *Academica*.
13. A short treatise on invention, the discovery or creation of arguments and material by the orator, it was later described by Cicero as immature, written when he was a teenager (*On the Orator* 15). As a handbook, it is far more basic than his later work and shares a great deal of thought and language with the slightly later, anonymous *Rhetoric for Herennius*; both texts may have had a common source or the authors may have shared a teacher.
14. Work probably began on this, his first dialogue, in 56 BCE (Fantham 2004, 13–15), although it did not circulate until the following year. It is set in 91 BCE and uses as its speakers figures from a previous generation of orators. One of the primary speakers, Lucius Crassus (140–91 BCE—his death came just days after the fictional date of the dialogue), at whose villa the dialogue takes place, was involved in Cicero's and his brother's education (*On the Orator* 2.2).

Other speakers include Marcus Antonius (the grandfather of the triumvir), another preeminent orator of this generation, soon to lose his life in the chaos of the 90s. Also present are P. Sulpicius Rufus and C. Aurelius Cotta, who belong to a younger generation and are followers of Crassus and Antonius.

15. *aut tam potens tamque magnificum, quam populi motus, iudicum religiones, senatus gravitatem unius oratione converti?*
16. Although Cicero himself said that in dialogues it was possible to have people say things (usually smarter things) that they had never said in real life (*Letters to Atticus* 13.16.1; Griffin 1989, 14), they had to at least say something plausible. If no one could imagine someone like Crassus translating from Greek to improve his Latin, then Cicero's point was weakened. Translation was certainly an accepted part of the pedagogical system by Quintilian's day (see Chapter 6) and formed part of the rhetor's standard "syllabus" (Suetonius, *On the Grammarians* 25.4).
17. As a censor's edict did not have the force of law, they could not physically close the schools (Kaster 1995, 272–74), and this edict appears to have had little lasting effect. The precise reasons for the attempted closure are controversial. It has been traditionally argued that the edict was issued for political reasons, because of the Latin schools' connection with Marius and *popularis* oratory; this, however, is not borne out by the evidence (see Gruen 1990, 180–92, who reviews the various arguments for their attempted closure and argues that Crassus's and Ahenobarbus's move was aimed at stamping out an innovation that devalued the Greek component of rhetorical education). Kaster suggests that these schools might have been thought to devalue the traditional practice of the apprenticeship for public life, the *tirocinium fori* (1995, 274). The ancient sources, unfortunately, are ambiguous. In *On the Orator* 3.93, Crassus says he acted because he felt these schools produced inferior orators. A lost letter of Cicero's preserved in Suetonius's *On the Grammarians* (at 26.1) states that he was kept from one, the school of L. Plotius Gallus, because it was felt that one could get a better education by "Greek training" (*Graecis exercitationibus*). Suetonius cites the original edict, which states that "these new practices, which do not accord with ordinary custom and the way of our ancestors, are vexatious and wayward seeming" (*haec nova, quae praeter consuetudinem ac morem maiorum fiunt, neque placent neque recta videntur*; Kaster's translation), phrasing which could cover both education and politics.
18. Crassus does not identify the Greek orators he translated, a situation reversed in *On the Best Type of Orator*, where Greek rather than Latin orators and authors are listed and categorized.
19. On the gaps in Roman knowledge of Greek, see Rawson (1985, 7–18) and Horsfall (1979); on aids in translating Greek poetry, see Fletcher (2011).
20. Compare Alan Wardman's comment that "the size of the Greek loan often led the borrowers to assert their independence, since it can be humiliating to be too precise about this kind of debt. Romans often sought to emphasize, not their likeness to, but their difference from Greeks, since they were proud of their own creations whether the model was acknowledged or not" (1976, 41; see also Kelly 1979, 41, 79–81).
21. On *munus* as referring to textual exchange and the production of texts, in Cicero and the Late Republic, see Stroup (2010, 66–96).
22. As such, it reflects the construction of Cicero's dialogues as duties, replies to requests by friends; on literary obligation as a theme in Cicero and other Roman authors, see Stroup (2010, 168–206).
23. As is Greek education: see Corbeill (2001) on how "the Romans selectively fashioned Greek educational principles into a uniquely Roman form of citizen

training" (261). As such, Greek teachers were guarded as a valuable resource for fashioning Roman elite identity. Elite education in Cicero's day was often a private institution kept within families, with highly negative attitudes toward those who opened public, fee-paying schools (Corbeill 2001, 271–75).

24. It is not accidental that the metaphors of athletic and gladiatorial combat permeate *On the Best Type of Orator*, although there they are used to describe oratorical competition; see 8 (on pseudo-Attic style) and 17 (on the competition between Aeschines and Demosthenes).
25. *doctrina Graecia nos et omni litterarum genere superabat, in quo erat facile vincere non repugnantes*. Similar sentiments are expressed at *Tusculan Disputations* 4.1–2: the Greeks only win literary battles, while the Romans are fighting real ones.
26. *Reliquas* ("the rest") evokes the image of Greek literature as inert "remains," a corpse to which Roman tutelage will give new life (on the use of the metaphor of tutelage in Cicero's prologues, see Habinek 1994, 59–60).
27. As with *On Moral Ends* 1.6, where Cicero says he will translate authors he approves of, there is a suggestion here that some filtering would be appropriate: there can surely be no need of an infinite number of books, especially as they all say the same things over and over again. Rather, what Cicero suggests is that there needs to be a judicious process of pruning with the right translators in charge; one does not want a situation where bad Greek books are translated into worse Latin versions by people like Amafinius and Rabirius (*On Moral Ends* 1.8).
28. *quae Menippum imitati non interpretati*: *interpretati* is a curious verb to use here, given that Cicero is not talking about literal translation and would never suggest that to someone of Varro's status and education. One wonders whether Cicero is slyly suggesting that Varro misunderstands what he means by translation. Cicero's response is his standard one to such criticism: if people read Roman poets such as Ennius, Pacuvius, and Accius, why not philosophy? These three poets are described along with "many others" as writers who translate "not the words but the force" (*non verba sed vim*) of the Greek original, at *Academica* 1.10; that this contradicts his statement in *On Moral Ends* 1.4 that they translate *ad verbum* does not trouble Cicero, or suggests that there, translating *ad verbum* does not actually refer to literal translation. Varro is described by Gellius as having rivaled, *aemulatus est*, Menippus (*Attic Nights* 2.18).
29. One problem here is that the word I am translating as "everyday" (*vulgari*) carries a negative connotation in Latin that "everyday" does not in English.
30. For an excellent analysis of the appeal and nature of Epicurean education and schools in Italy and in the Late Republic, see Asmis (2001). The Bay of Naples was in particular a "hotbed of Epicureanism" (Obbink 2008, 38). As Asmis points out, however, although Epicurean education aimed to educate anyone, it was not aimed at the "many" or the crowd (210–11). Many prominent Romans, including Cicero's friend Atticus and Julius Caesar's father-in-law, Piso, were Epicureans (Piso employed the Epicurean Philodemus, who wrote in Greek). Lucretius's epic poem *On the Nature of Things*, which will be discussed in the next chapter, was certainly aimed at an elite and well-educated audience.
31. Amafinius and the others must have had a decent understanding of Greek to undertake the project in the first place, even though Epicurus's texts were intentionally written in a plain, artless style.
32. Ease of understanding of philosophy is highly suspect to Cicero; even though he argues that he is writing his work to popularize philosophy in Rome, he clearly wants to popularize his type of philosophy among the elite. In

Tusculan Disputations 2.8, Cicero states that his work is meant to appeal to the learned. One does not want to make the obscure matters of the Greeks too clear in Latin, although one should be clearer than the obscure Greeks (see Atticus's request in *Tusculan Disputations* 4.10 that Cicero explain himself more clearly than the Greeks do).

33. The fact that the Romans struggled with the issues of absorbing Greek culture should not blind us to the fact that this process played out not only in terms of Greek versus Roman, but also in a context of elite competition and the creation of a new literary culture that served elite needs (cf. Bloomer 1997, 18–72; Habinek 1998, 34–68). We might expect no less given that "cultural capital is transmitted, distributed, and regulated by means of translation, among other factors, not only between cultures, but also within one given culture" (Lefevere 1998, 41).
34. *In quo eo magis nobis est elaborandum, quod multi iam esse libri Latini dicuntur scripti inconsiderate ab optimis illis quidem viris, sed non satis eruditis* (1.6).
35. *Sed ex eo credo quibusdam usu venire ut abhorreant a Latinis, quod inciderint in inculta quaedam et horrida, de malis Graecis Latine scripta deterius.*
36. To what extent there were translations in a modern sense is unclear. Our major Epicurean text from the Late Republic, Lucretius's epic *On the Nature of Things*, is hardly what we would consider to be a translation, though it contains translations of multiple authors (including a large section from the Greek historian Thucydides) and aims to express Epicurean philosophy in Latin. Cicero's own versions of Greek philosophy likewise do not resemble what we would consider translation, although as stated before, he certainly wrote at least one straight translation, that of Plato's *Timaeus*, and may have drafted translations of other dialogues in preparation for chopping sections up and using them in his works.
37. *Elaborarent* suggests the imperfect nature of the Greek original, an original which needs Roman translators to bring out its potential.
38. *meum semper iudicium fuit omnia nostros aut invenisse per se sapientius quam Graecos aut accepta ab illis fecisse meliora, quae quidem digna statuissent in quibus elaborarent* (*Tusculan Disputations* 1.1).
39. *omnes Catii et Amafinii, mali verborum interpretes* (*Letters to his Friends* 15.19.2).
40. Catius might have coined new words that failed to meet with general approval in his translations: for example, he coined *spectrum* as a translation of Greek *eidola*, but was the only person in classical Latin to use this word (Cicero, *Letters to his Friends* 25.6). However, in fairness, it should be noted that Cicero also had some failures, as with his coinage *veriloquium* for *etymologia* (*Topica* 8.35). Cicero could also produce some awkward lines when he translated Epicurus, though this may have had something to do with wanting to mimic the original's style. Powell comments on the translation of an Epicurean phrase at *On Moral Ends* 2.21: "perhaps Cicero . . . had in mind that Epicurus was not a great stylist, and to render him into less than elegant Latin would therefore be appropriate enough" (1995b, 282).
41. See Dyck (2004, 5–12) for discussion of evidence and arguments over its dates.
42. In *On the Best Type of Orator*, Cicero says he keeps the "type" (*genus*) of words when he translates.
43. Ironically, as Elizabeth Rawson (1991, 135–36) points out, although the passage above stakes a claim for Cicero's originality and his voice, the repeated praise of the gods in Plato's *Laws* 4.716ff. is probably the unspoken inspiration for this segment. On Cicero's use of Plato's name in *On the Laws*, see McElduff (forthcoming).

44. Cicero clearly expended considerable time and thought on the problems of finding the right Latin terms for Greek ones; see, for example, his discussions at *Topica* 35 and *On Moral Ends* 2.13–14.
45. Cf. Fögen (2000, 81). Occasionally, Cicero will make a point of underlining that he is engaging in literal translation—sometimes to score points over Epicureans by citing Epicurus closely translated, as at *Tusculan Disputations* 3.37. He will also sometimes claim to be translating literally when, in fact, the translation he produces is not literal at all, as at *On Divination* 1.60–61, which he claims is a literal translation of *Republic* 9.571c–572b (Jones 1959, 32).
46. *Summos fuisse in civitate nostra viros, qui id interpretari populo et responsitare soliti sint, sed eos magna professos in parvis esse versatos*. Note the close association of *interpretari* and *responsitare*, with the latter suggesting an almost parrot-like response, rather than one thought through, processed, and judged for value.
47. *Iudicium* = Greek *krisis*: it is both judgment and (literary) criticism and selection; at Quintilian's *Institutes of Oratory* 1.4.3, 10.1.54, and 10.1.60, *iudicium* is used to describe the process of making canonical selections of works.
48. In *Letters to Atticus* 16.6.4, he asks Atticus to switch out the old preface to book 3 of the *Academica* because he had mistakenly used one he had already used for *On Glory*.
49. Valette-Cagnac (2005), O'Sullivan (1997), and Wisse (1995) are good introductions to this topic.
50. Its precise origin—whether it was taken over from the Greeks or was a Roman phenomenon that was then exported back to the Greeks—is controversial, though our evidence for it first begins in Rome. Whatever its origins, it seems to have flourished in the 50s BCE but did not necessarily have a great deal of traction before then, since "Cicero shows no awareness of Atticism and Asianism as stylistic terms in *De Oratore [On the Orator]*; we have to wait until *Brutus* and *Orator* . . . for that" (O'Sullivan 1997, 36). However, Wisse (1995, 69) argues that it is not entirely absent from *On the Orator*, but had not gained enough traction to need aggressive rebuttal. Besides his treatments in his oratorical treatises, Cicero kept up a correspondence with Calvus and Brutus (now lost) on oratorical style (Tacitus, *A Dialogue on Oratory* 18; Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory* 12.10.12; see Hendrickson 1926a).
51. Other Athenian authors, such as the historian Thucydides, were also important stylistic models, especially in the Late Republic (on the reception and influence of Thucydides, see Canfora 2006). While Cicero is more than willing to grant Thucydides brilliance as a historian, he argues that writing a historical narrative is emphatically not the same thing as performing an oration, and Thucydidean style has no role in the courts (*On the Best Type of Orator* 15–16).
52. On this Athens as a fiction of the Romans, see Boutin (2005, 156–58).
53. On the use of the body in the Atticism-Asianism debate, see Dugan (2001).
54. A list of the polemical terms used in this debate can be found at Dugan (2001, 412–13) (the list, however, does not include *vis*).
55. *Oratorum genera esse dicuntur tamquam poetarum; id secus est, nam alterum est multiplex*. This and the following quotation show that the title is not Ciceronian in derivation; there is no "best type of orator," only the "best orator": all orators clearly belong to the same type, even if some are clearly better than others.
56. *Oratorem genere non divido; perfectum enim quaero. Unum est autem genus perfecti, a quo qui absunt, non genere differunt, ut Terentius ab Accio, sed in eodem genere non sunt pares*. This search for the perfect orator is also the subject of *Orator*, for which reason *On the Best Type of Orator* is sometimes

seen as a failed first attempt, later abandoned in favor of that dialogue and *Brutus* (Hendrickson 1926a, 109, 111).

57. Cicero's valorization of Demosthenes above all others appears to be a product of a heightened Atticist controversy; Cicero was hardly unaware of or unread in Demosthenes prior to this, but he exerts little influence on Cicero in his early speeches, and he is not mentioned in *On Invention*. Although he is praised in *On the Orator*, he is not singled out to the same degree as in Cicero's later works (see Wooton [1977] for further discussion).
58. *Itaque nemo est orator qui Demostheni se similem nolit esse; at Menander Homeri noluit; genus enim erat aliud.* Much of our knowledge about the Atticists in Rome comes via Cicero himself, and his characterization of the success of various Attic orators was not always accurate. Seneca the Elder talks of Calvus's success in the courts at *Controversiae* 7.4.6–7; see Gruen (1967) and Narducci (2002a, 411–12).
59. *vim eloquentiae sua facultate, non rei natura metiuntur*.
60. See, for example, *Brutus* 284–92, where the debate hinges around those who think they imitate Attic style by copying Thucydides, rather than looking at the range of other forms of Atticism available. Nor is it confined to Cicero's published works; in a letter he wrote, "although he [Calvus] had read a lot, some of it obscure, he had no force" (*multae erant et reconditae litterae, vis non erat* [*Letters to his Friends* 15.21.4]).
61. Sarah Stroup argues that this is not a mistake but an intentional error "to underline the tonal redirection that is involved in any appropriative act of 'translation' " (2010, 60). While this is possible, the fact that Cicero does not use such a strategy elsewhere suggests that this might be an error, not caught in revision or not considered worthy of revision even if he later caught it.
62. On Greek philosophy as "capital that has been expropriated and re-invested in the Roman cultural economy," see Habinek (1994, 59–61).
63. See *On Old Age* 51 and *On Friendship* 26, and discussion at Stroup (2010, 96).
64. See Habinek (1998, 106) on the denial of a financial motive in aristocratic literary production, and the related discussion of *existimatio* at 45–49, along with Stroup (2010, 131–36).
65. For related uses of *formula*, see *Orator* 36 and 43.
66. *erit regula, ad quam eorum dirigantur orationes qui Attice volent dicere*.
67. It is glossed both as *ineloquens* (ineloquent) and as *indoctus* (unlearned) in ancient glossaries (*TLL* 1204 65).
68. Rough ages and levels: *ludus litterarius*: 7–11, basic education; *schola grammatici*: 11–15; *rhetoris schola*: 15 and older. One did not necessarily move from one to another as some schools were run as dead ends that aimed at teaching a basic form of literacy (Booth 1978).
69. The grammarians concentrated on poetry rather than prose; on the grammarian's duties, see Copeland (1991, 12–14).
70. The full description is "the detailed study of the poets, the study of history, the interpretation of words" (*grammaticis poetarum pertractatio, historiarum cognitio, verborum interpretatio*, *On the Orator* 1.187).
71. According to Nepos, these were "the interpreters of the poets, who are called *grammatici* by the Greeks" (*poetarum interpretes, qui a Graecis grammatici nominetur*). The context for this comment is an attempt to distinguish the lettered (*litteratus*) man from the erudite (*eruditus*) one: according to Nepos, the grammarian belonged more to the first class than to the second (*On the Grammarians* 4.1 = frag. 61, Teubner).
72. *nihil amplius quam Graecos interpretabantur, aut si quid ipsi Latine composuissent praelegebant.*

73 There were also bilingual conversation manuals, such as the *Hermeneumata Dositheana* (Marrou 1956, 355–56; Biville 2002, 84).
74. Interpreters of dreams: *On Divination* 1.45.11,132.6, 2.54.9; religious interpreters: *On the Laws* 2.20.11, 2.16.2, *On Divination* 1.4.5; interpreters of the law: *Republic* 3.17.4, *On the Laws* 1.14.9, 2.34.6, 2.59.10, 2.62.14. Cicero only uses the verbal form once in relation to the grammarians' interpretation of early poets (*On Divination* 1.34.17).
75. See *Letters to his Friends* 13.54 and *In Defense of Balbus* 11.28.
76. *Sed de nobis satis. Aliquando enim Aeschinem ipsum Latine dicentem audiamus.*
77. A similar moment happens at *Tusculan Disputations* 1.15. Cicero mentions an aphorism of Epicharmus on the topic of death but does not quote it. This leads Atticus to ask (naturally enough) what aphorism he is referring to. Once Cicero quotes in Latin, Atticus comments "now I recognize the Greek." While the avoidance of Greek in Latin texts extends beyond Cicero (Quintilian also quotes Latin translations of Greek over the original, and Columella used one of Cicero's translations in his farming manual), it is not absolute: Seneca the Elder frequently quotes Greek rather than translating, so it would not have been entirely impossible for Cicero to quote Greek directly.
78. Interestingly, Balbus has just attacked the poetry of Pacuvius in 2.91, in a passage I have already discussed. He is annoyed because Pacuvius in one play explicitly mentions that his term for sky, *caelum*, is a translation of the Greek *aethera*. Rather ironically, Cicero uses little explanatory notes like this all the way through his translation of Aratus.
79. On the *Brutus* as history, see Steel (2003) and Narducci (2002a).
80. 2003, 41. Gunderson is speaking here within the context of discussions on the influence of oratorical style as a parallel for declamation's "techniques of rhetorical authority"; there are parallels between later declaimers representing the figure of Cicero at critical moments in his career and Cicero's representation of Aeschines at a critical moment in his career.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 5

1. Both, however, also translated portions of Greek texts and interwove them into their works.
2. On the connections between Cicero and Catullus, see Stroup (2010) and Krostenko (2001).
3. On Cicero and the neoterics, see Clausen (1986). Poets such as Horace were also influenced by Cicero's discussions of literature; such is the case with the *Epistle to Augustus*, where Horace's aversion to synkrisis shows the influence of Cicero's literary theory (Feeney 2002, 17).
4. The best text of Parthenius is Lightfoot (1999); this magisterial edition provides all that remains of his works in Greek, alongside an English translation, and includes all sources for his life and works. On the *Sufferings of Love*, the work I will discuss here, see the papers in Zucker and Billault (2008) and Francese (2001). On Parthenius as a translator, see especially Fletcher (2011).
5. All translations of Parthenius that follow are also from Lightfoot (1999).
6. Cinna the poet = Gaius Helvius Cinna, who is most famous now for being lynched after Caesar's assassination, when he was mistaken for the anti-Caesarian L. Cornelius Cinna. He wrote a tremendously learned and obscure poem, *Zmyrna*, whose publication Catullus celebrated (Poem 95) but which is no longer extant. Lightfoot (1999, 11–12) summarizes the evidence regarding dates.

7. We have little of Gallus's poetry. His fragments are collected in Courtney (2003, 259–70).
8. Parthenius refers to his work as resembling a little notebook, a *hupomnematon* (Latin *commentarius*), a summary that could be drawn and expanded on. In Rome, the exchange of such work could go either way: "clients might be sent raw material for them to amplify to the great glory of their patrons, while Greek literary men might amass raw material for Roman historians or poets to work up into something more finished" (Lightfoot 1999, 218). Cicero sent one such work in Greek on his consulship to the historian Lucceius in 55 BCE, hoping that he would write up a proper history of that period (he didn't, much to Cicero's disappointment); he had another drawn up for Posidonius's *On Duty* while he was getting ready to write his own *On Moral Duties* (*Letters to Atticus* 2.6.1; see further Francese 1999, 65–66). Lucius Ateius Philologus, who came as a slave from Athens, sent one to the historians Sallust and Pollio for their histories (Suetonius, *On the Grammarians* 10.6). For other such works, see Lightfoot (1999, 217–21).
9. See Francese (1999) for how Parthenius might have operated as a *grammaticus*.
10. These tortured love stories could be the subjects of a mythological excursus in elegiac poetry of the sort seen, for example, at the opening of Propertius 1.3, or of an epyllion, such as Catullus 64.
11. This is the most complex of the narratives that Parthenius tells (Biraud 2008, 82). He downplays the religious and political overtones in this myth, preferring to tell the love story (Vanhaegendoren 2008; Fletcher 2011, 20). The myth, however, presents a problem in translation, as in Greek the story tells of how a nymph called Daphne becomes the laurel tree (Greek *daphne*), the tree sacred to Apollo, while fleeing from his unwanted advances. Unfortunately, the Latin word for laurel is *laurus*, so the linguistic play does not translate. Parthenius does not raise this as an issue, concluding his narrative by saying, "and they say she became the tree named after her, the laurel [*daphne*]" (Lightfoot 1999, 339). Parthenius does not remark on the problem this would represent in translation. Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1.452–567), the most famous Latin treatment of this myth, puts a thoroughly Roman spin on the story by making it clear that the laurel is used in Roman triumphs and to adorn Augustus's doors.
12. His family was well connected in Rome; we know his father entertained Julius Caesar more than once (Suetonius, *Julius Caesar* 73).
13. The essays in Skinner (2007a) and Gaisser (2007) offer excellent starting points for understanding Catullus and his world; Wiseman (1985) covers his life and family extensively.
14. See further Greene (2007) on Sappho's influence on Catullus.
15. *Sodales* is the term he uses most frequently when talking of his friends (Habinek 2005, 187).
16. Skinner (2007b) is a good introduction to the debate; on the arrangement of poems 65–116, see Skinner (2003).
17. On *otiosi* in this poem, see Segal (1970): "in implicit opposition to the 'serious' work of law, politics, or business, it dwells upon the deliberately inconsequential activities, the frivolous—one might almost say, defiantly frivolous—pursuits of a privileged class of young men held together by common interests and tastes, and especially by common tastes in literature" (25).
18. The reference to Lesbia is Catullus's addition, and establishes a conversation between the original and the translation (Possanza 2004, 61).
19. Poem 51 is one of two Catullan poems to be written in Sapphic stanzas; the other is poem 11. The latter is addressed to two male friends of Catullus, Furius and Aurelius, who are asked to take a goodbye message to Catullus's

girlfriend (whom he accuses of promiscuity), before the poem closes in a fit of self-pity. The two poems are linked by more than meter: both revolve around the figure of Lesbia, who is out of reach—in the case of poem 11, not because of one man but because of the 300 she apparently has the energy to take on at one time. Both also share an unusual word, *identidem*, which cross-references the poems (Quinn 1970, 125).

20. "The first six lines are filled with the vocabulary of pleasure and leisure: *otiosi*, *lusimus*, *delicatos*, *ludebat*, *per iocum atque vinum*" (Finamore 1984, 12; page 13 notes the erotic overtones of the language).
21. See Wray (2001, 90–99) and Clark (2008, 261–63) for more extended comparisons between poems 50 and 51.
22. "The 'gift' of Greek verse transformed into Latin seems to have constituted a special category of late Republican textual exchange" (Stroup 2010, 205).
23. Campbell (1982, 80–81). The last stanza of Sappho's poem is incomplete.
24. Which draws attention away from the girl to the companion (Shipton 1980, 74), another shift from the ST.
25. See Vine (1992) on how Catullus's third stanza compresses Sappho's third and fourth stanzas.
26. There is a large bibliography discussing this issue, of which the following is but a selection. Against the final stanza belonging at the end of poem 51: Wilkinson (1974) and Jensen (1967); for the unity of the poem: Segal (1970); Frank (1968); Fredricksmeyer (1965). Knox (1984) argues that the *topos* of Catullus's final stanza may have belonged to the original poem; D'Angour (2006) also argues that at least part of Catullus's final stanza translates the final, lost stanza of Sappho 31 and that love was what destroyed cities in the original, not *otium*. Barring the recovery of the final stanza of Sappho 31 or a different manuscript tradition for Catullus, there is no certain way to assess the validity of the various claims. As can be seen from what I argue above, I believe that the final verse belongs where it now sits; whether or not it is a translation, nothing can alter the fact that Catullus inserts himself—and the very Roman concept of *otium*—into Sappho's original. By doing so Catullus invites his audience to focus their attention on him and his voice, not the original author's.
27. "Catullus' poetry circulated within both the microcommunity of poets and the macrocommunity of the Roman elite during the last years of the Republic, at a time when the performance of masculinity both remained extremely important and became increasingly at risk" (Clark 2008, 270). The crisis of masculinity at the end of (and after) the Late Republic has attracted a considerable body of scholarship. Clark (2008) presents a useful introduction to the way that the issues provoked by this crisis play out in Catullus; see also Wray (2001), Miller (1998), and Skinner (1997).
28. That is not to say that the tension between performing Sappho and being a Roman male is entirely resolved in the final stanza: "the last stanza of Catullus' poem does not . . . resolve these oppositions between Sapphic and Roman ideals. At most, he may implicitly be expressing the hope at the end that an adherence to traditional Roman ideals will enable him to get over not only his indulgence in love but also his identification with the more private, feminine world epitomized by Sappho" (Greene 2007, 141).
29. Frag. 1; see Courtney (2003, 72–74) for text and commentary. Aedituus's translation is not nearly as close as that of Catullus, but is still clearly a version of Sappho 31 (Clark 2008, 278).
30. The nine were Pindar, Bacchylides, Sappho, Anacreon, Stesichorus, Simonides, Ibycus, Alcaeus, and Alcman (the order of *Greek Anthology* 9.184, a Greek epigram from the first century BCE). The canon came from editorial

work in the Alexandrian library, specifically that of Aristophanes of Byzantium (c. 257–180 BCE).

31. Hortalus is often identified with Quintus Hortensius Hortalus, one of the Late Republic's greatest orators; the other option is his son, who would have been around the same age as Catullus, though a notch above him socially (Tatum 1997, 489).
32. Callimachus was the son of Battus, Battiades = the son of Battus.
33. The *Plokamos* only exists in fragments; we have some 30 lines and a summary of the poem. For the text and translation, see C.A. Trypanis's (1958) translation in the Loeb Classical Library series. Bing 1997 surveys the various attempts to reconstruct the poem based on Catullus; see also Van Sickle (1968).
34. Given that Catullus was Hortensius's social inferior, there might have been some problems with sending him a piece of court poetry as a gift, especially given Roman feelings about Hellenistic kings (see further, Tatum 1997, 494). Andrew Feldherr argues that "the prefatory poem 65 ensures that we see this Callimachean adaptation in terms of the social work it does, as recompense for the obligation the poet owes to the dedicatee, and in such a context there could be no more appropriate poem in the Hellenistic canon than this grand celebration of patronage" (2007, 98).
35. On the symbolism of apples in antiquity, see Littlewood (1968). On the Callimachean echoes of this passage, see Skinner (2003, 14–19) and Van Sickle (1968, 501–2).
36. On the interaction of this poem with poems 65 and 66, see Skinner (2003, 21–28).
37. Poem 116 may originally have been placed earlier in the collection, and thus preceded the accusations of sexual chicanery. For the subject at hand, its original placement does not much matter; the offer and its instantaneous withdrawal marks Gellius as someone who will never be connected to Catullus via translation.
38. Armstrong (2010) is an excellent treatment of the biographical element in Horace's poetry.
39. As *tribunus militum*, one of six per legion, a position that conferred equestrian status for life.
40. It usually appears after the *Odes*, or after the *Odes*, *Epodes*, and *Carmen Saeculare* (Rudd 1989, 19).
41. Although he had multiple lyric models, Horace's major lyric model was Alcaeus (Hutchinson 2007, 49), another poet from Lesbos, who was contemporary with Sappho (also an important influence). There are 37 Alcaic strophes and 25 Sapphic in 103 odes; the *Carmen Saeculare* is also in Sapphics.
42. Those interested in other aspects of Horace's poetry should begin with the essays in Davis (2010) and Harrison (2007). Other useful and accessible introductory works are Feeney (1993) on Horace and his Greek lyric predecessors, and the papers in Paschalis and Putnam (2002), which deal with various aspects of Horace's relationship to the lyric poets. Anyone wishing to see the depth and range of Horace's allusions in the *Odes* should consult the commentaries by Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, 1978) and Nisbet and Rudd (2004). Spencer (2011, 106–8) discusses the importance of Greek lyric and creating a lyric tradition in Rome during the Late Republican and Augustan ages.
43. On the running theme of wine drinking in this epistle, see Smith (1984); one feature of ancient drinking games was imitating other attendees or those familiar to the attendees.
44. The Parian iambics are the *Epodes*, in which Horace claimed that he would be ruthless towards the evil, as Archilochus had been towards Lycambes

(who had rejected him as a son-in-law), and as Hipponax was towards his enemy Bupalus (*Epode* 6.11–14).

45. The precise meaning of *temperat* here is problematic; it may have the connotation of mixing—as with water and wine—as much as controlling (Peponi 2002).
46. This refers to the *Odes,* and these lines are an echo of *Ode* 3.30.14: "I was the leader who brought the Aeolic song to Italian meters" (*princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos deduxisse modos*).
47. Lines 41–44 continue with discussion of Horace's audience, where he says that he is ashamed to present his trifles in the recital hall, and a critic insists that he is keeping his poetry for Jupiter's (Augustus's) ear, instead of the public's.
48. Timagenes, a Greek rhetor and historian, came to Rome as a slave in 55 BCE. After he was freed, he lived in Augustus's house. Porphyrio tells us that Iarbitas, another Greek, imitated him during a drinking bout and burst himself while doing so.
49. Archilochus, seventh century BCE; Hipponax, late sixth century BCE. Mankin (2010) is a good introduction to the themes of the *Epodes*; Barchiesi (2001) and Harrison (2001) investigate the relationship between Horace and Archilochus.
50. The precise meaning of *muto* here is not clear. It may mean "change completely" (Mayer 1994, 263) or simply translate (it is used elsewhere as a translation verb; see Appendix). Horace, *Satires* 1.4.7 uses this verb to describe the poetic work of Lucilius, a second-century BCE satirist, who imitated Athenian Old Comedy, changing meter and rhythm by switching iambic meter for hexameter. If that is what is meant here, then according to his critics Horace fails because he does not follow a Lucilian pattern of metrical substitution (Cucchiarelli 1999, 330). In other words, Horace is attacked for one of his great sources of pride: his retention of Greek meters.
51. Horace makes sure to remind his readers of that fact in *Epistle* 1.20, the next in the collection. This describes his poetry book as a runaway slave being handled by everybody (Feeney 2009, 31; Oliensis 1998, 174).
52. To temper his self-elevation, Horace continues by writing that anyone who does similar work will be as a *dux,* a general to a swarm, presenting an intentionally humorous anticlimactic image of himself ruling over bees (Smith 1984, 263).
53. There were many more lyric poets than those in the canon of nine established in the Hellenistic period, many of whom would have claimed Sappho and Alcaeus as models.
54. Horace mentions Catullus only once, alongside Calvus at *Satires* 1.1.19. On the connections between Horace's poetry and Catullus, see Putnam (2006).
55. Literally "leading down," the verb came to be used to describe a finely spun and elegant piece of poetry and was much favored by the neoterics and their heirs.
56. When I say dead, I do not mean that no one was still writing lyric verse in Greek in Horace's day; nonetheless, the lyric tradition that produced Sappho and Alcaeus had traditionally ended in the mid-fifth century BCE (the essays in Gerber [1997] provide a good introduction to Greek lyric).
57. Euterpe: Muse of instrumental music; Polyhymnia: Muse of choral verse and song.
58. Two of the meters never appear again in the collection (1.4 and 1.8), and two of the others (1.1 and 1.7) only appear again once (Santirocco 1986, 19).
59. The first public library in Rome was established by C. Asinius Pollio in the Hall of Liberty in 39 BCE, though Julius Caesar had touted establishing

one and commissioned Varro to collect as many Greek and Latin texts as he could for it (Suetonius, *Julius Caesar* 44). Augustus's library was the second and was dedicated in 28 BCE.

60. At *Epistle* 2.294, Horace describes the library as being empty on the Latin side; while it was certainly already stocked with Roman poets, it must have been emptier than the Greek side.
61. He also excludes any earlier Roman lyric poets, including Catullus (Barchiesi 2007, 146).
62. I deliberately do not discuss Horace's sources for this treatise, a complicated issue that lies outside the scope of this chapter. Porphyrio tells us that Horace incorporated a treatise by Neoptolemus, a third-century BCE critic and poet; Horace clearly drew from multiple sources, both Greek and Latin, including Cicero (Rudd 1989, 27).
63. Rudd (1989, 21–23) is a good guide to the layout of the poem and its various sections and themes.
64. *Communia* may also refer to themes and characters taken from Trojan stories, with *publica materies* referring to their literary treatment (Rudd 1989, 171).
65. An author who wrote one of the cyclic poems that filled out details of the Trojan War left untouched by Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey.* A Naevius (not to be confused with the Naevius who wrote the epic *Punic War*) translated one of these, the *Cypria*, which related the accounts up to the opening of the *Iliad*; we have no information about Naevius and only a few lines are extant, although the translation was several books long.
66. It is possible that Horace's edition of Homer had *nomos*, a word which is closer in meaning to *mores* (Rudd 1989, 174).
67. He has already summarized the *Iliad* in lines 6–16.
68. The connection goes back to Denis Lambin's sixteenth-century edition of Horace (Brink 1963, 211).
69. *vos exemplaria Graeca/nocturna versate manu, versate diurna* (268–69).
70. The difference between didactic and epic was slight in antiquity, and ancient criticism rarely seems to have noted a difference between the two genres, although poets did (Gale 1994, 99–105; see also Volk 2002, 34–44). Toohey (1996) is an excellent and accessible introduction to ancient didactic.
71. His identity is disputed, though most make him the praetor of 58, Gaius Memmius. This was the same Memmius on whose staff Catullus served in Bithynia; he also razed the gardens of Epicurus in Athens to make room for his house. Memmius was exiled for electoral bribery in 52 BCE, so the *DRN* must date from before then. Memmius is addressed repeatedly throughout the poem (11 times), but his persona is not developed; he should be primarily thought of as the typical student in the student-teacher relationship of didactic poetry rather than an individualized audience (Volk 2002, 74).
72. On this, see Foster (2011).
73. There is a great deal of irony here, given that Epicurus did not approve of poetry (Gale 1994, 14–18). He did, however, approve of clarity.
74. It may have been *On Nature*, though other candidates have been suggested, such as the *Letter to Herodotus.* Given the Roman propensity not to translate texts one-on-one, but to combine various texts into one whole and add original material, "it makes better sense to assume that Lucretius started out with a text that contained an argument of substantially the same form as we find in the *DRN*, but that he exercised freedom in reordering the sequence of topics" (Farrell 2008, 77).
75. Lucretius leans toward translating Homer and Euripides because they were popular authors in Latin schools; by doing so, he aims at appropriating "the authority of the great teachers of the past" (Markoviæ 2008, 44).

76. *te sociam studeo scribendis versibus esse/quos ego de rerum natura pangere conor/Memmiadae nostro* (1.24–26). It is extremely unusual for Venus to play the role normally reserved for a Muse or Muses (Volk 2002, 84), an issue Lucretius addresses at 1.21–23 and 1.26–28.
77. Lucretius says that he follows Epicurus's steps after another long proem filled with praise in Book Five (55–56). This does not preclude him celebrating himself as one who walks alone on the trackless places of the Muses (1.926), and as one who drinks from "untouched springs" (*integros . . . fontes*, 1.927; his use of *integros* suggests Terence's reference to the untouched sources of Greek comedy).
78. This is probably an Ennian reference, as Ennius had compared himself to an aged racehorse retired after a life of competition (Volk 2002, 111).
79. Clarity is of great importance to Lucretius (see Gale 1994, 143–44) and he is critical of philosophers who, like Anaxagoras, write in particularly impenetrable language (Tatum 1984, 184–85).
80. *On Moral Ends* 1.10; *On the Nature of the Gods* 1.8. Although Cicero praised the extent of Greek and noted the geographical limitations of Latin in *In Defense of Archias the Poet* 23, his comments were part of a defense strategy which rested on the value for Rome of Greek poets such as Archias.
81. On the theme of the poverty of Latin, see Fögen (2000).
82. Something similar occurs in Cicero's *On Moral Ends* 3.51, where Cato complains of the *inopia* (poverty) of Latin: "Cicero is slyly drawing attention to the way in which he has risen triumphantly to the challenge of disciplining a still-developing language to the lucid exposition of unfamiliar and often highly technical subject matter" (Kenney 2007, 97). Cicero has already complained of those who believe that Latin is *inopia*, at 1.10 of the dialogue, perhaps in a veiled response to Lucretius' comments (Porter-Packer 1938, 46).
83. The subject of the poverty of Latin occurs also in Book Three: "Now the poverty of our paternal language drags me away unwilling, although I am longing to translate (*reddere*) under what compact these [the four elements of the soul] are mixed with each other and in what ways they are united so as to function. But still, as far as I can touch briefly upon it, I will do so" (*Nunc ea quo pacto inter sese mixta quibusque/compta modis vigeant rationem reddere aventem/abstrahit invitum patrii egestas:/sed tamen, ut potero summatim attingere, tangam* [3.258–61]).
84. Lucretius often uses *expono* when drawing attention to the explicatory function of his verse, as when he refers to expounding his discoveries about nature in the language of his fathers (4.970; see also 1.946, 4.21, 4.778). He uses it also to describe Ennius's unfolding of what he had learned from Homer's ghost about the underworld, at 1.121. Cicero uses *expono* in the context of translation at *On Moral Ends* 3.15.10.
85. Lucretius uses many Greek words but almost all of these were already in use and incorporated into Latin, such as *corona, poema*, *scaena* (Classen 1968, 77–79); he prefers, like Cicero and the author of the *Rhetoric to Herennius* (4.10), to coin Latin words. When he uses transliteration it is to make a point and for Greek philosophical theories that he feels are erroneous (see the passage above, and 3.100 on *harmonia*). One particular run of transliterated Greek words occurs at 4.1160–69, a catalogue of all the polite words people use for women they are in love with; this passage has the most Greek words in the *DRN*. Cyril Bailey (1947, III, 1179–80) argues that the number of Greek words means that the passage probably comes from a Greek original. However, more pertinent for my point here is that this is a passage about love and its effects; the Greek words serve to express Lucretius's negative feelings about the emotion and the dangers of love-sickness, just as his

transliterations of Greek words elsewhere coalesce around Greek theories that he does not approve of. The passage also serves to make such behavior (i.e., behavior typical of Roman love poetry) look unattractively Greek.

86. *denique natura haec rerum ratioque repertast/nuper, hanc primus cum primis ipse repertus/nunc ego sum in patrias qui possim vertere voces.*
87. The authorship of this poem has been debated for a considerable time and some attribute the poem to Tiberius. For debates over authorship, see Possanza (2004, 227–33); I follow him in accepting Germanicus as the author and Augustus as the dedicatee.
88. Toohey (1996, 51–64) is an accessible introduction to Aratus. The Greek poem, along with an English translation and commentary, can be found in Kidd (1997).
89. We have a substantial connected portion (480 lines) along with some fragments; these are collected (together with fragments of the rest of Cicero's poetry) with a French translation, in Soubiran (1972). His translation is extremely unfaithful, and far more dramatic than the original.
90. This Varro (not to be confused with the Varro who appears in Cicero's work and wrote *On the Latin Language*) also translated Apollonius Rhodius's *Argonautica* (the ST is extant, the translation is not).
91. Gain (1976) provides a text and translation with notes. We have 725 lines that are a very free translation of lines 1–731, which give the map of the heavens and the calendar; these lines are of Aratus's original. There are also 222 fragmentary lines.
92. Mark Possanza's *Translating the Heavens* (2004) is the best discussion of the poem, its influences, and how it deviates from its original; much of the above relies heavily on his work.
93. Unfortunately, Cicero's opening is no longer extant, so we cannot tell how or even whether Germanicus's version referenced it.
94. The use of *at* (but) and *nobis* (for us) likewise points to the fact that the poem is intended to be read in counterpoint to the Greek (Possanza 2004, 107).
95. "On either side of it [the pole] two Bears wheel in unison and so they are called the Wagons" (26–27).
96. *Sis vati placata, precor, Latonia Virgo/haec ego non primus, veteres cecinere poetae.* The only other place Germanicus refers to *vates* is 146, which speaks of stars unknown to the *vatibus . . . priscis*, ancient poets.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 6

1. Of its 25 books, we only have Books Five and Ten, although there are mutilated and significant fragments of other books.
2. One son appears not to have opted for a career in public life; another, Mela, had a successful career and was the father of the epic poet Lucan.
3. Fairweather (1981) and Sussman (1978) are good introductions to his work.
4. The work probably dates to the late-thirties CE (McGill 2005, 338).
5. Sample topics for *suasoriae* included, "Should Cicero beg for mercy from Antony?" and "Should Cicero burn the *Philippics* so Antony will not kill him?"
6. As his intent was to provide good rhetorical examples for students to imitate and bad examples for them to avoid, it made sense to include and quote from Greek as well as Latin *exempla* (Fairweather 1981, 33); consequently, the work included a number of untranslated Greek quotations. Unfortunately, many of these were lost in transmission in the Middle Ages, as scribes found the unfamiliar script difficult to deal with.

7. See, for example, Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory* 5.12.17–21, and Petronius, *Satyricon* 1–2.
8. Like Quintilian, Seneca believed in using multiple models for imitation (*Controversia* 1, *preface* 6).
9. For Seneca's opinion of Fuscus as an orator, see *Controversia* 2, *preface* 1.
10. Adaeus wrote in the fourth century BCE.
11. *Commendationis*, the word used for recommending an individual for office.
12. Cicero occasionally uses this verb to describe translation (*Letters to Atticus* 6.2.3, *On Moral Ends* 1.3.7), though it is far from his favorite verb for the activity; on the whole, Seneca has a very different critical vocabulary than Cicero, using, for example, Latinized Greek terminology rather than coining Latin terms (Fairweather 1981, 69).
13. In Gellius, Sallust is compared unfavorably with his Greek source, in that case Demosthenes (*Attic Nights* 2.27).
14. *Cum sit praecipua in Thucydide virtus brevitas, hac eum Sallustius vicit et in suis illum castris cecidit.*
15. *Vim* is also carefully balanced against *faciem*, which may refer to building a Latin word on the pattern of the Greek one, or to transliteration. Brad Inwood argues that "Seneca is reacting . . . against a strategy of translating isomorphically and symbolically, a technique which works best if the reader already knows the Greek term in question and ultimately requires as much explanation as would be needed by simply dropping in the Greek word itself" (1995, 74). This is true, though as I argue above, he has also other reasons for using both *faciem* and *formam*.
16. Cicero's usual term was *natura*; Quintilian (*Institutes of Oratory* 8.33) tells us that Sergius Plautus was the originator of *ens* and *essentia*.
17. Seneca was phenomenally successful at this; on his reputation among later generations of Romans, see Habinek (2000).
18. These translations are no longer extant and are only known from this text. Earlier translations of the *Iliad*: Ninnius Crassus (possibly early first century BCE) and Gnaeus Matius (Gellius, *Attic Nights* 5.7; see Courtney 2003, 107, and 99–106). Matius wrote sometime before the end of the Republic, as Varro cites him in *On the Latin Language*. The translation is also cited by Gellius, who admires him; it seems to have been extremely free.
19. Phaedrus, however, refers to his own work not as a translation but as a "polishing" in *senarii*, evoking the image of final editing rather than creation (1, *prologue* 2). As the epilogue to Book Two shows, Phaedrus was not a timorous translator, but aimed, like other Roman translators, at rivaling his source: "Since he [Aesop] holds first place, I have tried to make sure that he is not alone: this is not envy but emulation. And if Latium favors my work, it will have more to challenge Greece with" (2.9.5–9). On Phaedrus's fables, see further Bloomer (1997a, 73–109).
20. By moral, I refer to how well Polybius (according to Seneca) has translated the *virtus* of the original poems into their new environment; the point is not so much that he has captured the language of the original, but that he has captured its essence, an essence which resides in its ability to comfort and inspire Polybius.
21. This novel is slightly later than the *Consolation to Polybius*. Petronius was another who rose to great heights under Nero, only to become his victim.
22. These were hired entertainers who recited Homer and performed scenes from his poems (Artemidorus 4.2; Achilles Tatius 3.20.)
23. He also states that Cassandra killed her sons (presumably confusing the Trojan princess with Medea), and that Daedalus built the Trojan horse and enclosed Niobe in it (52.1).

24. The theme of a distorted knowledge of Homer among this class is clearly entertaining enough to be a fertile vein for Petronius to mine: in 29.7 the narrator of the novel is shown some paintings of Homeric stories, but he needs captions to understand them—in other words, they are so badly distorted as to be unrecognizable; later Trimalchio claims that Hannibal, the arch-enemy of Rome, burned down Troy (50.5).
25. Rimmel (2007) is an excellent introduction to these issues.
26. In Homer's *Iliad*, these are the people Hector says he fears will criticize him if he leaves the battlefield (22.100–101).
27. *Labeo transtulit Iliadem et Odyssiam verbum ex verbo ridicule satis.*
28. *crudum manduces Priamum Priamique pisinnos.*
29. The complete text with Italian commentary can be found in Scaffai (1982); a privately printed English translation of the poem with the original text and notes by Kennedy (1998) is harder to find.
30. *lege quanto spiritu ingentibus intonueris verbis: pudebit te subito deficere et ex tanta orationis magnitudine desciscere.*
31. *vertere Graeca in Latinum veteres nostri oratores optimum iudicabant.*
32. *Neque ego paraphrasim esse interpretationem tantum volo, sed circa eosdem sensus certamen atque aemulationem.*
33. Quintilian compares Greek and Latin a few times in the *Institutes of Oratory*: Latin is harsher than Greek (12.10.27); Greek is the more agreeable language, which is why Roman poets use it in poetry (12.10.38; this, incidentally, is why the Romans cannot compete with Greeks in comedy). Similarly, Seneca the Younger wrote that Latin was weightier and slower than Greek (*Epistle* 40.11–14), and that while Latin was the more powerful language, Greek had more grace and license (*Dialogues* 11.216).
34. Pliny is fond of writing letters to describe either his own daily routine or those of his friends (see, for example, *Epistle* 3.1, which describes that of Vestricius Spurinna), or to recommend activities during holidays, that is, during retreats from the city, with its many social and political demands. On this topic, see further Johnson (2010, 36–39).
35. "You can even revise those speeches you have forgotten, keeping much, leaving out more, adding some and altering some" (*Poteris et quae dixeris post oblivionem, multa retinere plura transire, alia interscribere alia rescribere* [7.9.5]). Not surprisingly, given that Pliny was a student of Quintilian, this replicates Quintilian's advice to move from translation to paraphrase.
36. Over the past 10 years, Gellius has attracted an increasing amount of attention, and his originality and the depth of his thinking have been considerably reevaluated; see Holford-Strevens (2003); Holford-Strevens and Vardi (2004) (which also provides an excellent introduction to the literary politics of the period); and Keulen (2009). Beall (1997) is invaluable on Gellius and translation.
37. On Gellius's work as a strategy to impose his authority, see Keulen (2009).
38. See Vardi (2001, 41 and passim) for a full discussion of this theme.
39. On Gellius's antagonistic relationship to the grammarians, see Kaster (1997, 50–60); Vardi (2001); and Holford-Strevens (2003, 172–73); for full citations of this theme, see Nettleship (1883, 395n2).
40. The title, according to Gellius, came to him because the inspiration to write it struck during his residence in the countryside of Attica (Preface 4); he then reels off a list of such miscellanies, all with different and ambitious titles and all of which fail to live up to those titles (Preface 5–9). It is clear from the number of titles that this was a crowded marketplace. On the connection between Gellius's title and other texts which claimed to be the product of nighttime labor, see Ker (2004); on Gellius's careful efforts to show how appropriate

and fitting his title is in comparison to his competitors', see Johnson (2010, 99–100).

41. Holford-Strevens (2003, 65–80) provides an excellent discussion of Gellius's sources; it is a complicated topic, especially when one attempts to assess whether Gellius actually had access to the many works he name-drops.
42. He will describe discussions that seem unlikely to have taken place, given what we know from elsewhere of the participants' interests; for example, in a discussion of whether Latin or Greek is richer in color names (2.26), Fronto quotes passages from Virgil to prove his argument, and commends Virgil's care with words, although Fronto's extant writings never allude to Virgil or quote from his work (Holford-Strevens 2003, 66).
43. Rust (2009) provides an excellent discussion of the structure of the *Attic Nights*.
44. *Quod Graecorum verborum quorundam difficillima est in Latinam linguam mutatio, velut quod Graece dicitur polupragmosune*.
45. Translation of Plato 17.20; of Favorinus 12.1.21.
46. Other comparative chapters by Gellius: 19.9 Greek and Latin lyric poets; 9.9 Virgil, Theocritus, and Homer; 11.4 Ennius and Euripides; 13.27 Parthenius and Virgil; 10.3 Cato, Gaius Gracchus, and Cicero; 17.10 compares the description of Mount Etna in Pindar and in Virgil's *Aeneid*. On comparison of authors (*syncrisis*) in general and in Gellius, see Vardi (1996).
47. In the *Iliad*, Diomedes swaps his bronze armor for Glaucus's gold armor, getting by far the better deal.
48. Elaine Fantham has doubts (1996, 248). Some push the point further: Henry Nettleship thought that Gellius got all his discussions of translation from Octavius Avitus (1883, 44); however, Avitus only looked at Virgil's borrowings and not translation in general (Gamberale 1969, 56); Barry Baldwin suggested that Gellius got his comparisons from school exercises (1975, 59). Given the extent of Gellius's interest in the topic of translation, he probably plundered a wide range of secondary sources as he saw fit.
49. *Libitumst*; Fantham (1984, 309n40).
50. 2.23.11. We have some evidence that Menander's comedies were still being staged (Statius, *Silvae* 3.5.91ff. refers to performances at Naples); however, 2.23 suggests a textual rather than a theatrical experience of the dramatist. We do know that Menander was of interest enough to be translated by M. Pomponius Bassulus during the Hadrianic period (CIL 9.1164; cf. Richter 1938, 53), so texts must have been reasonably accessible.
51. *Caecilius vero hoc in loco ridiculus magis quam personae isti quam tractabat aptus atque conveniens videri maluit* (2.23.13).
52. Gamberale (1969, 80): he also questions whether Gellius actually had a secure method of determining the exact correspondence of any of the passages he paired up—witness in 17.10 his comparison of Virgil's description of Aetna at *Aeneid* 3.570–82 with Pindar's in *Pythian* 1.21: despite Gellius's assertions, it is far from clear that Virgil's lines were even tangentially a translation of Pindar's.
53. Chapter 9.9 is the only time that Gellius relates such extracts to their context (Holford-Strevens 2003, 201).
54. *pigra et levia et cunctantia et quasi in summo pectore supernantia*.

Bibliography

COMMENTARIES, EDITIONS, AND TRANSLATIONS OF ANCIENT TEXTS AND INSCRIPTIONS

Bailey, Cyril, ed. 1947. *Lucretius. De Rerum Natura. Volumes I-III*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Barsby, John, ed. 1986. *Plautus' Bacchides*. Warminster: Aris & Phillip.

———, ed. 1999. *Terence: Eunuchus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———, ed. and trans. 2001. *Terence Volume I and II* (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bernand, Etienne, ed. 1969. *Les Inscriptions grecques et latines De Philae*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Bertini, Ferruccio, ed. 1968. *Plauto Asinaria*. Padua: R.A.D.A.R.

Brink, Charles Oscar, ed. 1963. *Horace on Poetry: The Ars Poetica*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———, ed. 1982. *Horace on Poetry. Epistles Book II: The Letters to Augustus and Florus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brothers, A. J., ed. and trans. 1988. *Terence: The Self-Tormentor*. Warminster, Wiltshire: Aris & Phillips.

———, ed. 2000. *Terence: The Eunuch*. Warminster: Aris & Philips.

Büchner, Karl, Jürgen Blänsdorf, and Willy Morel, eds. 1995. *Fragmenta poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum praeter Ennium et Lucilium*. Stutgart: B.G. Teubner.

Campbell, David A., ed. and trans. 1982. *Sappho; Alcman* (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cooley, Alison E., ed. and tran. 2009. *Res gestae divi Augustae: Text, Translation, and Commentary.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Courtney, Edward, ed. 1999. *Archaic Latin Prose*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

———, ed. 2003. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Second Edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Daviault, André, ed. 1981. *Comoedia Togata: Fragments*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Douglas, Alan Edward, ed. and trans. 1985. *Tusculan Disputations I*. Chicago, Il: Bolchazy-Carducci.

———, ed. and trans. 1990. *Tusculan Disputations 2 & 5*. Warminster: Aris & Philips.

Duff, James Duff, ed. 1915. *Dialogorum, libri X, XI, XII. Three Dialogues of Seneca*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dyck, Andrew R., ed. 2004. *A Commentary on Cicero, De legibus*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ewbank, William Withers, ed. 1978. *The Poems of Cicero*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Gagé, Jean, ed. 1977. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
Gain, David B., ed. and trans. 1971. *The Aratus Ascribed to Germanicus Caesar.* London: Athlone Press.
Gratwick, Adrian S., ed. and trans. 1987. *Terence: The Brothers*. Warminster: Aris and Philips.
———, ed. 1993. *Plautus Menaechmi*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Grube, George Maximilian Anthony, trans. 1965. *The Greek and Roman Critics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Jocelyn, Henry David, ed. 1967. *The Tragedies of Ennius: Fragments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Jordon, Henri, ed. 1860. *M. Catonis praeter librum de re rustica quae extant*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
Hammond, Mason, ed. 1963. *Plautus: Miles Gloriosus*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Kaster, Robert A. 1995. *Suetonius: De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Keil, Heinrich. 1981. *Grammatici Latini Volumes 1–6*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
Kennedy, George Alexander, ed. and trans. 1998. *The Latin Iliad: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Notes*. Fort Collins, CO: Privately Printed.
Kidd, Douglas, ed. and trans. 1997. *Aratus Phaenomena*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 34.
Lindsay, Wallace Martin, ed. 1913. *Sexti Pompei Festi de Verborum Significatu quae Supersunt cum Paulu Epitome*. Leipzig: Teubner.
Livingston, Ivy. 2004. *A Linguistic Commentary on Livius Andronicus*. London: Routledge.
MacCary, W. Thomas, and Malcolm M. Willcock. 1976. *Plautus: Casina*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Marshall, Peter K, ed. 1977. *Cornelii Nepotis Vitae cum fragmentis*. Leipzig: Teubner.
Martin, Ronald H. 1976. *Terence: Adelphoe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Marx, Friedrich. 1959. *Plautus Rudens*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.
Mayer, Roland G. 1994. *Horace:* Epistles, *Book I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Nisbet, Robin George Murdoch, and Margaret Hubbard. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace*: *Odes, Book I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
———. 1978. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Nisbet, Robin George Murdoch, and Niall Rudd. 2004. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book III*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Oakley, Stephen P. 1998. *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI-X*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Quinn, Kenneth. 1970. *Catullus: The Poems*. London: MacMillan.
Ribbeck, Otto. 1898. *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta Volumes 1–2*. Leipzig: Teubner.
Rudd, Niall. 1989. *Horace: Epistles II and Epistle to the Pisones (Ars Poetica)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
Scaffai, Marco. 1982. *Baebii Italici Ilias Latina*. Bologna: Pàtron.
Scheid, John. 2007. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Hauts fait du divin Auguste*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
Sherk, Robert K., ed. 1969. *Roman Documents from the Greek East: Senatus Consulta and Epistulae to the Age of Augustus*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.
Sherwin-White, Adrian Nicholas, ed. 1966. *The Letters of Pliny.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Skutsch, Otto, ed. 1985. *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Smith, Martin S., ed. 1975. *Petronius: Cena Trimalchionis*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Sonnenschein, Edward A., ed. 1907a. *T. Macci Plauti Mostellaria. Second edition.* Oxford: Clarendon.
———, ed. 1907b. *Mostellaria*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
———, ed. 1979. *Rudens*. New York: Arno Press.
Soubiran, Jean, ed. and trans. 1972. *Aratea; Fragments poétiques*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
Trypanis, Constantine A., ed. and trans. 1958. *Callimachus: Aetia; Iambi; Lyric Poems; Hecale; Minor Epic and Elegiac Poems; Fragments of Epigrams; Fragments of Uncertain Location* (Loeb Classical Library Series). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Warmington, Eric Herbert, ed. and trans. 1935–40. *Remains of Old Latin, Volumes I–IV.* Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
Wessner, Paul, ed. 1902. *Aeli Donati quod Fertur Commentum Terenti. Volumes 1–3*. Leipzig: Teubner.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abel, Karlhans. 1955. *Die Plautusprologe*. Mülheim: Carl Fabri.
Adams, James N. 2002. "Bilingualism at Delos." In *Bilingualism in Ancient Society. Language Contact and the Written Word*. Edited by J. N. Adams, M. Janse, and S. Swain. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 103–127.
———. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Adams, James N., Mark Janse, and Simon Swain, eds. 2002. *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Adams, James N., and Roland G. Mayer, eds. 1999. *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Adams, James N., and Simon Swain. 2002. "Introduction." In *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word*. Edited by J.N. Adams, M. Janse, and S. Swain. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1–20.
Aicher, Peter. 1989. "Ennius' Dream of Homer." *American Journal of Philology* 110: 227–232.
Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. and extended edition. London and New York: Verso.
Anderson, William Scovil. 1984. "Love Plots in Menander and His Roman Adapters." *Ramus* 13: 124–134.
———. 1993. *Barbarian Play: Plautus' Roman Comedy.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
———. 2004. "Terence and the Roman Rhetorical Use of the Andria." *Leeds International Classical Studies* 3: 1–9.
Ando, Clifford. 1999. "Was Rome a Polis?" *Classical Antiquity* 18: 1–34.
Armstrong, David. 1993. "The Addressees of the Ars Poetica: Herculaneum, the Pisones and Epicurean Protreptic." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 31: 185–230.
———. 2010. "The Biographical and Social Foundations of Horace's Poetic Voice." *A Companion to Horace*. Gregson Davis, ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 7–33.
Armstrong, David, and Joseph J. Walsh. 1986. "SIG 593: The Letter of Flamininus to Chyretiae." *Classical Philology* 81: 32–46.

Arnott, William Geoffrey. 1964. "A Note on the Parallels between Menander's *Dyskolos* and Plautus' *Aulularia*." *Phoenix* 18: 232–37.

———. 1985. "Terence's Prologues." *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 5: 1–7.

———. 2001. "Plautus' *Epidicus* and Greek Comedy." *Studien zu Plautus' Epidicus*. Ulrike Auhagen, ed. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 71–90.

Asmis, Elizabeth. 2001. "Basic Education in Epicureanism." In *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity.* Edited by Yun Lee Too. Leiden: Brill, 209–240.

———. 2005. "A New Kind of Model: Cicero's Roman Constitution in *De republica*." *American Journal of Philology* 126: 377–416.

Assmann, Jan. 1996. "Translating Gods: Religion as a Factor of Cultural (Un)Translatability." In *The Translatability of Cultures: Figurations of the Space Between*. Edited by S. Budick and W. Iser. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 25–36.

Astarita, Maria Laura. 1993. *La cultura nelle* 'Noctes Atticae'. Catania: Centro di Studi Sull'antico Cristianesimo.

Astin, Alan Edgar. 1978. *Cato the Censor*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Atzert, Karl. 1908. *De Cicerone Interprete Graecorum.* Diss. Göttigen.

Badian, Ernst. 1971. "Ennius and His Friends." In *Ennius: sept exposes suivis de discussions*. Geneva: Foundation Hardt, 151–195.

———. 1985. "*Nobiles Amici:* Art and Literature in an Aristocratic Society." (Review of Gold 1982) *Classical Philology* 80: 341–357.

———. 1990. "The Consuls, 179–49 BC." *Chiron* 20: 371–413.

Baldwin, Barry. 1975. *Studies in Aulus Gellius.* Lawrence, KA: Coronado Press.

Balsdon, John Percy Vyvian Dacre. 1979. *Romans and Aliens*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Baltussen, Han. 2011. "Cicero's Translation of Greek Philosophy: Personal Mission or Public Service?" In *Complicating the History of Western Translation: The Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective*. Edited by Siobhán McElduff & Enrica Sciarrino. Manchester: St Jerome, 37–47.

Barchiesi, Alessandro. 2000. "Rituals in Ink: Horace on the Greek Lyric Tradition." In *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons and Society.* Edited by Mary Depew and Dirk Obbink. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 167–182.

———. 2001. "Horace and Iambos: The Poet as Literary Historian." In *Iambic Ideas.* Edited by Alberto Cavarzere, Antonio Aloni, and Alessandro Barchiesi. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 141–64.

———. 2007 "*Carmina*: *Odes* and *Carmen Saeculare*." In *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*. Edited by Stephen Harrison. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 144–161.

Barsby, John. 1982. "Actors and Act-Divisions: Some Questions of Adaptation in Roman Comedy." *Antichthon* 16: 77–87.

———. 2002. "Terence and His Greek Models." In *Due Seminari Plautini: la tradiziones del testo i modelli*. Edited by R. Questa. Urbino: C & Raffaelli, 251–277.

———. 2007. "Native Roman Rhetoric: Plautus and Terence." *Companion to Roman Rhetoric*. Edited by William J. Dominik and Jon Hall. Oxford: Blackwell: 38–53.

Beacham, Richard C. 1991. *The Roman Theatre and its Audience*. New York: Routledge.

Beall, Stephen. 1997. "Translation in Aulus Gellius." *Classical Quarterly* 47: 215–226.

———. 2001. "*Homo Fandi Dulcissimus*: The Role of Favorinus in the 'Attic Nights' of Aulus Gellius." *American Journal of Philology* 122: 87–106.

Beard, Mary. 2003. "The Triumph of the Absurd: Roman Street Theatre." In *Rome: The Cosmopolis*. Edited by Catharine Edwards and G. Woolf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 21–43.

Beare, William B. 1940. "The Life of Terence." *Hermathena* 59: 20–9.

———. 1950. *The Roman Stage: A Short History of Latin Drama in the Time of the Republic*. London: Methuen.
———. 1957. *Latin Verse and European Song: A Study in Accent and Rhythm*. London: Methuen.
———. 1959. "Contaminatio." *Classical Review* 9: 7–11.
Berman, Antoine. 1992. *The Experience of the Foreign: Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany*. SUNY Press.
Bernstein, Frank H. 1998. *Ludi publici: Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung der öffentlichen Spiele im republikanischen Rom*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
Berry, Dominic H. 1996. "The Value of Prose Rhythm in Questions of Authenticity: The Case of *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* Attributed to Cicero." *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 9: 47–74.
Bhabha, Homi. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
Bing, Peter. 1997. "Reconstructing Berenike's Lock." In *Collecting Fragments/Fragmente Sammein. Aporemata 1*. Edited by Glenn W. Most. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 78–94.
Biraud, Michèle. 2008. "Complexité narrative Et structuration du recueil des Erotica Pathémata de Parthénios de Nicée." In *Littérature et érotisme dans Les Passions d'amour de Parthénios de Nicée*. Edited by Arnaud Zucker. Grenoble: Millon, 67–82.
Biville, Frédérique. 2002. "The Graeco-Romans and Graeco-Latin: A Terminological Framework for Cases of Bilingualism." In *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*. Edited by J. N. Adams, M. Janse, and S. Swain. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 77–102
Bloembergen, Marieke. 2006. *Colonial Spectacles: The Netherlands and the Dutch East Indies at the World Exhibitions 1880–1931*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.
Bloomer, W. Martin 1997a. *Latinity and Literary Society at Rome*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
———. 1997b. "Schooling in Persona: Imagination and Subordination in Roman Education." *Classical Antiquity* 16: 57–78.
———. 2011. *The School of Rome: Latin Studies and the Origins of Liberal Education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Bonner, Stanley Frederick. 1977. *Education in Ancient Rome: from the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Booth, Adrian D. 1978. "The Appearance of the Schola Grammatici." *Hermes* 106: 117–125.
Bortolussi, Bernard, and Madeleine Keller, eds. 2009. *Traduire, transposer, transmettre dans l'Antiquité gréco-romaine*. Paris: Picard.
Bostroem, Eric. 1902. *De Vocabulis Graecis apud Plautum*. New York, NY: G.E. Stechert.
Bouffartigue, J. 1979. "Du grec au latin: la traduction latine des Sentences de Sextus." In *Études de littérature ancienne: Homère, Horace, le mythe d'Œdipe, les sentences de Sextus*. Edited by S. Saïd. Paris: Presses de l'école normale supérieure, 81–95.
Boutin, Renaud. 2005. "Quand Démosthène parle latin." In *Façons de parler grec à Rome*. Edited by Emanuelle Valette-Cagnac & Florence Dupont. Paris: Belin, 135–174.
Bowie, E. 1970. "Review of Barbara Levick, Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor." *Journal of Roman Studies* 60: 202–207.
Braund, David, Christopher Gill, and T.P. Wiseman, eds. 2003. *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome: Studies in Honour of T. P. Wiseman*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Bréguet, Esther. 1964. "Les archaïsmes dans le de re publica de Cicéron." *Hommages à J. Bayet*. Edited by M. Renard and R. Schilling. (Collection Latomus 70), 122–131.
Bresciani, Edda. 1989. "La stele trilingue di Cornelio Gallo: una rilettura egittologica." *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 12: 93–8.
Brink, Charles Oscar. 1972. "Ennius and the Hellenistic Worship of Homer." *American Journal of Philology* 4: 547–567.
Brittain, Charles. 2001. *Philo of Larissa: the Last of the Academic Sceptics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Broccia, Giuseppe. 1992. *Prolegomeni all'"Omero latino."* Macerata: Università degli studi di Macerata.
Brock, Sebastian. 1979. "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 20: 69–88.
Brooks, Robert A. 1981. *Ennius and Roman Tragedy*. New York, NY: Arno Press.
Brothers, A.J. 1980. "The Construction of Terence's *Heautontimorumenos*." *Classical Quarterly* 30: 94–119.
Brown, Peter G. McC. 2002. "Actors and Actor-managers at Rome in the Time of Plautus and Terence." In *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession*. Edited by P.E. Easterling and Edith Hall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 225–37.
Cameron, Alan. 1995. *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Campanile, Enrico. 1991 "Limiti e caratteri del bilinguismo romano." In *Il bilinguismo degli Antichi*. Genoa: Università di Genova, 9–23.
Campbell, Dennis. 2011. "Translation Among the Hittites." In *Complicating the History of Western Translation: The Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective*. Edited by Siobhán McElduff and Enrica Sciarrino. Manchester: St. Jerome, 161–175.
Canfora, Luciano. 2006. "Thucydides in Rome and Late Antiquity." In *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*. Edited by Antonios Rengakos & Antonis Tsakmakis. Leiden: Brill, 721–754.
Carey-Webb, Allen. 1998. *Making Subject(s): Literature and the Emergence of National Identity*. New York: Garland Publishing.
Cèbe, J-P. 1960. "Le niveau culturel du public plautinien." *Revue des Études Latines* 38: 101–6.
Çelik, Zeynep & Kinney, Linney. 1990. "Ethnography and Exhibitionism at the Exposition Universelles." *Assemblage* 13: 35–59.
Champlin, Edward. 2003. "Agamemnon at Rome: Roman Dynasts and Greek Heroes." In *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome: Studies in Honour of T.P. Wiseman*. Edited by D. Braund and C. Gill. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 295–319.
Cheyfitz, Edward. 1991. *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from the Tempest to Tarzan*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Cicu, Luciano. 1978. "L'originalità del teatro di Terenzio alla luce della nuova estetica e della politica del circolo Scipionico." *Sandalion* 1: 73–121.
Clark, Christina, A. 2008. "The Poetics of Manhood? Nonverbal Behavior in Catullus 51." *Classical Philology* 103: 257–281.
Clarke, M. L. 1968. "Cicero at School." *Greece & Rome* 15: 18–22.
Classen, C. Joachim. 1968. "Poetry and Rhetoric in Lucretius." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 99: 77–118.
Clausen, Wendell. 1964. "Callimachus and Latin Poetry." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 5: 181–196.
———. 1976. "Virgil and Parthenius." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 80: 179.
———. 1986. "Cicero and the New Poetry." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 90: 159–170.

Clay, Diskin. 2007. "The Sources of Lucretius' Inspiration." In *Lucretius*. Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Edited by Monica Gale. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 18–47.

Clay, Jenny Strauss. 2010. "Horace and Lesbian Lyric." In *A Companion to Horace*. Edited by Gregson Davis. Oxford: Blackwell, 128–146.

Cole, Spencer. 2006. "Cicero, Ennius, and the Concept of Apotheosis at Rome." *Arethusa* 39: 531–548.

Cole, Thomas. 1969. "The Saturnian Verse." *Yale Classical Studies* 19: 3–73.

———. 1991. "In Response to Nevio Zorzetti, 'Poetry and the Ancient City.' " *Classical Journal* 86: 377–9.

Connolly, Joy. 2007a. *The State of Speech: Rhetoric and Political Thought in Ancient Rome*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 2007b "Virile Tongues: Rhetoric and Masculinity." In *Companion to Roman Rhetoric*. Edited by William J. Dominik and Jon Hall. Oxford: Blackwell, 83–97.

Connors, Catherine. 2004. "Monkey Business: Imitation, Authenticity, and Identity from Pithekoussai to Plautus." *Classical Antiquity* 23: 179–207.

Conte, Gian Biagio. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Cooley, Alison, and Andrew Burnett, eds. 2002. *Becoming Roman, Writing Latin? Literacy and Epigraphy in the Roman West*. Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology.

Copeland, Rita. 1989. "The Fortunes of *non verbum pro verbo*: Or Why Jerome Is Not a Ciceronian." In *The Medieval Translator: The Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages*. Edited by R. Ellis. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer: 15–36.

———. 1991. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Copley, Frank O. 1970. "Plautus, *Poenulus* 53–55." *American Journal of Philology* 91: 77–78.

Corbeill, Anthony. 2001. "Education in the Roman Republic: Creating Traditions." In *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Edited by Yun Lee Too. Leiden: Brill, 261–288.

———. 2002. "Rhetorical Education in Cicero's Youth." In *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*. Edited by J. M. May. Leiden: Brill, 23–48.

Costabile, Feliciantonio. 2001 "Le 'Res Gestae' Di Cornelio Gallo Nella Trilingue Di Philae: Nuove Letture e Interpretazioni." *Minima epigraphica et papyrologica* 4: 297–330.

Cribiore, Raffaella. 1996. *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Crowther, N.B. 1976. "Parthenius and Roman Poetry." *Mnemosyne* 29: 65–71.

Cucchiarelli, Andrea. 1999. "Hor. Epist. 1, 19, 28: 'Pede Mascula Sappho'." *Hermes* 127: 328–344.

Cuendet, George. 1933. "Cicéron et Saint Jérôme traducteurs." *Revue des études latine* 11: 380–400.

Damen, Mark L. 1992. "Translating Scenes: Plautus' Adaptation of Menander's *Dis Exapaton*." *Phoenix* 46: 105–31.

D'Angour, Armand. 2006. "Conquering Love: Sappho 31 and Catullus 51." *Classical Quarterly* 56: 297–300.

Davis, Gregson. Ed. 2010. *A Companion to Horace*. Chichester, West Sussex, United Kingdom; Malden, MA: Blackwell.

De Souza, Philip. 1999. *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Degraff, Thelma B. 1940. "Plato in Cicero." *Classical Philology* 35: 143–53.

Derrida, Jacques. 1985. "Les Tours de Babel." In *Difference in Translation*. Edited and translated by J. Graham. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 165–248.

Desbordes, Françoise. 1989. "*Latinitas:* Constitution et évolution d'un modèle de l'identitité linguistique." In *Hellenismos: quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque*. Edited by S. Saïd. Strasbourg: Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg, 33–48.

Dihle, Albrecht. 1955. "Ein Spurium unter den rhetorischen Werken Ciceros." *Hermes* 83: 303–14.

Douglas, A. E. 1962. "Platonis Aemulus." *Greece & Rome* 2nd Series 9: 41–51.

———. 1995. "Form and Content in the Tusculan Disputations." In *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers*. Edited by J.G.F Powell. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 197–218.

Dubuisson, Michel. 1981. "Problèmes du bilinguisme romain." *Les études classiques* 49:27–45.

———. 1982. "Y a-t-il une politique linguistique romaine?" *Ktêma* 7: 187–210.

———. 1985. *Le latin de Polybe: les implications historiques d'un cas de bilinguisme*. Paris: Klincksieck.

———. 1989. "*Non quaerere externa, domesticis esse contentos*: Cicéron et le problème de la 'traduction' du grec en latin." *Ktêma* 14: 201–4.

———. 2000. "Art de la voltige et 'code-switching' (Apulée, *Métamorphoses,* I,1,5–6)." *Latomus* 59: 607–613.

Dufallo, Basil. 2001. "Appius' Indignation: Gossip, Tradition, and Performance in Republican Rome." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 131: 119–142.

———. 2007. *The Ghosts of the Past: Latin Literature, the Dead, and Rome's Transition to a Principate*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

Duckworth, George. 1952. *The Nature of Roman Comedy: A Study in Popular Entertainment.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Dugan, John. 2001. "Preventing Ciceronianism: C. Licinius Calvus' Regimens for Sexual and Oratorical Self-Mastery." *Classical Philology* 96: 400–428.

———. 2005. *Making a New Man: Ciceronian Self-Fashioning in the Rhetorical Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dumont, Jean-Christian. 1984. "Plaute, Barbare et heureux de l'être." *Ktêma* 9: 69–77.

Dupont, Florence, and Emmanuelle Valette-Cagnac. 2005. *Façons de parler grec à Rome*. Paris: Belin.

Edmunds, Lowell. 2001. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Edwards, Catharine. 2003. "Incorporating the Alien: the Art of Conquest." In *Rome The Cosmopolis*. Edited by Catharine Edwards and Greg Woolf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 44–70.

Edwards, John. 1994. *Multilingualism*. New York: Routledge.

Eidinow, J.S.C. 2009. "Horace: Critics, Canons and Canonicity." In *Perceptions of Horace: A Roman Poet and His Readers*. Edited by L.B.T. Houghton and Maria Wyke. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 80–95.

Enos, Richard. 1995. *Roman Rhetoric: Revolution and the Greek Influence*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Erasmi, Gabriele. 1980. "The Saturnian and Livius Andronicus." *Glotta* 58: 125–149.

Erasmo, Mario. 2004. *Roman Tragedy: Theatre to Theatricality*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Ernout, Alfred, and Antoine Meillet. 1959. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots*. Paris: C. Klincksieck.

Faider, Paul. 1909. "Le poète Comique Cécilius." *Le musée belge* 13: 5–35.

Fairweather, Janet. 1981. *Seneca the Elder.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Fantham, Elaine. 1965. "The *Curculio* of Plautus: An Illustration of Plautine Methods in Adaptation." *Classical Quarterly* 15: 84–100.

———. 1968. "Act IV of the *Menaechmi*: Plautus and His Original." *Classical Philology* 63: 175–183.

———. 1977. "Adaptation and Survival: A Genre Study of Roman Comedy in Relation to its Greek Sources." In *Versions of Medieval Comedy*. Edited by P. G. Ruggiers. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press: 19–49.

———. 1978a. "Imitation and Evolution: The Discussion of Rhetorical Imitation in Cicero De Oratore 2.87–97 and Some Related Problems of Ciceronian Theory." *Classical Philology* 73: 1–16.

———. 1978b. "Imitation and Decline: Rhetorical Theory and Practice in the First Century after Christ." *Classical Philology* 73: 102–116.

———. 1981. "The Synchronistic Chapter of Gellius (NA 17.21)." *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 6: 7–17.

———. 1984. "Roman Experience of Menander in the Late Republic and Early Empire." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 114: 299–309.

———. 1993. "The Roman Mime." In *Tria Lustra: Essays and Notes Presented to John Pinsent*. Edited by H.D. Jocelyn and H. Hurt. *Liverpool Classical Monthly*: 255–260.

———. 1996. *Roman Literary Culture: from Cicero to Apuleius*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

———. 2003. "Pacuvius: Melodrama, Reversals and Recognitions." In *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome: Studies in Honour of T.P. Wiseman*. Edited by D. Braund and C. Gill. Exeter: University of Exeter Press: 98–118.

———. 2004. *The Roman World of Cicero's* De Oratore. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Farrell, Joseph. 2001. *Latin Language and Latin Culture: from Ancient to Modern Times*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2008. "Lucretian Architecture: The Structure and Argument of the De Rerum Natura." In *Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*. Edited by Stuart Gillespie and Philip Hardie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 76–91.

Feeney, Denis C. 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. 1993. "Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets." In *Horace 2000: A Celebration. Essays for the Bimillennium*. Edited by Niall Rudd. London: Duckworth, 41–63.

———. 1998. *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts, and Beliefs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2002. "The Odiousness of Comparisons: Horace on Literary History and the Limitations of Synkrisis." In *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry*. Edited by Michael Paschalis. Rethymnon: University of Crete. 7–18.

———. 2009. "Becoming an Authority: Horace on His Own Reception." In *Receptions of Horace*. Edited by L.B.T. Houghton and Maria Wyke. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 16–38.

Feldherr, Andrew. 2007. "The Intellectual Climate." In *A Companion to Catullus*. Edited by Marilyn Skinner. Oxford: Blackwell, 92–110.

Finamore, John F. 1984. "Catullus 50 and 51: Friendship, Love, and 'Otium.'" *Classical World* 78: 11–19.

Fisher, Elizabeth A. 1982. "Greek Translations of Latin Literature in the Fourth Century." *Yale Classical Studies* 27: 173–215.

Fletcher, Kristopher. 2011. "A Handbook for the Translation of Greek Myth into Latin: Parthenius, Gallus, and the Erotica Pathemata." In *Complicating the History of Western Translation: The Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective*. Edited by Siobhán McElduff and Enrica Sciarrino. Manchester: St Jerome, 12–24.

Flower, Harriet. 1995. "*Fabulae Praetextae* in Context: When Were Plays on Contemporary Subjects Performed in Republican Rome?" *Classical Quarterly* 45: 170–190.

Fögen, Thorsten. 2000. *Patrii sermonis egestas: Einstellungen lateinischer Autoren zu ihrer Muttersprache*. Leipzig: K.G. Saur.

———. 2005. "The Transformation of Greek Scientific Knowledge by Roman Technical Writers: On the Translation of Technical Texts in Antiquity." *AKAN* 15: 91–114

Foster, Edith. 2011. "The Political Aims of Lucretius' Translation of Thucydides." In *Complicating the History of Western Translation: The Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective*. Edited by Siobhán McElduff and Enrica Sciarrino. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 88–100.

Fowler, Don. 1989. "Lucretius and Politics." In *Philosophia Togata: Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*. Edited by M. Griffin and J. Barnes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 120–150.

Fox, Matthew. 2000. "Dialogue and Irony in Cicero." In *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations*. Edited by H. Sharrock, A and H. Morales. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 263–286.

Fraenkel, Eduard. 1927. "Die Vorgeschichte Des Versus Quadratus." *Hermes* 62: 357–70.

———. 1951. "Additional Note on the Prose of Ennius." *Eranos* 49: 3–4: 50–56.

———. 1957. *Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2007. *Plautine Elements in Plautus*. Translated by Tomas Drevikovsky and Frances Muecke. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Francese, Christopher. 1999. "Parthenius 'Grammaticus.' " *Mnemosyne* 52: 63–71.

———. 2001. *Parthenius of Nicaea and Roman Poetry*. New York: Peter Lang.

Frank, Richard I. 1968. "Catullus 51: *Otium* versus *Virtus*." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 99: 233–239.

Franko, George Fredric. 1995. "*Fides*, Aetolia, And Plautus' *Captivi*." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 125: 155–76.

———. 1996. "The Characterization of Hanno in Plautus' *Poenulus*." *American Journal of Philology* 117 425–452.

Fraser, P.M. 1970. "Greek-Phoenician Bilingual Inscriptions from Rhodes." *Annual of the British School at Athens* 65: 31–36.

Frassinetti, Paola. 1953. *Fabula Atellana: saggio sul teatro populare latino*. Geneva: Istituto di Filologia classica.

Fredricksmeyer, Ernest A. 1965. "On the Unity of Catullus 51." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 96: 153–163.

Freeman, Philip. 1998. "Saturnian Verse and Early Latin Poetics." *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 26.1–2: 61–90.

Gaisser, Julia Haig, ed. 2007. *Catullus*. Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Gale, Monica. 1994. *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2008. "Lucretius and Previous Poetic Traditions." In *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*. Edited by Stuart Gillespie and Philip Hardie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 59–75.

Gamberale, Leopoldo. 1969. *La Traduzione in Gellio*. Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

Gantar, K. 1986. "Considerazioni sul bilingulismo in Roma antica." *Museum Patavinum* 4: 251–265.

Garnsey, Peter, and Richard P. Saller. 1987. *The Roman Empire: Economy, Society, and Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gehman, Henry Snyder. 1914. *The Interpreters of Foreign Languages among the Ancients*. PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania.

Gelhaus, Hermann. 1972. *Die Prologe des Terenz*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Gentili, Bruno. 1979. *Theatrical Performance in the Ancient World: Hellenistic and Early Roman Theatre*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.

Gerber, Douglas E., ed. 1997. *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*. Leiden: Brill.
Gildenhard, Ingo. 2007. *Paideia Romana: Cicero's Tusculan Disputations*. Cambridge: Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, Supplementary Volume 30.
Gilula, Dwora. 1989a. "The First Realistic Roles in European Theatre: Terence's Prologues." *Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica* 33: 95–106.
———. 1989b. "Greek Drama in Rome: Some Aspects of Cultural Transposition." In *The Play Out of Context: Transferring Plays from Culture to Culture*. Edited by H. Scolnicov and P. Holland. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 99–109.
Gleason, Maud. 1995. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
Glinister, Fay. 2007. "Constructing the Past." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 50: 11–32.
Glinister, Fay, John North, and Clare Woods. 2007. "Introduction: Verrius, Festus and Paul." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 50: 1–9.
Goldberg, Sander M. 1978. "Plautus' Epidicus and the Case of the Missing Original." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 108: 81–91.
———. 1983. "Terence, Cato, and the Rhetorical Prologue." *Classical Philology* 78: 198–211.
———. 1986. *Understanding Terence*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
———. 1993. "Saturnian Epic: Livius and Naevius." In *Roman Epic*. Edited by A. J. Boyle. London: Routledge, 19–36.
———. 1995. *Epic in Republican Rome*. New York: Oxford University Press.
———. 1998. "Plautus on the Palatine." *Journal of Roman Studies* 88: 1–20.
———. 2006. "Ennius After the Banquet." *Arethusa* 39: 427–447.
Gordon, Arthur E. 1968. "Notes on the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*." *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 1: 125–38.
Görler, Woldemar. 1988. "From Athens to Tusculum: Gleaning the Background of Cicero's *De oratore*." *Rhetorica* 6: 215–35.
Gratwick, Adrian S. 1971. "Hanno's Punic Speech in the *Poenulus* of Plautus." *Hermes* 99: 24–45.
———. 1972. "Plautus, *Poenulus* 967–981: Some Notes." *Glotta* 50: 228–233.
———. 1973. "Titus Maccius Plautus." *Classical Quarterly* N.S. 23: 78–84.
Greene, Ellen. 2007. "Catullus and Sappho." In *A Companion to Catulllus*. Edited by M. Skinner. Oxford: Blackwell, 131–150.
Griffin, Miriam. 1989. "Philosophy, Politics, and Politicians at Rome." In *Philosophia Togata: Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*. Edited by M. Griffin and J. Barnes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1–37.
Griffin, Miriam, and Jonathan Barnes, eds. 1989. *Philosophia Togata: Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Grilli, Alberto. 1965. *Studi Enniani*. Brescia: Paideia.
Gruen, Erich S. 1967. "Cicero and Licinius Calvus." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 71: 215–233.
———. 1982. Greek ϖ?στις and Roman *fides*. *Athenaeum* 60, 50–68.
———. 1990. *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy.* Leiden: Brill.
———. 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Guazzoni, Foà Virginia. 1957. "La terminologia filosofica ciceroniana." *Giornale di metafisica* 13: 225–242.
Guite, Harold. 1962. "Cicero's Attitude to the Greeks." *Greece & Rome* 2nd Series 9: 142–159.
Gunderson, Erik. 2000. *Staging Masculinity: The Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
———. 2003. *Declamation, Paternity, and Roman Identity: Authority and the Rhetorical Self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Güven, Suna. 1998. "Displaying the Res Gestae of Augustus: A Monument of Imperial Image for All." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 57: 30–45.

Habinek, Thomas. 1994. "Ideology for an Empire in the Prefaces to Cicero's Dialogues." *Ramus* 23: 55–67.

———. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature. Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 2000. "Seneca's Renown: *Gloria, Claritudo*, and the Replication of the Roman Elite." *Classical Antiquity* 19: 264–303.

———. 2005. *The World of Roman Song: From Ritualized Speech to Social Order*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

———. 2006. "The Wisdom of Ennius." *Arethusa* 39: 471–488.

Halporn, James. 1993. "Roman Comedy and Greek Models." In *Theatre and Society in the Classical World*. Edited by R. Scodel. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 191–213.

Hammond, Moses. 1957. "Composition of the Senate, A.D. 68–235." *Journal of Roman Studies* 47: 74–81.

Handley, Eric W. 1968. *Menander and Plautus: A Study in Comparison*. London: University College London.

———. 1975. "Plautus and his Public: Some Thoughts on New Comedy in Latin." *Dioniso* 46: 117–132.

Hardie, William Ross. 1920. *Res Metrica*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hardin, Justin K. 2008. *Galatians and the Imperial Cult: a Critical Analysis of the First-century Social Context of Paul's Letter.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Harrison, Stephen. 2001. "Some Generic Problems in Horace's Epodes." In *Iambic Ideas*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 165–187.

———. 2002. "Ennius and the Prologue to Lucretius *DRN* 1 (1.1–148)." *Leeds International Classical Studies* 1: 1–13.

Harrison, Stephen, ed. 2007. *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hauben, Hans. 1976. "On the Gallus Inscription at Philae." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 22: 189–190.

Henderson, John. 1994. "Hanno's Punic Heirs: Der Poenulusneid des Plautus." *Ramus* 23.1–2: 24–54.

———. 1999. *Writing Down Rome: Satire, Comedy, and Other Offences in Latin Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hendrickson, G.L. 1901. "Cicero's Judgment of Lucretius." *American Journal of Philology* 22: 438–9.

———. 1906. "Literary Sources in Cicero's *Brutus* and the Technique of Citation in Dialogue." *American Journal of Philology* 27: 184–99.

———. 1926a. "Cicero *de Optimo Genere Oratorum*." *American Journal of Philology* 47: 109–23

———. 1926b. "Cicero's Correspondence with Brutus and Calvus on Oratorical Style." *American Journal of Philology* 47: 234–258.

Henrichs, Albert. 1995. "Graecia Capta: Roman Views of Greek Culture." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 97: 243–261.

Hermann, Alfred. 1956. "Dolmetschen im Altertum. Ein Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte." In *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Dolmetschens*. Edited by K. Theime. Munich: Isar Verlag: 25–29.

Hermans, Theo. 1985. "Introduction: Translation Studies and a New Paradigm." In *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. Edited by T. Hermans. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 7–15.

———, ed. 2002a. *Crosscultural Transgressions: Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

———. 2002b. "Paradoxes and Aporias in Translation and Translation Studies." In *Translation Studies: Perspectives on an Emerging Discipline*. Edited by Alessandra Riccardi. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 10–23.

Heurgon, Jacques. 1976. "L'agronome carthaginois Magon, et ses traducteurs en latin et en grec." *Scripta Varia* (*Latomus* 191). Brussels: Revue d'etudes latines: 139–155.

Hinds, Stephen. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Holford-Strevens, Leofranc. 1993. "Utraque Lingua Doctus: Some Notes on Bilingualism in the Roman Empire." In *Tria Lustra: Essays and Notes Presented to John Pinsent*. Edited by H. D. Jocelyn and H. Hurt. *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, 203–213.

———. 2003. *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement* (revised edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holford-Strevens, Leofranc,and Amiel Vardi, Eds. 2004. *Bilingualism and Biculturalism in Antonine Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hölkeskamp, Karl J. 2000. "*Fides—deditio in Fidem—dextra data et accepta*. Recht, Religion und Ritual in Rom." *The Roman Middle Republic: Politics, Religion, and Historiography C. 400–133 B.C.* Christer Bruun, ed. Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, 223–250.

Holmes, James. 1988. *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Horbury, William, and David Noy. 1992. *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt: With an Index of the Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt and Cyrenaica*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horrocks, Geoffrey C. 1997. *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers.* London: John Wiley and Sons.

Horsfall, Nicholas. 1976. "The Collegium Poetarum." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies 23*: 79–95.

———. 1979. "Doctus Sermones Utriusque Linguae." *Echos du monde classique* 22: 79–95.

Hose, Martin. 1999. "Post-Colonial Theory and Greek Literature in Rome." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 40: 303–326.

Hough, John N. 1934. "The Use of Greek Words by Plautus." *American Journal of Philosophy* 55: 346–364.

———. 1940. "Miscellanea Plautina: Vulgarity, Extra-Dramatic Speeches, Roman Allusions." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 71: 195–97.

———. 1947. "Terence's Use of Greek Words." *Classical Weekly* 41: 18–21.

How, W.W. 1930. "Cicero's Ideal in His *de Republica*." *Journal of Roman Studies* 20: 22–42.

Howe, Herbert M. 1951. "Amafinius, Lucretius, and Cicero." *American Journal of Philology* 72: 57–62.

Hunter, R.L. 1985. *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1993. "Callimachean Echoes in Catullus 65." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 96: 179–182.

Hutchinson, Gregory O. 2001. "The Date of *De Rerum Natura*." *Classical Quarterly* 51: 150–162.

———. 2007. "Horace and Archaic Greek Poetry." *Cambridge Companion to Horace*. Edited by Stephen Harrison. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 36–49.

Inwood, Brad. 1995. "Seneca in His Philosophical Milieu." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 97: 63–76.

Janson, Tore. 1964. *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions*. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell.

Jensen, Richard C. 1967. "*Otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est*." *Classical Journal* 62: 363–365.

Jocelyn, H.D. 1969a. "Imperator Histricus." *Yale Classical Studies* 21: 97–121.

———. 1969b. "The Poet Cn. Naevius, P. Cornelius Scipio and Q. Caecilius Metellus." *Antichthon* 3: 32–47.

———. 1973. "Greek Poetry in Cicero's Prose Writing." *Yale Classical Studies* 23: 61–111.

———. 1995. "Horace and the Reputation of Plautus in the Late First Century BC." In *Homage to Horace: A Bimillenary Celebration*. Edited by S. J. Harrison. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 228–247.

———. 1999. "Code-Switching in the Comoedia Palliata." In *Rezeption und Identität*. Edited by G. Vogt-Spira and B. Rommel. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 169–95.

Johnson, Walter R. 1971. *Luxuriance and Economy: Cicero and the Alien Style*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Johnson, William A. 2010. *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jones, Arnold Hugh Martin. 1960a. "The Aerarium and the Fiscus." In *Studies in Roman Government and Law*. Oxford: Blackwell, 99–114.

———. 1960b. "The Roman Civil Service (Clerical and Sub-Clerical Grades)." In *Studies in Roman Government and Law*. Oxford: Blackwell, 153–173.

Jones, D.M. 1959. "Cicero as a Translator." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 6: 22–33.

Jones, William. 1771. *A Grammar of the Persian Language*. London: W. & J. Richardson.

Judge, E.A. 2008. *The First Christians in the Roman World: Augustan and New Testament Essays*. Edited by James R. Harrison. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Kaimio, Jorma. 1979. *The Romans and the Greek Language*. Helsinki: Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum.

Kaizer, Ted. 2002. *The Religious life of Palmyra: a Study of the Social Patterns of Worship in the Roman Period*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Kajanto, Iiro. 1963. *A Study of the Greek Epitaphs of Rome*. Helsinki: Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 2.

Kaster, Robert Andrew. 1997. *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Latin Antiquity*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Katsouris, Andreas G. 1977. "Plautus *Epidicus* = Menander's *Homopatrioi*?" *Latomus* 36: 316–24.

Kearsley, Rosalinde, and Trevor V. Evans, eds. 2001. *Greeks and Romans in Imperial Asia: Mixed Language Inscriptions and Linguistic Evidence for Cultural Interaction Until the End of AD III*. Bonn: R. Habelt.

Kelly, Louis Gerard. 1979. *The True Interpreter: A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kenney, E.J. 1982. "Books and Readers in the Roman World." In *The Cambridge History of Ancient Literature II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3–32.

———. 2007. "The Texture of the *De Rerum Natura*." In *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*. Edited by Stuart Gillespie and Philip Hardie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 92–110.

Ker, James. 2004. "Nocturnal Writers in Imperial Rome: The Culture of *Lucubratio*." *Classical Philology* 99: 209–242.

Keulen, Wytse. 2009. *Gellius the Satirist: Roman Cultural Authority in the Attic Nights*. Leiden: Brill.

King, Donald B. 1952. "The Greek Translation of Augustus' *Res Gestae*." *Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters* 41: 219–28.

King, Joy K. 1988. "Catullus' Callimachean *Carmina*, cc. 65–116." *Classical World* 81: 383–392.

Kirby, John T. 1997. "Ciceronian Rhetoric: Theory and Practice." In *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. Edited by William J. Dominik. London: Routledge, 13–31.

Knapp, Charles. 1919. "References in Plautus and Terence to Plays, Players and Playwrights." *Classical Philology* 14: 33–55.

Knox, Peter E. 1984 "Sappho, fr. 31 LP and Catullus 51: A Suggestion." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 17: 97–102.

Kolnik, T. 1978. "Q. Atilius Primus—Interprex Centurio und Negotiator." *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* xxx: 61–75

Kraan, Guus van der. 2001. "Juvenal I, 3, 10–20: The Location of Egeria's Abode." *Mnemosyne* 54.4 (2001): 472–475.

Kristmannsson, Gauti. 2005. *Literary Diplomacy, Volumes I & II*. Berlin: Peter Lang.

Krostenko, Brian A. 2001. *Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kurz, Ingrid. 1986. "Dolmetschen im alten Rom." *Babel* 32: 215–220.

Kuttner, Ann L. 1999. "Culture and History at Pompey's Museum." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 129: 343–373.

Kytzler, Bernhard. 1989. "*Fidus Interpres*: The Theory and Practice of Translation in Classical Antiquity." *Antichthon* 23: 42–50.

Lada-Richards, Ismene. 2004. "Authorial Voice and Theatrical Self-Definition in Terence and Beyond: The Hecyra Prologues in Ancient and Modern Contexts." *Greece & Rome* 51: 55–82.

Laidlaw, William Allison. 1938. *The Prosody of Terence: A Relational Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lambardi, Noemi. 1982. *Il Timaeus ciceroniano: Arte e tecnica del vertere*. Florence: Felice Le Monnier.

Larson, Jennifer. 2011. "Bilingual Inscriptions and Translation in the Ancient Mediterranean World." In *Complicating the History of Western Translation: The Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective*. Edited by Siobhán McElduff and Enrica Sciarrino. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 50–61.

Lattimore, Richmond. 1944. "Sappho 2 and Catullus 51." *Classical Philology* 39: 184–187.

Laughton, Eric. 1961. "Cicero and the Greek Orators." *American Journal of Philology* 82: 27–49.

Leeman, Anton D. 1963. *Orationis Ratio: The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians and Philosophers*. Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert.

———. 1983. "L'Hyperbole et l'ironie chez les Romains en tant que mécanismes de défense et d'assimilation a l'égard de la culture grecque." In *Hommages à Robert Schilling*. Edited by H. Zehnacker and G. Hentz. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 347–55.

Lefevere, André. 1992. *Translating, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge.

———. 1998. "Translation Practice(s) and the Circulation of Cultural Capital: Some *Aeneid*s in English." In *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Edited by André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 41–56.

Lefèvre, Eckard. 1985. "Handlungsgliederung in Nea und Palliata: Dis exapaton und Bacchides." *Gnomon* 57: 693–698.

———. 2006. *Plautu*s *Rudens*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Lefèvre, Eckard, Ekkehard Stärk, and Gregor Vogt-Spira, eds. 1991. *Plautus barbarus: sechs Kapitel zur Originalität des Plautus*. Tübingen: G. Narr.

Leigh, Matthew. 2000. "Primitivism and Power: The Beginnings of Latin Literature." In *Literature and the Roman World*. Edited by O. Taplin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 4–36.

———. 2004. *Comedy and the Rise of Rome*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
Leiwo, Martti. 2002. "From Contact to Mixture: Bilingual Inscriptions from Italy." In *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*. Edited by J. N. Adams, Mark Janse, and Simon Swain. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 168–194.
Lennartz, Klaus. 1994. *Non verba sed vim: Kritisch-exegetische Untersuchungen zu den Fragmenten archaischer römischer Tragiker*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
Leo, Friedrich. 1912. *Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie*. 2nd ed. Berlin: Weidmannn.
Levine, Philip. 1958. "Cicero and the Literary Dialogue." *Classical Journal* 53: 146–151.
Lévy, Carlos. 2003. "Cicero and the Timaeus." In *Plato's Timaeus as Cultural Icon*. Edited by G. J. Reydams-Schils. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 95–111.
Lewis, Naphtali. 1986. "The Process of Promulgation in Rome's Eastern Provinces." In *Studies in Roman Law in Memory of A. Arthur Schiller*. Edited by W. V. Harris and R. S. Bagnall. Leiden: Brill: 127–139.
Lianeri, Alexandra, and Vanda Zajko, eds. 2008. *Translation and the Classic: Identity As Change in the History of Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Lightfoot, J.L. 1999. *Parthenius of Nicaea: The Poetical Fragments and the Erotica Pathemata*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Lindsay, Wallace Martin. 1968. *Early Latin Verse*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Littlewood, A.R. 1968. "The Symbolism of the Apple in Greek and Roman Literature." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 72: 147–181.
Lockwood, Dean P. 1918. "Two Thousand Years of Latin Translation from the Greek." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 49: 115–129.
Long, Anthony A. 1995. "Cicero's Plato and Aristotle." In *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers*. J.G.F. Powell, ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 37–61.
Lowe, J.C.B. 1983. "Terentian Originality in the *Phormio* and *Hecyra*." *Hermes* 111: 431–452.
———. 1988. "Plautus *Poenulus* I 2." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies:* 35: 101–10.
———. 1992. "Aspects of Plautus' Originality in the *Asinaria*." *Classical Quarterly* 42: 152–75.
———. 1999. "L'Asinaria e il suo modello greco." in *Lecturae Plautinae Sarsinates II* Asinaria. Renato Raffaelli & Alba Tontini, Eds. Urbino: QuattroVenti, 13–24.
Lowe, N.J. 2008. *Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lowrie, Michèle. 1995. "A Parade of Lyric Predecessors: Horace C.1.12–1.18." *Phoenix* 49: 33–48.
———. 2002. "Horace, Cicero and Augustus or the Poet Statesman at *Epistles* 2.1.256." In *Traditions and Context in the Poetry of Horace*. Edited by Thomas Woodman and Denis Feeney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 158–171.
Luce, Torrey James. 1990. "Livy, Augustus, and the Forum Augustum." In *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate*. Edited by Kurt A. Raaflaub and Mark Toher. Berkeley: University of California Press, 123–138.
Ludwig, Walther. 1968. "The Originality of Terence and His Greek Models." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 9: 169–182.
Luiselli, Bruno. 1967. *Il Verso Saturnio*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
MacMullen, Ramsay. 1966. "Provincial Languages in the Roman Empire." *American Journal of Philology* 87: 1–17.
———. 1991. "Hellenizing the Romans (2nd Century B.C.)." *Historia* 40.4: 419–438.

———. 1993. “The Unromanized in Rome.” In *Diasporas in Antiquity.* Edited by Shaye J.D. Cohen and E.S. Frerichs. 47–64. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 47–64.

Mairs, Rachel. 2011. “Translator, Traditor: The Interpreter as Traitor in Classical Tradition.” *Greece & Rome* 58: 64–81.

Maltby, Robert. 1985. “The Distribution of Greek Loan-Words in Terence.” *Classical Quarterly* 35: 110–123.

———. 1991. *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. Leeds: Francis Cairns.

Mankin, David. 2010. “The Epodes: Genre, Theme and Arrangement.” *A Companion to Horace*. Edited by Gregson Davis. Oxford: Blackwell, 93–104.

Manuwald, Gesine. 2011. *Roman Republican Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mariotti, Scaevola. 1952. *Livio Andronico e la traduzione artistica.* Milan: Pubblicazione dell’Università di Urbino.

———. 1955. *Il Bellum Poenicum e l’arte di Nevio*. Rome: Angelo Signorelli.

———. 1991. *Lezioni su Ennio*. Urbino: QuattroVenti.

Markoviæ, Daniel. 2008. *The Rhetoric of Explanation in Lucretius’ De Rerum Natura*. Leiden: Brill.

Marmorale, Enzo V. 1950. *Naevius Poeta*. Florence: La Nuova Italia.

Marrou. Henri Irénée. 1956. *A History of Education in Antiquity.* Translated by G. Lamb. New York, NY: Sheed and Ward.

Marshall, Anthony J. 1976. “Library Resources and Creative Writing at Rome.” *Phoenix* 30: 252–264.

Marshall, Christopher W. 2006. *The Stagecraft and Performance of Roman Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mason, Hugh J. 1970. “The Roman Government in Greek Sources: The Effect of Literary Theory on the Translation of Official Titles.” *Phoenix* 24: 150–59.

———. 1974. *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions: a Lexicon and Analysis.* Toronto: Hakkert.

Mattingly, Harold B. 1960. “Naevius and the Metelli.” *Historia* 9: 414–439.

———. 1993. “L. Porcius Licinius and the Beginnings of Latin Poetry.” In *Tria Lustra: Essays and Notes Presented to John Pinsent.* Edited by H.D. Jocelyn and H. Hurt. Liverpool: *Liverpool Classical Monthly,* 163–168.

Mayer, Roland G. 1999. “Grecism.” In *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry.* Edited by J. N. Adams and R.G. Mayer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 157–182.

McElduff, Siobhán. 2004. “More than Menander’s Acolyte: Terence as Translator.” *Ramus* 33: 120–9.

———. Forthcoming. “*Noster Plato:* Making Plato Roman in Cicero’s *De republica* and *De legibus.*” In *Plato Inspirations.* Edited by Mark Beck and J. Opsomer. University of Leuven Press.

McElduff, Siobhán, and Enrica Sciarinno. 2011. *Complicating the History of Western Translation: The Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective.* Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

McGill, Scott. 2005. “Seneca the Elder on Plagiarizing Cicero’s *Verrines*.” *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 23: 337–346.

———. 2010. “Plagiarism or Imitation? The Case of Abronius Silo in Seneca the Elder’s *Suasoriae* 2.19–20.” *Arethusa* 43: 113–131.

Meillet, Antoine. 1928. *Esquisse d’une histoire de la langue latine.* Paris: Librairie Hachette.

Meuwese, Alphonsus Petrus Maria. 1920. *De rerum gestarum divi Augusti versione graeca.* Amsterdam: C.N. Teulings.

———. 1926. “De versione graeca Monumenti Ancyrani quaestiones.” *Mnemosyne* 54: 224–33.

Millar, Fergus. 1964. “The Aerarium and Its Officials under the Empire.” *Journal of Roman Studies* 54: 33–40.

———. 1968. "Local Cultures in the Roman Empire: Libyan, Punic and Latin in Roman Africa." *Journal of Roman Studies* 78: 126–134.

———. 1992. *The Emperor in the Roman World, 31 BC-AD 337*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Miller, Paul Allen. 1993. "Sappho 31 and Catullus 51: The Dialogism of Lyric." *Arethusa* 26: 183–99.

———. 1998. "Catullan Consciousness, the 'Care of the Self,' and the Force of the Negative in History." In *Rethinking Sexuality: Foucault and Classical Antiquity.* Edited by David Larmour, Paul Allen Miller, and C. Platter. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 171–203.

Mitchell, Timothy. 1989. "The World as Exhibition." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 31: 217–236.

Moatti, Claudia. 1997. *La Raison de Rome: Naissance de l'esprit critique à la fin de la République*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. 1971. *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1984. *Settimo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*. Rome: Storia e Letteratura 161.

Moore, Clifford H. 1924. "Latin Exercises from a Greek Schoolroom." *Classical Philology* 19: 317–328.

Moore, Timothy J. 1998. *The Theater of Plautus: Playing to the Audience*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Morgan, Teresa. 1998. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Most, Glenn W. 2003. "Violets in Crucibles: Translating, Traducing, Transmuting." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 133: 381–390.

Munday, Jeremy. 2001. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. London: Routledge.

Murley, Clyde. 1928. "Cicero's Attitude toward Lucretius." *Classical Philology* 23: 289–291.

Murphy, Trevor. 1998. "Cicero's First Readers: Epistolary Evidence for the Dissemination of His Works." *Classical Quarterly* 48: 492–505.

Myers, Micah Young. 2008. *The Frontiers of the Empire and the Edges of the World in the Augustan Poetic Imaginary.* PhD diss., Stanford University.

Narducci, Emanuele. 2002a. "Brutus: The History of Roman Eloquence." In *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*. Leiden: Brill, 401–425.

———. 2002b. "Orator and the Definition of the Ideal Orator." In *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*. Leiden: Brill, 427–444.

Naumann, Heinrich. 1979. "Lücken und Einfügungen in den Dichter-Viten Suetons." *Weiner Studien* 92: 151–65.

Nettleship, Henry. 1883. "The *Noctes Atticae* of Aulus Gellius." *American Journal of Philology* 4: 391–415.

Nicolas, Christian. 1996. *Utraque lingua: Le calque sémantique: domaine gréco-latin*. Peeters: Louvain.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. 2001. *The Gay Science*. Translated by J. Nauckhoff, and edited by B. Williams. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Niranjana, Tejaswini. 1992. *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Noy, David. 2000. *Foreigners at Rome: Citizens and Strangers*. London: Duckworth.

Obbink, Dirk. 2008. "Lucretius and the Herculaneum Library." In *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*. Edited by Stuart Gillespie and Philip Hardie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 33–40.

O'Bryhim, Shawn. 1989. "The Originality of Plautus' *Casina*." *American Journal of Philology* 110: 81–103.

———. 2001. *Greek and Roman Comedy: Translations and Interpretations of Four Representative Plays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

O'Sullivan, Neil. 1997. "Caecilius, the 'Canons' of Writers, and the Origins of Atticism." *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. Edited by William J. Dominik. London: Routledge, 32–49.

Oliensis, Ellen. 1998. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Owens, William M. 1994. "The Third Deception in *Bacchides*: *Fides* and Plautus' Originality." *American Journal of Philology* 115: 381–407.

Papaioannou, Sophia. 2011. "The Translation Politics of a Political Translations: the Case of Augustus' *Res gestae*." In *Complicating the History of Western Translation: the Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective*. Edited by Siobhán McElduff and Enrica Sciarrino. Manchester, St. Jerome, 62–74.

Park, Tim. 2012. "The Mysteries of the Meta-Task." *Iowa Review Forum on Literature*. http://iowareview.uiowa.edu/?q=page/mysteries_of_the_metatask&page=0,0"http://iowareview.uiowa.edu/?q=page/mysteries_of_the_metatask&page=0,0.

Parker, Holt. 1996. "Plautus vs. Terence: Audience and Popularity Re-examined." *American Journal of Philology* 117: 585–619.

Parsons, Jed. 1999. "A New Approach to the Saturnian Verse and Its Relation to Latin Prosody." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 129: 117–137.

Paschalis, Michael, and Michael C. J. Putnam, eds. 2002. *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry*. Rethymnon: University of Crete, Dept. of Philology.

Peponi, Anastasia-Erasmia. 2002. "Fantasizing Lyric: Horace, Epistles 1.19." In *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry.* Edited by Michael Paschalis and Michael C. J Putnam. Rethymnon: University of Crete, 19–45.

Peretz, Daniel. 2006. "The Roman Interpreter and His Diplomatic and Military Roles." *Historia* 55: 451–470.

Phillips, C. Roberts, III. 1991. "In Response to Nevio Zorzetti, 'Poetry and the Ancient City: The Case of Rome.'" *Classical Journal* 86: 382–389.

Poncelet, Roland. 1953. *Cicéron traducteur de Platon*. Paris: E. De Boccard.

Porter-Packer, Mary N. 1938. *Cicero's Presentation of Epicurean Ethics: A Study Based Primarily on De finibus I and II*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Possanza, D. Mark. 2004. *Translating the Heavens: Aratus, Germanicus, and the Poetics of Latin Translation*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Powell, J.G.F. 1995a. "Cicero's Translations from Greek." In *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers*. Edited by J.G.F. Powell. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 273–300.

———. 1995b. "Introduction: Cicero's Philosophical Works and their Background." In *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers*. Edited by J.G.F. Powell. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1–35.

———. 1996. "Review of Cicero, De Re Publica. Selections by J.E.G. Zetzel." *Classical Review* 46: 247–250.

Powell, J.G.F., and John A. North, eds. 2001. *Cicero's Republic*. London: Institute of Classical Studies.

Prunč, Erich. 2003. "Priests, Princes and Pariahs: Constructing the Professional Field of Translation." In *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Edited by Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 39–58.

Puelma, Mario. 1980. "Cicero als Platon-Übersetzer." *Museum Helveticum* 37: 137–178.

Putnam, Michael C. J. 2006. *Poetic Interplay: Catullus and Horace*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Pym, Anthony. 1995. "Translation as a Transaction Cost." *Meta* 40: 594–605.

Raggi, Andrea. 2001. "Senatus consultum de Asclepiade Clazomenio sociisque." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 135: 73–116.

Ramage, Edwin S. 1987. *The Nature and Purpose of Augustus*' Res Gestae. Stuttgart: *Historia* 54.
Ramsay, William Mitchell. 1922. "Studies in the Roman Province Galatia." *Journal of Roman Studies* 12: 147–186.
Rawson, Elizabeth. 1985. *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
———. 1991. "The Interpretation of Cicero's *De legibus*." In *Roman Culture and Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 125–148.
Regard, P.F. 1924. "La version grecque du monument d'Ancyre." *Revue des Études Anciennes* 26: 147–61.
Reiff, Arno. 1959. *Interpretatio, imitatio, aemulatio: Begriff und Vorstellung literarischer Abhängigkeit bei den Römern*. Diss. Cologne.
Rener, Frederick M. 1989. *Interpretatio: Language and Translation from Cicero to Tytler*. Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
Richlin, Amy. 1997. "Gender and Rhetoric: Producing Manhood in the Schools." I*n Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. Edited by William J. Dominik. London: Routledge, 90–110.
Richter, Hans E. 1938. *Uebersetzen und uebersetzungen in der römischen literatur*. Coburg: Tageblatt-haus.
Rimmel, Victoria. 2007. "Petronius' Lessons in Learning–The Hard Way." In *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire*. Edited by Jason König and Tim Whitmarsh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 108–132.
Robinson, David. 1926. "The Res Gestae Divi Augusti as Recorded on the Monumentum Antiochenum." *American Journal of Philology* 47: 1–54.
Robinson, Douglas. 1991b. "Classical Lessons for Modern Students: Cicero, Horace, Aulus Gellius, and the Training of the Translator." In *Horizons: Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Conference of the American Translators Association*. Edited by A. L. Wilson. Medford, NJ: Learned Information, 255–268.
———. 1992a. "Classical Theories of Translation from Cicero to Aulus Gellius." *TextconText* 7: 15–55.
———. 1992b. "The Ascetic Foundations of Western Translatology: Jerome and Augustine." *Translation and Literature* 1: 3–25.
Rochette, Bruno. 1990. "Les traductions grecques de l'Enéide sur papyrus." *Les Études classiques* 58: 333–46.
———. 1996. "Fidi interpretes. La traduction orale à Rome." *Ancient Society* 37: 75–89.
———. 1997a "Sur le bilinguisme dans les armées d'Hannibal." *Les Études classiques* 65: 153–9.
———. 1997b. *Le Latin dans le Monde Grec: recherches sur la diffusion de la lange et des lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l'Empire romaine*. Brussels: Collection Latomus.
———. 2011. "Language Policies in the Roman Republic and Empire." In *Blackwell Companion to the History of the Latin Language*. Edited and translated by James Clackson. New York: Blackwell, 549–563.
Ronconi, Alessandro. 1973. *Interpreti latini di Omero*. Turin: Bottega d'Erasmo.
Ross, David O. 1975. *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rowe, Greg. 2002. *Princes and Political Cultures: The New Tiberian Senatorial Decrees*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Ruch, M. 1958. "Nationalisme culturel et culture internationale dans la pensée de Cicéron." *Revue des études latines* 36:187–204.
Russell, D.A. 1979. "De Imitatione." In *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*. Edited by D. West and T. Woodman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–16.

Rust, Eleanor. 2009. “Ex angulis secretisque librorum: Reading, Writing, and Using Miscellaneous Knowledge in the Noctes Atticae.” PhD diss., University of Southern California.

Santirocco, Matthew S. 1986. *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Saunders, Catharine. 1994. “The Nature of Rome's Early Appraisal of Greek Culture.” *Classical Philology* 39: 209–217.

Schneider, Thomas. 2011 “Three Histories of Translation: Translating in Egypt, Translating Egypt, Translating in Egyptian.” In *Complicating the History of Western Translation: The Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective*. Edited by Siobhán McElduff and Enrica Sciarrino. Manchester: St. Jerome, 2011, 176–188.

Schmidt, Peter L. 1978. “Cicero's Place in Roman Philosophy: A Study of His Prefaces.” *Classical Journal* 74: 115–127.

Sciarrino, Enrica. 2004. “A Temple for the Professional Muse: The Aedes Herculis Musarum and Cultural Shifts in Second-Century B.C. Rome.” *Rituals in Ink*. Edited by A. Barchiesi, J. Rüpke, and S. Stephens. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 45–56.

———. 2006. “The Introduction of Epic in Rome: Cultural Thefts and Social Contests.” *Arethusa* 39: 449–469.

———. 2011. *Cato the Censor and the Beginnings of Latin Prose: From Poetic Translation to Elite Transcription*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

Scodel, Ruth, ed. 1993. *Theater and Society in the Classical World*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Seaman, William M. 1954. “The Understanding of Greek by Plautus' Audience.” *Classical Journal* 50: 115–119.

Sedley, David. 1997. “The Ethics of Brutus and Cassius.” *Journal of Roman Studies* 87: 41–53.

———. 1998. *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1999. “Lucretius' Use and Avoidance of Greek.” In *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*. Edited by J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 227–246.

Seele, Astrid. 1995. *Römische Übersetzer, Nöte, Freiheiten, Absichten: Verfahren des literarischen Übersetzens in der griechisch-römischen Antike*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Segal, Charles. 1970. “Catullan ‘Otiosi’: The Lover and the Poet.” *Greece & Rome* 17: 25–31.

Segal, Erich. 1968. *Roman Laughter: The Comedy of Plautus*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1969. “The Menaechmi: Roman Comedy of Errors.” *Yale Classical Studies* 21: 77–93.

Shipp, G. B. 1953. “Greek in Plautus.” *Wiener Studien* 66: 105–112.

Shipton, K.M.W. 1980. “Catullus 51: Just Another Love Poem?” *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 5: 73–6.

Sihler, E. G. 1897. “Lucretius and Cicero.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 28: 42–54.

Siméoni, Daniel. 1998. “The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus.” *Target* 10: 1–39.

Skinner, Marilyn B. 1997. “*Ego Mulier*: The Construction of Male Sexuality in Catullus.” In *Roman Sexualities*. Edited by Judith Hallett and Marilyn Skinner. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press: 129–50.

———. 2003. *Catullus in Verona: A Reading of the Elegaic Libellus, Poems 65–116*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

———, ed. 2007a. *A Companion to Catullus*. Oxford: Blackwell.

———. 2007b. "Authorial Arrangement of the Collection: Debate Past and Present." In Skinner 2007a. 35–53.
Slater, Niall W. 1992a. "Plautine Negotiations: The Poenulus Prologue Unpacked." *Yale Classical Studies* 29: 131–46.
———. 1992b. "Two Republican Poets on Drama: Terence and Accius." In *Antike Dramentheorien und ihre Rezeption*. Edited by B. Zimmermann. Stuttgart: M & P Verl. für Wissenschaft und Forschung, 85–106.
Smethurst, S. E. 1953. "Cicero and Isocrates." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 84: 262–320.
Small, Jocelyn Penny. 1997. *Wax Tablets of the Mind: Cognitive Studies of Memory and Literacy in Classical Antiquity*. London and New York: Routledge.
Smith, Warren S., Jr. 1984. "Horace Directs a Carouse: *Epistle* 1.19." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 114: 255–271.
Spencer, Diana. 2011. "Horace and the Con/straints of Translation." In *Complicating the History of Western Translation: The Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective*. Edited by Siobhán McElduff and Enrica Sciarrino. Manchester: St. Jerome: 101–116.
Stärk, Ekkehard. 1989. *Die Menaechmi des Plautus und kein griechisches Original*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
Steel, Catherine E. W. 2003. "Cicero's *Brutus*: The End of Oratory and the Beginning of History?" *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 46: 195–211.
Steele, R. B. 1900. "The Greek in Cicero's Epistles." *American Journal of Philology* 21: 387–410.
Steiner, George. 1975. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Stevens, Benjamin. 2006. "Aeolism: Latin as a Dialect of Greek." *Classical Journal* 102: 115–144.
Striker, Gisela. 1995. "Cicero and Greek Philosophy." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 97: 53–61.
Stronk, Jan. 2011. "Herodotus and Ctesias: Translators of the Oriental Past." In *Complicating the History of Western Translation: The Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective*. Edited by Siobhán McElduff and Enrica Sciarrino. Manchester: St. Jerome: 101–116.
Stroup, Sarah Culpepper. 2010. *Catullus, Cicero, and a Society of Patrons: The Generation of the Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Suerbaum, Werner. 1968. *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
———. 1992. "Zum Umfang der Bücher in der archaischen lateinischen Dichtung: Naevius, Ennius, Lukrez und Livius Andronicus auf Papyrus-Rollen." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 92: 53–173.
Sussman, Lewis A. 1978. *The Elder Seneca*. Leiden: Brill.
Swain, Simon. 2002. "Bilingualism in Cicero?: The Evidence of Code-Switching." In *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Word*. Edited by J. N. Adams, M. Janse, and S. Swain. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 128–67.
———. 2004. "Bilingualism and Biculturalism in Antonine Rome: Apuleius, Fronto, and Gellius." In *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*. Edited by Leofranc Holford-Strevens and Amiel Vardi. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 3–40.
Tahir- Gürçaĝlar, & Şehnaz. 2002. "What Texts Don't Tell: The Uses of Paratexts in Translation Research." In *Crosscultural Transgressions: Research Models in Translation Studies II. Historical and Ideological Studies*. Edited by T. Hermans. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing: 44–60.
Tarrant, Harold. 1985. *Scepticism or Platonism?: The Philosophy of the Fourth Academy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 2006. "Platonic Interpretation and Eclectic Theory." In *Reading Plato in Antiquity*. Edited by H Tarrant and D. Baltzly. London: Duckworth, 9–18.

Tarrant, Harold, and Dirk Baltzly, eds. 2006. *Reading Plato in Antiquity.* London: Duckworth.

Tarrant, Richard. 2007. "Horace and Roman Literary History." In *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*. Edited by Stephen Harrison. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 63–76.

Tatum, W. Jeffrey. 1984. "The Presocratics in Book One of Lucretius' De Rerum Natura." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 11: 177–189.

———. 1997. "Friendship, Politics, and Literature in Catullus: Poems 1, 65 and 66, 116." *Classical Quarterly* 47: 482–500.

Taylor. Daniel J. 1987. "History of Language Science in Antiquity." In *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period.* Edited by D. J. Taylor. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company: 1–16.

Taylor, L. R. 1937. "The Opportunities for Dramatic Performance in the Time of Plautus and Terence." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 68: 284–304.

Tenney, Frank. 1933. "On the Dates of Plautus' Casina and its Revival." *American Journal of Philology* 54: 368–72.

Thonemann, Peter. 2012. "A Copy of Augustus' *Res Gestae* at Sardis." Historia 61: 282–288.

Thorsrud, Harald. 2002. "Cicero on His Academic Predecessors: The Fallibilism of Arcesilaus and Carneades." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 40: 1–18.

Todd, O. J. 1940. "Servius on the Saturnian Metre." *Classical Quarterly* 34: 133–45.

Too, Yun Lee. 1998. *The Idea of Ancient Literary Criticism.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Toohey, Peter. 1996. *Epic Lessons: An Introduction to Ancient Didactic Poetry.* London and New York: Routledge, 1996.

Toury, Gideon. 1982. "A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies." In *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation.* Edited by Theo Hermans. London: Croom Helm: 16–41.

Traglia, Antonio. 1947. *Note su Cicerone critico e traduttore*. Rome: Casa Editrice Gismondi.

Trahmann, Carl. 1951. "The Attitude of the Roman Administration toward Greek and Latin." *Classical Bulletin* 27: 51–57.

Traina, Alfonso. 1970. *Vortit Barbare: le traduzione poetiche da Livio Andronico a Cicerone*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

———. 1989. "Le Traduzioni." In *Lo Spazio letterario di Roma antica: Volume 2: La circolazione del testo*. Edited by G. Cavallo, P. Fedeli, A. Giardina. Rome: Salerno Editrice: 93–123.

Tymoczko, Maria. 2006. "Reconceptualizing Western Translation Theory. Integrating Non-Western Thought About Translation." In *Translating Others* Volume I. Edited by T. Hermans. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 13–33.

Valette-Cagnac, Emmanuelle. 1997. *La Lecture à Rome: rites et pratiques*. Paris: Éditions Belin.

———. 2005. "Plus attique que la langue des Athéniens': le grec imaginaire des Romains." In *Façons de parler grec à Rome*. Edited by Florence Dupont & Emmanuelle Valette-Cagnac. Paris: Éditions Belin, 37–80.

Van Sickle, John B. 1968. "About Form and Feeling in Catullus 65." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 99: 487–508.

———. 1987. "The Elogia of the Cornelii Scipiones and the Origin of Epigram at Rome." *American Journal of Philology* 108: 41–55.

Vanhaegendoren, Koen 2008. 'Parthe´nios et Phylarque: analyses fragmentologiques.' In *Litte´rature et e´rotisme dans les Passions d'amour de Parthe´nios de Nice´e.* Edited by A. Zucker. Grenoble: Je´rome Millon, 125–147.

Vanotti, Gabriella. 1975. "Il Testo Greco Delle *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*." *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* 27: 306–25.

Vardi, Amiel. 1993. "Why *Attic Nights*? Or What's in a Name?" *Classical Quarterly* 43: 298–301.

———. 1996. "*Diiudicatio Locorum*: Gellius and the History of a Mode in Ancient Comparative Criticism." *Classical Quarterly* 46: 492–514.

———. 2000. "Brevity, Conciseness, and Compression in Roman Poetic Criticism and the Text of Gellius' *Noctes Atticae* 19.9.10." *American Journal of Philology* 121: 291–298.

———. 2001. "Gellius Against the Professors." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 137: 41–54.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.

———. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. New York: Routledge.

———. 2012. "Towards a Translation Culture." *Iowa Online Review Forum*. http://iowareview.uiowa.edu/?q=page/towards_a_translation_culture&page=0,0"http://iowareview.uiowa.edu/?q=page/towards_a_translation_culture&page=0,0

Versnel, H. S. 1970. *Triumphus: An Inquiry into the Origin, Developments and Meaning of the Roman Triumph*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Viereck, Paul. 1888. *Sermo graecus quo senatus populusque Romanus magistratusque populi Romani usque ad Tiberii Caesaris aetatem in scriptis publicis usi sunt examinatur.* Gottingen: Vandenhoeck et Ruprecht.

Vine, Brent. 1992. "On the 'Missing' Fourth Stanza of Catullus 51." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 94: 251–258.

Vogt-Spira, Gregor. 1991. "Asinaria oder *Maccus vortit Attice*." In *Plautus barbarus: sechs Kapitel zur Originalität des Plautus*. Edited by Eckard Lefèvre, Ekkehard Stärk and Gregor Vogt-Spira. Tübingen: Gunter Narr: 11–70.

———. 1999. "Literasche Imitatio und Kulturelle Identität: Die Rezeption griechischer Muster in der Selbstwahrnehmung römischer Literatur." In *Rezeption und Identität: die kulturelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Griechenland als europäisches Paradigma*. Edited by G. Vogt-Spira, B. Rommel, et al. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner; 22–37.

Vogt-Spira, Gregor, Bettina Rommel, et al. 1999. *Rezeption und Identität: Die kulturelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Griechenland als europäisches Paradigma*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

Volk, Katharina. 2002. *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2009. *Manilius and His Intellectual Background*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Von Flotow, Luise. 2012. "Upgrading the Downgraded." *Iowa Review Forum on Literature and Translation*. http://iowareview.uiowa.edu/?q=page/upgrading_the_downgraded"http://iowareview.uiowa.edu/?q=page/upgrading_the_downgraded). Last accessed April 15, 2012.

Wallace, Robert. 1990. "Hellenization and Roman Society in the Late Fourth Century B.C." In *Staat und Staatlichkeit in der frühen römischen Republik*. Edited by W. Eder. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner: 278–292.

Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. 1988. "Greek Knowledge, Roman Power." (Review of Fantham 1985). *Classical Philology* 83: 224–233.

———. 2008. *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2011. "To Be Roman Go Greek. Thoughts on Hellenization at Rome." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 42: 79–91.

Wardman, Alan. 1976. *Rome's Debt to Greece*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Warren, James. 2007. "Lucretius and Greek Philosophy." In *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*. Edited by Stuart Gillespie and Philip Hardie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 19–32.

Waszink, J.H. 1948. "Varro, Livy and Tertullian on the History of Roman Dramatic Art." *Vigiliae Christianae* 2: 224–242.

Wifstrand, A. 1939. "Autokrator, Kaisar, Basileus. Bemerjungen zu den greischischen Benennungen der romischen Kaiser." *Dragma* 1: 529–39.
Wigtil, David. 1982a. "The Ideology of the Greek *Res Gestae*." *ANRW* 2.30.1: 624–638.
———. 1982b. "The Translator of the Greek *Res Gestae* of Augustus." *American Journal of Philology* 103: 189–194.
Wilkinson, L. P. 1974. "Ancient and Modern: Catullus li Again." *Greece & Rome* 2: 82–85.
Wiotte-Franz, Claudia. 2001. *Hermeneus und Interpres: zum Dolmetscherwesen in der Antike*. Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag.
Wiseman, Timothy Peter. 1985. *Catullus and His World: A Reappraisal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
———. 1998. *Roman Drama and Roman History*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
———. 2006. "Fauns, Prophets, and Ennius' Annales." *Arethusa* 39: 513–529.
Wisse, Jakob. 1995. "Greeks, Romans, and the Rise of Atticism." In *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle*. Edited by S. R Slings, J.G.J. Abbenes, and I. Sluiter. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 65–82.
Wolf, Michaela. 2007. "Introduction" In *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Edited by Michaela Wolf and A. Fukari. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–36.
Wolf, Michaela, and A. Fukari. 2007. *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Woodman, Tony. 2002. "Biformis Vates: The Odes, Catullus and Greek Lyric." In *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*. Edited by Tony Woodman and Denis Feeney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 53–64.
Wooten, Cecil. 1977. "Cicero's Reactions to Demosthenes: A Clarification." *Classical Journal* 73: 37–43.
Wray, David. 2001. *Catullus and the Poetics of Roman Manhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Wright, Frederick Warren. 1931. *Cicero and the Theatre*. Northampton, MA: Smith College Classical Studies 11.
Wright, John 1974. *Dancing in Chains: The Stylistic Unity of the Comoedia Palliata*. Rome: American Academy in Rome.
Young, Elizabeth Marie. 2011. "Sappho Under My Skin: Catullus and the Translation of Erotic Lyric at Rome." In *Complicating the History of Western Translation: The Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective*. Edited by Siobhán McElduff and Enrica Sciarrino. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 25–36.
Zagagi, Neta. 1980. *Tradition and Originality in Plautus: Studies of the Amatory Motifs in Plautine Comedy*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprech.
———. 2004. "Tradition and Originality in *Cistellaria*: The Characterization of Selenium and Alcesimarchus as Comic Lovers." *Studien Zu Plautus' Cistellaria*. Edited by Florian Hurka and Rolf Hartkamp. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 167–186.
Zetzel, James E. G. 1983. "Recreating the Canon: Augustan Poetry and the Alexandrian Past." *Critical Inquiry* 10: 83–105.
———. 1998. "De *re publica* and De *rerum natura*." In *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen*. Stuttgart: Teubner, 203–427.
———. 2003. "Plato with Pillows: Cicero on the Uses of Greek Culture." In *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome: Studies in Honour of T.P. Wiseman*. Edited by D. Braund and C. Gill. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 119–138.
Zoll, Gallus. 1962. *Cicero Platonis aemulus*. Zürich: Juris-Verlag.
Zorzetti, Nevio. 1990. "The *Carmina Convivalia*." In *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. Edited by O. Murray. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 289–307.
———. 1991. "Poetry and the Ancient City: The Case of Rome." *Classical Journal* 86: 311–329.
Zucker, Arnaud, and Alain Billault, eds. 2008. *Littérature et érotisme dans les Passions d'amour*.

Page Intentionally Left Blank

Index

aemulor/aemulo 173, 189–90
Aeschines 5, 100, 110, 112–14, 118–20, 190, 222, 226
Aesop 165–6, 234
Aetolians 17–18, 27, 145, 197, 199
Amafinius 105–7, 222
Aratus 10, 90, 120, 152–6, 197, 226, 233
Atellan farce 46, 62, 69–70, 210, 213
Athens 29, 73–6, 111, 212, 215–16
Atticism 5, 97, 110–15, 118–20, 157, 176, 224–5
Augustine (Saint) 20, 191
Augustus (Emperor) 20, 22, 152–5, 203, 230, 233; *Res gestae* 33–8, 199, 201, 203–4

bilingualism 21–3, 200, 226; elite in Greek 18, 21–2, 54, 76, 97, 103–4, 157, 200, 220; nonelite 21; *see also* Cicero; inscriptions

Caecilius Statius 9, 15, 64, 84–5, 88, 102, 179–82, 211, 212
Callimachus 10, 56, 123, 126, 132–6, 209, 229
Calvus (Licinius) 110–12, 123, 129–30, 133, 150, 224, 225, 230
Camenae 43, 51–2, 56, 58–9, 144
carmina convivalia 47–50, 206
Cato the Elder 24, 29, 40, 47, 59–60, 68, 217, 218
Catullus 6, 10–11, 98, 126–35, 150, 226–9, 230
Cicero 2, 5–6, 9, 29, 30, 96–121, 123, 124, 131, 137, 145, 147, 161–4, 171, 197, 198, 199, 206, 215, 219–26; *Academica* 104–5, 150, 220, 224; bilingualism 20, 97; *Brutus* 110–11, 119–20, 219, 220, 225, 226; on interpreters 23, 25–6, 29, 108–9, 113–14, 115–18, 120, 202, 226; *On Divination* (*De Divinatione*) 25, 113, 224; *On Invention* (*De inventione*) 97–8, 99; *On Moral Duties (De officiis)* 9, 109; *On Moral Ends (De finibus)* 101–3, 106, 109, 115, 222, 223–4; *On the Best Type of Orator (De optimo genere oratorum)* 5, 100, 110–15, 118–20, 131, 145, 221–2, 223, 224–5; *On the laws (De legibus)* 11, 108–9, 199; *On the Nature of the Gods* (*De natura deorum*) 43, 107, 115–16, 120; *On the Orator (De oratore)* 98–100, 106–7, 116–17, 118–19, 171, 220; *Orator* 109, 110, 112, 119, 219; philosophical translations 5, 101, 103–5, 219, 223; *Republic/De republica* 5, 143, 199, 226; *Tusculan Disputations* 78, 103–4, 106, 107, 112, 119–20, 200, 222–3, 226
Collegium Poetarum 44, 66, 205, 212
comedy *see* Atellan farce; Caecilius Statius; drama; Menander; Plautus; Terence
contaminatio 41, 84, 87–91, 205, 218, 219
converto/convorto 42–3, 65, 72, 87, 98–9, 102, 108, 112–13, 160, 190–1; *see also verto/vorto*
Copeland, Rita 42

Demosthenes 100, 111–14, 118–20, 222, 225, 234
dictionaries 7, 9, 101, 117, 203

Donatus 64, 83–4, 211, 214, 218
drama: 45–8, 61–95; *see also* Atellan farce; Caecilius Statius; Livius Andronicus; Menander; Naevius; Plautus; Terence

education 5, 20, 53–4, 100, 114–20, 144, 149, 158, 167, 170–2, 203, 206, 220, 221–2, 225; *see also* grammarians
effingo 182, 191
Egypt 23, 75, 117, 198, 199, 203; *see also* hieroglyphics
Ennius 21, 41–4, 65, 80, 102, 138, 183–4, 205, 208–9, 214, 232, 236; *Annales* 55–60
epic poetry 12, 41–2, 49–50, 52, 124; 152–6, 166, 169, 206, 209, 231; *see also* Ennius; Germanicus Caesar; Homer; Livius Andronicus; Lucretius; meter, hexameter; Virgil
Epicurean translation 105–7, 122, 147–52; *see also* Amafinius; Cicero; Lucretius; Rabirius
Euripides 90, 102, 183–4, 205, 208, 231, 236
explico 99, 102, 104, 191–2
expono 151, 191, 232
exprimo 42–3, 93–4, 102, 132, 134, 163–4, 173, 192, 219

facio 87, 129

Gallus, C. Cornelius 23, 123–5, 201, 203, 227
Gallus, L. Anicius 76–7, 216
Gellius, Aulus 9, 15–16, 176–85, 198, 234, 235–6
Germanicus Caesar 7, 10, 31, 152–6, 233
Getic 18, 27, 199
grammarians 49–50, 116–17, 124, 177, 184, 225; *see also* education
grammaticus see grammarians
Greek: Attic 21, 187, 202; elite knowledge of in Rome 11, 20, 21, 30, 79, 187, 220, 221–2; inscriptions in 31–8, 203; *koiné* 21, 200; lack of translation into 11, 41, 198; in Plautus 78–9, 200, 216, 217; process of learning 22; in Roman senate 29, 30–1; Saturnian 51; translation into 24

hieroglyphics 23, 201
Hittite 198
Homer 9–10, 56–9, 113, 117–18, 164–70, 231, 234, 235; *Iliad* 41, 142–3, 167–70, 231, 234, 235; *Odyssey* 10, 39, 41, 45, 51–3, 82, 143–4, 168, 182–3, 211; *see also* Ennius; Livius Andronicus
Homeristae (performers of Homer) 167–8
Horace 1, 44, 53, 119, 121, 136–46, 229–30; *Art of Poetry/Ars Poetica* 6, 136, 142–6, 231

Ilias Latina (*Latin Iliad*) 169–70
imitation 105, 145–6, 148, 159, 234
imperialism 14, 37, 75–7
inscriptions 18–19, 199, 200; of senatorial decrees 31–3, 203; trilingual 23, 200, 201; *see also* Augustus (Emperor)
interpretatio 116–17, 171–2
interpreters 17, 20, 21, 24–30, 201–2, 212; *fidus interpres* 144–5; and literary translation 142–3, 172; military 25–6, 199, 201; in senate 23, 24, 27–8, 39, 202; used on official business 21, 28, 202; *see also* Cicero; oral translation
interpretor 24, 108–9, 117, 166, 192–3, 222, 224
intertexuality, 4–5, 197

Jerome (Saint) 78, 147, 209
John Lydus 20–1, 200

Labeo, Attius 117–18, 160, 168–9, 199
Latinisms (in inscriptions) 31–2, 35, 204
lexicons *see* dictionaries
libraries 24, 83, 104, 125, 140, 168, 197, 198, 202, 230–1
literal translation 5, 15, 52–3, 84–5, 88–9, 91–4, 108–9, 113–14, 117–18, 169, 171–2, 183, 199
Livius Andronicus 10, 13, 39, 40–1, 43–55, 58–9, 60, 65–6, 204–6, 210; dramatic translations 45–8, 212; *Odussia* 10, 41, 43–8, 144, 206
Livy 17–18, 45–7
Lucretius 5, 107, 147–52, 162, 173–4, 208, 222, 223, 231–2

ludi scaenici (stage games) 45–8, 62, 64–5, 69, 206, 211, 212–13
Luscius Lanuvinus 65, 83–5, 88–92, 94, 218–19
lyric poetry 6, 122, 126–32, 136–40, 197, 229–30

Mago 14, 23–4, 201
Menander 63, 66, 84, 86–7, 91–3, 179–82, 210, 212, 214, 218, 236
meter 58–62, 57, 136–42, 146, 230; elegiac 123–4, 127; hexameter 13, 44, 49–50, 58–9, 123–4, 205; lyric 127; Sapphic 142; Saturnian 13, 48, 49–52, 205, 207, 208; translation of 136–42
mistranslation 17–18, 145, 199
monolingualism 18
mutatio 175, 178, 193
muto 137, 163–4, 179, 193, 215, 230

Naevius 41, 52, 54, 59, 63, 65–6, 204–5, 208, 212
Nobilior, Fulvius 52, 55, 58–9, 69, 205, 208
nonelite translation 11, 106–7, 118, 168–70; *see also* education; Gellius, Aulus; Labeo, Attius

official language policy (Roman) 18, 19–20
official translation 31–3, 199–200; *see also* Augustus
oral translation 118, 202, 217; *see also* interpreters; simultaneous translation
oratory 87, 97–100, 110–16, 158–61, 220, 233–4; *see also* Cicero; Quintilian; Seneca (the Elder)
Ovid 8, 27, 42, 152, 170, 199

Pacuvius 43, 205, 226
pallium (Greek cloak) 20, 27, 200
paraphrase 99, 145, 166, 171–2, 196, 235
Parthenius 122–6, 134, 182, 190, 226–7, 236
philosophy 101–5, 161–4, 225; *see also* Amafinius; Cicero; Epicurean translation; Lucretius; Plato; Rabirius
Phrygian 18
plagiarism 65, 83, 85, 91–2, 159–60
Plato 5, 108–9, 150, 161–3, 171, 178, 184–5, 198, 223
Plautus 21, 50, 61–83, 84–5, 93, 210–15; *Amphytruo* 73; *Asinaria* 67, 211, 219; *Bacchides* 63, 210, 214, 216, 219; *Captivi* 70, 78; *Casina* 63, 67, 70, 71, 78, 216; *Curculio* 79–80, 212; *Menaechmi* 73–4, 210, 215; *Mercator* 67; *Miles Gloriosus* 63, 67, 202, 208, 215; *Mostellaria* 71–2, 212, 215, 216; *Poenulus* 67, 80–3, 212, 214, 215, 216, 217; prologues 62–3, 66–8, 73–4; *Pseudolus* 93, 211, 212, 213, 216; *Rudens* 73, 212, 214; *Stichus* 63, 70, 211, 212, 213, 215–16; *Trinummus* 68; *Truculentus* 74, 81, 216; use of Greek 78–9, 200, 216, 217; *Vidularia* 63
Pliny the Younger 9, 10, 172–6, 178–9, 197, 235–6
Plutarch 19, 22, 97, 178
Polybius (Greek Historian) 76, 83
polylingualism 18
polysystem 12
pono 184, 193
Punic 14, 18, 19, 23–4, 25, 29, 81–3, 200, 201, 217

Quintilian 9, 21–2, 170–2, 234–5

Rabirius 105–7, 109; *see also* Epicurean translation
reading (ancient) 7–8, 197
reddo 98, 99, 112, 114, 142, 144, 145, 193–4, 232
religious translation 6
Res gestae see Augustus (Emperor)
Romanization of texts 13, 43, 63, 144, 155, 210, 218

Sallust 24, 25, 160, 217, 227, 234
Sappho 10, 11, 122, 126–32, 134, 137–9, 141, 228–9
Sapphic meter 142
schools *see* education
senatorial decrees 21, 23, 30, 31–3, 199, 203
Seneca (the Elder) 20, 158–61, 177, 183, 200, 217, 225, 226, 233–4
Seneca (the Younger) 5, 9
simultaneous translation 28–9, 202

Spain 18, 19, 23, 30
Steiner, George 5–6
Suetonius 198
synkrisis 9

Tacitus 19–20
Terence 10, 64, 83–95, 129, 160, 212, 218–19; *Adelphoe/The Brothers* 64, 90, 92–4, 212, 218; *Andria* 84, 85–7, 102; *Eunuchus/The Eunuch* 91–2, 218; *Heautontimoroumenos/Self-Tormenter* 70, 89–91, 94, 218; *Hecyra/The Mother in Law* 62, 85, 212, 218, 219
Thucydides 115, 147, 160, 217, 223, 224, 225
Tiberius (Emperor) 30, 31, 35, 36
toga 19, 20, 28, 200
traduco 104, 194
tragedy 39, 44, 62, 80, 82, 161, 209, 214, 218; *see also* Ennius; Naevius
transfero 86–7, 92, 103–4, 159–60, 163, 194–5
translation and colonialism/imperialism 13, 75–8, 101, 103; as aristocratic exchange 132–6, 150, 173–5, 220, 229; of art and sculpture 69–70, 94, 213; as conquest 78, 222; as dismemberment 10, 166–7; as displacement 1–4; domesticating 13, 53; as duty 100, 103–5, 107, 146, 22; errors in 17–18, 22; foreignizing 13; literal 91–2, 94, 113; nonelite in Rome 106–7, 117, 167–9; of non-Greek texts 23–4; nonliterary 17; official in Rome 31–3; and power 14–15; as rewriting 12–13, 15; as shared experience in Rome 9, 101, 176–7
translation studies 5–6, 12–13
Transliteration 149, 150–2, 161, 184, 232–3

Ulpian 19

Varro (M. Terentius) 8, 51, 104–5, 106, 157, 190, 222, 231
verto/vorto 22, 42, 46, 53, 66–8, 72–3, 81–2, 91–2, 145–6, 151, 166, 171–2, 179, 182, 195–6
Virgil 9–10, 15, 20, 42, 123–4, 136, 152, 163–6, 170, 182–3, 190, 236
vis 8, 111–12, 113, 148, 161–2, 222, 224, 225, 234