Bibliographia. Annotated Bibliographies (www.bibliographia.co)

by Raul Corazzon | e-mail: rc@ontology.co

From Greek to Latin. The development of the Latin philosophical vocabulary

Contents

The Bibliography is composed by the following sections:

English studies A - J (Current page)
English studies K - Z
Studies in French, Italian and German

Bibliography

English studies A - J

1. Adams, James N. 2003. "'Romanitas' and the Latin Language." *The Classical Quarterly* no. 53:184-205
"In what ways (if any) could 'Romanness' be conveyed through language? Was knowledge of the Latin language a defining feature of being a Roman, and did Romans have any linguistic policy which sought to enforce a view that Latin was a component of their identity? Is it legitimate in this context to talk of Latin as if it were a unity, or was Romanness associated with a particular variety of the language? Did Romans practise any sort of policy that might be labelled 'linguistic nationalism'? These are questions that have been asked in different forms before, if not explicitly with reference to the all but non-existent term Romanitas. Here I offer a brief overview, concentrating on selected primary evidence rather than attempting to accumulate modern bibliography. (2)" (p. 184, a note omitted)
(2) There is of course a good deal of bibliography devoted to some of the questions listed in this paragraph. A notable paper, for example, is M. Dubuisson,'Y a-t-il une politique linguistique romaine?', *Ktema* 7 (1982), 197-210. There is much of relevance in J. Kaimio, *The Romans and the Greek Language* (Helsinki, 1979). Further material is cited and discussed in my book, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge, 2003).

2. ———. 2004. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Chapter 3.III: *Cicero Letters*, pp. 308-347.
"Among educated Greek terms which filled a gap in the Latin language were above all technical terms from philosophy and rhetoric.
That is not to say that many such words could not have been replaced by Latin equivalents. In the first century BC (as for example the works of the anon. *ad Herennium,* Lucretius and Cicero attest) much effort was devoted to establishing Latin technical vocabularies, by calquing, loan-shifts, metaphor and borrowing. But the business of finding Latin substitutes was a burdensome one (see above on Suet. *Tib*. 71) as can be deduced from discussions of the problem at the time (e.g. Lucr. 1.136-45, Cic. *Acad*. 1.24-6). Whereas the effort might be worthwhile in a formal philosophical or rhetorical treatise for public consumption, in private letters it was simpler to use the Greek terms themselves in addressing a sympathetic correspondent. Sometimes Greek offered not merely a single word appropriate to Roman concerns, but a whole group of cognate terms, nominal, verbal, adjectival and adverbial, which allowed a topic to be discussed in a more economical and varied way than might have been possible in Latin." (p. 339)

3. Backman, Jussi. 2020. "Modernity in Antiquity: Hellenistic and Roman Philosophy in Heidegger and Arendt." *Symposium* no. 24:5-29
Abstract: "This article looks at the role of Hellenistic thought in the historical narratives of Martin Heidegger and Hannah Arendt. To a certain extent, both see—with G. W. F. Hegel, J. G. Droysen, and Eduard Zeller—Hellenistic and Roman philosophy as a "modernity in antiquity," but with important differences. Heidegger is generally dismissive of Hellenistic thought and comes to see it as a decisive historical turning point at which a protomodern element of subjective willing and domination is injected into the classical heritage of Plato and Aristotle. Arendt, likewise, credits Stoic philosophy with the discovery of the will as an active faculty constituting a realm of subjective freedom and autonomy. While she considers Hellenistic philosophy as essentially apolitical and world-alienated—in contrast to the inherently political and practical Roman culture—it nonetheless holds for her an important but unexploited ethical and political potential."

4. Baldwin, Barry. 1992. "Greek in Cicero's Letters." *Acta Classica* no. 25:1-17
"The purpose of this paper is not to inventory each and every one of the 850 or so Greek words, phrases, and quotations in Cicero's letters. Apart from the indexes

provided in Shackleton Bailey's editions,(1) that has been done, and on the whole well done, at least twice this century, respectively by R.B. Steele(2) and H.J. Rose.(3)." (p. 1)
(...)
"At the risk of doing a Queen of Hearts, I preface the analysis with some general and suggestive conclusions. There are around 100 Greek words, phrases, and quotations in *Ad Fam*., compared with over 700 in *Ad Att.*
Meaningless as it may be, one cannot help noticing the absence of words beginning with β, ι, ξ, or ρ, whilst the only ones beginning with φ or ω occur in quotations (1 each). Virtually no single words are repeated in *Ad Fam*., albeit some phrases and quotations are. In *Ad Att*. there are quite a few more repetitions, but they are still a small proportion of the whole.
Cicero, then, does not have a large number of overworked favourites, nor is there much by way of unconscious Greek style into which he keeps slipping.
Only a dozen or so words, phrases, and quotations are shared between *Ad Fam*. and *Ad Att*. Cicero employs Greek in letters to almost 20 different correspondents, though to very different degrees; he receives letters with Greek in them from about half a dozen people. There is a good deal of Greek in the letters to his brother Quintus, whereas those to Brutus contain but a single word." (p. 2)
(1) Cicero's *Letters to Atticus*, Cambridge, 1965-70; Cicero: *Epistulae Ad Familiares*, Cambridge, 1977. His notes provide valuable remarks on many (by no means all) individual items; cf. n. 5, below.
(2) 'The Greek in Cicero's Epistles,' *The American Journal of Philology* 21 (1900) 387-410.
(3) 'The Greek of Cicero,' *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 41 (1921) 91-116.(...)

5. Baltussen, Han. 2014. "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 McElduff, Siobhán and Sciarrino, Enrica, 37-47. New York: Routledge
Volume first published by St. Jerome Publishing in 2011.
Abstract: "Cicero's achievement of producing a stream of philosophical works in the last few years of his life is as remarkable as it is unusual. This activity constituted a heady mix of linguistic skill, intellectual ambition and an attempt at self-healing after his political and personal life had been hit by disaster.
Cicero's important role in the transformation of Greek philosophy into Latin is well-known, but the linguistic and cultural aspects of his translation activities have not received a lot of attention. This paper explores the ways in which Cicero attempted to transpose Greek philosophical thought into the Latin language (*Latine reddere*) and examines how his personal circumstances prompted this flood of translation in his final years."

6. Barnes, Jonathan, and Griffin, Miriam, eds. 1989. *Philosophia Togata I. Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
Revised reprint 1997 with an updated bibliography.
Table of Contents: 1. Miriam Griffin: Philosophy, Politics, and Politicians at Rome 1; I.G. Kidd: Posidonius as Philosopher-Historian 38; 3. Jonathan Barnes: Antiochus of Ascalon 51; 4. David Sedley: Philosophical Allegiance in the Greco-Roman world 97; 5. D. P. Fowler: Lucretius and Politics 120; 6. Julia Annas: Cicero on Stoic Moral Philosophy and Private Property 151; 7. P. A. Brunt: Philosophy and Religion in the Late Republic 174; 8. Christopher Pelling: Plutarch: Roman Heroes and Greek Culture 199; 9. Elizabeth Rawson: Roman Rulers and the Philosophic Adviser 233; Philippa Smith *Revised* by Maddalena Bonelli and Ben Morison Bibliography 259; Indexes 289-308.

7. ———, eds. 1997. *Philosophia Togata II. Plato and Aristotle at Rome*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
Contents: 1. Jonathan Barnes: Roman Aristotle ι; 2. Andrew Lintott: The Theory of the Mixed Constitution at Rome 70; 3. Miriam Griffin: From Aristotle to Atticus:

Cicero and Matius on Friendship 86; 4. David Sedley: Plato's *Auctoritas* and the Rebirth of the Commentary Tradition 110; 5. Thomas Tarver: Varro and the Antiquarianism of Philosophy 130; 6. Simon Swain: Plutarch, Plato, Athens, and Rome 165; 7. Leofranc Holford-Strevens: Favorinus: the Man of Paradoxes 188: 8. Michael Frede: Celsus' Attack on the Christians 218; 9. Fergus Millar: Porphyry: Ethnicity, Language, and Alien Wisdom 241; Maddalena Bonelli and Benjamin Morison: Bibliography 263; Index Locorum 287; Index of Names 293; General Index 297-300.

8. Bell, Brenda. 1991. "Roman literary attitudes to technical terms." *Acta Classica* no. 34:83-92
"Ancient theoreticians have virtually nothing to say on literary attitudes to technical terms.(1) Yet it is commonly pointed out by modern scholars that Latin writers with stylistic pretensions deliberately avoid technical or official terminology.(2) This paper seeks to explore the reasons for the apparently cautious treatment of technical terms in Latin authors of the late Republic and early Principate.(3) Were such terms intrinsically suspect, considered unworthy of the higher genres of literature, simply because of their technical nature? Or were they handled with circumspection for other literary reasons." (p. 83)
(...)
"Complaints about the lexical poverty of Latin began with Lucretius, who laments the 'patrii sermonis egestas'(32) when faced with the practical prob lems of rendering Epicurean terms in Latin for the first time. Cicero faced the same difficulty of non-existent Latin terms when discussing philosophy and rhetoric.(33) He complains of the 'inopia' of Latin (*Fin*. 3.51 cf. 15; *Orat.* 211). Marouzeau sees the reason for these complaints as arising out of the fact that literary language at this stage had not developed to its full powers of expression.(34) In particular, it was lacking in abstract nouns. This is true, but the complaints continue well beyond the time of Cicero. In looking for resources to express the terms of Plato, Seneca laments, 'quanta verborum nobis paupertas, immo egestas sit numquam magis quam hodierno die in tellexi. Mille res inciderunt cum forte de Platone loqueremur, quae nomina desiderarent nec haberent, quaedam vero cum habuissent fastidio nostra perdidissent' (*Ep*. 58.1). As he says, 'quae philosophia fuit facta philologica est' *(Ep*. 108.23). It is noteworthy that charges of lexical poverty occur when the writer is declaring his need for neologisms. They can be seen in fact as excuses or justification for new coinages." (pp. 85-86.)
(1) Symptomatic is the fact that there is no entry under 'Technical' in the *General Index* of D.A. Russell and M. Winterbottom (eds.), *Ancient Literary Criticism: The Principal Texts in New Translations*, Oxford 1972. The later grammarians and commentators in H. Keil's *Grammatici Latini* (8 vols., Leipzig 1855-80, reprinted Hildesheim 1961) do not yield anything of interest either. Nor is this surprising. The grammarian's tradition remained remarkably stable. See R.A. Raster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarians and Society in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1988, 196f.
(2) e.g. R. Syme, *Tacitus,* Oxford 1958, 343; W. Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*, Stuttgart 1964, 112-4; F.R.D. Goodyear's commentary on Tacitus *Annals*, Vol. 1, Cambridge 1972, 344f.
(3) Following the *Cambridge History of Classical Literature* 2 (ed. E.J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen, Cambridge 1982), I regard the early Principate as ending with Gellius and Fronto. I am not here concerned with later authors or Christian technical terms.
(32) Lucr. 1.832; 3.260 (with Kenney's note) cf. 1.136-9.
(33) On Cicero's difficulties in creating a satisfactory philosophical vocabulary in Latin see Leeman [A.D. Leeman, *Orationis Ratio: The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators Historians and Philosophers* 1, Amsterdam 1963, 348-52] 1, 206-9.

9. Boys-Stones, George. 2013. "Seneca against Plato: Letters 58 and 65." In *Plato and the Stoics*, edited by Long, A. G., 128-146. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

"Seneca, I have argued, manifests an unqualified opposition to Platonic metaphysics in Letters 58 and 65, and it is a stance that defines his response to the Platonist movement which, emerging in his day, differentiated itself from Stoicism principally by its commitment to this metaphysics. (The attack is, in this sense, a total attack on Platonism as a movement, not a quibble over details.) But, as I noted in the Introduction, Seneca also allows it to determine his philosophical opposition to Plato. His argument might have been that Platonists were wrong, that they misunderstood what Plato actually meant. But it was not. As far as Seneca is concerned, the Platonists were quite right about Plato – and so much the worse for Plato. And in this retreat from the pro-Plato tendencies of the late Hellenistic Stoa, (28) Seneca is consistent with all our evidence for post-Hellenistic Stoicism.(29)" (pp. 142-143)
(28) I have in mind, most obviously, Panaetius and Posidonius; but cf. also Antipater (SVF 3 (Antipater).56).
(29) Boys-Stones 2009 ['Cornutus und sein philosophisches Umfeld: der Antiplatonismus der Epidrome' in *A. Cornutus: Die griechischen Götter. Ein Überblick über Namen*, Bilder und Deutungen, Scripta Antiquitatis Posterioris ad Ethicam Religionemque, ed. H.G. Nesselrath. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck: 141–61] is another case study of the phenomenon (dealing with Cornutus). A possible exception is the mysterious Trypho, 'Stoic and Platonist', mentioned at Porphyry, *Life of Plotinus* 17.3

10. Cassin, Barbara. 1990. "Greeks and Romans: Paradigms of the Past in Arendt and Heidegger." *Comparative Civilizations Review* no. 22:1-26
Translated from the French by Jonathan Barnes.
"The thread I shall follow is the contrast between political thought and professional thought or thought about thought. And with its help I shall analyse more closely the different dealings which Arendt and Heidegger have with the past.
We must, I think, begin with the most impressive piece of evidence: Arendt and Heidegger refer to different pasts. Arendt makes a double reference—to the Greeks and to the Romans. For Heidegger there is only one reference point: the Greeks—and again the Greeks.
One may say, with only a little exaggeration, that for Heidegger the relation between Rome and Greece is one of translation and betrayal. When Heidegger invokes Latin it is usually to show how the translation of Greek terms betrays the Greek experience of *aletheia*. *Veritas* bolts the door on *aletheia,* and Heidegger's intellectual journey takes him "upstream" (by what Rene Char calls a retour amont) from the Latins to the Greeks—and then from the Greeks to what is more Greek than the Greeks.
To indicate the tone and substance of this relation, one quotation may suffice. It comes from Heidegger's essay "The Origin of the Work of Art:"(5) "By these [Greek] determinations . . . the Western interpretation of the Being of beings [is] stabilized. The process begins with the appropriation of Greek words by Roman-Latin thought. Υποκείμενον becomes *subiectum*, ὑπόστασις becomes *substantia*, συμβεβηκός becomes *accidens*. However, this translation of Greek names into Latin is in no way the innocent process it is considered to this day. Beneath the seemingly literal and thus faithful translation there is concealed, rather, a translation of Greek experience into a different way of thinking.
Roman thought takes over the Greek words without a corresponding, equally original experience of what they say, without the Greek word. The rootlessness of Western thought begins with this translation." (p. 34)
(5) *Poetry, Language, Thought*, trans. A. Hofstadter (New York, 1971), p. 23 (the essay dates from 1935/6).

11. Coleman, Robert. 1989. "The Formation of Specialized Vocabularies in Philosophy, Grammar and Rhetoric: Winners and Losers." *Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain* no. 15:77-89.

12. Copeland, Rita. 1991. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Chapter 1: *Roman theories of translation: the fusion of grammar and rhetoric*, pp. 1-8.
"The book begins by constructing a history of the interaction of the disciplines of rhetoric and hermeneutics from late antiquity through the Latin Middle Ages. Modern work on hermeneutics, especially that of Gadamer, provides some valuable models for theorizing the way in which exegesis appropriates the tools of rhetoric. In the first chapter I consider how Roman disciplinary debates and practice created a space in which a rhetorical theory of translation could emerge; and the second chapter considers how that space could be redefined in the early Middle Ages by the force of new disciplinary directives. The rhetorical value of translation is lost in the very discourses that carry over Ciceronian theories of translation; but hermeneutical practice itself takes over the functions of rhetoric and creates a new context in which a rhetorical model of translation can emerge. In order to establish the terms of this argument it is necessary to examine the character of medieval hermeneutics, and in the third chapter I show how exegesis assumes the force of rhetorical performance and in fact supplants rhetoric as the master discourse. My concern here and throughout is with commentaries from the arts curriculum, not scriptural exegesis." (p. 6)

13. D'Alisera, Alexander Amir. 2015. "Romanus Sum Ergo Sum: Claims to Romanitas from Late Antiquity to the Dawn of Humanism." *Senior Projects Spring* no. 130:1-94
"It should first be noted that I use the term *Romanitas* anachronistically (in the vein of many contemporary historians) in order to refer to feelings and evocations of Roman-ness and Roman identity. Though the word itself is not found in classical Roman sources and was invented by Tertullian in the late-second or early-third centuries,[*] the concept of the cultural identity implied by *Romanitas* is present throughout the Latin corpus. The *Aeneid* of Virgil – the late-first century B.C.E. epic poem and cornerstone of the western literary canon both in its day and two thousand years later – carries the most cogent evocations of *Romanitas* among these ancient sources." (p. 4)
(...)
"It is with the Virgilian understanding of classical Romanitas in hand that my endeavor begins. Most generally, I seek to examine later historical claims to Romanitas by individual philosophers, political leaders, and literary figures whose actual cultural identity was far removed from that of Augustus and Virgil. In the broadest sense, my work stands as an intellectual and cultural history, grounded in various responses to the classical era by those individuals living and acting in decidedly post-classical times.
I shall first examine the period of late antiquity, as seen through (but not necessarily exemplified by) the writings of Saint Augustine in the late 300s and early 400s.
(...)
"I follow my discussion of late antiquity with an examination of the Romanitas found in the fragmentary period following Augustine's death, from the middle of the 400s to the late 900s."
(...)
"I end my macrohistorical examination with a nod towards Petrarch's transference of the Roman ideal into the proto-Italian national ideal at the dawning days of the Renaissance, before returning to Mussolini's fascistic appropriation of Romanitas as means of conclusion." (pp. 7-8)
[*] Tertullian, *De pallio*, IV, 1: "Quid nunc, si est Romanitas omni salus, nec honestis tamen modis ad Graios estis?" (note added)

14. De Graff, Thelma B. 1940. "Plato in Cicero." *Classical Philology* no. 35
"It would seem well to remind ourselves at the outset of Cicero's avowed aim, a highly laudable one. He wished to make available to his fellow-countrymen, who

regarded speculation per se as a dangerous pastime,(4) the rich treasures of Greek philosophy." (p. 143)
(...)
"The best method of throwing light upon this difficult but fascinating problem would be to select some philosopher whose works are extant, to examine carefully all of Cicero's works for references to that philosopher or his writings, and to endeavor to determine on the basis of the evidence amassed the degree of success with which Cicero has approximated both the spirit and the thought of his original. Our choice of philosopher is Plato, perhaps the greatest of all philosophers, whom Cicero reverenced and admired both for his beautiful literary style and for his brilliant philosophical speculations.(7) To the writer's best knowledge and belief all direct references in Cicero to Plato or to any work of Plato have been included in this paper. Moreover, since the personality of Socrates as created by his most famous pupil is infinitely more vivid and more appealing than that created by Xenophon and the lesser Socratici,(8) and since, possibly by virtue of that fact, references to Socrates are usually, though not invariably, to the Platonic Socrates, all references to Socrates himself (including those not found in Plato) have been assembled in similar fashion.
Finally, a number of probable references to Plato or to Plato's works has been added." (p. 144)
(4) *De orat*. ii. 37. 156; *Rep*. i. 18. 30; Tacitus *Agr*. 4.
(7) *Div*. i. 30. 62; i. 36. 78; ii. 31. 66; *Fin*. v. 3. 7; *Leg*. i. 5. 15; iii. 1. 1; iii. 6. 14; *Off*. i. 1. 4; *Rep*. iv. 4. 4; *Tusc*. i. 10. 22; i. 21. 49; i. 32. 79; ii. 3. 8; v. 4. 11; v. 10. 30; v. 41. 119; *Brut*. vi. 24; xxxi. 121; *De orat*. i. 11. 47-49; iii. 4. 15; *Opt. gen*. v. 16-vi. 17; *Orat*. iii. 12; ix. 62; xx. 67.

15. Deligiannis, Ioannis, ed. 2024. *Cicero in Greece, Greece in Cicero: Aspects of Reciprocal Reception from Classical Antiquity to Byzantium and Modern Greece*. Berlin: de Gruyter
Contents: Part I: Aspects of Greece and its World in Cicero's Works
Introduction 3; Georgia Tsouni: Athens' Authority in Cicero's Philosophical Works 11; Gabriel Evangelou: Loss of Self, Desperation, and Glimmers of Hope in Cicero's Letters from Exile 31; Ximing Lu: *Mercatura Bonarum Artium.* The Politics of Marcus' Study Abroad in Cicero's *De Officiis* 55; Matilde Oliva: Eloquence as Handmaiden of Wisdom. Hellenistic Philosoph(ies) in Cicero's Partitiones Oratoriae 73;
Part II: Aspects of the Reception of Cicero in the Greek-Speaking World
Introduction 97; Fernanda Maffei: Preliminary Remarks on the Technical Language of the Bilingual Glossaries of Cicero 103; Tiziano F. Ottobrini: Cicero and Photius. An Analysis of the Survival and Influence of Cicero on Photius' Bibliotheca, at the Crossroads between History and Drama 123; Vasileios Pappas: Greek Translations of Cicero's Works in the Nineteenth Century 139; Ioannis Deligiannis: The First Greek Translation of Cicero's *De re publica* (1839) 171; Appendix: Modern Greek Translations of and/or Commentaries on Cicero 203; Abbreviations 227; Bibliography 229; List of Contributors 255; Index Locorum 257; Index Nominum 267; Previous Volumes of the Series 273.

16. Detreville, Eleanor. 2015. *An Overview of Latin Morphological Calques on Greek Technical Terms. Formation and Success*
A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Master of Arts.
Abstract: "This thesis investigates the composition and success of Latin morphological calques on Greek technical terminology in the vocabulary of poetry and literature, rhetoric, philosophy, grammar, medicine, and early Christianity by studying the construction of these calques, including their individual morphemes and, where relevant, their Indo-European origins; and it compares the composition of the corresponding Greek terms. Considerable attention is given to trends in composition in each terminology field, such as suffixes and types of compound formations. Additionally, the study discusses those factors which appear to have

played the greatest role in the success of morphological calques over competing Greek loan words, semantic calques, and synonyms."
Chapter 4: *Philosophical calques*, pp. 50-59.

17. Douglas, Alan Edward. 1962. "Platonis Aemvlvs?" *Graece & Rome* no. 9:41-51
"Having then considered the general character of Cicero's sources, and the form in which he presented their works, we may look more closely at his relation to those sources as translator and adapter. How effectively does Cicero's Latin convey the ideas of his originals? It is usually conceded, even by those who find little other use for Cicero's philosophical writings, that as a redactor of the original Greek sources Cicero was competent, though not infallible, and that this competence was no small achievement, for it involved the virtual creation of a philosophical Latin.
But since this view is in danger of becoming a typical piece of uncritically transmitted second-hand textbook lore, it is well that it has recently been most penetratingly examined by Professor P. Poncelet,(2) even if one cannot accept all his conclusions. His argument is that Ciceronian Latin is an extremely inadequate vehicle for philosophy, and this of its nature-indeed the more faithful Cicero was to the genius of Latin, the less adequately could he render the Greeks. Classical Latin does not emerge well from Poncelet's rigorous and subtle investigation, which ranges beyond the more obvious deficiencies of Latin, e.g. the lack of the article, or the shortage of participles, into the problems of metaphor and abstraction in philosophical language, and much besides.
But there is something to be said on the other side. First, much of Poncelet's case rests on a comparison with its original of the surviving portion of Cicero's translation of Plato's *Timaios*, that is, on the hurried rendering of an abstruse work by a man who never claimed to be a scholar in the modern sense, working centuries before modern criteria of translation came into existence. Next, Poncelet often looks for philosophical conclusions without dealing with the problem of translation in general, that is, the extent to which thought is bound up with the language in which it is expressed. In the end his book does not prove much more than that Greek philosophy is best expressed in the Greek language. It is by ignoring this that Poncelet can see in Greek precision and flexibility, but in Latin nothing but rigidity and vagueness. He does not adequately distinguish the question of Cicero's faithfulness as a translator from that of the value of Latin as a vehicle for thought." (pp. 48-49)
(2) *Cicéron traducteur de Platon* (Paris, 1957).

18. Dowson, Christopher. 2023. "The Social Networking Function of Cicero’s Prefaces to the Philosophical Works." *Philologus* no. 167:22-45
Abstract: "The value of the *prohoemia* or ‘prefaces’ to Cicero’s later philosophical works, composed in the last years of his life, has not yet been settled. Two schools of thought have emerged somewhat more clearly in recent times: one places a greater value on the prefaces as tools for understanding Cicero’s *philosophica* as a whole,the other applies a more skeptical approach, using a degree of caution as to the nexus between the prefaces and the treatises to which they were affixed. The article advocates for the latter camp, however not only to temper the recent emphasis the optimists have placed on the prefaces as key interpretive elements to the dialogues, but to refocus their importance as extensions of Cicero’s personal and social networking with other Roman elites of his time. I rely on two main lines of argument: the anecdotal evidence from Cicero’s *volumen prohoemiorum*, “book of prefaces”, mentioned in a letter to Atticus in 44 BCE, as well as a broader analysis of a deeper disconnect between Cicero’s prefatory rhetoric regarding Latin philosophical vocabulary compared with Greek and his translation practices in his treatises."

19. ———. 2024. "Glossing as a Rhetorical Strategy: Seneca the Younger's Use of Greek Loan-Words in his Philosophical Works." In *Recent Trends and Findings in Latin Linguistics: Volume I: Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics. Volume II:*

Semantics and Lexicography. Discourse and Dialogue, edited by Cabrillana, Concepción. Berlin: de Gruyter
Abstract: "This paper examines the Greek scientific and philosophical vocabulary present in Seneca the Younger's *Naturales Quaestiones* and the *Epistulae Morales*. I discuss the function of Seneca's glossing of Greek terms and how they formed part of a broader rhetorical approach to explicating natural phenomena and philosophical concepts to his Roman audience. I argue that, rather than coining new Latin terms ex nihilo (neologisms) or extending the meaning or application of existing terms (semantic extension), Seneca used variations of specific rhetorical strategies such as *praeteritio* and *captatio benevolentiae*, which could be employed to enhance his exposit ion of technical expressions as well as to convey them more ingeniously to his readers."

20. Dowson, Christopher J. 2022. "The Translation of Greek Philosophical Terminology in Marius Victorinus' *Opera Theologica*: A Quantitative and Qualitative Study." *Antichthon* no. 56:203-225
Abstract: "The article collects and analyses philosophical terms formed in Latin by fourth-century rhetorician and philosopher Marius Victorinus (c. 285–360s C.E.) as a result of his translation from Greek sources. The study examines primarily his theological treatises: the *Ad Candidum Arianum* (*De Generatione Divini Verbi*) and the *Adversus Arium*. It undertakes a quantitative and qualitative examination of these terms by studying two linguistic mechanisms which constitute 'term-formation' in Latin: lexical innovation and lexical augmentation. Both functioned as important linguistic and conceptual devices in Victorinus' translations. The article also examines the theological contexts of certain metaphysical terms to understand further their similarities and differences, not only in Victorinus' translations, but also in earlier uses of central Latin philosophical terms, e.g., *essentia* and *substantia*. The article concludes that Victorinus was more didactic than his philosophical predecessors such as M. Tullius Cicero, Seneca the Younger or Apuleius of Madaura, preferring literal translation (particularly morphological calquing) rather than semantic extensions or metaphorical usages (lexical augmentation). By using neologisms formed using derivational word-formation processes and, on rare occasions, loan-words from Greek, Victorinus adopted an approach of adapting Greek terminology with a high degree of precision in Latin, from a range of sources including Christian, Neo-Platonist, and Gnostic authors. He thereby introduced a new Christological vocabulary in the Latin tradition, making him a significant intellectual figure of the fourth and fifth centuries. Although by no means as dominant as others, such as Augustine or Boethius, Victorinus would nonetheless come to exert influence over later Christian philosophers in the Latin West, particularly during the Scholastic period of the Middle Ages."

21. ———. 2023. *Philosophia Translata: The Development of Latin Philosophical Vocabulary through Translation from Greek. A Case Study Approach*. Leiden: Brill
"This book is first and foremost an investigation of Latin philosophical vocabulary that developed through a process of translation from Greek sources over an extended period, predominantly between the first century BC and the sixth century AD. The book includes not only a collation of terms which one might call 'Latin philosophical vocabulary', but further analyses of the methods bywhich philosophical expression was transferred, translated, or applied in new contexts (hence translata) from Ancient Greek language and culture into a new Roman context." (p. 1)
(...)
"A theme of this study is the interaction between Greek philosophical terminology and Latin authors' translation choices in adapting them through certain formal (morphological) and conceptual (semantic) parameters. These choices required invention, not simply along formal dimensions (what we might describe as ex nihilo: neologism; the creation of new lexemes), but using the raw lexical materials within the language as well, refashioning them into new meanings within a philosophical literary genre (ex materia: e.g. semantic shifts, extensions,

metaphorical usages). ‘Innovation’, in either of these cases, is often difficult to pinpoint given the lack of textual evidence. Claiming, for instance, that Cicero was the ‘first’ author to use a term in Latin is fraught with speculation unless a consistent methodology can be developed to circumscribe the lexical evidence available (the sheer size of the extant Ciceronian corpus alone dwarfs that of his predecessors or near-contemporaries, for example).
To that end, the dual approach of ‘innovation’ versus ‘augmentation’, ‘neologism’ versus ‘semantic shift’, ‘ad sensum’ versus ‘verbum e verbo’, etc., is useful in conceptualizing translation practices only in certain contexts.(2) This will form one aspect of the analysis, which aids in categorizing the lexical data collected throughout the case studies into certain types of common translation practices." (pp. 2-3)
(2) In the conclusion of this study, I turn to these specific contexts to elucidate certain findings along the lines of ‘literal’ and ‘non-literal’ translation practices These findings will be discussed in more detail.

22. Erler, Michael. 2022. "On the Relationship between *Auctoritas* and *Philosophia* in Greek and Roman Philosophy." In *Philodorema. Essays in Greek and Roman Philosophy in Honor of Phillip Mitsis*, edited by Konstan, David and Sider, David, 411-425. Fonte Aretusa: Parnassos Press
"In my discussion, I illustrate that a process of re-coloring was necessary during this *conspiratio in unum* [between Greek and Roman literature and philosophy]. I do so by using a rather minor example which nevertheless pertains to a concept of great importance for Roman culture—the concept of *auctoritas* and the part it plays in art, literature, and philosophy. It is particularly the latter role, the impact of auctoritas on philosophy, which Boethius addresses in a passage of the *Consolatio* that is going to be of interest to us. At the outset of his work, Boethius portrays *philosophia* as a woman endowed with many impressive features, including *auctoritas*(.8) In combining *philosophia* and *auctoritas*, Boethius not only brings together different concepts from different spheres, one Greek, the other Roman; he also introduces two concepts which, ever since the acculturation of philosophy in Rome, have formed a relationship characterized by tension or even opposition, as becomes obvious, e.g., from the philosophical writings of Cicero.(9)
It should be noted in what follows that Boethius evokes this very discussion and that he takes a stand in the controversy, as it were, by applying the Roman concept of *auctoritas* to the Greek idea of philosophy. By no means does this kind of approach have to be an impediment to independent thinking; rather, it helps to set it free, thus rendering the notion of this combination a useful tool for understanding the literary form of Boethius’s writing. We should therefore start by taking a first glance at the *Consolatio* and by reminding ourselves of the Roman concept of *auctoritas* and the role it plays (as *auctoritas antiquorum*) within the philosophical discourse of Cicero. Additionally, it should be kept in mind that the notion of “authority of the ancient” or “ancient wisdom” also played an important part in Greek philosophical —especially Platonic—discourse, where it emerges as a concept that does not inhibit independent ideas, but rather creates the necessary free space." (pp. 412-413)
(8) Cf. *Cons*. 1.1.13, 1.4.7, 5.1.2
(9) For Christian authors, see K.-H. Lütcke, *Auctoritas bei Augustin, mit einer Einleitung zur romischen Vorgeschichte des Begriffs*. Tubinger Beitrage zur Altertumswissenschaft 44 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1968), 51 ff., 64 ff.; K.-H. Lütcke, "Art. Auctoritas,” *Augustinus-Lexikon*. Band 1, vol. 1, fasc. 1/2, ed. C. Mayer (Basel: Schwabe, 1986), 86–1994.

23. Farrell, Joseph. 2001. *Latin Language and Latin Culture: from Ancient to Modern Times*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
"This grammatical geography is directly implicated in the poverty topos. Cicero, in a certain mood, could invert the topos completely. At one point he boasts that in writing philosophy ``we seem to have made such progress that the Greeks do not surpass us even in vocabulary" (*De natura deorum* 1.8); and again, more generally, ``I have often observed that Latin is not only not destitute (*inopem*), as is vulgarly

believed, but that it is even richer (l*ocupletiorem*) than Greek" (*De finibus* 1.10). The etymology of locuples refers to the extensive land holdings in which honest Roman wealth traditionally consisted. It is tempting to see an implied connection here (as of course there was in fact) with the enormous personal estates acquired by the Roman elite and the vast expansion of public holdings in the form of provinces ± including, of course, Greece. But for another purpose, Cicero would deploy the motif more conventionally by linking territorial to linguistic poverty: ``Greek is read among practically all peoples; Latin is contained within its own borders, and those quite small" (*pro Archia* 23)." (pp. 37-38)
(...)
"In his doxography Lucretius systematically debunks the idea that Greek is superior to Latin as a medium for poetry and philosophy on every score: its supposedly greater beauty and mellifluous qualities, its larger vocabulary, the ease with which it forms compounds, its capacity for subtle philosophical expression, all are revealed as traps that lead to obscurity, muddled thinking, silliness. Even the geographical extension of the language is turned to its disadvantage, except as westward colonization has brought about proximity to Lucretius' own linguistic domain. The ``poverty" of Latin is thus revealed as a positive advantage.
We tend to take Lucretius' disclaimer about ``poverty" too literally, to interpret it simplistically, and to believe in it implicitly; but we shouldnot. For that matter, we should be careful of assuming too easily that poverty does in fact connote inadequacy. In Epicurus' and therefore Lucretius' ethical system it is strongly asserted that human wants are few, that luxury corrupts and debilitates. In Latin culture too the praise of an unassuming, even a hardscrabble way of life is a constant theme, representing almost an article of faith. When Lucretius refers to the poverty of the Latin language that forces him to work hard at finding the right words to convey Epicurus' message, there is no reason to assume that he sees the poem he has labored to write as second best. In producing a Latin *De rerum natura*, Lucretius was not attempting to supply a surrogate *Peri phuseos* but rather to improve on the original as only the specific resources of the Latin language would allow him to do. Even Epicurus, forced to contend with the luxuriance of the Greek tongue, could not find a form adequate to his message; this task was left to his greatest disciple, who was also one of the greatest masters of Latin speech." (pp. 50-61)

24. Fögen, Thorsten. 2011. "Latin as a Technical and Scientific Language." In *A Companion to the Latin Language*, edited by Clackson, James, 445-463. Malden: Blackwell
"This overview of the technical and scientific elements of Latin starts with a brief summary of modern definitions of “technical” texts and languages and connects them with ancient approaches to their description. It takes into account the lexical, morphosyntactical, pragmatic and stylistic features of Latin technical texts and devotes particular attention to the role of Greek in the formation of Latin as a language for specific purposes." (p. 445)
(..)
"Cicero has contributed a great deal to the formation of Latin as a standard language, in particular its technical vocabulary. It is one of his major achievements to have developed a complex Latin terminology in the areas of philosophy and rhetoric. Although he does not deny that his own treatises are indebted to Greek thinking, he is one of the first Roman authors to exhibit a hitherto unknown self-confidence that enables him to create literary products of their own value and thus make a significant contribution to Roman culture as a whole. When he claims that there exist no noteworthy, stylistically accomplished and sufficiently precise philosophical texts in Latin before his own time (*Tusc*. 1.5–6), it becomes obvious that Cicero follows a rigorous strategy of self- advertisement.
He even goes so far as to say that he was the first to have created a philosophical terminology in Latin (*Fin*. 3.5). This in turn is part of what he calls the extension or expansion of the Latin language (*Fat.* 1: *ugentem linguam Latinam*), or, to be more precise, the enlargement or enrichment of its vocabulary (*copia uerborum*; cf. Ac.

1.26), which thanks to his personal commitment can now compete with that of Greek and even
surpass it (*N.D.* 1.8; cf. *Tusc*. 2.35, 3.8–11, *de Orat*. 2.17–18, *Sen*. 45)."

25. Fraño, Peter. 2020. "Cicero's Translations of the Stoic Term συμπάθεια into Latin." *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* no. 25:87-97
Abstract: "The present study analyses Cicero's approaches to translating the Stoic term συμπάθεια into Latin. In his treatise *On Fate*, the Roman author differentiates two types of situation in which Stoic sympathy functions. In the scientific sense, the word sympathy refers to mutual connections between physical phenomena, such as the connections between the phases of the moon and the alternating tides. In the divinatory sense, sympathy acts in the connection between a prophecy and its fulfilment, such as between the flight of birds and the start of a war.
In Cicero's view, only the scientific sense of sympathy should be accepted. For this reason, in his treatise *On Fate*, he translates the Greek term συμπάθεια using the Latin word *contagio* (Cic. *Fat*. 3, 5–6), since the verb *tango* means "to make or come into physical contact with". In contrast, he does not accept that sympathy acts in a divinatory sense, explaining the connection between a prophecy and its fulfilment as the result of chance."

26. Friedlander, Paul. 1944. "The Greek behind Latin." *The Classical Journal* no. 39:270-277
"It would be interesting to expatiate upon an enterprise of such far-reaching importance as Cicero's foundation of classical prose literature, "the only work," as Seneca says, "which the Roman mind produced worthy of the Roman Empire." Cicero himself tells us what induced him to write Latin philosophy. He wanted to oppose the conviction "that any Romans who were learned in the teaching of the Greeks and who felt an interest in philosophy would rather read Greek than Roman writings, and, conversely, that if they shrank from the sciences and the systems of the Greeks, they would not care even for philosophy in Latin, which cannot be understood without Greek learning."(5) He wanted to overcome this Roman contempt for Latin writings: "Why should they dislike their native language for serious and important subjects when they are quite willing to read Latin plays translated word for word from the Greek? Why should not Latin be read by Romans?"(6) Cicero could have written on philosophy in Greek, as he wrote the memoirs of his consulship in Greek, but he preferred to create, after Greek models, the classical prose of Roman philosophy. Creative philosophy, to be sure, had not very much to gain, but literature and general culture were better off for such works as the Platonizing *De Re Publica*, with the *Somnium* at the end, or the *Hortensius;* i.e., the Romanized Aristotle." (pp. 273-274)
(5) *Academica* 11 2, 4.
(6) *De Finibus* 1, 2, 4.

27. Glucker, John. 2012. "Cicero's Remarks on Translating Philosophical Terms - Some General Problems." In *Greek into Latin from Antiquity until the Nineteenth Century*, edited by Glucker, John and Burnett, Charles, 37-96. London: The Warburg Institute
"In this study I shall discuss some general problems concerning the general nature of the emarks made by Cicero himself, in various places in his philosophical and rhetorical works, about his translation of a Greek term into Latin. We have over two hundred such remarks scattered throughout these writings. Some of them are brief and give us only the bare facts about the Latin word and its Greek original – e.g. Luc. 54, 'ea dico incerta quae ἄδηλα Graeci'. Some are longer, explaining the various ways of rendering a Greek term into Latin, and the reasons for Cicero's preference for this or that Latin term. Some of these remarks appear as part of a more general discussion of how one should translate Greek words for abstract concepts. The Appendix to this article is, to the best of my knowledge, the second complete collection of all such Greek-into-Latin remarks in Cicero's philosophical and rhetorical works. The only other collection I have encountered is Appendix I to Christian Nicolas's *Sic enim appello*.1 Nicolas's collection of these notes is

'minimalist', and does not include the larger contexts of Cicero's explanations, hesitations, and methodological discussions." (p. 37)
(1) Christian Nicolas, *Sic enim appello: Essai sur l'autonymie terminologique Gréco-latine chez Cicéron* (Louvain, etc., 2005), pp. 315–25.

28. ———. 2015. "Cicero as Translator and Cicero in Translation." *Philologica* no. 10:37-53
"My lecture will attempt to consider some aspects of the influence of Cicero as translator from Greek on future generations, in Latin and beyond Latin. The influence of Cicero's translations of works like *Aratea* and *Timaeus* was restricted to the period in which there were Latin readers who preferred, even if they knew some Greek, to read works of philosophy in Latin, and when the classics of Greek philosophy were still regarded as essential reading for philosophers and philosophically-minded people. It is no accident, therefore, that of Cicero's translations of Greek works none has survived in a complete form. Indeed, most of Cicero's own philosophical works were also hardly read in the Middle Ages, when the Greek classics no longer stood at the centre of philosophical studies in Latin Western Europe, and they were rediscovered in manuscripts, mostly in isolated monastic libraries, by Italian Renaissance scholars, as part of the Revival of Learning.
Cicero's abiding influence, in Western civilization, as a translator from Greek consists in the Greek terms – philosophical and rhetorical – for which he was one of the first to create Latin equivalents. Some of these equivalents, such as *qualitas*, *comprehensio*, and *individuum*, have survived into modern English, French, German and Italian, and have been borrowed from them into other modern languages. Some of these terms have kept their original Latin meaning, or a meaning very close to it, in modern languages, while some have acquired a new – usually more restricted – meaning. Quality still has the same meaning as Latin *qualitas* (and Greek *ποιότης*), while honest and *honnête* have a rather limited meaning in modern English and French, as against the more general Latin *honestum* – on which later." (p. 38)

29. Görler, Woldemar. 2017. "Roman Philosophy? A Ciceronian Ambition." In *For a Skeptical Peripatetic: Festschrift in Honour of J. Glucker*, edited by Liebersohn, Yosef, Ludlam, Ivor and Edelheit, Amos, 2202-232. Sankt Augustin Academia Verlag.

30. Guite, Harold. 1962. "Cicero's Attitude to the Greeks." *Greece & Rome* no. 9:142-159
"The preface of the *De Finibus*, published in 45, is concerned to defend the translation of Greek philosophy into Latin and takes entirely for granted the value of the original. As in the other philosophical works the exposition is punctuated by allusions to Greek inferiority." (p. 156, anote omitted)
(...)
"Book III deals with Stoicism, and a prefatory reference to its technical language brings Cicero back to his favourite theme of Latin linguistic superiority." (p. 156)
(,,,)
In the last paragraph of the *De Finibus* Atticus congratulates Cicero on the success of his enterprise: (...) Here equality with the Greeks is high praise, and the praise depends on the admission that pre-Ciceronian Latin was inadequate for the exposition of philosophy." (p. 156)
(,,,)
"But whence the eclecticism? From the school in which he was trained and which was old when he was born, the school that confounded philosophy with rhetoric. If Cicero was no true philhellene, it was partly because he loved the wrong Greeks." (p. 159)

31. Halichias, Ana Cristina. 2012. "The Intellectual Vocabulary in Latin Philosophical Prose." *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Studies and Environmental Communication* no. 1:69-87

Abstract: "The article analyses the terms that make up the lexical field of intellectual traits in the philosophical works of Cicero, Seneca and Apuleius. The research demonstrates the fact that these authors use a rich vocabulary, expressing different nuances of the positive and negative intellectual capacities."

32. Henderson, John. 2006. "From ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑ into PHILOSOPHIA: Classicism and Ciceronianism." In *Classical Pasts: The Classical Traditions of Greece and Rome*, edited by Porter, James I., 173-203. Princeton: Princeton University Press
"The death of daughter Tullia figures as Cicero's equivalent of the death of Socrates in Platonic self-authorization; it opens a wound between the performativity of mourning rites within the norms of Romanness, and the therapeutic ambitions of Hellenistic philosophy to regulate grief and condolence.
While vindicating the father's humanity (and through her infant son's death, Tullia's postpartum decease stands as gentilician quasi-oblivion for M. Tullius Cicero), the personal catastrophe challenges the philosopher's capacity to handle his own case. Some of Tully has died, his purer self, immaculate love and self-love; and he has lived on to feel this death, the pain, distress, stress, and menace to his manliness (*uirtus*).(4) Mores and ethics pull in different directions: they were supposed to; yet their friction powers an ongoing competition in mutual intertranslatability: the crisis of bereavement was the proving ground for tradition and radicalism, it brought the self closest to sampling its own finitude.
In Latin culture, Greek thought met a massive limit to its purchase on credibility insofar as that might depend on generalizability across cultural divides. If applicability, let alone universalizability, mattered to φιλοσοφία, then norms for grief in bereavement posed amongst the stiffest of tests; if *philosophia* were to matter "beyond Athens," then it must bridge the intercultural chasm, cross every impasse into the empire of Latinity. Cicero staked out his own writerly self-cure programme as a brainstorming thrash-out between the imperatives of Rome and the Academy: life handed him an eloquent mise-en-scène: a death." (pp. 173-174)
(4) For the conciliatory style of the philosophers figured as "a young girl, innocent, modest, and somehow unspoilt": Cicero, *Orator* 64.

33. Hine, Harry. 2016. "Philosophy and *philosophi:* From Cicero to Apuleius." In *Roman Reflections: Studies in Latin Philosophy*, edited by Williams, Gareth D. and Volk, Katharina, 13-29. New York: Oxford University Press
"The aim of this chapter is to trace the history of the use of the Greek loan word *philosophus* ("philosopher") in Latin from the late Republic down to the time of Aulus Gellius and Apuleius in the second century CE. Cicero and Seneca regularly describe themselves as pursuing *philosophia* ("philosophy"), and they apply the verb *philosophari* ("to philosophize") to themselves, but neither of them ever straightforwardly calls himself, or any of his social and political peers, a *philosophus*, or expresses any aspiration to be one; nor are they so labeled by any contemporaries or near contemporaries.(1) This is because for them a *philosophus* is a professional, typically someone who offers teaching in philosophy to young men or offers public lectures on philosophy, and usually someone of lower social status, generally Greek. The first Latin writer known to us who publicly declares himself to be a *philosophus* is Apuleius.
This chapter will first describe the usage of Cicero and Seneca in more detail, then will look at Apuleius's usage, and will offer some remarks on the social and intellectual changes that accompanied this shift in the application of the word *philosophus.*" (pp. 13-14)
(1) The adjectival use of philosophus is well established in Christian Latin, but extremely rare in our period (see *TLL* 10.1.2038.68–2039.26).
(...)
In Greek, on the other hand, in our period φιλόσοφος is regularly used as an adjective; and whereas the Latin adverb philosophe is not found until much later (see *TLL* 10.1.2039.27–34), Greek writers do use φιλοσόφως (indeed Cicero switches into Greek and uses the adverb at *Att*. 7.8.3 and 13.20.4).

34. Hoenig, Christina. 2018. *Plato's Timaeus and the Latin Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Contents: List of Tables IX; Acknowledgements I; List of Abbreviations XIII; Introduction 1; 1 The Setting: Plato's *Timaeus* 14; 2 Cicero 38; 3 Apuleius 102; 4 Calcidius 160; 5 5 Augustine 215; Bibliography 285; Index Verborum Graecorum 305; Index Verborum Latinorum 306; Index Locorum 309; Subject Index 315-331.
"As we turn to Cicero's Timaean methodology, my aim is to provide evidence for the agenda I believe him to have followed in his *Timaeus* project: to present the Timaean creation account as the cosmological theory that would have been adopted by the sceptical Academy as the most probable position.
I will go about answering these questions in several steps. In the first part of this section, I illustrate how Cicero translated *Tim*. 29b2– d3, the passage in which Timaeus reflects upon his methodology as a narrator, by resorting to vocabulary characteristic of the investigative methodology associated with Philo's sceptical Academy. At the same time, I shall emphasize the extent to which Cicero stresses the rhetorical nature of the sceptical investigative method, an aspect of his Latin translation that has gone unnoticed thus far. Taking Cicero's translation of this passage to be representative of his overall authorial approach, I shall argue that Timaeus' speaking part was most likely intended for Cicero himself. Finally, I shall argue that Cicero found in Timaeus' narrative at *Tim*. 29d7– 30c1 an argumentative pattern that, with the help of some minor modifications of the Greek text, appeared rather like an example for the application of sceptical– rhetorical investigative method to a question of fundamental import, the inquiry after the reason that induced the demiurge to create the visible cosmos." (pp. 55-56)

35. ———. 2023. "Translation." In *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Philosophy*, edited by Garani, Myrto, Konstan, David and Reydams.Schils, Gretchen, 293-323. New York: Oxford University Press
"It has become a commonplace observation, in the particular case of Greek- Latin translation, that Roman translators generally prioritized literary creativity, invention, and variatio over authenticity and faithfulness. Yet, to appreciate their contributions fully, we need to contextualize Roman translators beyond customary references, for instance, to Horace's warning against the all- too- slavish "faithful interpreter" (*fidus interpres*, *Ars P*. 133), or to Cicero's maxim of translating not "like an interpreter [he means by this 'literally'], but like an orator" (De optimo genere oratorum 14, see below). In addition to adjusting our expectations with regard to the equivalence between Greek source text and Roman translation, it is useful to examine the specific manner in which a source text is integrated into a new environment: what parts of the Greek text are translated? Does the source text appear in a new genre? Are speaking parts assigned to a specific character, fictional or otherwise? Does the translation explicate, disambiguate, create new associations, connotations, semantic relations? I shall bring these and similar questions to bear on several writers of Roman philosophy." (p. 294)
(...)
"We will witness the changing role of translation for Roman philosophical literature as we look at the authors Cicero, Lucretius, Apuleius, and Calcidius. For each of these authors, we will find, translation is a defining factor in their engagement with Greek philosophy." (p. 295)

36. Hösle, Vittorio. 2008. "Cicero's Plato." *Wiener Studien* no. 121:145-170
Summary: "The essay explores the relation of Cicero to Plato. First, Cicero interprets Plato fundamentally as a sceptic (and so in a way radically different fom Middle and Neoplatonism); secondly, Cicero is proud of the superiority of the Roman culture in various respects; thirdly, Cicero vies with the dialogues written by Plato. The essay shows how even more than the explicit statements on Plato, the indirect criticism in the conception of Cicero's dialogues sheds light on his relation to Plato. Cicero's insistence on Plato's Pythagoreanism must be taken very seriously, since it does not fit well with his general view of Plato.

37. Hutchinson, G. O. 2013. *Greek to Latin: Frameworks and Contexts for Intertextuality*. New York: Oxford University Press
"This book is designed in four growing parts; a prospective on those parts may be helpful. Part I will look at Roman conceptions of Greek and Latin literature in time. It will show the notional separation in time of the two sequences of authors, and the quasi-military conflict imagined between them. Part II will set out the different places in which Romans would actually encounter, or have experience related to, Greek literature both classic and contemporary. Many kinds of performance and interaction will show the intensity and liveliness of such experience.
The panorama will bring out how Greek literature is both integrated with Roman existence and conceived of as located elsewhere. Part III will show Roman conceptions of the Greek language as contrasting with Latin, aesthetically and morally. Groups of related passages will be analysed closely, to see how Latin exploitation of Latin differs from Latin exploitation of Greek, and to see how Latin exploitation of Greek operates within the framework of the pre-existing stylistic parameters which are set by Latin author and period. Part IV will look at interaction with Greek within large generic frameworks. Three prose supergenres, philosophy, history, and oratory, are seen to exhibit basic differences in their relation to Greek. The hexameter super-genre will be explored in closer textual detail; diverging relations to Greek will appear. These differences will be seen to connect with material, period, author, text." (p. 2)

38. Inwood, Brad. 2007. "Seneca, Plato and Platonism: The case of Letter 65." In *Platonic Stoicism - Stoic Platonism: The Dialogue between Platonism and Stoicism in Antiquity*, edited by Bonazzi, Mauro and Helmig, Christoph, 149-168. Leuven: Leuven University Press
"I will be looking at one of the famous letters [Letter 65], whose main theme is causation, neither as a mere source for the recovery and reconstruction of middle Platonic doctrine nor as a simple reaction to the evolving school culture of the day. It is not as though we have any substantial body of evidence for such schools which antedates Seneca and so might be thought to have historical value greater than what we can infer from his texts, which are themselves some of the earliest and best evidence (best, if only because these are integral works not in need of complex reconstruction) for the state of philosophical life in Rome at the time.(4) I will be focussing on letter 65, but this cannot properly be done in abstraction from its obvious companion piece, letter 58 (which I believe helps to set the scene for it in the larger economy of the collection of letters), or from its immediate sequel, letter 66, which seems to be equally though less overtly engaged with Platonic themes such as the relation of body and soul to one another. One point for which I wish to argue is that Seneca should be seen as reacting directly to several Platonic dialogues and that we should not leap to the conclusion that his main sources – if it is even right to think in terms of 'sources' from which he might be supposed to have copied rather than works of philosophical literature by which he was influenced in some measure – were written works from Platonist schools." (p. 150)
(4) Note, for example, the closing chapter of *NQ* VII.

39. Jocelyn, H. D. 1977. "The ruling class of the Roman Republic and Greek philosophers." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* no. 59:323-366
"What I am concerned with in this essay is a kind of activity imported into Rome from those communities of Greek culture which fell under Roman domination during the last three centuries of the Republic and the degree to which this activity affected the character of Roman society and the behaviour of individual Romans. The formal study of logic, physics and ethics, the three areas into which Greek φιλοσοφοι divided the content of their teaching,(2) could be pursued seriously in an ancient Mediterranean society only by men of considerable wealth(3) and the modern student must bear in mind constantly how few of the families which possessed the Roman citizenship also possessed sufficient material resources to permit an individual member to devote part of his life to an activity like philosophical study. It is also important to remember that not all wealthy families

shared directly in the governance of the Republican state. The senator is not to be confused with the average Roman or even with the average wealthy Roman." (p. 323, a note omitted)
(2) For the triple division see Cic. *De orat*. 1.68, *Ac.* 1.19, 2.116, *Fin.* 4.4, *Diog. Laert*. 1.18,7.39,10.30.
(3) For the expensiveness of higher education see, for example, Plat. *Prot*. 326 c, [Lysias] 20.11, Lucian, *Somn*. I.

40. Jones, David Mervyn. 1959. "Cicero as a Translator." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* no. 6:22-34
"The subject of Cicaro's translations from Greek greatly exceeds the range of a single paper. It cannot be cleanly severed from topics of even wider scope, on the one hand the history of the development of Latin as a medium of literary and intellectual expression, on the other the history of Latin literature and Cicero's place in it. This paper, sketchy and superficial in treatment as it is, and notwithstanding some adverse criticisms of detail, is intended as a tribute to a genius notably creative in tha field of language and style.
Considering the variety of works cited by Cicero in translation, not all of which survive entire, it is remarkable that in the overwhelming majority of cases the Greek of the translated passages is known from one source or another. I therefore mention now, since I shall disregard it in what follows, the important passage of twenty-eight lines from Aeschylus' *Prometheus Liberatus* (*Tusc*. 11.23).
I begin with a review of the translations and the various motives which seem to have prompted them. They fall into two main groups, each containing both verse and prose; the first belongs to Cicero's youth, and can be related to his education, the second to the period of his philosophical writings. The translations of Aeschines and Demosthenes occupy a place apart." (p. 22)