
Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository

7-11-2014 12:00 AM

The Modalities of Roman Translation: Source-representative, Allusive, and Independent

James Kruck, *The University of Western Ontario*

Supervisor: Dr. Debra Nousek, *The University of Western Ontario*

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Classics

© James Kruck 2014

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd>



Part of the [Classical Literature and Philology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kruck, James, "The Modalities of Roman Translation: Source-representative, Allusive, and Independent" (2014). *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. 2167.
<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/2167>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact wlsadmin@uwo.ca.

The Modalities of Roman Translation: Source-representative, Allusive, and Independent.

A monograph

by

James Kruck

Graduate Program in Classical Studies

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
The University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada

© James Kruck 2014

Abstract

In my dissertation I argue that Roman translators promote themselves and their work by programmatic statements that indicate a relationship with a source author. Whereas the traditional understanding of translations has focused on *ad uerbum* and *ad sensum* translations, I deemphasize the binary division between *ad uerbum* and *ad sensum* translations since these terms are insufficient for appreciating the roles that translation can play in a literary system. By focusing on the statements of translators rather than the form of the translations, I elevate the translator as an agent who evaluates his socio-literary conditions and develops a response that capitalizes on those conditions.

I argue that there are three different styles of promotion that the Roman translator uses: the source-representative, the allusive, and the independent. The source-representative translator associates himself closely with the source, establishing his translation as the primary avenue to an accurate representation of a foreign author. The allusive translator strengthens his own position as an artist and asserts his own creative ability by encouraging comparison with established writers before distinctively embedding his own original material into the translation. Finally, the independent translator rejects the authority of the source author and endorses himself as more knowledgeable than the source.

My first chapter contextualizes the statements of Roman translators by examining similar statements from post-Classical translators who promote their own form of translation as the superior way in which to access the source author. In my second chapter I analyze source-representative translation in Livius Andronicus' *Oedusia* and Ennius' *Annales*. Chapter 3 reviews source-representative translation in Roman comedy with a focus on how Terence uses his translations to displace the drama of Plautus. In my fourth chapter I address allusive translation by showing how Catullus symbolically rejects translation and how Horace advertises his poetry as Roman songs played on a Greek instrument. In my final chapter, which concentrates on independent translation, I discuss how Cicero advertises his role as a judicious translator whose translation enhances and even replaces the source work. In each chapter I identify the programmatic statements that the translator uses to encourage the acceptance of his translation.

Keywords:

Translation theory, Roman translation, Latin literature, Livius Andronicus, Ennius, Plautus, Terence, Catullus, Horace, Cicero

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Abbreviations	vii
Acknowledgments.....	viii
1 Introduction	1
2 Translation as Promotion	16
2.1 <i>Ad uerbum</i> Translation in the Church.....	17
2.2 <i>Ad sensum</i> translation in the Church.....	22
2.3 The judgment of the translator.....	25
2.4 Imitation as a close relationship with the source	28
2.5 Criticism of imitation and Service to the Source	34
3 Source-representative, Epic.....	44
3.1 Situating source-representative translation	46
3.2 The socio-literary conditions of 3rd century Rome	48
3.3 Livius Andronicus.....	52
3.4 Gnaeus Naevius	61
3.5 Quintus Ennius.....	65
4 Source-Representative, Comedy	76
4.1 Plautus' prologues: <i>uortit barbare</i>	79
4.2 The Greek scene.....	84
4.3 Language.....	87

4.4	Characters	92
4.5	Deconstruction	95
4.6	Prologues of Terence: <i>uerbum de uerbo expressum</i>	100
4.7	Language	111
4.8	Characters	114
4.9	<i>Adelphoe</i>	115
4.10	The <i>Eunuchus</i>	123
4.11	Conclusion	129
5	Allusive Translation	133
5.1	Catullus	133
5.2	Catullus, Poem 51	134
5.3	Poem 66	142
5.4	Poem 68	144
5.5	Conclusion on Catullus	146
5.6	Horace	148
5.7	Horace and his source: the <i>Epodes</i>	152
5.8	<i>Epode</i> 11	153
5.9	<i>Epode</i> 12	157
5.10	<i>Epode</i> 15	160
5.11	The <i>Odes</i>	163
5.12	<i>Odes</i> 1.9	166
5.13	<i>Odes</i> 1.37	169
5.14	<i>Odes</i> 1.12	173
5.15	Horace Conclusions	176
5.16	Conclusion	177

6 Cicero and Independent Translation	179
6.1 Critical Remarks	181
6.1.1 Philosophical Study	184
6.1.2 Newfound freedom	190
6.1.3 Defence of philosophy	194
6.1.4 Critics of translation.....	196
6.1.5 The language advantage.....	200
6.1.6 Cicero's qualifications	205
6.2 Translating the Source	212
6.2.1 Greek words in Latin text	218
6.2.2 Distinguishing Translator from Author	222
6.3 Conclusion	226
7 Conclusion	229
Bibliography	236
Curriculum Vitae	254

List of Abbreviations

ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt.</i> Berlin.
Blänsdorf	Blänsdorf, J. 2011. <i>Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum.</i> Berlin.
CAH	<i>Cambridge Ancient History.</i>
FGrHist	Jacoby, F. <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker.</i> Berlin.
PCG ⁵	Kassel, R. and C. Austin, eds. 1986. <i>Poeta Comici Graeci: Damoxenus – Magnes.</i> Berlin.
PCG ^{6.2}	_____ 1998 <i>Poeta Comici Graeci: Menander.</i> Berlin.
Sandbach	Sandbach, F.H. 1990 [1972]. <i>Menandri reliquiae selectae.</i> Oxford.
SB	Bailey, D.R.S. 1987. <i>M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae ad Atticum</i> Stuttgart.
Sk.	Skutsch, O. 1985. <i>The Annals of Q. Ennius.</i> Oxford.
SVF	Armin, H. 1903–1924. <i>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta.</i> Stuttgart.
R ¹	Ribbeck, O. 1962 [1871]. <i>Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta: Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta.</i> Hildesheim.
R ²	_____ 1962 [1873]. <i>Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta. Comicum Romanorum Fragmenta.</i> Hildesheim.
Voigt	Voigt, E. 1971. <i>Sappho et Alcaeus.</i> Amsterdam.
West	West, M.L. 1989–1992 [1971–1972]. <i>Iambi et elegi Graeci.</i> Oxford.

Acknowledgments

I would like to offer my sincere thanks to my advisor Dr. Debra Nousek for all of the advice and encouragement she has provided during my time at Western, particularly during the writing of this thesis. Her supervision and ability to calm my concerns proved invaluable. I would also like to thank the other members of my thesis committee, Dr. Randall Pogorzelski and Dr. Christopher Brown, both of whom have given me a significant amount of guidance in the writing of the thesis and in other areas of my academic pursuits. I offer my gratitude to my board of examiners: Dr. Kelly Olson, Dr. Laurence de Looze, and Dr. Elaine Fantham. My thanks as well to Dr. Alex Meyer and Dr. Elizabeth Greene for offering me a position as a Research Assistant in the final year of my studies. In addition, I wish to thank all of the faculty and staff of the Department of Classical Studies for welcoming me to Western five years ago and for always showing kindness and an eagerness to help. Finally, I must thank my fellow graduate students for their unending support and friendship.

I have presented portions of my research at the University of Western Ontario Research Seminar Series (March 2013) and the Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of Canada (May 2013, Winnipeg; May 2012, London). I was able to complete my research through funding from the Department of Classical Studies, the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, and the School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies. Additional support was received from Ontario Graduate Scholarship program.

I am deeply indebted to my parents, Arnold and Carol Kruck, who have always supported and encouraged me in my academic pursuits. Sincere gratitude is owed to my wife, Lindsay Ferrier,

whose patience, understanding, and inspiration has made this and every other achievement possible. Finally, I dedicate this work to my two sons, Parker and Finley, who constantly remind me to smile when any task seems difficult.

1 Introduction

There are three agents who are influential in the creation of a translation: a source author, a translator, and a target audience.¹ All translators have in common the underlying position that the source text or author has value to a proposed audience. It is incumbent upon the translator to construct a compelling argument why his or her version of the source text is of more value than another translation. These arguments are often expressed via programmatic statements prominently placed in the work. I situate Roman translation, particularly the programmatic statements made by the translators, as a form of advertisement. Owing to the constitution of a translation, programmatic statements focus on the relationship between the source and translator as construed by the translator and are messages that the translator aims at the audience. There are three different types of relationship that Roman translators promoted: the source-representative, the allusive, and the independent. These three types of translation are separated by degrees of closeness to the source as promoted by the translator. The source-representative translator associates himself and his translation faithfully with the source, establishing his translation as the primary avenue to an accurate representation of a foreign author. The allusive translator strengthens his own position as an artist and asserts his own creative ability by evoking the works established writers before embedding his own original material into the translation. The allusive translator depicts in his translation how he is moving beyond the material of the source to fashion something new and original. Finally, the independent translator rejects the authority of the source author and endorses himself as more knowledgeable than the source, in the process

¹ The most extreme relationship between audience, translator and source is one in which the source does not exist. A work that claims to be a translation yet has no source text is technically known as a pseudo-translation (Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 134–135). Translation theorist Gideon Toury defines (1980: 31) pseudo-translations as “T(arget) L(anguage) texts which are regarded in the target culture as translations though no genuine S(ource) T(exts) exist for them.” As an example, James Macpherson claimed that his *Works of Ossian* was a translation of a Gaelic source, but in fact he seems to have written the work himself.

degrading the value of the source author in the target culture. The independent translator works not to bring the source to the target culture, but to elevate his own position in the target literary system by exceeding the source. Indeed, all of the Roman translators that I discuss here create programmatic statements to elevate their own status; the difference in the modalities is primarily in declarations of adherence.

A problem with scholarship on Roman translation is the practice of comparing source text with translation that leads to discussion of translations as “literal” or “free.” Analyses that compare translation with source text are valuable in that they highlight linguistic issues in the target language and reveal translator strategies, particularly when there are multiple translations of one source text. However, modern scholars who examine the translation alongside the source, point out the differences between the two texts, and conclude by calling the translation either “free” or “literal”, are applying their own subjective criteria and standards for translations to the texts and largely ignoring what the translator says. This type of analysis reveals more about modern scholars and the socio-literary conditions in which they operate than it does about the ancient author’s milieu. By contrast, I shift the focus away from the translation towards the translator, and to do so I privilege what the translator tells the reader about his relationship with the source author. In their statements that advertise a particular relationship to a source author, translators reveal how they conceive of translation: how they believe they should interact with the source author, what value they have in the target literary system, and who will read them.

Indeed, what often happens in discussions on translation is that differences from the source text that appear in the translation are assigned to translator error, rather than allowing the

translator agency in making a deliberate choice.² By assigning translation choices to error, scholars succumb to the idea that “perfect” translations exist, and that if the translator could have translated the source “correctly”, he would have. Recent scholarship has begun to move away from the problems that arise from this traditional classification of translation. Possanza’s study (2004) of translations of Aratus by Cicero, Vergil and Germanicus provides a careful analysis of the choices of each translator that looks beyond translator error. McElduff and Sciarrino (2011) urge Classicists to discard the *ad uerbum* / *ad sensum* dichotomy and view Roman translation through the lens of modern translation studies, which has largely moved towards *describing* translations, rather than *prescribing* translation ideals. While not exclusively on Roman translation, Sciarrino’s work (2011) on the role of Cato the Elder in the creation of Latin prose literature argues that society and literature interact with one another, with society influencing authors and authors creating responses to their society in ways that shape the perception of the author. Sciarrino thus contextualizes the literature that she discusses by placing it into its cultural environment. In her most recent monograph on translation that covers a wide breadth of Roman evidence, McElduff (2013) incorporates the thinking of modern translation theorists by moving towards a descriptive approach of translation and resisting the urge to map modern conceptions of translation onto Roman translation. Furthermore, McElduff’s emphasis on translations as “products of their particular historical and cultural moments” (2013: 5) helps move the conversation about Roman translation towards analyzing how translators used translations in response to their socio-literary conditions. In my inquiry into Roman translation, I further

² Garrison (2004: 145) mentions that in his translation of Callimachus in c. 66, Catullus glossed over “sticky and erudite passages that he could not figure out.” In his commentary on *de Officiis*, Dyck (1996) occasionally speaks of problems of the translation that he attributes to mistakes on the part of Cicero (see especially Dyck’s in-depth analysis of what he views as the problems of *Off.* 1.92-151, pp. 239-249). Cicero’s translations are, among Latin translations, most frequently criticized for errors, perhaps because there are other sources available that describe the same material as he does in his translations and the survival of much of his writing allows scholars to check his translations for consistency.

advance the positions of McElduff, Possanza, and Sciarrino that look beyond the form of the translation and describe translations as tools of their authors by concentrating on what Roman translators say about their translations and how they used these statements to advertise their writing to their audience.

In my study I take the names for my modalities of translation from the statements that the translators themselves make. Under source-representative translation I consider the *Odusia* of Livius Andronicus, the *Bellum Punicum* of Naevius, and the *Annales* of Ennius. Although I do not label Plautus' translations as source-representative, his drama is included here because without understanding how Plautus handles his sources it is difficult to appreciate how Terence depicts himself as a source-representative translator. Under allusive translation I examine the poetry of Catullus, in particular *c.* 50, 51, 66, and 68. I also consider under the allusive modality the *Odes* and *Epodes* of Horace, which he depicts as Roman representations of the work of Alcaeus and Archilochus, respectively. Finally, under the independent modality I investigate the philosophical translations of Cicero. In each chapter I analyze the programmatic statements of the translators to show how they viewed their translations fitting into the existing Latin literary system.

In several of my case studies I consider under the label translation works that do not regularly meet our post-Classical criteria for a translation. As I describe more fully in Chapter 2, the Western conception of translation is founded more in Christian ideology than it is in Roman practices. The historical practice of the Church took it for granted that God's message spoke across languages: for Augustine, language was only an artificial barrier to God's message.³ It

³ *De Doctrina Christina* 4.5

follows from this perception of language as words that refer to universals that a translator could theoretically perfectly recreate the source text. In Christian practice, perfection in translation only occurs with God's divine intervention, such as when seventy separated Greek translators all translated the Hebrew Bible into the Septuagint.⁴ However, as translation studies has formalized into an academic discipline, translation theorists have begun to move away from valuing translation in terms of their equivalence to a source text. For many modern translation theorists, perfect equivalence between translation and source does not occur: indeed, the translation theorist Douglas Robinson (1991) describes equivalence as “not the final goal of all translation”(259), but only one of many fictions for “the shaping of a successful text” (xv).

What was particularly problematic about the Christian practice is that it established guidelines on what a translation is and what it is not and what a translator should do in his or her writing. This type of standardization of translation is particularly prescriptive in that it identifies certain rules that a translator must follow to write a translation that aims at a sort of equivalence with a source text. In turn, it is easy to become distracted from what translators try to tell their audience by a need to weigh whether or not a text fulfills the requirements of a translation. Rather than enforce modern ideals of translation onto the practice of Romans who did not conceive of their source texts as divine agents whose very minds could not be perceived, I follow the practice of descriptive translation theorists who expand their definition of translations to look beyond the idea of equivalence. In particular, my primary criterion for naming something a translation is that the translator invites the audience to compare the work in question with a source text or a source author. My criteria also mean that there will not always be a source text for a translator and that a translator may translate something other than the words of the source

⁴ Augustine mentions the legend of the divinely inspired translation in *De Doctrina Christina* (15.22).

text: in the *Annales* Ennius did not work with a source text *per se*, but since he depicts himself as the embodiment of Homer, he invites the audience to compare his epic poetry with that of Homer. Similarly, Terence translates several non-textual aspects of Menandrian comedy, particularly the idea of family order and inclusion, into his Latin drama. My focus is on how Latin writers position themselves as representatives of a foreign author: to use the previous examples, Ennius encourages us to read him as Homer; Terence invites us to read him as a dramatist engaging in the same fashion of didacticism as his source Menander. To classify as translation in my study, there does not need to be a one-to-one correspondence between either word or message, the very thing that the *ad uerbum* / *ad sensum* scale demands: the translator needs only to promote an experience of the source in his translation.

In addition, I do not differentiate between what is traditionally referred to as “translation”, “imitation”, and “adaptation”, unless the translator himself does so. As I argue more fully in the following chapter on how post-Classical translators promoted their translations, these terms are more meaningful coming from the translator than from a critical audience that, in the case of Roman translation, is distanced by 2000 years. When a translator claims to be imitating a source author or work, I consider what type of relationship he is establishing with the source author versus a translator who says that he writes *ad uerbum* translations. I argue that these positions function primarily as forms of advertisements to different audiences that seek different aspects of a source. All of the translators across the traditional *ad uerbum* / *ad sensum* scale promote the notion that they are providing an essence of the source author; they only privilege different parts of the source for their audience.

By focusing on the statements of translators rather than the form of the translations, I position the translator as an agent who evaluates his socio-literary conditions and develops a

response that capitalizes on those conditions. The work of three translation theorists underpins my approach: Lawrence Venuti's foreignizing approach which opposes domestication of a foreign text and encourages representing the foreign aspects of a source text in a translation, Douglas Robinson's focus on the translator's ability to determine the format of the translation, and Itamar Even-Zohar's polysystem theory, which promotes the role that the target culture's socio-literary conditions have in determining the style of a translation. Ultimately, the source has no agency other than what the translator assigns to it, particularly so in Roman translation where the source authors are all deceased. Yet translators regularly structure their own endeavours in terms of how they are treating the source, generally along the lines of "faithfully" or "freely." A branch of modern translation theory and practice encourages the translator to write fluent translations that make the source text seem native to the target culture. Norman Shapiro, for example, says that he sees translation "as the attempt to produce a text so transparent that it does not seem to be translated. A good translation is like a pane of glass. You only notice that it's there when there are little imperfections—scratches, bubbles. Ideally, there shouldn't be any. It should never call attention to itself" (Venuti 1995: 1). In response to translation practices that position the translator as a transparent window through which the audience views the source, Lawrence Venuti rejects translations that "domesticate" foreign texts to the norms of the target language and instead advocates a system that calls attention to the fact that the text is a translation. He finds that "fluent" translations seek to hide the fact that they are translations,⁵ a process that renders the translator invisible. The translator's invisibility is "thus a weird self-annihilation, a way of conceiving and practicing translation that undoubtedly reinforces its marginal status in British and American cultures" (Venuti 1995: 7). Venuti argues that this type

⁵ Fluency is achieved by writing in language "that is current instead of archaic, that is widely used instead of specialized, and that is standard instead of colloquial" (Venuti 1995: 4).

of translation is assimilative of the foreign text and culture; translations primarily assimilate (or “domesticate”) a text by adapting it to the target-language norms, but also by the very act of putting the source text into the target-language. He seeks translation that never hides that it is a translation, one that puts up obstacles for the target language readers’ access to the text.⁶ For Venuti, no translation should ever hide what it is, nor present itself as something original. Instead, the translation should exhibit the source not only by way of words or style, but even by aspects of the foreign. Venuti’s theory aligns with the positions of post-colonial translators⁷ who argue that the foreign culture represented in a source text must not be domesticated, but represented. In these sentiments Venuti and the post-colonials are repeating the thoughts of major figures in the history of Western translation,⁸ yet Venuti pairs the call for translators to display the foreignness of a text with an explicit hope that by doing so translators can bring their own artistry to the forefront. Not domesticating a text makes it clear to the audience that it is experiencing something foreign, which in turn makes the role of the translator more prominent. That a translator can position himself clearly in a text and act symbolically as a guide to the foreign text is important for my study on Roman translation. Both Plautus and Cicero make

⁶ Venuti (2008) uses Robert Graves’ translation of Suetonius as an example of assimilation. Graves, having found that Classical scholarship had been marginalized in the post World War II period, revised the foreign text “to assimilate the foreign-language culture (Imperial Rome) to that of the target-language (the UK in 1957).” Such assimilation, Venuti points out, requires that the translator have extensive knowledge of both cultures. In Graves’ 1965 article *Moral principles in translation*, he explains his translation choices not only for Suetonius, but also Terence, Lucan, and Apuleius. He determines (54) that “A translator’s first duty must always be to choose the appropriate level of his own language for any particular task.”

⁷ The recognition of a postcolonial system in translation produced a renewed interest in literalism that denies immediate accessibility to the target audience. For Gayatri Spivak (1992), literalism is an “in-between discourse.” Spivak argues that rhetoric disrupts the “logical systematicity” of the source language in translation. She finds translation to be the most intimate fashion of reading, one in which she surrenders herself to the source text in the process. Spivak’s own practice is revealing: she claims to translate “at speed,” ignoring the question of potential audience. Her surrender means that she usually produces a literal draft. When she reaches the point of revision, she does so not on the standards of a possible audience, but “by the protocols of the thing in front of me.” Spivak privileges the source at the expense of the target audience. Post-colonial translators nevertheless make an appeal to a target audience, namely those in the target culture who approve of post-colonialism and are interested in experiencing a translation that adheres to the foreign text. On post-colonial translation, see Cheyftitz (1991) and Niranjana (1992).

⁸ Notably the German Romantic Friedrich Schleiermacher, whom I discuss in the following chapter (pp. 36-38).

themselves and their agency explicit in their translations, and both do so by depicting the source author or text as the Other. By not domesticating a foreign work, the translator can position himself more prominently in the translation and promote his translation activity.

Foreignization (and post-colonial translation) provide power to the source text as the translator preserves the signs that represent the foreign culture. Yet it is not always the case that the target audience will accept a foreignized text. Itamar Even-Zohar elevates the role of a receiving culture in what he calls “polysystem theory.”⁹ Even-Zohar structures a culture’s literature, arguing (1978a: 16) that there is a hierarchy to a culture’s literary system and that literature is either central (primary) or peripheral (secondary).¹⁰ Even-Zohar came to his conclusions from his analysis of Hebrew literature, where the data from translated literature showed that translations are positioned differently depending upon the age, strength, and stability of the particular literary polysystem. Specifically, he suggests (1978a: 24) that there are three social circumstances that enable translations to maintain a primary position in the polysystem: 1) when the literary polysystem is young, or in the process of being established; 2) when a literature is weak; and 3) when a literature is experiencing a crisis or turning point.

In the first scenario, a young literature is unable to create all forms and genres, and thus the translations function as substitutes for native examples. In the second scenario, the weak literature of an often smaller nation comes into contact with that of a stronger, larger system. The smaller system cannot produce all the kinds of writing of the larger system, and thus again translations serve as substitutes. Crucial to these first two scenarios is the understanding that a

⁹ Even-Zohar’s earliest publication on polysystem theory was in 1978. He presented his updated theories in a 1990 collection.

¹⁰ According to Even-Zohar, there can be “no equality between the various literary systems and types.” As a result of the nonexistence of equality, a literary system is a competitive, hierarchical environment that sees some systems being more central than others.

system that lacks certain forms and genres will realize its “defective” status and seek to repair itself (1978b: 122). In the third situation, established literary models no longer inspire writers, who turn elsewhere for new ideas. In any of these scenarios, or combination thereof, writers produce translations and, most importantly, through the translations introduce new elements into the literary system. When a literary system is strong, Even-Zohar tells us, original, native writing produces innovations in ideas and forms without the need for translations, and thus translations are relegated to a position of secondary importance in the literary hierarchy.

In addition to considering the role of translations in a literary system, Even-Zohar further theorizes why certain translations are accepted by a target audience. He argues that a literary system is aware of vacuums if features like forms or genres are missing. Like any vacuum, these literary voids need to be filled, and thus the most fitting texts are chosen to complete the polysystem. Gentzler (2001: 118) summarizes the theory succinctly: “Texts to be translated are chosen because of their compatibility with the new forms needed by a polysystem to achieve a complete, dynamic, homogeneous identity.” The socio-literary conditions of the receiving culture also determine *how* that text is translated (Even-Zohar 1978b: 124–126). When a translation assumes a central position in the literary system, it does so in order to introduce new features. This being the case, these translations necessarily adhere to the form of the source text. When translation is secondary, conversely, it seeks ready-made native models. As an example from Roman literature, Livius Andronicus’ *Odusia* occupies a central position in the Latin literary system as it introduces Latin epic poetry. After the *Odusia*, other Latin poets such as Naevius could draw on that native Latin example, rather than looking outside the literary system for models.

Gideon Toury, a colleague of Itamar Even-Zohar, formulates a series of “norms”, which could be defined as a series of interrelated factors that govern the translation product. Toury (1978) finds three kinds of translation norms: preliminary, operational, and initial. As Edwin Gentzler explains (2001: 128), “preliminary norms” are best reflected by certain questions: what is the translation policy of the target culture? What is the difference between translation, imitation, and adaptation for the specific period? What authors, periods, genres are preferred by the target culture? Preliminary norms administer the choice of the source work and the overall translation strategy. Toury (87) defines “operational norms” as those that “direct decisions made during the translation process itself”, including the extent to which the translation has omissions, additions, and changes from the source text.

Toury’s notion of “initial norms” refers to the translator’s initial choice between two distinct poles: either the translator can submit himself to the original text with its textual relations and norms and thus produce a translation that Toury calls “adequate”, or he may submit to the linguistic and literary norms that are active in the target literature (Toury: 88), a process that would result in an “acceptable” translation. Yet as Toury explains (90), these norms are not “initial choices”, for they are not initial, nor are they truly choices. All translational norms are dependent on the socio-literary conditions of the receiving audience. Polysystem theory recognizes that the translator engages the target audience and often reacts to the circumstances in the target culture. Most importantly for my own study, polysystem theory explains how translators can benefit by forming close associations with a source: in young or changing systems, innovation results from the adaptation of foreign models.

Douglas Robinson emphasizes the agency of the translator as he describes the process of acceptance in the target culture. Robinson sees the translator as a not consistently-rational agent;

for Robinson, the translator does not constantly contemplate and follow established norms and practices in translation choices.¹¹ However, Robinson also acknowledges that no agent is ever completely free from his circumstances and culture,¹² and so allows for the formats of translations being impacted by socio-literary conditions. In Robinson's terminology, audiences accept translations when they "feel" right in their language (Robinson 1991: 19–23). Robinson's analysis here points to an important factor: not everyone will accept a translation, nor will a translation necessarily displace a source text for all-time. Alexander Pope's 18th century translation of Homer is not the standard translation of Homer in modern English speaking societies because the translation no longer feels right; Pope's English is almost as foreign to a modern general audience as Homer's Greek. A translation that uses contemporary language seems to be the surest way to gain acceptance in a target audience, yet if Venuti's advocacy for foreignization is to have any success, it must be the case that a certain audience will find that foreignized translations will "feel" right. Different styles of translation will feel right to different audiences; some audiences seek a domesticated translation and thus will accept a translation that adheres to the norms of the target language, others, generally those who are already familiar with the source work, are more accepting of a foreignized version that signals.¹³ The audience's own background and preference informs what they accept as a translation. Robinson's understanding of translation allows numerous possibilities to the translator who is no longer indebted to the source text nor bound to follow a schema set by the target culture. There is nothing that the

¹¹ Robinson makes this point regularly throughout his works, but a particularly compelling account of how a translator functions is found in *The Translator's Turn* (1991) in his discussion on the ideosomatics of translation (29–38).

¹² Even a translator who is rebelling against established norms is responding to norms. For example, Robinson (1991: 65–69) lists Martin Luther's translation of the Bible as a paradigm shift, but a prerequisite of Luther's shift was that the Church practice surrounding translation was established and still current when Luther was translating.

¹³ A different name for a foreignizing translation is *ad uerbum* translation. As I discuss in the following chapter, various groups from the translators of scripture to the German Romantics have advocated *ad uerbum* translation and wrote translations for those already familiar with the original.

translator “needs” to do, although it may be prudent to make choices that the translator believes will appeal to a certain audience.¹⁴

Polysystem theory provides structure to a study of a culture’s history of translation in that it allows for the relevance of translations in the target literary system to wax and wane depending on socio-literary circumstances. In between the structure provided by Even-Zohar and Toury in their analysis of receiving culture is a space for a less structured theory that emphasizes the individuality and irrationality of the translator. Systems cannot explain all phenomena of translation, I would argue, but performing my analysis of Roman translation within the framework of polysystem theory helps contextualize the examined translations.

In the following chapter on the history of translation theory from Jerome to the German Romantics, I show how translators attempt to dislodge earlier translators by altering what it means to be faithful to a source, by promoting the importance of the target audience over the source author in importance, or by proclaiming new ways of presenting the source that they view as beneficial to both source and translator. Ultimately, all of these translators are promising a way to the “truth” of the source, whether that truth be the words, the sense, or the experience of the source text. Many of these strategies are visible in Roman practice, and the regularity of the translator’s self-promotion is an important point of my study. It is not always immediately apparent that a translator is using translation as a promotional tool; indeed, it is common for translators, particularly in post-Classical Rome, to downplay their own persona in the process of

¹⁴ As Robinson is aware: he recounts (1997:50–51) how when translating technical material he at times wants to make personal choices and privilege flashiness at the expense of accuracy, yet restrains himself because he also wants to receive pay for his work. Robinson and other translators may on occasion force themselves to write a certain way in the belief that a particular style is what the audience desires.

translation.¹⁵ Yet even while a translator may be able to reach a level of invisibility among certain members of the target audience, it is unlikely that the performance of translation will escape the notice of all audience members. For example, Norman Shapiro is an award winning translator;¹⁶ the very existence of the award reveals that the translator can never become entirely invisible. There are always those who commissioned the work or other experts who are in a position to judge the value and quality of the translation. The invisible translator may claim to write a translation for a lay audience in which only the source author is visible, but the performance aspect of translation is aimed at an informed audience who appreciates the process itself. That is, programmatic statements and general translation techniques are appeals to an audience who is in a position to judge the translation as a representation of another writer's work. Roman translators make appeals to learned members of their audience. For example, Livius Andronicus' translation of Homer's *Odyssey* shows signs that Livius aimed it at an audience who was already familiar with the Greek source and would appreciate how he had rendered Homeric hexameter into Latin Saturnian metre. Terence shows (*Ad.* 11) his allegiance to his source with the phrase *uerbum de uerbo expressum*, a declaration that would matter only to those who were concerned how Terence represents the foreign source; Horace (*Epistle* 19: 23–25) views his *iambi* as having the *numerus* and *animus* of Archilochus' poetry, but neither the *res* nor the *uerba*; in the preface to his *Tusculanae Disputationes* (1.1–2), Cicero points to Roman superiority in all fields before showing how he will continue the trend and surpass the Greek philosophers who trained him. Horace aims his claim at those who know Archilochus'

¹⁵ Translators of Scripture, such as Jerome (see pp. 18–19) and John Scotus Eriugena (see pp. 19–20), particularly downplay their authorship in a translation. However, translators of non-Holy material make similar claims that privilege the voice of the source author, such as Boethius when translating Aristotle.

¹⁶ Shapiro was the recipient of the 2009 *National Translation Award*, which is awarded by the American Literary Translators Association to an American translator writing in English.

poetry; Cicero at those Romans who already know how Romans have surpassed the Greeks in all areas but philosophy. On the audience end of the performance, Aulus Gellius (2.23) describes a scene in which the performance of translation is judged by an informed audience when he recounts how he and his guests passed around copies of Caecilius Statius and his source to determine which was superior. In Roman translation there are consistently signs that the translator knows that there is a portion of the audience that is judging how the translator interacts with the source text and therefore aims a message at this audience. My study focuses on these statements to illustrate and analyse how Latin writers viewed translation in their literary culture.

2 Translation as Promotion

In this chapter I outline various strategies which translators adopt in order to promote themselves and their work. I sample critical approaches to translation and strategies from translators in service of the Church, poetic imitators, and Romantics. Many of the stances taken by the translators below echo sentiments expressed by Roman translators of Greek literature and philosophy that I will discuss in the following chapters: concern for representing the source material is paired with anxiety over representing the voice of the translator; close relationships with the source material are advertised to the target audience; expert knowledge in language and subject matter is valued as translators promote their own ability to act as informed mediators between source and audience. Yet Roman translators differ from many of the examples below because they did not work under the same constraints placed on them by a governing body. Besides some apparent doubt from Atticus (*Att.* 16.14) about the translation of καθῆκον, Cicero records no other peer informing him that he was translating improperly. When Horace strives to replace Alcaeus in the lyric canon and drop the *res* and *uerba* of Archilochus (*Ep.* 1.19.23–32), nobody charges him with heresy. The translators in this chapter all worked in systems first established by the Church fathers. The practice of Church translation taught translators certain lessons that are still presently at work in translation, namely that the source was written by an inviolable author that could not be improved and that the only job of the translator was to serve the source. Every translator after Augustine has had to respond to his conceptualization of language as a series of signs that represent universalities.¹ For Augustine, all concrete objects

¹ On the importance of Augustine in the history of Western translation, see especially Robinson (1991).

and abstract thoughts could be expressed in every language since every aspect of the universe was common to all and ultimately derived from God.² Augustine's ideals mean that the perfect translation³ is possible, if only the translator can find the right method. Augustine effectively creates a scenario in which only one form of translation can be the "right method",⁴ that is, translation which overcomes differences in signs between cultures and speaks to the meaning.⁵ Thus begins the long practice of translators aligning themselves with one style or another as they advertise themselves as the true gateway to the source.

2.1 *Ad uerbum* Translation in the Church

Until the mid-20th century,⁶ translators have generally taken a position on the *ad uerbum*–*ad sensum* scale of adherence to a source text. Their claims to use these poles or an intermediary

² Augustine writes (*De Doctrina Christina* 4.5) that the signs themselves became non-universal because of human pride. To spread the message of God throughout the world after the fallout from the Tower of Babel, the Bible was scattered in the different languages of translators (5.6). The sign is a social construct that people use to communicate, but for Augustine that does not mean that the things represented by signs are dependent upon culture. As Robinson (1991: 46) observes, Augustine equates (1.13) the Word of God entering the mortal body of Jesus with thought entering the word; the immortal is set inside the mortal, but the immortal portion does not itself undergo any alteration. Robinson (1991: 47) theorizes that Augustine's conception of word and meaning led to the privileging of sense translation over word-for-word translation. The word is changeable; the sense is not.

³ Robinson (1997: 31) refers to Augustine's ideal translation as "the perfect transfer of a stable meaning from one language to another by the ideal interpreter." Key in this statement is the modifier "stable" since it speaks to the universality of that which the word signifies. If the meaning is not stable, and if ideas are not universal across all peoples and languages, then "perfect" translation is not possible. As Robinson (1991: 51) detects, the idea of universal meaning works particularly well where it concerns the Bible since the Bible itself is constructed from the meaning of God, and God's meaning is not (cannot be?) contained by human words.

⁴ Robinson argues (1991: 38-50) that Augustine's dualistic ideology has had an impact on translation. Something is either mind or body, changing or unchanging; a translation is either good or bad, *ad uerbum* or *ad sensum*; a writer is either original or a translator (Robinson 1991: 86).

⁵ As an opposing view, the modern scholar Willard Van Orman Quine argues that the meaning and value of words are prescribed by each culture; each new receiving (or translating) culture rewrites the text according to its own values: "Most talk of meaning requires tacit reference to a home language in much the way that talk of truth involves tacit reference to one's own system of the world" (Quine 1960: 171). Meaning is dependent upon language for Quine; unlike Augustine's conceptualization of meaning as a universality set by God, meaning does not exist outside of the way in which it is described.

⁶ Here I mark the formation of translation studies as an academic study. Translation studies theorists largely do not describe translation with the traditional *ad uerbum*–*ad sensum* dichotomy of translation any longer, though some of the ideas behind these terms remain a driving factor in the discussion around translation. For example, foreignization (Berman 1984, Venuti 2008) and post-colonialism (Cheyfitz 1991) translation theorists advocate approaches that do not obscure the foreign aspects of the source material. Yet translation studies has also moved beyond prescription, and thus as a branch of descriptive studies aims to explain why translations take the forms that they do, such as

function as advertisements in a superior style for translators. Avowals to follow one style of translation or another are generally responses to socio-literary conditions that work to entice a specific target audience into adopting the translation.

Owing to the role of an audience in determining the form of a translation, it is not always the case that a translator is free to use the style that he prefers. Jerome, for instance, wrote in support of *ad sensum* translation, yet was bound to the *ad uerbum* style when translating Scripture. Jerome discloses his translation choices in a letter to Pammachius (*Ep.* 57).⁷ He recounts that he had been asked by one Eusebius of Cremona to translate a letter of Pope Ephiphanius into Latin in a style that Eusebius, who did not know Greek, could understand (Carroll 1958: 133). Jerome accepted the task, quickly created a paraphrase, and requested that Eusebius keep the translation private. When Jerome's translation became public, his enemies accused him of falsifying the letter by not translating word for word (Carroll 1958: 134). He admits that his translation contained some alterations, but defends himself on the grounds that there were no changes in the sense and appeals to the authority of Cicero and Horace for his choice in translation style. Indeed, he writes that his ideal translator is Hilary the Confessor,⁸ who wrote using the *ad sensum* approach and whom Jerome describes as a conqueror who marched the original text as his captive into his native language.⁹

systems theories (Even-Zohar 1978b) and cultural norms (Toury 1980). Descriptive translation theorists generally do not use *ad uerbum* or *ad sensum* as titles, but the idea that translations can be either source-oriented (so *ad uerbum*) or target audience-oriented (so *ad sensum*) perseveres.

⁷ Carroll (1958: 132–151). The letter dates to circa 395 C.E. Pammachius was a Roman senator who knew Jerome from their shared training in rhetoric. Pammachius (*Ep.* 83, 84) asked Jerome to translate Origen's (an early Church writer) *De Principiis*, seemingly to clear himself of an accusation made by Rufinus (a monk and translator of several Greek patristic works) that Jerome was an Origenist. Origen had advocated a few teachings, most notably the pre-existence of souls, that were eventually declared heretical. At any rate, Rufinus' accusation appears to be the reason why Jerome wrote the letter in question above (*Ep.* 57).

⁸ Sometimes referred to as the *Malleus Arianorum*, St. Hilary translated some of Origen's commentary on Job.

⁹ Jerome's statement of ideal translation is similar to Cicero's compliment to Cato the Younger in *De Finibus* (3.12.40): "You seem to me to teach philosophy in Latin and it is as if you are giving it citizenship" (*itaque mihi uideris Latine docere philosophiam et ei quasi ciuitatem dare*).

Yet this avenue of translation is not open to Jerome: translators of Scripture encounter a fundamental problem. Since it is not possible for Church writers to claim that they are more authoritative about the message of God than God himself, this principle rules out any possibility of improving the source. Indeed, it was even problematic for translators to claim that they understood the message, which would be necessary for *ad sensum* translation. Jerome claims that even the word order in Scripture is a mystery:¹⁰ for him, the sense is unknowable, because understanding the sense is understanding God. While Jerome is careful to mention that he recognizes that *ad sensum* translation is not suitable when translating Scripture he reveals his frustration that he has come under criticism for using this style of translation outside of scripture translation. Yet Jerome's interest in keeping the translation of the Pope's letter private shows that he was aware that his style of translation would be criticized and indicates that he would have preferred not to be known as anything other than an *ad uerbum* translator when working with Holy Scripture.

Jerome claims that he abides by established practices when translating scripture to show that he is acting dutifully in his translator role. Certain conditions surrounding scripture translation made it possible for the *ad uerbum* translation to become popular and for translators to further show themselves as deferential to the source and the system that surrounds the proliferation of the source message. As John Scotus Eriugena explains, it was not his job as a translator to write a translation that could be understood by all.¹¹ Instead, he identifies his

¹⁰ *ego enim non solum fateor, sed libera uoce profiteor, me in interpretatione Graecorum, absque scripturis sanctis, ubi et uerborum ordo mysterium est, non uerbum e uerbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu* ("For I not only admit, but I declare it with a free voice that in my translation of the Greeks – apart from Holy Scripture, where even the word order is a mystery – I have translated not word for word, but sense for sense") Carroll 1958: 136–137.

¹¹ From the prologue to his translation of the *De caelesti hierarchia* of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite (mid-9th century C.E., excerpted in Copeland 1991:52): "If someone should find the text of the aforesaid translation obscure or impenetrable, let him consider me the *translator* of this work, not its *expositor*."

audience as the *expositor*, who would presumably already be familiar with the message of the source text and who would use the translation only as a tool in delivering that message to a wider audience. The function of the *expositor* allowed translators to avoid violating the holy word of the original, and removed the need to produce a translation accessible to a lay audience. Literal translations in the Church were not guides for the general populace, but tools for the *expositor*.

The role of the *expositor*, and concerns over producing a widely readable version of the Bible, is made clearer by the English abbot Aelfric in his preface to his translation of the Book of Genesis (997 C.E.).¹² Aelfric recounts that he once shirked the task of translation because he feared that once the book was in plain English, a foolish man could read the Bible and assume that he could live as those represented in the Bible had.¹³ Nevertheless, he knows that he cannot alter the Bible so that his translation omits that Jacob had four wives, for example.¹⁴ As a result, he worries that translations may actually do harm to the layman. Someone who does not understand what changes the New Testament introduced to Christendom¹⁵ may not be able to contextualize properly the Old Testament;¹⁶ Aelfric refers to the Old Testament as “a prefiguration of things to come.” Therefore, a mediator needs to exist between the Old Testament and the layman, someone who can explain that the audience is not to take Jacob’s polygamy as

¹² Cook 1898: lxx–lxxi.

¹³ His primary concern seems to be that such men will decide to take many wives, or even commit incest.

¹⁴ Robinson (1991: 131) describes a modern problem that speaks to the same issue when he documents his struggles with the idealization of translation that insists that translators do not change source texts in the process of translation. What if, Robinson asks, a translator is commissioned to work on a text that he finds offensive? The ruling practice tells the translator to “be a window” and “Don’t even ask. Just do it.” Robinson argues that the translator is left with no other recourse but a downcast aside “Too bad I’m a translator and have to translate this; otherwise I’d make it obvious to my reader just how pernicious this stuff is.” Aelfric identifies the same problem: as an aside, he wishes he could tell the audience not to have four wives, but knows that he cannot. It is the translator’s role to represent what is in the source text, not to engage visibly with the source author.

¹⁵ Aelfric declares (Cook 1898: lxxi) that “Any one who now, since the coming of Christ, lives as men lived before or under the Mosaic law, that man is no Christian.”

¹⁶ In the 1330s, Richard Rolle would voice similar concerns over his literal translation of the Psalter (Allen 1988: 68): “it could be that it (his translation) will come into the hands of someone malicious who has no idea how he ought to interpret the work.”

an example of acceptable behaviour. Aelfric, as translator, senses that it is not his position to explain, nor is it his right to make the needed alterations to his source.¹⁷

The *ad uerbum* translators are direct in their claims that they adhere to the *ad uerbum* style of translation. Even Jerome, whose entire letter to Pammachius commends the *ad sensum* type of translation, calls attention to the fact that when working with Scripture he observed the *ad uerbum* method. The *ad uerbum* style lends the impression that the translator has added or subtracted nothing in his service to the source text, even down to the detail of each word.

Translators assert themselves as *ad uerbum* translators outside of the Church as well for this very reason. Boethius claims to translate his sources (Aristotle and his commentator Porphyry) literally, even preserving each word of the Greek source in his Latin translation (*In Isagogen Porphyrii Commenta*, 510 CE).¹⁸ He alludes to Horace's warning (*Ars* 133–135) concerning this method,¹⁹ but argues that when knowledge of the subject matter contained in the source is sought, "it is not the charm of bright speech that is to be expressed, but the uncorrupted truth."²⁰ Literal translation has none of the oratorical decoration that is a part of the *ad sensum* approach. Boethius argues that adornment obscures the truth of the source in an attempt to make the translation more palatable to the target audience,²¹ and positions himself as a translator who caters to an audience that wants not decoration, but the truth.

¹⁷ The expositor gains prominence by holding key information about the source text that is not available to most. He functions as the arbiter of the source's message; in other scenarios, a translator can hold this position. Cicero, for example, in his practice of the independent translation modality, regularly positions himself as the judge over what is passed from source to audience (see Chapter 6 below)

¹⁸ Porphyry was a Greek Neoplatonist from Tyre (234–305 CE). His *Eisagoge* was an introduction to Aristotle.

¹⁹ *Quidem uereor ne subierim fidi interpretis culpam, cum uerbum uerbo expressum comparatumque reddiderim* ("I certainly fear lest I commit the fault of a faithful interpreter, when I translate a word copied and matched by another word") Schepss and Brandt 1989: 46.

²⁰ *Cuius incepti ratio est quod in his scriptis in quibus rerum cognitio quaeritur, non luculentae orationis lepos, sed incorrupta ueritas exprimenda est.*

²¹ It would perhaps be to Boethius' dismay that when Jean de Meun called for a translation of Boethius in his prologue to *Roman de la Rose* (1280), he advocated a translation that could be read by a general audience. He

Ad uerbum translators position their writing as an avenue to the “truth” of the source. They do not aim their *ad uerbum* translation at everyone, but at the members of the audience who can appreciate the complexities of the original text. The prospective audience and standard practices, which are part of the socio-literary conditions, shape the format of the translation. The role of audience and practice is most clear in the case of Jerome, who complains of the *ad uerbum* style and praises the *ad sensum*, but nevertheless enthusiastically acknowledges that in matters of faith he adheres to the *ad uerbum* style. When Jerome and other *ad uerbum* translators speak about their style, they promote their deference to the source author, text and the traditional principles followed in Roman authors such as Terence and Livius Andronicus similarly promote themselves and their poetry to an interested audience by situating themselves as adherents of foreign authors.

2.2 *Ad sensum* translation in the Church

The declaration of adherence to an *ad uerbum* style allows for a counter-proposal to be made in which translators position themselves as providing the *ad sensum* version. Jerome, John Scotus, and Aelfric submitted themselves to the authority of the source author while preparing translations aimed not at a general audience, but at a church official who would already be familiar with the source message. The use of *ad uerbum* translation aimed at the *expositor* means that source material is accessible only to an elite few. Translations can dismantle the language barrier between a source text and a target audience, but literal translation as described by Jerome, John Scotus, and Aelfric do little to remove that barrier. *Ad sensum* translators portray themselves as writing for a more general audience as they promote readability in the target

himself later translated the work into French, and proclaims in the dedication that he privileged reporting the sense of the original over following the words.

language. John of Trevisa (1387), for example, claims to make a translation that was available to the general populace. To show how his position benefits his audience, he presents a conversation between a lord and a clerk,²² in which the lord requests that the *Polychronicon*²³ be translated from Latin into English. This fictional scenario presents the two camps of scripture translation: the clerk represents the traditional viewpoint and believes that translations should remain out of the hands of the layman. Conversely, the lord argues that it is important to create a barrier-free version of Church writings so that the general populace can study them and not rely on a mediating agent.

Martin Luther similarly appeals to a broader audience in his translation of the Bible. He claims (*Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen*, 1530)²⁴ that he wants to speak German, not Latin or Greek, in his translation, a goal that led to his creation of a translation that sounds as if it had been originally composed in German (Störig 1969: 20–21). He provides an example of his methodology when he complains of how his critics²⁵ would have him translate *ex abundantia cordis os loquitur* as “aus dem Überfluß des Herzens redet der Mund.”²⁶ Luther argues that nobody would speak this way in Germany; the translation is meaningless to the audience. Similarly, Miles Smith²⁷ identifies the importance of the Bible being the message, not the words: “for is the kingdom of God become words or syllables?”²⁸ Smith joined fifty-three other

²² *Dialogue between a Lord and a Clerk upon translation* (excerpted from Pollard 1903: 203–208).

²³ The *Ranulphi Castrensis, cognomine Higden, Polychronicon (sive Historia Polycratica) ab initio mundi usque ad mortem regis Edwardi III in septem libros dispositum*, a universal history written by Ranulf Higden in 1342.

²⁴ Excerpted in Störig 1969: 14–37.

²⁵ Luther’s letter of defence seems to have been inspired by the papists’ criticism that he added the word *allein* (“alone”) to his translation of: *Arbitramur hominem iustificari ex fide absque operibus* (Romans 3:28). He claims to have added *allein* to reflect normal German speech.

²⁶ Störig 1969: 21. Robinson (1997b: 87) translates the phrase into suitably awkward English as “out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh” and points out (n.11) that this is how the translators of the King James Bible translated the phrase.

²⁷ A bishop of Gloucester who was appointed by King James I to produce a new version of the Bible. He joined the First Oxford Company, which worked on the Book of Isaiah to Malachi.

²⁸ Preface to the *Authorized version of the Bible* (1611).

scholars who followed a list of rules set by King James that would ensure that the new version would be of higher quality than previous English versions. In the preface to the Bible (1611), Smith writes that “translation it is that openeth the window, to let in the light; that breaketh the shell, that we may eat the kernel; that putteth aside the curtain, that we may look into the most holy place.” Smith proposes a direct relationship between the reader and the source in which the translator is the mediator through which the target audience views the source. The translator is a bridge between two cultures, but his presence is undetected.

Support for *ad sensum* translation existed outside of the sphere of the Church as well. The French poet Jean de Meun (*Li Livres de Confort de Philosophie*, c.1285–1305)²⁹ claims to translate Boethius in an *ad sensum* fashion; the humanist Etienne Dolet (*La manière de bien traduire d’une langue en aultre*, 1540)³⁰ advocates translation that uses common language; the translator of Homer George Chapman (preface to the *Iliad*, 1611)³¹ defends himself against critics who attack his periphrase in translation by indicating how many prior translators of Homer availed themselves of the same tactic. *Ad sensum* translators privilege the experience of an audience broader than that which the *ad uerbum* translators target. They argue that their versions of the text bring the reader closer to the source text and author as they conceal their own personas and domesticate a text to a target culture. *Ad sensum* translators in the Church do not rely on the *expositor* to reach the general audience, but instead position themselves as able judges of the message of God. Luther responds to his critics by affirming that he is a learned theologian who can interpret the psalms (Störig 1969: 18), insisting that he is capable of translating for the general audience. *Ad sensum* translators displace *ad uerbum* translators by

²⁹ Excerpted in Copeland 1991: 133-134.

³⁰ Excerpted in Robinson 1991: 95-97. Trans. David G. Ross.

³¹ Nicoll 1956: 14-18.

speaking directly to the target audience and bypassing other offices of the Church such as the *expositor*.³² By promoting their ability to bring the message of God to the audience, *ad sensum* translators assert their own knowledge and expertise in understanding the message and in knowing how to deliver the message to a general audience.

2.3 The judgment of the translator

Ad sensum translators aim to preserve the message, a goal that implies that the translator understands the message of the source text. The translator can subsequently market his expertise. For example, Roger Bacon, in his *Opus Maius* (1268: 1.3.1), opines that the translator must have perfect knowledge of not only the subject matter of the original, but also of the two languages in question.³³ Leonardo Bruni, in his *de Interpretatione Recta* (1424–1426)³⁴ harshly criticizes the translations of Aristotle made by the medieval translator William of Moerbeke³⁵ because Moerbeke was ignorant of literature.³⁶ Bruni demands knowledge that comes from “a long reading of the philosophers and orators and poets and all the other writers. No one who has not read, comprehended, thoroughly considered and retained all these can possibly grasp the force and significance of the words” (Hankins 1987: 218).³⁷ The translator’s claim to expertise encourages the use of judgment in translation. Translation that includes the translator’s judgment

³² Robinson (1991: 67) argues that a breakdown in ecclesiastical authority necessitated internalized authority wherein each member of the target audience decided whether or not to accept a translation of the Bible, rather than having their access to the Bible mediated by a third party such as the *expositor*. The breakdown in authority changed the target audience for Scripture translators.

³³ Few translators lived up to Bacon’s high expectations. In fact, on these grounds he recognized only Boethius as a true translator.

³⁴ Excerpted in Griffiths, Hankins and Thompson 1987: 216–229.

³⁵ Moerbeke made these translations under the *ad uerbum* approach, apparently at the urging of Thomas Aquinas, as cribs for use in education (Robinson 1997b: 57)

³⁶ *Quicumque uero non ita structus est disciplina et litteris, ut haec uitia effugere cuncta possit, is, si interpretari aggreditur, merito carpendus et improbandus est.*

³⁷ *Nemo enim, qui hos omnes non legerit, euoluerit, uersarit undique atque tenuerit, uim significataque uerborum intelligere potest.* A regular compliment among Cicero’s interlocutors is that the speaker/translator has achieved perfect understanding of the concept being expressed and has further brought it to Rome as if it were a Roman concept. See especially *Fin.* 3.40, where Cicero praises Cato for bringing philosophy to Rome.

is recognized by translators and theorists as a type of translation at least as early as the 16th century. For example, Giannozzo Manetti uses the customary limiting criteria of fidelity and free interpretation, but adds a style in the middle in which the translator could add or subtract something if he deemed it necessary.³⁸ Luis Vives (*de ratione dicendi*, 1534³⁹) also divides translation types into three:⁴⁰ he offers *sola phrasis et dictio* (= *ad uerbum*) in opposition to *solus sensus* (= *ad sensum*). In the middle, he positions *res et uerba*, a mixture of the two polar ends.⁴¹ The translator, since he knows the meaning, is free to add or subtract in order to render the message for a new audience.⁴² Only a translator who understands the message of the source and can read beyond the linguistic structure of the text is able to reduplicate the message.⁴³ By

³⁸ *Est enim triplex interpretatio. Una ad uerbum, altera, ut ita dixerim, ad sensum. Tertia ubi aliqua interdum ornatu gratia omittuntur, non nulla pro arbitrio uoluntateque interpretis superadduntur* ("For translation is threefold. One type is literal, the other, as I said, is sense. The third is where at times something is disregarded for the sake of ornamentation, or sometimes added, according to the judgment and will of the translator," *Apologeticus* fol. 103^r) (Rener 1989: 285).

³⁹ Excerpted in Robinson 1997b: 92-94.

⁴⁰ Lawrence Humphrey (*Interpretatio linguarum seu de ratione conuertendi et explicandi autores tam sacros quam prohanos*, 1559) also used a tripartite division (*triplex omnino est interpretatandi ratio*, 14). He rejects the two extremes, one because its observance to the words of the original make it unpleasant (*prima rudior et crassior: quum a uerbis nihil receditur*), the other because it is too loose and free (*altera ratio, qua nonnulli intepretes hodie utuntur, in contrariam partem offendit, liberior et solutior* "The other method, which some translators use today, is displeasing for the opposite reason, it is freer and looser," 22-23). The third method represents the middle path and mixes the two, and is the best option for Humphrey (*superest, ut de tertio genere, id est, media uia dicamus, quae utriusque particeps est*, 30). Similarly Rodolphus Goclenius (*Lexicon philosophicum* 2: 87) also allowed for a third, middle possibility, placing on one end the *genus* that is *religiosum et seruire* and that which is *audacius plane licentiosum et liberum*. The third option was a mixture of the two (*tertium est media cuiusdammodi*).

⁴¹ *Tertium genus est, ubi et res et uerba ponderantur, scilicet ubi uires et gratiam sensus adferunt uerba, eaque singula uel coniuncta, uel ipsa uersa ratione* ("There is a third kind [of translation], where both the subject and the words are weighed out, where the words bring strength and grace to the thought, either by themselves or joined together, or by the entire account itself.")

⁴² Andreas Schottus (1552-1629) in his *Tullianarum Quaestionum de instauranda Ciceronis imitatione libri IV*, established a binary division along the usual system, though with the new titles *interpretatio fida* (equivalent to *ad uerbum*) and *interpretatio liberior* (*ad sensum*). He also added a sub-category to the *liberior* type (Rener 1989: 287), which he named *arbitraria* (*arbitrarium uero interpretem nomino, qui argumentum aliunde mutuatus, e fontibus illis suo iudicio arbitrioque, quantam, quoque modo uidetur, haurire, et in suum opus deriuare satagit*). Schottus is explicit about the role of the translator in translation as he positions this third type of translation as the modality of the learned translator, someone who can judge where he will follow his source.

⁴³ Harris (1980: 377) argues that translators must go further than decoding "the surface word strings into syntactic and semantic structures" by "applying other knowledge so as to extract a cognitive message." The use of judgment requires an understanding of the cognitive message, which can only be extracted with "other knowledge", which could be a variety of background elements from an awareness of the cultural situation that produced the original to an understanding of the topic under discussion.

declaring their ability to reduplicate the message translators imply that they are equipped with an understanding of that message.

Despite the freedom that the ability to use judgment would seem to imply, claims of adherence to a source remain a tactic for particular translators who nevertheless insist that they are using their judgment in translation. Jean Chapelain (*Le gueux, ou la vie de Guzman d'Alfarache*, 1619–1620) sees the translator as one who presents the pleasing ideas of the original to the target language audience; he removes “useless things,” he adds that which he deems “necessary.” Yet Chapelain admits that he himself still had to adhere to his source author, lest he ruin the source’s “composition and interweaving.”⁴⁴

In his *Essays on the principles of translation* (1791), Alexander Fraser Tytler identifies that translation has long been divided into the camps of *ad sensum* and *ad uerbum* and concludes that the best type of translation must lie in between these two opposites. He provides (8–9) a succinct definition of the best translation: “That in which the merit of the original work is so completely transfused into another language as to be distinctly apprehended, and as strongly felt, by a native of the country to which that language belongs as it is by those who speak the language of the original work.” Tytler provides (9) three laws to achieve this end: the first is to give a complete transcript of the ideas of the original work since the translation cannot have the same effect unless it has the same ideas. A requirement of this law is that the translator should have “a perfect knowledge of the source language and competent acquaintance with the subject

⁴⁴ He describes this adherence as burdensome: in his preface to *Le gueux, ou la vie de Guzman d'Alfarache* (Robinson 1997:149), he writes that “translation is an abject thing, and translation in those who practice it presupposes a servility of spirit and a depreciation of intellect.” Chapelain argues that the only benefit of translation is as practice for being able to read the original in its native language. Around this time (1648), John Denham writes (*To Sir Richard Fanshaw upon his translation of Pastor Fido* [Steiner 1975:63]) that “few but such as cannot write, translate.”

matter.” The second law is that the translator should employ the same style and manner of writing as the original. The final law, Tytler concedes, is the most difficult. Tytler proposes that the translation “have all the ease of the original composition.” It should appear as if the translator is writing the work himself, not translating the source. It is dependent on the translator to use the proper judgment, which itself is a product of the appropriate training and background, to bring the source text into the target language “so completely.”

The translator presents his use of judgment as an advertisement as it requires that the translator is in the position and has the necessary background to make the appropriate judgments. The translator who makes these translation choices requires not only succinct knowledge of both target and source language, but also a clear understanding of the subject material. A translator who uses his judgment in translation publicizes that he has obtained the elite knowledge required to perform the task, and implies that he resides in a close literary relation with the source. Cicero particularly emphasizes the role that his judgment plays in his translations (*Fin.* 1.6, *Off.* 1.6) as he attempts to appease an audience that is already familiar with the source works. Cicero positions his translations as improvements upon the sources, and for his translations to actually be improvements he shows that he understands the values and failings of the source texts.

2.4 Imitation as a close relationship with the source

If a translator can understand the sense and the message of the source well enough to reproduce the necessary parts of that message in the target language, it may be possible for the translator to go a step further and reproduce the experience of the source audience. Such translations are known as imitations. Imitators claim the reduplication of the experience as their goal, and they assert that their form of translation is the best way for a target audience to access a source. Yet imitation follows *ad sensum* translation in that imitators insist that there is a close

relationship between imitator and source; the imitator requires a profound understanding of the source author in order to reproduce the source in a new literary context. Joachim du Bellay (*La Déffence et Illustration de la langue francayse*, 1549)⁴⁵ writes that imitation is the result of a close, symbiotic relationship between the translator and the source as he describes the imitator transforming himself into the source author by “devouring” the original work. Du Bellay believes that by imitation “Cicero reproduced the meaning of Plato, the vehemency of Demosthenes and the charm of Isocrates”; Vergil was the imitator of Homer, Hesiod, and Theocritus (Smith and Parks 1967: 172).⁴⁶ The process of consumption allows the imitator to then duplicate the best features of the source author, thereby creating the source anew.⁴⁷

Translators can promote imitation of a source as a means of “translator freedom” which benefits the target audience. Yet this freedom is also grounds for criticism from other translators. To some critics, for example Pierre Huet and Jean Chapelain,⁴⁸ the French poet Nicholas Pierrot d’Albancourt went too far towards the “free” end of the scale.⁴⁹ In his own defence, d’Albancourt writes⁵⁰ that he changes or clarifies portions of the original, especially when said portions are only there in the original to please the audience, assuming that what pleases the

⁴⁵ Excerpted in Smith and Parks 1967: 164–177.

⁴⁶ Pierre Daniel Huet (1630-1721) thought Romans should not be considered translators because “their purpose was to imitate these authors or follow them, not translate them.” According to Huet, all Romans translated in this way: Ennius, Pacuvius, Accius, Attilius from Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides; Plautus, Terence, Caecilius, Afranius, Aquilius from Demophilus, Philemon, Diphilus, Epicharmus, Menander and Apollodorus; Ovid and Germanicus from Aratus; Cicero from Aratus, Homer, Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides; Catullus from Sappho and Callimachus; Varro of Atax from Apollonius. Huet supposes that the arrogance of the translator, paired with ignorance of good things, created the audacity to distort ancient writers. This audacity has given license to the translator to act as judge, spurning anything he dislikes, substituting his own inventions in place of the original.

⁴⁷ Similar is divine inspiration in translation. Augustine used divine explanation to explain how many translators all produced the same translation of the Septuagint, even down to word order, even though they were separated in various cells.

⁴⁸ Robinson (1997b: 149) records the ridiculing of d’Albancourt that occurred in letters between Pierre Huet and Jean Chapelain.

⁴⁹ As Robinson (1997b: 157) reveals, it became unclear to them why he even bothered to refer to his works as translations; rather, they argued, he should simply write something original. Albancourt, however, denied the existence of original works, calling them translations in disguise.

⁵⁰ From the dedication of a French translation of Lucian, 1654, (Robinson 1997b:158)

original audience does not necessarily please the new audience. D’Albancourt does not bind his translation to word or to style of the source author, but rather adjusts items according to his own judgment, while claiming to preserve the goal of the original (Robinson 1997b: 158).⁵¹ He takes a broad view of translation, concerning himself less with the aim of each word or portion of the original, instead aspiring to bring about the same result as the original work as a whole. In so doing, d’Albancourt positions himself as in service to the target audience, not the source. Against complaints that in imitating he is not really translating, d’Albancourt positions imitation as a higher art form than translation.⁵² He appeals to the authority of the Romans, arguing that Terence translated Menander, and Cicero Panaetius in *de Officiis* via imitation. For d’Albancourt, imitation is superior to *ad uerbum* translation because *ad uerbum* translation cannot be understood if the reader has not already read the original, while imitation can please an audience that is unfamiliar with the source.

D’Albancourt supports imitation in the translation of poetry because an imitation can achieve the same results in the general audience as the source author did in his own target audience. While Abraham Cowley, an English poet who translated Pindar, does not refer to himself as an imitator, he does claim (preface to *Pindarique Odes*, 1656)⁵³ that he is trying to reproduce the style of Pindar. Undercutting the value of *ad uerbum* translations, he opens his preface to his translation with “If a man should undertake to translate Pindar word for word, it would be thought that one madman had translated another.” He acknowledges that the

⁵¹ D’Albancourt’s conception of translation is similar to the 20th century theorists Hans Vermeer and Katharina Reiss (1984), who appraise translation on the basis of its purpose (*skopos*). The two also raise the possibility that a translator and his source may have different goals.

⁵² “Nonetheless, that (translating without binding oneself to the words or reasoning of the source) is not really translation; yet it is worth more than translation; and the ancients did not translate any other way” (Robinson 1997: 159).

⁵³ Excerpted in Steiner 1975: 66-67.

grammarians of his time will not likely suffer his “libertine” method of translating to even be called translation, yet he is not so concerned about earning the title translator; like d’Albancourt, he seeks something better, “though it yet want a name” (Steiner 1975: 66). Cowley’s method involves leaving out or adding whatever he pleases: as he claims “nor (do I) make it so much my aim to let the reader know precisely what he (Pindar) spoke, as what was his way and manner of speaking” (Steiner 1975: 67). He positions his poetry as being in the style of Pindar. He considers this a worthwhile task because, so far as he is aware, nobody has yet achieved this in English. Still, Cowley does not aim beyond the source with any type of translation; in his mind, translations are copies like pictures that can never be better than the original because translators (copyists) do not aim beyond copying, and so can never be better than the original that obviously never aimed at copying, but towards something grander (Steiner 1975: 67).

That imitation cannot surpass the original was a common theme even among imitators. Anne Dacier, in her preface to *L’Iliade d’Homère* (1699)⁵⁴ uses an analogy of translation being akin to the embalming of Helen of Troy. While the embalming process will preserve her fair appearance, it will be completely unable to save her charm for future generations. Translation is the same; it will keep the appearance of the original, but will lose a certain aspect in the process of preservation. Dacier’s style of translation adheres strictly to the original, but searches out “the beauties of its language and represents the images without retailing the words” (Robinson 1997: 189). She believes that literal translation is actually an unfaithful translation, in that it loses the spirit of the original. The product of Dacier’s ideal translation is not only a faithful copy, but a “second original.” Dacier separates herself from other translators when she denies that there is no creation in her form of translation; she rejects the idea that translation is akin to the copying of a

⁵⁴ Excerpted in Robinson 1997: 187-189.

picture, where the artist is tied down to the features of the original. She believes that a good translator is not so confined, and the process is (at most) like that of the sculptor working after the picture, or the painter copying a sculpture. Dacier views translation as art imitating art, rather than translation being a copy of art that has no artistic value in itself (Robinson 1997: 189). The soul of her imitator, like that of du Bellay, becomes inebriated with the beauties of the original and in the process the soul gives itself over to foreign enthusiasms. Subsequently, the translator's soul can produce its own beauties.

Similar to the imitator's claim that he cannot outdo the source is the assertion that imitation serves and preserves the source. Jacques Peletier writes that imitation was the truest form of translation, for imitating is nothing else than wanting to do what another has done (*L'art poetique francaise*, 1555: 30). Peletier sees a close tie between an imitation and its object, despite the notions that this form is the most free. Indeed, he proclaims that the imitator submits not only to another's invention, but even to his arrangement and style (in so far as the target language permits). Peletier writes that this submission does not garner praise for the translator, for he refers to translation as a labour more of work than of praise; even if the translation is well done the greater share of glory belongs to the original. If you translate badly, the translator is to blame. Peletier's translator is tied so closely to the source that no improvement is possible; the ideal is to reproduce entirely the source.

Even translators who emphasize the requirement for translations that satisfy a general audience still deny that they can act "freely" in their translations. John Denham argues (preface to *The Destruction of Troy*, 1656) that it was a "vulgar error" to act as the *fidus interpres* when

translating poetry.⁵⁵ He believes that the translator of verse is to bring the author into the world of the target language: “if Virgil must needs speak English, it were fit he should speak not only as a man of this nation, but as a man of this age.”⁵⁶ However, Denham does not claim that such translation will produce a version that can in any way rival the original.⁵⁷ The sense is still to be that of the source author, and he claims not to have made any part bigger or less. His adherence and service to his source is quite clear: “Neither have I anywhere offered such violence to his sense as to make it seem mine and not his (the source author’s)” (Steiner 1975: 65).

Imitation is a form of translation that translators present as better for the audience in that imitation alone can recreate the experience of the original audience. By doing so, imitators assert that they are in fact the truest representatives of the source, a fact that writers such as Peletier and Denham accentuate when they remind their audience that they must adhere strictly to the source text. Imitators claim that their form of translation is that which sounds the best to a target audience, recreates some of the original reactions of the source’s target audience, yet does so while adhering to the source author. None of these claims need be true, but it is important to observe the manner in which imitators try to establish themselves in a literary culture. By promising an experience of the foreign, imitators endeavor to displace both *ad uerbum* and *ad sensum* translators.

⁵⁵ Although to do so was completely permissible for someone translating “matters of fact, or matters of faith” (Steiner 1975: 64-65).

⁵⁶ Two hundred years later Nietzsche appears to echo an opinion of Denham when Nietzsche places into the mouth of Roman poets “Should we not make new for ourselves what is old and find ourselves in it? Should we not have the right to breathe our own soul into this dead body?” (Kaufmann 1974: 137). Denham (in his preface to *The Destruction of Troy* [1656]) believed that the act of translation deprived the source material of its soul: “and poesie is of so subtle a spirit, that in pouring out of one language into another, it will all evaporate; and if a new spirit be not added in the transfusion, there will remain nothing but a *caput mortuum*.”

⁵⁷ “And therefore I have not the vanity to think my copy equal to the original, nor (consequently) myself altogether guiltless of what I accuse others; but if I can do Virgil less injury than others have done, it will be in some degree to do him right” (Steiner 1975: 64). This may well be false modesty, but it is important to note that Denham does not claim to be superior to his source.

2.5 Criticism of imitation and Service to the Source

Critics of imitation do not find imitation entirely devoid of worth, but rather position imitators as erring in what the critics themselves find important in translation. For example, John Dryden (preface to *Ovid's Epistles*, 1680) alleges that while imitation best serves the imitator himself, it does the greatest wrong to the memory and reputation of the dead (Steiner 1975: 70).⁵⁸ Rather, Dryden recommends the *sensum de sensu* approach (his “paraphrase;” he also refers to it as “the mean betwixt [literal translation and imitation]” [Steiner 1975: 71]). Yet Dryden’s translation is still a “close” translation; while he allows for liberty in translating expressions, he refers to the sense as “sacred and inviolable” (Steiner 1975: 71). He equates the translator with the painter of a concrete subject in that both have “no right to lop off superfluous branches, although it may make the end product better” (Steiner 1975: 71). The translator is not to improve the product; instead, he is to represent accurately the sense of the source, with however many blemishes it may have. How well he achieves this accurate representation is the translator’s sole claim to accomplishment: “Slaves we are, and labour on another man’s plantation; we dress the vineyard, but the wine is the owner’s: if the soil be sometimes barren, then we are sure of being scourged; if it be fruitful, and our care succeeds, we are not thanked; for the proud reader will only say, the poor drudge has done his duty” (Steiner 1975: 73). Alexander Pope (preface to the *Iliad*, 1715)⁵⁹ similarly suggests that the only liberties to be taken are those required for bringing

⁵⁸ In similar terms the 12th century translator Burgundio of Pisa defended (preface of *Homilies on the Gospel of John*) word-for-word translation “so long as the phrases and idioms of the other language do not become an impediment, and one does not wish to establish one’s own glory and pretend that others’ words are one’s own” (Robinson 1997b: 42). Burgundio recognizes that the literal system was not the Roman system, for “imbued as they were with the highest wisdom, and disdaining to be slaves to the cases and figures of the Greeks, they did not adhere to the Greek words but rather by their own eloquence preserved the beauty and elegance of the original sentences in their translations” (Robinson 1997b: 42-43). Since, unlike the Romans, Burgundio is not seeking glory by means of his translations, he claims to adhere to the literal model. His concern is for the source; as translator, he is in service to the preservation of that material.

⁵⁹ Excerpted in Steiner 1975: 90-95.

across the spirit and poetical style of the original. He writes that more translators have been deluded in his time “by a chimerical, insolent hope of raising and improving their author” than in a previous era “by a servile and dull adherence to the letter” (Steiner 1975: 91).

The idea of faithfully revealing a source text to a target audience is prominent in the writings and theories of the German Romantics. August Wilhelm von Schlegel (*Dante - über die Göttliche Komödie*, 1791)⁶⁰ writes that translation of poetry is directed at one of two aspects, either the work or the author. The translator who directs his attention towards revealing the work is free to cover up imperfections; his goal is not to represent that source as he finds it, but to bring a suitable work to the target audience. Translation aiming at the author will represent that author with all the characteristics of that author intact, including errors or cultural remnants. Schlegel’s analogy explains why he prefers translations that represent the author. He observes that numismatists use the presence of “noble rust” (*aerugonobilis*) on coins to determine their authenticity. The noble rust is the only thing that counterfeiters are unable to duplicate, and thus anyone who would polish this rust off the coin is an ignoramus. Schlegel sees similar rust on authors, and concludes that “only an erstwhile Frenchman would coldly polish off that rust while describing or translating the work” (Robinson 1997b: 214). Schlegel promotes his ideal form of translation as that which preserves the foreign experience, rendering the work more authoritative.

While Friedrich Schleiermacher (*Ueber die verschiedenen Methoden des Uebersetzens*, 1813)⁶¹ writes as if he is largely pessimistic that a translation that perfectly recreates the source will ever be realized since the gap between languages is too vast, he advocates an approach that brings the audience to the foreign circumstances of the source text.

⁶⁰ Excerpted in Robinson 1997b: 214.

⁶¹ Excerpted in Robinson 1997b: 225-238.

Schleiermacher believes that in art and scholarship, the word is an arbitrary and well-established sign for something set by each culture to represent an idea. A certain abstract quality may not exist in another culture, or similar ideas may have different connotations. There is no one-to-one correspondence between two languages or cultures for these abstract qualities, which prevents artistic and scholarly translation from being mechanical. Due to the differences in complex languages, Schleiermacher believes that different language speakers cannot truly understand each other. While Schleiermacher recognizes that a *translator* can approach understanding with the source since the translator has some appreciation of word meaning, the target-language reader is far removed from the thinking of the source: “If the target language readers are to understand, they must grasp the spirit of the language native to the author, they must be able to gaze upon the author’s inimitable patterns of thinking and meaning; but the only tools the translator can offer them in pursuit of these goals are their own language, which nowhere quite corresponds to the author’s” (Robinson 1997b: 228). Thus the matrix in which the translator must work restrains his ability to pass on understanding to the target audience.

Schleiermacher is aware of two common solutions to this issue, neither of which he approves. The first is paraphrase.⁶² The second solution that he identifies is imitation, whereby the translator creates an effect on the reader that will be as close as possible to that of the original work on the source-language reader. The problem that Schleiermacher identifies with imitation (Robinson 1997b:229) is that it forgoes the identity of the original in striving to recreate the original effect. An imitation strays too much from the source text as the translator directs it

⁶² Paraphrase was a well-recognized tactic among translators. Pierre Huet (*De Interpretatione libri duo*, 1684: 14) recognizes it as a method used when the translator was concerned about the target-language audience's enjoyment. John Dryden (Steiner 1975: 68–72) associates paraphrase with the customary *sensum de sensu* approach. Charles Batteux (1761: 345) refused to paraphrase since he believed it to be a type of commentary, which should not be present in translations.

toward the target audience. The imitator focuses not on representing the source, but on affecting the target-language reader. Schleiermacher writes that “neither approach can satisfy one who has been pierced through with the beauty of the original, who would extend the sphere of its influence to those who speak his language, and who conceives translation in the stricter sense” (Robinson 1997b: 229). Schleiermacher has restricted his target audience; the person unsatisfied with imitation or paraphrasing is the one who has read the original.⁶³

To return to his proposed binary system, Schleiermacher rejects the idea that there can be any mixture between the options of bringing the author to the reader or reader to author, since they are simply too far apart. In moving the reader to the author, Schleiermacher argues (Robinson 1997: 229) that “the translator works to compensate for his reader’s unfamiliarity with the source language, by sharing with them the very image and impression he has gained through familiarity with the work.” In moving the author to the reader, the “author is displayed not as he would have translated his own work into the target, but rather as he would have written as a target language speaker.” Schleiermacher makes an important distinction here, because it is easy to think that if the source author could translate his own work into a new language, then that version would be the authoritative version in that language.⁶⁴ Schleiermacher denies this, presumably assuming that the source author would not be properly equipped to pass on “understanding” to the target audience.

⁶³ Strikingly, Anne Dacier proposes the exact opposite audience, stating that her audience is not those who have read the original because they know Homer better than she: “Besides, I do not write for the learned, who read Homer in his own tongue; they know him better than I pretend to; I write for those who do not know him” (Robinson 1997: 187). There is a degree of false modesty in the declaration, but translator modesty is not uncommon.

⁶⁴ As an example, Plato would not have been the best equipped to translate his works into Latin, because he was not a native Latin speaker.

Schleiermacher insists that “reader to author” translation exists because not enough of the audience has sufficient knowledge of the source language. If they knew the source language, they would read the source. As such, translation fills a particular vacuum, although it seems that only those who have been pierced by the beauty of the original can truly appreciate it since they would be the only ones who would be seeking an equivalent to the source.⁶⁵ The other approach, Schleiermacher supposes, has nothing to do with necessity; it creeps dangerously close to imitations, which Schleiermacher derides as shams of art.

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, in his (*West-Ostlicher divan*, 1819)⁶⁶ is similarly concerned with bringing a target audience closer to the source but believes that ultimately a translation that is the perfect representation of a source is possible. He argues for a style of translation that “seeks to make the translation identical with the original, so that one would no longer be in the stead but in the place of the other” (Robinson 1997b: 223). However, this identical nature is not aimed at *replacing* the original, but instead at driving the audience to it. Or rather, the translation is to become a new and equal version of the source in a different language, which allows the target audience to realize more fully the original. As Goethe defines it (trans. Robinson 1997b: 224): “A translation that seeks to be identified with the original approximates, finally, the interlinear⁶⁷ version; in its attempt to enhance our understanding of the original it leads us onward, drives us on toward the source text, and so finally closes the circle in which the

⁶⁵ Schleiermacher argues that translations would not be sought if the audience could read the original. As I discuss in Chapter Six, Cicero responded (*Fin.* 1.1) to the objection that translations of philosophy were not required since the interested Romans learned Greek. Cicero takes the stance that by translating philosophy he will build upon the Roman literary system. Even-Zohar acknowledges the notion of a weak literary system needing to become stronger in his polysystem theory. A literary system seeks to become complete, and the members of the literary culture would, according to his theory, not be satisfied by substituting literature in a foreign language for native literature.

⁶⁶ Excerpted in Robinson 1997b: 222-224

⁶⁷ The interlinear version of a translation is that which goes beyond even literal translation in adhering to the source (Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 81-82).

alien and the familiar, the known and the unknown, move toward each other.” The translator bridges the gap between target audience and the foreign, in fact almost erasing the divide.

Goethe does not mean that this type of translation will literally push us towards the source text; the audience is not to seek out the actual source text and read it. Rather, it brings the audience closer to the source as an idea, including its vocabulary and its ideas.⁶⁸

Yet if it is possible to recreate the circumstances of the source text and bring the audience to the source, it may also be possible to bring the audience into a closer relationship with the source author. This appears to be the ideal of the German Romantic Novalis. Novalis (the pen name of Friedrich Leopold Baron von Hardenberg), in his work *Blutenstaub* (1798),⁶⁹ offers three types of translation: the “grammatical,” the “transformative,” and the “mythic.” Novalis expresses his dissatisfaction with the state of translations: the grammatical translations are “translations in the ordinary sense of that word,” and thus require much learning but “no more than expository writing skills.” He describes transformative translations are those that “body forth the sublimest poetic spirit”, yet these translations “verge constantly on travesty, as in Burger’s iambic Homer, Pope’s Homer, or French translations generally.” He censures contemporary models of translation while approving the mythic modality, which he construes as an ideal that had not yet been realized. Mythic translations “reveal the pure and perfect character of the individual work of art. The work of art they give us is not the actual one, but its ideal.” Novalis’ mythic translation posits that a translator can look beyond the source text to the

⁶⁸ Kelly’s summary (1979: 49) of the Romantic ideal of translation is helpful in clarifying what Goethe is aiming for: “If the translator sought to find what was already there, and to present it as it was, the original became present in a way the eighteenth century had found impossible.” Kelly is drawing a distinction between earlier translators who tried to produce a “French Virgil” by writing translations in regular French vernacular and those who try to make a work sound as foreign (here Latin) as possible in the target language, generally by using arcane language. Goethe’s sentiments are a response and an attempt to displace earlier translators.

⁶⁹ Excerpted in Robinson 1997: 212-213

intended message. Douglas Robinson (1991: 17) relates an anecdote that shows an example⁷⁰ of what Novalis is suggesting here with mythical translation: the poet Diane derHovanessian worked with an Armenian scholar to translate Armenian poetry. DerHovanessian and the scholar argued over the translation of a certain word: the scholar insisted that the word that derHovanessian wanted to use was incorrect, but she maintained that it felt right. On a trip to Armenia derHovanessian told the source poet about the translation. He replied that not only did her word choice perfectly capture what he had meant but, in fact, it did so better than the word he had used. He informed derHovanessian that he wished he had used the Armenian equivalent to the term derHovanessian had chosen when he originally wrote the poem. DerHovanessian succeeds in doing what Novalis can only imagine as she taps into the sentiment of the original and presents it in perfect form.⁷¹

Whereas imitators are focused on recreating the original in the circumstances of the target culture, the German Romantics Schlegel, Goethe, Schleiermacher, and Novalis move the audience towards the circumstances of the original. They represent themselves as intimately familiar with the socio-literary conditions of the source and position themselves as the only agents capable of helping guide the audience across the gap between target and source. Schleiermacher doubts whether that gap can in fact be bridged, but he is certain that it is the translator who lives in the space between cultures. His appeal to pleasing the experts shows how he seeks to recreate the source in past circumstances that only the expert knows, and he awaits the professional judgment on whether or not he has succeeded.

⁷⁰ Though not for the purpose of showing what Novalis meant.

⁷¹ That this circumstance would regularly occur seems unlikely, a fact that Novalis acknowledges. However, that it could happen is what is important for Novalis, since its occurrence means that a translator can, through the process of translating and by having other points of knowledge with the source culture and author, reach beyond the words to the ideas that motivated the writing of the source text.

I end the historical survey of translators at this juncture to emphasize a particular point: despite the warnings about the shortcomings of literal translation that Cicero, Horace, and Jerome present, it is not the case that literal translation was always viewed as inferior. Translation styles came in and out of fashion and, in fact, Matthew Arnold (*On Translating Homer*, 1861) supports *ad sensum* translation shortly after the Romantics claim *ad uerbum* as the superior form in a debate with his fellow countryman and rival translator Francis Newman. Since Cicero and Horace provide the most succinct statements about their programs of translation, they dominate the discussion surrounding Roman translation.⁷² As a result, it appears as if Roman translation theory was in favour of *ad sensum* and derisive of *ad uerbum* translation. A study spread over a longer period of time finds that the position of Cicero and Horace is not representative of every Roman translation. Indeed, although I do not label the translation modalities as *ad uerbum* or *ad sensum*, many of the sentiments and positions of the translators above are echoes of Roman translators. Translators make appeals to the target audience in an effort to sway the audience into accepting their translation, and this process often includes privileging one style of translation over another.

All of the translators in this chapter refer to the practice of the Church in one way or another even where their works are secular in nature; as their background, they all have the idea that a translator serves to preserve the source for a new audience. The arguments amongst themselves are about who and what style best joins audience to source author. This thinking is a development of Church translation, particularly of the Bible, since translation of the Bible included a source author whom the translator could never hope to overtake. God's role as the

⁷² Cicero and Horace occupy primary positions among Romans in particularly in historical reviews of translation that treat the Romans as precursors to translation theory in continental Europe and the United Kingdom (see, for example, Renier [1989]).

source author of the Bible resulted in the translator's dogma "Do not go beyond the source" that even imitators such as Cowley and Dacier dared not betray. Romans were not under the same compulsion to represent the source, although Roman translators could take advantage of claiming a close association with the source. Those who position themselves in the source-representative modality, for example, promote themselves by portraying a close association with the source author. Livius Andronicus uses the opening statement of his translation of Homer's *Odyssey* to show how closely he can render Greek hexameter into Latin Saturnian; Ennius acts to displace Andronicus by depicting himself as the reincarnation of Homer; Terence overthrows Plautus' role in Roman comedy by positioning himself as a more faithful representative of Menander and other Greek playwrights. The actual adherence to the words or the sense of the source author varies among the source-representative translators. Indeed, Ennius' text is not a translation of a source text, but rather the representation of a source author in new circumstances. What determines the source-representative modality is less the rendering of a source word into the target-language word than the idea that the translator will bridge the space between two cultures and bring the target audience and source author as close together as possible. It is this promise that translators use to promote themselves and their work.

Like source-representative translators, allusive translators associate themselves with a source. However, they differ in that they mark a split from the world of the source to the world of the translator and the target culture. The poetry of Catullus and Horace embodies allusive translation: Catullus famously ends the translation of a poem of Sappho in c. 51 and rebukes himself for wasting away in *otium*. Horace promises his audience the *numerus* and *animus* of Archilochus, but disassociates himself from the *res* and *uerba* that Archilochus uses in his *iambic* poetry. Allusive translators show that they view translation as a vehicle that will take

them only so far in their poetic endeavors. To go further, they must break away from translation and show themselves in the text, distancing themselves from the source and his world. The space between the translation and the source made by the allusive translator is critical for defining himself, both as a translator and as a poet.

Cicero's translation of Greek philosophy is the subject of my chapter on independent translation. Cicero's programmatic statements regarding his translations are in response to putative criticism from his peers that there was no reason for him to undertake the translation. To combat the disapproval, Cicero regularly makes explicit comments about how he is improving upon the source. He proclaims his and his fellow Romans' superiority over the Greek sources, arguing that he is bringing into the control of Rome the last stronghold of Greek culture. Cicero's translation of Greek philosophy is systematic appropriation, a facet that he never hides from his audience. Indeed, he promotes the idea. For Cicero, the creation of a system of philosophy that is embodied in Latin writings will see the Romans surpass the Greeks in the last area where they are behind. Independence motivates Cicero's translations. My study on the modalities of Roman translation shows how Roman translators displaced each other by privileging certain relationships with the source text and author.

3 Source-representative, Epic

In this chapter I examine the epic poems of Livius Andronicus, Naevius, and Ennius under the source-representative modality. The defining feature of the source-representative modality is the self-positioning by the translator as the representative of his source in the target culture. The translator projects the appearance that he is giving his audience unadulterated source material, with an implied minimal amount of translator intrusion on the translation. The notion of providing the source unfiltered may be presented in a statement extratextual from the actual translation; a translator may, for example, claim to have translated in the *ad uerbum* style, which implies that the preservation of each word was of primary importance to the translation project. Literal translation (*ad uerbum*) generally falls under the source-representative modality because *ad uerbum* translation indicates that the translator considers it necessary to adhere to the very words of the source. Nevertheless, a declaration of *ad uerbum* translation is a sign of source-representative translation,¹ not a determinant: source-representative translation is by no means the exclusive domain of an *ad uerbum* translator. The *ad uerbum*–*ad sensum* dichotomy is inadequate because it obscures the relationship that a translator constructs with his source. Translators represent *ad sensum* translation and even imitation as translation that represents the source, albeit in different ways. *Ad sensum* translators generally privilege the meaning of the source text while imitators claim to recreate the experience of the original text in new circumstances; both argue that their method is the best way for a target audience to appreciate the source author.

¹ Possanza (2004: 31) describes how an *ad uerbum* translation can construct the “illusion of being in direct contact with the source text” through characteristics such as oddities of diction, phrasing, and syntax that give the translation a foreign quality.

I admit that basing my analysis on what an author says, rather than what he does, could be somewhat problematic. Remarks that occur outside of the actual translation tend to be biased and inclined towards propaganda, and thus must be treated with some caution if used to describe how translators actually translated.² Despite their tendency towards bias, the inclusion of these remarks is still important to a study that attempts to describe any translation. As Toury (1978: 92) recognizes, these comments are formulations of certain translation norms: obviously so, since they prescribe practices. They therefore represent the optimum theoretical practices of their author and his literary culture. Furthermore, the translation itself is similarly tendentious; it is not only in theorizing prologues that artists construct the place of their poetics. As Hinds (1998: 52–73) documents, Latin poets allude to other earlier poets in an attempt to claim primacy. For example, in the line *Musae quae pedibus magnum pulsatis Olympum* (fr. 1 Sk.) Ennius alludes to Andronicus' *uirum mihi, Camena, insece uersutum* as he replaces *Camena* with *Musae*. Ennius uses textual material to construct his role as the *primus*. Both extratextual and textual material show signs of bias and propaganda and constitute programmatic remarks on the part of the translator.

I construct the source-representative modality from programmatic remarks. I include translation material that appears to show the translator acting faithfully in the translation. Lest anyone think that the source-representative (or any) modality of translation is a simple task wherein the translator depends on the source, I explore how these translations often require a deeper reading in order to be appreciated for their ability to align themselves with a source and

² Gideon Toury (1978: 91-92) treats the issue of trusting extratextual remarks well. Toury is a descriptive translation theorist, and is thus primarily focused on describing actual translation practices. Extratextual remarks are prescriptive, meaning that they describe how translations are optimally performed. Naturally, translations and extratextual remarks, even from the same writer, may not correspond to each other.

how these translations can be viewed as products of the translator and the socio-literary conditions of his time.

3.1 Situating source-representative translation

Since the defining factor of the source-representative modality is that the translator represents himself as a mouthpiece of the source and as someone who injects minimum interference in the process of translation, it is not immediately clear why anyone chose to represent himself as the representative of the source. In my preceding survey of translators there were instances of complaints made by translators who felt themselves bound and restricted by the source text, such as Jean Chapelain (“translation is an abject thing, and translation in those who practice it presupposes a servility of spirit and a depreciation of intellect”)³ or John Denham (“Such is our pride, our folly, or our fate / That few but such as cannot write, translate”).⁴ Modern theory also complains of the tendency of the translator to act as an invisible agent.⁵ Yet according to polysystem theory, translators imagine a poor reception for their translations because they believe that they are writing in strong literary systems that are not dependent on translations for innovation.⁶ In such a situation, it is more beneficial to write original material; in

³ See n. 41 on page 26 above.

⁴ From *To Sir Richard Fanshaw upon his translation of Pastor Fido*, excerpted in Steiner 1975 (63-64).

⁵ The professional translator Norman Shapiro describes the ideal translation to be like “Like a pane of glass through which the audience can clearly see the source (Venuti 1995:1). Lawrence Venuti, however, argues against the invisible translation, contending that translators should become visible in the resultant translation by never allowing the audience to forget that they are experiencing something foreign.

⁶ The literary system of France shows how writers may reject translations. Chapelain made his comments in 17th century France, and followed similar sentiments by fellow French writers Jacques Peletier and Etienne Pasquier of the 16th century. These writers were experiencing a French literary system that had undergone significant changes as part of its Renaissance. As Worth-Stylianou observes (1996: 43), the Renaissance was a time of experimentation in literature, particularly as French began to be recognized as a literary language (the Edict of Villers-Cotterêts in 1539 adopted French as the official language of some legal documents). During the Renaissance, French writers were inspired to create their own body of literature in competition with the larger Italian system; translations of Latin authors promised less innovation than native French creations. However, one must be aware of the complexity of a literary system’s relationship with a foreign system and the manner in which a modern audience can learn about the system. The French system is illustrative of the complexity: in the early Renaissance (1549), Joachim du Bellay (*La Défense et illustration de la langue française*) called for French writers to imitate Latin forms for inspiration, though

a strong system, translations are generally influenced by established literary forms and are not representative of innovations to the system. In a strong system, translations are relegated to the periphery.

Yet in Even-Zohar's analysis of literary systems there are three social scenarios that result in a weak literature, a status that encourages translations to occupy a central, or primary, position. A translation may occupy a central position if a literature is young or being established, when a literature is weaker than another literature system with which it has come into contact, and when a literature is in a crisis or turning point. In these three social circumstances, translations tend towards fidelity since the purpose of the translation is to introduce something new. Here these translators are innovators rather than imitators.⁷

Under the conventional interpretation of early Roman-Greek relations,⁸ when the younger literary-system Latin came into contact with the older and more complete Greek system, Romans determined that the Latin system was lacking, or "defective."⁹ Translation plays a central role in completing and stimulating the Latin literary system. Alternatively, Romans became unsatisfied with their established models for artistic expression, such as the early Latin *carmina*, and

he was opposed to the idea that his ideal of imitation would include slavish reproduction. Du Bellay believed that translations are central and are promising tools for innovation; Pasquier, writing twenty-five years later, found translation slavish and useful only for an audience unversed in Latin. Their different stances could reflect either a change in French literature, or merely a difference of opinion. What can be said is that certain authors concluded that writing translations would not be as beneficial to them as writing something original.

⁷ Examples of innovations could be the introduction of thematic material or even poetic metre into the literary system. Translators are innovators in that they introduce new material into the target literary system.

⁸ Examples of the conventional interpretation are: Quinn (1982: 116) "Roman literature was not a natural growth; it was a transplant by professionals trained in, or drawing their inspiration and knowledge from, the Greek-speaking Hellenistic world"; and Nisbet (1999: 153) "Roman poetry was not an indigenous growth, and when it peaked it was very dependent on Hellenistic models, where the divorce from living Greek was greater than in the classical period." Both of these viewpoints are invoked by Michèle Lowrie in her review (*Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2006.04.34) of Habinek's *The World of Roman Song: From Ritualized Speech to Social Order*, a book that contests such claims.

⁹ Even-Zohar calls a polysystem that does not have "full dynamic diversity" (something he believes every system desires) "defective."

imported the models of Greece in a type of literary revolution. Either scenario encourages translators to promote the notion that they are turning to a foreign source in order to innovate, for innovation lies outside of the target literary system.

When Livius Andronicus produced his translation of Homer's *Odyssey*, the resultant epic poem occupied a primary position in the Roman polysystem because no other examples of epic poetry existed. Once Romans began to write native Latin epics, any translation produced thereafter would tend towards the periphery, or secondary position, until such time as that type of literature experienced a turning point or a crisis, or even until Romans came into contact with an even greater literary system. In the event of a turning point or a crisis, native speakers would look to outside literature systems in order to rejuvenate their own literature.¹⁰

3.2 The socio-literary conditions of 3rd century Rome

The socio-literary conditions that were in place when Livius Andronicus wrote his *Odusia* encourage his stance as a source-representative translator, even though the exact nature of those conditions is currently disputed among scholars. While Livius Andronicus had once received much of the credit for initiating Latin literature, more recent scholarly attention¹¹ has looked to what may have existed prior to Andronicus' arrival in Rome in terms of creative output. As Habinek (1998: 36) concludes, there may well have been a musical culture in Rome that could have developed into a literary one, quite independent of Greek influence.¹² Yet that

¹⁰ Gentzler (2001: 117) draws an analogy to North American literature in the 1960's, when the "established literary models no longer stimulated the new generation of writers," who therefore "turn elsewhere for ideas and forms."

¹¹ For examples of recent examination of pre-Livius artistic output, see Sciarrino (2011), Feeney (2005), Goldberg (2005), Habinek (1998 and 2005), and Zorzetti (1990 and 1991). While I find the discussion surrounding the origin of Latin literature to be a fascinating debate that, if resolved, would aid in situating the material that I am discussing here, I am primarily focused on the works that are first identified as translations, what social circumstances helped produce them, and how the translators used translation to make poetic self-definitions.

¹² Habinek is following the work of Nevio Zorzetti (1991), who argues (314) that the banquet songs were associated with a "lyric tradition of hymns performed in the *convivium* and devoted to the praise of the heroes of the city".

was not how Latin literature developed, and attempts to link the musical culture with the literary culture that *did* result are not convincing since, as Goldberg (2006: 434) points out, no link between the musical and literary culture is explicit in the sources. Goldberg¹³ cautions against using the analogy of the Greek development when discussing archaic Rome, since epic poetry came to Rome only long after the aristocratic banquets which featured the singing of *laudes* were long forgotten, thus highlighting the gap in time between the two practices. Due to the lack of evidence, Goldberg's argument for seeing a separation between the musical culture and the literary culture that was influenced by the Greek system is prudent.¹⁴ The poetic activity of the 3rd century BCE in Rome was not the result of a traditional Roman practice, but was rather inspired by an outside influence. The traditional answer for what inspired Latin literature has been that a confrontation with the Greek literary system in the 3rd century BCE¹⁵ awed the Romans into a state of competition.¹⁶ What is disputable here is whether Greek art and literature was new to the Romans in the third century; Sciarrino (2005: 451) argues that the archeological records indicate that the Romans were greatly affected by Greek culture as early as the late 8th century. Indeed, it is now difficult to accept the notion that Romans first came into contact with, and were overwhelmed by, Greek culture in the 3rd century BCE

¹³ Feeney (2005: 235) similarly cautions against arguing on the basis of an analogy between Rome in a period of oral culture and archaic Greece because "archaic Greek songs were texts."

¹⁴ Even Habinek (1998: 43), who promotes the song culture that preceded Livius Andronicus, agrees that there was a Hellenic influence on Latin literature.

¹⁵ In the 3rd century BCE Rome expanded her dominion over the Greek states in Italy. Victory over Pyrrhus in 275 led to the capture of Tarentum, when Livius Andronicus may have been brought to Rome. Later, near the end of the 3rd century and into the 2nd, the Macedonian Wars against Philip V brought Roman armies into the Greek mainland.

¹⁶ George Sheets (1981) is a clear supporter of this theory when he asserts that "toward the end of the third century Rome was for the first time directly confronted by the full force of Greek art and literature. It is well known that the experience was a revelation for the Romans (60-61)." More recently, Glenn Most (2003: 388) has characterized the Romans as "latecomers in the highly competitive cultural market-place of the Hellenistic Mediterranean," and thus "seem to have decided early that a program of intensive translation was the best strategy for catching up."

A model that discounts the notion that Greek culture overwhelmed the Romans has been presented in its most complete form by Thomas Habinek (1998). According to Habinek, the Romans were not awed by the greatness of Greek culture into a mode of imitation and competition, but rather adopted Greek culture for symbolic and practical reasons. In Habinek's model, the shift from a music culture to reliance on the foreign was brought about by two factors: a crisis of identity occurred among Rome's rulers as Rome became an aristocracy (35), as did a transformation after the Second Punic War that Habinek calls a "revolution in the sociology of literary production", the outcome of which was a demand for literary professionals (36). Habinek emphasizes the notion that the revolution was part of an effort by the aristocracy in Rome to exclude others from the literary tradition; by importing outsiders to write new Latin literature, the aristocrats "effectively guaranteed that it (literary culture) would be their unique possession" (38).¹⁷

For Habinek, Latin literature was a device for propaganda used to promote social cohesion.¹⁸ When Livius Andronicus performed his dram at the Ludi Romani in 240 BCE, his play was associated with the Roman victory in the First Punic War. Using Livy's narrative (25.12, 26.23.3, 27.23.5–8) as support, Habinek (39) suggests that the increase in dramatic performances was part of senatorial attempts to maintain unity. Unity among the Roman classes was especially important during the Second Punic War as Hannibal invaded Italy. Livy describes

¹⁷ Habinek (1998: 3) observes numerous ways in which Latin literature can advance the interests of the elite: "by fostering development and promulgation of a prestige dialect; by providing a means of recruitment and acculturation for members of the imperial elites; by negotiating potentially explosive conflicts over value and authority; by augmenting the symbolic capital of the Roman state through expropriation of the cultural resources of recently colonized communities; and, eventually, by constructing the Roman reader as the quiescent subject of an imperial regime."

¹⁸ "Virtually every scrap of information that we have pertaining to Latin literature in the 3rd century BCE can be related to the preservation of social cohesion at Rome" (39). It is worth observing, however, that we have limited amounts of evidence from which to draw conclusions on the socio-literary conditions of the 3rd century BCE.

the tension in the city: he reports (26.1.5ff) that as refugees gathered in the city as the war dragged on, religious superstition among the populace increased. Even after Hannibal had been defeated, and Italy became unified, the aristocratic concern over cohesion and the vulnerability of their status remained. Literary Latin was a vehicle for communication among the aristocratic elite, and since the writers were outsiders, the language of the invented literature was artificial (Habinek 1998: 44). The aspect of artificiality guaranteed that literature would be inaccessible to the non-elite members of society. Rather than seeing a primitive culture bowing to a superior one, Habinek argues (60) that Greek literature was imported to widen “the gap between sectors of Romano-Italic society”.¹⁹

Habinek’s version of events does much to restore an independent nature to the Romans’ literary development. No longer are Romans helplessly and inevitably overwhelmed by a superior culture; instead they choose a path divergent from their musical past that will secure the aristocrats in their aristocratic spheres. The Greek canon is the tool of Roman aristocracy. Indeed, no longer does the outsider Livius Andronicus invade the Roman literary system, but instead serves as the tool of the aristocracy.²⁰ Although Habinek rejects the notion that Greek culture overcame its Roman counterpart, translations assume a central role in his model of Latin literary development. Habinek sees a period of crisis in which the aristocrats seek a method to secure their prominence; the crisis is the stimulus for the importation of a foreign model.²¹ A crisis in the target culture is one of the social scenarios that, according to Even-Zohar, results in

¹⁹ Habinek (60) also argues that the borrowing from Greek culture had a practical dimension in that “new devices, procedures, institutions, and ideas brought with them new vocabulary and modes of description.”

²⁰ A necessary caution to Habinek’s proposal that the Roman elite unified against the threat of a rising lower class is that the evidence indicates that members of the Roman aristocracy were regularly in competition amongst each other.

²¹ Habinek (1998: 36) advises that we view the transformation that occurred after the Second Punic War as not an “invention of literature”, but rather as a “revolution in the sociology of literature production.”

translations occupying a central position. In either interpretation of events (i.e., that the Romans of a young literature were inspired by a confrontation with the full body of Greek art and literature, knowing that in comparison their literary system was defective, *or* that a period of crisis among the elite inspired a shift away from traditional models) translation was a tool that was inspired by certain social conditions. The situation at Rome created an opportunity for Livius Andronicus to position himself as an innovator in the target literary system while simultaneously showing that his work was part of a tradition that looked back to Homer's source text.

3.3 Livius Andronicus

Livius Andronicus was taken from Tarentum²² after that city fell to the Romans in 272 BCE and brought to Rome where he served as a *grammaticus*.²³ Livius Andronicus wrote both tragic and comic plays that were versions of Greek sources²⁴ and, famously, produced the *Oedipus*, the work on which I will now focus.²⁵ The *Oedipus*, written in the Saturnian metre, survives only in

²² Habinek (1998:38) draws attention to the peculiarity that so many (excluding only Naevius and Cato) of the representatives of early Latin literature were non-Romans, arguing that the aristocrats who encouraged the development of literary culture used outsiders to ensure that the new literary culture would only be accessible through them.

²³ The date of Livius Andronicus' arrival in Rome is disputed. Cicero reports (*Brut.* 72) Accius' assertion that Livius Andronicus was brought to Rome in 209 BCE after Tarentum fell in the Second Punic War. However, Cicero supports Atticus' finding that the first play produced by Livius Andronicus in Rome was in 240 BCE, meaning Accius must have been mistaken. Cicero does not posit an alternate date for Livius' arrival, but if Livius Andronicus was brought from Tarentum, as all reports agree, then it is logical to conclude that it was in 272 BCE, the year Pyrrhus abandoned the city.

²⁴ We have the titles for eight of his tragedies (*Achilles*, *Aegisthus*, *Ajax Mastigophorus*, *Equos Troianus*, *Hermiona*, *Andromeda*, *Danaë*, and *Tereus*). We have six fragments from his *palliatae* (R¹: 2-3).

²⁵ One might ask why Livius (and his backers) chose the *Odyssey*, rather than the *Iliad*—which judging from the papyri evidence—was more popular than the *Odyssey*. Ronconi (1973: 16-17) discusses the issue at some length. The best theory that Ronconi offers is that during the time of writing, Ulysses was already a hero of central Italy (as Diomedes was in southern Italy). In contrast to the *Iliad*, which Ronconi describes as the Bible of the Greek world, the *Odyssey* is the poem of the Western World. Ulysses had already been Latinized, and thus he makes a natural choice for an Italian hero. Ronconi supposes that had Livius translated the *Iliad*, some Romans may have viewed him as glorifying the deeds of Aeneas' enemies. Solmsen (1986) provides useful background on the tradition of Odysseus founding Rome, including Hellanicus' of Lesbos account (*FGrHist* 4 F 84) that Aeneas founded Rome with Odysseus. Odysseus' role as a founding figure during his travels may have made him a popular hero in Rome.

fragments. The textual evidence that remains, including an opening line that is itself programmatic, indicates that Andronicus strove to show adherence to his Greek source. That is, the fragments of the translation that remain encourage the audience to recognize that Andronicus is actively staying close to the language and format of Homer's *Odyssey*.

That it is unknown whether Livius Andronicus translated the entire *Odyssey* or only select episodes makes it uncertain whether Andronicus' *Odusia* was written as a reproduction of the source.²⁶ The barrier to a solution is that what survives of the *Odusia* is so fragmentary that forming a satisfying conclusion is unlikely. Maria Verrusio has treated the question in some detail; indeed, she argues that whether Andronicus translated the entirety of the *Odyssey* is the most important question concerning the *Odusia* (1977: 66). Verrusio (68) argues that the survival of fragments which depict relatively minor details means that the *Odusia* was not likely a summarized form of Homer's *Odyssey* but instead a translation proper (70), since a summary would presumably omit these details.²⁷ However, source-representative translation does not depend on the aspect of completeness since I assign the title to translations that signal adherence to the source, of which it is still possible to find evidence in the fragments.

Andronicus evokes the source text in a manner that does not diminish his own poetic voice. Sander Goldberg (1995: 65) describes Livius' translation style as "flexible fidelity."²⁸ The idea in the description is that Livius can move between faithfulness and freedom repeatedly while translating. For example, Livius opens his translation with the phrase *uirum mihi, Camena*,

²⁶ Goldberg (1995: 46) suggests that Andronicus translated only select passages, seemingly because no source indicates any book divisions in the *Odusia*. Sciarrino (2011: 76) follows Goldberg.

²⁷ Kaimio, in fact, refers (1979: 272) to the *Odusia* as a "probably unabridged translation."

²⁸ Goldberg (1995: 65) also labels the translation as "close but clever." Possanza (2004: 58) similarly speaks of a controlled freedom, in which the Roman "subjective, innovative approach to translation does not give carte blanche to a lawless rewriting of the original in which the translator-poet obliterates almost all resemblance to the source text."

insece uersutum (“Tell me, Camena, of the wily man”, fr. 1 Blänsdorf),²⁹ which is a close rendering of Homer’s opening line ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον.³⁰ The opening line of the *Odusia* has long been discussed in terms of its remarkable closeness to the original: Mariotti (35) claims that no other fragment of Livius Andronicus, and perhaps no other fragment of “traduzioni artistiche”, has so great a degree of correspondence. As Mariotti contends (36), Livius Andronicus shows greater freedom in the other fragments, but it is here in the opening line that the poet makes his authorial statement. The closeness is a programmatic advertisement³¹ to the reader that Livius Andronicus will be interacting with Homer in the manner that I describe as source-representative, since it is the goal of such a translator to evoke a sense of allegiance to the source.

The German Romantic Friedrich Schleiermacher’s argument³² that the primary audience of a translation is those who are already familiar with the source text is useful in understanding the opening line of the *Odusia*. Schleiermacher believes that a general audience is not in a position to judge a translation properly, because anyone unfamiliar with the source does not know what should be represented in the translation. That is, the criteria for labelling the work as

²⁹ All translations are my own, unless otherwise noted.

³⁰ When Samuel Clarke translated Homer’s line into Latin (*uirum dic mihi, Musa, uersutum*), he used the rather bland *dic* for ἔννεπε and retains the Muse. The latter choice is a logical choice since his 18th century English audience would have appreciated the Muses more than they did the *Camenae*. Clarke prints the Latin text underneath the Greek, and the close pairing of the Latin with the Greek makes it appear that the translation acts as companion to the original and that the two should be read together. Horace (*Epist.* 2.3.141-142) translates the opening as *Dic mihi, Musa, uirum captae post tempora Troiae/ qui mores hominum multorum uidit et urbes*. Sciarrino (2011: 74) reads these lines of Horace (written in dactylic hexameter) as a corrective commentary on Livius’ “seemingly faithful translation.” Part of Horace’s commentary is leaving πολύτροπος untranslated. It may have been the case that Andronicus was influenced in his word choice by the Saturnian metre that he was using.

³¹ Ronconi (1973: 14) observes that Livius expresses loyalty to the source in the exact correspondence of each word. Mariotti (1952: 36-37) discusses how Livius Andronicus on the surface declares loyalty while a deeper investigation will demonstrate the possibilities and tone of his poetry, and thus moves beyond a search for matches with the original and turns the *Odusia* into a masterpiece of technical skill, a tour-de-force of the grammarian translator and artist.

³² See pp. 35-38 above.

“good” are different between experts and non-experts: experts seek traces of the translation interacting with the source.

On these grounds Andronicus’ translation functions as a representation of the source as it adheres closely to the original version. The opening establishes Andronicus’ credentials in bringing the source text to Latin intact. Indeed, Andronicus translates each element of the original. Yet Andronicus’ representation of the source does not diminish his own display of poetic skill; there is a level of complexity in the line that identifies how Andronicus promoted himself as a translator-poet.³³ Both Hinds (1998: 61–62) and Sciarrino (2011: 70–77) have considered the poetic self-consciousness on display here. Sciarrino, following Hinds, claims that Livius Andronicus identifies himself with Odysseus with the term *uersutus* at the end of the line, attributing to Odysseus “the very qualities that made up his [sc. Livius Andronicus’] professional selfhood (71)”. In fact, Sciarrino sees Odysseus “exploited as an object of both projective and introjective identification (72)” by Livius Andronicus. In the opening line of his work Livius Andronicus advertises himself as *uersutus*. By the term *uersutus* Andronicus makes claims to his aptitude for translation, if we are to understand “wily”, or even better “full of stratagems.”³⁴ Indeed, Hinds (61) calls attention to the word since *uertere* functioned as the standard term for

³³ A translation, although a representation of a source, reveals the translator and the target culture. I am in firm agreement with Possanza’s sentiment (2004: 30) that “the translator must create anew the source text through reading and interpretation; nothing comes ready-made for the translator to assemble into a translation.” Every term in a translation, therefore, represents a choice made by a translator who is influenced by his socio-literary conditions.

³⁴ So Mariotti (1952: 35) reads it. Possanza raises the possibility (2004: 53) that term *uersutum* may also function as an interpretative gloss on πολύτροπος, the meaning of which was taken by some as “much traveled” or “much wandering” rather than “of many wiles.”

translation in early Latin literature.³⁵ Andronicus depicts himself as the wily translator in the act of displaying his adherence to the source.³⁶

The most discussed element of the opening line of the *Odusia* is the translation of Μοῦσα by *Camena*, a native Italic water divinity.³⁷ This translation choice shows Andronicus' sensitivity to his target audience, since the mention of a deity native to the target culture works to domesticate the poem. By contrast, the peculiar word *insece* creates an echo of the source in the translation. Scholars have long appreciated Andronicus' choice of *insece* as a translation of ἔννεπε: Goldberg (1995: 64), for instance, writes that “with *insece* (Andronicus) offers a rare Latin word of similar meaning, sound, and accent to Homer's own uncommon ἔννεπε.”³⁸ The word choice signals fidelity to the source. Andronicus is presenting the *Odyssey* as Homer might, almost in a word-for-word fashion, even seeking a way to *sound* like Homer.³⁹ The archaic

³⁵ While the verb *uertere* certainly was a term for translation (e.g., Pl. *As*. 11; Var.*R.* 1.1.10; Cic. *Fin.* 1.7; Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.134; Ov. *Tr.* 2.443; Quint. *Inst.* 6.2.8; Suet. *Aug.* 89.1; Gell. 9.9.1; Lucr. 5.337; Livy 25.39.12) I disagree with the statement that it was the *standard* term. Other options for describing translation are *exprimere* (Ter. *Ad.* 11; Catullus 65.16; Pliny *Ep.* 4.18.1; Cic. *Luc.* 31, *Fin.* 3.15; Sen. *Con.* 7.1.27), *interpretari* (Cic. *Ac.* 1.1; Livy 10.4.9; Sen. *Nat.* 3.29.1; Tac. *Ann.* 2.89; Quint. *Inst.* 8.6.44) or *transferre*. Hinds may be correct in referring to *uertere* as the standard word for translation if he means that the word was used without any negative connotations. Cicero, for instance, used the word *interpretari* to denote a translation made by someone who did not have rhetorical training (*Fin.* 3.55, *Off.* 1.6) and *exprimere* to signify a translation that adhered to the source (*Fin.* 1.4, *Tusc.* 3.44).

³⁶ McElduff (2013: 53) promotes the subtext of the opening line at the expense of the immediate reading of the line as an accurate translation, suggesting that the line could also be read as “pursue for me, Camena, the translated man.” McElduff's suggestion is attractive in that it promotes the agency of Andronicus in the translation, but her reading of the subtext should not distract from the immediate impression that the first line presents, which is one of adherence to the source for the reasons that I describe above.

³⁷ Conte (41) observes that the term *Camena* was thought to come from the word *Casmena*/*Carmena*, and thus from the title that Andronicus' poetry would be known as, *carmen*.

³⁸ Both Leo (1913) and Fraenkel (1931) found *insece* to be a lexical archaism which adds solemnity to the invocation, which would be lacking had the verb been translated with *dicere*. Interestingly, Horace translates ἔννεπε with *dicere* when giving an example of literal translation (*Epist.* 2.3.141-142). Sheets (1981: 68) argues that with *insece*, Livius Andronicus has “translated the Aeolic gloss, *ivvere*, of the first line of the *Odyssey* with an Umbrian gloss, *insece*.” Fraenkel pointed out that in fr. 20 (Blänsdorf): *nexebant multa inter se flexu nodorum dubio* Andronicus appears to translate ὀρχεῖσθην δὴ ἔπειτα ποτὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ / ταρφέ' ἀμειβομένῳ (8.378-379), but also seems to have taken into account the scholion's explanation of ταρφέ' ἀμειβομένῳ as πυκνῶς πλέκοντες εἰς ἀλλήλους writing the Latin and thus offered a clearer description. Both Possanza (2004: 53-54) and Sheets, who refers to the line as evidence of the “unmistakable influence of Hellenistic commentary to Homer” (60), discuss the passage in reference to glosses; Sheets, entirely focused on glosses in Livius Andronicus, provides other examples.

³⁹ There may be some foreignizing strategy at play here, as well, since Livius uses a rare word that sounds Greek. That is, he deliberately prevents an easy reading/hearing of the text by using an uncommon word, which causes a

nature of the term resists domestication: both in its sound and archaism the word transports the reader to the foreign culture. Behind the *ad uerbum* level of translation that lies on the surface of this line, there is another level of poetic composition that interacts with the source text. The opening is not only an advertisement of fidelity, but it is also an advertisement of Livius' *ability* in fidelity.⁴⁰

Andronicus writes similarly closely in fr.3 (Blänsdorf): *mea puer, quid uerbi ex tuo ore supra / fugit*,⁴¹ which is a translation of τέκνον ἐμόν, ποῖόν σε ἔπος φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων ("My child, what sort of word has fled the barrier of your teeth?" 1.64). Here Andronicus mimics φύγεν with *fugit* and associates the translation with its source via sound. Yet beyond that immediate aspect of association, Livius Andronicus has provided a Latin version of Homer here that in the opinion of Verrusio (1977: 76) is more human than the imaginative and winged Homeric language. Indeed, Possanza (2004: 49) views the translation as a process of assimilation, where the graphic detail of the Homeric formula is replaced by "a more generalized picture of speech traveling upwards and out of the mouth." Possanza further directs our attention to the important point that Livius has simplified the syntax: where Homer has a double accusative in σε and ἕρκος ὀδόντων, Livius has only the prepositional phrase *ex tuo ore*. Ronconi (1973: 14) argues that Livius Andronicus is behaving as a grammarian when he dissolves the periphrastic ἕρκος ὀδόντων into *os*. Behind the mimicry of sound there are levels of detail that allow Andronicus to show his own poetic skill while avoiding an awkward attempt at translating a Homeric formula in close fashion.

recognition that the translation is representative of a source text. The term acts as a foil to *Camenae*, a name which domesticates the work by changing the source name to a concept more familiar to the target audience and culture.

⁴⁰ As Goldberg recognizes (2005: 37), the fragment "simultaneously allied itself with and distinguished itself from its model by elaborate echoes of Homer's famous opening in an Italic metre inspired by an Italic divinity."

⁴¹ "My child, what word fled up out of your mouth?"

The flexible fidelity is shown in other fragments: in fr. 2 (Blänsdorf) *pater noster, Saturni filie* <...> (“our father, the son of Saturn”), corresponds to *Od.* 1.45, ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη. Here Andronicus translates the patronymic Κρονίδη as *Saturni filie*. “Flexible fidelity” is an apt description for Andronicus’ translation; Andronicus has no Latin patronymic system with which to work, but he nevertheless manages to remain close to his source text in his translation. Mariotti (1952: 45) submits a particular fragment as example (fr. 12 Blänsdorf): *Sancta puer, Saturni filia, regina* (“Sacred queen, daughter of Saturn”⁴²), which is a periphrasis of the Homeric πότνια Ἥρη. Mariotti suggests that the Latin recalls the expansive formulas of worship in Latin. The freedom in the *Odusia* is a result of target-language restraints, but it also seems motivated by an artistic aim to add epic solemnity to the poem.

The *Odusia* further shows its status as a product of the target culture in fr. 10 (*ibidemque uir summus adprimus Patroclus*), which corresponds to 3.110 ἐνθα δὲ Πάτροκλος, θεόφιν μῆστωρ ἀτάλαντος (“There is Patroclus, a strategist equal to the gods”). It was not suitable for Livius Andronicus to describe a hero as a rival of a god in Rome,⁴³ and so Andronicus translates the passage by changing Patroclus’ description to “foremost among men”. The culture of the target audience prevents Andronicus from using the exact same imagery as Homer in his description; nevertheless, he creates a sense of equivalence with the source by depicting Patroclus in a way that Possanza (2004: 49) calls “familiar to Romans from its use in elogia of members of the socio-political elite.”

⁴² Translation Warmington 1961: 31.

⁴³ Highlighting the difference between the Greek and Roman tradition, Gentili (1979: 102) states that “according to Roman religious feeling, heroic excellence showed itself in primacy over the other heroes, and not in a professed likeness to or equality with the gods.”

The above fragments show Livius Andronicus as a highly-aware poet whose translations successfully blend source-evocation with certain aspects of the target culture.⁴⁴ He uses archaic words for solemnity, glosses difficult passages and contextualized the Greek epic into a Latin setting. Indeed, even the use of the Saturnian metre indicates that Andronicus was sensitive to Roman culture: Possanza (52) argues that the use of the Saturnian metre is evidence of Andronicus grounding his translation in the sphere of Roman religious discourse. Like the hexameter in Greek, the Saturnian was used for prophetic utterances. As Sciarrino (2006: 457–458) contends, the Saturnian rhythm is linked to the elite in that the Saturnian “accommodates *dicta* and ritual songs performed by aristocrats”,⁴⁵ and thus Livius grafted “the contents of a text in which the whole Greek speaking world recognized itself onto a song rhythm that signified the cultural hegemony of those who held political and social power in Rome.” Sciarrino thus agrees with the argument of Habinek that the *Odusia* was a tool of the elite for promoting hegemony.⁴⁶ By translating a Greek epic poem into Latin Saturnians, Andronicus effectively blends the two cultures together.

Mariotti’s summary (1952: 70–71) of the *Odusia* indicates how Andronicus is able to balance depicting both representations of his source and aspects of the target culture. Mariotti sees Andronicus entering into a contest with Homer that had a particular limit; he did not remodel the source to the extent that Plautus did, nor did he aim for an entirely new work like

⁴⁴ I do not discuss the aspect here, but scholars have seen Livius Andronicus as a poet well acquainted with the topics and themes of the Alexandrians. For instance, Mariotti (1952: 20–21) believes that Livius took the side of Antimachus in the literary debates of Alexandria about the feasibility of writing traditional epic poetry.

⁴⁵ Sciarrino (2006: 457–458) observes that the Saturnian metre is also used in public writings that “represented the achievements and the moral qualities of individual members of the ruling elite.”

⁴⁶ Sciarrino (2006: 458) goes even further in her analysis of the Saturnians. According to her, the metre reminds the audience of the past, the “back then.” The metre was then enhanced by the *Odyssey*, which was from the “out there.” Therefore, Sciarrino concludes, the *Odusia* marked “an important turning point because it showed [Livius’] elite audience how to expand their ideological legitimacy by drawing simultaneously from two distinct cosmological places located outside the here and now.”

Naeivius. Livius follows Homer, but within that restriction he can unfurl numerous poetic techniques. Translation is a complex process that involves all manner of influences. While there is a close similarity in many of the lines to the original source, an examination of the word choices in the translation reveals an interaction with Roman culture that shows how the *Odusia* is a product of Rome.⁴⁷ Rather than bowing under the weight of fidelity to the source, Livius Andronicus exploits the opportunity to provide a faithful surface level text that is enriched by the creative level that lies underneath.

It is not necessary for Andronicus to adhere always to Homer to represent Homer. As translators have long argued, there are numerous ways to represent the source. Boethius and Schleiermacher claim the *ad uerbum* style is the best; Luther and Denham position *ad sensum* as superior; d'Albancourt and Dacier assert that imitation best represents the source author. At times Livius transports the audience into foreign circumstances by using vocabulary that sounds like words from the source text; at other times he transports the source author to the target circumstances, since he is writing in Saturnian metre. In the fragments available to us, Andronicus does not deviate from the opening programmatic statement that aligns his work with the source material.

Andronicus' *Odusia* entered the Latin literary system as a central text, a positioning that explains some of the translation phenomena described above. The *Odusia* is set into the Latin

⁴⁷ McElduff (2013: 54) refers to the *Odusia* as a domesticating translation, i.e., a translation that conceals the source culture. McElduff's primary example of Andronicus' domesticating is the use of the Saturnian metre which, she argues (52), "nails it (the story of the *Odyssey*) down to the space of Rome." However, her statement (54) that the use of the metre "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" goes too far: a part of the appeal of Andronicus' *Odusia* is that it is the product of an alien culture, and Livius Andronicus promotes this aspect in his poetry. The use of the Saturnian metre does not obscure the aspect of translation, but instead promotes the skill of the translator in adapting a well-known foreign text to a new cultural setting.

epic literary system, from where, as a primary form, it can influence the rest of the polysystem. Epic poets afterwards have a model from which to work and can, theoretically, move further away from the translation sources in their forms. Andronicus' translation is then primary, an influence on everything contemporary and subsequent. Furthermore, as the representative of Homer, Livius Andronicus could be viewed as bringing something important to Rome; in the symbolic sense, he is bringing Homer to those who lack Homer. Or, in a different sense, he is bringing epic poetry to a literary system that lacks it. Homer's text has inherent value, but it also functions as the symbolic text of epic poetry. Yet the actual translation indicates that readers who were unfamiliar with the source text were not his primary audience. The adherence to the form and content of the original, particularly the practice of using words that sound the same in Latin as the original Greek terms (such as *insece*) demonstrates that Andronicus was aiming his translation at those who knew the Greek text and could recognize a close translation when they saw one.

3.4 Gnaeus Naevius

I discuss Naevius here because he is the next known epic poet in Rome, but also for one aspect of his poetry and to act as a foil for both Livius Andronicus and Ennius, whose *Annales* I discuss later in this chapter. Both Andronicus and Quintus Ennius interact with Homer in such a way that they can both be seen as would-be representatives of Homer. Both Andronicus and Ennius seek to portray a sense of equivalence with the source, Livius Andronicus on the level of the text, Ennius, as we shall see, on that of the author. Yet Naevius does something different, and the *Bellum Poenicum* developed in light of Andronicus' translation. I have suggested that Livius Andronicus' *Odusia* acted as a central text; as such, it influenced subsequent works. Andronicus' influence is visible in Naevius immediately on the surface level, as the Saturnian metre is also

used in the *Bellum Poenicum*. Furthermore, Naevius seems to follow Livius Andronicus when he refers to the gods via patronymics.⁴⁸ It is also possible that Naevius followed Livius Andronicus in referring to the *Camenae*.⁴⁹ Some of the practices that are reflected, if not established, in the *Odusia* appear in Naevius' *Bellum Poenicum*,⁵⁰ thus providing indications that Andronicus' poetry was an influence on the poetry of Naevius.

Yet Naevius did not follow Livius Andronicus exclusively. Naevius' choice of content allowed him to depict himself as an innovator. For while the *Bellum Poenicum* did recount the tale of Rome's foundation, it focused on the First Punic War. The *Bellum Poenicum* then was a mythical epic poem with historical content. The differences in the *Bellum Poenicum* to the form of epic poetry that the *Odusia* represents serve as moments of innovation. Naevius' model for

⁴⁸ In fr. 1 (Blänsdorf) Naevius refers to the *novem Iovis concordēs filiae sorores* ("Nine daughters of Jupiter, united sisters"). Von Albrecht (1999: 56) situates the use of patronymics within the social context, arguing that "for an audience which believed that a person's social rank was determined by his birth, the use of patronymics must have added considerably even to the authority of the gods."

⁴⁹ Jocelyn (1972: 1014 n.264) claims that Naevius almost certainly followed Livius in his use of *Camenae*, but the evidence for the use of *Camenae* is ambiguous. The *testimonia* to fr. 1, where he addresses the nine daughters of Jupiter (*Novem Iovis concordēs filiae sorores*), indicates that Naevius did speak of the *Camenae*, but the *Camenae* do not appear in the extant fragments of the *Bellum Poenicum*. Part of the ambiguity for *Camenae* stems from an unclear fragment of Porcius Licinus (fr. 1 Blänsdorf): *Poenico bello secundo Musa pinnato gradu / intulit se bellicosam in Romuli gentem feram* ("In the second Punic war the Muse bore herself with winged step to the warlike race of Romulus"). Courtney (1993: 83) observes that "this fragment has been the subject of infinite disagreement," and it is not difficult to see why: it is not at all clear which poet Porcius is referencing. The issue is not at all clarified by Gellius, who may not have the same poet in mind as Porcius did if he, as some argue, took the passage from Varro and in the process obscured Varro's point. Courtney (84-86) favors the theory that Porcius is speaking of Naevius, at least partially because Courtney believes that Naevius fr. 1 is about the Greek Muses, following Mariotti in detecting an echo of Hesiod (*Theog.* 60 and 70). Furthermore, since Naevius is said to have written the *Bellum Poenicum* in his old age (Cic. *Cato* 50) and died in 204 or 201, he likely wrote during the Second Punic War. Ennius, however, did not come to Rome until 204. Nevertheless, as Hinds (1998: 58 n. 9) correctly identifies, the use of *Musa* here may just be metonymy for poetry and would thus be a "red herring." The epitaph of Naevius (Courtney [2003: 47] = Gell. 1.24) may be more certain: *immortales mortales si foret fas flere / flerent diucae Camenae Naevium poetam / itaque postquam est Orci traditus thesauro / obliti sunt Romae loquiere lingua Latina* ("If it is lawful for the immortals to weep for mortals, the divine Camenae weep for the poet Naevius, and so after he was handed over to the vault of Orcus, the Romans forgot to speak the Latin language"). On this reading, after Naevius died, the Latin language was forgotten, presumably because of the Hellenizing tendency introduced by Ennius. Thus here the *Camenae* are meant to represent the old style.

⁵⁰ Any echo of the *Odusia* in the *Bellum Poenicum* may not be deliberate on the part of Naevius, but when both poets use similar forms, such as the Saturnian metre, there is an indication that that form was standard practice among epic poets in the early 3rd century BCE.

historical epic is seemingly a foreign one.⁵¹ Choerilus of Samos wrote his *Persica*,⁵² an epic poem about the conflicts between the Greeks and Persians.⁵³ In his prologue Choerilus indicates that he is doing something new when he calls for inspiration of a different kind: “inspire me with another theme, how from the land of Asia a great war crossed into Europe”⁵⁴ (ἡγεό μοι λόγον ἄλλον, ὅπως Ἀσίας ἀπὸ γαίης ἦλθεν ἐς Εὐρώπην πόλεμος μέγας, *SH* 316 = Aristotle *Rhet.* 3.14.6) because all of the suitable epic material had already been used (νῦν δ’ ὅτε πάντα δέδασται, *SH* 317.3 = Aristotle *Rhet.* 3.14.4). Kelly MacFarlane (2009) explores what Choerilus intended to show in his opening, concluding that the Greek poet’s apparent dismay at the dearth of suitable material is not to be taken at face value. Instead, Choerilus structured the opening as a rhetorical apology that set out the formidable obstacle before Choerilus in his poetic endeavors, one that he will presently overcome (222). MacFarlane believes that Choerilus found the meadow of the Muses violated by recent poets. His solution to the problem is twofold: first, he returns to the status of servant of the Muses; second, he revitalizes epic poetry by using historical, not mythological, events (229). Choerilus then, far from apologizing for his poetry, establishes historical material as a suitable subject for epic song.

⁵¹ This is not to say that Naevius was an innovator in composing history. Notably, however, Naevius differs from the early historical writers in that prose authors such as Quintus Fabius Pictor or Lucius Cincius Alimentus wrote in Greek, not Latin. Prose history in Latin was begun by Cato some sixty years after Naevius’ epic poem, though even after Cato established a model for Latin historical writing the tradition of composing in Greek continued in Aulus Postumius Albinus and Gaius Acilius.

⁵² The poem was first performed towards the end of the fifth century. The dating is not certain, but the *Suda* records Choerilus as the younger friend of Herodotus, and Plutarch (*Vit. Lys.* 18.4-7) writes that Lysander added Choerilus to his retinue so that Choerilus would write a poem in his honour. On the authority of the *Suda* and Plutarch, MacFarlane (2009: 219) suggests that the first performance of the *Persica* must have been between 425 and 395 BCE.

⁵³ Von Albrecht (1999: 51) links Naevius with Choerilus on these grounds, also noting that there is a double herm showing portraits of a Greek and a Roman which have been understood as representations of Naevius and Choerilus.

⁵⁴ Trans. John Henry Freese (1926).

Naevius has in Choerilus a precedent and model.⁵⁵ The situation was not as dire in Latin epic poetry as it (reportedly) was in Greek epic poetry: Andronicus wrote his *Odusia* ten years before Naevius wrote the *Bellum Poenicum*,⁵⁶ and so it would be difficult for Naevius to claim that the poetic track is too crowded. Yet Livius Andronicus, in bringing the essence of Homer to Rome via the *Odusia* may have rendered further translation of Homer undesirable to competing poets. Naevius was a near-contemporary of Livius Andronicus: a translation of Homer would put Naevius into direct competition with Andronicus or position him as an imitator of Andronicus. Andronicus complicated what constituted a translation of Homer: Ennius, for instance, had to simultaneously handle his relationship with both Homer and Livius Andronicus. It is also worth mentioning here that Naevius was not a Greek slave brought to Rome, but instead hailed from Campania. The combination of all of these factors make it beneficial for Naevius to differentiate himself from Livius Andronicus as much as possible: he rejects the role of translator, makes Rome the center of his tale, and imports a foreign model⁵⁷ that sees mythological events displaced by historical.

The content of the *Bellum Poenicum* represents a movement towards independent and native literature, but the structure is still foreign. The Latin system is still maturing, and certain gaps still remain. Thus in the early stage of Latin literature, the socio-literary conditions and

⁵⁵ Hollis (2000) discusses Roman knowledge of Choerilus, pointing out (13) that Choerilus is never mentioned in Latin poetry. However, Hollis argues that Propertius 3.1.13-14, in which the poet seems to imply that he leads a race on a track that does not allow passing, is actually a deliberate reversal of Choerilus' complaint that he "can find no vacant space amid the solid array of competitors ahead of him" (SH 317.4-5). Furthermore, Hollis (15) sees an echo of Choerilus' opening lines (ἦγεό μοι λόγον ἄλλον, ὅπως Ἀσίης ἀπὸ γαίης / ἦλθεν ἐς Εὐρώπην πόλεμος μέγας, SH 316) in Valerius Flaccus (*incipit nunc cantus alios, dea, uisaeque uobis/ Thessalici da bella ducis*, 5.217-218). One cannot be certain, however, that there were not intermediary Latin authors between Choerilus and Propertius or Valerius Flaccus whom Propertius and Valerius Flaccus are echoing.

⁵⁶ The dating around Andronicus' life is uncertain, but Kaimio (1979: 213) dates the *Odusia* to circa 230 BCE, and the *Bellum Poenicum* to circa 220 BCE.

⁵⁷ One *might* speak of Naevius seeking to find an equivalence with the Greek model presented by Choerilus, but I do not think that Naevius can be depicted as a representative of Choerilus.

Naeivius' own disposition encourage importation of foreign material to complete the system. In fact, an association, or interaction, with the foreign never truly seems to recede in Latin poetry, as each subsequent poet attempts to show how he is more familiar with the Greek archetypes.

How Ennius managed these demands is the subject of my next section.

3.5 Quintus Ennius

I consider under the label of translation that which eschews the translation of a particular work, and instead attempts to translate a source author.⁵⁸ In the *Annales* Ennius translates does not translate a work of Homer, but the epic author himself. Ennius' treatment of his predecessors Naeivius and Livius Andronicus is bound up with the portrayal of his relationship with his source Homer. In the proem to the *Annales*, Ennius makes a telling self-characterization. He recounts a dream that he had in which Homer appeared before him (*somno leni placidoque reuinctus*,⁵⁹ fr. 2

⁵⁸ The notion is that a translation could be seen as an attempt to produce something equivalent to its source. The idea of "equivalence" in translation theory studies is a disputed one, not least of all because the English word is ambiguous. Yet translations have been thought of as a "replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)" (Catford 1965:20), thinking which has led to the expansion of individual categories of equivalence (dynamic, formal, total, approximative, zero, pragmatic, linguistic, stylistic, etc.). Reiss and Vermeer (1984: 1391–1340) use "equivalence" to describe the instances in which the source text and the target text fulfill the same communicative function (for a full discussion of "equivalence", see Shuttleworth and Cowie). Possanza (2004: 29) discusses how literary translation distinguishes itself from other types by seeking to create an equivalence in an aesthetic effect. Possanza (38) defends the idea of equivalence, arguing that the since the impetus for translation is the intent to reproduce the source text in way that the target audience can understand, there must exist "a core equivalence, a basic, demonstrable correspondence which defines the relationship between two texts as that of source text and translation." Among the wide range of interpretations of equivalence, a translator could propose to achieve equivalence with a source author by fulfilling the same communicative function or aesthetic effect. As I argue in chapter five, Horace appears to view equivalence in these terms as he presents himself as the Latin Alcaeus. Certainly, the notion that a translator could see beyond the source text to the source author has been discussed by translators throughout history. For instance, Joachim du Bellay (*La Déffence et Illustration de la langue francayse*, pp. 28-29 above) theorizes that Cicero so gave himself over to the Greeks that he was able to reproduce the meaning of Plato, the vehemency of Demosthenes, and the charm of Isocrates. Anne Dacier (pp. 31-32 above) imagined a type of imitation wherein the soul of the translator gives itself over to foreign enthusiasms that will result in representations and expressions that are different but similar to the source. Novalis (pp. 39-40 above) looked beyond the text in two of his three forms of translation: the "transformative", which "body forth the sublimest poetic spirit", and the "mythic", which reveal the pure and perfect character of the individual work of art. The text is an imperfect representation of the author, and it would then follow that a translator could strive to look beyond that imperfect representation. In the *Annales* Ennius recreates the Homeric persona that the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* only represent.

⁵⁹ "Bound in gentle calm sleep"

[Sk.] and *uisus Homerus adesse poeta*, fr. 3 [Sk.]).⁶⁰ Skutsch (1985: 147–166) reconstructs the fragments to form a dream sequence in which Homer reveals to Ennius that Homer’s soul has passed into Ennius, a scene that he suggests (164–165) is modelled on Pythagoras’ claim to be the reincarnation of the Trojan hero Euphorbus.⁶¹ The reconstructed scene shows traces of transmigration and creation of life theories taken from Pythagorism and other schools of philosophy. Skutsch (1985: 160) argues that fr. 7 (Sk.)⁶² indicates that Ennius was familiar with the Greek pre-Socratic philosopher Empedocles’ doctrine of transmigration.⁶³ Varro (*LL* 5.59) quotes fr. 8 to describe the theory that life enters the body after the body is created.⁶⁴ The rather mysterious fr. 9 (*memini me fieri pauom*, “I remember that I became a peacock”) represents Homer recalling an earlier transmigration before his soul passed into Ennius.⁶⁵ Additionally, Lucretius,⁶⁶ Horace,⁶⁷ and the scholia to Persius⁶⁸ all describe the dream sequence in Ennius’

⁶⁰ “The poet Homer appeared near me.” Cicero (*Luc.* 51) introduces Ennius’ line with *cum somniauit* (Ennius) *narravit*. He also asserts (*Rep.* 6.10) that Ennius dreamt of Homer because of how often he thought and spoke of him while awake.

⁶¹ The descent of Pythagoras’ soul from Euphorbus is known to us from Diogenes Laertius (8.4).

⁶² *terra<que> corpus / Quae dedit ipsa capit neque dispendi facit hilum*, “And earth who gave the body herself takes it and makes not a whit of waste.”

⁶³ Skutsch (160) points out that Ennius may be following Epicharmus, or even Euripides (*Chrysipp.* frg. 839 N.).

⁶⁴ *oua parere solet genus pennis condecoratum / non animam. [et] post inde uenit diuinitus pullis / ipsa anima*, “The race adorned with feathers is accustomed to give birth to eggs, not life. And after that time life itself comes by heaven to the chicken”

⁶⁵ Why the peacock is a stage between Homer and Ennius is unclear. Skutsch (1985: 164–165) observes that the peacock was a symbol of immortality and that, as the bird of Samos, the peacock may have appeared in stories about Pythagoras of Samos.

⁶⁶ 1.120–126 (= fr. 4 Sk.): *Etsi praeterea tamen esse Acherusia templa / Ennius aeternis exponit uersibus edens, / Quo neque permanent animae neque corpora nostra / Sed quaedam simulacra modis pallentia miris. / Unde sibi exortam semper florentis Homeri / commemorat speciem lacrimas effundere salsas / coepisse et rerum naturam expandere dictis* (“Though in addition Ennius set forth in everlasting verse that the Acheron temple exists, where neither our souls nor our bodies pass through, but a certain image, pale in a strange manner. From where he related the sight of shining Homer, rising to him, poured out salty tears and began to expound the nature of things with words”).

⁶⁷ *Ep.* 2.1.50–52: *Ennius et sapiens et fortis et alter Homerus / ut critici dicunt, leuiter curare uidetur / quo promissa cadant et somnia Pythagora* (“Ennius the wise and brave, another Homer as the critics say, has little concern where his Pythagorean promises and dreams may fall”).

⁶⁸ *ad* 6.11: ‘*postquam destertuit*’: *sic Ennius ait in Annalium suorum principio, ubi dicit se uidisse in somnis Homerum dicentem fuisse quondam pauonem et ex eo translata in se (Ennium) animam esse secundum Pythagorae philosophi definitionem* (“‘After he dreamt’: so Ennius said in the beginning of his *Annales*, where he said that he saw Homer in his dream, telling him that he was once a peacock and that his soul had moved out of him

Annales. The scene, placed at the beginning of the *Annales*, shows how Ennius fashions himself as a new Homer, a Homer that has been reborn into Roman circumstances. This self-fashioning is for his own poetic identity: Ennius' *Annales* promises innovation by invoking the inspiration of a foreign model. The scene suggests that the reader is to understand in the *Annales* a poem that is written as if the author were Homer himself in a type of divine-inspiration. To the audience familiar with Homer's poetry, Ennius claims that he will revive Homer in a new setting.

Ennius' self-depiction brings him into direct conflict with Livius Andronicus in an attempt to establish poetic authority: how can Ennius bring Homer to Rome better than Livius Andronicus had?⁶⁹ By depicting a dream in which Homer himself explains to Ennius that his soul has transmigrated into the body of Ennius, the Latin poet displaces Livius Andronicus in his position as the representative of Homer.⁷⁰ Livius Andronicus brought the *Odyssey* to Rome, but Ennius looks beyond a text that is an imperfect representation of the poet, and instead brings Homer himself. As the vessel of Homer's soul, Ennius constructs himself as the perfect representative of Homer in the Latin world.⁷¹

The concept of Ennius as the representation of Homer in a Latin world is evident in the text as well.⁷² For example, Ennius uses the tactic of association by sound by using numerous

into Ennius, in accordance with the explanation of Pythagorean philosophy"). Skutsch (1985: 151–153) provides a full listing for references to the dream scene.

⁶⁹ Here Ennius may be indebted to Hesiod and Callimachus, both of whom encountered the Muses in their sleep. Skutsch (1985: 148) theorizes that Ennius sees an opportunity in the migration of souls to circumvent Callimachus' ban on the imitation of Homer.

⁷⁰ Brooks (1981: 19) argues that Ennius is distinguishing himself here not only from earlier Latin poets, but also Greek ones.

⁷¹ Brooks (1981: 9) collects references in the ancient world to Ennius as another Homer: Lucretius (I.112f), Cicero (*Acad. Pr.* 2.16.51; 27.88), Horace, (*Epist.* 2.1.50–52), Vergil (*Aen.* 2.268–75), Propertius (3.3), Persius (prol.1–2, 6.9–11). The idea of Ennius as *alter Homerus* was clearly popular.

⁷² Recently Elliot (2014) has cautioned that collections of fragments can be limiting in the reading of an author. In the case of Ennius, Elliot identifies (75–134) a group of sources of the fragments that view the *Annales* as a poem

Graecisms in his text;⁷³ Conte (1994: 81) credits him with inventing the genitive /-oeo/ to correspond with the Homeric /-οιο/, as well as shortening *domum* to *do* in order to reflect Homer's δῶ form of δόμος.⁷⁴ These Graecisms assure an audience familiar with Homer's Greek that Ennius is indeed representing Homer; to those unfamiliar with Greek the Graecisms are aspects of the foreign, yet they are also new and innovative. To both audiences Ennius represents Homer as he presents his poetry as if Homer is speaking a new language but cannot help sounding Greek when speaking Latin.

Yet the most important thing that Ennius did in acting as the Latin Homer was to bring the dactylic (epic) hexameter to Rome, an achievement that is important in Ennius' attempt to displace his predecessors.⁷⁵ The adaptation of a foreign metre to a new language is a noteworthy achievement. The effect of the translation of the metre is striking: using the same metre as Homer causes an association of Ennius' *Annales* with the Greek epic tradition while separating Ennius from the previous epic authors Livius Andronicus and Naevius who used the Saturnian metre. After Ennius wrote the *Annales*, Latin epic would be written in hexameter, as the metre

that engages with Homer whom she terms the "Vergiliocentric sources." Elliot argues that since the Vergiliocentric sources are primarily concerned with "Vergil's use of language, choice of characters and articulation of scenes", they cite Ennius in instances where he replicates "specific Homeric modes of expression, episodes, and techniques" (76). As a result, the Vergiliocentric sources limit Ennius to a Homerising poet, whereas earlier Romans such as Cicero focused on the *Annales* as a "document of Rome's past and as a testament to her core identity." Elliot's solution is to argue (233-294) that Ennius combined literary modes (epic and historiography) to communicate "a complex vision of Rome's place in the wider world" (233).

⁷³ Habinek (1998: 43-44), following Traglia (1985: 109-112), deems that Livius Andronicus "finds Latin equivalents of Greek terms", but Ennius "introduced Greek terms, Greek inflections, and Greek versification into his epic account of the origin and development of the Roman state."

⁷⁴ Adams (2003: 460) also points out that Ennius was involved in calquing (which Hock and Joseph [1996: 264] define as the process "of translating morphologically complex foreign expressions by means of novel combinations of native elements that match the meanings and the structure of the foreign expressions and their component parts"). For example, see *altiuolantum* for ὑψηλότης (*Ann.* 76 Sk.) and *altitonantis* for ὑψηλοβρεμετης (*Ann.* 554 Sk.). Since calquing relies on the audience's identification of the Greek word in the background, it is similar to phrasal renderings (*dicti studiosus* for φιλόλογος [*Ann.* 209 Sk.]) and *cum* expressions (*cum pulcris animis* for εὐθυμοις [*Ann.* 563 Sk.] and *audaci cum pectore* for θρασυκάρδιος [*Ann.* 371 Sk.]). Adams discusses how phrasal renderings and *cum* expressions function as replacements of Greek compounds.

⁷⁵ Later, Horace would consider it a credit to his artistic ability that he brought iambic to Rome (*Ep.* 19. 23-25).

became the standard form of native epic creation. Again, however, the innovation to the epic form was brought about by the introduction of a foreign model by Ennius, a poet who, at least in his representation of himself as the embodiment of Homer's soul, claimed to be an outsider to the target culture. That is, a foreign author introduced innovation by means of the foreign hexameter form.

In form, and in a moment of poetic self-definition, there is an interaction with the model of Homer. The same interaction is also represented in content. The poem begins with Aeneas, and thus is situated as a continuation of Homer.⁷⁶ Rossi and Breed (2006: 412) position the climax of the poem in Book 6 when the Roman descendants of Aeneas defeat Pyrrhus, who functions as the descendent of Achilles. Many passages in the *Annales* appear to be modeled on lines of Homer: the most commonly cited example is the felling of trees in lines 175–179 and their model from the scene of the funeral of Patroclus in the *Iliad* (23.114–22).⁷⁷ The content of Ennius' *Annales* shows the author combining Roman material with Homeric models while functioning as the representative of Homer; the use of Homeric models gives the impression that Homer is writing a Latin historical epic and using forms familiar to him.

Beyond representing a foreign source, Ennius also had to respond to the standards set by his predecessors in the Latin literary system. One sees in Ennius an attempt to displace earlier

⁷⁶ Rossi and Breed (2006: 412) suggest that Ennius' *Annales* continues Homer's work. The opening then accords with the self-definition that implied that were Homer to come to Rome, the *Annales* would be what he wrote.

⁷⁷ Rossi and Breed also include the defense made by Caelius against the Istrians (391–398, paired with Ajax's retreat, *Il.* 16.102–111), the horse simile (535–539, modelled on the simile in Paris' return to battle, *Il.* 6.506–511). Jocelyn (1972) provides a thorough list of Homeric elements (1014–1015), and non-Homeric elements (1015–1017). Rossi and Breed also raise the critical point that we have no way of knowing whether the fragments are representative of the overall work, or whether they were chosen by ancient commentators because of their Homeric qualities. Obviously, the same issue could be raised for Livius Andronicus, but at least in the case of Ennius we have his self-definition as depicted in the dream sequence that helps to explain how he viewed his relationship with his source.

representations of Homer. An affirmation of primacy is immediately apparent in the text: the first fragment features an invocation to the Muses: *Musae, quae pedibus magnum pulsatis Olympum* (“Muses, who strike mighty Olympus with your feet”). Livius Andronicus’ use of the term *Camēnae* to represent Homer’s Muses provides the opportunity for Ennius to differentiate himself and declare, as Skutsch phrases it, “his intention to subject Roman poetry more closely to the discipline of Greek poetic form.”⁷⁸

Of special note in the opening of the *Odusia* was the fact that Livius Andronicus translated ἔννεπε as *insece* and Μοῦσα as *Camēnae*. Ennius borrows the clever translation of ἔννεπε as *insece*, again presumably because the sound of the word itself should invoke the Greek source, but Ennius transliterates Μοῦσα with *Musae* rather than continuing to use Livius Andronicus’ *Camēnae* (*Ann.* 322–3 Sk.): *insece Musa manu Romanorum induperator / quod quisque in bello gessit cum rege Philippo* (“Muse, tell what each commander of the Romans did with his troop in the war with King Philip”). Ennius uses the unique word *insece* to allude to his predecessor while simultaneously dissociating himself from that tradition, in a way showing the same “flexible fidelity” to Livius Andronicus as Livius had to Homer. With *Musa* Ennius again answers both Livius and Homer, but here in one word he differentiates himself from Livius Andronicus and shows his adherence to his Greek source.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ Note that I am not arguing that Livius Andronicus did not see himself as a disciple of the Greek form, only that Ennius tries to present himself as a better disciple than Livius Andronicus.

⁷⁹ Skutsch (1985: 144–145) lays out a historical reason for the appearance of the *Musae*: around the time of writing the patron of Ennius, M. Fulvius Nobilior, introduced the Muses into the cult of Rome. Thus Ennius works alongside his elite patron in bringing the Muses to Rome. Sciarrino (2006: 450) seems to dispute Skutsch’s comment on the grounds that Skutsch implies that *carmen*, *uates*, and Saturnians are signifiers of “a more primitive (Roman) civilization”, while *poema*, *poeta*, and the hexameter “stand for a more refined (Greek) sensibility.” Sciarrino also observes that the point made by Skutsch about Fulvius Nobilior “obscures the fact that Fulvius’ temple hosted statues of the Muses plundered from Ambracia.” Sciarrino’s remarks on Skutsch serve as the touchstone for her discussion on Livius Andronicus and the introduction of epic, where she does a remarkable job of properly situating the *Odusia* in its social context. However, she has attached value words (“primitive” and “refined”) to the point made by Skutsch where Skutsch, so far as I can tell, makes no judgment. I suspect that she does so because we cannot be sure that Ennius’ audience would understand the words *carmen*, *uates*, and the Saturnian as more refined

The issue of the Muses appears again in another fragment, where Ennius is direct about his displacement of an earlier tradition. He writes that *Musas quas memorant nosce nos esse Camenas*⁸⁰ (“Know us Muses to be those whom they call Camenae”, *Ann.* 487 Sk.).⁸¹ The line seems like a direct confrontation with an earlier tradition, notably represented by Livius Andronicus, that saw the Muses translated as *Camenae*. Habinek (2006: 476) offers a compelling interpretation of the line, arguing that Ennius is here announcing a substitution (Muses for Camenae) in the same way as he did in the dream (Ennius for Homer).⁸² In the *Annales*, then, Habinek sees a recognition that “the Camenae are no longer productive cultural agents any more than Homer is.” In a similar vein, as Rossi and Breed (2006: 406) observe, are Ennius’ substitutions of *carmina* with *poemata* (fr. 12) and *uates* with *poeta* (fr. 3).⁸³ Again, such substitutions are representative of Ennius’ Hellenizing tendencies, a direct turn away from the poetic tradition of the *uates*.

Further displacement of earlier models occurs since Naevius had likely covered some of the same material in his *Bellum Poenicum* as Ennius in the *Annales*. Stephen Hinds (1998: 57)

than Livius’ terms. Yet despite the uncertainty about the reception of Ennius, I am confident that Ennius changed the terms in order to differentiate himself from Livius Andronicus, and that a learned audience appreciated these changes. Whether or not the same audience would apply value words like primitive or refined to these terms remains unclear, though Hinds (1998: 53-83) provides a thorough discussion. For instance, Hinds wonders whether from the perspective of Andronicus the strategy of Ennius in saying *Musa* represents “a retrograde step, a cruder alternative to his own strategy (60).”

⁸⁰ There is a possible corruption in *nosce nos*. Skutsch (1968: 21) admits of a temptation to read *nosces nos esse Camenas*, which he supposes would then need to be read as Ennius “explicitly rejecting the identification of *Camenae* and *Musae* made by his predecessors Livius and Naevius.” Nevertheless, Skutsch prints *nosce nos*.

⁸¹ Habinek (2006: 476) makes the valid point that the line is ambiguous in its use of the predicate accusative: is the line “Know us Muses to be the ones they call Camenae” or is it “Know us Camenae to be the ones they call Muses”? Either way, Habinek sees Ennius suggesting “an interconvertibility on a par with that between *uentus* and *aer*, or *arcus* and *iris*.”

⁸² Skutsch (1968: 18) observes that while it seems unreasonable to think that the Romans of Livius Andronicus’ time were unfamiliar with the *Musae*, there is no evidence that says they were familiar.

⁸³ McElduff (2013: 59) argues that the loanword *poeta* marks Ennius as “the harbinger of a new form of verse in Rome.” The title that Ennius gives himself characterizes him as an innovator who is bringing foreign material to a new setting.

argues that both Naevius and Livius Andronicus are the subject of *Annales* 206–10 (Sk.):⁸⁴

scripsere alii rem / uorsibus quos olim Faune uatesque canebant... neque Musarum scopulos /

nec dicti studiosus ... ante hunc...nos ausi reserare (“Others have written of the matter in the

verses which once the Fauns and priests used to sing...[when] no one [...]”⁸⁵ the cliffs of the

Muses, nor [was anyone] devoted before this man... we dared to uncover⁸⁶). Here Ennius

projects the notion that he, unlike those before him, is *dicti studiosus*.⁸⁷ Again Ennius draws our

attention to the Muses, claiming that those “others” did not uncover the rocks of the Muses.⁸⁸

There is an implied contrast between the *poeta* and the *uates* in the line *uorsibus quos olim*

Faune uatesque canebant. Skutsch (371) identifies Ennius’ inference that the *Faune*⁸⁹ belong to

the past (*olim*), and so does the poetry of the *uates*.⁹⁰ Hinds, citing Skutsch’s belief (1985) that

Ennius is declaring that he will be more observant of the Greek form than Andronicus had been,

⁸⁴ Skutsch (1985: 371) sees only Naevius, stating that “in accordance with a common device of polemics the person attacked is veiled in an anonymous plural, the vagueness of reference conveying a sense of contempt.”

⁸⁵ The meaning of the fragment is complicated. Skutsch (1985: 373–374) sees Cicero mixing the *Annales* with his own thought, which seems to have led to Cicero omitting the verb governing *scopulos* and changing perfects to pluperfects and imperfects, tenses required in the clause introduced by *cum*. Skutsch introduces what the text of the *Annales* could potentially have been: *nam neque Musarum scopulos descendit ad altos / nec dicti studiosus fuit Romanus homo ante hunc*. According to Skutsch, Cicero signals that he is not giving a verbatim version of Ennius by only giving the line five feet.

⁸⁶ Skutsch (1985: 375) contends that the object of *reserare* was either *claustra* (*Musarum*) or *fontes*. Vergil (*Georg.* 2.175, *sanctos ausus recludere fontes*) gives support to the latter. Skutsch prefers *claustra*, explaining that while *recludere fontes* is a natural phrase, *reserare fontes* “sounds very strained.” Skutsch (119–120) also believes that both *cum* and *quisquam erat* are the words of Cicero, where the fragment appears (*Brut.* 71). If *cum* belongs to Cicero, then it refers to the time before Livius Andronicus; if to Ennius, then it would seem to point to Naevius.

⁸⁷ Here Skutsch (1968: 6) sees a connection to the poetic school of Alexandria on the grounds that *dicti studiosus* translates φιλόλογος; Skutsch believes that *dicti studiosus* is a translation since there is no interpretation of the Latin phrase that is consistent with a Latin idiom. As evidence that φιλόλογος was a term of the Alexandrians, Skutsch looks to Eratosthenes assuming the style and surname of ὁ φιλόλογος, a scholiast’s note telling us that Hipponax called together the φιλόλογοι at Alexandria, and Strabo speaking of the φιλόλογοι ἄνδρες of the Μουσείον, which Skutsch describes as the central seat of learning and research at Alexandria. Thus the awareness of, and engagement with, the Alexandrians that was in Livius Andronicus is also in Ennius.

⁸⁸ Brooks (1981: 31) sees in the line a declaration that earlier poets “did not consciously recreate in their work the great tradition of Greek epic poetry, and make Greece over in the Roman world.” Brooks also argues that by so doing, Ennius turned Latin into a “derivative literature.”

⁸⁹ Skutsch (1985: 371) provides Lucil. 484f. (*terriculas, lamias, Fauni quas Pompiliique / instituere Numae*) as evidence that the *Fauni* represented the past.

⁹⁰ *Vates* and *poeta* only became poetic synonyms in Vergil (Skutsch 1985: 372). Skutsch points out that the two terms are still distinguished in Lucretius, and postulates that the disparaging tone in Ennius “played a certain part in delaying what would seem to be an almost inevitable development” (i.e., the two terms becoming synonyms).

observes that “the implication is that Livius’ rendering of Homer’s *Μοῦσα* as *Camena* shows him to be a less disciplined Hellenizer (59).”⁹¹

To show how the claim of closeness to the source became a trope in Latin epic poets, it is worth illustrating how Vergil used a similar approach to claim primacy:⁹² in the opening to his third *Georgic* (10–12), he situates himself as the “first”: *primus ego in patriam mecum, modo uita supersit, / Aonio rediens deducam uertice Musas; / primus Idumaeas referam tibi, Mantua, palmas*⁹³ (“I will be the first to lead the Muses into my fatherland when returning from the Aonian peak, if only life remains; I will be the first to bring the Idumaeae palms to you, Mantua”).⁹⁴ How is it that Vergil can be the first to lead the Muses to Italy, when Ennius was the first to uncover the Muses? In a paradox noted by Hinds (54), Vergil’s claim to primacy is “‘authorized’ by its association with Ennius’ claim to be first—even though the Ennian precedent can be argued to disqualify the Virgilian claim.” The poetic primacy of Vergil, like that of Ennius before him, depends on displacing earlier poets with claims to primacy that “operate through a revision of previous Hellenizing revolutions, a revision which can be simultaneously an appropriation and a denial” (Hinds 1998: 55).

Hinds (55) argues that these proclamations of primacy are declarations that the predecessors are old, their time now past. Thus one can see that the new, by staking a claim to be

⁹¹ Hinds (1998: 58–62) cautions against reading Andronicus’ call to the *Camena* through Ennian teleology. Ennius is displacing Andronicus by showing how he is a better representative of the source, but that construction does not mean that Andronicus’ use of the term *Camena* represents an uncultured choice.

⁹² As Hinds (1998: 52–56) does.

⁹³ Thomas (1988: ad *Geo* 3.11) dismisses Wagner’s argument that Vergil is limiting his primacy to Mantua (*primus Mantuanorum [non Romanorum, quod superbum esset]*), and Hinds (1998: 54) follows. To Mynors (1990: ad *Geo*. 3.11), Vergil here “imagines himself returning to Italy from a victorious campaign.”

⁹⁴ For Hinds (1998: 53–54), Ennius is the clear target of Vergil’s allusion, pointing out that Lucretius (1.117–119) praised Ennius in the “first” formula: *Ennius ut noster cecinit, qui primus amoeno / detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam / per gentes Italas hominum quae clara clueret* (“As our Ennius sang, who was the first to lead a crown of everlasting foliage down from beautiful Helicon which was called splendid through the Italian race of men”).

a better and closer representative of the source, seeks to replace the old. Ennius shows how he is a better Hellene when he corrects Livius Andronicus' *Camena* with *Musa*; Ennius, in turn, is disregarded as the first to uncover the Muses of Greece by Vergil. There is a persistent feature in Latin poetry whereby the new author displaces the earlier by claiming primacy in matters of the Muses. As Hinds (1998: 55) suggests, claims of primacy also proclaim the end of earlier authors.

A stronger interest in Greek culture among Ennius' contemporary audience members encouraged him to claim primacy by arguing that he was a better representative of Homer than Livius Andronicus had been. For instance, an association between himself and the Scipios, themselves reputed Hellenizers, is attested in Cicero (*de Oratore* 2.276).⁹⁵ In these conditions, innovation is represented by a return to the source.

Andronicus and Ennius both position themselves as representatives of Homer in order to establish themselves in the Latin literary system. For Andronicus, Homer's *Odyssey* provided the essential foundation for the *Odusia* as Andronicus established a new literary form in Rome. Ennius used the backing of Homer to displace Andronicus in the literary system. For neither author is being a source-representative translator restrictive of their creative output or authorial voice. Both poets use their self-positioning as source-representative poets to signify how they are stimulating innovation.

An additional feature of both Andronicus and Ennius is that they target their translations at members of the audience who are already familiar with the source. Andronicus' opening line

⁹⁵ Rossi and Breed (2006) discuss the nature of the relationship between Ennius and the Roman elite, believing that relationship to be the key to understanding much of the *Annales*. Rossi and Breed view Ennius less as a client poet (as Jocelyn and Skutsch believe him to have been), and instead see a mutually beneficial relationship between poet and sponsor. The main contribution of the article is a focus on the poem as a reflection of the circumstances of its writing, and the portrayal of the process of Hellenization in the Middle Republic as "a phenomenon of active appropriation and reuse that finds its causes in the complex political and social dynamics of the time (420)."

signals how closely he will adhere to the source text, even using vocabulary that sounds similar to the original Greek terms, yet only an audience familiar with the original is equipped to recognize this signal. Ennius appeals to the same learned portion of the audience when he uses Greek terms, inflections, and the hexameter. Both poets promise a representation of the source, but Ennius' promise necessarily brings him into conflict with Andronicus. To supplant the *Odusia* of Livius Andronicus, Ennius promotes himself as a better embodiment of Homer, an aspect of Ennius' poetic self-identification that is apparent in the dream sequence wherein the soul of Homer enters Ennius' body. Ennius is not just a representative of Homer: he is Homer reborn.

4 Source-Representative, Comedy

This section on source-representative translation centers on Plautus and Terence, the two Roman comedic writers for whom we have the most evidence.¹ Scholars have long contrasted these two dramatists, and I do so again here for several reasons. The first reason is the simple fact that most of the evidence that we have for Roman comedy comes from these two authors. The second reason is that there is a perceivable difference in the way that each describes how he translates his Greek sources. The prologues of Plautus' comedies do not usually include information about the source author, and when Plautus does apply a name to the process of translation, he uses the phrase *uortit barbare* ("translate into an uncivilized language"). The phrase creates a schism between the audience and the characters on stage as it announces the difference in language between the source and the translation. Conversely, Terence routinely provides relevant source information, and when he describes his translation method he uses the phrase *uerbum de uerbo expressum*, an expression in Latin literature that implies close translation. Plautus' prologues speak to the divide between the Greek characters being presented and the Romans watching them; those of Terence to the careful handling of source material and his self-positioning as a source-representative translator. Both playwrights carry the themes of their respective prologues into the main bodies of their dramas, as evidenced particularly in the areas of language and characters. When the Roman playwrights translated Greek New Comedy into Latin, they were translating more than the words of the source. New Comedy exposes aspects of Greek life which Plautus and Terence handled differently. In particular, Plautus mocked the didacticism of Menandrian comedy, whereas Terence upheld and preserved the

¹ I do not discuss Roman tragedy: Seneca's dramas form the bulk of our evidence for this genre, and his period of writing falls outside of my scope in this study.

lessons that Menander presented in his drama. Indeed, Plautus' treatment of Greek life is indicative of how he positions himself as a translator. That is, Plautus' characters act and speak in such a way that the audience is regularly confronted with the fact that they are watching something foreign. The characters speak Greek, comment on how they are acting like Greeks, and use a stylized language. In the plot, generally a cunning slave aids his lovelorn master in overthrowing his greedy father. Plautus' translation, comments, and techniques create a sense of dissonance between audience and source, which in turn shatters the illusion that the Roman audience is actually located in the Greece that Plautus presents. In contrast, Terence's characters use a more restrained style of speech, rarely using a hybrid speech that combines Greek and Latin, and act more in line with those of Menander as dramas that start out with conflict and end in a resolution that sees families united. By aligning himself with his sources in both his programmatic remarks and in the actions and words of his characters, Terence promotes himself as the true Roman representative of Menandrian comedy.

The final reason that I organize this section on translation with Plautus acting as the foil to Terence has to do with the production and form of translations, and how a translation competes with models that are already established in the target society. As products of their target culture, translations are responses to certain conditions of the target culture. In the epic genre, Ennius' scene of Homer appearing to him in a dream was a response to Livius Andronicus' *Odisia*. In effect, the scene represents Ennius displacing the text of Livius Andronicus more than the work of Homer. The success of Ennius' epic ensures that Homer remains prominent while the text of Livius Andronicus is removed from his role in the target culture. The same phenomenon of translations aimed at other translations occurs in comedy. Terence's translations represent a response to Plautus' successful drama as Terence attempts to

displace his predecessor. Since the drama of Plautus was an established form when Terence was writing, it was incumbent upon Terence to differentiate himself from that model. Plautus advances a narrative about the rift between Greek and Roman culture; Terence proposes to bridge that gap between the two cultures. Much work has been done on the different styles of Plautus and Terence by John Wright (*Dancing in Chains*, 1974), Sander Goldberg (*Understanding Terence*, 1986), and Evangelos Karakasis (*Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy*, 2005), all of whom tabulate a compelling amount of data to conclude that the difference between Terence and other writers of Latin comedy is real. My work differs from theirs, however, in making prominent the idea of self-portrayal that occurs in the prologues and stressing that the deviations from the Roman comedic tradition that Terence makes cast him as a source-representative translator.

To understand how Terence represents himself it is necessary to appreciate how Plautus creates distance between himself and his source. By placing Plautus in this chapter I am not classifying him as a source-representative translator. Plautus does not make claims to represent a source; indeed, in his style of translation he has more in common with Cicero than he does Terence. Like Cicero, Plautus frequently draws attention to himself and his role as translator in the translation. Conventionally, scholars have understood translations to assimilate towards either the target culture or the source text. The *ad uerbum* to *ad sensum* scale of translation is a reflection of this understanding: *ad uerbum* aims at the source, *ad sensum* the target audience. An *ad uerbum* translation reflects the source by adhering to the verbal structure of the source or perhaps by using terminology that resists domestication, such as anachronisms. Venuti's foreignized translation (see pp. 7–9 above) is an example. Conversely, *ad sensum* translations privilege the experience of the target audience and use language that a general audience could

easily understand.² A translation that aims at the general audience is domesticated. On the scale between foreignized and domesticated translation, Plautus falls somewhere in between. He situates his translations neither in the circumstances of the source nor in those of the target, instead depicting fantasy lands where Greeks speak both Latin and Greek while referencing details from Roman life and Roman geography. The result is that the focus is on Plautus and his role in the translation as he disrupts the illusion of the theatre. In turn, Terence positions himself as a source-representative translator by aligning himself more closely to the source than Plautus did. Terence competes with the drama of Plautus by promising to bridge the gap between translator and target audience: he offers his audience, changed since the time of Plautus, a truer representation of the source than what Plautus gave them. Since Terence's source-representative stance depends on understanding how Plautus separated himself and his comedy from his sources, I first discuss the aspects of Plautus' dramas that create a sense of distance between audience and source author. After I establish this feature of Plautus' comedies, I show how Terence moved away from the model set by Plautine comedy and brought his audience and source author closer together.

4.1 Plautus' prologues: *uortit barbare*

In their respective prologues, Plautus and Terence establish a relationship with the source material that they continue in the main text of the dramas. Plautus does not usually reveal the source author in his prologues. He never mentions Menander in any of his extant plays.³ When Plautus does provide information about the source, he does not treat it as important. The

² As an example from an earlier chapter, Martin Luther (see pp. 23 above) claimed to write a translation for a more general audience than what Church writers usually targeted.

³ Anderson (1996: 31) finds it remarkable that Plautus never mentions Menander either to give him credit or to dismiss him and emphasize his own creativity.

prologues indicate that the *Casina* is based on a play called *Kleroumenoi* (*Cas.* 31) written by Diphilos (32–33) and that the *Mercator* is from the *Emporos* of Philemon (9). In the prologue to the *Asinaria* (10–11), Plautus informs the audience that the Greek title of the play is *Onagos* and that the source author is Demophilos. In the prologue to the *Trinummus* the character Luxury identifies the original as the *Thesaurus* by Philemon. In the *Poenulus* Plautus identifies only the source text (the *Carchedonius*), but not the source author, and refers to himself as *pultiphagonides* (“son of a porridge eater”, 54).⁴ The source material for the *Rudens* comes from a play by Diphilos, but the prologue does not name the original play. Thus, from twenty plays there is source information in six of them, and only four of these provide both the source author and the source play. In his indifference to providing source information Plautus appears to be apathetic to the source, and thus the playwright creates separation between himself and the source. When Plautus names his translation process he further promotes the segregation between himself and his source. In the prologue to the *Asinaria* Plautus caps the identification of the source with the claim that *Maccus uortit barbare* (“Maccus translated it into an uncivilized language”, 11). The formula reappears in the *Trinummus*, where Luxury appears before the audience and declares (18–19): *huic Graece nomen est Thensauro fabulae: / Philemon scripsit, Plautus uertit barbare* (“The name of this play is *Thesaurus* in Greek: Philemon wrote it, Plautus translated it into an uncivilized language”).

⁴ Plautus is the only extant Latin author to use this word: it also occurs in Plautus’ *Mostellaria* as *pultiphagus*. The name is a Greek slur for a Roman. The *OLD* cites the word as the combination of the Greek word φάγος with the Latin *puls*. *Puls* was a type of porridge made by the Romans from crushed grain in water; according to Juvenal (11.58), it was the primitive food of the Romans. Plautus’ term *pultiphagus*, or the patronymic *Pultiphagonides* is a Greek name for the Romans, and marks Plautus as casting himself as a primitive foreigner.

By providing none or half of the relevant source information,⁵ the prologues of Plautus reveal that this information was not important to either the playwright or his audience.⁶ Plautus' indifference to providing source information signals to the audience that they should not be interested in this information.⁷ Had more of earlier Latin comedies survived, such as those of Livius Andronicus and Naevius, there would be an indication whether earlier playwrights had included source-information more faithfully than Plautus. In turn, this information would enable us to imagine a scenario in which Romans had long become familiar with the Greek source authors and texts, making their mention in a prologue irrelevant by the time of Plautus. In fact, I suggest that Livius Andronicus treated comedy as he did epic; when introducing a form to the Roman public, he followed the guide established by the source material. In such a scenario Livius would have emphasized the source in order to establish the relevance of the material that was about to be presented to the Roman audience. By claiming fidelity to the source, Livius could indicate that the Roman audience was about to experience the same drama as their Greek

⁵ Citing the frequency with which Plautus cites the source, Kaimio (1979: 276) believes that providing source information was more important to Plautus than I do, recounting that of the seven more or less completely preserved prologues of Plautus, four of them refer to the source. Kaimio's numbering requires some updating: there are nine prologues of Plautus intact, and in four of them he mentions something of the source. At any rate, when he does mention the source, he does not do so in a way that promotes that information. For instance, in the prologue to the *Rudens*, the audience knows that the play is based on a Greek original by Diphilus only because Plautus casually says (ll. 32-33) that *huic esse nomen urbi Diphilus / Cyrenas uoluit*.

⁶ Sciarrino (2011) essentially disagrees with the notion of Plautus' disinterest in the source, as she (64) argues that the prologues of Plautus show off the Greek original as "victorious generals paraded their foreign spoils during their triumphs." In this idea Sciarrino follows Connors (2004) and Beard (2003). Connors (204) argues that "playwrights who parade the Greek origin of their plots are the literary equivalent of triumphing generals who parade their foreign spoils." Beard (41-43) discusses how *Amphitruo* should be seen in terms of the *triumphator* and concludes that the *Amphitruo* is an "in-your-face parody of triumphal *mimesis*", since a Roman triumph paraded the general as a look-alike Jupiter. In the *Amphitruo*, Plautus reverses the *mimesis* so that Jupiter looks identical to the triumphant general Amphitruo. Sciarrino's assessment is right in that Plautus does treat the source like a foreign spoil; I would stress, however, that Plautus' treatment of the source in this way also implies a disinterest in the well-being of the spoils. That is, he sides with his audience as he puts the foreign goods on display.

⁷ Conte (1994: 56) explains that "unlike Terence, (Plautus) does not presuppose an audience Hellenized enough to enjoy in detail the reference to well-known originals", and on account of the audience's lack of familiarity Plautus does not generally offer much in the way of discussion in respect to his sources. Recent scholars have done much to negate the theory that Plautus' audience was completely unlearned: that some of Plautus' humour depends on knowledge of Greek indicates that a portion of his audience knew Greek. However, the general thesis that Plautus' audience was less Hellenized than Terence's nevertheless holds true.

counterparts. Yet I am limited to hypothesizing: there are six fragments associated with Livius Andronicus, and Wright (1974: 16) finds that only two, for a total of fourteen words, can be accepted without any question to their authenticity. We are more fortunate in the state of Naevius' comedic fragments: 130 lines are extant, the largest section of which comes from the *Tarentilla*.⁸ Nevertheless, these lines do not indicate Naevius' proposed relationship with his source texts in any meaningful way.

Yet despite the lack of evidence for earlier playwrights, it is possible to reconstruct Plautus' relationship with his source material by his chosen phrase *uortit barbare*.⁹ Although after Plautus *uertere* is a common term for the process of translation that reveals very little of the process itself,¹⁰ the modifier *barbare* discloses an important feature of Plautine comedy. The term announces the separation between Greek and Latin, and more importantly the Roman concern that to Greeks all non-Greeks were uncivilized foreigners. Cato the Elder famously warned his son about Greek doctors for this very reason, claiming that they had sworn to kill all *barbari* with their medicine and that the Greeks often called the Romans barbarians, polluting

⁸ This section is representative of the stylized comedic form in its excessive alliteration (*Alii adnutat, alii adnctat, alium amat alium tenet, Com. 76 R*²).

⁹ Karakasis (2003: 182) reads this phrase as indicative of Plautus' "audacious, transformative imitation." Karakasis argues (183) that with the self-deprecating tone of *barbare* Plautus preempts Greek scorn and acknowledges the distance from his Greek models. By creating a scenario in which the Greeks might scorn Plautus and his work, he creates the mirage of the critical Other.

¹⁰ Gentili (1979: 98–99) argues that *uertere* denotes loose translation and *exprimere* literal. I agree in respect to *exprimere*, but *uertere* in fact seems to denote nothing in respect to fidelity. When Cicero (*Fin.* 1.7) uses it (*quamquam si plane sic ueterem Platonem aut Aristotelem nostri poetae fabulas, male, credo, mererer de meis ciuibus si ad eorum cognitionem diuina illa ingenia transferrem*), he is implying close translation, since the good that he could do the state is providing it with close versions of Plato and Aristotle, and also because he quickly backs away from this unfulfilled statement by proclaiming that he has not done this type of translation yet (*sed id neque feci adhuc nec mihi tamen ne faciam interdictum puto*). Although literal translation is described in Latin by either *exprimere* or *interpretari* (at least in Cicero, cf. *Off.* 1.142), loose translation does not seem to have a verb associated with it, although Cicero does contrast *sequi* with the activity of the *interpret* on one occasion (*Off.* 1.6). Moreover, the focus of the phrase *uortit barbare* in Plautus is on *barbare*: Plautus here pairs the meaningful modifier with the standard term for translation.

them with the name *Opici*¹¹ (Plin. *Nat.* 29.13). The claim that Greek doctors will kill all foreigners is less important than the worry that the Greeks consider Romans to be *Opici*. In Plautus' time the Greek labelling is something to be laughed at. Plautus exploits the theme of Greeks labelling Romans *Opici* and grouping them with other *barbari* for comedic effect: in the prologues a Greek character, like Luxury in the *Trinummus*, comes before the audience and describes how Plautus has sullied the original text by translating it into a barbarian language. The dismissal of Plautus creates the effect of solidarity among the Roman audience against the Greeks presented on stage.¹² The characters deride Plautus' craftsmanship, and indeed at times these characters mock Plautus himself, either by referring to his "barking name" (*cum latranti nomine*, *Cas.* 34) or by calling him "porridge-eater" (*multiphagonides*, *Poen.* 54), a title which calls attention to the early days of Roman culture in a derogatory sense. Plautus promotes the estrangement between himself and his source and thereby aligns himself with the Roman audience. He depicts the source text as the "other", emphasizing its foreignness.

Anderson (1996: 137) summarizes the effect that Plautus' tendency not to inform the listeners of the background information to the play has, asserting that the prologues of Plautus are performed "with a certain nonchalance and confidential smile that lets us in on an important secret: he does not take this Greek play very seriously." Anderson suggests that when Plautus does cite the source author, he does so only to imply that "the whole thing is non-Roman but that he is doing his best to adapt this alien material." Anderson recognizes Plautus dismantling the

¹¹ The label *Opici* can denote someone as "Oscan", but it comes to be used as an insult against people deemed ignorant of Latin (see *OLD* 2).

¹² It is worth pointing out that Plautus is perfectly capable of preserving source material in his translation. A translation that Possanza (2004: 32) offers as an example of literal translation is Plautus' *quem di diligent / adulescens moritur* (*Bacch.* 816–817), which translates Menander ὃν οἱ θεοὶ φιλοῦσιν ἀποθνήσκει νέος ("He whom the gods love die young", *D.E.* fr. 4 Sandbach). For Possanza, the Latin "neatly preserves the aphoristic quality of the Greek as well as the semantic content." Plautus makes deliberate translation choices, and does not translate the way he does because he knows no other way.

illusion that the audience is in Greece watching Greek actors. Plautus removes himself and his audience from the dramatic situation and instills a sense of superiority in the audience over the dramatic characters. The prologues of Plautus serve as the first step in dividing audience from dramatization, a process that results in the audience's attention being drawn to the translator Plautus.

4.2 The Greek scene

Plautus creates a sense of 'otherness' that creates a foreign feel to his dramas by a variety of means. The most fundamental is the Greek setting, a place that Goldberg (1986: 3) calls a "comic fantasy land populated by absurd Greeks."¹³ For Goldberg (1986: 212), Plautus takes advantage of the Greek setting to stage a clash of values that existed between Greeks and Romans. Plautus brings his audience to Greece and invites them to laugh together at the scene depicted. In the real world of the Roman theatre Plautus is doing the opposite when he sets his translated comedies before a Roman audience, but this reality does not affect the scenario that Plautus depicts.¹⁴ The scene indicates that Plautus is a translator who prefers to bring the audience to the circumstances of the source author.¹⁵

¹³ The aspect of characters is an important point of separation between Plautus and Menander for Arnott (1975). In Arnott's theory, Menander's characters represent the poet's aim to provide a realistic scenario, while Plautus uses larger than life figures in his attempt to amuse the audience (1975: 40). Arnott's understanding of the characters of Menander align with the traditional understanding of Menander's drama as didactic, an aspect that would encourage the use of realistic characters. Plautus' characters, as I describe them below, are often extravagant in language and action.

¹⁴ As Barsby (1999: 14) observes, despite the formally Greek world, the characters of a Plautine comedy periodically lapse into Roman jokes. Ludwig (1968: 175) points out that Terence consciously avoided these types of lapses, leaving out Greek place names and customs that meant nothing to the audience. For example, in the *Phormio* (adapted from a play of Apollodorus) Terence eliminated a scene in which a young girl cuts her hair in the mourning of her mother.

¹⁵ Plautus does Romanize the Greek dramas that he translated to the point that modern translation theorists would describe the process of his translation as one in which the original is brought to the audience. That is, Plautus changes the play to suit his Roman audience, rather than retain the Greek features of the original and force his audience to adapt to that material. Or, as Elaine Fantham (1977: 43) phrases it when discussing Terence, "let the audience adapt themselves to the requirement of art."

However, the Greek scenery of Plautine comedy is artificial; Plautus frequently fills the Greek settings with Roman details, even when he appears to be faithfully representing a Greek scene.¹⁶ The *Pseudolus*, for instance, opens with a scene modelled on Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Aulis*,¹⁷ and includes contractual details that were valid only in Greece, not in Rome.¹⁸ Plautus here emphasizes the Greekness of the drama. Yet Plautus quickly undercuts the Greek scene: a *cantica*¹⁹ performed by the pimp Ballio follows the opening, in which he mentions specific cuts of meat.²⁰ Williams (1968: 286) understands the reference as a detail particularly Roman: Pliny is able to list fifty cuts of pork (*Nat.* 8.209), but, for example, the Athenian diet was largely vegetarian supplemented with fish. The Roman quality of the scene continues as Ballio speaks of the *prouvinciae* of the girls who work for him; each has a type of man whom she specializes in.²¹ In response to Calidorus' growing anger at Ballio's speech (201), Pseudolus is surprised that the youth of Attica allow this man to remain here (*huncine hic hominem pati / colere iuuentutem*

¹⁶ As Leigh (2004: 7) argues, the most Plautine element in Plautus is his habit of undermining "any naturalistic representation of Attic life by shamelessly jarring references to the differences between Greeks and Romans or to specifically Roman or Italian places and institutions." The disruption of the naturalistic representation reminds the audience that it is viewing a Plautine representation of Attic life.

¹⁷ In modeling portions of the drama on tragedy, Plautus is in line with other comedic playwrights. For example, Goldberg (1986: 208) finds that tragic scenes of madness were the inspiration for those in Plautus, specifically *Menaechmi* 865–867 where Menaechmus feigns madness and pretends to hear Bacchus and Apollo urging him on to violence. Goldberg argues (210) that since metres were shared between tragedy and comedy it was fairly simple for comedians to incorporate tragic language for a melodramatic, parodying effect. As a consequence of this tradition of tragic incorporation, Goldberg concludes, Terence could not simply use tragic language to signal a serious intent, as such language would presumably be understood as parody. In Plautus, tragic scenes of madness are also scenes where characters emphasize their Greek nature. In the example of the *Pseudolus* above, the contract details are Greek.

¹⁸ Williams (1956: 425) claims that "the terms of Ballio's contract with the soldier, the payment of part of the price, all have nothing that is characteristically Roman, and in the part-payment, at any rate, it is characteristically Greek."

¹⁹ Scholars have traditionally understood the *cantica* as an original feature of Plautine comedy (cf. Fraenkel [1922; trans. 2007]; Arnott [1975:32]), but Zagagi (1980: 68–105) has shown that there are parallels to the *cantica* in the Greek erotic tradition. Wright (1974: 57) finds the *cantica* in a fragment of Naevius (*Com.* 25 R²). The *cantica* in Plautus is then an example of a standard feature of Latin comedy that has its origins in Greek poetry, just not comedy.

²⁰ *Pernam, callum, glandium, sumen facito in aqua iaceant* (166).

²¹ So Hedylium specializes in corn-dealers, Aeschrodora in butchers, Xystilis in olive-merchants, etc.

Atticam, 202–202^a). The juxtaposition between the Romanness²² of Ballio’s *cantica* and Pseudolus’ reminder that the scene is, in fact, set in Athens is jarring: if the audience members were forgetting that they were watching foreigners, Plautus returns their attention to the Greek setting by referencing the youth of Attica.²³ By jarring the audience out of the illusion of the theatre, that is, by reminding them that they are at a staged production, Plautus returns their attention to the fact that *he* has brought them this scene.

Translation theorists and practitioners have postulated that one style of translation is to bring a foreign author to the target culture and make him speak the native tongue and culture. For example, a Roman could translate Homer in such a way that it was as if Homer had been born in Rome and spoke only in Latin and of Roman culture. The opposite has similarly been recognized as a possibility when translating, whereby the translator projects the audience into a foreign culture. All aspects of the foreign would remain in this type of text, and the audience would not forget that it is experiencing a translation. Plautus avails himself of neither method; instead his translation practice, one that mixes Greek scenes with Roman details, works in a manner that exploits the difference between the cultures in a humorous fashion. Indeed, the practice of going only halfway between the target audience and the foreign source is jarring, and draws attention to itself and the translator. The audience never has the opportunity to become acclimatized to the foreign setting since Plautus continually draws it back to Rome with Roman details. Nor do the texts encourage the audience to believe that they are experiencing something native: the names of the characters are Greek, their actions are peculiar, and they speak in a

²² Plautus regularly puts Roman details into his dramas. For example, the character Trainio in the *Mostellaria* twice mentions convening a senate (688 and 1049), and Sino claims that he is trying to escape his wife by going to the Forum (708f).

²³ As Moore (1998: 55-56) observes in his analysis of the *Mostellaria*, “the spectators, now in Rome, now in Greece, are left with their heads spinning.”

different language. In presenting his translated dramas, Plautus makes his role as a translator evident to the audience, never allowing the audience to believe that they are actually experiencing the source. In Robinson's terminology, the drama never "feels" right since the audience never has the chance to become acclimatized to a foreign or a domestic situation.

4.3 Language

Plautus further reinforces the otherness of his comedies by the language of the characters. Numerous studies have been done on the Greek in Plautus' comedies; each scholar who undertakes the task of tabulating this evidence has different criteria for what is included as a proper Greek word. In general, most scholars follow Meillet's observation (1928: 108–109) that the Greek of Plautus comes from a low form; that is, not that of the literary elite, but of the streets.²⁴ The nature of the Greek terms raises an issue in tabulating these lists: scholars must formulate criteria for deciding which words had not lost their foreign essence and would be recognized as Greek by Romans. Different scholars handle this problem in varying fashions, and due to the diversity of criteria it is difficult to provide agreed-upon numbers for the Greek words in the texts of Plautus. For my purposes of comparing and contrasting the use of Greek by Plautus and Terence, I will use the evidence from the study done by John Hough (1934),²⁵ partially because he later provided a similar treatment (if not a more detailed one) for the works

²⁴ That Plautus uses the low form of Greek, that is, the type of Greek that Romans would have become familiar with while living in Rome, is not compelling evidence that Plautus was aiming for realism. Zagagi (2012: 20, 29) doubts that Plautus was aiming for a reflection of realism in the language that he used, or at least that it was his main motive. Zagagi points to Plautus' complex lyric metres and *ubertas sermonis* as evidence that realistic discourse was not a priority. Even if the Greek language were not jarring to a Roman audience since it had become acclimated to hearing Greek in public places, the exaggerated speech (for example, the sequence of infinitives in the *Poenulus* [220–221]) would still prevent the dramas from being reflections of realism.

²⁵ Maltby has also analyzed the Greek vocabulary in both Terence (1985) and Plautus (1995), but despite criticizing (1985: 110) Hough's study for his failure in providing any comprehensive list of occurrences which prevents others from checking the objectivity of Hough's study, Maltby largely comes to similar conclusions as Hough. I provide Maltby's ratios in the relevant places throughout my study.

of Terence (1947), but also because he analyses the groupings of the Greek terms to determine if they are assembled for effect. Hough's study (1934: 346) shows a range in frequency between one Greek word every fifteen lines to one every thirty-seven, depending on the play.²⁶ To put this number in perspective, Hough (1947: 18) finds a variation between 1:28 and 1:206 among the works of Terence.²⁷ In a similar study, Michael Gilleland (1979: 158) determines that Greek words were spoken most commonly by the *parasitus*, the *miles*, the *leno*, and the *seruus*, and least frequently by female characters.²⁸ The conclusion from this data is that Greek words were more common among the low characters of a Plautine comedy. Hough (1947: 18–19)²⁹ concludes that Greek words are clustered in scenes for the greatest comedic or elegant effect, “particularly in static scenes, in dramatic situations, or in speeches by characters who would be most likely to talk in rich humorous vein.” Hough (1934: 351–352) also points to a scene in the *Aulularia* as an example of clustering for effect. Lines 508–522 conclude a discussion on feminine economies, but end with the topic of feminine luxury and extravagance. In this passage on luxury and extravagance, vices commonly associated with Greeks, there are eleven Greek words. In a similar finding, Zagagi detects (2012: 29) that when a character poses as insane he or she uses more Greek vocabulary than usual.³⁰ Scenes of deception are also full of Greek

²⁶ The ratios that Maltby (1995: 33) provides vary from one Greek word to every 308 lines to 1:37, with an average of 1:143.

²⁷ The 1: 206 ratio is from Terence's play the *Hecyra*, and the 1: 28 ratio is from the *Eunuchus*. I discuss these numbers further in the section on Terence.

²⁸ Maltby (1995: 34) finds that the *cocus* is the character with the highest ratio of Greek terms (1: 55). Maltby's breakdown of the data makes it apparent that Greek is more common among low male characters than any other type. On average, the low male characters use Greek once every 119 words, high male characters once every 271 words, low females once every 329 words, and high female once every 1880 words. In his study (Maltby 1985) on the distribution of Greek words in Terence, in which he expresses his ratios in terms of Greek words per line, Maltby finds (119) that the low male characters use Greek once every 39 words, high males once every 96 words, low females once every 104 words, and high females not at all.

²⁹ In his 1947 study on Terence Hough revisits some of the data from Plautus and makes some further conclusions that I assume were aided or brought about by a comparison with the statistics that he had tabulated from Terence.

³⁰ On the basis of these findings Zagagi says (2012: 29) “Plautine insanity comedy relies to a large extent on the assumption that the more insane you are, the more of a Greek you are.”

terminology.³¹ Plautus clusters the Greek words here to emphasize the Greek nature of the subject at hand: these are vices anathema to the Romans. The behaviour of the characters is at best alien and at worst destructive to the Roman way of life. Plautus reminds the audience of the Greek scene by depicting the most deplorable characters as Greeks by grouping Greek words in their scenes.

Greek characters in Plautus' comedies often emphasize their nature by speaking Greek words: in the *Curculio* the parasite Curculio bursts onto the stage (*date uiam mihi*, 280), warning all to stay out of his way. He claims that nobody is important enough to hinder him, not even a *strategus*, a *tyrannus*, a *agoranomus*, a *demarchus*, or a *comarchus* (285–286). The parasite is boisterous and unlikable in this scene and it is here that Plautus emphasizes the character's Greekness. At the outset of Act Four the Choragus appears and uses the words *halophantam an sycophantam* in relation to the slave Phaedromus (463).³² Likewise, when the soldier with the Greek name that looks like a Roman joke—Therapontigonus Platagidorus³³—arrives and is threatened by the pimp, he twice refers to his sword as a *machaera*³⁴ (567, 574) and calls the *leno* a *mastigia* (567). When the *leno* Ballio arrives on stage in the *Pseudolus*³⁵ (133), he uses a

³¹ Zagagi (2012: 32) lists Plautus' Greek intrigue terminology: *sycophantia*, *focus*, *contechnari*, *techina*, *machinari*.

³² The Choragus opens by speaking Greek terminology, but soon mentions a number of Roman topographical locations, including the Comitium (470), the *lucus Curtius* (477), the temple of Castor (481), and the Tuscan village (482). By depicting a Greek character speaking Greek as he looks at Rome around him, Plautus makes clear that he is presenting a Greek in Rome.

³³ Amy Richlin (2005: 64) translates the name as “Squire-Antigonius Flat- (or Street-) (or Broad-) Mover-Gift”, and devises an equivalent in “Lt. Napoleon Plaza-Toro.” In the most recent Loeb version of Plautus (2011), Wolfgang de Melo does not translate the name, reasonably I believe. The joke in the name is how ridiculously Greek it sounds, although Richlin's attempt to find a cultural equivalent is admirable. The very names that Plautus gives his characters evoke laughter. Anderson (1996: 25) cites also the pun built into the slave name Chrysalus (originally Syros), which plays upon gold and on the cross upon which he will be punished if Chrysalus fails in his plots.

³⁴ Greek μάχαυρα

³⁵ In this play the slave Pseudolus frequently uses Greek words, a characteristic which, when combined with Ballio's use of Greek, results in the fairly high ratio of one Greek term for every 73 words, as provided by Maltby (1995: 33).

number of Greek words as he threatens the prostitutes in his boisterous *canticum* (*plagis*, 136; *flagritribae*, 137; *harpaga*, 139; *plagigera*, 153).³⁶

Beyond the use of Greek language, Plautus also invokes the divide between Greeks and Romans by using words like *barbare*, *pergraecari*, and *congraecare*. Plautus uses the term *barbare* in his prologues in a self-deprecating fashion when he presents a Greek character speaking of the barbarous style of the playwright. Zagagi (2012: 21) perceives that *pergraecari* and *congraecare* are used in situations that Romans would typically see as representations of extreme hedonism and loose morals, behaviour that would be destructive to the state. For instance, the slave Chrysalus uses the verb *congraecare* to describe squandering away money in the brothels (*atque id pollicetur se daturum aurum mihi / quod dem scortis quodque in lustris comedim congraecem, pater* [*Bacch.* 742–743]). Plautus uses *pergraecari* correspondingly: Nicobulus (*Bacch.* 812–813) explains his actions against the slave Chrysalus as a lesson for “Greeking-it-up”³⁷ with his son (*propterea hoc facio ut suadeas gnato meo / ut pergraecetur, tervenefice*).³⁸ Sutton observes (1993: 82) that in the *Mostellaria* there are three instances (ll. 22, 64, 960) in which the audience is told that the characters are acting like Greeks, a characterization that would not need to be made about actual Greeks. These moments in which a character calls attention to his or her own Greekness destroy the illusion of the stage: why would Greeks in Greece say that they are acting like Greeks? Plautus uses this language to remind his audience that they are watching Greeks, not Romans.³⁹

³⁶ He also uses the term δύναιμι when giving orders to the girl Xytilis (211).

³⁷ This seems to be the accepted translation of *pergraecari* (cf. the translations of Barsby [1986] and Segal [1969]. De Melo [2011] translates the verb as “to live in Greek style”; McElduff [2013: 77] sees the verb as a claim for the truth of his representation of the Greeks).

³⁸ For other instances, cf. *Most.* 22–24, 959–961; *Poen.* 601–603; *Truc.* 88.

³⁹ As Moore (1998: 55) observes, when Plautus’ Greeks call one another Greeks, they are speaking “not as Greeks but as Romans, to whom Greekness is something to be noted.”

Plautus uses exaggerated vocabulary also to illustrate the alien nature of the characters. Barsby (1999: 18) determines that Plautus exaggerates colloquial elements of language for effect whereas Terence hopes to avoid detracting from his portrayal of character and theme. There are, for instance, many more occurrences of uttered oaths in Plautus than in Terence (1368 vs 188 [Barsby 1999: 21]), and three times more diminutives. Plautus' heavy use of alliteration further strengthens the caricature status of the characters. Wright (1974: 23) documents examples from the *Poenulus* of a Plautine system of alliteration whereby more than just the first letter of the words forms a pattern, but even the first syllable: *et bene et benigne* (589), *nummos numeratos* (594), *leniter lenonibus* (622^a). In the *Poenulus* Adelphasium mouths eight infinitives in a row (*lauari aut fricari aut tergeri aut ornari, / poliri, expoliri, pingi, fingi*, 220–221), and ends a sentence with four straight passive verbs (*ornantur, lauantur, tergentur, poliuntur*, 229). Nobody in Plautus' contemporary society would speak the way that the actors do, and in their extravagant speech they appear strange to the audience. Moreover, what emerges from the studies of Greek words in Plautus is that they are most frequent in low, antagonistic characters during scenes that are extraneous to the plot. The words are there as parts of scenes that function only in depicting the brutish antagonists as Greeks. Both the parasite Curculio and the pimp Ballio emphasize their Greekness in scenes where they are acting boisterously. These scenes are devices for solidifying the alien quality of the action and actors on stage.

The language that the characters in Plautus' comedies use creates a barrier between the characters and the audience. Their use of Greek vocabulary gives the impression that Plautus is showing authentic Greeks on stage. Yet by doing so Plautus makes it more difficult to accept and sympathize with the characters. Words, Robinson argues (1991: 3–15), have meaning because a society has formulated normal uses for them. If the words of a translation do not comply with

those norms, then the translation does not “feel” right. When Plautus presents his characters using Greek words or exaggerated speech, the experience is jarring and does not “feel” right. The language resists acceptance in the target audience because eight infinitives in a row do not “feel” right. Consequently, the dramas of Plautus do not bridge the gap between source and target audience. Instead, the focus of the comedies is on the gap that Plautus has brought the audience to.

4.4 Characters

To develop the division between Roman audience and source text, Plautus depicts the Greek “other” as the embodiment of the opposite of Roman moral values. He paints the Greeks as an exotic people, living in a comic fantasy.⁴⁰ In Plautus, “a sensible attitude is a wrong attitude” (Goldberg 1986: 212) and frequently the youth triumphs by overcoming the responsible attitude of the older generation.⁴¹ The otherworldly scene⁴² on display in Plautine comedy⁴³ creates a material gap between source and target, uniting moralistic Romans against deriding, yet humorously absurd Greeks.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ Sutton (1993) is somewhat against this idea. Instead, Sutton argues that Plautus aimed his attack on patriarchal society, and used comedy “as a vehicle transmitting the more liberal and humane values of Hellenism, giving frequent unfavorable representations of ostensibly Greek equivalents of traditional Roman authoritarianism, severity, legal-mindedness, and similar aspects of the *mos maiorum*” (67).

⁴¹ Segal (1987) and Sutton (1993) argue that Plautus’ comedies reflect a generational dispute in Rome that challenges the authority of the *paterfamilias*. For Segal, the ill-tempered fathers of Plautus’ dramas are caricatures of the Roman head of the household, and their defeat is the depiction of a wish come true.

⁴² For Conte (1994: 61), making the details foreign means that the comedy resides in an “elsewhere” location. The elsewhere location enables Plautus to make the setting a fantasy land and supports the impression that the audience was experiencing the foreign.

⁴³ Without more evidence from earlier Latin dramatists it is difficult to know if the otherworldly aspect was a Plautine invention. It does not seem that Plautus adapted this feature from Greek New Comedy: Greek (and Latin) new comedy generally feature stock plots that are not fantastical, unlike those of Aristophanes in which protagonists descend to the Underworld to stage a contest between poets (*Frogs*) or forge private treaties with warring states (*Acharnians*). Moreover, Plautus constructs much of the otherworldly aspect by displaying foreign Greek details in the comedy, a tactic which would not have the same results in the Greek plays.

⁴⁴ Williams summarizes (1968: 288) the otherworldly dynamic of Plautus comedies succinctly: “What he (Plautus) – and no doubt other early Roman playwrights now lost – created, almost by accident, was a world of imagination that was in its main essence Greek but into which he fitted things Roman with such gay abandon that the resulting world

Plautus' caricatures of Greek life are drawn from stock Roman comedic characters and not from his Greek sources. His characters are generally the same across his plays: slaves are clever, old men have flaws that cause them to lose in the competition with their sons and slaves, and young men are in love. Even Plautus' plots share characteristics across plays: there is a conflict between two antagonists over money or a woman, and a young man overcomes an old man, inverting real life roles and relationships. Usually the youth works alongside the slave to overcome the old man.⁴⁵ The sons in Plautus' plays are aided by the clever slave. Plautus stirs a Roman sense of superiority among his audience by having his roguish slaves overcome and overthrow⁴⁶ their decadent Greek masters (Anderson 1996: 139–140).⁴⁷ Barsby (1999: 14) argues that these overdrawn, larger-than-life characters like the slave and the pimp, dominate the scenes. Zagagi (2012: 21) calls the Plautine Greek an “unbridled hedonist with dubious moral principles, a schemer, a lecherous bon-vivant” and points out that despite the fact that some parallels of male licentious conduct can be found in Menander (eg. *Epit.* 127–139, 691–695, 716–755), this image of the Greek was intensified in Plautus to form an antithesis to severe Roman norms. The slave represents Plautus the translator; like the slave, Plautus overturns the world of the Greeks.⁴⁸

was a pure ideal creation. Thus his imagination was freed from the restrictions of a close dependence on reality, and his characters are larger than life.”

⁴⁵Conte (1994: 55) considers the pairing of the youth with the slave the “most usual thematic constant in Plautus’ drama.”

⁴⁶Anderson (1996: 146) points out how the slave Pseudolous (the *Pseudolus*), uses military language as he overcomes his antagonists Harpax and Ballio. For instance, he boasts (761-763): *omnis ordine his sub signis ducam legions meas / aui sinistra, auspicio liquido atque ex <mea> sententia; / confidentia est inimicos meos me posse perdere* (“I shall lead out all of my legions in order under these standards with the bird on the left, with clear auspices and from my plans; it is assured that I will destroy my enemies”).

⁴⁷Elaine Fantham (1977: 40), however, identifies the glorification of the slaves in Plautus as acceptable to Romans since the plays were set in another society. By removing the action of the drama to a land outside of Rome, Plautus can subvert the customary boundaries of the Roman social order.

⁴⁸Sciarrino (2011: 68) argues that Plautus fuses the clever slave with the poet’s self in the *Mostellaria* (1149-1151): *Si amicus Diphilo aut Philemoni es / dicito is quo pacto tuos te servos ludificauerit / optumas frustationes dederis in comoediis* (“If you are a friend of Diphilus or Philemon, tell them how your slave has cheated you. In comedies you will give them excellent deceptions”). The sources Diphilus and Philemon are presented as “reservoirs of raw

Anderson (1996: 144–145) suggests that the soldier of the *Miles Gloriosus* is a prime example of a ridiculous character that is meant to invoke the “other”.⁴⁹ His background alone separates him from the audience: the soldier is a Greek mercenary, and in Plautus’ lifetime the Roman army was still conscription based. For the Romans, who may have been familiar with the Greek mercenaries fighting in Hannibal’s army or the Greeks in Philip V of Macedon’s army, the Greek soldier is a representative of the Greek army and an enemy. Indeed, the soldier plays the boastful antagonist in Plautus’ comedies, the over-proud coward whom the young man must overcome.⁵⁰

The prime example of an absurd character in Plautus is the libidinous *senex*, who “in the original Greek play serves as the focus of legitimate authority” (Anderson 1996: 147). W.T. MacCary, who has published extensively on the characters in Plautus, speaks of the old men in Menander as maintaining their dignity (1971: 322) and as having none of the “arrogant stupidity” seen in Plautus’ *senes*, who are “so consistently made fools of by their slaves” (1971: 323). He asserts that the enlargement and glorification of the slave role in Plautus was at the expense of the *senex* whom Plautus reduced and simplified. Even when the old men in Menander act as barriers to the solution of the plot (which usually ends in a marriage), they do not act as villains.

material (Sciarrino 68).” In a similar but slightly divergent view, Anderson (1996: 33) observes that both Tranio and the poet fuse together as they taunt their masters, Theopropides and the Greek predecessors respectively. I favour Anderson’s interpretation: the plays of Plautus regularly divulge a translator uninterested in presenting his sources in any faithful fashion, and the mocking tone that Anderson detects fits this aspect perfectly. However, Sciarrino’s argument that Plautus fuses himself with the slave shows how Plautus further distances himself from his source. It is not only a slave that disrupts the comedic world of the Greek source, but Plautus the slave.

⁴⁹ Anderson argues that “The principal function of the soldier is to represent a ridiculous and non-Roman kind of soldier and soldiering, at which the entire audience, as Romans, can join in laughing.” For those in the audience who had experience in the Roman military, the joke would have been particularly funny.

⁵⁰ For example, Therapontigonus in the *Curculio* is the rival to the hero Phaedromus for the love of Planesium. The parasite Curculio reveals that he tricked Therapontigonus out of a sum of thirty minas in order to purchase the girl Planesium for Phaedromus (335–37). Therapontigonus enters the drama by boasting of his anger through which he has leveled towns (533–536). With his shield and sword he threatens the pimp Cappadox (567), who does not fear the soldier at all and only returns the threat (568–570), comically with his tweezers, makeup pot, and bath towel.

Instead, they function as checks to the “simple enthusiasm and the moral absolutism of youth” (MacCary 1971: 325). The audience of the Greek drama comes to expect that youth must prevail and a marriage must occur in the comedy, but Menander shows that “just because youth consistently prevails does not mean that age is consistently foolish” (MacCary 1971: 325). The old men in Plautus are entirely different: Simo blocks the conclusion of the action in the *Mostellaria*, but unlike one of Menander’s old men, he has no ethical issues at stake. His only motivation is greed. As Anderson (1996: 149) suggests, to the Romans this old man could represent Greeks who “amidst all their affluence and so-called culture, were so decadent as to be primarily focused on protecting their wealth.” Anderson depicts Plautus as an artist painting caricatures of Greeks that Romans want to look down upon.⁵¹ While it is easy to understand Menander’s characters, whom Anderson describes (117) as characters who “seem to be straining to understand what it means to be a human being”, it is difficult to sympathize with the villains that populate Plautus’ comedies. Plautus’ portrayal of his characters encourages indifference to their plight, and in effect moves the Roman audience further apart from the Greek characters.

4.5 Deconstruction⁵²

W.S. Anderson (1996) provides a persuasive argument on Plautus’ manipulation of his source material. Anderson refers to Plautus’ “artful deconstruction” of the Greek comedic form into a format that was successful at Rome.⁵³ By comparing specific passages in Plautus and

⁵¹ The caricatures on stage are, Anderson suggests (139) “representative of Greek weaknesses Romans wanted to believe in.” Anderson (144) recognizes the comedies enacting an ideological conflict between Roman self-identity against “their biased feelings, whetted by Plautus, about Greek civilization.”

⁵² I am borrowing the title “deconstruction” from Anderson, and not using the term in a Derridean sense.

⁵³ The deconstruction “confirms the audience in their basic Roman preconceptions: it’s better to be Roman than Greek, to live in contemporary Rome than in the incredible, effete Athens of which Menander and his contemporaries wrote” (Anderson 1996: 139). Goldberg (1986: 21), while using a different vocabulary, speaks of a similar process, particularly with respect to the Plautine style of elaborating on stock elements in comedies. Goldberg argues that this elaboration, while amusing, distorted both the original shape and focus of the Greek text. In contrast, Goldberg writes, Terence avoided elaboration of stock elements, presented characters rather than

Menander, Anderson shows how Plautus invites the audience to laugh not only at the characters depicted on stage, but even at the very complexity of plot that Menander developed. Anderson contrasts a monologue from Menander's *Double Deceiver* with Plautus' representation in the *Bacchides*. In Menander, the youthful Sostratos falls in love with a prostitute already contracted to a soldier. He writes to his friend Moschos in Athens, asking him to find the girl. Moschos finds the girl, falling in love with her twin sister in the process. When Sostratos returns to Athens, he mistakenly believes that Moschos has betrayed him, and delivers a monologue of high-sentimentality (18–30).⁵⁴

In contrast, the monologue in the *Bacchides* features an uneven linguistic texture (Anderson 1996: 11) that “creates a distinct unreality in what is said by Mnesilochus.” He starts by threatening the girl but finishes the threat by turning it back on himself: *ne illa illud hercle cum male fecit ... meo* (“Seriously, there will be a price for doing that ... and I'll pay it”,⁵⁵ 503). He continues to undercut his anger: *nam mihi diuini numquam quisquam creduat, / ni ego illam exemplis plurimis planeque ... amo* (“Yes, let no one ever believe me when I swear by the gods if I don't pay her back in every conceivable way by ... loving her”, 504–505) and *ego faxo hau dicet nactam quem derideat. / Nam iam domum ibo atque ... aliquid surrupiam patri*. (“I'll take care that she won't say she's found someone to make fun of: I'll go straight home and ... steal something from my father”, 506–507). His love and his anger pull him in two directions before the audience, and somehow his father will be the one punished. Menander's Sostratos aims to undo the harm done to his father; Mnesilochus looks to do more. As a result of the unevenness

caricatures, and developed rather than obscured “the genuine problems of family relationships and social obligations on which his comic material was based.”

⁵⁴ Anderson (1996: 11) summarizes the monologue as “engrossing melodrama”, finding Sostratos expressing his bitter disappointment and anger, characterizing the girl as a typical whore.

⁵⁵ Translations in this paragraph are from De Melo (2011).

in this monologue, Anderson argues that the audience would refuse to sympathize with Mnesilochus as they would with Sostratos. Mnesilochus is the lover who cannot make up his mind, who cannot decide whom to hate and whom to love and how to express his anger (Anderson 1996: 11).

Mnesilochus' behaviour continues to alienate him from his friends and the audience to the drama. In Menander's text, when Sostratos finds Moschus he is upfront about what has upset him,⁵⁶ but when Mnesilochus confronts Moschus' counterpart Pistoclerus, he hides the truth and seems to Pistoclerus to be speaking about someone else. When Pistoclerus asks him if something is upsetting him, Mnesilochus answers *ab homine quem mi amicum esse arbitratus sum anti hac* ("By the man whom I thought to be my friend before now", 539). Pistoclerus answers that there are many people like that, clearly not aware that Mnesilochus is speaking about him. Even when Pistoclerus begs for clarification about who has harmed his friend (*opsecro hercle loquere, quis is est*, 553), Mnesilochus continues to obfuscate, answering *beneuolens uiuit tibi* ("He lives as a friend of yours", 553) and later *uerum hercle amicus est tibi* ("By Heracles he is your friend", 557). As Anderson observes (20), Mnesilochus deceives Pistoclerus for twenty lines for the amusement of himself and the audience, never feeling any real anguish. The characters from Plautus' comedy seem to be self-aware actors who "exaggerate their postures, overstate the tensions of the scene, and riot in words" (Anderson 1996: 21).⁵⁷

Anderson (1996: 28) argues that Plautus has deconstructed Menander's comedy which consists of believable characters, "whose comic quality consists in mild defects of youthful

⁵⁶ The two meet (103-104), Moschos asks his friend if he is upset, and Sostratos quickly explains that he feels betrayed by Moschos (108-110).

⁵⁷ Anderson (1996: 21) points out how Plautus' desire to get a laugh disrupts what is a serious scene. Plautus appears to be mocking the serious tone.

irresponsibilities or simple ignorance.” The audience is expected to sympathize with the youth and his harmless, temporary defects. Anderson describes the movement of Menander’s comedy as one from ignorance to knowledge, self-indulgence to reform, and perhaps most importantly, from family disruption to unity⁵⁸ in which the son happily returns to paternal authority. Plautus disrupts this movement, often leaving the old fathers excluded from the circle who appear to have the upper hand by the end of the play. In Plautus’ world—Anderson (29) calls it one of wild polar oppositions—all moral authority is challenged, and usually successfully; we admire the roguish slave who is able to disrupt paternal authority.⁵⁹ As Barsby (1999: 14) observes, the denouement of the Plautine drama turns on the success of the trickster, not on the resolution of an actual human problem, a feature that likely stems from the lack of realism in Plautus’ characters.

In the dismantling of the Greek plots Plautus stands aside from what he is presenting to his fellow Romans. He invites the audience to laugh at the action along with him, at times pointing out the very absurdity of it all. Any material from the source that speaks to a difference between Greek and Roman culture is exploited to make that difference well perceived among the audience. In the dismantling of the original Plautus shows the same care in handling his source as he did in the prologues. Plautus opens his dramas by not honouring the source; he does not

⁵⁸ Saylor (2008) observes how comedies often end with scenes of inclusion and exclusion. As he summarizes (116), “inclusion admits a character into a new comic society while exclusion shuts him out.” Those included are the comic heroes. Saylor finds it odd that in Plautus’ *Bacchides* the two fathers are included because “their inclusion levels them with the society represented by the wayward young, and thus signals failure of restraint and prudence of age.” In contrast, the old men of the *Asinaria* and the *Casina*, whom Saylor refers to as lechers who are trying to win the lovers of their sons, are unfit for inclusion.

⁵⁹ Anderson (1996: 88) refers to the “heroic badness” on display in Plautus, where social inferiority “goes hand in hand with a striking indifference to strict ethical tenets; an adaptability to conditions; basic cunning and enjoyment of deception; a combative, anarchic attitude towards life; and total indifference to such ordinary things as property rights, duty, responsibility, truth or authority.” All of these qualities are contained in the heroic rogues who themselves call attention to their own badness. Anderson (101) offers Pseudolous (from the *Pseudolus*) as the exemplar of heroic badness for his humiliation of his master Simo and the way in which he celebrates that victory: he belches in Simo’s face (1294, 1299) and boasts of how Simo has been tricked (1308).

advertise his close association with a Greek precedent. Instead, he moves himself away from his source as Greek characters refer to his foreigner status and his rustic nature (*pultiphagonides*).

By separating himself from the material he is about to present, Plautus makes his presence as a translator more prominent. Robinson (see pp. 11–13 above) discusses how modern translators are trained to suppress their voice, even when translating something with which they do not agree. It is not the place for the modern translator to comment on the work, but to be invisible. Plautus does the opposite by inserting and emphasizing the difference between target and source culture into the text.

Prominent features in Plautus' dramas call attention to his presence by hindering acceptance of the foreign as something domestic. The scenes are Greek, but only on the surface: Plautus undermines the Greek mirage with references to details of Roman life. The characters make use of Greek liberally, but also a form of exaggerated speech that falls outside of regular use. The slave approaches the status of hero in Plautine comedy as he overthrows the decadent aged Greek *senex*. Far from representing his source, Plautus actively denies that he is associated with the source. Plautus' practice in representing his source as the Other dissociates him from his source and draws attention to the fact that the Roman audience is viewing a production that Plautus, not Menander or any other Greek source, is presenting. However, by alienating his source, Plautus also creates an opportunity for later translators like Terence to displace Plautine comedy by offering a closer representation of the source.

4.6 Prologues of Terence: *uerbum de uerbo expressum*

Scholars have long argued that Terence was a literal translator.⁶⁰ The title “literal translator” is associated, specifically, with a fashion of translating that sees the translator examining each word of the source text in order, translating that word, then moving on to the next word.⁶¹ The translation produced by this process is often unintelligible to a general audience, a characteristic that may be desirable in certain circumstances.⁶² It is easy to defend Terence against this charge: his plays are perfectly intelligible to a general Roman audience. Indeed, Terence regularly removes anything in the play itself that hinders comprehension, specifically unnecessary Greek details like the names of Athenian demes.⁶³

As I have argued, Plautus does not regularly provide his audience with all of the relevant source-information: at times he gives the original title, at other times the author only, and sometimes nothing at all. Significantly, he uses the phrase *uortit barbare* to describe his own translations. The phrase suggests the segregation between Greeks and Romans that is further reflected in Plautus’ use of Greek terms, absurd stock characters and scenarios, and stylized language. Terence sets himself apart from this practice by using different vocabulary for translation. While Plautus can elicit laughter by having his characters refer to the Romans as

⁶⁰ At least since Fraenkel (1922) used recently discovered fragments of Menander to compare Plautus to his source, concluding that Terence, not Plautus, was the Roman playwright noteworthy for staying close to the source. Jachmann (1934) argues that Terence is an original poet only in his practice of *contaminatio*. Ludwig (1968) argues against Terence’s originality.

⁶¹ The scholar Aṣ-Ṣafadī (14th century) described this process (discussed in Brock 1979: 74): “The translator studies each individual Greek word and its meaning, chooses an Arabic word of corresponding meaning and uses it. Then he turns to the next word and proceeds in the same manner until in the end he has rendered the Arabic text he wishes to translate.” However, the other method that Aṣ-Ṣafadī recognized was one in which the translator read the whole sentence, considered the meaning, and then expresses it with a sentence identical in meaning. Even in this other method, there is no freedom granted to the translator.

⁶² In Chapter 1 (pp. 17-22) I describe how translations of Holy Scripture might be deliberately obtuse to necessitate the interpretations of clergy, which would prevent the layman from misunderstanding the text. Similarly, a text may be obtuse because the translator wants to put up comprehension blocks in order to stress the idea that the text is a translation of a foreign text.

⁶³ *Heauton Timorumenos* (61–64).

barbari,⁶⁴ Terence never uses the word (Goldberg 1986: 216). As Goldberg reasons, the clash of values between Greeks and Romans became a serious matter in the 160s BCE, and could no longer be exploited for laughter.

Terence's rejection of Plautus' vocabulary can be partially explained by his biography and by social conditions in Rome. There are six extant plays of Terence, dating from between 166–160 BCE. The biographical details of Terence that Suetonius collects are of dubious reliability, but in his account Terence was born in 184 BCE, brought to Rome from Carthage as a slave of the senator Terentius Lucanus, and died in 159 as he was returning from Greece with more source material. His period of writing coincided with a marked increase in contact with the Greek world. In 168 Aemilius Paullus had brought the Third Macedonian War to a conclusion and had returned to Rome not only with a vast number of paintings and statues, but also the library of King Perseus.⁶⁵ These slaves entered Roman households as tutors to the young, educating Roman youth in Greek learning. A change in the populace is evident in the so-called Scipionic Circle, famous for being a gathering of similar-minded artists with Hellenic interests.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ There are several examples that show how Plautus alluded to Romans with the term *barbari*. In the *Bacchides*, the youth Pistoclerus calls the slave tutor Lydus a foreigner in exasperation, and proceeds to describe him as more foolish than a foreigner baby (*o Lyde, es barbarus; / quem ego sapere nimio censui plus quam Thalem / is stultior es barbaro poticio*, 121–123); the parasite Ergasilus of the *Capitui* speaks of his foreigner laws (492); later in the *Capitui*, Ergasilus answers a series of questions from the *senex* Hegio by swearing on the names of Italian cities – but he does so in Greek, with the Greek names (ναὶ τὸν Πραϊνέστην, ναὶ τὸν Σιγνίαν, ναὶ τὸν Φρουσινῶνα, ναὶ τὸν Ἀλάτριον, 881–883). This series of oaths is capped by Hegio asking why Ergasilus is swearing by the names of foreigner towns (*quid tu per barbaricas urbes iuras?* 884). In the *Casina*, the slave Olympio, reversing roles with his master Lysidamus, orders the cook to prepare him a splendid dinner (*lepide nitideque*), and warns them against giving him any tasteless foreigner food (745–747^a); the youth Phaedromus, the lover singing to a door in the *Curculio*, asks that the bolts leap like foreigner dancers (*ludii barbari*, 150); the *senex* Periplectomenus, whose complex name with the root *plectere* must be a joke in itself, refers to Naevius as the foreigner poet (211); Tranio of the *Mostellaria* refers to the craftsmanship of a pair of pillars, claiming that no porridge-eating foreigner (*pultiphagus barbarus*) made them (828); there is a reference to foreigner lands in the *Poenulus* (598); in the *Rudens*, the slave Sceparnio calls the Sicilian Charmides a foreigner guest (*barbarum hospitem*, 583); Gelasimus claims in the *Stichus* that he is being reduced to foreigner habits (*mores barbaros*, 193), perhaps referring to the Roman custom of selling by auction (Riley 1912: *ad loc*).

⁶⁵ *CAH* v.8²: pp. 316–317. Cf. Polyb. 30.15.

⁶⁶ Parker's blunt statement (1996: 604) that "there was no Scipionic circle" is too simplistic, but Kenney's assessment (1982: 11) that the usual members of the circle "cannot on the basis of the extant evidence be shown to have represented any shared artistic position" appears true, and the discrediting of a unified circle lessens the notion

In contrast to Plautus' prologues, those of Terence show a greater interest in promoting the name of the original.⁶⁷ Terence's titles are frequently transliterations of the Greek versions, and though a transliterated title does not necessarily indicate that the play itself is faithful to the source, it does give the perception that the playwright is capitalizing on the audience's familiarity with the Greek source and advertising that alignment. Terence relies on the audience's familiarity with the source in the *Heauton Timorumenos*, a play that takes its name and content from a Greek comedy of Menander. Yet Terence does not provide all of the information concerning the source; instead, he only tells the audience that he is delivering a fresh comedy based on a fresh Greek play (*ex integra Graeca integram comoediam / hodie sum acturus Heauton Timorumenon*, 4–5). Terence then shares a moment of familiarity with the audience,⁶⁸ stating that he would tell the audience the title of the original and who wrote it, if they did not already know (*nunc qui scripserit / et quonia Graeca sit, ni partem maxumam / existumarem scire uostrum, id dicerem*, 7–9). The implication of this deliberate remark is that after Terence states the title of his play, based on a Greek source, he expects his audience to know the work and its author.⁶⁹

that Terence was part of a programmatic regime set to bring Greek values to Rome. If the Circle did not exist, an increase in Hellenic interests is not the result of a small group of wealthy elite forcing Greek culture on the masses, but rather a reflection of widespread interests among Romans during Terence's time. The thrust behind discrediting the notion of the Scipionic Circle is in arguing that the apparent members were not part of a hive mind. Parker's aim, as he positions Terence on more equal footing in popularity with Plautus, is to show that various people of various interests supported the plays of Terence and to disprove the idea that there were competing factions in the city divided between their support for Plautus or Terence.

⁶⁷ Quite regularly in the prologues Terence defends himself against Luscius, to varying degrees of length and directness (the *Andria* [1-7], the *Heauton Timorumenos* [22-26], the *Eunuchus* [4-19], the *Phormio* [1-23], and perhaps the *Adelphoe* [1-3]).

⁶⁸ As Hunter observes (1985: 30–34), the prologues of Terence are similar to the *parabases* of Aristophanes in that both playwrights will provide insight into the world of theatrical rivalries, defend themselves against slander (*Ach.* 380, 502, 630), and explain an earlier failed performance of the play (*Clouds*). It is in the parabasis and the prologue that the dramatic illusion is the weakest. However, Hunter explains (32) that the scale of Terence's literary polemic may be influenced by the style of the law court.

⁶⁹ Parker (1996: 608) reads this line as Terence assuming that the audience knows their Menander. Barsby (2001: *ad loc*) argues that the line indicates that details such as source author and source title were posted by the aediles during the games. Barsby's theory is possible, but then why does Terence sometimes provide this information, and sometimes neglect to tell it? Terence is engaging with his audience here, expecting them to be familiar with the

In the prologue to the *Heauton Timorumenos* Terence also shows how he formulates his primacy in translation. Terence asserts that he is delivering a fresh (*integra*)⁷⁰ comedy. Martin (1976: 102) documents how claims of newness are regular in Terence, explaining that what Terence usually means by “new” is “unheard”⁷¹ in Latin. Terence is not claiming that he is writing original poetry when he refers to something as *intergra*, only that the comedy is new to his audience. Terence’s concept of *integra* relies on the audiences’ experience with the source text: after introducing the title of the comedy in the *Heauton Timorumenos*, Terence says (7) *nouam esse ostendi*, a statement that depends on the acceptance of the earlier claim *ex integra Graeca integram comoediam hodie sum acturus Heauton Timorumenos*.⁷² The Greek source is unheard and so the Latin translation is as well.⁷³ However, Terence’s use of *integra* in reference to the Greek source has dual meanings. Terence is presenting a Greek comedy that is “unheard”, but he also proclaims it as “whole”,⁷⁴ implying that he has not altered the source text. When Terence applies the term *integra* to a Greek source, he advertises not only the source’s relevance to the target audience but also his adherence to the source.

original and knowing the author of the Greek original on the basis of the Greek title that he gives his play in the prologue.

⁷⁰ The first entry under *integer* in the *OLD* is “not previously touched, tried, used, etc., fresh”. In Terence’s particular case, the word implies that no other Latin poet has used the material. This meaning is clearer in the *Adelphoe* when Terence states that Plautus left a scene of the source Diphilos *integrum* (9-10).

⁷¹ Unheard does not necessarily mean unperformed: Parker (1996: 592-601) reconstructs the events of the multiple staging of the *Hecyra*, arguing that the audience was twice disturbed by an influx of people who were trying to view a different show. In the prologue to *Hecyra* Terence asserts that he is offering the comedy as something new (*nunc haec planest pro noua*, 5), despite having already performed it. There are two possible reasons why it may be considered new: the first time it was performed, the audience was distracted by a tightrope walker and therefore neither watched nor heard the comedy. The other possibility is that he has made changes to the play since being forced from the stage, though Terence does not explicitly make this argument. He does, though, present it again as a new play for a third time, as shown in the prologue to the third performance. Terence explains that during the hopeful second performance, a rumour spread that a gladiatorial show was about to take place, and subsequently the audience fled. The newness is explained *both* times by the fact that the prior performances were interrupted, which means that the audience did not hear the conclusion of the play.

⁷² Plautus similarly pairs the two words in the *Casina* (*nouam atque integram audaciam*, 626).

⁷³ Shuckburgh (1877: 64) translates and expands the Terentian statement to “a play never before represented in Latin, from a Greek original of which no adaptation had before been made.”

⁷⁴ *OLD* 5.

Finally, the bulk of the prologue is a defense against the criticisms of Luscius of Lanuvium, as is often the case in Terence's prologues. Here the apology is against the charge of *contaminatio*, and Terence is uninterested in the criticism: he openly admits to the act and proclaims that he will do it again the future (he will, in the *Adelphoe* and in the *Andria*).⁷⁵ In the *Andria* Terence discusses how he transferred suitable material from Menander's *Perinthia* to Menander's *Andria* in the process of translation,⁷⁶ and observes that he has good precedent for doing so.⁷⁷

I summarize the prologue of the *Heauton Timorumenos* here because there is an important point to be made here concerning Terence and the association with his sources that he depicts. First, Terence says that he made an unheard (*integra*) Latin comedy from an unheard (*integra*) Greek one. Despite also telling the audience that he feels justified in combining his Greek sources into one translation, the aspect of newness does not rely on the act of combination. What Terence means by the two key adjectives *integra* and *noua* is that his Roman audience has

⁷⁵ Scholars are uncertain of the exact meaning of this charge. Beare (1959: 7) lists three possible meanings: spoil; combine; or spoil by mixing. Beare concludes (11) that the meaning is "to spoil", but that spoiling is brought about by altering the source text in the translation. Kujore (1974: 42) reaches a similar conclusion, though he argues that Terence misrepresents the meaning of *contaminatio* to his audience. Goldberg (1986: 95) argues that the charge of *contaminatio* is motivated by the frustration of other poets who now, thanks to Terence's combination of multiple plays, have fewer Greek originals with which to work. Sciarrino (2011: 110-111) sides with Goldberg, observing that the criticism indicates that "once a part of the 'original' had been translated, this became the individual possession of the translating poet and could no longer be retranslated by others." All of these views indicate that the manner in which a source was treated by a translator was important to Terence's audience. I side with Goldberg and Sciarrino in seeing the term hinging on the combination of two different comedies.

⁷⁶ *Menander fecit Andriam et Perinthiam. / qui utramvis recte norit ambas nouerit, / non ita dissimili sunt argumento, et tamen / dissimili oratione sunt factae ac stilo. / quae conuenere in Andriam ex Perinthia / fatetur transtulisse atque pro suis* ("Menander wrote the *Andria* and the *Perinthia*. Whoever knows well one knows them both, since the plots are not different, and yet they are written in different language and style. He (Terence) admits to have transferred fitting material in the *Andria* from the *Perinthia* and used it for himself", 9-14).

⁷⁷ In the *Heauton Timorumenos* he says: *Factum id esse hic non negat / neque se pigere et deinde facturum autumat / habet bonorum exemplum*, ("He does not deny that he did so and says that he is not ashamed of it, and moreover he will do it again. He has the example of good men", 18-20). In the *Andria* he explicitly named Naevius, Plautus, and Ennius as his precedents.

not heard these plays before.⁷⁸ He introduces himself as a translator providing something new from a foreign literary system to his target audience. When Terence describes his plays as *intergrae*, he draws attention to the fact that earlier Latin poets had not touched the material. What Terence presents to them are foreign comedies, and as a translator Terence positions himself as the initial communicator between two cultural spheres, a position that Livius Andronicus also took. Since this position relies upon the act of providing the source material, holders of this position claim adherence to their model. If a translator who was acting as the “first” did not make this claim, then the position would be severely undercut. In the example of the epic poets, Livius Andronicus acted as the first, and gave Homer to the Latin literary system (see pp. 50–59 above). Ennius positions himself as a better “first” than Livius by depicting himself as the embodiment of Homer’s soul. By advertising themselves as the initial communicator, poets imply that what their audiences seek is contact with the source. Terence, by regularly stating that his plays are unheard while simultaneously associating them with Greek sources implies that his audience seeks access to those Greek models and that he is the only one who will provide it.⁷⁹ The initial communicator operates between the target audience and a foreign source. The role of the first in translation depends upon the idea that the source is worth representing, and it is this idea that lessens the translator’s claims to freedom in the translation. It is by his claims to be the “first” that Terence displaces Plautus.

⁷⁸ Davies (1860: *ad loc.*) glosses *novam* as “new to the Latin stage,” contrasting it with the *uetus* of the Greek original. Barsby (1999: 16) constructs *noua* as a defence against the charge of *furtum*, a charge that is only concerned with a Latin playwright stealing from another Latin playwright.

⁷⁹ As Hinds (1998: 52) observes, “claims of poetic primacy and innovation in Roman literary history down to the Augustan period are characteristically claims of an epiphany of Hellenic influence.” Although Livius Andronicus and Plautus were influenced by Hellenic literature, both Ennius and Terence attempt to displace them by claiming a privileged relationship with Hellenic culture.

The prologue of the *Adelphoe* is particularly relevant here since in it Terence uses some key vocabulary to describe his own translation and downplay any deviation from the source.

Terence asserts that he has added a scene that Plautus, his predecessor in this domain, had omitted when he wrote his *Commorientes*, which is itself based upon the *Synapthescontes* by Diphilus.⁸⁰

*in Graeca adulescens est qui lenoni eripit
meretricem in prima fabula. eum Plautus locum
reliquit integrum, eum hic locum sumpsit sibi
in Adelphos, **uerbum de uerbo expressum extulit.**
eam nos acturi sumus novam. pernoscite
furtumne factum existumetis an locum
reprehensum qui praeteritus neglegentiast. (8–14).*

In the Greek there is a young man who snatches a prostitute from a pimp in the first act. Plautus left that scene untouched, but he (Terence) took up that scene in his own *Adelphoi*, **and he brought it copied word for word.** We intend to deliver it as something new. Decide whether you think it is a stolen item or a scene (taken back) which had (the past had left behind).

The important phrase here is the *uerbum de uerbo expressum extulit*.⁸¹ While the terminology is not found prior to Terence's *Adelphoe*, it becomes the de facto fashion in which

⁸⁰ Diphilus was an older contemporary of Menander (Diphilus fr. 1 *PCG*⁵)

⁸¹ This phrase must be taken as a whole. McElduff (2004) argues that the playwright did not act as a literal translator partially on the basis of the meaning of the term *exprimere*. McElduff (2004: 122–123, 2013: 93) looks to the term's use in the plastic arts in her assessment, and in this stance she has the support of Robinson (1997a: 184–186), who contends that with *exprimere* we see a translator who is “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].” He finds that “*exprimere* means to mold or form one thing in imitation of another,” and suggests as example “the potter shaping clay into the likeness of a face,” whereby the artist “creates something *new* (stress Robinson's) in imitation of something that already exists. Thus the translator, by existing between two “modes of understanding”, is an artist active in two different forms. Problematic for this theory is the fact that Terence himself equated the format of the translation and the source, as is evident in the text. As he describes it, he brought the scene over *uerbum de uerbo*, signaling that he views the Latin and the Greek word as the same, for he uses the same Latin term. This is not like going from natural to plastic, from living being to stone, from book to film, two different things denoted as such by different words. In fact, Plautus' *uortit barbare* does a better job of separating the Greek

to describe translation that adheres to the source.⁸² The sequence in this passage is as follows:

Plautus omitted a scene when he was bringing the Greek source into Latin. Terence promotes the idea that Plautus did a poor job of representing his source. Plautus, to judge partially from his prologues and his descriptions of his translation methodology, was not concerned about source-representation, and it is Plautus' lack of concern about the source that Terence critiques here:

Terence presents Plautus' omission as an opportunity to restore the source to wholeness. He brings to the Roman audience a previously missing piece, and he emphasizes that he has brought it over as faithfully as possible, an aspect denoted by the phrase *uerbum de uerbo exprimere*. The aspect of close, or literal, translation is important here to Terence. As Possanza (2004: 31) observes, literalness in translation can create "the illusion of being in direct contact with the source text." Terence advertises that he is restoring something that was passed over (*praeteritus est*). Terence carefully delineates his translation role, most obviously by providing the title and author of his source material. He openly announces this material, thereby clearing himself from any charges of theft. The borrowing of source material is upfront, not hidden, but put on display to be recognized.⁸³ Terence is not "stealing" material from the source; he is advertising his use of source material.

and Latin versions. I agree with Fantham (1968: 200), who understands *uerbum de uerbo expressum* as "meaning a close phrase by phrase equivalent of the Greek original, without either additions or alterations to reconcile it with any difference of plot in Menander's *Adelphoe*."

⁸² Aulus Gellius (11.16.4) and Servius (*ad Aen.* 3.692, 4.356) use the phrase to describe close translation. A variant which shows the preposition *e* in place of *de* appears in Cicero (*Luc.* 31 and *Fin* 3.15). The verb is paired with *uerbo e Graecis* at *Fin.* 1.4. Also similar to *uerbum de uerbo* is *ad uerbum*, which is paired with the verb *exprimere* by Cicero (*Tusc.* 3.44), with *traferre* by Pliny (*Nat.* 18.65) and Quintilian (*Inst.* 7.4.4) and (with *transferre*) 7.4.7. What these instances show is that the phrase *uerbum de uerbo* (or one of its cognates) was paired with a Latin verb of translating—such as *exprimere* or *transferre*—to denote literal translation.

⁸³ Seneca (*Suas.* 3.5,7) says Ovid borrowed material from Vergil in the same manner (*subripiendi causa, sed palam mutuandi, hoc animo ut uellet agnoscere*).

As Livius Andronicus and Ennius had associated their primacy with a Hellenic epiphany, so too does Terence in his prologues. He describes his poetry and the Greek sources as *integra*, emphasizing that they are foreign works that are unknown to the audience and promotes his closeness to the source when he describes his translation process with the phrase *uerbum de uerbo expressum*. He elides any previous representation of these sources and indeed undermines the translations done by others: his representation of his drama as translations based on unheard originals calls into question how Roman playwrights advertised the unheard aspect of their dramas. Sciarrino's understanding of charges of *contaminatio* is helpful here. Sciarrino (2011: 110–111) argues that the charges of *contaminatio* were brought by other dramatists who were concerned that the combination of different plays would quickly deplete the resources of unheard Greek comedy. Indeed, Suetonius' account of Terence's death supports Sciarrino's argument since he was reportedly returning from Greece bearing untranslated material.

On the other hand, Terence's assertions of his poetry's unheard quality may not reflect a real-world scenario. As Hinds observes (1998: 52–59), neither Ennius' nor Vergil's claim that he was the first to bring the Muse to Rome is exactly true since Livius Andronicus had already represented the Muse in Rome. Instead, the claim of primacy signals the dismissal of the previous poet. Ennius and Vergil promote the notion that they are better Hellenizers than earlier poets. Terence similarly positions himself as closer to his sources: his phrase *uerbum de uerbo expressum* is an example of the relationship that he promotes. Terence's use of *integra* then speaks not to the status of a Greek original in the target audience, but to Terence's signal that he provides a truer representation of his source than previous playwrights had. At times Terence is more explicit in how he is a superior writer in comparison to his rivals. In the prologue of the

Eunuchus Terence answers the criticism of Luscius⁸⁴ by casting disdain of Luscius' translation methodology, claiming that by translating well but writing poorly he makes bad Latin plays from good Greek ones *qui bene uortendo et easdem scribendo male ex / Graecis bonis Latinas fecit non bonas* (7–8). The standard interpretation of this line is that Terence is arguing that Luscius has translated too literally.⁸⁵ In this interpretation, the slight picks up on Terence's remark in the *Andria* (21) that Luscius was guilty of *obscura diligentia* (Brothers 2000: 159). The interpretation partially relies on the understanding of the *et* that joins *bene uortendo* and *easdem scribendo male*. Barsby (1999: 83) observes that *easdem* gives an adversative sense to *et*, rendering the line “while at the same time”, but translates (2001) the line with the stronger adversative “but at the same time.” The latter rendering sounds as if Luscius succeeded in one area (translating), failed in another (writing), but not necessarily as a consequence of the success in the translating. Terence does not imply that translating well will lead to poor writing; on the contrary, here he promises that in the drama he will show the audience, and Luscius, exactly how both translating and writing can be done well at the same time. Terence reveals in this announcement that the receiving language and audience of a translation are of utmost importance to him,⁸⁶ but he also promises that his representation of foreign sources will be superior to other representations before him.

Terence's prologues show the dramatist using language that aligns his translation with the source material. His practice of identifying the source text and author promotes the source

⁸⁴ In the *Eunuchus* Terence only alludes to Luscius and does not provide any details of their ongoing dispute. In the prologue to the *Heauton Timoroumenos* Terence reveals that Luscius has charged him with *contaminatio*; in the *Phormio* (4-5), the audience learns that Luscius has described Terence's plays as “thin in style and light in content” (*tenui oratione et scriptura leui*, trans. Barsby [1999]).

⁸⁵ See Barsby (1999: 83), Brothers (2000: 159), Kaimio (1979: 276), Parker (1996: 613), Possanza (2004: 32).

⁸⁶ Possanza (2004: 32) summarizes the implications of Terence's statement as “to make good Latin plays out of Greek plays, the translator must ... give priority to the linguistic and stylistic resources of the receiving language.”

author; his language of translation emphasizes how closely he adheres to the source text. Terence petitions a certain group in the audience that is interested in the source and seeks performances in Latin that adhere to the source material. It is likely that some members of this group were already familiar with the source text,⁸⁷ and so Terence's claims of privileging the source material appeals to this group's desire to promote Hellenic culture, and less to a need for close translations of Greek texts.⁸⁸ Yet an interest in Hellenic culture is not the only difference in socio-literary circumstances for Plautus and Terence. Terence staged his comedies in a Rome where Plautus and his form of comedy was the dominant form. Terence's prologues represent not just an appeal to his audience's Hellenic interests, but also an attempt to dislodge Plautus from his central position by promising a superior form of translation. In his formulation of polysystem theory, Even-Zohar (see pp. 9–10 above) categorizes foreign epiphanies as a normal development in a literary system. For Even-Zohar, when the established literary models no longer inspire writers, these uninspired writers look outside of the literary system for new ideas. Terence publicizes his return to the source as an innovation, in the process promoting his "new" model over Plautus' comedy.⁸⁹ Yet Terence's promise of newness does not mean that he is abandoning Roman comedy altogether as traditionally performed. Terence's comedies are part of a Roman tradition,

⁸⁷ Terence's joke to the audience in the *Heauton Timorumenos* that he need not actually disclose the title of the source (*nunc qui scripserit / et quonia Graeca sit, ni partem maxumam / existumarem scire uostrum, id dicerem*, 7-9) indicates that he could take it for granted that at least some members of the audience were familiar with the source material.

⁸⁸ Terence's claims that his plays were "unheard" are promotional and reflect the fact that the Latin versions were "unheard" and "new" to the audience, not the Greek originals.

⁸⁹ Brooks (1981: 40–41) observes another difference between the prologues of Plautus and Terence, arguing that Terence is a self-conscious playwright who engages in the debates of literary theory that were active in his time. The opening lines of the *Andria* are offered as evidence of this stance: *poeta quom primum animum ad scribendum appulit / id sibi negoti credidit solum dari / populo ut placerent quas fecisset fabulas. / verum aliter evenire multo intellegit* ("When the poet first turned his mind to writing, he thought that his only concern was to give to the people plays which he had made that would please them. However, he knows it has turned out much differently", 1–4). In his prologue Terence explains that he once believed it enough to amuse his audience; now, however, he sees that he must devote his prologues to answering the criticism leveled at him by Luscius. In contrast, Brooks finds Plautus concerned only with the audience, not critics or theory, and argues (60) that popular approval was the only criterion of success for Roman dramatists in the time of Ennius and Plautus.

and while some of the elements in his plays disrupt that tradition (for instance his downplaying of stock elements), he cannot entirely stand outside of that tradition. At times, being a part of the Roman tradition means that Terence makes changes in his translations to add in more recognizably comedic elements. However these changes do not significantly diminish the relationship that Terence establishes in the prologues with his source material.⁹⁰

4.7 Language

Plautus used language that cast the Greeks on stage as foreigners, in the process disrupting the illusion of the theatre. Terence does not use words that call attention to the divide between the audience and the characters on stage, such as *barbari* or *pergraecari*. These types of words disrupt the experience of the work for the target audience. Plautus reminds the audience that it is experiencing the “other” by remarking on that otherness, or at least by illustrating the divide between audience and what is being presented.⁹¹ Even more disruptive are the occasions when his Greek characters observe how they are acting like Greeks. However, the audience could similarly be disrupted were Terence to retain the Greek details that are found in the plays of Menander. It is to avoid these disruptions that Terence, according to Goldberg (1986: 11) usually generalizes Greek references.⁹² Goldberg cites a passage from Terence’s *Heauton Timorumenos* (61–64)—which has as its source Menander fr. 77 PCG^{6.20}—in which Terence

⁹⁰ Habinek (1998: 63) argues that Terence downplays the specific Greekness of the plays in the prologues, though the Greekness is apparent throughout the plays in nomenclature, setting, and social context. Habinek cites Terence’s claim in the *Andria* prologue that he is following traditional Roman playwrights. I do not see this as “downplaying”: Terence compares himself with the comic tradition because that is the tradition that is available for him to participate in. More importantly, in contrast to the prologues of Plautus, Terence builds up the Greekness of his plays.

⁹¹ In the *Stichus* Plautus points to the absurdity of his characters by having Stichus say that to drink, to have affairs, and to be invited to dinner is permitted to slaves in Athens (*licet haec Athenis nobis*, 448)

⁹² Williams (1968: 289) argues rather that Terence only avoids the “excessively abstruse” Greek details, listing the region Halai (Ἁλαί) as one of these details. As Williams remarks, Terence does retain other geographical names, such as Sunium, Imbros, and Myconos. The difference between the interpretation of Goldberg and Williams is one of perception: Goldberg sees Terence as usually generalizing; Williams rarely. This difference in perception has no effect on the meaning of Terence’s generalizations: he generalizes so that his audience is not perplexed by obscure references.

replaces an Athenian deme name (Halai) with the vague *in his regionibus* as an example of Terence generalizing a Greek reference that would have little meaning to his audience.

Greek words also function as reminders of the foreign nature of the scene. As he did for Plautus, John Hough (1947) has documented Terence's use of Greek. He discovers a large discrepancy in the use of Greek words: the ratio he provides finds one Greek word for every 206 lines in Terence's play the *Hecyra*, but one for every twenty-eight in the *Eunuchus*.⁹³ Hough argues (1947: 19–20) against reading Terence's use of Greek words as a continuation of Plautus' technique of using Greek words for humorous effect. Hough argues that the low occurrence of Greek words in Terence means that they are scarcely noticeable, that the words that he does use are "less startling and unusual than Plautus'", and that as Terence's career progressed he began to put Greek words more in the mouths of youths, slaves and other lower class characters while the numbers decrease in respect to the *senex* character.⁹⁴ Maltby recognizes (1985: 123) Terence's tendency to use these words to characterize the language of slaves and other low characters, and he associates this tendency with an increase in Terence's poetic skill, pointing out that in Terence's first two plays linguistic characterization was absent, perhaps because Terence was focused on creating the purity of style that both Julius Caesar⁹⁵ and Cicero⁹⁶ praise him for.

⁹³ As noted above, Hough's study on Plautus (1934: 346) observes a variation in the relationship between one Greek word every fifteen lines to one every thirty-seven.

⁹⁴ Hough's accounting is not entirely convincing: for instance, the two *senex* characters in the *Adelphoe*, Terence's penultimate performance, speak a Greek word 13 times, which is the highest occurrence of any character of any of Terence's plays.

⁹⁵ Suetonius (*Poet.* 11) *Tu quoque, tu in summis, o dimidiate Menander / Poneris, et merito, puri sermonis amator.*

⁹⁶ Suetonius (*Poet.* 11) *tu quoque, qui solus lecto sermone, Terenti, / conversum expressumque Latina voce Menandrum / in medium nobis sedatis motibus effers, / quiddam come loquens atque omnia dulcia dicens.*

Karakasis' findings (2005) are largely in-line with Hough's and Maltby's: low-style language such as colloquialisms⁹⁷ is primarily used by low-status or rustic characters, such as the slave, parasite or soldier. Karakasis also observes (2005: 25) that low characters can induce other types of characters into speaking in the low register. However, Karakasis is aware of one exception to this general rule: the language in Terence's *Eunuchus* (first performed in 161 BCE) is more akin to that of Plautus' comedies than any other play of Terence. Certain features that are common in Plautus but rare in Terence appear in the *Eunuchus*, such as long inorganic speeches, incongruous Romanisms, certain terms of abuse (*fur*, *scelestus*, *monstrum hominis*, etc.), and interjections and Greek expressions (Karakasis 2005: 121).⁹⁸ Below I consider the vocabulary of the *Eunuchus* in more depth.

The evidence for Greek words in Terence shows that overall he made considerably less use of Greek than did Plautus.⁹⁹ Greek words in a Plautine play increase the impression that the Other is being presented: the Greek words act as blocks to the audience's acceptance of the translation as something belonging to their own culture. Greek words, Greek location reminders

⁹⁷ For examples of colloquialisms Karakasis (2005: 30ff) offers substantives ending *-arius*, adjectives ending in *-inus*, diminutives, verbs in *-illare* or *-issare* among others. Karakasis (26-28) explains the use of the term "colloquial" as a label of linguistic features that: 1) are frequently found in comedy; 2) disappear from Classical Latin literature, with the exception of less formal genres such as satire; 3) reappear later in non-literary texts such as inscriptions and graffiti. Karakasis also draws upon information concerning linguistic level from technical treatises, from grammarians who compiled glosses and linguistic commentaries, from legal texts of the Middle Ages and "by the reflexes of various linguistic items and phenomena in the modern Romance languages, which stem not from CL but from the vernacular" (28).

⁹⁸ Karakasis does not draw any conclusions from the evidence. Maltby (1985: 116-117) argues that the higher number of Greek words in the *Eunuchus* is due to the larger role allotted to women in the drama. Women in Terence use oaths far more frequently than men (at a rate of 1:11 for women and 1:41 for men, [Maltby 116]). The oaths are usually Greek words (*ecastor*, *hercle*, *edepol*, etc.). Additionally, the Greek word *eunuchus* occurs eighteen times in the *Eunuchus* (Maltby 1985: 118). When Maltby removes (1985: 120) these instances on account of these words being naturalized and not likely to be recognized as Greek, the *Eunuchus* still has more occurrences than any other of Terence's plays. Maltby concludes that Terence set out to challenge traditional Roman comedy early in his career by using a purity of diction that would necessitate avoiding Greek words, but over time adapted the traditional style seen in Plautus. Barsby (1999: 15) and Ludwig (1968: 171-4) agree that in the *Eunuchus* Terence was likely making changes to appeal to his audience.

⁹⁹ Maltby (1985: 113) calls Terence "clearly more cautious in his use of Greek loan-words." The downplaying of Greek words may have resulted the high regard Terence garnered for his language: Cicero (*Att.* 7.3.10) refers to his *elegantiam sermonis* (in contrast to Caecilius Statius' *malus auctor Latinitatis*).

like demes, and references to Roman barbarianism or to “Greeking it up”, act as reminders of the foreign quality, but in Plautus these words are part of the joke. Terence avoids the distractions that Greek words bring to the play, and the implication is that the comedies of Terence aim at something beyond humour derived mainly from cultural difference. Terence identifies the message as the important part of the source that he represents to his audience, and he presents that message without the disruptions to the narrative that Greek words create.

4.8 Characters

Plautus makes use of certain elements, notably stock characters, plots, and exaggerated language to maximize the schism between audience and source. For example, aged Greek men greedily interfere with the love lives of their sons, who are in turn aided by a cunning slave who overthrows the rule of the father. Goldberg (1986) shows how Terence effectively turned the comedy of Plautus on its head by manipulating the old formulae. No longer are clever slaves the victors at the end; as Goldberg observes (217), “plots are resolved more by rightness than by wit.” Young men, foolishly in love, remain so while their fathers keep their dignity. In the presentation of his characters Terence follows the lead of his frequent source Menander. By aligning himself with his source in the presentation of his characters, Terence positions himself as the ideal representative of Menander in Rome. He advertises his plays as accurate portrayals of a valued foreign work.

Lord (1977: 199) argues that Menander’s characters appear as both comic and sympathetic on account of the fact that they are fundamentally decent and all too human, given to passions and weaknesses that all experience. Typical Menandrian characters are flawed¹⁰⁰ in

¹⁰⁰ In Aristotelian terms these characters have a *ἁμαρτία* and thus they commit misdeeds (*ἁμαρτήματα*, Latin *peccata*).

such a way that they are susceptible to an excess of passion, which in turn causes the character to commit misdeeds. Lord associates the characters of Menander with the teachings of Aristotle who wrote that comic poetry is “an imitation of men who are worse than the ordinary, though without being completely vicious” (*Poet.* 1149A32–37, trans. Lord 1977: 199–200). Anderson (1996: 147) maintains that “Menander and his fellow Greek poets supported a rationale of society which emphasized the central importance of the family and of the father as the final arbiter of family needs and values. Menander’s fathers tend to be forbearing, gentle, concerned for family feelings, and honourable in their practical efforts to advance the family fortunes.”

The *Adelphoe* and the *Eunuchus* in particular are illuminating case-studies in respect to Terence’s use of characters. Both of these plays present grounds for objections to the classifying of Terence as a source-representative translator. The *Adelphoe* is notable not only for the scene of *contaminatio* that Terence acknowledges in the prologue, but also for its ending which has left many scholars with the impression that Terence deviated from his source material. The *Eunuchus* is widely recognized as the most Plautine play that Terence wrote.¹⁰¹ However, I argue that both of these dramas are consistent with Terence’s positioning as a source-representative translator and that the characters and their actions further support Terence’s promise to bring Menander to his Roman audience.

4.9 *Adelphoe*

The ending of the *Adelphoe* features an abrupt about-face by the character Demea that is, to some scholars, inconsistent with the development of the rest of the play and therefore reflective of a change made by Terence in the translating. Yet Terence’s *Adelphoe* is one of the

¹⁰¹ Maltby (1976: 232) Karakasis (2005: 123).

plays that scholars most frequently compare to the Greek original, perhaps because of Terence's tantalizing opening remark that he combined the original with a scene from Diphilus.¹⁰² The action and characters of the *Adelphoe*, however, align Terence with the didacticism of Menander and separate his drama from that of his predecessor Plautus. In the *Adelphoe*, Terence presents two clashing styles of parenting. That the parenting styles are in an actual competition differentiates his presentation from a similar situation in Plautus' *Mostellaria*. In the *Adelphoe*, the strict father Demea has given one of his sons, Aeschinus, to his lenient brother Micio to raise, keeping the other son Ctesipho for himself (*Ad.* 47–48). Ctesipho becomes involved in an affair with a music girl and Aeschinus aids his brother by abducting the girl and taking all of the blame.¹⁰³ Aeschinus further appears as the lesser of the two sons when it is revealed that he has impregnated a neighbour's daughter (292–297).¹⁰⁴ Micio discovers the truth, rebukes Aeschinus for keeping secrets from him, but arranges for Aeschinus to marry the girl (679–696). The outcome of the events would seem to be a victory for Micio and his parenting style, but Demea decides to abandon his previous course of stern parenting (855–881). He embarks upon a change that sees him suggesting to Aeschinus that they hasten the wedding, a suggestion that is met with approval (906–910). Demea goes even further, convincing Micio to marry the mother of Aeschinus' bride (925–945) and free the slave Syrus (959–970). Micio is wonderstruck at the change in his brother,¹⁰⁵ and the play concludes with Demea revealing his purpose (985–995).

¹⁰² I primarily leave aside the issue of inconsistency that the *contaminatio* introduces and instead focus on how the conflict in parenting styles is a reflection of a Menandrian theme. On the topic of inconsistency, see Fantham (1968), Ludwig (1968), and Lloyd-Jones (1973).

¹⁰³ Demea complains of Aeschinus' behaviour in lines 90–91; Ctesipho appears in the second act and praises Aeschinus, revealing that the deed was done on his behalf (261–264).

¹⁰⁴ Demea finds out about the rape from the senex Hegio, who is gossiping with the slave Geta about the *illiberale facinus* (447–516).

¹⁰⁵ *Quid istuc? Quae res tam repente mores mutauit tuos? Quod prolubium? Quae istaec subitast largitas?* ("What's this? What matter has so suddenly changed your morals? What is this whim? What is this unexpected liberality?" 984–985).

He was proving that Micio only went along with the desires of the two sons because of his weakness, not from sincerity or a sense of right. Demea informs his sons that he will not always go along with their wishes, but he will offer his advice and support to the boys if they will have it. Demea triumphs when this offer is accepted.

The success of Demea, coming swiftly in the final lines of the play, has troubled many critics who have detected an approving treatment of Micio and his parenting style for most of the play.¹⁰⁶ The sudden coup of Demea has led to theories about Terence deviating from Menander in this regard. Ludwig (1968: 177), for instance, holds that Demea's victory represents a regard for Roman morality, arguing that Demea "comes off better than in the original, in which the mild and humane Micio apparently was preferred."¹⁰⁷

However, Hugh Lloyd-Jones argues (1973: 283) that "the whole movement of the plot requires that Demea be vindicated," seeing the ending as a natural development of a Menandrian play.¹⁰⁸ Lloyd-Jones downplays Rieth's belief that the play is representative of a serious philosophical debate about parenting.¹⁰⁹ John Grant (1975) also accepts the ending of the *Adelphoe* as is, following Lloyd-Jones in reading the play as a comedy, not a philosophical tract

¹⁰⁶ As John Grant (1975: 42) points out, it is also discomfoting that Demea's change to lenient parenting which seems sincere (855–881), lasts only a short while and to prove a point.

¹⁰⁷ As Greenberg observes (1979: 222), it is only the critics who approve of Micio's treatment that speculate how and why Terence deviated from his original, that is, those who want Micio to succeed are disappointed that he does not.

¹⁰⁸ Lloyd-Jones allays complaints about the marriage that Micio accepts in the end by pointing out that Donatus makes it clear that Menander's Micio also married, though with less complaint (*apud Menandrum senex de nuptiis non gravatur* "In Menander the old man was not so reluctant about the marriage"), and that both the *Andria* and the *Heauton Timorumenos* feature sudden weddings.

¹⁰⁹ Rieth (1964 [1943]) finds similarities between Micio and the Peripatetics, and suggests that Menander's Micio would have been the preferred model. Lloyd-Jones remarks (283): "In a semi-serious and quasi-philosophical comedy of the kind Rieth thinks this is, this (the ending) would be inconsistent; in Menander's play, it would be natural."

(47).¹¹⁰ Grant considers why the audience would expect Micio to fail, finding (47) flaws in his character such as being pretentious, patronizing, supremely self-confident in the correctness of his method.¹¹¹ Grant argues (1975: 59) that Demea realizes that his character flaw is not so much his strictness, but his “failure to develop the necessary bonds of trust and friendship between father and son because of his preoccupation with accumulating as large a patrimony as possible”, a flaw that is remedied by his abandonment of the *uita dura*. As LloydJones discerns (1973: 283), Demea allowing Ctesipho to keep the girl (*sino: habeat, in istac finem faciat*, 996–997) is proof that Demea has softened.

Indeed, the comedy and Demea’s change may have little to do with parenting styles. Grant (1975) recognizes that in his monologue Demea does not blame his style of parenting for his unpopularity, but instead speaks of how he is perceived. On these grounds Grant compares (57) this monologue with one from Menander’s *Dyskolos*, where Knemon, who had been preventing the happy resolution of a love interest, similarly appraises himself (708ff.). While Knemon admits that he was wrong, he does not change his character or way of life, which Grant argues attests to Menander’s realistic portrayal of character. In the *Adelphoe*, when Ctesipho seems to align with Micio, Demea does not question whether he has been too strict, but why

¹¹⁰ Lord (1977) provides the most thorough dismantling of Rieth’s interpretation, claiming (186) that Reith’s analysis “wildly misrepresents the real situation of the play”: both Micio and Demea seek to educate and benefit the two boys, their only disagreement is in the means of doing so. Micio clearly has the proper goal: *hoc patrumst, potius consuefacere filium / sua sponte recte facere quam alieno metu: / hoc pater ac dominus interest* (“This is fatherhood, to accustom his son to do right by his own will rather than by fear of someone else: this is the difference between a father and a master”, 74–76).

¹¹¹ Lord (1974: 193–194) finds a central failing in Micio’s parenting theory. He argues that Micio tends to identify shame with virtue, which leads Micio to assume that Aeschinus’ reluctance to disappoint him translates him into a settled disposition not to do wrong. For example, Micio believes that Aeschinus’ blushing is a sign that Aeschinus will stop acting against his father’s wishes (*erubuit: salua res est*, 643). Micio, then, fails to make the distinction between doing good for the sake of praise and doing good because it is good. As Lord points out, shame is just another passion, and acting according to the whims of passion does not equate with doing good for the sake of good. That Micio is prepared to treat Aeschinus as an adult with established (good) habits prepares the fall he suffers at the end of the play.

everyone dislikes him. The answer he comes up with is that he has been obsessed with accumulating money for his sons. From Demea's reflective answer Grant concludes (58) that Terence has omitted a portion of the Menandrian original in which Demea first defended his way of life before pushing himself to see if he can answer Micio's challenge (*age age, nunciam experiamur contra ecquid ego possiem / blande dicere aut benigne facere, quando hoc prouocat*, 877–878).¹¹² Terence thus creates confusion by omitting Demea's defence of his parenting, but he also allows the audience to share in the surprise.¹¹³ The omission increases the humor of the finale as the audience is as surprised as Micio by Demea's behaviour, but that does not make the ending inconsistent with the original.

Greenberg (1979: 222) takes a different approach to understanding the play by assessing the competing parenting styles on the basis of the results. Greenberg begins with the theory that the better parenting style should produce the better son; to that end he finds Aeschinus to be “clearly superior to Ctesipho”, and concludes that Micio's style of parenting is better. Nevertheless, Greenberg does see a flaw in the character Micio: Micio troubles the audience because he is not the real father of Aeschinus (233–236).¹¹⁴ Greenberg (236) argues that by the close of the *Adelphoe* the audience welcomes the fall of Micio because he has usurped the role of the father, not because he made any mistakes.¹¹⁵ Greenberg believes that Micio's parenting is

¹¹² “Come come, now let us see if I am able to speak charmingly or do generous acts, since he challenged this.”

¹¹³ Grant (59) argues that Terence had a “predilection for exploiting surprise and for creating uncertainty in the minds of the spectators, and thus for making them share in, rather than observe, the reaction of the characters in the play.”

¹¹⁴ According to Greenberg (233), if the positions were reversed and Demea were the adoptive father, the play “would be somehow less palatable.” Greenberg continues with this point, stating that (233) “In a quite irrational fashion, the artificiality of Micio's position constitutes an offence against the passionate order of nature, and it is this offense which justifies the farcical tone of the closing scenes of the drama when rationality has been abandoned.”

¹¹⁵ Greenberg does, however, blame Micio for parenting in his style less to produce a good man than to win his affection (*in eo me oblectio, solum id est carum mihi / ille ut item contra me habeat facio seduolo; do, praetermitto, non necesse habeo omnia / pro meo iure agere*, “In him I delight, he is the only thing dear to me. I act carefully so that he holds me in the same regard. I give him things, I overlook things, I do not consider it necessary to conduct all things by my rule”, 49–52). So the error is in the intention, not the means, which many scholars find blameless. Cf.

“intellectually defensible, but the uncertain limits of his role give rise to disquiet and resentment.”

As for how Terence’s characters are different from Plautus’, Goldberg (1986: 211–14) contrasts the plot and lesson of the *Adelphoe* with Plautus’ *Mostellaria* and the conflict between the Plautine slaves Tranio and Grumio. Grumio criticizes Tranio for allowing the young master Philolaches to squander the money of his father (25–28), accusing Tranio of corrupting him. He assaults Philolaches and Tranio when he claims that they are “Greeking it up” (*pergraecamini*, 22).¹¹⁶ Tranio sees no issue with his behaviour (*Quid tibi, malum, me aut quid ego agam curatior? / an ruri quaeso non sunt, quos cures, bouis? / lubet portare, amare, scorta ducere. / mei tergi facio haec, non tui fiducia*, 34–37).¹¹⁷ Tranio, like Micio, defends the “corrupt” way of life.¹¹⁸ Yet Tranio is the victor of the *Mostellaria*: he deceives the father Theopropides through much of the play.¹¹⁹ When Tranio’s lies are discovered, he escapes punishment and is forgiven when the friend Callidamates repays the debt (1160–1161). Grumio is only a temporary foil to Tranio who presents no actual obstacle to Tranio’s lifestyle. In no way does the *Mostellaria* present competing theories of life. Goldberg (1986: 211) detects that Terence has cast Micio as Plautus’ clever slave who so often aids his young master. Aeschinus reveals Micio’s role as the aid in a speech (707–709):

Fantham (1971: 984): “nothing that is said or done by Micio or his son in the first four acts of the *Adelphoe* suggests that his concept of fatherhood is anything but successful”, Grant (1975: 59): “Micio’s theory of education is for the most part excellent.”

¹¹⁶ Since the play is set in Athens it is difficult to imagine that a real Grumio would accuse Tranio of living like a Greek with a derogatory sense. The use of the verb here is an instance of Plautus pulling the audience out of the scene so that it can laugh at the Greeks.

¹¹⁷ “Why do you, you jerk, care about me or what I do? I wonder, don’t you have some cows to care for at the farm? I like to drink, to have affairs, to bring home prostitutes. I do these things by faith of my own back, not yours.” Goldberg (1986: 212) observes that Tranio’s defence relies upon the understanding that corrupting youth is “precisely the duty of the Plautine slave.”

¹¹⁸ *Ad.* 101–102: *non est flagitum, mihi crede, adolescentulum / scortari neque potare: non est* (“It is not shameful, believe me, that a young man behave promiscuously or drink: it’s not”)

¹¹⁹ Goldberg (1986: 213) identifies the “absurdity of Tranio’s success as part of his charm.”

*Quid est negoti? Hoc est patrem esse aut hoc est filium esse?
 Si frater aut sodalist esset, qui mage morem gereret?
 Hic non amandus, hicine non gestandus in sinust? Hem?*

What is this business? Is this what it is to be a father, or this to be a son?
 If he were a brother or a friend, how could he oblige me more?
 Should he not be loved, should he not be held close? Alas.

While Aeschinus is uncertain that a father should act as Micio does, he is certain that Micio is behaving like a friend, thereby aligning his actions with the typical Plautine slave, and therefore Terence's drama demands that Micio fall.¹²⁰

The characters of the *Adelphoe* are complex individuals who have more in common with their counterparts in Menander than those in Plautus. Terence's actors are not one-dimensional individuals who represent an extreme of human behaviour. When Demea reflects on how his *uita dura* has not rewarded him the way he wishes, he changes. The alteration to his demeanor means that the family can happily reunite in the finale. The ending is intricate, but that complexity is not necessarily a sign that Terence has deviated from the Menandrian original. Both Demea and Micio are, essentially, right.¹²¹ This style of characters may be why scholars such as Nathan Greenberg (1980: 221) detect in Terence's *Adelphoe* "an uncomfortable amalgam of the serious and the comic."¹²² The comedies of Plautus feature the *paterfamilias* overthrown, excluded from the circle of the victors. The conclusion of the *Adelphoe* shows the order of *paterfamilias*

¹²⁰ According to Goldberg (1986: 214), the fall of Micio "inverts the logic of Plautus' comic world. Micio is punished for just the values that brought rewards to Tranio.

¹²¹ For the view that both fathers are wrong, see Duckworth (1952: 287). Greenberg (1979: 223) criticizes this position since it is not clear what constitutes success in the play and, without knowing this, it is not apparent that by the end of the play Micio has "failed." The important point is that the conflict of the drama is resolved peacefully and in a way that allows the family to come together under the guidance of the father Demea.

¹²² Greenberg appraises the ending as "one of the most startling comic reversals in ancient comedy" when Demea achieves a "final farcical triumph which is in strong and jarring contrast with the seemingly serious and approving treatment of Micio and Micio's theories on child raising throughout the preceding bulk of the play."

restored. Both fathers are included in the happy victorious group at the end: Saylor (2008: 122) summarizes the plot in terms of inclusion versus exclusion, and how Demea, originally excluded, becomes the foremost of the included at the end.¹²³ The *Adelphoe* features the restoration of the family unit as Demea is included with his sons and brother, an ending that is in unison with the themes of Menander, but is dissonant with the humor of Plautine comedy.

The lesson from this type of inversion of Plautine logic is that Terence expects an audience less willing to accept the comedy of Plautus, characterized by young immoral Greeks defeating their fathers. Goldberg's assessment (216) is that the conflict between Greek and Roman morals had become too real, and not a laughing matter. He cites Cato the Elder as exemplary of the tension that existed in Rome in respect to the Greeks. The argument then is that Terence cannot allow Plautus' immoral young men to prosper in his comedies. Elaine Fantham (2011) observes Terence reinforcing his patriarchal society, arguing that Terence, once likely a tutor himself, used his plays to teach the same lessons he would have taught in the home (213). Fantham argues (208–209) that Terence tries to preserve decorum¹²⁴ and balance among the families in an effort to educate the young Roman elite. The reconciliation of the *Adelphoe* (683f) promises forgiveness for straying from a father's rule while making clear the requirement that

¹²³ Grant's reading solves the incongruity that has long been recognized (Donatus [*ad Ad.* 992] writes that *hic ostendit Terentius magis Demeam simulasse mutatos mores quam mutavisse*) between the monologue of Demea in which he says that he is switching parenting styles (855–881) and his closing response to Micio (985–988) in which he reveals that his previous generosity was only a ruse to teach a lesson to his brother and sons. Still, scholars such as Goldberg (1986: 23–28), seeing that close reading of the monologue leads to difficulties with the ending, argue that Terence has complicated a Menandrian original in which the monologue was either more truly spoken or more definitive. On Terence's complicating the Menandrian plot, cf. Williams (1968: 172) who connects Terence to Plautus in this practice.

¹²⁴ Ludwig (1968: 170) points out how there are no lovesick old men who compete with their sons for the love of a *hetaera* as an example of decorum preserved, as well as slaves who act in intrigue but are not too unscrupulous about it.

sons honour and obey (Fantham 2011: 213). Terence's comedies are then opportunities to educate the young by showing them how to become good Romans.

In the *Adelphoe* Terence presents himself as a source-representative translator. In the prologue he highlights his translation style when he comments that he has added in a scene from Diphilus' *Syncaopothnescontes* that he translated word-by-word. Terence emphasizes his adherence to the source in the prologue to lend credence to his message that reinforces the patriarchal society. Menander, not Diphilus, is the primary source with whom Terence aligns himself in the *Adelphoe*, but the message that Terence sends in the prologue characterizes his general translation practice. What appears to be an ending changed in the translation is in fact Terence aligning the message of his drama with that of Menander and dissociating the work from the chaotic society that Plautus presented.

4.10 The *Eunuchus*

The *Eunuchus* features the largest number of Greek words in a Terentian play.¹²⁵ In addition, Terence has added two characters to his translation that did not exist in the Menandrian original. As a result of these features, the *Eunuchus* is “generally regarded as (Terence's) most “Plautine” play (Barsby 1999: 15).¹²⁶ Yet even these changes, made perhaps to appease the audience, are not indicators that Terence departed from source-representative translation. Donatus documents two types of changes made by Terence in this play. The first is the addition of characters (here probably Thraso and Gnatho, a soldier and a parasite).¹²⁷ While the soldier

¹²⁵ According to Hough's tabulation (1947: 18), 26 different Greek words occur for a total of 36 times, or a ratio of one Greek word for every 28 lines.

¹²⁶ Ludwig (1968: 171-174) argues that Terence made these changes to appease his audience. Ludwig's theory is supported by Suetonius' testimony, who writes (*Vit. Ter.* 3) that the *Eunuchus* received the highest sum ever for a comedy (8,000 sesterces).

¹²⁷ As Lowe (1983: 428) attests, Terence's known changes fall into a pattern. First, they involve replacing one speaking character with two, as here with Thraso and Gnatho. Secondly, Terence occasionally changes monologue to

and the parasite are generally stock characters from Roman comedy, Terence adapted these two in particular from another Menandrian play, the *Kolax*. As Brothers (2000: 23) observes, the two additional characters can “easily be isolated” since they take part in only one of the two main strands of the plot, are on stage for just over 300 lines—a significant portion of which (232–64, 395–433) Brothers believes, has “nothing to do with the play at all.” Brothers raises an important point here: do these characters *replace* counterparts in Menander, or are they purely additions? Brothers, following Ludwig (1959: 26), Lloyd-Jones (283), Gratwick (1972: 31), Webster (1974: 139), and Sandbach (1975: 201, 1977: 142–143), believes that there was a character fulfilling a similar rival role in Menander, and he was probably a soldier like Terence’s Thraso. A Gnatho role in Menander is more debatable, with Sandbach (1975: 201), Ludwig (1959: 26), and Webster (1974: 140) all seeing him as an additional character.¹²⁸

The second alteration is monologue replaced by dialogue (Donatus sees Antipho added in *Eun.* 539 to avoid a monologue by Chaerea). The replacement of monologue with dialogue paired with the expansion of characters is a tactic used by Terence to create a livelier play. Yet how much consequence do these changes have on Terence’s putative relationship with his source? Terence opens the play by giving both title and author of the source material (*quam nunc acturi sumus / Menandri Eunuchum*, 19–20), showing no hint that he is deviating from his usual

dialogue as Donatus claims happens at *Eun.* 593 (*bene inuenta persona est, cui narret Chaerea ne unus diu loquatur, ut apud Menandrum*). Lowe (431–442) argues that in *Eunuchus* 207–224 Terence has changed a monologue from Menander into a dialogue, and probably curtailed an exit monologue.

¹²⁸ Clifford’s study (1931) on dramatic technique in Terence is helpful here. Aristotle has a dictum by which a poet should constantly visualize the movements of off-stage characters in order to avoid incongruities (*Poetics* 1455a22–29). Clifford (605) explains that in comedy a character that is exiting the stage will announce his destination, and on his reentry he returns from the same place – or explains the change in plans. If a second character arrives on stage and reports seeing the first character, he reports him as having been in the place he said he was going. Terence usually adheres to this dictum, but Clifford identifies (609) three circumstances in which Terence does not: in the passages that Terence himself composed; in portions that bridge over a contact between the original play and a scene of *contaminatio*; and where the movements of Greek characters in the original were affected by the chorus. Importantly for our section here in deciding the source of Thraso and Gnatho, Clifford finds (610) that Thraso and Gnatho often have aimless, unexplained, movements, and suggests that they are Terentian inventions.

methods. Lowe (1983: 428) argues that the changes made by Terence have little effect on the original Menandrian plot. In his argument he looks to two specific passages, lines 46–231 and 905–942. On the first passage Lowe says (432) “there can be no doubt that Terence took over the substance of the scene from Menander.” Evidence from Donatus is important here: Donatus pairs the opening line of this passage (*quid igitur faciam? Non eam ne nunc quidem / quom accersor ultro*, 46–47)¹²⁹ to a similar line of Menander (ἀλλὰ τί ποιήσω, fr. 137 *PCG*^{6.2}). Furthermore, the advice of the character Parmeno (*si sapis / neque praeterquam quas ipse amor molestias / habet addas, et illas quas habet recte feras*, 76–78)¹³⁰ appears to Lowe (1983: 432) to be a translation of Menander’s μὴ θεομάχει μηδὲ προσάγου τῷ πράγματι / χεიმῶνας ἑτέρους, τοὺς δ’ ἀναγκαίους φέρει (fr. 138 *PCG*^{6.2}). Lowe cites the translation as an example of Terence’s free translation that still retains the basic idea of the original: the Greek conception of love as a god is removed in the translation, and the metaphorical χεიმῶνες are replaced by *molestiae*.

Brothers (2000: 25) maintains that the changes¹³¹ show Terence “injecting life and actions into a play which he [Terence] presumably felt did not contain enough of them for the tastes of his Roman—as opposed to the original Greek—audience.” The changes conspire to make the *Eunuchus* the “funniest” play of Terence, at least if Roman audiences derived humour from larger-than-life characters and farcical humour.¹³² These changes do not significantly alter

¹²⁹ “So what will I do? Should I not go, not even now, when I am summoned voluntarily (by Thais, his lover)?”

¹³⁰ “If you are smart, you won’t add more troubles to those that love has, and those which it has you will bear well.”

¹³¹ In addition to the changes made by Terence mentioned above, Brothers (2000: 25) also groups the creation of the characters Antipho and Dorias, and the assigning of words to Sanga and Sophrona, as changes made by Terence.

¹³² Ludwig (1968: 172) associates the addition and expansion of the characters from the *Kolax* in the *Eunuchus* with the addition of a scene from the *Synapothescontes* in the *Adelphoe*. Ludwig calls the entrance speech of Gnatho in the second act an effective bravura scene which shifts the emphasis of the original. Ludwig further argues (173) that the ending of the *Eunuchus* was based on the ending of the *Kolax*, which in effect destroys the unity of the play. For both the *Adelphoe* and the *Eunuchus* Ludwig says “Terence chose in each case a psychologically complex Menandrian play as his primary model. But he enriched it and strengthened its farcial elements from cruder plays of Menander and Diphilos, doing some damage thereby to the balanced organization of his primary models.” Ludwig’s main goal in the article is to counter critics who see Terence as responsible for a fundamental humanizing and deepening of his models.

the tone of the play so that it should be classified as not just “more Plautine”, but in fact Plautine. Brothers offers some reasons why declaring the play Plautine would be going too far: for one, some of the characters never take on their stock roles. Brothers describes (2000: 31–32) the prostitute Thais as having a “kindlier, more genuine side to her nature” (than the conventional picture of the courtesan in Roman comedy). Thais is a variation on the courtesan type, what Donatus (I 309 on 198) calls a *bona meretrix*. The *bona meretrix* is also a feature of Menander’s drama, particularly in his *Samian Girl* and the *Epitrepontes*. Rather than a typical Roman comedy stock character, Thais in the *Eunuchus* represents a borrowing from Menander that is consistent with Terence’s characters in his other dramas.

Nor is the slave Parmeno the typical *seruus callidus*: he does not display the heroic badness exemplified in Plautus’ slaves.¹³³ As Brothers (2000: 33) shows, Parmeno is more bungling than he is cunning: he appears rather timid, showing fear that Chaerea will follow his jocular suggestion to switch places with the eunuch (*quid agis? Iocabar equidem; perii! Quid ego egi miser?* 378). When Chaerea insists on continuing, Parmeno fears that the plan will be too difficult and advises caution (*uide ne nimium calidum hoc sit modo*, 380) and that he will be the one who is punished (*at enim istaec in me cudetur faba*, 381). Later, he is deceived by Pythias into believing that Chaerea is about to be punished; Pythias enjoys this trickery and mocks Parmeno (*defessa iam sum misera te ridendo*, 1008; *numquam pol hominem stultiorem uidi nec uidebo. Ah! / non possum satis narrare quos ludos praebueris intus. / at etiam primo callidum et disertum credidi hominem*, 1009–1011).¹³⁴

¹³³ The typical *seruus callidus* does exist in Terence’s *Heauton Timorumenos* in the character Syrus (Brothers 2000: 32).

¹³⁴ “Poor me, I am worn out laughing at you”; “By god I have never seen a more stupid man, nor will I. Ah! I am not able to tell you what entertainment you provided us inside. But once, I actually believed you to be a cunning and eloquent man.”

Even the character who is representative of the *contaminatio* of the work, the soldier Thraso, is not the typical braggart soldier (Brothers 2000: 34). He does deploy centuries and maniples and finds inspiration in Pyrrhus, but Goldberg (1986: 12) finds the influence of his greatest scene to have its parallel not in Plautus, but in the *Perikeiromene* of Menander. Even more unlike the treatment of the soldier in Plautus is the way in which Thraso is included in the group at the end of the play (Wright 1974: 136). Saylor's understanding of how comedies feature groups of inclusion and exclusion in their finales is important here: by including the soldier in the victorious group, Terence is admitting him to the status of hero in the comedy. Terence's depiction of the soldier Thraso, rather than being illustrative of how Terence may write like Plautus, emphasizes the differences between Plautus and Terence as Terence reincorporates the character into the happy conclusion.

In this way the characters that appear at first to be the standard representations of Roman comedy turn out to be Terentian characters. No cunning Plautine slave overthrows the rule of a greedy father. Even the language, despite being *more* Plautine, does not reach the levels of that in Plautus. Wright (131ff) compares scenes of the *Eunuchus* with those of Plautus that are identical in content, such as 81–90. The situation in the *Eunuchus*, as Wright describes it, is standard new comedy: there is a beautiful meretrix, a young man foolishly in love, and a joking servant. However, Wright points out how there is no alliteration, no run-on lines, and how Thais acts realistically.¹³⁵ The scene from the *Poenulus* (129–197), by contrast, is overdrawn. Agorastocles discusses his love woes with the slave Milphio. Adelphasium and her sister appear, but the two girls do not notice the men watching while they discuss the way that they prepare

¹³⁵ According to Wright (1974: 132), there is a sense of realism in the play displayed by how Thais “overhears the conversation of Phaedria and Parmeno and then ignores Parmeno’s interruption.”

themselves and dress and how they fail to attract attention from men. Banter between the two men interrupts the conversation between the sisters throughout the scene. The entire scene is exaggerated and drawn out: what takes Terence ten lines to relate takes Plautus two hundred, and Plautus' scene advances the plot hardly at all. The language and metre in the *Poenulus* is lively as sound is privileged: Adelphasium mouths eight infinitives in a row (*lauari aut fricari aut tergeri aut ornari, / poliri, expoliri, pingi, fingi*, 220–221), and ends a sentence with four straight passive verbs (*ornantur, lauantur, tergentur, poliuntur*, 229).¹³⁶ Wright finds (134–135) that the scene is so unrealistic that the characters twice refer to themselves as comedians (280, 296), and at the outset both Milphio (*si uis uidere ludos iucundissimos*, 206) and Agorastocles (*quid istuc tumulti est*, 206) identify the scene as a stage production. Even the metre reveals the difference in seriousness between the scenes from Plautus and Terence: in the *Eunuchus* the metre in the passage is iambic senarii, but the *Poenulus* begins with a *canticum* in bacchic rhythm and concludes in the trochaic septenarii, which Wright describes (134) as lively. The scene in Terence hints at traditional Roman comedy, but Terence does not go so far as to write a Plautine event.

Ludwig (1968: 181) concludes that the changes introduced by Terence are aimed towards livelier plots, an increase in suspense or emotional effect, and are founded on a regard for Roman morality or Romans' limited knowledge about Greek lives. These aims converge, according to Ludwig, in such a way that “while sticking as closely to possible to the Greek comedies, they (the plays) might also be more effective on the Roman stage for the Roman public.” In other words, the necessities of the dramatization dictated the changes; Terence did not write ambiguous plays for the point of being ambiguous. Terence's translations are a far cry from

¹³⁶ Wright here says (134) that content is subordinate to sound, a hierarchy that is characteristic of Plautine comedy.

Lawrence Venuti's call for foreignized translations that hinder the reading, always reminding the audience of their foreign nature. Terence does make changes to the original drama, but he does so according to his own practice: what he adds to the comedy is borrowed from another of the source's dramas. He presents the drama as Menander's *Eunuchus*, thereby signaling to the audience that they are to understand his *Eunuchus* as representative of Menander's version. If the audience has preconceived notions of what to expect from Terence's versions of Menander, the alterations that he does make would not be jarring. Terence practices a style of translation in which he eliminates foreign aspects in order to domesticate the text. As a representation of Menander, the *Eunuchus* feels right to the audience and does little to create the same distance between source and target audience that Plautus cultivates. He represents the source not by adhering to Menander's words, but by retaining the message.

4.11 Conclusion

The prologues and relative fidelity unite to create the picture of Terence's plays as "the first systematic attempt to bring Greek values to rude Latium" (Goldberg 1986: 10). The proposal of a strategy to popularize Greek values may be the result of attributing too much programmatic forethought to Terence's comedies, other than his desire to please his audience.¹³⁷ The key to understanding Terence's translations lies in recognizing that Terence wrote his

¹³⁷ Goldberg (1986: 14) argues against the idea that Terence was representative of any faction in Rome, observing that none of the aediles who bought his plays were intimate with Scipio Aemilianus. If the Scipionic Circle were real, it is likely that its members would support each other. Although the aediles were not members of a Scipionic group, there are reasons to believe that some of them had philhellenic interests. In 166 BCE, the year that Terence's *Andria* was presented, Marcus Fulvius Nobilior, the son of the patron of Ennius, was aedile. In 160, Marcus' brother Quintus Fulvius Nobilior was an aedile when the *Hecyra* was performed. In 161 Lucius Postumius Albinus was one of the aediles when the *Eunuchus* and *Phormio* were performed. Lucius Postumius was a relative of Aulus Postumius, who wrote a history of Rome in Greek. He was not the first to do so (Quintus Fabius Pictor), but he irked Cato by asking in his prologue for the audience's forgiveness if he made any mistakes in his Greek (Aulus Gellius 11.8). Polybius (35.3) writes of him as a man who turned from his own people in his focus on the Greeks and their literature.

comedies as responses to socio-literary conditions. While he may not have been involved with a close-knit, strategic group in the so-called Scipionic Circle, his peers were Romans who were increasingly interested in the Hellenic life. His translations are shaped by the circumstances of the target culture: his prologues display an interest in promoting the source text and author, and his comedies themselves retain features of the Greek originals that are like episodes of Greek wisdom.

The audience is not the only influence or literary condition to which Terence responds, however. As we have seen in the genre of epic, Ennius' portrayal of the spirit of Homer appearing to him in a dream is a response to Livius Andronicus. The outcome of this response is the self-positioning of Ennius as a better representative of Homer than Livius Andronicus. Ennius does not supplant the text of Homer, but that of Livius Andronicus. The same process of supplanting occurs in the comic genre. Terence positions himself as a better representative of the Greek wisdom in comedies than Plautus had been. In the *Adelphoe* he "recovers" a portion of a text that Plautus had (carelessly?) left out when he was translating. The recovery presents the notion that Terence has uncovered a piece of information that is relevant to the audience, and would otherwise be lost. This is the "Homer-less people" scenario that can be manipulated by a translator so that the translator presents the idea that without his work the audience would be missing an important piece of foreign knowledge. The recovery presents this information as valuable.

The tactic was a successful one for Terence. Holt Parker (1996) challenges the persistent theory that Terence was unpopular.¹³⁸ Parker allows for Plautus' popularity (590), but asserts that on the basis of the ancient testimony¹³⁹ Plautus was *inter pares* among the other Roman playwrights, not *primus*. Parker (591) points out how every single play of Terence was a hit,¹⁴⁰ and that the *Eunuchus* received the single largest cash payment ever made to a comic playwright to that date. Parker rejects the notion that the differences between the comedies of Plautus and Terence are reflective of competing factions.

Due to an increase in interaction with the Greeks, Terence's audience had an increased level of familiarity with Greeks and rejected Plautus' caricatures. Increased familiarity may have led to cultural tensions between Romans and Greeks, and due to cultural tensions Terence could not, or would not, use the differences between Greeks and Romans as a joke. It is worth stating that Plautus was an insider in Rome, born in Umbria, a *socius* who may have reached *ciuis* status.¹⁴¹ Terence, conversely, was a slave from Carthage who eventually earned his freedom. Plautus can stand alongside the Romans and mock the way that the Greeks deride them; Terence, himself an outsider, would not have found it so amusing to point at the divide between Romans and outsiders. Finally, Terence may himself have had an interest in educating the audience, and

¹³⁸ Wright (1974) regularly claims that by the changes Terence made to traditional Roman comedy, he effectively killed off comedy in Rome. Barsby (1999: 15) remarks that is tempting to link the more refrained style of Terence with the intellectuals of his day, but finds that Terence's style did not find favour with his audience at large.

¹³⁹ Varro praises Titinius, Terence, and Atta for character delineation, Trabea, Atilius, and Caecilius for pathos, and does not mention Plautus. In another place he places Caecilius foremost for plot construction, Terence for delineation of character, and Plautus for exuberance of language. Volcarius Sedigitus (Gell. 15.24) ranks Caecilius above Plautus (and Terence in the sixth position). Cicero hesitatingly (*fortasse*) calls Caecilius the best comic poet (*Opt. Gen.* 2).

¹⁴⁰ So says Suetonius (*Vit. Ter.* 2): *et hanc autem et quinque reliquas aequaliter populo probavit, quamvis Vulcatius dinumeratione omnium ita scribat: sumetur Hecyra sexta ex his fabula* ("He pleased the people equally with this and his other five plays, although Vulcatius in his reckoning of all writes thus: the *Hecyra* will be taken as the sixth from his plays).

¹⁴¹ The details on Plautus' life are scarce; in fact, as an article by Gratwick attests (1973), Plautus' true name is very much a mystery. Kaimio hesitantly posits (1979: 213) that Plautus may have attained citizenship.

so could not present immorality triumphing over morality. All of these explanations may be true, but the essential piece of information to take away is that Roman tastes had changed from Plautus' time to Terence's, and the old models were no longer acceptable. The conditions that produced Plautus' comedies were gone by Terence's time some twenty years later. Not only were there different conditions in the audience at large, but the very success of Plautus meant that anyone who sought to challenge his position would need to do something different. Proponents of polysystem theory posit that dissatisfaction with established models may result in a return to source material. This dissatisfaction made it compelling for Terence to return and remain more faithful than his predecessors to the source material in an effort to reinvigorate the genre. Terence responded to all of these conditions by positioning himself as a true representative of the source.

5 Allusive Translation

Like the source-representative translator, the allusive translator associates himself with the source author. Unlike the source-representative translator, however, the allusive translator promotes the way his work goes beyond the precedent set by the source. Livius Andronicus and Terence both go beyond what is in their source text, but they downplay the notion of translator freedom and stress adherence. In the time between Terence and Catullus, Roman poets and playwrights continued to work with Greek source material as the culture and artistic output of Greece became more familiar to Romans. Catullus and Horace, in contrast to the practice of source-representative translators, call attention to the fact that translation alone cannot satisfy them. Catullus presents translation as an activity of leisure, and encourages himself to cease translating. Horace's *Odes* and *Epodes* reveal Horace creating a sense of expectations through the openings of his poems that he subsequently disrupts by departing from the source model. In this way, Catullus and Horace abandon the source to promote their own relationship with the source: for Catullus and Horace, adherence to a source text will advance their poetics only so far. They promise innovation by escaping from the source text with which they are engaging. Their departure from the source brings their faithfulness and originality into stark contrast: each engagement with a source text creates a sense of anticipation that the allusive translator subverts to emphasize his originality.

5.1 Catullus

Born in Cisalpine Gaul, Catullus came to Rome on an unknown date and died in 54 BCE. He is commonly associated with an Alexandrian movement in Rome. The Latin Alexandrian poets, like their Greek predecessors, turned away from traditional styles of poetry. The Latin

Alexandrians found new forms of poetry in Greek Alexandriandism, particularly elegy and epigram. Catullus was part of the second generation of Alexandrian Latin poets, and while his poetry reflects the influence of the Greek Alexandrians, it also indicates that Sappho was an influence. My primary focus is on poem 51, which is largely a faithful translation of a fragment of Sappho, but ends with a striking rebuke aimed simultaneously at Catullus the lover depicted and Catullus the poet. Evidence from poems 66 and 68 supports my conclusions on poem 51; poem 66 is a translation of Callimachus, and poem 68 features a *recusatio* that shows how Catullus views translation as essentially a non-creative process. When Catullus ends poem 51 by warning himself of the dangers of *otium*, he is recognizing that translation is an activity for *otium*. He urges himself to leave translation behind and return to his *negotium*, which for Catullus is the writing of original poetry.

5.2 Catullus, Poem 51

In poem 51, Catullus undertakes a translation of Sappho fr. 31, but he abandons the translation project to make a statement of independence from his source, urging himself to avoid lingering in the act of translation. The standard commentaries on poem 51 by C.J. Fordyce (1961: 218), Kenneth Quinn (1972: 56), and Douglas Thomson (1997: 327) all recognize 51 as a translation of Sappho fr. 31 (Voigt). Scholars have found many ways to quell their discomfort with the abruptness of the change between stanza 3 and stanza 4, including excising the final stanza from the previous three completely. As I propose, the final stanza is crucial to not only the poem, but to the poet himself: it is at this moment that Catullus portrays himself moving beyond both Sappho and the act of translation.

For the first twelve lines, Catullus' poem follows the Sapphic original. Catullus alters a few aspects of the text, perhaps to better describe his own personal circumstances, but overall

Catullus does not stray from the thread of the poem. As Sappho did, Catullus views his love interest from across the room; both poets are taken aback at how well their lover's partner remains composed at the side of such a beauty. Catullus adheres to the Sappho poem in imagining that the partner must be a god or, at least equal to a god (*Ille mi par esse deo videtur*, 1 = φαίνεται μοι κῆνος ἴσος θεοῖσιν, 1). Catullus follows Sappho in describing the effect that the lover's beauty has on his person: the subject forcefully loses his perception (*eripit sensus*, 6) and his voice (*nihil est super mi/ uocis in ore/ lingua sed torpet*, 6–8 = ὥς με φώναι/-ς οὐδ' ἔν' ἔτ' εἴκει/ ἀλλὰ καὶ μὲν γλῶσσά <μ'> ἔαγε, 7–9); passion runs deep in his limbs (*tenuis sub artus/ flamma demanat*, 9 – 10 = λέπτον / δ' αὐτίκα χρῶ πῦρ ὑπαδεδρόμηκεν, 9–10); and his eyes go dark (*gemina teguntur/ lumina nocte*, 11–12 = ὀπάτεσσι δ' οὐδ' ἔν' ὄρημι, 11). The two poems are so close in structure that it indeed seems difficult to imagine that any interpretative introduction to Catullus 51 would neglect to mention the Sapphic source.

Catullus' shifts away from the Sapphic material reveal the complex nature of translation. His modification of Sappho's declaration that the lover is equal to the gods (ἴσος θεοῖσιν) to the more humble *ille, si fas est, superare divos*, recalls Livius Andronicus' tempering of Homer's (3.110) description of Patroclus as θεόφιν μῆστωρ ἀτάλαντος to *uir summus adprimus* (fr. 10). Livius Andronicus' translation represents what Toury (1995: 57) refers to as a “non-obligatory shift”, since the shift is motivated by cultural considerations and not linguistic requirements, which cause “obligatory shifts.” The name “non-obligatory shift” does not lessen the compulsion for Livius Andronicus to make the change: the restrictions placed upon him by Roman culture do not permit him to speak of a mortal as equal to a god. *Uir summus adprimus* is a translation that fulfills a similar function as the source description, namely pointing out the supremacy of

Patroclus.¹ Although the modification of Catullus indicates a complicated thought process, the imagery of the translation nevertheless evokes the Sapphic original.

Various commentaries and articles on this poem have all discussed at length the other alterations that Catullus makes. Notable among these alterations are: the *identidem* in line 3; the *misero quod omnis / eripit sensus mihi* of lines 5 and 6; and notably the vocative *Lesbia* in line 7. Wiseman (1969: 34) argues that these additions recall the entirety of the *Lesbia* cycle itself; Thomson (1997: 327) believes that the *misero* is employed to introduce the masculine gender and “change the poem’s direction”; Quinn (1972: 59) contends that the vocative address in *Lesbia*, despite there being nothing that corresponds to this in the original, still “had every right to be there”.² These are all minor changes that reflect the individuality of Catullus’ own situation, but do not illustrate Catullus’ role as a translator. While his audience may expect some degree of closeness to the original in order to qualify the poem as a meaningful allusion, Catullus is free to make minor changes, since his concern here is presumably to evoke the poem of Sappho. I agree with Jensen’s (1967: 365) assessment that “these are actually quite insignificant modifications” and Kinsey’s (1974) conclusion that “the affinities between the two [the poems of Catullus and Sappho] are so obvious that Catullus clearly intended for his readers to have Sappho in mind. If the reader does not, Poem 51 loses a dimension which Catullus intended to have.” I will address this latter point made by Kinsey later in this chapter, but here I follow his general thesis that Catullus stresses his engagement with his source Sappho in the first three

¹ Although there is no evidence that Catullus was aware of Livius Andronicus’ translation, it appears that he is engaging in some metapoetics as he questions not only Sappho’s description of the lover, but even Livius Andronicus’ shift in his translation of Homer.

² Edwards (1989) offers a more thorough analysis, discussing both poems in turn with special attention to the thematic movements of each poem. I do not present such detail here because I assert that even if we sense different moods between the two poems, we still recognize that the first 3 stanzas are intended to be read as a faithful translation of Sappho.

stanzas.³ Indeed, his addition of the vocative *Lesbia* loudly proclaims how Catullus is working with a source text in that the name functions as an address not only to the lover of the poem, but also to the source author Sappho.

A true departure from the source comes when Catullus suddenly breaks off the description of his love-sickness in such dramatic fashion that both Jensen (1967) and Fordyce (1961:219) believe that the fourth stanza does not belong to the rest of the poem. By a self-address in the vocative in line 13, Catullus cautions himself that *otium* is a problem for him (*otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est*, 13). He reproves himself with the censure of line 14 “too greatly do you delight and spend time in leisure” (*otio exsultas nimiumque gestis*). Self-admonition subsequently becomes the theme of the remainder of the poem. No longer does Catullus follow the thread started by Sappho, but instead deviates into a conversation with himself, and not with the self as a lover, but as a poet. He ends with his warning in lines 15-16 that *otium* has the power to destroy even kings and flourishing cities (*otium et reges prius et beatas / perdidit urbes*).

It is not immediately clear from the poem what risk *otium* presents to Catullus. The question that has stymied scholars is what this last stanza, and specifically the reference to *otium*, has to do with the rest of the poem. The fact that this is actually two questions further complicates the problem: namely, why does Catullus apparently stop translating Sappho and, as noted, what relation do the sentiments expressed in the *otium* stanza have with the rest of the

³ I do not go as far as Quinn, however, who writes (1970: 58) that Catullus follows Sappho’s Greek “about as closely as one could reasonably expect in a verse translation from Greek into Latin.” I do not doubt that Catullus could have provided a “closer” or more literal translation, had he chosen. Quinn does, however, raise the possibility that this translation of Sappho could have passed as a “literary exercise.” This is an intriguing suggestion since it speaks to the practice of leisurely creating translations among certain Roman writers, such as Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 4.18, 7.9).

poem? Scholars have proposed various explanations for why Catullus stops translating: Thomson (1997: 329) presents a variety of reasons, two of which concern the feminine vocabulary of Sappho's text and Catullus' apparent inability to work with this vocabulary.⁴ Some scholars, such as Fordyce (1961: 219), argue that the final stanza does not belong to the poem, that its appearance with the first three stanzas is an error in the manuscript tradition; Friedrich (1908: 237) argues that the abruptness occurs because Catullus added the last four lines to the poem only after the separation of Lesbia and Catullus.

Thomson's arguments are unconvincing because they neglect the possibility that Catullus would manipulate gender roles for poetic effect. While Fordyce's suggestion that there is an error in the manuscript does create a unified *Carmen* 51, it does not satisfactorily explain what we are to do with the *otium* stanza.⁵ I therefore offer an alternative explanation of why Catullus ends his translation, and why the portion that is not translation features a description of the perils of *otium*. In the final stanza, Catullus makes a forceful statement about how he defines himself as a poet.⁶ In the first three stanzas Catullus is not only displaying his persona in the relationship with Lesbia, but he is also, as the author of the poem, translating. Thus as the poem progresses,

⁴ Thomson points out that Sappho's fourth stanza has three feminine inflections, and that one of the symptoms described in the fourth (χλωροτέρα δὲ ποίας ἔμμι) would not be used to describe a male. Thomson's third possibility is that Catullus may have felt that he had already done enough translating to make a complete poem. This explanation is not a convincing argument for the *removal* of the fourth stanza, though it may have helped to explain why Catullus translated no further if the manuscripts did not show a fourth stanza in this poem. Vine's argument (1992), which Thomson references, that Catullus compresses the third and fourth stanza of Sappho into his third is a more compelling thesis, though it still does not explain Catullus' fourth stanza.

⁵ Fordyce (1961: *ad loc*) conjectures that an accident has removed the end of *c.* 51 and the beginning of an original poem, of which the final stanza is a part.

⁶ Segal (1989) proposes that Catullus models the final stanza on the theme of conflict between social responsibilities (*negotium*) and "the personal intensity of erotic experience" (*eros*) found especially in the character Phaedra in Euripides' *Hippolytus*. Segal notices how the final stanza becomes an address not only to Catullus the lover, but to the literary tradition of this theme itself, which enables him to Romanize and personalize the "literary experience of translating Sappho (820)." The concept of a new addressee in the final stanza (that is, *not* the lover Catullus) is an attractive one, and Segal's further idea that this final stanza is "a mark of Catullus' authorial freedom even in the bondage of close translation (821)." I, however, take these ideas in a somewhat different direction by calling particular attention to the translation aspect of the poem.

the audience is aware of Catullus the lover, depicted in the narrative, and Catullus the poet, here acting as translator. The fourth stanza marks the departure point not *only* from the narrative of his feelings for Lesbia, but even from the literary act of translating. This is the moment at which Catullus depicts himself as ceasing from his translating and alters the direction of the poem so that he can comment upon what he has written. No longer is Catullus the poet writing about Catullus the lover, but rather about Catullus the translator-poet. In this way, the mention of *otium* has little to do with the love and desire that Catullus feels for Lesbia, a popular explanation among scholars, but rather indicates that Catullus filled his *otium* with translating.⁷ In the final stanza, Catullus presents his belief that translation is an act belonging to *otium* while writing original poetry is one of *negotium*.

Activities fit for *otium* and *negotium* vary among Romans;⁸ in c. 51, Catullus, a *doctus poeta*, recognizes a personal definition of *otium* and *negotium*. He is not the only author of the Late Republic to fashion a personal meaning for *negotium*. In the preface to Sallust's *Catiline*, that author explains why it is an appropriate act for a Roman to write, thus attempting to eschew the regular political path and thereby excuse his failure in that sphere. In his own words (2.9): "in the great abundance of affairs, nature reveals a different path to different people".⁹ He writes that he was drawn to political affairs in his youth, yet he left that life due to the corruption of the political system. Sallust, after his mind had rested from miseries and dangers, decided to spend

⁷ For an example of this common interpretation, see Finamore 1984, who suggests that "He [Catullus] uses his *otium* to think about Lesbia, but he goes too far and is brought to suffer" (17). Cf. Fredricksmeyer (1965), Harrison (2001) and Kinsey (1974) for similar explanations for *otium*.

⁸ Lejnieks (1968: 263) argues that *otium* here is referring to inactivity (as it often does), and the inertia that is "a sensation characteristically produced in the lover by an unresponsive and unfaithful beloved." Frank (1968) offers a slight twist to this appraisal, noting that *otium* is not idleness, but "living for oneself, free from the burdens of public responsibilities (237)." For Frank, Catullus is neglecting his public duties because of his *amor*; and thus has been led away from "the rule of *ratio*."

⁹ *Sed in magna copia rerum aliud alii natura iter ostendit.*

his remaining time out of public affairs, and claims that it was not his intent to waste his *bonum otium* in inactivity and leisure.¹⁰ Rather, he decided that he would use his *otium* to write historiography. In the opening to the *Jugurtha* (4.1–5), his second monograph, Sallust shows that he now classifies writing history as *negotium*. Here he notes that among those occupations (*negotia*) which are administered by the mind, the writing of history is especially serviceable (*Ceterum ex aliis negotiis quae ingenio exercentur in primis magno usui est memoria rerum gestarum*, 4.2). Yet he also shows that he is aware that his work may be discounted when he laments that some will assign the name of inactivity to his great and useful task because Sallust decided to spend his life away from public affairs (*Atque ego credo fore qui, quia decreui procul a re publica aetatem agere, tanto tamque utili labori meo nomen inertiae inponant*, 4.3). He acknowledges a common classification of writing as a task fit for *otium*, and his preface sets out to dispute this notion.

Of course, these prefaces are special pleading on the part of Sallust who was a political failure, yet Sallust shows how a Roman writer could reasonably fashion a personal definition of *negotium*. Similarly, in c. 51 Catullus fashions translations as an activity for *otium*. When he urges himself to put aside translating, he is presumably stating that he should be undertaking original writing, thus presenting original poetry as an activity belonging to his personal *negotium*. By ending his translation with a call to put aside activities fit for *otium*, Catullus makes a statement of the inadequacy of the translation in his world of poetics. Translation, here depicted as an activity fit for *otium*, cannot fulfill Catullus as a poet.

¹⁰ *Igitur ubi animus ex multis miseriis atque periculis requieuit et mihi relicuam aetatem a re publica procul habendam decreui, non fuit consilium socordia atque desidia bonum otium conterere* (4.1).

Many scholars see an indication of the role of translation as a leisurely activity elsewhere in the poems of Catullus. Finamore (1984), Gaisser (2009), Jensen (1967), Young (2011) and Wray (2001), recommend that we read *c.* 50 as the companion piece to 51.¹¹ The common theme of both concerns *otium*. As 50 opens with reference to the activities of *otium* (*hesterno, Licini, die otiosi*, 1), 51 likewise closes. On this reading, everything that falls between the opening of 50 and the finale of poem 51 is a part of Catullus' creation while at leisure. In 50, Catullus depicts himself and Licinius Calvus as writing poetry in a playful manner, never using vocabulary that would make us believe that "serious" poetry was being undertaken (*lusimus* [2]; *versiculos* [4]; *ludebat* [5]; *reddens mutua per iocum atque vinum* [6]). True, this vocabulary also designates a portion of the activity that the *poetae novi* are famed for, notably the playful aspect of poetry (and thus Fordyce's description [215] of the poem as "a glimpse of the *poetae novi* at play"). Yet it is important to observe that the portion of 51 that is a literal translation falls between the two *otium* markers. When Catullus calls for himself to cease from *otium* and *otiosa*, he simultaneously ends his translation. The simultaneous cessation of *otium* and translating is not a coincidence, and I take it as evidence that Catullus classified translating as a leisurely pursuit.

Outside of the poetic sphere, Catullus' contemporary Cicero classifies translation in a similar fashion. In the opening to his *Academica*, Cicero asks Varro why he has not written on philosophy (1.3). Varro explains that, rather than writing on items already covered, he sent those youths interested in philosophy to Greece, while he covered subjects left unwritten by the Greeks (1.4). Cicero questions this line of reasoning but acknowledges that he himself did not write on

¹¹ Wiseman (1969) argued that Catullus arranged the collection as we have it and, moreover, intended that the placement and cross-references between poems would provide significance to the reader. Whether Catullus arranged the poems has since been constantly debated, but Thomson is aware of a general agreement that there is a three-part division of the poems (1-60, 61-8, 69-116).

philosophy while he was limited by public life and duties (*dum me ambitio, dum honores, dum causae, dum rei publicae non solum cura sed quaedam etiam procuratio multis officiis implicatum et constrictum tenebat*, 1.11); he only *read* philosophy, and this he did to prevent the lessons from fading away. Now, however, he can turn his mind to philosophy—to writing philosophy, which, in this context, means *translating*—because he has been freed from taking part in public affairs (*administratione rei publicae liberatus*). Thus, there is a similarity between what we find here in Cicero and the final stanza of Catullus 51. Cicero only translates when he is free from other duties. Catullus is not telling himself to abandon the leisurely pursuit of poetry, but to put aside translating and aspire to create original poetry.

5.3 Poem 66

Yet if Catullus acknowledges that there were negative aspects of translating literally, why does he produce (as far as we can tell) a literal translation of Callimachus in Poem 66? Scholars generally agree¹² that 66 is a closely translated version of Callimachus' *Lock of Berenice* (*fr.* 110.1 Pfeiffer); the poem, as any translation, may take on different meanings in the Latin than what Callimachus presented in the Greek. Overall, Catullus uses Callimachus' poem to express his own sentiments, and he alters very little. The question then becomes, why he does not stop himself from translating too closely, as he did in 51? Although it would be easy to answer that the aspirations of creative variety would prevent him from following the same formula in two

¹² For the view that this is a literal translation, see especially Thomson (1997: 447) and Fordyce (1961: 328–329), who argues that Catullus reproduces the structure and rhythm of the Callimachean source. For an opposing view, see Garrison (2004: 145), who surmises that Catullus “took liberties with the text of Callimachus, sometimes glossing over sticky and erudite passages that he could not figure out.” Yet we should note that these “opposing views” may arise simply from different definitions among scholars of what constitutes a close translation, as even Fordyce acknowledges that Catullus contracts and expands the source, even at one point failing “to bring out an essential point in the Greek.”

different poems, this answer does not quite satisfy the question. Catullus provides a different answer in poem 65, which is a companion to 66.

To judge from an apparent mention of poem 66 in poem 65 (*mitto / haec expressa tibi carmina Battiadae*, 15–16), it appears that Catullus sent both poems 65 and 66 to Quintus Hortensius Hortalus in reply to a request. He opens poem 65 with an explanation of the circumstances for the writing of 66. He begins with a conjecture, explaining that *even though* his spirit is continually consumed by grief (*etsi me assiduo confectum cura dolore*, 1), in such a state that his soul is unable to produce the sweet fruits of the Muses (*nec potis est dulcis Musarum expromere fetus/ mens animi*, 3–4) and in such pain (*sed tamen in tantis maeroribus*, 15), Catullus will send a poem translated literally from Callimachus (*mitto / haec expressa tibi carmina Battiadae*, 15–16). The verb that Catullus uses (*expressa*) to describe the process is significant in that it indicates that the translation forthcoming will be literal.¹³ Catullus designates the accompanying poem 66 as a faithful translation, but that he does so at the end of his description of grief is important. The sequence is more than just “Even though I am crushed by the grief of my brother’s death, I am still sending you this poem because I love you.” Rather, he is explaining *why* he is sending a *carmen* that is *expressum* from *Battiadae*. He cannot bring himself to write something original because his grief besets him; instead, in order to satisfy Hortalus’ request he sends a translation. A translation may satisfy Hortalus’ desire for poetry, but it does not, as indicated in poem 51, fulfil Catullus as a poet.

¹³ Cicero uses the phrase *verbum e Graecis expressum* to indicate a literal process when describing Latin plays translated from Greek versions (*Fin.* 1.4–5). As Wormell (1986: 198) notes, from Terence onward the term *exprimere* was used to denote a literal translation.

5.4 Poem 68

As in poem 66, in poem 68 Catullus explains that he is unable to create poetry since he is overcome by grief and unable to write something original.¹⁴ This poem, sent either to Manius (or Allius or Mallius; his name is uncertain) in thanks for the comfort he had provided Catullus while the poet was grieving, also functions as a *recusatio* of sorts. Catullus opens the poem by alluding to what must have been in the letter of request Manius sent him. Catullus alludes to how hard fortune overwhelms Manius and has sent him a letter written with tears. His addressee has asked Catullus to rescue him from this shipwreck and restore him to life (*naufragum ut eiectum spumantibus aequoris undis / sublevem et a mortis limine restituum*, 3–4), but Catullus is away from Rome at Verona. The subsequent lines (5–8) reveal that Manius has been abandoned by his lover. Catullus explains that he is grateful to have received a request (*id gratum est mihi, me quoniam tibi dicis amicum / muneraque et Musarum hinc petis et Veneris*, 9–10). Catullus, however, needs to refuse, and he wants Manius to know why this request, and perhaps future ones, will be denied (*sed tibi ne mea sint ignota incommode, Mani, / neu me odisse putes hospitis officium / accipe, quis merse fortunae fluctibus ipse / ne amplius a misero dona beata petas*, 11–14): the death of his brother has taken all eagerness for writing poetry out of his life (*sed totum hoc studium luctu fraterna mihi mors / abstulit*, 19–20), even all joy has perished alongside his brother (*omnia tecum una perierunt gaudia nostra*, 23). Due to the death of his brother, Catullus actively avoids both the writing of poetry and any other delight (*cuius ego interitu tota de mente fugavi / haec studia atque omnes delicias animi*, 25–26). The poet is able to explain his presence

¹⁴ Much of the bibliography for this poem concerns the unity of the poem due to the shift in tone in line 48 which has led to the poem being divided into 68a and 68b. Thomson (1997: 472–474) describes history of the debate about the unity of the poem in some detail. Beyond Thomson's commentary, there are studies on the subject by Prescott (1940), Copley (1957), Skinner (1972), Wiseman (1974), Sarkissian (1983) and Courtney (1985). I myself find it unlikely that 68a and 68b represent one united poem, but this problem does not fall within the scope of the current study.

at Verona by this grief (27–30). He asks for Manius’ forgiveness, because he cannot give what grief has taken from him (*ignosces igitur si, quae mihi luctus ademit / haec tibi non tribuo munera, cum nequeo*, 31–32).

These elements of the poem are typical of the *recusatio* in that Catullus has, in the act of refusing, written a version of what Manius requested of him (Lowrie 2006: 130). If it were actually sent to the addressee, however, it does not seem suitable for relieving him from his despair. Catullus explains his refusal by stating that since he is away from his home in Rome he does not have many “resources” at hand; in fact, he has only a trunk with him (*nam, quod scriptorum non magna est copia apud me ... huc una ex multis capsula me sequitur*, ll. 33, 36). What this *copia* could be is the subject of debate. Some, such as Quinn (1970: 380) and Thomson (1997 *ad loc*), posit that the *scriptorum copia* is some of Catullus’ works that are not in a complete state, which Catullus could have finished, polished, and sent to Manius to fulfill his duty as a friend. Others, most notably Fordyce (1961: 348) and Yardley (1978), argue that the *scriptorum* of which Catullus lacks a *copia* is the genitive of not *scripta* but of *scriptores*. In this interpretation, Catullus uses these *scriptores* as either models or sources of translations. Yardley (338) illustrates how *copia librorum* is something of a technical term for a library (drawing on Ovid *Trist.* 3.14.37–38; Horace *Ep.* 1.18/109–110; Cicero *Att.* 2.6.1 and Aulus Gellius [7.17]), and thus concludes that *scriptorum copia* is used as an equivalent for *copia librorum*.

The counterpoint to the interpretation of Yardley and Fordyce is that this excuse of Catullus for not writing is not altogether satisfactory.¹⁵ Why should a lack of a library of authors

¹⁵ Kinsey (1967: 39) argues that if Ovid was able to write poetry at Tomi, surely Catullus could while in Verona. Yardley (1978: 338–339) answers this claim by noting how Ovid, while writing at Tomi, “continually complains that the quality of his poetry has declined,” and how the exiled author attributed this to “literary undernourishment (see *Trist.* 3.14.37ff).”

prevent Catullus from writing? Catullus reveals that without his library he is unable to send a translation. A closer examination of the lines of this poem shows that Catullus provides two reasons why he cannot send something. The first 32 lines answer why Catullus cannot send anything *original*: his brother is dead, and with him is gone any desire he had for writing poetry. The second method Catullus has at his disposal for, at least partially, fulfilling Manius' request is to send a translation, as he did in poem 66. Yet as Catullus explains, he cannot even do this; he is away from Rome, and away from his library of items suitable for translation.

In poems 68, 66 and its accompanying poem 65, and 51, paired with 50, Catullus acknowledges the difference between translating and writing something original. In poem 68, Catullus reveals that he can translate in periods of grief, but he cannot create an original work. He sends poem 65 along with 66, explaining that Catullus is under such distress that he has sent a translation in response to a request from Hortalus. Theoretically, then, poem 68 could have been accompanied by a translation, since Catullus begins here, as he does in 65, by describing his misery. In different instances, Catullus explains his translation, remarking on the process, even excusing the translated pieces. In contrast, by his self-rebuke to create an individual work he acknowledges that he has no excuse in 51.

5.5 Conclusion on Catullus

The importance of the self-rebuke is not evident if the audience is not aware of the source text. Only the audience members who know what Sappho does with the subject and then subsequently read Catullus breaking off from that subject can appreciate how Catullus is staking out a claim to his own poetic ability. Without the knowledge of Sappho's version the poem appears rather different: the love-struck poet attempts to cope with his feelings for Lesbia, all the while admiring that any man can keep his composure in her presence. Catullus wrestles with his

feelings for her, noting the complexity of the relationship: she already has a lover, and thus his affair with her is illicit. Catullus attempts to pull himself away from this affair in lines 13–16. These lines then feature a call for Catullus to regain his composure and put aside his strong desire for Lesbia. Without familiarity with the source, 51 appears similar to *c.* 8, when Catullus urges himself to cease to play the fool (*desinas ineptire*), and to acknowledge that this affair with Lesbia is over (*et quod vides perisse perditum ducas*, 2). He urges himself to remain steadfast (*destinatus obdura*, 19). The call to remain firm (*destinatus obdura*) is similar to the finale of poem 51, where the poet takes a hard stance against his own irrational desires. Poem 11 carries the same message as Catullus describes how Furius and Aurelius will bear Lesbia a message of ‘so long’. Without knowledge of Sappho’s version, 51 appears to be in-sync thematically with other poems of Catullus. He portrays himself as struggling with the emotions to which he finds himself subject. Yet when we are aware of the allusion, we understand how Catullus is engaging in the allusive modality of translation. Knowledge of the source material enriches his poem. He follows in the tracks of Sappho only up to a point, and at the point of departure we glimpse his ability to make a poem his own. The expectation that he sets in the opening of the poem by his close adhesion to Sappho is upset in the final stanza as Catullus turns away from his source and urges himself back to original creative activity.

The problem that Catullus identifies in the final stanza of 51 is less that he may lose himself as a Roman male in his burning love for Lesbia, but rather that he may lose himself as a poet in his translating of Lesbian source material. The only cure would be to produce something original and make the poem the personal property of the poet. The warning is the vehicle for Catullus’ statement of independence and Catullus makes his pronouncement the original portion

itself. Thereby Catullus makes the subject his own, and establishes his relationship with not only his Lesbia, but with Greek literature as his source in general.

5.6 Horace

Horace's comments in the *Ars Poetica* and *Epistle* 19 demonstrate how Horace views his relationship with his source authors Archilochus and Alcaeus. In the *Ars Poetica* Horace reveals that it is in fact better for a poet to bring forth something from the *Iliad* (*tuque / rectius Iliacum carmen deducis in actus*, 128–129), a theme that was familiar to the literary circles of Rome, than to be the first to offer something unknown and previously unsaid (*quam si proferres ignota indictaque primus*, 130). Horace tells his audience that public material will become the property of the individual poet (*publica materies priuati iuris erit*, 131) so long as the poet does not let himself be detained by the common and easy path (*si / non circa uilem patulumque moraberis orbem*, 131–132). Success will belong to the poet who does not concern himself with translating word for word like a faithful translator (*nec uerbo uerbum curabis reddere fidus / interpret*, 133–134) nor leap like the imitator into the narrow strait (*nec desilies imitator in artum*, 134). Such a place, Horace warns, is where either shame or the *lex operis* prevents him from extracting himself (*unde pedem proferre pudor uetet aut operis lex*, 135).

Horace's actions throughout his *Odes* and *Epodes* mirror the advice given here. His primary Greek models for these poems are Archilochus and Alcaeus in the *Epodes* and the *Odes*, respectively. Although Horace mentions Archilochus and Alcaeus as his primary sources, the influence of Callimachus is notable in several instances throughout the *Epodes*,¹⁶ as is that of

¹⁶ I am largely sidestepping the problem of who was the largest influence on Horace in the *Epodes*, taking my cue from Barchiesi (2001), who dismisses the debate by arguing that: "choosing between the archaic-Archilochean and the Hellenistic-Callimachean matrix would be an arbitrary oversimplification," and Watson (2003: 4), who writes that "behind an explicit reference to Archilochus is an implicit one to Callimachus," pointing specifically to *Epode*

Hipponax;¹⁷ the poetry of Sappho surely plays a role in the *Odes*,¹⁸ and Catullus's influence is a significant factor in much of Horace's poetry. Yet my examination of Horace's translations is less a search for models than an exploration of how Horace uses translation to identify himself and his poetry. I seek to examine Horace's self-promotion by the relationships with the sources that he explicitly constructs. Unlike Catullus, Horace makes clear statements about what he owes his sources, and it is through these comments that Horace advertises himself as a poet.

An important source of how Horace views his role as a translator is *Epistle* 19, which he opens (1–20) by deriding a group he calls “imitators”,¹⁹ a process that culminates with his characterizing them as a servile flock (*o imitatores, servum pecus*, 19). Horace does not envision himself as a member of this flock, and thus this criticism serves as an introduction to his own contributions to the poetic art. Horace was the first to place his *free* footsteps on vacant land; he did not walk upon the footsteps of others (*libera per vacuum posui vestigia princeps / non aliena meo pressi pede*, 21–22); in a statement of self-confidence, Horace argues that only he who trusts in his own ability can be a leader (*qui sibi fidet / dux reget examen*, 22–23). Here Horace

6. Instead, I examine Horace's own statements about his translation, here specifically his claims to have used Archilochus. This assertion is clearly an attempt by Horace to associate himself with a specific author. Of course, at the same time Horace is obscuring his debt to Callimachus by positioning Archilochus as his primary source. By so doing, Horace can create the impression that he is the direct descendent of an archetype of iambic poetry.

¹⁷ Hipponax is mentioned as a source in *Epode* 6, and Fraenkel (1957: 58) argues that the Greek iambist was a strong influence on *Epode* 12.

¹⁸ Readers frequently argue that both Alcaeus and Sappho were influences in the *Odes*, though many eventually attempt to conclude which was the larger presence in Horace's poems. Scholars often settle on Alcaeus as the primary influence, yet many observe an equal placement for Sappho (though Sappho is not, to my knowledge, ever given the position of primary influence). For examples of Alcaeus as dominant, see Fraenkel (1957), Lyne (1980) and Garrison (1991). Both Ancona (2002) and Woodman (2002) look to the subtext for a large part of Sappho's influence and find the influence of Alcaeus and Sappho equal. See nn. 38–40 below for further discussion on specific referrals to sources.

¹⁹ These are poets who would try to represent Cato's *virtus* and morals via a fierce face, bare foot, and a short toga. Horace clearly believes that these efforts are in vain, and complains that their uproar has often provoked his wrath and jest. He then deliberately sets himself in opposition by declaring that *he* was a leader in his own poetry.

constructs his poetic individuality and originality on his willingness to go beyond what others have done, to be the *princeps* in his poems.

As Hinds (1998: 52–63) observes the epic poets doing, Horace associates his primacy with a Hellenizing revolution. He looks beyond the activity of the imitators to areas that he claims are unexplored. Horace's claim of primacy is a Hellenic revolution that devalues all previous Latin representations of Archilochus and iambic poetry. In the subsequent lines of the *Epistle*, his claims of originality agree with his advice in the *Ars Poetica*. Horace asserts that his originality centers on him being the first to show Latium the iambic. Yet he qualifies this assertion, simultaneously proclaiming his originality while associating himself with his source Archilochus: he maintains that in his iambic poetry, he used the rhythm and spirit of Archilochus, but not the subject matter or the words persecuting Lycambes (*Parios ego primus iambos / ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus / Archilochi, non res et agentia uerba Lycamben*, 23–25). Thus there is a fine balance that Horace hopes to maintain between allegiance and independence in his relation with his source. Horace's *iambi* are set apart from those of his model by his rejection of the subject matter and invective of Archilochus. In other words, Horace does not turn Greek poetry into Latin by adhering to his source, either in sense (*ad sensum*) or word (*ad uerbum*). Yet Horace does rely on the use of borrowed metre and *animus*, and is quick to defend even this borrowing: he warns his critics not to think less of him as a poet because he refused to alter the metre of his sources (*ac ne me foliis ideo brevioribus ornes / quod timui mutare modos et carminis artem*, 26–27). The defence reveals his concerns about the borrowing: on the one hand, the setting of Latin words to Greek metres is Horace's claim to originality. On the other hand, he is aware that his critics may even construe this borrowing as relying too much on his source. He is adamant that putting Latin poetry into Greek

metres is in fact an accomplishment, and that the borrowing does not represent a failing in his poetic ability. In something of a paradox, not only does his use of Greek metre intimately connect him with his source, but it also serves as the foundation of his claim to originality. This paradox and the conflict between originality and adherence to source material exists across all of the translation modalities. Here Horace projects the notion that his Greek source is but the framework of his own poetic project. He depicts himself as a translator who is indebted to his source Archilochus, but only to a point: he positions himself as an artist who does not need to borrow everything that Archilochus offers, but is able to choose what he approves of and add himself to the translation. Like scholars such as Giannozzo Manetti and Luis Vives (see pp. 26–27 above), Horace assumes for himself the right to judge what of his source text is valuable to the target audience.

Horace carefully delineates his process of judging when he fixes the poetry of Archilochus by the terms *numeros*, *animos*, *res* and *agentia uerba Lycamben*. These are the items that Horace sets as identifying features of Archilochus' poetry. Nowhere here is the dichotomy between "sense" and "words" that the traditional scale of translation promotes. Horace shapes the audience's perception of Archilochus in this statement: broken down to essential properties, Archilochus' poetry is four things: rhythm, spirit, subject matter and invective against Lycambes. It is dependent upon every translator to decide what is important in the source text, but it is important that Horace reveals his framing of Archilochus' poetry rather than keeping it in the background. Horace neatly divides the four identifying features into items that he follows and those that he does not. He classifies himself as a translator by this division: he is aware that to claim primacy in showing the *iambos* to Rome he must follow the *numeros* and *animos* of the source. Yet he promises more when he rejects the *res* and *uerba* of

Archilochus. Horace observes how the *res* and *uerba* of Archilochus brought about the death of both Lycambes and his bride (30–31). He seeks to avoid causing a real-world effect with his iambic poetry,²⁰ and casts these two aspects of Archilochus' poetry as negative parts of the source. Horace denies (28–29) that he need transfer the *res* and the *uerba*: as precedents, both Sappho and Alcaeus made the poetry of Archilochus milder.²¹ Horace explicitly assumes the role of a translator who chooses what is suitable and what is not for the target audience and culture. Yet unlike translators such as Luis Vives (see pp. 26 above) and Jean Chapelain (see pp. 27 above), who similarly promote the role of a translator's judgment, Horace does not employ his judgment to represent the source. Horace does not claim that by omitting the *res* and *uerba* of Archilochus he will make Archilochus more acceptable to a Roman audience. Instead, in this statement Horace focuses on his own credentials and originality.

5.7 Horace and his source: the *Epodes*

Horace's claim to follow the *numeros* and the *animos* sets two expectations in the audience: first, that the metres of Archilochus are a regular feature of the *Epodes*.²² Indeed, Horace does use iambic metres throughout the *Epodes*: 1–10 use the iambic strophe; 11 uses the third Archilochean; 12 the Alcmanic strophe; 13 the second Archilochean; 14 and 15 the first pythiambic; 16 the second pythiambic and 17 the iambic trimeter.²³

²⁰ See Lowrie (2009: 251–275) for the effect of Horace's poetry in Rome. Lowrie (254) identifies that in dropping the *res* and *uerba* of Archilochus, Horace rejects "poetry with worldly consequence."

²¹ *temperat Archilochi musam pede mascula Sappho / temperat Alcaeus, Ep. 1.19.28–29.*

²² As Rothstein (2010) has recently shown, it is difficult to define iambic poetry. Rothstein, in fact, refuses to answer this question, but does a remarkable job of revealing how varied iambic poetry could be, concluding at one point (284) that iambic was "only occasionally related to abuse." I am aware of this issue, and thus in the following study I aim to restrict myself to instances where we may find a specific source and treatment of a theme. While the fragmentary state of the poetry of Archilochus makes this difficult, Horace had a definition of Archilochean iambic and characterizes it as *numerus*, *animus*, *res*, and *uerba*.

²³ See Garrison (1991) for classification of the metres and Bailey (1985) for grouping and description.

The second expectation that Horace establishes is poetry with the same *animos* as those iambic poems of Archilochus. Fraenkel (1957: 342) argues that *animos* refers to anger in this context.²⁴ This reading of Horace's *animos* situates Horace as the follower of Archilochus, who may have undertaken his poetry under the guise of anger. While Archilochus' anger could direct him to write invective against an external enemy, the anger behind Horace's poetry often leads him to aim his attack on himself or at least the Horatian persona portrayed in the poetry. The use of *animos* then simultaneously associates and separates Horace from his model, and it is evident that Horace is manipulating the division of features of Archilochus that he follows.

5.8 *Epode 11*

Epode 11 opens with an echo of Archilochus (*Petti, nihil me sicut antea iuuat / scribere uersiculos amore percussum graui* ["Pettius, it pleases me not at all to write verses, as it did before, now that I am struck with painful love, 1–2] and καί μ' οὔτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε τερπωλέων μέλει ("and I have no interest in iambs or amusements", fr. 215 West). The scholiast Tzetzes (*Tzetz. alleg. Hom. Ω 125 sqq.*), who quotes the Archilochean fragment, surmises that Archilochus no longer takes pleasure from writing poetry because he is in grief, brought about by the death of a loved one.²⁵ Conversely, Horace discloses that writing playful poetry no longer pleases him because he has been struck with serious love (*amore percussum graui*, 2). While Horace's source apparently explained his apathy towards poetry in terms of grief, Horace chooses to attribute the same lack of interest to love.²⁶

²⁴ Cf. *OLD* 11.

²⁵ σφῆς ἀδελφῆς γὰρ σύζυγον πνιγέοντα τῇ θαλάσῃ περιπαθῶς ὠδύρετο, γράφειν μὴ θέλων ὅλως (when his sister's husband drowned at sea he mourned intensely, refusing to write at all).

²⁶ Grassman (1966: 90) summarizes the opening of Horace as "Starke Verliebtheit hindert Horaz am Dichten," and thus theorizes that love is the causal force. However, Watson (2003: 352-359) has argued that *amore percussum graui* is not causal but temporal, and stresses the idea that "no longer" does such poetry please him while he is in love, though it must surely have once. Stephen J. Harrison (2001: 180) argues that here Horace is saying that he is no longer satisfied by playful poetry, which is how Harrison translates *uersiculos* (as it was in Catullus poem 50).

Horace's change from the pain of grief to that of love is a signal for the way Horace claims this theme of emotional distraction for himself. In Archilochus, a lack of interest in writing is an aftereffect of grief.²⁷ Here Horace modifies the idea and shifts from the source in the opening of the allusion to Archilochus' poem. The modification brings the voice of Horace to the forefront. In the very act of associating himself with Archilochus, Horace promotes his own independence from that source. Nothing else from the Archilochean fragment other than the lines quoted above are extant, and thus it is not possible to know what additional adaptations Horace may have made from that source material. However, many scholars classify *Epode* 11 as a "blame narrative," and thus connect it with the best preserved example from Archilochus, namely fr. 196a²⁸ otherwise known as the *First Cologne Epode*. A comparison between Horace's *Epode* and that of Archilochus introduces a persistent feature in Horace's adaptations of Archilochus' *iambi*.

In the *First Cologne Epode*, Archilochus aims his invective at his former lover Neobule. Archilochus informs his new lover that he is leaving his fiancée. His reasoning is simple: Neobule has lost her good looks (24–28: Νεοβούλη[ν / ἄ]λλος ἀνὴρ ἐχέτω. / αἰαῖ, πέπειρα, δις [τόση / ἄν]θος δ' ἀπερρύηκε παρθενίον / καὶ χάρις ἣ πρὶν ἐπῆν. ["As for Neobule, let (some?) other man have her. Ugh, she's overripe, twice your age, and her girlhood's flower has lost its bloom as has the charm which formerly was on it"]²⁹). He disparages her for her passions (30) and the affairs she has had while in a relationship with him (35–38). Archilochus claims that if

The contrast that Harrison sees between Archilochus and Horace, then, is that Archilochus can no longer enjoy his regular activities owing to the tragic event, but Horace, with a lighter tone, is switching genres. Harrison summarizes the situation as: "Archilochean mourning becomes Horatian metegenetic musing."

²⁷ Horace could also have been familiar with this theme through Catullus. See Catullus 65 and 68 for examples.

²⁸ Mankin (1995: 193), Watson (2003: 361-362), Gentili (1988: 187-188), Griffin (1993: 8) all pair Horace's poem with this fragment of Archilochus.

²⁹ Translation by Douglas Gerber (1999).

he were to marry Neobule, he would become a subject of mockery (μὴ τοῦτ' ἐφ' ἵταν [/ὅπως ἐγὼ γυναῖκα τ[ο]ιαύτην ἔχων / γείτοσι χάρμ' ἔσομαι [“(Let) no (one bid?) this, that I have such a wife and become a laughingstock to my neighbours]”). The notion of being a laughingstock is in Horace’s *Epode* 11, but in a rather different context.

In *Epode* 11 Horace reveals how he had not been able to act rationally in his affair with one Inachia. In the poem Horace appears to view himself with distaste, as he discloses that he once was in a mad passion for her (*ex quo destiti / Inachia furere*, 5–6). Horace reveals that now he feels ashamed to have behaved in this way: his love-sickness must have made him a *fabula* throughout Rome (*heu me, per Urbem - nam pudet tanti mali - / fabula quanta fui!*, 7–8). He shudders to recall how he revealed this illness at parties, and appears to regret that he would not heed the advice of Pettius, but would instead lie outside Inachia’s door (19–22):

*ubi haec seuerus te palam laudaueram
iussus abire domum ferebar incerto pede
ad non amicos heu mihi postis et heu
limina dura, quibus lumbos et infregi latus*

When I, stern, had openly praised these (recommendations) to you,
and ordered to go home I went with uncertain footsteps
to a door that was no friend of mine,
and to that hard threshold, on which I broke my loins and my sides.³⁰

Horace aims the invective towards himself, who became notorious (he was a *fabula*) for his pathetic actions. Whereas in Archilochus the poet describes a scenario in which he will become a

³⁰ The *exclusus amator* is a theme typical of the lyric genre, yet note here that Horace may shift the customary formula: he writes that upon the hard doorway he broke his loins and flank (*limina dura, quibus lumbos et infregi latus*, 22). Watson (2003: 378) claims that he is tempted to associate the *infringere* that Horace imposed upon himself with that which the refused *amator* either threatened for the door or actually did (Theocr. 2. 127–8; Herod. 2. 63; Lucil. 773 M., *Ode* 3.26. 6–8). The Latin verb used for this action is *frangere* (Prop. 2.5.22, 3.25.10; Tib. 1.1.73; Ov. *Am.* 1.9.20, *AA* 3.71, 567, *RA* 31), although its compound *perfringere* is also used by Tibullus (1.10.54) and *effringere* by Terence (*Ad.* 102–103). Thus when Horace breaks *himself*, he is altering an accepted theme that pertains to the refused lover. This shows Horace’s ability to adapt a poetic trope in order to reveal more of his own character than the stock item would have allowed unaltered. His translation method is much the same.

laughingstock, Horace already has been the talk of the people. In further contrast, Archilochus' shame would result from Neobule's poor qualities, not his own.³¹ She would be his source of shame if he allowed this relationship to continue. Horace's own actions have caused him shame, and he is the basis of his own disgrace.

The poem concludes (23–28) with Horace revealing that, even with a new love in his life, he has not changed from his condition during his previous affair. The poem then discloses an embarrassing failure of Horace; even though he knows better, he is in the same situation as before. This failure to improve his behaviour relates to Horace's adaptation of his source. As Burnett (1983: 59) surmises, iambic poetry “searched out what was shameful, obscene, deformed or grotesque,” in order to “keep that part (the bestial part of humans which causes these qualities) from controlling society and offending gods.” Invective poetry served as course correction for citizens who veered from proper behaviour. Horace aims at himself, pointing out his shameful behaviour in an attempt to correct this negative emotional response. However, at the end of the poem it is clear that his invective has failed, since it has not resulted in the improved behaviour of its target. In the conclusion of the poem, Horace depicts himself as a rather ineffective iambic poet in that he cannot achieve change, even in his own person. Horace emphasizes his own poetic ability by promoting a comparison between his poetry and that of Archilochus. Indeed, the force of the poem relies on the audience's appreciation for how Horace has turned Archilochus' poetry back on himself for it is in this movement that Horace takes iambic poetry in an innovative direction. Moreover, familiarity with Archilochus' poetry heightens the sense of

³¹ She appears to be cheating on him (πολλοὺς δὲ ποιεῖται φίλους, 38), and thus he could perhaps become a laughingstock because he was being taken advantage of in this way. For obvious reasons, Archilochus downplays this aspect of Neobule, and instead focuses on her old age.

humour in Horace's *Epodes* as the audience experiences Horace faltering in his attempts to correct his own behaviour.

5.9 *Epode* 12

Horace continues the same method of poetic self-identification in the twelfth *Epode*, which again thematically echoes Archilochus' *First Cologne* (fr. 196a West). The Horatian poem takes the premise of the Archilochean source as Horace tells his lover that he is leaving her, at least partially because of her old age. Horace attacks his former lover in harsher tones than Archilochus does. He criticizes her smell (*namque sagacius unus odoror*, 4), positing that perhaps a cuttlefish or a goat now lives in her hairy armpits (*polypus an grauis hirsutis cubet hircus in alis*, 5). He continues to refer to her scent, commenting on its strength when she comes upon him (*qui sudor uietis et quam malus undique membris / crescit odor*, 7–8). Archilochus describes Neobule as a ματνόλις γυνή, and Horace follows his model when he refers to his object's *indomita rabies* (9). Horace's invective starts in an expected manner as it sets out to lampoon the object of the poets' ire.

There is, however, a sense of peculiarity in the scene that Horace depicts. As Watson (2003: 384) argues, the soon to be ex-lovers of both source and translation have a certain claim over the poets since they were engaged in a relationship. Archilochus and Neobule were held by the ties of their apparent engagement to be wed. While she was young, she was attractive; now that she is older, he has found a younger lover. The fault of Neobule that Archilochus most forcefully identifies is her age. Yet Horace's relationship with the *uetula* is not so straightforward. Due to his depiction of her as smelling as if an animal lives in her armpits, it is not clear why he was ever involved with her. While the relationship between Archilochus and Neobule has worsened from a past state of mutual happiness and attraction, Horace does not

depict his complaint of the *uetula*'s smell and forceful approaches as something new to the relationship; rather, it appears that she always smelled and that she always forced herself on him.

Horace amplifies the uniqueness of the scene in the translation when the mistress replies to his rejection with her own insults and completes the reversal that Horace had begun as he becomes the sole object of mockery. The *uetula* reveals that she found Horace after taking the advice of one Lesbia (*pereat male, quae te / Lesbia quaerenti taurum monstravit inertem*, 16–17), who directed her to Horace when the elderly lover was seeking a bull. This turned out to be poor advice: the *uetula* laments that she has wasted all this time with Horace, since she could have been with Amynta of Cos, whose sexual virility she depicts as much stronger (*cuius in indomito constantior inguine neruus / quam noua collibus arbor inhaeret*, 19–20). Watson recognizes (1995: 193) in her attack another inversion, since the *uetula* here subjects the iambist to objectification as a body – how iambists usually denigrate women.³² In spite of the *uetula*'s attempts to win over Horace, there is no relationship beyond the sexual aspect, and even that facet of their liaison is lacking. As the mistress reveals, the blame for this failing belongs not only to her and her smell, but also to Horace and his lack of virility.

That Horace gives the *uetula* a place to speak is remarkable in itself. In the Archilochean source, Archilochus describes to his new lover why he is leaving Neobule. Neobule's sentiments about being abandoned are left unexpressed; since she is not present in the poem, she has no chance to defend herself. Conversely, Horace leaves a prominent place for the *uetula* to speak: her speech is the finale of the poem. Anger inspires the beginning of her speech, yet the sentiment shifts: in a somber tone she rhetorically asks why she had gifted him woolen fleeces

³² On the basis of such an inversion of roles, Watson (2003) ties this *Epode* with *Epode* 8.

that were dyed with Tyrian crimson. She answers her own question: it was because she wanted nobody to appear more loved by a woman than Horace was. She laments her poor luck (25) as Horace runs away from her like a lamb frightened by fierce wolves or a deer by lions. The Archilochean model ends with Archilochus making love to his new mistress and thus as the tone of the poem shifts to elegy, the focus is on the new love. Archilochus is ultimately the winner. In Horace the focus is the failure of this relationship, however peculiar that bond may have been. Any sympathy that we have for her, the object of Horace's scornful attack, only strengthens the shift in focus from the attacked to the attacker that we have been observing. The prominent role Horace gives to the *uetula* elevates the poem above the source as Horace portrays both sides of the argument.

As in *Epode* 11, Horace uses translation to contextualize himself as an iambist. Horace's indication that he is working with a familiar theme generates certain anticipations in respect to the poetic content. Horace uses these expectations to show his poetic independence: despite the initial sign that he is leaving his mistress because she is too old, he quickly deviates into the *uetula*'s numerous failings. The inclusion of elements attacking both Horace and the *uetula* produces some doubt and hesitation about Horace himself, as the verbal assault that was initially aimed at her turns towards him. The final speech of the former lover, a character given no voice in the source, completes the shift in blame from the *uetula* back to Horace. Horace fails to make himself superior to the object of his invective. In fact, he draws attention to his own impotence (both poetic and sexual). Invective aims to point out the grotesque, and Horace begins with this purpose. His object is fit for an elephant, she smells like an animal, she is sex-crazed. Yet the identification of the grotesque is not how Horace's poem ends. At the end of Archilochus' iambic, there is promise in the poet's new love. Here, however, we exit less mindful of the

promise of Horace and Inachia than we are of the failure of the *uetula* and Horace. If we feel any sympathy for the *uetula*, the arousal of this sentiment only speaks to Horace's poetic ability to make us sympathize with someone initially described as fit for a black elephant. In creating a sense of sympathy for his victim, Horace achieves the surpassing of his source that he promises when he rejects Archilochus' *res* and *uerba*.

5.10 *Epode 15*

On the surface *Epode 15* follows the theme presented in *Epode 12*, namely that of the poet attacking his one-time lover. Yet the more important topic is Horace's impotence and the undermining of the invective. Here Horace recounts how at one time Neaera swore an oath to him (*in uerba iurabas mea*, 4) that their love would last (*fore hunc amorem mutuum*, 10). Yet Neaera has broken the oath, and Horace follows his reminiscence by declaring that his manliness will cause her grief (*o dolitura mea multum uirtute Neaera!* 11). Horace then casts some doubt on the certainty of his revenge when he presents the conditional statement³³ that if there is any manliness in him (playing on his name Flaccus, *nam si quid in Flacco uiri est*, 12) then he will not suffer her to give herself away each night (*non feret adsiduas potiori te dare noctes*, 13). Horace swears that he will remain hard to the allure of Neaera's beauty (*nec semel offensae cedit constantia formae*, 15) but once again softens the vow by creating a conditional clause (*si certus intrarit dolor*, 16). Horace then turns his attack to Neaera's new lover, taking some joy in the idea that she will leave him as she is now leaving Horace (*heu heu translotos alio maerebis amores / ast ego uicissim risero*, 23–24). The structure of the invective is that the iambist, hurt by one dear to him, sets out to destroy his former lover with his blame poetry. Instead, Horace

³³ On these threats, Watson (1995: 195) argues that they “are not expressed in provisional terms simply in order to give Neaera the chance to amend her ways. They also disclose a deep-seated vacillation on Horace's part which makes it highly unlikely that he will ever make good his promised reprisals.”

undercuts his iambic position with the conditional statements, placing doubt in the audience that Horace could carry out these threats.

The result, as it has been in these other three *Epodes*, is that Horace the iambist portrays himself as an ineffective blame poet. While it is true that the weaker party often uses the invective,³⁴ Horace is doing something different in the *Epodes*. As Ellen Oliensis (1991: 122) detects, Horace distinguishes his *Epodes* from his sources by their “failure to erase the origins of invective in impotence.”³⁵ In the process of pointing out the flaws of others and taking vengeance on those who had wronged them, Horace’s iambic sources used the invective to place themselves in a position of power; other members of society are base, and lovers who were unfaithful were unwanted anyway.³⁶ Horace, in his translation of this genre, fails to elevate himself and maintains his impotence. In fact, Horace’s invective attack often flounders and returns back against the speaker. This self-invective nature of his poetry is a tool by which Horace contextualizes himself as an iambic poet. It is a method used to explain his role in these poems, and the effectiveness of that method is only realized when the aspect of translation and adaptation is clear to see. As in *Epode* 11, Horace uses the comparison between his poetry and that of his source to develop the humour as the expected promise of vengeance falls flat.

³⁴ Fitzgerald (1988: 189) contends that “invective more often than not derives from a sense of inadequacy or weakness.” See also Watson (1995: 189), but observe that Watson’s primary evidence comes from Hipponax, who differs from Archilochus. Per Burnett (1983: 98–99): “the two bodies (of Archilochus’ and Hipponax’s) verses are wholly unlike in temper and style,” and “Hipponax chooses to sing as if he and his companions were all of them depraved and stupid men with concerns obsessively physical – equal citizens of the lowest depths.” Hipponax does not aspire to bring himself to a higher level, but rather bring everyone down to the low level at which he operates. Oliensis (1991: 122) ties this idea of iambist-inadequacy to Horace, specifically to *Epode* 17, *Satires* 1.8 and *Epode* 5, stating that “in each case, invective originates as a compensation for impotence.”

³⁵ Oliensis does not restrict herself to the sexual variety of impotence, though that aspect plays a large part in two of the *Epodes* examined here.

³⁶ Such as Neaera, who is now too old for Archilochus.

In contrast, Archilochus uses the invective to put himself in a stronger position than he started in. A suitable example from Archilochus is fr. 23, which features a conversation between a man and a woman. The opening remarks of the woman are missing, but it is reasonable to conclude that she had pointed out some failings of the man because what we do have is the man's (Archilochus') reply, which Archilochus structures as a defence (Burnett 1983: 71). The poem reveals that the invective poet did open himself to accusations of his own baseness. Yet the order of the speakers in Archilochus' poem differs from that in Horace *Epode* 12. In Archilochus, the poem opens with the woman pressing her complaints against the iambic poet and closes with his defence. The iambic poet finishes the poem unscathed. In *Epode* 12, however, Horace assumes the opening position previously granted to the woman, a space in which he attacks his female counterpart. The woman then closes the poem with her reply by way of refutation of the blame, and thus *she* finishes the poem in a position better than the iambic poet. By reversing the order, Horace switches the positions of the iambic poet and his object, and thus the iambic poet cannot escape the poem unscathed.

Horace characterizes the poetry of Archilochus in *Epistle* 1.19 by listing four main elements: *numeros*, *animos*, *res*, and *uerba*. Rather than stating that he adheres to all of these elements in showing the *iambic* to Rome as a *fidelis interpres* would do, he declares that he follows only the *numeri* and the *animi*, simultaneously associating and separating his *Epodes* from Archilochus' poetry. In his self-identifying assertion, Horace reveals his ideology of translation. Horace commits to providing his own *res* and *uerba* that are suited to his brand of *iambic poetry*. His statement implies that his *uerba* and *res* are better than what were in Archilochus' poetry, and it is in the rejection of the source's tools that Horace the translator stands apart from his source. In the actual translations Horace's disengagement from the source

happens early in the poems: Horace is apathetic in *Epode* 11 because he is overcome by the passion of love, whereas Archilochus is listless because of his grief; in *Epode* 12 Horace attacks the former lover with such vitriol that the focus of the poem turns back towards Horace, an action that the speech of the *uetula* completes; in *Epode* 15 Horace's lack of virility renders all of his iambic power ineffective. Each engagement with Archilochus that begins the poem allows a subsequent withdrawal, a symbolic move away from the source, and it is in the gap that Horace creates between translation and source that he shows how his variation of the model is superior to the model.

5.11 The *Odes*

In the *Odes* Horace positions himself as a member of the lyric canon by transferring Greek lyric poetry to Rome. The final lines of *Odes* 1.1 feature an explicit hope for Horace to be entered into the canon of lyric poets (*Quodsi me lyricis uatibus inseres / sublimi feriam sidera uertice* ["But if you place me among the lyric poets, I will strike the stars with the top of my head"], 35–36). This would be a lofty achievement for Horace, since that particular canon had been set in Alexandria some 150 years before Horace was writing.³⁷ *Odes* 1.1 also gives notice of Horace's source. He writes that his poetry is setting him apart from the crowd (*me gelidum nemus / nympharumque leues cum Satyris chori / secernunt populo*, 1.30–32) provided that Euterpe does not repress the pipes nor Polyhymnia stop tuning the Lesbian lyre (*si neque tibiae /*

³⁷ Feeney (1993: 41) comments on the set quality of this list, drawing upon an epigram (*Anth. Graec.* 9.184.9–10), proclaiming that the canon was "fixed forever." Feeney further remarks on how incredible a goal Horace hopes to achieve, concluding that "Horace will vault across that divide (between Greek and Latin works) to become number ten in a Greek list of poets organized by the criteria of Greek scholarship."

Euterpe cohibet nec Polyhymnia / Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton, 32–34).³⁸ Via reference to the Lesbian lyre, Horace indicates not only Alcaeus but also Sappho.³⁹

While the allusion to the Lesbian lyre leaves the possibility of sources somewhat open, a separate allusion is more direct.⁴⁰ In *Odes* 1.32, Horace writes an invocation to his lyre, asking his *barbitos*—a term for a lyre that has Greek connotations—to play a Latin song (*age dic Latinum, / barbite, carmen*, 1.32.3–4). In *Odes* 1.32 Horace identifies the previous owner of this lyre: a citizen of Lesbos who was the first to tune the lyre (*Lesbio primum modulate ciui*, 5). As Feeney (1993: 47) observes, the *modulate ciui* is both emphatic and refers to “a function that Sappho could not discharge” since Sappho could not be a *ciuis*. The following lines reinforce this source selection when they describe this citizen of Lesbos as fierce in war (*ferox bello*, 6), and as one who would sing of Bacchus, the Muses, Venus and Cupid even while armed (*tamen inter arma... Liberum et Musas Ueneremque et illi/ semper haerentem puerum caneabat*, 6–10). The portrayal of a soldier-poet reinforces the selection of Alcaeus as a primary model.

Outside of the poetry of the *Odes*, there is more information about Horace’s sources. In *Epistle* 1.19 Horace claims that he was the first to show Latium the iambics, using the *numeri* and *animi* of Archilochus, but neither the *res* nor the abusive *uerba* (23–25; see pp. 150–152 above). Shortly after these lines, Horace names himself as the one who made Alcaeus known

³⁸ Woodman (2002: 54) refers to *barbitos* as an “arguably un-Alcaic word,” instead associating the term with Sappho.

³⁹ Opinion among scholars is divided. Quinn (1980) and West (1995) have argued that the allusion is to both Alcaeus and Sappho, and many had said the same in earlier centuries (Doering [1826], Maclean [1881] and Jani [1778] among others); Kiessling (1964; *ad loc*) and Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: xii) argue for Alcaeus only; Barchiesi (2000: 168) argues that Aeolian and Lesbian will always imply both Alcaeus and Sappho.

⁴⁰ As Woodman (2002: 54) observes: “it is of course clear that the reference is exclusively to Alcaeus.” Yet Woodman provides evidence that may make us question whether Horace had only Alcaeus in mind here. First, the poem itself is written in Sapphics; second, Horace uses the word *barbitos* (which, as Woodman notes [53], is a word that is not found in the extant remains of Alcaeus, but is associated with Sappho); and finally that there is a striking mimicking in Horace of the sound produced in a fragment of Sappho (fr. 118) when he writes *age dic*, which finds parallel in the Greek ἀγὶ δὴ χέλυ.

among the people of Latin tongue (*hunc* [Alcaeus] *ego, non alio dictum prius ore, Latinus / uolgaui fidicen*, 31–32). This retrospective remark reveals how Horace views himself as an originator in the target language literary system. He brought something unknown and foreign to a new audience, and thereby asserts that he alone is the source of this information. As he did with his discussion of his role in bringing the iambic poetry of Archilochus to Rome (23–25), Horace is following the Roman practice that Hinds (1998: 52) calls attention to, whereby Roman declarations of primacy and innovation are associated with “claims of an epiphany of Hellenic influence.” Horace’s role in the target literary system is defined by his claim of Hellenic innovation: he is the one who brought Alcaeus to Rome, and he disparages all other previous attempts to recreate the lyric genre in Rome.

Horace here associates himself closely with Alcaeus; indeed, while he explicitly denies using the *res* and *uerba* of Archilochus, when he speaks of his relationship with Alcaeus he makes no such claims. He promotes himself as closer to Alcaeus than he was to Archilochus, for it is not the *iambos* that Horace is showing to Rome but Alcaeus himself. As Barchiesi (2000: 169) argues, lyric poetry presents special problems in imitation, since “more than other genres, it implies the imitation of individuals, not just texts.” In Barchiesi’s evaluation, Horace needs to become the Latin Alcaeus; he cannot step into the tradition with his own ideas about elegy, as he did with iambic poetry. Macleod (1983: 89) had come to a similar conclusion about Horace’s relationship with his source, detecting that “what he [Horace] imitates is not merely metres or lines or poems of Alcaeus, but a whole poet.” In the *Odes* Horace discards the translation methodology he employs in the *Epodes*, and he can no longer claim that he used only the metre and spirit of his subject.

While Horace provides a list of Archilochus' primary features, here he speaks only in terms of bringing Alcaeus to Rome. As Macleod (1983: 93) observes, Horace creates a matrix of Alcaeus that can be whatever Horace wants it to be. Archilochus is *numeros, animos, res et agentia uerba Lycamben*; Alcaeus is *hunc*. Alcaeus' poetry is not the sum of four things; it is something played on a *barbitos*. The result of Horace's lack of definition of Alcaeus is that there is nothing that Horace can move away from in the translation except the cultural setting of Alcaeus' poetry. That is, the only way that Horace can depart from the influence of his Greek source is to leave Greece behind. Horace achieves the sense of a departure from Greece in *Odes* 1.9 when he situates a Greek drinking scene in view of Mt. Soracte. In *Odes* 1.37 Horace adapts Alcaeus' call to celebrate the death of a tyrant for a somber reflection on the death of the Roman nemesis Cleopatra. Horace situates the poetic types of sources other than Alcaeus as well. In *Odes* 1.12 Horace moves the celebratory poetry of Pindar from Greece to Rome by beginning the poem geographically in Greece before crossing over to Rome. In these three poems Horace promotes his originality as a translator by geographically relocating his source poetry to Rome.

5.12 *Odes* 1.9

In *Odes* 1.9 Horace calls for his addressee to bring forth the wine (7), to leave the rest to the gods (9) and to leave tomorrow's cares for tomorrow (*quid sit futurum cras fuge quaerere et / quem Fors dierum cumque dabit lucro / appone*, 13–15). Horace models the opening two strophes of the poem on Alcaeus (fr. 338 Voigt). Below I print both Horace's Latin and Alcaeus' Greek original. First the Horace:

*uides ut alta stet niue candidum
Soracte, nec iam sustineant onus
silvae laborantes, geluque
flumina constiterint acuto*

dissolue frigus ligna super foco (5)
large reponens atque benignius
deprome quadrimum Sabina,
*O Thaliarche, merum diota*⁴¹

and the Alcaeus (of which only 6 lines remain; lines 3 and 4 are missing)

ὔει μὲν ὁ Ζεὺς, ἐκ δ' ὀράνω
 χείμων, πεπάγαισιν δ' ὑδάτων ῥόαι...

κάβαλλε τὸν χείμων', ἐπὶ μὲν τίθεις
 πῦρ, ἐν δὲ κέρναις οἶνον ἀφειδεως
 μέλιχρον, αὐτὰρ ἀμφὶ κόρσα
 μόλθακον ἀμφὶ<βάλων> γνόφαλλον⁴²

As Bentley (1978: 29 [1869]) long ago detected,⁴³ the opening lines of Horace adhere to the opening of Alcaeus: in both, bad weather has forced the party inside, where there is the warmth of the fire and the comfort of wine; as Nisbet and Hubbard observe (116), Horace even “keeps something of the movement of the exemplar” as his call *dissolue frigus* follows the form of κάλλαβε τὸν χείμων'.

Yet most commentators only allow the resemblances to go that far. We cannot accurately assess Horace's dependence on the source material due to fact that the relevant portion of

⁴¹ “Do you see how Soracte stands there white with deep snow, and how the straining woods no longer sustain their burden, and how the rivers stand fixed by sharp ice? Melt the frost away by piling the logs above the hearth and freely bring forth the four year old wine from a Sabine jar.”

⁴² “Zeus sends rain, a great storm comes from the heavens, running waters are frozen solid...Down with the storm! Stroke up the fire, mix the honeysweet wine unsparingly, and put a soft fillet round your brows” (Trans. Gerber)

⁴³ “*et sic Graeca Alcae unde haec ad uerbum fere conuersa sunt*,” I am uncertain whether Bentley intends to denote this opening as near (*fere*) literal; his phrasing of the act of translation certainly complies with how a Roman could indicate a literal translation. Cicero pairs *ad uerbum* with *expressa* at *Fin.* 1.4 and *Tusc.* 3.44 to denote literal translation; Pliny the Elder (*Nat.* 18.65) uses the phrase *ad uerbum tralata*, as does Quintilian (*Inst.* 7.4.4). The verb *convertere* is used of literal translations in Cic. *Fin.* 1.5. The prepositional phrase *ad uerbum* seems to be a cognate of *uerbum e uerbo*, for which see Cic. *Fin.* 3.15, 52; *Luc.* 17, 21.

Alcaeus has been lost,⁴⁴ but some general alterations are notable in what we can compare: as Quinn observes (1980: 140), in Alcaeus the storm that forces the group indoors for the comfort of warmth and wine is currently raging. Horace's storm here, however, is already over.⁴⁵ Edmunds (1992: 5) notices the disappearance of Zeus in the Latin translation as Horace shifts the conversation between a speaker and an addressee.⁴⁶ Nisbet and Hubbard look more to the background of the two poems, reasoning that the source must have been very different than Horace's *Ode*, since Alcaeus wrote for a society in which the symposium was an institution (116). Finally, the last three stanzas take on a decidedly Epicurean colouring (famously seen in *Odes* 1.11 and the imperative *carpe diem* of line 8).

Edmunds (1992: 10) further observes that our attention should be drawn to the Horatian description of the wine, since it is "fuller" than the description in Alcaeus (who refers to the wine only as sweet [μέλιχρος]). Horace labels the wine as four years old and coming from a Sabine jar (*Sabina diota*). Horace begins a string of Greek elements, for the command issued by the narrator is aimed at one Thaliarchus, a name that indicates that he is a Greek, and likely a slave. The wine jar is qualified by the ablative *diota*, a recognizably Greek word that occurs nowhere else in Latin poetry. Horace amplifies the description of the wine in his translation to depict the wine as Greek. The sum of the description is that the Greek slave is to bring the wine in a diota.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Kiessling (1964: 48) is representative of a large portion of commentators when he says "wieviel von dem Folgenden Alkaeus gehört, last sich nicht sagen," in response to the uncertainty caused by the Alcaeus poem being incomplete.

⁴⁵ The reverse is true in *Epode* 10, where Horace is more focused on the storm than his source. Cairns (1972: 56-60) maintains that the *Epode* is an "inverse proemtikion," and so rather than wish well for the traveller, he hopes for disaster. He therefore links it with the First Strasbourg Epode (variously attributed to Archilochus or Hipponax); both the First Strasbourg and *Epode* 10 feature curses against someone at sea (as does the *Odyssey* [9.528-535], the *Aeneid* [4.381-387], Ovid's *Ibis* [275-278; 339-342; 589-594]).

⁴⁶ Edmunds believes that Thaliarchus is the addressee throughout the poem. Though the addressee's identification is not crucial to my argument, I believe that Thaliarchus represents a slave who is only spoken to when it is time to call for the wine.

⁴⁷ By labelling the Greek wine jar "Sabine", Horace further locates Greek aspects of Roman life in an Italian setting. That the wine that comes from the jar is presumably Italian also joins Greek and Italian culture.

The true effect of this string of Greek mentions is only realized when compared to the opening question posed to the narrator's fellow whether he saw how Mt. Soracte stood, bright with snow (1–2). Mt. Soracte, as various commentators have pointed out,⁴⁸ is visible from *some* places in Rome. The possibility of visibility, either from Rome or from a Sabine farm, is not a sign that this poem represents an actual conversation that took place in Rome.⁴⁹ Instead, the mention of Mt. Soracte conjures the image of Rome (Nisbet and Hubbard: 116). Horace provides the local (Roman) setting for his Greek theme. Despite this setting, the poem retains its Greek themes, even expanding on them as Horace strengthens the Greek aspects of the wine. In the language of *Odes* 1.32, *Odes* 1.9 is the Latin song played on the Greek lyre. The instrument of expression is Greek, but the setting is Latin. In this particular poem, we see that Greece is moved to Rome, in view of Mt. Soracte itself. The transfer (*transfere*) occurs quickly, as the literal translation of the opening reminds us of Alcaeus while simultaneously situating us in Rome. The description of the wine further propels the idea of Greece in Rome, as the Greek elements find a place in a Roman poem.

5.13 *Odes* 1.37

Horace opens *Odes* 1.37 with a sense of celebration in a translation of Alcaeus (fr. 332 Voigt). However, Horace moves beyond the celebratory theme to a reflection on Rome's enemy Cleopatra. The reflection diminishes the celebratory mood established at the outset. Horace's Italian geographical reminders situate the poem in a new Roman context and foreshadow the change in tone that Horace brings about in the conclusion.

⁴⁸ Nisbet and Hubbard (1970: 119) observe that the mountain "is visible from the Gianicolo, the Pincio, some tall buildings in Rome, much of the Campagna, and Tivoli"; Page (1895: 156) writes that the mountain is "plainly visible from the city"; Quinn (141) claims that "Soracte might at a pinch be visible from Rome."

⁴⁹ Nisbet and Hubbard (116) point out that "we should not suppose that Horace saw the mountain twenty miles away on a winter evening through the narrow slit of an ancient window."

The beginning of *Odes* 1.37 is celebratory:

*Nunc est bibendum, nunc pede libero
pulsanda tellus, nunc Saliaribus
ornare puluinar deorum
tempus erat dapibus, sodales
antehac nefas depromere Caecubum (5)
cellis auitis, dum Capitolio
regina †dementis †ruinas
funus et imperio parabat*⁵⁰

On the surface, *Odes* 1.37 celebrates the death of Cleopatra; the poem positions her as an enemy of Augustus. Horace exclaims that *now* is the time for celebration: while Cleopatra was devising ruin for Rome, such activity was forbidden (*nefas*). In the opening call for celebration, Horace echoes Alcaeus (*fr.* 332 Voigt).⁵¹

νῦν χρὴ μεθύσθην καὶ τινα πὲρ βίαν
πώνην, ἐπεὶ δ' ἡ κάτθανε Μύρσιλος.⁵²

Alcaeus calls upon his audience to drink, and to do so with all strength. The occasion for such revelry in Alcaeus is the death of the tyrant Myrsilus. It is likely that Alcaeus' poem continues as Horace's *ode*: the rule of the tyrant prohibited such joyous events, so now freed from fear the people should celebrate. Horace casts Cleopatra into a similar role to that of the Alcaic tyrant, portrayed as a threat to the daily lives of the people. The call to decorate the couch of the gods with a feast of the Salii situates the poem in Italy, as does the reference to the Caecuban wine and to the Capitoline. Nevertheless, the opening portion adheres to the Alcaic celebratory motif in *fr.* 332. Yet Horace departs from the source in his own description of his object.

⁵⁰ "Now is the time to drink, now the ground must be beat with free feet, now is the time to decorate the couch of the gods with a feast of the Salii, my friends. Before it was unlawful to bring the Caecuban wine from the ancestral storerooms, when the queen was preparing mad ruin and death for the state."

⁵¹ Hutchinson (2007: 42) sees Horace rising above his model in this poem, as his scope exceeds that of Alcaeus.

⁵² "Now men must get drunk and drink with all their strength, since Myrsilus has died."

(12)

sed minuit furorem
uix una sospes nauis ab ignibus
 ...

(21)

quae generosius
perire quaerens nec muliebriter
expauit ensem nec latentis
classe cita reparuit oras,
ausa et iacentem uisere regiam
uultu sereno, fortis et asperas
tractare serpentis, ut atrum
corpore combiberet uenenum,
deliberata morte ferocior,
saevis Liburnis scilicet inuidens
priuata deduci superbo
*non humilis mulier triumpho*⁵³

(25)

(30)

With her madness diminished, Cleopatra looks to die more nobly (21–22) and puts aside her “womanly” fear of the sword (22–23). The description of the Egyptian queen, which began as defamatory account, strikingly develops into praise. It is difficult to imagine that Alcaeus similarly moved from slander to praise. Horace opens with a familiar concept, taken from the Greek source that he names as his primary model, but soon veers into his own direction.⁵⁴ The opening call for celebration prepares the turn to reflection: Horace’s adaptation asks the audience to consider not only the celebration, but what lies behind the celebration and the complexity of the person whose death occasions the dancing and feasting.

⁵³ “But the safety on barely one ship from the fire diminished her frenzy... Seeking a more noble way to die, she did not fear the sword in a womanly manner, nor did she take in exchange a hidden shore with her swift fleet, even enduring to look upon ruined kingdom with tranquil face, and strong she handled the cruel serpents, so that she could drink black venom in her body, more fierce when death was decided upon, begrudging, of course, the cruel Liburnians that she, deprived of her kingdom, be led to a proud triumph, no humble woman she.”

⁵⁴ As Clay (2010: 138) explains: “After the Alcaic opening, we immediately expect to hear whose death precipitates the festivities, but we wait rather a long time for the other shoe to drop; and when it does, Horace has manipulated us so that we celebrate not so much the death of an enemy as Cleopatra’s triumph in her death.”

The different tone of the final 12 lines has caused Quinn (1980: 192) to wonder whether it was written separately from the rest of the poem.⁵⁵ At times, strong shifts in tone make commentators suspicious of the poem's integrity. Yet as I argued in respect to Catullus 51, there is good reason to keep the finale with the rest of *Odes* 1.37. The shift in tone makes us cognizant of Horace's authorial voice, which we are not immediately aware of since the first 21 lines follow a model established by Alcaeus. In general terms, Horace's ode celebrates the death of someone who would oppress the people, bring the state to ruin, and displayed a degree of madness. It is not difficult to imagine that Alcaeus represented the tyrant Myrsilus in a similar style, as a mad despot who ruined life for the general populace. Yet Horace refuses this structuring in the final 11 lines (21–32). Instead, he reflects on the positive qualities of Cleopatra: she sought a noble death, she showed no fear, she did not flee. She was calm in the face of disaster; she braved the serpents that meant her death. The contemplative quality of the finale is remarkable, and there is a somber ending as Horace reflects that Cleopatra was no humble woman (*non humilis mulier*, 32).

There is a strong contrast between the opening and the ending. The finale, reflective and somber, stands apart from where the poem began with a call to drink (*nunc est bibendum*), to dance (*nunc pede libero / pulsanda tellus*, 1–2) and to feast (*nunc Saliaribus / ornare puluinar deorum / tempus erat dapibus, sodales*, 2–4). The sentiment at the end of the poem is different than the one set by the opening. Horace's poem is complex in the way it alters the audience's perception of Cleopatra as she turns from villain to humble hero. It is through playing on audience expectations that arose not only from the Latin phrases of celebration but also from the

⁵⁵ Per Quinn: "the ungrudging generosity with which Horace speaks of Cleopatra's suicide is unexpected after the abuse heaped on her in the preceding lines....the suspicion that the ode represents a revision and expansion of an earlier poem is hard to resist." I mentioned similar arguments in respect to Catullus poem 51 above.

celebratory nature of the source behind them that Horace achieves his final effect. In between the divergence in source and translation, between expectation and reality, Horace shows how he outperforms his source.

5.14 *Odes* 1.12

Horace's methodology of poet-appropriation functions in relation to poets other than Alcaeus as well. *Odes* 1.12 opens with a translation of Pindar (*Ol.* 2.2). As Feeney argues (1993: 53), the translation of Pindar should not be a surprise since in *Odes* 1.1. Horace hopes to play not only the Lesbian *barbitos*, but also the *tibia*, which for Feeney is a musical instrument associated with Pindar. At any rate, the use of a tag from Pindar is noteworthy for any reader who has the entirety of Horace's work in mind. In *Odes* 4.2, Horace warns that anyone who wishes to imitate Pindar depends on wings that are waxed with Daedalus' ability, and moreover will give his name to the sea (*Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari/ Iule, ceratis ope Daedalea / nititur pennis uitreo daturus / nomina ponto*, *Odes* 4.2.1-4). It is possible that the advice contained in *Odes* 4.2 reveals a lesson learned in *Odes* 1.12, since 4.2 features Horace refusing to compose a Pindaric ode to Augustus, while 1.12 approaches being such an ode.

The opening tag of this Horatian poem is a near element for element translation of the opening of Pindar's *Olympian* 2.⁵⁶ The opening to Pindar's praise of Theron runs as follows: ἀναξифόρμιγγες ὕμνοι / τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν; (what god, what hero, what man shall we celebrate? [2]). Horace translates this with *quem uirum aut heroa lyra uel acri / tibia sumis celebrare, Clio? / quem deum?* (which man or hero do you choose to celebrate

⁵⁶ Clay (2010: 138) recognizes that "here, so often with the Augustan poets, the closer the opening of the model, the more surprising the subsequent development." Horace adheres to a literal translation in his opening so that the finale, which as we will see veers into a different tone, can be that much more effective.

with the lyre or shrill pipe, Clio? Which god?). All of the elements of the original are represented in the translation: there is an address to a poetic power featuring a question that seeks an object of praise, whether it be god, man, or hero. Horace reverses the ordering of the god - hero - man arrangement in Pindar, though he follows the order of the source when he expands on these categories later in the poem.

The first 11 lines of Pindar's *Ode* concentrate on Theron and the people of Acragas before the poet turns his attention to a lengthy mythological portion in the middle (which lasts until line 89). This middle portion opens with a mention of Kronos and Rhea (ἀλλ' ὦ Κρόνιε παῖ Ῥέας, ἕδος Ὀλύμπου νέμων, 12), but deals with some gnomic ideas such as that the past cannot be changed (16–17), and that good fortune can help us forget a sorrowful past (18–22). The mythological details of Semele and Ino follow; their history leads to the contemplation that we mortals cannot know the date of our death (ἦτοι βροτῶν γε κέκριται / πείρας οὔ τι θανάτου / οὐδ' ἡσύχιμον ἀμέραν ὅποτε παῖδ' ἀελίου / ἀτειρεῖ σὺν ἀγαθῷ τελευτάσομεν, 30–33). Pindar recounts the murder of Laius by Oedipus, which resulted in the Furies killing his sons. The middle section of the Pindaric Ode continues in this fashion, mixing mythological stories with gnomic statements. In line 89 Pindar returns to the target of the victory ode. He declares that no city has produced a man who is more beneficial to his friends and generous than Theron (αὐδάσομαι ἐνόρικιον λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόω, / τεκεῖν μή τιν' ἑκατόν γε ἐτέων πόλιν φίλοις ἄνδρα μᾶλλον / εὐεργέταν πραπίσιν ἀφθονέστερον τε χέρα / Θήρωνος. 92–95). In Pindar, praise of the individual often frames the mythological details and gnomic truths of Pindar's encomiums.⁵⁷

⁵⁷ *Olympian* 3, also addressed to Theron, features the same structure.

As the first two and a half lines of the Horatian *Ode* are nearly word-for-word translations of Pindar the opening provides clear thematic contextualization; Horace creates an expectation for praise poetry here. In these first lines, Horace refers to the leafy slopes of Helicon, Pindus' summit and icy Haemus. All of these mountains provide geographical contextualization, but whereas in *Odes* 1.9 there was a reference to a mountain located in Italy, here there are three examples of mountains in Greece. At this juncture, the poem has not yet moved away from Greece. A mention of Orpheus and his adventures in the woods of Mount Haemus in lines 7–8 keeps the poem in Greece.

The next three strophes do not necessarily sever the poem's association with Greece. In lines 13–24, Horace sings the praises of the gods: specifically Jupiter, Athena, Bacchus, Diana and Apollo. All of these gods are appropriations of Greek deities, and Horace's use of their Latin names signals Roman culture appropriating Greek culture. The next two strophes (lines 25–32) cover a regular assortment of heroes: Hercules, Castor and Pollux.⁵⁸ The last seven strophes (lines 33–60, and so roughly half the poem) situate the poem clearly in Rome. Horace does so by fulfilling the *qui uir* portion of his opening question.⁵⁹ Horace starts with Romulus and moves on to Numa Pompilius, Tarquin, Cato, Regulus, Scaurus, Paulus, Fabricus, Curius and Camillus.⁶⁰

The twelfth strophe (45–48) brings the poet to the object of this praise poem, as Horace recounts the glory of Marcellus and the Julian house. The final two strophes (lines 53–60) feature a prayer to Jupiter to protect Augustus, recount the glory of Augustus' military deeds, and

⁵⁸ These three were popular at Rome, however. As Nisbet and Hubbard observe (153), their popularity is evidenced by the expletives *mehercule*, *ecastor* and *edepol*.

⁵⁹ Yet note that Horace does with a bit of uncertainty (*dubito*, 35).

⁶⁰ The order in which Horace presents these *uiri* is not chronological, finishing as he does with a mention of Manius Curius Dentatus, who fought against Pyrrhus, and to Marcus Furius Camillus, who was the hero of the Gallic invasion of 390 BCE while Cato the Younger appears roughly at mid point.

position Augustus as Jupiter's earthly regent. The movement starts with a tag of Greek praise poetry, moves to the geography of Greece, then to the gods, to heroes, to Romulus, to other notable Roman men and finally finishes with Augustus. Horace creates a progression that moves from Greece to Rome; by the conclusion of the poem the Greek origins of the poem are only vestiges. Horace not only adapts his source material, but completely shifts the genre of praise to Rome in sixty lines.

5.15 Horace Conclusions

Each poem relies on the audience's knowledge of the source material in order for a higher level of reading to function. Without this familiarity, we are less able to read the poet. Other poems show the same methodology. For instance, *Odes* 1.4 features a fragment of Alcaeus (286 Voigt), as does 1.10 and 1.18; in 3.2 Horace translates two tags from Simonides. Similarly, there are other *Epodes* that contain translations: *Epode* 15 begins with a curse aimed at a former lover, but a pun about Horace's flaccidity destabilizes the curse; *Epode* 16 may take from Archilochus fr.13; the beginning of *Epode* 7 appears to have fr. 88 as an influence; the kidnapped boy's impassioned plea to Zeus in the beginning of *Epode* 5 could be modeled on a similar call for justice in fr. 177. In the *Epodes*, Horace presents his own version of an iambic poet. Here the poet is ineffective in his aims, consistently undercutting himself.⁶¹ Those who are familiar with how Archilochus handled similar themes are in the best position to understand Horace's originality; Archilochus may depict himself in a weakened position (Neobule), but his poetry is often a means for him to escape that situation. Horace achieves the opposite; instead of becoming the stronger, he becomes the weaker as he offers his own take on the genre. By positioning himself as the weaker target of the invective, he moves his poetry away from what he deemed the

⁶¹ Watson (1995: 199) reads a similar undercutting also in *Epodes* 2, 3, 6, 11, 14, and 17.

negative aspect of his source Archilochus' poetry: the ability to cause harm to someone like Lycambes. His translations in the *Epodes* highlight how Horace outdoes his source by bringing originality and faithfulness into stark contrast. The contrast provides insight into Horace moving beyond the source from which he takes his start. He symbolically moves into new areas in each poem as he leaves behind the *res* and *uerba* of Archilochus.

Horace's method of promoting his translations is different in the *Odes*: rather than attempting to provide a personal take on a literary model, he claims to bring the lyric genre itself to Rome. He achieves this by positioning himself as one of the members of the set lyric canon. If Horace wants to bring Alcaeus to Rome, he has to create a sense of placement for a Greek type at Rome. This he does by subtle means, by presenting Greek ideas and actions among Roman geographical locations. As Horace himself writes, he plays a Latin song on a Greek instrument. Horace presents himself as the embodiment of Alcaeus, now come to Rome.

The advice of the *Ars Poetica* is in alignment with Horace's translation poetry. Horace tells us that while a poet should follow along familiar paths, he must also make his own mark upon that path, thus demanding simultaneous faithfulness and originality when writing. His own observance of this mandate is apparent when he puts Roman aspects into Greek metres. What is observable is that Horace perceived an audience that *did* want to hear familiar stories, but one that also sought out artists who could handle the source material in such a way that the poet's personality was evident in the poem.

5.16 Conclusion

The translation poems of Catullus and Horace above offer a mixture between source-adherence and poetic freedom. Both Catullus and Horace, albeit in slightly different fashions, use

the departure from the faithful aspect of translation to declare their own poetic ability. Catullus shows his awareness that translations can function as meaningful self-expressions when he adopts Sappho's poem of love-pains to describe his own affair with Lesbia. Yet Catullus rejects the role of faithful translator: poem 66 is a literal translation because Catullus is in mourning, and unable to be more creative. Poem 51 is composed in a time of *otium*; it is a leisurely pursuit that Catullus calls an end to in the final four lines of the poem, and in the culmination we see that the translation was a platform for Catullus' declaration of poetic voice. In this facet poem 51 stands as symbolic step away from the need for translation.

Horace uses the source only as his opening. When he takes Archilochus as his model for the *iambi*, Horace subverts the genre by turning the attack of the poem on his own behaviour. The implication of the subversion is that we are to read Horace the iambist through an Archilochean lens and constantly contrast the translation with source. When his model is Alcaeus, he associates himself with the poet via a short tag translation that he follows with Roman aspects that move the poem, and the genre itself, from Greece to Rome. In the *Epodes* Horace establishes his poetic identity via separation from the source; in the *Odes*, via the embodiment of the Greek source that permits Horace to displace his model from the canon of nine lyricists.

Allusive translation does not function as a platform for poetic voice if the audience is not familiar with the source material. Roman translators operate on the expectation that their audience is well-versed already, and thus do not "require" a translation. Horace can thus meet every expectation of the audience that is inspired by some degree of faithful translation with either personalization or perhaps subversion. Nowhere among the Roman translation modalities that I describe is this perceived more than here among the allusive translators.

6 Cicero and Independent Translation

Throughout my study of Roman translation practices I define the translation modalities as a category of relationship with the source that the translator promotes. Source-representative translators position themselves as authorities of the source and downplay the notion of alterations or of translator-freedom in the translation. The allusive translator presents his material as the continuation of the source, positioning himself as following in a tradition while ultimately promising a greater achievement. The style of translation evident in Cicero's treatment of Greek philosophy differs from the allusive and the source-representative modalities in that the translator undermines the authority of the source in the target culture in favour of his own self-promotion. In Cicero, the explicit self-promotion aspect is necessitated by critics who question the value of philosophical translations. To alleviate the concerns of his critics Cicero regularly reminds his audience of his authoritative hand in the translation, both in the translations themselves and in the programmatic statements that function as prologues to the works.

The most efficient way to determine how a translator perceives his association with the source is through the study of programmatic statements. While clearly tendentious, these declarations are indicative of how a translator views his work vis-à-vis the source text and author. Most of the programmatic remarks on translation in Rome come from Cicero's philosophical treatises; indeed, Cicero is so direct and open about his translation methodology that his comments are often taken as indicative of Roman thought as a whole. Yet evaluating Roman translation theory based on Cicero's remarks is problematic: Cicero's reflexive commentary on his translations of Stoic philosophy is usually of a defensive nature. Several of

his philosophical texts¹ began with lengthy prologues that describe why Cicero has undertaken the translation. The defensive statements in Cicero's writings are remarkable for their rarity among Latin translations. The self-justifying stance suggests that Cicero and those around him recognized certain limits to translation. While Catullus identifies that translations could not serve his poetic aims, the function and limit of translations that he follows are self-imposed. His audience, to judge from the requests made, was receptive to translations: in poem 65 his friend Hortalus requests the translation of Callimachus that is poem 66. In Cicero's philosophical translations the reverse is true: it appears that his audience does not seek translations of Greek philosophy, and Cicero defends the practice of translation against his critics.

On the other hand, the defensive nature is surprising in that translations among the Romans are a traditional means of self-promotion since allegiance with a source serves as validation of the author. As I have shown above, among poets of the epic genre, Ennius promotes himself by associating himself with Homer. Ennius does not argue why anyone should want a Latin poet who embodies the soul of Homer, but uses the transmigration of Homer's soul as validation of his own poetry.² Similarly, Terence does not excuse himself for not creating original material. Horace assumes that a Latin Alcaeus is a good for the Roman audience. None of these authors depicts an audience that considers these translations to be a waste of their time. Yet Cicero's prefaces indicate that he was criticized for wasting his time writing translations, and it is his responsibility to prove that he has done something new and worthwhile. He takes on this task not only in the formal response of the prefaces, but regularly throughout the body of the translation where Cicero consistently reminds the reader that he is an authoritative figure in the

¹ Most notably *de Finibus* but also *de Officiis*, *de Natura Deorum*, and *Lucullus*.

² See Chapter 2 above.

matter who is adding something to the translation.³ Ultimately, he demonstrates the worth of his task by comparing Greek and Roman practices and the Greek and Latin languages, by highlighting his skill in target-language word choice, and by emphasizing his role as arbiter.

6.1 Critical Remarks

Much of Cicero's theory of translation develops out of his response to his critics. Cicero opens *de Finibus* by listing four points that his critics have leveled against him. All are concerned with how Cicero is misusing his time.⁴ Cicero lists the areas of censure one after the other (1.1):

Nam quibusdam, et iis quidem non admodum indoctis, totum hoc displicet philosophari. quidam autem non tam id reprehendunt si remissius agatur, sed tantum studium tamque multam operam ponendam in eo non arbitrantur. Erunt etiam, et ii quidem eruditi Graecis litteris, contemnentes Latinas, qui se dicant in Graecis legendis operam malle consumere. postremo aliquos futuros suspicor, qui me ad alias litteras uocent, genus hoc scribendi, etsi sit elegans, personae tamen et dignitatis esse negent.

For to certain people (and certainly these people are not entirely unlearned), philosophy is entirely displeasing. While there will be some who do not so much disapprove of it if it is pursued mildly, they do not think that much devotion and care should be placed in it. And there will be those (and certainly these people are learned in Greek letters and look down upon Latin), who say that they would rather spend their time in reading Greek. Finally I suspect there will be others who call me to other forms of writing, and deny that this type of writing, although it may be tasteful, is of my character and worth.

³ Striker (1995: 56) argues that for Cicero and other philosophical writers, originality was not a concern since they were trying to show that their doctrine was founded in the theories of Socrates. She also claims that since Cicero could not have known that all of the Greek sources would be lost, he wrote only introductory texts that were to whet the appetite of the reader. That Cicero could not have foretold the loss of the Greek texts is true, but Cicero himself disagrees with the notion that his texts are introductory: he speaks against Varro for claiming to do this very thing (*Ac.* 1.2.4). Furthermore, he often remarks that a translation is so well done that the source is no longer needed (*Ac.* 1.2.12; *Fin.* 5.96). As to the former point of Striker, I do not think that associating with a tradition impedes the goal of originality. Horace shows himself as a Latin Alcaeus while simultaneously trying to displace at least the former from the poetic canon. Here Cicero may wish to associate himself with Socrates, but that association does not diminish how emphatically he argues his original contributions.

⁴ Cicero may here be answering judgments on his earlier works (I follow Powell's chronology [1995a: xiii-xvii]: Cicero wrote the Academic books *Catulus* and the *Lucullus* in May 45, the *de Finibus* in June 45 and revised the Academic books at the same time, *Tusculanae Disputationes* and *de Natura Deorum* in July–December of 45, *de Divinatione* and *Cato Maior de Senectute* in January to March 44, *de Fato*, *Laelius de Amicitia*, *de Gloria*, and *Topica* in April to November 44, and *de Officiis* in November of 44). Glucker (2012: 51-52) indicates that some of Cicero's remarks on translation were reactions to those who criticized his Academic books.

The four groups of critics are: those who disapprove of philosophy entirely; those who would see the study of philosophy limited; those who do not see a reason why Latin translations of philosophy need exist; those who want Cicero to write something other than philosophy. Before moving on to how Cicero answers these objections, it is worth observing the scenario that Cicero constructs here. By claiming that he is criticized for his actions, he depicts himself as going against the attitude of his peers. He is translating against their wishes, making inaccessible Greek texts more broadly available.⁵ He does not provide the names of his critics other than to say that Hortensius' bitter attack on philosophy caused Cicero to write a defence of philosophy, the no-longer extant *Hortensius*. The identity of the critics remains undefined in Cicero's texts, but it is most likely that Cicero aims the defensive remarks themselves at his primary audience, who are peers learned enough to judge the quality of the translation. As Glucker (2012: 48–52) argues, the remarks that Cicero makes while translating particular Greek terms would be significant only to readers who were aware of the significance of the Greek word.⁶ By depicting the criticisms against his work he presents himself as a popularizer of Greek texts.⁷ In his popularization of source material Cicero is like John Trevisa and Martin Luther, both of whom criticized Church

⁵ In the opening to *de Officiis* (1.1) Cicero raises the point that the work may be a great service (a *magnum adiumentum*) to those who are *rudes* in respect to Greek literature. Yet this goal seems like an afterthought, for immediately after stating that he may help those who are *Graecarum litterarum rudes*, he posits that he will benefit the *docti* (*Quam quidem ad rem nos, ut uidemur, magnum attulimus adiumentum hominibus nostris, ut non modo Graecarum litterarum rudes, sed etiam docti aliquantum se arbitrentur adeptos et ad dicendum et ad iudicandum*). The latter group is his real target here; the *docti* will be the ones who might think that they have gained in speaking and judgment after they read the *de Officiis*.

⁶ For example, when he translates *πάθος* as *perturbatio animi* in *de Finibus* (3.35), he says that he could have translated the Greek literally by using the Latin word *morbus*, but the Latin word does not properly cover the necessary range of meanings. These remarks are most interesting to the members of the audience who are familiar with the Greek sources and understand the process of rendering Greek philosophy into Latin that Cicero is undertaking in his translation.

⁷ Habinek (1998: 67) takes the view that Cicero succeeded in “widening the circle of self-conscious, interconnected elites” by “expanding the commonwealth of the Romans and making that wealth available to later and larger groups of readers.” Habinek may be following too closely the narrative that Cicero imposes.

translators for writing translations which failed to bridge the gap between the target audience and the foreign text.⁸ While Cicero hints that the desired audience is outside of his immediate peer circle,⁹ before he can reach that group he needs to earn the approval of those around him. Indeed, the passage indicates a characteristic of the detractors: they are all presumed to have some degree of education. Even the first group of cynics in this passage, those who have nothing to do with philosophy, are not entirely unlearned (*non admodum indoctus*); Cicero does not depict himself being censured by the mass populace of Rome. He constructs the scenario that his writing must earn the approval of the learned reader before reaching a wider audience.

The most problematic barrier for Cicero the translator is the third point that he depicts, namely that there are those who are learned in Greek and who deny the value of having Greek texts in Latin. To dispute the first, second, and fourth objection Cicero needs to show to those who either do not approve of or would limit philosophical inquiry why the study of philosophy is valuable. Cicero does not devote much time to proving this point in any one of his philosophical translations; many members of his learned audience, such as Varro,¹⁰ Atticus,¹¹ and Brutus¹² are familiar with the benefits of philosophy already. The third objection is more complicated because it demands that Cicero show how a Roman, and Cicero in particular, can benefit the target

⁸ See Chapter 1 above.

⁹ He claims in *de Finibus* (1.10) that he will work to make his fellow citizens wiser by his efforts.

¹⁰ Varro wrote his own text on philosophy, the *de Philosophia*. The text is no longer extant, but it discussed the various schools of philosophy.

¹¹ Rawson (1985: 100–102) downplays Atticus' interests in philosophy, observing that Cicero never makes Atticus the voice of the Epicureans in any dialogue. Rawson argues that Atticus was more interested in Cicero's rhetorical treatises, on oratory in general, and, to judge from a treatise on Greek accents by Tyrannio that was dedicated to him (*Att.* 12.6.2), the Greek language. She makes the interesting point that Atticus was more interested in trying to find a way to express Greek concepts in Latin than he was in debating philosophical doctrine, as the words of his character in the *Academica* (1.14, 18, 25, 41) and *de Finibus* (5.96) indicate. Furthermore, there is the implied exchange between Cicero and Atticus in the letters (*Att.* 16.14.3) about the proper naming of the treatise *de Officiis*. Nevertheless, Atticus regularly appears familiar with philosophical studies.

¹² Cicero compliments Brutus on being able to translate so well that the Greek sources will no longer be needed (*Ac.* 1.12).

culture by translating Greek philosophy. The third criticism reveals the crux of the problem with Cicero writing translations of philosophy: while Roman aristocrats accepted the study of philosophy, there are limits placed upon the display of philosophical engagement. Therefore, while Cicero is able to respond to the questioning of philosophy's value by alluding to Rome's tradition with philosophers and the customs of well-known and respected Romans, the rebuttal of the third misgiving about his task influences nearly every aspect of Cicero's philosophical writing.¹³

6.1.1 Philosophical Study

The issue that Cicero identifies in his list of critics is the Roman aristocratic practice of limiting the display of philosophical learning. The practice itself develops out of the growth in Hellenism that occurred in the late third and second century BCE. As Gruen (1992: 84–85) observes, the growth in Hellenism resulted from Roman generals returning from Greek cities with Greek art and Greek artists: Marcellus returned from the sack of Syracuse with paintings and statues; Lucius Scipio brought home with him Greek craftsmen from Greek Asia; Marcus Fulvius Nobilior returned to Rome with the spoils from the temples of Ambracia. Greeks also came to the city and served as household tutors. Livius Andronicus was brought from Tarentum and Cato the Elder had a Greek tutor in his house, although he reportedly did not use him in educating his son (Plut. *Cato*. 20.3–5). Ennius (Suet. *De Gramm.* 1) taught at Rome in both Latin and Greek, in both private and public settings. Plautus, meanwhile, presented Greek plays on Roman stages.

¹³ Cicero answers all of these points not only in *de Finibus*, but also in his other works. For convenience I draw together his rebuttals from his various treatises under each point of contention.

The period also is also notable for the visits that Greek philosophers made to Rome. The Stoic Crates of Mallos came to Rome as an envoy, but after breaking his leg remained in the city and offered lectures (Suet. *de Gramm.* 2). The Stoic Panaetius came to Rome and stayed with Laelius and Scipio, men both of the so-called Scipionic Circle. In his youth Cicero met the visiting Epicurean Phaedrus (Cic. *Fam.* 13.1.2) and the Stoic Posidonius (Plu. *Mor.* 45.4).¹⁴ In a later generation the younger Cato urged the Stoics Antipater and Athenodorus to come to Rome (Plin. *Nat.* 7.113).

The visits of foreign teachers seem to have resulted in the practice of Roman youth going abroad for their education. By the generation of Cicero and Caesar,¹⁵ foreign study had become an accepted part of a youth's upbringing for those who could avail themselves of it. Primarily, young Roman aristocrats went to the East for rhetorical training: Cicero went to Rhodes to study with Apollonius Molon (*Brut.* 314), as did Caesar (Suet. *DJ* 2.4); Crassus visited Charmadas, Cleitomachus, and Aeschines of the Academy, but also Mnesarchus of the Stoa and the Peripatetic Diodotus (Cic. *de Orat.* 1.145–7, 2.365, 3.75); Marcus Brutus worked at Athens with two rhetors (*Brut.* 332); Cassius (Appian *BC* 4.67) studied literature in the school of Archelaus; Antony studied rhetoric in Greece (Plut. *Ant.* 2.4). Yet these men also heard the lectures of philosophers while abroad: in Athens Cicero heard the Academic Antiochus (*Fin.* 1.5), and the Epicureans Phaedrus and Zeno (*Fin.* 1.16; *Tusc.* 3.38); Brutus worked with the Academic Aristus

¹⁴ Cicero calls Posidonius a close friend (*Noster Posidonius, quem et ipse saepe uidi, Tusc.* 2.61; *In primisque familiarem nostrum Posidonium, Fin.* 1.6)

¹⁵ Rawson (1985: 7-11) argues that the Mithridatic Wars marked a substantial increase in Romans studying abroad. She speaks of Cicero and Caesar as leaders of a "newish fashion" as they go to the East to study from rhetors. Cicero went abroad in 79 BCE, and Caesar in 75. Rawson (10) argues that in the generation after Caesar and Cicero it was almost obligatory for aristocratic youth to study abroad, citing the studies of Marcus Brutus, Cassius, Antony, and the anonymous pupil from Cicero's *Tusculanae Disputationes*.

(*Brut.* 332), and when he returned to the East after the assassination of Caesar, he heard the Academic Theomnestus and the Peripatetic Cratippus (Plut. *Brut.* 24).

However, the other side of the increase in Hellenism is the Roman desire to define Roman culture as unique. As Gruen argues (1990: 169) the embracing of Hellenic intellectual imports at the individual level resulted in a need felt by the community to “define itself as distinct from those imports.” A number of decrees from this period suggest that Roman self-definition came at the expense of the Hellenic community. In 173 BCE¹⁶ two Epicurean teachers were expelled from Rome for teaching. In 161 the Senate authorized the urban praetor Marcus Pomponius to purge Rome of all philosophers and rhetors (Suet. *Rhet.* 1; Gell. 15.11). These decrees characterize the Senate as hostile to Greek philosophical teaching in Rome.

The most notorious anti-Hellene is Cato the Elder,¹⁷ though recently Sciarrino (2011) has convincingly argued that Cato’s remarks were inspired less by an actual hate of all things Greek than his own desire to promote himself. The traditional account of Cato’s anti-Hellenism is partially based on an event in 155, when a trio of philosophers came to Rome as ambassadors. Cato was famously unreceptive to the display put on by Carneades. Both Plutarch (*Cat. Ma.*

¹⁶ Gruen (1990: 177) dates the event to 154 BCE.

¹⁷ Plutarch (*Cat. Ma.* 12.5) reports that Cato said that the words of Greek orators came from their lips, those of Romans from their hearts, that he was wholly hostile to Greek philosophy (23.1). According to Pliny, Cato called the Greeks as a useless and ignorant race (*nequissimum et indocile genus*, *Nat.* 29.14), warned that learning from the Greeks would cause the Romans to lose control of their own affairs (*Nat.* 29.14), and that he even called for the expulsion of all Greeks from Italy (*Nat.* 7.113), though how he thought the Senate could carry out the lattermost is unclear. Both Astin (1978) and Gruen (1992) consider the issue of Cato’s anti-Hellenism in detail. The issue that both identify is that despite Plutarch’s reporting of Cato as completely hostile to Greek learning, he appears to have himself been well-versed in Greek studies. Plutarch (12.5) writes that Cato could have delivered a speech to the Athenian assembly in 191 BCE in Greek, had he chosen to do so. Gruen (57) remarks that Cato often makes allusions in his own writings that require familiarity with Greek legends, learning and tradition, and that Cato promoted Ennius’ migration to Rome in his early stages and was later in life associated with Polybius. Gruen (76-80) concludes that the work dedicated to his son, in which all of Cato’s most immoderate remarks on the Greeks can be found, was not aimed at his son but at a much wider audience. To a wide audience, then, Cato was trying to promote Roman culture as “distinct from and not subordinate to Greek culture.”

22.1) and Pliny (*Nat.* 7.112) report that Cato urged the Senate to expel the embassy because nobody could tell when Carneades was speaking the truth, so adept at speaking both sides of an argument was he, and also (or) because Cato was concerned that the youth of Rome would be influenced by Carneades to turn their attention to speaking, rather than doing.

Nevertheless, Carneades' lecture was popular among Romans who were interested in philosophy. Plutarch relates (*Cat. Ma.* 22) that the most philosophically inclined young men attended the lectures of the philosophers and were fascinated by them (εὐθὺς οὖν οἱ φιλολογώτατοι τῶν νεανίσκων ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἵεντο καὶ συνῆσαν, ἀκροώμενοι καὶ θαυμάζοντες αὐτούς). Plutarch (*Cat. Ma.* 22) depicts Cato as alone in his negativity towards the lecture:

ταῦτα τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις ἤρεσκε Ῥωμαίοις γινόμενα, καὶ τὰ μεράκια παιδείας Ἑλληνικῆς μεταλαμβάνοντα καὶ συνόντα θαυματομένοις ἀνδράσιν ἡδέως ἐώρων. ὁ δὲ Κάτων ...

These events were pleasing to the other Romans, who looked happily upon the young taking part in Greek education and associating with wondrous men. But Cato, on the other hand

Whether they attended due to general curiosity or because they were philosophically inclined, Romans were present at the lectures offered by the Athenian ambassadors. Yet as Sciarrino argues (2013: 4) as a *nouus homo* Cato need to promote his own heritage in a way that would support him in a position of power. While Cato was able to achieve offices, Sciarrino observes that the advantages held by the *nobiles* were not available to him. Sciarrino argues that Cato “negotiated his successful career as an ‘insider outsider’ by projecting on his Sabine origins the old greatness of Rome in a countering move to the influence of Greek culture, particularly among the *nobiles*, whose ranks were beginning to associate with Greek poets. Cato depicts Greek culture as alien and corrupting in order to strengthen his own claim to the advantages of

the *nobiles*. In Sciarrino's analysis, Cato is less of an outsider in his approach to Hellenism than tradition reports. Indeed, Gruen (1992) argues against the tradition that Romans were divided into camps over their Hellenic interests and instead contends that Romans were consistent in the posture towards Greek learning. For the Romans, "command of Greek learning was not only respectable but fundamental in projecting Rome's own cultural ascendancy" (Gruen 1992: 270). In Gruen's analysis, "token expulsions" of philosophers were not meant to curb philosophy, but to "assure the community's role as custodian of Roman traditions." As Gruen observes, in response to the growth of Hellenism Roman aristocrats developed a proper manner in which to display their Hellenic interests.

It is the system of obscuring Hellenic interests that Cicero is arguing against. Cicero's questioning of the aristocrat's practice is evident in *de Oratore*. In this work Cicero positions philosophy as a valuable form of knowledge while advocating that Romans no longer obscure their familiarity with the subject.¹⁸ He phrases his appeal on philosophy's behalf in terms of philosophy's benefit to the orator. All of the interlocutors of the *de Oratore* ¹⁹ agree in the belief that philosophy, as a mechanism for gaining knowledge, is instrumental in the development of an orator. In his introduction to the discussion, Cicero situates philosophy as the *procreatrix* and *parens* of all of the praiseworthy arts (1.9). He subsequently says to Quintus (1.6.20) that all orators require the knowledge derived from philosophical training: *Ac, mea quidem sententia, nemo poterit esse omni laude cumulatus orator, nisi erit omnium rerum magnarum atque artium*

¹⁸ As Fantham (2004: 53-54) identifies, Cicero's *de Oratore* was part of his attempt to "enlist Greek education" in service of the *mos maiorum* and to "reconcile the quarrel between philosophers and rhetoricians by arguing for a new, Roman, synthesis of philosophical and rhetorical training." My focus is on the particular stances of Lucius Crassus and Marcus Antonius, but Fantham's analysis reminds us that Cicero structures the entire dialogue as a mechanism for the acceptance of Greek learning.

¹⁹ Interestingly, in the view afforded a modern audience, the *de Oratore* serves as something of an advance warning of what Cicero's future writings will focus on since *de Oratore* predates the rest of Cicero's philosophical treatises.

scientiam consecutus (“And, in my opinion, no one will be able to be an orator who is heaped in praise, unless he will have obtained a knowledge of all the great subjects and arts”). Cicero believes that philosophy exposes its students to a wealth of knowledge that is important for an orator to have. The issue of philosophical familiarity peaks after Cicero opens the second book by discrediting the belief of some that Lucius Crassus had only dabbled in learning (*doctrinae*), and that Marcus Antonius was entirely unlearned (*omnino omnis eruditionis expertem atque ignarum fuisse*, 2.1). Cicero and his brother, due to their familiarity with Crassus’ teachers, knew that this was not the case, that Crassus spoke Greek as if it was his only language and could discuss topics with the teachers so well that it seemed he was familiar with all matters (2.2). Furthermore, the Ciceros learned from their uncle how Antonius had devoted himself to conversation with the most learned at both Athens and Rhodes (2.3).

Cicero recognizes one important difference between Crassus and Antonius: Crassus wished to have the appearance of one who had learning, especially Greek learning, but simultaneously looked down upon it (2.4).²⁰ Antonius, however, thought his speeches would be more acceptable to a Roman audience if it was believed that he had never studied at all (2.4).²¹ Cicero’s summarizing comment about the two is telling for the way Romans perceived their relationship to the Greeks and their learning: *Atque ita se uterque grauorem fore, si alter contemnere, alter ne nosse quidem Graecos uideretur* (“Thus each thought he would be more important, the one if he seemed to think little of the Greeks, the other if he seemed not even to know them”). Antonius himself is made to say as much in the course of the dialogue (2.153), but asserts that to have ignored Greek learning would have been inhuman, and thus his strategy was

²⁰ *Crassus non tam existimari uellet non didicisse, quam illa despicere, et nostrorum hominum in omni genere prudentiam Graecis anteferre.*

²¹ *Antonius autem probabiliorem hoc populo orationem fore censebat suam, si omnino didicisse nunquam putaretur.*

not to listen to the Greeks openly, but secretly. Gruen (1992: 268) argues that the stance of Antonius is typical of the Roman aristocrat. For Gruen, Antonius in Cicero reflects the notion that “the Hellenism of a Roman aristocrat needs to be worn lightly.” However, Cicero calls into question their approach when his character Quintus Catulus attacks Antonius’ strategy, observing that Antonius approaches philosophy as if he approaches some rock of temptation (*aliquem libidinis scopulum*, 2.154). Catulus points out that ever since Numa became associated with the Pythagoreans, philosophy has never been scorned in Rome.²² Furthermore, Publius Africanus, Gaius Laelius and Lucius Furius are among the most illustrious men of Rome and they were all surrounded by Greek men of learning.²³ Cicero’s Catulus disputes the idea that Roman aristocrats should obscure their familiarity with philosophy. In Cicero’s defence of philosophy, he appears to be arguing against the very attitude that Gruen identifies as a consistent stance among Roman aristocrats. Cicero contends that Romans should not conceal their familiarity with philosophy, but openly reveal it.

6.1.2 Newfound freedom

Cicero’s translations are problematic in the socio-literary conditions of his time, in part because they reveal a serious engagement with the subject of philosophy, but also because they suggest that Romans need something from the Greeks. McElduff (2013: 101–103) argues that while Cicero’s translations were partially inspired by his urge to improve the status of Latin

²² Cicero does not believe in the legend himself, but he is willing to cite the existence of the legend as proof that Romans have accepted philosophy.

²³ Cicero was aware that his portrayal of famous Roman statesmen as philosophers might lead to complaints from his audience. In the *Lucullus* (2.5) he expresses his worry that he may diminish the fame of his interlocutors when in fact he is trying to magnify it. Cicero blames those who do not like Greek literature and the even greater number of people who disdain philosophy. Beyond these people are those who think that philosophical discussions are unbecoming of Roman statesmen. Cicero falls back on the practice of Publius Africanus for support; Scipio, Cicero writes, traveled with the Stoic Panaetius as the sole member of his staff. Cicero dismisses those who deny that these Romans were learned in philosophy by accusing them of jealousy (2.2.7).

literature, “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” (101). Cicero must prove to his critics that the writing of his translations is worth his time and the reading of them worth theirs. The easiest way that Cicero can answer charges of misuse of time is by alluding to the fact that he has much more free time now that he has been forced out of public duty. In the opening to *Tusculanae Disputationes* (1.1), Cicero explains his free time:

*Cum defensionum laboribus senatoriisque muneribus aut omnino aut magna ex parte essem aliquando liberatus, rettuli me, Brute, te hortante maxime ad ea studia, quae retenta animo, remissa temporibus, longo interuallo intermissa revocaui*²⁴

When I was finally freed from all, or at least a great part of my work of advocacy and my senatorial duties, and with you urging me, Brutus, I returned to those studies which were kept back in memory, put aside by necessity, and are now revived after a long period of interruption.

His explanation in the *Academica* (1.11) is similar while looking towards the potential benefit of Cicero's writing:

Ego autem (dicam enim ut res est), dum me ambitio dum honores dum causae, dum rei publicae non solum cura sed quaedam etiam procuratio multis officiis implicatum et constrictum tenebat, animo haec inclusa habebam et ne obsolescerent renouabam cum licebat legendo; nunc uero et fortunae grauissimo percussus uulnere et administratione rei publicae liberatus doloris medicinam a philosophia peto et otii oblectationem hanc honestissimam iudico. aut enim huic aetati hoc maxime aptum est, aut his rebus si quas dignas laude gessimus hoc in primis consentaneum, aut etiam ad nostros ciues erudiendos nihil utilius, aut si haec ita non sunt nihil aliud uideo quod agere possimus

²⁴ Dyck (1996: 362) contrasts this passage with similar comments in the *de Officiis* (2.2), and *de Divinatione* (2.6-7). While in these latter sections Cicero acts as if the study of philosophy was something of a sore substitute for the political life, here he speaks of being liberated (*liberatus*) from the toils (*laboribus*) of public life. I hesitate to use any of these passages as indicators of how Cicero really felt about his forced withdrawal from the public. In all instances he is more concerned with validating his use of time, not in providing insight. The public image that Cicero presents is one of a hard-working servant of the Republic who now has no choice but to turn his mind to other affairs.

But I (for I shall speak as the matter is), while my ambition, public offices, cases, while not only the care but also the administration of the republic held me bound and confined by many duties, I kept these (studies) closed off in my mind and lest they fade away I used to revive them with some reading when I had the time; but now, since I have been struck by a painful wound of fate and freed from the management of the republic, I seek a cure for my pain from philosophy and I consider this to be the most reputable delight of my free time. For either this is very suited to my time of life, or it is especially consistent with those matters if we have done anything worthy of praise, or also there is nothing more useful for educating our citizens, or if these things are not so, I see nothing else that I can do.

An account of Cicero's free time is a regular feature of his philosophical writings; in *De Officiis* (2.2) Cicero explains what happened when Caesar took over the Republic and he was forced out of active politics.²⁵ The account of current free time might be accompanied by a defense of effort during active duty in Cicero, as in *de Officiis* (2.4).

Cui cum multum adulescens discendi causa temporis tribuissem, posteaquam honoribus inseruire coepi meque totum rei publicae tradidi, tantum erat philosophiae loci, quantum superfuerat amicorum et rei publicae temporibus; id autem omne consumebatur in legendo, scribendi otium non erat.

To which (philosophy) while I was a young man I had assigned much of my time so that I could become familiar with it, but after I began to serve in positions of power I gave myself entirely to the Republic, and there was only so much time for philosophy as was left over from the troubles of my friends and the Republic; but this time was entirely spent in reading, there was not spare time for writing.

Cicero explains that he is making good use of his time since philosophy is a good, and Cicero turns his misfortune in the public sphere into what he believes to be a benefit to his fellow

²⁵ *Ego autem quam diu res publica per eos gerebatur, quibus se ipsa commiserat, omnes meas curas cogitationesque in eam conferebam. Cum autem dominatu unius omnia tenerentur neque esset usquam consilio aut auctoritati locus, socios denique tuendae rei publicae summos uiros amissem, nec me angoribus dedidi, quibus essem confectus, nisi iis restitsem, nec rursus indignis homine docto uoluptatibus* ("But I, as long as the Republic was being governed by those men to whom she had committed herself, I directed all of my attention and thought to her; but when everything was controlled by the absolute rule of one and there was no place for my counsel or authority, and I finally lost the friends who were to protect the Republic, men of the highest standing, I did not surrender myself to my distress, by which I would have been destroyed, if I had not resisted it, nor, on the other hand, did I surrender myself to pleasures unworthy of a learned man"). Cicero explains (2.3) that he wishes that the Republic had stood, because if it had he would still be devoted to public speaking, and not writing. Even if he were limited to writing, he would be writing down his public speeches as he used to. Sallust (*Cat.* 4.1; see pp. 139-140 above) has a similar argument that the author is turning his removal from politics into a benefit for the Republic.

citizens.²⁶ For while he recognizes that writing philosophy has provided him with comfort (*existimaui honestissime molestias posse deponi, si me ad philosophiam rettulissem, Off. 2.4*), he proposes that he has achieved some good in making the unfamiliar familiar in his writings (*boni assecuti uidemur, ut ea litteris mandaremus, quae nec errant satis nota nostris et errant cognitione dignissima, 2.5*).²⁷ Cicero projects the notion that he looks beyond his immediate audience to those who have never had contact with the source work.

Not only does Cicero use philosophical writing to fill the *otium* he now experiences, but also to combat harmful emotions. Cicero's first philosophical work was his *Consolatio*, a work addressed to himself (now lost). Cicero wrote this work in 45 BCE, the same year that his daughter Tullia died. The death of Tullia was the catalyst for Cicero's philosophical output,²⁸ which was significant in the final two years of his life.²⁹ As a reaction to the death of his daughter, the writing of philosophy is the better alternative to inactivity or general *angores*. In writing philosophy Cicero can hope to produce something useful, or achieve an end.

To those that disapprove of his translation activity Cicero answers that he has the time to spare. Yet Cicero does not present his translations as products of waste, but as something potentially beneficial. In order to argue their worth, Cicero promotes the value of philosophy, but

²⁶ In *Div* 2.6-7 Cicero explains again that philosophy is a substitute for politics.

²⁷ After this statement Cicero again questions what could be better than wisdom in his defence of philosophy. He cuts the defence short here, stating that he had only meant to answer why, after being deprived of service to the Republic, he turned to philosophy (*cur, orbat rei publicae muneribus, ad hoc nos studium potissimum contulissemus, 2.6*).

²⁸ A series of letters to Atticus depict Cicero in a state of grief (12.13, 14, 15, 16, 18 [= SB 250, 251, 252, 253, 254]); in one (12.14) he reveals that he has taken to writing as a means of consolation (*quin etiam feci, quod profecto ante me nemo, ut ipse me per litteras consolaretur*) and that he writes all day long. Another letter (12.15) indicates that this practice of writing is failing in its purpose, for Cicero claims that he spends the day hidden in the woods, and when he tries to read he is interrupted by fits of weeping.

²⁹ From 45 BCE to 43 BCE, Cicero wrote the *Academica*, *de Finibus*, *Tusculanae Disputationes*, *Hortensius*, *Consolatio*, *de Natura Deorum*, *de Divinatione*, *de Fato*, *Cato Maior de Senectute*, *Laelius de Amicitia*, *de Gloria*, and *de Officiis*.

more importantly he emphasizes that his translations will improve upon the source in such a way that Romans will no longer need to rely on the Greeks in this area of learning. Cicero is required to promote the value of philosophical translations because, as the passages above show, he has no other recourse for promoting himself in the Republic now that he has been forced out.

6.1.3 Defence of philosophy

The first criticism that Cicero lists in the opening of *de Finibus* requires a defence of philosophy. The second criticism that Cicero answers to are those who wish to put limits on the study of philosophy (*Fin.* 1.2–3). The third criticism is that translations of philosophy have no value to Romans since they prefer to read the source text. The fourth complaint presented by Cicero is that others wish him to write on some other subject. All of these complaints question Cicero's involvement with philosophy, and suggest that once Romans appropriated Hellenic culture they set boundaries on how they displayed their Hellenism.

Cicero's list of criticisms depicts his detractors as Roman aristocrats who seek to control the display of Hellenic familiarity. Cicero's response to those who would limit or outright banish the study of philosophy is short; indeed, in *de Finibus* he does not even respond to those who see no value in philosophy, instead stating that his defence in the *Hortensius* will suffice (*Fin.* 1.2). Yet to answer the concern that he is overstepping what is proper for him in his involvement with philosophy, Cicero reminds his audience of the long-standing tradition that Romans had with philosophy. In *Tusculanae Disputationes* (4.2.3),³⁰ he postulates that Romans have long

³⁰ Cicero does not defend philosophy in *de Finibus* because, as he claims, he sufficiently did so in the *Hortensius* (*quamquam philosophiae quidem uituperatoribus satis responsum est eo libro quo a nobis philosophia defensa et collaudata est cum esset accusata et uituperata ab Hortensio*). That work apparently was well-received, and Cicero takes this reception as an indicator that he should continue writing philosophy. That it apparently featured such a compelling defense for philosophy makes it unfortunate that the *Hortensius* exists for a modern audience only in fragments; Cicero does not revisit the topic in *de Finibus* again.

cultivated philosophy, a facet of Roman culture reflected in the association between Numa and Pythagoras.³¹ The study of philosophy is valuable and recognized as such by leading Romans, and therefore there is no logical reason to enforce limits upon the study. Cicero implies (*Fin.* 1.2–3) that the second crowd of opponents who recognize the good in philosophy but wish to see limits placed upon its study is less reasonable than the first, in that those who would set limits are trying to limit the unlimited and to stop a study that only gets better the further progressed. If a little philosophy does some good, Cicero argues that much philosophy will do much good.

The fourth grievance that Cicero lists in the opening to *De Finibus* is that some wished he would write in fields other than philosophy. Since Cicero has shown that philosophy is useful, and perhaps more importantly that Romans have long accepted it as such, it is relatively easy to answer those who want him to write on a different subject. Cicero asks for their patience while he turns his energy to philosophy, a request he feels comfortable with since he has already written so much, in fact more than any other Roman (1.11).³² He acknowledges that legal writings may be more marketable among his audience, but he calls philosophy the richer subject (*nam ut sint illa uendibilia, haec uberiora certe sunt*, 1.12). It is not clear how much faith one should put into this perceived criticism and outcry for Cicero's writings; in *de Legibus* (1.5-8)

³¹ Cicero mentions the connection between Pythagoras and the Romans, particularly with King Numa in *De Oratore* (2.154). Livy, Valerius Maximus, Pliny, Plutarch, and Lactantius all testify that Pythagorean instructions were found under the two stones of Janus. In 181 BCE the tomb of Numa was uncovered, and Pythagorean writings were found within the tomb (Liv. 40.29.3-14, Plin. *Nat.* 13.84-87, Plut. *Num.* 22.6-8). The Urban Praetor ordered the writings burned. Gruen (1990: 169-170) argues that the event was planned by the Romans to define themselves as distinct from cultural imports. The burning of the Pythagorean writings implies a distinct, native tradition in Rome. In the opening of book four of the *Tusculanae Disputationes* (4.2-3), Cicero again points out that the teachings of Pythagoras had spread throughout Italy, including Rome. Cicero is aware that Numa could not have been a disciple of Pythagoras since Numa died one hundred years before Pythagoras was born. Cicero even discredits the connection in his *de Republica* when Manilius asks Scipio Africanus for confirmation that Numa was a pupil of Pythagoras (2.28). Scipio calls the story an ignorant and absurd invention. Manilius is happy to hear that Roman culture developed from the native excellence of Romans. For Cicero, what is important is that Roman acceptance of philosophy is shown by the tradition of this association between Numa and Pythagoras, though he himself does not believe in that the truth of the legendary association.

³² *Qui autem alia malunt scribi a nobis, aequi esse debent, quod et scripta multa sunt, sic ut plura nemini e nostris.*

Atticus tells Cicero that there is a popular desire that Cicero write history, in the hope that the Romans could rival the Greeks in this genre of literature. Cicero refuses, on the grounds that he has no free time (1.8). Whether or not others were in truth urging Cicero to write on other subjects does not form a serious obstacle: by defending the study of philosophy from those who would either limit it or debar it completely, Cicero has already shown how philosophical writings are as important as any other type.

Cicero's defence of philosophy disputes those who would place limits on how they display familiarity with Hellenism. Cicero argues for more openness about Roman familiarity with philosophy, which would include translating the Greek sources into Latin and would result in Roman independence from the Greeks. Cicero devotes little time to arguing that philosophy is a valuable subject since his audience is already aware of the benefits of philosophy. What remains for Cicero to argue is why he is best suited to the task of popularizing Greek wisdom.

6.1.4 Critics of translation

Cicero's defense of philosophy is an important feature, but proving to his immediate audience that philosophy is useful is not a major hurdle to his project. Cicero is able to deflect the concerns of those who doubt the value of philosophy by indicating its value in the training of an orator and alluding to traditional Roman practice. His audience already knows the value of philosophy; it remains for Cicero to show why he specifically should write translations of philosophy. Cicero depicts his critics as learned individuals who have access to the Greek sources and so see no reason to have Latin versions. Indeed, Varro in Cicero's *Academica* serves as a mouthpiece for the notion that a translation is impractical and a waste of time (1.2.8):

nam cum philosophiam uiderem diligentissime Graecis litteris explicatam, existimaui 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.

For when I saw philosophy set out most carefully in Greek literature, I decided that if some Romans were possessed by zeal for philosophy, if they were learned in Greek they would rather read the Greeks than us, but if they shrank away from the Greek arts and education, they would care not even for those, since Greek things cannot be understood without learning. And thus I did not want to write that which the unlearned could not understand nor what the learned did not care to read.

Since Varro sees translating Greek texts as a misuse of his time, he sent his friends who wanted to learn philosophy to Greece so that they could drink from the fountain rather than seek out the rivulets.³³ Cicero's response in the *Academica* (1.2.10) suggests to Varro and the audience that it will be just as pleasurable³⁴ for a Roman to read Plato, Aristotle or Theophrastus translated as reading the words of Ennius, Pacuvius and Accius, poets who imitated Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides as they reproduced not the words but the meaning (*qui non uerba sed uim Graecorum expressunt poetarum*).³⁵ While Cicero considers no man *eruditus* if he is ignorant of

³³ *sed meos amicos in quibus est studium in Graeciam mitto id est ad Graecos ire iubeo, ut ex fontibus potius hauriant quam riuulos consecretur*, 1.8)

³⁴ The idea that hearing Greek philosophy translated into Latin was pleasurable occurs later in the *Academica* as well. Atticus (1.2.18), calling for Varro to expound the doctrine of the Old Academy, explains that he loves "our literature and our fellow countrymen profoundly, and I delight in the doctrines of your school when set forth in Latin and as you are setting them forth." The Atticus presented in Cicero's treatises was well familiar with the doctrines of the Old Academy; for him, it was pleasurable to hear Varro translate them into Latin.

³⁵ It may appear that Cicero's description of the Latin poets here is at odds with that in *de Finibus*: there Cicero interprets the poets as word-for-word translators, but here they are said to translate not the words, but the meaning. Reid (1968 [1925]: *ad loc*) argues that Cicero limits his criticism in *de Finibus* to only some inferior Latin plays by the word *fabellas*. Powell (1995b: 277) believes that in *de Finibus* Cicero is exaggerating the closeness of the poets' translations to contrast his own work. Jocelyn (1967: 27) rightly points out that the character of Cicero's argument in *de Finibus* "forces him to attribute less independence to the dramatic poets and more to himself than he does at *Ac.* 1.1-10." Any discrepancy between the two descriptions of poetic translation is a result of Cicero's emphasis. In *de Finibus* Cicero is separating his translations from those of the poets, here he is associating his theoretical translations of Plato, Aristotle or Theophrastus with the dramatic translations. The problem is not that he means something different in each instance, but that he establishes a different relationship with the translating poets in each circumstance.

his own literature,³⁶ he admits that he really need not worry about people who prefer to read the Greek versions of texts, provided that they actually do read the Greek (*Fin.* 1.10). The self-fashioned role that Cicero proposes is to serve either those who want the books in both languages, or those who might not perceive a need for the Greek if a Latin version is available.³⁷ The group that Cicero targets seems to value translations for the sake of translations. That is, they like having both Greek and Latin versions so that they can compare the two. Certainly, if the process of translation is a puzzle that needs to be solved, one could be amused by reading translations in comparison with their source and determining whether the translator “failed” or “succeeded” using some arbitrary means of judgment.

Yet Cicero identifies a larger goal than satisfying a curiosity in how he writes translations when he adds that those whom he serves may not have a need for the Greek versions once Latin ones are available. Here Cicero reveals his idea that a successful translation could replace the source, and the achievement of replacing the source is one that he credits to other Romans in select instances: Cicero compliments Brutus on having translated so well that he rendered the source worthless (*Ac.* 1.2.12). After Piso completes his speech on the tenets of the Academy in *De Finibus* both Cicero and Atticus compliment him on the proficient translation: Cicero declares (5.75) that if Piso could give more lectures of this sort then the Romans would have less need of the Greeks (*Et ego: Tu uero, inquam, Piso, ut saepe alias, sic hodie ita nosse ista uisus es, ut, si tui nobis potestas saepius fieret, non multum Graecis supplicandum putarem*). Atticus closes the discussion (5.96) by praising Piso for giving a talk he thought would have been

³⁶ Cicero suggests that his critical eye is superior to other Latin writers when he allows that some people have been disappointed in Latin literature because they have read bad pieces which are based on bad Greek books made even worse in Latin (*Fin.* 1.8). Cicero will avoid this issue by translating only the select items from the Greek world.

³⁷ ... *et iis seruire qui uel utrisque litteris uti uelint uel, si suas habent, illas non magno opera desiderant.*

impossible in Latin; moreover, he says that Piso did so as clearly as the Greeks (*quae enim dici Latine posse non arbitrabar, ea dicta sunt a te uerbis aptis nec minus plane quam dicuntur a Graecis*). In *Tusculanae Disputationes* (2.6), Cicero expresses his hope that once philosophical studies are transferred to the Romans there will be no need for Greek libraries (*Quod si haec studia traducta erunt ad nostros, ne bibliothecis quidem Graecis egebimus*); in *de Divinatione* (2.5) he observes how glorious it would be for the Romans not to require Greek philosophical texts (*Magnificum illud etiam Romanisque hominibus gloriosum, ut Graecis de philosophia litteris non egeant*) and places his own actions firmly in this movement towards independence (*quod adsequar profecto, si instituta perfecero*). What is necessary in this process of replacement is that those who know both choose the Latin over the Greek. It is the learned members of the audience who can prevent the Latin translations from replacing the source by refusing to stop using the source. Cicero aims his appeal throughout his philosophical translations at this group of experts.

To convince the learned audience who will be judging his work that his work will be a valuable replacement, Cicero must propose an additional benefit to the translation beyond the fact that there will be books on philosophy written in Latin. The translation must be better than the source, either by the strength of the translator or the weakness of the source. In *Tusculanae Disputationes* (1.24) Cicero shows his awareness of the situation:

(M) *Quid tibi ergo opera nostra opus est? num eloquentia Platonem superare possumus? evolue diligenter eius eum librum, qui est de animo: amplius quod desideres nihil erit.*

(A) *Feci mehercule, et quidem saepius; sed nescio quo modo, dum lego, adsentior; cum posui librum et mecum ipse de immortalitate animorum coepi cogitare, adsensio omnis illa elabitur.*

(M) So what do you need of us? For can we surpass Plato in eloquence? Read carefully that book of his on the soul: there will be nothing more that you need.

(A) Indeed I have, and often; I don't know why, but while I read I am in assent, but when I put down the book and I begin to think about the immortality of the soul, all that assent slips away.

At first Cicero acknowledges that he cannot hope to discuss the soul better than Plato had in the *Phaedo*. Yet the interlocutor convinces him otherwise, complaining that the lessons of Plato are fleeting. His interlocutor presents translation as an opportunity to improve upon the source. Thus as a justification for translation Cicero suggests that he can improve upon the source in terms of *eloquentia*, a description that suggests that Cicero's rhetorical training will be required if Latin translations are to replace Greek sources.

6.1.5 The language advantage

One of the ways in which Cicero answers the objection to translating philosophical texts is by proposing that Romans are better at discussing philosophy, and Latin is a better language for holding these discussions than Greeks and their language. A formulation of this belief is a regular feature of Cicero's writings: it appears in the opening to *Tusculanae Disputationes* when he confides to Brutus his belief that Romans have always shown more wisdom than the Greeks in making discoveries or in improving upon what they have taken up from the Greeks (1.1);³⁸ in *de Republica* (4.3.3) the character Scipio voices his opinion that Romans excel the Greeks in the practice of education. Cicero has Crassus proclaim Roman superiority in *de Oratore* (2.18) when he observes how the Greeks are so oblivious to their own tactlessness that they do not even have

³⁸ *non quia philosophia Graecis et litteris et doctoribus percipi non posset, sed meum semper iudicium fuit omnia nostros aut inuenisse per se sapientius quam Graecos aut accepta ab illis fecisse meliora, quae quidem digna statuissent, in quibus elaborarent. Nam mores et instituta uitae resque domesticas ac familiaris nos profecto et melius tuemur et lautius, rem uero publicam nostri maiores certe melioribus tempera uerunt et institutis et legibus.*

a name for the fault.³⁹ Yet the most important area of advantage over the source for Cicero is in language. Lucretius' lament⁴⁰ on the poverty of Latin (*sermonis egestas*, *DRN* 1.832)⁴¹ as a tool for the expression of philosophical concepts indicates how the position of Latin vis-à-vis Greek would have been a topic of contention among Latin translators. Cicero (*Tusc.* 2.35) concedes that Greek is richer, though perhaps not as copious as the Greeks would claim.

haec duo Graeci illi, quorum copiosior est lingua quam nostra, uno nomine appellant. itaque industrios homines illi studiosos uel potius amantis doloris appellant, nos commodius laboriosos: aliud est enim laborare, aliud dolere. o uerborum inops interdum, quibus abundare te semper putas, Graecia! aliud, inquam, est dolere, aliud laborare.

These two things (toil and pain) the Greeks, whose language is richer than ours, give one name. Thus they call diligent men devotees, or rather, lovers of pain, but we more fittingly call them toilers: for it is one thing to toil, another to feel pain. Oh Greece, how you sometimes are lacking in words in which you always think that you have an abundance! I say that to feel pain is one thing, to toil another.

The notion that Greek is the superior language could complement Cicero's argument: Greeks had superior tools at their disposal, but some did a poorer job in their naming of certain conditions. Romans, with lesser resources, had to overcome the shortcomings of their Greek predecessors. Yet Cicero is not comfortable with spreading the belief that Latin is inadequate for expressing Greek. If Cicero were to admit to the poverty of Latin he would undercut his premise that his translations were worthwhile since the Greek prose original would be superior to the translation on the grounds that the translation lacked the proper terminology. For Cicero to defend against the criticism that he outlines in his prologues he needs to answer the question of language

³⁹ *Hoc uitio cumulata est eruditissima illa Graecorum natio; itaque quod uim huius mali Graeci non uident, ne nomen quidem ei uitio imposuerunt; ut enim quaeras omnia, quo modo Graeci ineptum appellant, non reperies.*

⁴⁰ Pliny (*Ep.* 4.18) cites Lucretius as he laments his own attempt to translate some of Arrius Antoninus' Greek epigrams.

⁴¹ *nunc et Anaxagorae scrutemur homoeomerian / quam Grai memorant nec nostra dicere lingua / concedit nobis patrii sermonis egestas / sed tamen ipsam rem facilest exponere uerbis*, 830-833.

suitability, in the process taking a stance opposite to Lucretius. In *de Finibus* 1.10, for instance, he positions Latin as superior to Greek:

non est omnino hic docendi locus; sed ita sentio et saepe disserui, Latinam linguam non modo non inopem, ut uulgo putarent, sed locupletiore etiam esse quam Graecam.

This is not altogether the place for asserting it, but I believe, and I have often said so, that not only is the Latin language not lacking, as they generally think, but is even richer than the Greek language.

When Cato is concerned about using unfamiliar language, Cicero digresses into how much greater Latin is than Greek (*Fin.* 3.5): ⁴²

et quoniam saepe diximus, et quidem cum aliqua querela non Graecorum modo, sed eorum etiam, qui se Graecos magis quam nostros haberi uolunt, nos non modo non uinci a Graecis uerborum copia, sed esse in ea etiam superiores

Since we have often said, and even with some difference of opinion from not only Greeks but also those who want themselves to be thought of as Greeks rather than Romans, that not only are we not overcome by the Greeks in abundance of vocabulary, but even that we are their betters in this regard.

Often the superiority of Latin over Greek stems from the idea that Romans employ better and clearer naming practices. For instance, at *Tusc.* 3.11 Cicero makes the point that Romans distinguish between *insania* and *furor* while the Greeks have only the term μανία:

Graeci autem μανίαν unde appellent, non facile dixerim; eam tamen ipsam distinguimus nos melius quam illi. hanc enim insaniam, quae iuncta stultitiae patet latius, a furore disiungimus. Graeci uolunt illi quidem, sed parum ualent uerbo: quem nos furorem, μελαγχολίαν illi uocant

However, why the Greeks call it μανία, I could not easily say; nevertheless, we distinguish it better than they. For we separate this madness, which, associated with

⁴² Cato argues against the idea that Latin is better in these matters later on in *de Finibus* (*quod Zeno προηγμένον, contraque quod ἀποπροηγμένον nominauit, cum uteretur in lingua copiosa factis tamen nominibus ac nouis, quod nobis in hac inopi lingua non conceditur; quamquam tu hanc copiosiore etiam soles dicere*, 3.51). That Cicero depicts Cato voicing this sentiment is only testament to the widespread belief that Latin was unable to express Greek abstracts, and that Cicero long fought against this idea.

stupidity has a broader meaning, from fury. The Greeks wish (to make the distinction), but they lack the terminology: what we call fury, they call μελαγχολία.

A further passage in the *Tusculanae* follows the same sentiment, and it is a difference between Greek and Roman naming practices that Cicero is especially fond of pointing out.⁴³ The passage deals with how the Greeks speak of a πάθος: the Romans do better in separating bodily illnesses from *animi perturbationes* while the Greeks⁴⁴ group distresses of body and soul together (*Tusc.* 3.7):⁴⁵

Num reliquae quoque perturbationes animi, formidines, libidines, iracundiae? haec enim fere sunt eius modi, quae Graeci πάθη appellant; ego poteram 'morbos', et id uerbum esset e uerbo, sed in consuetudinem nostram non caderet. nam misereri, inuidere, gestire, laetari, haec omnia morbos Graeci appellant, motus animi rationi non obtemperantis, nos autem hos eosdem motus concitati animi recte, ut opinor, perturbationes dixerimus, morbos autem non satis usitate, nisi quid aliud tibi uidetur.

Do you also mean the other distresses of the mind, fear, lust, and anger? For these are generally of that group which the Greeks call πάθη; I might have called them *morbi*, and that would be a word-for-word translation, but it would not fall into our usage. For to feel pity, envy, exultation, joy, all these things the Greeks call *morbi*, that is, movements of the soul that are not submissive to reason; but we rightly, as I think, call these same movements of an agitated mind *perturbationes*, but we would not really call them *morbi* in ordinary usage, unless you think otherwise.

⁴³ Cicero makes the same point in *de Finibus* (3.35, *Nec uero perturbationes animorum, quae uitam insipientium miseram acerbamque reddunt, quas Graeci πάθη appellant – poteram ego uerbum ipsum interpretans morbos appellare, sed non conueniret ad omnia; quis enim misericordiam aut ipsam iracundiam morbum solet dicere? at illi dicunt πάθος* [Nor indeed the disturbances of the mind, which make the life of the foolish miserable and harsh, and what the Greeks call πάθη—interpreting the word itself, I could call them diseases, but that does not fit all uses; for who usually calls pity or anger itself a “disease”? But yet the Greeks call them πάθη]). Cicero uses the occasion also to differentiate himself from anyone who would translate πάθος as *morbos*. Cicero is not an *interpres* who translates πάθος as *morbos*.

⁴⁴ At least, Cicero claims that Greeks do this. Graver (2002: 79) points out that Cicero is overstating his case here; while πάθος can have medical contexts, it is generally a “broad and colorless term.” Nevertheless, as Graver concludes, Cicero here scores a point against those who would group emotional and physical distress together.

⁴⁵ The notion that Romans are better at naming things for what they really are also appears in *de Senectute*, wherein Cato commends the Romans for calling a gathering of friends a *conuiuium*, rather than, as the Greeks, sometimes a “drinking party” and sometimes a “dinner party” (*bene enim maiores accubitionem epularem amicorum, quia uitae coniunctionem haberet, conuiuium nominauerunt melius quam Graeci, qui hoc idem tum compotationem tum concenationem uocant, ut quod in eo genere minimum est, id maxime probare uideantur*; [For well did our ancestors call a banquet reclining of friends a *conuiuium*, because it implies a fellowship of life. They named it better than the Greeks, who sometimes call it a “drinking party” and sometimes a “dinner party”, so that they seem to approve most of all that which is the least important in that activity], 13.45)

He restates his case again in 3.10,⁴⁶ and again in 3.23:

hoc propemodum uerbo Graeci omnem animi perturbationem appellant; uocant enim πάθος, id est morbum, quicumque est motus in animo turbidus. nos melius: aegris enim corporibus simillima animi est aegritudo, at non similis aegrotationis est libido, non immoderata laetitia, quae est uoluptas animi elata et gestiens.

With nearly the same word the Greeks name every disturbance of the soul; for they call anything that is a wild movement of the soul a πάθος, that is a *morbus*. We do better: for an illness of the soul is most like an ill body, but lust is not similar to disease, nor is immoderate joy, which is a high exulting pleasure of the soul.

Cicero demonstrates that the Greek discussions are ineffective because of issues with their language; specifically here, they group too many disparate types of suffering under one word. Cato (*Fin.* 3.35) is made to observe the same phenomenon in the way that Greeks group both mental emotions and bodily feelings under the term ἡδονή, while in Latin Cicero has *laetitia* for pleasure of the mind. Similarly Cicero shows the richness of the Latin language when he observes (*Tusc.* 3.16) that while the Greeks have the descriptor σωφροσύνη, Latin has a variety of terms including *temperantia*, *moderatio*, *modestia*, and even *frugalitas*. The Greeks cannot be as precise in their discussion; the remedy is that Cicero has overcome the deficiency of Greek presentations of these topics.

The setting that Cicero uses for his dialogues further enforces Cicero's argument for Roman superiority. In *de Finibus* Cato sits in a Roman library that houses Greek books and becomes their only living representative; in book five Cicero depicts a group of Romans

⁴⁶ *qui est enim animus in aliquo morbo – morbos autem hos perturbatos motus, ut modo dixi, philosophi appellant – non magis est sanus quam id corpus quod in morbo est. ita fit ut sapientia sanitas sit animi, insipientia autem quasi insanitas quaedam, quae est insania eademque dementia; multoque melius haec notata sunt uerbis Latinis quam Graecis* (For the soul in some disease – as I have just said, philosophers calls these troubled movements “diseases” – is not more healthy than a body in disease is. Thus it is that wisdom is healthiness of the soul, but foolishness is a sort of madness, which is madness and at the same time folly; these things are observed much better by Latin words than Greek ones).

discussing philosophy in the Academy at Athens as if it were their old haunts. The Greeks survive only in books in Cicero's dialogues. No Greeks are to be found in either scene,⁴⁷ and thus the depiction appears to be a sign of cultural appropriation: Romans now philosophize where Greeks once wandered peripatetically. The settings function as a subtle reminder to the audience of the political reality that Rome now rules over Greece; Cicero suggests that the political situation can be transferred to the intellectual arena as well.

6.1.6 Cicero's qualifications

Cicero's assertion that the Romans are better at discussing philosophy than Greeks does not demonstrate why he is better prepared than other Romans for the task. Translation is a tool of self-promotion in the target culture, and in order to exercise the self-promotional aspect Cicero needs to indicate why he is an ideal translator. In order to show how his translations will be valuable to his audience and perhaps displace the source texts, Cicero demarcates what he does in translating, both in his programmatic statements and in the translations themselves. In the reproduction of foreign material, Cicero is the arbiter in what makes it to the target text.⁴⁸ He

⁴⁷ Cicero writes in the *de Finibus* scene at the Academy (5.1) that the group arranged to go to the Academy because they knew it would be quiet and deserted. When they arrive, the reality meets their expectations and the Academy is deserted (*Cum autem uenissemus in Academiae non sine causa nobilitata spatia, solitudo erat ea quam uolueramus*).

⁴⁸ Harris (1980: 377) argues that anyone who fully understands the source text "decode[s] the surface word strings into syntactic and semantic structures" when translating, but what differentiates translators is that "they must go further and interpret the linguistic structure by applying other knowledge so as to extract a cognitive message." Since a translator requires "other knowledge" to extract the message, the quality of the translation is tied to the degree that the translator has other knowledge. Harris contends that good translation relies on the translator encoding a supralinguistic message in the target language. Nord (1997: 25) looks to something similar in "rich points", which are the more complex elements of a text – the notions behind the writing of the text, for instance – that the translator must be aware of. Augustine (*de Doctrina Christiana* 3.1.1.) insists that the translator have knowledge of the two languages and of the subject matter, some skill in textual criticism, and care for accuracy. Cicero appears to understand that good translation depends on other knowledge when he cites his understanding of Epicurus' definition (or lack thereof) of pleasure in *de Finibus*. First he shows what the common understanding of the term *uoluptas* is (*Fin.* 2.6 and 2.8); then he stresses his knowledge of both Greek and Latin (2.12); he describes the proper Latin usage of the term *uoluptas* (2.14); he argues against Epicureans by providing counter-statements from other philosophers (2.16, 2.18, 2.19). Cicero's ability to translate and understand Epicurus relies on his knowledge of matters beyond the source text. In addition to having read Epicurus, he points to his familiarity with Greek and

does not make claims that he will be cautious in preserving the style or substance of the source.⁴⁹

The only position he takes is that he will mediate the source information, preserving what he approves, discounting what he disagrees with. In *de Finibus* he outlines what his concept of translation entails (*Fin.* 1.6):

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 conuersa de Graecis?

But what if we do not perform the service of translators, but protect those things which have been said by those men whom we approve of, and add to those things our judgment and arrangement of writing? What reasons do those critics have for preferring the Greek texts before those which are well-styled and not simple reproductions from the Greek sources?

He makes a statement that looks to a similar method in *De Officiis* (1.6) when he explains which philosophical school he will follow:

Sequemur 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 uidebitur, hauriemus.

Therefore, at this time and in this investigation we will follow primarily the Stoics, not as interpreters, but, as we are accustomed, we will drink from their fountain according to my own judgment and choice, as much and in what way as seems proper.

These proclamations at the opening of two different philosophical treatises establish that Cicero will translate the information that he identifies as appropriate for his audience, even changing the style and arrangement of the original if Cicero finds it unfitting,⁵⁰ or move between the doctrines

Latin, with proper Latin usage, and with other philosophical doctrines. Knowledge in all of these areas is required to extract and reproduce the cognitive message that Harris speaks of.

⁴⁹ Kelly (1979: 34-35) traces the longstanding notion that translators had no right to comment or interpret back to the Jewish translators of the Old Testament. Kelly (36) cites John Scotus Erigena's denial that "the translator had the right to avoid obscurities by using their own judgment" as a case of this notion expressed. Cicero and Romans in general stood outside of this tradition, but it is important to be aware how Cicero emphasizes his judgment in relation to other Roman writers who apparently did not utilize their own judgment, most notably the poets.

⁵⁰ The point on arrangement is an important one, for Cicero criticizes translators of Epicurus (Gaius Amafinius, for example) for their lack of care in this area when translating (*est enim quoddam genus eorum, qui se philosophos*

of the different schools as required.⁵¹ In some aspects, Cicero is not assuming more than is regular for a translator: all translators perform some kind of editorial function in the process of translation, even if it is only at the level of linguistic structure. Terence omits Greek facets of the original, such as Athenian deme names, which he considers meaningless to his audience. Cicero differentiates himself from customary practices like Terence's by being explicit about his authoritative role and promoting the application of his judgment as the benefit of his translation.⁵² He delineates what his active role as translator will entail; his declarations proclaim that he will not function as a passive agent for the source. By emphasizing his role at the outset, Cicero establishes why he is the ideal Roman translator of Greek philosophy. His active involvement promises that his audience will experience philosophy in a meaningful and understandable manner.

The role of Cicero's judgment leads to an important point of self-definition for Cicero. The opening passages of these treatises also show Cicero defining himself by making clear what he is not. Namely, he is not one of the *interpretes*.⁵³ When Cicero mentions the *interpretes* they

appellari uolunt, quorum dicuntur esse Latini sane multi libri, quos non contemno equidem, quippe quos numquam legerim; sed quia profitentur ipsi illi, qui eos scribunt, se neque distincte neque distribute neque eleganter neque ornate scribere, lectionem sine ulla delectatione negligo, [For there is a group of people who wish to be called philosophers, to whom many Latin books are attributed, and whom I do not altogether hate, for I have never read them; but because they themselves, who write them, declare that they write without definition or division or eloquence or style, I refuse a reading without any delight] *Tusc.* 2.7). Later in the treatise (4.6) Cicero credits the writings of Amafinius for the popularity of Epicureanism in Rome; Cicero does not decide whether the popularity was because the tenets were easy to grasp, or because the doctrine of pleasure was enticing, or because there was simply nothing else in Rome at that time, but he does claim that their arguments of these texts lack precision.

⁵¹ Cicero makes the claim several times that as a New Academic he is free to support whatever arguments seem right to him in the moment, and is not bound to the doctrine of any one school. As he describes in *Academica* (2.7), he uses whatever argument seems necessary in order to bring out an answer that comes close to the truth (*neque nostrae disputationes quidquam aliud agunt nisi ut in utramque partem dicendo eliciant et tamquam exprimant aliquid quod aut uerum sit aut ad id quam proxime accedat*). See also *Off.* 2.8 and *Tusc.* 33 for Cicero's remarks on his freedom to adopt any argument.

⁵² As the Renaissance translators Manetti and Vives do (see pp. 26 above).

⁵³ Nor does Cicero think that his peers are *interpretes*. Varro is depicted as stating that he once imitated, not interpreted, Menippus (*Menippum imitati, non interpretati*, *Ac.* 1.8).

are usually present as a foil to his own provided translation:⁵⁴ particularly, he describes them as those who would offer the translation that Cicero is rejecting.⁵⁵ Their mention in *de Officiis* 1.6 gives the impression that they do not employ their judgment. In *de Finibus* (3.15) he defines them as those who force out a translation, seemingly at the expense of eloquence in the target language: *nec tamen exprimi uerbum e uerbo necesse erit, ut interpretes indiserti solent, cum sit uerbum, quod idem declaret, magis usitatum*. The *interpretes* are described as *indiserti* here; McElduff (2009: 138) argues that the adjective here means ineloquent in a particular sense, that is, those who are *indiserti* have not received training in rhetoric. Cicero sets himself apart from other Latin translators by alluding to his rhetorical training that guarantees a superior product in the target culture. In *Tusculanae Disputationes* (2.7), Cicero singles out a group of translators as those who do not translate their sources into well-written Latin. He observes that there are some who wish to be called philosophers that have written philosophy in Latin, but dismisses these writers, though he himself has never read them. According to the report of the audience, this group of translators claims that they do not write with care towards proper definition, arrangement, elegance or style.⁵⁶ As in the interaction between the student and Cicero (*Tusc.* 1.24) when Cicero wonders how he could outperform Plato in *eloquentia*, Cicero justifies his

⁵⁴ McElduff (2009: 135) raises the possibility that the *interpretes* were a competing model of translation. It seems unlikely that Cicero thought the *interpretes* to be a competitor that presented a different model of translation: the evidence does not indicate that the *interpretes* could be unified by any stylistic doctrine, but were instead called in *ad hoc*. Translators who work in certain conditions in the Senate may display certain tendencies – such as quick, non-stylized translation – but to say that these translators offered a competing model to the written, prepared, planned translations of Cicero seems to give too much power to the *interpretes* in the field of translation.

⁵⁵ Cicero performs transliteration under the term *intepretari*. See *de Officiis* 2.5: *Hanc igitur qui expetunt, philosophi nominantur, nec quicquam aliud est philosophia, si interpretari uelis, praeter studium sapientiae*. See also *de Fin.* 3.35, *N.D.* 2.45.

⁵⁶ *Sed quia profitentur ipsi illi, qui eos scribunt, se neque distincte neque distribute neque eleganter neque ornate scribere, lectionem sine ulla delectatio negligo*. He could be referring specifically to Gaius Amafinius, whom Cicero mentions later (4.6) as one of the first to write Latin philosophy.

role as translator by reminding his audience of his educational background. He asserts that his translations are more readable than anything currently available to his Roman audience.

Cicero's criticism of the *interpretes* goes beyond their lack of eloquence in Latin. Their deficiency in training also means that they choose terms for their translations that fail to render the meaning of the source word. In both cases above Cicero describes the discarded translation with the verb *interpretari* (*poteram ego uerbum ipsum interpretans morbos appellare*, *Fin.* 3.35; *quam Graeci εὐταξίαν nominant, non hanc, quam interpretamur modestiam*, *Off.* 1.142). That is, when Cicero offers the rejected word choice, he claims that if he were to *interpretari*, then he would choose this (wrong) word. Those who *interpretari*—the *interpretes*—can translate, but they do not understand what they are reading, nor do they appreciate proper Latin usage. It is striking that Cicero assumes that his audience knows whom he is indicating, for he devotes very little attention to describing them. Beyond what is said here by Cicero, we do not have much information on the *interpretes*.⁵⁷ One possibility is that he is speaking about official translators whose job it was to translate senatorial decrees for the provinces, though the existence of this

⁵⁷ The *interpretes* appear to have functioned in some official capacity as translators. Cicero describes (2 *Verr.* 3.84) Aulus Valentinus as the *interpres* to Verres in Sicily not only for the Greek language, but also crimes. He recounts (*Balb.* 28) how Gnaeus Publicius Menander was chosen by Roman ambassadors to act as *interpres* when they went to Greece. Livy tells (7.26) how a Gaul challenged the Roman soldiers by means of an interpreter. A remark by Piso in *de Finibus* (5.89) reveals that people regularly demanded that translations accompany foreign speeches (*ita quemadmodum in senatu semper est aliquis qui interpretem postulet*), and Valerius Maximus (2.2.3) supports their presence in the Senate. The Athenian embassy of 155 had Gaius Acilius as their *interpres* in the Senate. Curiously, it is not clear that Romans would normally use an *interpres* when in Greek speaking communities. Lucius Postumius Megellus, for instance, spoke before the council in Tarentum in 282 BCE, though he was ridiculed for the act (*Dion. Hal.* 19.5). Valerius Maximus reports (8.7.6) that Publius Licinius Crassus used all five dialects of Greek when serving as proconsul in Asia Minor in 131 BCE. Tiberius Gracchus went to Rhodes as an ambassador in 165 BCE and seems to have spoken in Greek. Lucius Aemilius Paullus spoke to Perseus in Greek when the latter was captured (*Polyb.* 29.20.1; *Liv.* 45.8.5–6; *Val. Max.* 5.1.8. However, when Paullus was in Amphipolis, he used his praetor Gnaeus Octavius as his *interpres* while he spoke in Latin). That Romans did not always rely on intermediaries when abroad but often called for them to act in the Senate suggests that the role of the *interpres* in Rome was a formal one (as the lack of one would be as well). That is, the Romans would want to hear a Latin appeal in the Senate from foreign dignitaries for, perhaps, a show of power. If this formal role was well-understood among the participants, both translator and audience, then undoubtedly the translation would have been impacted. Theoretically, an *interpres* who understood that his audience already understood what was being said would be free in his translation.

office is not at all certain.⁵⁸ Another possibility is that Cicero views other Roman translators of philosophy as *interpretes*, though it is worth pointing out that when he does mention these translators he does not name them *interpretes*.⁵⁹ Regardless of their real world representatives, the *interpretes* in Cicero are emblematic of translators who cannot and will not move beyond the source; it is this fashion of translating that Cicero is careful to declare that he is avoiding, because if all he is offering is a translation that the *interpretes* could produce then his immediate audience does not require his translation. Instead, Cicero shows how he is an informed reader of Greek philosophy.

Cicero's criticism of the *interpretes* suggests that they fail to understand the source properly. To separate himself from these translators, Cicero projects his familiarity and mastery over the subject matter by writing as if he is translating *ad hoc*, with no prior preparation other than his considerable training. He does this in *Tusculanae Disputationes* (1.14): "Every proposition—for it just occurred to me in the present circumstances to translate ἄξιωμα this way: later I will use another word, if I discover one better"⁶⁰ and in *de Finibus* (3.53): "For it just occurred to me that I call indifferent what they call ἀδιάφορος."⁶¹ Neither statement is necessarily problematic nor unbelievable, but the carefully posed rhetorical declarations project the notion that Cicero barely needs to apply any forethought to his translations and thereby

⁵⁸ Sherk (1969: 13-20) argues that the *senatus consulta* were translated by an official source in Rome. Sherk recognizes a "remarkable consistency in phraseology and vocabulary" in extant Greek copies of the decrees, which he concludes would not be possible if the decrees were translated in each country. Furthermore, Sherk observes that leaving the translation to Greek provincials would allow the locals to deliberately or unintentionally distort the true meaning. Sherk concludes that it was the duty of the *scribae librarii questorii* of the *aerarium* to translate the decrees.

⁵⁹ In the *Academica* (1.5), Varro mentions the translators Amafinius and Rabirius who use everyday language (*uulgari sermone disputant*); in *Tusculanae Disputationes* (2.7), Cicero appears to allude to Amafinius when he criticizes other translators whose writings are lacking in elegance.

⁶⁰ *Omne pronuntiatum – sic enim mihi in praesentia occurrit ut appellarem ἄξιωμα: utar post alio, si inuenero melius.*

⁶¹ *quod enim illi ἀδιάφορον dicunt, id mihi ita occurrit, ut indifferens dicerem.*

reveals his intimacy with his source material. Statements such as these illustrate Cicero's qualifications as arbiter. In a similar vein Scipio in *de Republica* (1.42.65–43.66) reproduces a passage of Plato's *Republic* (7.562C–563E) by first describing what happens when the people overthrow a just king. Scipio reveals that this produces a condition that Plato brilliantly described. He pauses before reporting what Plato said to warn of the difficulty of his task: *si modo id exprimere Latine potuero; difficile factu est, sed conabor tamen* ("if only I can translate it into Latin; it is a difficult task, but I will still try"). Scipio translates the passage, and at the conclusion Laelius praises him, stating *prorsus ... expressa sunt a te, quae dicta sunt ab illo* ("What was said by him has been translated by you exactly"). Cicero reveals three important aspects of the translation in the passage: despite the protest of the difficulty of the task of translating Plato, Scipio does it so well that Laelius compliments him on the task performed. Second, Cicero depicts Scipio translating here *ad hoc*, with neither source text at hand nor preparation. As an event in a text the scene identifies Scipio's familiarity with Plato, but the scene is also a platform for Cicero as the author of the scene to show how he is able to translate Plato. Cicero invites the audience to recognize Cicero in his characters as he emphasizes their familiarity with the topic under discussion.

Finally, Laelius' praise indicates that he is in a position to have made the judgment: Laelius did not require a translation of Plato since he already knew the Greek. In the fictional scene of the dialogue, Scipio translated Plato into Latin to show that he could, not because Laelius was unaware of what Plato had said. Cicero uses the first two aspects to identify how adept the translator is at translating, but the final facet of the translator identifies the primary audience of Cicero's translation. Cicero envisions readers such as Laelius approving his translations as Laelius approves Scipio's. The qualifications that Cicero presents respond to

doubts about the value of his translations. He explains at the outset that he is not a passive conduit between the source and the target audience, but an arbiter who decides what is fitting and what is not. He identifies that he is unlike the *interpretes* who do not understand the Greek concept nor appreciate proper Latin usage. Instead, he reveals his familiarity with the source material as he depicts his interlocutors translating *ad hoc*. His initial audience is a group of individuals who are capable of making distinctions and appreciate the areas of familiarity with the source and proper Latin usage, and to assuage their concerns Cicero displays his qualifications as a translator.

6.2 Translating the Source

Cicero's most famous comment on translation occurs when he claims to translate not *ad uerbum*,⁶² but *ut orator* (*Opt. Gen.* 14):

nec conuerti ut interpretes, sed ut orator, sententiis isdem et earum formis tamquam figuris, uerbis ad nostrum consuetudinem aptis. In quibus non uerbum pro uerbo necesse habui reddere, sed genus omne uerborum uimque seruaui.

I did not translate as an interpreter, but as an orator, with the same ideas, with their forms, with their figures of speech, so to speak, and with their language fitted to our usage. In these translations I did not think it necessary to render word-for-word, but I preserved every class and the force of their speech.

While Cicero does not name his brand of translation of the orators Aeschines and Demosthenes, it is apparent that he is talking about *ad sensum* translation. He privileges meaning, style, force and figure of speech if they fit into Latin usage over the actual words of the original. He follows his description of his translations by stating that he translated the two speeches for his students,

⁶² The notion of *ad uerbum* translation in Cicero is generally designated by the phrase *uerbum e uerbo* or a similar expression. Gucker (2012: 52-53) catalogues the instances of the phrase and finds that when it appears in the context of a Greek into Latin remark three times out of four it implies an etymological translation. Gucker argues that the other instance (*Fin.* 3.35) marks a literal translation (*morbis* for *πάθος*). Indeed, Cicero does say that *uerbum Latinum par Graeco et quod idem ualet* and *uerbum ipsum interpretari* in relation to using *morbis*. Powell too (1995b: 277) argues that the phrase *uerbum e uerbo* implies literal translation.

so that Romans would know how to measure those who call themselves Atticists and to what character of speech they should be held (*hic labor meus hoc assequatur, ut nostri homines quid ab illis exigent, qui se Atticos uolunt, et ad quam eos quasi formulam dicendi reuocent, Opt. Gen. 15*). The purpose of the translation reveals the reasoning for the system: Cicero argues that in translating these speeches he was revealing the Attic style to Roman students. He was not concerned in representing what his source authors' said, but *how* they said it.

Cicero's description of translation in *de Optimo Genere Oratorum* reveals that an orator translates the style of the original. In *de Oratore* (1.154–155), Cicero's Crassus provides an account of this translation in practice. He recounts how he once practiced oratory by memorizing a poem or speech then declaiming on the subject of his memorization using different words than his reading. The problem with the process that Crassus recognizes is that his reading has already used the best words, so by insisting that he use different words he was using less appropriate words. His solution was to replace the Latin readings with Greek ones. When he translated the Greek sources, he was free to use the best Latin words. The entire statement discloses less an idea of *how* an orator translates (it is not indicated, for example, as the opposite of *ad uerbum* here), but *why* he does so. He translates in order to improve his *eloquentia*, and once we understand that motivation the notion that the translator was concerned with outdoing his source becomes less plausible. The product of the relationship between translator and source material does not produce a translation. Both Quintilian (10.1, 10.2)⁶³ and Pliny (*Ep.* 76) advocate translation for the same end of improving one's eloquence. What Cicero describes in translating

⁶³ Quintilian describes Cicero (10.1.108) as one who imitated the force of Demosthenes, the *copia* of Plato, and the charm of Isocrates (*Nam mihi uidetur M. Tullius, cum se totum ad imitationem Graecorum contulisset, effinxisse uim Demosthenis, copiam Platonis, iucunditatem Isocratis*). What Cicero imitated in each was style, not substance. The orator Cicero may have tried to outperform Demosthenes in *uis*, but that competition has little to do with translation. Quintilian reinforces the notion that what is imitated is style when he cautions (10.2.21) that in an oration one should not translate poets or historians, nor orators in history and poetry.

ut orator is different from what Cicero does when translating philosophy: in one instance he is illustrating to his students a certain style of speaking; in another, he is trying to improve his Latin style. When Cicero translates *ut orator*, he is focused on the style of the source author. Cicero's philosophical translations are different from these examples in that Cicero is trying to represent his source's arguments, namely the substance of the text, not the style.

Cicero best exposes his practice of translating philosophy in the meeting between Cato and Cicero in the third and fourth book of *de Finibus*.⁶⁴ The preface to the dialogue itself notifies the audience that someone versed in Stoic doctrine is about to handle the process. Arriving in Tusculum, Cicero finds Cato already in the library, surrounded by books on Stoicism (*Catonem quem ibi esse nescieram uidi in bibliotheca sedentem, multis circumfusus Stoicorum libris, Fin. 3.7*). Cicero depicts Cato as the voice of Stoicism here, and the setting of the library implies that Cato is about to give a translation of Stoic texts. That is, the inference from the library setting is that Cato is going to recount what he has just read, a process that will necessitate translation. As Stephanie Ann Frampton (2014) has recently argued, the ancient library is an unlikely place to read, let alone hold a conversation. Frampton contends that the ancient library was a small area intended for storage, not for reading; indeed, upon finding Cato, Cicero explains that it was his intent to pick up and take away some *commentarii* of Aristotle (*causa autem fuit huc ueniendi ut quosdam hinc libros promerem* [3.8] and *ueni ut auferrem [commentarios Aristotelios]*, 3.10). Rather than depicting the men strolling among the walkways, Cicero, as author, keeps his interlocutors in a small room with only two chairs for furnishing, surrounded by an audience composed of authoritative Stoic documents that with their presence lend their *auctoritas* to the

⁶⁴ Glucker (2012: 46) argues that Cato's speech here is "probably the first systematic exposition in Latin of some of the basic ideas of Stoic ethics." According to Glucker, the fact that this was the first exposition accounts for the high number of remarks on Greek into Latin.

discussion and Cicero's position as a translator. Cato becomes the living representation of the Stoic books that surround him; the setting symbolizes familiarity with and mastery over the subject at hand.

An exposition on Stoic doctrine is occasioned when Cato bemoans that Cicero has not sided with the Stoics in recognizing that virtue is the only good (*nihil praeter uirtutem in bonis*).⁶⁵ Cicero responds that he is not a Stoic because he objects to the vocabulary in use: for Cicero, the Stoics only differ from other Hellenic schools by using different words (3.12). Cato objects, and Cicero asks him to prove his stance. In an exchange that alludes to the dialogues of Plato and Socrates' style of questioning his interlocutors, Cato refuses to answer Cicero's pointed questions point by point (*ad singulum*) because he knows already that Cicero is just trying to catch a mistake in Cato's short answers.⁶⁶ Cato then offers to expound the entire system of Zeno and the Stoics, a suggestion that Cicero welcomes.

Cato begins by providing his own opinion about a variety of tenets, such as what is good and whether acts can be distinguished in terms of goodness.⁶⁷ Yet he soon promises to fulfill the

⁶⁵ The Latin vocabulary requires some explanation here; I could capitalize both *uirtutem* and *bonis* here, for these words carry particular meaning among the Stoics. Cato, as a Stoic, is stating that the only proper action is to live according to your proper measure (to live virtuously). All other aspects of life that are commonly considered to be the Good are meaningless, including health, death, and wealth. Cato himself later clarifies this as: *quidquid enim praeter id quod honestum sit expetendum esse dixeris in bonisque numeraueris, et honestum ipsum, quasi uirtutis lumen, exstinxeris et uirtutem penitus euerteris* ("For whatever you have declared as that which is to be sought beyond that which is upright, and whatever you have counted among the good, you have extinguished the upright itself, as if the light of virtue, and you have overturned thoroughly virtue").

⁶⁶ *Non ignoranti tibi, inquit, quid sim dicturus, sed aliquid, ut ego suspicor, ex mea breui responsione arripere cupienti non respondebo ad singula* (3.14).

⁶⁷ This is a problematic and divisive issue in Stoicism. Some Stoics maintain that the only proper act is that which is suitable to your nature, and therefore if it is according to your nature to die, to kill your parents, to walk backwards, these are all proper acts. Others, such as Cato here, appear to have universal examples of right, wrong, or intermediate actions. Long and Sedley (1987: 58) mark Cicero's discussion of the topic here as "confusing" due to his assertion that some acts are "neither good nor bad." Stobaeus (2.96,18-97,5 [=SVF 3.501]) also lists some examples of "neither good nor bad" actions, such as talking or walking, as does Diogenes Laertius (7.108-109 [=SVF 3.495-496]). Acts, however, cannot be "neither good nor bad" in the Stoic system, because the only thing that determines whether an action is correct (good) or not is the actor's intent in the doing. Stobaeus (2.85.13-86.4 [=SVF 3.494]) defines correct action as "something which, once it has been done, has a reasonable justification" (trans. Long

translator role promised by his setting among the books on Stoicism, and act as their translator and representative in a passage that also underscores the difficulty of the task set before him

(3.15):

Experiamur igitur, inquit, etsi habet haec Stoicorum ratio difficilior quiddam et obscurius. Nam cum in Graeco sermone haec ipsa quondam rerum nomina nouarum noua erant, ferenda †non uidebantur† quae nunc consuetudo diuturna triuit; quid censes in Latino fore?

Then let us try, he said, although this reasoning of the Stoics is somewhat more inflexible and imperceptible. For when these very names of new concepts were new, they did not seem bearable in the Greek language,⁶⁸ which now long usage has worn out; what do you think it will be like in Latin?

The passage shows that Cato's thoughts about Stoicism exist for him in the Greek language. He thinks about Stoicism in Greek terms, and Cicero presents him here as if he has to express those concepts in Latin for the first time. The difficulty that Cato expresses is also a signal to the audience that the translation of Stoic doctrine will be an immediate one, springing from the mind of Cicero's Cato. Cicero brandishes immediacy as evidence of his familiarity with the text, since immediate translation requires familiarity with both the languages in question and the material of the source. When he does interrupt his speech on Stoic doctrine, he does so to check that his translation is correct, as is the case when he translates κακία as *uitia* (3.39). When questions of correct translation arise, Cicero himself reassures Cato that he is doing an admirable job. When

and Sedley); Diogenes Laertius (7.107 [=SVF 3.493]) defines proper action as that which is accordance with nature; and Sextus Empiricus (*Against the Professors*, 11.200-201 [=SVF 3.516]) discusses how intent is the defining factor when he suggests that: "The virtuous man's function is not to look after his parents and honour them in other respects but to do this on the basis of prudence" (trans. Long and Sedley: 362). Once done, any act is either good or bad, according to the intent of the actor: someone may, for instance, walk appropriately. The confusion that leads to listing acts as "neither good nor bad" comes from the problem that *before* these acts are done there is no way to determine whether they are good or bad.

⁶⁸ I am following Madvig's suggestion (*ad loc.*) that *noua erant, ferenda* fills the lacuna. The point that Cicero is making here is that new words seem strange when first introduced, but over time become commonplace.

the praise is extracted from the narrative of the scene, it is apparent that Cicero is praising Cicero.

Cato explains that the difficulty he envisages in translating Stoic doctrine is that he will have to find Latin terms for this Greek terminology as he proceeds.⁶⁹ Cicero is ready to answer this concern by raising three translation strategies: first, he grants Cato the same freedom to use unfamiliar vocabulary as was permitted to the Stoic founder Zeno.⁷⁰ Second, Cicero points out that Cato may avail himself of the practice of paraphrase, and not force himself to translate each word on a one-to-one ratio. Finally, if Cato cannot translate a word, he may just as readily use the Greek word, as Cicero claims Romans do with the terms *ephippia* and *acratophora*.⁷¹ These three guiding principles allow Cato the maneuverability to translate Stoic doctrine, but the outlining of them also indicates how Cicero is working to present an understandable system to his Roman audience. When Cicero presents the options to Cato, he is also speaking to the audience and describing how he translates. Cicero does invent new words and apply new

⁶⁹ The question that Cato's difficulty in translating raises is why the two do not have the conversation in Greek. While the answer might be that the language choice is determined by the type of work that Cicero is writing, the implication behind Cato's difficulty is that these types of philosophical conversations did occasionally take place in Greek. That is, if he were used to speaking about Stoicism in Latin he would have no issues doing so here.

⁷⁰ In the *Academica* (1.6.24) Varro pleads for the same license. Atticus grants him this, even allowing that Varro speak in Greek if he cannot find a suitable Latin word. Varro is thankful, but expresses that he will put forth all his efforts to speak only in Latin. A dialogue such as this is what Cicero must have wished someone would have with him, one in which he was granted the license to invent new words in the acknowledgment that his was a difficult task. It is worth pointing out that Varro cannot or will not translate *φαντασίαν* (1.11.40).

⁷¹ Cicero argues that the same freedom to borrow a Greek word exists for philosophical terms as it does for concrete objects. His example of an abstract term that might be borrowed is *proegmena* and *apoproegmena*, but after suggesting that a borrowing will suffice when it comes to expressing these terms, Cicero displays his translation ability by translating these Greek terms by *praeposita* and *reiecta*. In these types of theoretical translation passages in Cicero, he rarely misses the opportunity to show off his insight into the process.

meanings to old words,⁷² he does paraphrase,⁷³ and he does borrow words from Greek.⁷⁴ The methods are important parts of Cicero's effort to replace the source texts in his target culture as they suggest the prominence of clarity in the translation. If Cicero can produce a translation that leaves no doubt what the source means, or even if he can make it clearer than the source did in the original text, then there is no need for the source text.

6.2.1 Greek words in Latin text

In his prologues or preludes to his dialogues, Cicero prepares the audience for the way in which he interacts with the source material. In the portion of his treatises that the translation occupies, it is difficult to forget that the audience is experiencing the writing of Cicero. Throughout the philosophical treatises, Cicero reminds his audience of his role by stating what the Greek word that he is translating is.⁷⁵ The explicit acknowledgment of the Greek word is a regular occurrence in Cicero's philosophical writings, and a practice that is evident in the

⁷² Powell (1995b: 288-291) lists the words *comprehendibilis*, *medietas*, *beatitudo* as words that Cicero invented. On using words with new meanings, Powell (293) mentions Cicero's use of the word *finis* as a translation of τέλος in *de Finibus*. An additional example of Cicero applying new meanings to words in regular use is his translation of εὐταξία with *modestia*, (*de Off.* 1.142), but *modestia* meaning *ordinis conseruatio*.

⁷³ As Powell (1995b: 293) observes, Cicero paraphrases 'ethics', 'physics', and 'logic' in the *Academica* (1.19) and *Tusculanae Disputationes* (5.68), and 'monarchy', 'oligarchy' and 'democracy' in *de Republica* (1.42). He also paraphrases τέλος with *extremum*, *ultimum*, *summum* in *de Finibus* (3.26).

⁷⁴ The most obvious example is his use of the word *philosophia*. That Cicero is aware that the term is a borrowing and is not naturalized into Latin is shown by a passage in *de Officiis* (2.5) in which he says that philosophy is nothing other than the study of wisdom (*hanc igitur qui expetunt, philosophi nominantur, nec quicquam aliud est philosophia, si interpretari uelis, praeter studium sapientiae*). He also glosses *philosophi* as *sapientiae studiosi* (*Tusc.* 5.9). Finally, in *de Oratore* (1.9) he refers to "what the Greeks call philosophy", though he does not offer a Latin word here to gloss the Greek.

⁷⁵ Glucker (2012) calls these "Greek into Latin remarks." Glucker disputes the notion that these remarks always (and primarily) occurred at the first instance of a Greek word (cf. Powell [1995b], who claims that Cicero explains the meaning of the Greek words "certainly on their first occurrence"). Through an analysis that includes the words κατάληψις, ἐννοία, and καθήκον, Glucker shows that what he calls the "birth-pang" principle does not hold up, and in its place posits a few theories for the appearances of the remarks, such as where Cicero is not sure about the proper Latin term he will continue to make these remarks. Glucker (39) writes that he considers his project a "first step" towards discussing these remarks, and he devotes most of his study to categorizing the remarks. However, he does call attention to the fact that translators primarily use these remarks in "literature where the subject of the work is fairly new to the language, and many speakers would be grateful for an explanation of the more abstract new terms in a language where such terms have long been established." Cicero's remarks explain his new use of Latin terms, but they also call attention to the fact that it is Cicero who is creating this new vocabulary.

examples of Latin's superiority above. In *de Finibus* Cato regularly disrupts the reading by pointing out what the Greek source word that he is translating is.⁷⁶ These disruptions function as signals of Cato's mastery over the source elements by reminding the audience that Cato is in the act of translating, an act that he has already described as difficult.⁷⁷ The translator is nowhere as visible in Roman practice as here. Each instance of pointing out the Greek source is an invitation to appreciate the result since the audience can immediately compare the original with the translation. To facilitate this comparison Cicero periodically explains his translation choices. This practice opens to the reader the process that Cicero went through to reach his conclusion as he shows his work.

As an example from those instances I raised above with respect to Latin and Roman superiority, when Cato discusses the *perturbationes animorum* (*Fin.* 3.35) he discloses that he is translating the Greek term *πάθη*. He points out that he *could* translate the term with *morbi*, but the Latin term does not convey all possible meanings of *πάθη* (*sed non conueniret ad omnia*). People do not usually call pity and anger *morbi*, Cato explains. By showing how he reached his conclusion, Cicero invites the audience to agree with his translation and approve his methodology. In this instance alone he shows his familiarity with not only how the Greeks speak of a *πάθη*, but how Greek Stoics use the term. Furthermore, Cicero the author displays his understanding of the finer points of the Latin language and shows why *his* translation, as

⁷⁶ Καταλήψεις, 3.17; ἀξία, 3.20; καθήκον, 3.20; ἔννοια, 3.21; ὁμολογία, 3.21; ὁρμή, 3.23; κατορθώματα, 3.24; τέλος, 3.26; ἐπιγεννηματικόν, 3.32; ὠφέλημα, 3.33; ἀξία (again), 3.34; πάθη, 3.35; ἡδονή, 3.35; κακία, 3.39; εὐκαιρία, κατόρθωσις, κατόρθωμα, 3.45; προηγμένον, ἀποπροηγμένον, 3.51; προηγμένον, προηγμένα, 3.52; ἀδιάφορον, 3.53; τελικά, 3.55; ποιητικά, 3.55; εὐδοξία, 3.57; ὠφελήματα, βλάμματα, εὐχρηστήματα, δυσχρηστήματα, 3.69.

⁷⁷ Curiously Cato translates much more than Cicero does; Cicero is silent for much of Book 3 but responds in Book 4.

opposed to another Roman's, will be the superior version.⁷⁸ Others will translate *πάθη* as *morbi*, but they will be wrong. A similar revelation of the process occurs in *de Officiis* (1.142) when Cicero translates *εὐταξία*. Before he translates the term, he affirms that he is not talking about *modestia*, but in fact *ordinis conseruatio*. Once he makes the point that he is not using *modestia* in its usual sense, Cicero proceeds to translate *εὐταξία* as *modestia*. He has redefined the Latin term to suit a specific Greek meaning. In both of these instances Cicero shows his familiarity with the foreign concept, with the Greek language, and finally with the proper use of Latin.

An example of narrative disruption occurs when Cato makes a reference to the *rerum cognitiones* (*Fin.* 3.17). It is not immediately clear what he is translating. Apparently fearing that the audience has failed to understand what he means,⁷⁹ he also offers *comprehensiones*⁸⁰ or *perceptiones*⁸¹ (presumably still with *rerum*). By paraphrase Cato offers to the audience, who in the dialogue is Cicero, three choices. Yet even that may not be enough, for Cato says that if these words are not pleasing to use or well understood, we can as readily borrow the Greek source term *καταλήψεις* (*si haec uerba aut minus placent aut minus intelleguntur, καταλήψεις appellemus licet*). Cicero is not always consistent in the choice of translation: *κατάληψεις* is given as the source word when the Latin *comprehensio* is being used three times in the *Lucullus* (17, 18, 31), and in the *Academica* (1.41) Varro and Atticus agree that the only way to translate

⁷⁸ The translation of the "Other Roman" is largely a hypothetical for Cicero. Cicero's defence of his philosophical translations has two points: philosophy should be written in Latin and transferred to Roman control; and Cicero should be the one to perform the task. Cicero argues the first point in his prefaces, but once that point is taken as proven he shows why he is the logical choice to do the now-accepted task throughout the texts.

⁷⁹ Cicero is the first Latin author to use the word *cognitio* in reference to *res*; Terence (*Eun.* 921) uses the term to describe a recognition of men (*ibo intro de cognitione ut certum sciam*). Earlier in *de Finibus* (1.25) Cicero uses the phrase *rerum cognitio* with the meaning of "learning", which seems to be the earliest use of the word *cognitio* with the meaning of *καταλήψεις*.

⁸⁰ The term is an invention by Cicero, first appearing in *Academica* 1.41.

⁸¹ Both of these terms are first attested in Cicero; *comprehensio* first appears in *Academica* 1.41, *perceptio* in *Academica* 1.45.

καταλημπτόν is with *comprehensionem*. Cicero's handling of the term has led Glucker (2012: 42) to hypothesize that Cicero was unsure about the proper Latin term to use, and it is his uncertainty on display in these remarks. Yet his uncertainty would undercut his claims of being in a position to make proper judgments in translation and imply that he has a clear understanding of neither the source nor the target language. Cicero makes the accommodation in *de Finibus* to naturalize the word κατάληψις not because he is uncertain that his chosen word *comprehensio* is the right choice, but because he is proving that he is a capable translator who recognizes the complexities of translating foreign philosophical terms. The same phenomenon is evident in Cicero's translation of ἀξίωμα. In the *Lucullus* (95), Cicero translates the Greek term as *quidquid enuntietur* and *effatum*; in *Tusculanae Disputationes* (1.14) he uses the Latin term *pronuntiatum*, promising that he will use a different term later if he can think of another.⁸² In both cases it is less important how exactly Cicero translates the term than it is that he show how he is reaching his conclusion. The translation is paused so that Cicero can show the background to the act of translating, and in the process the focus of the passage switches from the Stoic sources to Cicero the translator. That is, the attention is on how Cicero will translate κατάληψις and ἀξίωμα, not what the Stoics have to say about it.

At other times Cicero only lists the Greek source word without any further commentary. For instance, in the *Lucullus* (15) he glosses a type of *dissimulatio* as *quam Graeci εἰρωνείαν*; in *De Finibus* (1.22) he explains his use of *imagines* as *quae εἶδωλα nominant*; in *Tusculanae Disputationes* (4.23) Cicero informs the audience that the Stoics call *aegrotationes* ἀρρωστήματα.⁸³ While offering the Greek reinforces the specific notion behind the Latin term

⁸² In *de Fato* (1.20), he uses *enuntiatio*.

⁸³ My list of Greek words in Cicero is not exhaustive. For studies on Greek words in Cicero, see Rose (1921), who lists every term throughout the corpus of Cicero's literature (though he misses some), and Glucker (2012), who

that Cicero is discussing, the appearance of the Greek term in a Latin text is a jarring experience that forces consideration of the authorial voice, turning the reader away from the presentation of ideas. Cicero frequently uses Greek terms in his letters, but the difference is that in the letters he does not pause to translate the Greek term into Latin. Furthermore, instances of the phrase *Graeci uocant* function as a cue to the audience that an intermediary stands between them and the Greek sources.⁸⁴ Indeed, the reference to the Greek Other is an act that separates the translator from the source author.

6.2.2 Distinguishing Translator from Author

Instances in which Cicero provides the Greek term that he is translating also serve to separate the source author from the translator. Powell (1995b: 279–280) classifies every passage of a surviving Greek source that Cicero translates in his philosophical treatises. Cicero obscures the fact that he is translating only twice out of twenty-two instances.⁸⁵ Several times Cicero indicates that he is translating his source as closely as possible: in *Tusculanae Disputationes* (3.41) he prefaces his translation of a letter of Epicurus by downplaying his authorial hand (*fungar enim iam interpretis munere, ne quis me putet fingere*); in *de Finibus* (2.21) he challenges the Epicurean Torquatus to correct him if he mistranslates Epicurus. In other passages he is less rigid in his adherence to the source: in the *Tusculanae Disputationes* (5.100), he prefaces a passage of Plato by saying that it appeared in a letter from Plato to the relative of

compiles the instances of “Greek into Latin remarks”, that is, instances where Cicero provides both the Latin and Greek term with some explanation. To provide some numbers for how often Cicero uses a Greek word, Gucker records over fifty instances of such a remark in *de Finibus* in his appendix. *De Finibus* shows the greatest frequency of Greek terms, however, likely due to Cato’s exposition of Stoic doctrine which, as he claims, requires him to use a lot of new Latin terminology to explain the philosophical concepts. To make himself clearer, he cites the Greek source.

⁸⁴ Cicero uses the phrase fourteen times in his texts. See, for example, *Fin.* 5.6.17 (*ut ipsum per se inuitaret et alliceret appetitum animi, quem ὁρμήν Graeci uocant*).

⁸⁵ Although Cicero does not say so, *de Republica* 6.27 is a translation of Plato’s *Phaedrus* 245c–246a, and *Cato Maior* is a translation of Plato’s *Republic* 1.328e–330a. As Powell is aware (282), the list he presents is problematic since there could be other unacknowledged translations whose sources are now lost.

Dion, in which Plato more or less wrote in these words (*in qua scriptum est his fere uerbis*). In each instance Cicero emphasizes that he is translating: he does not open the translation with a mention of only the author such as “As Plato says...”, but rather calls attention to how he is translating. In these passages Cicero accentuates his role in the presentation of another’s thoughts and arguments, but he also draws attention to the fact that he is not the source author.

The largest translation of an entire work that Cicero undertakes is his *de Officiis*, which has a source in Panaetius’ περὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος, a fact that Cicero indicates in his introduction.⁸⁶ An explicit disruption from the source occurs early on in the treatise as Cicero proposes to define what duty is, a task that Cicero accuses Panaetius of neglecting to do in his work.⁸⁷ He argues that neutral duties can be distinguished from excellent duties (*nam et medium quoddam officium dicitur et perfectum*, 1.8). This sentiment is appropriate for the original Stoic text, for the Stoics differentiate between duties in respect to their appropriateness; some duties could be “good”, some “bad”, and others still “neither.”⁸⁸ While Panaetius may never have explained duties at the

⁸⁶ He claims that in his discussion of duties he will follow the Stoics (*sequemur igitur hoc quidem tempore et hac in quaestione potissimum Stoicos*, 1.6). After this declaration he makes it clear that he is following Panaetius specifically (1.7).

⁸⁷ *Placet igitur, quoniam omnis disputatio de officio futura est, ante definire, quid sit officium; quod a Panaetio praetermissum esse miror*. Cicero’s complaint here is not that Panaetius never defined the duties, only that he failed to do so at the start. The difference in where the definition is placed in the text may stem from a difference in philosophical practices: Pohlenz (17) supposes that Panaetius would have developed the definition in the course of the text, and Dyck (1996: 75) argues that by offering the definition at the outset Cicero is acting accordingly for an Academic. For instance, in *Rep.* 1.38, Scipio alludes to a practice whereby if a name of a subject is agreed upon, what is indicated by that name is explained; only when the explanation is agreed upon should the actual conversation take place (*si nomen quod sit conueniat, explicetur, quid declaretur eo nomine. Quod si conuenerit, tum demum decebit ingredi in sermonem*).

⁸⁸ The most basic definition of a Stoic proper action is one that once done has a reasonable justification (Stobaeus 2.85.13–86.4 = *SVF* 3.494). The proper action is also one done in accordance with nature, both universal nature and an individual’s nature (Diogenes Laertius 7.107 = *SVF* 3.493). In theory, that is as good a definition that a Stoic could provide since proper action is defined by each individual’s nature and faculty of reasoning. Since no other person is cognizant of your personal nature or reason for acting, another person could not tell you whether or not your action was proper. However, for purposes of practicality it is apparent that some general guidelines were listed by some Stoic teachers. Diogenes Laertius (7.108–9 = *SVF* 3.495–496) lists honouring parents, brothers and country and spending times with friends as proper functions, while the opposite actions are improper. Picking up a twig is an example of a neither action. The division of actions that Cicero lists is then in accord with other evidence from Stoic writings.

outset, the definition that Cicero does provide of the duties is coherent with Stoic doctrine. That is, when Cicero presents the definition of duties, he does so as a Stoic would. He does not preface the definition with an announcement that identifies the author as someone other than Cicero. Next he claims that he could rightly call the excellent duties “proper duties” since the Greeks call them κατόρθωμα, while they call the neutral duties καθήκον. This sentence begins the shift of voice from the Stoic Panaetius to Cicero, Cicero draws a divide between what *we* might call it, and what *they* call it. Cicero continues to speak about “they” in the next line: “And they define them thus, that what is right they define to be excellent duty; but they say that neutral duty is that for which a justifiable explanation can be given.”⁸⁹

As Cicero begins to speak of “them” and what “they” say, he draws the attention away from his source to himself and to the divide between him and his source.⁹⁰ Dyck (1996:81) argues that the next section (1.9) returns to Panaetius, whom Cicero had left at 1.7. Cicero separates himself from the source with an explicit mention of the source name: *triplex igitur est, ut Panaetio uidetur, consilii capiendi deliberatio*. When Cicero mentions the source, one can hardly forget that Cicero is writing, not Panaetius. If, for example, a translator of Homer framed certain scenes of the *Iliad* with the phrase “Homer says” it would be clear that the text is a second-hand report. By mentioning the source in what is ostensibly a translation, Cicero reinforces his role and breaks any sense of immersion.

Cicero further ruptures the immersion and sense of alignment with his source when he criticizes Panaetius. Cicero claims that Panaetius has overlooked two points in the division that

⁸⁹ *Atque ea sic definiunt, ut, rectum quod sit, id officium id esse dicunt, quod cur factum sit, ratio probabilis reddi possit.*

⁹⁰ In the next line Cicero writes that the deliberation for a plan to be taken is threefold, as it seems to Panaetius (*triplex igitur est, ut Panaetio uidetur, consilii capiendi deliberatio*). The explicit mention of the source gives the impression that in this text Cicero is talking about his source more than he is translating.

he provided (*hac diuisione...duo praetermissa sunt*, 1.10). He makes it clear that this is a criticism aimed at Panaetius, not one made by Panaetius, when he observes how Panaetius was wrong in thinking it was a threefold division, when really the subject is divided into five (*ita, quam ille triplicem putauit esse rationem, in quinque partes distribui debere reperitur*).⁹¹ Later (1.152), he criticizes Panaetius again. Cicero, following Panaetius, has explained (1.152) that there are four parts of moral rectitude (*honestas*): foresight (*cognitio*), a sense of community (*communitas*), courage (*magnanimitas*) and self-control (*moderatio*). According to Cicero, however, Panaetius failed to consider what would happen if a conflict arose between the actions of each part, which requires him to rank the duties. The explicit criticism of source material is an intriguing type of translation in that it places the translator in a position of authority while simultaneously promoting the source. While Cicero aims to endorse the overall message of his source in *de Officiis*,⁹² he nevertheless undercuts the value of the source by disputing the theories or criticizing the author. The deficiencies that Cicero has found in the source text require his editorial hand. The picture depicted is then one of Cicero being the ultimate authority; Panaetius was wrong to divide duties into three. He should have recognized that duty had five parts.⁹³

⁹¹ Pohlenz (AF 6) thought the criticism came from other Stoics; Dyck (1996:82) observes that Cicero makes a similar criticism later, and theorizes that the critique stems from Cicero's time at the Academy. Either scenario seems possible: Cicero was close to the Stoic Posidonius (the pupil of Panaetius), who may have suggested the critique. In a different section (1.30–41), Johann (1981: 107, 504) has argued that the philosophical doctrines in the section derive from Posidonius (though Dyck [124] rejects the idea). For my purposes, the source of the criticism is not a large concern, only that it is aimed at Panaetius by Cicero who uses the criticism to separate himself from his flawed source.

⁹² Cicero structures his translation *de Officiis* as an aid for his son (*Off.* 1.1–4).

⁹³ Other scenes are more benign in their separating effect. At 1.62, Cicero offers a definition of bravery: "Thus bravery is rightly defined by the Stoics, when they say that virtue is fighting for what is right" (*itaque probe definitur a Stoicis fortitudo, cum eam uirtutem esse dicunt propugnantem pro aequitate*). Since the definition appears in no other Stoic sources, Dyck (1996: 191–92) concludes that Panaetius wrote it, and thus the reference to the Stoics is to one, Panaetius. Elsewhere (1.90), Cicero uses the phrase *Panaetius ait. Panaetius quidem Africanum, auditorem et familiarem suum, solitum ait dicere*.

Cicero separates himself from the source Panaetius in *de Officiis*. He does not dismiss the validity of the source text, but he is aware of how he can improve it. He does not always mark the additions that he makes throughout the text,⁹⁴ but the opening establishes that Cicero will be making alterations. In the opening he delineates between “they” and “we”, establishing the notion that the two will not always coincide. The translator does not disappear into the text on his way to becoming invisible, but instead the translator as a judge remains prominent. Cicero does not downplay his alterations like Terence, nor does he gradually set aside the workings of his source as Horace does. His translation is a constant engagement with the source text that sees him praising certain aspects while disagreeing with others. Throughout the entire discussion with the source that he offers his audience, it is his voice that is most prominent. The audience can access the source only through Cicero, and Cicero plays a major role in arbitrating what will reach the target audience. In *de Officiis* Cicero answers the question of why anyone would read philosophy in Latin over the Greek by explicitly pointing out how the Greek text is lacking and how he improves upon it.

6.3 Conclusion

If Cicero is to become the agent of philosophy in Rome and earn his independence from his Greek sources, he must satisfy his detractors who are already familiar with the source texts. Cicero identifies four areas of criticism in the opening of *de Finibus* that all allude to the concern that Cicero is misusing his time in translating Greek philosophy. The biggest obstacle to the acceptance of Cicero’s philosophical texts is that those who would be interested in reading them

⁹⁴ Dyck (1996), however, does considerable work in deciphering which passages belong to Cicero and which ones come from Panaetius. At times, Dyck (102, 245) blames confusing passages in *de Officiis* (1.18-19, 1.96) on Cicero’s interference with his model. Dyck (484-491) argues that Cicero pieces together material for book three of *de Officiis* from Posidonius, from the Stoic Hecato, and from an Academic doxographical work.

have already read the Greek versions. To these people Cicero needs to promise that he will go beyond the source author. He begins to position his translations as better than the source by observing that philosophical discussions are best held in Latin. Cicero's praise of Latin shows how his translation will improve upon the Greek source even by the mere rendering of the text into Latin: Latin is better at identifying between genus and species, as Cicero does (*Fin.* 3.39–40) when he makes a distinction between *uitium* and *malitia* when translating κακία. By positioning Latin as a superior language, Cicero establishes a foundation for his argument that his translations should replace the Greek sources in the Latin literary system.

Beyond the benefit derived from discussing philosophy in Latin, Cicero promotes his translation by promising that he will take an active role in deciding what information is useful to his target audience. Cicero shows himself making informed translation choices, ones that both adequately represent the source term while using sensible Latin. When he uses a Latin word in an unusual sense, or when he invents a new term, he explains why he is doing so, offering the audience a view into his reasoning and justification. By promoting his agency in the translation, Cicero creates the image that he is offering something that his audience cannot derive from the source text.

All of the tactics that Cicero uses work to keep Cicero the translator in prominence. Cicero and the source do not join into a single voice to the point that the translation seems to be written by the source author himself; Cicero does not allow his audience to forget that he, not the source Panaetius, is the author of *de Officiis*. Cicero's remarks on his translations identify how he has moved beyond the source, but more importantly he stresses the notion that he has made good use of his time by improving the source. The argument that Cicero uses against those who would obscure their philosophical study is that it is only by embracing their role as the new

masters of Greek wisdom and translating foreign philosophy into Latin will Romans earn their independence from the Greeks.

7 Conclusion

The programmatic statements made by the translators discussed above indicate how they advertise themselves and their work. Some authors position themselves as adherents to the source model; others separate themselves from the source, marketing themselves as the authoritative figure in the literary genre of the translation. Rather than focus on the form of the translation along the lines of the *ad uerbum* / *ad sensum* scale of translations, I have discussed these statements as promotional remarks made by the translator in response to circumstances in the socio-literary conditions of the target literary system. Roman translators identify certain aspects of the source text that they believe the audience seeks, and in this way their programmatic statements are promotional.

My analysis of Roman translation thus moves away from the traditional view that translations exist to serve a source. Since the time of Augustine the notion that words in different languages are representative of universals has pervaded translation practice and theory, resulting in the belief that a “perfect” or “true” translation is a possibility. The search for the perfect translation led to a focus on the form of translations, particularly *ad uerbum* and *ad sensum* forms, and whether or not the translator had “succeeded” in recreating the source text. Since there is no universal agreement on how best to recreate a source text, post-Classical translators have traditionally promoted their adherence to one form or the other as a part of their method of showing the target audience the “truth” of the source text; *ad uerbum* translators argued that by recreating even the words of the source text they were bringing their audience as close as possible to the experience of reading the foreign text; *ad sensum* translators, meanwhile, asserted that their translations privileged the message of the source author, which they claimed was the

important part of the source. In either instance, however, the translators were identifying the desires of their target audiences, and the application of labels that are derived from the form of the translation conceals the fact that a translator is able to render a translation however he believes fit. In addition, a study in translation on the form of the translation along the lines of *ad uerbum* / *ad sensum* reveals more about the audience that assigns these titles than the translation itself. That is, an audience assigns the title “close” or “literal” to translations that it has determined remains close to some aspect of the source text. What qualifies as a literal translation is completely subjective: there is no set amount of source text words that the translator must render into the target language for it to qualify as “literal.” Rather, to return to Robinson’s terminology (see pp. 11–13 above), critics base their titles on “feel”; a reader recognizes a close translation when he or she sees one, granted the reader is in a position to make such a judgment. The Romans provide no criteria for what they consider to be an *ad uerbum* translation of an entire work— the closest we come is Cicero saying that he is *not* creating *ad uerbum* translations. When modern Western scholars label a Latin translation, they do so on the basis of their experience, and their experience in Western culture has a foundation in the Christian practices of translation. However, the Greek source authors of the Romans were not inviolable authorities whose very minds could not be known, as God was to the Christian translators. Christian translators did not veer from the source lest they be charged with heresy; the translator translated each word of the source text so that he would not misrepresent the message of God. Their claims of adherence look towards the preservation of each word or the exact message of the source text. In Roman translation, claims of adherence to a source author are promises that the translation accurately recreates and reveals some chosen aspect of the source text, but more importantly these claims are a part of the translator’s self-promotion. Roman writers did not write unreadable

or awkward translations for the sake of preserving a source; their use of a source text was part of the advertisement of their own poetic activity, and this left them free to alter the source text as they wished. Moreover, claims of fidelity are not persistently representative of the true state of the text. Livius Andronicus, for instance, alters the Greek *Musae* to the Roman *Camenae*, a change that represents a cultural equivalent but also sees the foreign aspect of the text diminished.

Yet that freedom to depart from a source does not necessarily mean that claims of fidelity to the source were not a valuable advertisement to certain members of a target audience. Livius Andronicus presents his *Oduvia* as an accurate representation of Homer's *Odyssey* when he translates the first line as closely as possible to the source text, even mirroring the sound of the Greek words. Livius' translation here is programmatic, since it publicizes the notion that the fidelity achieved here will be mirrored throughout the text. For Livius, fidelity to Homer was a marketable ability that appealed to people who sought Homer's *Odyssey* in Latin. Indeed, fidelity to Homer remained an important feature in Roman translation as the later epic poet Ennius positioned himself as a truer representative of Homer. Ennius portrays Livius Andronicus' translation as outdated and irrelevant when he depicts himself as the embodiment of Homer's soul; according to this positioning, Andronicus was an intermediary between the source and the target audience, but Ennius is a Latin Homer who will give his audience the Latin epic poem they have long sought. In this way, source-representative translation is a tool that aids translators in designating earlier translations as outdated by promoting a new standard of closeness or as a "truer" representation of the source.

Similarly, Terence displaces Plautus' dramas by emphasizing his faithfulness to his source. He uses key terminology, particularly the phrase *uerbum de uerbo*, to signal his

adherence to the Greek source. Terence capitalizes on Plautus' strategy of distancing himself and his works from the Greek comedies on which he bases his dramas. Plautus creates a fantasy land that he populates with absurd Greeks who disrupt the societal order. He opens his dramas by characterizing himself and his Roman audience as the "other" when his characters claim that *Plautus uortit barbare*. The phrase disrupts the illusion of reality when its speaker views the audience from the perspective of the source: to the Greeks in the play, the Romans are the outsiders. Plautus fills his plays with people whom he invites the audience to view as non-Roman: they speak oddly, they have no morals, and they verbally call attention to the fact that they are behaving like Greeks (*pergraecari*) while representing the Roman audience as outsiders (*barbari*). In contrast, Terence downplays the differences between his Greek sources and his Roman audience as he promotes inclusion and the social order that the fathers in Menander's drama enforce. Terence represses elements of the original that remind the audience that they are watching something foreign, such as small Greek details like the names of demes. His translation technique makes the translation easier to accept since the audience is not regularly taken out of the drama by awkward language or bizarre characters. By downplaying the foreign aspects, Terence bridges the space between the source author and the target text while, at the same time, promising a presentation that is true to that source. Rather than pointing out that Terence's translations are not entirely faithful to their sources, it is more useful to consider how Terence views his translations fitting into the competitive environment of Roman drama. In this light, his programmatic statements and selective adherence to Menander function as promotional tools in Terence's effort to replace Plautus' comedies with his own.

While source-representative translators advertise their work as accurate portrayals of the source, the allusive translators Catullus and Horace declare their originality. Catullus renounces

the practice of translation when he abruptly ceases the translation of Sappho's original in c. 51. The change in the poem's direction calls attention towards Catullus the poet: translation, he declares, is a leisurely activity that does not match his perception of what his poetry should be. He urges himself away from translating the work of others towards original creation; Sappho's depiction of her relationship with her lover is inadequate for describing his affair with Lesbia. Catullus' placement of his affair with Lesbia over the frame of Sappho's poetry is a game to see if it can be done, but once done the product of the game is left aside. Catullus shows himself as a capable translator, one aware of the literary tradition of his poetry, but more importantly as a poet who is uninterested in using the tapestry from others to portray his emotions.

In his programmatic statements in the *Ars Poetica*, Horace portrays himself as willing to use the instruments of his precursors, particularly of Alcaeus and Archilochus. However, while Horace claims himself to be the first to show Rome Alcaic poetry, in the *Odes* themselves Alcaeus' poetry provides only the framework for Horace's poetry. Horace emphasizes his agency in adapting the foreign poems to a new cultural context, particularly in *Odes* 1.9 when the geographical locations alert the audience to the fact that the Greek scene is set in a new, Roman context. Horace achieves the transmission of the poetry between two cultures, and it is this achievement that Horace emphasizes in the *Odes*. In the *Epodes*, however, he depicts his poetry as essentially different from his primary model Archilochus. In the *Ars Poetica*, he describes the poetry of Archilochus as dangerous, as it resulted in the deaths of Lycambes and his bride. His proposed solution is to do away with the *res* and *uerba* of Archilochus, but in making this claim Horace is simultaneously establishing his ability to imitate a source while infusing the model with original poetry that corrects a defect. Archilochus' poetry harmed others; Horace's poetry turns that model inwards, and the target of the invective is the character Horace. He thus

contextualizes the source poetry in a new culture by inverting the roles and improves it by rejecting the opportunity to cause real harm. Yet Horace promotes his activity by welcoming comparison with the source model; that is, the comparison between the poetry of Horace and Archilochus encourages the reader to conclude that Horace has improved upon something. The identification of Archilochus as a source provides the proper context in which to judge Horace's poetry while establishing the *Epodes* in a larger tradition.

Cicero's independent translation shows familiarity with the source, as well as his own originality, but ultimately proves Cicero's superiority to the source as he advertises his translations as replacements of the source texts in the Latin literary system. Cicero prefaces his translations by announcing that his judgment, which the source texts were obviously lacking, will play the deciding role in what he actually translates; he is clear that he is no passive agent who allows all of the source text to pass through him into the translation. To support his claim he regularly shows what he is translating and how he reached the translation conclusion that he did. Beyond inviting the reader to approve Cicero's choices, showing his work also reminds the reader that he is not reading the Greek source, but Cicero's mediation of that source. No reader of Cicero's *de Officiis* lapses into the illusion that he is reading Panaetius because Cicero disrupts that illusion by pausing the discussion to describe his translation or by referencing the source as someone other. A translator who was trying to be invisible would do well to not call attention to the fact that his voice is not the voice of the source author; it is distracting and reminds the reader of the gap between target and source culture. Since Cicero is advertising *his* work, not that of the source, faulting Cicero for not translating a particular piece of doctrine or mistranslating something is missing the point: he is far more concerned with how he represents himself than how he represents the source.

All of the insights that emerge from weighing the translator's own words are lost when we apply the labels *ad sensum* or *ad uerbum*, terms that mean more to us in our heritage of Western thought than they did to Republican Romans. An examination of translations on the fabricated basis of how closely we perceive the translator stayed to the source obscures how the translator situates himself in his literary system. Indeed, by focusing on adherence we come dangerously close to eliminating the agency of the translator, as if the role of the translator is to render source text into translation in a mechanical fashion. By focusing on the form of the text and judging how well it represents the source, we suppose that a "perfect translation" is possible, if only the translator could perfectly understand the words and the message of the source author. In reality, the final format of a translation is the result of numberless decisions made by the translator that are representative of his or her own ideals about translation. By calling a translation "literal" or "loose" we obscure the negotiations that the translator must have while translating. To gain a proper appreciation of how translators see their role in a literary society, we must promote their voices and acknowledge that what they have written is a reflection of them and their perceived audience.

Bibliography

Allen, R.S. ed. 1988. *Richard Rolle: the English writings*. New York.

Anaconda, R. 2002. "The untouched self: Sapphic and Catullan Muses in Horace, *Odes* 1.22," in E. Spentzou and D. Fowler, eds. *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*. Oxford.

Anderson, W.S. 1996. *Barbarian Play: Plautus' Roman comedy*. Toronto.

Armin, H. 1903–1905. *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*. Stuttgart

Arnott, W.G. 1975. *Menander, Plautus, Terence*. Oxford.

Astin, A.E. 1978. *Cato the Censor*. Oxford.

_____, et al., eds. 1989. *The Cambridge Ancient History*. 2nd ed. Vol. 8. Cambridge.

Bain, D. 1979. "*Plautus vortit barbare*: Plautus, *Bacchides* 526–61 and Menander, *Dis exapaton* 102–12," in D. West and T. Woodman, eds. *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*. Cambridge. 17–34.

Barchiesi, A. 2000. "Rituals in ink: Horace on the Greek lyric tradition," in M. Depew and D. Obbink, eds. *Matrices of genre, authors, canons and society*. Harvard.

_____. 2001. "Horace and Iambos: The poet as literary historian," in Alberto Cavarzere, Antonio Aloni, Alessandro Barchiesi, eds. *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a poetic tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*. Oxford. 141–164.

Barchiesi, M. 1962. *Nevio Epico*. Padua.

Barsby, J. ed. and tr. 1986. *Plautus: Bacchides*. Oxford.

_____. 1999. *Terence: Eunuchus*. Cambridge.

- Bassnett, S. and A. Lefevere, eds. 1990. *Translation, History and Culture*. London.
- Batteux, C. 1761. *A course of the belles lettres: or the Principles of Literature*. Trans. John Miller, London.
- Beard, M. 2003. "The Triumph of the Absurd: Roman Street Theatre." In C. Edwards and G. Woolf, eds., *Rome the Cosmopolis*. Cambridge. 21–43
- Beare, W. 1959. "Contaminatio," *CR* 9.1: 7–11.
- Bentley, R. ed. and comm. 1978 (reprint of the 3rd ed. published in 1869). *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Ex recensione et cum notis*. New York.
- Berman, A. (trans. S. Heyvaert) 1984. *The Experience of the Foreign: Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany*. Albany.
- Biville, F. 1990. *Les emprunts du latin au grec. Approche phonetique*. Paris.
- _____. 2002. "The Graeco-Romans and Graeco-Latin; a Terminological Framework for Cases of Bilingualism," in Adams, Janse and Swain 2002: 77–102.
- Blänsdorf, J. 2011. *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum*. Berlin.
- Brink, C.O., ed. 1968. *Horace on Poetry: the Ars Poetica*. Cambridge.
- _____. 1972. "Ennius and the Hellenistic worship of Homer," *AJP* 93.4: 547–567.
- Broccia, G. 1974. *Ricerche su Livio Andronico Epico*. Padua.
- Brock, S. 1979. "Aspects of translation technique in antiquity," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 20: 69–87.
- Brooks, R.A. 1981. *Ennius and Roman tragedy*. New York.
- Brothers, A.J., ed. 2000. *Terence: Eunuch*. Warminster.
- Burnett, A.P. 1983. *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho*. Cambridge.

Cairns, F. 1972. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh.

_____ 1979. *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*. Cambridge.

Carroll, P. ed. and trans. 1958. *The Satirical Letters of St. Jerome*. Chicago.

Catford, J.C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London.

Cavarzere, A. ed. and comm. 1992. *Il libro degli Epodi Orazio*. Venice.

Cheyfitz, E. 1991. *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from the Tempest to Tarzan*. London.

Clay, J.S. 2010. "Horace and Lesbian Lyric," in G. Davis, ed. *A Companion to Horace*. West Sussex. 128–146.

Clifford, H.R. 1931. "Dramatic Technique and the Originality of Terence," *Classical Journal*. Vol. 26.8: 605–618.

Connors, C. 2004. "Monkey Business: Imitation, Authenticity, and Identify from Pithekoussai to Plautus," *Classical Antiquity* 23: 179–207.

Conte, G.B. 1986. *The rhetoric of imitation: genre and poetic memory in Virgil and other Latin poets*. Ithaca, NY.

_____ 1994. *Latin Literature: a History*. Trans. J.B. Solodow. Baltimore.

Cook, A.S. ed. 1898. *Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose*. London.

Copeland, R. 1991. *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts*. Cambridge.

Copley, F.O. 1957. "The Unity of C. 68: a Further View," *CPh* 52: 29–32.

Courtney, E. 1985. "Three poems of Catullus," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 32: 85–100.

_____ 1993. *The fragmentary Latin poets*. Oxford.

Curbera, J.B. and J.M. Curbera. 1997. "Graecolatina," *ZPE* 118: 235–236.

Davies, J. 1860. ed. *Publii Terentii Afri Adelphi, Hecyra, et Phormio*. London.

Delisle, J. and J. Woodsworth, eds. 1995. *Translators through history*. Paris.

Doering, F.G. 1826. *Q. Horatii Flacci opera omnia*. London.

Dougan, T.W. 1979. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum Libri Quinque*. New York.

Drexler, H. 1934. *Die Komposition von Terenz' Adelphen und Plautus' Rudens*. Leipzig.

Dubuisson, M. 1985. *Le latin de Polybe: les implications historiques d'un cas de bilinguisme*. Paris

_____ 1992. "Le grec à Rome à l'époque de Cicéron: Extension et qualité du bilinguisme," *Annales* 47: 187–206.

Duckworth, G.E. 1952. *The Nature of Roman Comedy*. Princeton.

Dyck, A., ed. 1996. *A Commentary on Cicero, De Officiis*. Ann Arbor.

Edmunds, L. 1992. *From a Sabine Jar: Reading Horace Odes 1.9*. Chapel Hill.

Edwards, M.J. 1989. "Greek into Latin," *Latomus* 48: 590–600.

Elliot, J. 2014. *Ennius and the architecture of the Annales*. Cambridge.

Even-Zohar, I. 1978a. "Papers in Historical Poetics," in B. Hrushovski and I. Even-Zohar, eds. *Papers on Poetics and Semiotics* 8. Tel Aviv.

_____ 1978b. "The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem," in J.S. Holmes, J. Lambert and R. van den Broeck, eds. *Literature and translation: new perspectives in literary studies with a basic bibliography of books on translation studies*. Leuven. 117–127.

_____ 1990. *Polysystem studies. Poetics today* 11.

Fantham, E. 1968. "Terence, Diphilus, and Menander. A Re-examination of Terence, *Adelphoe*, Act II," *Philologus* 112: 196–216.

_____ 1971. "*Hautontimorumenos* and *Adelphoe*: A Study of Fatherhood in Terence and Menander," *Latomus* 30.4: 970–998.

_____ 1977. "Adaptation and Survival: A Genre Study of Roman Comedy in Relation to its Greek Sources," in P.G. Ruggiers, ed. *Versions of Medieval comedy*, Norman, OK. 19–50.

_____ 1984. "Roman Experience of Menander in the Late Republican and Early Empire," *TAPA* 114: 299–309.

_____ 2004. *The Roman world of Cicero's De Oratore*. Oxford.

_____ 2011. *Roman Readings: Roman Response to Greek Literature from Plautus to Statius and Quintilian*. Berlin.

Feeney, D. 1993. "Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets," in N. Rudd, ed. *Horace 2000: A Celebration*. Ann Arbor. 41–63.

_____ 2005. Review of Suerbaum, W. 2002. *Handbuch der Lateinischen Literatur der Antike. Erster Band: Die Archaische Literatur*. *JRS* 95: 226–240.

Finamore, J.F. 1984. "Catullus 50 and 51: Friendship, love and 'otium'," *Classical World* 78.1: 11–19.

Fitzgerald, W. 1988. "Power and impotence in Horace's *Epodes*," *Arethusa* 17: 176–191.

Fordyce, C.J. 1961. *Catullus*. Oxford.

Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace*. Oxford.

_____ 2007 [trans. of 1922 *Plautinisches im Plautus*] *Plautine elements in Plautus*. Oxford.

Frank, R.I. 1968. "Catullus 51: *Otium* versus *virtus*," *TAPA* 99: 233–239.

- Frank, T. 1927. "How Horace Employed Alcaeus," *CPh* 22.3: 291–295.
- Fredricksmeyer, E.A. 1965. "On the Unity of Catullus 51," *TAPA* 96: 153–166.
- Friedrich, G. ed and comm. 1908. *Catulli Veronensis Liber*. Leipzig.
- Gaiser, J.H. 2009. *Catullus*. Blackwell.
- Garrison, D.H. ed. and comm. 1991. *Horace, Epodes and Odes*. Norman, OK.
- _____ ed. and comm. 2004 [1989]. *The Student's Catullus*. Norman, OK.
- Gentili, B. 1979. *Theatrical Performances in the Ancient World: Hellenistic and Early Roman Theatre*. Amsterdam.
- _____ 1988. *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece*. Baltimore.
- Gentzler, E. 2001. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. Clevedon, UK.
- Gerber, D. E. ed. and trans. 1999. *Greek Iambic Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Gildenhard, I. 2007. *Paideia Romana*. Cambridge.
- Gilleland, M.E. 1978. *Linguistic Differentiation of Character Type and Sex in the Comedies of Plautus and Terence*. Ph.D. Thesis. Charlottesville.
- Glucker, J. 2012. "Cicero's Remarks on Translating Philosophical Terms – some General Problems," in J. Glucker and C. Burnett, eds. *Greek into Latin from Antiquity until the Nineteenth Century*. London. 37–96.
- Goldberg, S.M. 1986. *Understanding Terence*. Princeton.
- _____ 1995. *Epic in republican Rome*. New York.
- _____ 1996. "The fall and rise of Roman tragedy," *TAPA* 126: 265–286.
- _____ 2005. *Constructing literature in the Roman republic: poetry and its reception*. Cambridge.

- _____. 2006. "Ennius after the banquet," *Arethusa* 39.3: 427–447.
- Gomme, A.W. and Sandbach, F.H., eds. 1973. *Menander: A commentary*. Oxford.
- Gow, A.S.F. and Page, D.L., eds. 1965. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. Cambridge.
- Grant, J. 1975. "The ending of Terence's *Adelphoe* and the Menandrian original," *AJPh* 96.1: 42–60.
- Gratwick, A.S. 1972. Review of Lefèvre, E. 1969. *Die Expositionstechnik in den Komödien des Terenz*. in *Classical Review* n.s. 22: 29–32.
- _____. 1973. "Titus Maccius Plautus," *Classical Quarterly* ns 23: 78–84.
- _____. ed. 1999. *Terence: the Brothers*. Warminster.
- Grassman, V. 1966. *Die erotischen epoden des Horaz*. Munich.
- Graver, M. ed. 2002. *Cicero on the emotions: "Tusculan Disputations" 3 and 4*. Chicago.
- Graves, R. 1965. "Moral Principles in Translation," *Encounter* 24.4: 47–54.
- Greenberg, N.A. 1979. "Success and Failure in the *Adelphoe*," *CW* 73.4: 221236.
- Griffin, J. 1986. *Latin poets and Roman life*. Chapel Hill.
- Griffiths, G., Hankins, J. and D. Thompson. eds. and trans. 1987. *The Humanism of Leonardo Bruni: selected texts*. Binghamton, NY.
- Gruen, E.S. 1990. *Studies in Greek culture and Roman policy*. Leiden.
- _____. 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca.
- Habinek, T.N. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature*. Princeton.
- _____. 2005. *The World of Roman Song: from Ritualized Speech to Social Order*. Baltimore.
- _____. 2006. "The Wisdom of Ennius," *Arethusa* 39.3: 471–488.

- Hallet, J.P. 2006. "Catullus and Horace on Roman Women Poets," *Antichthon* 40: 65–88.
- Halliwell, S. 2002. *The aesthetics of mimesis*. Princeton.
- Handley, E.W. 1968. *Menander and Plautus: a Study in Comparison*. Edinburgh.
- Harris, B. 1980. "How a Three-year-old Translates," in E.A. Afrendas, ed. *Patterns of Bilingualism*. Singapore. 370-398.
- Harrison, S.J. 2001a. "Paris, Helen and the unity of Catullus 51," *Classical Bulletin* 77: 161–168.
- _____. 2001b. "Some Generic Problems in Horace's *Epodes*: or, on (not) being Archilochus," in A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni, and A. Barchiesi, eds. *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a poetic tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*. Oxford. 165–186.
- Herescu, N.J. 1957. "Catulle traducetur du grec," *Eranos* 55. 151–170.
- Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext : Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman poetry*. New York.
- Hollis, A.S. 2000. "The Reputation and Influence of Choerilus of Samos," *ZPE* 130: 13–15.
- Horrocks, G.C. 1997. *Greek: a History of the Language and the Speakers*. London.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. 1979. "*Doctus sermones utriusque linguae*," *Echoes du monde classique* 22: 79–95.
- Hough, J.N. 1934. "The use of Greek words by Plautus" *American Journal of Philology* 55: 346–364.
- _____. 1940. "Miscellanea Plautina: Vulgarly, Extra-dramatic Speeches, Roman allusions," *TAPA* 71: 186–198.
- _____. 1947. "Terence's use of Greek words," *Classical Weekly* 41.2: 18–21.
- Hulk, A. 1991. "Parameter setting and the acquisition of word order in L2 French," *Second Language Research* 7: 1–34.

Hunter, R. 1985. *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*. Cambridge.

_____ 1993. *The Argonautica of Apollonius*. Cambridge.

Hutchinson, G.O. 2007. "Horace and Archaic Greek poetry," in S. Harrison, ed. *Cambridge companion to Horace*. New York. 36–49.

Itzkowitz, J.B. 1983. "On the Last Stanza of Catullus 51," *Latomus* 42: 129–134.

Jacoby, F. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Berlin.

Jani, C.D. 1778. *Q. Horatii Flacci opera*. Leipzig.

Jensen, R.C. 1967. "Otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est," *Classical Journal* 62.8: 363–365.

Jocelyn, H.D. 1967. *The Tragedies of Ennius; the Fragments*. Cambridge.

_____ 1972. "The Poems of Quintus Ennius," *ANRW* 1.2: 987–1026.

_____ 1973. "Greek Poetry in Cicero's Prose Writing," in T. Cole and D. Ross, eds. *Studies in Latin Language and Literature*. Vol. XXIII. Cambridge. 61–112.

Johann, H.T. 1981. *Gerechtigkeit und Nutzen. Studien zur ciceronischen und hellenistischen Naturrechts- und Staatslehre*. Heidelberg.

Kaimio, J. 1979. *The Romans and the Greek Language*. Helsinki.

Karakasis, E. 2005. *Terence and the Language of Roman Comedy*. Cambridge.

Kassel, R. and C. Austin, eds. 1983–2001. *Poeta Comici Graeci*. Berlin.

_____ 1998. *Poeta Comici Graeci: Menander*. Berlin.

Kaufmann, W. ed. and trans. 1974. *Friedrich Nietzsche: The Gay Science*. New York.

Kelly, L.G. 1979. *The True Interpreter: a History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West*. New York.

- Kennedy, G. 1969. *Quintilian*. New York.
- Kiessling, A. ed. and comm. 1964. *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Open und Epoden*. Berlin.
- Kilpatrick, R.S. 1990. *The poetry of criticism; Horace, Epistles II and Ars Poetica*. Edmonton, AB.
- Kinsey, T.E. 1974. "Catullus 51," *Latomus* 33: 372–378.
- Kujore, O. 1974. "A Note on the *contaminatio* in Terence," *CPh* 69.1: 39–42.
- Lambardi, N. 1982. *Il Timaeus ciceroniano : arte e tecnica del vertere*. Florence
- Lefevere, A. ed. 1992. *Translation/History/Culture: a Sourcebook*. London.
- Leigh, M. 2004. *Comedy and the Rise of Rome*. Oxford.
- Lejnieks, V. 1968. "Otium Catullianum Reconsidered," *CJ* 63.6: 262–264.
- Leo, F. 1967 [1913]. *Geschichte der Römischen literature*. Darmstadt.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1973. "Terentian Technique in the *Adelphi* and the *Eunuchus*," *CQ* 23.2: 279–284.
- Long, A.A. 1974. *Hellenistic Philosophy*. London.
- _____ and D.N. Sedley. 1987. *The Hellenistic Philosophers*. Cambridge.
- Lord, C. 1977. "Aristotle, Menander and the Adelphoe of Terence," *TAPA*, 107: 183–202.
- Lowe, J.C.B. 1983. "The *Eunuchus*: Terence and Menander," *CQ*, 33.2: 428–444.
- Lowrie, M. 2006. "Hic and Absence in Catullus 68," *CPh* 101.2: 115–132.
- _____ 2009. *Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome*. Oxford.
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. 1980. *The Latin Love Poets: from Catullus to Horace*. Oxford.

_____. 2005. "Horace *Odes* Book 1 and the Alexandrian Edition of Alcaeus," *CQ* 55.2: 542–558.

Lucas, D.W., ed. 1968. *Poetics*. Oxford.

Ludwig, W. 1968. "The Originality of Terence and his Greek Models," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 9:2. 169–182.

Madvig, N. 1963 [1876]. *M. Tulli Ciceronis: de Finibus Bonorum et Malorum*. Hildesheim.

MacCary, W.T. 1971. "Menander's Old Men," *TAPA*, 102. 303–325.

MacFarlane, K.A. 2009. "Choerilus of Samos' lament (SH 317) and the revitalization of epic," *AJPH* 130: 219–234.

Macleane, A.J. 1881. *Q. Horatii Flacci opera omnia*. London.

Macleod, C.W. 1982. "Horace and his Lyric Models: a Note on *Epode* 9 and *Odes* 1.37," *Hermes* 110: 371–375.

_____. 1983. *Collected Essays*. Oxford.

Maltby, R. 1985. "The Distribution of Greek Loan-words in Terence," *CQ* 35.1: 110–123.

_____. 1995. "The Distribution of Greek loan-words in Plautus," in R. Brock and A.J. Woodman, eds. *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 8. Leeds. 31–70.

Mankin, D. ed. and comm. 1995. *Horace: Epodes*. Cambridge.

Mariotti, S. 1952. *Livio Andronico e la traduzione artistica*. Milan.

Marrou, H.I. 1956. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. London.

Martin, R.H. ed. 1959. *Terence: Adelphoe*. Cambridge.

McElduff, S. 2004. "More than Menander's acolyte: Terence on translation," in *Ramus* (Special Edition: *Rethinking Terence*) 33.120–9.

_____. 2009. "Living at the Level of the Word: Cicero's Rejection of the Interpreter as Translator," *Translation Studies* 2.2:133–146.

_____. 2013. *Roman Theories of Translation: Surpassing the Source*. New York.

McElduff, S. and E. Sciarrino, eds. *Complicating the History of Western Translation: the Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective*. Manchester.

Meillet, A. 1928. *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine*. Paris.

Moore, T.J. 1998. *The Theater of Plautus: Playing to the Audience*. Austin.

Mynors, R.A.B. ed. and comm. 1990. *Georgics*. Oxford.

Nicoll, A. ed. and comm. 1956. *Chapman's Homer*. New York.

Nisbet, R.G.M. and Hubbard, M. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book 1*. Oxford.

Nisbet, R. G. M. 1999. "The Word Order of the Odes," in J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer (eds.) *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*. Oxford: 135–54.

Nord, C. 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester.

Norwood, G. 1932. *Plautus and Terence*. New York.

Oksala, P. 1953. *Die griechischen Lehnwörter in den Prosaschriften Ciceros*. Helsinki.

Oliensis, E. 1991. "Canidia, Canicula, and the Decorum of Horace's *Epodes*, *Arethusa* 24.1: 107–138.

Page, T.E. ed. and comm. 1905. *Q. Horatii Flacci: Carminum Libri IV, Epodon Liber*. London.

Parker, H. 1996. "Plautus vs. Terence: Audience and Popularity Re-examined," *AJPh* 117. 4: 585–617.

Pollard, A.W. ed. 1903. *Fifteenth Century Prose and Verse: an English Garner*. New York.

Possanza, D.M. 2004. *Translating the Heavens: Aratus, Germanicus, and the Poetics of Latin Translation*. New York.

Powell, J.G.F. ed. 1988. *Cicero, Cato Maior De Senectute*. Cambridge.

_____ 1995a. *Cicero the Philosopher*. Oxford.

_____ 1995b. "Cicero's Translations from Greek," in J.G.F. Powell 1995a: 273–300.

Prescott, H.W. 1940. "The Unity of C. 68," *TAPA* 71: 473–500.

Quine, W. 1960. *Word and Object*. Cambridge.

Quinn, K. 1970. *Catullus: the Poems*. London.

_____ 1972. *Catullus; an interpretation*. London.

_____ ed. and comm. 1980. *Horace: the Odes*. London.

_____ 1982. "The Poet and his Audience in the Augustan Age," *ANRW* 30.1: 75–180.

Rand, E.K. 1932. "The Art of Terence's *Eunuchus*," *TAPA* 63: 54–72.

Rawson, E. 1985. *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*. Baltimore.

Reid, J.S., ed. 1968 [1925]. *De finibus bonorum et malorum*. Hildesheim.

Reiss, K. and Vermeer, H.J. 1984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen.

Ribbeck, O. 1962 [1871]. *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta: Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*. Hildesheim.

_____ 1962 [1873] *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta: Comicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*. Hildesheim.

Rieth, O. 1964 [1943]. *Die Kunst Menanders in den Adelphen des Terenz*. Hildesheim.

Renner, F.M. 1989. *Interpretatio: Language and Translation from Cicero to Tytler*. Amsterdam.

Richlin, A. 2005. *Rome and the Mysterious Orient: Three Plays by Plautus*. Berkeley.

Robinson, D. 1991. *The Translator's Turn*. Baltimore.

_____ 1997a. *What is Translation? Centrifugal Theories, Critical Interventions*. Kent.

_____ 1997b. *Western Translation Theory: from Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Manchester.

_____ 2001. *Who Translates? Translator Subjectivities beyond Reason*. Albany.

Ronconi, A. 1973. *Interpreti latini di Omero*.

Rose, H.J. 1921. "The Greek of Cicero," *JHS* 41: 91–116.

Rossi, A. and Breed, B.W. 2006. "Introduction: Ennius and the Traditions of Epic" *Arethusa* 39.3: 397–425.

Rothstein, A. 2010. *The Idea of Iambos*. Oxford.

Sandbach, F. 1975. "Menander and the Three-Actor Rule," in *Le Mond Grec. Hommages à Claire Préaux*. Brussels. 197–204.

_____ 1977. *The comic theatre of Greece and Rome*. London.

_____ 1990 [1972]. *Menandri Reliquiae Selectae*. Oxford.

Saylor, C. 2008. "Inclusion and Exclusion of Characters in the New Comic Society in Plautus and Terence" *Studies in Latin literature and Roman History* 14: 115–130.

Sarkissian, J. 1983. *Catullus 68: an Interpretation*. Leiden.

Schepps, G. and Brandt, S. eds. 1905. *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*. Vol. 48. Turnhout.

Sciarrino, E. 2006. "The Introduction of Epic in Rome: Cultural Thefts and Social Contests," *Arethusa* 39.3: 449–469.

_____. 2011. *Cato the Censor and the Beginnings of Latin Prose: from Poetic Translation to Elite Transcription*. Columbus, OH.

Segal, C. 1989. "Otium and Eros," *Latomus* 48: 817–822.

Segal, E. 1969. *Plautus: Three comedies*. New York.

_____. 1987. *Roman Laughter*. Cambridge.

Shackelton Bailey, D.R. ed. 1985. *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*. Stuttgart.

_____. 1987. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae ad Atticum* Stuttgart

Sheets, G.A. 1981. "The Dialectic Gloss, Hellenistic Poets and Livius Andronicus," *AJPh* 102: 58–78.

Shipp, G.P., ed. 1979. *P. Terenti Afri: Andria*. New York.

Shuckburgh, E.S. 1877. ed. *The Hauton Timorumenos of Terence*. London.

Skinner, M.B. 1972. "The Unity of C. 68: the Structure of 68a," *TAPA* 103: 495–512.

Skinner, M.B. 2003. *Catullus in Verona*. Columbus, OH.

Skutsch, O. 1968. *Studia Enniana*. London.

_____. 1985. *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford.

Shuttleworth, M. and M. Cowie. 1997. *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester.

Smith, J.H. and E.W. Parks, eds. and trans. 1967. *The Great Critics: an Anthology of Literary Criticism*. New York.

Solmsen, F. 1986. "Aeneas Founded Rome with Odysseus," *HSPH* 90: 93–110.

Spivak, G. 1992. "The Politics of Translation," in *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. London.

Steiner, G. 1975. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. New York.

- Steiner, T.R. 1975. *English Translation Theory, 1650–1800*. Amsterdam.
- Störig, H.J. 1969. *Das Problem des Übersetzens*. Darmstadt.
- Striker, G. 1995. “Cicero and Greek Philosophy,” *HSPH* 97: 53–61.
- Sutton, D.F. 1993. *Ancient Comedy: the War of the Generations*. New York.
- Szemerényi, O. 1975. “The Origins of Roman Drama and Greek Tragedy,” *Hermes* 103: 300–322.
- Thomas, R.F. ed. and comm. 1988. *Virgil: Georgics*. Cambridge.
- _____. 2007. “Horace and Hellenistic poetry,” in S. Harrison, ed. *Cambridge Companion to Horace*. New York. 50–62.
- Thomson, D.S.F. 1997. *Catullus*. Toronto.
- Toury, G. 1978. “The Nature and Role of Norms in Literary Translation,” in J.S. Holmes, J. Lambert and R. van den Broeck, eds. *Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies*. Leuven. 83–100.
- _____. 1995. *Description Translation Studies—and Beyond*. Amsterdam.
- Traglia, A. 1985. “Sulle origini della lingua letteraria Latina,” in *La formazione delle lingue letterarie*, ed. A. Moreschini, Biblioteca della Società Italiana di Glottologia 8: 109–112. Pisa.
- Tränkle, H. 1972. “Micio und Demea in den terenzischen Adelphen,” *Museum Helveticum* 29: 241–255.
- Tytler, A. F. 1978 [1791] *Essays on the Principles of Translation*. Philadelphia.
- Venuti, L. 2008 [1995]. *The Translator’s Invisibility*. New York.
- Verrusio, M. 1977. *Livio Andronico e la sua traduzione dell’Odissea Omerica*. Rome.

Vinay, J.P. and J. Darbelnet (trans. J.C. Sager and M.J. Hamel). 1995. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: a Methodology for Translation*. Amsterdam.

Vine, B. 1992. "On the 'Missing' Fourth Stanza of Catullus 51," *HSPH* 94: 251–258.

Voigt, E. 1971. *Sappho et Alcaeus*. Amsterdam.

Von Albrecht, M. 1997. *A History of Roman Literature: from Livius Andronicus to Boethius*. Leiden.

_____. 1999. *Roman Epic: an Interpretative Introduction*. Leiden.

Wagner, P. ed. and comm. 1861. *P. Virgili Maronis: Carmina*. Leipzig.

Walbank, F.W., et al., eds. 1990. *The Cambridge Ancient History* 2nd ed. Vol. 8. Cambridge.

Warmington, E.H. ed. and trans. 1967 [1936]. *Remains of Old Latin*. Cambridge.

Watson, L. 1995. "Horace's *Epodes*: the Importance of Iambos," in S.J. Harrison, ed., *Homage to Horace*. Oxford. 188–202.

_____. 2003. *A commentary on Horace's Epodes*. Oxford.

Webster, T.B.L. 1974. *An Introduction to Menander*. Manchester.

West, D. 1995. *Horace Odes 1: Carpe Diem*. Oxford.

West, M.L. 1989–1992 [1971–1972]. *Iambi et elegi Graeci*. Oxford

Williams, G. 1956. "Some Problems in the Construction of Plautus' *Pseudolus*," *Hermes* 84: 424–455.

_____. 1968. *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*. Oxford.

Winterbottom, M. 1994. Cicero. *De Officiis*. Oxford.

Wiseman, T.P. 1969. *Catullan Questions*. Leeds.

_____ 1974. "C. 68.157," *CR* 24: 6–7.

_____ 1985. *Catullus and his World*. Cambridge.

Woodman, T. 2002. "Biformis Vates: the *Odes*, Catullus and Greek lyric," in T. Woodman and D. Feeney, eds. *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*. Cambridge.

Wormell, D.E. 1966. "Catullus as Translator," in L. Wallach, ed., *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*. Ithaca. 187–201.

Worth-Stylianou, V. 1996. "The Renaissance," in V. Worth-Stylianou, ed. *Cassel guide to French literature*. 42–66. New York.

Wright, J. 1974. *Dancing in Chains: the Stylistic Unity of the comoedia palliata*. Rome.

Yardley, J.C. 1978. "Copia scriptorum in Catullus 68.33," *Phoenix* 32: 337–339.

Young, E.M. 2011. "Sappho under my Skin: Catullus and the Translation of Erotic Lyric at Rome" in S. McElduff and E. Sciarrino, eds. *Complicating the history of Western translation*. Manchester. 25–36.

Zagagi, N. 1980. *Tradition and Originality in Plautus*. Gottingen.

_____ 2012. "What do Greek Words do in Plautus?" in J. Glucker and C. Burnett, eds., *Greek into Latin from Antiquity until the Nineteenth Century*. London. 19–36.

Zorzetti, N. 1990. "The *Carmina Convivalia*" in O. Murray, ed. *Symptica. A Symposium on the Symposium*. Oxford.

_____ 1991. "Poetry and Ancient City: the Case of Rome," *CJ* 86: 311–329.

Curriculum Vitae

Education:

2009 - : Ph.D., Classical Studies, University of Western Ontario
Dissertation: "The Modalities of Roman Translation: Source-representative, Allusive, and Independent"
Advisor: Debra Nousek
2006-2009: M.A., Classics, University of Manitoba
2005: B.A., Classics, University of Manitoba

Teaching Experience:

2013-2014: Fate and Virtue, Quest University, Visiting Faculty
2011-2012: Latin 1000, University of Western Ontario, Instructor
2008: Latin 1080, University of Manitoba, Instructor
2008: Latin 1090, University of Manitoba, Instructor

Grants, Fellowships, Awards:

2013: Alumni Graduate Award for travel, University of Western Ontario
2012-2013: Ontario Graduate Scholarship
2011-2012: Ontario Graduate Scholarship
2011: Faculty of Arts and Humanities Alumni Graduate Awards, University of Western Ontario
2010: Society of Graduate Student's Bursaries, University of Western Ontario
2010: Provost's Entrance Scholarship, University of Western Ontario
2006-2007: Faculty of Arts Graduate Fellowship, University of Manitoba
2004-2005: Lila May Guest Hugill Scholarship in Classics, University of Manitoba

Presentations:

May 2013: "Catullus, Horace, and a Polysystem in Rome" at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of Canada, Winnipeg
March 2013: "Horace in the Latin Polysystem" at the University of Western Ontario Departmental Research Seminar Series
May 2012: "A Statement of Independence in Catullus 51" at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of Canada, London
May 2011: "Horror in the fifth *Epode* of Horace" at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of Canada, Halifax

Affiliations:

2012-present: American Philological Association
2010-present: Classical Association of Canada

Committees:

2008: Classics Headship Renewal Committee, University of Manitoba