DE GRUYTER

CICERO IN GREECE, GREECE IN CICERO

ASPECTS OF RECIPROCAL RECEPTION FROM CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY TO BYZANTIUM AND MODERN GREECE

Edited by Ioannis Deligiannis

CICERO – STUDIES ON ROMAN THOUGHT AND ITS RECEPTION

DE G

Cicero in Greece, Greece in Cicero

CICERO
Studies on Roman Thought and Its Reception

Publications of the Foundation
Patrum Lumen Sustine (Basel)
and of the *Société Internationale des Amis de Cicéron* (Paris)

Volume 9

Cicero in Greece, Greece in Cicero

Aspects of Reciprocal Reception from Classical Antiquity to Byzantium and Modern Greece

Edited by
Ioannis Deligiannis

DE GRUYTER

The publication of this volume was made possible through the financial support of the *Patrum Lumen Sustine* foundation in Basel and the scholarly direction of the *Société Internationale des Amis de Cicéron* (SIAC, Paris).

www.patrumlumensustine.com

www.tulliana.eu

ISBN 978-3-11-121589-1
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-129277-9
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-129286-1
ISSN 2567-0158
DOI https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779

Library of Congress Control Number: 2023944033

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at http://dnb.dnb.de.

Cover image: Cesare Maccari, *Cicero Denounces Catiline* @ AKG
Manuscript proposals should be sent to Cicero_SIAC_DeG@tulliana.eu
Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

Prologue

The year 2021 marked 2100 years since Cicero's first trip to Greece in 79 BCE, a significant factor in moulding him as an orator, philosopher and politician. This provided the opportunity to bring together new and unpublished material on Cicero's presence in Greece literally, namely for the years he spent in nowadays Modern Greek territory, including his aforementioned travel in 79–78 BCE and the period of his exile in 58–57 BCE, and metaphorically, that is the reception of Cicero in Late Roman, Byzantine, post-Byzantine, Early Modern, and Modern Greece through translations, studies, imitations, etc. It was also an opportunity to approach the presence of Greece in Cicero from a new point of view, namely how the Greek world, people, language, civilisation, history, philosophy, politics and political theory, religion, geography, etc. appear in his work. Although some parts of the aforementioned threefold approach have been extensively studied as parts of both individual works of his and more or less holistic studies, the reception of Cicero and his work in Modern Greece (from the early nineteenth century up to date) has not as yet been given any special attention.

The contributions to the volume cover a wide range of subjects and periods: from Cicero's times in Greece, both as a student and as an exile, as well as his son's period in Greece just before his father's death, as depicted in Cicero's works, and certain aspects of the reception of Greece and its world by Cicero (the idealistic depiction of Athens, the effect of Greek philosophy on Cicero, etc.), to the reception of Cicero in the Eastern European World from the period of Late Antiquity to Middle, Later and post-Byzantine times, up to the revival of the Greeks' interest in Cicero in the nineteenth century and his *fortuna* in Greece in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The material discussed derives from a variety of sources: Cicero's works and epistolography, bilingual papyri glossaries, Byzantine compendia and imitations of Cicero's works, manuscripts, early editions and translations of and commentaries on his texts, etc.

Every effort has been made to ensure that there is coherence in the content of the contributions and the two major thematic sections of the volume, that is certain aspects of Greece and its world as emerging from Cicero's works (places, people, ideology and philosophy) and aspects of the reception of Cicero in the Greek-speaking world. Their treatment in whole would be practically impossible, because each would require a sizable amount of material. Therefore, the volume is restricted to some illustrative and indicative contributions. There are certainly other fields and perspectives that were inevitably left out of the content or were paid less attention to, not because they were deemed less important, but because the contributions did not focus on them.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779-001

All the papers included in this volume were composed exclusively to address its research objectives and themes, which were then grouped under the relevant sections. Their order followed the thematic fields mentioned above and their content. In the case of the latter, contributions generally treating the theme of the corresponding section or subsection are followed by those dealing with more specific issues. So, a relevant coherence in the organisation and structure of their content, which leads gradually and chronologically from the more general to the more specific, has been achieved. Subsequently, the volume provides an image as illustrative as possible of various aspects of the presence of the Greek world in Cicero's works and of Cicero's presence in Greece from his own times to the present day.

I would like to thank all the contributors to this volume for their inspiring studies and their fullest collaboration. I would also like to express my gratitude to the Scientific Board of De Gruyter's series "CICERO – Studies on Roman Thought and Its Reception" for the immediate approval of the initial volume proposal, and the anonymous reviewers of the volume for their comments and corrections, which significantly improved its drafts and saved us from many errors.

Ioannis Deligiannis

Table of Contents

Part I: **Aspects of Greece and its World in Cicero's Works**

Introduction

4 September 100 BCE: a group of Romans returning from Cilicia to Rome after the successful campaign of "M. Antonius, the orator and grandfather of Mark Antony, on his expedition against the Cilician pirates" and who had left Rome two years ago (102 BCE),[1] have stopped on Samothrace "to offer thanks for their success to the Theoi Megaloi, gods who were famous for helping men at sea".[2] They also have the opportunity to initiate themselves in the Samothracian Mysteries on the aforementioned date, as can be gathered from an inscription on a stele of white Thasian marble discovered in 1984 and preserved in the Archaeological Museum of Samothrace.[3] Among them is Lucius Tullius Cicero (*L.* · *Tullius* · *M.* · *f.* / *Cor*(*nelia*) [vac.] *praif*(*ectus*)),[4] son of Marcus and younger brother of Marcus,[5] the father of Marcus Tullius Cicero, the orator and politician.[6] "The older Cicero's journey represents a significant detour. His initiation had no expedient political value [...]. Instead, its main purposes must be explained otherwise: a satisfaction of cultural curiosity; a communication with ancestral roots; an aim to honour gods whose assistance at sea was paramount; a desire for personal betterment; or, an attraction to the sacred power of the island and its cult".[7]

Cicero himself must not have felt the same way as his uncle towards Samothrace and its Mysteries. The island (in the Northern Aegean Sea) is certainly not en route from Cilicia (modern Southern Eastern Turkey) to Rome. However, if he had desired to initiate himself in the Mysteries, it is almost sure that he would have spared the time to detour towards Samothrace on his way back from Cilicia to Rome at the end of his proconsulate there in 50 BCE, especially given the length of his trip (from late July to late November) and the fact that he stopped first in Rhodes and then in Athens (see further down). A strong reason for Cicero not having done so, as indicated from his letters to Atticus from the time,[8] were his concerns over the looming civil war between Caesar and Pompey

1 Clinton 2001, 29–30. See also Dimitrova 2008, 152–153, no 66; Wescoat 2013, 59–60.

2 Clinton 2001, 31.

3 Clinton 2001, 28: *L.* · *Valer*(*io*) · *C* · *Mar*(*io*) · *cos.* · *pr*(*idie*) · *n*(*onas*) *Sept.* ("in the consulship of L. Valerius [Flaccus] and G. Marius on the fourth day of September"). I am grateful to Dr Chrysa Karadima, Director of the Ephorate of Antiquities of Rhodope, Greece, for brining this inscription and its edition to my attention.

4 *Paulys Realencyclopädie* (*RE*) 7 A1, 1939, cols. 822–823, s.v. *Tullius* (25).

5 *RE* 7 A1, 1939, cols. 824–827, s.v. *Tullius* (28).

6 *RE* 7 A1, 1939, cols. 827–1274, s.v. *Tullius* (29).

7 Wescoat 2013, 60.

8 See, e. g., Cic. *Att*. 6.8; 7.1; 7.3.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779-002

and his desire to return to Rome to help ameliorate tensions. Another, though less likely, reason for Cicero not having stopped by Samothrace might have been Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus' visit to the island upon his recall as proconsul of Macedonia a few years earlier (55 BCE); Piso's role in Cicero's banishment from Rome in 58–57 BCE and the fact that "the Samothracians found Piso's visit worth commemorating (they erected a statue in his honour in the ancient city, on which he is described as *patronus*)",[9] might have deterred Cicero from visiting the island, although he does not "discredit the rite of initiation"[10] in his account of Piso's visit to Samothrace in his speech against him,[11] delivered that year. Another reason, perhaps more important, might have been Cicero's earlier initiation in the Eleusinian Mysteries, "probably [...] in Boedromion of 79, when for reasons of health and study he was spending six months in Athens".[12]

Cicero's visit to Athens and other places of Greece in 79–78 BCE is very well documented in his works and by other authors too.[13] On this trip, he was accompanied by his brother Quintus, his cousin Lucius, the son of the aforementioned Lucius, and some friends of theirs. The company was welcomed by Titus Pomponius Atticus, already in Athens from 86 or 85 BCE. While in Athens, Cicero attended lectures by the Academic philosopher Antiochus of Ascalon, the Epicureans Phaedrus and Zeno, and the orator Demetrius the Syrian. The following year he travelled to Asia Minor, where he attended the classes of Menippus of Stratonicea, Dionysius of Magnesia, Aeschylus of Cnidus and Xenocles of Adramyttium. It must have been during this year that he also met P. Rutilius Rufus in Smyrna, who, according to Cicero (although his testimony ought not to be taken literally),[14] described to him and his brother the dialogue *De re publica* between Scipio Aemilianus and his friends. In Rhodes he was taught by the orator Apollonius of Molon and the philosopher Posidonius of Apamea. This first trip to Greece was concluded in 77 BCE, when Cicero returned to Rome along with his brother.

Being the core of his trip, the city of Athens undeniably played a crucial role in Cicero's engagement with the Greek tradition. In her contribution "Athens' Author-

9 Wescoat 2013, 56.

10 Wescoat 2013, 56.

11 Cic. *Pis.* 89.

12 Clinton 1989, 1504. Cf. Cic. *Leg.* 2.36.

13 Throughout the volume, the chronology of Cicero's life and works follows that by Marinone/Malaspina 2004 and Malaspina 2008. See, e. g., Cic. *Brut.* 314–316; *Fin.* 1.16 and 5.1; *Leg.* 2.36; *Nat. D.* 1.59; Plut. *Cic.* 3.6–4.7; Strab. 14.2.25. For a brief account of this trip, see, e. g., Rawson 1975, 25–28; Crawford 1979; Rawson 1985; Grimal 1986, ch. 4; Fuhrmann 1992, 29–33; Narducci 2009, 41–56; Corbeill 2013. See also Tsouni and Lu in this volume.

14 Cf. Cic. *Rep.* 1.13.

ity in Cicero's Philosophical Works", Georgia Tsouni investigates how Cicero in his philosophical works constructs and discusses Athens' cultural authority (*auctoritas*). The authority of the city itself is reflected most prominently in the way Cicero presents Athens' cultural landmarks in the prologue to *De finibus* 5. Athens' authority is linked there to its role as a primary centre of liberal education and to being the birthplace of authoritative figures of the past, like Plato. At the same time, Cicero's philosophical dialogues testify to a cultural appropriation of Athens' intellectual legacy, whereas his dramatic settings aim at transferring Athenian landmarks, together with philosophical discourse, to Roman soil. Furthermore, by putting an emphasis on Roman traditions and *exempla*, but also by engaging in the justification of his own preoccupation with philosophy in the prologues to his works, Cicero places intellectual ('theoretical') activities (particularly linked to Athens) under the primacy of political action taking place in Rome. Cicero's attitude towards Athens' intellectual tradition ultimately reveals the ambivalence involved in his attempt to integrate Greek learning into a Roman context.

Having mastered Greek learning, Cicero strived for transferring and adapting Greek language, literature and theories to the Roman world, recognising the need to create terms in Latin that would capture and render the meaning of the original[15] by re-elaborating his sources. In her paper "Eloquence as Handmaiden of Wisdom. Hellenistic Philosoph(ies) in Cicero's *Partitiones Oratoriae*", Matilde Oliva sheds light on the complexity of Cicero's sources, especially for his philosophical theories and works. She focuses on the allegorical image of the *chorus*/*comitatus virtutum*, a personified representation of virtues that first appears in Cicero's works within Latin literature. In his *Partitiones oratoriae*, a rhetorical handbook conceived as a dialogue between himself and his son Marcus, Cicero, dealing with each of the three Aristotelian *genera* of speech, first explains the *genus laudativum*, which is supposed to teach Marcus not just to speak eloquently, but also to live honestly and virtuously. In a context so strongly characterised from an ethical point of view, Cicero inserts a complex and accurate system of virtues of clear Stoic derivation. Here one finds an intriguing personification of dialectic and oratory, which are portrayed as handmaidens and companions of wisdom. This personification, which reflects an already Stoic concept, brings up a question on the influence of Stoicism on *Partitiones oratoriae*'s treatment of virtues and on the way Cicero seems to imagine and represent them. Starting from the personification found in *Partitiones oratoriae*, the author moves through all the Ciceronian

15 See, e. g., Burns 1906; Costanza 1950; Traina 1961; Jocelyn 1973; Chinnici 2000; Zambarbieri 2001; Manuello 2006; Arcidiacono 2007; Kruck 2008; Glucker 2012; Deligiannis 2014; Glucker 2015; Lévy 2022.

occurrences of the *chorus*/*comitatus virtutum.* She thus reconstructs the Greek sources of this image and looks for common patterns between the passages, trying to understand where the *chorus*/*comitatus* came from exactly and to what extent its presence can be explained in Cicero as a result of the long and deep bond between him and Greece.

Cicero's strong connection with the Greek world in its entirety is reflected in his writings by frequent references to its people and places, its language and literature, its history and civilisation, its politics and political theory, its law and religion, etc.[16] Growing up and being educated in an intellectual, cultural and educational milieu inevitably and robustly interacting with and imbued by the Greek world undeniably affected Cicero's attitudes, which were ambivalent, towards the Greeks and their life from every point of view.[17]

Almost twenty years later, Cicero's second trip to Greece was made under gloomy circumstances related to his *fabula rerum eventorumque.*[18] His stance towards the Catilinarian conspirators in late 63 BCE and, most importantly, some other, deeper political reasons related to the members of the First Triumvirate, especially to J. Caesar, led to his banishment from Rome and Italy by a series of plebiscites issued by the tribune of 58 BCE P. Clodius Pulcher, under the silent tolerance or the overt support of the consuls of the year, L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus and A. Gabinius, and other Roman magistrates. The night of 18 or 19 March 58 BCE, Cicero fled Rome intending to sail from Brundisium to Epirus and from there to Cyzicus in Propontis.[19] Wandering around Italy and hoping for a favourable change, he arrived at Brundisium on 17 April, where he remained until 29 or 30 April, when he finally sailed for Dyrrachium. Probably having taken the Via Egnatia he arrived in Thessalonica on 23 May, where he was welcomed and hosted by

16 Even a quick glance through Shackleton Bailey's *Onomastica* (1992, 1995 and 1996) can offer an idea of Cicero's references to the Greek world.

17 See, e. g., Lull 1919; Trouard 1942; Guite 1962; Rowland 1972; Petrochilos 1974; Kuèinskienë 2006; van der Blom 2007.

18 Cic. *Fam.* 5.12.6. Plutarch's account (*Cic.* 3.6) that Cicero left Rome in 79 BCE because of fear of Sulla is an interesting approach, as this would show that all his trips to Greece were born of desperation. Cicero himself, however, claims that he left for Greece to improve his health and skills (Cic. *Brut.* 313–314). For a brief account of the background of Cicero's exile and the years he spent in exile until his return to Rome, see, e. g., Rawson 1975, 106–123; Grimal 1986, ch. 9 (for the events that led to his exile) and 10 (for his exile); Fuhrmann 1992, 89–96. See also Claassen 1992; Robinson 1994; Narducci 1997; Claassen 1999; Garcea 2005; Kelly 2006; Cohen 2007; Narducci 2009, 209–217.

19 For a detailed account of Cicero's journey to exile, see, e. g., Shackleton Bailey 1965–1970, vol. 2, 227–232; Marinone/Malaspina 2004; Malaspina 2008.

his friend and quaestor of Macedonia Gn. Plancius.[20] He stayed with him until mid-November, when Cicero decided to leave Thessalonica, so as not to be found there upon the arrival of the new proconsular governor of Macedonia, L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus. He returned to Dyrrachium in late November, expecting some good news after the election of P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther and Q. Caecilius Metellus Nepos as consuls for the following year and some initiatives for his recall from exile. Cicero remained in Epirus until the summer of 57 BCE, alternating his time between Dyrrachium and Atticus' villa in Buthrotum. On August 4, the very day when the law for his recall (*Lex Cornelia Caecilia de revocando Cicerone*) was passed, Cicero sailed from Dyrrachium back to Brundisium, where he arrived the following day, and almost a month later (on September 4) he entered Rome gloriously just before the commencement of the *Ludi Romani.*

Despite his triumphant return, his exile certainly caused him to fall into depression. Destitute of his political position and his family and having been abandoned by his friends and allies, he informed his loved ones that he felt betrayed, that he had lost all hope and that he was even considering taking his own life. He complained about his calamity that had made his living condition a fate worse than death. He expressed his fear of Crassus, criticised Pompey for betraying him by refusing to protect him from Clodius, despite his promises, attacked his treacherous friends who gave him bad advice to leave Rome and even revealed to his most intimate friend, Atticus, that he considered him also partly responsible for his exile. In his paper "Loss of Self, Desperation, and Glimmers of Hope in Cicero's Letters from Exile", Gabriel Evangelou explores Cicero's banishment from Rome between March 58 and September 57 BCE by focusing on the safe haven that he found in Thessalonica. Through a close examination of his extant letters primarily to his intimate friend, Atticus, but also his wife, Terentia, and his brother, Quintus, the author investigates the magnitude of Cicero's suffering, while drawing an important distinction between facts and claims found in his letters. Even though it appears that he experienced severe sorrow during his stay in Thessalonica, Cicero had ample reason throughout his exile to believe that he would one day be recalled to Rome. More importantly, his constant requests to his loved ones and the place in which he chose to reside are strong indications of the hope that he cherished during his exile. The discussion thus aims to challenge the conventional view of Cicero's letters from exile as entirely genuine expressions of his condition by arguing that, because he was deprived of his public-facing oratory, the only weapon left in his arsenal was his rhetorical skills that he could use primarily

20 See also further down and Evangelou in this volume.

in the letter exchange with his loved ones, in an attempt to stress the urgency of his proper return to Rome.

Within six years of his return to Rome, Cicero reluctantly left for Cilicia to serve as a proconsul.[21] Sometime between May and July of 51 BCE he travelled from Rome to Cilicia accompanied by his son Marcus, his brother Quintus, his nephew Quintus and other members of staff. He arrived there in August and remained until 30 July 50 BCE. As stated above, "on his voyage back from his province he first touched at Rhodes, and then gladly spent some time at Athens in fond remembrance of his old pursuits in that place. Then, after associating with men who were foremost for their learning, and after greeting his old-time friends and intimates, and after receiving from Greece the tokens of admiration that were his due, he returned to Rome, where a violent inflammation, as it were, was already forcing matters on towards the civil war" (transl. Perrin 1919, 175), according to Plutarch.[22]

That was the third time that Cicero was found in Greece, but it was certainly not the last one. The shortness of his stay in Rhodes and Athens apparently was the result of the conditions of the imminent civil war between Caesar and Pompey. Cicero arrived in Rome on 4 January 49 BCE, greeted by a large crowd, but less than a week later, on January 10, Caesar crossed the Rubicon, triggering the civil war that followed. Supporting Pompey as a defender of the Senate and the *res publica*, Cicero left Rome in mid-January (sometime between the 17th and the 19th of the month) along with Pompey, accompanied by his son, brother and nephew, while the female members of the family remained in Rome. In late March, he met with Caesar in the latter's last attempt to find an endorsement of his actions by a senior senator. Despite or because of this meeting, Cicero decided to leave Italy in early June to join Pompey in Macedonia. The following months he participated in war councils taking place in Thessalonica, while in mid-December he followed the Pompeian troops to Epirus. After the Battle of Dyrrachium in July and Caesar's retreat to Thessaly, Cicero did not follow the Pompeian army there, but remained in Dyrrachium. The decisive Battle of Pharsalus on August 10 found Cicero in Corfu

21 See, e.g., Rawson 1975, 164–182; Grimal 1986, ch. 14; Fuhrmann 1992, 122–131; Marinone/Malaspina 2004; Lintott 2008, 253–267; Malaspina 2008; Narducci 2009, 357–364. For a detailed account of Cicero's proconsulship in Cilicia, see, e.g., Mitchell 1991, 204–231. See also Caiazza 1959; Wilkinson 1959; Bernard 2012. See also Evangelou in this volume, p. 43.

22 Plut. *Cic*. 36.7: Πλέων δ' ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπαρχίας τοῦτο μὲν Ῥόδῳ προσέσχε, τοῦτο δ' Ἀθήναις ἐνδιέτριψεν, ἄσμενος πόθῳ τῶν πάλαι διατριβῶν. Ἀνδράσι δὲ τοῖς πρώτοις ἀπὸ παιδείας συγγενόμενος, καὶ τούς [τό]τε φίλους καὶ συνήθεις ἀσπασάμενος, καὶ τὰ πρέποντα θαυμασθεὶς ὑπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος, εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐπανῆλθεν, ἤδη τῶν πραγμάτων ὥσπερ ὑπὸ φλεγμονῆς δισταμένων ἐπὶ τὸν ἐμφύλιον πόλεμον.

and from there he decided to return to Italy along with his son, while Quintus and his son took refuge in Patras. Cicero remained in Brundisium uncertain of his fate after Caesar's victory until December 48 BCE, when an edict issued by Mark Antony granted him to remain in Italy.[23]

That was Cicero's last and rather inopportune presence in Greece, while an interrupted trip was made in mid-44 BCE. In late March or early April 45 BCE, his son Marcus left Italy for a study trip to Athens.[24] Though troubled by the political conditions in Rome, Cicero planned a trip there to visit his son. While travelling by sea to Greece between 17 July and 7 August 44 BCE, he decided to cancel his trip (8 August) and by 31 August he was back in Rome. Upon arrival in Rome, Cicero used fatigue from his journey as a pretext to excuse himself from the Senate meeting presided by Mark Antony on 1 September.[25] Antony's threat to punish Cicero for this absence prompted Cicero to deliver the *First Philippic* in the Senate, which publicised and politicised his interrupted plan to visit Marcus in Athens. Thus, Marcus' study abroad gained new meanings for Cicero and broader attention as the conflict between Cicero and Antony intensified. Cicero composed *De officiis* in the autumn of 44 BCE shortly after finishing the *Second Philippic* and addressed it to Marcus in Athens in lieu of his personal visit. In his contribution, "*Mercatura Bonarum Artium:* The Politics of Marcus' Study Abroad in Cicero's *De Officiis*", Ximing Lu investigates the significance of Marcus' study abroad for Cicero's political self-fashioning in *De officiis.* By analysing *De officiis* in the political context of late 44 BCE, he argues that Cicero presents Marcus' study abroad as an imitation of his own study in the East (79–77 BCE) in order to defend his intellectual legacy against the assault of M. Antony. His argument is based on an intertextual reading of *De officiis* with the first two *Philippics.* The treatise's opening presents Marcus as imitating Cicero's study abroad. Both father and son benefited from their physical presence in Athens and the lectures by prominent philosophers. Moreover, Cicero sets out his bilingual training in philosophy and oratory as a model for Marcus to follow. By foregrounding the similarity between Marcus' study abroad and Cicero's way of learning, the treatise shapes a family tradition rooted in intellectual pursuits rather than military victories. Thus, Marcus in Athens appears as Cicero's intellectual heir, carrying on the family banner in the non-military fields when Cicero faced Antony's attacks in Rome.

Almost a year later, in early December 43 BCE, Cicero was once more hoping to find refuge in Greece from Antony's men hunting him viciously among those pro-

23 See, e. g., Rawson 1975, 183–204; Grimal 1986, ch. 15; Fuhrmann 1992, 132–144; Narducci 2009, 357–364.

24 See Tsouni, Lu and Oliva in this volume.

25 Cic. *Phil.* 1.12. See also Rawson 1975, 269–271; Fuhrmann 1992, 171–174.

scribed. Accompanied by his brother Quintus and his nephew, he attempted to sail from Gaeta to Macedonia and join his son and M. Junius Brutus. This last attempt ended with his assassination on 7 December near his villa at Formiae, soon after the assassination of his brother and nephew.[26]

26 Cf. Plut. *Cic*. 47–48. See also Rawson 1975, 293–295; Grimal 1986, ch. 19; Fuhrmann 1992, 218; Narducci 2009, 3–18.

Georgia Tsouni

Athens' Authority in Cicero's Philosophical Works

Introduction

The primary meaning of *auctoritas* is a political one; it is linked both to the political legitimacy of venerated Roman institutional bodies, such as the Senate, but also to non-institutionalised trustworthy testimony.[1] In Cicero, however, we may trace an extension of the application of *auctoritas* to intellectual traditions as well; for example, Cicero refers to figures like Homer and Plato as major *auctores* in the fields of poetry and philosophy, respectively. This process transfers the unique political and social connotations of the word *auctoritas*[2] into the Greek past and its intellectual traditions. In what follows, I would like to examine, more specifically, how Athens is invested with authority in Cicero, both as a space of (formal) education and as the place of origin of the most weighty philosophical tradition, namely that of Plato. Subsequently, it will be shown how Cicero in various ways negotiates Athenian intellectual authority in his philosophical works, appropriates it in a peculiarly Roman context and combines it with 'indigenous' sources of authority. The focus lies here in Cicero's appropriation of the Academic discourse in his philosophical dialogues, in the construction of their dramatic setting and 'scenography' as a conscious response to Athens' cultural landscape, as also in his remarks on the superior value of political activity over and above intellectual pursuits which originate in Athens. The analysis will suggest that the straightforward promotion of Athens' intellectual authority which can be found in some passages in Cicero is only one part of his multifaceted engagement with Athens and its traditions.

1 See, e. g., Cic. *Rep*. 2.56–58; *Leg*. 3.27–28; *De or.* 1.201. Heinze 1925 offers an overview of the semantic field of the term *auctoritas* in Latin. For an overview of the political aspects of *auctoritas* in the Roman republic, see Hellegouarc'h 1972, 295–320. Goodwin 2001 discusses specifically appeals to auhority in relation to *dignitas* in Cicero's rhetorical works. Schofield 2018 offers a discussion of the use of *auctoritas* in various philosophical works of Cicero in relation to traditional Roman religion and the 'authority' of the forefathers, whereas Tsouni 2018a discusses *auctoritas* in Cicero's philosophical writings in relation to Antiochus' revival of the 'Old Academy'.

2 It is suggestive that Cassius Dio (55.3.5) deems the term untranslatable into Greek.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779-003

Athens' *Auctoritas:* Athenian Landmarks and Roman Settings

In the prologue to the last Book of *De finibus bonorum et malorum*, the only prologue of Cicero's dialogues taking place on Greek soil (with the exception of the incomplete *Timaeus*), Athens appears to possess supreme *auctoritas.* The dramatic setting that Cicero creates there puts the focus entirely on the glorious past of Athens, leading the reader to almost forget the gloomy contemporary reality of the city after the conquest of Sulla.[3] The emphasis on Athens' historical traditions is reflected in the shift of the dramatic dating of the dialogue which takes place in 79 BCE, as against 50 BCE (Books One and Two) and 52 BCE (Books Three and Four).

The shift to the past reflects also a particular period in Cicero's life: in *De finibus* 5 it is not Cicero the politician who is depicted visiting Athens, as one station in a 'grand tour' which culminates in Rhodes, but a young Cicero who has not yet assumed political office.[4] He is surrounded by his brother Quintus, his friend Titus Pomponius (so-called 'Atticus') and his young cousin Lucius, alongside his friend Marcus Piso, who is the main speaker of the Book. The interest of the characters in the educational opportunities available in the city matches Cicero's own *Bildungsreise*;[5] however, the educational aspirations of Roman youth are represented in the dialogue by the young cousin of Cicero, Lucius, who visits Athens with the aim of gaining education before embarking on a political career.

Contrary to the familiar setting of a Roman villa known from other Ciceronian dialogues, in the last Book of *De finibus* it is the city of Athens *itself* which becomes the setting of a 'Roman' philosophical discussion. Thus, the dramatic characters are presented as taking an afternoon stroll from the Dipylon gate in the Athenian Agora to the Platonic Academy, a scene which locates them into the very centre

3 The contrast between the motivation of Cicero's visit to Athens, as opposed to that of Sulla, is evident in Plutarch's *Sulla* 13.4: ἐγὼ [sc. ὁ Σύλλας] γὰρ οὐ φιλομαθήσων εἰς Ἀθήνας ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἐπέμφθην, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀφισταμένους καταστρεψόμενος ("for I [sc. Sulla] was not sent to Athens by the Romans in order to seek knowledge but in order to subdue the rebels"; unless otherwise indicated, translations of ancient texts are made by the author of the contribution). On the historical background during Sulla's siege of Athens and its impact on the Academy, see Dörrie 1978, 211–213.

4 On the other hand, for someone who had already assumed political office, the justification of a stay in Athens becomes more problematic; see for example Marcus Antonius in Cic. *De or.* 1.82, who, on his way to assume office in Cilicia, justifies his stay in the city and his encounter with *doctissimi viri* on the grounds of difficulties of sailing (*propter navigandi difficultatem*). Cf. Rawson 1985, 6–7; 9–12.

5 For references to Cicero's trips to Greece, cf. Cic. *Brut.* 315; *Leg.* 2.36. See also Marinone/Malaspina 2004; Malaspina 2008, and the Introduction to this section of the volume.

of the (classical) Athenian intellectual scene.[6] The psychological impact that the city of Athens has on the characters receives here particular attention: Piso underlines the emotional effect that places, where admirable figures of the past acted, have on a person, an effect far superior to merely hearing about their deeds or reading about them.[7] This may be linked to the way places enable some sort of imaginative interaction with those who acted in them, intensifying thereby our connection with the past.[8] Cicero's interest in the way particular places bear a symbolic value, triggering associations with figures of the past and their achievements seems to be prompted by the importance of memory for rhetorical training; thus, while depicting the Athenian dramatic setting in the prologue to *De finibus* 5, the character Piso comments on the way *loci* have the power to function as mental 'signs' in mnemotechnic exercises.[9] Cicero's narration in the case of *De finibus* 5, involves showing how particular places in Athens evoke particular authorities, which in their own right stand for major intellectual disciplines.

In line with the emphasis put on the emotional and associative effect of places, intellectual disciplines are associated with particular Athenian landmarks which function as 'monuments'.[10] Thus, while the characters of *De finibus* 5 appear to engage in intellectual 'sightseeing',[11] Cicero describes in writing Athens' cultural landscape. The Athenian landmarks present Athens not only as a philosophical

6 Cic. *Fin.* 5.1.

7 Suggestive is the use of the verb *moveor* at Cic. *Fin.* 5.2: *Naturane nobis hoc, inquit, datum dicam an errore quodam, ut, cum ea loca videamus, in quibus memoria dignos viros acceperimus multum esse versatos, magis moveamur, quam si quando eorum ipsorum aut facta audiamus aut scriptum aliquod legamus? Velut ego nunc moveor* ("I cannot say whether it is a natural instinct or a kind of illusion, but when we see the places where we are told that the notables of the past spent their time, it is far more moving than when we hear about their achievements or read their writings. This is how I am affected right now"; transl. Annas/Woolf 2001). Cf. Dörrie 1978, 213 n. 19; 220: "wurde Vergangenheit als eine formende Kraft erlebt".

8 Dörrie 1978, 219, thematises the novelty of Cicero's approach towards the figures of the past, which he understands as a particularly 'Roman' development: "Eine solche Verehrung, nun auf 'Heroen des Geistes' bezogen, ist in der griechisch-römischen Welt etwas durchaus Neues. Und dieses Neue wird nur in seiner vorwiegend römischen Ausprägung kenntlich. Es steht am Anfang einer langen, bis in die Zeit der Romantik (ja, bis in die Literatur der Reiseführer) herabreichende Wirkungsgeschichte".

9 Cic. *Fin.* 5.2. Cicero describes the process of the creation of memories through (rhetorical) 'places' in *De or.* 2.351–360. For the spatial patterns involved in *ars memoriae*, see Leach 1988, 75–78.

10 Cf. Alcock 2002, 67.

11 See Cic. *Fin.* 5.4: *Ego autem tibi, Piso, assentior usu hoc venire, ut acrius aliquanto et attentius de claris viris locorum admonitu cogitemus* ("But I agree with you, Piso. It is a fact that the stimulus of place considerably sharpens and intensifies the thoughts we have about famous individuals"; transl. Annas/Woolf 2001). Cf. Howley 2014, 181.

centre, evoked by the sight of both the Academy and Epicurus' Garden, the latter mentioned with admiration by Cicero's Epicurean friend Pomponius (Atticus),[12] but also as the birthplace of two of the most important representatives of dramatic poetry and rhetoric, namely Sophocles and Demosthenes. The former is invoked by Quintus, who mentions that the site of Colonus brings to memory Sophocles but also his literary hero Oedipus and his homonymous tragedy.[13] The young Lucius, on the other hand, mentions, while blushing (a sign of timidity on the part of the young man, but also of awe and reverence), his visit to the bay of Phalerum, where Demosthenes used to practice in order to train his voice for public speaking.[14] The mention of Pericles' tomb as another significant Athenian *locus* suggests, on the other hand, that Lucius is about to embark on a political career in Rome, a path for which philosophical training may be useful as well.

The peculiar emotional effect triggered by the places themselves, where admirable 'authorities' were active, is mentioned also by Atticus in the prologue to the second Book of *De legibus* (2.4). Atticus mentions there that what gives him most pleasure in 'his' Athens, his chosen place of residence, are not the exquisite buildings and works of art but the recollection of the highest men (*recordatio summorum virorum*) who resided there; this is triggered by observing where they lived, where they sat and where they discussed, while Atticus also mentions how eager he is to visit their graves.[15] A 'young' Cicero alludes to a similar feeling in *De finibus* 5 by noting that "every part of Athens is filled with many traces of the most illustrious men (found) in the very places themselves" (*multa in omni parte*

12 Cic. *Fin.* 5.3.

13 Cic. *Fin.* 5.3.

14 Cic. *Fin.* 5.5: *Et ille, cum erubuisset: Noli, inquit, ex me quaerere, qui in Phalericum etiam descenderim, quo in loco ad fluctum aiunt declamare solitum Demosthenem, ut fremitum assuesceret voce vincere. Modo etiam paulum ad dexteram de via declinavi, ut ad Pericli sepulcrum accederem* ("'Do not ask', blushed Lucius. 'I have actually been down to the Bay of Phalerum where they say that Demosthenes used to practise declaiming against the waves, to train his voice to overcome the roar of a crowd. And just now I turned off a little to the right to visit the tomb of Pericles'"; transl. Annas/Woolf 2001). For Athens as the 'birthplace' of rhetoric, see Cic. *Brut.* 26. Cicero's engagement with Demosthenes as a rhetorical and political authority, as also his conscious use of him as a model of free speech in relation to the *Philippics*, is discussed extensively in Bishop 2019, ch. 4.

15 Cic. *Leg.* 2.4: *Movemur enim nescio quo pacto locis ipsis, in quibus eorum quos diligimus aut admiramur adsunt vestigia. Me quidem ipsae illae nostrae Athenae non tam operibus magnificis exquisitisque antiquorum artibus delectant, quam recordatione summorum virorum, ubi quisque habitare, ubi sedere, ubi disputare sit solitus, studioseque eorum etiam sepulcra contemplor* ("We are somehow moved by the places in which the signs of those we love or admire are present. My beloved Athens pleases me not so much because of the grand buildings and refined arts of the ancients as because of the recollection of great men – where each one lived, where he sat, where he used to teach – and I make a point of visiting their tombs as well"; transl. Zetzel 1999).

Athenarum sunt in ipsis locis indicia summorum virorum).[16] Lucius adds that such memorials are endless and that wherever one treads in Athens, one steps on some historical ground (*in aliqua historia*).[17] On the other hand, in the second Book of *De legibus* (2.3), Cicero (the character) subtly juxtaposes to the memories of great men that Athens incites to Atticus the traces of the forefathers (*maiorum* [...] *vestigia*) triggered by the view of Cicero's native land in Arpinum, where the dialogue takes place.[18] The interaction between the characters of Atticus and Cicero in this passage testifies not only to the peculiar affective quality with which locations can be invested in Cicero[19] but also creates a contrast between the Athenian intellectual tradition, on the one hand, and the ancestral Roman values and political identity (through the connection of Rome and Arpinum),[20] on the other.

The importance assigned in the prologue to *De finibus* 5 to the Platonic Academy is not accidental, since it is precisely the *auctoritas* of Plato and the tradition that he initiated that is at the centre of interest in this Book. The interest in the Academy corresponds to intensive debates in the first century BCE surrounding the pedigree and authority of Plato's teaching.[21] For Piso explicitly acts in the dialogue as the spokesperson of Antiochus of Ascalon, the lectures of whom Cicero is presented to have attended in the Roman gymnasium of the city, the Ptolemaeum, just before the discussion of *De finibus* 5 begins.[22] In a conscious attempt to rewrite the history of the Academy, a process undoubtedly linked to the closure of the school after Sulla's siege of Athens in 88 BCE, Antiochus deserted the 'sceptical' Academy of Philo of Larissa (who was the legitimate scholarch and successor of Plato in the Academy) and initiated a new movement which professed a return to the intellectual origins of the Academic tradition. As it becomes clear from passages in Cicero which reflect the Antiochean understanding of history of philosophy, Plato is regarded as the initiator of a tradition which laid the foundations for all other important subsequent philosophical developments, including the Aristotelian-Peripatetic tradition but even the Stoic tradition as well.[23] This was based on

16 Cic. *Fin.* 5.4.

17 Cic. *Fin.* 5.5.

18 Cic. *Leg.* 2.3.

19 For the 'atmospheric' quality of places and their 'affective resonance' in Cicero, see Calcò 2018.

20 See Spencer 2010, 67–69.

21 On the emergence of Platonic and Peripatetic authority in the first century BCE, see Tsouni 2018a.

22 Cic. *Fin.* 5.1. For Cicero's studies with Antiochus in Athens, see also Cic. *Brut.* 315.

23 For the inclusion of the Peripatos in Antiochus' 'Old Academy', see Cic. *Fin.* 5.7. On Antiochus' movement of the 'Old Academy', see Barnes 1989; Sedley 2012; Tsouni 2019, 19–35. For the 'dynamic' notion of authority that this reading of Plato entails, see Tsouni 2019, 43–48. For Antiochus' 'hermeneutical' methods, cf. Sedley 2012.

a dogmatic reading of Plato which took into account his immediate Hellenistic successors (down to Arcesilaus) but rejected the post-Arcesilean 'sceptical' reading of Plato's dialogues. Thus, Antiochus creates on the basis of Plato's *auctoritas* a single and unified Athenian tradition of philosophy which (with the exception of the Epicureans) includes the most important philosophical currents of his time.

Independently from Antiochus, Cicero is keen to demonstrate in many cases his appreciation for Plato's authority. Thus, in three of his most influential works, *De oratore*, *De re publica* and *De legibus*, he uses Platonic works as his models.[24] The admiration for Plato's authority centers primarily on the superior qualities of his style.[25] Thus, in some passages Cicero deems Plato (and none other Greek philosopher) 'a god',[26] a statement linked primarily to his eloquence, as *Brutus* 121 attests, where it is stated that "if Zeus would speak Greek, he would speak it in his manner [sc. of Plato]".[27] A great testimony to Cicero's deep admiration for Plato and the Academy is also found in a letter from 50 BCE, where Cicero expresses the wish to create his own memorial (*monumentum*) in the Academy; this gives to him the opportunity to express his intensive love for the city of Athens itself (*valde ipsas Athenas amo*).[28]

On the other hand, Cicero grounds Plato's authority in a radically different tradition from the 'dogmatic' school of Antiochus. Thus, for him the Platonic dialogues do not convey a doctrinal teaching but exemplify the 'Socratic' method, which later developed into the method of speaking in *utramque partem*, a dialectical methodology used in the construction of the majority of Cicero's philosophical works.[29] Accordingly, uncritical commitment to the doctrines of a school and to the authority

24 On Cicero's engagement with Plato as an 'authority', see Bishop 2019, ch. 2, and Aubert-Baillot 2021, 302–314.

25 In Cic. *Orat.* 10, Plato is characterised "the most eminent *auctor* and teacher both in style and in thought" (*ille non intellegendi solum sed etiam dicendi gravissimus auctor et magister Plato*).

26 Cic. *Att*. 4.16.3; cf. Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.32.

27 *Iovem sic* […]*, si Graece loquatur, loqui.* For the view that Plato is a *princeps* among all other philosophers (including Aristotle) with regard to style, see also Cic. *Orat.* 62; *Leg.* 1.15.

28 Cic. *Att.* 6.1.26: *Audio Appium πρόπυλον Eleusine facere; num inepti fuerimus si nos quoque Academiae fecerimus? 'Puto' inquies. Ergo id ipsum scribes ad me. Equidem valde ipsas Athenas amo; volo esse aliquod monumentum, odi falsas inscriptiones statuarum alienarum* ("I hear that Appius is making a gateway at Eleusis. Would it be out of the way if I did the same for the Academy? 'I think it would,' you'll say. Very well, just write and tell me so. I am really very fond of Athens, the actual city. I want to have some memorial there, and I hate false inscriptions on other people's statues"; transl. Shackleton Bailey 1999). The affectionate tone matches the personal way in which Cicero conveys his greetings to Attica at the end of some of his letters; see, e. g., Cic. *Att.* 16.6.4; 15.28.

29 *De officiis* seems to be an exception, although it integrates dialectical moments in the third Book, where a challenge to Panaetius' views is addressed through the discussion of a possible conflict between the *honestum* and the *utile.*

of a teacher is vehemently criticised by Cicero at the beginning of the *De natura deorum.*[30] By attacking the notorious commitment of the Pythagoreans to the views of their master, exemplified through the *ipse dixit* formula, Cicero attacks the attitude of an adherent to a dogmatic philosophical school.[31] Instead, he praises the peculiar freedom (*libertas*) enjoyed by the 'New Academy' of Carneades and his followers, which deems something (merely) convincing (*probabilis*) or approximate to truth (*veri simile*) after having examined both sides of a question. This anti-authoritarian strand of Cicero's philosophical project suggests that he is prepared to engage critically with the Athenian intellectual tradition and the authority assigned to it by Antiochus and his followers.

Cicero's own attitude towards Platonic authority is reflected in the dramatic prologue to *De finibus* 5. While Piso, the Antiochean spokesperson, is at awe when visiting the Academy in the remembrance of the authority of Plato, (the character) Cicero commemorates with admiration the more recent presence of the Academic sceptic Carneades,[32] who is representing the 'sceptical' tradition of the Academy (as Antiochus reconstructed it). Cicero thus implicitly presents himself as the continuator of this Academic tradition, which has in the meantime been eclipsed from its Athenian birthplace.[33] In line with this, a passage from the *Lucullus* suggests that Cicero is the sole continuator of Carneades' tradition.[34]

Taking into account the aims of Cicero's philosophical project, the depiction of his visit to Athens at the beginning of *De finibus* 5, along with other Roman com-

30 Similar statements of Cicero's 'New Academic' identity are contained in the prologues of other philosophical dialogues as well, e. g. Cic. *Tusc.* 1.8; *Luc.* 7; and *Off.* 2.7–8.

31 Cic. *Nat. D.* 1.10: *Qui autem requirunt quid quaque de re ipsi sentiamus, curiosius id faciunt quam necesse est; non enim tam auctoritatis in disputando quam rationis momenta quaerenda sunt* ("Those, on the other hand, who ask what our opinion about each topic is are being more inquisitive than necessary. For in debate, it is not so much the weight of authority that should be sought as that of reason").

32 Cic. *Fin.* 5.4. The role of the Academic sceptic is also reflected in the way Cicero presents himself as an arbitrator between the 'Old Academy' and Zeno at Cic. *Leg.* 1.53.

33 For an account of the consequences of the closure of the Platonic Academy and the 'decentralisation' of the philosophical activity that this caused, see Sedley 2003.

34 Cic. *Luc.* 11: *Heraclitus Tyrius, qui et Clitomachum multos annos et Philonem audierat, homo sane in ista philosophia, quae nunc prope dimissa revocatur, probatus et nobilis* ("The Tyrian Heraclitus […] had been for many years a pupil of both Clitomachus and Philo, and was undoubtedly a person of standing and distinction in the school of philosophy in question, which after having been almost abandoned is now being revived"; transl. Rackham 1951). Cf. also the way Cicero is commenting on the 'poverty' of the philosophical scene of Athens in a letter to Atticus from 51 BCE; see Cic. *Att*. 5.10.5: *sed mutata multa. Philosophia sursum deorsum. Si quid est, est in Aristo, apud quem eram* ("but many things have changed, and philosophy is 'upside down'. If there is anything of value, you may find it in Aristus whom I visited"). Cf. Rawson 1985, 11.

panions, reflects not only a nostalgic trip of *aficionados* of the Greek culture but also has the characteristics of an attempt at a cultural appropriation, which aims to cast Cicero *himself* as a philosopher and heir to the Platonic/Academic tradition in its very birthplace. Suggestive is in this respect Piso's remark that he and his Roman companions can without disruption debate philosophical issues in the (deserted) Academy, something which would be inconceivable before "had even a god foretold it";[35] thus, the absence of the (long dead) Greek philosophers of the Academy, as also of contemporary 'Academics' like Philo, who were in the meantime exiled to Rome, gives space to the young Romans to develop their own distinctive philosophical voice. This is reflected at the very end of *De finibus* 5 when, after Piso has exposed the 'Old Academic' views, as Antiochus reconstructed them, he engages in the dialectical challenge of these very views, concentrating in particular on the topic of the sufficiency of virtue for happiness.[36] Cicero's active engagement with the Academic tradition chimes with Piso's explicit call towards the young Lucius in *De finibus* 5.6 to reach beyond cultural nostalgia and imitate the 'ancients'. Thus, their 'walk' around the Athenian intellectual landmarks should not reflect merely a historical interest or intellectual curiosity but should aim at the emulation (*ad imitandos*) of the great authorities of the past.[37] As Bishop notes, there is the expression of a wish here for the Romans "to create their own classics using Greek ones as models".[38]

The settings of other Ciceronian philosophical dialogues offer an interesting counterpart to the cultural Athenian landscape, which forms the backdrop to the discussion in the last Book of *De finibus*; such settings may allude to a 'learned' environment but present us with Roman alternatives to the city-symbol of the 'fine arts'. Suggestive in this respect is the prologue to *De finibus* 3, which presents Cicero searching for some Aristotelian *commentarii* (note-books) in L. Licinius Lucullus' library, which contained, most probably, books brought as booty from Athens to Rome.[39] This matches the increased interest in rediscovering the texts of philo-

35 Cic. *Fin.* 5.8: *dat enim id nobis solitudo, quod si qui deus diceret, numquam putarem me in Academia tamquam philosophum disputaturum* ("since the Academy is deserted, I have the chance to discourse in it like a philosopher, which I would never have believed possible had even a god foretold it"; transl. Annas/Woolf 2001).

36 Cic. *Fin.* 5.76–96. For the accusation of 'inconsistency', see in particular *ibid.* 5.85.

37 Cic. *Fin.* 5.6: *Tum Piso: Atqui, Cicero, inquit, ista studia, si ad imitandos summos viros spectant, ingeniosorum sunt; sin tantum modo ad indicia veteris memoriae cognoscenda, curiosorum* (""These enthusiasms of yours, Lucius', said Piso, 'are worthy of a genuine talent if their purpose is the emulation of great individuals. If, however, they serve merely to acquaint you with memorials of the ancient past, that shows no more than inquisitiveness'"; transl. Annas/Woolf 2001).

38 Bishop 2019, 15.

39 For Lucullus' library, see Tutrone 2013, 157–160.

sophical authorities in this period.[40] If philosophy originated in the city of Athens, Roman libraries appear as the new 'constructed' environments, where the Athenian tradition (and its resources) finds a new home.

Even when the philosophical discussion is transfered to villas in the Roman countryside,[41] there are explicit allusions to the authority of Athens.[42] The fact that Cicero calls the two gymnasia of his villa at Tusculum 'Academy' and 'Lyceum' is suggestive of both an imagined continuity with Athens and of a conscious attempt at 'relocation' of intellectual activity to Rome.[43] Athens' landmarks are thereby transformed into symbolic spaces, which can be reconstructed and revived outside of their original context.

Athens' *Auctoritas* and Roman education

Cicero's attempt to appropriate Athenian landmarks and present himself as an heir to an Athenian philosophical tradition (namely, the Academic one) is linked to his support of a specific educational ideal for the Roman youth. The connection of this ideal to Athens is made visible in a passage from *De senectute*, where Cicero addresses the dedicatee of the dialogue, namely his friend Titus Pomponius (so-called 'Atticus'). He praises there Atticus' moderation and evenness of mind, which is due, to some extent at least, to his chosen place of residence; thus, Atticus owes to Athens not only his *cognomen* but also his humanity (*humanitas*) and practical wisdom (*prudentia*), traits which make him less prone to unseemly behaviour.[44]

Cicero's educational ideal involves training in philosophy and rhetoric by authoritative (Greek) teachers. By Cicero's time, a stay in Athens during one's forma-

40 See Cic. *Fin*. 3.10. Cf. Marconi 1994, 288. For the exchange of books between Cicero and Atticus, see, e. g., Cic. *Att*. 1.11.3; 13.32.2; 13.39. This is matched by frequent discussions between Cicero and Atticus surrounding the exchange of objects of art; see e. g. Cic. *Att*. 1.4.3; 1.5.7; 1.6.2; 1.7; 1.10.3–4.
41 For a list of the places where the rest of Cicero's philosophical dialogues take place, see Marconi 1994, 285.
42 Suggestive is also the way in which Cicero reproduces in writing the natural landscape of Athens, by presenting Crassus walking along the banks of a stream underneath a plane tree, as an allusion to the dramatic setting of Plato's *Phaedrus* at *De or*. 1.28. For a discussion, see Spencer 2010, 65–66.
43 Cic. *Tusc*. 2.9. Cf. Cic. *De or*. 2.20. See also Görler 1988, 224. Suggestive in this respect is also the background to the dialogue *Brutus,* which takes place near a statue of Plato; see Cic. *Brut*. 24.
44 Cic. *Sen*. 1: *teque cognomen non solum Athenis deportasse, sed humanitatem et prudentiam intellego* ("I am aware that you have brought from Athens not only your *cognomen* but also humanity and practical wisdom"). For the ideal of *humanitas*, see, e. g., Cic. *Rep*. 1.28.

tive years had acquired particular value in the educational market for the Roman elite.[45] The importance assigned to Greek education as a marker of authority may well be also linked to Cicero's status as an *homo novus* and to an attempt to challenge the existing social hierarchies, linked to one's family origin, which were traditionally shaping the Roman political landscape.[46] Acquiring 'technical' skills in rhetoric and philosophy, the *doctrinae* particularly linked to Athens' intellectual tradition, was an important 'cultural capital', which could help someone climb up the social ladder and prove oneself worthy of the highest political offices.[47] Although this trend among the Roman elite had started some generations before Cicero, it is clear that in the late Republican era, Cicero is one of the greatest defenders of Greek education in Rome, something which invited the (derogatory) remarks in Plutarch that he was a Greek (γραικός) and scholar (σχολαστικός).[48] Such a cultural 'investement' on Cicero's part is coupled by a genuine appreciation of the inherent value of the *artes* which are associated with Athens and by awareness of the status they enjoyed in the Greek world. As Bishop 2019 has recently shown, Cicero's works exhibit a conscious and strategic attempt to engage and adapt Greek 'classical' models, actively promoting thereby 'classicism' as an ideology in the hope of achieving longevity for his own written works.

A passage from Cicero's rhetorical speech *Pro Flacco* (62), which functions as a eulogy of the city, summarises the reasons for which Athens deserves admiration, linking the city not only to *humanitas* and *doctrina* but also to long-lasting religious, legal and political institutions.[49] A 'classicist' attitude does not, however, prohibit one from raising claims of exclusivity towards this tradition and taking an 'ironic' distance from its contemporary heirs. Thus, at the end of the 'encomiastic' passage in *Pro Flacco* Cicero notes that the *auctoritas* of the city of Athens is such that the name of Greece as a whole, while almost "broken and debilitated" in his

45 This may also explain the success of Greek-speaking intellectuals in Rome, such as Antiochus of Ascalon, who became a (philosophical) 'companion' to the leading Roman general Lucius Licinius Lucullus.

46 See Gildenhard 2007, 23 and 30: "in part, his treatises and dialogues are a strategic attempt at transforming his supreme mastery of Greek knowledge and learning into an enhanced reputation and standing among his aristocratic peers". Cf. Bishop 2019, 3–7, for Cicero's 'intellectual politics'.

47 Cf. Corbeill 2013, 10.

48 Plut. *Cic*. 5.2. For the 'polemical' tone of these remarks, see Bishop 2019, 19. The examples of Marcus Cato and Scipio Aemilianus Africanus are invoked in Cic. *Luc.* 5 as precedents for the appreciation of Greek learning in Rome. For the long row of Roman *nobiles* in the third and second centuries BCE, who had already endorsed Greek learning, see Gruen 1992, 241–271.

49 Cic. *Flac.* 62. This is supplemented at Cic. *Leg*. 2.36 by a reference to Athens as the birthplace of the Eleusinian mysteries alluding to the way Athens does not merely offer a 'way of living' but also hope for the afterlife.

time (*iam fractum prope ac debilitatum*), rests on the praise of this city.[50] This suggests that the veneration of Athens is linked primarily to the study of its history rather than to its present.[51] This point is sharpened in a passage from *De oratore* 3.43, which runs as follows:

> *Athenis iam diu doctrina ipsorum Atheniensium interiit, domicilium tantum in illa urbe remanet studiorum, quibus vacant cives, peregrini fruuntur capti quodam modo nomine urbis et auctoritate.*
>
> At Athens learning among the Athenians themselves has long ago perished and that city now only continues to supply a lodging for studies from which the citizens are entirely aloof, and which are enjoyed by foreign visitors who are somehow captured by the city's name and authority. (transl. Rackham 1942, with alterations)

Here, the character Crassus claims that Athenian *auctoritas* itself is sustained by the 'foreign', i. e. Roman, presence in the city, since Athenians themselves seem unaware of the value of their cultural heritage (a message reinforced by the use of chiasmus in the passage). According to this view, Athens serves only as lodging (*domicilium*) for the foreigners (*peregrini*) who come to study there and who are somehow captured (*capti*) by the city's name and authority.[52] Anticipating the attitude of many generations of foreign travellers to Greece down to the modern era, contemporary Athenians are thereby deemed unworthy heirs to the glorious past of the city, their learning having long been perished.[53]

Although Crassus' claim that Athens' authority is sustained primarily through Roman efforts must be read in the dramatic context of the dialogue (91 BCE) and in relation to the historical Crassus, it may also be linked to Cicero's own belief in a peculiar *paideia Romana* which does not simply copy its Greek models.[54] This also suggests taking a cautionary attitude towards the intellectual authority linked to Athens as the sole vehicle of Roman education. Thus, sometimes Cicero points to the need of supplementing the intellectual authority of Athens with 'indigenous'

50 Cic. *Flac.* 62.

51 Cf. Howley 2014, 182: "Republican Romans, in their veneration of Classical Athens, saw the modern city as a ghost town". Howley goes on to contrast Cicero's depiction of Athens as an intellectual landscape to that of Aulus Gellius two centuries after Cicero. Cf. *ibid.*, 183: "What appreciation Cicero and his friends have for the city around them is historical, and even when they see what is around them, they seem to be in a museum".

52 The participle *capti* anticipates the famous verse of Horace at *Epist.* 2.1.156: *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit* ("conquered Greece took captive her savage conqueror").

53 On the difference between the illustrious Greeks of the past and the contemporary (to Cicero) Greeks, cf. also Cic. *De or.* 2.19. See also Bishop 2019, 18.

54 After the homonymous book by Gildenhard 2007.

values and traditions. Suggestive in this respect are the references to Athens' authority at the beginning to *De officiis*, a treatise that Cicero addresses in the form of a letter to his son, Marcus, who is studying philosophy with Cratippus in Athens.[55] Cicero is urging Marcus to engage in philosophical study with the hope that such an engagement with philosophy will prepare him for assuming a dignified role in the future for the sake of the Roman republic and will help him acquire the good reasoning linked to discharging duties (*officia*) in all domains of life. At the very beginning of the work (1.1), Cicero points to Marcus the different domains of education he needs to dedicate himself to; one is linked to philosophical teachings (*praecepta* […] *instituta philosophiae*), which Marcus acquires both by his teacher *and* by the city where the teacher resides, namely Cratippus and Athens, by virtue of the highest authority (*propter summam et doctoris auctoritatem et urbis*) they both possess. The source of the authority of the teacher is knowledge (*scientia*), whereas that of the city are examples (*exempla*), by which Cicero means the great intellectual authorites of the past which were associated with Athenian landmarks at the prologue of *De finibus* 5. As transpires from another passage in *De officiis* (3.6), the recognition of the authority of both Athens and Cratippus brings with it an ethical obligation to show the right diligence needed for a student of such a weighty tradition:

> *Quod cum omnibus est faciendum, qui vitam honestam ingredi cogitant, tum haud scio an nemini potius quam tibi. Sustines enim non parvam exspectationem imitandae industriae nostrae, magnam honorum, non nullam fortasse nominis. Suscepisti onus praeterea grave Athenarum et Cratippi; ad quos cum tamquam ad mercaturam bonarum artium sis profectus inanem redire turpissimum est dedecorantem et urbis auctoritatem et magistri.* (Cic. *Off.* 3.6)
>
> Anyone who is thinking about embarking upon an honourable life ought to do so, but perhaps no one more than you. For you carry this burden: many expect you to emulate my diligence, most my honours and some, perhaps, even my renown. Besides, you have incurred a weighty responsibility from Athens and from Cratippus; since you went to them as if going to 'purchase fine arts', it would be most dishonourable to return empty-handed, thus disgracing the authority of both city and teacher. (transl. Griffin/Atkins 1991, with small alterations)

The passage has a clear protreptic function, attempting to motivate the young Marcus to put all his energy into the philosophical studies he pursues in Athens. An important reason to do so is Cicero's own illustrious career, and the expectations linked to continuing in the footsteps of a successful father.[56] Cicero, however, ad-

55 On Cratippus, see Dyck 1996, 61, and Verde 2022, 155–172.

56 Cicero expresses his expectation that his son follows and imitates his example also at *Off.* 1.78: *Licet enim mihi, M. fili, apud te gloriari, ad quem et hereditas huius gloriae et factorum imitatio pertinet* ("I am allowed to boast to you, Marcus my son. For yours it is both to inherit my glory

duces an additional reason: he reminds Marcus that by embarking on his studies in Athens he has assumed a weighty responsibility (*onus grave*) both to his teacher Cratippus and to the city of Athens. Here and a few lines later in the same passage, the *auctoritas* and *gravitas* of both teacher and city are intimately linked, as Cicero connects Cratippus with the larger and most venerable Athenian intellectual lineage, that of the towering figures of Plato and Aristotle. The protreptic tone of the passage is reinforced by likening Marcus to someone who is engaged in the 'purchase of fine arts' (*mercatura bonarum artium*);[57] this is a 'mission' with ethical overtones, since it would be most disgraceful (*turpissimum*) for Marcus to return from his studies in Athens empty-handed (*inanis*) and bring to shame (*dedecorantem*) both the authority of the city and that of his teacher. The noble 'mission' in which Marcus is involved is subtly underlined in this passage by the Homeric allusion found in the expression *inanem redire*, which is reminiscent of the *Iliad* 2.298.[58] Marcus appears thereby as a defender of heroic values, rather than as a mere student. Considering the tense historical context in which *De officiis* is written, one may speculate that Cicero links here education in the 'fine arts', and especially in philosophy, with the political and military role that Marcus is about to assume for the defence of the *res publica.* Athenian authority in this case supplements parental authority in functioning as an incentive for ethical and political action.

Greek learning is, however, not the only valid authority for Marcus' education. At the beginning of *De officiis*, Cicero urges Marcus to supplement the Greek learning he acquires in Athens with further expertise in Latin oratory, following the example of his father.[59] Cicero goes on to pride himself on creating a philosophical discourse that unites, in his view, in an unparalleled way two *doctrinae*, rhetoric and philosophy and, thus, public speaking with the investigation of theoretical sub-

---

and to imitate my deeds"; transl. Griffin/Atkins 1991). Cf. *ibid.*1.121: *Optima autem hereditas a patribus traditur liberis omnique patrimonio praestantior gloria virtutis rerumque gestarum, cui dedecori esse nefas et vitium iudicandum est* ("The best inheritance, however, is that passed down to children by their fathers, that glory of virtue and of worthy achievements that is more excellent than any patrimony; to disgrace that must be judged wicked and vicious"; transl. Griffin/Atkins 1991). See also the comments at *ibid.* 2.44 and 3.6.

57 In Cic. *De or.* 1.158, poetry and history are presented as examples of the *bonae artes.* On the superiority of philosophy among the *artes*, see Cic. *Acad.* 1.3. For a discussion of the peculiar expression *mercatura bonarum atrium*, see also Lu in this volume.

58 αἰσχρόν τοι δηρόν τε μένειν κενεόν τενέεσθαι ("yet even so it is a shameful thing to tarry long, and return empty"; transl. Murray 1924). As becomes clear from Aristotle's *Rhetoric* 1.6.1363a, the verse had acquired proverbial value.

59 Cic. *Off.* 1.1.

jects;[60] accordingly, at the beginning of the *De officiis*, Cicero traces his superiority as an intellectual in that, while Greek intellectuals excelled in either oratory (Demosthenes) or philosophy (Plato), he can claim to have pursued both, the only comparable Greek example mentioned being that of the Athenian politician Demetrius of Phalerum, Theophrastus' student.[61] This is coupled by Cicero's optimism, expressed for example at the beginning of the *De finibus*, that Romans can (despite the low quality of some Epicurean writers like Amafinius)[62] rival their Greek peers in the domain of philosophy, as they arguably did in the domains of poetry and rhetoric.[63] Such optimism is also reflected in the view that the Latin language is an adequate, or even superior, vehicle for the transmission of philosophical content.[64]

The combination of Greek and Latin learning in the case of Marcus should extend beyond mere matters of style: a feature of Cicero's 'Roman' philosophical discourse is the extensive use of historical *exempla*, which had wide currency in the Roman world, as also the frequent references to Roman legal practices. The third Book of *De officiis*, which aims at going beyond the influence of Cicero's Greek source Panaetius, provides a very good example for this, showing how the philosophical education of the young Marcus can and should be supplemented by 'indigenous' sources of authority, like the *exemplum* of Regulus.[65] The reliance on the *auctoritas* of Roman *exempla*, serves there to show the identification of utility with virtue, a point theoretically argued for by the Stoics[66] but 'practically' shown, according to Cicero, in Roman history.

The tension between the authority of Greek teaching and that of Roman tradition is most explicitly thematised in two other Ciceronian dialogues, the *De oratore* and *De re publica*; suggestively the two texts engage with the Roman rhetorical and political traditions respectively, in an explicit demarcation and opposition to the Greek tradition. Cicero does not hesitate to say in the prologue to *De re publica*

60 On the link between eloquence and theoretical wisdom in Cicero, see also Oliva in this volume.
61 Cic. *Off.* 1.3–4. See also Cic. *Leg.* 3.14. For a very positive appreciation of Demetrius' style, see Cic. *Orat.* 92.
62 For a pejorative reference to Amafinius, see Cic. *Tusc.* 4.6.
63 See especially Cic. *Fin.* 1.4. For the idea of Latin philosophy as 'cultural warfare', cf. Gildenhard 2007, 76.
64 Cic. *Fin.* 1.10: *sed ita sentio et saepe disserui, Latinam linguam non modo non inopem, ut vulgo putarent, sed locupletiorem etiam esse quam Graecam* ("my view is, as I have often argued, that, far from lacking in resources, the Latin language is even richer than the Greek"; transl. Annas/Woolf 2001). See also the critique of excessive 'hellenising' at Cic. *Fin.* 1.8–9 with reference to Albucius. Cf. Cic. *De or.* 3.95.
65 For Regulus, see Cic. *Off.* 3.99–100.
66 See Cic. *Off.* 3.74; cf. *ibid.* 3.81.

that those who lead the governance of cities are superior, even with regard to wisdom (*sapientia*), to those who spend their life in leisure, implying thereby the Greek philosophers.[67] This is further elaborated by the character of Scipio in the first Book of *De re publica.* While referring to the 'liberal' Greek education that he received in his youth (alluding also to his association with the Greek intellectuals Polybius and Panaetius), Scipio declares that, especially in the political domain, he would not give precedence to Greek ideas over Roman ones. In a conscious opposition of theoretical knowledge and practice, Scipio declares that he was educated more by practice (*usu*) and parental advice (*domesticis praeceptis*) than by studies (*quam litteris*).[68] This chimes with Cicero's justification of the relatively late Roman preoccupation with philosophy, as opposed to other genres of writing, on the grounds that the forefathers pursued the discipline of (philosophical) ethics (*bene vivendi disciplina*) more through their own way of life rather than through writings (*vita magis quam litteris persecuti sunt*).[69]

The debate around the relative value of theoretical *sapientia*, intimately linked to Athens, even gives to Cicero an opportunity to stage an argument for Roman supremacy in the ethical/political domain. Thus, Miltiades and Themistocles provide (negative) examples of the fickleness (*levitas*) and the crudelity (*crudelitas*) of the Athenians against some of its most illustrious citizens, a practice which, "while it was born and often practiced in the city of Athens, has even reached the most dignified Roman state".[70] Again, in the prologue to the *De finibus* 5, where the intellectual glory of Athens is so prominent, Piso juxtaposes to the memory of illustrious philosophers, triggered by the view of the Platonic Academy, the memories of

67 Cic. *Rep*. 1.3: *sic eos, qui his urbibus consilio atque auctoritate praesunt, iis, qui omnis negotii publici expertes sint, longe duco sapientia ipsa esse anteponendos* ("so too I think that the men who lead these cities by their counsel and authority should be considered far wiser than philosophers who have no experience at all of public life"; transl. Zetzel 1999).

68 Cic. *Rep*. 1.36: *Quam ob rem peto a vobis, ut me sic audiatis, neque ut omnino expertem Graecarum rerum neque ut eas nostris in hoc praesertim genere anteponentem, sed ut unum e togatis patris diligentia non inliberaliter institutum studioque discendi a pueritia incensum, usu tamen et domesticis praeceptis multo magis eruditum quam litteris* ("Therefore, I ask you to listen to me in this way: as someone neither completely ignorant of Greek learning nor deferring to the Greeks – particularly on this subject – but as one Roman citizen, reasonably well educated by the care of his father and inflamed from childhood with the desire for learning, but educated much more by experience and home learning than by books"; transl. Zetzel 1999). For the superiority of *usus* over *doctrina* in the domain of rhetoric, see Cic. *De or.* 1.15; 1.105. Cf. Zetzel 2003, 130.

69 Cic. *Tusc.* 4.5. This matches the pattern of Roman attitudes towards Greek culture in the second century BCE, on which see Gruen 1992, 241–271.

70 Cic. *Rep*. 1.5: *quae nata et frequentata apud illos etiam in gravissimam civitatem nostram dicuntur redundasse.* On the 'ungratefulness' of the city of Athens and its inhabitants, see also Cic. *Leg.* 3.26. Cf. Cic. *Sest.* 141.

illustrious politicians and generals of the Roman past, like Scipio, Cato, Laelius and that of Piso's grandfather (Lucius Calpurnius Piso Frugi), who are brought to mind through the remembrance of the (old) Roman Senate-house (*curia*).[71] Thus, at the same time as he presents the landmarks of Athens, Cicero juxtaposes to them Rome's landmarks, which carry a different symbolic value, i. e. a political, as opposed to an intellectual one.

Athens' *auctoritas* and the Vicissitudes of *otium*

Although Athens appears as a symbol of *doctrina*[72] and as the birthplace of the most influential intellectual tradition (the Academic one) in many Ciceronian passages, its superior authority is as controversial as the value of intellectual studies when the latter are wholly disconnected from political action.[73] This is linked to deeper tensions surrounding Cicero's own attitude towards intellectual activity in relation to political praxis. While Piso's speech in *De finibus* 5 (48–54) contains a unique defence of the inherent value of intellectual activity or *theoria* in Cicero's philosophical writings,[74] it is not an accident that this defence takes place in Athens, which is understood by Cicero primarily as a 'depoliticised' place devoted to learning. The exclusive devotion to intellectual activities is, however, either linked to a period of study before one assumes political offices (as the setting of *De finibus* 5 suggests), or to special circumstances which prohibit one from exercising one's political duties.

Such occasions abound in Cicero's life, especially after Caesar's ascent to power. This is reflected in the way Cicero addresses Atticus, his dear friend and a permanent resident of Athens,[75] through whom he sustains a lasting link with the city throughout his life. When the situation at Rome appears threatening, Cicero views Athens as a refuge which provides a safe space of leisure (*otium*), away from the political rivalries at Rome. In a letter written in 61 BCE, in a momentary reaction of disdain for the tactics of his political opponents in Rome, Cicero appro-

71 Cic. *Fin.* 5.2.

72 This matches the characterisation of the city as inventor of all sciences (*omnium doctrinarum inventrices Athenas*) at Cic. *De or.* 1.13.

73 For the opposition between (Roman ancestral) *virtus* and *doctrina*, see also Cic. *De or.* 3.137.

74 For a discussion of this defence, see Tsouni 2018b.

75 One may discern a slightly 'ironic' tone in the way Cicero comments on Pomponius' permanent residency in Athens at Cic. *Fin.* 5.4, which will make him 'earn' the cognomen 'Atticus'.

ves Atticus' abstinence from politics urging him to dedicate himself to philosophy.[76] Cicero's jest is corroborated by the Epicurean leanings of Atticus which justify abstinence from political engagement and devotion to *otium*.[77] Later, in a letter from October 50 BCE, after learning some rumors about Caesar's military activities, Cicero states, again as a jest, that he would prefer to remain at the 'citadel' of Athens, where he is found at the moment, rather than to return to the dangerous political situation at Rome.[78]

Such a prioritisation of *otium* must be, however, read in the context and (personal) circumstances of writing of the specific letters; elsewhere Cicero seems much more aware of the negative connotations of 'leisure' in Roman society. That *otium* is controversial for Cicero (and his readers) is reflected most poignantly in the caricature of the *otiosus Graeculus* which is put into the mouth of Crassus at *De oratore* 1.102.[79] Furthermore, it is manifested in Cicero's concerns, expressed primarily in the prologues to his philosophical works,[80] regarding an *otium cum dignitate*, that is a 'leisure' compatible with his standing of a Roman nobleman.[81] Suggestively, in the prologue to the *De divinatione* Cicero presents the writing of philosophical dialogues as an alternative kind of political action, which is chosen

76 Cic. *Att.* 1.16.13: *qua re, ut opinor, φιλοσοφητέον, id quod tu facis, et istos consulatus non flocci facteon.* ("therefore I suppose one must take to letters, as you do, and not care a button for their consulships"; transl. Shackleton Bailey 1999). Also compare *ibid.* 2.13.2. In another example, Cicero professes, under the current circumstances, to choose retirement, alluding to his earlier studies in Greece, *ibid.* 2.16.3: *qua re incumbamus, o noster Tite, ad illa praeclara studia, et eo unde discedere non oportuit aliquando revertamur* ("so, Titus mine, let me throw myself into my studies, those wonderful studies which I ought never to have left and to which I must now at last return"; transl. Shackleton Bailey 1999). Cf. Cic. *Att*. 2.5.2 and the discussion at Lévy 2012, 67–68, Bishop 2019, 22–23, and Aubert-Baillot 2021, 203–205.

77 See, e.g., Cic. *Att*. 16.7.4. Cf. Corbeill 2013, 13.

78 Cic. *Att.* 6.9.5: *Id. Oct. has dedi litteras, quo die, ut scribis, Caesar Placentiam legiones iiii. Quaeso, quid nobis futurum est? In arce Athenis statio mea nunc placet* ("I am dispatching this letter on the Ides of October, the day on which you say Caesar is taking four legions to Placentia. Pray what is to become of us? My present station in the citadel at Athens is to my liking"; transl. Shackleton Bailey 1999). For a commentary on this passage, see McConnell 2014, 151–152.

79 Cic. *De or.* 1.102. Cf. *ibid.* 2.19. On the 'ambivalent' attitude of Crassus towards the Greeks in the *De oratore*, see Gruen 1992, 264–266, and Bishop 2019, 17–19.

80 For an analysis of the various modes of justification of Cicero's preoccupation with Greek learning in the prologues to his philosophical writings, see Gildenhard 2007, 46–88, and Baraz 2012.

81 See especially Cic. *De or.* 1.1–3. For different occurrences of the expression in Cicero, see Balsdon 1960, 47–50.

due to his exclusion from political action after the ascent of Caesar to power,[82] rather than as products of 'disinterested' leisure.

A last episode from Cicero's life helps to illustrate his 'ambivalent' relation to Athens: thus, in the turmoil following Caesar's assassination, Cicero postpones a trip to Athens to see his son in order to take part in a meeting of the senate[83] and, thus, deliberately places political action over leisure (and parental duties). His choice gives precedence to Rome, as the central scene of political developments, above Athens, as a 'peripheral' place of retreat; this is expressed succinctly in a letter from July 44 BCE, where Cicero states that he "would rather be frightened at home than secure in your [sc. Atticus'] Athens".[84] Despite not choosing to return to Athens at the end of his life, it is suggestive that Cicero's last hopes for the revival of the Roman republic are expressed through a letter-treatise sent to his son Marcus in Athens,[85] a text where the *auctoritas* of the city is invoked in order to motivate the young Roman to act honourably.

Conclusion

According to the link that Cicero establishes between Athens and *auctoritas*, discussed in the first two parts of the paper, Athens deserves reverence and admiration: the city has an uncontestable authority because of the intellectual traditions (and the supreme *auctores*) to whom it gave rise, Plato being a prime example among them. Such traditions are visible in the very landscape of the city through landmarks which carry associations of illustrious intellectual *exempla.* At the same time, Athens, and what it stands for, is in some passages in Cicero supplemented by or even subordinated to the Roman tradition. Cicero in various places asserts Roman supremacy in the 'ethical' field (matching its political and military suprem-

82 Cic. *Div.* 2.6–7; cf. Cic. *Acad.* 1.11; *Luc.* 6; *Fin.* 1.10; *Nat. D.* 1.7; *Tusc.* 1.5; *Off.* 2.3; *Fam*. 9.2.5. The way in which Cicero's works function as alternative methods of political action is discussed extensively in Fox 2007, Gildenhard 2007, and Baraz 2012. Cf. Lévy 2012.

83 The event is described at Cic. *Att.* 16.7. Cf. Cic. *Off.* 3.121: *si ipse venissem Athenas, quod quidem esset factum, nisi me e medio cursu clara voce patria revocasset* ("if, however, I had come to Athens in person (as indeed I should have done had not my country called me back in a loud voice in the middle of my journey)"; transl. Griffin/Atkins 1991).

84 Cic. *Att.* 16.6.2: *malo enim vel cum timore domi esse quam sine timore Athenis tuis.* Cf. also Cic. *Att*. 5.11.2 (from July 51 BCE), where, while at Athens, Cicero expresses his desire to return to Rome: *non dici potest quam flagrem desiderio urbis, quam vix harum rerum insulsitatem feram* ("I cannot tell you how passionately I long for Rome, how difficult I find it to endure the insipidity of my present environment"; transl. Shackleton Bailey 1999).

85 Cf. Woolf 2015, 186; 200.

acy) on the basis of 'indigenous' values and *exempla.* An 'Athenian' exclusive devotion to intellectual pursuits and to *otium* becomes also subject to dialectical challenges in Cicero's dialogues. While a devotion to theoretical studies may serve as a propaedeutic to a political career, Cicero never goes so far as to defend an exclusive devotion to it, unless special circumstances obtain. Thus, while Athens never ceased to exercise its intellectual allure on Cicero, Rome always remained at the centre of his preoccupations.

Gabriel Evangelou

Loss of Self, Desperation, and Glimmers of Hope in Cicero's Letters from Exile

Introduction

As a man with an active public life, but also a *novus homo*, Cicero constantly had to prove himself as an invaluable asset to the *res publica.* An ostensibly perfect opportunity arose in 63 BCE when he exposed the Catilinarian conspiracy and had Catiline's five co-conspirators executed. Based on his remarks, he viewed himself as Rome's saviour (Cic. *Pis*. 78; *Sest*. 49) for his proactive decision.[1] In fact, when Pompey, whom he claims to have considered not only an ally, but also a potentially close friend, did not offer him congratulations in 62 BCE for his achievements as consul, he expressed his disappointment (Cic. *Fam*. 5.7.3) by indicating how important it would be to him for Pompey to applaud him either publicly or in a pseudo-private letter.[2] Nevertheless, it was in 58 BCE that he experienced the ultimate humiliation when his political enemy and tribune of the plebs, Clodius,[3] took advantage of the triumvirate's discontent at Cicero[4] and engineered his exile.[5] He

1 The resentment that Cicero provoked with his decision to execute five Roman citizens without a trial is carefully explored in Rundell 1979, 304–306.

2 White 2010, 66–67, 199 n. 25, argues that there is a clear dichotomy between Cicero's private and public letters. He points out that Cicero himself reveals in a letter to Atticus the methods that he used to conceal the identity of his letter, viz. refraining from using his external seal, dictating his letters to a freedman to avoid his handwriting being recognised, and coming up with a pseudonym for the letter heading (Cic. *Att*. 2.20.5). McConnell 2014, 12 n. 28, takes the discussion of the nature of letters in Cicero's time a step further by recognising several groups of letters: letters that were meant to be read by a wide audience, such as Cicero's extensive account of events to Lentulus Spinther (Cic. *Fam*. 1.9), letters that were sent to intimate friends, letters which included 'coded language', and letters that Cicero was at pains to keep private for a variety of reasons. He concludes that the consensus in Cicero's time was that "merely by putting pen to paper one was doing something 'public'". On the very public nature of the correspondence between Roman politicians in the age of Cicero, see also Miller 1914, 69; von Albrecht 2003, 68–69; Steel 2005, 59; Lintott 2008, 223; Hall 2009, 25; White 2010, 31–34; Evangelou 2022, 50.

3 Craig 2004, 187, states that in the *Pro Milone* Cicero presents the deceased Clodius as "a clear and present danger to the continued survival of the Roman state".

4 According to Rundell 1979, 313–314, the triumvirs' support of Clodius was to a certain extent the result of coercion. Mitchell 1991, 130, expresses a similar view by underlining the repercussions that they would face if they were to go against Clodius, who had become a notably popular tribune. Degl'Innocenti Pierini 1996, 1–2, argues that the triumvirate chose to sacrifice Cicero for fear of

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779-004

promulgated two bills, which were then voted into law; the first was directed at those who had ordered the execution of Roman citizens without granting them a formal trial and the second named Cicero specifically. Likely for fear for his life (Cic. *QFr.* 1.4.5), Cicero decided to leave Rome. He appears to have fled from Rome while being hopeful that in a few days his supporters would ensure his safe return (Cic. *QFr.* 1.4.4). Nonetheless, it was not until 4 August 57 BCE that an official decision was made for his recall from exile. The letters that he wrote to his wife, Terentia, and to their children, Tullia and Marcus,[6] to his brother, Quintus, and to his closest friend, Atticus, provide unique insight into the safety that Greece, and specifically Thessalonica, offered him during one of the most intense challenges that he faced in his entire life. The following discussion focuses chiefly on the letters that Cicero wrote during his time in Thessalonica.[7] Its primary aims are to delve deeper into his experience in Thessalonica as both a safe haven and a hopeless place during a significant part of his banishment and to demonstrate his attempts to elicit his loved ones pity (*misericordia*) in order to convince them to intensify their efforts for his restoration to Rome.[8]

losing the support of the *populares*. Seager 1965, 531, interprets Pompey's decision to refrain from protecting Cicero from Clodius in 58 BCE as a sacrifice that he was forced to make out of self-interest. However, as Williams 2013, 54–55, rightly points out, Pompey was already dissatisfied with Cicero's consulship in 63 BCE, because of Cicero's opposition to the agrarian reform bill that Pompey wanted for his veterans (Cic. *Leg. agr.* 1.2.5–6).

5 As Robinson 1994, 475, observes, Cicero refrains entirely from referring to his absence from Rome in 58–57 BCE as an exile, whereas "he uses the words *exsilium*, *exsul*, and *exsulo* frequently in other contexts". Géraud 2014, 245–246, raises the same point. On Cicero's usage of *exsilium* in his writings, see Gaertner 2007, 3.

6 Cavarzere 2007, 1507 n. 1, notes that, despite Cicero's letters technically having three recipients, they were essentially written for Terentia.

7 Overall, thirty-four letters that Cicero wrote during his banishment have survived: twenty-seven to Atticus (Cic. *Att*. 3), four to his family (Cic. *Fam*. 14.1–4), two to Quintus (Cic. *QFr.* 1.3, 1.4) and one to one of the consuls of 57 BCE, Metellus Nepos (Cic. *Fam*. 5.4). Von Albrecht 2003, 69, observes a notable absence of colloquialisms from his letters to his loved ones, even though they are private letters. Similarly, Adams 2003, 343–344, points out the complete absence of Greek words in Cicero's letters from exile. After noting that Cicero refrains from using Greek also in the letters from 48 and 47 BCE as well as in the letters from 7 to 15 March 45 BCE, i. e. after Tullia's death, he argues that there is a "psychological dimension to Cicero's code-switching" into Greek and asserts that the use of Greek words during such emotionally charged periods would feel pretentious, as code-switching was "contrived and artificial" and essentially "a game [Cicero] played with Atticus".

8 Some of the most comprehensive discussions of Cicero's banishment include Smith 1896; Ciaceri 1941, 59–70; Carcopino 1951, 196–201; Shackleton Bailey 1971, 64–72; Seager 1979, 103–113; Mitchell 1991, 127–143; Fuhrmann 1992, 89–95; Garcea 2005; Kelly 2006, 110–125; Kaster 2006, 393–409; Cohen 2007, 109–128; Bellemore 2008, 100–120; Tempest 2011, 113–124; Williams 2013, 53–72; Marsh 2014, 37–59.

Accusations of *infirmitas*

Cicero's banishment indubitably constitutes a unique period of his life. The reader of the correspondence is confronted with a distinctively different Cicero. Not the confident orator of his public speeches, not the wise man of the philosophical dialogues, not the shrewd friend and politician of the rest of the extant letters, but a man who constantly complains about his calamity and repeatedly refers to the prospect of dying, in order to put an end to his sorrow. For this lack of fortitude (*infirmitas*),[9] which he displays in his correspondence, he has been heavily censured by his critics.[10] A prime example can be found in Lord Lyttelton's *Observations on the Life of Cicero*, in which he remarks: "In how spiritless and effeminate a manner he behaved during his exile is sufficiently known to all the world: the strain that was left upon his character was too great to be varnished over by all the glory of his triumphant return".[11] Similarly, Stockton lambasts Cicero for acting like a "petulant and emotionally self-indulgent child".[12] Ancient historians, such as Plutarch (*Cic*. 32.5–7) and Cassius Dio (38.18–29) also condemned Cicero's attitude during his banishment and especially for his failure to bear his calamity with more dignity by resorting to philosophy.[13] More importantly, Cicero's most intimate and loyal friend, Atticus, repeatedly and heavily criticised Cicero for displaying a weak spirit (*animo infirmo*; Cic. *Att*. 3.10.2) in their correspondence.[14] On 17 June 58 BCE, Cicero replies by expressing his disappointment in Atticus' reproaches

9 All translations are made by the author.

10 For a list of his critics in antiquity as well as in modern scholarship, see Hutchinson 1998, 25 n. 1.

11 Lord Lyttelton 1775, 19. Berry 2020, xxi, also notes that Cicero never fully recovered from the blow that Clodius inflicted on him by leading him into exile.

12 Stockton 1971, 190. Interestingly, unlike the overt criticism that Cicero received both for his public and private life from Mommsen 1854–1856, Drumann/Groebe 1899–1929, and Carcopino 1951, Stockton's uncharacteristically harsh remarks are limited to the period of Cicero's exile, specifically because of how he dealt with his misfortune as attested in his extant letters.

13 For an interesting discussion of the reception of Cicero's exile in the early Roman Empire, see Keeline 2018, 164–177. McConnell 2014, 224, observes a shift in Cicero's view of the place of philosophy in politics before and after his exile.

14 Cic. *Att*. 3.10.2; 3.11.2; 3.12.1; 3.13.2; 3.15.1. On Atticus' disapproval of Cicero's continuous lamentations in his letters from exile, see also Narducci 1997, 59. Robinson 1994, 480, refers to Cicero's replies to Atticus' criticism as "a disingenuous attempt to portray himself as a hero". Schwitter 2017, 389, interprets Atticus' reproaches as concern to protect his friend from damaging his reputation. Hutchinson 1998, 27 n. 2, rightly observes that Atticus' tone towards Cicero was equally firm when Cicero was mourning Tullia's death (Cic. *Att*. 12.41.3).

and by stressing that no man has suffered such a devasting blow in his life.[15] He also implores him to stop castigating him and instead to focus on how to alleviate his burden (Cic. *Att*. 3.10.3).[16]

Assertions about Cicero's mental condition are surprisingly common in scholarship. In many notable studies of his exile, he is perceived as a hopeless man suffering from depression.[17] While many of his statements do give the impression that he was struggling with coming to terms with his new life in exile – irrespective of the city in which he was forced to remain –, it also needs to be borne in mind that a diagnosis of a mental condition of a historical person is highly problematic. Apart from the fact that most classicists lack the necessary qualifications to diagnose mental illness,[18] the extant evidence that sheds light on Cicero's exile is fairly limited and thus any observations made rely heavily on Cicero's depictions of events and of his perception of reality, since the correspondence is unidirectional. Moreover, there is a tendency to take statements found in Cicero's letters, especially from exile, at face value. I maintain that more caution needs to be exercised when dealing with Cicero's claims in his correspondence. Consequently, his constant references to weeping during his banishment[19] do not necessarily mean that he literally wept in all those occasions, as his statements could be an exagger-

15 He raises this point again on 5 and 17 August 58 BCE (Cic. *Att*. 3.13.2; 3.15.2).

16 Cf. Cic. *Att*. 3.11.2; 3.15.7. For a further list of references to the disapproval of Cicero's letters from exile both in antiquity and by modern scholars, see Hutchinson 1998, 25 n. 1.

17 Mitchell 1991, 141, argues that at certain points of his banishment he was on "the verge of mental collapse". Similar assertions about Cicero's mental condition can be found in many notable studies of his exile. Claassen 1996, 222, notes that Cicero was "in despair", while Seager 1979, 108, states that he "had not been hopeful" and that he "sunk in pessimism". Tyrrell/Purser 1969, 30, assert that he "was on the point of self-destruction". For Marsh 2014, 42, Cicero "was nearly driven to suicide by anguish and despair". May 2002, 11, also observes a serious consideration of suicide in Cicero's correspondence and attributes it to his depression. Dugan 2014, 13–14, detects "suicidal impulses" in his letters and asserts that "he was driven to contemplate self-destruction". According to Shackleton Bailey 1971, 65, "Cicero wanted to destroy himself, whether by ordinary suicide or in a desperate sally against Clodius […]. He continued to contemplate suicide in the following months". Treggiari 2007, 57, following completely Cicero's claims, states that he seriously contemplated ending his life and then regretted not having done so. Contrast, however, Robinson 1994, 475 n. 1, who does not simply assume that Cicero's statements are unequivocally an accurate representation of his inner thoughts and thus simply notes that Cicero "expresses the wish that he had committed suicide". Baraz 2012, 55, rightly states that "any letter penned by Cicero cannot be taken to present the author's thought in an entirely direct and unmediated way".

18 Cohen 2007, 110, raises a similar point by noting that "authors attempt to apply modern psychological terminology based on the letters he wrote during this period".

19 Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.3; 1.3.10; *Fam*. 14.1.5; 14.2.1; 14.2.2; 14.3.1; 14.3.5; 14.4.1; *Att*. 3.15.4; 3.10.2.

ation used to stress the magnitude of his plight.[20] Similarly, the fact that Cicero repeatedly and categorically denies that he entertains any hope of ever being recalled to Rome or that he is contemplating suicide should not be treated as conclusive evidence that he felt completely hopeless[21] and suicidal.[22] As the discussion aims to demonstrate, a closer reading of the statements that he makes in his letters to Atticus, Quintus, and Terentia suggests that he held varying degrees of hope throughout his banishment.

The Impact of his Banishment

Before delving deeper into the impact that Cicero's exile had on him, it is imperative to bear in mind the possibility that the claims in his letters to Atticus and his family were made with rhetorical purposes in mind; specifically, with the intention of *commiseratio* (appeal to one's pity/compassion). As Hutchinson has demonstrated convincingly, the view of Cicero being so distraught throughout his exile that his mental state affected his ability to write letters to his family, his friends, and allies in Rome should be rejected.[23] The fact that Cicero had in mind the power of emotive language, especially in the elicitation of pity,[24] can be observed in a remark that he makes in a letter to Quintus (Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.5):

> *Nunc, si potes, id quod ego qui tibi semper fortis videbar non possum, erige te et confirma, si qua subeunda dimicatio erit. Spero, si quid mea spes habet auctoritatis, tibi et integritatem tuam et amorem in te civitatis et aliquid etiam misericordiam nostri praesidi laturum.*

20 Hutchinson 1998, 27, stresses that such exaggerations are typical in Cicero's works, including his public speeches and philosophical treatises.

21 According to Marsh 2014, 45, Cicero held some hope throughout his banishment, hence his attempts to secure the support of people whose collaborative efforts could effect his restoration. Smith 2015, 30, expresses a similar view by asserting that the hope to rehabilitate his public persona was the driving force behind his persistence in exile.

22 Hill 2004, 2, argues against associating suicide with depression in ancient sources and stresses that in the ancient world the former was "dramatically public in character" as it could attract "publicity for its agent/victim and enhance his or her reputation in society at large".

23 Hutchinson 1998, 25. He also argues strongly against the view that one could possibly express one's emotions without a thought process.

24 As Tempest 2011, 121, points out, Cicero followed the example of his fellow members of the equestrian order who attempted to aid Cicero's cause, before he left Rome, by wearing mourning garments. The theatricality of their actions is perhaps best exemplified in the attempt of certain senators, who, as soon as the consuls forbade them from wearing mourning clothes in support of Cicero, rushed out of the Senate screaming and tearing their clothes in public.

> Now, if you can, do that which I, who always seemed valiant to you, cannot, i. e. lift yourself up and take heart, if a struggle is to be faced. I hope, if my hope carries any weight, that your integrity, the love that the community has for you, and also to some extent the pity for myself will bear protection for you. (transl. by the author)

Since the letter was written on 13 June 58 BCE in Thessalonica, Cicero was acutely aware of the benefits of being pitied by others.[25] As the discussion below will attempt to demonstrate, Cicero's life in Greece during his exile was so strenuous that his remarks in his letters to his loved ones appear to reflect the reality in Cicero's eyes. Nevertheless, even though the act of writing letters, in which he laments over the state of his life, was a valuable outlet for him to express his emotions, his remarks to his family also served a different purpose: they allowed him to seize control of the way that his correspondents felt about him and his conduct towards them. Thus, the more they pitied him, the more likely it would be to excuse his behaviour[26] and to fulfil any wish he had, no matter the obstacles that they would have to face.[27]

One of his main concerns after the promulgation of Clodius' second bill that named Cicero as its target (Cic. *Att*. 3.1; 3.2) was his physical safety. As soon as Clodius' bill was voted into law, Cicero had every reason to fear for his life,[28] because the law denied Cicero access to fire and water within 400 or 500 miles from Rome (Cic. *Att*. 3.4; *Fam*. 14.4.3).[29] That meant that during his journey, until he reached his destination, if anyone were caught offering him shelter, they were in danger of facing punishment for breaking the law (Cic. *Fam*. 14.4.2).[30] Despite having many friends and acquaintances that assured him that they were willing to help him in his time of need, thus endangering their own lives (Cic. *Att*. 3.4), Cicero had every reason to remain doubtful, considering that he had been abandoned by Pom-

25 Kaster 2005, 145, interprets Cicero's remark to Quintus as a conviction that Quintus would be protected because of the combination of two emotions, love (for Quintus) and pity (for himself).
26 As it will be demonstrated later on, Cicero repeatedly admits that he was wrong, but places most of the blame on others.
27 Hutchinson 1998, 47, also considers Cicero's outpour of emotions in his letters from exile as an attempt to persuade his correspondents.
28 Explicit references to fear can be found thirty-one times in Cicero's extant letters from exile: *metus* (fear): Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.11; *Att*. 3.8.2; 3.8.4; 3.9.3; *metuere* (to fear): Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.4; *Fam*. 14.2.2; 14.4.3; 14.4.4; *Att*. 3.18.2; 3.23.4; *timor* (terror): Cic. *QFr*. 1.4.4; *Att*. 3.13.2; 3.17.1; *timidus* (fearful): Cic. *Fam*. 14.2.1; *Att*. 3.23.4; *timere* (to be fearful): Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.9; *Fam*. 14.2.3; *Att*. 3.4; 3.8.2; 3.9.1; 3.15.7; *pertimere* (to fear greatly): Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.4; 1.4.1; *pertimescere* (to be terrified): Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.5; *vereri* (to be afraid): Cic. *Att*. 3.7.1; 3.17.3; 3.23.4; 3.24.1; 3.24.2.
29 Moreau 1987, 475.
30 As Ciaceri 1941, 53, and Fuhrmann 1992, 91, observe, the punishment for anyone caught offering shelter to Cicero was death.

pey, who had pledged to support him against Clodius (Cic. *Att*. 2.22.2).[31] More importantly, he states that he felt betrayed also by his friends, who offered him pernicious counsel by urging him to leave Rome (Cic. *Att*. 3.10.2).

The possibility that he experienced genuine fear until he reached Thessalonica is strengthened by his pleas to Atticus to join him.[32] In May 58 BCE, he politely rejects Atticus' generous offer of his estate in Epirus, because he wants to avoid being in close proximity to Achaea, where he had many enemies (Cic. *Att*. 3.8.1). In the first extant letter to Atticus, while heading towards Vibo, he stresses that, in order to travel through Epirus, he will need to be escorted by Atticus and his men.[33] He also laments his inability to stay at one place for an extensive period of time, for fear of Clodius' law. As a result, he has to move constantly from one friend's property to another (Cic. *Att*. 3.2). On 29 April 58 BCE, he notes that, in order to feel safe to live somewhere, it would have to be a fortified place, unless he was staying there only for a limited amount of time (Cic. *Att*. 3.7.1). Based on the letter to Atticus from 27 March 58 BCE (Cic. *Att*. 3.2), it appears that he planned to make it to Greece, but was afraid to travel there on his own, hence his repeated request to Atticus to join him, so that he could safely move from Greece to Brindisium, if there was such a need. If Atticus were to decide to grant Cicero's request, he would have put his own life in danger, as Cicero admits that Atticus' journey would be troublesome (*molestum*; Cic. *Att*. 3.2). Despite the desperation that Cicero displayed in his letters to Atticus in his attempts to persuade him to accompany him, Atticus proved reluctant to endanger his own life for his friend's sake and ultimately chose to support Cicero from the safety of Rome. As a result, every time a friend and ally offered his home to him, Cicero expressed his gratitude, acknowledged the danger that they were facing, and did not take their assistance for granted.[34]

Cicero's distress evidently did not stem solely from his fear for his life. In a matter of days, he was forced to face a startlingly new reality. His lamentations in his correspondence with his loved ones provide adequate information about his perception of his peril. He repeatedly refers to everything that he was deprived of by opting for exile over remaining in Rome and clashing with Clodius and his supporters.[35] Even though each reference differs considerably, the emphasis is

31 Luibheid 1970, 92–93, points out that Pompey tended to conceal his intentions from Cicero.
32 On Cicero's continuous efforts to convince Atticus to join him, see Evangelou 2019, 155–161.
33 Cic. *Att*. 3.1: *tuo tuorumque praesidio* ("your and your men's protection").
34 Laenius Flaccus (Cic. *Fam*. 14.4.2); Sicca (Cic. *Att*. 3.4); Atticus (Cic. *Att*. 3.7.1); Plancius (Cic. *Att*. 3.14.2).
35 Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.1; 1.3.6; *Fam*. 1.4.3; 1.4.6; *Att*. 3.5; 3.7.1; 3.7.3; 3.10.2; 3.11.2; 3.15.2; 3.15.4; 3.17.3; 3.20.1. Narducci 1997, 58, views Cicero's continuous references to everything that he had lost in exile as an obses-

clearly placed on the members of his family.[36] He notes that he can no longer see his children or his wife (Cic. *Fam*. 14.4.3) or be held in Terentia's arms (Cic. *Fam*. 14.4.1).[37] He, nonetheless, claims that he can still picture his wife, but that image of her only intensifies his suffering (Cic. *Fam*. 14.2.3; 14.3.2).[38] He also stresses that the thought of his two children as being miserable during his absence because of him makes the tragedy of his banishment all the more unbearable.[39] He expresses equal emotional pain because of his brother's absence from his life. Quintus is presented as an excellent man who is devoted[40] to him and as someone whose actions have always made Cicero feel proud to be his brother (Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.1).[41] Cicero seems to have greatly enjoyed Quintus' company, as he claims that it gave him pleasure (Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.3). He further stresses their bond by referring to themselves as most loving and intimate brothers (*amantissimis et coniunctissimis fratribus*; Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.4),[42] thereby underscoring the impact that his inability to see Quintus has on him.[43] Based on Cicero's remarks, it would appear that the bond that he shared with his family was as strong as his steadfast friendship with Atticus.

---

sion. Similarly, Pina Polo 2017, 96, states that "Cicero obsessively demanded that Atticus join him in exile".

36 In his letter to Quintus from June 58 BCE, he reminisces about the life that he enjoyed before his exile and understandably mentions his brother first and then his children and his wife as constituent elements of his jubilation in Rome (Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.6).

37 While relying completely on Cicero's claims, Grebe 2011, 43, notes that "Cicero wanted Terentia to be with him in exile and he desired to die in her arms". Treggiari 2007, 64, also views Cicero's remarks in his correspondence with Terentia as expressions of "genuine emotions". In contrast, White 2010, 135, argues that the chief reason that Cicero asked Terentia to remain in Rome was that he relied on her for the constant and reliable provision of information.

38 Grebe 2003, 132, argues that Cicero's letters to Terentia are a testament of her obedience towards him, considering that she offers to join him in exile, but only if he so wishes (Cic. *Fam*. 14.3.5).

39 Cic. *Fam*. 14.1.1; 14.1.5; 14.2.1. Hence his request to Terentia to send him updates not only on the efforts of his friends and allies to effect his restoration, but also on her and their children's well-being (Cic. *Fam*. 14.1.6).

40 Quintus' loyalty to Cicero is also stressed in Cic. *Sest*. 145. In a letter to Atticus from 13 June 58 BCE, he claims that he chose to refrain from seeing Quintus, because he was certain that his brother would be incapable of seeing him in misery and then leaving him alone in exile (Cic. *Att*. 3.9.1).

41 Clearly an exaggeration, as evident in Cicero's letters to Quintus himself (Cic. *QFr*. 1.1, 1.2), in which he expresses his disapproval of his brother's administration of Asia and even stresses how Quintus' actions and his irritability reflect badly on Cicero (Cic. *QFr*. 1.2.10–11).

42 Cf. Cic. *Att*. 3.11.2: *fratrem optimum humanissimumque* ("the greatest and kindest brother").

43 Hutchinson 1998, 38–40, observes Cicero's use of emotion in his letter to Quintus as an attempt to assuage Quintus' plausible anger at him for refusing to meet Quintus, as was expected of him because Quintus was returning from a province. He also argues that Cicero attempts to mollify his brother by arousing Quintus' pity for him.

The absence of Atticus from his life appears to have hurt him deeply and to have been one of the relationships that he missed the most during his banishment.[44] Apart from his family and dear friends, Cicero had lost everything that was good in his life (Cic. *Fam*. 14.4.6), including his fortune, his political career and influence, his rank, his glory, and especially his ability to exhibit his many talents and virtues (Cic. *Att*. 3.10.2). His remark in a letter to Terentia from April 58 BCE that they lived and prospered (*viximus, floruimus*; Cic. *Fam*. 14.4.6) perfectly illustrates the stark difference between his life in Rome and in exile. Essentially, Cicero suggests that, while banished, he does not feel alive or able to achieve anything meaningful in his life.

Through his efforts, Clodius managed to punish Cicero for his testimony in 61 BCE at the Bona Dea trial by delivering a crushing blow to him which affected every aspect of his life.[45] In addition to losing everything that Rome represented for him, his banishment seems to have cost him even his sense of identity (Cic. *Att*. 3.15.7), best illustrated in his remark to Atticus: *desidero enim non mea solum neque meos sed me ipsum. Quid enim sum?* ("I verily long for not only my things and my loved ones, but also myself. For what am I?"; Cic. *Att*. 3.15.2).[46] In his correspondence with Terentia and Atticus, he complains that he is losing himself. In November 58 BCE, he expresses a wish to be recalled to Rome, to be reunited with his family, but perhaps more importantly, to gain himself back as well (Cic. *Fam*. 14.1.3). His statements in his letters from exile about his state of mind vary considerably.[47] On 6 April 58 BCE, he reassures Atticus that he is the same man whom Atticus has always loved and, even though his enemies have managed to deprive him of everything that he had, he did not lose himself as well in the process (Cic. *Att*. 3.5).[48] The rest of his correspondence with Atticus gives the impression of deterioration of his mental state and his ability to think clearly. Throughout his exile, he chose isolation over spending time with friends or acquaintances, and he actively avoided crowds and even daylight (Cic. *Att*. 3.7.1; 3.19.1). On 29 April 58 BCE, he attempts to explain to Atticus the fact that he has not been sending letters

44 Cic. *Att*. 3.7.3; 3.11.2; 3.15.2; 3.17.3.

45 As Epstein 1987, 78, points out, exile in Cicero's time was "the consummate legal injury short of execution". Hutchinson 1998, 26, refers to exile as the worst punishment that a Roman citizen could receive. Claassen 1999, 10–11, notes that "in the Roman world, exile and death were closely related. Because exile frequently served as pre-emption of, or substitute for the death penalty, it was often portrayed in literature as the virtual equivalent of death".

46 On Cicero's expressed concern throughout his banishment that he was losing himself, see Narducci 1997, esp. 58–59, and Hutchinson 1998, 41. His identity crisis is also stressed by Citroni Marchetti 1999, 73, and Géraud 2014, 242.

47 Dugan 2014, 12 n. 11, also points out Cicero's conflicting remarks about losing his identity.

48 Claassen 1992, 28, views Cicero's remark as "philosophical equanimity".

more often, by claiming that his distress has affected his mind (Cic. *Att*. 3.7.3). A month later, he laments to Atticus that his concern about Quintus has rendered him incapable of making decisions on anything (Cic. *Att*. 3.8.3).[49] He attributes the inconsistency, which Atticus may have observed in the letters that he has been receiving from Cicero, to the agitation of his mind. His cognitive abilities have thus been affected not only by the misery that his banishment has caused him, but, more importantly, by the thought that his disaster could have been avoided had he not made the mistake of trusting certain persons to help him in his time of need (Cic. *Att*. 3.8.4). He further notes that he was unable to see through the villainy of those whom he trusted, because he was overcome with grief (Cic. *Att*. 3.8.4). Such claims notwithstanding, on 5 August 58 BCE he dismisses Atticus' concern over the balance of his mind and emphatically claims that *mihi vero mens integra est* ("my mind is truly unimpaired"; Cic. *Att*. 3.13.2), unlike the time when he left Rome (Cic. *Att*. 3.13.2). Atticus must have been unconvinced by Cicero's reassurances and pressed further on this matter, which prompted Cicero to stress, once again, that, despite his misery, his mind was sound (Cic. *Att*. 3.15.2). His contradictory remarks suggest that even though he realised that his ability to think clearly was affected to a certain extent by his sorrow, he refused to admit so in his letters to Atticus.[50]

Whereas Cicero's misery during his exile is ubiquitous in his letters, the suffering inflicted on his friends and family as a further cause of his distress has not been adequately explored. In his correspondence with his loved ones, Cicero repeatedly acknowledges that he is not the only person suffering as a result of his exile. His wife is deprived of a husband who would protect her if he were in Rome. In a letter to Terentia from October 58 BCE, he informs her that he has learned from Publius Valerius how she was forced to leave the Temple of Vesta, where she was taking refuge, and was taken to the *Tabula Valeria* (Cic. *Fam*. 14.2.2).[51] Cicero's reaction to learning about this incident suggests that he believed that it was orchestrated by Clodius and his supporters, who were eager to

49 He makes a similar claim at the end of his second extant letter to Quintus (Cic. *QFr*. 1.4.5).
50 Hutchinson 1998, 28, argues that, even though Cicero's replies to his correspondents who expressed some kind of disappointment in his conduct towards them are emotionally charged, they should not be interpreted as "insincere acting".
51 Shackleton Bailey 2001, 64–65 n. 1, argues that Terentia was likely forced to go to the Comitium, where the Tribunes met, in regard to a matter of financial nature. Buonopane 2016, 56, asserts that Clodius must also have been present. Epstein 1986, 235, considers Terentia's harassment by the Clodian family during Cicero's absence as evidence that they blamed her for encouraging Cicero to testify against Clodius at the Bona Dea trial. On the financial impact of Cicero's exile on Terentia, see Dixon 1984, 80–88.

punish Cicero further by oppressing his wife. He claims that, having been made aware of how she is being tormented, he cannot help but think of her as crying and mourning (Cic. *Fam*. 14.2.2), which inevitably intensifies his anguish.[52] In fact, he emphatically states[53] that Terentia's misery causes him more sorrow than his own condition as an exile (Cic. *Fam*. 14.4.6).[54] Similarly, Quintus cannot bear the thought of losing his brother and cries while Cicero is also crying, when Cicero is forced to leave Rome (Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.1). In his attempt to ensure that Cicero had enough funds in his exile, in addition to the sum that Cicero received from the Treasury on Quintus' behalf, Quintus informed Cicero of his plan to send him more money through a bill of exchange. While Cicero does not attempt to dissuade him from doing so, he reveals that he is deeply concerned about the financial strain that such an action would put on Quintus, being well aware that he would struggle to pay off his creditors (Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.7). Nonetheless, Quintus' selfless act seems to increase Cicero's distress over the toil that his banishment continuously takes on his family. In both extant letters that he wrote to his brother during his exile, Cicero expresses distinctly the extent of his sorrow. He stresses that Quintus is robbed of someone who had used his voice to defend effectively such a large number of men, yet he is prevented from defending his own brother from a possible prosecution,[55] as his removal from Rome ensures that he remains silent in exile (Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.2). Cicero goes as far as to assert that no man has ever been thrust down by as much mourning as Quintus has (Cic. *QFr*. 1.4.5). Hence his claim that he is incapable of thinking of Quintus without crying (Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.3).[56] In all these examples a clear vicious circle can be observed: Cicero suffers in exile, which causes distress to his loved ones, the thought of which makes Cicero even more miserable.

---

52 Hutchinson 1998, 32, 36, makes an interesting observation in his study of Cicero's letters to his family and to Atticus. He points out that he displays more restraint in his correspondence with Atticus, since, in his letters addressed to Terentia and his children, he appears to be overwhelmed by his emotions. He also interprets the common references to tears as a rhetorical device that he employs frequently in letters from exile as a climax that can also be found in his public speeches, since weeping in public was not perceived as "acting by the audience".

53 Cic. *Fam*. 14.4.6: *sic existimes* ("Reckon, as I do").

54 In his last extant letter to Terentia, he reiterates this point and adds also his children's suffering as more difficult to bear than his own peril (Cic. *Fam*. 14.3.1). Grebe 2003, 143, asserts that Cicero's letters to his wife "document intrinsic love, a love valued in itself rather than instrumentally for personal interest".

55 Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.9; 1.4.5; cf. Cic. *Att*. 3.8.2.

56 In a letter to Atticus from 27 June 58 BCE, he asserts that Atticus is inconsolable because of Cicero's calamity (Cic. *Att*. 3.11.2), though in this case without adding that the thought of Atticus as suffering causes him further distress.

Apart from the clear display of affection in his letters to his family and to Atticus, the reader of the correspondence can observe a man who refuses to come to terms with his new reality. His lamentations do not focus entirely on his loved ones, but also on himself. His letters suggest that he was greatly concerned about his possessions, including his confiscated and demolished houses. Notably, while Sestius was drafting a bill for Cicero's return from exile,[57] Cicero stresses to Atticus that he is not satisfied with the proposal at its current form, as he will not feel completely restored unless his house is also restored.[58] Similarly, he appears to be deeply disturbed about the prospect of Terentia selling some of her estates,[59] because of the financial difficulties that she was facing (Cic. *Fam*. 14.1.5; 14.2.3).[60] The fact that his resources were limited during his exile, as he relied principally on the financial aid that he had received from Quintus (Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.7) and Atticus,[61] does not seem to have troubled him sorely (Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.7). His primary grievance was arguably over losing his hard-earned place in Roman society. During his banishment, he was no longer able to deliver public speeches and thus to experience the admiration and gratitude of his fellow citizens. Having lost his dignity, his status, his fame, his reputation, and his political power, he had essentially been stripped of almost everything that made him special in the eyes of his fellow Romans.[62] It is worth stressing that for the first time in his career, he had to rely entirely on the efforts of others who were speaking on his

57 Cic. *Att*. 3.20.3; 3.23.4.

58 Cf. Cic. *Att*. 3.15.6; 3.20.2; 3.23.2; *Fam*. 14.2.3.

59 On Cicero's dependence on Terentia's resources, see Claassen 1996, 229.

60 Wood 1988, 109, asserts that Cicero's "deep attachment to his properties is evident from the pain he felt when during his exile in 58 the Palatine residence was confiscated" by Clodius. Nevertheless, taking into consideration Cicero's opposition to Terentia selling any of her estates and the fact that he strongly urges her to borrow money from their friends to cover her and their son's expenses (Cic. *Fam*. 14.1.5), it could be argued that Cicero was primarily interested in retaining his entire fortune and return to Rome as lightly wounded as possible. At the same time, Allen 1944, 3, points out that his house on the Palatine Hill was of particular import to him, precisely because "it exemplified his acceptance into high Roman politics and society". Géraud 2014, 248, raises a similar point by stressing its association with Cicero's *dignitas*. Buonopane 2016, 55, also underscores the symbolic value that the Palatine house had for Cicero. Therefore, since the loss of such a property would be perceived as a massive blow on Cicero's prestige, he had every reason to avoid returning in a weakened state, devoid of his house as well as some of his wife's estates. Claassen 1992, 28, offers an interesting interpretation of Cicero's remark about his house by suggesting that his public and personal life were inextricably intertwined.

61 For a list of references to the financial support that Atticus provided for Cicero and his family during Cicero's banishment, see Rauh 1986, 9 n. 30.

62 Cic. *Att*. 3.15.2; 3.20.1.

behalf.[63] He was unable to defend himself or work on his restoration by employing the art of rhetoric that he had mastered over the years. He could only send letters to those interested and those potentially interested[64] in helping with his recall[65] and to give instructions to Quintus, Atticus, and Terentia on how to work most effectively on his restoration. This sense of powerlessness is prevalent in his exilic correspondence,[66] but also explicitly stated in a letter to Terentia from October 58 BCE, in which he concedes that *verum haec non sunt in nostra manu* ("alas, these matters are not in our hands"; Cic. *Fam*. 14.2.3). At the same time, his inability to return to Rome must have been one of the principal causes of his suffering. His love for Rome and his refusal to leave the city was well known to his friends and fellow politicians[67] and manifested in 51 BCE with his appointment as governor of Cilicia.[68] In his letters, he explicitly states that he is displeased with the governorship and, more importantly, he develops efforts to limit it to one year by securing the assistance even of his former enemy, Appius Claudius.[69] By being forced to remain away from Rome, Cicero was not only deprived of his country or of his friends and family, but also unable to defend the republic from men like Clodius as well as the triumvirs.

His incessant struggle with accepting his calamity seems to have been exacerbated by his poignant regret over listening to his close friends who advised him to leave Rome. Throughout his banishment, he recurrently dwells on the cause of his misery, which was his decision to flee from Rome after the promulgation of the first bill that did not even target him by name (Cic. *Att*. 3.15.5). Prima facie the constant references to *mea culpa* give the impression that Cicero held primarily himself responsible for his misfortune.[70] In his correspondence from exile, his banish-

63 While Dyck 2008b, 161, rightly observes that "Cicero is painfully aware of his dependence on others outside his family circle", it is worth stressing that he relied heavily also on his brother's, his wife's, and even his son-in-law's efforts for his restoration, despite their ostensibly limited political influence.

64 Such as Pompey (Cic. *Fam*. 14.1.2; 14.2.2; *Att*. 3.14.1) and Metellus Nepos (Cic. *Fam*. 5.4).

65 Cic. *Fam*. 14.1.4; 14.3.3; *Att*. 3.8.3; 3.8.4; 3.9.3.

66 See, e.g., Cic. *Att*. 3.10.3.

67 Rawson 1978, 18 n. 53, argues that whenever Cicero had to remain away from Rome, he "felt only partly alive". Notably, in a letter to his brother from June 58 BCE, he claims that neither he nor Quintus could experience any pleasure while being away from each other (Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.3).

68 Lintott 2008, 253, observes that his letters to Atticus confirm that he did not wish for his appointment to be prolonged for an additional year.

69 Gruen 1995, 354.

70 Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.2; 1.3.3; 1.3.6; 1.4.1; 1.4.4; *Fam*. 14.1.1; 14.2.1; 14.3.1–2; 14.4.1; 14.4.6; *Att*. 3.8.4; 3.9.1–2; 3.14.1–2; 3.15.4; 3.15.5; 3.15.7. Mitchell 1991, 127, points out Cicero's misjudgement of the situation that led to his exile, whereas Carcopino 1951, 197, attributes Cicero's disaster to his overconfidence. Even though

ment is presented as a mistake that he made or even as the result of cowardice, because, ultimately, he failed to provide to his family the happiness that they deserved (Cic. *Fam*. 14.2.1; 14.3.2). However, a closer look at the context of those references indicates an intention to shift at least some of the blame from himself to those who advised him to abandon Rome under the false premise that he would soon be able to return to Rome (Cic. *QFr*. 1.4.4).[71] In his letters to his loved ones, even when he states that everything was his fault (*omnia sunt mea culpa*; Cic. *Fam*. 14.1.1), he immediately argues that his only error was the false impression that he could trust the judgment of his wise and knowledgeable friends over his own.[72]

Most of his remarks about his treacherous friends are vague, as he refrains from naming the persons whom he holds responsible for his plight.[73] One exception is Hortensius, at whom most of his ire is directed (Cic. *Att*. 3.9.2). He also mentions Q. Arrius as well as Pompey. While he does not hide his disappointment in Pompey entirely,[74] he is careful not to include any scathing remarks about him, as he was acutely aware that he was in dire need of his support, if he were to be recalled to Rome. Even his trusted friend, Atticus, did not escape his criticism. Atticus, to Cicero's dismay, not only offered him – in Cicero's opinion – bad counsel by telling him to flee from Rome, but, more importantly, when Cicero was being exiled, Atticus looked on and remained silent (*inspectante et tacente te*; Cic. *Att*. 3.15.7).[75] In addition to blaming his friends for the condition in which he

---

he expresses regret for his actions, as Claassen 1992, 27, observes, at no point does he refer to the execution of the Catilinarian conspirators as a mistake.

71 Dyck 2008b, 160, also points out Cicero's attempt to blame anyone other than himself and detects rage in the first few extant letters from his banishment. Claassen 1996, 227, argues that at no point does Cicero assume any responsibility for his disaster. Conversely, Tempest 2011, 122, notes that he bears some of the blame himself.

72 Thus, he essentially admits that he committed one of the gravest mistakes in politics possible. According to Keeline 2018, 164, in his correspondence from exile Cicero is "morose and reproachful, despondent and distrusting of even his staunchest friends".

73 Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.5; 1.3.8; 1.4.2–4; *Fam*. 14.4.1; *Att*. 3.7.1–2; 3.8.4; 3.9.1–2; 3.10.2; 3.13.2; 3.15.2–3; 3.15.7; 3.19.3; 3.20.1.

74 Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.9; 1.4.4; *Fam*. 14.1.2; 14.2.2; *Att*. 3.8.3; 3.14.1; 3.15.4.

75 The crisis in Cicero's relationship with Atticus as attested in their correspondence has not received considerable attention. For example, Fuhrmann 1992, 93, Welch 1996, 458–460, Narducci 1997, 59, Shackleton Bailey 1971, 70, Tempest 2011, 122, Marsh 2014, 46, and Smith 2015, 28, observe that Cicero assigns blame to Atticus for his plight, but do not stress how unique such an accusation was in their correspondence. More importantly, Citroni Marchetti 2000, 197–198, does not detect sarcasm in Cicero's remark to Atticus that he only had tears for Cicero when he was being exiled (Cic. *Att*. 3.15.4) and thus she refers to Atticus' emotional pain as the reason that he failed to help Cicero. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that Atticus' reaction to Cicero's misfortune in 58 BCE is

found himself, he makes a direct connection between his consulship and his exile. By referring to his consulship as extolled (*laudatus*; Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.1) and claiming that it was this very consulship that snatched away his family, his country, and his possessions (Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.1), he implicitly expresses his grievance over being punished for saving the republic and also reminds Quintus – and anyone else who could possibly read this letter – that he did not end up in exile because of a mistake that he made while being motivated by personal considerations, but for the sake of the public interest. In the same letter, while discussing Quintus' own troubles in Rome and the prosecution that Quintus could face,[76] he reiterates that both his and Quintus' perils were not the result of mistakes that they made; on the contrary, they were being severely punished for their honourable actions (Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.9). He makes a similar statement in a letter to his wife, in which he explicitly states that he made no mistake (*peccatum est nullum*; Cic. *Fam*. 14.4.6).

A distinctively different approach can be observed in his last extant letter to Terentia, when he moved from Thessalonica to Dyrrachium (Cic. *Fam*. 14.3.1–2). Not only does Cicero make no reference – in connection with his decision to leave Rome – to his friends who betrayed him either with their advice or with their inaction at his greatest time of need, but more than in any previous extant letter from exile, he appears to hold himself responsible for his actions and decisions. He begins by asserting that his calamity is greater than Terentia's, because, while both are indeed suffering during Cicero's banishment, Cicero has an additional reason to feel miserable: his regret over the way in which he dealt with Clodius' threats. He emphatically notes that his wretchedness is his fault alone and argues that he had three better options than to flee from Rome, i. e. to accept Caesar's offer for the land commission,[77] to refuse Caesar's offer, though more carefully than he did, or, as he mentions in the rest of his correspondence from exile, to remain in Rome and die bravely defending his honour, thereby protecting his good name and his family.[78] He argues that his decision to abandon Rome brought shame to him and showed that he lacked valour and assiduity (*virtutem et diligentiam*; Cic. *Fam*. 14.3.2).

---

consistent with his tendency to separate himself from one of his most intimate friends, as it became particularly clear in 43 BCE.

76 On G. Clodius' son, Appius Claudius, and his desire to prosecute Quintus (Cic. *Att*. 3.17.1) in an attempt to prevent him from working on Cicero's recall, see Nicholson 1992, 75; see also Wiseman 1970, 207–208, Kaster 2005, 204 n. 30, and Alexander 1993, 247, who simply notes that Quintus was facing a threat "by a Claudius" for his maladministration of Asia.

77 Cic. *Prov. cons.* 41–42. For an in-depth discussion of what Caesar's offer entailed, see Rising 2015.

78 According to Géraud 2014, 244, Caesar certainly regretted abandoning Cicero for rejecting his offer.

His conflicting remarks about leaving Rome instead of facing prosecution indicate that his decision was inextricably complex. It would appear that during the initial period of his banishment, he refused to assume complete responsibility for his decision to flee from Rome as a coping mechanism. By focusing on men like Pompey, who abandoned him, or Hortensius, Q. Arrius, and Atticus, who assured him that leaving Rome for a few days would give his supporters enough time to settle the matter and ensure his safe return, he did not have to face the harsh reality: first, trustfully relying on Pompey's promises to protect him was a gross miscalculation on his part. Second, his friends did not force him to take their advice, since he could have simply trusted his better judgment, as he had done up to that point. Third, his decision to flee from Rome was motivated, at least partially, by his desire to remain alive, as he lacked the courage to stay in Rome and face Clodius' gangs or a trial for the execution of the five Catilinarian conspirators. At the same time, in his letter to Terentia, the possibility of being recalled to Rome, thanks to a large extent to the efforts of men whom he had accused of having betrayed him, seems well within grasp (Cic. *Fam*. 14.2–5). Therefore, he could have chosen to avoid even implicitly attacking them, for fear that his letter could have been intercepted and fallen to the wrong hands.

Secret Hopes for Restoration

The lack of hope that Cicero professes to experience is unsurprisingly prevalent throughout his entire extant correspondence from exile. He consistently and categorically denies that he entertains any hope of ever returning to Rome.[79] A clear intention can be observed to clarify that others may have reason to be hopeful, but he most certainly does not. He claims that even when he is ostensibly entertaining some hope, he simply goes along with the hopes of his loved ones,[80] because he does not wish to discourage them or seem ungrateful.[81] As a result, in most instances that the word *spes* (hope) is used,[82] it is in reference to someone

79 Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.5; 1.4.2; *Fam*. 14.3.2; 14.4.4; *Att*. 3.3; 3.7.2; 3.7.3; 3.8.3; 3.9.2; 3.15.6; 3.19.2; 3.23.5; 3.24.1. As Hutchinson 1998, 37, observes, the vast majority of Cicero's letters suggests that he did not entertain any hope of ever being restored to Rome.

80 For example, on 21 July 58 BCE, he notes that, despite plausibly giving the impression of a fool who believes that his situation will improve, in reality he is only entertaining some hope because Atticus himself is urging him to do so through the optimism that his letters exude (Cic. *Att*. 3.14.1).

81 Cic. *Att*. 3.13.1; 3.19.2; 3.23.4; 3.25.

82 The noun *spes* (hope) and the verb *sperare* (to hope) are used sixty-five times in Cicero's extant letters from exile: Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.5; 1.3.6; 1.4.2; 1.4.3; *Fam*. 5.4.1; 14.1.2; 14.1.3; 14.2.3; 14.2.4; 14.3.2; 14.4.3; 14.4.4;

else's hope[83] and when Cicero uses it about himself, it is in order to state that he sees no reason to be optimistic about his restoration.[84] In the rare occasions that it is used to express Cicero's own hope, it is in relation to his hope for other persons. One example can be found in the aforementioned letter to Quintus, in which he states that he hopes that Quintus' character and the pity that others feel for Cicero will be enough to offer Quintus protection from prosecution (Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.5). Despite the fact that he does not use the verb *sperare* in reference to himself, he, once again, displays some negativity by adding: *si quid mea spes habet auctoritatis* ("if my hope carries any weight"; Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.5). Similarly, at the very end of his first extant letter to Terentia, he uses the word *spes* not in relation to his recall to Rome, but to characterise their young son, Marcus (Cic. *Fam*. 14.4.6). Interestingly, in an effort to signify that his hopes for restoration were raised after hearing about Pompey's commitment to his cause, he chooses to begin his letter with the word *exspectatio* (expectation) over *spes* (Cic. *Att*. 3.18.1). His choice suggests that he is studiously avoiding giving the impression that he is hopeful that through his allies' efforts he may soon be allowed to return to Rome. His aversion to hope is perhaps best expressed at the very end of his first letter to Atticus from Dyrrachium. He emphatically states: *ego iam aut rem aut ne spem quidem expecto* ("at this point, in fact, I no longer desire hope, but results"; Cic. *Att*. 3.22.4). Consequently, through his remarks he appears to suggest to his correspondents that, if they want to change his mind, they should not focus on trying to restore his hope, but instead to provide him concrete evidence that his official recall is imminent.

Throughout his exilic correspondence, Cicero is consistently pessimistic. Whenever he receives positive reports about the progress of his recall, he expresses doubts as to whether that particular development would be enough to lead to his restoration.[85] A typical example of Cicero's pessimistic attitude can be found in one of his letters to Atticus from 29 April 58 BCE. After acknowledging Atticus' strenuous efforts to collect as much positive news as possible, in order to revive Cicero's hopes, he refers to them as scanty (*exigua*) and suggests that they should

14.4.5; 14.4.6; *Att*. 3.7.2; 3.7.3; 3.9.2; 3.10.1; 3.11.1; 3.12.1; 3.13.1; 3.14.1; 3.15.6; 3.16; 3.17.2; 3.18.1; 3.18.2; 3.19.1; 3.19.2; 3.20.1; 3.22.1; 3.22.2; 3.22.3; 3.22.4; 3.23.1; 3.23.4; 3.23.5; 3.24.1; 3.25. In the letters before his exile, they are used only forty-seven times. Thus, before the exile forty-seven references can be found in fifty-two letters in thirty-nine pages of text as opposed to during the exile with sixty-five references in thirty-four letters in twenty-one pages of text. Similarly, Michalopoulos 2018, 184, observes that *spes* and *sperare* are used much more frequently in Ovid's poems from exile than his previous writings. He attributes this frequency to Ovid's ordeal as well as to the absence of his loved ones from his life.

83 Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.5; 1.3.6; 1.4.5; *Fam*. 14.1.2; 14.1.3; 14.2.3; 14.3.2; *Att*. 3.7.3; 3.10.1; 3.12.1–2; 3.14.1; 3.15.6; 3.19.2; 3.22.1.

84 Hutchinson 1998, 46, makes a similar observation.

85 Cic. *Fam*. 14.3.3–4; *Att*. 3.7.3; 3.9.2; 3.13.1; 3.14.2; 3.15.6; 3.16; 3.22.4.

wait and see what happens, only because Atticus so desires (Cic. *Att*. 3.7.3). He thus unequivocally refuses to admit that Atticus' reports have made him more hopeful about his future. His reasoning behind his wariness is best explained in a letter to Quintus. He states that he sees no reason to indulge hope when the last time that he trusted his friends and allies, they all betrayed him.[86] More importantly, his political rival and bitter enemy, Clodius, is still in office as a tribune.[87] He argues that even after Clodius' term is over, he could still persuade the new tribunes to veto Cicero's restoration (Cic. *QFr*. 1.4.2–3). Therefore, Cicero clearly had legitimate reason to refrain from immediately embracing all ostensibly positive reports that he was receiving.

Nevertheless, many of his remarks and the requests that he makes to everyone working on his recall indicate that, despite painstakingly refusing to admit it, he did not consider a recall to Rome beyond the realms of possibility.[88] Clearly, when he left Rome, he was hoping that within three days he would be able to return safely (Cic. *QFr*. 1.4.3).[89] That hope clearly did not initially materialise, but, as his letters reveal, the hope of restoration was not lost, as his friends and allies were reportedly working on his recall. One of the strongest indications that he had not given up hope entirely at any point of his banishment can be found towards the end of most extant letters that he sent to his loved ones. Atticus, Terentia, and Quintus are asked repeatedly to send him as many and as detailed reports as possible on the affairs in Rome and updates on their efforts for his restoration.[90] He even asks Terentia to send him couriers frequently, so that he can be promptly informed about everything taking place in Rome (Cic. *Fam*. 14.3.4), especially regarding the new tribunes, on whom most of his hopes were resting (Cic. *Fam*. 14.3.3). Although he welcomes any rumours they may have heard (Cic. *Att*. 3.10.3; 3.11.1), he stresses that he prefers to be informed about the facts. Because of the tendency of some of his correspondents to paint a picture less grim than the reality, at certain points Cicero found himself receiving conflicting reports,[91] hence

86 The same point is raised again in his letter to Atticus (Cic. *Att*. 3.9.2).

87 Gruen 1966, 130, notes that, even though Clodius' tribunate only became possible thanks to the triumvirs, he did not display much gratitude to them and thus could not have been acting on their behalf when he forced Cicero into exile.

88 Cic. *Fam*. 14.1.3; 14.2.3; 14.2.4; 14.3.3; 14.3.5; 14.4.1; *Att*. 3.7.2; 3.13.1; 3.14.1; 3.15.4; 3.17.3; 3.20.1.

89 Smith 1896, 81, convincingly argues that the fact that Cicero remained close to Rome and refrained from heading towards "southern Italy until April" suggests that he believed that that he would soon be recalled to Rome.

90 Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.10; 1.4.5; *Fam*. 14.1.6; 14.2.4; 14.3.4; 14.3.5; *Att*. 3.7.1; 3.7.3; 3.8.2; 3.10.3; 3.11.2; 3.12.3; 3.13.2; 3.15.2; 3.15.3; 3.15.8; 3.17.3; 3.18.2; 3.19.3; 3.20.3; 3.21; 3.22.1; 3.22.3; 3.23.5; 3.24.2.

91 It is worth noting that Cicero did not rely for news on the events taking place in Rome solely on the letters that he was receiving from Terentia, Quintus, his friends, and allies, as he would also

his implicit request to Atticus to avoid bending the truth in his attempt to offer him a reason to cling to life.[92] His letter to Atticus from 10 September 58 BCE, in which he asserts that Quintus refrains from writing frankly to his brother for fear of losing all hope of being recalled to Rome (Cic. *Att*. 3.18.2), indicates that he was thoroughly aware that his loved ones were alarmed because of his remarks about dying or ending his life during his exile and, as a result, they were at pains to give him false hope by twisting the truth or a real reason to remain alive by securing his restoration.

The place in which he resided was also a strong indication of his hopes to be recalled to Rome. Whenever he was optimistic (Cic. *Att*. 3.10.1) that such a decision could be made in his favour, he moved as close to Rome as he possibly could. At the beginning of his exile, when he entertained some hope that his restoration would be effected in a matter of days (Cic. *QFr*. 1.4.3), he was reluctant to move immediately to Greece. In contrast, he spent a considerable amount of time in Thessalonica,[93] where, based on his remarks in his correspondence with Terentia, Quintus, and Atticus, it would appear that, despite feeling protected, he was most miserable because the prospects of his recall were still relatively slim. Hence, when the elections of the new tribunes gave him hope about a bill being drafted for his restoration to Rome, he decided to move closer to Italy, from Thessalonica to Dyrrachium. On 25 November 58 BCE, when he moved to Dyrrachium, he sent a letter to Terentia, in which he informs her that one of the main reasons that he chose it was that it was the nearest city to Italy (Cic. *Fam*. 14.1.7). While in Dyrrachium, he anxiously awaited reports from his correspondents (Cic. *Att*. 3.2.4). He notes that he remained there to receive letters with updates as quickly as possible (Cic. *Fam*. 14.3.4).

Cicero's letters from exile indicate that he stayed in Thessalonica purely out of necessity and convenience (Cic. *Att*. 3.20.1). In a letter to Atticus from Brundisium, he reveals that his initial plan was to travel to Athens and remain there, but he decided against it both for fear of his enemies in Athens, and also because he was concerned that it would not be considered far enough from Italy (Cic. *Att*. 3.7.1). Even though Thessalonica was clearly not Cicero's first choice of residence, it apparently became a relatively safe place for him at which to remain

---

acquire information from travellers who were simply passing by the place at which he was staying (Cic. *Fam*. 5.4.1; *Att*. 3.13.1). On Cicero's sources of information during his exile, see also Pina Polo 2017, 98–99.

92 Cic. *Att*. 3.8.3; 3.11.2; 3.14.1; 3.16; 3.17.3; 3.18.2; 3.24.2. He makes a similar claim to Quintus when he asks him to write to him truthfully (*vere*, Cic. *QFr*. 1.4.5).

93 From 23 May (Cic. *Att*. 3.8.1) to mid-November 58 BCE (Cic. *Att*. 3.22; *Fam*. 14.1).

(Cic. *Att*. 3.8.2).[94] It seems that he did not intend to stay in Thessalonica for a considerable part of his banishment, but decided to follow Terentia's and Atticus' advice and remain there until there was substantial progress with his recall to Rome.[95] On 27 June 58 BCE he notes that he is reluctant to leave Thessalonica, because he is expecting letters from Atticus and other persons, who, presumably, were working in some capacity on his restoration (Cic. *Att*. 3.11.1). In his references to Thessalonica, it becomes abundantly clear that he does not associate with the locals (Cic. *Att*. 3.19.1),[96] that he has no reason to feel any joy to live there, and that he does not wish to improve the quality of his life as long as he remains in that place, because he sees it only as a temporary residence. His misery appears to have been so intense that when Crassus' freedman saw him in Thessalonica, he reported that Cicero was particularly anxious and that he had lost weight (Cic. *Att*. 3.15.2). Interestingly, in a letter to Atticus he refers to living in Thessalonica as *iaceo* (Cic. *Att*. 3.12.3), a verb used for someone who is idle, neglected, dejected, ruined, sick, or even dead. Although he notes that he has no one to talk to,[97] he does not wish to have Atticus join him in Thessalonica either and informs him that he would prefer if Atticus remained in Rome and continued his work on his restoration (Cic. *Att*. 3.12.3). His remark to Atticus suggests that he did not wish to give the impression to anyone working on his recall that he was adjusting in life in exile, as his sole concern remained to return to Rome.

A particularly insightful reference to Thessalonica can be found in a letter to Atticus from 21 July 58 BCE. After mentioning that he has not left Thessalonica yet because he wants to avoid the crowded route and because he is still expecting letters with reports on the developments regarding his restoration, he informs Atticus that he has to leave Thessalonica. He clarifies that his host, Plancius, is not the reason,[98] but rather the city itself, which he considers the worst place to bear his calamity. The fact that he does not specify what exactly irks him about the city suggests that Thessalonica and its people were not the problem for Cicero, but what they represented. Despite his plan to move to Epirus, he chooses to remain in Thessalonica, as a move to Epirus would signify his renewed hope for re-

94 It is worth mentioning that a few days before he moved to Dyrrachium, there was an epidemic in Thessalonica that, nonetheless, did not touch him (Cic. *Fam*. 14.1.3).

95 Cic. *Fam*. 14.2.4; *Att*. 3.9.3; 3.10.1; 3.11.1.

96 Conversely, he notes that townspeople of Dyrrachium were dear friends of his (Cic. *Att*. 3.22.4).

97 He complains about the lack of company in Thessalonica also on 17 August 58 BCE (Cic. *Att*. 3.15.2).

98 In fact, he claims that Plancius was such a generous host that he kept postponing moving to Epirus (Cic. *Att*. 3.22.1). Similar praise of Plancius as a reason that he remained in Thessalonica can be found in his last letter to Terentia before he moved to Dyrrachium (Cic. *Fam*. 14.1.3).

storation (Cic. *Att*. 3.14.2),[99] which he repeatedly claims that he does not entertain. He reiterates this point in his following letter to Atticus by stressing that he chose to remain in Thessalonica because he saw that his chances of returning to Rome were getting slimmer (Cic. *Att*. 3.13.1). A similar claim can be found in a letter from 17 August 58 BCE, in which he informs Atticus that he will stay in Thessalonica until the proceedings of the Kalends of August. If their outcome is positive, he will move to Atticus' estate in Epirus; conversely, he states that he will move to Cyzicus (Cic. *Att*. 3.15.6), if the outcome is negative. Thus, Thessalonica becomes synonymous with forlorn hope, though not complete hopelessness,[100] as, based on his claims, if he were to lose all hope of being restored, he would seek an end to his life (Cic. *Att*. 3.15.6).

Evidently, from the beginning of his exile, Cicero had abundant reason to be hopeful that he would one day return to Rome.[101] First and foremost, his dear friend, Atticus, was working vigorously on his recall.[102] Cicero's letters attest that his restoration to Rome gradually became one of Atticus' main concerns. On 5 October 58 BCE, he expresses his gratitude to Atticus for prioritising his recall over Atticus' own many pressing matters, including the management of the large inheritance that he had received (Cic. *Att*. 3.20.2).[103] Being fully aware of the importance of having as many allies as possible at such perilous times, Cicero asks Atticus to use his network of influential friends to effect his restoration (Cic. *Att*. 3.20.3; 3.23.1)[104] by writing letters to anyone who was willing to help end his calamity (Cic. *Att*. 3.15.8; 3.21). In addition to Atticus, his family became a pillar of the force behind his return to Rome. Terentia and Quintus unsurprisingly worked relentlessly and most passionately on his restoration,[105] which almost

99 Cf. Cic. *Att*. 3.16; 3.19.2.

100 He explicitly states this in his letter to Atticus from 15 September 58 BCE, by noting that he has remained in Thessalonica because he expects at least some results regarding his recall (Cic. *Att*. 3.19.1).

101 As Marsh 2014, 48, points out, already in June 58 BCE Cicero received support in the Senate, when the matter of his restoration was being discussed.

102 Cic. *Fam*. 5.4.1; *Att*. 3.8.3; 3.13.1; 3.14.1; 3.15.1; 3.15.4; 3.15.7; 3.18.1; 3.20.2–3; 3.21; 3.22.2–3; 3.23.1; 3.25.5. Along with Quintus he was tasked with protecting Cicero's wife and children (Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.10; *Att*. 3.6; 3.8.4; 3.13.2; 3.17.3; 3.19.3; 3.23.5; 3.27).

103 It is worth noting that Cicero's letter reveals that Atticus himself had reassured Cicero that he was using all his resources to aid him, because Cicero's restoration had become his top priority (Cic. *Att*. 3.20.2).

104 Fuhrmann 1992, 94, also stresses how influential Atticus was, despite his decision to refrain from seeking an active role in Roman politics.

105 Cic. *QFr*. 1.3.5; *Fam*. 5.4.1; 14.3.3; 14.3.5; 14.4.3. Notably, as Hall 2009, 36, observes, Cicero wrote letters thanking each person who was helping with his recall and stressed that it was Terentia who had informed him of their generous support.

cost Quintus his life (Cic. *Sest.* 76; Plut. *Cic.* 33.3).[106] His son-in-law, Piso, also proved himself to be a reliable asset to him. His loyalty and his attempts to secure Cicero's recall are well attested in Cicero's letters from exile, as Cicero continuously expresses his fervent gratitude for Piso's public support as well as for the advice that he was providing him.[107] Apart from his loved ones, his correspondence indicates that his hopes rested primarily on the new magistrates (Cic. *Att*. 3.19.1). While he makes several general positive remarks about the new tribunes,[108] the consuls (Cic. *Att*. 3.24.1), the Senate (Cic. *Att*. 3.12.1), even the *boni* (Cic. *Att*. 3.25.5),[109] he singles out certain persons whom he deemed most devoted to his cause. In addition to the tribune, Sestius, who already in 58 BCE had drafted the bill for Cicero's recall and became one of Cicero's most ardent supporters,[110] he mentions Curtius, Milo, Fadius, and Atilius (Cic. *QFr*. 1.4.3). He also appears to have been cautiously optimistic about the consuls of 57 BCE, Metellus and Lentulus,[111] who had expressed interest in aiding the efforts for his restoration. The last – and perhaps most important – step to ensure that he would be allowed to return to Rome was to receive permission by the triumvirate. Even though in a letter to Terentia from mid-November 58 BCE he reveals that he is afraid of Crassus, he seems more optimistic about Pompey and Caesar.[112] Despite his reservations about Pompey, after he abandoned Cicero for fear of jeopardising his alliance with Caesar and Crassus (Cic. *Att*. 10.4.3), he slowly began to indulge hope that Pompey would at least attempt to assist him. Apart from sending letters to Pompey himself (Cic. *Att*. 3.8.4; 3.9.3), he received several reports from Quintus and Atticus that Pompey has reassured them that he was willing to assist their efforts.[113] In the end, Pompey played a key role in Cicero's official recall to Rome,[114] for which Cicero expresses gratitude to him upon his return to Rome in his public speeches.[115]

---

106 It is worth stressing that Quintus' network also proved to be useful to Cicero for his recall. According to McDermott 1971, 706–707, Quintus was on much better terms than Cicero with Crassus and Calidius, praetor of 57 BCE who supported his restoration.

107 Cic. *QFr*. 1.4.2; *Fam*. 14.1.4; 14.2.2; 14.3.3; 14.4.4; *Att*. 3.22.1. Gruen 1968, 162, underscores the role that Piso played in Cicero's restoration.

108 Cic. *QFr*. 1.4.3; 1.4.5; *Fam*. 14.1.2; 14.2.2; *Att*. 3.23.4.

109 As Epstein 1987, 9, points out, Cicero assigned blamed also to the *boni* in his works after his return, especially for not preventing his banishment and for taking a soft stance towards Clodius.

110 Cic. *QFr*. 1.4.2; 1.4.3; 1.4.5; *Att*. 3.19.2; 3.20.3; 3.23.4.

111 Cic. *Fam*. 5.4.1; 14.1.2; *Att*. 3.22.2–3; 3.23.1.

112 Cic. *Fam*. 14.1.2; cf. Cic. *Att*. 3.18.1.

113 Cic. *Fam*. 14.1.2; *Att*. 3.15.1; 3.22.2; 3.23.1.

114 As Gruen 1969, 79, observes, despite the fact that Pompey managed to secure Cicero's restoration by working with the tribunes, Milo and Sestius, he only embraced Cicero's cause when it was safe for himself to do so. His inability to deal with Clodius sooner thus became a grave embarrass-

Conclusion

Cicero's exile proved to be a reverberating disaster and, in many respects, unlike anything he had faced hitherto. Greece, and especially Thessalonica, became a safe haven for him, though not without its challenges. While staying in Plancius' property in Thessalonica, he was sufficiently safe from his many enemies, but he also reports that he refrained from associating with the locals, as he preferred isolation. The frequent use of the language of emotions during his stay in Thessalonica indicates an intention to appeal to his correspondents' pity for him and thus to urge them implicitly to work more intensely on his restoration to Rome. Atticus, who seems to have been able to write most frankly to him, disagreed with the attitude that his friend was displaying and vehemently urged him to endure his calamity with more fortitude. Because Cicero did not simply inform Terentia, Quintus, and Atticus that during his banishment he was experiencing sorrow, but rather that he had no desire to continue living, his loved ones were alarmed and wanted to ensure that he would have ample reason to cling on to life. Following his remarks, it would appear that his exile had deprived him of everything that he had, including his sense of identity, since he was unable to enjoy the life that he had experienced in all of his years in Rome. As a result, his time away from Rome became synonymous with death. His letters also suggest that, despite his overt pessimism and his comments on death, he did cherish hopes that he would one day be officially recalled to Rome. Even though he misses no opportunity to insist to his correspondents that, unlike them, he sees no cogent reason to be hopeful, he repeatedly asks them to send him detailed, frequent, and accurate reports about the developments in Rome, he always treats each new place, in which he had to reside, as temporary and constantly discusses moving to a different location, he moves closer to Italy whenever there is positive development with Pompey, the tribunes, and the consuls, and when a bill of his restoration is being drafted, he is not content with simply returning to his country, but asks for his properties to be restored as well. Ultimately, even if on certain occasions when he was in Thessalonica, he was losing hope of returning to Rome, at no point of his exile did have a valid reason to be completely hopeless.

---

ment for him. According to Tyrrell/Purser 1969, 31, it was Pompey's hatred for Clodius that prompted him to seek Cicero's recall. Nonetheless, as Marsh 1927, 33, points out, his return to Rome was perceived as a resounding success both for Pompey and the Senate.

115 Cic. *Red. sen.* 29–30; *Red. pop.* 16–17; *Dom.* 30; cf. Cic. *Fam.* 3.10.10.

Ximing Lu

Mercatura Bonarum Artium

The Politics of Marcus' Study Abroad in Cicero's *De Officiis*

Introduction

In 45 BCE, thirty-four years after Cicero's own study in Greece, his son Marcus embarked on a study trip to Athens. A number of letters in the Ciceronian corpus shed light on the logistics of Marcus' study abroad, his life in Athens, and the young man's involvement in Cicero's political network. The correspondence between Cicero and Marcus in Athens is mentioned in primary sources,[1] but only a few fragments have survived besides the philosophical treatise *De officiis*.[2] Cicero composed *De officiis* in late 44 BCE and framed the work as a fatherly letter to Marcus.[3] However, as is consistent with Cicero's other intellectual writings, this treatise was also intended for a wider audience.[4] This study argues that *De officiis* presents Marcus in Athens as Cicero's intellectual heir who was imitating Cicero's study abroad and would carry on with Cicero's 'trade of noble arts'. In contrast to Rome's previous acquisition of Greek knowledge and artefacts through wars and conquests, this portrayal of Marcus as a peaceful trader in turn helped Cicero defend his own legacy and image in light of his intensifying conflict with Mark Antony in late 44 BCE.

Note: Throughout this study I use the name Marcus to refer to Cicero's son. This paper is adapted from one of my dissertation chapters; see Lu 2021, 103–125. An earlier version of it was also presented at Bowdoin College in March 2021. For a general overview of Roman study abroad in the Late Republic, see Daly 1950; Rawson 1985, 9–12. For a description of Marcus' study in Athens, see Testard 1962, 200–207; Burgeon 2017, 13–22. Certain aspects of Cicero's life discussed in this study provide the necessary background information in order not to alienate the more general audience, who might not be steeped in Ciceronian studies. All the translations in this paper were made by the author.

1 Cic. *Att*. 14.7.2; Cic. *Fam*. 16.21.6. The datings of Ciceronian letters used in this paper are Shackleton Bailey's; see Shackleton Bailey 1965–1970, 1977, 1980.

2 McDermott 1972, 270.

3 Gibson/Morrison 2007, 9, point out that Cicero followed an established literary tradition of casting philosophy in an epistolary format, which began at least with Epicurus and possibly even with Plato and Aristotle.

4 Dyck 1996, 16 and 29–36. Bishop 2019, 238–239, regards *De officiis* as "similar to epistolary philosophical lectures in Greek".

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779-005

In the following pages, I first discuss how Marcus' intellectual profile in *De officiis* echoes Cicero's study in Athens in 79 BCE and intellectual activities in the 40s BCE. I then consider the political implications of this portrayal of Marcus through an intertextual reading of *De officiis* and the first two *Philippics*, which were all composed in autumn 44 BCE.[5] My intertextual analysis shows how the theme of Marcus' study abroad in *De officiis* interacts and collaborates with these two *Philippics* for Cicero's political self-fashioning in Rome. Thus, *De officiis* is not only connected with *a* Cicero's physical presence in Greece, but also concerns *the* Cicero's legacy as a Roman intellect versed in Greek learning.

Mercatura bonarum artium

In Book Three of *De officiis* Cicero characterises Marcus' study with the Peripatetic philosopher Cratippus in Athens as a 'trade of noble arts' (*mercatura bonarum artium*). Cicero suggests that Marcus' performance in Athens would affect the reputations of both Cratippus and Athens (Cic. *Off*. 3.6):

> *Sustines enim non parvam exspectationem imitandae industriae nostrae, magnam honorum, non nullam fortasse nominis. Suscepisti onus praeterea grave et Athenarum et Cratippi; ad quos cum tamquam ad mercaturam bonarum artium sis profectus, inanem redire turpissimum est dedecorantem et urbis auctoritatem et magistri.*
>
> For you bear the not small expectation that you should imitate my diligence, my political positions, and perhaps my name. Besides, you have taken up a heavy burden of both Athens and Cratippus; since you have come to them as if for the trade of noble arts, it would be very shameful for you to come back empty-handed and disgrace the reputations of both the city and the teacher. (transl. by the author)

This commercial image of trade in this passage partly alludes to the substantial costs of Marcus' study in Athens. The epistolary evidence shows that Marcus' annual allowance in Athens amounted to 80,000 sesterces,[6] which appears to exceed what other Roman students of similar social standing would receive for their stays in Athens.[7] In two letters to Atticus dated to 15 April and 2 May 44 BCE, Cicero in-

5 Previous scholars have noted Cicero's effort to reaffirm aristocratic values in both the *Philippics* and *De officiis*. See Long 1995b; Pitcher 2008; Stone 2008.

6 Cic. *Att*. 16.1.5. Marcus' allowance came from the rental revenues of Cicero's Argiletum and Aventine properties. These two properties were originally part of Terentia's dowry which Cicero retained after their divorce through the settlement legally known as *retentio propter liberos*; see Cic. *Att*. 15.20.4; Dixon 1986, 106; Treggiari 2007, 139.

7 Cic. *Att*. 12.32.2.

dicates that it was a matter of his own reputation (*existimatio*) and rank (*dignitas*) to provide abundantly for Marcus in Athens.[8] Thomas Späth has argued that Cicero's funding for Marcus in Athens shows an underlying intention of maintaining male offspring's social status and safeguarding the family name. In Späth's opinion, Marcus in Athens becomes Cicero's "*alter ego*, whose political and social standing he must display outwardly".[9]

Besides the outward display of Cicero's wealth and standing, I shall add that Marcus was also Cicero's *alter ego* in the intellectual realm. In the passage quoted above, Cicero calls on Marcus to imitate his political career and name, as well as his diligence (*industria*). As Yelena Baraz points out, although *industria* is not limited to denoting diligence in a particular field, the context of this passage indicates that here Cicero is referring to his intellectual diligence.[10] Namely, shortly before the passage quoted above, Cicero mentions the large number of literary and philosophical works he produced during the 40s BCE.[11] Thus, through this emphasis on his intellectual *industria*, Cicero suggests that Marcus should carry on his father's prolific contributions to Rome's intellectual life, which largely consisted of his translation and adaption of Greek knowledge, especially philosophy, into the Latin language.[12] In other words, Cicero is also calling upon Marcus to imitate his diligence in transmitting Greek learning to the Roman audience.

In a way Cicero's translation and transmission of Greek learning in his old age can be conceived as a more advanced version of the 'trade of noble arts' (*mercatura bonarum artium*) that occurred after the study abroad stage.[13] Just as Marcus,

8 Cic. *Att*. 14.7.2; 14.16.4.

9 Späth 2010, 155.

10 Baraz 2012, 222.

11 Cic. *Off*. 3.4: *itaque plura brevi tempore eversa quam multis annis stante re publica scripsimus* ("Therefore after the republic was overturned, I wrote more in the short period of time than the many years when the republic was standing").

12 For example, Cicero indicates that his philosophical discussions in *De officiis* largely follow the Stoic school, but he is also making adjustments in his presentation; see Cic. *Off*. 1.6.

13 Scholars sometimes interpret the Latin phrase *bonae artes* as liberal arts (see, e. g., Rudd 1989, 127). Adler 2020, 38–39, suggests that *artes liberales*, *bonae artes*, *optimae artes* (best arts), and *ingenuae artes* (freeborn arts) were all used in Roman antiquity to refer to *studia humanitatis* (studies of humanity), namely "a broad educational regimen that would inculcate particularly intellectual and moral virtues in its devotees". However, one passage from Cicero's *De oratore* suggests that Cicero sometimes presents *bonae artes* only as one component of the overarching liberal educational regimen. The phrase *bonae artes* appears in *De oratore* when the interlocutor Crassus discusses the education of an orator (Cic. *De or.* 1.158): *Legendi etiam poetae, cognoscendae historiae, omnium bonarum artium doctores atque scriptores eligendi et pervolutandi et exercitationis causa laudandi, interpretandi, corrigendi, vituperandi, refellendi* ("Poets must also be read, history must be learned, masters and writers of all noble arts must be picked out, perused, and praised for

Cicero in his younger days also studied oratory and philosophy in Athens. According to Cicero's *Brutus*, Cicero's study with Antiochus in Athens in 79 BCE was an important milestone in his philosophical journey: *studiumque philosophiae numquam intermissum a primaque adulescentia cultum et semper auctum hoc rursus summo auctore et doctore renovavi* ("I renewed my passion for philosophy, which I had cultivated in an early age, had made progress in, and had not given up ever since").[14] A more vivid snapshot of Cicero's philosophical education in Athens appears in his philosophical treatise *De finibus* composed in 45 BCE. The treatise's fifth and final Book opens on a peaceful Athenian afternoon in 79 BCE, when the young Cicero and his companions were sauntering to the Academy after attending a lecture by Antiochus.[15] Catherine Steel suggests that by setting this Book in his student time, Cicero demonstrates his "lifelong commitment to philosophy".[16] It should also be noted that Cicero opens *De finibus* with a painstaking defence of his Latin adaptation of Greek philosophy.[17] Thus, by bookending *De finibus* with his translation project in the preface and his study in Athens in the final Book, Cicero charts the trajectory of his lifelong 'trade of noble arts' for his audience. In turn in *De officiis*, by reminding Marcus of this *mercatura* and by asking Marcus to emulate his intellectual *industria*, Cicero imposes his own career path upon Marcus to follow, a path that started in Athens.[18]

---

the sake of practice, explained, corrected, censured, and rebutted"). Tempest 2020, 489, suggests that Crassus' approach in this sentence recalls the Greek educational system based on modern reconstruction. This critical study of *bonae artes* is then juxtaposed with subjects of Roman characteristics: Cic. *De or.* 1.159: *perdiscendum ius civile, cognoscendae leges, percipienda omnis antiquitas, senatoria consuetudo, disciplina rei publicae, iura sociorum, foedera, pactiones, causa imperi cognoscenda est* ("Civil law must be thoroughly studied, statutes must be learned, all ancient ages must be understood, senatorial custom, political education, the laws of the allies, treaties, agreements, and the cause of command must be understood"). According to Tempest 2020, 489–490, Cicero added two new arts into liberal education, ethics (*de hominum moribus*) and politics (*de rebus publicis*), for which subjects such as civil law and senatorial custom provided training. The *De oratore* passage thus shows that *bonae artes* should not always be equated with liberal education. Rather, Cicero can use *bonae artes* to refer to subjects with strong Greek connections such as poetry. In other words, *bonae artes* were imports from the Greek East.

14 Cic. *Brut.* 315.

15 Cic. *Fin.* 5.1.

16 Steel 2001, 113.

17 Cic. *Fin.* 1.4–10.

18 For the philosophical significance of Athens in Ciceronian dialogues, see Tsouni in this volume.

The Ciceros in Athens

Cicero starts *De officiis* by praising Marcus' academic performance in Athens and encouraging the young man to learn from his philosophical writings. The opening sentence states that Marcus had been studying under the philosopher Cratippus in Athens for a year. Marcus appears to have gained substantial philosophical knowledge during that time (Cic. *Off*. 1.1):

> *te, Marce fili, annum iam audientem Cratippum, idque Athenis, abundare oportet praeceptis institutisque philosophiae propter summam et doctoris auctoritatem et urbis, quorum alter te scientia augere potest, altera exemplis.*
>
> my dear Marcus, you must be versed in philosophical precepts and principles after studying for one year under Cratippus in Athens, thanks to the highest reputation of the teacher and of the city, as Cratippus can improve you with knowledge, Athens can improve you with examples. (transl. by the author)

Cicero's comment that Athens has supplied Marcus with examples for his philosophical enrichment recalls the opening scene of *De finibus* 5, in which the interlocutors remark on various Athenian landmarks linked to famous historical figures. The interlocutor Cicero in that scene points out that viewing these landmarks helps him better understand the associated figures. As he remarks, *assentior usu hoc venire ut acrius aliquanto et attentius de claris viris locorum admonitu cogitemus* ("I agree from experience that we somehow think about the famous men more acutely and more attentively with the reminder of the places").[19] The *De finibus* echo in the opening sentence of *De officiis* thus creates the impression that Marcus' process of acquiring and enhancing philosophical knowledge in Athens is similar to Cicero's experience in his younger days. More specifically, both of them had eminent philosophers as their teachers, Antiochus for Cicero and Cratippus for Marcus.[20] Furthermore, both father and son appear to have benefited from their physical presence in Athens.

While the opening clause of *De officiis* suggests that Marcus is tracing his father's steps in Athens, Cicero more explicitly encourages Marcus to imitate his learning method in the next clause of the passage. Cicero asks Marcus to have bilingual training in both oratory and philosophy, just like what Cicero himself did in youth (Cic. *Off*. 1.1):

---

19 Cic. *Fin*. 5.4. Calcò 2018, 217, suggests that the setting of Ciceronian dialogues often serves "come sede di un'esperienza affettiva e memoriale".

20 For more on Antiochus, see Barnes 1989.

> *tamen, ut ipse ad meam utilitatem semper cum Graecis Latina coniunxi, neque id in philosophia solum, sed etiam in dicendi exercitatione feci, idem tibi censeo faciendum, ut par sis in utriusque orationis facultate. Quam quidem ad rem nos, ut videmur, magnum attulimus adiumentum hominibus nostris, ut non modo Graecarum litterarum rudes, sed etiam docti aliquantum se arbitrentur adeptos et ad dicendum et ad iudicandum.*
>
> Nevertheless, as I myself always combined Latin with Greek for my benefit, and I did that not only in philosophy, but also in the exercise of speaking, I think you should do the same, so that you are balanced in your ability of each language. Indeed, in that matter, so it seems, I rendered a great aid to our people, so that not only those inexperienced in Greek literature, but also those learned think that they obtained something for speaking and for thinking. (transl. by the author)

Cicero justifies his recommendation by claiming that his bilingual excellence has enabled him to make great contributions to his fellow Romans, ostensibly through his translation and transmission of Greek learning.[21] The juxtaposition of Cicero's translation project with his calling on Marcus to follow his bilingual training indicates Cicero's encouragement of Marcus to carry on with this project. In other words, this passage once again shows that Cicero implicitly charts a step-by-step path for Marcus to become his *alter ego* and successor in the 'trade of noble arts' (*mercatura bonarum artium*).

Imitatio factorum

Later in the treatise, Cicero revisits the topic of intergenerational imitation when he argues that non-military achievements (*res urbanae*) are more important than military ones (*res bellicae*). According to Cicero, *sed cum plerique arbitrentur res bellicas maiores esse quam urbanas, minuenda est haec opinio* ("although most people think that military achievements are greater than non-military ones, this opinion must be refuted.").[22] He then uses a series of historical figures to make his case. For example, he argues that Solon's laws are more significant than Themistocles' victory in Salamis, because Solon's laws had more long-lasting benefits to the state than Themistocles' victory.[23] Cicero culminates his argument by citing his success-

21 See Baraz 2012, 214–215, for how Cicero's presentation of his translation project in *De officiis* compares to his defence of the project in other texts. For Cicero's translation, see also Powell 1995.
22 Cic. *Off.* 1.74.
23 Cic. *Off.* 1.75: *illud enim semel profuit, hoc semper proderit civitati* ("for that deed profited the state only once, this deed will benefit the state forever").

ful quashing of the Catilinarian conspiracy, arguing that his counsels (*consilia*) and vigilance (*diligentia*) prevailed over the conspirators' weapons.[24]

Within this context, Cicero once again urges Marcus to imitate his deeds: *licet enim mihi, M. fili, apud te gloriari, ad quem et hereditas huius gloriae et factorum imitatio pertinet* ("may I be allowed to boast to you, my son Marcus, to whom the inheritance of this glory and the imitation of these deeds belong").[25] The context makes clear that the *gloria* and *facta* mentioned here are specifically non-military ones (*res urbanae*). On the surface, Cicero's words make Marcus appear to live in the shadow of his father. By referring to his son's inheritance, Cicero creates the impression that he had already earned concrete and indisputable glory from his non-military achievements. However, given that most people (*plerique*) regarded military achievements as more important, Cicero's reputation and glory were not as secure as he presents, which in turn made Marcus' imitation crucial for Cicero. As Cicero explains a few chapters later, *quorum vero patres aut maiores aliqua gloria praestiterunt, ii student plerumque eodem in genere laudis excellere* ("indeed, those people, whose fathers or forefathers had stood out with some glory, generally strive to excel in the same field of glory").[26] Based on this model, should Marcus choose a military career, i. e. a path different from Cicero's, it would harm Cicero's legacy built on his *res urbanae.* Thus, as much as Marcus could inherit fame and name from his father, Cicero also needed Marcus' imitation to defend his legacy.

Cedant arma togae

Besides its importance for Cicero's reputation in posterity, Marcus' imitation of Cicero's *res urbanae* also bore an immediate political significance. As Cicero recounts his defeat of the Catilinarian conspiracy in his argument for *res urbanae*, he cites a line from his self-congratulatory poem *De consulatu suo: illud autem optimum est, in quod invadi solere ab improbis et invidis audio: 'cedant arma togae, concedat laurea laudi'* ("and that is the best expression, which I hear is prone to be attacked by wicked and envious people: 'let weapons yield to toga, let laurel yield to praise'").[27] "The wicked and the envious people" (*improbi et invidi*) mentioned in this quota-

24 Cic. *Off.* 1.77. For a Freudian reading of Cicero's habit of referring to his consulship and the Catilinarian conspiracy, see Dugan 2014.

25 Cic. *Off.* 1.78. For a discussion on Cicero's use of himself as an *exemplum* for Marcus, see also van der Blom 2010, 316–324.

26 Cic. *Off.* 1.116.

27 Cic. *Off.* 1.77.

tion allude to Mark Antony, who attacked Cicero's *cedant arma togae* in the Senate meeting on 19 September 44 BCE. This instance is mentioned in Cicero's *Second Philippic*,[28] which served as his response to Antony's attack on 19 September. It is worth noting that the epistolary evidence from autumn 44 BCE suggests a close connection between the composition of *De officiis* and that of the *Second Philippic*. On 25 October Cicero sent a copy of the *Second Philippic* to Atticus, asking Atticus to decide whether to circulate the speech or not.[29] A few days later on 28 October Cicero mentioned the composition of *De officiis* for the first time.[30] By 5 November Cicero had already finished the treatise's first two Books.[31] The last known reference to the treatise occurs in a letter dated around November 13.[32] Given Cicero's active participation in politics during the last year of his life, scholars generally agree that Cicero did not have the leisure to revise *De officiis* after its completion in November or shortly after.[33] In other words, *De officiis* in its current shape is closely connected with the political circumstances of autumn 44 BCE, which featured the early stage of Cicero's final struggles with Antony demarcated by the *First* and the *Second Philippic*.[34]

In fact, prior to the composition of *De officiis*, Marcus' study in Athens had already been embroiled in Cicero's conflict with Antony. Based on the extant sources, Cicero's aborted trip to visit Marcus in Summer 44 BCE was the immediate *casus belli* that launched his twelve *Philippics*. Cicero had planned for this trip to Athens for quite a while before his departure in summer.[35] He went as far as Leucopetra in Rhegium but reverted his course when the political situation in Rome changed. Upon his arrival in Rome, Cicero used fatigue from his journey as a pretext to excuse himself from the Senate meeting presided by Antony on 1 September. Antony's threat to punish Cicero for this absence prompted Cicero to compose and deliver the *First Philippic* in the Senate meeting on 2 September.[36] This aborted trip is

28 Cic. *Phil.* 2.20.
29 Cic. *Att*. 15.13.1.
30 Cic. *Att*. 15.13a.2.
31 Cic. *Att*. 16.11.4.
32 Cic. *Att*. 16.14.3.
33 Dyck 1996, 8–9.
34 Cicero delivered the *Third Philippic* in the Senate meeting on 20 December 44 BCE, in all likelihood postdating the completion of *De officiis*. For the relationship between *De officiis* and Cicero's conflict with Antony, see also Corbeill 2013, 23–24. For the historical background of *De officiis*, see also Grimal 1989, 2–3. For a discussion on the relation between the philosophical issues in *De officiis* and the historical context of the treatise, see Luciani 2013.
35 In April 44 BCE Cicero had already thought about going to Greece to check on Marcus; see Cic. *Att*. 14.7.2. See also Daly 1950, 51–52.
36 Cic. *Phil*. 1.3–10.

mentioned again in the final chapter of *De officiis*, where Cicero calls the treatise a great gift (*munus magnum*) for Marcus in lieu of his personal visit to Athens.[37] Moreover, Cicero presents a vivid image with a personified *patria* to explain why his trip was interrupted: *nisi me e medio cursu clara voce patria revocasset* ("had the fatherland not called me back en route with a clear voice").[38] This personification of a speaking *patria* recalls Cicero's *First Catilinarian* oration, in which the orator imagines *patria* questioning him about the delay to punish Catiline.[39] This intertextuality then compels readers to compare the political situation in autumn 44 BCE with the Catilinarian conspiracy during Cicero's consular year of 63 BCE. Thus, this closing chapter of *De officiis* once again ties the treatise's political threads, particularly Cicero's ongoing struggle against Antony and his reminiscence of his consulship in 63 BCE, with Marcus' study in Athens. In turn, Cicero's call for Marcus to imitate his *res urbanae* in *De officiis* should be considered along with his political self-fashioning and his struggle against Antony.

Antony's mockery of Cicero's *cedant arma togae*, which is mentioned in the *Second Philippic*, exposed Cicero's deficient military experience compared to other Roman statesmen, particularly Antony himself. While Cicero used his oratorical talent as a springboard to launch his political career, William Harris has pointed out that a military service was still the more typical path for a young Roman aristocrat to gain influence in Late Republic.[40] Even Cicero himself concedes that a military career was a viable and traditional path for young Romans to obtain glory.[41] Indeed, not every victorious Roman general succeeded in political elections, but a military victory was nevertheless a source of "symbolic capital" in Henriette van der Blom's words.[42] After all, Cicero himself had also actively sought a triumph from the Senate after his victory against the Parthian cavalry and his successful siege in Pindenissum during his governorship in Cilicia (51–50 BCE).[43] Therefore, the phrase *cedant arma togae* is a double-edged sword for Cicero that

37 Cic. *Off*. 3.121.

38 Cic. *Off*. 3.121.

39 Cic. *Cat*. 1.27–29. For more discussion on this personification of *patria*, see Dyck 1996, 653–654.

40 Harris 1979, 17. For a statistical analysis of the relationship between military victory and electoral success, see Waller 2011.

41 Cic. *Off*. 2.45. Cicero has also expressed a similar opinion on the importance of a military record in Cic. *Mur*. 19–24; *Planc*. 60–61; *De or*. 1.7. See also Waller 2011, 18.

42 For a discussion on the impact of military service in Roman aristocrats' career, see van der Blom 2016, 55–59; Rosenstein 2007.

43 Cicero wrote a letter to Cato (Cic. *Fam*. 15.4) trying to win Cato's assistance and endorsement on his triumph for his military activities in Cilicia. For a detailed analysis of Cic. *Fam*.15.4, see Hutchinson 1998, 86–100.

brandishes his non-military accomplishments on the one hand but exposes his poor swordsmanship on the other.

In the *Second Philippic* Cicero rebuts Antony's mockery by casting his opponent as an uncouth person ignorant of literature (Cic. *Phil.* 2.20):

> *nec vero tibi de versibus plura respondebo; tantum dicam breviter, te neque illos neque ullas omnino litteras nosse, me nec rei publicae nec amicis umquam defuisse et tamen omni genere monimentorum meorum perfecisse, ut meae vigiliae meaeque litterae et iuventuti utilitatis et nomini Romano laudis aliquid adferrent. Sed haec non huius temporis; maiora videamus.*
>
> And I will not say more to you about the verses. Let me just say it briefly that you are ignorant of those verses and any literature completely. I never failed the republic nor my friends, and, through every genre of my writings, I have also endeavoured during my free time so that my lucubration and my words may offer some benefits to the youth and some praise to the Roman name. But this is not the time for this, let us look at the more serious matters. (transl. by the author)

Previous scholarship has noted that Cicero's negative presentation of Antony's literary ignorance is misleading.[44] After all, Antony was born into a distinguished and cultured family. Antony's grandfather was an eminent orator, whom Cicero casts as one of the speakers in his *De oratore.* Plutarch even reports that Antony went to Greece, where he trained both for military actions and oratory.[45] In other words, Cicero can only detract from Antony's learning and education to a limited degree. Moreover, Antony's background in both military and oratory can even draw more attention to Cicero's lack of military experience. Hence, rather than further assailing Antony's literary knowledge, Cicero limits the attack and shifts the focus back to defending himself.

In the *Second Philippic* passage above Cicero stresses his own productive *otium* and intellectual contributions to the Roman youth and the republic. This emphasis not only carves out an area where Cicero supposedly excelled Antony, but also anticipates the composition of *De officiis.* As a treatise addressed to Marcus, *De officiis* is literally a work that brings some benefits (*aliquid utilitatis*) to the youth. As a treatise composed within four weeks, *De officiis* conjures the image of Cicero writing (or dictating) diligently at night (*meae vigiliae*). While Cicero needs to move on to other matters in the *Second Philippic*, he spends more time and space in *De officiis* defending his *cedant arma togae* through the discussion of *res urbanae* and

44 Huzar 1982, 639–642, and van der Blom 2016, 248–279.

45 Plut. *Ant*. 2.4. Pelling 1988, 119, suggests that Plutarch may have known about Antony's study abroad from oral sources.

res bellicae.[46] In short, the intersection between the *Second Philippic* and *De officiis* on the phrase *cedant arma togae* suggests that *De officiis* aids Cicero's defence of his intellectual achievements in light of Antony's assailment.[47] By extension, Marcus' imitation of Cicero's *res urbanae*, which would help defend Cicero's intellectual legacy, also became crucial for Cicero's political standing in the tumultuous late 44 BCE.

Intergenerational Differences and Tension

Given the importance of Marcus' career choice for Cicero's legacy and political self-fashioning in late 44 BCE, Cicero made a great effort in *De officiis* to encourage Marcus to choose an intellectual career. However, the extant sources suggest that the young man was more interested in military pursuits. In late 46 BCE, before Marcus went to Athens, he had thought of joining Caesar's army in Spain and fighting against Pompey's sons. Marcus' plan to go to Spain eventually fell through for unknown reasons, but one of Cicero's letters to Atticus makes clear that Cicero was reluctant to endorse Marcus' decision (Cic. *Att*. 12.7.1):

> *locutus sum cum eo liberalissime; quod ex ipso velim, si modo tibi erit commodum, sciscitere. Sed quid differo? Exposui te ad me detulisse et quid vellet et quid requireret: velle Hispaniam, requirere liberalitatem. De liberalitate dixi, quantum Publius, quantum flamen Lentulus filio. De Hispania duo attuli, primum idem quod tibi, me vereri vituperationem. Non satis esse si haec arma reliquissemus? Etiam contraria? Deinde fore ut angeretur cum a fratre familiaritate et omni gratia vinceretur. Vel nimia <malim> liberalitate uti mea quam sua libertate. Sed tamen permisi; tibi enim intellexeram non nimis displicere. Ego etiam atque etiam cogitabo teque ut idem facias rogo. Magnas res; et simplex est manere, illud anceps. Verum videbimus.*
>
> I spoke with him [sc. Marcus] very courteously. You could ask him about what I wish, if only it will be convenient for you. But why do I delay? I related that you had told me what he wants and what he asks for: he wants to go to Spain, he asks for allowance. About the allowance, I said that I would give him the same as Publius and Flamen Lentulus give to their sons. About Spain I gave two caveats, first is the same as what I told you, that I am afraid of censure that asks whether it is enough if we have already put down these weapons? But even joining the other side? Secondly, he would be distressed if he were outdone by his brother [sc. his cousin young Quintus] in terms of personal network and friendship. I even wish he would utilise my

46 Woolf 2015, 178, suggests that Cicero's discussion of *res urbanae* and *res bellicae* aims beyond defending his career. From Cicero's discussion Woolf sees "a more general insistence that every sort of character and talent can and should have the opportunity to flourish, rather than a more restricted set that particular social norms or traditions might happen to favour".

47 Dyck 1996, 209, and Ramsey 2003, 191–192, have also noted that *cedant arma togae* appears in both *De officiis* and the *Second Philippic.*

> generosity excessively rather than his own liberty. But I gave my grant, for I had known that his plan did not displease you very much. I will think about it again and I ask you to do the same. It is an important issue. It is straightforward for him to stay; his plan is uncertain. But we will see. (transl. by the author)

The passage shows that Atticus did not share Cicero's hesitation over Marcus' plan to join Caesar (*tibi enim intellexeram non nimis displicere*). Cicero's urgency reflected by the phrase *quid differo* suggests his wish to strike a common ground with Atticus before Marcus and Atticus could strengthen their alliance. Marcus made a strategic move to discuss his plan with Atticus first before approaching his father, thereby enlisting Atticus both as an ally and a mediator. The involvement of Atticus in these issues in 46 BCE suggests the tension and, perhaps, the distance between father and son caused by the disagreement over Marcus' future.[48] In a nutshell, from the extant epistolary evidence, Marcus appears more interested in pursuing *res bellicae.*

In the passage above, Cicero indicates that his objection arises from both private and public grounds. On the private level, Cicero was concerned for Marcus' self-esteem because the young man would fall behind his cousin Quintus junior with regard to personal connections with the Caesarians (*familiaritate et omni gratia*). Cicero's concern for Marcus also alludes to an underlying fissure between the Marcus branch and the Quintus branch of the Ciceronian family. Namely, the *familiaritas* and *gratia* between the Quintus branch and Caesar were partially strengthened at the cost of Cicero's reputation during the uneasy time after Pompey's defeat at Pharsalus. In October 48 BCE, Cicero returned to Italy after fighting for the Pompeians in Greece. After landing in Brundisium he would remain there for almost a year, anxiously waiting for Caesar's decision on his fate. Meanwhile, the Quintus branch was keen on getting back into Caesar's good books. In December 48 BCE Cicero heard that his brother Quintus sent Quintus junior to make peace with Caesar and to make accusations against his uncle.[49] In January 47 BCE, Cicero got words that Quintus junior had arrived in Ephesus, about to make a speech against him in front of Caesar.[50] Hence, Marcus' plan to join Caesar in Spain in 46 BCE would also rip open Cicero's recent wounds caused by his brother and his nephew.

---

48 Testard 1962, 200, suggests that Marcus' wish to join Caesar could have resulted from the deterioration of Cicero's reputation and the family's circumstances after Pharsalus. Moreover, the divorce of Cicero and Marcus' mother Terentia could also have played a role.

49 Cic. *Att*. 11.8.2.

50 Cic. *Att*. 11.10.1.

On the public level, Cicero expresses his concern over the spectacle of Marcus fighting against his former allies and perpetuating the civil war. This concern suggests the level of social scrutiny Cicero and Marcus were subjected to even during Caesar's dictatorship in 46 BCE when Cicero held a less prominent political role. Thus, Cicero sometimes had to make a difficult choice between respecting Marcus' wish and tending to his family's public image. As Cicero phrases it, he would rather Marcus took advantage of his father's generosity (*liberalitas*) than his own freedom (*libertas*). In short, studying abroad in Athens was not Marcus' first choice; instead the young man eyed on a military career. The disagreement between father and son over career choice in 46 BCE led to a certain degree of tension, which made Cicero's encouragement of Marcus to pursue *res urbanae* a delicate task. In other words, in *De officiis* Cicero performed a balancing act between fulfilling his own political needs and caring for Marcus' feelings. This balancing act can be characterised as a 'sticks and carrots' strategy of Cicero to both admonish and sweet-talk Marcus into pursuing a career in *res urbanae.*

Sticks and Carrots

As a part of the 'sticks and carrots' strategy in *De officiis*, Cicero reassures Marcus that the young man's military talents were widely recognised. When Cicero discusses the career paths for Roman youth, he makes a digression to stress Marcus' superb performance in Pompey's camp during the civil war (Cic. *Off*. 2.45):

> *prima igitur est adulescenti commendatio ad gloriam, si qua ex bellicis rebus comparari potest, in qua multi apud maiores nostros exstiterunt; semper enim fere bella gerebantur. Tua autem aetas incidit in id bellum, cuius altera pars sceleris nimium habuit, alter felicitatis parum. Quo tamen in bello cum te Pompeius alae praefecisset, magnam laudem et a summo viro et ab exercitu consequebare equitando, iaculando, omni militari labore tolerando. Atque ea quidem tua laus pariter cum re publica cecidit. Mihi autem haec oratio suscepta non de te est, sed de genere toto; quam ob rem pergamus ad ea, quae restant.*
>
> Therefore, there is the first recommendation for a young man to attain glory, if any can be obtained from military affairs, in which many among our forefathers stood out; for they almost always waged wars. However, your age fell into that war, of which one side was full of crimes, the other short of luck. Nevertheless, when Pompey placed you in command of a wing in that war, you won great praise from that best man and from the army for your horsemanship, your javelin skills, your endurance of all military toils. But when the republic fell, so did that praise of you. However, I take up this discussion not about you, but about the general type; let us proceed to the rest of this issue. (transl. by the author)

It is unclear whether Cicero's claim about Marcus' horsemanship and javelin skills is credible, but he nevertheless manages to present Marcus as a talented soldier

and respected military leader, which in turn feeds into the young man's ego.[51] However, Marcus lived in the unfortunate time of a civil war when neither side was innocent or righteous. Any praise of Marcus' military achievements would risk causing scrutiny over the young man's role in the civil war. In response to such a risk, Cicero shifts blame away from Marcus' participation in the civil war by portraying the Pompeians as the less guilty party. While he casts the Caesarians as criminals (*sceleris nimium*), the Pompeians get the more sympathetic label as 'short of fortune' (*felicitatis parum*).[52] Hence, in Cicero's characterisation, Caesar and his followers actively sought to wrong the republic, while the Pompeians were defending the republic against criminals. Moreover, the contrast between *sceleris nimium* and *felicitatis parum* implies that Caesar defeated Pompey not because of his superior skills and talents, but thanks to Pompey's unfortunate circumstances. Cicero in fact calls Pompey the greatest man (*summus vir*). As an extension of this contrast, Cicero reiterates that Marcus (and Cicero himself) had joined the more righteous side to fight against the sinful Caesarians. Thus, this passage manages to soothe Marcus' self-esteem for his military talents while protecting him from scrutiny over his past.

It is worth noting that, by meticulously presenting Marcus' military credentials in the recent civil war, Cicero is also looking forward as he grooms Marcus as his intellectual heir. As Antony's attack on Cicero's lack of military experience suggests, Marcus could also face similar disparagement in the future should he embark on a career in *res urbanae.* Thus, this passage including Pompey's praise of Marcus' military talents becomes Cicero's way to preemptively protect Marcus from potential criticism of lacking military experience. While this intricately crafted passage shows Cicero's care for Marcus, it also serves as a part of Cicero's 'carrots and sticks' strategy to coax Marcus onto a career in *res urbanae.*[53]

Another carrot from Cicero is his meticulous grooming of Marcus' intellectual profile. He emphasises the pedigree of Marcus' education in Athens by highlighting the fame and reputation of Marcus' teacher Cratippus. Cicero says that Marcus is learning "from the leading philosopher of the day" (*a principe huius aetatis philo-*

51 Dyck 1996, 428, points out that this passage (Cic. *Off.* 2.45) is the only extant source for Marcus' role during the civil war.

52 The negative portrayal of Caesar is also found elsewhere in the treatise. For example, Cicero (Cic. *Off.* 1.26) characterises Caesar as someone *qui omnia iura divina et humana pervertit propter eum, quem sibi ipse opinionis errore finxerat, principatum* ("who overturned all divine and human laws for the rule which he devised for himself by false thinking").

53 My reading of the passage (Cic. *Off.* 2.45) thus differs from van der Blom 2010, 319, which argues that Cicero here recommends a military path for Marcus.

sophorum).[54] Cicero's compliment of Cratippus in *De officiis* is consistent with his opinions found elsewhere. For example, in *De divinatione*, Cicero regards Cratippus as "comparable to the best Peripatetics" (*parem summis Peripateticis*).[55] Moreover, Cratippus was active in Roman elite circles whom Marcus Marcellus, Pompey, and Brutus were all likely to have met.[56] Thus, by emphasising the prestige and name recognition of Marcus' teacher, Cicero accords more philosophical authority to his son and boosts up the young man's image as an up-and-coming philosopher even though Marcus most likely fell short of that image.[57]

Cicero further lures Marcus onto *res urbanae* by granting him the intellectual freedom to disagree with his father.[58] When presenting his philosophical works to Marcus, Cicero limits their main achievement to his writing style rather than philosophy per se. Cicero only tentatively suggests that Marcus can benefit philosophically from his father's writings (Cic. *Off*. 1.2):

> *sed tamen nostra legens non multum a Peripateticis dissidentia, quoniam utrique Socratici et Platonici volumus esse, de rebus ipsis utere tuo iudicio (nihil enim impedio), orationem autem Latinam efficies profecto legendis nostris pleniorem.*
>
> But nevertheless, when you read my writings, which are not too different from the Peripatetics since we both want to be followers of Socrates and Plato, use your own judgement about these issues (for I do not hinder you), but by reading my works you will surely make your Latin style richer. (transl. by the author)

In terms of philosophy, Cicero implies that Marcus can benefit from reading his writings because both his thinking and Cratippus' Peripatetic teachings stem from Plato and Socrates.[59] However, Marcus was free to conclude whether Cicero's philosophy is similar to the Peripatetics and whether Cicero's Academic skepticism follows the Platonic tradition. The phrase *nihil enim impedio* even gives out the impression that Cicero was inviting Marcus to object his claim to the similarity. This intellectual freedom Cicero bestowed on Marcus indicates that Cicero was negotiating between his control over Marcus' study and Marcus' agency in his own intellectual growth. Once again, Cicero was playing the role of a caring father mindful of his son's ego.

---

54 Cic. *Off*. 1.2.

55 Cic. *Div*. 1.5.

56 See Cic. *Brut.* 250; Plut. *Pomp.* 75.3; *Brut.* 24.1.

57 According to Testard 1962, 207–208, the fact that Cicero did not use a dialogue form in *De officiis* indicates Marcus' insufficiency in philosophy.

58 For Cicero's modesty in addressing Marcus, see also Testard 1962, 208–212.

59 For more on philosophical allegiance, see Sedley 1989. For Cicero's philosophical affiliations, see Glucker 1988.

Cicero further restricts his philosophical identity when he proceeds to justify his claim that his writings can help Marcus improve his Latin style. Cicero draws attention to his lifelong devotion to oratory (Cic. *Off.* 1.2):

> *nec vero hoc arroganter dictum existimari velim. Nam philosophandi scientiam concedens multis, quod est oratoris proprium, apte, distincte, ornate dicere, quoniam in eo studio aetatem consumpsi, si id mihi assumo, videor id meo iure quodam modo vindicare.*
>
> And I do not want you to think this is said arrogantly. I think I am justified by some measure to make that claim even though I concede to many people in terms of philosophical knowledge, because it is characteristic of an orator to speak suitably, clearly, and ornately, and because I have devoted my life to that passion. (transl. by the author)

On the one hand, the passage reveals Cicero's pride in his oratorical achievement. He is not embarrassed to yield ground in the realm of philosophy, because his oratorical excellence can make up for it. On the other hand, Cicero also presents philosophy as the opportunity cost of studying and improving oratory. By foregrounding his dedication to oratory, Cicero pushes his philosophical accomplishments into the shadow. Cicero's modest self-fashioning again leaves more space for Marcus to launch his own philosophical career.

While sugarcoating Marcus, Cicero also reminds the young man of his responsibility to imitate his father. In other words, Cicero is also using a 'stick' to keep Marcus on the intellectual path. This 'stick' can be seen in the *mercatura* passage quoted at the start of my discussion, where Cicero uses the superlative *turpissimum* to admonish Marcus not to come back empty-handed.[60] In the same passage, Cicero warns Marcus that the reputations of Cratippus and Athens were also at stake. Thus, the very pedigree and credentials Cicero uses to groom Marcus' profile and feed into the young man's self-esteem in the treatise's preface now become a burden for Marcus to bear. With a slight twist, the carrot transforms into a stick.

Conclusion: the Politics of *mercatura*

At the end of this paper, it is worth considering another political connotation embedded in the *mercatura* image in light of Cicero's defence of his *res urbanae*. Namely, the use of *mercatura* creates a subtle contrast between the Ciceros' acquis-

60 Cic. *Off.* 3.6. The image of returning home empty-handed echoes a line from Book Two of Homer's *Iliad* (2.298), when Odysseus tries to persuade the Achaeans to stay and fight in Troy: αἰσχρόν τοι δηρόν τε μένειν κενεόν τε νέεσθαι ("it is shameful to stay so long and return home empty-handed").

ition of knowledge and how Rome had obtained Greek learning thus far, i. e. as a result of military conquests. For example, Aemilius Paulus brought the library of King Perseus back to Rome after the Third Macedonian War (171–168 BCE) and the sack of Ephesus.[61] Similarly, Sulla's sack of Athens in 86 BCE was an invaluable boon for Rome's cultural life while causing irreparable destructions to Athens' cultural heritages.[62] Both Appian and Plutarch report that Sulla's troop felled the groves of Plato's Academy in Athens, and in Plutarch's account the Lyceum also fell victim to Sulla.[63] More importantly, Sulla also transported Apellicon's book collection from Athens to Rome along with other war spoils.[64] In Lionel Casson's words, this collection, which included books by Aristotle and Theophrastus, was a "literary windfall" for Rome.[65] In addition, Lucullus was also likely to have obtained part of his library from his campaigns against Mithridates.[66] Thus, until Cicero's time Rome's intellectual life appears in extant sources to be intertwined with her military activities. On the other hand, by portraying Marcus' study abroad as a 'trade' (*mercatura*), Cicero indicates that his son would acquire knowledge in a peaceful and warless manner unlike previous Roman statesmen. Once again Cicero reaffirms the message that his family's reputation and fame were built upon non-military achievements (*res urbanae*) rather than military ones (*res bellicae*).

As much as Cicero needed Marcus to pursue an intellectual career, the young man nevertheless joined Brutus' camp shortly after the composition of *De officiis.*[67] With our hindsight knowledge of what would happen, Cicero's message for Marcus in *De officiis* reads particularly poignant. We are not sure when or whether Cicero had sent *De officiis* to his son before his tragic death in 43 BCE. As I have pointed out, scholars think that Cicero never had the chance to revise the treatise after its initial completion in late 44 BCE.[68] Perhaps Cicero had put the draft away because he knew it was too late to change his son's mind. Perhaps Cicero had wanted to talk to Marcus in person and planned another trip. Unfortunately, the father and son never saw each other again before Cicero's death. No one could have thought that Marcus' departure for Athens in 45 BCE was the farewell.

---

61 See Plut. *Aem*. 28.11; Dix 2000, 442.

62 For more on the historical background of Sulla's sack of Athens, see Hoff 1997.

63 See Plut. *Sull.* 12.3 and App. *Mith.* 30.

64 See Strab. 13.609; Plut. *Sull.* 26.1; Tutrone 2013, 160–166.

65 See Casson 2001, 68.

66 For a discussion on the acquisition of Lucullus' library, see Dix 2000, 441–444.

67 The epistolary evidence for Marcus' studies abroad in late 44 BCE is scanty in the extant corpus. Marcus is last mentioned in one of Cicero's letters to Atticus dated to 8 July 44 BCE; see Cic. *Att*. 16.1.5. When we hear about the young man again in Cicero's correspondence of April 43 BCE, Marcus had already joined Brutus' army; see Cic. *Ad Brut.* 2.3.6.

68 Dyck 1996, 8–9.

Matilde Oliva

Eloquence as Handmaiden of Wisdom

Hellenistic Philosoph(ies) in Cicero's *Partitiones Oratoriae*

Introduction

Cicero's multifaceted relationship with Greece can be investigated from many perspectives, a manifoldness to which the variety of topics addressed in this volume testifies. Cicero was the greatest interpreter of an era that marked one of the strongest turning points in the cultural relationship between Rome and Greece. This historical period was recently described by Caroline Bishop as "the second major wave of cultural Hellenization in Rome".[1] Indeed, after the first 'wave' of the third and second centuries, the increasing importation of book collections and Greek intellectuals resulting from Sulla's and Lucullus' campaigns against Mithridates[2] contributed significantly to a new Hellenisation. The unprecedented access to Greek authors and Greek books, in particular, had a considerable impact on Rome's cultural life as well as on the personal history of Cicero, whose first contacts with Greece can be traced back to his association with some of these Greek scholars.[3]

From Cicero's account of his own education, scattered throughout his writings and masterly summed up in *Brut.* 304–316, we learn about a richness of sources and a variety of subjects that eventually proved crucial for the development of the synthesis he evolved between philosophy and eloquence. We know, for instance, that Cicero listened to the Stoic Diodotus when he was a child (Cic. *Acad.* 2.115; *Tusc.* 5.113) and that in the same years he was introduced to the Epicurean school by Phaedrus (Cic. *Fam.* 13.1.2). Later, when Philo of Larissa, the head of the Academy in Athens, fled to Rome (88 BCE), the young Cicero devoted himself to studying under this philosopher (Cic. *Brut.* 306),[4] and in the same period he also met Molon (Cic. *Brut.* 307; 312), under whom he would later study in Rhodes.[5]

1 Bishop 2019, 10. On this period of cultural turmoil, see also Wisse 2002a, 334–341.

2 Cf. Cic. *Att.* 4.10.1, where Cicero briefly describes a visit to Sulla's library in Cuma, and Cic. *Fin.* 3.7, in which Lucullus' library provides the occasion and the perfect setting for the dialogue.

3 On Cicero's education, cf. Clarke 1968; Corbeill 2002a; Treggiari 2015, 241–245.

4 Other mentions of Philo's teaching can be found in Cic. *Fam.* 13.1.2; *Nat. D.* 1.6; *Acad.* 1.13; *Tusc.* 2.9; Plut. *Cic.* 3.1.

5 Corbeill 2002a, 27.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779-006

Cicero's attachment to teachers of Greek origin did not end with the conclusion of his education in Rome. On the contrary, such engagement continued into adulthood. First, during his study tour to Athens, Asia Minor, and Rhodes, where he encountered many more Greek intellectuals, such as Antiochus of Ascalon, Demetrius the Syrian, Apollonius Molon, and Posidonius of Apamea. Later, during his mature years, he loved to surround himself with the company of Greek intellectuals, such as the poet Archias, for whom he also composed a brilliant speech, and some freedmen like Tyrannio[6] and Dionysius,[7] both of whom were originally hired as teachers to his nephew Quintus and his son Marcus.

This early fascination with Greek culture endured, and Cicero's philhellenism remained a distinctive trait of his personality throughout his life. From a literary point of view, it was reflected by the choice – in some ways an obliged one – of Greek literary models. One of those models was, of course, Plato, who was the inspiration behind the ambitious project of the political dialogues of the fifties (*De oratore*, *De re publica*, *De legibus*). But others were also important, such as Aristotle, Isocrates, Demosthenes – to name but a few –, the latter of whom was intentionally chosen by Cicero as the programmatic model for his own oratory (Cic. *Att.* 2.1.3) and as the highest term of comparison to strive for.[8] Beyond rhetoric and oratory, however, the field in which Cicero was most aware of the need to import the Greek cultural heritage into Rome was undoubtedly philosophy,[9] a discipline to which he devoted himself intensely, especially in the last years of his life. The huge philosophical production of these years bears witness not so much to Cicero's originality of thought as to his desire to play the role of mediator and 'Latin-

6 See, e.g., Cic. *QFr.* 2.4.2 (56 BCE), where Quintus is said to be excellently educated (*eruditur egregie*) by Tyrannio, who lived at Cicero's house (*apud me*). Tyrannio was also responsible for the organisation of Cicero's library in Antium (cf. Cic. *Att.* 4.4a and 4.8.2).

7 Dionysius, who helped Tyrannio with the arrangement of Cicero's library in Antium (Cic. *Att.* 4.8), later remained with Cicero (Cic. *Att.* 4.11.2; 4.13.1) and became Marcus' teacher. The first reference to the freedman as being Marcus' teacher dates from 54 BCE and is found in Cic. *Att.* 4.15.10, a particularly interesting piece of evidence, in which Cicero urges his friend to send Dionysius in order to instruct not only Marcus but also himself (*et eum roges et hortere, ut quam primum veniat, ut possit Ciceronem meum atque etiam me ipsum erudire*; "and beg and urge him to come as soon as possible and undertake the instruction of my son and of myself too"; transl. Winstedt 1962). On young Marcus' education, see Treggiari 2015, 245–250. For his study trip to Greece, see also Lu in this volume.

8 On Cicero's Demosthenic self-fashioning, see Bishop 2016, who focuses especially on *Brutus* and *Orator*.

9 See on this Tsouni 2019, 24–35.

iser' (including linguistically)[10] of Greek philosophy. In his cultural project, in fact, philosophy merges indissolubly with eloquence in order to shape the public figure Cicero held most dear: not the rhetorician, not the mere philosopher, but the politician, understood as the ideal orator (*perfectus orator*).

Taking as a starting point the semantic and cultural Latinisation of a Greek literary image found in *Partitiones oratoriae*, this study aims at investigating the relationship between rhetoric and philosophy in this work, one of Cicero's last writings on rhetoric.[11] The work, a handbook conceived as a dialogue between Cicero himself and his son Marcus, contains an intriguing and as yet not investigated representation of dialectics and oratory as 'handmaidens and companions of wisdom' (Cic. *Part. or.* 78). This personified image, surprisingly overlooked by *Partitiones oratoriae*'s few commentators, eventually deserves to be examined more in depth. The explicit representation of the ancillary relationship between eloquence and philosophy as well as the potential metaliterary value of such an image could in fact turn out to be crucial in order better to frame the complex relationship between these two disciplines, in a work where philosophy (and Greece) appears to be more present and rooted than it might seem at first sight.

Dialectics and Oratory as Handmaidens and Companions of Wisdom

About halfway through *Partitiones oratoriae*, after concluding the explanation of the unlimited questions (Cic. *Part. or.* 62–68), Cicero moves on to the limited ones and structures his account according to Aristotle's three kinds of speech. Rather unexpectedly,[12] the first to be addressed is the encomiastic kind, here named *genus laudativum* (laudatory genre; Cic. *Part. or.* 70–82).[13]

10 Cicero's awareness of his role as a 'Latiniser' of Greek philosophical knowledge and his attempt to make Latin a 'philosophical language' comparable to Greek are appreciable for example in Cic. *De or.* 3.95; *Nat. D.* 1.8; *Fin.* 1.10; 3.3–5; *Tusc.* 2.35. See on this Powell 1995, esp. 283–297; Lévy 2022 (with more bibliography).

11 Following Bornecque 1924, xi–xiv, and Romano 1964, I hold that *Partitiones oratoriae* was composed in the final phase of Cicero's life, between 46 and 45 BCE. I refer to Gilleland 1961 for a good overview of dating proposals. See also Gaines 2002, 447–450.

12 In Cicero's other rhetorical treatises, the encomiastic kind of speech usually follows the two others (deliberative and judicial). See, e. g., Cic. *De or.* 2.43; 341.

13 The *genus deliberativum* (deliberative genre) is addressed in Cic. *Part. or.* 83–97, while the *genus iudiciale* (judicial genre) occupies Cic. *Part. or.* 98–138.

Cicero gives the explanation a strong ethical overtone. Perhaps thinking of his son, the recipient of the work, he enriches the treatment of the *genus laudativum* with a catalogue of virtues and vices loaded with strong moral implications, thus bringing *Partitiones oratoriae* closer to the later *De officiis*, the 'spiritual testament' through which Cicero entrusted his political and philosophical legacy to Marcus, and to all the Roman youth. The ethical dimension of the encomiastic section is already appreciable in the way the author introduces the topic, stating that the "principles of awarding praise and blame [...] have a value not only for good oratory but also for right conduct",[14] thereby giving a precept that Marcus later confirms having understood when he claims to have received "instructions not merely as to how to praise another but also as to how to endeavour to be able to be deservedly praised myself".[15]

Despite the manual-like nature of the work, the ethical tone of this section is not overshadowed by the technicalities of the *genus laudativum.* Rather, it takes central stage and results in what could be described as a proper ethical digression, in which virtues and vices are discussed (Cic. *Part. or.* 76–81). The final result is a highly articulated system of virtues, for which it is not easy to identify a single source and which Alberto Grilli has convincingly traced back to Stoicism, arguing in particular for Panaetius.[16] Following the Aristotelian subdivision between dianoetic and ethical virtues, later theorised also by Panaetius in a form much more similar to that found in *Partitiones oratoriae*,[17] Cicero divides virtues into matters of knowledge and action (Cic. *Part. or.* 76). In the former class, he places prudence (*prudentia*), shrewdness (*calliditas*), and wisdom (*sapientia*). In the latter, he places temperance (*temperantia*), fortitude (*fortitudo*), patience (*patientia*), greatness of mind (*magnitudo animi*), liberality (*liberalitas*), loftiness of mind (*altitudo animi*), and justice (*iustitia*), flanked with religion towards the gods (*erga deos religio*), piety towards parents (*erga parentes pietas*), goodness (*bonitas*), faith (*fides*), mercy (*lenitas*), and friendship (*amicitia*), in other words a list of vir-

14 Cic. *Part. or.* 70: *Ac laudandi vituperandique rationes, quae non ad bene dicendum solum, sed etiam ad honeste vivendum valent, exponam breviter* ("I will give a brief account of the principles of awarding praise and blame, which have a value not only for good oratory but also for right conduct"; unless otherwise indicated, all translations from *Partitiones oratoriae* are by Rackham 1942).
15 Cic. *Part. or.* 83: *Accepi ista didicique breviter non solum quem ad modum laudarem alterum, sed etiam quem ad modum eniterer, ut possem iure ipse laudari* ("You have given me brief instructions not merely as to how to praise another but also as to how to endeavour to be able to be deservedly praised myself").
16 Grilli 1992.
17 Cf. Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1.13 (especially 1103a), and Diog. Laert. 7.92: Παναίτιος μὲν οὖν δύο φησὶν ἀρετάς, θεωρητικὴν καὶ πρακτικήν ("Panaetius, however, divides virtue into two kinds, theoretical and practical"; transl. Hicks 1925).

tues strikingly similar to the one laid out by the 'Antiochean' Piso in the fifth Book of *De finibus*, with which *Partitiones oratoriae* seems to share the conception of *iustitia* as the highest expression of social οἰκείωσις (appropriation).[18]

To this elaborate system Cicero adds a series of subordinate virtues, or, according to Stoic terminology, ὑποτεταγμέναι ἀρεταί,[19] among which dialectics and oratory also feature (Cic. *Part. or.* 78–79). The passage runs as follows:

> *Sunt autem aliae quasi ministrae comitesque sapientiae; quarum altera, quae sint in disputando vera atque falsa quibusque positis quid sequatur distinguit et iudicat, quae virtus omnis in ratione scientiaque disputandi sita est, altera autem oratoria. Nihil est enim aliud eloquentia nisi copiose loquens sapientia; quae ex eodem hausta genere, quo illa quae in disputando, est uberior atque latior et ad motus animorum vulgique sensus accommodatior.*
>
> But there are others which are so to speak the handmaidens and companions of wisdom; of these one is displayed in debate, distinguishing truth from falsehood and judging the logical consequence of given premisses – this virtue resides entirely in the method and science of debating; while the sphere of the other is oratory. For eloquence is nothing else but wisdom delivering copious utterance; and this, while derived from the same class as the virtue above that operates in debate, is more abundant and wider and more closely adapted to the emotions and to the feelings of the common herd. (transl. Rackham 1942)

In keeping with the main topic of the treatise, the *doctrina dicendi* (theory of speaking), Cicero principally focuses on two subordinate virtues related to the broader field of rhetoric, that is dialectics, here indicated by a long periphrasis, and oratory.[20] The former, described as the virtue that *omnis in ratione scientiaque disputandi sita est* ("resides entirely in the method and science of debating"), is entrusted with the tasks of distinguishing the true from the false and of judging the

18 Cic. *Fin.* 5.65: *Quae animi affectio* […] *iustitia dicitur, cui sunt adiunctae pietas, bonitas, liberalitas, benignitas, comitas, quaeque sunt generis eiusdem* ("This sentiment […] is termed justice; connected with it are dutiful affection, kindness, liberality, good-will, courtesy and the other graces of the same kind"; all translations from *De finibus* are by Rackham 1967). Despite the generic nature of the philosophical material, which can be traced back to both Stoic and Neo-Academic doctrines, the parallelism with Cic. *Part. or.* 78 is quite strong. The emphasis on the social value of justice, highlighted in Cic. *Part. or.* 78 by the expression *in communione*, is consistent with Antiochus' conception of *societas* (alliance) and *caritas generis humani* (affection between man and man; Cic. *Fin.* 5.65) derived from the – typically Antiochean – synthesis between Peripatetic and Stoic doctrines. On Cic. *Fin.* 5.65, see Schofield 2012, 176–182; Tsouni 2019, 156–166.

19 For the distinction between 'primary virtues' (πρῶται ἀρεταί) and 'secondary virtues' (ὑποτεταγμέναι ἀρεταί) see, e.g., *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* (*SVF*) 3.264; 265.

20 That eloquence was regarded as a virtue by the Stoics is made clear for example by Cic. *De or.* 1.83, where it is said that Mnesarchus considered eloquence one type of virtue (*una quaedam virtus*; see also Cic. *De or.* 3.55; 65, where a certain subordination to *sapientia* emerges).

logical consequences of given premises.[21] Of the second, by contrast, what is accentuated is the abundant, rich, and pathetic character, according to a representation consistent with the Stoic didactic gesture traditionally attributed to Zeno, who likened dialectics to a clenched fist and rhetoric to an open hand.[22] Such a distinction was well known to Cicero, who reiterates it at the end of the dialogue when he divides the rhetorical exercise into subtle disputation and copious oratory (*subtiliter disputandi et copiose dicendi artis*), attributing close analysis (*anguste disserere*) to the so-called dialecticians and broad exposition (*late expromere*) to the orator.[23]

If we return to the passage quoted above, however, we note that to this rather traditional description Cicero adds a significant personifying impulse, which invests dialectics and oratory with what Sarah Culpepper Stroup has classified as "middling personification".[24] Dialectics and oratory are indeed defined as the handmaidens and companions of wisdom; a little further on, eloquence itself becomes *copiose loquens sapientia* ("wisdom delivering copious utterance") – with an expression resembling the metaphor of Cic. *Orat.* 70 –, while at the end of the paragraph modesty is proclaimed guardian of all virtues (*custos vero virtutum omnium, dedecus fugiens laudemque maxime consequens, verecundia est*; "but the guardian of all the virtues, which shuns disgrace and attains praise in the greatest degree, is modesty").

The peculiar personification, which, as it happens, is not found in any other rhetorical work by Cicero, inevitably captures the reader's attention and links this passage to the allegory – more philosophical than rhetorical – of the *comitatus virtutum* (companionship of virtues), a likely Latinisation of the Greek and Stoic

21 The same characterisation of dialectics can be found in Cic. *De or.* 2.157; *Acad.* 1.5; *Fin.* 2.17; *Tusc.* 5.72.

22 Zeno's own explanation of this analogy is not preserved, and we only have testimonies from later authorities. Evidence is collected in *SVF* 1.75.

23 Cic. *Part. or.* 139: *et eadem vel anguste disserere, ut dialectici qui appellantur, vel, ut oratorem decet, late expromere, illius exercitationis et subtiliter disputandi et copiose dicendi artis est* ("and treating the same topics either with close analysis, as do those who are termed dialecticians, or with broad exposition, as befits an orator, all come under the exercises mentioned and are part of the science of subtle disputation and copious oratory").

24 According to Stroup 2003, 121–122, a "middling personification" is "the detailed and literalizing endowment of an abstract concept with [...] variously human characteristics (e. g., heredity and appearance, thought and sensation, intention and action)". Despite the fact that this definition refers to the personification of Eloquence in *Brutus*, it could easily be applied to our personification of dialectics and oratory, too: indeed, in the present case as well, abstract concepts are transformed into increasingly human, and identifiably feminine, characters.

chorus virtutum (ἀρετῶν χορός; chorus of virtues).[25] Cicero, an admirer of Greek-style personified abstractions and a keen user of figurative language, especially in his literary and philosophical writings,[26] was the first Latin author to use the image of the *chorus virtutum* and to propose a Latin resemantisation of it by resorting to the semantic calque of the *comitatus.*[27] Aware of the importance of creating a Latin literary imagery, Cicero appropriated the typically Greek image of the *chorus* and imported it into his cultural and imaginative system by making use of an intrinsically Roman word. The term *comes* indeed not only recalls the entourage that traditionally accompanied aristocrats, provincial governors, and exiles,[28] but also gives the image a deeper meaning based on the ideas of companionship and consolation, both absent from the original *chorus* which, by resorting to an image typical of the visual arts, was semantically limited to the artistic field, when *comitatus*, on the contrary, enriches the metaphor by adding to it a philosophical and social element not found in the Greek word.

Moreover, alongside the concept of companionship, the image of Cic. *Part. or.* 78 is enriched by a further semantic nuance, related to the idea of subordination and rendered through the word *ministra* (handmaiden), whose figurative meaning, conveying the idea of subordination, appears in several other passages in Cicero. We find it for instance in Cic. *Fin.* 2.37, where virtues are polemically defined as *satellites* (subordinates) and *ministrae* (handmaidens) of pleasure, and

25 The image of the *chorus virtutum* seems to be shaped on models already present in ancient, and especially Greek, imagery. We could think, for instance, of the Charites allegorised by the Stoic Chrysippus to stress reciprocity in the exchange of benefits (Sen. *Ben.* 1.3.2–4.6), or of the Muses, often portrayed through images evoking gracefulness and interdependence. The Stoic origin of the image is also suggested by the ἀρετῶν χορός later attested in Arius Didymus and Philo of Alexandria (see Ar. Did. *ap.* Stob. *Flor.* 2.7.14; Philo *De spec. leg.* 1.269; 2.259; 4.134). On the Stoic origin of the *chorus virtutum*, see Degl'Innocenti Pierini 2016, esp. 133–137.

26 See on this Fantham 1972, who devotes two chapters (5 and 6) of her study on figurative language in Republican Rome to the imagery of Cicero's oratory and literary dialogues.

27 We find the image of the *chorus virtutum* in Cic. *Tusc.* 5.13–14 and *Off.* 3.116. Its Latinisation, the *comitatus*, is found in Cic. *Fin.* 2.111; *Tusc.* 5.80; *Parad.* 16. Something similar, though not identical, can be seen in Cic. *Fin.* 2.12, where a *concilium virtutum* (company of virtues) is mentioned, and in Cic. *Tusc.* 5.68, where the verb *comitor* (accompany, to go with) refers to the term virtue. Finally, the personifying word *comes* (companion) appears in reference to virtues in Cic. *Tusc.* 2.32 and in a fragment from the *Hortensius* (frg. 104 Grilli). After Cicero, the image of the *comitatus virtutum* is attested in Sen. *Helv.* 9.2; *Ep.* 67.10; 90.3 (see on this Degli'Innocenti Pierini 2016, esp. 125–126 and 133–135).

28 On these kinds of 'ambulatory performances', see O'Sullivan 2011, esp. 59–64. For the accompaniment into exile, see also Kelly 2006, 133–137. Examples of the aristocrats' *comitatus* can be found in Cic. *Cael.* 49; *Clu.* 192 (a particularly interesting use, as the word here refers to a woman); *Mil.* 28; 55; *Fam.* 6.19.1. For provincial governors, see Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.27; 2.3.30.

again in *Fin*. 2.69, where Cicero, in a similar attack against hedonists, takes up an image that the Stoic Cleanthes used to employ in his lectures, describing virtues as handmaidens (*ancillulae*) intent on no other task than of serving *Voluptas* (*quae* […] *nullum suum officium ducerent, nisi ut Voluptati ministrarent*; "who should make it their sole duty to minister to Pleasure"), here personified as a queen.[29] The word *ministra*, moreover, is not exclusive to figurative representations of *Voluptas* or to philosophical discussions concerning the relationship between pleasure and virtues. On the contrary, it is also found in rhetorical and oratorical contexts more similar to our passage from *Partitiones oratoriae.* This is the case in Cic. *Leg. Man.* 36, where Cicero argues the need, in order to make a perfect commander, for a man not only to possess military virtue but also to be skilled in other illustrious arts (*artes eximiae*) portrayed as handmaidens and companions of virtue (*administrae comitesque virtutis*), and in *De or.* 1.75, where *artes* are said to be *comites ac ministratrices oratoris* ("companions and handmaidens of the orator").

In both these passages, Cicero's objective does not seem to be hierarchisation.[30] Rather, as we shall see, he toys with the Greek image of handmaidens by adding the typically Roman idea of companionship, which, in the case of *Partitiones oratoriae*, is used (once more) to convey the ideal of synthesis between rhetoric and philosophy. Indeed, although the recurrence of the image within the Ciceronian corpus might suggest that in *Part. or.* 78 Cicero was using an image he had already developed, probably drawing on pre-existing Greek literary models, it seems to me that in the case of *Partitiones oratoriae*, and in particular of this ethical digression, we should consider the hypothesis that by mixing the ideas of companionship and subordination Cicero had in mind a precise representation of dialectics and oratory, in which he achieved the perfect balance between figurative tradition and philosophical conception. Indeed, as Alberto Grilli observed, the definition of dialectics and oratory as *ministrae* fits well with the already mentioned Stoic concept of ὑποτεταγμέναι ἀρεταί, of which *ministrae* could be an ingenious

29 See also Cic. *Off.* 1.150, where Cicero speaks of some arts that are *ministrae* of pleasures (*minimeque artes eae probandae, quae ministrae sunt voluptatum*; "least respectable of all are those trades which are handmaids of pleasures"; transl. Miller 1975 with adaptations).

30 This is also confirmed by passages in which *comes* and *ministra* appear to be the two canonical components of an almost idiomatic and stereotypical expression. Such is the case in Cic. *Flac.* 5: *Socii consiliorum, ministri comitesque vexantur; quid auctores, quid duces, quid principes sibi exspectent?* ("Those who shared his counsels, his assistants and comrades, are being attacked; what may the authors, the leaders, the chief men, expect?"; transl. Lord 1964), and *Fin.* 2.113: *tu autem etiam membra ipsa sensusque considera, qui tibi, ut reliquae corporis partes, non comites solum virtutum, sed ministri etiam videbuntur* ("but I would also have you consider our actual members, and our organs of sensation, which like the other parts of the body you for your part will esteem not as the comrades merely but actually as the servants of the virtues").

and fortunate Latin translation.[31] At the same time, however, since for the Stoics these two disciplines, meant as subdivisions of logic, were autonomous parts of philosophy and not just subordinate virtues, it is also possible that multiple influences acted upon this Ciceronian personification. On the one hand, there are the Stoics, for whom dialectics and rhetoric, defined as 'arts' and different kinds of 'science',[32] were constituent parts of a single sapiential system to which they could be subordinate in view of their precise functions and different technical tasks. On the other hand, there are other possible Greek and philosophical models in which similar personifications occur. We could think, for instance, of Plato's τέχναι συνέριθοι (assistant) and συμπεριαγωγοί (assistant in converting others)[33] or of the allegory of the liberal arts (τὰ ἐγκύκλια παιδεύματα) portrayed as handmaidens of Penelope, herself a personification of philosophy.[34] Whatever the source from which Cicero drew the image of an ancillary virtue, the word *ministra* shows once again Cicero's role as Latiniser. Indeed, in creating this original image, Cicero does not merely add to the personification the all-Latin idea of companionship but finds in *ministra* the perfect word to express a Greek, philosophical and abstract concept, attributing to dialectics and oratory the specific role of 'performers of a service' in favour of philosophy.

Adopting the broader perspective of Ciceronian thought in general, we could therefore be led to think that through this intriguing personification Cicero was testing a new way of portraying the complex relationship between wisdom, i. e. philosophy, and eloquence. He would thus be situating *Partitiones oratoriae* within the broader debate on the relationship between the two disciplines and investing the work with a theoretical reflection on which much remains to be investigated. It is known, in fact, that Cicero, placing himself at the pinnacle of the long-standing quarrel between rhetoricians and philosophers,[35] developed a highly personal po-

31 Grilli 1992, 269.

32 Dialectics was the ἐπιστήμη […] τοῦ ὀρθῶς διαλέγεσθαι περὶ τῶν ἐν ἐρωτήσει καὶ ἀποκρίσει λόγων ("science […] of correctly discussing subjects by question and answer"), while rhetoric was the ἐπιστήμη […] τοῦ εὖ λέγειν περὶ τῶν ἐν διεξόδῳ λόγων ("science […] of speaking well on matters set forth by plain narrative"); see *SVF* 2.48, transl. Hicks 1925. See also *SVF* 3.267. Almost the same definition is found in Cic. *De or.* 1.83, where Cicero states that Mnesarchus thought that eloquence *ex bene dicendi scientia constaret* ("was the science of speaking well").

33 Pl. *Resp.* 7.533d. For the first adjective, see also Pl. *Leg.* 10.889d.

34 The allegory is attested in Bion of Borysthenes (Plut. *De lib. educ.* 7D), Aristippus (Diog. Laert. 2.79–80), and Aristo of Chios (Stob. *Flor.* 4.140; Diog. Laert. 2.80). On philosophy's personification as Penelope, see Helleman 1995, 286–293.

35 The quarrel is central in Cicero's *De oratore*, in which it provides the context to the author's claim that the orator needs philosophical knowledge. Crucial passages are Cic. *De or.* 1.82–93, where Charmadas is said to have taken a prominent part in the controversy, and *De or.* 3.56–73,

sition within this debate, identifying the solution to the conundrum as residing in a synthesis between the two disciplines. After having argued for a clear separation of spheres in *De inventione* (1.8; 33; 77; 86), though in the uncertain context of an oscillating position that already hinted at the emergence of an encyclopaedic ideal of culture (1.1),[36] Cicero came, in his maturity, to a somewhat 'inclusive' position. This is especially true for *De oratore*, where the possibility for the orator to know and expound philosophical topics (1.56–57) is stated together with the need for him to know philosophy and ethics (1.67–69). It is in the same *De oratore*, moreover, that the subordination of eloquence to philosophy becomes evident (1.60), and that Cicero even goes so far as to claim that the two disciplines have but one common origin (3.69).[37] The original position matured by Cicero in the fifties was then constantly maintained throughout later works, up until the rhetorical production of the forties, where the importance of turning to philosophy for the knowledge of the theoretical principles of rhetoric often arises, giving the impression that eloquence was always slightly subordinated to philosophy, though in the awareness that only their association could lead to the *perfectus orator.*

Coming back to Cic. *Part. or.* 78 and reading it in this perspective, therefore, we see that it finds a perfect place in the Ciceronian debate on the relationship between rhetoric and philosophy and is even more perfectly framed in the rhetorical-philosophical design of *Partitiones oratoriae.* As emerges more and more clearly, Cicero did not want to confine this handbook to rhetorical technicalities, aiming instead at providing the future orator – Marcus in the literary fiction of the dialogue, the readers of the treatise in reality – with all the tools necessary to become *perfectus.* It is Cicero himself who reveals such an intention in the final part of the dialogue, when he states that without knowledge of the *artes* (i. e. dialectics and oratory) of which he has just summarised the key aspects (Cic. *Part. or.* 139), it would be impossible for the orator to have faculty (*facultas*) and flow (*copia*) about good and bad, right and wrong, about utility and inutility, virtue and

where Crassus presents his claim for a synthesis of oratory and philosophy as a claim for the restoration of the original 'unity' of the two, which existed before Socrates (cf. Wisse 2002b, 390).

36 Although *De inventione* did not yet envisage a complete synthesis of eloquence and philosophy, it is indisputably in this youthful treatise that Cicero posits his original idea of a combination of the two. Quite different is the position held by Gaines 2002, who thinks that the combination of wisdom and philosophy advocated in *Inv. rhet.* 1.1 does not yet imply a recommendation for serious study of philosophy (see Gaines 2002, 446 n. 5).

37 The whole of Book Three, dominated by the figure of Crassus, is pervaded by the idea that the orator must escape the narrowness of the rules to acquire philosophical knowledge. Wisse 2002b, 383, speaks of "a number of successive 'waves' in which the theme is developed" culminating in "Crassus' statement that the orator who possesses full philosophical knowledge surpasses everyone else (3.143)".

vice.[38] That is to say, about a whole series of declaredly philosophical themes and topics whose mention at the very end of the work underlines once again the complementarity of rhetoric and philosophy.[39]

Rhetoric and Philosophy in Cicero's *Partitiones Oratoriae*

The close connection between rhetoric and philosophy in *Partitiones oratoriae* has already been pointed out by Robert N. Gaines, who argued that Cicero "constructed *Partitiones oratoriae* to represent philosophical inquiry into the nature of rhetoric".[40] In fact, if we consider the work as a whole, leaving aside the reductive label of rhetorical catechism to which some scholars have confined it,[41] we note that *Partitiones oratoriae* cannot be interpreted as a 'simple' handbook of rhetoric written in Greek style, of the type of *De inventione* or *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* Instead, the literary identity of this work is much more complex, complicated both by its form, which is that of a dialogue between father and son,[42] and by its message, which is at the same time rhetorical and ethical. Though the main intent of the work is undoubtedly to teach rhetoric, here rhetorical teaching is enriched by significant ethical and philosophical stakes, possibly resulting from the dedication to Marcus and from Cicero's reflection on the relationship between rhetoric and philosophy. In this perspective, therefore, returning to the image of eloquence as the handmaiden of wisdom, we might now attempt a new reading of such a personification, that will enable us to comprehend in what sense rhetoric is for Cicero a *ministra* to wisdom and why rhetorical teaching is represented as the privileged vehicle of a message which concerns not only the rules of eloquence but also philosophy.

---

38 Cic. *Part. or.* 140: *De bonis vero rebus et malis, aequis iniquis, utilibus inutilibus, honestis turpibus quam potest habere orator sine illis maximarum rerum artibus facultatem aut copiam?* ("Moreover, what readiness of style or supply of matter can a speaker possess on the subject of good and bad, right and wrong, utility and inutility, virtue and vice, without knowing these sciences of primary importance?").

39 Similar catalogues of philosophical topics that can be addressed only by the combined front of philosophy and rhetoric can be found in Cic. *De or.* 3.107 and *Orat.* 118.

40 Gaines 2002, 446–447.

41 On the interpretation of *Partitiones oratoriae* as a rhetorical catechism, see for instance Wisse 1989, 172, and Narducci 2005, 127–128. See also Arweiler 2003, 23–24, who convincingly argues the unsuitability of this definition.

42 On the literary genre of the work, see Oliva 2022.

That *Partitiones oratoriae* cannot be traced back to a single rhetorical theory or philosophical doctrine has already been noted, and any attempt to find a single source to which to attribute it is bound to be frustrated.[43] Despite the explicit debt of gratitude to the Academy placed at the end of the work,[44] it is impossible to identify a single philosophical or rhetorical authority in the wake of which Cicero might have composed the whole treatise, which rather seems to arise from his personal reworking of themes and topics elaborated throughout his life. Moreover, what we have seen so far already seems to point to a certain philosophical syncretism or to an Academic derivation in the broadest sense.

If we look first at the general structure of the treatise, we can note that *Partitiones oratoriae*'s first peculiarity lies in the organisation of the subject matter. The treatise, in fact, presents a tripartite structure (Cic. *Part. or.* 3) according to which the theory of speaking is broken down into the power of the speaker (*vis oratoris*), the speech (*oratio*), and the question (*quaestio*):

> *Marcus. Quot in partes tribuenda est omnis doctrina dicendi?*
> *Cicero. Tris.*
> *Marcus. Cedo quas?*
> *Cicero. Primum in ipsam vim oratoris, deinde in orationem, tum in quaestionem.*
>
> Marcus. Into how many parts ought the theory of rhetoric as a whole to be divided?
> Cicero. Three.
> Marcus. Pray tell me what they are.
> Cicero. First, the speaker's personal resources, second the speech, and third the question. (transl. Rackham 1942)

This unusual subdivision, already presented in Cic. *Part. or.* 3 and then maintained throughout the handbook,[45] is "not employed or fully realised in any other ancient discussion on rhetoric".[46] It produces what Gaines has defined a 'conjunctive' treatise: a treatise built on an unintegrated combination of more traditional rhetorical treatise forms organised according to speech parts (quantitative treatises), speech kinds (generic treatises), and speaker activities (functional treatises).[47] Such a

43 For a comprehensive overview of the hypotheses put forward over the years, see Grilli 1992, 255.

44 The passage is quoted and analysed below, p. 87.

45 After the first four 'proemial' paragraphs, Cicero deals with the power of the speaker in §§ 5–26, with the speech in §§ 27–60, and with the *quaestio* in §§ 61–138.

46 See Gaines 2002, 460. The novelty of this tripartition is noted also by Merchant 1890, 13, and Wisse 1989, 172.

47 This classification of treatise forms is elaborated by Gaines 1989, who explicitly addresses *Partitiones oratoriae* at pp. 336–339. See also Gaines 2002, 460 n. 24.

structure, which in itself raises a number of questions about the sources of the work, leads to considerable repetition of theoretical material.[48] Furthermore, while we do not necessarily concur with Jakob Wisse's solution, which identifies this system as an unmistakable feature of Academic rhetoric and thus as evidence for Cicero's statement in Cic. *Part. or.* 139,[49] there is no doubt that this structure represents a novelty opening up the possibility that it could be traced back to the Academy. Beyond the Academy, however, there are other philosophical schools on which *Partitiones oratoriae* relies. Among those schools are the Peripatos and, as we have already noted, the Stoa.

The point where the influence of Aristotelian rhetoric on our treatise is most evident is undoubtedly the division of the three kinds of speech (Cic. *Part. or.* 10; 69), although, compared with Aristotle, Cicero gives the encomiastic and deliberative genres an unusually extensive treatment.[50] Further traces of this Aristotelian influence can be found in the division of the speech into four parts instead of six (Cic. *Part. or.* 4); in the characterisation of invention as the production of conviction and the arousal of emotions among the audience (Cic. *Part. or.* 5);[51] and in the division of delivery into variations in voice, gesture, and visage (Cic. *Part. or.* 25). All these elements testify to the presence of Aristotelian doctrines, without however implying Cicero's first-hand consultation of the *Rhetoric* and suggesting, rather, that Aristotle's theories were by then an integral part of the theoretical knowledge of rhetoric.[52]

That Cicero was not relying on any specific source but rather on his own excellent theoretical knowledge of rhetoric and philosophy is confirmed by the presence of two other philosophical schools besides the Peripatos. The first is the Stoa, whose traces can be seen in the aforementioned ethical digression (Cic. *Part. or.* 76–81) as well as in the passage in which the five qualities of speech are delineated (Cic. *Part. or.* 19–22),[53] and the second is the Academy, both Old and

48 The parts of the speech, for instance, are addressed under each of the three macro-sections. Another topic which gives rise to numerous repetitions is that of the *status rationales* discussed in Cic. *Part. or.* 34–43; 62–66; 101–107; 110–131.

49 Wisse 1989, 172–173.

50 This difference has already been highlighted by Kennedy 1963, 329. Compare also Romano 1964, who thinks that behind the extensive treatment of the encomiastic genre may lie chronological evidence in favour of 46 BCE as the most likely date of composition of the work.

51 See, e. g., Arist. *Rh.* 1.2.1356a.

52 Cicero's knowledge of Peripatetic writings on rhetoric is a vexed issue. A good overview of the question can be found in Fortenbaugh 1989 and 2005.

53 Renouncing the Theophrastean system of the four virtues of eloquence followed in Cic. *De or.* 3.37–55 and *Orat.* 79, Cicero here structures his explanation of the qualities of speech (*lumina orationis*) according to the categories of lucidity (*dilucidum*), brevity (*breve*), acceptability (*proba-*

New. It is to the dogmatic and Antiochean branch of the Academy that we can attribute the lexicon of Cic. *Part. or.* 5 regarding the definition of the *argumentum* (argument),[54] the tripartition of the *bona malave* (goods and evils) into external, physical, and mental (Cic. *Part. or.* 38; 74),[55] and the classification of the goods into *bona per se* and *propter se expetenda* ("goods desirable for themselves and for their own sakes"; Cic. *Part. or.* 86–87).[56] As for the sceptical and Philonian branch, it is responsible for a substantial part of the rhetorical material, most evident in the lengthy exposition of the unlimited questions (Cic. *Part. or.* 62–68), which were introduced in rhetorical theory by Hermagoras of Temnos and later became a subject of teaching for Philo of Larissa as well (Cic. *De or.* 3.110).[57]

As things stand, in the light of the variety of doctrines on which *Partitiones oratoriae* seems to rely, we might begin to discern the metaliterary meaning behind the term *ministra* as well as to make sense of the related idea of eloquence performing a service in favour of philosophy. Indeed, in *Partitiones oratoriae*, the definition of rhetoric as a 'handmaiden of wisdom' is not a matter of stylistic affectation; rhetoric, on the contrary, is genuinely presented as being at the service of a major project of synthesis, for the exposition of rhetorical rules becomes the perfect opportunity to enrich such rules by mixing them with teachings drawn from the most important Hellenistic philosophies. For this reason, the Ciceronian idea of synthesis between the two disciplines, along with the continuous interactions between them, forbids the conclusion that the representation of eloquence as a handmaiden could be due to its ontological inferiority. Rather, it is likely that the handmaiden image accounts for eloquence's arising from philosophy, while at the same time making eloquence a fertile ground for the exposition and mixture of different philosophical doctrines.

---

bile), brilliance (*inlustre*), and charm (*suave*), following a scheme of plausible Stoic origin (see on this Michel 1982, 129–130).

54 Cic. *Part. or.* 5: *Marcus. Quid est argumentum? Cicero. Probabile inventum ad faciendam fidem* ("Marcus. What is an argument? Cicero. A plausible device to obtain belief"). In regard to this definition, see Lévy 2011, 260, who identifies in the adjective "plausible" (*probabile*) and in the expression "to obtain belief" (*ad faciendam fidem*) the concepts of εὔλογον and πείθεσθαι, both characteristic of the New Academy.

55 This tripartition is Platonic (Pl. *Grg.* 477c) and Peripatetic (Cic. *Fin.* 3.43; *Tusc.* 5.85) in origin. We find it widely articulated in the fifth Book of *De finibus*, where the description of the supreme good as fruition of goods is explained through reference to physical properties (5.46–47), mental properties (5.48–64), and external properties (5.65–67).

56 See on this Grilli 1992, 271–277.

57 The passage is analysed by Reinhardt 2000, 537–538, as a piece of evidence for Philo's teaching of both limited and unlimited questions. See also Brittain 2001, 296–297.

Eloquence Springing from Philosophy

It is thus at this point, in the concluding section of the present study, that it is worth quoting in full the line in which Cicero bids farewell to his son with the following intriguing statement, from which *Quellenforschung* studies of *Partitiones oratoriae* usually begin (Cic. *Part. or.* 139):

> *Expositae tibi omnes sunt oratoriae partitiones, quae quidem e media illa nostra Academia efloruerunt, neque sine ea aut inveniri aut intellegi aut tractari possunt.*
>
> You have been presented with all the partitions of oratory, which certainly sprang from the heart of our Academy. And without it those partitions could not be discovered, understood or treated. (transl. by the author)

All the partitions of oratory just discussed with Marcus have sprouted *e media illa nostra Academia.* But what does Cicero mean by *e media Academia?* Referring to the Academy, the adjective *medius* could, in fact, have two different meanings. According to the doxographic classification of the phases of the Academy,[58] it could refer to the so-called Middle Academy of the sceptic Arcesilaus. At the same time, however, it could indicate Cicero's general debt to the Academy, showing his gratitude towards a school that formed him in both eloquence and philosophy. Several clues point in this direction. First, we have no direct or indirect evidence of any technical rhetorical teaching dispensed by Arcesilaus or his successor Carneades. Both certainly played a significant role in the development of dialectics, but they had no didactical pretensions in the field of rhetoric, pursuing instead philosophical (sceptical) ends, such as the demonstration of the unattainability of truth.[59] Second, there are no known passages in which Cicero uses *medius* as a periodising adjective referring to the history of the Academy. Indeed, as made evident by Marcello Gigante,[60] Cicero tends to use a binary periodisation dividing the Academy into Old and New.[61] Finally, we have other passages in the Ciceronian

58 See, e.g., Sext. Emp. *Pyr.* 1.220.

59 On the Academy's lack of interest in teaching rhetoric, see, e.g., Quint. *Inst.* 3.1.15, where it is said that after Theophrastus it was mainly the Stoics and Peripatetics who dealt with rhetoric. As for the practice of arguing both sides of a question, Cicero acknowledges its Aristotelian origin (Cic. *Orat.* 46), but correctly associates it also with the Academy of Arcesilaus and Carneades (Cic. *De or.* 2.161; 3.80; *Tusc.* 2.9). Of particular interest are the considerations found in Cic. *Fin.* 5.10, where Cicero stresses the substantial difference between the two schools, with the sceptical Academy aiming at the suspension of judgment and the Peripatos at the defence of a thesis or the attainment of knowledge. See on this Tsouni 2019, 54–55.

60 Gigante 1980.

61 It is the case, e.g., in Cic. *Leg.* 1.38–39; *De or.* 3.67; *Fin.* 5.7; *Acad.* 1.46; *Off.* 3.20.

corpus in which the reference to the Academy does indeed appear to corroborate the thesis of generic debt and binary periodisation. I am referring to the first proem of the *Orator* and to the well-known dedicatory epistle of the *Academica Posteriora* to Varro:

> *Ego autem et me saepe nova videri dicere intellego, cum pervetera dicam sed inaudita plerisque, et fateor me oratorem, si modo sim aut etiam quicumque sim, non ex rhetorum officinis sed ex Academiae spatiis exstitisse; illa enim sunt curricula multiplicium variorumque sermonum, in quibus Platonis primum sunt impressa vestigia. Sed et huius et aliorum philosophorum disputationibus et exagitatus maxime orator est et adiutus; omnis enim ubertas et quasi silva dicendi ducta ab illis est nec satis tamen instructa ad forensis causas, quas, ut illi ipsi dicere solebant, agrestioribus Musis reliquerunt.* (Cic. *Orat.* 12)
>
> However, I am aware that I often seem to be making original remarks when what I am saying is very old but generally unknown; and I confess that whatever ability I possess as an orator comes, not from the workshops of the rhetoricians, but from the spacious grounds of the Academy. There indeed is the field for manifold and varied debate, which was first trodden by the feet of Plato. By his discussions and those of other philosophers the orator has been severely criticised but has also received assistance – for all richness of style, and what may be called the raw material of oratory is derived from them – but he has not received from the philosophers sufficient training for pleading in the courts of law. They left this to the ruder Muses, as they were wont to say themselves. (transl. Hubbell 1971)
>
> *Etsi munus flagitare, quamvis quis ostenderit, ne populus quidem solet nisi concitatus, tamen ego exspectatione promissi tui moveor, ut admoneam te, non ut flagitem; misi autem ad te quattuor admonitores non nimis verecundos; nosti enim profecto os huius adolescentioris Academiae. Ex ea igitur media excitatos misi, qui metuo ne te forte flagitent; ego autem mandavi, ut rogarent* (Cic. *Fam.* 9.8.1)
>
> Although to demand a gift, whatever hopes of it have been held out by anybody, is not usual even with the people, unless they are wildly excited, none the less the eager expectation of what you promised moves me to address you a reminder, certainly not a demand. But I have despatched to you a quartette of 'reminders', not overburdened with modesty; for of course you know the effrontery of this somewhat juvenile Academy. It was from the midst of that Academy that I routed them out and sent them; and now I am afraid they may perhaps make a demand of you, whereas my instructions were merely to make a request. (transl. Williams 1965)

Although both of these parallel passages have already been noted and studied by some scholars,[62] it is worth quoting them here in order to underline further common patterns with our Cic. *Part. or.* 139. Indeed, beyond the reference to the Academy, there are some interesting correspondences in which it seems to me that figurative language, already extensively investigated with regard to the personification of dialectics and oratory, plays a central role. In the passage

62 See Lévy 1980, 263, and Lévy 2011, 250–252; Gaines 2002, 459 n. 21.

from the *Orator*, for instance, Cicero does not merely claim to have been trained as an orator in the spacious grounds of the Academy. He goes further, arguing that eloquence, which here comes to be described as *ubertas* and *quasi silva dicendi*,[63] is born from philosophical disputations, according to a conception of eloquence as springing from philosophy that was particularly dear to Cicero, who had already expressed it in Cic. *De or.* 1.20 (*etenim ex rerum cognitione efflorescat et redundet oportet oratio*; "for it is from knowledge that oratory should flourish and flow") through the same verb *effloresco* of Cic. *Part. or.* 139. In Cic. *Fam.* 9.8.1, on the other hand, we find the same use of the adjective *medius* as in Cic. *Part. or.* 139, but here explicitly referring to the sceptical Academy, identified by an expression (*adulescentior Academia*) that confirms Cicero's preference for the binary periodisation and weakens, at the same time, the possibility that *medius* could have a meaning other than 'from the heart of …'. Moreover, in this passage too, the figurative language which is attached to the word *munus* and to the concept of reciprocity helps to bring *Partitiones oratoriae*'s conclusion closer to the epistle.[64] Granted that the association between the literary work and the idea of textual *munus* qua performance of a service and exchange of benefit was a literary *topos* (indeed a Ciceronian one),[65] the fact that both *Partitiones oratoriae*'s final line and the dedicatory epistle to Varro refer to the *munus* brings the two passages closer together on a semantic level as well. This makes it even more reasonable to think that in both cases *media Academia* metaphorically refers to the fulcrum of

63 The term *silva* is used metaphorically in various contexts to indicate 'matter', 'mass of material', 'raw material', hence the plural usage as a title for collections of occasional poems. In addition to Cic. *Orat.* 12, see, e.g., Cic. *Inv. rhet.* 1.34; *De or.* 3.93; Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* 24; Quint. *Inst.* 10.3.17. In this regard, Horace's use of *silva* in *Sat.* 1.10.34–35 is also worth noting; here *silva* might designate the *corpus* of books already composed by Greek writers to which the poet was adding his own (Cucchiarelli 2007, 200). In this perspective, it is probably not by chance that the exegete Porphyrion, commenting on Hor. *Epist.* 1.4.4, notes *silvas libros φιλοσοφουμένους significat* ("by *silvas* [Horace] means books on philosophical subjects"), suggesting once more the connection between *silva* and literary material. On the metaphorical use of *silva*, cf. Hinds 1998, 12–13.

64 The word *munus* appears twice in *Partitiones oratoriae* – the first time in Cic. *Part. or.* 132, where it has the meaning of 'task, or performance of a service', and the second time in the concluding line of the work, in *Part. or.* 140, where its meaning is that of 'gift'.

65 The analogy between text and *munus* is a well-established literary *topos*, and we find it in a number of writings by Cicero (e.g. Cic. *Parad.* 1; *Brut.* 16; *Sen.* 2). In the present case, however, it is particularly worth noting that the concept of *munus* connects *Partitiones oratoriae* to the only other treatise dedicated to Marcus, the *De officiis*, in the conclusion of which Cicero entrusts to Marcus what he has just finished writing as a *munus* born from the rethinking of the concept of *officium* after the full realisation of the death of the republic (Cic. *Off.* 3.121). On the literary *topos* of the *munus*, see Lemoine 1991, esp. 353–355; Stroup 2010, 66–100 (with particular regard to Cicero at 88–97); Stroup 2013, esp. 113–116.

the school. To these two well-known parallel passages, I would like to add a third one, which – as far as I know – has never been associated with the conclusion of *Partitiones oratoriae*, but might reinforce the idea that the Academy is the source of both philosophy and eloquence in Cicero (Cic. *Fat.* 3):

> *Quibus actis, Quid ergo? inquit ille, quoniam oratorias exercitationes non tu quidem, ut spero, reliquisti, sed certe philosophiam illis anteposuisti, possumne aliquid audire? Tu vero, inquam, vel audire vel dicere; nec enim, id quod recte existimas, oratoria illa studia deserui, quibus etiam te incendi, quamquam flagrantissumum acceperam, nec ea, quae nunc tracto, minuunt, sed augent potius illam facultatem. Nam cum hoc genere philosophiae, quod nos sequimur, magnam habet orator societatem; subtilitatem enim ab Academia mutuatur et ei vicissim reddit ubertatem orationis et ornamenta dicendi.*
>
> These dealt with, Hirtius remarked, "What now? I hope you have not actually abandoned your oratorical exercises, though you have undoubtedly placed philosophy in front of them; well then, is it possible for me to hear something?" "Well," I said, "you can either hear something or say something yourself; for you are right in supposing that I have not abandoned my old interest in oratory, – indeed I have kindled it in you also, although you came to me an ardent devotee already; and moreover my oratorical powers are not diminished by the subjects that I now have in hand, but rather increased. For there is a close alliance between the orator and the philosophical system of which I am a follower, since the orator borrows subtlety from the Academy and repays the loan by giving to it a copious and flowing style and rhetorical ornament. (transl. Rackham 1942)

Responding to his pupil Hirtius, who worries that the master had abandoned rhetorical exercises in favour of philosophy, Cicero assures him that he has not left his interest in oratory, and indeed argues that philosophy actually increases oratorical powers. Accordingly, the good orator must be familiar with the school of philosophy of which Cicero professes to be a follower: the Academy, from which the orator derives the ability of *subtiliter disputandi* (subtle disputation) while giving it in return *ubertas orationis* (copious and flowing style) and *ornamenta dicendi* (rhetorical ornament).

As Carlos Lévy has rightly pointed out,[66] however, even if we understand *e media illa nostra Academia* as meaning 'from the heart of our Academy', two possible interpretations of the passage remain. On the one hand, we can think that in Cic. *Part. or.* 139, as in Cic. *Orat.* 12, Cicero is giving credit to the Academy for providing him with a general philosophical education which, through Academic tools such as the *divisio* (diairesis) and the practice of arguing both sides of a question, represented the best possible training for him as an orator. On the other hand, it is also possible that Cicero's statement conceals a reference to a proper technical teaching dispensed by the Academy, one based on rhetorical rules and principles.

66 Lévy 2011, 252–253.

In this case *Partitiones oratoriae* would not be a mere handbook of rhetoric *inspired* by the Academy, but an authentically *Academic* rhetorical handbook. This is a very suggestive hypothesis, which is not however confirmed by the sources on the relationship between the Academy and rhetoric. As previously noted, in fact, the Academy (probably in the wake of the positions held by Plato) remained hostile and essentially alien to the technical teaching of rhetoric until the late second/early first century BCE, when Philo of Larissa opened the school to rhetoric, perhaps influenced by Charmadas, who had already shown a certain interest in rhetoric without reaching Philo's technicality.[67]

According to Cicero's account in *Tusc.* 2.9, Philo had established the practice of teaching rhetoric and philosophy alternately,[68] and from the already mentioned Cic. *De or.* 3.110 we know that his rhetorical teaching must surely have contained both limited and unlimited questions. To these two elements, according to Tobias Reinhardt's reconstruction of Philonian rhetoric,[69] we should add the dialectical method of the *disputatio* (disputation) and the readaptation of the Hermagorean doctrine of the *status* to the Aristotelian theory of the *loci* (places), two points that also recur in *Partitiones oratoriae.* Limited questions are addressed in Cic. *Part. or.* 68–138, while unlimited questions are given an unusually large space (comparable only to their treatment in the third Book of *De oratore* and in the *Topica*)[70] in Cic. *Part. or.* 62–68. The dialectical method, which permeates the treatise already in the question-and-answer form, finds space for example in Cic. *Part. or.* 78–79 and *Part. or.* 139, while the connection between the *status* of the unlimited questions and the *loci* of the invention is found in Cic. *Part. or.* 68.

From the perspective of rhetoric, therefore, there are good grounds for tracing *Partitiones oratoriae*'s rhetorical teaching, or at least part of it, back to Philo of Larissa. At the same time, however, the marked theoretical syncretism we have put forward so far cautions against trying to identify a single source or name be-

67 On the role of Charmadas as a possible mediator between Plato's anti-technicism and Philo's rhetorical teaching, see Brittain 2001, 319–328, who argues that for Charmadas rhetoric was a (non-technical) faculty of persuasion, attained by experience, and for the perfection of which philosophical training was a necessary condition.

68 Cic. *Tusc.* 2.9: *Nostra autem memoria Philo, quem nos frequenter audivimus, instituit alio tempore rhetorum praecepta tradere, alio philosophorum: ad quam nos consuetudinem a familiaribus nostris adducti in Tusculano, quod datum est temporis nobis, in eo consumpsimus* ("Philo, however, as we remember, for we often heard him lecture, made a practice of teaching the rules of the rhetoricians at one time, and those of the philosophers at another. I was induced by our friends to follow this practice, and in my house at Tusculum I thus employed the time at our disposal"; transl. King 1971).

69 Reinhardt 2000, esp. 546–547.

70 See Cic. *De or.* 3.111–118 and *Top.* 81–90.

hind the words *e media illa nostra Academia.* Even if we accept the hypothesis according to which Cicero remained affiliated to sceptical thought throughout his life,[71] or the hybrid approach that sees in him a generic 'Platonist', as much Philonian as Antiochean,[72] the only perspective in which it seems reasonable to accept a sceptical derivation of *Partitiones oratoriae* is the one proposed by Anthony A. Long, who observes that "his [sc. Cicero's] Philonian scepticism is entirely compatible with choosing theories that, on examination, he finds the most plausible or probable. This dual allegiance to Philo and, with qualification, to Antiochus, is a highly intelligent interpretation of the Academic tradition. It allows Cicero to draw heavily on Plato and Stoicism, in advocating positions he strongly supports, while preserving an exploratory rather than dogmatic style, and reserving the right to criticise Stoics and even Plato on occasion".[73]

By mentioning the Academy at the end of the work, therefore, Cicero "allows himself free access to a wide range of intellectual resources"[74] and philosophical doctrines that allow him to combine the contributions of the ancient Academy, the Peripatos, the Stoa, the sceptical Academy of Philo and the dogmatic Academy of Antiochus in a single treatise. Moreover, in the same reference to the Academy it is likely that Cicero attributes to Philo some of the rhetorical theories that have just been exposed, acknowledging his master's scepticism as an opportunity to combine different doctrines. It is therefore to Philo's 'mitigated' version of the original Academic scepticism, and to his epistemology, that we could perhaps attribute *Partitiones oratoriae*'s philosophical and theoretical syncretism.[75]

Conclusion

In spite of the label of 'minor work' that has often been attached to *Partitiones oratoriae*, the work – as I hope has emerged from this paper – is not a hasty and catechetical compendium of rhetoric, but rather the successful product of Cicero's deep knowledge of rhetoric and philosophy, here bestowed upon his son and the Roman youth. In *Partitiones oratoriae*, which due to its form as a lesson provides

71 The sceptical continuity has been argued by Görler 1995 and more recently by Reinhardt 2000. On the other hand, the idea that Cicero changed his philosophical affiliation from Philo to Antiochus and then again to Philo, already advanced by Hirzel 1895, 511 n. 2, is supported by Glucker 1988 and Steinmetz 1989.

72 This is the opinion of Long 1995a.

73 Long 2003, 199.

74 Gaines 2002, 459 n. 21.

75 On Philo's mitigated version of scepticism, see Brittain 2001.

the perfect pedagogical context for delivering enduring and relevant teachings, Cicero had the chance, once more, to develop his reflections about philosophy and rhetoric, reflections already cautiously sketched out in *De inventione* and then fully delineated in *De oratore.* Thus, taking as our starting point the personification of dialectics and oratory, clear evidence of Cicero's full development of a literary Latin language intended as a vehicle for abstract thought, we analysed in which sense eloquence was for him the handmaiden and companion of wisdom. It was wisdom's companion in the sense of an ever-so-slightly subordinate attendant, since without *sapientia* the art of speaking had no reason to exist. It would have been sterile, empty, morally useless, and only by being accompanied by philosophical wisdom could it expect to become the privileged tool of the perfect orator. It was wisdom's handmaiden, on the other hand, because it was always slightly subordinate, although – I would say – not so much because of any ontological inferiority on the part of eloquence, but rather because it was only by performing a service for wisdom that eloquence could find its *raison d'être*, overcoming the arid 'sophistic' technicality that Plato had already warned against. The presence of this highly illustrative image in the middle of *Partitiones oratoriae* acquires, therefore, the metaliterary significance we have seen.[76] Conceived as a 'dialogical handbook' addressed to Cicero's son, *Partitiones oratoriae* is only apparently, in fact, a textbook of rhetoric. Although eloquence understood as *doctrina dicendi* (theory of speaking) is certainly present, it is not the only protagonist on the scene here: the stage is shared, and next to *Eloquentia* stands *Philosophia*, its companion and *domina.* The synthesis of these two entities thus gives rise to a philosophical-rhetorical work, a possible canvas for the future *De officiis* as well as unprecedented ground of iteration and contamination for the author's whole philosophical knowledge. Cicero was an Academic, he always remained one, and would probably never have defined himself otherwise. Precisely for this reason, therefore, it is not surprising to find a reference to the Academy at the end of the work, although this reference, if read in the perspective of the Ciceronian synthesis between philosophy and rhetoric, should prevent us from searching for a single source, school, or philosopher. Certainly, Philo's thetical rhetoric is present and at times prominent, but Antiochus, the Peripatos, and the Stoa are equally present, so that it would perhaps be more legitimate to think of a syncretism 'philosophically authorised' by Philonian scepticism, or, more simply, a syncretism derived from Cicero's reworking of his own philosophical culture, the origin of which he clearly acknowledges to be Academic. In this sense, *Partitiones oratoriae*, taking up the form of a lesson of rhetoric given to Marcus, becomes the perfect

76 Cf. *supra* pp. 77–83.

opportunity for Cicero to realise through a literary work the ideal synthesis between rhetoric and philosophy he had theorised in *De oratore*. Here, such a synthesis is achieved through the exposition of various Greek philosophical doctrines and their combination into a treatise that is only apparently a textbook of rhetoric.

Part II: **Aspects of the Reception of Cicero in the Greek-Speaking World**

Introduction

While the reception of Cicero as a man, orator, philosopher and politician in Western European literature and thought from the Roman Imperial period until the twenty-first century has been extensively studied,[1] his reception by the Greek population of the Eastern Roman Empire and the later Byzantine Empire is tolerably investigated,[2] and the survey of his appreciation by the post-Byzantine, Early Modern and Modern Greece is still very sparse and not exclusively dedicated to Cicero.[3]

The reception of Cicero in the post-Classical Greek world appears to have been related to the learning of the Latin language by Greek officials still under the Late Roman Empire. This is at least the prevailing opinion on the four papyrical bilingual glossaries preserving portions of Cicero's *Catilinarian* speeches and dating between the late fourth and the early sixth centuries CE. All of them originally belonged to papyrus codices found in Egypt. Their text is organised in columns: the Latin one on the left and the corresponding Greek word-by-word translation on the right. At the end of the fourth century, Emperor Diocletian (284–305 CE) created a new system of highly bureaucratised government, requiring, especially in the provinces, several civil and military officials to be managed. These people, often Greek speakers, were in charge of the new administration and so they had to know Roman Law perfectly and have at least a smattering of the Latin language. Therefore, from the fourth century, there was an increase in Latin papyri and scholastic tools, such as the abovementioned glossaries but also alphabets and inflection tables. In her contribution "Preliminary Remarks on the Technical Language of the Bilingual Glossaries of Cicero", Fernanda Maffei conducts a deep investigation of the language and the translations of Ciceronian glossaries, starting from the textual edition by Internullo (2011–2012; 2016). Cicero was very well known and appreciated by the jurists in Late Antiquity, who often quote or allude

1 See, e. g., Kennedy 2002; the chapters by Gowing, MacCormack, Marsh, Fox, Cole, and Fotheringham in Steel 2013; Altman 2015a; Keeline 2018; La Bua 2019; Clare 2020; Pià-Comella 2020.

2 See, e. g., Irmscher 1959; Irmscher 1960; Irmscher 1961; Gigante 1962; Schmitt 1968; Fisher 1982; Benakis 1990; Nikitas 2001; the chapters by Gengler, and Rochette (esp. pp. 299–300) in Garcea *et al.* 2019.

3 Banou-Tsiami 2003, 107–111; Deligiannis *et al.* 2020; Research Project "Greek Translations of Latin works in the Greek world from the Fall of Constantinople (1453) to the end of the 19th century" (http://gtll.lit.auth.gr/). A doctoral dissertation under the title *Διερεύνηση της μεταφραστικής τύχης των φιλοσοφικών έργων του Κικέρωνα στη νεοελληνική λογοτεχνική παραγωγή από τις αρχές του 19ου αιώνα* ("Investigating the translation fortune of Cicero's philosophical works in the Modern Greek literary production from the early nineteenth century") by M. Nikolaidou is under preparation at Democritus University of Thrace, Greece.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779-007

to his speeches in more than a law.[4] This being the case, the author detects juridical and technical language and its translation in the Ciceronian glossaries, and makes a comparison with, on one side, the translations from the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* (*CGL*), in particular with the *capitula* concerning *de magistratibus*, and on the other, the translations in the documentary papyri, sometimes bilingual too, to underline the practical use of these glossaries among the officials. She also highlights the importance of Cicero in rhetorical teaching in the Eastern part of the Empire: starting from Moroni's observation that in the Theodosian Codex there are rhetorical expressions from the *Catilinarians*, she reconstructs the value of these speeches, and of the other Ciceronian speeches from Egypt in the frame of other witnesses of classical authors from Egypt.

The sixth century and the court of Emperor Justinian I must have been the milieu within which an anonymous Byzantine dialogue on politics is placed, presumably based on Cicero's *De re public*a.[5] Between the sixth and the ninth centuries, there are no traces of the reception of Cicero in the Byzantine Empire, which appears to revive during the ninth-century Macedonian Renaissance. The way in which Cicero was received by a major figure of this very century, Photius I of Constantinople, Patriarch and scholar, is the focal point of Tiziano F. Ottobrini's paper "Cicero and Photius. An Analysis of the Survival and Influence of Cicero on Photius' *Bibliotheca*, at the Crossroads between History and Drama". Cicero was one of the authors read and reviewed by Photius in his *Bibliotheca*, but to date both the judgment that the Patriarch expressed on him and the reasons why he came to develop this evaluation are completely neglected from a critical point of view. The author points out that Photius dedicates a whole specific section to Cicero (*Bibl.* 245.395a), quoting that he was killed while reading Euripides' *Medea* and arguing that this was made with precise ideological intent: as Medea came from the East and killed her children, so Cicero was killed at the request of Mark Antony (linked to the East through Cleopatra), who as a Roman killed another Roman (hence Rome kills her own son). He also focuses on the Latin authors known by Photius in general and the knowledge that Photius specifically demonstrates about Cicero. It emerges that Photius perceived Cicero as an orator above all, almost entirely leaving out his philosophical production. In parallel, he finally makes some observations on the diffusion of Cicero in Greece during the ninth century, so as to bring out Photius' specific position within this framework. The paper offers a framework to shed light on Cicero's legacy among the highest Con-

4 See Moroni 2008.

5 *Μηνᾶ πατρικίου πρὸς Θωμᾶν ῥεφερενδάριον περὶ πολιτικῆς*; see Mazzucchi 1982; Licandro 2017.

stantinopolitan intellectual of all, with special regard to the Christian appropriation that was made of the greatest pagan orator.

While the reception of Cicero in the first Byzantine Renaissance was rather limited, the second one, the so-called Palaeologan Renaissance, was more prolific in reading and transferring Cicero. The Byzantine Greek translations of some of Cicero's texts by Maximus Planudes in the thirteenth century have been extensively studied,[6] and the same applies to the corresponding translations by Theodore Gaza in the fifteenth century.[7] Starting from the translations of Cicero by Byzantine and post-Byzantine scholars, Vasileios Pappas focuses on Cicero's works that were rendered into Greek in the nineteenth century. He traces twenty-seven different versions and offers an overview of them, by presenting their contents and dividing them into three main categories related to Cicero's works (philosophical works, rhetorical works and epistles). Moreover, he analyses the reasons that urged the nineteenth-century Greek scholars to translate these particular works of Cicero (educational, political reasons, etc.).

One of the translations mentioned by Pappas is the focal point of Ioannis Deligiannis' contribution "The First Greek Translation of Cicero's *De re publica* (1839)". The *editio princeps* of Cicero's dialogue in 1822 by Mai was soon followed by the first Greek version, produced by Viaros Kapodistrias (1774–1842) and published under a pseudonym in Athens in 1839. The still unstable political conditions of the Greek State, under which the translation was made, are implied by the translator in his address to the readers in the prologue, which closes with an exhortation to his compatriots to benefit by reading Cicero's political thoughts. A detailed examination reveals that Viaros worked not on the original Latin text, but on Villemain's French version (Paris 1823), of which a copy was certainly in the personal library of his brother, Ioannis Kapodistrias, and thus available to Viaros. Furthermore, the Greek terms used by the translator show remarkable similarities with the vocabulary of French-Greek dictionaries earlier than or contemporary with the translation. The reasons behind publishing his version under a pseudonym are not clear, but it is likely to relate to the political conditions of the time, especially after the assassination of his brother in 1831 and an increasing discontent towards King Otto's refusal to grant a constitution to the Greeks.

The thread of Cicero's reception in Modern Greece does not end in the nineteenth century. Despite the significant number of Modern Greek translations of and commentaries on Cicero's works produced in the twentieth and twenty-first

6 See, e. g., Gigante 1958; Gigante 1961; Pavano 1987; Pavano 1988; Pavano 1989; Pavano 1992; Tzamos 1998; Caldini Montanari 2000; Fodor 2004.

7 See, e. g., Salanitro 1975–1976; Salanitro 1987, with further bibliography; Bevegni 1992; Santoro 1992; Bianca 1999; Ciccolella 2020; Nikitas 2020.

centuries (see the Appendix at the end of this volume), and Cicero's appearances in a wide range of media (from political newspapers and websites to arts and sporting columns), nonetheless, although Cicero is arguably one of the most important and celebrated figures of ancient Rome, widely known all over the world, it would seem that Greece is an interesting exception to this rule; oddly enough and despite Cicero's large interaction with ancient Greek literature and philosophy, he is relatively less popular among modern Greeks in contrast to other political and/or literary Roman figures such as Julius Caesar, Octavian Augustus, Caligula, Nero, Virgil, Horace and Ovid, to name but a few. Even in Modern Greek legal thought, the presence of Cicero is rather limited, although to Greek lawyers Cicero has been a famous name: a statesman, an orator and a philosopher. It is less easy, however, to trace Cicero's influence in Modern Greek legal thought. It is telling that Konstantinos Tsatsos (1899–1987), President of the Hellenic Republic (1975–1980), a diplomat, professor of law and one of the leading twentieth-century Greek legal philosophers, chose to translate some of Cicero's political speeches into Greek, but barely cited Cicero's philosophical works in his scholarly books. This is even more remarkable because the Roman law was officially the law of Greece, at least until the promulgation of a Civil Code in 1940/1946. An important reason appears to be a perceived division of labour (and hence legacy) between Greece and Rome, with regard to the development of law: in this narrative, the Romans have bequeathed the world with legal doctrine, whereas the Greeks' legacy lies in legal philosophy (theoretical thinking about law and justice) and forensic oratory. There is little law in the great Greek forensic orators and there is little doctrinal discussion in philosophical and political works. On the other hand, the philosophy underlying the Roman law texts of the *Corpus Iuris* had appeared derivative of Hellenistic Greek philosophy, especially the Stoic tradition. In the law faculties of the late twentieth and early twenty-first century Greece, while the study of Ancient Greek law has been elevated, there has been little interest in the reverse, i. e. studying doctrinal legal arguments in Roman forensic speeches, notably by Cicero. In this environment, Cicero is more interesting as a complex statesman, a master political orator, observer and actor. As Cicero came to be defined by his political action and speeches, Greek intellectuals, active in both law and politics, found themselves in parallel experiences. Tsatsos, e. g., published his translation of six speeches by Cicero in 1968, at a moment when the military dictatorship that took power the previous year was entrenched and his own political career (over twenty years in the parliament, many of which as a cabinet minister) was suspended. Tsatsos chose the four *Catilinarian* speeches, as well as the *Pro Marcello* and *Pro Ligario*, that is the speeches detailing a successful defence of the republican constitution from a would-be dictatorial conspiracy, but also two less well-known speeches in which Cicero pleaded successfully with Caesar for reconcilia-

tion and clemency, on behalf of two prominent Romans who had fought against him in the Civil War. In other words, Cicero's rhetoric serves as an artful way to comment, and reflect upon, analogous political situations in a turbulent moment of Greek history.

Fernanda Maffei

Preliminary Remarks on the Technical Language of the Bilingual Glossaries of Cicero

Introduction

The bilingual glossaries of Cicero[1] belong to a wider range of scholastic tools[2] used to teach Latin as a second language to Greek native speakers in the eastern part of the Roman Empire. The reason for the spreading of these tools must be sought in the diffusion of Latin language in the eastern part of the Empire. The reforms established by Diocletian (284–305 CE) were crucial in this respect; they brought a high bureaucratisation to the Empire: in fact, people working in prefectures, dioceses and provinces had to become well acquainted with the Roman law and Latin language. This reform was meant, in Diocletian's intention, to provide a common element for bureaucrats and offices throughout the Empire and enhance its cohesion.[3] It is worth noting that half of the documentary Latin papyri can be dated to the fourth century, as well as literary and juridical ones.[4]

From Egypt, in the form of papyrus rolls or papyrus and parchment codices, come many bilingual and digraphic[5] educational tools: alphabets and grammars,[6] conversation manuals, fables[7] and glossaries. In most cases, the text is disposed in

1 I will refer to the papyri by quoting them according to the edition by Internullo 2011–2012 and following the order proposed in his edition, while I will quote the passages from the *Catilinarians* according to the edition by Maslowski 2003.

2 For a detailed list of these materials, see Dickey 2016, esp. 179–196; there were also bilingual, but non digraphic tools; see Radiciotti 1997, 112, with further bibliography.

3 Cf. Gaebel 1969–1970, 293–296, and Rochette 1997, 167–174; for the role of Diocletian in the spread of Latin language, see Rochette 1997, 117; a deep analysis about the spread of Latin in documentary papyri from the Diocletian period can be found in Fournet 2019.

4 See Fournet 2019, 74; 86–89; Garcea/Scappaticcio 2019; Nocchi Macedo 2021, 144.

5 From now on, with the term bilingual, I will refer to bilingual and digraphic texts. However, there are bilingual but monographic glossaries in both Greek (P. Oxy. XXXIII 2660, third cent.) and Latin scripts (P. Louvre inv. E 2329, fifth cent.). Kramer 1984, 1379–1380, defines this phenomenon as "bilinguismo imperfetto", referring to the fact that those who made use of such tools did not need to learn to write in that language, but were interested in learning how to speak it. Cf. also Radiciotti 1997, 112–113.

6 On Latin grammatical texts on papyrus, see Scappaticcio 2015.

7 On Latin and bilingual fables on papyrus, see Scappaticcio 2017.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779-008

narrow columns,[8] with the Latin one on the left side and the corresponding Greek word-by-word translation on the right side. Among the glossaries, three typologies can be so far identified: the alphabetical ones, in which the words are ordered alphabetically; the thematic ones,[9] which are organised in sections concerning coherent word groups, according to their semantic sphere; finally, there are glossaries related to specific authors of Latin canon. Only the latter typology did not make it into the Middle Ages and is not included in the *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana.*[10]

Only Virgil and Cicero are dealt with in the surviving bilingual glossaries:[11] eleven glossaries on the *Aeneid* are preserved, datable between the fourth and sixth centuries;[12] the four glossaries of the *Catilinarians* belong to the same period.[13]

As Ammirati has already pointed out, certain codicological and palaeographical features can be found in the bilingual glossaries on authors as well as in the fragments of legal content from the same time span.[14] As for the Ciceronian glossaries, it has been noted by Internullo[15] that the *titulus* above the abbreviation through *compendium* of the *praenomen L*(*uc*)*i* is not typical of the literary *codices* from the fifth century, but of those of technical-legal content; these similarities reveal the common substratum of this type of texts, produced within the provincial bureaucracy. Ammirati[16] pointed out that from a textual point of view, author's glossaries have not yet been explored in their relationship with coeval juridical manuscripts.

Starting from these considerations, the present study has three aims: first, to single out the technical and juridical language and its translation in the Ciceronian

8 According to the list in Dickey 2015, 815–817, only four documents are in a facing-page format. It is important to stress that, in such a typology of texts, the position of the language is crucial: on the left there is the main language, while on the right there is the translation; see Ammirati/Fressura 2017 about the palaeographical features of the glossaries transmitted on papyrus.

9 They are the majority in the papyrological finds; cf. Dickey 2012, 11.

10 On the *Hermeneumata*, see below.

11 There is a difference between the two authors: in some cases, Virgilian glossaries do not bear the whole text, but only selected words, i. e. P. Oxy. VIII 1099 (MP^3 2950, *Leuven Database of Ancient Books* [*LDAB*] 4162); on the contrary, every Ciceronian glossary bears the whole text of the *Catilinarians.*

12 See Fressura 2017, 9.

13 As for Greek, the only classical author featured in bilingual glossary is Isocrates (*Ad Nicoclem*): TBrux inv. E8507 (III^{ex}) 2.15–16; P. Berol. Inv. 21245 (IV), 2.7–8. Cf. Ammirati 2015b, 52.

14 Ammirati 2018, 84–85.

15 Internullo 2011–2012, 92 n. 270, and 105.

16 Ammirati 2018, 91.

glossaries; secondly, to make a comparison with the *Hermeneumata*[17] and the papyri, both documentary and juridical,[18] with the aim of underlining the effective use of these glossaries; finally, to highlight the importance of Cicero with the respect to the educational environment in the eastern part of the Empire.

Cicero in Egypt: An Overview

Cicero is one of the few Latin authors whose tradition can be followed back into antiquity, sometimes due to the orator himself.[19] The material evidence consists of palimpsests[20] and papyri. The main difference between these two groups of manuscripts is that the palimpsests feature many kinds of Cicero's works, such as letters, philosophical works, speeches and furthermore *scholia*, while the papyri bear only speeches.[21]

Among the more than 1500 Latin papyri extant,[22] few are literary texts, especially about classical authors.[23] Besides rare exceptions, many of the papyri featuring Latin classical authors fit with the so-called *Quadriga Messii:*[24] thirty-seven documents bearing Virgil,[25] eleven bearing Cicero, seven bearing Sallust[26] and two bearing Terence,[27] hence, it is easy to assume that they probably belong to

17 See below.

18 Commonly, papyri containing works by jurists are considered 'literary', but in this case, we want to highlight how the technical language contained in a scholastic author, Cicero, is the same used in works of a technical nature.

19 For an overview, see Espluga 2016; specifically, on the famous case of the *Pro Ligario*, see Pecere 2010, 184.

20 About the palimpsests, see Lo Monaco 2012.

21 See below.

22 Cf. Scappaticcio 2019.

23 Ammirati 2015a, 12.

24 A scholastic canon of authors to be studied: Virgil and Terence in poetry, Cicero and Sallust in prose; cf. Cassiod. *Inst.* 1.15.7: *regulas igitur elocutionum Latinorum, id est quadrigam Messii, omnimodis non sequaris, ubi tamen priscorum codicum auctoritate convinceris; expedit enim interdum praetermittere humanarum formulas dictionum, et divini magis eloquii custodire mensuram* ("Do not, therefore, completely follow the rules of Latin idioms, i. e. the Quadriga of Messius, provided you are convinced by the authority of ancient copies; for sometimes it is right to pass over the rules of human expression and instead keep the arrangement of divine speech"; transl. Halporn/Vessey 2004).

25 For a general overview of the survey of Virgil from East, see Scappaticcio 2013; see also Fressura 2017 about the bilingual glossaries.

26 Cf. Funari 2008.

27 About P. Oxy XXIV 2401, see Nocchi Macedo 2018; about P. Vindob. Inv. L 103, see Danese 1990.

an educational environment. Concerning the dating, Ciceronian papyri reflect the situation of the other Latin literary texts from Egypt: according to the results of a search made through *Trismegistos* (*TM*),[28] there are sixty in the period between the first and third centuries CE, while there are 177 between the third and sixth centuries CE; regarding Cicero, only one papyrus survives from the first to the third centuries, otherwise the other ten can be referred to the fourth to sixth centuries.

Below, I present a table to give an overview of Ciceronian papyri, about the works handed down, dates, writing and book-form.

	Papyrus	Date (in cent.)	Bookform and Material	Work	Typology
1	P. Iand. V 90 *recto*	first	papyrus roll	*In Verrem* 2.2.3–4	text with reading marks
2	P. Monts. Roca inv. 129–149 + P. Duke inv 798	late fourth	papyrus codex	*In Catilinam* 1.6–9, 13–33; 2	within a miscellaneous codex
3	P. mil. Vogl. Inv. 1190	late fourth–early fifth	parchment codex	*In Verrem* 2.5.39–41	columnar text
4	P. Vindob. G 30885 a +e + P. Vindob. L17	fourth–fifth	papyrus codex	*In Catilinam* 1.16–18, 15 (sic!), 19–20 + 1.14–15+27	bilingual glossary
5	P. Ryl. Gr. I 61	fifth	papyrus codex	*In Catilinam* 2.14–15	bilingual glossary
6	P. Vindob. L127	fifth	papyrus codex	*In Catilinam* 3.15–16	bilingual glossary
7	PSI Congr. XXI.2	fifth	papyrus codex	*In Catilinam* 1.10–11	bilingual glossary
8	P. Ryl. Gr. 3 477	fifth	papyrus codex	*Divinatio in Caecilium* 33–37, 44–46	annotated in greek and latin
9	P. Oxy. VIII 1097 + P. Oxy. X 1251 + P. Koln. I 49	fifth	papyrus codex	*De imperio Cn. Pompei* 60–65, 70–71; *In Verrem* 2.1.1–9, 2.2.3; 12; *Pro Caelio* 26–55	anthology of cicero's speeches

28 https://www.trismegistos.org/index.php (seen: 12.12.2020).

Continued

	Papyrus	Date (in cent.)	Bookform and Material	Work	Typology
10	P. Berol. Inv. 13299 a–b	fifth	parchment codex	*Pro Plancio* 27–28, 46–47	continuous text
11	P. Cair. Inv. S.R. 3732	fifth	parchment codex	*In Catilinam* 1.3–4	columnar text
12	PSI I 20	fifth–sixth	papyrus codex	*In Verrem* 2.1.60–61; 62–63	continuous text

In the table, the papyri from number 4 to 7 are the bilingual glossaries that are the object of this contribution.

I give below a correspondence between the glossaries, the number in the table above and the number referred to them starting from now.

4	P. Vindob. G 30885 a+e	P^1
5	P. Ryl. I 61	P^2
6	P. Vindob. L 127	P^3
7	PSI Congr. XXI.2	P^4

P^1 is considered the most ancient Ciceronian glossary and is the only one written in four columns.[29] On one hand, the Latin part of P^1, P^2 and P^3 is written in a primitive minuscule and the Greek part in a majuscule with some minuscule elements; on the other hand, P^4 presents a Latin New Roman cursive and a Greek cursive, being a good exemplification of the so-called "κοινή scrittoria greco-romana".[30] The only speeches of Cicero that survived as bilingual glossaries are the *Catilinarians*,[31] but other evidence survives about the presence of Cicero in the education of the Hellenophones in the eastern part of the Empire: P. Ryl. III 477, a bifolium from a papyrus codex containing the *Divinatio in Caecilium* with Greek and Latin *marginalia* related to a different level of education.[32]

29 Internullo 2011–2012, 44. As Fressura 2013, 74, pointed out, a link between the number of columns and the antiquity of a glossary does not exist.

30 Internullo 2011–2012, 30; see also Cavallo 2005.

31 See in this respect Internullo 2011–2012, 36, with whom I agree.

32 McNamee 2007, 473–478.

The *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* and the Roman Law

For our purposes, it is crucial to underline that a large group of people who studied Latin in the eastern part of the Empire did so in order to learn jurisprudence[33] and consequently obtain a better social position due to a job in the Roman administration.[34] Therefore, it is easy to imagine the key role of Roman Law in the *curriculum studiorum* and, in addition, to understand why a large quantity[35] of juridical papyri survived.

The *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*[36] (from now on, HP) are a collection of ancient bilingual language learning material; they survived the Middle Ages in the western part of the Empire, due to their usefulness to Latin speakers learning Greek. Numerous papyrus scraps, however, testify to the fact that much of the HP material was used in antiquity and late antiquity by Hellenophones learning Latin; moreover, it is possible to link these scraps to a specific redaction of the HP.[37] Their origin can be fixed, on the basis of their content, to the Imperial Age especially between the first and the third centuries CE.[38]

The HP have a very complex tradition, since they are featured by many manuscripts and in nine different versions; moreover, different text typologies belong to the HP: alphabetic and thematic glossaries, *colloquia*, fables, mythological (Genealogy of Hyginus and a book-by-book summary of the *Iliad*), philosophical (*Responsa sapientium*, *interrogationes et responsa sapientium*,[39] Delphic precepts) and legal texts.[40]

---

33 In 239 CE we find the first attestation of a school of Roman law in the eastern part of the Roman Empire, in Beirut; cf. Rochette 1997, 167–168; moreover, cf. *orator* and *iuris peritus* in the *Edictum Pretiis* by the Emperor Diocletian, Lauffer 1971, 124–124; 242.

34 According to Signes Codoñer 2013, 85, already quoting Goetz, there are many terms belonging to the semantic sphere of law and administration in the *Hermeneumata*.

35 Ammirati 2010, 55; see also Fournet 2019, 86.

36 At first stages of studies, these have been considered as a product of the teaching activity of Dositheus, a grammarian who wrote a bilingual grammar; cf. Flammini 1990, 3–5, for a summary of the question; about the *Hermeneumata*, see Dickey 2012, 16–56, with further bibliography.

37 Dickey 2017, 212.

38 Dickey 2012, 50.

39 "Replies of wise men", "Questions and replies of wise men" (unless otherwise indicated, all translations have been made by the author).

40 All the text typologies belonging to the *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*, listed in relation to their redaction, can be found in Dickey 2012, 29.

Heterogeneous texts pertain to this latter typology:

- Thematic glossaries concerning numerous aspects of juridical life: *de magistratibus*, *de legibus*, *de civitatibus/de civitate, de negotiis forensibus*, *de militibus/de militia*;[41]
- The *Sententiae Hadriani*,[42] belonging only to the *Hermeneumata Leidensia* and to the *Hermeneumata Stephani*, are a group of legal judgments made by Emperor Hadrian,[43] which can be related to the judgment made by King Solomon;[44]
- The *Tractatus de manumissionibus*,[45] concerning the different practices of emancipation from slavery;[46] it is transmitted by the *Hermeneumata Leidensia* and the *Fragmentum parisinum* (Paris. Lat. 6503, ninth century);
- Some *Colloquia*,[47] as Dickey recently pointed out, concern legal aspects showing forum and trial scenes: *Monacensia-Einsidlensia* (4), *Celtis* (73–76), *Harleianum* (24 a–e) and *Montpessulanum* (5a–b).[48]

Moreover, HP are an important source of knowledge regarding the functioning of education in antiquity and late antiquity, not only due to their bilingual structure but also to their content. In our case, in addition to providing us with information about the key role of jurisprudence in ancient studies, they testify to how Cicero was read and studied in classrooms.[49] For instance, in the *Colloquium Celtis* 37–38 there is a list of literary genres and authors read at school by advanced students and in this 'canon' we find the *Actiones Tullianae* (38a).

---

41 "About magistrates", "About law", "About the state", "About the activities in the law-court", "About soldiers / about the military service".

42 "Judgment of Hadrian"; cf. Flammini 1990, 13–16.

43 The interest in Emperor Hadrian is testified, among papyri, also by the *Hadrianus of Montserrat*, belonging to P. Monts. Roca inv. 162–165; none of the *Sententiae* is similar to the Tale of Hadrian in the content; see Gil/Torallas Tovar 2010.

44 Dickey 2017, 213.

45 "Treatise on the emancipation from slavery".

46 About the Greek translation of the term *manumissio,* see Stornaiuolo 2019, 46 n. 8; about the *manumissiones* in Latin papyri, see *ibid.*, 47–48.

47 The *Colloquia* are bilingual conversation manuals, regarding various aspects of everyday-life in antiquity. A new edition, with a commentary, of all the *Colloquia* belonging to the HP was recently made by Dickey in two volumes: Dickey 2012 and 2015.

48 Concerning the legal texts included in the *Colloquia*, see Dickey 2014.

49 Cf. also *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (*CIL*) IV 4208: *si ti[b]i Cicero dol[et], vap[u]labis* ("If you dislike Cicero, you will be beaten"), another witness of Cicero in the classrooms.

Lemmata

In order to emphasise the link between Ciceronian bilingual glossaries on papyrus and juridical education in the eastern part of the Roman Empire, as first step, I selected in the text of the glossaries the technical lemmata, words pertaining to the juridical practice or environment. I will present the selected lemmata following alphabetical order, specifying for each one the line in the papyrus and the extract from the *Catilinarians.* Subsequently, I will give a general discussion of the technical meaning on the basis of the lexicographic resources. I will highlight in what section of HP[50] the lemma can be found and then I will discuss its presence in the documentary and juridical papyri. The mark '~' between two words has to be meant as 'corresponds to.[51]

– *abdico*
P[3] *recto* l. 1: [*abdicavit*] ~ απεκηρυ]ξ[εν[52]
Cic. *Cat.* 3.15: *Tamen magistratu se abdicavit.*[53]

The term does not occur in the HP; however, it is well attested among other glossaries of the *CGL:* for instance, *CGL* II 3.11–13. The specific meaning of 'resign from a charge' in the syntagm *abdicare magistratu* is pointed out in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (*ThLL*) I 54 53, quoting this passage from Cicero. The same expression can be found in the *Vocabularium Iurisprudentiae Romanae* (*VIR*) I.59–60.

– *carcer*
P[1] frg. 3 *recto* l. 98: *a carce*]*re* ~ απο φρουρας[54]
Cic. *Cat*. 1.19: *Sed quam longe videtur a carcere atque a vinculis abesse debere.*[55]

50 I choose to quote the HP following the edition in the *CGL* by Goetz, except when there are recent editions, i. e. Flammini 2004 for the *Hermeneumata Leidensia* and Dickey 2012 and 2015 for the *Colloquia.* Note that Goetz prints the transcription of manuscripts, hence in his edition in many cases there are not diacritics.
51 Körte 1920, 260.
52 "He resigned office".
53 "He was nevertheless permitted to resign his office"; transl. Berry 2006.
54 "From prison".
55 "But how far away from prison and chains do you think a man ought to be?"; transl. Berry 2006.

This lemma occurs, among papyri, only in P. Vindob L. 110 (= *TM* 65155; *LDAB* 6397),[56] a still unidentified Latin legal text with Latin *marginalia*, containing a juridical handbook on criminal law: *catenatus esse debet non tamen ut in carcere agat nisi suspecta sit persona.*[57] The annotation lies in the right margin of the text. In the HP, the word can be found only in the thematic sections concerning *de civitate: CGL* III 306.26 (*Hermeneumata Montpessulana*) and *CGL* III 353.48 (*Hermeneumata Stephani*). No-one of the Greek translation of the HP matches the one in the Ciceronian glossary, however there are some attestations of the term φρουρά meaning 'prison'.[58] The *Hermeneumata Montpessulana* has a double translation: είρκτή (in the manuscript we find Ιρκτη, an error of iotacism) and φυλακή;[59] in the *Hermeneumata Stephani* the term is glossed as λάξ, an adverb meaning 'with the foot'.[60] Maybe, the compiler of the glossary had in mind the similar word λαξεία 'quarrying',[61] referring to the punishment.

– *clarissimus vir*
P[3] *recto*, l. 3: [*clarissimo vir*]*o* ~ [τ]ω λ[αμ]προτατω ανδρι[62]
Cic. *Cat*. 3.15: *ut quae religio C. Mario, clarissimo viro, non fuerat.*[63]

Among documentary papyri, this syntagm occurs many times, both in the singular and plural form; furthermore, it can be found in an abbreviated form, for instance: *vv cc.* (*viris clarissimis*) in P. Abinn. 63, l. 1 (ca 350 CE), or *vc* (*virum clarissimum*) in P. Ryl. IV 615, l. 2 (fourth–fifth cent.). The syntagm can be found frequently as a form of address both in Latin literature[64] and in documentary papyri, e. g. *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores* (*ChLA*) XII 527 l. 1 (third–fourth cent.). Moreover, this superlative pertains to the language of official documents.[65] Among juridical papyri, the expression occurs in P. Vindob. L 59 + 92 (*TM* 64631= *LDAB* 5862) *verso* col. II ll. 35–36, Marcianus, *Institutiones* 1.2.[66] The HP bear *clarissimus* in the *recensio Lei-*

56 See also McNamee 2007, 511–512, but a new edition of the text is currently in progress by Marco Fressura and Dario Mantovani in the frame of ERC Project REDHIS (http://redhis.unipv.it/).
57 "Nevertheless, unless a person is suspected he should not be chained in order to go to prison"; transl. McNamee 2007.
58 Internullo 2011–2012, 74.
59 See below, *custodia.*
60 Cf. *Greek-English Lexicon* (*LSJ*) s.v. λάξ
61 Cf. *LSJ* s.v. λαξεία.
62 "To the most illustrious man".
63 "No such scruple prevented the illustrious Gaius Marius"; transl. Berry 2006.
64 Dickey 2002, 147.
65 Harrauer 1982, 218.
66 A new edition with introduction and commentary is Fressura/Mantovani 2018.

densis, in the *Hadriani sententiae* (Flammini 2004, 70 1791) referring to the *praefectus*, but the Greek translation does not correspond to the one in the Ciceronian glossary: in fact, we find ἐπισημότατος. In the thematic glossary concerning *de magistratibus* of the *Hermeneumata Stephani*, there is the equivalence λαμπρότατος ~ *clarissimus*, implying ἀνήρ ~ *vir.* The same correspondence can be found in Mason 1974, 65.

> – *consul*
> P[1] frg. I *recto* l. 19: *consulis* ~ του υπατου[67]
> Cic. *Cat*. 1.16: *Quae quidem quibus ab te initiata sacris ac devota sit nescio, quod eam necesse putas esse in consulis corpore defigere.*[68]
> P[2] *recto* l. 15: *a consule* ~ [απο υπατου][69]
> Cic. *Cat*. 2.14: *Sed indemnatus innocens in exilium eiectus a consule vi minis esse dicetur.*[70]

The word *consul* has many occurrences in Latin documentary papyri; it is attested, especially in abbreviated form *co*(*n*)*s*(*ulibus*),[71] in the dating *formulae*, both in Latin and bilingual documents as a part of the text itself or added at a later stage.[72] In both Ciceronian papyri, *consul* is glossed as ὕπατος. This word, as Mason points out, does not belong to the Greek language of administration, like the others adapted for the Latin context;[73] indeed the first attestation of the term, as an adjective, can be found in Homer where it is an epithet of Zeus.[74] Subsequently, the shift from adjective to noun, implying the term ἀνήρ, allowed the birth of the noun, to designate the Roman magistrate and with this meaning is used, according to the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (*TLG*), starting from Plutarch.[75] The original belonging to the religious semantic sphere is confirmed, in the *Hermeneumata*, by the presence of ὕπατος ~ *consul* in the section Θεων λοινον ~ *deorum reliquorum* (*CGL* III 290.11); elsewhere in the *Hermeneumata*, the matching ὕπατος ~ *consul*, as well as *consul* ~ ὕπατος, can be found five times in the sections *de mag-*

67 "Of the consul".
68 "With what special rites you must have consecrated and dedicated it I do not know, for you to plunge it into the body of a consul"; transl. Berry 2006.
69 "By the consul".
70 "But that an innocent man has been driven into exile without trial by the violent threats of the consul"; transl. Berry 2006.
71 Cf. *ThLL* s.v. *consul* IV 562 47–80; about the abbreviation and their function in documentary papyri, see Gonis 2009, 170–171.
72 Iovine 2019, 157–159.
73 Mason 1974, 165.
74 Hom. *Il*. 5.756: Ζῆν' ὕπατον Κρονίδην ἐξείρετο καὶ προσέειπε ("and made question of Zeus most high, the son of Cronos, and spoke to him"; transl. Murray 1978).
75 Cf. Mason 1974, 165–169; about the Greek translation of *consul*, see also *ThLL* IV 563 1–5.

istratibus ~ περὶ ἀρχόντων (*CGL* III 28.15; 182.28; 275.50; 297.52; 362.37, respectively *Leidensia*, *Monacensia*, *Einsidlensia*, *Montpessulana* and *Stephani*). Occasionally, we find the word transliterated in Greek characters and in abbreviated form.[76]

> – *custodia*
> P[1] frg. II *recto* l. 105: *custodia* ~ φυλακης[77]
> Cic. *Cat.* 1.19: *Sed quam longe videtur a carcere atque a vinculis esse debere qui se ipse iam dugnum custodia iudicarit?*[78]

This section deals with Catiline's attempts to place himself under the judicial custody of private citizens: firstly Manius Lepidus, then Cicero himself and Quintus Metellus, who both refused, and finally Marcus Metellus (or Marcellus).[79] The lemma is glossed as φυλακή in the HP as well as in the Ciceronian glossary.[80] Among Latin papyri, the term occurs in the documents related to the Roman army, in particular daily reports, e. g. *ChLA* X 454, ll. 26–27 *recto* (third cent.),[81] or in the so called *acta diurna*, i. e. *ChLA* IV 270, l. 5 (225–275 CE)[82]. In this field, *custodia* means 'to be in charge of watching over something or someone'.[83] In this respect, we find the word also in the thematic section of HP pertaining *de militia: CGL* III 352.77 (*Hermeneumata Stephani*). The other sphere concerning *custodia* is the juridical one,[84] found in the passage from Cicero quoted above; it is not clear if in the *Hermeneumata Stephani* section *de civitatibus* (*CGL* III 353.49) the word has to be meant as 'house arrest'[85] or as '*custodia Urbis*'.[86] In my opinion, it is reasonable to believe that the first meaning is suitable, since the previous word in the glossary is *carcer.*

76 Mason 1974, 9.
77 "Guard".
78 "But how far away from prison and chains do you think a man ought to be who has already himself come to the conclusion that he needs to be kept under guard?"; transl. Berry 2006.
79 Dyck 2008a, 101; Maslowski 2003, 21.
80 See also *ThLL* IV 1555, 13.
81 See Salati 2020, 29; 32–34; 37–39; 43; 46–47; 49–50.
82 See Salati 2020, 11–15; 17; 19; 124.
83 For instance, see *ThLL* s.v. IV 1556 2 and 1556 10.
84 *VIR* I 1552 35–53; 1553 1–7.
85 In this respect, see *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (*OLD*) s.v. *custodia* 6, where the passage from Cicero is quoted as an example.
86 *ThLL* IV 1556 85.

– *custos*
P[4] *verso* l. 15: [*custo*]*di huius urbis* ~ φυλακτω ταυτης της πολεως[87]
Cic. *Cat*. 1.11: *huic ipsi Iovi Statori, antiquissimo custodi huius urbis.*[88]

Firstly, I would like to underline that, in the glossary, the syntagm *Iovi Statori antiquissimo* is missing, probably because the compiler did not consider it useful for the students.[89] The Greek translation does not match with the one in the HP, indeed φυλακτω might be "una forma eteroclita, con tema in o, del dative di φυλάκτης" or a scribal error.[90] The HP have *custos* only in the thematic section about *de militia:* Flammini 2004, 61.1573 and *CGL* III 208.29, in both cases the word is in the plural form glossed as φυλακής. The same translation can be found in *ThLL* IV 1572.10. This evidence matches the content of Latin papyri: among them, indeed, the word appears mainly in documents dealing with Roman army. For instance, *Roman Military Records on Papyrus* (*RMR*) I 58 (*ca* 90 CE), a report concerning soldiers and their charge,[91] frg. 2 *verso*, l. 4 has *armorum custos*[92] and l. 8 has *custos domi Ploti.*[93] In this typology of document, the term can be found in abbreviated form, for example *a*(*rmorum*) *c*(*ustos*) in *ChLA* IV 272 l. 6 (87 CE) or *armoru* (sic) *cus*(*todi*) in T. *Vindon.* 38 l. 1. The syntagm *armorum custos* is discussed also in *ThLL* IV 1574, 75–77 and in *VIR* I 1154, 32.

– *exilium*
P[2] *recto* l. 13: *in exilium* ~ [εις] εξορισμ[ον][94]
Cic. *Cat*. 2.14: *sed indemnatus innocens in exilium eiectus a consule vi.*[95]
P[2] *verso* l. 31: [*in exilium* ~ εις] εξορισμον[96]
Cic. *Cat*. 2.15: *dicatur sane eiectus esse a me, dum modo eat in exilium.*[97]

Among papyri, the term occurs only in the *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum* (*CPL*) 74 (*TM* 62359 = *LDAB* 3524) *recto,* l. 23: *si iud*(*ices*) *pedanei pecunia corru*[*pti dicantur,*

87 "To the guardian of this city".
88 "To this Jupiter Stator, the god who from the earliest times had stood guard over our city"; transl. Berry 2006.
89 Manfredi 1995, 9.
90 Internullo 2011–2012, 119.
91 Cf. Salati 2020, 30; 32.
92 "Guardian of weapons".
93 "Guardian of Plotius' house".
94 "In exile" or "exiled".
95 "But that an innocent man has been driven into exile without a trial by the violent threats of a consul"; transl. Berry 2006.
96 See note 93.
97 "So by all means let it be said that I have forced him into exile – just so long as that is where he goes"; transl. Berry 2006.

ple]*rumq*(*ue*) *a p*(*rae*)*side aut curia s*[*ubmoventur aut in exilium mittuntur*].[98] This scrap contains the *Sententiae* 5.24–25 by the jurist Paulus and can be dated to the fifth century. Concerning the HP, the word can be found only in the *Hadriani Sententiae,* in both the redaction *Leidensis,* Από εξοριας ~ *ab exilio* (Flammini 2004, 71, 1811), and *Stephani, Ab exilio* ~ Από ἐξορισμοῦ (*CGL* III.388.24); only the second translation matches the glossary of the *Catilinarians*. The Greek translation[99] in the glossary matches only the one in the *Hermeneumata Stephani,* while ἐξορίας is quoted by the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* besides φυγαδεία.[100] The lemma pertains to the semantic field of law because it is a punishment for some crimes: *minimae poene sunt relegatio, exilium, opus publicum, vincula*[101] (Paul. 5.7.12).[102]

– *indemnatus*
P^2 *recto* l. 11: *sed indemnastus* ~ [αλλ] ακατακριθεις[103]
Cic. *Cat*. 2.14: *sed indemnatus innocens in exilium eiectus a consule vi.*[104]

The term does not occur either in the papyri or in the HP; this passage from Cicero is quoted by *ThLL*, s.v. *indemnatus* VII 2314, 55.

– *innocens*
P^2 *recto* l. 12: *innocens* ~ [ανα]ιτιος[105]
Cic. *Cat*. 2.14: *sed indemnatus innocens in exilium eiectus a consule vi.*[106]

The word is missing from Latin papyri; nevertheless, it can be found twice in the HP: once in the thematic section *de moribus humanis* of the *Monacensia* (*CGL* III 178.1) and one in the *Colloquium Celtis* (Dickey 2015 76a). In both cases, the translation matches the Ciceronian glossary.

98 "If the subordinate judges will be considered corrupted by money, generally, they are pushed away by the provincial governor or the assembly or they are banished".
99 According to the *LSJ*, there is a difference between ἐξορία and ἐξορισμός: the first term refers to the life in exile or isolation, while the second one is the act of sending someone beyond the frontier.
100 *ThLL* V 1484.39–40.
101 "The lightest punishments are banishment, exile, forced labour, chains".
102 Cf. *VIR* II 695, 36–38.
103 "But guiltless".
104 "But that an innocent man has been driven into exile without a trial by the violent threats of a consul"; transl. Berry 2006.
105 "Innocent".
106 "But that an innocent man has been driven into exile without a trial by the violent threats of a consul"; transl. Berry 2006.

– *iudicium*
P[1] fr. 1+ fr. 4 *verso* l. 46: *iudicium* ~ κριτηριον[107]
Cic. *Cat.* 1.17: *huius tu neque auctoritatem verebere nec iudicium*[108]*sequere nec vim pertimescens?*[109]

We find the word four times in the HP, once in the *Colloquia* (*Colloquium Monacensium-Einsidlensium*, Dickey 2012 4a–p: κριτήριον ~ *iudicium*) and three times in the thematic sections (*Hermeneumata Leidensia,* Flammini 2004, 55.1410: Κρισις ~ *iudicium*, *Hermeneumata Montpessulana CGL* III 336.41: κριτήριον ~ *iudicium*, *Hermeneumata Einsidlensia CGL* III 276.57: κριτήριον ~ *Iudicium examen* and κρίσις κρίμα ~ *iudicatio iudicium*). The thematic sections of HP in which we find the term *iudicium* are an excellent example of the interaction between school and law: indeed, they are *de studiis, de forensibus negotiis, de legibus.*[110] The HP offer three different Greek translations of this word. The one that occurs the most is κριτήριον: its technical meaning of 'court judgement' pertains also to Greek papyri.[111] In the *Hermeneumata Einsidlensia* it has a double translation: besides *iudicium* there is *examen*, which figuratively can be meant as *actus iudicandi.*[112] Κρίμα is the translation most related to the branch of law, indeed it has only technical meaning: 'decree, legal decision, question, lawsuit'.[113] Finally, we find Κρίσις, as a translation of *iudicatio*; its first meaning 'distinguishing', but sometimes it is meant as 'result of a trial.[114] Among juridical papyri, the term is attested in BKT X 30 (= *TM* 64538 = *LDAB* 5766), a Latin legal treatise on criminal law dated to fourth–fifth centuries at frg. I fol. I *verso* l.6: *sunt et ạcṭạ iudicia publica · g̣ravis e̊x̊s̊e̊cu̇ṭiọnis p*(*er*) *provinci̇as.*[115] Moreover, the word occurs several times in BGU II 611 (= *TM* 66432 = *LDAB* 7682), a papyrus roll containing the *Oratio in senatu habita* by the Emperor Claudius about justice reform.[116] The word occurs also in documentary papyri, i. e. the petition addressed by Abinnaeus to the Emperors Constantius II and Constans (340–342 CE), P. Abinn. 2, l. 12 bis: *ex suffragio eos pr*[*omotos*]

107 "Judgement".
108 About the *iudicium* in this passage, see Dyck 2008a, 41.
109 "Will you not then respect her authority, defer to her judgement or fear her power"; transl. Berry 2006.
110 "About studies", "About the activities in the law-court", "About law".
111 *LSJ* s.v. κριτήριον.
112 *ThLL* V 1164 b; "the action of judge".
113 *LSJ* s.v. κρίμα.
114 *LSJ* s.v. κρίσις.
115 "There are, additionally, public judgements, that imply severe punishments through the provinces".
116 Cf. Buongiorno 2010, 207.

fuiṣṣẹ me vero iudicio sacro…[117] The term can be found in abbreviated form, for instance in P. Ant. I 22 (fourth cent.), a Latin legal treatise by an unidentified jurist: col. II *recto* l. 6: *iud*(*icium*).

– *iudico*
P[1] frg. 2 + frg. 3 *verso* l. 106: *iudic*]*averit* ~ εκρινεν[118]
Cic. *Cat*. 1.19: *sed quam longe viderur a carcere atque a vinculis esse debere qui se ipse iam dignum custodia iudicarit?*[119]

Firstly, it has to be noted that the papyrus bears a different and simpler *lectio.*[120] The verb κρίνω is semantically related to all the Greek translations of the term *iudicium* discussed above, although it has different meanings: 'chose', 'decide a contest', 'give a judgment'.[121] In the HP, the lemma can be found only in the *Hadriani sententiae*, in both the redactions *Leidensis* (Flammini 2004, 72) and *Stephani* (*CGL* III 388.8); their translation matches the one in the Ciceronian glossary. Among juridical papyri, the term occurs in BKT X 30 (*TM* 64538 = *LDAB* 5766), a Latin legal treatise on criminal law, l. 11 *recto* (fourth–fifth cent.) *iudicando.*[122] In the documentary papyri, the verb is attested rarely, e. g., in *ChLA* 42 1212, l. 4: *rogo domine* [*dig*]*num me iudices.*[123]

– *lex*
P[1] frg. 1+ fr. 3 *recto* l. 70: *leges* ~ νομους[124]
Cic. *Cat*. 1.18: *tu non solum ad neglegendas leges et quaestiones verum etiam ad evertendas perfringendasque valuisti.*[125]

This is a very common word in documents from Egypt; plenty of documentary typologies on papyrus, indeed, need to specify the law which states the rule they refer to, e. g. P. Mich. III 169, a bilingual birth certificate dated to 145 CE: *ideoque*

117 Cugusi 1992, II, 336; "they were promoted by a decision, but I through a sacred judgment".
118 "Judged".
119 "But how far from prison and chain do you think a man ought to be who has already himself come to the conclusion that he needs to be kept under guard?"; transl. Berry 2006.
120 All the mediaeval manuscripts have *iudicarit*, apart from the Harleianus 2682; cf. Maslowski 2003, 21.
121 *LSJ* s.v. κρίνω.
122 The whole line is poorly preserved and there are only few letters before *iudicando*, hence I do not quote the passage.
123 "I beg you, lord, to assume that I am worthy".
124 "Laws".
125 "You have managed not merely to ignore the laws and the courts, but to overturn and shatter them"; transl. Berry 2006.

[*s*]*e has testationes · interposuisse dixit quia ḷe̯x̣* [*Ae*]*ḷia Sentia · et Papia Poppae̯a̯* [*spu*]*r̥i̯o*[*s*] *s̩puriasve in albo pr̥*[*ofiteri ve*]*t̩at.*[126] For the same reason, the lemma can be found several times in papyri of legal content, e. g. PSI XI 1182, containing the *Institutiones* by Gaius and dated to the sixth cent.: frg. I *recto*, ll. 180–181: *sicut̩i lex XII* [*t*]*abular*(*um*).[127] Sometimes, we find the word in abbreviated form, both in documentary and juridical papyri, e. g. P. Oxy IV 720 (247 CE), l. 14: *leg*(*e*) and *CPL* 74 (= *TM* 62359 = *LDAB* 3524) *Paulus sententiae* 5.24–25 (fifth cent.), *recto* l. 20: *leg*(*e*). Among the HP, the word is attested only in the thematic section, specifically: *de legibus* (*CGL* III 276.26), *de negotiis forensibus* (*CGL* III 336.40) and *de magistratibus* (*CGL* III 362.66).[128]

– *quaestio*
P[1] fr. 1+ fr. 3 *recto* l. 71: *et questiones* ~ και εξετασι[ς[129]
Cic. *Cat*. 1.18: *tu non solum ad neglegendas leges et quaestiones verum etiam ad evertendas perfringendasque valuisti.*[130]

In the juridical field, the word has many meanings: "examination of witnesses, often accompanied by torture in the case of slave', 'judicial investigation' and an 'ad hoc or, after 149 BCE, a standing commission appointed to try cases of public crime'.[131] Among juridical papyri, the word is attested few times: P. Strasb. 6B, fifth cent. (= *TM* 62945 = *LDAB* 4137) col. II l. 17: *q*(*uaesti*)*onis fuisse ut*[132] the *Disputationes* by Ulpian and PSI XIII 1348, p. 3 l. 29 *de satisdando qu*(*aestio*)*ni*,[133] a Greek legal text with Latin technical term and quotations. The term occurs very frequently among the Albertini tablets,[134] in the monophtongised form *questionem.*

– *vindico*
P[1] frg. 2+frg. 3 *recto* l. 91: *et ad vindican*]d*um* ~ και προ[ς] το εκδικιν[135]
Cic. *Cat*. 1.19: *Et ad vindicandum fortissimum fore putasti*[136].

126 "And she said that she had employed these written testimonies for this reason, because the Aelian-Sentian and the Papian-Poppaean laws forbid that illegitimate sons and daughters be registered in the public record"; transl. from https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.mich;3;169 (seen: 15. 01. 2021).
127 "As the laws in the Twelve Tables".
128 "About law", "About the activities in the law-court", "About magistrates".
129 "And the courts".
130 "You have managed not merely to ignore the laws and the courts, but to overturn and shatter them"; transl. Berry 2006.
131 *OLD* s.v. *quaestio.*
132 "The inquiry was about".
133 "The discussion about giving a guarantee".
134 Cf. Courtois *et al.* 1952.
135 "In order to punish".

According to the *OLD*, the term has various technical meanings: 'to claim as one's property', 'to claim as free', referred to the practice of the *manumissio ex vindicta*[137] and to punish. The passage from Cicero has to be meant in this last way. Among the HP, the word is attested only in the *Hadriani sententiae* in both their redactions: *Leidensis* (Flammini 2004 69, 1770) and *Stephani* (*CGL* III 387.31) with the same Greek translation as the Ciceronian glossary.

Conclusion

I give here a table to collect all the data assembled during my research: they are the starting point for my conclusions.

Lemma in Cicero's glossaries	*Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*				Papyri	
	Thematic glossaries	*Hadriani sententiae*	*Tractatus de manumissionibus*	*Colloquia*	Juridical papyri	Documentary papyri
abdico						
carcer	x				x	
clarissimus vir	x	x			x	x
consul	x				x	x
custodia	x					x
custos	x					x
exilium		x			x	
indemnatus						
innocens	x			x		
iudicium	x			x	x	
iudico		x			x	
lex	x	x	x		x	x
quaestio					x	x
vindico		x				

136 "You thought to be [...] very active in punishing"; transl. Berry 2006.

137 "Emancipation through rod"; cf. *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (*OCD*) s.v. *freedman* and bibliography.

The first evidence of an existing link, in the eastern part of the Empire, between the teaching of jurisprudence and Cicero's production lies in the nature itself of his works which survive from Egypt: as mentioned below, in fact, among the Ciceronian papyri we find only speeches.[138] The speeches surviving from papyrus scraps, additionally, nearly correspond to the choice made by the grammarians: according to the index of the *CGL*, the most quoted speeches are the *Verrines*, the *Catilinarians*, *Pro Cluentio* and *Pro Caelio.*[139]

Looking at the table above, on one side, we immediately note that only two lemmata (*abdico* and *indemnatus*) are completely absent from the scrutinised texts; on the other side, it is remarkable that the remaining twelve words occur in the legal texts at least once. Moreover, among these twelve lemmata, eleven can be found both in the HP and papyri.

Reading the data in the table, starting from the text typologies, we easily note that all of them contain many technical words matching those in the Ciceronian glossaries; however, there are two exceptions in this respect: the *Tractatus de manumissionibus* and the *Colloquia.* In my opinion, this lack can be explained with their own nature: the *Tractatus* is a very specific juridical text, concerning a single aspect of the private law, consequently the majority of its technical words (i. e. *manumissio, manumittere, ingenuus, libertus, vindicta*) pertain only to that kind of text and not to juridical texts at all. Concerning the *Colloquia*, they are a kind of learning material about almost every aspect of daily life, as a result the space devoted to juridical texts is minimal.

The term that occurs the most over all the text typologies is *lex*, followed by *clarissimus vir*, *iudicium* and *consul.* In addition, we find *lex*, *clarissumus vir* and *consul* frequently attested in their abbreviated form: abbreviations and symbols are typical of technical language and specific typology of documents and sometimes they appear in *formulae.* The need of the officers to write more documents in a smaller amount of time is the reason for the spread of abbreviated words, especially of the most used.

Furthermore, another aspect is noteworthy: the words *consul* and *clarissimus vir*, in their abbreviated form, can be frequently found in the bilingual reports of proceedings.[140] They are a common documentary typology in Late Antique Egypt and use code-switching: the frame (date, place, introduction of the speakers) is in Latin, the body is in Greek and the *sententia* is both in Greek and Latin.[141]

138 It is necessary to underline that Papyrology is a science that evolves constantly, hence my considerations fit the present status of our knowledge about Ciceronian papyri.

139 See De Paolis 2000, 47.

140 A list of these documents can be found in Thomas 1998, 132–133.

141 Adams 2003, 383–390; Fournet 2019, 76–79.

These documents are the best example of the interaction between the two languages: the official parts, pertaining to the administration are in Latin, the language of power; the body, otherwise, pertaining to common citizens is in Greek. The *sententia* is the official result of the trial and, of course is in Latin but accompanied by a Greek translation or resume, to be understood even by Hellenophones. The reason for the bilingual reports of proceedings is nearly the same as the bilingual glossaries: both the phenomena, indeed, are linked to the Diocletian reforms.[142]

Beside the glossaries, another evidence of the link between Cicero and the learning of Roman law is P. Ryl. III 477, especially the note, written both in Latin and Greek, about the *indicium*, a crime committed by two people together.[143]

Consequently, it is possible to assume, in my opinion, that it is not a coincidence that, among the lemmata selected for our purpose, the words most attested in the bilingual scholastic texts are those more attested among documentary papyri, also in their abbreviated form: the major need of people capable to write Latin documents concerning juridical aspects was linked to the increase of bilingual scholastic tools and the Ciceronian glossaries are a good example of this phenomenon.

142 See the introduction to this study.

143 Concerning bilingualism and juridical papyri, see Ammirati 2018.

Tiziano F. Ottobrini

Cicero and Photius

An Analysis of the Survival and Influence of Cicero on Photius' *Bibliotheca*, at the Crossroads between History and Drama

Il passato [...] *appartiene di fatto e di diritto, come possesso reale, all'uomo; e l'uomo può quindi ritornarne padrone e ospite*
(L. Santucci, *Orfeo in Paradiso*, Milano 1967, 38)

To this day, the topic of the Latin authors read and cited by Photius in his *Bibliotheca* (or *Myriobiblos*/*Myriobiblion*) has been little investigated.[1] In this context, Cicero's case offers a privileged point of view at least for three main reasons: firstly, because Cicero is among the few non-ecclesiastical Latin authors mentioned by Photius,[2] who devotes a specific section to him;[3] secondly, because Photius significantly contributed to show Cicero's enduring popularity and *Wirkungsgeschichte* in the Greek East;[4] thirdly, because the figure of Cicero is a multifaceted and complex one, and therefore it is important to investigate which aspects of him stood out in the eyes of an exceptional reader such as the patriarch of Constantinople[5] during the ninth century, so as to better understand Cicero's personality and genius. *Rebus sic stantibus*, it will be appropriate to proceed – for the first time in an analytical and organic way – with an examination of Cicero's presence in Photius,

1 Among the few contributions, besides Pade 2014, 532 and 548, it is worth mentioning Mendels 1986, which reflects the most common scholarly approach to the subject in question, although we have to consider that this investigation is limited to the context of historical sources only, whereas – as is well known – Cicero illustrates a case that goes well beyond the issue of historical influence.

2 Photius' interest in a Latin-language author like Augustine is explained precisely by the importance that this Christian author had from a spiritual and, above all, dogmatic point of view: in *Bibl.* 53 Photius quotes Augustine for his πίστις (14a) regarding the synod of Carthage (411 or 412 CE), against Pelagius and Caelestius and regarding the dispute over the denial of free will (*Bibl.* 54.15a).

3 In this regard, there is also an indirect mention of Cicero in the reference to Brutus (*Bibl.* 245.393b): by the words ἐν μὲν οὖν ταῖς πρώταις ἐπιστολαῖς τοιοῦτος ὁ Βροῦτος ("therefore, in the first letters such was Brutus"; here and after transl. by the author), Photius is alluding to the first letters which Brutus himself (see Nogara 1991) wrote to Cicero "pour lui reprocher son empressement envers César" (Henry 1971, 175 n. 2).

4 Among Cicero's epigones in the ninth century, we only find the western Frank Hadoardus (who was obviously interested in Latin literature). See von Albrecht 1995, 552–553.

5 More properly, the future patriarch of the Constantinopolitan see, given that the *Bibliotheca* dates back to around the year 838, while Photius received his first patriarchal mandate at Christmas some time between 858 and 867.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779-009

so as to illustrate what consideration the main Latin orator enjoyed according to one of the sharpest readers of the Byzantine period.[6]

To approach this subject, it is first of all necessary to make a preliminary observation, namely that the Patriarch quotes Cicero at two very precise and distinct points of the *Bibliotheca:*[7] we find a fleeting yet evocative reference to Cicero's final hours in the section devoted to Ptolemy Hephaestion (*Bibl.* 190) and a longer monographic section focusing on the Latin author in the context of a review of Plutarch's *Lives* (*Bibl.* 245).[8] Photius here touches on topics ranging from the Ciceronian declamatory technique to various anecdotal details and the conspiracy hatched against the Roman orator. This introductory observation allows us to immediately highlight two aspects: a) for the most part, Photius' Cicero is not based on a first-hand reading of the great orator's Latin works (not least owing to the language barrier), but is rather filtered through Plutarch;[9] b) not everything that Photius says about Cicero, however, is drawn from Plutarch,[10] as is evidenced by the valuable information about the orator's death, which had been transmitted by Ptolemy Hephaestion. We shall begin our analysis from this last source. Photius writes:[11]

> ὁ μέντοι νομοθέτης Ἀρκάδων Κερκίδας συνταφῆναι αὐτῷ τὸ α΄ καὶ β΄ τῆς Ἰλιάδος κελεύσειεν. Ὁ δὲ Πομπήϊος ὁ Μάγνος οὐδ' εἰς πόλεμον προίοι, πρὶν ἂν τὸ λ΄ τῆς Ἰλιάδος ἀναγνώσειε, ζηλωτὴς ὢν Ἀγαμέμνονος· ὁ δὲ Ῥωμαῖος Κικέρων Μήδειαν Εὐριπίδου ἀναγινώσκων ἐν φορείῳ φερόμενος, ἀποτμηθείη τὴν κεφαλήν.
>
> well, Cercidas – the Arcadian legislator – would have given orders for Books α and β of the *Iliad* to be buried with him. And Pompey the Great would not even have started to go into battle before having read Book λ of the *Iliad*, since he was an imitator of Agamemnon; the Roman Cicero, moreover, would have his head cut off while he was being carried in a litter and reading Euripides' *Medea.* (transl. by the author)

6 Significantly, André Schott identified Cicero, along with Julian, Ptolemy II and Asinius Pollio, as interesting to Photius on account of the wide range of sources these authors drew upon (Carlucci 2012, 58).

7 For an overview of Photius' work and its genesis, see Bevegni 1996 and Nogara 1975, as well as the remarks on its encyclopedic and erudite character in Canfora 1999, esp. 409.

8 This finding is all the more important, given that Photius devotes little space to other highly prominent figures in the Latin tradition, as emerges, for example, from the few lines he reserves for Cato (395b), Caesar (396a) and Marius (398a).

9 On Photius' use of Plutarch in general and, more specifically, on his abridgement of the latter's writing, see Schamp 1995, esp. 158–161 (and the previous Schamp 1982).

10 The question of the sources which Plutarch draws upon when discussing Cicero has given rise to some extravagant views, starting from Alfred Gudeman's idea that Plutarch made use of a previous life written by Suetonius (Gudeman 1902, *passim*).

11 Phot. *Bibl.* 190 on Ptolemy Hephaestion, 151a (the following text is taken from Henry 1962, 190).

After a learned quotation from *Eunides* by Cratinus and Hesiod's *Work and Days*, Photius continues with highly selected memoirs of an erudite and anecdotal nature. The first concerns the Arcadian lawgiver Cercidas,[12] who is said to have been buried together with Books One and Two of the *Iliad.* This leads – as though through a free flow of recollections – to another similar anecdote concerning the *Iliad:* we are told that a far better known personality from Classical antiquity, namely Pompey the Great, never went to war without first reading Book Eleven of the Homeric poem, which was evidently perceived as an *exemplum* and incitement to military virtue – particularly considering that Pompey is referred to as a lover of Agamemnon and his admirer (ζηλωτής).[13] At this point, Photius introduces news pertaining to our topic, as he shifts his attention to Cicero; while in the case of Cercidas and Pompey the *Iliad* was the intermediate element linking the mention of the two subjects, now the medium between Pompey (just mentioned) and Cicero (mentioned immediately after) is their common trait of *Romanitas.* In a single, visually striking brushstroke, Photius reports that the Roman Cicero was beheaded as he was being carried in a litter and intent on reading Euripides' *Medea.*

The passage is relevant both for the information it provides – which would otherwise be unknown to us – and for its narrative construction of Cicero's character within the broader context of Photius' work. First of all, the source from which Photius draws this Ciceronian anecdote is Ptolemy Hephaestion, also known as Chennus (Χέννος, quail), an Alexandrian grammarian who lived under Trajan and Hadrian. He was the author – among other things – of a *Strange History* (*Περὶ παραδόξου ἱστορίας*, a text of the paradoxical genre),[14] and probably of a historical drama (or novel) entitled *Sphinx* (*Σφίγξ*) and of a collection of twenty-four poems entitled *Ἀνθόμηρος.*[15] While the last two works by Ptolemy are lost, something from the six or seven Books that made up the *Strange History* has survived, thanks to Photius himself, who summarised this work in the *Bibliotheca.*[16]

12 In addition to being a poet (*Meliambi*) and philosopher (of Cynical orientation, according to Diog. Laert. 6.76), Cercidas is especially known for having drafted the constitution of Megalopolis (Polyb. 5.93); on this figure, see Lomiento 1993 and Gerhard's entry in *RE*, s.v. *Kerkidas*, n. 1, 11 (1922), coll. 294–308.

13 Book Eleven of the *Iliad* was known in ancient times – according to Eust. *Il.* 3.133 – by the *titulus* of Ἀγαμέμνονος ἀριστεία, insofar as it recounted Agamemnon's deeds (the hero takes up arms and, with the support of Athena and Hera, enters into battle against the Trojans' champion, Hector).

14 All that remains of this text is what has been transmitted by Photius himself; Roulez 1834 remains the reference edition.

15 This can be inferred from *Suda*, Π 3037.

16 Phot. *Bibl.* 190; Photius says that the work is dedicated to a certain Tertulla, an otherwise unknown lover of Ptolemy's (I will refer here to Stein's entry for Tertulla, n. 24, in *RE*, 2nd series, 5 (1934), col. 848). What is most important to note is that Tertulla is celebrated by Ptolemy for her

What attracted Photius' interest was Ptolemy Hephaestion's erudition, that πολυμαθία which at 146b he enthusiastically describes as follows:

> χρήσιμον ὡς ἀληθῶς τὸ βιβλίον τοῖς περὶ τὴν ἱστορικὴν πολυμαθίαν πονεῖν ὡρμημένοις· ἔχει γὰρ δοῦναι συνειλεγμένα βραχεῖ χρόνῳ εἰδέναι, ἃ σποράδην τις τῶν βιβλίων ἀναλέγειν πόνον δεδεγμένοις μακρὸν κατατρίψει βίον.
>
> the book is really useful for those who intend to undertake to have generally a form of historical culture: in fact, it offers the possibility of knowing in a short time, collected together, things that – scattered here and there among the books – would have taken a lifetime to accumulate for those who care. (transl. by the author)

Photius, therefore, drew on the grammarian with the enthusiasm of someone who knows all too well how difficult it is to find minute and detailed information on a specific topic. Ptolemy Hephaestion made it possible for Photius to find in a short time what otherwise he would have to have searched for with meticulous inspections in many books. Within these coordinates the entire pericope on Cercidas and Pompey is inserted in a perfectly harmonious way – particularly the reference to Cicero reading Euripides at the time of his torture.

Photius here goes further, however, because in the selection of the material that he cites he sets up a first tragic scenario, which finds Cicero as central focus; in the Photian redaction of our pericope we note a common tragic matrix that binds together all the literary works and figures mentioned: in the case of Cercidas, the *Iliad* is buried with him, while in the case of Pompey, Book Eleven of the same Homeric poem is still connected to a context of death (Pompey did not fail to read it before entering combat, which could only endanger his life). Likewise, Cicero is portrayed as reading *Medea* when he falls into the deadly ambush. In this first tragic plot built by Photius around Cicero it is possible to grasp a further important element: the fact that Cicero was intent on reading *Medea* is not neutral, since this Euripidean drama hinges on the bloody crime perpetrated by Medea against her children. In this way, a close parallel begins to emerge, which – by tragic irony, in the Aristotelian sense – foreshadows the story of Cicero himself, who shortly thereafter was to be assassinated by the very Rome that had nurtured and raised him: for the conspirators were *cives* like Cicero himself and he was destined to fall under the blows not of nature or of barbarians, but of members of his own *civitas.*

---

love of literature and scholarship, in full harmony with the nature of the work that is dedicated to her, one rich in ideas drawn from different doctrines, historical references, erudite information, and legendary and mythological *mirabilia.*

It seems, then, that Photius found the information about Cicero that we are considering in an erudite source, namely Ptolemy Hephaestion. However, in all likelihood Photius altered this material, by giving it a tragic and proleptic framework that both speaks for itself and offers an initial outline of the idea of Cicero that Photius had developed, an idea which is further clarified in the Ciceronian section within the review of Plutarch's *Bίοι*.

In *Bibl.* 245, focusing on Plutarch, Photius devotes (from 395a onwards) a specific section to Cicero, within the context of the Plutarchian juxtaposition of the *Lives* of Cicero and Demosthenes.[17] Photius' text reads:[18]

> ὅτι οὐ μικρά (φησίν) ἐκ τοῦ ὑποκρίνεσθαι ῥοπὴ προσῆν εἰς τὸ πείθειν τῷ Κικέρωνι· καὶ τοὺς τῷ μεγάλα βοᾶν χρωμένους ῥήτορας ἐπισκώπτων ἔλεγε δι' ἀσθένειαν ἐπὶ τὴν κραυγὴν ὥσπερ τοὺς χωλοὺς ἐφ' ἵππον πηδᾶν. Ὅτι τὸ μὲν πρὸς ἐχθροὺς ἢ πρὸς ἀντιδίκους σκώμμασι χρῆσθαι πικροτέροις δοκεῖ ῥητορικὸν εἶναι· τὸ δὲ οἷς ἔτυχε προσκρούειν ἕνεκα τοῦ γελοίου πολὺ συνήγαγε μῖσος τῷ Κικέρωνι, καὶ ἐκ τούτου πολλοῖς γέγονεν ἐπαχθής, καὶ οἱ μετὰ Κλωδίου συνέστησαν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀρχὴν τοιαύτην λαβόντες. Ὅτι τὸ λεπτότατον τοῦ χαλκοῦ νόμισμα κουαδράντην Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσιν. Ὅτι λέγεται, φησί, τὰς πρώτας ἡμέρας διαγωνισάμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ Κικέρωνος ὁ Καῖσαρ ἐνδοῦναι τῇ τρίτῃ καὶ προέσθαι τὸν φίλον. Τὰ δὲ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως οὕτως εἶχεν· ἔδει Κικέρωνος μὲν ἐκστῆναι Καίσαρα, Παύλου δὲ τἀδελφοῦ Λέπιδον, Λευκίου δὲ Καίσαρος Ἀντώνιον, ὃς ἦν θεῖος αὐτῷ πρὸς μητρός. Οὕτως ἐξέπεσον ὑπὸ θυμοῦ καὶ λύσσης τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων λογισμῶν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀπέδειξαν, ὡς οὐδὲν θηρίον ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶν ἀγριώτερον, ἐξουσίαν πάθει προσλαβόντος.
>
> Cicero, says the author, drew considerable advantage from his talent as an actor in order to persuade; he laughed at the orators who spoke loudly by saying that they resorted to cries like lame people jump on horseback. To resort to rather harsh jokes against enemies or adversaries in court seems to be a rhetorical process. But the hatred of those his laughter happened to offend afflicted Cicero, and he became unbearable to quite a few people and Clodius' supporters ganged up against him because of such a grievance. The Romans call their lightest bronze currency a quadrant. It is reported, the author says, that after struggling for the first few days to defend Cicero, Caesar surrendered his friend on the third day and gave up. The terms of the deal were as follows: Caesar was to abandon Cicero, Lepidus his brother Paul, and Antony was to abandon Lucius Caesar, his maternal uncle. Thus, this rabid anger made them lose

17 Concerning his intended reading of Plutarch's *Lives*, Photius himself informs us that ἀνεγνώσθησαν ἐκ τῶν Πλουτάρχου παραλλήλων διάφοροι λόγοι, ὧν ἡ ἔκδοσις κατὰ σύνοψιν ἐκλέγεται διάφορον χρηστομαθίαν ("different passages from Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* have been read, of which the edition synoptically chooses an anthology of differences") (*Bibl.* 245.393b). In this regard, it should be noted that while Photius certainly gives ample space to Cicero as a Latin author, on the whole he certainly focuses more on Demosthenes: the entire section 394a–b is devoted to Demosthenes, while the specific section discussing Cicero only runs to a length of twenty lines in the modern edition by Les Belles Lettres. Concerning the *syncrises* of Cicero and Demosthenes in Caecilius of Calacte, Plutarch, Longinus and Quintilian, see also de Jonge 2019, 307–319.

18 Phot. *Bibl.* 245, in Henry 1971, 178–179 ἐκ τοῦ Κικέρωνος ("from Cicero").

human reason and they even demonstrated that there is no beast more ferocious than man when power is added to his passion. (transl. by the author)

Photius here carefully combines five extracts from Plutarch's biography of Cicero, offering not a mere juxtaposition but a coherent portrayal and self-enclosed narrative, a story within a story. Photius was able to accurately select the Plutarchian passages, so as to fashion his Cicero out of pre-existing material.

Photius achieves this result by cutting out and partially adapting the following passages from Plutarch:[19]

a) οὐ μικρὰ δὴ πρὸς τὸ πείθειν ὑπῆρχεν ἐκ τοῦ ὑποκρίνεσθαι ῥοπὴ τῷ Κικέρωνι καὶ τούς γε τῷ μεγά βοᾶν χρωμένους ῥήτορας ἐπισκώπτων, ἔλεγε δι' ἀσθένειαν ἐπὶ τὴν κραυγὴν ὥσπερ χωλοὺς ἐφ' ἵππον πηδᾶν. Ἡ δὲ περὶ τὰ σκώμματα καὶ τὴν παιδιὰν ταύτην εὐτραπελία δικανικὸν μὲν ἐδόκει καὶ γλαφυρὸν εἶναι, χρώμενος δ' αὐτῇ κατακόρως, πολλοὺς ἐλύπει καὶ κακοηθείας ἐλάμβανε δόξαν. (from Plut. *Cic*. 5.6)

Cicero drew considerable advantage from his talent as an actor in order to persuade; he laughed at the orators who spoke loudly by saying that they resorted to cries like lame people jump on horseback. This disposition to jokes and irony was effective and pleasant in the trials, but, used with excessive insistence, it annoyed many people and was judged malignancy. (transl. by the author)

b) τὸ μὲν οὖν πρὸς ἐχθροὺς ἢ πρὸς ἀντιδίκους σκώμμασι χρῆσθαι πικροτέροις δοκεῖ ῥητορικὸν εἶναι· τὸ δ' οἷς ἔτυχε προσκρούειν ἕνεκα τοῦ γελοίου πολὺ συνήγαγε μῖσος αὐτῷ. Γράψω δὲ καὶ τούτων ὀλίγα. (from Plut. *Cic*. 27.1)

to resort to rather harsh jokes against enemies or adversaries in court seems to be a rhetorical process. But the hatred of those his laughter happened to offend afflicted him. I will also list a few examples of his offensive jokes. (transl. by the author)

c) ἐκ τούτου πολλοῖς γέγονεν ἐπαχθής, καὶ οἱ μετὰ Κλωδίου συνέστησαν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀρχὴν τοιαύτην λαβόντες (from Plut. *Cic*. 28.1)

and he became unbearable to quite a few people and Clodius' supporters ganged up against him because of such a grievance (transl. by the author)

d) ὅτι τὸ λεπτότατον τοῦ χαλκοῦ νόμισμα κουαδράντην Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσιν (from Plut. *Cic*. 29.5)

the Romans call their lightest bronze currency a quadrant (transl. by the author)

e) ὅτι λέγεται, φησί, τὰς πρώτας ἡμέρας διαγωνισάμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ Κικέρωνος ὁ Καῖσαρ ἐνδοῦναι τῇ τρίτῃ καὶ προέσθαι τὸν φίλον. Τὰ δὲ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως οὕτως εἶχεν· ἔδει Κικέρω-

19 Plutarch's Greek text (here and elsewhere) is quoted from Ziegler's edition (Ziegler 1971). Generally speaking, see also the introductions of Magnino 1963 and Geiger *et al*. 1995.

> νος μὲν ἐκστῆναι Καίσαρα, Παύλου δὲ τἀδελφοῦ Λέπιδον, Λευκίου δὲ Καίσαρος Ἀντώνιον, ὃς ἦν θεῖος αὐτῷ πρὸς μητρός. Οὕτως ἐξέπεσον ὑπὸ θυμοῦ καὶ λύσσης τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων λογισμῶν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀπέδειξαν, ὡς οὐδὲν θηρίον ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶν ἀγριώτερον, ἐξουσίαν πάθει προσλαβόντος (from Plut. *Cic*. 46.5–6)[20]

> it is reported, the author says, that after struggling for the first few days to defend Cicero, Caesar surrendered his friend on the third day and gave up. The terms of the deal were as follows: Caesar was to abandon Cicero, Lepidus his brother Paul, and Antony was to abandon Lucius Caesar, his maternal uncle. Thus, this rabid anger made them lose human reason and they even demonstrated that there is no beast more ferocious than man when power is added to his passion. (transl. by the author)

Photius reworks the Plutarchian material (which had the undisputed merit for him of transmitting information about a Latin author such as Cicero in Greek) with minimal adaptations. It may be observed that in a) Photius greatly reduces the pathos of Plutarch's description of Cicero's salacious or even satirical[21] verve by leaving out the expansion that begins with ἡ δὲ περὶ τὰ σκώμματα. Likewise, in b) he drops the explanatory parenthesis introduced by γράψω δὲ καὶ τούτων ὀλίγα; without then dwelling on mere formal adaptations, such as – again in b) – the substitution of Cicero's name for the pronoun αὐτῷ (which in the Plutarchian text had a clear antecedent, which would have been lost in the new Photian redaction).[22] Where Photius' intervention becomes more noticeable is rather in the selection of the episodes from the Plutarchian tale and in the overall effect these create, once assembled.

In the first place, it may be noted that the passages selected by Photius follow the succession of Plutarch's biography, but do not include Cicero's birth and education. It follows that Photius presents a nuanced picture of Cicero as a fully trained orator and politician. Text a) presents Cicero as a rhetorician who greatly benefits from the influence of theatrical acting. This trait alludes in an implicit yet decisive way to a kind of deficiency in the argumentative force of words alone, as if argumentative rigour requires support from an element foreign to logical persua-

20 In Plutarch the passage is introduced only by λέγεται, to which Photius, for obvious editorial reasons, alongside a further φησί (quotation in the quotation) adds an initial connective ὅτι. On the concept of the apex of brutality, see also Plut. *Ant*. 19.4: οὐδὲν ὠμότερον οὐδ' ἀγριώτερον ("nothing rawer nor wilder"), about the destruction of the horrible market which Antony's political events gave rise to.

21 See Corbeill 1996, 174–217, Corbeill 2002b, and also, generally speaking, Guérin 2011, 146–154.

22 From an ecdotic point of view, Photius allows us to focus on which text of Plutarch should circulate: on the manuscript tradition of Plutarch in which Photius is to be inserted, Ziegler 1907 remains valid and, specifically, the contribution that Photius gives to the reconstruction of the text of the Plutarchian *Lives*, see Severyns 1937.

sion, namely the actor's *actio* (analogously to a lame person having to jump onto a horse, in order to move forward).[23] This point is further strengthened by the fact that in the passage just before the pericope quoted by Photius, Plutarch refers that Cicero carefully sought to draw inspiration from the comic actor Roscius[24] and the tragic actor Aesopus.[25] With regard to the latter, Plutarch recounts a negative episode: one time, when he was starring as Atreus on stage and had come to the point in the play when the character is plotting revenge against Thyestes, he walked, passed an attendant, struck him with his sceptre and killed him, because "he was beside himself with the impetus of acting".[26] Clearly, while it is true that the element of pathos is generally neither foreign to nor unseemly for an orator – who in the fullness of his role is indeed also required to know how to draw upon this resource in view of persuading his audience – we are here dealing with a case marked by excess, whereby the actor is caught in a frenzy which clouds his mind. Read in its context, therefore, the passage gives the idea of an opposition between oratory and theatricality, the former being presented as a rational activity and the latter as one that can lead to a loss of composure.

Photius chooses to introduce Cicero, therefore, by sending ambiguous signals about his rhetorical skills: on the one hand, Photius presents him in close connection with Demosthenes – who is explicitly said to have been proficient in delivery –[27] but, on the other hand, he raises some suspicion towards this Ciceronian practice, given that Photius must have known the broader context of the quotation offered. This is the first relevant element to bear in mind when it comes to the Patriarch's idea and opinion of the Latin orator, given that previously Cicero had been compared to Medea (who, as is well known, killed her own children in a fit of mad-

23 See on this also Plut. *Reg. Imp. apoph.* 204F.

24 He is Quintus Roscius Gallus, a native of Silonium, perhaps near Lanuvium, on the slopes of Mount Albanus (Cic. *Nat. D.* 1.79; *Div.* 1.79 and 2.66), defended by Cicero in the *Pro Roscio comoedo.* Roscius was a friend of Cicero's (Cic. *Leg.* 1.11), an element that highlights the orator's affinity for the world of theatre – and hence acting.

25 Like the aforementioned Roscius, Clodius Aesopus was also a friend of Cicero's, as we read in Cic. *Div.* 1.80; *Sest.* 120–123, where his name appears among those who voted in favour of his return from exile imposed on him by the tribune Clodius (see also Plut. *Cic.* 31–33). Aesopus stood out for his *gravitas* (Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.111 and Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.82) but also for his passionate character, which fits well within the idea of a loss of rationality we find in the episode quoted by Plutarch in this passage.

26 See Plut. *Cic.* 5.5: ἔξω τῶν ἑαυτοῦ λογισμῶν διὰ τὸ πάθος ὄντα τῷ σκήπτρῳ πατάξαι καὶ ἀνελεῖν ("he killed him by hitting him with the sceptre, since he was out of his mind because of the impetus of acting").

27 Plut. *Cic.* 5.4: λέγεται δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς οὐδὲν ἧττον νοσήσας τοῦ Δημοσθένους περὶ τὴν ὑπόκρισιν ("it is said, however, that he lacked no less than Demosthenes in delivery").

ness)[28] and that the *passiones* typical of theatrical performances can produce consequences of the sort seen with the actor Aesopus.

It should be noted that this subsection is followed by another essentially critical note: Cicero is portrayed in his propensity for jokes and quips, even when this habit could lend itself to unpleasant outcomes. Indeed, irony is close to sarcasm or denigration and has an ambiguous character, since it can please the person it targets but also annoy him or her. Now, Photius appears here to be presenting this characteristic of Cicero from a different perspective: that the Latin orator attributed importance to *facetia* and *iocus* can easily be deduced from many passages in his writings[29] and, for sure, a similar disposition must also be corroborated by his close acquaintance with the aforementioned comedian Roscius; after the simile of the lame man, Plutarch dwells on Cicero's salaciousness[30] (a description omitted by Photius, who draws on another Plutarchian passage highlighting the same feature), but inserted this list of Cicero's character traits in the broader context of data about his life and career. Indeed, immediately afterwards – with the beginning of ch. 6 – Plutarch goes on to present the period in Cicero's life covering his years as *quaestor* in Sicily during a time of famine.[31] The editing and the communication strategy by which Photius restructures this information about Cicero produce a very different effect: after mentioning Cicero's inclination towards *Witz*, Photius attacks Plutarch's idea that it earned the Roman orator quite a lot of opposition and enmity (ἐκ τούτου πολλοῖς γέγονεν ἐπαχθής; "hence he became unbearable to quite a few people"), to the point that a faction was formed to oppose him, gravitating around Clodius (καὶ οἱ μετὰ Κλωδίου συνέστησαν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀρχὴν τοιαύτην λαβόντες; "and Clodius' supporters ganged up against him because of such a grievance"). Thus, a clear climax is outlined in the Photian text, whereby Cicero is presented first as prone to theatricality, then as a figure who did not fail to offend his audience and, finally, as someone who, as a consequence of this behaviour, was disliked by many people. In doing so, Photius skillfully shifts his gaze

28 Concerning the infanticide planned by Medea, cf. the lamentation in Eur. *Med*. 1010–1079.

29 It should be borne in mind that what Cicero admired about Caesar's eloquence was specifically its taste for quips, as stated in Cic. *De or.* 2.216–217. On Cicero's propensity for scathing words, see Haury 1955, esp. 116.

30 This propensity did not fail to lead to *vituperatio*, which earned Cicero many people's hatred and the name of gossipmonger, as noted by Achard 1981, 223–229. The use of ridicule, for instance by targeting the physical defects of one's opponent, is functional and very useful, as Cicero himself notes in *De or.* 2.236; Aristotle also says that effective ridicule requires mocking deformity (*Poet.* 5.1449a; cf. Gudeman 1934, 144) – but without exaggerations, Cicero adds in *De or.* 2.237–239 and *Orat.* 88–90.

31 The office of *quaestor* – the first step of the *cursus honorum* – was filled by Cicero in 75 BCE (Cic. *Brut.* 318; *Cat.* 4.15).

from Cicero's personal life to the political level of the opposition set up against him.

This picture – a decisive one, as we will soon see – nevertheless experiences a momentary interruption, at least apparently: for Photius suddenly moves on to make an observation that prima facie seems rather out of context and incomprehensible, by borrowing from Plutarch's passage d) the idea that τὸ λεπτότατον τοῦ χαλκοῦ νόμισμα κουαδράντην Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσιν. One wonders why Photius may have wished to report this piece of antiquarian erudition here, according to which a bronze coin (or copper coin, since bronze is an alloy of copper and tin) of a smaller cut is called a quadrant in Latin. To understand how things stand, it is necessary to bear in mind what Plutarch writes about Clodia, the sister of the aforementioned Clodius:[32]

> πολλὴ δ' ἦν δόξα καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις δυσὶν ἀδελφαῖς πλησιάζειν τὸν Κλώδιον, ὧν Τερτίαν μὲν Μάρκιος ὁ Ῥήξ, Κλωδίαν δὲ Μέτελλος ὁ Κέλερ εἶχεν, ἣν Κουαδρανταρίαν ἐκάλουν, ὅτι τῶν ἐραστῶν τις αὐτῇ χαλκοῦς ἐμβαλὼν εἰς βαλάντιον ὡς ἀργύριον εἰσέπεμψε· τὸ δὲ λεπτότατον τοῦ χαλκοῦ νόμισμα κουαδράντην Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσιν. Ἐπὶ ταύτῃ μάλιστα τῶν ἀδελφῶν κακῶς ἤκουσεν ὁ Κλώδιος.
>
> it was rumored that Clodius had illicit relations also with the other two sisters: Tertia, married to Marcius Rex, and Clodia, married to Metellus Celer. The latter was nicknamed Quadrantaria, because one of her lovers had sent her a purse of copper instead of silver coins; in fact, the Romans call the smallest copper coin quadrant. Clodius had a bad reputation especially on account of his sister. (transl. by the author)

The picture that is obtained from Plutarch's continuous narrative is clear: Clodius – who had developed a fierce hatred of Cicero – is presented as the brother of Tertia and, above all, of Clodia, a character with a rather dark reputation.[33] Although married to Metellus Celer, she had affairs with various lovers,[34] which earned her the nickname of Quadrantaria (Κουαδρανταρία).[35] This offers Plutarch the chance

32 Plut. *Cic*. 29.5.

33 Clodia, the Lesbia of Catullus (Apul. *Apol.* 10.3), was the wife of Quintus Metellus Celer (see esp. Cic. *Fam*. 5.2.7 and *Att*. 2.1.5); in 56 BCE she was involved in the trial against Caelius, whom she had accused of attempted poisoning and Cicero defended in his *Pro Caelio.*

34 With a refined wink, Cicero (*Cael.* 32) defines Clodia as *amica omnium* (lover of all). One of Clodia's love affairs was her incestuous relationship with her brother Clodius, who in the same passage is ironically defined as both *vir* and *frater* for this reason (cf. also Cic. *QFr.* 2.3.2; *Har. resp.* 9; *Dom.* 92; *Pis.* 28; Vell. Pat. 2.45.1). More generally, Clodius was accused of incestuous relations also with his other two sisters (on which see Plut. *Luc.* 34.1 and 38.1, as well as *Caes.* 10.6), providing an even more rounded picture of his debauchery.

35 Indeed, according to Battaglia 1990, 9 col. a, s.v. *quadrantario*, the word *quadrantaria* in Italian has become a sophisticated synonym for 'messalina', a woman of easy virtue or harlot (albeit often

to offer an erudite explanation:[36] since one of her lovers had paid her with a very small coin (the quadrant), she had been given the nickname of Quadrantaria, that is, of 'cheap woman'.[37] Given this picture, it is easy to understand Plutarch's intention to discredit Clodia and, *de facto*, also Clodius as low-ranking and unreliable characters. By contrast, within the framework of Photius' account, where this contextualisation is lacking, the reference to the quadrant becomes difficult to understand,[38] as it bears no direct relation – or at least no explicit relation – to the figure of Clodia, who is linked by kinship to the Clodius quoted by Photius in the previous sub-section.

At this point Photius brings in the longest pericope written by Plutarch (*Cic*. 46.5–6), the one presenting the way in which the fatal conspiracy against Cicero was hatched. It is worth quoting the Photian text in full again, as an aid to our analysis:

> τὰ δὲ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως οὕτως εἶχεν· ἔδει Κικέρωνος μὲν ἐκστῆναι Καίσαρα, Παύλου δὲ τἀδελφοῦ Λέπιδον, Λευκίου δὲ Καίσαρος Ἀντώνιον, ὃς ἦν θεῖος αὐτῷ πρὸς μητρός. Οὕτως ἐξέπεσον ὑπὸ θυμοῦ καὶ λύσσης τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων λογισμῶν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀπέδειξαν, ὡς οὐδὲν θηρίον ἀνθρώπου ἐστὶν ἀγριώτερον, ἐξουσίαν πάθει προσλαβόντος.[39]

---

of high rank), as we find in Gabriele D'Annunzio ("Le stanze sembrano quelle delle meretrici quadrantarie", *Taccuini*), Giosue Carducci ("Non potendo altro, fanno dello scandalo borghese per le quadrantarie poco alfabete di cotesta spregevole aristocrazia romana", *Lettere*), and in Gian Pietro Lucini ("Messalina, sgualdrina imperiale, quadrantaria ospitale alli angiporti", *Prose e canzoni amare*; "Atleti di sobborgo, rigonfi di muscoli, le braccia pugnaci [...], mantenuti dall'amore anormale delle quadrantarie", *Antidannunziana*; "Venere è quadrantaria", *Gian Pietro de Core*), as well as in *Tradimento e fedeltà* by Augusto Monti ("Poveri ma onesti [...] e non solo l'arte quadrantaria gli manca").

36 Forcellini 1965, s.v. *quadrantarius*, only quotes Plutarch's *Life of Cicero*, besides Quint. *Inst.* 1.8.6, and perhaps ("*fortasse huc pertinet*") Cic. *Cael.* 62. According to *OLD*, s.v. *quadrantarius* (b), we only read, as far as our point is concerned: "of or costing a quarter of an *as* (in quots., referring to the entrance-fee to the baths)", besides again Cic. *Cael.* 62 and mainly Sen. *Ep.* 86.9.

37 But Quintilian (*Inst.* 8.6.53) associates the name with Clytemnestra, who is called *quadrantaria* (Clodia too may have killed her husband, Quintus Metellus Celer, who died mysteriously in 59 BCE: cf. Cic. *Cael.* 59–63). *Quadrantaria*, viz. cheap (Cic. *Cael.* 62 and 69), since the *quadrans* was a quarter of an *as*.

38 Nor – given the linguistic erudition of Photius' annotation, at least in the form in which it has reached us – should we overlook the importance of Photius from a purely lexical perspective. Indeed, Photius also wrote lexicographical texts (see Naber 1864, perhaps an early work, as may be inferred from the *Patrologia Latina* (*PL*), 101, 153C) in some respects comparable to the Suida (cf. Bossi 2002). He also had many lexicons at his disposal, such as that by Aelius Dionysius and the Platonic one pertaining to the *Timaeus* (both in *Bibl.* 151), in addition to the lexicons mentioned in *Bibl.* 145–158 (cf., *inter alia*, Nogara 1975, 234 and 240 n. 80 on Helladius' lexicon in *Bibl.* 145).

39 For the translation of this passage, see above pp. 127–128.

It is immediately clear that Photius carefully reports the conditions of the plot against Cicero and the conspirators' names. In doing so, however, Photius overlooks the political background: before the pericope reproduced above,[40] Plutarch had focused on the establishment of the second triumvirate to restore the *res publica* (*triumviri* or *tresviri rei publicae constituendae*), through the agreement ratified on 27 November 43 BCE by the *lex Titia*, aimed at consolidating this special magistracy (the triumvirate was to have a five-year duration and the faculty to elect magistrates; see Livy *Per.* 120; App. *B. Civ.* 4.1.2). Precisely because Photius is not interested in the broader historical context and problems,[41] he uncritically borrows Plutarch's claim that the agreement was reached in three days, when instead Appian asserts that it was reached in two.[42] As can be seen, Photius focuses on the conspiracy itself, rather than the reasons behind it; therefore, he takes from Plutarch the elements he needs to refashion the event as a tragedy in the making: in the first instance, Photius takes from Plutarch an introductory sentence with a strong dramatic impact, in which he says that Caesar initially tried to save Cicero but eventually abandoned him to his fate. Secondly, Photius – like Plutarch – offers a list of the names of the *triumviri* and of the victims allotted to each, in a sinister division of roles.[43] Finally, Photius selects a *sententia* with a universal character from Plutarch, underlining how man is the most brutish living creature of all when he lets himself be dominated by anger and irrational instincts.

---

40 Plut. *Cic*. 46.4. Among the many possible parallels, cf. Livy *Per.* 120; Flor. 2.16.6; Suet. *Aug*. 12; 27; 96.1; Plut. *Brut.* 27.5 and *Ant*. 19.1; Oros. 6.18.6; Eutr. *Brev.* 7.2; Vell. Pat. 2.65.1–67.1; App. *B. Civ.* 3.14.96 and 4.1.2; Cass. Dio 46.42.

41 Photius does not devote a single word to the geographical context in which the meeting took place, whereas Plutarch recounts that it was held near Bologna, in a place far from the camps and surrounded by a river (Plut. *Cic*. 46.5: περὶ πόλιν Βονωνίαν ἐφ' ἡμέρας τρεῖς, καὶ συνήεσαν εἰς τόπον τινὰ πρόσω τῶν στρατοπέδων, ποταμῷ περιρρεόμενον; "they met for three days near the city of Bologna, in a place far from the fields and surrounded by a river"). Similarly, Cassius Dio (46.55.1) speaks of an islet in a river near Bologna, and Appian (*B. Civ.* 4.2.4) refers to a river called Lavinium; Florus (*Epit.* 2.16b) mentions two rivers between Modena (*Perusiam* for a textual error) and Bologna, perhaps referring to a small peninsula between the Rhine and the Lavinium. It was in Bologna that a proscription list was drawn up with only a few names (12 or 17: see App. *B. Civ.* 4.6.21), including that of Cicero.

42 App. *B. Civ.* 4.1.2.

43 On the whole affair, see Livy *Per.* 120; Flor. 2.16.4; *De vir. ill*. 85.3; Oros. 6.18.11; Vell. Pat. 2.67.3; Cass. Dio 47.6.3 and 8.5. Lucius Aemilius Paulus was *quaestor* in 60 BCE, then *aedilis* in 55 BCE and *consul* in 50 BCE; Plutarch reports that Lepidus desired the death of Paulus' brother (*Ant*. 19.3). Lucius Julius Caesar was *quaestor* in 77 BCE and *consul* in 64 BCE and was the brother of Antonia's mother, Julia, to whom his salvation is attributed (Plut. *Ant.* 20.2 and again Cass. Dio 47.8.5). On the political period, referring to the rhetoric of consent, see Schwartz 1898 (still remarkable).

In general, therefore, this is a section full of historical references, as can be deduced from a comparison with the many historical sources underlying the Plutarchian passage. However, it emerges that in Photius' redaction the historical element is almost left out, as it does not constitute his primary interest. Rather, Photius draws from Plutarch the section we are examining, extrapolating it from the context in such a way as to deprive it – almost 'cleanse' it – of its main function of providing historical confirmation, with the result of heightening its tragic character. The Plutarchian section, once inserted into Photius' context, becomes a miniature drama, where the story of Cicero becomes an almost mythical – yet at the same time very real – narrative of someone who faces death at the hands of his political opponents. While in Plutarch the killing of Cicero is only a moment – albeit an important one – in his life experience, in Photius it is instead the culmination of all the argumentative tension accumulated from the beginning. It may be argued that the episode of Cicero's killing is for Photius the only relevant element in the orator's biography and that all the other elements contribute to this ending. Furthermore, all the other elements introduced serve to prepare and, in a certain way, to justify (or at least to explain) the decision to kill Cicero: as we have seen, he is initially presented by Photius as a lover of theatre with a particular inclination towards jokes; this propensity for quips earned him not a few enemies, which fuelled the anger of Clodius and his associates; finally, we arrive at the real conspiracy of which Cicero was the victim.[44] At this point, Photius – like Plutarch before him – only offers a resigned observation concerning the brutality in which man often indulges, in spite of himself: man is indeed superior to all animals thanks to the light of reason but, when this light is obscured or, worse still, extinguished by the instinctual part, then man is more ferocious than any beast, as the case of the anti-Ciceronian conspirators demonstrates.

In all this, Photius skillfully reworks the material he has selected from his source, so much so that the guiding thread that runs through his choice of passages can be traced back to his desire to create a tragedy centred on Cicero, a tragedy already anticipated – as we have seen – by his reading of Medea during the final hours of life, as reported by Ptolemy Hephaestion. Cicero was fated to live a story similar to that of the Euripidean drama shortly thereafter, transferring into concrete history what until then had been only a literary fancy.[45] In Photius'

44 For Photius the bloody end that Cicero met is, therefore, due to his bold speech first of all and, secondly, to his political attitude; Plutarch had already highlighted ambition as a peculiar trait of Cicero's *animus:* φιλότιμος ὤν ("being ambitious"; Plut. *Cic.* 5.3). Cf., e. g., Lucan's presentation of the figure of Cicero in La Bua 2020, 81–84.

45 In this perspective, however, Plutarch devoted himself to a particularly faithful reconstruction of Cicero's last hours because – as Levi 1933, 2, 206–208, already recalled – Plutarch is the most

artistic reinterpretation – much more than a simple summary – Cicero's existential parable brings myth to reality and poetry to history.

From Photius' narrative about Cicero a consistent yet partial portrait emerges: if Photius' writing were our only source about Cicero's life, we would know nothing about his skills and prestige as an orator, which are completely blotted out by Photius. Cicero is also a rather unique Roman author, inasmuch as he had an excellent command of the Greek language:[46] this trait – which could not have been insignificant for a writer as versed in Greek as Photius – is nevertheless neglected by our author. From what has been said so far, it is clear that Photius instead shapes a story within a story, creating his own Cicero starting from the narrative and the information that he could draw mainly from Plutarch, who for the Patriarch must have served as a treasure trove of information as well as a Greek source of Latin material. One point especially stands out: Photius presents Cicero more than anything else in terms of his political engagement.[47] While it is true that only minimal space is assigned to Cicero's oratory technique, no mention at all is made of the great weight that he had in the philosophical field:[48] Photius is anx-

faithful source about the orator's death, notwithstanding the fact that Plutarch must also have drawn upon testimonies very close to the events described, such as Octavian (who turned to Cicero to find a way out of the dangerous isolation he had been forced into: cf. p. 218, which considers Plut. *Cic*. 45.6 as being drawn *ex sermonibus Augusti*) and Tiro, Cicero's own freedman (the fact that the latter did not mention Philologus' betrayal could only come from Tiro himself: cf. Plut. *Cic*. 49.4). On Plutarch's working habit of reading and taking notes while reading, cf. Plut. *De tranq. anim.* 464F and *De cohib. ira* 457D.

46 Plut. *Cic*. 4.6 reports that in Rhodes the rhetorician Apollonius Molon, not understanding the Latin language, asked Cicero to speak in Greek. Cicero then offered a performance that astonished all onlookers and earned him the highest praise: λέγεται δὲ τὸν Ἀπολλώνιον οὐ συνιέντα τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν διάλεκτον δεηθῆναι τοῦ Κικέρωνος Ἑλληνιστὶ μελετῆσαι […] ἐπεὶ δ' ἐμελέτησε, τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ἐκπεπλῆχθαι καὶ διαμιλλᾶσθαι πρὸς ἀλλήλους τοῖς ἐπαίνοις ("it is said that Apollonius, not understanding the Latin language, asked Cicero to declaim in Greek […] after he finished the talk, the others were amazed and competed to praise him"). Cicero himself does not fail to speak of his knowledge of Greek (cf. Cic. *Brut.* 310 and *Fin*. 1.6 where he remembers that the Greek language proved to be of great use to him in carrying out his activities; cf. Boldrer 2003 and also Grimal 1987, 23–24). In *Cic*. 40.2, Plutarch describes the finesse with which Cicero translated the technical Greek lexicon of philosophical works into Latin. On Cicero's deep knowledge of all things Greek, see Marrou 1948, 350–355, Boyancé 1956, 119–120, and Desmouliez 1976, 99. More generally, see also Bishop 2019.

47 In the light of Photius' taste, it can therefore be said that the *Bibliotheca* presents Cicero neither as a Roman Plato nor as a Latin Demosthenes (to take up the discussion and expressions found in Bishop 2015), but as a politician destined to meet a tragic fate.

48 This should not be surprising, if it is true that Photius was the direct heir to the shining Greek tradition that gave birth to philosophy: in this perspective, a Roman like Cicero could only offer a mere reflection of the philosophical tradition that had arisen in Greece (that philosophy was a pe-

ious to grasp only Cicero's political side – and he does so from an essentially tragic perspective, constructing a dramatic cameo of Cicero.

culiarly Greek thing is also be demonstrated by the fact that philosophy teachers in Rome were sometimes regarded as immigrants and strangers, albeit belonging to an intellectual class; see Hunger 1987, 18–20 and 25). On Cicero and philosophy, see mainly Lévy 1992, Vesperini 2012, 410–421, Auvray-Assayas 2018, and Steel 2018, as well as Tsouni and Oliva in this volume.

Vasileios Pappas

Greek Translations of Cicero's Works in the Nineteenth Century

Introduction

Cicero the Translator and his Reception

Cicero was the first to realise the great value of translation, as he rendered several Greek works into Latin. He was also the first to make the distinction between the *ad verbum* (verbatim) and the *ad sensum* (attributing the sense to words) forms of translation, adopting the latter as his style of translation,[1] a practice that other Latin authors also followed after him, including Horace, Pliny the Younger, Quintilian, and St. Jerome.[2] Cicero translated Aratus' *Phaenomena* into Latin hexameters (we have approximately five hundred verses of this translation).[3] In *De officiis* 2.87, he also informs us that in his youth he translated Xenophon.[4] Sidonius Apollinaris (*Epist.* 2.9.4) mentions Cicero's translation of Demosthenes' *De corona*, adding that Jerome had also read it.[5] Regarding his translations of Greek philosophical works, we know that he rendered into Latin Plato's *Timaeus.* In fact, he included many passages by the Greek philosopher into his own works, which he translated into Latin himself.[6] Furthermore, Cicero included fourteen Latin translated passages from Greek tragic poets within his works,[7] as indicatively in Cic. *Tusc.* 2.20–22, where he cites his Latin translation of Sophocles' *Trachiniae* 1046–1102,[8] and 2.23–25, where he includes in his narration a translated passage from Aeschylus' *Prom-*

1 Cic. *Opt. gen.* 13–14: *nec converti ut intepres, sed ut orator, sententiis isdem et earum formis tamquam figuris, verbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis* ("I did not translate as an interpreter, but as an orator, maintaining the same ideas and the same form, by words that are harmonised to our customs"; here and after transl. by the author).

2 See Munday 2001, 20–21; Robinson [2]2002, 15 and 18–19; Weissbort/Eysteinsson 2006, 26–27; Missiou 2012, 31.

3 Glucker 2015, 37. For the possible dates of this translation, see Soubiran 1972, 9–14.

4 Altman 2015b, 10.

5 MacCormack 2013, 290.

6 Glucker 2015, 37.

7 See Karamalengou 2003, 113, where she mentions that these passages are: nine from *Tusculanae disputationes* (1.115; 2.20–22; 2.23; 3.29; 3.59; 3.67; 3.71; 3.76; 4.63), two from *De officiis* (3.82; 3.108), and one each from *De divinatione* (2.12), *De finibus* (2.105), and *De natura deorum* (2.65) respectively.

8 For this translation, see Gasti 2003.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779-010

etheus Lyomenos (whose original Greek is now lost).[9] Aside from his translation practice, Cicero was also the first scholar to deal with translation theory, introducing new terms to render Greek texts into Latin,[10] and highlighting the use of the translation as a pedagogical tool to improve an orator's skills.[11]

The reception of Cicero, from the imperial period through to our modern era, is a subject that has been studied prolifically by several scholars.[12] The large number of mediaeval manuscripts,[13] the Renaissance Ciceronianism[14] (the imitation of Cicero by several scholars in this period, such as Matteo Palmieri),[15] and Cicero's impact on their own works (e. g. in Leonardo Bruni)[16] all demonstrate that he was a well-studied author up to recent times.[17] As Marsh notes, Brunetto Latini, Dante's teacher, translated part of the *De inventione* with the title *Rettorica* (1260), and a few years later produced Tuscan versions of *Pro Ligario*, *Pro rege Deiotaro* and *Pro Marcello.*[18] Between 1460 and 1700 we have over three hundred editions of and commentaries on Cicero's rhetorical works.[19] Scholars made vernacular translations of Cicero, and his philosophical works *De officiis*, *De amicitia*, *De senectute*, *Paradoxa Stoicorum* and *Tusculanae disputationes* were also translated in English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish between 1468 and 1561.[20] The great German Lutheran reformer, Philip Melanchthon (1497–1560), composed many editions as well as commentaries on Cicero's works, which were used as textbooks in the University of Wittenberg, where he also gave several lectures on Cicero.[21] The Enlightenment contributed to the diffusion of Cicero's works even more, as it "brought enormous progress in the production of printed books: printing and paper became

9 For Cicero's translations from Greek, see Jones 1959; Gamberale 1973; Powell 1995; Chinnici 2000; Kopeczky 2009; White 2015. For Latin translations of Greek works in general, see, indicatively, Traina 1970; Lewis 1986; Kytzler 1989; Vaiopoulos 2010; McElduff 2013; Deligiannis 2017a and 2020.
10 Fyntikoglou 2003, 87, who notes that Cicero added the terms *interpretari*, *explicare*, *reddere*, and *transferre* to the traditional (pre-Ciceronian) *vertere* and *exprimere.*
11 Robinson 1992, 19–34.
12 See, indicatively, Cowing 2013; MacCormack 2013; Fox 2013; Cole 2013; Fotheringham 2013; Altman 2015b; Keeline 2018; La Bua 2019.
13 See Ward 2015, 313; La Bua 2019, 55–99.
14 Grafton, 2010; McLaughlin 2016.
15 Marsh 2013, 313.
16 Ianziti 2000.
17 For the study of Cicero's rhetoric works in the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance, see Cox/Ward 2006.
18 Marsh 2013, 309–310.
19 Marsh 2013, 309.
20 Marsh 2013, 313.
21 Springer 2018, 131–135.

cheaper, and the reading public grew".[22] During this period, many translations of Cicero's works began to be published across Europe, and continued into the nineteenth century.[23] Indicatively, I mention Jonathan Swift's translation of a passage from the *Verrines* in 1710,[24] and William Melmoth's translations of *Epistulae ad familiares* in 1753, and of *De senectute* in 1773.[25] The existence of a large number of commentaries on Cicero's works from Late Antiquity (Asconius, Macrobius, Victorinus) until the sixteenth century (e. g. those by Antonio Loschi,[26] Giorgio Merula,[27] Daniele Barbaro, Johannes Rosa and Giulio Castellani) prove that the study of Cicero's text and ideas was widespread and long-lived.[28] In the eighteenth century, we have several editions, also accompanied by commentaries, including those by P. Victorius *et al.* (1724), and P. J. Thoulier d' Olivet (1740).[29] Finally, many editions, translations and commentaries on Cicero were composed during the nineteenth century (e. g. Francis Barham's translation of *De re publica* in 1822),[30] a phenomenon that increased during the modern era (the twentieth and twenty-first centuries).[31]

The existence of many translations of Cicero's works in several European languages is fully justified by the dominant position that the Latin language and literature occupied in the educational system of Renaissance Europe, and especially after the sixteenth century (the centuries following the Reformation).[32] Cicero also played a dominant role in the curricula of Italian grammar schools during the fifteenth century.[33] In seventeenth-and-eighteenth-century France, Latin – and more specifically Cicero – was widely taught in schools and universities; however, this changed following the French Revolution, when Latin began to lose its important position.[34] The Latin language (in its written and oral form), and Cicero,

22 Fox 2013, 320.
23 Fox 2013, 320–321.
24 Fox 2013, 322.
25 Fox 2013, 331.
26 Marsh 2013, 307.
27 Marsh 2013, 310.
28 Marsh 2013, 313–314.
29 Fox 2013, 327 n. 24.
30 Cole 2013, 346.
31 For Cicero in the nineteenth century, see Cole 2013. For Cicero in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, see Fotheringham 2013.
32 Springer 2018, 157.
33 Black 1996.
34 Springer 2018, 157.

was also dominant in other countries of Europe from the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries (England, Germany, Spain, Switzerland, and Poland).[35]

Latin in the Greek-Speaking World

In the Greek-speaking world (which I define as the inhabitants of mainland Greece, the Ionian Islands, the islands of the Aegean Sea, but also those who lived in the Greek East, i. e. in Asia Minor, Constantinople, and the Black Sea), things were different. During the age between the early Byzantine Empire and the twelfth century, knowledge of Latin was mainly focused on the fields of grammar, law and administration.[36] Nevertheless, a few translations of Latin works (of pagan and Christian Latin authors) into the Greek language were produced. Indicatively, I mention the ancient Greek translations of Cicero's *Catilinarians* in the fourth century,[37] and of Eutropius' *Breviarium ab urbe condita* by Paenius and Capito in approximately 380 and 600, respectively.[38] Furthermore, it seems that a small number of Byzantine authors were influenced by Latin literature, such as Agathias and John Malalas.[39]

During the thirteenth – probably because of the Latinocracy (1204–1261) of Byzantium – and fourteenth centuries, we observe a light flourishing of Greek translations of Latin works. Maximus Planudes (ca 1255–ca 1305) translated into Greek Caesar's *De bello Gallico*,[40] Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and *Heroides*,[41] Macrobius' *Commentarii* on Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*,[42] Boethius' *Consolatio philosophiae*,[43] and

35 Springer 2018, 158–162. The same scholar notes that even in post-Petrine Russia "there were 26 colleges by 1750 with a Latin curriculum" (Springer 2018, 160).

36 See Pellizzari 2019; Signes Codoñer 2019; Rosellini/Yanes 2019; Baratin 2019; Bochove 2019.

37 Rochette 2019, 299.

38 For these translations, see Trivolis 1941; Baffetti 1922; Roberto 2003; Rochette 2019, 302–304. Also, I must note the existence of a paraphrase in Modern Greek of Paenius' ancient Greek translation by Neophytos Doukas, and the dictionary of the names of men existing in the Latin work by the same scholar in 1807; see Pappas 2014. For an overview of Greek translations of Latin works in Byzantium, see Rochette 2019. For a general sketch of translations from Latin from the fifteenth to nineteenth centuries, see Nikitas 2001 and 2020; Mavrelos 2020.

39 For the impact of Ovid on Agathias, see Alexakis 2008. For the existence of Latin literature in John Malalas, see Gengler 2019. For Latin models of Greek works of this era, see also Agosti 2019; Gastgeber 2019; Roberto 2019; Mecella 2019.

40 Tromaras 1999, 292.

41 For Planudes' translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, see Fisher 1990; Megas 1998; Papathomopoulos/Tsavari 2002. For his translation of *Heroides*, see Papathomopoulos 1976; Michalopoulos 2003.

42 Megas 1995.

Augustine's *De Trinitate* and pseudo-Augustine's *De duodecim abusivis saeculi.*[44] Scholars disagree on a Greek translation of Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* made in the fourteenth or fifteenth century, as most attribute it to Planudes, while a few believe that it belongs to Theodore Gaza (1398–1478).[45] Manuel Olovolos (1245–1310) and Prochoros Kydones (1330–1369) translated into Greek Boethius' *De topicis differentiis*,[46] and Demetrius Kydones translated the *Soliloquia* of pseudo-Augustine.[47] Theodore Gaza translated Cicero's *De senectute* in 1500, which according to Ciccolella, is his "only authentic translation from Latin to Greek".[48] Cicero greatly affected the rhetorical work of George of Trebizond (1395–1472),[49] and the political theory of Nikolaos Mavrokordatos (1670–1730), the Greek prince of the Danube Principalities.[50]

During the period from the Fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks (1453) until the Greek War of Independence (1821), we mainly find: Greek translations of Latin works that covered ancient Greek (and Roman) history and mythology (indicatively: Justin's *Epitome of Trogus* by Ioannis Makolas in 1686 and Daniel Philippidis in 1817, who also translated Florus' *Epitome rerum Romanarum* in 1818,[51] Cornelius Nepos' *De viris illustribus* by Spyridon Vlantis in 1798,[52] several translations of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, etc.);[53] a few translations of famous Latin poems (such as the translations of Virgil's *Aeneid* and *Georgics* in 1791/1792 and 1796, respectively, into Homerising language and metre by Eugenios Voulgaris);[54] several translations from Neo-Latin philosophical, theological, and scientific treatises;[55] and several Greek renderings of Neo-Latin literature works, such as the translation of Ambrosio Marliano's *Theatrum politicum* by John Abramios in 1758,[56] and that

43 Megas 1996.

44 Papathomopoulos *et al.* 1995; Giannakis 1974.

45 For the attribution of this translation to Planudes, see Sathas 1868, 40; Sfoini 1993, 325; Tromaras 1999, 292. Sebastiano Ciampi (1769–1847; for his life and works, see: http://www.forteguerriana.comune.pistoia.it/ciampi-sebastiano, seen: 10.02.2021) published the work under the name of Planudes as translator in 1816 (Ciampi 1816). On this subject, see Deligiannis 2015, 36*–37* and Deligiannis in this volume.

46 Nikitas 1990.

47 Koltsiou-Nikita 2005.

48 Ciccolella 2020, 50, and her entire paper for this translation.

49 Classen 1993; Calboli 2008.

50 Noutsos 1982.

51 For these translations, see Pappas 2020, 2015 and 2016, respectively.

52 Nikitas 1998a.

53 Nikitas 2012.

54 Papaioannou 2008 and 2018; Paschalis 2018.

55 Athanasiadou *et al.* 2019, 198.

56 Michalopoulos/Michalopoulos 2020.

of Comenius' *Orbis pictus* by Anthimos Papas in 1806.[57] These translations were influenced by the Greek Enlightenment and were probably used to teach Latin during the late eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century at progressive Greek schools (in Iași, Bucharest, in the Patriarchal School of Constantinople, in Smyrna, in Chios and in Milies of Pelion).[58] The Greek translations of Latin works (as well as those from modern European languages) are included in the spirit of Adamantios Korais' (1748–1833) μετακένωσις (i. e. the utilisation of the western achievements of his era by the Greek enslaved nation), and are fully justified by the belief of Dimitrios Katartzis (1730–1807) and Iosipos Moisiodakas (1725–1800) that translation could contribute to an awakening of the Greek nation.[59]

Greek translations of Latin works in the period between 1453 and 1821 were few in comparison to Europe and, in fact, individual cases. Most Greeks did not consider Latin literature to be a part of their own cultural heritage; so, they remained stuck in the glorious past of ancient Greece and their belief that ancient Greek literature was superior to Latin, which was considered a mere copy of the former.[60] However, the number of Greek translations of Latin works increased significantly after the foundation of the Greek State (1830), as well as the Ottonian University of Athens (1837). The Bavarian kingship of Greece planned the curricula (in 1836) based on German models, and thus Latin had a dominant role in Greek high schools and the University, a role that was maintained during the nineteenth century, albeit with various fluctuations.[61] It is rather surprising that most of the Greek translations of Latin works during the period between 1453 and 1821 were composed in *dimotiki*, the language of the people, a practice that changed after the foundation of the Greek State. The *katharevousa* (a kind of mixture of ancient and modern Greek) was adopted as the official language of education and administration – a factor that also affected the Greek translations of Latin works, as most were made by high school teachers and university professors, and were used by pupils and students. The conflict between *dimotiki* and *katharevousa* and their representatives formed the basis of the so-called 'Greek language question' (i. e. the adoption of one of these two dialects for education, administration, and literature),

57 For this translation, see the database "Greek translations of Latin works since 1453", at http://gtll.lit.auth.gr/node/84 (seen: 20.12.2020).

58 Athanasiadou *et al.* 2019, 197. See also, Chatzopoulos 1991, 247, 257–258; Skarveli-Nikolopoulou 1994, 199–208.

59 Patsiou 1993; Kehagioglou 1998; Tabaki 2018. For an overview of Greek scholars with Latin knowledge for the period between 1204–1980, see Banou-Tsiami 2003.

60 Athanasiadou *et al.* 2019, 199.

61 Zioga 2015, 19–40; Karakasis/Sarra 2017, 290–293. For the teaching of Latin literature at the University of Athens in the nineteenth century, see Matthaiou 2021, 302–320, and Nikitas 2023.

which lasted for almost one and a half centuries (and included the loss of human lives).[62] This dichotomy affected the intellectual milieu of Greece of the nineteenth century. Thus, the poets of the Old Athenian School (1830–1880) adopted the *katharevousa* in their prototype works and their translations (they followed the *ad verbum* translation, and even adopted prosodic metres for their translations from ancient poems),[63] while the New Athenian School (1880–1920) adopted modern Greek and the *ad sensum* translation.[64] The Heptanesian School (from late eighteenth until late nineteenth centuries) had made this progressive choice long ago.[65] We must not forget – for the latter School in particular – that it consisted of poets and scholars with an excellent knowledge of Latin (Dionysios Solomos, Lorentzos Mavilis, Iakovos Polylas, Nikolaos Kogevinas), a fact that is apparent in their own works as well as their Greek translations of Latin works (e. g. Mavilis' translation of the *Aeneid*, Polylas' and Kogevinas' translations of certain elegies from Tibullus, etc.)[66] and is justified by the dominant position of Latin in the Ionian Islands, which were under Venetian rule until their incorporation into the Greek State in 1864.[67] The 'language question' also affected the Greek translations of Latin works. Thus, those that were composed for educational use (i. e. the translations of Cicero, Caesar, Catullus, Cornelius Nepos, Virgil, Livy, Ovid, Horace, and Tacitus)[68] were made mainly in *katharevousa*, a language that was far from the spoken language, usually adhered strictly to the words of the original (*ad verbum*), and were accompanied by commentaries. The truth is that these translations were mainly technical school textbooks, and of little literary value.[69]

Cicero was one of the Roman authors favoured in the Greek educational system of the nineteenth century. During the period 1836–1855, several of his works were taught in the Greek Secondary Education (see the Appendix at the end of this volume). In the curriculum of 1897, the teaching of the first and second *Cati-*

62 For the 'Greek language question', see Beaton 1999, 296–346; Athanasiadou *et al*. 2019, 200.
63 For the Old Athenian School, see, indicatively, Dimaras 1982; Moullas 1993; Vagenas 2000; Pappas 2018, 10.
64 For the New Athenian School, see Karvelis 2003, 27–36; Pappas 2018, 10.
65 For the Heptanesian School, see Pylarinos 2003; Pappas 2018, 10 n. 59. See also, Polylas 1891.
66 Athanasiadou *et al*. 2019.
67 Karapidakis 2020; Pylarinos/Vaiopoulos 2020. For the translation theories of Greek poets of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, see Missiou 2012.
68 For a catalogue of Greek translations, studies, and papers for these Latin authors (for the period 1204–1980), see Banou-Tsiami 2003, 101–102 (for Caesar); 104 (for Catullus); 107–115 (for Cicero); 131–132 (for Cornelius Nepos); 118–125 (for Horace); 154–160 (for Virgil); 127 (for Livy); 133–136 (for Ovid); 149 (for Tacitus). For Tacitus, see also Gasti/Polymerakis 2017. See also the Introduction to this section of the volume.
69 Nikitas 2012, 105–107.

linarians, *Pro Ligario*, *Pro Marcello*, *De imperio Cn. Pompei*, Books One and Three of *De officiis*, and *Tusculanae disputationes* were defined for the fourth grade of the Greek high school (Gymnasium).[70] In 1900, Greek pupils in the third grade of high school had to be able to interpret one or more Ciceronian works (indicatively: *Pro Archia poeta*, the first or the second *Catilinarians*, *Pro Ligario*, *Pro Marcello*, and *De imperio Cn. Pompei*).[71] Cicero remained one of the main protagonists of the Greek curricula during the twentieth century (along with Caesar, Virgil, Horace, and Ovid), until the reformation of 1984, which paused the interpretation of passages of several Roman authors and poets, and established three main goals for the course: the learning of a basic vocabulary of the Latin language and the study of Latin grammar and syntax.[72] Furthermore, Cicero was (and remains) one of the main authors in the programmes of studies at Philology Departments of Greece from 1837 until the present day.[73]

The Nineteenth-Century Greek Translations of Cicero

Cicero was the most translated Roman author in nineteenth-century Greece,[74] as many of his works were included in the curricula of schools and of the university, thus the need for Greek translations of his works was great. As a result of my research, I have managed to find twenty-seven translations of several of his works. The majority of these were used for educational reasons, i. e. as textbooks for pupils attending the high schools and the University of Athens for Latin courses. This is why their translators mostly followed the *ad verbum* translation theory and supplemented their translations with introductions, which offer valuable information on Cicero's life and works. They also feature brief commentaries in the footnotes, where they include several interpretive and historical comments. In a few cases, they explain the translation practice they followed within their prologues and introductions. Some of these include the Latin text, while others do not. As they were used for predominantly educational reasons, most of Cicero's Greek translations from the nineteenth century were in *katharevousa*, the official language of the

70 Zioga 2015, 34–35; Karakasis/Sarra 2017, 293.

71 Zioga 2015, 37. For a catalogue of Greek translations of Cicero (from Latin and from European languages, such as Italian) for the period 1500–1981, see Banou-Tsiami 2003, 107–111.

72 Zioga 2015, 41–85; Karakasis/Sarra 2017, 294–301. See also, Nikitas 1998b.

73 Nikitas 2017. For a presentation of Greek translations of and commentaries on Cicero, see the Appendix at the end of this volume.

74 See also the Appendix at the end of this volume.

Greek State and education. Alongside these translations, a few school textbooks with the Latin text and notes also circulated for educational reasons.[75] In this section, I present the Greek translations of Ciceronian works, which were published in the nineteenth century.[76] In order to better organise this material, I divide my study into three categories: a) translations of Cicero's philosophical works; b) translations of Cicero's rhetorical works; and c) a translation of Cicero's epistles. The focus of my research are the authors of these translations and the reasons

75 Cf., e. g., the anonymous 1835 (Cicero's *Laelius* or *De amicitia*, containing only the Latin text); the leaflets made by Karolos Favrikios 1844 and 1868 (selected orations by Cicero, containing the Latin text and notes on them); Michael Gkiolmas 1878 (Cicero's *Pro lege Manilia* and *Pro Archia poeta*) and 1879 (Cicero's first and second *Philippics*), containing a prologue, introduction, the Latin texts and notes; Evangelos Kofiniotis 1880 (Cicero's first and fourth *Catilinarians*, including the Latin texts and notes); Eustratios Tsakalotos 1893 (Cicero's selected orations, containing an introduction, the Latin text and many comments in the footnotes); Dimitrios Chatzimichail 1898 (the first and fifth Books of Cicero's *Tusculanae disputationes*, containing only the Latin text). I must note that Gkiolmas consciously chose not to include Greek translations of the Ciceronian works he examines in his books. He justifies his choice, noting in the prologue of his first book (p. δ΄): Δὲν προσέθηκα δὲ καὶ μετάφρασιν ἢ καὶ παράφρασιν τῶν λόγων τούτων, ὥσπερ νῦν πολλοὶ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἐκδοτῶν ποιοῦσι, διότι πενταετὴς ἐν τῷ Γυμνασίῳ πεῖρα, καὶ ἄλλοι ἀρχαιότεροι καὶ περὶ τὴν διδασκαλίαν ἐμπειρότεροι μ' ἐδίδαξαν, ὅτι αἱ τοιαῦται μεταφράσεις εἰς οὐδὲν ἄλλο συντελοῦσιν, εἰμὴ εἰς τὸ ὑποθάλπωσι τὴν συνήθη εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς φυγοπονία, κακὸν ὀλέθριον διά τε τὸν μαθητικὸν καὶ τὸν μετ' ἔπειτα βίον τῶν νέων, καὶ ῥίζαν πάσης κακίας, καθιστῶσαι αὐτοὺς ἧττον ζητητικοὺς καὶ ἀμνημονεστέρους τῶν δεδιδαγμένων ("I did not add a translation or a paraphrase of these orations, as many of our editors do now, because my five years' experience and other older and more experienced teachers advised me that translations of this kind offer nothing to the pupils. On the contrary, they make them lazy as usual, a fact that is a disastrous calamity for their student life and their life after school. This bad practice is the root of every malice, as the translations make them demanding and forgetful of everything they were taught"). Gkiolmas' books were used by Doukakis and Livieratos in their translations (see below). Livieratos also used Favrikios' book (see below).

76 My main sources of research were the "Anemi" website of the University of Crete (https://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/, seen: 20.12.2020), the database of the "Greek translations of Latin works since 1453" (http://gtll.lit.auth.gr/, seen: 20.12.2020), as well as several Greek Libraries such as the National Library of Greece (EBE), the Library of the Greek Literary and Historical Archive (ΕΛΙΑ) hosted in the Benaki Museum (Athens), the Public Central Library of Veria, the Koventarios Municipal Library of Kozani and the Vikelaia Municipal Library of Heraklion. I must note that the quotations from the Library of the Greek Literary and Historical Archive (ΕΛΙΑ) come from the "Bibliological Laboratory 'Philippos Iliou'", which contains the bibliographical recordings of the book of Iliou/Polemi 2006. This is why, when I quote from the copies I found at the Library of the Greek Literary and Historical Archive, I note their recording numbers, e. g. for Farantatos' translation, I note: ΕΛΙΑ, see Iliou/Polemi no 1880.553. For each book, I note its location in each library (its link, if it is accessible online, or its call number, if it is available only in print). The English translations of the Greek texts are my own throughout the paper.

why they produced them (this is why I mainly study the paratexts of their books, i. e. the prologues or introductions – however, in a few cases I examine samples of the translations themselves). At the end of the paper, I present my conclusions.

Greek Translations of Cicero's Philosophical Works

The philosophical Ciceronian works that were translated into Greek in the nineteenth century were the *De re publica*, its most famous part, namely the *Somnium Scipionis* (= *De re publica* 6.9–29), *Laelius* or *De amicitia*, the *Tusculanae disputationes*, and the *De officiis.* As we will see, some of these were produced for educational reasons, while some were intended for the political and philosophical awakening of the Greek nation, which had been deprived of education for almost four hundred years (under the rule of the Ottoman Turks).

The first modern Greek translation of Cicero's ***Somnium Scipionis*** was made probably in 1831 by **Georgios Tertsetis** (1800–1873),[77] a Greek judge, scholar and poet from Zakynthos, who was a member of the Heptanesian School, which justifies the language choice of translation, namely modern Greek (*dimotiki*).[78] Tertsetis' family came from Marseille and was Catholic. He studied law and attended courses on Italian literature at the Universities of Bologna and Padua. He was a member of the Filiki Etairia (i. e. the Society of Friends, a secret organisation that contributed to the Greek War of Independence in 1821),[79] and was the only judge not to sign the condemnation of Theodoros Kolokotronis, the main leader of the Greek War of Independence of 1821, in the trial of Nauplion (1834). His origin and studies justify his knowledge of Latin language and literature. Furthermore, his political activity proves that he was a man with national consciousness, interested in the awakening of his enslaved compatriots.

The translation was first published by Konomos in 1959 and later in 1984, in collective volumes that contained all of his unpublished works and then all of his works, respectively.[80] According to Konomos, the translation was made in

77 Tertsetis 1831 (?).

78 For Tertsetis' life and work, see http://www.ekebi.gr/frontoffice/portal.asp?cpage=NODE&cnode=461&t=575 (seen: 28.12.2020).

79 For Filiki Etairia, see Vournas 1982.

80 Konomos 1959, 127–135, and Konomos 1984, 877–880.

1831.[81] It does not include a prologue of the translator nor the Latin text or footnotes. Here is a sample of Tertsetis' translation (Cic. *Rep*. 6.9):

> Ὅταν ἦτον ὕπατος ὁ Μανίλιος, ἐγὼ ἐπῆγα εἰς τὴν Ἀφρικὴ δήμαρχος, ὡς ἠξεύρετε, εἰς τὸ τέταρτο τάγμα τοῦ στρατεύματος, καὶ δὲν εἶχα ἄλλη προθυμία, παρὰ νὰ σμίξω τὸν βασιλέα Μασινίσσαν, ὁ ὁποῖος διὰ δίκαιες αἰτίες ἦτον ἀκριβὸς φίλος τῆς φαμελιᾶς μου. Καὶ ὡς τὸν εἶδα καὶ μὲ εἶδε, μ' ἀγκάλιασε ὁ γέρος κι ἐδάκρυσε· κι ἔπειτα, κοιτάζοντας τὰ οὐράνια, "Σ' εὐχαριστῶ", εἶπε, "μέγα καὶ ὕψιστε Ἥλιε, εὐχαριστῶ ὅλους τοὺς ἄλλους οὐράνιους θεούς, ἐπειδὴ πρὶν νὰ χωρίσω ἀπὸ τὴν ζωήν, θωρῶ εἰς τὸ βασίλειόν μου καὶ εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν μου κατοικίαν τὸν Π(όπλιον) Κορνήλιον Σκιπίωνα, μὲ τοῦ ὁποίου τὸ ὄνομα ὅλος ἀναγαλλιάζω καὶ ξανανιώνω· γιατὶ ποτὲ δὲν βγαίνει ἀπὸ τὸ νοῦ μου ἡ ἐνθύμηση τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ κι ἀνδρειωμένου Σκιπίωνος, τοῦ θείου σου." Ἔπειτα, ἐγὼ διὰ τὸ βασίλειόν του, αὐτὸς διὰ τὴν πολιτείαν μας, ἐρωτηθήκαμε καὶ μὲ τὰ συχνομιλήματα πέρασε ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμέρα.
>
> When Manilius was consul, I went to Africa as commander of the fourth order of the army, as you know, and I had no other desire but to meet the king Masinissa, who was a unique friend of my family for reasonable causes. And, as I saw him and he saw me, the old man hugged me and cried; "I thank you", he said, "great and sublime Sun, I thank all the celestial gods, because, before separating from life, I see in my kingdom and in my home itself Publius Cornelius Scipio, by whose name I rejoice and renew myself; because the reminiscence of your kind and brave Scipio, your uncle, never leaves my mind". After that, I asked him about his kingdom, he asked me about our republic, and the day passed with our frequent discussions. (transl. by the author)

As we can see, several types of modern Greek are included, such as τῆς φαμελιᾶς μου, ξανανιώνω and συχνομιλήματα. Moreover, Tertsetis does not mention the oldest Greek translation of *Somnium Scipionis* by Planudes (or Theodore Gaza), as Viaros Kapodistrias does (see below). The reasons for this highly interesting translation are unknown. Tertsetis had worked as a teacher of French and history in the preliminary school of Nauplion since 1832, and later as professor of military history at the Military School in the same town, so perhaps he taught this part of *De re publica* in these schools.[82] However, his progressive character, along with the language of his translation, makes me believe that he addressed this translation to a wider readership. Perhaps the historical context justifies his translation: one year had passed since the official foundation (1830) of the modern Greek State (with its then highly restricted boundaries), and perhaps Tertsetis aimed to offer his compatriots some great historical examples from the past (after all, we know that Byzantine and post-Byzantine Greeks considered Roman history to be part of their own history; cf. Philippidis' translations of Trogus and Florus).

81 Konomos 1984, 15–16.

82 See http://www.ekebi.gr/frontoffice/portal.asp?cpage=NODE&cnode=461&t=575 (seen: 28.12.2020).

Almost within the same historical and political conditions and for the same reasons, is placed the translation of ***De re publica*** by **Viaros Kapodistrias** (1774–1842), published in 1839 and discussed in detail by Deligiannis in this volume. Kapodistrias, who signed his book by using the acronym A. St., was the brother of the first governor of Greece, Ioannis Kapodistrias (1776–1831), a lawyer, politician and scholar from Corfu.[83] His origin probably justifies the choice of the translation language, which may be *katharevousa*, albeit a mild variant, including several types of *dimotiki.*[84]

The second Ciceronian philosophical work that was translated into Greek twice is ***Laelius* or *De amicitia*.** The first translation was done by **D. G. Petridis** and was published in 1859.[85] We know almost nothing about him, except that he was a student at the School of Philosophy at the University of Athens, and that he also wrote a manual with instructions for teaching in primary schools.[86] Petridis' book includes a prologue and the Greek translation (with brief footnotes). Petridis begins with a dedication to an anonymous man,[87] whom he calls 'friend' (Φίλε!), and cites two verses by Homer, i. e. *Od*. 8.585–586: ἐπεὶ οὐ μέν τι κασιγνήτοιο χερείων | γίγνεται ὅς κεν ἐταῖρος ἐὼν πεπνυμένα εἰδῇ ("Because the friend is better than the brother, as long as he has an understanding heart").[88] It seems that this friend was his fellow student and very close to the translator:

> Εἰς τίνα ἄλλον τὴν μικρὰν ταύτην τῶν πόνων μου ἀπαρχὴν πρεπωδέστερον ἤθελον ἀφιερώσει, ἀφοῦ τοῦτο εἴθισται, καὶ ἔστιν ὁ λόγος περὶ φιλίας, ἢ εἰς σὲ μεθ' οὗ καὶ τὸν ἥλιον πρῶτον εἶδον, καὶ συναναστραφεὶς, καὶ ἐπὶ μακρὸν συσπουδάσας συνδέομαι διὰ τῆς ἀρρήκτου ἐκείνης φιλίας;[89]
>
> To whom else could I dedicate this small beginning of my pains, since this is a common practice, and the subject of the book is friendship? To whom else than you, with whom I saw the sun for the first time, with whom I am spending my time? You have been a fellow student of mine for a long time and I have been associated with you in an unbroken friendship. (transl. by the author)

His friend had illustrious ancestors who contributed to the liberation of Greece. He mentions a man called Panoutsos (perhaps Panoutsos Notaras (1752–1849), a poli-

83 *Εκπαιδευτική Ελληνική Εγκυκλοπαίδεια – Παγκόσμιο Βιογραφικό Λεξικό* 1991, vol. 4, 262.
84 See http://gtll.lit.auth.gr/node/223 (seen: 28.12.2020) and https://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/metadata/4/f/8/metadata-39-0000569.tkl (seen: 29.12.2020).
85 The book exists in printed form at the National Library of Greece (call number: ΛΦ–2815).
86 For its title, see Petridis 1881.
87 Petridis 1859, ε΄–στ΄.
88 Petridis 1859, ε΄.
89 Petridis 1859, ε΄.

tician who participated in the Greek Revolution), a John from Piraeus, and his grandfather Karaiskos (perhaps the hero of the Greek Revolution, George Karaiskakis (1782–1827)):

> ἔχων τὸ τῶν προγόνων σου κλέος, οἵτινες, ἀείποτε ὑπὸ πολυτλήμονος Ἑλλάδος κλεϊζόμενοι, διατελέσουσι, τοιοῦτοι περὶ αὐτὴν γεγονότες. Εἰς τίνα οὐ παρίσταται μετὰ σεβασμοῦ τοῦ Νέστορος τῆς νέας Ἑλλάδος, τοῦ γεραροῦ ἐκείνου καὶ πολυμήτιος Πανούτσου ἡ μνήμη; Τίς οὐκ ἀναμιμνήσκεται μετὰ θαυμασμοῦ τοῦ Ἥρωος ἐκείνου τοῦ Πειραιῶς, τοῦ ἀθανάτου Ἰωάννου, ὃς καὶ τὴν κολοσσιαίαν τοῦ οἴκου ὑμῶν περιουσίαν εἰς τὸν βωμὸν τῆς φίλης Πατρίδος προσήνεγκε; Τί δὲ νὰ εἴπω περὶ τοῦ πάππου σου Καραΐσκου;[90]
>
> You have the glory of your ancestors, who, each time they were called by miserable Greece, took care of it. What respectful man can compare the reminiscence of the venerable and ingenious Panoutsos, the Nestor of the modern Greece? Who does not remember with admiration the hero from Piraeus, the immortal Ioannis, who offered your huge property for the motherland's sake? What could I say about your grandfather Karaiskos? (transl. by the author)

As we can see, the language of this section is a strict *katharevousa*, which resembles ancient Greek (cf. the forms πολυτλήμονος, γεραροῦ and πολυμήτιος).[91] Petridis maintains this linguistic choice for his prologue and his translation. In the prologue, he mainly discusses the moral dimensions of friendship:

> Καὶ ἐν τῇ ἱστορίᾳ αὐτῇ ἀπαντῶμεν κατὰ διαφόρους ἐποχὰς ἀκμάσαντας φίλους ἀδιασπάστους καὶ ὄντως θαυμασμοῦ ἀξίους, ὡς τοὺς Φιντίαν καὶ Δάμωνα, Ἐπαμινώνδαν καὶ Πελοπίδαν καὶ πλείστους ἄλλους, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ νεωτέρᾳ. Ἀλλὰ μήπως εὑρίσκεταί τις ἀντιλέγων ὅτι ἡ φιλία δὲν ἀναφαίνεται ἐν τῇ ἀνθρωπότητι;[92]
>
> And within history itself we see inseparable and remarkable friends in several times, like Damon and Phintias, Epaminondas and Pelopidas and many others, in ancient and in modern history as well. Is there any man who could say that friendship cannot appear in humankind? (transl. by the author)

The readers of Petridis' translation were likely his fellow students at the University of Athens. However, his archaic language, his dedication to his friend and his prologue on the moral value of friendship reveal that he also aimed the text at a broader readership.

90 Petridis 1859, ε′–στ′.
91 See Montanari ^{3}2016, s.v. πολυτλήμων, γεραρός, and πολύμητις.
92 Petridis 1859, ιδ′.

The second Greek translator of ***Laelius* or *De amicitia*** was **Vasileios Antoniadis.** His book was published in 1878 in Constantinople.[93] Vasileios Antoniadis (1851–1932) was an alumnus of the School of Theology in Chalke and a professor of Theology and Philosophy in Constantinople; he had written two doctoral dissertations, one in Germany (on philosophy) and one in Moscow (on theology). It seems that his Latin knowledge was excellent, as in his first year in Germany he gained a prize for his paper on the martyr Justin, which was written in Latin.[94] Antoniadis belonged to the intellectual milieu of the Greeks of Constantinople, who founded the Greek Philological Club of Constantinople (Ἑλληνικὸς Φιλολογικὸς Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως), which published a journal under the same name.[95] It is no coincidence that he dedicated his translation of Cicero's *Laelius* to two of the most eminent members of the Club, namely Ioannis Alibertis and Themistocles Saltelis.[96] The Greek scholars of Constantinople wrote their works in ancient Greek, a language that Antoniadis also chose for his translation. This linguistic choice reveals that the readers of this book were – apart from being the students of Greek high schools, as we will see below – also his learned compatriots.

Antoniadis' book on Cicero's *Laelius* includes a prologue, introduction, the Latin text, the Greek translation and comments in the footnotes. It seems that he ignored Petridis' translation. In his prologue,[97] he includes several pieces of information about friendship and his translation. He highlights the fact that Cicero used many Greek sources for this work, and for this reason he considered it to be a part of the Greek heritage, and thus an offering to his compatriots:

> ἐπειδὴ μεταφράζοντες ἡμεῖς τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ποιοῦμεν ἢ μετὰ τοῦ νομίμου τόκου ἀπολαμβάνομεν τὴν τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν κληρονομίαν [...]. Ὅτι δὲ μεθερμηνεύοντες τὸ ἔργον

93 The whole book exists in digitised form in the Public Central Library of Veria (link: http://medusa.libver.gr/jspui/handle/123/7910, seen: 2.1.2021), and a part of it (up to p. ιε΄) at the "Anemi" website (see https://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/metadata/0/6/1/metadata-86-0000073.tkl, seen: 2.1.2021).

94 For his life and work, see https://www.greekencyclopedia.com/antwniadis-vasileios-kappadokia-1851-athina-1932-p755.html (seen: 2.1.2021).

95 Mamoni 1983.

96 Alibertis and Saltelis were Greek scholars of Constantinople of the nineteenth century, who published many philological studies (see, e.g., Alibertis 1891 and Saltelis 1893). They were members of the Greek Philological Club of Constantinople – their names exist in every issue of the homonymous journal. The dedication to these two scholars is placed in p. ε΄ of Antoniadis' translation: ΙΩΑΝΝΗι ΑΛΙΜΠΕΡΤΗι | ΚΑΙ | ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΙ ΣΑΛΤΕΛΗι | ΑΝΔΡΑΣΙ ΦΙΛΤΑΤΟΙΣ | ΤΟΥΤΙ ΠΕΡΙ ΦΙΛΙΑΣ ΠΟΝΗΜΑΤΙΟΝ | ΦΙΛΙΩΣ ΑΝΑΤΙΘΗΣΙΝ | Ο ΕΞΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΑΣ ("To Ioannis Alimpertis and Themistocles Saltelis, my dearest friends, I dedicate this small work about friendship. The man who Hellenised the work").

97 Antoniadis 1878, θ΄–ιε΄.

> τοῦτον προσφέρομεν τοῖς ἡμετέροις οὐχὶ ξένον τι, ἀλλά κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον πράγματι κληρονομίαν τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν.[98]
>
> Because by translating his [i. e. Cicero's] work we do nothing else but enjoy the heritage of our ancestors along with its legal birth […]. Because, by translating this work, we offer to our compatriots not something foreign to them, but mostly the heritage of our fathers indeed. (transl. by the author)

Below Antoniadis states that his book is addressed to high school pupils, and that, for this reason, a friend convinced him to include in it the Latin text of Reinhold Klotz's edition.[99] However, he changes certain parts of this edition (mainly regarding the punctuation and some readings) based on other editions he had access to:

> Προτιθέμενοι δὲ τὸ πρῶτον νὰ ἐξενέγκωμεν εἰς φῶς μόνον τὴν μετάφρασιν μετὰ τῶν προρρηθεισῶν παραθέσεων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀναγκαίων σχολίων, ὕστερον παρωρμήθημεν ὑπὸ φίλου ἀρίστου, ἵνα καταστήσωμεν τὸ ἔργον χρήσιμον τῇ ἐν τοῖς Γυμνασίοις σπουδαζούσῃ νεολαίᾳ, νὰ συμπεριλάβωμεν ἐν τῇ ἐκδόσει καὶ τὸ λατινικὸν κείμενον. […] Ἀλλὰ κατὰ προτροπὴν τοῦ αὐτοῦ φίλου παρεδέχθημεν μίαν τῶν ἐν χρήσει στερεοτύπων ἐκδόσεων, τὴν ὑπὸ Reinhold Klotz ἀναθεωρηθεῖσαν καὶ ἐν Λειψίᾳ τῷ 1862 ἐκτυπωθεῖσαν, ὀλίγας μόνον περὶ τὴν στίξιν καὶ ἐλαχίστας περὶ τὴν γραφὴν καθ' ἃς εἴχομεν ἄλλας ἐκδόσεις ἐπενεγκότες μεταβολὰς, ἃς καὶ σημειοῦμεν ἐν τῷ τέλει.[100]
>
> Although firstly we had in mind to produce a translation along with introduction and other necessary comments, later we were convinced by an excellent friend to include the Latin text in the edition, in order to be useful for the young men who study in the gymnasiums. […] But urged again by the same friend, we included one of the critical editions that are currently in use, this by Reinhold Klotz, which was revised and printed in Leipzig in 1862, changing only the punctuation of a few parts, and bringing even more changes in writing based on other editions, which we note at the end. (transl. by the author)

Antoniadis' translation is one of the most complete books, as it contains a prologue, an introduction, the Latin text, the Greek translation, and some comments. The translator uses the ancient Greek language, which at several points becomes quite difficult. The readership of his translation were the Greek pupils of high schools in Constantinople, but also his learned compatriots who belonged to his coterie, such as Alibertis and Saltelis, to whom Antoniadis dedicated his book.

The third Ciceronian philosophical work in Greek was the ***Tusculanae disputationes.*** **Nikolaos Kogevinas** (1856–1897), a scholar from Corfu, who belonged to the Heptanesian School, rendered in *dimotiki* and in verse ***Tusc.* 2.23–25**, which is a fragment of Aeschylus' lost tragedy *Prometheus Lyomenos* (*Tragicorum Graeco-*

98 Antoniadis 1878, ιβ΄.
99 Klotz ²1862.
100 Antoniadis 1878, ιγ΄.

rum Fragmenta [*TrGF*] frg. 189–204). Kogevinas translated Tibullus' 1.1, 1.3 and 1.10 within literary journals from May 1891 to February 1892 (the last translation was also republished with changes in December 1893) in modern Greek and in verse.[101] He signed all of his Tibullan translations with the pseudonym 'Glaucus Pontius', which, according to Plutarch, was the short title of a (now lost) poem by Cicero.[102] Kogevinas' translation was never published when he was alive, but is included in Dentrinou's edition of his complete works in 1916.[103] We do not know exactly when this translation was produced, but Dentrinou's note at the end gives us a hint. She notes that this passage was translated by Karolos Manesis (a Greek scholar from Corfu) into ancient Greek verses, and was published in the literary journal *Hestia* in 1892 (issue 1, p. 351).[104] Since Manesis' ancient Greek translation of Kogevinas' modern Greek translation of Cic. *Tusc.* 2.23–25 was published in 1892, we can deduce that Kogevinas' translation was probably made earlier (perhaps in 1891). I cite below the first four verses of the passage:

> Ὦ σεῖς, συναίματοί μου, γενεὰ Τιτάνων, | οὐρανογέννητοι, κυττᾶχτε με ζωσμένον | σφιχτὰ σὲ σκληραὶς πέτραις, ὡσὰν πλοῖο, ποῦ ναύταις | περίφοβοι ἀπ' τὸν τρόμο τῆς νυχτὸς προσδένουν | εἰς τὰ βαρύβογγα νερά.
>
> O you, generation of the Titans, who share the same blood with me, you who were born from the sky, look at how I am tightly tied to hard rocks, like the ship which the sailors, who are very afraid of the terror of the night, tie in the water that groans widely. (transl. by the author)

As we can deduce from this passage, Kogevinas translated the Latin text into modern Greek (cf. the types οὐρανογέννητοι, κυττᾶχτε, σφιχτὰ), and in 13-syllable modern Greek iambic metre (based on the accent of the spoken language, not on prosody), as he did for his translation of Goethe's *Iphigenie auf Tauris*.[105] As in the cases of his translations of Tibullus, Kogevinas produced a literary translation that could be read by a wider readership (aided by the use of the modern Greek language), as a poem that was independent of its Latin original.

Within two years (1897 and 1898), several Greek translations of the ***Tusculanae disputationes*** and the ***De officiis*** were produced. The choice of these trans-

101 For Kogevinas and his translations of Tibullus, see Athanasiadou *et al.* 2019, 207–231.

102 Cf. Plut. *Cic.* 2.

103 For the translation of Cicero's passage, see Dentrinou 1916, 149–150.

104 Dentrinou 1916, 150: "ΣΗΜ. ΤΟΥ ΕΓΔ. Τὸ ἀπόσπασμα μεταφράστηκε σὲ ἀρχαίους ἑλληνικοὺς στίχους ἀπὸ τὸν Κάρλο [sic] Μάνεση στὴν "Εστία" (1892. Α΄. σελ. 351)". The journal exists in digitised form. For Manesis' ancient Greek translation of the modern Greek translation of Kogevinas, see http://pleias.lis.upatras.gr/index.php/estia/issue/view/7871 (seen: 10.1.2021).

105 Dentrinou 1916, 18–110; Athanasiadou *et al.* 2019, 222.

lations did not occur by accident, as Books One or Three of *De officiis* and Books One or Five of *Tusculanae disputationes* were included in the curriculum of 1897 (for the fourth class of the high school).[106] Furthermore, the fact that the translators used the *katharevousa* shows that their use was mainly educational.

Ioannis Kavrakis published his translation of **the first Book of *Tusculanae disputationes*** in 1897.[107] Of Kavrakis (1867–1931), we know very little.[108] As it appears from his short prologue (see below), he was likely a high school teacher. In 1895, he published his Greek translation of another Latin work, Terence's *Andria.*[109] Kavrakis' language is the *katharevousa*, and his book includes a brief prologue, the Greek translation and a few comments.

In his prologue, Kavrakis reveals the nature of his readership, the edition that he followed, and the commentary he consulted. Furthermore, he states that he tried to convert the Latin text into a simple style:

> Ἐκ τῶν πέντε φιλοσοφικῶν διαλέξεων τοῦ Κικέρωνος τῶν εἰσαγμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὑπουργείου τῆς Δημοσίας Ἐκπαιδεύσεως ἐν τοῖς γυμνασίοις κατὰ προτίμησιν μεταφράσαμεν τὴν de morte contemnenda διάλεξιν, εἰς οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἀπιδόντες εἰμὴ εἰς τὴν διευκόλυνσιν τῶν μαθητῶν. Μεταφράζοντες ἀείποτε προσεπαθοῦμεν [*sic*] ν' ἀποφεύγωμεν τὸ τραχὺ καὶ τὸ ἄχαρι. Κείμενον πρὸς τοῦτο προεστησάμεθα τὸ τοῦ Μυλλέρου καὶ σχόλια τὰ τοῦ Κυνέρου.[110]
>
> From the five philosophical lectures of Cicero that are introduced by the Ministry of Public Education in high schools, I chose to translate the *de morte contemnenda* lecture aiming at nothing else but the facility of the pupils. By my translation I try every time to avoid a rough and unpleasant rendering. I followed Müller's edition and Kühner's comments. (transl. by the author)

Kavrakis mentions that of the five Books from this Ciceronian philosophical work that were included in the high school curriculum, he chose to translate the fifth, aiming to make the text easier for students. This information gives us an extra clue as to the date of Kavrakis' book. Apparently, it was published before 11 September 1897, when the curriculum of high schools changed and included the teaching of the first or fifth Book of Cicero's *Tusculanae disputationes.*[111] Kavrakis followed the previous curriculum, that of 1884, which included teaching the

106 Zioga 2015, 35.

107 This book exists in printed form at the Library of the Greek Literary and Historical Archive (ΕΛΙΑ, see Iliou/Polemi 2006, no 1897.545) and at Koventarios Municipal Library of Kozani (call number: 1897 ΜΤU).

108 See http://pandektis.ekt.gr/pandektis/handle/10442/128481 (seen: 14.1.2021).

109 See http://gtll.lit.auth.gr/node/218 (seen: 14.1.2021).

110 Kavrakis 1897, 3.

111 Zioga 2015, 35.

entirety of this work.[112] The translator mentions his sources: he followed the Latin text edited by Carl Friedrich Wilhelm Müller (1889), and the commentary of Raphaël Kühner (1853).[113]

Nikolaos Kontopoulos' translation of **the fifth Book of *Tusculane disputationes*** was published in 1898.[114] Kontopoulos published his translation of another philosophical Ciceronian work in the same year, that of *De officiis* (see below). He was a teacher in high schools and published several schoolbooks.[115] The book includes a detailed prooemium (ἀναλυτικόν προοίμιον), the Greek translation of the Book and brief footnotes. As with his translation of *De officiis*, Kontopoulos used the *katharevousa* and followed the *ad verbum* translation practice. I cite below a brief passage from Kontopoulos' prooemium:

> Ὁ Κικέρων ποιεῖται ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ νέον ἐγκώμιον τῆς φιλοσοφίας. Ἔστιν οὖν αὕτη ἐπιστήμη τοῦ εὖ ζῆν. Οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ σκοπὸς αὐτῆς, τὸ ἔργον αὐτῆς ἀπ' αἰώνων· ὄντως δ' ἐκπληροῖ τὴν ἀποστολὴν ταύτην.[116]
>
> In this book, Cicero makes a new praise of philosophy. It is the science of a virtuous life. This is its purpose, its work for all centuries; indeed, it fulfils this mission. (transl. by the author)

and a short passage from his translation of Cic. *Tusc.* 5.10, which includes one footnote:

> Πρῶτος δὲ ὁ Σωκράτης προσεκάλεσε (κατεβίβασε) τὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,* καὶ αὐτὴν ἐτοποθέτησεν ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι καὶ εἰς τοὺς οἴκους εἰσήγαγε, καὶ τὴν ἠνάγκασε περὶ διὰ βίου καὶ τῶν ἠθῶν καὶ περὶ τῶν καλῶν καὶ κακῶν πραγμάτων νὰ ἐξετάζῃ.
> * Ὀλίγη ὑπερβολὴ αὕτη τοῦ Κικέρωνος, διότι ἀρκεῖ νὰ ἀναφέρωμεν τὰ ἠθικὰ δόγματα τοῦ Πυθαγόρου, καὶ τὰς πρὸς τὴν πρακτικὴν ἠθικὴν τάσεις τοῦ Ἀρχελάου.[117]
>
> First Socrates invited (removed) the philosophy from the sky,* and placed it in the cities and introduced it into the houses and forced it to examine life and morals, good and bad things.
> * This is a small exaggeration by Cicero, because it is enough to mention the moral dogmas of Pythagoras, and Archelaus' trends to applied ethics. (transl. by the author)

As with the translation of *De officiis*, Kontopoulos also follows the *ad verbum* method here; cf., e.g., the rendering of the phrase *coegit de vita et moribus rebusque*

112 Zioga 2015, 31.
113 Müller 1889 and Kühner 1853.
114 This book exists in a few Greek libraries. The copy I used comes from Vikelaia Municipal Library of Heraklion. Its recording number in Iliou/Polemi 2006 is no 1898.672.
115 See, e.g., Kontopoulos 1891, 1898a, 1900 and 1925.
116 Kontopoulos 1898b, 3.
117 Kontopoulos 1898b, 9–10.

bonis et malis quaerere into τὴν ἠνάγκασε περὶ διὰ βίου καὶ τῶν ἠθῶν καὶ περὶ τῶν καλῶν καὶ κακῶν πραγμάτων νὰ ἐξετάζῃ. Moreover, he offers an extra interpretation of the verb *devocavit* in parentheses, i. e. προσεκάλεσε (κατεβίβασε). Furthermore, in his footnote he does not hesitate to criticise Cicero for his statement that Socrates was the first philosopher, because Pythagoras (580–496 BC) and Archelaus (fifth century BCE) of Miletus, a student of Anaxagoras and possibly Socrates' teacher,[118] both preceded him.

Kontopoulos' translation of ***De officiis*** was first published in 1898,[119] while it was reprinted in 1917.[120] The publisher of this book was Michael Saliveros, who owned a publishing and a printing house, as well as a bookstore in Athens. Saliveros mainly printed schoolbooks and educational material in general.[121] Kontopoulos' book does not include a prologue, the Latin text or footnotes, only a short introduction and the Greek translation in *katharevousa.* In several parts of the translation, Kontopoulos offers alternative renderings of Latin terms in parentheses. As we can see from the book's title (see the Appendix at the end of this volume), he followed the *ad verbum* translation method (ΣΧΕΔΟΝ ΚΑΤΑ ΛΕΞΙΝ, an almost verbatim translation).

Pericles Iasemidis published his translation of **the fifth Book of *Tusculanae disputationes*** in 1898.[122] Iasemidis (born in Athens in 1841) was a teacher in secondary education and the author of several books concerning the syntax of the Greek language, the religion of ancient Greeks and Romans, and ancient Greek literature.[123] His book includes a short hypothesis of the fifth Book of this Ciceronian work, its Greek translation and comments in footnotes (where he explains several terms of Roman political life, offers information about the persons of the work, notes the figures of speech, etc.). Iasemidis does not reveal the edition he followed or the source of his comments. Like Kontopoulos, he used the *katharevousa* and followed the *ad verbum* translation practice, since their books were mainly used for educational purposes. Perhaps they knew of each other's books, as they have several similarities in their translations.

---

118 As Cicero himself notes earlier in *Tusc.* 4.10: *Sed ab antiqua philosophia usque ad Socratem, qui Archelaum, Anaxagorae discipulum, audierat* ("But from the antique philosophy until Socrates, who had listened Archelaus, Anaxagoras' student").

119 The edition of 1898 exists in printed form at the Library of the Greek Literary and Historical Archive (ΕΛΙΑ, see Iliou/Polemi 2006, no 1898.654).

120 Kontopoulos ^{2}1917. The book exists in digitised form at the "Anemi" website (see: https://anemi.lib.uoc.gr, seen: 13.1.2021).

121 See http://www.ekebi.gr/frontoffice/portal.asp?cpage=node&cnode=596 (seen: 13.1.2021).

122 Iasemidis 1898b. The book exists in printed form at the National Library of Greece (call number: ΛΦ–2849).

123 See, e. g., Iasemidis 1871, 1879 and 1898a.

Summarising, the Greek translations of Cicero's philosophical works can be divided into three categories: a) those that were written in *dimotiki* (Tertsetis' and Kogevinas') or in mild *katharevousa*, including several types of *dimotiki* (Kapodistrias'), which were intended to be read by a wider readership; Tertsetis' and Kapodistrias' books intended to bring about the political and philosophical awakening of their compatriots, while Koveginas' translation was made mainly for literary reasons, i. e. to offer aesthetic pleasure to its readers; b) those that were composed in *katharevousa* (Kavrakis', Kontopoulos', and Iasemidis') and were used as textbooks by pupils and students; and c) those that were written in ancient Greek or in strict *katharevousa* (Petridis' and Antoniadis' translations of *Laelius*), which aimed to be read by pupils and students, but also by scholars. Furthermore, we must note Kapodistrias' and Antoniadis' belief that Cicero's teachings are actually part of the Greek heritage.

Greek Translations of Cicero's Rhetorical Works

Most translations are of Ciceronian rhetorical works (17 books). All of them were written in *katharevousa* and used as textbooks by pupils in Greek high schools and by students at the University of Athens. However, as we will see, some of the translators addressed their books to anyone who also loved Antiquity.

The first translation of a Ciceronian rhetorical work is in manuscript form and remains unpublished.[124] It is contained in the student notebook of Procopios Oikonomidis, a holy deacon (ιεροδιάκονος). It includes notes from the courses he attended at the high school of Nauplion.[125] The notes concern Theocritus' *Idyll* 15, passages of Aeschylus' *Prometheus Vinctus* and Thucydides' *Histories*, and Cicero's first *Catilinarian.* Although Oikonomidis had his notes regarding the ancient Greek works in the proper order, i. e. from the beginning of the notebook to the end (fol. 1*r*–54*v*), the notes for the Ciceronian work are included in the fol. 55*r*–71*v*

124 The manuscript is located at the National Library of Greece, Athens, Fonds principal, ms. 3304. For the description of the manuscript, see Nikolopoulos 1996, 127–128. I must note that all the information I cite here for this translation comes from the database "Greek translations of Latin works since 1453" (link: http://gtll.lit.auth.gr/db), which was one of the deliverables of the project entitled "Greek Translations of Latin works in the Greek world from the Fall of Constantinople (1453) to the end of the 19th century" (from June 2018 until September 2019, Aristotle University of Thessalonica), which I participated in as a member of the research team (Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. V. Fyntikoglou). The link for this translation is the following: http://gtll.lit.auth.gr/node/225 (seen: 17.1.2021).

125 Nikolopoulos 1996, 128.

from the end to the beginning of the notebook (in reverse order, i. e. 71*v* is page 1, 71*r* is page 2, etc.).

Fol. 71*v*–58*v* (= pp. 1–27) include the Greek translation of **the first *Catilinarian***, while fol. 58*v*–55*r* (= pp. 27–34) contain various comments on the political and social life of Rome (e. g. an interpretation of terms such as *senatus*, *consules* and *comitia*). The register of the part that concerns Cicero took place from 20 February 1863 until 30 May 1863, as is proven by the notes of the scribe at the beginning (Ναύπλιον 1863 Φεβρ. 20 Π. Οἰκονομίδης; "Nauplion, 20 February 1863. P. Oikonomidis")[126] and at the end of the translation:

> Τέλος τῶν ἐξηγήσεων τούτου τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Κικέρωνος παραδοθέντος ὑπὸ τοῦ καθ. Κ. Γραμματικόπουλου, ὑπ' ἐμοῦ φοιτῶντος τακτῶς εἰς τὸ γυμν[άσιον] Προκοπίου Οἰκονομίδου Ἱεροδιακόνου [...] 30 Μαΐου 1863. Ναύπλιον.[127]
>
> This is the end of the notes on this speech of Cicero, which was taught by the teacher K. Grammatikopoulos. These notes are written down by me, the holy deacon Procopios Oikonomidis, a regular student at high school [...] 30 May of 1863. Nauplion. (transl. by the author)

As we see in this note, as a pupil Oikonomidis wrote down the translation and comments that were delivered by his teacher **K. Grammatikopoulos** – a testimony that proves that he is the translator. This manuscript shows the educational use of the first *Catilinarian* in Greek high schools of the nineteenth century.

Panagiotis Koupitoris published his translations of **the first and fourth *Catilinarians*** and the ***Pro Archia poeta*** in one book in 1876.[128] He was an Arvanite Greek philologist, who taught at several high schools in Greece. He published a Latin-Greek dictionary in 1873, and several studies on the Albanian language.[129] As can be seen from the title, Koupitoris rendered these Ciceronian speeches into Greek to be used by students. He included, in one book, the translations of three Ciceronian speeches, i. e. the first and fourth *Catilinarians* and the *Pro Archia poeta*, which, as we saw above, were taught in Greek high schools. The translator provides a brief description of the content (*argumentum*) of each speech before its translation, and includes some brief footnotes, mainly on subjects such as textual criticism and interpretation. The Latin text does not appear in the book. The translator uses a mild *katharevousa*, in order to be comprehensible to the young pupils (notice that Petridis' language resembles ancient Greek, which the students of Phi-

126 Grammatikopoulos 1863, 71*v* (= p. 1).

127 Grammatikopoulos 1863, *58v (= p. 27).*

128 Koupitoris 1876. The book exists in digitised form on the "Anemi" website (see https://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/metadata/2/2/a/metadata-265-0000171.tkl, seen: 29.12.2020).

129 Skendi 1967, 127–128; Clayer 2007, 203.

lology and scholars could understand) throughout his book. His translation was made only for educational reasons and has a limited literary value.

In the same year (1876) **Eustathios K. Livieratos'** translation of ***Catilinarians*** and the ***Pro Archia poeta*** was published.[130] As we saw above, it was not the first time that a Greek translation of these Ciceronian works was published in a single book. Koupitoris' translation of the first and fourth *Catilinarians* and the *Pro Arcia poeta* was published in 1876. Dr. Eustathios K. Livieratos was a teacher in the high school of Argostoli (Cephalonia). We do not know a great deal about Livieratos, but only what he tells us in his prologue; he studied at the University of Athens and in Germany (apparently, he gained his doctorate degree there). We also know that he wrote a book on the history of Cephalonia (*Ιστορία τῆς Νήσου Κεφαλληνίας*, 1916) and translated the *Aeneid* in 1875, when he was studying Philology.[131] His origin, from the Ionian Islands, apparently influenced his choice of language for the translation (see above). As Tertsetis used the *dimotiki* in his translation of *Somnium Scipionis*, so Livieratos used a mild *katharevousa* that – in many cases – appears similar to the spoken language. Livieratos' book includes a brief prologue, the Latin text, the Greek translation, and several comments in the footnotes.

Livieratos gives us a lot of information about the book in his prologue, entitled ΤΟΙΣ ΕΝΤΕΥΞΟΜΕΝΟΙΣ ("To the readers").[132] The first edition was published in 1876, when he was a student. He states that his readership was not only the pupils and the students, but everyone who loves literature, and especially Roman history and archaeology. Furthermore, he informs us about his bibliography: he used many German editions, especially the edition of the Ciceronian works by Karl Halm,[133] the translation of the first and the fourth *Catilinarians* and the *Pro Archia poeta* by Koupitoris, the notes on these speeches by Favrikios, and the edition of the *Pro Archia poeta* by his compatriot, Gkiolmas:[134]

> ἀπεφάσισα νὰ ἐπιχειρήσω ἐγὼ τοιαύτην ἔκδοσιν, τὴν ὁποίαν καὶ ἐδημοσίευσα ἐν ἔτει 1876 φοιτητὴς ἔτι τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου ὤν [...]. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀποπεράτωσιν τῶν σπουδῶν μου καὶ τὴν ἐκ Γερμανίας ἐπάνοδόν μου ἰδών ὅτι τὸ ἔργον ἐκεῖνο καίπερ λίαν ἐλλιπὲς εἶχεν ἐξαντληθῆ σχεδὸν ἀπεφάσισα νὰ ἀσχοληθῶ εἰς δευτέραν ἔκδοσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' εἰσαγωγῶν, γραμματικῶν, συντακτικῶν, ἱστορικῶν, γεωγραφικῶν καὶ ἀρχαιολογικῶν σημειώσεων καταστήσω αὐτὸ χρήσιμον ὄχι μόνον εἰς τὴν μαθητιῶσαν φίλην νεολαίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς πάντα ἄλλον φιλόμουσον ἄνδρα.[135]

130 This book exists in printed form at the National Library of Greece (call number: ΛΦ–2120).
131 See https://gtll.lit.auth.gr/node/198 (seen: 25.5.2023).
132 Livieratos 1883, ε′–ζ′.
133 Halm 1867.
134 See n. 75 above.
135 Livieratos 1883, ε′.

> I decided to attempt this edition, which I published in 1876, when I was a student at the University […]. After the completion of my studies and my return from Germany, seeing that this book – although it was incomplete – was almost out of print, I decided to publish a second edition of it, and by introductions, grammatical, syntactical, geographical and archaeological notes to make it useful not only for the youth at school, but for every man who loves the Muses. (transl. by the author)

and

> Ἐν τῇ ἐκδόσει δὲ ταύτῃ μετεχειρίσθην πλείστας ὅσας Γερμανικὰς ἐκδόσεις καὶ ἰδίως τὴν ἀρίστην ἔκδοσιν τοῦ διασήμου Λατινιστοῦ Halm […] ἔτι δὲ τὴν ὑπὲρ Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ ἔκδοσιν τοῦ ἀοιδίμου συμπολίτου μου Μ. Γκιόλμου […] καὶ τὴν μετάφρασιν τῶν δύω κατὰ τοῦ Κατιλίνου λόγων καὶ τοῦ ὑπὲρ Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ ἔκδοσιν τοῦ ἀοιδίμου Π. Κουπιτώρου ὡς καὶ τὰς σημειώσεις εἰς τοὺς αὐτοὺς τρεῖς λόγους του ἀοιδίμου Κ. Φαβρικίου. Ὡς δὲ θὰ ἴδῃ ὁ ἀναγνώστης, οὐδενὸς κόπου ἐφείσθην, ἵνα καταστήσω τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο χρήσιμον ὄχι μόνον εἰς τὴν ἐν τοῖς Γυμνασίοις καὶ ἐν τῷ Πανεπιστημίῳ σπουδάζουσαν νεολαίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς πάντα ἄλλον ἐραστὴν τῶν γραμμάτων καὶ ἰδίως τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἱστορίας καὶ ἀρχαιολογίας.[136]
>
> In this book I used many German editions, and especially the excellent edition of the famous Latinist Halm […]; for the *Pro Archia poeta* I used the edition of the illustrious compatriot of mine, M. Gkiolmas; I used the translation of the two *Catilinarians* and the *Pro Archia poeta* made by the illustrious P. Koupitoris, and the notes on these three speeches by the illustrious K. Favrikios. As the reader will see, I did not spare any pain, in order to make this work useful not only for the pupils of gymnasiums and students at the University, but for everyone who loves literature, and especially Roman history and archaeology. (transl. by the author)

As in Antoniadis' case, Livieratos' book includes a prologue, an introduction, the Latin text, the Greek translation, and many comments in the footnotes. Its readership were not only pupils of high schools and students of the University, but also anyone who loved Latin literature and Roman history.

Nikolaos Farantatos published his translation of **the ninth *Philippic*** in 1880.[137] Apart from the translation, the book contains some notes on Cicero's ninth *Philippic* oration as well. Farantatos (born in Cephalonia in 1857, thus another scholar from the Ionian Islands, like Tertsetis and Livieratos) was a high school teacher and held a doctoral degree in Linguistics (he published his thesis in 1882).[138] He wrote several school books, including a grammar text on the Greek language (1896),[139] a book with orthographic and grammar exercises (1897),[140]

136 Livieratos 1883, στ′–ζ′.

137 This book exists in printed form at several Greek libraries. I used a copy from the Library of the Greek Literary and Historical Archive (ΕΛΙΑ, see Iliou/Polemi 2006, no 1880.553).

138 For Farantatos, see http://pandektis.ekt.gr/pandektis/handle/10442/134837 (seen: 4.1.2021). For this dissertation, see Farantatos 1882.

139 Farantatos 1896.

and a translation of Plato's *Phaedo* (1898).[141] Farantatos' book on the Ciceronian speech is very brief (only 16 pages, so it is actually a leaflet). It contains a prologue, a brief description of the work, the translation, and notes. The language of the book is the *katharevousa.*

In the prologue, Farantatos mentions that his translation follows the Latin text, and it is not a paraphrase, a practice that – according to him – was followed by French and German translators. He also notes that he used the edition of Cicero's *Philippics* by Gregorius Gottlieb Wernsdort,[142] and for the syntax of the Ciceronian text directs his readers towards the brief Latin Grammar by Euthymios Kastorchis, Professor of Latin Philology at the University of Athens.[143] Furthermore, he criticises the fact that, although this Ciceronian speech is included in the curriculum of the Greek high schools, it has never been taught until now:

> Ἡ μετάφρασις ἐγένετο ὅσον οἷον τε πλησιεστέρα τῷ κειμένῳ τοῦ λόγου καὶ κατ' αὐτὸ ἀκριβής. Δὲν εἶνε τουτέστιν παράφρασις, ὡς τοῦτο οἱ πλεῖστοι τῶν Γάλλων, Γερμανῶν κλπ. πράττουσι μεταφράζοντες. Κυρίως ὑπ' ὄψιν εἶχον τὴν παλαιὰν κριτικὴν ἔκδοσιν τοῦ Gr. Wernsdort [...]. Περὶ τῶν διαφόρων συντάξεων παραπέμπομεν εἰς τὴν εὐμέθοδον μικρὰν γραμματικὴν τοῦ σοφοῦ καθηγητοῦ Εὐθ. Καστόρχη. Τελευτῶντες ὀφείλομεν νὰ ἐπιστήσωμεν τὴν προσοχὴν τῶν ἁρμοδίων, διότι ἐν ᾧ ὁ λόγος οὗτος κατὰ τὸ πρόγραμμα τοῦ ὑπουργείου εἶνε κατάλληλος πρὸς διδαχὴν ἐν τοῖς Γυμνασίοις [...] οὐδέποτε μέχρι τοῦδε ἐδιδάχθη.[144]
>
> The translation was made – as far as possible – strictly to the text, and that is why it is an exact translation. It is not a paraphrase, as most of the French, Germans, etc. do when translating. I mainly followed the old critical edition of Gr. Wernsdort [...]. For several parts of the syntax, I quote from the methodical little grammar of the wise professor Euth. Kastorchis. Finally, I ought to draw the attention of those that are in charge, because, while this speech is – according to the programme of the Ministry [sc. of Education] – suitable for the curriculum in high schools [...] however it has never been taught until now. (transl. by the author)

We may observe that, although Farantatos' book is very brief, it includes a prologue, *argumentum*, translation and notes. As he notes in his prologue, its readership were the pupils of the high schools.

Dimitrios Doukakis' translation of ***Pro lege Manilia*** was published twice. The first edition was in 1883, and the second in 1893 (in this he added a short in-

140 Farantatos 1897.
141 Farantatos 1898.
142 Wernsdort 1825.
143 Kastorchis 1864.
144 Farantatos 1880, 2.

troduction and brief notes).[145] Of the translator, we know nothing. In the section of the book entitled *ΤΟΙΣ ΕΝΤΕΥΞΟΜΕΝΟΙΣ* ("To the readers"), he mentions several pieces of information about his translation:

> Μεταφράσας τὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Μανιλείου νόμου, ἢ ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ μεγάλου Πομπηΐου ἀρχῆς λόγον τοῦ Κικέρωνος μετὰ βραχειῶν ἱστορικῶν σημειώσεων ἐκ τῆς εὐσυνειδήτου καὶ ἐπιτυχεστάτης τοῦ μακαρίτου καθηγητοῦ Γκιόλμα ἐκδόσεως ὡς τὰ πολλὰ εἰλημμένων, ὅσαι μόνον ἐχρειάζοντο πρὸς διασάφησιν τῆς μεταφράσεως, ἐκδίδωμι πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν μαθητῶν τῶν Γυμνασίων καὶ παντὸς φιλαρχαίου, εὐχόμενος, ὅπως ὡς τάχιστα ἴδω ὑπ' ἄλλων μεταπεφρασμένα καὶ πολλὰ ἔργα τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς φιλολογίας, πάντα ξένα εἰς ἡμᾶς διατελοῦντα. Βιογραφίαν τοῦ συγγραφέως καὶ ἐκτενῆ ἀνάλυσιν τοῦ λόγου δύναταί τις νὰ ἴδῃ ἐν τῇ εἰρημένῃ ἐκδόσει. Ἐγὼ μόνον προέταξα σύντομον περίληψιν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς στερεοτύπου ἐκδόσεως τοῦ Ῥεϊνόλδου Κλοτσίου.[146]
>
> I translated the *Pro lege Manilia* or *De imperio Cn. Pompeii* speech of Cicero with brief historical notes that I have mainly taken from the conscientious and very successful edition of the deceased teacher Gkiolmas – as many were necessary for the clarification of the translation. I publish this book in order to be used by the pupils of the high schools and everyone who loves Antiquity, and I wish to see as soon as possible many more works of Latin literature translated into Greek – works that are entirely unknown to us. For Cicero's life, see his biography and an extensive analysis of this speech in Gkiolmas' book. I just prefixed a brief abstract of it from the critical edition of Reinhold Klotz. (transl. by the author)

Doukakis informs his readers that he drew the short comments (in the footnotes) of his book from that of Dr. M. Gkiolmas (a book also used by Livieratos),[147] and that the abstract comes from the edition by Reinhold Klotz.[148] He addresses his book to the pupils of high schools, and to everyone who loves Antiquity. Moreover, he wishes for other Latin works to be translated into Greek. Doukakis uses the official language of the Greek educational system, the *katharevousa.*

The book is short (44 pages). The abstract is translated from Klotz's *argumentum* of this speech, written in Latin:[149]

> Ὅτε ὁ Λεύκιος Λούκουλλος [...] εἶχεν ἀνακληθῆ ὑπὸ τῆς γερουσίας καὶ τοῦτον διεδέχθη ὁ Μάνιος Ἀκίλιος Γλαβρίων [...] κατὰ τὸ ἐπόμενον ἔτος 66 π.Χ. [...] ὁ Γάϊος Μανίλιος δήμαρχος εἰσή-

145 Doukakis 1883 and 1893. This book exists in printed form at several Greek libraries. Its first edition is preserved at the Library of the Greek Literary and Historical Archive (ΕΛΙΑ, see Iliou/Polemi 2006, no 1883.594).

146 Doukakis 1883, 3.

147 See n. 75 above.

148 Klotz 1878.

149 Klotz 1878, 184.

> γαγε νόμον εἰς τὸν λαὸν, ὅπως ἡ διαχείρισις τούτου τοῦ πολέμου ἀνατεθῇ εἰς τὸν Γναῖον Πομπήϊον.[150]
>
> When Lucius Lucullus [...] had been recalled by the senate, and Manius Acilius Glabrio succeeded him [...] in the following year of 66 BCE [...] Gaius Manilius introduced this law to the people, i. e. the administration of this war to be assigned to Gnaeus Pompey. (transl. by the author)

K. P. Soutsas published his translation of ***Pro Milone*** in 1886.[151] This is the first Greek translation of this speech during the nineteenth century. As we will see below, Karatzas also translated this speech in 1893. From the book's title, we learn that Soutsas was a student (probably at the School of Philosophy at the University of Athens) and addressed his translation to high school pupils. He states that the language he used was the spoken Greek, but that this is not exactly true, as he did not use the *dimotiki*, but a *katharevousa.* Soutsas' book only includes a short introduction and the Greek translation. It is a textbook, without any literary value.

Galinos Kalimeris published his translation of the ***Pro Ligario*** in 1887.[152] From the title, we learn that the book includes the Greek translation of this Ciceronian speech, critical notes, and an interpretation of its most difficult passages. For Kalimeris we know only that he was a student of the School of Philosophy at the University of Athens (during the period 1875–1880) and that he was from Amfissa.[153] Due to the fact that he addressed this book to high schools' students, he was likely a teacher of secondary education. The book is brief (40 pages), and its language is the *katharevousa.* It includes the Latin text (in the prime numbers), without naming the edition he follows, and several comments in the footnotes that exist only on the pages with Latin text. Kalimeris' brief book was a textbook that included the basic information for pupils of high schools: the Latin text, its Greek translation and a few notes.

Markos Viagkinis' translation of **the first *Philippic*** was published in 1888.[154] The title informs us of the contents of the book: a brief biography of Cicero, an introduction to his *Philippics*, general notes on the first *Phillipic*, a short argument,

150 Doukakis 1883, 5.

151 Soutsas 1886. The book is available in digitised form in the "Anemi" website (see https://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/metadata/6/e/7/metadata-425-0000109.tkl, seen: 3.1.2021).

152 Kalimeris 1887. This book is found in printed form at several Greek libraries. I used a copy from the Library of the Greek Literary and Historical Archive (ΕΛΙΑ, see Iliou/Polemi 2006, no 1887.662).

153 See https://pergamos.lib.uoa.gr/uoa/dl/frontend/el/browse/238237 (seen: 5.1.2021).

154 Viagkinis 1888a. The book exists in printed form at the National Library of Greece (it has no call number; its recording number is: nlg.465955).

and the Greek translation of the work. It also informs us about the book's readership: the pupils of the higher classes in high schools. Markos Viagkinis was from Zakynthos (another scholar from the Ionian Islands), and was a teacher in a famous school of Athens, the Varvakeion high school (founded in 1860). In the same year (1888), Viagkinis also published a commentary on the first *Philippic* and in 1890 a commentary on the second *Philippic.*[155] These two books included only comments on and not translations of the Ciceronian speeches.[156]

In 1889, he published his translation of **the second *Philippic.***[157] The title informs us of the contents of the book: an introduction, some general notes on the second *Philippic*, a brief argument, a corrected edition of the Latin text, and the Greek translation of the work.

Viagkinis' language is the official language of the Greek educational system, the *katharevousa.* His books were used as textbooks by pupils of the higher classes of high schools. He produced a faithful translation that follows the Latin text, and included a great deal of information about these Ciceronian speeches, as well as the Roman author's rhetorical practices.

Georgios Kampasis' translation of ***Pro Sestio*** in 1891[158] is the only Greek translation of this Ciceronian speech from the nineteenth century. As we learn from the title (see the Appendix at the end of this volume), Kampasis was also a bookseller – and this is the only information we have about him. The book does not include a prologue or the Latin text and comments. It has only an *argumentum* (ὑπόθεσις) and the Greek translation in a severe *katharevousa*, which in several passages looks like ancient Greek. Apparently, the book was likely used as a textbook by high school pupils or university students.

Panagiotis Mataragkas published his translation of the ***Catilinarians*** in 1892.[159] There is disagreement regarding the year of the publication, because, in the inner cover, we find the year 1892. Iliou and Polemi note that 1891 is the correct year of publication.[160] This book is the Greek translation of Cicero's *Catilinarians*

155 Viagkinis 1888b and 1890, respectively.

156 For the commentary on the first *Philippic*, see https://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/metadata/8/d/8/metadata-438-0000028.tkl. For the commentary on the second *Philippic*, see https://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/metadata/0/1/8/metadata-438-0000078.tkl (seen: 3.1.2021).

157 Viagkinis 1889. The book exists in a digitised form at the "Anemi" website (see https://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/metadata/d/e/c/metadata-438-0000079.tkl, seen: 3.1.2021).

158 Kampasis 1891. This book exists in printed form at several Greek libraries. I used a copy from the Library of the Greek Literary and Historical Archive (ΕΛΙΑ, see Iliou/Polemi 2006, no 1891.91).

159 Mataragkas 1891. This book exists in printed form at several Greek libraries. I used a copy from the Library of the Greek Literary and Historical Archive (ΕΛΙΑ, see Iliou/Polemi 2006, no 1891.540).

160 Cf. Iliou/Polemi 2006, no 1891.540.

by Panagiotis Mataragkas (1834–1895), who was a lawyer, diplomat, politician and poet.[161] Mataragkas also translated three *Carmina* by Horace (1.5, 1.23 and 3.9),[162] and he probably published (under the acronym P. M.) a short article (in two parts) that was a presentation of various translations and adaptations of Catullus' third poem.[163]

Mataragkas' book does not include a prologue or the Latin text. The structure is simple. At the beginning, he offers a little information about Cicero's life and works. After this, the Greek translation of each *Catilinarian* follows, preceded by its argument. Mataragkas includes various comments in the footnotes, where he offers abundant information regarding the political system of Rome, the persons in each speech, etc. The language of the translation is a mild *katharevousa*, and its main readership was likely high school pupils. However, given that he was a lawyer and politician, he might have also addressed this book to his colleagues. If we compare his translation with that of Livieratos (see above), we will observe that there are several similarities. This means that he may have consulted Livieratos' book, or that they both drew their material from a common (unknown) source.

During the period between 1891 and 1893, we find Dr. **Georgios Karatzas**' translations of six Ciceronian rhetorical works. Karatzas, born in 1868 in Samos, studied philology and law and was publishing a local newspaper in his hometown, called *Φώς* ("Light"). He worked as a teacher in high schools in several towns of Greece (Samos, Kozani, Athens), as well as in Constantinople and Jerusalem. He was a zealous supporter of the *dimotiki* language, and gained a prize from the literary journal *Noumas* for his *Ῥωμαίικο Ἀρφαβητάρι* ("Alphabet Book of Modern Greek").[164] He also translated Caesar's *De bello civili* in 1892.[165] All of his translations from Latin were published by Grigorios Lamprou. Although Karatzas was a supporter of the *dimotiki* language, his translations of Latin works are made in a mild *katharevousa*, apparently because they were addressed to pupils and students. All of his translations of Cicero's works have the same format: the argument of each speech, its Greek translation and comments in footnotes (all except for *Pro Ligario*, which also contains the Latin text (see below)). He followed the *ad verbum* translation practice. His books were valuable tools for the pupils and students, as they provided them with a reliable translation, and many comments.

---

161 See *Νεώτερον Εγκυκλοπαιδικόν Λεξικόν Ηλίου* 1980, vol. 13, 103.

162 Athanasiadou *et al.* 2019, 206.

163 Athanasiadou *et al.* 2019, 202 n. 9.

164 For Karatzas' life and work, see Adamopoulou 2014.

165 This book exists in digitised form at the "Anemi" website (see https://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/metadata/9/6/5/metadata-1512731639-608421-19019.tkl, seen: 6.1.2021).

In 1891, Karatzas published his translation of the ***Pro Murena***,[166] which he dedicated with love to his dear teacher, Dimitrios Konstas, a schoolmaster at the high school in Ioannina, and a good and virtuous man (Τῷ ἀγαπητῷ μου διδασκάλῳ Δημητρίῳ Δ. Κώνστα, γυμνασιάρχη Ἰωαννίνων, ἀνδρὶ καλῷ καγαθῷ μετ' ἀγάπης τὸ παρὸν ἀνατίθημι. Ὁ μεταφράσας).[167]

In 1892, two of Karatzas' translations were published. The first is that of **the fifth *Verrine*.**[168] The book includes a general introduction to Cicero's *Verrines*, after which there is an analysis of the fifth *Verrine*, and at the end the Greek translation of this speech, with several comments in the footnotes. The second is his translation of the ***Pro Archia poeta***,[169] which contains a brief argument of the Ciceronian speech, and its Greek translation is accompanied by several footnotes.

In 1893, Karatzas published his other three translations of Ciceronian speeches, ***Pro Sulla***,[170] ***Pro Milone***,[171] and ***Pro Ligario.***[172] Regarding the first, as with Mataragkas' translation, there is a disagreement regarding the year of publication, as in the inner cover we find the year 1892. For his translation of the *Pro Milone*, we must note that this Ciceronian work was also translated into Greek by Soutsas in 1886 (see above), and by other scholars during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries for educational reasons.[173] In contrast to Karatzas' other translations, his book for the *Pro Ligario* includes the Latin text, without noting which edition he followed. The book has the following structure: an argument of the speech; the Latin text, accompanied by footnotes; and finally, the translation. Karatzas does not note anything about his sources. Nevertheless, it is possible that he knew of Kalimeris' translation of the same speech (see above).

All of these Greek translations of Ciceronian rhetorical works were written in *katharevousa*; most of them in mild *katharevousa*, e. g. Koupitoris', Livieratos', Mataragkas', and Karatzas', while Kampasis' book was written in severe *katharevousa*,

166 This book exists in printed form at several Greek libraries. I used a copy from the Library of the Greek Literary and Historical Archive (ΕΛΙΑ, see Iliou/Polemi 2006, no 1891.555).

167 Karatzas 1891, [3].

168 Karatzas 1892a. The book exists in printed form at the National Library of Greece (call number: ΛΦ–2784).

169 Karatzas 1892b. This book exists in printed form at several Greek libraries. I used a copy from the Library of the Greek Literary and Historical Archive (ΕΛΙΑ, see Iliou/Polemi 2006, no 1892.605).

170 Karatzas 1893a. The book exists in digitised form in the Anemi website (see https://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/metadata/2/a/4/metadata-181-0000088.tkl, seen: 11.1.2021).

171 Karatzas 1893b. The book exists in printed form in several libraries of Greece. I used a copy from the National Library of Greece (call number: ΛΦ–2769).

172 Karatzas 1893c. This book exists in printed form at several Greek libraries. I used the copy at the Library of the Greek Literary and Historical Archive (ΕΛΙΑ, see Iliou/Polemi 2006, no 1893.556).

173 Indicatively, I mention Kakridis [2]1928 and Karakasis *et al.* 2020.

as several passages resemble ancient Greek. This language choice as well as many books' titles and translator's words in their prologues signify their readership: the pupils of high schools and the students of the Ottonian University of Athens. However, Doukakis and Livieratos state that they also addressed their books to whoever loved Antiquity. The translators followed the *ad verbum* translation practice, a fact that reduced their potential literary value. The Greek translations of Ciceronian rhetorical works were made with the intention of being used as textbooks. With these books, the Greek pupils and students exercised in classical Latin language (grammar, syntax and vocabulary), and drew information about Roman history, society, and political life.

A Greek Translation of Cicero's Epistles

The only translation of Cicero's ***Epistulae ad familares*** belongs to an **anonymous**; it is in manuscript form, and remains unpublished until today.[174] We do not know its exact date; as Politis notes, it may belong to the eighteenth or nineteenth century. It is a small, handwritten notebook, which includes the Latin text and above it the Greek translation, written in smaller characters. Each Greek word is above the corresponding Latin word. It was likely used to teach Latin. It contains a Greek translation of several epistles of Cicero's *Epistulae ad familiares.* Each epistle is preceded by a brief argument (in Latin, without its Greek translation), a practice that was followed in the editions of this Ciceronian work from the sixteenth until the nineteenth century.[175]

In its first eleven folia, the notebook contains the first six epistles of the second Book of the *Epistulae ad familiares,* and the first part of the seventh epistle (all addressed to Curio). In fol. 11*v,* the text is interrupted and on the following page (fol. 12*r*) the ninth epistle (to Lentulus) of the first Book begins from paragraph 22 until its end. Then, the epistle 1.10 (to Valerius) follows. The notebook likely contained the entire translation of epistles 2.7 and 1.9, and several other epistles as well (since many folia are lost). In sum, the manuscript includes the translation

174 The manuscript exists at the National Library of Greece in Athens, Fonds principal, ms. 2239. For a description of the manuscript, see Politis 1991, 263. I must note that all the information I cite here for this translation comes from the database "Greek translations of Latin works since 1453" (link: http://gtll.lit.auth.gr/db). The link for this translation is the http://gtll.lit.auth.gr/node/224 (seen: 17.1.2021).

175 See http://gtll.lit.auth.gr/node/224 (seen: 17.1.2021).

of Cic. *Fam*. 1.9.22 until the end, 1.10, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7.1–2 (until the phrase *tecum loquere*).[176]

I cite below a short passage from the translation of Cic. *Fam*. 2.1:

> Εἰ καὶ ἐμαυτὸν τῷ ὀνόματι τῆς ἀμελείας ὑποπτευθέντα ὑπεύθυνον σοι εἶναι ἀλγῶ, ὅμως οὐ τοσοῦτον ἐμοὶ ὀχληρὸν χαλεπὸν ἦν τὸ αἰτιᾶσθαι ὑπὸ σου τὸ καθῆκον τὸ ἐμόν, ὅσον ἡδὺ τὸ ἀπαιτεῖσθαι ὑπὸ σου τοῦτο, μάλιστα ὅταν ἐν ᾧ ἠτιώμην κατηγορούμην, τοῦ ἐγκλήματος εἴην ἀθῶος.
>
> Though I am sorry you should have suspected that I am responsible for neglect, however, your accusation of my office was not so annoying and difficult to me, as long as it is delightful to demand this from you, especially since, in so far as your charge went, I was in no sense to blame. (transl. by the author)

The language of the translation is ancient Greek, as Politis noted.[177] Moreover, we notice that the anonymous translator used the translation practice of the 'translation pair',[178] as he often used two words to render a single word of the original (cf. ὑποπτευθέντα ὑπεύθυνον for *suspectum*, ὀχληρὸν χαλεπὸν for *molestum*, and ἠτιώμην κατηγορούμην for *accusabar*).

Conclusion

Following the presentation above, it is observable that many Ciceronian works were translated again by different translators (*Laelius*, *Catilinarians*, *Philippics*, *Pro Archia poeta*, *Pro Milone*, *Pro Ligario*, and parts of the *Tusculanae disputationes*). This is probably justified by the fact that these works were taught in schools and at the university, and there was always the need for new translations and commentaries on them. Most of the Greek translations of Ciceronian works from the nineteenth century were made for mainly educational reasons. Therefore, the majority of the translated works were rhetorical (*Catilinarians*, *Philippics*, *Pro Archia poeta*, *Pro Milone*, *Pro Ligario*, *Pro lege Manilia*, the fifth *Verrine*, *Pro Sestio*, *Pro Murena* and *Pro Sulla*). Cicero's philosophical works then follow (*Somnium Scipionis*, *De re publica*, *Laelius*, *De officiis* and Books One and Five of the *Tusculanae disputationes*), and finally, there is a sole translation of Cicero's *Epistulae ad familiares*. Undoubtedly, the translations of Ciceronian philosophical works excel, as they have literary value (e. g. Kogevinas' translation) and aim for a higher purpose,

176 For a detailed analysis of the contents of this manuscript, see http://gtll.lit.auth.gr/node/224 (seen: 17.1.2021).
177 Politis 1991, 263.
178 Kopanos 1974.

i. e. the political and philosophical awakening of the Greek nation (e. g. Tertsetis' and Kapodistrias' translations). The common origin of these translators from the Ionian Islands (Kapodistrias and Kogevinas were from Corfu, and Tertsetis from Zakynthos) led to their use of *dimotiki* (or mild *katharevousa*, in Kapodistrias' case); therefore, they addressed a wider readership, i. e. all the Greek-speaking people. Their translations were creative and literary, not simple textbooks of a technical character. After all, we must note several Heptanesian scholars' belief that their translations were not only mere renderings of a foreign literary work into the modern Greek language, but rather part of modern Greek literature.[179] Petridis' and Antoniadis' translations of *Laelius* in strict *katharevousa* (which looked like ancient Greek) aimed to be read by pupils and students, as well as by scholars. Moreover, Kapodistrias and Antoniadis consider Cicero's teachings as part of the Greek heritage. The translations of Ciceronian rhetorical works were produced in order to be used as school textbooks – this is why they were written in the official language of Greek education, the *katharevousa.* However, Doukakis and Livieratos also wanted their books to be read by a wider public. The ancient Greek translation of certain Ciceronian epistles in the unpublished manuscript signifies that the *Epistulae ad familiares* were likely also used in the educational process. Finally, we can note that the translators predominantly worked as teachers in high schools, and that some held a doctorate degree (Farantatos, Livieratos, Viagkinis, Karatzas). Karatzas was specialised in the translation of Ciceronian rhetorical works, as he translated six of these during the period between 1891 and 1893.

179 See Polylas 1891; Athanasiadou *et al.* 2019, 211 n. 29.

Ioannis Deligiannis

The First Greek Translation of Cicero's *De re publica* (1839)

Introduction

The discovery of Cicero's *De re publica* in 1819 by Angelo Mai on the palimpsest Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 5757[1] and the resulting *editio princeps* of what survived from the dialogue's six Books in 1822 (including the significant number of fragments of the indirect tradition),[2] were soon followed by more critical editions and translations of the text. The first Greek translation of Cicero's *De re publica* was produced by a certain A. ΣΤ., soon identified with Viaros Kapodistrias (1774–1842),[3] and was published in Athens in 1839,[4] only a few years after the recognition of the nascent Greek state in 1830 under the London Protocol and the subsequent declaration of the Kingdom of Greece in 1832. The political conditions of the Greek State, under which the translation was produced, are implied by the translator in his address to the readers in the prologue to the translation. Although, as will be shown below, the translation was based on another translation and not on the original Latin text, it was, however, a significant contribution to the familiarisation of the Greeks with the Latin Classics, especially with Cicero's political writings.[5]

1 For details on ms. Vat. lat. 5757, see Reynolds 1983, 131–132; Powell 2006, v–xxiii; Ziegler 1969, v–xxxiv; Bréguet 1980, vol. 1, 150–155; Stover/Revello (forthcoming).

2 Mai 1822.

3 Moustoxydis 1843, 126: "Ὑπὸ τὰ ἀρκτικὰ ταῦτα στοιχεῖα κρύπτεται τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μεταφράσαντος Κόμητος Βιάρου τοῦ Καποδιστρίου" ("Behind these initial letters is concealed the name of the translator Count Viaros Kapodistrias"). Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own.

4 The book, which was printed by P. Mantsarakis and contains the translation of the first three Books of the dialogue (Book One, pp. [1]–46, Book Two, pp. 46–80, and Book Three, pp. 80–97), is preceded by a prologue "Πρὸς τοὺς ἀναγνώστας" ("To the readers") (pp. [γ΄]–ς΄). A fairly good copy of it has been digitised by "Anemi. The Digital Library of Modern Greek Studies", https://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/metadata/4/f/8/metadata-39-0000569.tkl (seen 8.1.2021). See also the Appendix at the end of this volume and Pappas (p. 150) in this volume.

5 Cicero was mostly known to the Greeks only by translations of some of his rhetorical works and a few philosophical treatises and dialogues, as well as the *Somnium Scipionis*, the most extensive fragment of *De re publica*. *De re publica* itself did not meet with any modern Greek translation until 2015 (Deligiannis 2015), while *De legibus*, his second political dialogue, was only versed into Greek in 2017 (Deligiannis 2017b).

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779-011

The Prologue to and the Historical Background of the Translation

The prologue contains all the necessary elements of an address to the readers: a *praeparatio* or *praemunitio*, that is a justification for the translator's endeavouring the particular translation, a brief account of the history of Cicero's text and a description of its content in comparison with the political theories and ideas of Greek philosophers, its utility and aim with reference to the historical conditions of the Greek nation and the newly established Greek state, and an exhortation to the readers.

The translator's *praeparatio* and justification of selecting Cicero's *De re publica* for translation are emphatically placed in the opening paragraph of his introduction:

> Ἐπειδὴ μέχρι τῆς σήμερον δὲν ἐφάνη μεταφρασμένον εἰς τὴν καθομιλουμένην μας γλῶσσαν τὸ περὶ πολιτειῶν σύγγραμμα τοῦ Ῥωμαίου ῥήτορος, καὶ φιλοσόφου Κικέρωνος, ἐπεχειρίσθην ἐγὼ ἔργον τοιοῦτον, μολονότι βέβαια ἀνώτερον κατὰ πάντα τῶν δυνάμεών μου.[6]
>
> Because, as of today, there has been no translation into our spoken language of the work on constitutions by Cicero, the Roman orator and philosopher, I have myself attempted this kind of endeavour, though indeed it exceeds my abilities. (transl. by the author)

His self-defence in anticipation of an attack about his translation is also found twice further down in the prologue:

> Ἐὰν ἐδυνήθην νὰ μεταφράσω εἰς τὴν γλῶσσάν μας τὰ ὑψηλὰ καὶ φιλοσοφικὰ διανοήματα τοῦ Συγγραφέως, ἐλπίζω νὰ δώσω εὐάρεστον ἀσχόλημα εἰς τοὺς λογίους μας.[7]
>
> If I have managed to translate into our language the author's high-spirited and philosophical thoughts, I hope to give a pleasant engagement to our scholars. (transl. by the author)

and:

> Ὑποβάλλω εἰς τὸ ἔθνος μου τὴν εὐτελῆ προσφορὰν τοῦ κόπου μου, ἐπὶ σκοπῷ νὰ τὸ ὠφελήσω, διότι μὲ τὸ μελετᾷν τοιούτους σοφοὺς συγγραφεῖς ἀποκτῶμεν καλὸν ὁδηγὸν εἰς τὰ βήματά μας.[8]

---

6 Kapodistrias 1839, [γ΄]. The prologue, transcribed with its original spelling and accentuation, is placed at the end of this study along with its English translation, produced by the author.

7 Kapodistrias 1839, δ΄.

8 Kapodistrias 1839, ε΄.

> I submit to my nation this little offering of my effort, so that I can benefit it, because, by studying such wise authors, we acquire a good guide for our steps. (transl. by the author)

While these anticipatory comments are addressed to his nation and its scholars, the prologue closes with an exhortation to his compatriots in the second person plural, the only case in which he uses this person, while in the part between he uses the first singular and plural when addressing the readers:

> Φίλοι ὁμογενεῖς, βάλετε ὑπ' ὄψιν τὰ διανοήματα τοῦ Ῥωμαίου φιλοσόφου, τὰς σκέψεις του, καὶ τὰς ἱστορικὰς διηγήσεις του, καὶ συγκρίνατε τὰ πάντα μὲ τὰ ἡμέτερα, καὶ μετὰ τὴν σύγκρισιν κρίνατε.[9]
>
> My compatriot friends, do take into consideration the Roman philosopher's notions, thoughts and historical narrations, compare them all with our own, and, after the comparison, then decide. (transl. by the author)

The comparison to which he refers precedes and is made between Cicero's political theories and those by Greek philosophers:

> διότι θέλουν δυνηθῆ νὰ συμπαραβάλωσι τὸν Ῥωμαῖον συγγραφέα μὲ τοὺς ἡμετέρους τοὺς διαπραγματευσαμένους τὴν αὐτὴν ὕλην, καὶ νὰ ἀποφασίσωσι ποῖος αὐτῶν ὠφελιμώτερα συνέγραψε, περὶ πρακτέων πραγμάτων, ποῖος ἐθεώρησε τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὡς εἶναι, καὶ εἶπεν ὡς δύναται νὰ ἦναι· ἢ ἐὰν τοῦ μεταγενεστέρου τὸ σύγγραμμα συμπαραβαλλόμενον μὲ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν ἀρχαιοτέρων δὲν εἶναι, εἰμὴ, τρόπον τινὰ, αὐτῶν ἀντίγραφον· ἢ τελευταῖον ἀπονέμοντες ἑκάστῳ τὸν ἀνήκοντα ἔπαινον, θέλουσι γνωρίσει ὅτι ἅπαντες συνέγραψαν κατὰ τὸν καιρόν των, ὁ μὲν ἀρχαιότερος, διὰ τὴν ἠθικὴν κατάστασιν τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, λογικῶς ἐλπίζων ὅτι δύνανται οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ἢ κἂν τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν γένος νὰ μορφωθῶσιν εἰς τρόπον ὥστε ἡ καθαρότης τῶν ἠθῶν νὰ καταστήσῃ πρακτέον, ὅ,τι εἰς τὸν μετέπειτα καιρὸν ἐθεωρήθη ὡς ἕν τι μᾶλλον ἐλπιζόμενον, παρὰ πραττόμενον. Ὁ δὲ μετ' αὐτὸν πολεμήσας τὰς διδασκαλίας του, καὶ ἄλλα διδάξας ἐνόμισε πρακτέον ὅ,τι ἐπρόβαλεν. Ὁ μεταγενέστερος ὅμως θεωρῶν τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα ὡς ἦτο τότε, καὶ ποίαν ἐλπίδα ἔδιδε διὰ τὸ μέλλον, ἔλαβεν ὡς παράδειγμα τὰ παρελθόντα, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν ὡδηγήθη ἵνα κρίνῃ καὶ δώσῃ τὰς συμβουλάς του, ἐὰν ὄχι εἰς τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, βέβαια εἰς τὸ ῥωμαϊκὸν ἔθνος, ὅπως κρίνῃ, ποία δι' αὐτὸ ἤθελεν εἶσθαι ἡ βελτίων μορφὴ κυβερνήσεως.[10]
>
> for they will be able to compare the Roman author with those of ours who examined the same subject, and to decide which of them wrote more beneficially on how things must be done, who considered human things as they are, and said how they could be; or if the work of the later author compared with the works of the earlier authors is not but a sort of a copy of them; or, lastly, having awarded each their own merit, they will be able to find out that they all wrote according to their own times, the oldest one on the moral condition of humanity, reasonably hoping that men, or at least the Greek nation, could be educated

9 Kapodistrias 1839, ς΄.

10 Kapodistrias 1839, δ΄–ε΄.

> in a way that the purity of morals can make doable what was later considered hopeful rather than practical. The author after him, having fought the latter's teaching and instructed other things, considered what he proposed doable. However, the later author, having seen humanity as it was then and what hope it gave for the future, took as an example what happened in the past and was led by it to judge and give his advice, if not to the entire world, at least to the Roman nation, so that it could appraise which form of constitution would be best for it. (transl. by the author)

The comparison is made between Cicero and the Greek political philosophers, without naming them, but implying their identity by his subsequent references to them. He offers a tripartite assessment of their contribution to the development of the political thought and practice: a) "which of them wrote more beneficially on how things must be done, who considered human things as they are, and said how they could be", the emphasis being placed on the value and usefulness of their philosophical writings and whether or not these were based on reality and pragmatism; b) "if the work of the later author compared with the works of the earlier authors is not but a sort of a copy of them", that is if Cicero's dialogue simply repeats the ideas expressed by the Greek philosophers;[11] and c) awarding "each their

11 Compared to the content of the prologue to this translation, which is very positive for Cicero's political theories, there were evaluations of them that considered them no more than an imitation of the Greek political ideas; see, e. g., Kokkonis 1829, 390 and n. 2: "Ο Κικέρων, ὁ Λουκρήτιος καὶ ὁ Σένεκκας ἔγραψαν εὐγλώττως καὶ γλαφυρῶς περὶ φιλοσοφίας εἰς τὴν γλῶσσάν των· ἀλλ' ἡ φιλοσοφία αὕτη ἦτο ἡ Ἑλληνική. […] Περὶ δὲ πολιτικῆς δὲν διεσώθη κάνὲν σύγγραμμα τῶν Ῥωμαίων. Τὸ νεωστὶ ἀνακαλυφθὲν περὶ πολιτειῶν τοῦ Κικέρωνος δὲν περιέχει τίποτε νεώτερον ἄλλο ταρὰ [sic] τὰς θεωρίας τῶν Ἑλλήνων. Τῆς βιωτικῆς ἐπιστήμης αἱ γνώσεις δὲν ἦτο δυνατὸν νὰ μεταφυτευθῶσι καὶ νὰ τελειοποιηθῶσιν εἰς τὴν Ρώμην, ἐν ᾧ καιρῷ ἢ ἐλευθερία ἔπνεε τὰ λοίσθια (2). (2) Τὸ σύγγραμμα τοῦτο τοῦ Κικέρωνος εὑρέθη περὶ τὰ 1822 εἰς τὴν Βιβλιοθήκην τῆς Ῥώμης ὑπὸ Μαΐου, καὶ μετεφράσθη ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισήμου προφέσσορος τῶν Παρισίων Βιλμαίνου εἰς τὸ Γαλλικὸν" ("Cicero, Lucretius and Seneca wrote articulately and flowingly on philosophy in their language; however, this philosophy was the Greek one. […] On the political theory, no work of the Romans has survived. The recently discovered one of Cicero's on constitutions contains nothing new but the theories of the Greeks. The knowledge of this useful-for-life science was not possible to get transplanted and perfected in Rome, when liberty was breathing its last breath (2). (2) This work of Cicero was found around 1822 in the Library of Rome by Mai, and was translated into French by the notable professor Villemain in Paris"). Evaluations of this kind might have been instigated by statements of Cicero such as the one included in a letter to Atticus from 45 BCE (Cic. *Att*. 12.52.3: *De lingua Latina securi es animi. Dices †qui alia quae scribis†.* Ἀπόγραφα *sunt, minore labore fiunt; verba tantum adfero, quibus abundo*; "About the Latin Language you can set your mind at rest. You will say 'What's that compared to your writings?' (?) They are mere transcripts, requiring less work. I just contribute the words, which I have in plenty"; transl. Shackleton Bailey 1999), only "eight days after completing 'two big books' on Academic epistemology (*duo magna* συντάγματα, *Att*. 12.44)", which statement "seems to offer a general reflection on how the author goes about philosophizing"

own merit", referring first to Plato's philosophical and political views ("the oldest one [...] rather than practical") as rather utopian, abstract and idealistic, then to Aristotle's ("The author after him [...] what he proposed doable") as more rational, pragmatic and practical compared to his teacher's, and finally to Cicero ("However, the later author [...] would be best for it") as the most realist of all three authors, whose theories and ideas were shaped by the past for the future benefit of the Romans. The characterisation of Plato as the most idealist, Cicero the most realist, and Aristotle in between them by the translator might have derived from Cicero's dialogue itself, where the Roman author criticises Plato's republic comparing it to his own on several occasions,[12] while many of his views on ethics and politics in the dialogue were borrowed from Aristotle, indicative of Cicero's reception of this philosopher's views as, at least, more practical than Plato's.[13] Cicero, furthermore, expresses the rudiments of realism in Book One of his dialogue and in the passages where he compares his state to Plato's.[14] His realism originates from building up his political theory on the Roman state through its various historical and political changes and fluctuations; listing the positive and negative elements of each constitution that Rome went through enabled him to suggest the best form of constitution to the Romans, which would secure the future survival of the state.

This is precisely the point of Cicero's theory that appeals most to the translator and his decision to attempt his translation. The aforementioned comparison is necessary for his compatriots to be more prepared in choosing their constitution correctly, making a connection with their current political conditions:

> Τὰ τοιαῦτα θέλουσι παρέξει ἄφθονον ὕλην εἰς τὰς σκέψεις, καὶ μελέτας τῶν ὁμογενῶν μου, ἵνα, ὁπόταν προτείνωσί τι διὰ τὴν ἐθνικὴν ὠφέλειαν, ἔχωσι προμελετημένον, ἐὰν ἡ πρότασίς των ἐπιστηρίζεται εἰς τὰς γνώμας τῶν παλαιῶν φιλοσόφων, καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ Ῥωμαίου φιλοσόφου, ὁ ὁποῖος εἰς τὰς περιγραφὰς τῶν ἀποτελεσμάτων παντὸς εἴδους πολιτικῆς μορφῆς Κυβερνήσεως, ἐπαρέστησε τὰ πράγματα, ἔκτοτε, ὡς τὰ εἴδομεν εἰς τὰς ἡμέρας μας, τόσον τὰ καλά, ὅσον καὶ τὰ κακά. Εἰς τὸν Ῥωμαῖον φιλόσοφον θέλουσιν εὑρεῖ σώφρονα σύμβουλον, καὶ ὁδηγὸν, ὁ ὁποῖος θέλει τοὺς θέσει εἰς κατάστασιν νὰ διακρίνωσι, καὶ νὰ προτιμήσωσι τὸ κατὰ τὸ

and "was to have a momentous impact on how later scholarship would interpret his philosophy" (Cappello 2019, 13).

12 See, e. g., Cic. *Rep.* 2.3; 2.21–22; 2.51–52.

13 See, e. g., Cic. *Rep.* 1.2 (on the balance between theory and practice; cf. Arist. *Pol.* 7.3.1325a.16–34); 1.3 (on political leader's role; cf. Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 8.9.1160a.11–14 and 1.2.1094b.5–15); 1.39 (on the formation of the first human communities and on man as a political being; cf. Arist. *Pol.* 7.8.1328b.16–17; 1.2.1252b.30–31; 1.2.1253a.2–3); 1.42 (on the various versions of the constitutions; cf. Arist. *Pol.* 3.7.1279a.25–31); 1.45 (on the mixed constitution; cf. Arist. *Pol.* 2.6.1265b.26–1266a.7; 4.3.1290a.26–27; 4.11.1295a.25–1296b.12; 5.8.1307b.30–31); 1.50 (on the Spartan constitution; cf. Arist. *Pol.* 2.9.1270b.39–41; 3.14.1285b.27–28; 3.15.1285b.33–1286a.1; 3.15.1286b.22–27), etc.

14 For the latter, see n. 12 above; for the former, see, e. g., Cic. *Rep.* 1.1–13.

φαινόμενον περιωρισμένον, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν ὠφέλιμον καὶ δίκαιον, ἀπὸ τὸ κατὰ τὸ πρῶτον λαμπρὸν, καὶ ἐλκυστικὸν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν δευτέραν ὀλέθριον.[15]

These will be able to provide ample material to the thoughts and studies of my compatriots, so that, when they ever propose something for the national benefit, they have deliberated about, if their proposal is based on the thoughts of the ancient philosophers, and indeed of the Roman philosopher, who in the descriptions of the results of every kind of political form of constitution, showed the things then as we saw them in our days, both the good and the bad. In the Roman philosopher they will be able to find a prudent advisor and guide, who will be able to make them judge and prefer what looks suppressive, but in essence is beneficial and right, to what at first appears glorious and attractive, while on a second look is catastrophic. (transl. by the author)

Although his references to the political conditions of Greece at the time are rather vague, they could be defined if they are discussed along with the actual political and historical events of the time. To better understand, however, the translator's messages to his compatriots, one also needs to consider another passage from his introduction:

Τὰ πασιφανῆ παραδείγματα τῶν στρατιωτικῶν κατορθωμάτων τοῦ ἐμπειροπολέμου Μιλτιάδου, τοῦ συνετοῦ Θεμιστοκλέους, καὶ τοῦ ἀνδρείου Λεωνίδου, καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν, τὰ ὁποῖα ἦσαν, εἶναι, καὶ ἔσονται παρόντα εἰς μνήμην ὅλου τοῦ ἔθνους μας, πόσων καὶ πόσων δὲν ἐθέρμανον τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ δὲν ἠρέθισαν τὴν τόλμην ἵνα περιφρονήσωσι κινδύνους, καὶ τυφλοὶ γινόμενοι εἰς αὐτοὺς, νὰ προσηλώσωσι τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς των πρὸς τὴν δόξαν, καὶ τὴν σωτηρίαν τῆς πατρίδος; Παύσαντος τώρα τοῦ πολέμου, καὶ ἐμβαίνοντος τοῦ ἔθνους εἰς πολιτικὸν στάδιον, νομίζω ὅτι θέλει ἀποτελέσει ὠφέλιμα ἡ ἀνάμνησις τῆς σοφίας τῶν ἀρχαίων, ἥτις θέλει παραχωρήσει τὴν αὐτῶν σύνεσιν ὁδηγὸν εἰς ἡμᾶς, καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν διανοήματα θέλουσι καρποφορήσει καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν μας. Δὲν θέλομεν ἀδικηθῆ οὐδόλως συμβουλευόμενοι τὴν πολιτικὴν σοφίαν τοῦ Κικέρωνος, σκεπτόμενοι περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων πραγμάτων, διότι κατὰ τοῦτο θέλομεν εἶσθαι εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν κατάστασιν, τώρα, πρὸς αὐτὸν, καθὼς αὐτὸς ἦτο, τότε πρὸς τὴν ἑλληνικὴν πολιτικὴν σοφίαν, σκεπτόμενος περὶ τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν πραγμάτων.[16]

The evident examples of the military achievements of Miltiades the war-seasoned, of Themistocles the prudent, of Leonidas the gallant, and many others, which were, are and will be present in the memory of our entire nation, how many souls have they not heated up and excited their valour so that they could scorn dangers and, having become blind towards them, could fix their eyes to the glory and salvation of their country? Now that the war is over and the nation has entered a civil stage, I believe that the remembrance of the ancients' wisdom will be proved beneficial, as it will offer their prudence as a guide to us and their thoughts will bear fruits in our days too. It will not disserve us at all to consult Cicero's political wisdom and to consider our own condition, because, with respect to this, we will be now in the same condition as he was then in regard to the Greek political wisdom, when he was thinking about the Roman conditions. (transl. by the author)

15 Kapodistrias 1839, ε′.

16 Kapodistrias 1839, ε′–ς′.

The reconnection of the nineteenth-century Greek population with the ancient Greek past was the result of the ideological and philosophical movement of the Modern Greek Enlightenment in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Greek scholars of the time conscientiously and persistently turned their rather uncultured compatriots into fervent admirers of ancient Greek culture, history and its heroes, by taking advantage of their lack of self-confidence towards other Europeans and their yearning for national identity, independence from Ottoman rule and establishment of their own state. This whole movement was partly responsible for leading the Greek population of the Balkans to the Greek War of Independence in 1821. The war officially ended in 1830 with the establishment of Greece as an independent, sovereign state under the London Protocol, and the subsequent declaration of the Kingdom of Greece in 1832.

However, the decade from 1822, when the First National Assembly of Epidaurus marked, by establishing a central administration, the birth of the modern Greek state, until 1832, when the Kingdom of Greece was declared at the Convention of London by the Great Powers (England, France and Russia), was full of dangers and political changes for the nascent nation. Two civil wars between 1823 and 1825, conflicts among powerful local magnates and chieftains, along with organisational and financial problems and victories of the Turco-Egyptian army, threatened the revolution with collapse. A ray of hope for the success of the insurgents appeared in 1827, when the Third National Assembly of Troezen declared the Hellenic State and selected Count Ioannis Kapodistrias (1776–1831), the translator's younger brother, as Governor of Greece. Kapodistrias arrived in Greece in early 1828 and, in order to redress the problems of the war-devastated country, adopted a rather authoritarian way of government, appointed his brothers, Viaros and Augustinos, to political and military positions, thus being accused of nepotism, and clashed with powerful landowners and chieftains, which resulted in his assassination in 1831, followed by renewed civil strife. He was succeeded by his younger brother, Augustinos Kapodistrias (1778–1857), until early 1832, but the latter's rule was marked by political instability and anarchy. The official establishment of the Kingdom of Greece in May 1832 was followed by the selection of Otto of Wittelsbach, the seventeen-year-old son of King Ludwig I of Bavaria, as the first King of Greece. Otto arrived in Greece in early 1833 along with 3.500 Bavarian troops and three Bavarian ministers as Regents.

The regency council governed until 1835 as an oligarchy, making itself very unpopular to the Greeks by trying to impose ideas and practices foreign to the locals. Even after the termination of the regency in 1835, political tension remained strong, because Otto refused to grant a constitution and ruled the country as an absolute monarch until 1843, causing an increasing sentiment of discontent. Otto's absolutism in combination with other reasons (his refusal to convert from

Catholicism to Orthodoxy, his queen's Lutheran faith and interference in the government, the ongoing Bavarian influence even after the appointment of Greek prime ministers, the disproportionate share of public high offices granted to Greeks who moved to the kingdom from other areas of the Balkans and Asia Minor, onerous tax burdens and limited revenues) led to a coup d'état on 3 September 1843, resulting in the change of Otto's absolute monarchy to a constitutional monarchy.

The year when the translation was published (1839), "an obscure 'Philorthodox' conspiracy came to light, seemingly aimed at forcing Otto either to convert from Catholicism to Orthodoxy or to abdicate".[17] The Philorthodox Society that organised this conspiracy was a secret society under the support of the Russian Party (one of the three political parties named after the three Great Powers that established the kingdom) and "emerged sometime after the arrival of Konstantinos Oikonomou in 1834 and crystallised as a definitive society when Georgios Kapodistrias moved [from Corfu] to Athens in 1838",[18] or "in 1836, to claim from the Greek government what the Greek state owed to his brother, Ioannis Kapodistrias".[19] Georgios Kapodistrias (1783–1841), who was considered one of the leaders of the conspiracy, was arrested and jailed. It is not certain whether or not his elder brother, Viaros, was aware of Georgios' secret plans. Having been accused of nepotism, authoritarianism and abuse of power, Viaros, who held important political offices during the rule of both his brothers, Ioannis and Augustinos, fled to Corfu in May 1832 (after the fall of Augustinos from power), where he died in 1842, only three years after publishing his translation.

Viaros Kapodistrias appears to imply the aforementioned political conditions in the passages of the prologue cited above. The closing paragraph of the second passage ("It will not disserve us […] about the Roman conditions") makes a comparison between the Roman historical and political conditions of Cicero's times, especially when he composed his dialogue (54–51 BCE), and the Greek conditions of the translator's times. The decade of the 50s BCE was preceded by the civil wars between G. Marius and L. Cornelius Sulla (88–81 BCE), the latter's dictatorship (82–79 BCE), the Catilinarian conspiracy (63 BCE), and the first Triumvirate of Gn. Pompey, J. Caesar and M. Licinius Crassus (60 BCE), while, in the late 50s, Rome was on the verge of another civil war that broke out between Caesar and Pompey in the first half of the 40s BCE. All these conditions can relate to those of the Greek state as described above: the civil wars, the authoritarian government of the Bavarian

17 Clogg 1992, 51.

18 Frary 2015, 170–177, esp. 176. See also Jelavich 1966.

19 Loukos 1997, 327.

regency council followed by Otto's absolute monarchy and the discontent they had caused, and the peril of another civil war among the supporters of Otto and those who demanded a constitution. So, as Cicero considered Greek political wisdom, so that he could advise his compatriots of the best form of constitution for Rome, the translator suggests that the Greeks should consider the Roman philosopher's political ideas in order to choose the best constitution for themselves.

However, this does not necessarily mean that Viaros suggested a change of constitution. This must be implied in the closing paragraph of the first passage cited above, where he states that Cicero will help the Greeks "judge and prefer what looks suppressive, but in essence is beneficial and right, to what at first appears glorious and attractive, while on a second look is catastrophic". This conclusion comes after his observation that "the Roman philosopher [...] in the descriptions of the results of every kind of political form of constitution, showed the things then as we saw them in our days, both the good and the bad". The translator apparently refers to the discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of each constitution by Cicero in Book One of this dialogue, while he implies that the Greek nation too experienced the strengths and weaknesses of various constitutions in the period from 1821 to his times: democracy (the central administration in the first years of the revolution) that soon turned to anarchy and mob-rule (during the civil wars), aristocracy (of the local magnates) and its degenerate counterpart, oligarchy (during the Bavarian regency), and tyranny (Otto's absolutism). There was only one constitution the Greeks had not yet tried and that was monarchy, the just and fair monarchy as described by Cicero in Book One of his *De re publica.*[20] Given the increasing demand of a constitution from Otto after 1835, which led to the 1843 coup d'état, it may not be totally groundless to assume that the translator's statement "what looks suppressive, but in essence is beneficial and right" might refer to his preference to monarchy, in comparison to "what at first appears glorious and attractive, while on a second look is catastrophic" referring to democracy or mob-rule, as these three forms of government are described by Cicero in what remained of his dialogue's Book One.

The dialogue's fragmentary condition is also an issue addressed by the translator in his prologue, where he refers to both its direct and indirect tradition, especially to the fragments preserved in Christian authors:

> Τοῦ συγγράμματος τούτου, γνωστοῦ εἰς τοὺς προαπελθόντας αἰῶνας, ἡ φορὰ τῶν πραγμάτων δὲν εἶχεν ἀφήσει, εἰμὴ τεμάχιά τινα, τὰ ὁποῖα ἀνεγινώσκοντο εἰς ἄλλους πολὺ μεταγενε-

20 See Cic. *Rep.* 1.56–64.

> στέρους Συγγραφεῖς, καὶ τὸ περισσότερον ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς, ὡς εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Αὐγουστῖνον καὶ εἰς ἄλλους.[21]
>
> Of this work, well-known in past centuries, the impetus of nature had left but only a few fragments, which were preserved in other, much later authors, mostly ecclesiastical, as for example in Saint Augustine and others. (transl. by the author)

He pays tribute to A. Mai and his discovery of the Vatican Library palimpsest in 1819,[22] and provides a brief description of the condition and content of the dialogue's Books (One, Two and Three) translated by him:

> Ὁ καιρὸς ὅμως ἢ μᾶλλον εἰπεῖν, ἡ παρέλευσις αἰώνων, τοῦ αὐτοῦ παλαιοτάτου συγγράμματος, ἐπὶ τοῦ ὁποίου ἄλλη γραφὴ εἶχεν ἐπιτεθῆ, ἔφθειρε πολλά. Καλῇ τύχῃ, τοῦ πρώτου, καὶ τοῦ δευτέρου βιβλίου, καίτοι ὀλιγώτερον τοῦ τρίτου, τὰ σωζόμενα παρασταίνουσι τὰ φρονήματα τοῦ συγγραφέως, μολονότι μὲ ἐλλείψεις, ὅμως ἀρκετὰ σαφῆ, ἵνα ὁ ἀναγνώστης γνωρίσῃ τὶ ἐφρόνει περὶ τοῦ ἐμβριθοῦς ἀντικειμένου, ποία ἡ βελτίων μορφὴ Κυβερνήσεως, καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς μορφῆς διὰ τὴν συνδιατήρησίν της, καὶ διὰ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν τοῦ ἔθνους, ποία πρέπει νὰ ᾖναι ἡ κυρία της βάσις.[23]
>
> Time, however, or rather the elapsing of centuries has destroyed much of this very old work, on which another script was superposed. By good fortune, what has survived of the first and the second book, though a little less of the third book, shows the author's thoughts, which, although with omissions, are clear enough for the reader to become acquainted with what he believed on this profound subject, namely what the best form of constitution was and what the main foundation of this constitution must be for its conservation and for a nation's prosperity. (transl. by the author)

He obviously feels the need to justify his decision not to have translated into Greek the remaining three Books:

> Τῶν ἄλλων τριῶν βιβλίων σώζονται μόνον ὀλίγα τινα, μὲ χάσματα μεγαλώτατα εἰς τρόπον ὥστε ἡ ἔννοια τῶν γεγραμμένων διόλου λείπει, πλὴν τοῦ ἐνυπνίου τοῦ Σκιπίωνος, μεταφρασθέντος εἰς τὴν παλαιάν μας γλῶσσαν παρὰ τοῦ λογίου Πλανούδη.[24]
>
> Of the other three books only little has survived, with huge gaps in a way that it is impossible to understand their content, with the exception of the Dream of Scipio, which was translated into our older language by the erudite Planudes. (transl. by the author)

---

21 Kapodistrias 1839, [γ΄].

22 Kapodistrias 1839, [γ΄]: "χάρις τῷ σοφῷ Ἰταλῷ Κυρίῳ Μάϊ, ὅστις διὰ τῆς ἐπιμελείας του, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐφευρεθείσης τέχνης τοῦ παλιμψήστου ἀνεκάλυψε καὶ εὗρε τὸ αὐτὸ σύγγραμμα" ("thanks to the prudent Italian Master Mai, who, by his assiduity and through the invented art of palimpsest reading, discovered and found this work").

23 Kapodistrias 1839, [γ΄].

24 Kapodistrias 1839, [γ΄]–δ΄.

The latter translation, that of the Dream of Scipio from Book Six of Cicero's dialogue, attributed to the Byzantine scholar Maximus Planudes (ca 1260–ca 1305), was ascribed by A. Moustoxydis to Theodore Gaza (1408/10–1475/76); for "[t]he Dream of Scipio, rendered into the Greek language by Maximus Planudes [published in] Florence [in] 1816", he comments that "Professor Ciampi published it under Planudes' name instead of Gaza's, having followed the testimony of the codices of the Laurenziana and Marciana Libraries and relied on the style of the language".[25] K. Sathas, in contrast, writes for Gaza that "he translated from Latin into the Greek Cicero's *Cato Maior vel de senectute*, published in Florence, 1507 [...] in Ingolstadt, 1596. However, to Gaza was erroneously attributed Maximus Planudes' translation of the Dream of Scipio, published along with the above-mentioned work as a translation by Gaza".[26] More recent studies have established the attribution of this version to Planudes.[27]

The Translation

Although one may think that Moustoxydis' misattribution of Planudes' translation to Gaza perhaps casts doubt on his attribution of the translation of Cicero's *De re publica* to Viaros Kapodistrias,[28] there are strong indications that he must be correct. Andreas Moustoxydis (1785–1860), a scholar and politician from Corfu, was not only a contemporary of Viaros, but also close to Ioannis Kapodistrias, who, during his government, appointed him director of education. After Kapodistrias' assassination in 1831, Moustoxydis returned to Corfu, where he resumed his historical and philological studies by founding the journal *Ἑλληνομνήμων ἢ Σύμμικτα*

25 Moustoxydis 1843, 125: "Κικέρωνος (M. T.) – Κάτων ὁ μείζων ἢ τοῦ γήρως, καὶ ὁ ὄνειρος τοῦ Σκιπίωνος, μεταφράσαντος Θεοδώρου τοῦ Γαζῆ – Ἐν Φλωρεντίᾳ 1507 [...] – Μόνος ὁ ὄνειρος τοῦ Σκιπίωνος, ἐν Παρισίοις 1552. – Σκιπίωνος ὄνειρος, εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν μετενεχθεὶς παρὰ Μαξίμου τοῦ Πλανούδου. – Ἐν Φλωρεντίᾳ 1816. – Εἶναι ἡ αὐτὴ καὶ ἡ ἀνωτέρω μετάφρασις· ὁ δὲ καθηγητὴς Κιάμπιος ἐξέδωκεν αὐτὴν ὑπὸ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πλανούδου ἀντὶ τοῦ Γαζῆ, ἀκολουθήσας τὴν σύμφωνον μαρτυρίαν τῶν κωδήκων τῆς Λαυρεντιανῆς καὶ τῆς Μαρκιανῆς καὶ ἐπιστηριχθεὶς εἰς τὸν χαρακτῆρα τοῦ λόγου" ("Cicero (M. T.) – Cato the Elder or on Old Age, and the Dream of Scipio, translated by Theodore Gaza – Florence 1507 [...] – Only the Dream of Scipio, Paris 1552. – The Dream of Scipio, rendered into the Greek language by Maximus Planudes. – Florence 1816. – It is the same translation as the one above; Professor Ciampi published it under Planudes' name instead of Gaza's, having followed the testimony of the codices of the Laurenziana and Marciana Libraries and relied on the style of the language"). See also Göz 1801.

26 Sathas 1868, 40.

27 See also Gigante 1958; Pavano 1992; Megas 1995; Papathomopoulos 2000.

28 See n. 3 above.

Ἑλληνικά. It could, therefore, be assumed that his attribution of the translation to Viaros in 1843, just four years after its publication, originated from a direct and personal knowledge of the latter's endeavour. Moreover, as will be shown below, it seems that Viaros' translation was based not on the Latin text in Mai's 1822 edition, to which he makes reference in the prologue, but on the French version published in 1823 by Abel François Villemain.[29] A copy of this translation was certainly in the possession of Ioannis Kapodistrias' personal library,[30] and it is reasonable to assume that Viaros, who spent the last decade of his life (1832–1842) in Corfu, had access to it, especially after his brother's death. He undoubtedly knew French, as can be gathered from the correspondence between the two brothers,[31] so he could well have used Villemain's translation for the production of his own in Greek.

To show the relationship between the two translations, below will be listed and discussed some examples from the first three Books of the dialogue (K), grouped under two different categories: a) passages in which the Greek translation faithfully follows the French one both in cases where the Latin text is preserved and in cases where there are gaps in the Latin text, filled in by contextual supplementations; b) passages in which the Greek translation deviates either from the Latin or from the French text or from both. References to Cicero's dialogue are made to its edition by Powell 2006. The Latin text is that of Mai's edition (M) as reproduced by Villemain in his 1823 one (V); all quotes are followed by page references to Villemain 1823 and Kapodistrias 1839.

Similarities between the Greek and the French Translations

Cic. *Rep.* 1.13
M, vol. 1, 24: *et in explicandis rationibus rerum civilium quamdam facultatem*
V, vol. 1, 25: et [...] quelque facilité pour expliquer les mouvemens [sic] et les ressorts de la politique
K, 8: καὶ [τὴν ἱκανότητα] νὰ ἀναπτύξω τὰ κινήματα, καὶ τὰ ἐλατήρια τῆς πολιτικῆς.[32]

29 Villemain 1823.
30 See http://kapodistrias.digitalarchive.gr/archive.php?type=book&id=1438 (seen 9.1.2021).
31 Bétant 1839, 138–139; 171–173; 175–178, etc.
32 M: "and a certain competence in explaining the issues of civic life"; V: "and some facility to explain the movements and springs of politics"; K: "and [the ability] to elaborate on the movements and springs of politics".

The phrase "τὰ κινήματα καὶ τὰ ἐλατήρια τῆς πολιτικῆς" follows word for word the French "les mouvemens [sic] et les ressorts de la politique" for rendering the Latin *rationibus rerum civilium.*

Cic. *Rep.* 1.14
M, vol. 1, 26: *Nam cum P. Africanus hic Pauli filius,* [...] *Tuditano consule et Aquilio*
V, vol. 1, 27: Dans l'année du consulat de Tuditanus et d'Aquilius, Scipion l'Africain, le fils de Paul-Emile
K, 9: Ἐπὶ Τουδιτανοῦ, καὶ Ἀκουϊλίου ὑπάτων, Σκιπίων ὁ Ἀφρικανὸς υἱὸς Παύλου Αἰμιλίου.[33]

The transposition of the Latin *Tuditano consule et Aquilio* at the beginning of the period, the change of "Publius" of the original to "Scipio", and the addition of "Aemilius" to his father's name are common features in both the French and the Greek translations.

Cic. *Rep.* 1.22
M, vol. 1, 42–44: *et eam a Thalete milesio primum esse tornatam* [...] *et incideret luna tum in eam metam, quae esset umbra terrae, cum sol e regione*
V, vol. 1, 43–45: et que le premier modèle en avait été donné par Thalès de Milet [...] et que la lune touchait le point où elle est obscurcie par l'ombre de la terre, à l'instant où le soleil reparaissait sur l'horizon, etc.
K, 14–15: καὶ ὅτι τὸ πρῶτον σχέδιον τὸ εἶχε δώσει Θαλῆς ὁ Μιλήσιος [...] καὶ ὅτι ἡ σελήνη τότε ἔφθανεν εἰς τὴν θέσιν, εἰς τὴν ὁποίαν ἐσκοτίζετο, ἀπὸ τὴν σκιὰν τῆς γῆς, καθ' ἣν στιγμὴν ὁ ἥλιος ἀνέτελλεν εἰς τὸν ὁρίζοντα.[34]

The Latin *primum esse tornatam* with reference to the sphere was translated both in French and in Greek by the same periphrasis, including terms absent from the original text ("model" and "give"). The contextual supplementation of the fragmentary end of the chapter ("à l'instant où le soleil reparaissait sur l'horizon") by Villemain is repeated word for word by the Greek translator.

33 M: "For when Publius Africanus, the son of Paulus, [...] in the consulate of Tuditanus and Aquilius"; V: "In the year of the consulate of Tuditanus and Aquilius, Scipio Africanus, Paulus Aemilius' son"; K: "During the consulship of Tuditanus and Aquilius, Scipio Africanus, Paulus Aemilius' son".
34 M: "it had first been made by Thales of Miletus [...] and the moon then happened to fall into the cone where the shadow of the earth was, when the sun from the region"; V: "and that the first model had been given by Thales of Miletus [...] and that the moon touched the point where it was obscured by the shadow of the earth, the moment when the sun reappeared on the horizon, etc."; K: "and that the first model was given by Thales of Miletus [...] and that the moon then arrived at the place where it was obscured by the shadow of the earth, at the moment when the sun was rising on the horizon".

Cic. *Rep.* 1.39
M, vol. 1, 70: *non est enim singulare nec solivagum genus hoc; sed ita generatum, ut ne in omnium quidem rerum affluentia*
V, vol. 1, 71–73: Car l'espèce humaine n'est pas une race d'individus isolés, errans, solitaires; elle naît avec une disposition qui, même dans l'abondance de toutes choses et sans besoin de secours, lui rend nécessaire la societé des hommes
K, 25: διότι τοῦτο τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος δὲν συνίσταται ἐξ ἀτόμων μεμωνομένων καὶ πλανωμένων, ἀλλὰ καὶ γεννᾶται μὲ τὴν διάθεσιν τῆς κοινωνικότητος ἐν μέσῳ τῆς ἀφθονίας παντὸς πράγματος, καὶ ἄνευ ἀνάγκης βοηθείας.[35]

Similarities between the two translations are spotted in rendering the two Latin adjectives for *genus* (*singulare* and *solivagum*) as prepositional phrases "of isolated, wandering, solitary individuals" (the Greek translator keeping the first two adjectives only), and in filling in the incomplete end of the period: the Greek "μὲ τὴν διάθεσιν τῆς κοινωνικότητος" and "καὶ ἄνευ ἀνάγκης βοηθείας" correspond to the French "avec une disposition qui [...] lui rend nécessaire la societé des hommes" and "et sans besoin de secours", respectively.

Cic. *Rep.* 1.44
M, vol. 1, 76: *Nam illi regi, ut eum potissimum nominem, tolerabili, aut si vultis, etiam amabili Cyro*
V, vol. 1, 77: Après ce roi tolérable, pour me servir de l'expression la plus juste, ou même si vous le voulez, après ce roi digne d'amour, Cyrus
K, 27: Μετ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν ἀνεκτὸν, (διὰ νὰ μεταχειρισθῶ τὴν ὀρθοτέραν ἔκφρασιν) ἢ ἐὰν θέλετε, ἀξιάγαστον βασιλέα Κῦρον.[36]

The Greek translation of the Latin final clause *ut eum potissimum nominem* repeats the erroneous French translation of it.

Cic. *Rep.* 2.1
M, vol. 1, 128–130: *cuique vel patris utriusque judicio, vel etiam meo studio*
V, vol. 1, 129: et à qui, soit par l'influence éclairée de mes parens adoptifs et naturels, soit de

35 M: "For this species is neither solitary nor unsocial, but it is so created that not even in an abundance of everything"; V: "For the human species is not a race of isolated, wandering, solitary individuals; it is born with a disposition which, even in the abundance of all things and without the need for help, makes human society necessary for it"; K: "For the human race does not consist of isolated and wandering individuals, but it is born both with the disposition of sociability even in the abundance of all things and without the need for help".
36 M: "For beneath that tolerable or, if you wish, even lovable king Cyrus, to name him as the best example"; V: "After this tolerable king, to use the most appropriate expression, or even if you like, after this king worthy of love, Cyrus"; K: "After that tolerable (to use the most appropriate expression) or if you like, admirable king Cyrus".

mon propre mouvement
K, 46: καὶ πρὸς τὸν ὁποῖον εἴτε διὰ γνώμης τοῦτο γεννήσαντός με πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοθετήσαντος, εἴτε ἐξ ἰδίας μου προαιρέσεως.[37]

The interpretative translation of the Latin *patris utriusque* in the French and Greek translations differentiates Scipio's natural father (L. Aemilius Paulus) from his adoptive father (P. Cornelius Scipio).

Cic. *Rep.* 2.2
M, vol. 1, 130: *postremo exsanguem jam et jacentem doctus vir phalereus sustentasset Demetrius*
V, vol. 1, 131: et enfin, pour ranimer son épuisement et sa faiblesse, un savant homme, Démétrius de Phalère
K, 47: καὶ τελευταῖον διὰ νὰ ἐνισχύσωσι τὴν ἀδράνειάν των καὶ τὴν ἀδυναμίαν των, ἔλαβον τὸν σοφὸν Δημήτριον τὸν Φαληρέα.[38]

The Latin *exsanguem* (Attributive Adjective) and *jacentem* (Present Participle denoting continuance) with reference to the Athenians' *rem publicam* were turned into a final clause in both the French and the Greek translations, using exactly the same terms.

Cic. *Rep.* 2.9
M, vol. 1, 142: *Ita barbarorum agris quasi adtexta quaedam videtur ora esse Graeciae*
V, vol. 1, 143: Il semblerait qu'une portion détachée des rivages de la Grèce est venue border ces continens barbares
K, 51: ὥστε φαίνεται ὅτι μέρος τὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος διεσπάσθη ἀπὸ τὰ παραθαλάσσιά της, καὶ προσετέθη εἰς τῶν βαρβάρων τὰς χώρας.[39]

The Greek translation follows word for word the rather free French version in rendering the Latin infinitive phrase *adtexta quaedam ora esse*, by *quaedam ora* be-

37 M: "and to whom either following the judgment of both my fathers or also from my own interest"; V: "and to whom, either by the enlightened influence of my adoptive and natural parents, or of my own movement"; K: "and to whom, either by the opinion of the father who begot me and the one who adopted me, or from my own will".
38 M: "finally being already drained of blood and prostrate, it [sc. Athens] was restored by a learned man, Demetrius of Phalerum"; V: "and finally, to revive its [sc. Athens'] weariness and its weakness, a learned man, Demetrius of Phalerum"; K: "and finally, to help its [sc. Athens'] inactiveness and its weakness, it accepted the learned Demetrius of Phalerum".
39 M: "So the coast of Greece seems to be sort of knitted together with the lands of the barbarians"; V: "It seems that a part detached from the shores of Greece came to border these barbarian lands"; K: "so that it appears that a part of Greece got detached from its shores and added to the countries of the barbarians".

coming “a part of the shores” and *adtexta esse* rendered periphrastically as “detached from and border/added to”.

Cic. *Rep.* 2.27
M, vol. 1, 170–172: *Sic ille cum undequadraginta annos* […] *regnavisset*
V, vol. 1, 171: Ayant ainsi régné […] pendant quarante-deux ans
K, 59: Οὕτω βασιλεύσας ὁ Νουμᾶς τεσσαράκοντα καὶ δύω ἔτη.[40]

Although the Latin text has *undequadraginta* (thirty-nine), both translations render it as “forty-two”.

Cic. *Rep.* 2.49
M, vol. 1, 206: *et modo Ti. Gracchus*
V, vol. 1, 207: et naguère, Tibérius Gracchus a encouru la même accusation
K, 69: καὶ πρὸ ὀλίγου ὁ Τιβέριος Γράκχος ὑπέπεσεν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν κατηγορίαν.[41]

The completion with reference to T. Gracchus, who “incurred the same charge”, is common to both the French and the Greek translations.

Cic. Rep. 3.9
M, vol. 2, 18: *Nunc autem, si quis illo Pacuviano invehens alitum anguium curru*
V, vol. 2, 19: Maintenant, si quelqu’un porté sur ce char aux serpens ailés dont parle le poëte Pacuvius
K, 84: Νῦν δὲ ἐάν τις ὀχούμενος ἐφ᾽ ἁμάξης συρομένης ὑπὸ πτερωτῶν ὄφεων, καθὼς λέγει ὁ ποιητὴς Πανούβιος [sic].[42]

The Latin *Pacuviano curru* becomes “of which [in French] / as [in Greek] the poet Pacuvius speaks/says” in both translations.

Cic. *Rep.* 3.34
M, vol. 2, 46: *Quae cum dixisset Laelius, etsi omnes, qui aderant, significabant ab eo se esse admodum delectatos*
V, vol. 2, 47: Quand Laelius eut achevé de parler, tous ceux qui étaient présens laissaient voir l’extrême plaisir que leur avait fait son discours

40 M: “After ruling thus for thirty-nine years”; V: “Having thus reigned […] for forty-two years”; K: “Numa having thus reigned for forty-two years”.
41 M: “and more recently T. Gracchus”; V: “and not long ago, Tiberius Gracchus incurred the same charge”; K: “and not long ago Tiberius Gracchus incurred the same charge”.
42 M: “But now, if someone, riding on that Pacuvian chariot of winged snakes”; V: “Now, if someone carried on that chariot with winged serpents of which the poet Pacuvius speaks”; K: “Now if someone carried on a chariot pulled by winged serpents, as says the poet Pacuvius”.

K, 93: Ἀφοῦ ὁ Λαίλιος εἶπε ταῦτα, ἅπαντες οἱ παρευρισκόμενοι ἐδείκνυον τὴν ἄκραν εὐχαρίστησιν, τὴν ὁποίαν ἐπροξένησαν εἰς αὐτοὺς οἱ λόγοι του.[43]

Both the French and the Greek translation rendered the infinitive phrase *se esse admodum delectatos* by the noun phrase "the extreme pleasure" and the prepositional *ab eo* by a whole relative sentence "that [pleasure] his speech (had) caused them".

Cic. *Rep.* 3.35
M, vol. 2, 52: *Nec vero convenit cum furiosorum bona legibus in adgnatorum potestate sint, quod eorum jam*
V, vol. 2, 53: Et lorsque nos lois placent les biens des insensés sous la tutelle de leurs proches, il n'est pas conséquent de laisser une aveugle multitude maîtresse absolue de tout faire
K, 95: Καὶ καθὼς τῶν μανικῶν τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐπιτρέπονται εἰς τοὺς συγγενεῖς, οὕτω καὶ εἰς τὸ τυφλὸν πλῆθος δὲν πρέπει νὰ ἀφίνηται ἡ ἐξουσία νὰ πράττῃ τὰ πάντα.[44]

Besides the changes in the sentence structure of the original, the phrasing of the completion of the fragmentary end by Villemain is closely repeated by the Greek translator with reference to the "blind mob's" absolute power.

The preceding examples and brief discussion of the cases in which the Greek translation follows the French one almost *ad verbum* are strong indications of the former's dependence on the latter. Their closeness is not limited to the translation of parts of the Latin text extant in the Vatican manuscript or in the supplementation of gaps in the text, but extends even to the repetition of the errors of the French translator by the Greek in his own version. However, as emerges from the examples listed and discussed below, the Greek translator occasionally deviated from the French version and either consulted the original Latin, thus incorporating the reading of it, or provided an interpretative translation to facilitate his readers in better understanding Cicero's text.

43 M: "When Laelius said these things, although all those present indicated that they were extremely delighted by him"; V: "When Laelius had finished speaking, all those present showed the extreme pleasure that his speech had caused them"; K: "When Laelius said these things, all those present showed the extreme pleasure that his speech caused them".

44 M: "Nor is it right, since according to laws the property of madmen goes under the control of their relatives, because they no longer"; V: "And when our laws place the property of madmen under the tutelage of their relatives, it is not therefore to leave a blind mob absolute master of doing everything"; K: "And because the property of madmen is placed under the relatives, likewise the power to do everything must not be left to the blind mob".

Differences between the Greek and the French Translations and/or the Latin Text

Cic. *Rep.* 1.1
M, vol. 1, 2: *Impetu liberavissent; nec G. Duelius, Aulus Atilius, L. Metellus terrore Carthaginis;* […] *nec id excitatum majoribus copiis aut Quintus Maximus enervavisset, aut M. Marcellus contudisset*
V, vol. 1, 3: Sans cette vertu, Duillius, Regulus, Metellus, n'auraient point affranchi Rome de la terreur de Carthage; […] Fabius n'eût point affaibli, Marcellus n'eût point écrasé ce fléau reproduit plus terrible
K, 1: Δουΐλιος, Ῥέγολος, Μετέλλος, δὲν ἤθελαν ἐλευθερώσει τὴν Ῥώμην ἀπὸ τὸν τρόμον τῆς Καρχηδόνος, […] Κουΐντος Μάξιμος δὲν ἤθελεν ἀδυνατήσει, οὔτε ὁ Μαρκέλλος ἤθελε καταπιέσει κακόν, τὸ ὁποῖον μεγαλήτερον εἶχεν ἀναφανῇ.[45]

The passage includes some similarities and some differences between the two translations under discussion in comparison with the Latin text. The replacement of *Aulus Atilius* of the original by "Regulus" in Villemain's translation, which is followed by the Greek translator, is not justified or explained in any version. Nor is clarified Villemain's choice for "Fabius" instead of *Quintus Maximus* of the Latin (and the Greek in this case). The Greek translator also leaves out the French supplementation of the fragmentary opening of the period ("Sans cette vertu").

Cic. *Rep.* 1.34
M, vol. 1, 64: *Qua in disputatione quoniam tu paratior es; feceris, ut etiam pro his dicam, si de re publica quid sentias explicaris, nobis gratum omnibus*
V, vol. 1, 65: Préparé comme vous l'êtes sur ce sujet, si vous voulez donc nous exposer votre pensée touchant la république, (je parle ici pour nos amis), vous nous ferez plaisir à tous
K, 22: Καὶ ἐπειδὴ, σὺ, εἰς τὰ τοιαῦτα εἶσαι προπαρασκευασμένος, ἐὰν εἴπῃς τὶ φρονεῖς περὶ τῆς πολιτείας, ἡδονὴν θέλεις προξενήσει εἰς ἡμᾶς ὅλους.[46]

45 M: "they would <not> have freed from the attack; nor G. Duilius, Aulus Atilius, and L. Metellus from the terror of Carthage; […] when it was reignited with greater force Quintus Maximus would not have confined it or M. Marcellus crushed it"; V: "Without this virtue, Duillius, Regulus, Metellus, would not have freed Rome from the terror of Carthage; […] Fabius would not have weakened, Marcellus would not have crushed this evil repeated more terrible"; K: "Duilius, Regulus, Metellus would not have freed Rome from the terror of Carthage, […] Quintus Maximus would not have weakened, neither Marcellus would have crushed an evil that had reappeared bigger".
46 M: "Since you are better prepared for this discussion, you will have done us all a great favour (to speak for them too) if you explain what you believe about the state"; V: "Prepared as you are on this subject, if you want to present your thoughts on the republic to us, (I am speaking here for our friends), you will please us all"; K: "And since you are prepared on these, if you tell us what you think about the state, you will please us all".

Although the Greek version follows the French phrasing closely, it omits the Latin final clause *ut etiam pro his dicam*, rendered into French as a parenthetical sentence ("je parle ici pour nos amis").

Cic. *Rep.* 1.37
M, vol. 1, 66: *Hic Philus: Non hercule, inquit, Scipio, dubito quin tibi ingenio praestiterit nemo*
V, vol. 1, 67: Philus dit alors: je ne doute pas que, pour le génie naturel, personne ne vous soit supérieur
K, 23: Τότε ὁ Φίλων εἶπε. Δὲν ἀμφιβάλλω, μὰ τὸν Δία, ὅτι οὐδεὶς εἶναι ἀνώτερός σου, ὦ Σκιπίων, κατὰ τὴν εὐφυΐαν.[47]

The Greek translator incorporated the Latin interjection *hercule* into his version, though changed to "by Zeus",[48] while the French omitted it.

Cic. *Rep.* 1.43
M, vol. 1, 76: *Ac modo si Massilienses nostri clientes*
V, vol. 1, 77: Et maintenant, si les Marseillais, nos cliens
K, 26: Καὶ τανῦν ἐὰν οἱ Μασσαλιεῖς, φίλοι μας.[49]

The Greek "φίλοι μας" (our friends) renders neither the Latin *nostri clientes* nor the French "nos cliens" (our clients). It cannot be certain whether the Greek term originated from the translator's inadequacy to understand the Latin or French terms or from a deliberate choice founded on political or other reasons.

Cic. *Rep.* 1.63
M, vol. 1, 108: *Nam dictator quidem ab eo appellatur quia dicitur*
V, vol. 1, 109: On l'appelle dictateur, parce qu'il est élu par le dire d'un consul
K, 39–40: καὶ καλεῖται Δικτάτωρ, διότι ἐκλέγεται ἀπὸ τὸ λέγειν ἑνὸς ὑπάτου (α). *(α) Dictator quidem ab eo appetatur* [sic] *quia dicitur.*[50]

---

47 M: "Here Philus says: I do not doubt, by Hercules, that no one, Scipio, surpasses you in talent"; V: "Philus then said: I have no doubt that no one is superior to you in natural talent"; K: "Then Philus said: I do not doubt, by Zeus, that no one is superior to you, Scipio, in intelligence".

48 Cf. Cic. *Rep.* 1.59: M, vol. 1, 100: *L. Non mehercule, inquit, sed imitor Archytam illum tarentinum*; V, vol. 1, 103: – L. Non, par Hercule, j'imite cet Archytas de Tarente; K, 36: Λαίλιος. Ὄχι, μὰ τὸν Δία, ἀλλὰ μιμοῦμαι τὸν Ταραντινὸν Ἀρχύταν (M: "Laelius says: No, by Hercules, but I imitate that Archytas of Tarentum"; V: "L. No, by Hercules, I imitate that Archytas of Tarentum"; K: "No, by Zeus, but I imitate Archytas of Tarentum").

49 M: "And now, if the Marseillais, our clients"; V: "And now, if the Marseillais, our clients"; K: "And now, if the Marseillais, our friends".

50 M: "For he is of course called a dictator because of this, that he is appointed"; V: "He is called a dictator, because he is elected by the speech of a consul"; K: "He is called a dictator, because he is elected by the speech of a consul".

Although the Greek translator follows the French interpretative translation in rendering the Latin causal sentence *quia dicitur*, which apparently made no sense as it stood, he provides the original Latin in a footnote, perhaps to point to the interpretation added to his translation.

> Cic. *Rep.* 2.16
> M, vol. 1, 154: *quod tum erat res in pecore et locorum possessionibus, ex quo pecuniosi et locupletes vocabantur*
> V, vol. 1, 155: car toute la fortune consistait alors en troupeaux et en terres, ce qui même a déterminé le choix des expressions par lesquelles, en latin, on désigne les riches
> K, 54: διότι ἡ ἰδιοκτησία συνίστατο τότε εἰς θρέμματα καὶ ἀρούρας, ὅθεν ὠνομάζοντο οἱ πλούσιοι, πολυθρέμμονες καὶ πολυάρουροι.[51]

The Latin terms *pecuniosi* and *locupletes* seem to have caused some difficulties to Villemain in rendering them into French, so he opts for their interpretation rather than their translation ("which even determined the choice of expressions by which the rich are denoted in Latin"). The Greek translator renders them by resorting to ancient Greek vocabulary, translating *pecuniosi* as πολυθρέμμονες – "feeding many", thus not having exactly the meaning of *pecuniosi* (rich in cattle) – and *locupletes* as πολυάρουροι (with many fields).[52]

> Cic. *Rep.* 2.50
> M, vol. 1, 206: *Ex quo nostri idem illud secuti atque interpretati, quos senes ille appellavit, nominaverunt senatum*
> V, vol. 1, 207: Nos Romains imitant son exemple, et traduisant son expression, désignèrent ceux qu'il avait appelés vieillards, par le terme de sénat
> K, 69: Οἱ ἡμέτεροι τὸ αὐτὸ ἀκολουθήσαντες παράδειγμα, καὶ μεταφράσαντες τὴν λέξιν γέροντας εἰς τὴν ἰδικήν των ἐσχημάτισαν τὸ Senatus δηλαδὴ Γερουσίαν.[53]

---

51 M: "because wealth then was based on livestock and landed property, thus the wealthy were denoted by the terms *pecuniosi* and *locupletes*"; V: "because all the fortune then consisted of herds and land, which even determined the choice of expressions by which the rich are denoted in Latin"; K: "because property then consisted of herds and land, thus the rich were called πολυθρέμμονες ['feeding many'] and πολυάρουροι ['with many fields']".

52 Cf., however, Cic. *Rep.* 2.40, where Villemain's inability to translate the Latin *assiduus* into French is repeated by the Greek translator: M, vol. 1, 194: *qui cum locupletes assiduos appellasset ab aere dando*; V, vol. 1, 195: Il appela les riches d'un nom qui indiquait les secours qu'ils donnaient à l'état; K, 65: Τοὺς μὲν πλουσίους ἐκάλεσε μὲ ὄνομα δεικνύον τὴν ὁποίαν ἔδιδον χρηματικὴν βοήθειαν εἰς τὸ Κράτος (M: "who while he called the wealthy *assidui* from contributing money"; V: "He called the wealthy by a name that indicated the aid they were giving to the state"; K: "He called the wealthy by a name that indicated the financial aid they were giving to the state").

53 M: "Our own people, having followed and translated this, named those whom he called elders, the senate"; V: "Our Romans, imitating his example, and translating his term, designated those he

Compared to the French translation, which is closer to the original in translating the phrase *nominaverunt senatum*, the Greek provides both the Latin term (*Senatus*) along with the corresponding Greek term (Γερουσία), a term familiar to his readers, given that the regional councils in the first years of the Greek War of Independence were termed as γερουσίες (senates), while, from 1829 until the arrival of King Otto in 1833, Γερουσία was the main advisory and legislative body.

Cic. *Rep.* 2.53
M, vol. 1, 212: *Idemque, in quo fuit Publicola maxime, legem ad populum tulit*
V, vol. 1, 213: Ce fut également lui, et il mérita surtout ainsi le nom de Publicola, qui fit voter par le peuple la première loi
K, 71: Ὁ αὐτὸς οὗτος καθυπέβαλεν εἰς τὰς ψήφους τοῦ λαοῦ, διὸ καὶ ἐπωνομάσθη Ποπλικόλας, ὅ ἐστι δημοκυδὴς, τὸν πρῶτον νόμον.[54]

The Greek translator considers it necessary to explain P. Valerius' cognomen (*Publicola* < *populus* + *colo*, so a favourer or friend of the people), so he adds an interpretative translation (ὅ ἐστι δημοκυδὴς), employing an adjective (δημοκηδὴς < δῆμος + κήδομαι, caring for, friendly to the people) previously used by Plutarch, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Cassius Dio.[55]

Cic. *Rep.* 3.4
M, vol. 2, 12: *si deinde Assyrios, si Persas, si Poenos, si haec*
M, vol. 2, 13: si nous passions ensuite aux Assyriens, aux Perses, aux Carthaginois, combien de

had called elders, by the term of senate"; K: "Our own people, having followed this example and translated the term elders into their language, formed [the term] *Senatus*, that is Γερουσία ['Senate']".

54 M: "He too, in an action in which he truly proved himself a 'Publicola', proposed a law to the people"; V: "It was also he, and he thus deserved above all the name of Publicola, who made the first law to be voted by the people"; K: "He himself put the first law under the people's votes, for which he was named Publicola, that is a friend of the people".

55 Plut. *Publ.* 10.9: καὶ Ποπλικόλαν ἀνηγόρευσεν αὐτόν· σημαίνει δὲ τοὔνομα δημοκηδῆ ("They therefore called him Publicola, a name which signifies *people-cherisher*"; transl. Perrin 1914); Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 5.19.5: καὶ τίθενται αὐτῷ ἐπωνύμιον Ποπλικόλαν· τοῦτο κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλήνων διάλεκτον βούλεται δηλοῦν δημοκηδῆ ("who gave him the nickname of Publicola, which means in the Greek language *dêmokêdês* or 'the People's Friend'"; transl. Cary 1940); Cass. Dio 3.13.2, p. 37 Boissevain (= Zonaras 7.12): εἵλοντο δὲ ἀντ' ἐκείνου συνάρχοντα Πόπλιον Οὐαλλέριον, ὃς Ποπλικόλας προσωνομάσθη· δηλοῖ δ' ἡ κλῆσις ἑξελληνιζομένη δημοκηδῆ ἢ δημοτικώτατον ("In his place they elected as Brutus' colleague Publius Valerius, whose cognomen was Publicola; this appellation, translated, means Friend of the People, or Most Democratic"; transl. Cary 1914).

législateurs, combien de fondateurs d'empires!
K, 82: ἐὰν ἔπειτα μεταβῶμεν εἰς τοὺς Ἀσσυρίους, εἰς τοὺς Πέρσας, εἰς τοὺς Καρχηδονίους.[56]

While the Greek translator adopts the verb ('pass, proceed, move') used by Villemain for the missing Latin verb in the fragmentary conditional clauses (unless it is assumed that the verb (*collustrare voluerimus*) is supplied by the preceding sentence),[57] he leaves out of his version the French supplementation ("combien [...] d'empires!"), opting instead for an indication of the gap in the text.

Cic. *Rep.* 3.8
M, vol. 2, 16: *et reperiret et tueretur; alter autem de ipsa justitia quatuor implevit sane grandes libros*
V, vol. 2, 17: Aristote a traité la question de la justice, et en a rempli quatre livres assez étendus
K, 83: Ἄλλος τέσσαρα ὀγκώδη βιβλία συνέγραψε περὶ δικαιοσύνης.[58]

Although by the Latin *alter* Cicero definitely implies Aristotle, apparently comparing his work *On Justice* (*Περὶ δικαιοσύνης*) in four Books with Plato's *Republic or On Justice* (*Πολιτεία ἢ περὶ δικαίου*),[59] to which reference must have been made in the fragmentary beginning of the period, the Greek translator prefers to render *alter* by the Greek corresponding term (ἄλλος) rather than following the French text.

The deviations of the Greek translator from his French exemplar are neither quantitatively nor qualitatively strong enough to suggest that he might have used another translation or produced his Greek version directly from the Latin original. The most obvious and numerous cases of his deviations are those in which Villemain provides fillings in of gaps in the fragmentary manuscript text. Evidently, the translator was either not convinced by or not interested in them. The omissions of phrases of the original Latin or of the French translation in the Greek one (e. g., Cic. *Rep.* 1.34) could well be explained by a lack of attentiveness by the translator. The translation of *clientes* in Cic. *Rep.* 1.43 as 'friends' (φίλοι) by the Greek trans-

56 M: "if then the Assyrians, the Persians, the Carthaginians, if these"; V: "if we then passed to the Assyrians, the Persians, the Carthaginians, how many legislators, how many founders of empires!"; K: "if we then move to the Assyrians, the Persians, the Carthaginians".
57 M, vol. 2, 12: *si magnam illam Graeciam collustrare animo voluerimus*; V, vol. 2, 13: si nous examinions la grande Grèce; K, 82: ἐὰν θελήσωμεν νὰ ἐξετάσωμεν τὴν μεγάλην Ἑλλάδα (M: "If we would like to examine that Magna Graecia"; V: "if we examined Magna Graecia"; K: "if we want to examine Magna Graecia").
58 M: "in order to find and defend it [sc. justice]; the other, however, filled four quite large books about justice itself"; V: "Aristotle treated the question of justice, and filled four fairly extensive books about it"; K: "The other wrote four massive books on justice".
59 See Diog. Laert. 5.22 and 3.60, respectively.

lator is bizarre, given that, in the other cases where the nouns *cliens* or *clientela* appear in the dialogue, he translated them with the correct corresponding Greek terms, πελάτης and προστασία, respectively.[60] Whether or not the reasons for having rendered *clientes* as 'friends' with reference to the people of Marseille were political (perhaps not to offend the French Party and its supporters, especially after recent insinuations that France was directly or indirectly involved in Ioannis Kapodistrias' assassination), is a speculation. For the other cases where the Greek translator differentiated from the French, it seems that he did so in order to provide his Greek readers with terms that they were familiar with from their contact with ancient Greek literature (e. g., Cic. *Rep.* 1.37; 2.16; 2.53) or their contemporary political conditions (e. g., Cic. *Rep.* 2.50).

The familiarisation of his readership with Greek literature is also indicated by the translator's choice not to render into Modern Greek the passages from Plato's *Republic* translated into Latin by Cicero in his dialogue (Cic. *Rep.* 1.66–67), but to quote the original ancient Greek text (Pl. *Resp.* 8.562c–563e) and a footnote (α) to justify his choice:

> Τότε συμβαίνει τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Πλάτωνος ζωηρῶς περιγραφέν (α) ἐὰν εἰς τὴν γλῶσσάν μας δυνηθῶ νὰ τὸ μεταφράσω, διότι εἶναι ἔργον δύσκολον, ἀλλὰ μ' ὅλον τοῦτο θέλω δοκιμάσει, λέγει δὲ οὕτως· "Οἷον, οἶμαι, δημοκρατουμένη πόλις, ἐλευθερίας διψήσασα, κοινῶν οἰνοχόων προστατούντων τύχῃ, [...] οὐδὲ τῶν νόμων φροντίζουσι γεγραμμένων ἢ ἀγράφων, ἵνα δὴ μηδαμῆ μηδεὶς αὐτοῖς ᾖ δεσπότης."
> (Πλάτων Πολιτ. ὄγδοον).
> Λαίλιος. Σὺ εἶπας ὅ,τι εἶπε καὶ ἐκεῖνος.
>
> (α) Καταχωροῦμεν τὰς αὐτὰς λέξεις τοῦ Πλάτωνος διότι εἰς τὴν μετάφρασίν μας ἀφήσαμεν τὸ Λατινικὸν κείμενον, καὶ ἀντιγράφομεν τὸ ἀπόσπασμα τοῦ Πλάτωνος μεταφρασθὲν παρὰ Κικέρωνος.[61]
>
> Then happens what was vividly described by Plato (a), if I can render it into our language, because it is a hard task, but I will try anyway; he speaks thus: 'Οἷον, οἶμαι, δημοκρατουμένη

60 Cic. *Rep.* 2.16: M, vol. 1, 152–154: *et habuit plebem in clientelas principum descriptam*; V, vol. 1, 153–155: Il mit aussi le peuple sous la clientèle des grands; K, 54: καὶ ἔθεσε τὸν λαὸν ὑπὸ τὴν προστασίαν τῶν προὐχόντων (M: "He also had the people divided up as clients of the leading citizens"; V: "He also put the people under the patronage of the noble"; K: "and he put the people under the protection of the rich"). Cic. *Rep.* 2.37: M, vol. 1, 190: *cum esset ex quodam regis cliente conceptus*; V, vol. 1, 191: qui avait eu commerce avec un client du roi; K, 63: ἥτις συνευρίσκετο μετά τινος πελάτου τοῦ βασιλέως (M: "while he was conceived by a client of the king"; V: "who had a relationship with a client of the king"; K: "who coupled with a client of the king"). The term also appears in a fragment from Cic. *Rep.* 3.30b, but it was not included in the Greek translation.

61 Kapodistrias 1839, 41–43. There are obvious differences between Plato's text quoted by the translator and the standard text of Plato's *Republic*, apparently because of the text that was then available to the translator.

> […] αὐτοῖς ᾗ δεσπότης.' (Plato, Polit. Book Eight)
> Laelius. You said what he also said.
>
> (a) We are quoting the very words of Plato, because, while translating, we put aside the Latin text, and we are coping Plato's passage translated by Cicero. (transl. by the author)

Another remarkable case in which the Greek translator apparently draws from what he believed to be ancient Greek, so that he could relate his translation to his readership's education or familiarity, is the usage of the long and widely used phrase πᾶς μὴ Ἕλλην βάρβαρος to render the Latin *omnes aut Graios esse aut barbaros* in Cic. *Rep.* 1.58:

> M, vol. 1, 100: *Si ut Graeci dicunt omnes aut Graios esse aut barbaros*
> V, vol. 1, 101: Si, à l'exemple des Grecs, on ne fait d'autre distinction que celle de peuple grec et de peuple barbare
> K, 36: Κατὰ τὴν δόξαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ὅτι πᾶς μὴ Ἕλλην βάρβαρος.[62]

Though there are numerous references to the distinction between Greeks and barbarians in ancient Greek texts, the phrase is not to be found per se in any of the surviving pagan or Christian Greek texts. However, it was commonly used to denote not just the difference between the Greek language and other national languages, but a difference between the Greeks and 'the others' on a nationalistic and moral level as well.[63]

---

62 M: "If, as the Greeks say, everyone is either a Greek or a barbarian"; V: "If, like the Greeks, no other distinction is made than that of the Greek people and the barbarian people"; K: "According to the opinion of the Greeks, that everyone not a Greek is a barbarian".

63 Cf. Korais 1821, ξβ΄: "Ἀλλὰ πῶς ἦτο δυνατὸν νὰ λάβῃ χώραν ἡ τοιαύτη ἀνατροφὴ εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, κατεχομένους ἀπὸ τὴν ὀλέθριον πρόληψιν, ὅτι ἡ φύσις γεννᾷ τοὺς δούλους καὶ τοὺς ἐλευθέρους, καθὼς γεννᾷ τοὺς νάννους καὶ τοὺς γίγαντας; ὅτι αὐτὴ ἔπλασε τοὺς βαρβάρους, ἤγουν τὸ πλειότερον μέρος τοῦ κόσμου (ἐπειδὴ κατ' αὐτούς, Πᾶς μὴ Ἕλλην, βάρβαρος) δούλους, καὶ μόνους τοὺς Ἕλληνας δεσπότας; Τὴν πρόληψιν ταύτην ἐθήλαζαν μὲ τὸ γάλα, καὶ τὴν ἤκουαν ἔπειτα ἐπαινουμένην καὶ εἰς τὰ θέατρα ἀπὸ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους ἐπαινέτας τῆς εὐνομίας ποιητάς· Βαρβάρων δ' Ἕλληνας εἰκὸς ἄρχειν, ἀλλ' οὐ βαρβάρους, / Μῆτερ, Ἑλλήνων· τὸ μὲν γὰρ δοῦλον, οἱ δ' ἐλεύθεροι (1). (1) Εὐριπίδ. Ἰφιγ. Αὐλ. 1400. Τὴν πρόληψιν ταύτην ἰσχυροποίησεν εἰς τὰς ψυχάς των ἐπιπλέον καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ ἀγριότης πολλῶν βαρβάρων ἐθνῶν, τὰ ὁποῖα τοὺς ἐνωχλοῦσαν παντοχόθεν, ὥστε μὴν ἀρκούμενοι πλέον εἰς τοὺς δικαίους καὶ ἐνδόξους ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἀγῶνας κατὰ τῶν βαρβάρων, τοὺς ἐστοχάζοντο ὅλους ὡς ἄγρια θηρία, καὶ τὸν κατ' αὐτὸν πόλεμον, ὡς ἀληθὲς κυνήγιον θηρίων". ("However, how would it have been possible for the Greeks to have this kind of edification, since they were possessed by the pernicious perception that nature gives birth to slaves and freemen, just like it gives birth to dwarfs and giants? That it also created the barbarians, that is the majority of the world (for in their opinion, everyone not a Greek is a barbarian), as slaves, while it made only the Greeks masters? They were nursed with this perception, and they

The usage of a well-established expression for a matching entrenched attitude towards foreigners is certainly not coincidental. The translator used a standardised political vocabulary to render primarily the corresponding French terms and occasionally the Latin ones, as is also the case in the examples of the translation discussed above. The basic constitutions and their respective degenerations are rendered with terms that repeatedly appear in the translation.

For the Latin *regnum*, the translator indiscriminately used the terms βασιλεία (kingship) and μοναρχία (monarchy),[64] while in Cic. *Rep.* 1.42 he used both to better translate the definition of monarchy:

> M, vol. 1, 72: *Quare cum penes unum est omnium summa rerum, regem illum unum vocamus, et regnum eius rei publicae statum*
> V, vol. 1, 75: Ainsi, lorsque la direction de toutes choses dépend d'un seul, nous appelons cet individu roi, et cette forme de constitution politique, royaume
> K, 25–26: Διὸ ὅταν τὸ πᾶν τῆς αὐτῆς διευθύνσεως ἀφιερωθῇ εἰς ἕνα μόνον, ὀνομαζόμενον αὐτὸν Μονάρχην, ἢ Βασιλέα, καὶ τὸ πολιτικὸν αὐτὸ σύστημα μοναρχίαν, ἢ Βασιλείαν,[65]

The same applies to the relative terms, the noun *rex* and the adjectives *regius* and *regalis*, which are rendered by the nouns βασιλεὺς or μονάρχης and the adjectives βασιλικὸς or μοναρχικὸς.[66] In two cases, he closely follows the French translation by adding the adjective "absolute" to monarchy (Cic. *Rep.* 1.65: M, vol. 1, 112: *regiae* [*rei publicae*]; V, vol. 1, 113: la royauté absolue; K, 41: ἡ ἀπόλυτος Μοναρχία)[67] and by rendering *regalis* as "worthy of the throne" (Cic. *Rep.* 2.24: M, vol. 1, 168: *virtutem et sapientiam regale*; V, vol. 1, 169: une sagesse et une vertu dignes du trône; K, 57: σύνεσις, και ἀρετὴ ἀξία τοῦ θρόνου).[68]

---

heard it being praised even in the theatres by those very poets who praised loyalty to law; It is right, mother, for the Greeks to rule the barbarians, but not for the barbarians / to rule the Greeks; for those are slaves, while these are free. (1) (1) Euripid. Iphig. Aul. 1400. This perception was further intensified in their souls by the ferocity of many barbaric nations, which disturbed them from all around, which made them [sc. the Greeks], not being any longer content with their just and glorious struggles for their freedom against the barbarians, deem them all [sc. the barbarians] as wild animals and the war against them as a true beast hunting").

64 Kapodistrias 1839, 28, 33, etc.

65 M: "So, when the control of everything is in the hands of one person, we call that one person a king and that type of state a monarchy"; V: "So, when the direction of all things depends on one, we call that individual a king, and this form of political constitution a kingdom"; K: "For when everything of this administration is assigned to one only, who is called a monarch or a king, this political system too [is called] a monarchy or a kingship".

66 Kapodistrias 1839, 26–27, 29–31, 37, 44–45, 60–61, etc.

67 M: "of the monarchic [state]"; V: "the absolute monarchy"; K: "the absolute monarchy".

68 M: "virtue and regal wisdom"; V: "wisdom and virtue worthy of the throne"; K: "wisdom and virtue worthy of the throne".

While *civitas optimatium* is consistently translated as ἀριστοκρατ(ε)ία (aristocracy),[69] *optimates* is a term rendered in various ways: ἄριστοι,[70] ἀριστοκράται, προὔχοντες and μεγιστάναι (the corresponding French terms used by Villemain are "les aristocrates" and "les grands").[71] Some of these terms are also used to translate the Latin *potentes* (προὔχοντες) and *principes* (ἄριστοι, ἀριστοκράται, προὔχοντες) in the sense of 'aristocrats'; for the latter, he also used the characterisation πρώτιστοι πολίται after the French "citoyens principaux".[72]

For the definition of *civitas popularis* in Cic. *Rep.* 1.42, the Greek term used is δημοκρατία (democracy), while in all the other cases the translator made use of the adjective δημοτικός when referring to this form of government (δημοτικὴ ἐξουσία, δημοτικὸν σύστημα, δημοτικὸν δημόσιον).[73] The same terminology was used to render the Latin *res publica* in its various meanings; the definition of *res publica* as *res populi* in Cic. *Rep.* 1.39 was rendered as τὰ δημόσια εἶναι ὁ δῆμος ("la chose publique est la chose du peuple"), the noun τὸ δημόσιον in singular or plural denoting *res publica* in many cases. Alternatively, the translator made use of the nouns πολιτεία (πολιτείαν, ἤτοι πρᾶγμα τοῦ λαοῦ) and δημοκρατία (δημοκρατία, πρᾶγμα τούτέστι τοῦ λαοῦ, accompanied by the footnote: *Res publica, res populi*) or δημοκρατικὸν σύστημα. The examples listed above also include the Greek terms used for the Latin *populus:* ὁ λαός, occasionally alternating with ὁ δῆμος or τὸ πλῆθος (a term largely used to render the Latin *multitudo*).[74]

The Greek vocabulary for the degenerate counterparts of the aforementioned constitutions is very limited, if compared with that of the previous forms. For tyranny, the degeneration of monarchy, the translator simply used the Greek terms τυραννία (tyranny) and τύραννος (tyrant);[75] the latter was also sporadically used to render the Latin *dominus*, regularly translated as δεσπότης (and, respectively, *dominatio* as δεσποτεία).[76] The Latin *factio* in the sense of oligarchy (as the opposite of aristocracy) is mostly translated as φατρία and only twice as φατριαστικὴ ὀλιγαρχία in imitation of the French "l'oligarchie factieuse".[77] The anarchy, the degeneration of democracy, an obscure term that in Cicero's text is de-

69 Kapodistrias 1839, 26–27, 31, 44, etc.

70 The adjective ἄριστος/οι is also used for the Latin *optimus/i* ("le meilleur/s" in Villemain).

71 Kapodistrias 1839, 5, 16, 29, 31–34, 43–45, etc.

72 For *princeps*/*ipes* in the sense of 'leader/s', the Greek terms used are ὁ πρῶτος (τῶν πολιτῶν) (in Villemain as "le premier homme" or "le premier citoyen"), ἄρχοντες (chefs), ἀρχηγοί (chefs), and ἡγεμόνες (princes). See Kapodistrias 1839, 16, 22, 27, 34, 42, 53, etc.

73 Kapodistrias 1839, 16, 27, 29, 93–97.

74 Kapodistrias 1839, 16, 29, 32–33, 45, 93, 95–97.

75 Kapodistrias 1839, 30, 45, 68–69, 88, 94.

76 Kapodistrias 1839, 67–68, 96.

77 Kapodistrias 1839, 27, 44–45, 88, 94.

noted by *turba*, *confusio* (Cic. *Rep.* 1.69), *libertas* or *licentia* (Cic. *Rep.* 3.17), was rendered in Greek as ὄχλος, ἀναρχία, ἐλευθερία and ἀκολασία, respectively.[78]

An analogous tendency for a standardised vocabulary by the Greek translator can be detected in his translation of Latin terms of institutions, authorities and offices. The Latin *senatus* is mostly rendered as γερουσία and occasionally as βουλή,[79] both nouns also used to rarely denote the senators (*patres*) as a collective body, for which he regularly used πατέρες and γερουσιασταί.[80] For *patricii* he uses the Hellenised transliteration πατρίκιοι.[81] The *comitia* is always rendered as τὰ ἀρχαιρέσια ("comices"),[82] *legatus* as τοποτηρητής ("lieutenant"),[83] *tribunus plebis* as δήμαρχος,[84] *quaestor* as ταμίας ("questeur"),[85] but to render the adjective *quaestorius* (Cic. *Rep.* 1.18) he follows the French translation "de la questure", τῆς Κεστορίας,[86] while *impero*, *imperium*, and *imperator* were translated into the Greek by ἡγεμονεύω, ἡγεμονία and ἡγεμών, respectively.[87]

The Greek terms used by the translator show remarkable similarities with the vocabulary of French-Greek dictionaries earlier than or contemporary with the translation.[88] These, along with the examples of the similarities in phraseology between the Greek and the French translations discussed above, reveal a considerable, if not a full dependence of the former on the latter.

Conclusion

The dependence of the first Greek translation of Cicero's *De re publica* (1839) on the first French version of it (1823) does not obviously lessen its significance in making Cicero's dialogue available to the Greeks, especially at times uncertain for their future as a nation and a sovereign state. Almost two decades after the outbreak of

78 Kapodistrias 1839, 43, 45.

79 Kapodistrias 1839, 21, 30, 53–57, 60, 66, 69, 73–74, 78, 90, 92, 97. The Latin *curia* was also translated as γερουσία twice (Cic. *Rep.* 2.31 and 3.36) after Villemain's "sénat".

80 Kapodistrias 1839, 53, 56, 62, 64, 69, 77.

81 Kapodistrias 1839, 29, 56.

82 Kapodistrias 1839, 60.

83 Kapodistrias 1839, 15, 78.

84 Kapodistrias 1839, 74, 76; however, *tribunatus* as τριβούνος in Cic. *Rep.* 1.31 (Kapodistrias 1839, 21).

85 Kapodistrias 1839, 75.

86 Kapodistrias 1839, 12.

87 Kapodistrias 1839, 90, 92–93.

88 See, e.g., Vendotis 1804 and 1837, s.vv. For the French-Greek dictionaries of the time, see, e.g., Delveroudi 2017.

the Greek War of Independence (1821), the nascent nation, having been through various political vicissitudes (from democracy to anarchy, from aristocracy to oligarchy and tyranny or absolute monarchy) in its attempts to establish itself, was once again on the verge of another civil war over a decision on the form of government for the new state. In the prologue to his translation, Viaros Kapodistrias (identified as the translator protected or covered by the initials Α. ΣΤ.) addresses the hazards faced by the newly established Greek state, subtly expressing his preference for monarchy over democracy. To do so, he advises and encourages his compatriots to read Cicero's dialogue, consider his realistic political ideas (compared to the rather utopian or unpractical theories of Plato and Aristotle), given the country's current conditions, closely resembling those of Cicero's times, and prudently decide for their future.

In view of the turbulent political conditions of his times and his rather short and unfortunate personal involvement in the Greek politics in the late 1820s and early 1830s, it comes as no surprise that Viaros chose to sign his translation covering up his identity behind the aforementioned initials, especially because of what he wrote in the prologue, challenging the authority of the major ancient Greek philosophers, sacred to the Greeks as a result of the προγονοπληξία or the strong obsession with their ancient ancestors forged under the Modern Greek Enlightenment movement, and suggesting a form of government that his compatriots did not particularly favour. The increasing discontent caused to the Greeks by King Otto's unyielding refusal to grant a constitution between 1835 and 1843, when a coup d'état turned his absolute monarchy into a constitutional monarchy, might have been a strong reason for Viaros to conceal his identity, especially after suggesting that monarchy could be the best form of government for his compatriots under the then existing conditions, compared to democracy. Moreover, his brother's assassination in 1831 and the accusations against Viaros of authoritarianism and abuse of power, which made him flee to Corfu in 1832, must have discouraged him from publishing the translation under his real name in 1839.

Whatever the reasons behind his cover up might have been, Viaros undeniably produced his translation aspiring to offer a beneficial reading to his compatriots for the best of them and his country.[89] Its reception by his contemporaries is uncertain, but apparently it met with a limited circulation and remained obscure for most part of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It is also unknown if its unfortunate fate resulted from its quality and its dependence on Villemain's French version, or its incompleteness, or the content of Cicero's text along with the trans-

89 Just as Cicero himself regarded his philosophical works, translated or adapted from Greek into Latin, as a service to the state and for the education of his fellow citizens (cf. Cic. *Div.* 2.4–7).

lator's insinuations in his prologue, or the latter's political background, views and stance towards monarchy, or for other reasons. Although it might have had some influence on the formation of the Greeks' political ideology towards the constitutional monarchy, established in 1843, it played, however, a rather meagre role in promoting the study of Cicero's political philosophy, which resulted in the Greeks' lack of acquaintance with and interest in Cicero's political dialogues, excepting the Dream of Scipio.

Addendum: The Prologue to the Translation

ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΥΣ ΑΝΑΓΝΩΣΤΑΣ.

[p. γ΄] Ἐπειδὴ μέχρι τῆς σήμερον δὲν ἐφάνη μεταφρασμένον εἰς τὴν καθομιλουμένην μας γλῶσσαν τὸ περὶ πολιτειῶν σύγγραμμα τοῦ Ῥωμαίου ῥήτορος, καὶ φιλοσόφου Κικέρωνος, ἐπεχειρίσθην ἐγὼ ἔργον τοιοῦτον, μολονότι βέβαια ἀνώτερον κατὰ πάντα τῶν δυνάμεών μου.

Τοῦ συγγράμματος τούτου, γνωστοῦ εἰς τοὺς προαπελθόντας αἰῶνας, ἡ φορὰ τῶν πραγμάτων δὲν εἶχεν ἀφήσει, εἰμὴ τεμάχιά τινα, τὰ ὁποῖα ἀνεγινώσκοντο εἰς ἄλλους πολὺ μεταγενεστέρους Συγγραφεῖς, καὶ τὸ περισσότερον ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς, ὡς εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Αὐγουστῖνον καὶ εἰς ἄλλους· χάρις τῷ σοφῷ Ἰταλῷ Κυρίῳ Μάϊ, ὅστις διὰ τῆς ἐπιμελείας του, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐφευρεθείσης τέχνης τοῦ παλιμψήστου ἀνεκάλυψε καὶ εὗρε τὸ αὐτὸ σύγγραμμα.

Ὁ καιρὸς ὅμως ἢ μᾶλλον εἰπεῖν, ἡ παρέλευσις αἰώνων, τοῦ αὐτοῦ παλαιοτάτου συγγράμματος, ἐπὶ τοῦ ὁποίου ἄλλη γραφὴ εἶχεν ἐπιτεθῆ, ἔφθειρε πολλά. Καλῇ τύχῃ, τοῦ πρώτου, καὶ τοῦ δευτέρου βιβλίου, καίτοι ὀλιγώτερον τοῦ τρίτου, τὰ σωζόμενα παρασταίνουσι τὰ φρονήματα τοῦ συγγραφέως, μολονότι μὲ ἐλλείψεις, ὅμως ἀρκετὰ σαφῆ, ἵνα ὁ ἀναγνώστης γνωρίσῃ τὶ ἐφρόνει περὶ τοῦ ἐμβριθοῦς ἀντικειμένου, ποία ἡ βελτίων μορφὴ Κυβερνήσεως, καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς μορφῆς διὰ τὴν συνδιατήρησίν της, καὶ διὰ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν τοῦ ἔθνους, ποία πρέπει νὰ ᾖναι ἡ κυρία της βάσις. Τῶν ἄλλων τριῶν [p. δ΄] βιβλίων σώζονται μόνον ὀλίγα τινα, μὲ χάσματα μεγαλώτατα εἰς τρόπον ὥστε ἡ ἔννοια τῶν γεγραμμένων διόλου λείπει, πλὴν τοῦ ἐνυπνίου τοῦ Σκιπίωνος, μεταφρασθέντος εἰς τὴν παλαιάν μας γλῶσσαν παρὰ τοῦ λογίου Πλανούδη.

Ἐὰν ἐδυνήθην νὰ μεταφράσω εἰς τὴν γλῶσσάν μας τὰ ὑψηλὰ καὶ φιλοσοφικὰ διανοήματα τοῦ Συγγραφέως, ἐλπίζω νὰ δώσω εὐάρεστον ἀσχόλημα εἰς τοὺς λογίους μας· διότι θέλουν δυνηθῆ νὰ συμπαραβάλωσι τὸν Ῥωμαῖον συγγραφέα μὲ τοὺς ἡμετέρους τοὺς διαπραγματευσαμένους τὴν αὐτὴν ὕλην, καὶ νὰ ἀποφασίσωσι ποῖος αὐτῶν ὠφελιμώτερα συνέγραψε, περὶ πρακτέων πραγμάτων, ποῖος ἐθεώρησε τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὡς εἶναι, καὶ εἶπεν ὡς δύναται νὰ ᾖναι· ἢ ἐὰν τοῦ μεταγενεστέρου τὸ σύγγραμμα συμπαραβαλλόμενον μὲ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν ἀρχαιοτέρων δὲν εἶναι, εἰμὴ, τρόπον τινὰ, αὐτῶν ἀντίγραφον· ἢ τελευταῖον ἀπονέμοντες ἑκάστῳ τὸν ἀνήκοντα ἔπαινον, θέλουσι γνωρίσει ὅτι ἅπαντες συνέγραψαν κατὰ τὸν καιρόν των, ὁ μὲν ἀρχαιότερος, διὰ τὴν ἠθικὴν κατάστασιν τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, λογικῶς ἐλπίζων ὅτι δύνανται οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ἢ κἂν τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν γένος νὰ μορφωθῶσιν εἰς τρόπον ὥστε ἡ καθαρότης τῶν ἠθῶν νὰ καταστήσῃ πρακτέον, ὅ,τι εἰς τὸν μετέπειτα καιρὸν ἐθεωρήθη ὡς ἕν τι μᾶλλον ἐλπιζόμενον, παρὰ πραττόμενον. Ὁ δὲ μετ' αὐτὸν πολεμήσας τὰς διδασκαλίας του, καὶ ἄλλα διδάξας ἐνόμισε πρακτέον ὅ,τι ἐπρόβαλεν.

Ὁ μεταγενέστερος ὅμως θεωρῶν τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα ὡς ἦτο τότε, καὶ ποίαν ἐλπίδα ἔδιδε διὰ τὸ μέλλον, ἔλαβεν ὡς παράδειγμα τὰ παρελθόντα, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν ὡδηγήθη ἵνα κρίνῃ καὶ δώσῃ τὰς συμβουλάς του, ἐὰν ὄχι εἰς τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, [p. ε´] βέβαια εἰς τὸ ῥωμαϊκὸν ἔθνος, ὅπως κρίνῃ, ποία δι' αὐτὸ ἤθελεν εἶσθαι ἡ βελτίων μορφὴ κυβερνήσεως.

Τὰ τοιαῦτα θέλουσι παρέξει ἄφθονον ὕλην εἰς τὰς σκέψεις, καὶ μελέτας τῶν ὁμογενῶν μου, ἵνα, ὁπόταν προτείνωσί τι διὰ τὴν ἐθνικὴν ὠφέλειαν, ἔχωσι προμελετημένον, ἐὰν ἡ πρότασίς των ἐπιστηρίζεται εἰς τὰς γνώμας τῶν παλαιῶν φιλοσόφων, καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ Ῥωμαίου φιλοσόφου, ὁ ὁποῖος εἰς τὰς περιγραφὰς τῶν ἀποτελεσμάτων παντὸς εἴδους πολιτικῆς μορφῆς Κυβερνήσεως, ἐπαρέστησε τὰ πράγματα, ἔκτοτε, ὡς τὰ εἴδομεν εἰς τὰς ἡμέρας μας, τόσον τὰ καλά, ὅσον καὶ τὰ κακά.

Εἰς τὸν Ῥωμαῖον φιλόσοφον θέλουσιν εὑρεῖ σώφρονα σύμβουλον, καὶ ὁδηγὸν, ὁ ὁποῖος θέλει τοὺς θέσει εἰς κατάστασιν νὰ διακρίνωσι, καὶ νὰ προτιμήσωσι τὸ κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον περιωρισμένον, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν ὠφέλιμον καὶ δίκαιον, ἀπὸ τὸ κατὰ τὸ πρῶτον λαμπρὸν, καὶ ἑλκυστικὸν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν δευτέραν ὀλέθριον.

Ὑποβάλλω εἰς τὸ ἔθνος μου τὴν εὐτελῆ προσφορὰν τοῦ κόπου μου, ἐπὶ σκοπῷ νὰ τὸ ὠφελήσω, διότι μὲ τὸ μελετᾷν τοιούτους σοφοὺς συγγραφεῖς ἀποκτῶμεν καλὸν ὁδηγὸν εἰς τὰ βήματά μας.

Τὰ πασιφανῆ παραδείγματα τῶν στρατιωτικῶν κατορθωμάτων τοῦ ἐμπειροπολέμου Μιλτιάδου, τοῦ συνετοῦ Θεμιστοκλέους, καὶ τοῦ ἀνδρείου Λεωνίδου, καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν, τὰ ὁποῖα ἦσαν, εἶναι, καὶ ἔσονται παρόντα εἰς μνήμην ὅλου τοῦ ἔθνους μας, πόσων καὶ πόσων δὲν ἐθέρμανον τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ δὲν ἠρέθισαν τὴν τόλμην ἵνα περιφρονήσωσι κινδύνους, καὶ τυφλοὶ γινόμενοι εἰς αὐτοὺς, νὰ προσηλώσωσι τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς των πρὸς τὴν δόξαν, καὶ τὴν σωτηρίαν τῆς [p. ς´] πατρίδος; Παύσαντος τώρα τοῦ πολέμου, καὶ ἐμβαίνοντος τοῦ ἔθνους εἰς πολιτικὸν στάδιον, νομίζω ὅτι θέλει ἀποτελέσει ὠφέλιμα ἡ ἀνάμνησις τῆς σοφίας τῶν ἀρχαίων, ἥτις θέλει παραχωρήσει τὴν αὐτῶν σύνεσιν ὁδηγὸν εἰς ἡμᾶς, καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν διανοήματα θέλουσι καρποφορήσει καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν μας.

Δὲν θέλομεν ἀδικηθῆ οὐδόλως συμβουλευόμενοι τὴν πολιτικὴν σοφίαν τοῦ Κικέρωνος, σκεπτόμενοι περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων πραγμάτων, διότι κατὰ τοῦτο θέλομεν εἶσθαι εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν κατάστασιν, τώρα, πρὸς αὐτὸν, καθὼς αὐτὸς ἦτο, τότε πρὸς τὴν ἑλληνικὴν πολιτικὴν σοφίαν, σκεπτόμενος περὶ τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν πραγμάτων.

Φίλοι ὁμογενεῖς, βάλετε ὑπ' ὄψιν τὰ διανοήματα τοῦ Ῥωμαίου φιλοσόφου, τὰς σκέψεις του, καὶ τὰς ἱστορικὰς διηγήσεις του, καὶ συγκρίνατε τὰ πάντα μὲ τὰ ἡμέτερα, καὶ μετὰ τὴν σύγκρισιν κρίνατε.

TO THE READERS.

[p. 3] Because, as of today, there has been no translation into our spoken language of the work on constitutions by Cicero, the Roman orator and philosopher, I have myself attempted this kind of endeavour, though indeed it exceeds my abilities.

Of this work, well-known in past centuries, the impetus of nature had left but only a few fragments, which were preserved in other, much later authors, mostly ecclesiastical, as for example in Saint Augustine and others, thanks to the prudent Italian Master Mai, who, by his assiduity and through the invented art of palimpsest reading, discovered and found this work.

Time, however, or rather the elapsing of centuries has destroyed much of this very old work, on which another script was superposed. By good fortune, what has survived of the first and the second book, though a little less of the third book, shows the author's thoughts, which, although with omissions, are clear enough for the reader to become acquainted with

what he believed on this profound subject, namely what the best form of constitution was and what the main foundation of this constitution must be for its conservation and for a nation's prosperity. Of the other three [p. 4] books only little has survived, with huge gaps in a way that it is impossible to understand their content, with the exception of the Dream of Scipio, which was translated into our older language by the erudite Planudes.

If I have managed to translate into our language the author's high-spirited and philosophical thoughts, I hope to give a pleasant engagement to our scholars; for they will be able to compare the Roman author with those of ours who examined the same subject, and to decide which of them wrote more beneficially on how things must be done, who considered human things as they are, and said how they could be; or if the work of the later author compared with the works of the earlier authors is not but a sort of a copy of them; or, lastly, having awarded each their own merit, they will be able to find out that they all wrote according to their own times, the oldest one on the moral condition of humanity, reasonably hoping that men, or at least the Greek nation, could be educated in a way that the purity of morals can make doable what was later considered hopeful rather than practical. The author after him, having fought the latter's teaching and instructed other things, considered what he proposed doable.

However, the later author, having seen humanity as it was then and what hope it gave for the future, took as an example what happened in the past and was led by it to judge and give his advice, if not to the entire world, [p. 5] at least to the Roman nation, so that it could appraise which form of constitution would be best for it.

These will be able to provide ample material to the thoughts and studies of my compatriots, so that, when they ever propose something for the national benefit, they have deliberated about, if their proposal is based on the thoughts of the ancient philosophers, and indeed of the Roman philosopher, who in the descriptions of the results of every kind of political form of constitution, showed the things then as we saw them in our days, both the good and the bad.

In the Roman philosopher they will be able to find a prudent advisor and guide, who will be able to make them judge and prefer what looks suppressive, but in essence is beneficial and right, to what at first appears glorious and attractive, while on a second look is catastrophic.

I submit to my nation this little offering of my effort, so that I can benefit it, because, by studying such wise authors, we acquire a good guide for our steps.

The evident examples of the military achievements of Miltiades the war-seasoned, of Themistocles the prudent, of Leonidas the gallant, and many others, which were, are and will be present in the memory of our entire nation, how many souls have they not heated up and excited their valour so that they could scorn dangers and, having become blind towards them, could fix their eyes to the glory and salvation of their [p. 6] country? Now that the war is over and the nation has entered a civil stage, I believe that the remembrance of the ancients' wisdom will be proved beneficial, as it will offer their prudence as a guide to us and their thoughts will bear fruits in our days too.

It will not disserve us at all to consult Cicero's political wisdom and to consider our own condition, because, with respect to this, we will be now in the same condition as he was then in regard to the Greek political wisdom, when he was thinking about the Roman conditions.

My compatriot friends, do take into consideration the Roman philosopher's notions, thoughts and historical narrations, compare them all with our own, and, after the comparison, then decide.

Appendix: Modern Greek Translations of and/or Commentaries on Cicero

In the most recent study on the place of the Latin language and literature in the Greek educational system, Karakasis and Sarra describe the almost uninterrupted, but gradually decreasing presence of Latin in the school curricula from 1824 to 2017.[1] Although the year after this study the teaching of Latin was further limited in the secondary school curriculum and Latin was abolished as one of the major taught subjects that students were examined in for their final examinations to enter tertiary education, especially into Classics and Law Schools, it was restored to its previous status in 2020. However, while the return to its pre-2018 status was a positive step towards the teaching of Latin, Latin never went back to its early 1970s status, when students were taught Latin texts in their entirety or extensive excerpts from them, including works of Caesar, Livy, Sallust, Virgil, Horace and Cicero; the emphasis has since then been limited to the students' acquisition of basic Latin vocabulary, grammar and syntax. A new curriculum for Latin is under preparation by the Institute of Educational Policy of the Hellenic Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs, which is very much anticipated and will hopefully provide for a holistic approach to the Roman world, including texts from its major representatives.

Cicero has definitely been considered one of the major figures of the Roman world by the Modern Greeks and this is reflected in his works included in the Greek school curricula and taught both in the secondary and tertiary Greek educational system. More than half of the works attributed to him have been rendered into Greek from the early nineteenth century to the present,[2] some of them having been translated more than once, especially texts taught in secondary schools. Among these are also included editions that do not offer a translation of Cicero's texts, but provide the Latin text followed by Greek vocabulary, grammatical and syntactical comments to facilitate students' understanding of the text, as well as interpretative and exegetical comments. A catalogue of all these editions follows this appendix.

The *Catilinarian* speeches have proved Greek readers' favourite with thirty-one translations, while second in preference is Cicero's speech *Pro Archia* with

1 Karakasis/Sarra 2017, with further bibliography. See also Zioga 2015; Athanasiadou *et al.* 2019, 197–200 with further bibliography; Nikitas 2023; Pappas in this volume.

2 See Tables 1 and 2, which supplement and correct, where necessary, a first catalogue of Modern Greek translations of Cicero's works from 1500 to 1980, compiled by Banou-Tsiami 2003, 107–111.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779-012

eighteen translations, followed by the most noted fragment of *De re publica*, the Dream of Scipio, largely taught in Greek secondary schools, with sixteen translations. Close in number are some of the *Philippics* (I, II, IV and IX) with twelve translations and a selection of *Epistulae ad familiares* and *ad Atticum*, included in the school curricula and rendered into Greek ten times. Equal in number are the Modern Greek versions of Cicero's *De amicitia*, while the *Pro Milone* and the *Tusculanae disputationes* have been translated into Greek eight times, followed by the *De officiis*, also included in the school curriculum, which was rendered into Greek seven times. The *De senectute* has met with five translations, while there is information for another translation, apparently unpublished.[3] Two of Cicero's speeches, *Pro lege Manilia* and *Pro Ligario*, have been translated into Greek five times each. Another two speeches, the *Pro Marcello* and *Pro Murena*, have three versions each. The speech *Pro rege Deiotaro* has been translated twice, and the same applies to two of Cicero's philosophical treatises: *De natura deorum* I and the *De re publica.* The following works have met with one translation only to date: *Pro Sestio*, *In Verrem* V, *Pro Sulla*, *De domo sua*, *Divinatio in Caecilium*, *De partitionibus oratoriae*, *De divinatione*, *De oratore*, *Orator*, *Pro Caelio*, *De legibus*, *De lege agraria* III, *Pro Rabirio perduellionis reo*, *Pro Flacco*, *De finibus*, and the two *Post reditum* speeches (*in senatu* and *ad populum*) along with the pseudo-ciceronian *Pridie quam in exsilium iret.*

To the abovementioned brief presentation of Cicero's translations and commentaries in Greek, one should also add the various studies published in Greek (without taking into consideration those published in other modern languages by Greek scholars) in journals and conference proceedings,[4] doctoral dissertations produced in Greek universities,[5] translations of studies on Cicero written in other languages,[6] or even novels on and biographies of Cicero both in translation and Greek.[7] These, however, would require a further sizeable category and amount of material, which could not possibly fit within this section.

3 See Papamichail 1932, 191: "Καὶ ἀμέσως μὲν μετὰ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς τελευταίας ἀποφοίτησιν ἐξέδωκε τὸ De amititia [*sic*] τοῦ Κικέρωνος μετὰ θαυμασίας μεταφράσεως εἰς τὴν ἑλληνικὴν καὶ ἀξιολόγων ὑπομνημάτων, εἶχε δ' ἕτοιμον πρὸς ἔκδοσιν καὶ τὸ De Senectute τοῦ αὐτοῦ" ("Immediately after his [sc. Antoniadis] graduation from the latter [sc. Halki Theological School], he published Cicero's *De amicitia* along with an extraordinary translation in Greek and remarkable comments, but he also had prepared an edition of *De senectute* by the same author").

4 A non-exhaustive catalogue of journal and conference papers on Cicero until 1980 was compiled by Banou-Tsiami 2003, 112–115.

5 See, e.g., Charokopos 1965; Kontonasios 2015.

6 See, e.g., May 2017; Olalla 2018; Freeman 2019.

7 See, e.g., Fougias 2001; Saylor 2002.

Despite the lack of Modern Greek translations of a significant number of Cicero's works (a number of speeches and treatises like *De fato*, *Brutus*, etc.), a revived interest in Cicero is recently discernible given the number of translations and/or commentaries produced in the past twenty-one years as well as various studies in the form of journal and conference papers, doctoral and post-doctoral dissertations, etc. Taking also into consideration the rather limited readership of translations and/or commentaries written in Greek compared to other modern languages, one should deem the Greek scholarly production of Cicero's works so far as an important achievement.

Catalogue of the Modern Greek Translations of and/or Commentaries on Cicero in Alphabetical Order

Amic. (De amicitia)

[Anonymous] 1835: [Anonymous], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Λαίλιος εἴτε Περὶ φιλίας διάλογος. Πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν Γυμνασίων*, Athens.

Antoniadis 1878: Vasileios Antoniadis [Βασίλειος Ἀντωνιάδης], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Λαίλιος ἢ διάλογος περὶ φιλίας: ἐκ τῆς λατινίδος εἰς τὴν ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν μετενεχθείς*, Constantinople.[8]

Chatziemmanouil 1911: Dimitrios P. Chatziemmanouil [Δημήτριος Π. Χατζηεμμανουήλ], *Μᾶρκος Τύλλιος Κικέρων καὶ Λεύκιος Ἀνναῖος Σενέκας, Περὶ γήρως, φιλίας καὶ βίου εὐδαίμονος, ἐξελληνισθέντα ἐκ τοῦ λατινικοῦ*, Athens.

Christodoulou 1996: Iphigenia Christodoulou [Ιφιγένεια Χριστοδούλου], *Κικέρωνα, Περί Φιλίας*, Απόδοση – Πρόλογος Δ. Βίτσος, Athens.

Kekropoulou 1997: Maria Kekropoulou [Μαρία Κεκροπούλου], *Κικέρων, Περί φιλίας, Εισαγωγή – Μετάφραση*, Athens.

Nikitas 1960: Anastasios A. Nikitas [Ἀναστάσιος Ἀ. Νικήτας], *M. T. Ciceronis de amicitia. Κείμενον – Ἑρμηνεία – Σχόλια*, Athens.

Papadimitriou 1999: Maria Papadimitriou [Μαρία Παπαδημητρίου], *Κικέρωνος Λαίλιος ἢ Περί φιλίας*, Ioannina.

Note: Entries followed by a note either indicate that the actual publications were not seen by the author, but were found in bibliography, or refer to translations and/or commentaries studied by Pappas and Deligiannis in this volume. The list is as complete and accurate as possible, but definitely not exhaustive.

8 Pappas in this volume, 152–153.

Papatsimpas 2002: Georgios E. Papatsimpas [Γεώργιος Ε. Παπατσίμπας], *Marcus Tullius Cicero, Laelius de amicitia, Εισαγωγή – Μετάφραση – Σημειώσεις*, Patra.

Petridis 1859: Dimitrios G. Petridis [Δημήτριος Γ. Πετρίδης], *Μάρκου Τουλλίου Κικέρωνος, Λαίλιος ἢ Περὶ φιλίας διάλογος: ἐκ τοῦ λατινικοῦ μεταφρασθείς*, Athens.[9]

Taifakos 1974: Ioannis G. Taifakos [Ἰωάννης Γ. Ταϊφάκος], *M. T. Ciceronis, Laelius de amicitia. M. T Κικέρωνος, Λαίλιος περὶ φιλίας. Εἰσαγωγή, κείμενον, μετάφρασις*, Athens.

Arch. (Pro Archia)

Alexiou 1940: Dimitrios E. Alexiou [Δημήτριος Ἐ. Ἀλεξίου], *Μετάφρασις Κικέρωνος τοῦ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ λόγου, διὰ τὴν Ε΄ τάξιν τῶν Γυμνασίων π. τύπου*, Athens.

Andreou 1946: P. Andreou [Π. Ἀνδρέου], *Κικέρωνος Ὑπὲρ Ἀρχίου ποιητοῦ. Κείμενον τεχνολογημένον λέξιν πρὸς λέξιν καὶ μετάφρασις*, Athens.

Doukakis 1913: Dimitrios Ch. Doukakis [Δημήτριος Χ. Δουκάκης], *Ὑπὲρ Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ λόγος τοῦ Κικέρωνος*, Athens.

Favrikios 1851: Karolos Favrikios [Κάρολος Φαβρίκιος], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος ἐκλεκτοὶ λόγοι πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν σχολείων καὶ γυμνασίων. Φυλλάδιον Τρίτον ἐμπεριέχον τὸν ὑπὲρ Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ λόγον*, Athens.

Fragkiskos 1940: Zaphirios N. Fragkiskos [Ζαφείριος Ν. Φραγκίσκος], *Κικέρωνος Λόγοι. Ὁ Τρίτος κατὰ Κατιλίνα καὶ ὁ Ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀρχίου τοῦ Ποιητοῦ. Διὰ τὴν Ε΄ τάξιν τῶν γυμνασίων παλαιοῦ τύπου καὶ τὴν Στ΄ τάξιν τῶν γυμνασίων νέου τύπου*, Athens.

Georgiadis 1906: Nikolaos P. Georgiadis [Νικόλαος Π. Γεωργιάδης], *Μετάφρασις τοῦ ὑπὲρ Αὔλου Λικινίου Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ λόγου τοῦ Κικέρωνος*, Athens.

Gkiolmas 1878: Michael Gkiolmas [Μιχαὴλ Γκιόλμας], *Μ. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Λόγοι: ὁ Ὑπὲρ τοῦ Μανιλιείου νόμου καὶ ὁ Ὑπὲρ Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ μετὰ σημειώσεων*, Cephalonia.

Kakridis 1921: Theophanis A. Kakridis [Θεοφάνης Ἀ. Κακριδῆς], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος ὁ ὑπὲρ Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ λόγος, ἑρμηνευθεὶς καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὑπουργείου τῆς Παιδείας ἐγκριθείς. Εἰς χρῆσιν τῶν μαθητῶν τῆς Γ΄ τάξεως τῶν Γυμνασίων*, Athens.

Karatzas 1892: Georgios N. Karatzas [Γεώργιος Ν. Καρατζᾶς], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Λόγος ὑπὲρ τοῦ ποιητοῦ Αὔλου Λικινίου Ἀρχίου μεταφρασθείς*, Athens.[10]

Koupitoris 1876: Panagiotis Koupitoris [Παναγιώτης Κουπιτώρης], *Κικέρωνος τρεῖς λόγοι. Ὁ Α΄ καὶ Δ΄ κατὰ Κατιλίνα καὶ ὁ ὑπὲρ Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ μεταφρασθέντες ἐκ τοῦ λατινικοῦ χάριν τῶν μαθητῶν*, Athens.

Leventogiannis 194-: Michael Leventogiannis [Μιχαὴλ Λεβεντογιάννης], *Κικέρωνος λόγοι. Ὁ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ: μετὰ γραμματικῶν, συντακτικῶν παρατηρήσεων καὶ περιλήψεων τοῦ νέου ἐγκεκριμένου σχολικοῦ κειμένου διὰ τὴν Ε΄ τάξιν τῶν γυμνασίων π. τύπου*, Athens.

Livieratos 1876: Eustathios K. Livieratos [Εὐστάθιος Κ. Λιβιεράτος], *Κικέρωνος οἱ τέσσαρες Κατιλινιακοὶ λόγοι καὶ ὁ ὑπὲρ Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ μετὰ μεταφράσεως, σημειώσεων καὶ λεξιλογίου ἁπασῶν τῶν τῷ κειμένῳ λέξεων*, Athens.[11]

9 Pappas in this volume, 150–151.

10 Pappas in this volume, 166–167.

11 Pappas in this volume, 160–161.

Mantzilas 2015: Dimitrios Mantzilas [Δημήτριος Μαντζίλας], *Μάρκου Τύλλιου Κικέρωνα Λόγος υπέρ του ποιητή Αύλου Λικίνιου Αρχία. Εισαγωγή – κείμενο – μετάφραση – σχόλια – επίμετρο για τα επιγράμματα του Αρχία*, Ioannina.

Mantzilas/Panoutsopoulos 2017: Dimitrios Mantzilas and Andreas G. Panoutsopoulos [Δημήτριος Μαντζίλας και Ανδρέας Γ. Πανουτσόπουλος], *M. Tullius Cicero. Orationes. Pro Archia Poeta – De Lege Agraria III – Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo – In Catilinam I–IV – Pro Marcello – Pro Ligario – Pro Rege Deiotaro – In M. Antonium Orationum Philippicarum Libri II, IV, IX. Εισαγωγή – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια*, Ioannina.

Rossis [2]1928: Ioannis Th. Rossis [Ἰωάννης Θ. Ρώσσης], *Σχολικὴ μετάφρασις Ὑπὲρ Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ λόγου Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος, πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν μαθητῶν τῆς τρίτης τάξεως τῶν τετραταξίων Γυμνασίων καὶ τῆς ἀντιστοίχου τάξεως τῶν λοιπῶν σχολείων τῆς Μέσης Ἐκπαιδεύσεως*, Athens.

Sotiriou 1923: Andreas Sotiriou [Ἀνδρέας Σωτηρίου], *Ὑπὲρ Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ λόγος τοῦ Κικέρωνος. Μετάφρασις*, Athens.

Tasopoulos 1948: Theodoros D. Tasopoulos [Θεόδωρος Δ. Τασόπουλος], *M. Tulli Ciceronis Λόγος ὑπὲρ τοῦ ποιητῆ Ἀρχία (Pro Archia poeta oratio). Μετάφραση, εἰσαγωγὴ κὶ ἀνάλυση. Προλογίζει Ν. Ἀ. Βέης*, Athens.

Tsakalotos 1893: Eustratios Tsakalotos [Εὐστράτιος Τσακαλῶτος], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Λόγοι ἐκλεκτοὶ ἑρμηνευθέντες, Τεῦχος Α΄. I. Oratio pro lege Manilia, II. Oratio pro Archia poeta*, Athens.

Cael. (Pro Caelio)

Fyntikoglou 2013: Vasileios A. Fyntikoglou [Βασίλειος Α. Φυντίκογλου], *Μάρκος Τούλλιος Κικέρων: Υπέρ του Μάρκου Καίλιου*, Thessalonica.

Cat. (In Catilinam)

Alexiou [2]1943: Dimitrios E. Alexiou [Δημήτριος Ἐ. Ἀλεξίου], *Μετάφρασις τοῦ Γ΄ κατὰ Κατιλίνα λόγου τοῦ Κικέρωνος διὰ τὴν ΣΤ΄ τάξιν τῶν γυμνασίων νέου τύπου*, Athens.

Andreou 1946: P. Andreou [Π. Ἀνδρέου], *Κικέρωνος Γ΄ Κατὰ Κατιλίνα: Κείμενον (τεχνολογημένον λέξιν πρὸς λέξιν) καὶ μετάφρασις*, Athens.

Bithakakis 1928: Theodoros Bithakakis [Θεόδωρος Μπιθακάκης], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος ὁ Τρίτος καὶ Τέταρτος κατὰ Κατιλίνα Λόγοι μεταφρασθέντες*, Athens.

Doukakis 1910: Dimitrios Ch. Doukakis [Δημήτριος Χ. Δουκάκης], *Μετάφρασις τοῦ κατὰ Κατιλίνα Α΄ λόγου τοῦ Κικέρωνος*, Athens.

Favrikios 1844a: Karolos Favrikios [Κάρολος Φαβρίκιος], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος ἐκλεκτοὶ λόγοι πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν σχολείων καὶ γυμνασίων. Φυλλάδιον πρῶτον ἐμπεριέχον τὸν πρῶτον κατὰ τοῦ Κατιλίνα λόγον*, Athens.

Favrikios 1844b: Karolos Favrikios [Κάρολος Φαβρίκιος], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος ἐκλεκτοὶ λόγοι πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν σχολείων καὶ γυμνασίων. Φυλλάδιον δεύτερον ἐμπεριέχον τὸν τέταρτον κατὰ τοῦ Κατιλίνα λόγον*, Athens.

Fragkiskos 1924: Zaphirios N. Fragkiskos [Ζαφείριος Ν. Φραγκίσκος], *Κικέρωνος ὁ Γ΄ κατὰ Κατιλίνα λόγος μετὰ βιογραφίας τοῦ Κικέρωνος*, Athens.

Fragkiskos 1940: Zaphirios N. Fragkiskos [Ζαφείριος Ν. Φραγκίσκος], *Κικέρωνος Λόγοι. Ὁ Τρίτος κατὰ Κατιλίνα καὶ ὁ Ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀρχίου τοῦ Ποιητοῦ. Διὰ τὴν Ε΄ τάξιν τῶν γυμνασίων παλαιοῦ τύπου καὶ τὴν Στ΄ τάξιν τῶν γυμνασίων νέου τύπου*, Athens.

Garani/Mastrogianni 2022: Myrto Garani and Anna Mastrogianni [Μυρτώ Γκαράνη και Άννα Μαστρογιάννη], *Μάρκος Τούλλιος Κικέρωνας. Πρώτος Κατιλινιακός Λόγος. Εισαγωγή, κείμενο, λεξιλόγιο, μετάφραση, σχόλια*, Athens.

Georgiadis 1906: Nikolaos P. Georgiadis [Νικόλαος Π. Γεωργιάδης], *Μετάφρασις τοῦ κατὰ Κατιλίνα πρώτου λόγου τοῦ Κικέρωνος*, Athens.

Grammatikopoulos 1863: K. Grammatikopoulos [Κ. Γραμματικόπουλος], [Τέλος τῶν ἐξηγήσεων τούτου τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Κικέρωνος παραδοθέντος ὑπὸ τοῦ καθ. Κ. Γραμματικοπούλου, ὑπ' ἐμοῦ φοιτῶντος τακτῶς εἰς τὸ γυμν[άσιον] Προκοπίου Οἰκονομίδου Ἱεροδιακόνου], [Nafplio].[12]

Ioannidis 1938a: Th. Th. Ioannidis [Θ. Θ. Ἰωαννίδης], *Μ. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Γ΄ κατὰ Κατιλίνα λόγου σχολικὴ μετάφρασις μετὰ γραμματικῶν, συντακτικῶν καὶ πραγματικῶν παρατηρήσεων, πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν μαθητῶν τῆς Ε΄ τάξεως τῶν Ἑξαταξίων Γυμνασίων*, Athens.

Ioannidis 1938b: Th. Th. Ioannidis [Θ. Θ. Ἰωαννίδης], *Μάρκου Τύλλιου Κικέρωνος Δ΄ κατὰ Κατιλίνα λόγου σχολικὴ μετάφρασις μετὰ περιλήψεων, γραμματικῶν, συντακτικῶν καὶ πραγματικῶν παρατηρήσεων, πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν μαθητῶν τῆς Ε΄ τάξεως τῶν Ἑξαταξίων Γυμνασίων*, Athens.

Kakridis 1915: Theophanis A. Kakridis [Θεοφάνης Ἀ. Κακριδῆς], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος ὁ Τρίτος κατὰ Κατιλίνα λόγος ἑρμηνευθεὶς διὰ τὴν Γ΄τάξιν τῶν Γυμνασίων*, Athens.

Kakridis 1916: Theophanis A. Kakridis [Θεοφάνης Ἀ. Κακριδῆς], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος ὁ Τέταρτος Κατὰ Κατιλίνα λόγος, ἑρμηνευθείς*, Athens.

Kakridis 1931: Theophanis A. Kakridis [Θεοφάνης Ἀ. Κακριδῆς], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος ὁ τρίτος καὶ τέταρτος κατὰ Κατιλίνα λόγος*, Athens.

Karatheodori 1843: Stephanos Karatheodori [Στέφανος Καραθεοδωρῆ], [Δύο πρῶτοι κατὰ Κατιλίνα λόγοι τοῦ Κικέρωνος. Μετάφρασις ἐκ τοῦ λατινικοῦ, μετὰ προλεγομένων καὶ φιλολογικῶν καὶ κριτικῶν σημειώσεων], Constantinople.[13]

Kofiniotis 1880: Evangelos K. Kofiniotis [Εὐάγγελος Κ. Κοφινιώτης], *Κικέρωνος ὁ Α΄ καὶ Δ΄ κατὰ Κατιλίνα λόγος μετὰ σημειώσεων πρὸς χρῆσιν μαθητῶν γυμνασίων*, Athens.

Kosmas 1944: Kyriakos Kosmas [Κυριάκος Κοσμᾶς], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος ὁ τρίτος κατὰ Καταλίνα λόγος. Σχολικὴ μετάφρασις μὲ παρατηρήσεις (γραμματικάς, συντακτικάς, πραγματικὰς) καὶ μὲ ρητορικὴν ἀνάλυσιν, διὰ τὴν ΣΤ΄ τάξιν τῶν γυμνασίων*, Athens.

Koupitoris 1876: Panagiotis Koupitoris [Παναγιώτης Κουπιτώρης], *Κικέρωνος τρεῖς λόγοι. Ὁ Α΄ καὶ Δ΄ κατὰ Κατιλίνα καὶ ὁ ὑπὲρ Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ μεταφρασθέντες ἐκ τοῦ λατινικοῦ χάριν τῶν μαθητῶν*, Athens.[14]

Livieratos 1876: Eustathios K. Livieratos [Εὐστάθιος Κ. Λιβιεράτος], *Κικέρωνος οἱ τέσσαρες Κατιλινιακοὶ λόγοι καὶ ὁ ὑπὲρ Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ μετὰ μεταφράσεως, σημειώσεων καὶ λεξιλογίου ἁπασῶν τῶν τῷ κειμένῳ λέξεων*, Athens.[15]

Manis 1952: Evangelos I. Manis [Εὐάγγελος Ἰ. Μάνης], *Λατῖνοι Συγγραφεῖς, Τόμος Ι. M. Tulli Ciceronis Λόγος Τρίτος Κατὰ Κατιλίνα. (Πρόλογος, εἰσαγωγή, βίος Κικέρωνος, ἀνάλυσις, κώδικες, κείμενον, μετάφρασις λογοτεχνικὴ καὶ κατὰ λέξιν, γραμματικά, συντακτικά, πραγματικά, κύρια ὀνόματα, πίναξ λέξεων, πηγαὶ καὶ βοηθήματα)*, Athens.

12 Pappas in this volume, 158–159.

13 Tantalidis 1868, 54; Banou-Tsiami 2003, 107.

14 Pappas in this volume, 159–160.

15 Pappas in this volume, 160–161.

Mantzilas/Panoutsopoulos 2017: Dimitrios Mantzilas and Andreas G. Panoutsopoulos [Δημήτριος Μαντζίλας και Ανδρέας Γ. Πανουτσόπουλος], *M. Tullius Cicero. Orationes. Pro Archia Poeta – De Lege Agraria III – Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo – In Catilinam I–IV – Pro Marcello – Pro Ligario – Pro Rege Deiotaro – In M. Antonium Orationum Philippicarum Libri II, IV, IX. Εισαγωγή – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια*, Ioannina.

Mataragkas 1892: Panagiotis Mataragkas [Παναγιώτης Ματαράγκας], *Κικέρωνος οἱ τέσσαρες κατὰ Κατιλίνα Λόγοι μεταφρασθέντες μετὰ σημειώσεων*, Athens.[16]

Papanikolaou 194-: Ioannis N. Papanikolaou [Ιωάννης. Ν. Παπανικολάου], *Κικέρωνος Λόγοι. Τρίτος κατὰ Κατιλίνα. Μετὰ γραμματικῶν, συντακτικῶν παρατηρήσεων καὶ περιλήψεων τοῦ νέου ἐγκεκριμένου σχολικοῦ κειμένου. Διὰ τὴν Ε΄ τάξιν τῶν Γυμνασίων π. τύπου*, Athens.

Papanikolaou 195-: Georgios N. Papanikolaou [Γεώργιος Ν. Παπανικολάου], *Κικέρωνος ὁ Γ΄ κατὰ Κατιλίνα λόγος: σχολικὸν βοήθημα διὰ τὴν Ζ΄ τάξιν τῶν Ὀκταταξίων Γυμνασίων κατὰ τὸ ἐγκεκριμένον βιβλίον τοῦ Ὀ.Ἐ.Σ.Β.*, Athens.

Rossis 1921: Ioannis Th. Rossis [Ἰωάννης Θ. Ρώσσης], *Σχολικὴ μετάφρασις τοῦ τρίτου κατὰ Κατιλίνα λόγου Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος, πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν μαθητῶν τῆς τρίτης τάξεως τῶν τετραταξίων Γυμνασίων καὶ τῆς ἀντιστοίχου τάξεως τῶν λοιπῶν σχολείων τῆς Μ. Ἐκπαιδεύσεως*, Athens.

Rossis 1922: Ioannis Th. Rossis [Ἰωάννης Θ. Ρώσσης], *Σχολικὴ μετάφρασις τοῦ τετάρτου κατὰ Κατιλίνα λόγου Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος, πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν μαθητῶν τῆς τρίτης τάξεως τῶν τετραταξίων Γυμνασίων καὶ τῆς ἀντιστοίχου τάξεως τῶν λοιπῶν σχολείων τῆς Μ. Ἐκπαιδεύσεως*, Athens.

Tsakalotos 1906 (?): Eustratios Tsakalotos [Εὐστράτιος Τσακαλῶτος], *Λόγοι τέσσερες κατὰ Λευκίου Σεργίου Κατιλίνου (Κείμενον, σχόλια)*, s.l.[17]

Tsatsos 1968: Konstantinos Tsatsos [Κωνσταντῖνος Τσάτσος], *Κικέρων. Τέσσερις λόγοι κατὰ Κατιλίνα, οἱ λόγοι γιὰ τὸν Μάρκελλο καὶ τὸν Λιγάριο, μετάφραση, εἰσαγωγικὰ σημειώματα καὶ σχόλια*, Athens.

Tsoureas 1995: Efstratios Tsoureas [Ευστράτιος Τσουρέας], *Κικέρωνος Πρώτος και Δεύτερος κατά Κατιλίνα λόγοι. Για τους φοιτητές, καθηγητές και βιβλιόφιλους*, Athens.

De or. (De oratore)

Kentrotis 2008: Georgios D. Kentrotis [Γεώργιος Δ. Κεντρωτής], Κικέρων, *Ο τέλειος ρήτορας: De oratore. Εισαγωγή, μετάφραση, σχόλια*, Athens.

Deiot. (Pro rege Deiotaro)

Louizidis 1957: Louizos L. Louizidis [Λουΐζος Λ. Λουϊζίδης], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Λόγος ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλέως Δηϊοτάρου*, Athens.

Mantzilas/Panoutsopoulos 2017: Dimitrios Mantzilas and Andreas G. Panoutsopoulos [Δημήτριος Μαντζίλας και Ανδρέας Γ. Πανουτσόπουλος], *M. Tullius Cicero. Orationes. Pro Archia Poeta – De Lege Agraria III – Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo – In Catilinam I–IV – Pro Marcello – Pro Ligario – Pro Rege Deiotaro – In M. Antonium Orationum Philippicarum Libri II, IV, IX. Εισαγωγή – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια*, Ioannina.

16 Pappas in this volume, 165–166.

17 Banou-Tsiami 2003, 109.

Div. (De divinatione)

Pappa 2005: Katerina Pappa [Κατερίνα Παππά], *Κικέρωνα Περί μαντικής*, Athens.

Div. Caec. (Divinatio in Caecilium)

Kakridis 1928 (?): Theophanis A. Kakridis [Θεοφάνης Ἀ. Κακριδῆς], *M. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος ὁ λόγος Divinatio in Caecilium, μεταφρασμένος εἰς τὴν νεωτέραν ἑλληνικὴν γλῶσσαν*, [unpublished].[18]

Dom. (De domo sua)

Konemenos 1900: Nikolaos Konemenos [Νικόλαος Κονεμένος], *Cicero Pro domo sua*, Corfu.[19]

Ep. (Epistulae)

[Anonymous] 18th cent.ex.: [Anonymous], [Κικέρωνος, Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Κουρίωνα, μετὰ διαστίχου ἑρμηνείας εἰς ἀρχαίαν ἑλληνικήν (μόνον σπανίως κατὰ την "ψυχαγωγικὴν" μέθοδον)].[20]

Apostolidis 1916: D. Apostolidis [Δ. Ἀποστολίδης], *M. Tulli Ciceronis Ἐκλεκταὶ ἐπιστολαὶ πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν γυμνασίων μετὰ μεταφράσεως εἰς τὴν νέαν ἑλληνικήν*, Athens.[21]

Fragkiskos 1916: Zaphirios N. Fragkiskos [Ζαφείριος Ν. Φραγκίσκος], *Μετάφρασις ἐκλεκτῶν ἐπιστολῶν τοῦ Κικέρωνος πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους καὶ πρὸς τὸν Ἀττικὸν (Ad familiares – Ad Atticum) μετὰ σημειώσεων διὰ τοὺς μαθητὰς τῆς Γ΄ τάξεως τοῦ Γυμνασίου*, Athens.

Gratsiatos 1927: Georgios K. Gratsiatos [Γεώργιος Κ. Γρατσιάτος], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Ἐπιστολαὶ.* Athens.[22]

Ioannidis 1938: Th. Th. Ioannidis [Θ. Θ. Ἰωαννίδης], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος σχολικὴ μετάφρασις ἐκλεκτῶν ἐπιστολῶν μετ' εἰσαγωγῆς, περιλήψεων, γραμματικῶν, συντακτικῶν καὶ πραγματικῶν παρατηρήσεων, πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν μαθητῶν τῆς Ε΄ τάξεως τῶν Ἑξαταξίων Γυμνασίων*, Athens.

Kakridis 1916: Theophanis A. Kakridis [Θεοφάνης Ἀ. Κακριδῆς], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος, Ἐπιστολαὶ αἱ πρὸς διδασκαλίαν ἐν τοῖς Γυμνασίοις ὑπὸ τοῦ ὑπουργείου ὡρισμέναι ἑρμηνευθεῖσαι*, Athens.

Kofiniotis 1878: Evangelos K. Kofiniotis [Εὐάγγελος Κ. Κοφινιώτης], *Κικέρωνος ἐπιστολαὶ κατ' ἐκλογὴν μετὰ σημειώσεων πρὸς χρῆσιν μαθητῶν Γυμνασίων*, Athens.

Mpertos 1916: Nikolaos I. Mpertos [Νικόλαος Ἰ. Μπέρτος], *Κικέρωνος ἐπιστολαί. Τεῦχος Α΄: Κείμενον. Κατὰ τὸ ἐπίσημον πρόγραμμα πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν μαθητῶν τῆς Γ΄ τάξεως τῶν Γυμνασίων, ἐκδιδόμεναι μετὰ σχολίων*, Athens.

---

18 Banou-Tsiami 2003, 110.

19 Banou-Tsiami 2003, 109.

20 Pappas in this volume, 168–169. See http://xeir.nlg.gr/all1.asp?id=19584&pg=0.

21 Banou-Tsiami 2003, 110.

22 Banou-Tsiami 2003, 110.

Skassis 1915: Errikos A. Skassis [Ἐρρῖκος Ἀ. Σκάσσης], *Κικέρωνος Ἐπιστολαί. Ἔκδοσις στερεότυπος. Περιέχουσα πάσας τὰς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισήμου προγράμματος τῆς 31 Ὀκτωβρίου 1914 ὁριζομένας ἐπιστολάς. Μέρος Α΄: Κείμενον*, Athens.

Tsoulios 1960: Georgios M. Tsoulios [Γεώργιος Μ. Τσούλιος], *Κικέρωνος ἐπιστολαί. Μετάφρασις – Σχόλια*, Athens.

Fin. (De finibus bonorum et malorum)

Karamanolis/Mitousi 2021: Georgios Karamanolis and Eirini Mitousi [Γεώργιος Καραμανώλης και Ειρήνη Μητούση], *Κικέρων: Τα όρια του αγαθού και του κακού (De finibus bonorum et malorum). Εισαγωγή – Επιμέλεια – Σχόλια – Μετάφραση*, Heraklion.

Flac. (Pro Flacco)

Karakasis *et al*. 2020: Evangelos Karakasis, Thalia Papadopoulou and Vasileios Pappas [Ευάγγελος Καρακάσης, Θάλεια Παπαδοπούλου και Βασίλειος Παππάς], *Κικερώνειας Πεζογραφίας Απάνθισμα. Εισαγωγή – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Ρητορική Ανάλυση – Λεξιλόγιο*, Ioannina.

Leg. (De legibus)

Deligiannis 2017: Ioannis Deligiannis [Ἰωάννης Ντεληγιάννης], *Μ. Τύλλιου Κικέρωνα, Περὶ Νόμων Βιβλία Τρία. Εἰσαγωγὴ – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια*, Αθήνα.

Leg. agr. (De lege agraria)

Mantzilas/Panoutsopoulos 2017: Dimitrios Mantzilas and Andreas G. Panoutsopoulos [Δημήτριος Μαντζίλας και Ανδρέας Γ. Πανουτσόπουλος], *M. Tullius Cicero. Orationes. Pro Archia Poeta – De Lege Agraria III – Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo – In Catilinam I–IV – Pro Marcello – Pro Ligario – Pro Rege Deiotaro – In M. Antonium Orationum Philippicarum Libri II, IV, IX. Εισαγωγή – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια*, Ioannina.

Leg. Man. (Pro lege Manilia or De imperio Cn. Pompeii)

Doukakis 1883: Dimitrios Ch. Doukakis [Δημήτριος Χ. Δουκάκης], *Μ. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος λόγος ὑπὲρ τοῦ Μανιλιείου νόμου ἢ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Γναίου Πομπηίου μεταφρασθείς*, Kalamata.[23]

23 Pappas in this volume, 162–164.

Favrikios (?) 1846: Karolos Favrikios [Κάρολος Φαβρίκιος], *Λόγος Κικέρωνος Ὑπὲρ τοῦ Μανιλίου νόμου, μετὰ σημειώσεων*, Athens.[24]

Gkiolmas 1878: Michael Gkiolmas [Μιχαὴλ Γκιόλμας], *Μ. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Λόγοι : ὁ Ὑπὲρ τοῦ Μανιλιείου νόμου καὶ ὁ Ὑπὲρ Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ μετὰ σημειώσεων*, Cephalonia.

Politis 1908: Nikolaos I. Politis [Νικόλαος Ἰ. Πολίτης], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Λόγος ὑπὲρ τοῦ Μανιλιείου νόμου ἢ Περὶ τῆς τοῦ Γναίου Πομπηίου ἀρχῆς : εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετενεχθεὶς φωνὴν τῇ ἐν τοῖς γυμνασίοις φιλοτίμως σπουδαζούσῃ νεολαίᾳ*, Ermoupoli.

Tsakalotos 1893: Eustratios Tsakalotos [Εὐστράτιος Τσακαλῶτος], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Λόγοι ἐκλεκτοὶ ἑρμηνευθέντες, Τεῦχος Α΄. I. Oratio pro lege Manilia, II. Oratio pro Archia poeta*, Athens.

Lig. (Pro Ligario)

Kalimeris 1887: Galinos Kalimeris [Γαληνὸς Καλημέρης], *Ὁ ὑπὲρ Λιγαρίου λόγος τοῦ Κικέρωνος μεταγλωττισθεὶς εἰς τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς μετὰ κριτικῶν σχολίων καὶ ἑρμηνείας τῶν δυσκολοτέρων χωρίων πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν μαθητῶν*, Athens.[25]

Karatzas 1893: Georgios N. Karatzas [Γεώργιος Ν. Καρατζᾶς], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Λόγος ὑπὲρ Κοΐντου Λιγαρίου, μετὰ σχολίων καὶ μεταφράσεως*, Athens.[26]

Louizidis 1958: Louizos L. Louizidis [Λουΐζος Λ. Λουϊζίδης], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Λόγος ὑπὲρ τοῦ Κοΐντου Λιγαρίου. Εισαγωγή – Μετάφρασις*, Athens.

Mantzilas/Panoutsopoulos 2017: Dimitrios Mantzilas and Andreas G. Panoutsopoulos [Δημήτριος Μαντζίλας και Ανδρέας Γ. Πανουτσόπουλος], *M. Tullius Cicero. Orationes. Pro Archia Poeta – De Lege Agraria III – Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo – In Catilinam I–IV – Pro Marcello – Pro Ligario – Pro Rege Deiotaro – In M. Antonium Orationum Philippicarum Libri II, IV, IX. Εισαγωγή – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια*, Ioannina.

Tsatsos 1968: Konstantinos Tsatsos [Κωνσταντῖνος Τσάτσος], *Κικέρων. Τέσσερις λόγοι κατὰ Κατιλίνα, οἱ λόγοι γιὰ τὸν Μάρκελλο καὶ τὸν Λιγάριο, μετάφραση, εἰσαγωγικὰ σημειώματα καὶ σχόλια*, Athens.

Marcell. (Pro Marcello)

Mantzilas/Panoutsopoulos 2017: Dimitrios Mantzilas and Andreas G. Panoutsopoulos [Δημήτριος Μαντζίλας και Ανδρέας Γ. Πανουτσόπουλος], *M. Tullius Cicero. Orationes. Pro Archia Poeta – De Lege Agraria III – Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo – In Catilinam I–IV – Pro Marcello – Pro Ligario – Pro Rege Deiotaro – In M. Antonium Orationum Philippicarum Libri II, IV, IX. Εισαγωγή – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια*, Ioannina.

Tsatsos 1968: Konstantinos Tsatsos [Κωνσταντῖνος Τσάτσος], *Κικέρων. Τέσσερις λόγοι κατὰ Κατιλίνα, οἱ λόγοι γιὰ τὸν Μάρκελλο καὶ τὸν Λιγάριο, μετάφραση, εἰσαγωγικὰ σημειώματα καὶ σχόλια*, Athens.

---

24 Banou-Tsiami 2003, 107. A similar entry in the National Library Greece catalogue does not provide the translator's name (see https://catalogue.nlg.gr/Record/b.465627).

25 Pappas in this volume, 164.

26 Pappas in this volume, 167.

Tsoureas/Tsoureas 2006: Eustratios Tsoureas and Georgios Tsoureas [Ευστράτιος Τσουρέας και Γεώργιος Τσουρέας], *Μάρκου Τύλλιου Κικέρωνα Ο υπέρ του Μάρκου Μαρκέλλου λόγος: Για τους φοιτητές, καθηγητές και βιβλιόφιλους*, Athens.

Mil. (Pro Milone)

Eleutheriadis 1974: Antonios Eleutheriadis [Ἀντώνιος Ἐλευθεριάδης], *Κικέρωνος Pro Milone. Εἰσαγωγή, κείμενο, φυσικὴ καὶ συντακτικὴ σειρὰ τῶν λέξεων, λεξιλόγιον κατὰ κεφάλαια*, Athens.

Kakridis 1912: Theophanis A. Kakridis [Θεοφάνης Ἀ. Κακριδῆς], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος ὁ Ὑπὲρ Τίτου Ἀννίου Μίλωνος Λόγος διορθωθεὶς καὶ ἑρμηνευθείς*, Athens.

Karakasis *et al*. 2020: Evangelos Karakasis, Thalia Papadopoulou and Vasileios Pappas [Ευάγγελος Καρακάσης, Θάλεια Παπαδοπούλου και Βασίλειος Παππάς], *Κικέρων. Λόγος υπέρ του Τ. Άννιου Μίλωνα/Cicero Pro Milone. Εισαγωγή – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Ρητορική Ανάλυση – Λεξιλόγιο*, Ioannina.

Karatzas 1893: Georgios N. Karatzas [Γεώργιος Ν. Καρατζᾶς], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος λόγος ὑπὲρ Τίτου Ἀννίου Μίλωνος μεταφρασθεὶς καὶ δι' ὑποσημειώσεων διασαφηνισθεὶς*, Athens.[27]

Koilias 1961: Georgios F. Koilias [Γεώργιος Φ. Κοίλιας], *Μ. Κικέρωνος λόγος ὑπὲρ τοῦ Μίλωνος*, Athens.

Melissovas 1973: Vasileios Melissovas [Βασίλειος Μελισσόβας], *Pro T. A. Milone oratio "ὑπὲρ τοῦ Τ. Ἀ. Μίλωνα" δικανικὸς λόγος τοῦ Μάρκου Τουλλίου Κικέρωνα*, Ioannina.

Soutsas 1886: Konstantinos P. Soutsas [Κωνσταντῖνος Π. Σούτσας], *Κικέρωνος, ὁ ὑπὲρ Τ. Ἀννίου Μίλωνος Λόγος: μεταφρασθεὶς εἰς τὴν καθομιλουμένην πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν γυμνασίων*, Athens.[28]

Tsoureas 1998: Eustratios Tsoureas [Ευστράτιος Τσουρέας], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνα υπέρ Τίτου Αννίου Μίλωνα : Για τους φοιτητές, καθηγητές και βιβλιόφιλους*, Athens.

Mur. (Pro Murena)

Kakridis 1925: Theophanis A. Kakridis [Θεοφάνης Ἀ. Κακριδῆς], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος ὁ ὑπέρ τοῦ Λευκίου Λικίνου Μουρήνα λόγος μεταφρασθεὶς εἰς τὴν νεωτέραν ἑλληνικὴν γλῶσσαν*, Athens.

Karatzas 1891: Georgios N. Karatzas [Γεώργιος Ν. Καρατζᾶς], *Μ. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος λόγος ὑπὲρ Λ. Λικινίου Μουρήνα, Μετάφρασις*, Athens.[29]

Mertani 19–: Artemis Mertani [Ἀρτεμις Μερτάνη], *M. T. Ciceronis Oratio pro Murena. Εισαγωγή – Σχόλια – Μετάφρασις. Κείμενον κατὰ τὴν ἔκδοσιν Teubner*, Athens.

Nat. D. (De natura deorum)

Karakasis *et al*. 2020: Evangelos Karakasis, Thalia Papadopoulou and Vasileios Pappas [Ευάγγελος Καρακάσης, Θάλεια Παπαδοπούλου και Βασίλειος Παππάς], *Κικερώνειας Πεζογραφίας Απάνθισμα. Εισαγωγή – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Ρητορική Ανάλυση – Λεξιλόγιο*, Ioannina.

27 Pappas in this volume, 167.
28 Pappas in this volume, 164.
29 Pappas in this volume, 166–167.

Papadimitriou 1995: Maria Papadimitriou [Μαρία Παπαδημητρίου], *Κικέρωνος Περί Θεών Βιβλίο πρώτο*, Ioannina.

Off. (De officiis)

Chalkomatas 2017: Dionysios Chalkomatas [Διονύσιος Χαλκωματάς], *Κικέρων, Περί Καθηκόντων, De Officiis, Εισαγωγή, μετάφραση, σχόλια, βιογραφικές πληροφορίες*, Athens.

Gratsiatos 1916: Georgios K. Gratsiatos [Γεώργιος Κ. Γρατσιάτος], *M. Tulli Ciceronis De officiis ad Marcum filium: liber secundus. Πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν μαθητῶν τῶν Γυμνασίων*, Athens.

Kontopoulos 1898: Nikolaos Kontopoulos [Νικόλαος Κοντόπουλος], *M. T. Κικέρωνος, Περὶ Καθηκόντων. Μετάφρασις*, Athens.[30]

Oikonomou 1997: Lampros P. Oikonomou [Λάμπρος Π. Οικονόμου], *M. T. Κικέρων, Περί Καθηκόντων. Στο γυιο του Μάρκο*, Athens.

Rossis 1933: Ioannis Th. Rossis [Ἰωάννης Θ. Ρώσσης], *Σχολικὴ μετάφρασις Περὶ καθηκόντων (de officiis) Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος, πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν μαθητῶν τῆς ἕκτης τάξεως τῶν ἑξαταξίων Γυμνασίων*, Athens.

Theocharis 1921: Theocharis Z. Theocharis, [Θεοχάρης Ζ. Θεοχάρης], *M. T. Κικέρωνος Περὶ Καθηκόντων. Μετάφρασις*, Athens.

Zafeiriou 20th cent.med.: Nikolaos I. Zafeiriou [Νικόλαος Ἰ. Ζαφειρίου], *M. T. Κικέρωνος, De officiis ad Marcum filium: ἐκλογαὶ ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου βιβλίου: πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν μαθητῶν τῆς Η΄ τάξεως τῶν γυμνασίων κατὰ τῷ ἐν ἰσχύι ἀναλυτικὸν πρόγραμμα*, Athens.

Orat. (Orator)

Melissovas 1972: Vasileios Melissovas [Βασίλειος Μελισσόβας], *Μάρκου Τούλλιου Κικέρωνα Orator / Ο Ρήτορας. Κείμενο, μετάφραση, λεξιλόγιο*, Ioannina.

Part. or. (Partitiones oratoriae)

Fountedakis 1975: Nikolaos Th. Fountedakis [Νικόλαος Θ. Φουντεδάκης], *Marcus Tullius Cicero Διαιρέσεις τῆς ῥητορικῆς (Partitiones oratoriae). Βιογραφικά, εἰσαγωγή, ὑπομνηματισμοί, μετάφραση*, Athens.

Phil. (Orationes Philippicae)

Farantatos 1880: Nikolaos Farantatos [Νικόλαος Φαραντάτος], *M. T. Κικέρωνος εἰς Μ. Ἀντώνιον ἔνατος Φιλιππικὸς μεταφρασθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ Λατινικοῦ μετὰ σημειώσεων*, Athens.[31]

30 Pappas in this volume, 157.

31 Pappas in this volume, 161–162.

Favrikios 1849: Karolos Favrikios [Κάρολος Φαβρίκιος], *Μ. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Φιλιππικῶν ὁ πρῶτος*, Athens.[32]

Krispis 1914: Manthos K. Krispis [Μάνθος Κ. Κρίσπης], *Γαΐου* [sic] *Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος ὁ πρῶτος Φιλιππικός. Μετάφρασις μετ' εἰσαγωγῆς καὶ σημειώσεων*, Athens.

Mantzilas/Panoutsopoulos 2017: Dimitrios Mantzilas and Andreas G. Panoutsopoulos [Δημήτριος Μαντζίλας και Ανδρέας Γ. Πανουτσόπουλος], *M. Tullius Cicero. Orationes. Pro Archia Poeta – De Lege Agraria III – Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo – In Catilinam I–IV – Pro Marcello – Pro Ligario – Pro Rege Deiotaro – In M. Antonium Orationum Philippicarum Libri II, IV, IX. Εισαγωγή – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια*, Ioannina.

Mitsomponou 2009: Asimina Mitsomponou [Ασημίνα Μητσομπόνου], *Κικέρων, Επίθεση σε έναν εχθρό της ελευθερίας*, Athens.

Papadimitriou 1995: Maria Papadimitriou [Μαρία Παπαδημητρίου], *Κικέρωνος Δεύτερος Φιλιππικός*, Ioannina.

Tourlidis 1977: Georgios A. Tourlidis [Γεώργιος Ἀ. Τουρλίδης], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Κατὰ Μάρκου Ἀντωνίου Πρῶτος Φιλιππικὸς λόγος (ἐκλογὴ κεφ. 1–6), ἐξελληνισθείς*, Athens.

Viagkinis 1888: Markos Viagkinis [Μᾶρκος Βιαγκίνης], *Μ. Τ. Κικέρωνος ὁ πρῶτος κατὰ Ἀντωνίου εἴτε Φιλιππικὸς λόγος πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν ἀνωτέρων γυμνασιακῶν τάξεων, μετὰ συντομοτάτου βίου τοῦ συγγραφέως, εἰσαγωγῆς εἰς τοὺς Φιλιππικούς, γενικῶν παρατηρήσεων εἰς τὸν Α΄ Φιλιππικόν, συντόμου ὑποθέσεως καὶ μεταφράσεως*, & *Σημειώσεις εἰς τὸν Πρῶτον κατὰ Ἀντωνίου εἴτε Φιλιππικὸν τοῦ Μ. Τ. Κικέρωνος*, Athens.[33]

Viagkinis 1889: Markos Viagkinis [Μᾶρκος Βιαγκίνης], *Μ. Τ. Κικέρωνος ὁ δεύτερος κατ' Ἀντωνίου εἴτε Φιλιππικὸς λόγος, μετὰ συντομοτάτου βίου τοῦ συγγραφέως, εἰσαγωγῆς εἰς τοὺς Φιλιππικούς, γενικῶν παρατηρήσεων εἰς τὸν Β΄ Φιλιππικόν, συντόμου ὑποθέσεως καὶ μεταφράσεως*, Athens.[34]

Viagkinis 1890: Markos Viagkinis [Μᾶρκος Βιαγκίνης], *Σημειώσεις εἰς τὸν Δεύτερον κατ' Ἀντωνίου εἴτε Φιλιππικὸν τοῦ Μ. Τ. Κικέρωνος πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν φοιτητῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνωτέρων τάξεων τῶν Γυμνασίων*, Athens.

Rab. perd. (Pro Rabirio perduellionis reo)

Mantzilas/Panoutsopoulos 2017: Dimitrios Mantzilas and Andreas G. Panoutsopoulos [Δημήτριος Μαντζίλας και Ανδρέας Γ. Πανουτσόπουλος], *M. Tullius Cicero. Orationes. Pro Archia Poeta – De Lege Agraria III – Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo – In Catilinam I–IV – Pro Marcello – Pro Ligario – Pro Rege Deiotaro – In M. Antonium Orationum Philippicarum Libri II, IV, IX. Εισαγωγή – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια*, Ioannina.

Red. pop. (Post reditum ad populum)

Deligiannis 2021: Ioannis Deligiannis [Ιωάννης Ντεληγιάννης], *Μ. Τύλλιου Κικέρωνα Λόγοι επ' απονοστήσει ευχαριστήριοι ενώπιον της Συγκλήτου και προς τους Ρωμαίους πολίτες. Επίμετρο: [Μ.*

32 Banou-Tsiami 2003, 107.

33 Pappas in this volume, 164–165.

34 Pappas in this volume, 165.

Τύλλιου Κικέρωνα] Ο της προηγουμένης της εξορίας λόγος. Εισαγωγή – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Ερμηνευτικός σχολιασμός, Athens.

Red. sen. (Post reditum in senatu)

Deligiannis 2021: Ioannis Deligiannis [Ιωάννης Ντεληγιάννης], *Μ. Τύλλιου Κικέρωνα Λόγοι επ' απονοστήσει ευχαριστήριοι ενώπιον της Συγκλήτου και προς τους Ρωμαίους πολίτες. Επίμετρο: [Μ. Τύλλιου Κικέρωνα] Ο της προηγουμένης της εξορίας λόγος. Εισαγωγή – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Ερμηνευτικός σχολιασμός*, Athens.

Rep. (De re publica)

Deligiannis 2015: Ioannis Deligiannis [Ἰωάννης Ντεληγιάννης], *Μ. Τύλλιου Κικέρωνα, Περὶ Πολιτείας Βιβλία Ἕξι. Εἰσαγτωγὴ – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια*, Athens.

Kapodistrias 1839: Viaros Kapodistrias [Βιάρος Καποδίστριας], *Κικέρωνος, Περὶ πολιτειῶν. Ἐκ τοῦ Λατινικοῦ ὑπὸ Ἀ. ΣΤ.*, Athens.[35]

Sen. (De senectute)

[Anonymous] 18–: [Anonymous]. *Μ. Τυλλ. Κικέρωνος ρωμαίου, Κάτων ὁ μείζων ἢ Περὶ γήρως*, s.l.

Antoniadis <1932: Vasileios Antoniadis [Βασίλειος Ἀντωνιάδης].[36]

Chatziemmanouil 1911: Dimitrios P. Chatziemmanouil [Δημήτριος Π. Χατζηεμμανουήλ], *Μᾶρκος Τύλλιος Κικέρων καὶ Λεύκιος Ἀνναῖος Σενέκας, Περὶ γήρως, φιλίας καὶ βίου εὐδαίμονος, ἐξελληνισθέντα ἐκ τοῦ λατινικοῦ*, Athens.

Melissovas 1977: Vasileios Melissovas [Βασίλειος Μελισσόβας], *De Senectute / Περί του γήρατος του Μ. Τ. Κικέρωνος. Κείμενο, μετάφραση, λεξιλόγιο*, Ioannina.

Sakellariou 2016: Antonios I. Sakellariou [Αντώνιος Η. Σακελλαρίου], *Μάρκος Τύλλιος Κικέρων, Κάτων ο Πρεσβύτερος, Περί των γηρατειών [Cato Maior, De senectute], λατινικό κείμενο, εισαγωγή, μετάφραση, σχόλια*, Athens.

Tsakalotos 1906 (?): Eustratios Tsakalotos [Εὐστράτιος Τσακαλῶτος], *Κάτων ὁ Μείζων ἢ Περὶ γήρατος*, s.l.[37]

35 Pappas, 150, and Deligiannis in this volume.

36 See Papamichail 1932, 191.

37 Banou-Tsiami 2003, 109.

Sest. (Pro Sestio)

Kampasis 1891: Georgios Kampasis [Γεώργιος Καμπάσης], *Κικέρωνος : Ὁ ὑπέρ Σηστίου λόγος, μετάφρασις*, Athens.[38]

Somn. (Somnium Scipionis)

Andreou 1951: P. Andreou [Π. Ἀνδρέου], *Κικέρωνος Ἐνύπνιον Σκιπίωνος*, Athens.[39]

Christopoulos 1966: Euthimios D. Christopoulos [Εὐθύμιος Δ. Χριστόπουλος], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Somnium Scipionis (Ἐνύπνιον Σκιπίωνος). Σχολικὴ μετάφρασις διὰ τοὺς μαθητὰς τῆς Στ΄ τάξεως τῶν ἑξαταξίων γυμνασίων κατὰ τὸ ἐγκεκριμένον βιβλίον τοῦ Ὀ.Ἐ.Δ.Β.*, Athens.

Deligiannis 2015: Ioannis Deligiannis [Ἰωάννης Ντεληγιάννης], *Μ. Τύλλιου Κικέρωνα, Περὶ Πολιτείας Βιβλία Ἕξι. Εἰσαγωγὴ – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια*, Athens.

Gkinopoulos 1927: Nikolaos S. Gkinopoulos [Νικόλαος Σ. Γκινόπουλος], *Μ. Τ. Κικέρωνος Ὄνειρον Σκιπίωνος πρὸς χρῆσιν τῆς Δ΄ τάξεως τῶν Γυμνασίων ἐγκεκριμένον*, Athens.

Mantzilas 2005: Dimitrios Mantzilas [Δημήτριος Μαντζίλας], *Μάρκου Τύλλιου Κικέρωνα: Το Όνειρο τον Σκιπίωνα (Somnium Scipionis), Μετάφραση – Σχόλια*, Athens.

Nikodimos 197-: Pavlos Nikodimos [Παῦλος Νικόδημος], *Κικέρωνος Ἐνύπνιον Σκιπίωνος: Νεωτάτη μετάφρασις διὰ τοὺς μαθητὰς τῆς ΣΤ΄ τάξεως Γυμνασίου καὶ λοιπῶν σχολείων μέσης ἐκπαιδεύσεως*, Athens.

Oikonomou 1915: Georgios M. Oikonomou [Γεώργιος Μ. Οἰκονόμου], *Μ. Τ. Κικέρωνος Ἐνύπνιον Σκιπίωνος, μετὰ ποικίλων σημειώσεων καὶ πίνακος τῶν ἐν τῷ κειμένῳ ρημάτων, πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν μαθητῶν τῆς Δ΄ τάξεως τοῦ Γυμνασίου κατὰ τὸ τελευταῖον πρόγραμμα τοῦ Ὑπουργείου*, Athens.

Pantoulas 19–: Socrates. I. Pantoulas [Σωκράτης Ἰ. Παντούλας,], *Κικέρωνος Ἐνύπνιον Σκιπίωνος, διὰ τοὺς μαθητὰς τῆς Στ΄ τάξεως γυμνασίων καὶ λοιπῶν σχολείων μέσης ἐκπαιδεύσεως*, Athens.

Papanikolaou 195-: Georgios N. Papanikolaou [Γεώργιος Ν. Παπανικολάου], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος, Somnium Scipionis (de re publica liber VI). Σχολικὸν βοήθημα διὰ τὴν Η΄ τάξιν τῶν ὀκταταξίων γυμνασίων κατὰ τὸ ἐγκεκριμένον βιβλίον τοῦ Ὀ.Ἐ.Σ.Β.*, Athens.

Politis 1915: Nikolaos I. Politis [Νικόλαος Ἰ. Πολίτης], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Ἐνύπνιον Σκιπίωνος. Εἰς τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς Ἑλληνικὴν μεταγλωττισθέν, πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν μαθητῶν καὶ Ἑλλήνων φιλαναγνωστῶν*, Chalkida.

Rossis 193-: Ioannis Th. Rossis [Ἰωάννης Θ. Ρώσσης], *M. Tullii Ciceronis Somnium Scipionis (de re publica liber VI). Κείμενον μετ' εἰσαγωγῆς & σχολικῆς ἑρμηνείας. Πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν μαθητῶν τῆς τετάρτης τάξεως τῶν τετραταξίων Γυμνασίων καὶ τῆς ἀντιστοίχου τάξεως τῶν λοιπῶν σχολείων τῆς Μ. Ἐκπαιδεύσεως*, Athens.

Skassis 1915: Errikos A. Skassis [Ἐρρῖκος Ἀ. Σκάσσης], *M. Tullii Ciceronis Somnium Scipionis (De re publica liber VI): Ἑρμηνευτικὰ ὑπομνήματα*, Athens.

Tertsetis 1831: Georgios Tertsetis [Γεώργιος Τερτσέτης], *Ὄνειρο τοῦ Σκιπίωνος, μεταφρασμένο ἀπὸ τὸ λατινικὸν*, Athens [1959].[40]

---

38 Pappas in this volume, 165.

39 Banou-Tsiami 2003, 111.

40 Pappas in this volume, 148–149.

Theocharis 1915: Theocharis Z. Theocharis, [Θεοχάρης Ζ. Θεοχάρης], *Μ. Τ. Κικέρωνος Ἐνύπνιον Σκιπιωνος. Μετάφρασις*, Athens.
Tourlidis 1975: Georgios A. Tourlidis [Γεώργιος Ἀ. Τουρλίδης], *Μ. Τ. Κικέρωνος, Ἐνύπνιον Σκιπίωνος (Somnium Scipionis), Μετάφρασις*, Athens.
Tzouganatos 1949: Nikolaos D. Tzouganatos [Νικόλαος Δ. Τζουγανάτος], *M. T. Ciceronis Somnium Scipionis (de re publica lib. VI). Κείμενον – Λεξιλόγιον – Σχόλια – Μετάφρασις*, Athens.

Sull. (Pro Sulla)

Karatzas 1893: Georgios N. Karatzas [Γεώργιος Ν. Καρατζᾶς], *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Λόγος ὑπὲρ Ποπλίου Σύλλα, μεταφρασθείς καὶ δι' ὑποσημειώσεων διασαφηνισθείς*, Athens.[41]

Tusc. (Tusculanae disputationes)

Iasemidis 1898: Pericles P. Iasemidis [Περικλῆς Π. Ἰασεμίδης], *Μ. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος τῶν Τουσκουλανῶν διαλόγων Βιβλίον Πέμπτον μεταφρασθὲν καὶ σχολιασθέν*, Athens.[42]
Kavrakis 1897: Ioannis A. Kavrakis [Ἰωάννης Ἀ. Καβράκης], *M. Tullii Ciceronis Tusculanarum disputationum prima de contemnenda morte, κατὰ μετάφρασιν*, Athens.[43]
Kogevinas <1897: Nikolaos Kogevinas [Νικόλαος Κογεβίνας], *Τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Νικ. Κογεβίνα (Γλαύκου Ποντίου)*, Athens [1916].[44]
Kontopoulos 1898: Nikolaos Kontopoulos [Νικόλαος Κοντόπουλος], *Κικέρωνος αἱ Τουσκολαναὶ* [sic] *Διατριβαὶ Βιβλίον Ε΄, μεταφρασθὲν σχεδὸν κατὰ λέξιν*, Athens.[45]
Papakosta 2003a: Olga Papakosta [Όλγα Παπακώστα], *Κικέρων, Όταν σκέφτομαι τον θάνατο: Πρώτη Τουσκουλανή διατριβή*, Athens.
Papakosta 2003b: Olga Papakosta [Όλγα Παπακώστα], *Κικέρων, το φάρμακο της λύπης: Τρίτη Τουσκουλανή διατριβή*, Athens.
Papakosta 2004a: Olga Papakosta [Όλγα Παπακώστα], *Κικέρων, Για τον πόνο και τα πάθη: Δεύτερη και Τέταρτη Τουσκουλανή διατριβή*, Athens.
Papakosta 2004b: Olga Papakosta [Όλγα Παπακώστα], *Κικέρων, ο δρόμος προς την ευτυχία: Πέμπτη Τουσκουλανή διατριβή*, Athens.

Verr. (In Verrem)

Karatzas 1892: Georgios N. Karatzas [Γεώργιος Ν. Καρατζᾶς], *Μ. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος λόγος Ἑ κατὰ Οὐέρρου μεταφρασθείς*, Athens.[46]

41 Pappas in this volume, 167.
42 Pappas in this volume, 157.
43 Pappas in this volume, 155–156.
44 Pappas in this volume, 153–154.
45 Pappas in this volume, 156–157.
46 Pappas in this volume, 167.

Table 1: Modern Greek Translations of and/or Commentaries on Cicero per Number.

Work	Number of Translations and/or Commentaries	Year(s)
Cat.	31	1843–2022
Arch.	18	1851–2017
Somn.	16	1831–2015
Phil.	12	1849–2017
Ep.	10	18th cent.$^{ex.}$–1960
Amic.	10	1835–2002
Mil.	8	1886–2020
Tusc.	8	<1897–2004
Off.	7	1898–2017
Sen.	6	19th cent.–2016
Leg. Man.	5	1846–1908
Lig.	5	1887–2017
Mur.	3	1891–20th cent.$^{med.}$
Marcell.	3	1968–2017
Rep.	2	1839 & 2015
Deiot.	2	1957 & 2017
Nat. D.	2	1995 & 2020
Sest.	1	1891
Verr.	1	1892
Sull.	1	1893
Dom.	1	1900
Div. Caec.	1	1928?
Orat.	1	1972
Part. or.	1	1975
Div.	1	2005
De or.	1	2008
Cael.	1	2013
Leg.	1	2017

Table 1: Modern Greek Translations of and/or Commentaries on Cicero per Number. *(Continued)*

Work	Number of Translations and/or Commentaries	Year(s)
Leg. agr.	1	2017
Rab. perd.	1	2017
Flac.	1	2020
Fin.	1	2021
Red. pop.	1	2021
Red. sen.	1	2021

Table 2: Modern Greek Translations of and/or Commentaries on Cicero in Chronological Order.

Translator/Commentator	Date	Work	Place
[Anonymous]	18th cent.ex.	*Ep.*	?
[Anonymous]	18–	*Sen.*	?
Tertsetis	1831	*Somn.*	Athens
[Anonymous]	1835	*Amic.*	Athens
Kapodistrias	1839	*Rep.* I–III	Athens
Karatheodori	1843	*Cat.* I–II	Constantinople
Favrikios	1844	*Cat.* I	Athens
Favrikios	1844	*Cat.* IV	Athens
Favrikios (?)	1846	*Leg. Man.*	Athens
Favrikios	1849	*Phil.* I	Athens
Favrikios	1851	*Arch.*	Athens
Petridis	1859	*Amic.*	Athens
Grammatikopoulos	1863	*Cat.* I	[Nafplio]
Koupitoris	1876	*Arch.*	Athens
Livieratos	1876	*Arch.*	Athens
Koupitoris	1876	*Cat.* I & IV	Athens
Livieratos	1876	*Cat.* I–IV	Athens
Antoniadis	1878	*Amic.*	Constantinople
Gkiolmas	1878	*Arch.*	Cephalonia
Kofiniotis	1878	*Ep.*	Athens
Gkiolmas	1878	*Leg. Man.*	Cephalonia
Kofiniotis	1880	*Cat.* I & IV	Athens
Farantatos	1880	*Phil.* IX	Athens
Doukakis	1883	*Leg. Man.*	Kalamata
Soutsas	1886	*Mil.*	Athens
Kalimeris	1887	*Lig.*	Athens
Viagkinis	1888	*Phil.* I	Athens
Viagkinis	1889	*Phil.* II	Athens

Table 2: Modern Greek Translations of and/or Commentaries on Cicero in Chronological Order. *(Continued)*

Translator/Commentator	Date	Work	Place
Viagkinis	1890	*Phil.* II	Athens
Karatzas	1891	*Mur.*	Athens
Kampasis	1891	*Sest.*	Athens
Karatzas	1892	*Arch.*	Athens
Mataragkas	1892	*Cat.* I–IV	Athens
Karatzas	1892	*Verr.* V	Athens
Tsakalotos	1893	*Arch.*	Athens
Tsakalotos	1893	*Leg. Man.*	Athens
Karatzas	1893	*Lig.*	Athens
Karatzas	1893	*Mil.*	Athens
Karatzas	1893	*Sull.*	Athens
Kogevinas	<1897	*Tusc.* II	Athens
Kavrakis	1897	*Tusc.* I	Athens
Kontopoulos	1898	*Off.*	Athens
Iasemidis	1898	*Tusc.* V	Athens
Kontopoulos	1898	*Tusc.* V	Athens
Pantoulas	19–	*Somn.*	Athens
Konemenos	1900	*Dom.*	Corfu
Georgiadis	1906	*Arch.*	Athens
Georgiadis	1906	*Cat.* I	Athens
Tsakalotos	1906 (?)	*Cat.* I–IV	?
Tsakalotos	1906 (?)	*Sen.*	?
Politis	1908	*Leg. Man.*	Ermoupoli
Doukakis	1910	*Cat.* I	Athens
Chatziemmanouil	1911	*Amic.*	Athens
Chatziemmanouil	1911	*Sen.*	Athens
Kakridis	1912	*Mil.*	Athens
Doukakis	1913	*Arch.*	Athens

Table 2: Modern Greek Translations of and/or Commentaries on Cicero in Chronological Order. *(Continued)*

Translator/Commentator	Date	Work	Place
Krispis	1914	*Phil.* I	Athens
Kakridis	1915	*Cat.* III	Athens
Skassis	1915	*Ep.*	Athens
Theocharis	1915	*Somn.*	Athens
Oikonomou	1915	*Somn.*	Athens
Politis	1915	*Somn.*	Chalkida
Skassis	1915	*Somn.*	Athens
Kakridis	1916	*Cat.* IV	Athens
Apostolidis	1916	*Ep.*	Athens
Kakridis	1916	*Ep.*	Athens
Mpertos	1916	*Ep.*	Athens
Fragkiskos	1916	*Ep.*	Athens
Gratsiatos	1916	*Off.* II	Athens
Kakridis	1921	*Arch.*	Athens
Rossis	1921	*Cat.* III	Athens
Theocharis	1921	*Off.*	Athens
Rossis	1922	*Cat.* IV	Athens
Sotiriou	1923	*Arch.*	Athens
Fragkiskos	1924	*Cat.* III	Athens
Kakridis	1925	*Mur.*	Athens
Gratsiatos	1927	*Ep.*	Athens
Gkinopoulos	1927	*Somn.*	Athens
Mpithakakis	1928	*Cat.* III–IV	Athens
Kakridis	1928 (?)	*Div. Caec.*	(unpublished)
Rossis	^{2}1928	*Arch.*	Athens
Rossis	193-	*Somn.*	Athens
Kakridis	1931	*Cat.* III–IV	Athens
Antoniadis	<1932	*Sen.*	(unpublished)

Table 2: Modern Greek Translations of and/or Commentaries on Cicero in Chronological Order. *(Continued)*

Translator/Commentator	Date	Work	Place
Rossis	1933	*Off.*	Athens
Ioannidis	1938	*Cat.* III	Athens
Ioannidis	1938	*Cat.* IV	Athens
Ioannidis	1938	*Ep.*	Athens
Leventogiannis	194-	*Arch.*	Athens
Papanikolaou	194-	*Cat.* III	Athens
Alexiou	1940	*Arch.*	Athens
Fragkiskos	1940	*Arch.*	Athens
Fragkiskos	1940	*Cat.* III	Athens
Alexiou	^{2}1943	*Cat.* III	Athens
Kosmas	1944	*Cat.* III	Athens
Andreou	1946	*Arch.*	Athens
Andreou	1946	*Cat.* III	Athens
Tasopoulos	1948	*Arch.*	Athens
Tzouganatos	1949	*Somn.*	Athens
Mertani	20th cent.$^{med.}$	*Mur.*	Athens
Zafeiriou	20th cent.$^{med.}$	*Off.* II	Athens
Papanikolaou	195-	*Cat.* III	Athens
Papanikolaou	195-	*Somn.*	Athens
Andreou	1951	*Somn.*	Athens
Manis	1952	*Cat.* III	Athens
Louizidis	1957	*Deiot.*	Athens
Louizidis	1958	*Lig.*	Athens
Nikitas	1960	*Amic.*	Athens
Tsoulios	1960	*Ep.*	Athens
Koilias	1961	*Mil.*	Athens
Christopoulos	1966	*Somn.*	Athens
Tsatsos	1968	*Cat.* I–IV	Athens

Table 2: Modern Greek Translations of and/or Commentaries on Cicero in Chronological Order. *(Continued)*

Translator/Commentator	Date	Work	Place
Tsatsos	1968	*Lig.*	Athens
Tsatsos	1968	*Marcell.*	Athens
Nikodimos	197-	*Somn.*	Athens
Melissovas	1972	*Orat.*	Ioannina
Melissovas	1973	*Mil.*	Ioannina
Taifakos	1974	*Amic.*	Athens
Eleutheriadis	1974	*Mil.*	Athens
Fountedakis	1975	*Part. or.*	Athens
Tourlidis	1975	*Somn.*	Athens
Tourlidis	1977	*Phil.* I	Athens
Melissovas	1977	*Sen.*	Ioannina
Tsoureas	1995	*Cat.* I–II	Athens
Papadimitriou	1995	*Nat. D.* I	Ioannina
Papadimitriou	1995	*Phil.* II	Ioannina
Christodoulou	1996	*Amic.*	Athens
Kekropoulou	1997	*Amic.*	Athens
Oikonomou	1997	*Off.*	Athens
Tsoureas	1998	*Mil.*	Athens
Papadimitriou	1999	*Amic.*	Ioannina
Papatsimpas	2002	*Amic.*	Patra
Papakosta	2003	*Tusc.* I	Athens
Papakosta	2003	*Tusc.* III	Athens
Papakosta	2004	*Tusc.* II & IV	Athens
Papakosta	2004	*Tusc.* V	Athens
Pappa	2005	*Div.*	Athens
Mantzilas	2005	*Somn.*	Athens
Tsoureas/Tsoureas	2006	*Marcell.*	Athens
Kentrotis	2008	*De or.*	Athens

Table 2: Modern Greek Translations of and/or Commentaries on Cicero in Chronological Order. *(Continued)*

Translator/Commentator	Date	Work	Place
Mitsomponou	2009	*Phil.* II	Athens
Fyntikoglou	2013	*Cael.*	Thessalonica
Mantzilas	2015	*Arch.*	Ioannina
Deligiannis	2015	*Rep.*	Athens
Deligiannis	2015	*Somn.*	Athens
Sakellariou	2016	*Sen.*	Athens
Mantzilas	2017	*Arch.*	Ioannina
Panoutsopoulos	2017	*Cat.* I–IV	Ioannina
Mantzilas	2017	*Deiot.*	Ioannina
Deligiannis	2017	*Leg.*	Athens
Mantzilas	2017	*Leg. agr.* III	Ioannina
Panoutsopoulos	2017	*Lig.*	Ioannina
Panoutsopoulos	2017	*Marcell.*	Ioannina
Chalkomatas	2017	*Off.*	Athens
Panoutsopoulos	2017	*Phil.* II	Ioannina
Mantzilas	2017	*Phil.* IV	Ioannina
Mantzilas	2017	*Phil.* IX	Ioannina
Mantzilas	2017	*Rab. perd.*	Ioannina
Karakasis *et al.*	2020	*Flac.*	Ioannina
Karakasis *et al.*	2020	*Mil.*	Ioannina
Karakasis *et al.*	2020	*Nat. D.* I	Ioannina
Karamanolis/Mitousi	2021	*Fin.*	Heraklion
Deligiannis	2021	*Red. pop.*	Athens
Deligiannis	2021	*Red. sen.*	Athens
Garani/Mastrogianni	2022	*Cat.* I	Athens

Abbreviations

CGL *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, ed. by Georg Goetz, Gustav Loewe, Gotthold Gundermann *et al.*, vol. 7, Leipzig–Berlin, 1888–1923.

ChLA *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores*, ed. by Albert Bruckner, Robert Marichal, Guglielmo Cavallo and Giovanna Nicolaj, Olten, 1954–2019.

CIL *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Königlich Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Berlin, 1893–.

CPL *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum*, ed. by Robert Cavenaile, Wiesbaden, 1958.

LDAB *Leuven Database of Ancient Books* (online: https://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/).

LSJ *Greek-English Lexicon*, With a Revised Supplement, ed. by Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott and Henry Stuart Jones, Oxford, 1996.

OCD *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. by Simon Hornblower, Antony Spawforth and Esther Eidinow, Oxford, 2012, 4th edition.

OLD *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. by Peter G. W. Glare, Oxford, 1968–1982 (reprinted in one volume 1994, 8th edition).

PL *Patrologiae cursus completus: seu bibliotheca universalis, integra, uniformis, commoda, oeconomica, omnium SS. Patrum, doctorum scriptorumque ecclesiasticorum, sive latinorum, sive graecorum, qui ab aevo apostolico ad tempora Innocentii III (anno 1216) pro latinis et ad concilii Florentini tempora (ann. 1439) pro graecis floruerunt. Series graeca, in quo prodeunt patres, doctores scriptoresque ecclesiae graecae a S. Barnaba ad Photium,* ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, vols. 161, Paris, 1857–1866.

RE *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft: neve Bearbeitung*, ed. by August F. Pauly, Georg Wissowa, Wilhelm Kroll, Keith White, Karl Mittelhaus, and Konrat Ziegler, Stuttgart, 1894–1980.

RMR Robert O. Fink, *Roman Military Records on Papyrus*, London, 1971.

SVF *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, ed. by Ioannes ab Arnim, vol. 4, Stuttgart, 1964 (editio stereotypa editionis primae 1903–1924).

ThLL *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae.* Editus iussu et auctoritate consilii ab academiis societatibusque diversarum nationum electi, Stuttgart–Leipzig et al., 1900–.

TLG *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae:* A Digital Library of Greek Literature (online: https://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/).

TM *Trismegistos:* An Interdisciplinary Portal of the Ancient World (online: https://www.trismegistos.org/).

TrGF *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, ed. by Bruno Snell, Richard Kannicht and Stefan Radt, vols. 6, Göttingen, 1971–2004.

VIR *Vocabularium Iurisprudentiae Romanae*, ed. by Otto Gradenwitz, Bernard Gustav Adolf Kübler, Ernst Theodor Schulze, Rudolf Wilhelm Oskar Helm *et al.*, Berlin, 1903–.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779-013

Bibliography

Achard 1981: Guy Achard, *Pratique rhétorique et idéologie politique dans les discours "optimates" de Cicéron*, Leiden.

Adamopoulou 2014: Eugenia Adamopoulou, *Ο Γεώργιος Καρατζάς και ο δημοτικισμός ως πεδίο ανάδειξης πολλαπλών ιδιοτήτων*, in: *Από την αυτονομία στο εθνικό κράτος. Η ενσωμάτωση της Σάμου στην Ελλάδα*. Πρακτικά Συνεδρίου, Σάμος 2–4 Νοεμβρίου 2012, Samos, 455–468.

Adams 2003: James N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge.

Adler 2020: Eric Adler, *The Battle of the Classics: How a Nineteenth-Century Debate Can Save the Humanities Today*, Oxford.

Agosti 2019: Gianfranco Agosti, *Modelli latini per poemi greci? Sulla possibile influenza di autori latini sulla poesia epica tardoantica*, in: Alessandro Garcea, Michela Rosellini and Luigi Silvano (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium I: Late Antiquity and Beyond*, Turnhout, 313–331.

Alcock 2002: Susan Alcock, *Archaeologies of the Greek Past. Landscape, Monuments, and Memories*, Cambridge.

Alexakis 2008: Alexander Alexakis, *Two verses of Ovid liberally translated by Agathias of Myrina (*Metamorphoses *8, 877-78 and* Historiae *2, 3, 7)*, in: «Byzantinishce Zeitschrift» 101, 609–616.

Alexander 1993: Michael C. Alexander, *How many Roman senators were ever prosecuted? The evidence from the Late Republic*, in: «Phoenix» 47, 238–255.

Alibertis 1891: Ioannis Alibertis, *Κάτοπτρον Χαρακτήρων*, Bucharest.

Allen 1944: Walter J. Allen, *Cicero's house and libertas*, in: «Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association» 75, 1–9.

Altman 2015a: William H. F. Altman (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Cicero*, vols. 2, Leiden–Boston.

Altman 2015b: William H. F. Altman, *Introduction*, in: William H. F. Altman (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Cicero*, vols. 2, Leiden–Boston, 1–15.

Ammirati 2010: Serena Ammirati, *Per una storia del libro latino antico. Osservazioni paleografiche, bibliologiche e codicologiche sui manoscritti latini di argomento legale dalle origini alla tarda antichità*, in: «Journal of Juristic Papyrology» 40, 55–110.

Ammirati 2015a: Serena Ammirati, *Leggere Cicerone in Egitto. Osservazioni paleografiche (e filologiche)*, in: Paolo De Paolis (ed.), *Dai papiri al XX secolo. L'eternità di Cicerone*. Atti del Vi Simposio Ciceroniano, Arpino 9 maggio 2014, Cassino, 11–29.

Ammirati 2015b: Serena Ammirati, *Sul libro latino antico. Ricerche bibliologiche e paleografiche*, Pisa–Roma.

Ammirati 2018: Serena Ammirati, *Bilinguismo, digrafismo e letteratura giuridica della tarda antichità: un approccio paleografico (e qualche considerazione testuale)*, in: Serena Ammirati and Dario Mantovani (eds.), *Giurisprudenza romana nei papiri. Tracce per una ricerca*, Pavia, 81–92.

Ammirati/Fressura 2017: Serena Ammirati and Marco Fressura, *Towards a typology of ancient bilingual glossaries: palaeography, bibliology and codicology*, in: «Journal of Juristic Papyrology» 47, 1–26.

Annas/Woolf 2001: Julia Annas and Raphael Woolf (eds. & transl.), *Cicero, On Moral Ends*, Cambridge.

Anonymous 1835: *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Λαίλιος εἴτε Περὶ φιλίας διάλογος*, Athens.

Antoniadis 1878: Vasileios Antoniadis, *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Λαίλιος ἢ Διάλογος Περὶ Φιλίας, ἐκ τῆς Λατινίδος εἰς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν μετενεχθείς*, Constantinople.

Arcidiacono 2007: Carmen Arcidiacono, *Le citazioni omeriche nell'opera di Cicerone*, in: «Sileno» 33, 1–42.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779-014

Arweiler 2003: Alexander Arweiler, *Cicero rhetor. Die Partitiones oratoriae und das Konzept des gelehrten Politikers*, Berlin–New York.

Athanasiadou *et al*. 2019: Garyfallia Athanasiadou, Vasileios Pappas, Sotirios Stathis, and Vasileios Fyntikoglou, *Translating Latin elegy in 19th century Greece: An overview with Tibullus as case study*, in: «Mediterranean Chronicle» 9, 197–235.

Aubert-Baillot 2021: Sophie Aubert-Baillot, *Le grec et la philosophie dans la correspondance de Cicéron*, Turnhout.

Auvray-Assayas 2018: Clara Auvray-Assayas, *Lectures néoplatoniciennes de Cicéron: le témoignage du manuscrit Reg. Lat. 1762 de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, in: Gernot Michael Müller and Fosca Mariani Zini (eds.), *Philosophie im Rom - Römische Philosophie? Kultur-, literatur- und philosophiegeschichtliche Perspektiven*, Berlin–Boston, 491–500.

Baffetti 1922: Luigi Baffetti, *Di Peanio traduttore di Eutropio*, in: «Byzantinisch- Neugriechische Jahrbücher» 3, 15–36.

Balsdon 1960: John Balsdon, *Auctoritas, Dignitas, Otium*, in: «The Classical Quarterly» 10, 43–50.

Banou-Tsiami 2003: Theodora Banou-Tsiami, *Έλληνες Λατινομαθείς Λόγιοι (1204-1980). Ιστορική ανασκόπηση – εργογραφία*, Dissertation, Thessalonica.

Baratin 2019: Marc Baratin, *Sur un silence de Jean le Lydien*, in: Alessandro Garcea, Michela Rosellini and Luigi Silvano (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium I: Late Antiquity and Beyond*, Turnhout, 183–198.

Baraz 2012: Yelena Baraz, *A Written Republic. Cicero's Philosophical Politics*, Princeton–Oxford.

Barnes 1989: Jonathan Barnes, *Antiochus of Ascalon*, in: Miriam Griffin and Jonathan Barnes (eds.), *Philosophia Togata: Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*, Oxford, 51–96.

Battaglia 1990: Salvatore Battaglia (ed.), *Grande Dizionario della Lingua Italiana*, vols. 15, Torino.

Beaton 1999: Roderick Beaton, *An Introduction to Modern Greek Literature*, Oxford.

Bellemore 2008: Jane Bellemore, *Cicero's retreat from Rome in early 58 BC*, in: «Antichthon» 42, 100–120.

Benakis 1990: Linos G. Benakis, *Lateinische Literatur in Byzanz: Die Übersetzungen philosophischer Texte bis zum 14. Jahrhundert*, in: «Bulletin de Philosophie Médiévale» 32, 159–160.

Bernard 2012: Jacques-Emmanuel Bernard, *La narration dans les lettres proconsulaires de Cicéron*, in: «Latomus» 71.1, 24–39.

Berry 2006: Dominic H. Berry, *Cicero. Political Speeches*, Oxford.

Berry 2020: Dominic H. Berry, *Cicero's Catilinarians. Oxford Approaches to Classical Literature*, Oxford–New York.

Bétant 1839: Élie–Ami Bétant (ed.), *Correspondance du Comte J. Capodistrias, Président de la Grèce*, comprenant les lettres diplomatiques, administratives et particulières, écrites par lui depuis le 20 Avril 1827 jusqu'au 9 Octobre 1831, recueillies et mises en ordre par les soins de ses frères et publiées par É.–A. Bétant, l'un de ses secretaries, vol. 1, Geneva.

Bevegni 1992: Claudio Bevegni, *Teodoro Gaza fra la cultura greca e la cultura latina*, in: «Studi Umanistici Piceni» 12, 47–55.

Bevegni 1996: Claudio Bevegni, *La Biblioteca di Fozio e la sua origine*, in: «Humanitas» 51.3, 326–347.

Bianca 1999: Concetta Bianca, *Gaza, Teodoro*, in: *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 52, Rome, 737–746.

Bishop 2015: Caroline Bishop, *The Bifurcation of Cicero in Ancient Scholarship*, in: William H. F. Altman (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Cicero*, Leiden–Boston, 281–306.

Bishop 2016: Caroline Bishop, *How to Make a Roman Demosthenes: Self-Fashioning in Cicero's Brutus and Orator*, in: «The Classical Journal» 111.2, 167–192.

Bishop 2019: Caroline Bishop, *Cicero, Greek learning and the Making of a Roman Classic*, Oxford.

Black 1996: Robert Black, *Cicero in the curriculum of Italian Renaissance Grammar schools*, in: *Atti del IX Colloquium 9*, *Tullianum*, Courmayeur 29 Aprile – 1 Maggio 1995, 105–120.

Bochove 2019: Thomas Ernst van Bochove, *Justinianus Latinograecus. Language and Law during the Reign of Justinian*, in: Alessandro Garcea, Michela Rosellini and Luigi Silvano (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium I: Late Antiquity and Beyond*, Turnhout, 199–243.

Boldrer 2003: Francesca Boldrer, *Il bilinguismo di Cicerone: scripta graeca latina (fam. 15, 4)*, in: Renato Oniga (ed.), *Il plurilinguismo nella tradizione letteraria latina*, Roma, 131–150.

Bornecque 1924: Henri Bornecque, *Cicéron. Divisions de l'art oratoire; Topiques*, Paris.

Bossi 2002: Francesco Bossi, *Sui rapporti tra Fozio e la Suda*, in: «Eikasmós» 13, 269–271.

Boyancé 1956: Pierre Boyancé, *La connaissance du grec à Rome*, in: «Revue des Études Latines» 34, 111–131.

Bréguet 1980: Esther Bréguet (ed.), *Cicéron: La République*, vols. 2, Paris.

Brittain 2001: Charles Brittain, *Philo of Larissa. The Last of the Academic Sceptics*, Oxford.

Buongiorno 2010: Pierangelo Buongiorno, *Senatus consulta claudianis temporibus. Una palingenesis delle deliberazioni senatorie dell'età di Claudio (41-54 d.C.)*, Napoli.

Buonopane 2016: Alfredo Buonopane, *Terenzia, una matrona in domo et in re publica agens*, in: Francesca Cenerini and Francesca Rohr Vio (eds.), *Matronae in Domo et in Re Publica Agentes. Spazi e occasioni dell'azione femminile nel mondo romano tra tarda repubblica e primo impero*, Trieste, 51–64.

Burgeon 2017: Christophe Burgeon, *Le séjour d'étude de Cicéron le Jeune en Grèce d'après la correspondance de Cicéron père*, in: «Folia Electronica Classica» 33, 1–24.

Burns 1906: Mary Z. Burns, *A Study of Cicero's Translations of Greek Poetry*, Dissertation, California.

Caiazza 1959: Daniele Caiazza, *Il proconsolato di Cicerone in Cilicia*, in: «Ciceroniana» 1.2, 140–156.

Calboli 2008: Lucia M. Calboli, *Ciceronian and Hermogenean Influence on George of Trebizond's Rheticorum Libri V,* in: «Rhetorica» 26.2, 139–164.

Calcò 2018: Valentina Calcò, *Oltre il* topos *letterario: il* locus amoenus *come spazio vissuto nei dialoghi ciceroniani*, in: «Ciceroniana on Line» 2.2, 207–228.

Caldini Montanari 2000: Roberta Caldini Montanari, *Tradizione medievale ed edizione critica del Somnium Scipionis*, Firenze.

Canfora 1999: Luciano Canfora, *Il libro-biblioteca*, in: «Lares» 65.4, 401–411.

Cappello 2019: Orazio Cappello, *The School of Doubt. Skepticism, History and Politics in Cicero's Academica*, Leiden–Boston.

Carcopino 1951: Jérôme Carcopino, *Cicero: The Secrets of his Correspondence* [*Les Secrets de la Correspondance de Cicéron*], vol. 1, transl. Emily O. Lorimer, London.

Carlucci 2012: Giuseppe Carlucci, *I Prolegomena di André Schott alla Biblioteca di Fozio*, Bari.

Cary 1914: Earnest Cary (transl.), *Dio Cassius: Roman History Books I-XI*, On the basis of the version of Herbert Baldwin Foster, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Cary 1940: Earnest Cary (transl.), *Dionysius of Halicarnassus: The Roman Antiquities Books V–VI.48*, On the basis of the version of Edward Spelman, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Casson 2001: Lionel Casson, *Libraries in the Ancient World*, New Haven.

Cavallo 2005: Guglielmo Cavallo, *La κοινή scrittoria greco-romana nella prassi documentaria di età bizantina*, in: Guglielmo Cavallo (ed.), *Il calamo e il papiro. La scrittura greca dall'età ellenistica ai primi secoli di Bisanzio*, Firenze, 43–71.

Cavarzere 2007: Alberto Cavarzere (ed.), *Cicerone. Lettere ai familiari*, Milano.

Charokopos 1965: Antonios N. Charokopos, *Αἱ περὶ γήρατος γνῶμαι τοῦ Κικέρωνος καὶ ἡ σύγχρονος ψυχολογία*, Dissertation, Athens.

Chatzimichail 1898: Dimitrios Chatzimichail, *M. Tullii Ciceronis Tusculanarum Dispuatationum Liber I et V*, Athens.

Chatzopoulos 1991: Konstantinos Chatzopoulos, *Ελληνικά Σχολεία στην περίοδο της Οθωμανικής Κυριαρχίας (1453-1821)*, Thessalonica.

Chinnici 2000: Valentina Chinnici, *Cicerone interprete di Omero: Un capitolo di storia della traduzione artistica*, Napoli.

Ciaceri 1941: Emanuele Ciaceri, *Cicerone e i suoi tempi*, Genova.

Ciampi 1816: Sebastiano Ciampi, *Il sogno di Scipione, voltato in Greco per Massimo Planude e fatto volgare per M. Zanobi da Strata, coronato poeta Fiorentino*, Pisa.

Ciccolella 2020: Federica Ciccolella, *When Cicero Meets Hermogenes: The Defence of Greek Studies in Quattrocento Italy*, in: Ioannis Deligiannis, Vasileios Pappas and Vaios Vaiopoulos (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium III: Post-Byzantine Latinitas. Latin in Post-Byzantine Scholarship (15th-19th centuries)*, Turnhout, 47–58.

Citroni Marchetti 1999: Sandra Citroni Marchetti, *Volontà degli amici ed esercizio del potere in Cicerone*, in: «Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici» 42, 65–94.

Citroni Marchetti 2000: Sandra Citroni Marchetti, *Amicizia e potere nelle lettere di Cicerone e nelle elegie ovidiane dall'esilio*, Firenze.

Claassen 1992: Jo-Marie Claassen, *Cicero's Banishment: Tempora et Mores*, in: «Acta Classica» 35, 19–47.

Claassen 1996: Jo-Marie Claassen, *Documents of a crumbling marriage: the case of Cicero and Terentia*, in: «Phoenix» 50, 208–232.

Claassen 1999: Jo-Marie Claassen, *Displaced Persons. The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius*, London–Madison (WI).

Clare 2020: Janet Clare, *The Great Patrician of the Speaking Art: Cicero, from the Republic of Letters to the English Republic*, in: «Ciceroniana on Line» 4.2, 353–373.

Clarke 1968: Martin L. Clarke, *Cicero at School*, in: «Greece & Rome» 5, 18–22.

Classen 1993: Joachim C. Classen, *The Rhetorical Works of George of Trebizond and Their Debt to Cicero*, in: «Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes» 56, 75–84.

Clayer 2007: Nathalie Clayer, *Aux origines du nationalisme albanais: la naissance d'une nation majoritairement musulmane en Europe*, Paris.

Clinton 1989: Kevin Clinton, *The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman Initiates and Benefactors, Second Century B.C. to A.D. 267*, in: «Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt» 2.18.2, 1499–1539.

Clinton 2001: Kevin Clinton, *Initiates in the Samothracian Mysteries, September 4, 100 B.C.*, in: «Chiron» 31, 27–35.

Clogg 1992: Richard Clogg, *A Concise History of Greece*, Cambridge.

Cohen 2007: Sarah T. Cohen, *Cicero's Roman Exile*, in: Jan Felix Gaertner (ed.), *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, Leiden–Boston, 109–128.

Cole 2013: Nicholas P. Cole, *Nineteenth-century Ciceros*, in: Catherine Steel (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, Cambridge, 337–349.

Corbeill 1996: Anthony Corbeill, *Controlling Laughter. Political Humor in the Late Roman Republic*, Princeton.

Corbeill 2002a: Anthony Corbeill, *Rhetorical Education in Cicero's Youth*, in: James M. May (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Cicero. Oratory and Rhetoric*, Leiden–Boston–Köln, 23–48.

Corbeill 2002b: Anthony Corbeill, *Ciceronian Invective*, in: James M. May (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Cicero. Oratory and Rhetoric*, Leiden–Boston–Köln, 197–217.

Corbeill 2013: Anthony Corbeill, *Cicero and the Intellectual Milieu of the Late Republic*, in: Catherine Steel (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, Cambridge, 9–24.

Costanza 1950: Salvatore Costanza, *Saggio su alcune traduzioni poetiche di Cicerone*, in: «Messana» 1, 165–201.

Courtois *et al*. 1952: Christian Courtois, Louis Leschi, Charles Perrat and Charles Saumagne, *Tablettes Albertini. Actes privés de l'époque Vandale*, Paris.

Cowing 2013: Alain M. Cowing, *Tully's boat: responses to Cicero in the imperial period*, in: Catherine Steel (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, Cambridge, 233–250.

Cox/Ward 2006: Virginia Cox and John O. Ward (eds.), *The Rhetoric of Cicero in Its Medieval and Early Renaissance Commentary Tradition*, Leiden–Boston.

Craig 2004: Christopher Craig, *Audience expectations, invective, and proof*, in: Jonathan Powell and Jeremy Paterson (eds.), *Cicero the Advocate*, Oxford, 187–213.

Crawford 1979: Michael H. Crawford, *Greek Intellectuals and the Roman Aristocracy in the First Century B.C.*, in: Peter D. A. Garnsey and Charles R. Whittaker (eds.), *Imperialism in the Ancient world: The Cambridge University Research Seminar in Ancient History* (Cambridge Classical Studies), Cambridge, 193–208.

Cucchiarelli 2007: Andrea Cucchiarelli, *Come si legge la satira romana?*, in: Kirk Freudenburg, Andrea Cucchiarelli and Alessandro Barchiesi (eds.), *Musa pedestre. Storia e interpretazione della satira in Roma antica*, Roma, 167–202.

Cugusi 1992: Paolo Cugusi, *Corpus Epistolarum Latinarum*, vols. 3, Firenze.

Daly 1950: Lloyd Daly, *Roman Study Abroad*, in: «The American Journal of Philology» 71, 40–58.

Danese 1990: Roberto Mario Danese, *Revisione del P. Vindob. L103 (Terenzio)*, in: «Studi Classici e Orientali» 39, 133–157.

de Jonge 2019: Casper C. de Jonge, *Demosthenes versus Cicero: Intercultural Competition in Ancient Literary Criticism*, in: Cynthia Damon and Christoph Pieper (eds.), *Eris vs. Aemulatio. Valuing Competition in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden–Boston, 300–323.

De Paolis 2000: Paolo De Paolis, *Cicerone nei grammatici tardoantichi e altomedievali*, in: «Ciceroniana» 2, 37–67.

Degl'Innocenti Pierini 1996: Rita Degl'Innocenti Pierini (ed.), *M. Tullio Cicerone, Lettere dall'esilio*, Firenze.

Degl'Innocenti Pierini 2016: Rita Degli'Innocenti Pierini, *La virtù come compagna e la 'compagnia' delle virtù in Seneca e nella tradizione filosofica*, in: «Prometheus» 42, 123–143.

Deligiannis 2014: Ioannis Deligiannis, *Το ομηρικό τραγούδι των Σειρήνων στην υπηρεσία της φιλοσοφίας του Κικέρωνα: η πρώτη θεωρητική προσέγγιση του τραγουδιού στη λατινική γραμματεία και η επίδρασή της στον Δάντη*, in: «Mediterranean Chronicle» 4, 13–26.

Deligiannis 2015: Ioannis Deligiannis, *Μ. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνα Περὶ Πολιτείας Βιβλία Ἕξι. Εἰσαγωγὴ – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια*, Athens.

Deligiannis 2017a: Ioannis Deligiannis (ed.), *Investigating the Translation Process in Humanistic Latin Translations of Greek Texts*. Proceedings of an International Conference, Democritus University of Thrace, Komotini 28–29 April 2017 [«Mediterranean Chronicle» 7] Corfu.

Deligiannis 2017b: Ioannis Deligiannis, *Μ. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνα Περί Νόμων Βιβλία Τρία. Εἰσαγωγὴ – Κείμενο – Μετάφραση – Σχόλια*, Athens.

Deligiannis 2020: Ioannis Deligiannis, *The Diffusion of the Latin Translations of Greek Texts Produced by Late and Post-Byzantine Scholars and Printed from the Mid-Fifteenth to Late Sixteenth Century*, in: Ioannis Deligiannis, Vasileios Pappas and Vaios Vaiopoulos (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium III: Post-Byzantine Latinitas. Latin in Post-Byzantine Scholarship (15th-19th centuries)*, Turnhout, 165–188.

Deligiannis *et al*. 2020: Ioannis Deligiannis, Vasileios Pappas and Vaios Vaiopoulos (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium III: Post-Byzantine Latinitas. Latin in Post-Byzantine Scholarship (15th – 19th centuries)*, Turnhout.

Delveroudi 2017: Réa Delveroudi, *La place du français parmi les langues pratiquées par les milieux hellénophones dans la seconde moitié du XVIIIe siècle: témoignages et données éditoriales*, in: «Documents pour l'histoire du français langue étrangère ou seconde» 58–59, http://journals.openedition.org/dhfles/4451 (seen 9.1.2021).

Dentrinou 1916: Eirini Dentrinou (ed.), *Τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Νικ. Κογεβίνα (Γλαύκου Ποντίου)*, Athens.

Desmouliez 1976: André Desmouliez, *Cicéron et son goût*, Bruxelles.

Dickey 2002: Eleanor Dickey, *Latin form of address*, Oxford.

Dickey 2012: Eleanor Dickey, *The Colloquia of Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana Volume I*, Cambridge.

Dickey 2014: Eleanor Dickey, *New legal texts from the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*, in: «The Legal History Review» 82, 30–44.

Dickey 2015: Eleanor Dickey, *Columnar translation: an ancient interpretive tool that Romans gave to Greeks*, in: «Classical Quarterly» n.s. 65.2, 807–821.

Dickey 2016: Eleanor Dickey, *Learning Latin the Ancient Way. Latin Textbooks from the Ancient World*, Cambridge.

Dickey 2017: Eleanor Dickey, *The Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana in the Greek East*, in: Alessandro Garcea and Maria Chiara Scappaticcio (eds.), *Centro Vs Periferia. Il latino tra testi e contesti, lingua e letteratura (I-V d.C)*, Pisa–Roma, 211–229.

Dimaras 1982: Konstantinos Th. Dimaras, *Ελληνικός ρωμαντισμός*, Athens.

Dimitrova 2008: Nora M. Dimitrova, *Theoroi and Initiates in Samothrace. The Epigraphical Evidence* (Hesperia Suppl. 37), Princeton (NJ).

Dix 2000: Thomas Keith Dix, *The Library of Lucullus*, in: «Athenaeum» 88, 441–464.

Dixon 1984: Suzanne Dixon, *Family Finances: Tullia and Terentia*, in: «Antichthon» 18, 78–101.

Dixon 1986: Suzanne Dixon, *Family Finances: Terentia and Tullia*, in: Beryl Rawson (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome: New Perspectives*, London, 93–120.

Dörrie 1978: Heinrich Dörrie, *Summorum Virorum Vestigia. Das Erlebnis der Vergangenheit bei Cicero*, in: «Grazer Beiträge» 7, 207–220.

Doukakis 1883: Dimitrios Doukakis, *Μ. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Λόγος ὑπὲρ τοῦ Μανιλείου νόμου ἢ Ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Γναίου Πομπηίου μεταφρασθείς*, Athens.

Doukakis 1893: Dimitrios Doukakis, *Μ. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Λόγος ὑπὲρ τοῦ Μανιλείου νόμου ἢ Ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Γναίου Πομπηίου μεταφρασθεὶς* [...] *ἔκδοσις δευτέρα βελτίων μετὰ σημειώσεων καὶ εἰσαγωγῆς τοῦ λόγου*, Kalamata.

Drumann/Groebe 1899–1929: Wilhelm K. A. Drumann and Paul Groebe, *Geschichte Roms in seinem Übergange von der republikanischen zur monarchischen Verfassung oder Pompeius, Caesar, Cicero und ihre Zeitgenossen nach Geschlechtern und mit genealogischen Tabellen*, vols. 6, 2nd ed., Leipzig.

Dugan 2014: John Dugan, *Non sine causa sed sine fine*: *Cicero's Compulsion to Repeat His Consulate*, in: «Classical Journal» 110, 9–22.

Dyck 1996: Andrew R. Dyck, *A Commentary on Cicero De Officiis*, Ann Arbor.

Dyck 2008a: Andrew R. Dyck, *Cicero Catilinarians*, Cambridge.

Dyck 2008b: Andrew R. Dyck, *Rivals into partners: Hortensius and Cicero*, in: «Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte» 57, 142–173.

Εκπαιδευτική Ελληνική Εγκυκλοπαίδεια – Παγκόσμιο Βιογραφικό Λεξικό, vols. 4, Athens 1991.

Epstein 1986: David F. Epstein, *Cicero's testimony at the Bona Dea trial*, in: «Classical Philology» 81, 229–235.

Epstein 1987: David F. Epstein, *Personal Enmity in Roman Politics, 218-49 B.C.*, London–New York–Sydney.

Espluga 2016: Xavier Espluga, *Cicero Speeches an overview*, in: Javier Velaza (ed.), *From the Protohistory to the History of the text*, Frankfurt am Main, 55–102.

Evangelou 2019: Gabriel Evangelou, *The use of emotion as persuasion in Cicero's letters to Atticus*, in: Sophia Papaioannou and Andreas Serafim (eds.), *Addressing Matters in Context: The Art of Persuasion across Genres and Time Periods*, Leiden–Boston, 153–167.

Evangelou 2022: Gabriel Evangelou, *Love, Friendship, and Expediency in Cicero's Letters*, Newcastle.

Fantham 1972: Elaine Fantham, *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery*, Toronto.

Farantatos 1880: Nikolaos Farantatos, *M. T. Κικέρωνος εἰς Μ. Ἀντώνιον ἔνατος Φιλιππικὸς μεταφρασθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ Λατινικοῦ μετὰ σημειώσεων,* Athens.

Farantatos 1882: Nikolaos Farantatos, *Περὶ ῥήματος καὶ περὶ τῆς μορφῆς αὐτοῦ*, Dissertation, Athens.

Farantatos 1896: Nikolaos Farantatos, *Γραμματικὴ τῆς ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης*, Athens.

Farantatos 1897: Nikolaos Farantatos, *Σύστημα ὀρθογραφικῶν ἀσκήσεων καὶ γραμματικῶν*, Athens.

Farantatos 1898: Nikolaos Farantatos, *Πλάτωνος Φαίδων μετενεχθείς εἰς τὴν ἑλληνικήν*, Athens.

Favrikios 1844 and 1868: Karolos Favrikios, *Μάρκου Τουλλίου Κικέρωνος ἐκλεκτοὶ λόγοι*, Athens.

Fisher 1982: Elizabeth A. Fisher, *Greek Translations of Latin Literature in the Fourth Century A.D.*, in: «Yale Classical Studies» 28, 173–215.

Fisher 1990: Elizabeth A. Fisher, *Planudes' Greek Translation of Ovid's Metamorphoses*, New York–London.

Flammini 1990: Giuseppe Flammini, *Prolegomeni alla recensio plenior degli Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana*, in: «Giornale italiano di Filologia» 42, 3–43.

Flammini 2004: Giuseppe Flammini (ed.), *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana Leidensia*, Monachi–Lipsiae.

Fodor 2004: Nóra Fodor, *Die griechischen Übersetzungen lateinischer Autoren durch Maximos Planudes*, Dissertation, Heidelberg.

Forcellini 1965: Egidio Forcellini, *Lexicon totius Latinitatis*, vols. 6, Patavii.

Fortenbaugh 1989: William W. Fortenbaugh, *Cicero's Knowledge of the Rhetorical Treatises of Aristotle and Theophrastus*, in: William W. Fortenbaugh and Peter Steinmetz (eds.), *Cicero's Knowledge of the Peripatos*, New Brunswick–London, 39–60.

Fortenbaugh 2005: William W. Fortenbaugh, *Cicero as a Reporter of Aristotelian and Theophrastean Rhetorical Doctrine*, in: «Rhetorica» 23.1, 37–64.

Fotheringham 2013: Lynn S. Fotheringham, *Twentieth/twenty-first-century Cicero(s)*, in: Catherine Steel (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, Cambridge, 350–373.

Fougias 2001: Panagiotis G. Fougias, *Κικέρων. Ο ελληνολάτρης φιλόσοφος ρήτορας*, Athens.

Fournet 2019: Jean-Luc Fournet, *La pratique du latin dans l'Égypte de l'antiquité tardive*, in: Alessandro Garcea, Michela Rosellini and Luigi Silvano (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium I. Late antiquity and beyond*, Turnhout, 73–92.

Fox 2007: Matthew Fox, *Cicero's Philosophy of History*, Oxford.

Fox 2013: Matthew Fox, *Cicero during the Enlightenment*, in: Catherine Steel (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, Cambridge, 318–336.

Frary 2015: Lucien J. Frary, *Russia and the Making of Modern Greek Identity, 1821–1844*, Oxford.

Freeman 2019: Philip Freeman, *Μάρκος Τύλλιος Κικέρων. Το δώρο της ωριμότητας: Αρχαία σοφία για το δεύτερο μισό της ζωής* [*How to Grow Old: Ancient Wisdom for the Second Half of Life*], transl. Violetta Zeuki-Vorgia, Athens.

Fressura 2013: Marco Fressura, *Tipologie del glossario virgiliano*, in: Marie-Hélène Marganne and Bruno Rochette (eds.), *Bilinguisme et digraphisme dans le monde gréco-roman: l'apport des papyrus latins*, Liège, 71–116.

Fressura 2017: Marco Fressura, *Vergilius latinograecus. Corpus dei manoscritti bilingui dell'Eneide. Parte prima*, Pisa–Roma.

Fressura/Mantovani 2018: Marco Fressura and Dario Mantovani, *P. Vindob. L 59+92. Frammenti delle Institutiones di Elio Marciano*, in: «Athenaeum» 106, 619–690.

Fuhrmann 1992: Manfred Fuhrmann, *Cicero and the Roman Republic* [*Cicero und die römische Republik*], transl. Wedekind E. Yuill, Oxford–Cambridge (MA).

Funari 2008: Rodolfo Funari, *Corpus dei papiri storici greci e latini. Parte B. Storici latini*, vol. 1: *Autori noti. Caius Sallustius Crispus*, Pisa–Roma.

Fyntikoglou 2003: Vasileios Fyntikoglou, *Η μεταφραστική ορολογία στο έργο του Κικέρωνα*, in: *Πρακτικά Ζ΄ Πανελλήνιου Συμποσίου Λατινικών Σπουδών,* Θεσσαλονίκη 16–19 Οκτωβρίου 2002, Thessalonica, 85–96.

Gaebel 1969–1970: Robert E. Gaebel, *The Greek word-list to Virgil and Cicero*, in: «Bulletin of the John Rylands Library» 52, 284–325.

Gaertner 2007: Jan Felix Gaertner, *The discourse of displacement in Greco-Roman antiquity*, in: Jan Felix Gaertner (ed.), *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, Leiden, 1–20.

Gaines 1989: Robert N. Gaines, *On the Rhetorical Significance of P. Hamb. 131*, in: «Rhetorica» 7.4, 329–340.

Gaines 2002: Robert N. Gaines, *Cicero's Partitiones oratoriae and Topica: Rhetorical Philosophy and Philosophical Rhetoric*, in: James M. May (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Cicero. Oratory and Rhetoric*, Leiden–Boston–Köln, 445–480.

Gamberale 1973: Leopoldo Gamberale, *Tradizione indiretta di Cicerone in Cicerone. Le opera poetiche*, in: «Ciceroniana» n.s. 1, 105–115.

Garcea 2005: Alessandro Garcea, *Cicerone in esilio. L'epistolario e le passion*, Hildesheim.

Garcea *et al*. 2019: Alessandro Garcea, Michela Rosellini and Luigi Silvano (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium I. Late Antiquity and Beyond*, Tunhout.

Garcea/Scappaticcio 2019: Alessandro Garcea and Maria Chiara Scappaticcio, *Per una geografia della circolazione letteraria in Egitto (V-VII s.): il contributo dei testi latini su papiro*, in: «Philologia Antiqua» 12, 37–50.

Gastgeber 2019: Christian Gastgeber, *Latin and the Chronicon Pachale*, in: Alessandro Garcea, Michela Rosellini and Luigi Silvano (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium I: Late Antiquity and Beyond*, Turnhout, 333–347.

Gasti 2003: Eleni Gasti, *Tusc. Disp. 2. VIII.20-IX.22: Η ποιητική του πρωτοτύπου (Σοφοκλής Τραχίνιαι 1046-1102) και η μεταφραστική πρακτική*, in: *Πρακτικά Ζ΄ Πανελλήνιου Συμποσίου Λατινικών Σπουδών,* Θεσσαλονίκη 16–19 Οκτωβρίου 2002, Thessalonica, 133–143.

Gasti/Polymerakis 2017: Eleni Gasti and Fotis Polymerakis, *Quidam Cornelius: όψεις της πρόσληψης του Τάκιτου*, in: «Δωδώνη: Φιλολογία» 42–44, 155–180.

Geiger *et al*. 1995: Joseph Geiger, Beatrice Mugelli and Lucia Ghilli (eds.), *Plutarco, Vite parallele: Demostene e Cicerone*, Milano.

Gengler 2019: Olivier Gengler, *Latin Literature in Johannes Malalas's Chronicle*, in: Alessandro Garcea, Michela Rosellini and Luigi Silvano (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium I: Late Antiquity and Beyond*, Turnhout, 377–394.

Géraud 2014: Jean-François Géraud, *Exil, retour d'exil: Cicéron*, in: «Journées de l'Antiquité et des Temps Anciens» 48, 241–257.

Giannakis 1974: Georgios Giannakis (ed.), *Μάξιμου Πλανούδη μετάφραση τοῦ "περὶ τῶν δώδεκα βαθμῶν τῆς παρηχήσεως" τοῦ ψευδο-Αὐγουστίνου*, Ioannina.

Gibson/Morrison 2007: Roy Gibson and Andrew D. Morrison, *Introduction: What is a Letter?*, in: Ruth Morello and Andrew D. Morrison (eds.), *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antiquity Epistolography*, Oxford, 1–16.

Gigante 1958: Marcello Gigante, *Ciceronis Somnium Scipionis in Graecum a Maximo Planude translatum*, in: «La Parola del Passato» 13, 173–194.

Gigante 1961: Marcello Gigante, *Maximo Planude interprete di Cicerone. Contributo alla critica del testo dei Somnium Scipionis*. Atti del I Congresso Internazionale di Studi Ciceroniani: Roma Aprile 1959, vol. 2, Rome, 207–226.

Gigante 1962: Marcello Gigante, *La cultura latina a Bisanzio nel secólo XIII*, in: «La Parola del Passato» 17, 32–51.

Gigante 1980: Marcello Gigante, *Testimonianze sull'Accademia platonica*, in: Margherita Isnardi Parente (ed. & transl.), *Speusippo – Frammenti*, Napoli, 11–25.

Gil/Torallas Tovar 2010: Juan Gil and Sofia Torallas Tovar, *Hadrianus P. Monts. Roca III*, Barcelona.

Gildenhard 2007: Ingo Gildenhard, *Paideia Romana. Cicero's Tusculan Disputations*, Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, Supplementary Volume 30, Cambridge.

Gilleland 1961: Brady B. Gilleland, *The Date of Cicero's Partitiones oratoriae*, in: «Classical Philology» 56, 29–32.

Gkiolmas 1878: Michael Gkiolmas, *Μ. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος ὁ Ὑπὲρ τοῦ Μανιλείου νόμου καὶ ὁ Ὑπὲρ Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ*, Cephalonia.

Gkiolmas 1879: Michael Gkiolmas, *Μ. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Α΄ Φιλιππικὸς λόγος καὶ Β΄ Φιλιππικὸς λόγος*, Cephalonia.

Glucker 1988: John Glucker, *Cicero's Philosophical Affiliations*, in: John M. Dillon and Anthony A. Long (eds.), *The Question of "Eclecticism". Studies in Later Greek Philosophy*, Berkeley–Los Angeles, 34–69.

Glucker 2012: John Glucker, *Cicero's Remarks on Translating Philosophical Terms – Some General Problems*, in: John Glucker and Charles Burnett (eds.), *Greek into Latin from Antiquity until the Nineteenth Century*, London–Turin, 37–96.

Glucker 2015: John Glucker, *Cicero as Translator and Cicero in Translation*, in: «Philologica» 10, 37–53.

Gonis 2009: Nikolaos Gonis, *Abbreviations and symbols*, in: Roger Bagnall (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, Oxford, 170–178.

Goodwin 2001: Jean Goodwin, *Cicero's Authority*, in: «Philosophy and Rhetoric» 34.1, 38–60.

Görler 1988: Woldemar Görler, *From Athens to Tusculum: Gleaning the Background of Cicero's De Oratore*, in: «Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric» 6.3, 215–235.

Görler 1995: Woldemar Görler, *Silencing the Troublemaker: De Legibus 1.39 and the Continuity of Cicero's Scepticism*, in: Jonathan G. F. Powell (ed.), *Cicero the Philosopher*, Oxford, 85–114.

Gowing 2013: Alain M. Gowing, *Tully's boat: responses to Cicero in the imperial period*, in: Catherine Steel (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, Cambridge, 233–250.

Göz 1801: Johann A. Göz, *M. Tullii Ciceronis Cato Major et Somnium Scipionis. Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Κάτων καὶ Ὄνειρος τοῦ Σκιπίωνος, ἑρμηνεία Θεοδώρου.* In einem hie und da berichtigten Texte, und durch Parallelstellen erläutert, Nuremberg.

Grafton 2010: Anthony Grafton, *Cicero and Ciceronianism*, in: Anthony Grafton, Glenn W. Most and Salvatore Settis (eds.), *The Classical Tradition*, Cambridge (MA)–London, 194–197.

Grammatikopoulos 1863: K. Grammatikopoulos, *Ἐξηγήσεις Κικέρωνος Ῥωμαίου* (in manuscript).

Grebe 2003: Sabine Grebe, *Marriage and exile: Cicero's letters to Terentia*, in: «Helios» 30, 127–146.

Grebe 2011: Sabine Grebe, *Transformation of the husband/wife relationship during exile: letters from Cicero and Ovid*, in: Adrianne Leigh McEvoy (ed.), *Sex, Love, and Friendship: Studies of the Society for the Philosophy of Sex and Love: 1993-2003*, Amsterdam–New York, 433–448.

Griffin/Atkins 1991: Miriam Griffin and Margaret Atkins (eds. & transl.), *Cicero, On Duties*, Cambridge.

Grilli 1992: Alberto Grilli, *Sulle fonti delle Partitiones oratoriae di Cicerone*, in: Alberto Grilli (ed.), *Stoicismo Epicureismo Letteratura*, Brescia, 255–280.

Grimal 1986: Pierre Grimal, *Cicéron*, Paris.

Grimal 1987: Pierre Grimal, *Cicerone* [*Cicéron*], transl. Lia Guagnellini Del Corno, Milano.

Grimal 1989: Pierre Grimal, *Le* De officiis *de Cicéron*, in: «Vita Latina» 115, 2–9.

Gruen 1966: Erich S. Gruen, *P. Clodius: Instrument or Independent Agent?*, in: «Phoenix» 20, 120–130.

Gruen 1968: Erich S. Gruen, *Pompey and the Pisones*, in: «California Studies in Classical Antiquity» 1, 155–170.

Gruen 1969: Erich S. Gruen, *Pompey, the Roman Aristocracy, and the Conference at Luca*, in: «Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte» 18, 71–108.

Gruen 1992: Erich S. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*, London.

Gruen 1995: Erich S. Gruen, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, 2nd ed., Berkeley.

Gudeman 1902: Alfred Gudeman, *The Sources of Plutarch's Life of Cicero*, Philadelphia.

Gudeman 1934: Alfred Gudeman, *Aristoteles, Περὶ ποιητικῆς*, Dublin–Leipzig.

Guérin 2011: Charles Guérin, *Persona. L'élaboration d'une notion rhétorique au Ier siècle av. J.-C.*, vol. 2: *Théorisation cicéronienne de la persona oratoire*, Paris.

Guite 1962: Harold Guite, *Cicero's Attitude to the Greeks*, in: «Greece & Rome» 9.2, 142–159.

Hall 2009: John Hall, *Politeness and Politics in Cicero's Letters*, Oxford.

Halm 1867: Karl Halm (ed.), *Ciceros Reden gegen L. Sergius Catilina und für den Dichter Archias*, Berlin.

Halporn/Vessey 2004: James W. Halporn and Mark Vessey, *Cassiodorus, Institutions of divine and secular learning and On the soul*, Liverpool.

Harrauer 1982: Herman Harrauer, *Ein neues Cicero-Fragment auf Papyrus (P. Vindob. l 127)*, in: «Wiener Studien: Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie und Patristik» n.s. 16, 212–219.

Harris 1979: William Harris, *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome 327-70* B.C., Oxford.

Haury 1955: Auguste Haury, *L'ironie et l'humour chez Ciceron*, Leiden.

Heinze 1925: Richard Heinze, *Auctoritas*, in: «Hermes» 60.3, 348–366.

Hellegouarc'h 1972: Joseph Hellegouarc'h, *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la République*, Paris.

Helleman 1995: Wendy E. Helleman, *Penelope as Lady Philosophy*, in: «Phoenix» 49.4, 283–302.

Henry 1962: René Henry (ed.), *Photius*, *Bibliothèque. Texte établi et traduit*, vol. 3: *codices 186–222*, Paris.

Henry 1971: René Henry (ed.), *Photius*, *Bibliothèque*. *Texte établi et traduit*, vol. 6: *codices 242–245*, Paris.

Hicks 1925: Robert D. Hicks, *Diogenes Laertius – Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, London–New York.

Hill 2004: Timothy D. Hill, *Ambitiosa Mors: Suicide and Self in Roman Thought and Literature*, New York–London.

Hinds 1998: Stephen Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext. Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge.

Hirzel 1895: Rudolf Hirzel, *Der Dialog. Ein literarhistorischer Versuch*, Leipzig.

Hoff 1997: Michael Hoff, *Laceratae Athenae*: *Sulla's Siege of Athens in 87/6 B.C. and its Aftermath*, in: Michael Hoff and Susan Rotroff (eds.), *The Romanization of Athens*. Proceedings of an International Conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska (April 1996), Lincoln–Oxford, 33–51.

Howley 2014: Joseph Howley, *Heus tu, rhetorisce: Gellius, Cicero, Plutarch, and Roman Study Abroad*, in: Jesper Madsen and Roger Rees (eds.), *Roman Rule in Greek and Latin Writing*, Leiden, 163–192.

Hubbell 1971: Harry M. Hubbell, *Cicero. Orator*, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Hunger 1987: Herbert Hunger, *Graeculus perfidus – Ἰταλός ἰταμός. Il senso dell'alterità nei rapporti greco-romani ed italo-bizantini*, Roma.

Hutchinson 1998: Gregory O. Hutchinson, *Cicero's Correspondence: A Literary Study*, Oxford.

Huzar 1982: Eleanor Huzar, *The Literary Efforts of Mark Antony*, in: «Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt» 2.30.1, 639–657.

Ianziti 2000: Gary Ianziti, *A Life in Politics: Leonardo Bruni's Cicero*, in: «Journal of the History of Ideas» 61, 39–58.

Iasemidis 1871: Pericles Iasemidis, *Ἐγχειρίδιον τῆς Θρησκείας καὶ Μυθολογίας τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ Ῥωμαίων*, Athens.

Iasemidis 1879: Pericles Iasemidis, *Τῆς ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσας Συντακτικὸν*, Athens.

Iasemidis 1898a: Pericles Iasemidis, *Λυσίου λόγοι κατ' ἐκλογήν*, Athens.

Iasemidis 1898b: Pericles Iasemidis, *M. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος τῶν Τουσκουλανῶν διαλόγων, βιβλίον Ε΄, μεταφρασθὲν και σχολιασθέν*, Athens.

Iliou/Polemi 2006: Philippos Iliou and Popi Polemi, *Ελληνική βιβλιογραφία 1864–1900*, Athens.

Internullo 2011–2012: Dario Internullo, *Cicerone latinogreco. Corpus dei papiri bilingui delle Catilinarie di Cicerone*, in: «Papyrologica Lupiensia» 20–21, 25–150.

Internullo 2016: Dario Internullo, *P. Vindob. L 17 identificato: Cicero, In Catilinam I 14-15 + 27*, in: «Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik» 199, 36–40.

Iovine 2019: Giulio Iovine, *Data epistula: Later additions of Latin dating formulae in Latin and Greek papyri and Ostraka from the first to the sixth centuries AD*, in: «Manuscripta» 63.2, 157–230.

Irmscher 1959: Johannes Irmscher, *Cicero und Byzantium*, in: «Byzantinoslavica» 20.1, 28–39.

Irmscher 1960: Johannes Irmscher, *Cicero und Byzanz*. Acta Sessionis Ciceronianae diebus 3–5 mensis Decembris a. 1957 Varsaviae habitae, Warszawa, 143–168.

Irmscher 1961: Johannes Irmscher, *Nachklänge der byzantinischen Cicero-Renaissance*. Atti del I Congresso Internazionale di Studi Ciceroniani: Roma Aprile 1959, vol. 2, Rome, 227–240.

Jelavich 1966: Barbara Jelavich, *The Philorthodox conspiracy of 1839: a report to Metternich*, in: «Balkan Studies**»** 7.1, 89–102.

Jocelyn 1973: Henry D. Jocelyn, *Greek poetry in Cicero's prose writing*, in: «Yale Classical Studies» 23, 61–111.

Jones 1959: David M. Jones, *Cicero as a Translator*, in: «Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies» 6, 22–34.

Kakridis [2]1928: Theophanis A. Kakridis, *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος ὁ Ὑπὲρ Τίτου Αννίου Μίλωνος λόγος ἑρμηνευθεὶς καὶ μεταφρασθεὶς εἰς τὴν νεωτέραν ἑλληνικὴν γλῶσσαν*, Athens.

Kalimeris 1887: Galinos Kalimeris, *Ὁ ῾Υπὲρ Λιγαρίου Λόγος τοῦ Κικέρωνος μεταγλωττισθεὶς εἰς τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς μετὰ κριτικῶν σχολίων καὶ ἑρμηνείας τῶν δυσκολότερων χωρίων πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν μαθητῶν*, Athens.

Kampasis 1891: Georgios Kampasis, *Κικέρωνος ὁ ῾Υπὲρ Σηστίου λόγος (μετάφρασις)*, Athens.

Kapodistrias 1839: Viaros Kapodistrias (transl.), *Κικέρωνος, Περὶ πολιτειῶν. Ἐκ τοῦ Λατινικοῦ ὑπὸ Ἀ. ΣΤ.*, Athens.

Karakasis *et al*. 2020: Evangelos Karakasis, Thalia Papadopoulou and Vasileios Pappas (eds. & transl.), *Κικερώνειας Πεζογραφίας Απάνθισμα*, Ioannina.

Karakasis/Sarra 2017: Evangelos Karakasis and Aliki Sarra, *Τα Λατινικά γράμματα στο ελληνικό Σχολείο: πορεία μέσα στο χρόνο*, in: «Δωδώνη: Φιλολογία» 42–44, 289–304.

Karamalengou 2003: Eleni Karamalengou, *Οι μεταφράσεις των Ελλήνων τραγικών από τον Κικέρωνα*, in: *Πρακτικά Ζ΄ Πανελλήνιου Συμποσίου Λατινικών Σπουδών,* Θεσσαλονίκη 16–19 Οκτωβρίου 2002, Thessalonica, 111–131.

Karapidakis 2020: Nikolaos Karapidakis, *Latinitas or Romanitas Nostra: Latin Culture in the Ionian Islands under the Venetian Domination (Fifteenth – Nineteenth Centuries)*, in: Ioannis Deligiannis, Vasileios Pappas and Vaios Vaiopoulos (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium III: Post-Byzantine Latinitas. Latin in Post-Byzantine Scholarship (15th-19th centuries)*, Turnhout, 105–123.

Karatzas 1891: Georgios Karatzas, *Μ. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος λόγος ῾Υπὲρ Λ. Λικινίου Μουρῆνα μεταφρασθείς*, Athens.

Karatzas 1892a: Georgios Karatzas, *Μ. Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος Λόγος Ε΄ Κατὰ Οὐέρρου μεταφρασθείς*, Athens.

Karatzas 1892b: Georgios Karatzas, *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος λόγος ῾Υπὲρ τοῦ ποιητοῦ Αὔλου Λικινίου Μάρκου Ἀρχίου μεταφρασθείς*, Athens.

Karatzas 1893a: Georgios Karatzas, *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος λόγος ῾Υπὲρ Ποπλίου Σύλλα μεταφρασθεὶς καὶ δι' ὑποσημειώσεων διασαφηνισθείς*, Athens.

Karatzas 1893b: Georgios Karatzas, *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος λόγος ῾Υπὲρ Τίτου Ἀννίου Μίλωνος μεταφρασθείς*, Athens.

Karatzas 1893c: Georgios Karatzas, *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος λόγος ῾Υπὲρ Κοΐντου Λιγαρίου μετὰ σχολίων καὶ μεταφράσεως*, Athens.

Karvelis 2003: Takis Karvelis, *Η Γενιά του 1880*, Athens.

Kaster 2005: Robert A. Kaster, *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome*, Oxford.

Kaster 2006: Robert A. Kaster (ed. & transl.), *Cicero. Speech on Behalf of Publius Sestius*, Oxford.

Kastorchis 1864: Euthymios Kastorchis, *Ἐπίτομος Λατινικὴ Γραμματική*, Athens.

Kavrakis 1897: Ioannis Kavrakis, *M. Tullii Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum prima de contemnenda morte κατὰ μετάφρασιν*, Athens.

Keeline 2018: Thomas J. Keeline, *The Reception of Cicero in the Early Roman Empire: The Rhetorical Schoolroom and the Creation of a Cultural Legend*, Cambridge–New York.

Kehagioglou 1998: Georgios Kehagioglou, *Ελληνικές μεταφράσεις στον 18ο αιώνα: "Μεταδοτικές ή προδοτικές;" "Πιστές και άσχημες" – "Άπιστες και όμορφες"*, in: «Σύγκριση» 9, 44–70.

Kelly 2006: Gordon P. Kelly, *A History of Exile in the Roman Republic*, Cambridge.

Kennedy 1963: George A. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*, Princeton.

Kennedy 2002: George A. Kennedy, *Cicero's Oratorical and Rhetorical Legacy*, in: James M. May (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Cicero. Oratory and Rhetoric*, Leiden–Boston–Köln, 481–501.

King 1971: John E. King, *Cicero. Tusculan Disputations*, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Klotz 1878: Reinhold Klotz (ed.), *M. Tullii Ciceronis Orationes selectae XXI*, Leipzig.

Klotz ^{2}1862: Reinhold Klotz (ed.), *Marcus Tullius Cicero*: *Laelius sive de amicitia dialogus*, Leipzig.

Kofiniotis 1880: Evangelos Kofiniotis, *Κικέρωνος ὁ Α΄ καὶ Δ΄ Κατὰ Κατιλίνα λόγος*, Athens.
Kokkonis 1829: Ioannis P. Kokkonis, *Περὶ πολιτειῶν. Περὶ τῶν εἰς σύνταξιν καὶ συντήρησιν αὐτῶν, καὶ περὶ πολιτικῆς κυβερνήσεως. Τόμος Δεύτερος περιέχων τὴν περὶ συντάξεως πολιτειῶν θεωρίαν*, Paris.
Koltsiou-Nikita 2005: Anna Koltsiou-Nikita (ed.), *Δημητρίου Κυδώνη μετάφραση του ψευδαυγουστίνειου Sololoquia (Τί ἂν εἴποι ψυχὴ μόνη πρὸς μόνον τὸν θεόν), Εἰσαγωγή, κείμενα, εὐρετήρια*, Athens.
Konomos 1959: Ntinos Konomos, *Γεώργιος Τερτσέτης. Ἀνέκδοτα κείμενα*, Athens.
Konomos 1984: Ntinos Konomos, *Ο Γεώργιος Τερτσέτης και τα Ευρισκόμενα Έργα του*, Athens.
Kontonasios 2015: Panagiotis Kontonasios, *Η ρητορική των contiones του Κικέρωνα: το ειδικό ακροατήριο και οι όροι διαμόρφωσης της eloquentia popularis*, Dissertation, Athens.
Kontopoulos 1891: Nikolaos Kontopoulos, *Γαλλικὴ Θεματογραφία*, Athens.
Kontopoulos 1898a: Nikolaos Kontopoulos, *Γαλλικὴ Χρηστομάθεια*, Athens.
Kontopoulos 1898b: Nikolaos Kontopoulos, *Κικέρωνος Αἱ Τουσκολάναι* [*sic*] *διατριβαὶ βιβλίον Ε΄ μεταφρασθὲν σχεδὸν κατὰ λέξιν*, Athens.
Kontopoulos 1900: *Greek-English Lexicon*, Athens.
Kontopoulos 1925: Nikolaos Kontopoulos, *Νεοελληνικὰ ἀναγνώσματα*, Athens.
Kontopoulos ^{2}1917: Nikolaos Kontopoulos, *Μ. Τ. Κικέρωνος Περὶ καθηκόντων μετάφρασις σχεδὸν κατὰ λέξιν*, Athens.
Kopanos 1974: Vasileios Kopanos, *Παρατακτικά ζεύγη στις μεταφράσεις του Μαξίμου Πλανούδη*, in: «Επιστημονική Επετηρίς Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης» 13, 19–34.
Kopeczky 2009: Rita Kopeczky, *Cicero and the Art of Translation*, in: «Journal of Latin Linguistics» 9.2, 853–862.
Korais 1821: Adamantios Korais (ed.), *Ἀριστοτέλους Πολιτικῶν τὰ σωζόμενα*, ἐκδιδόντος καὶ διορθοῦντος Α. Κ., φιλοτίμῳ δαπάνῃ τῶν ὁμογενῶν, ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ τῆς Ἑλλάδος, Paris.
Körte 1920: Alfred Körte, *Literarische Texte mit Ausschluß der christlichen*, in: «Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete» 6, 223–268.
Koupitoris 1876: Panagiotis Koupitoris, *Κικέρωνος τρεῖς λόγοι, ὁ Α΄ καὶ Δ΄ Κατὰ Κατιλίνα καὶ ὁ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἀρχίου ποιητοῦ μεταφρασθέντες ἐκ τοῦ Λατινικοῦ χάριν τῶν μαθητῶν*, Athens.
Kramer 1984: Johannes Kramer, *Testi greci scritti nell'alfabeto latino e testi latini scritti nell'alfabeto greco: un caso di bilinguismo imperfetto*, in: *Atti del XVII congresso internazionale di papirologia*, Napoli 19-26 Maggio 1983, III, Napoli, 1377–1384.
Kruck 2008: James Kruck, *Cicero as Translator of Greek in his Presentation of the Stoic Theory of Action*, Dissertation, Manitoba.
Kuèinskienė 2006: Audronė Kuèinskienė, *Cicerono santykis su graikais ir jų kultūra*, in: «Literatūra» 48.3, 68–78.
Kühner 1853: Raphaël Kühner, *M. Tullii Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum libri quinque*, Jena.
Kytzler 1989: Bernhard Kytzler, *Fidus Interpres: The Theory and Practice of Translation in Classical Antiquity*, in: «Antichthon» 23, 46–48.
La Bua 2019: Giuseppe La Bua, *Cicero and Roman Education. The Reception of the Speeches and Ancient Scholarship*, Cambridge.
La Bua 2020: Giuseppe La Bua, *Man of Peace? Cicero's Last Fight for the Republic in Greek and Roman Historical ʿFictionsʾ*, in: Christoph Pieper and Bram van der Velden (eds.), *Reading Cicero's Final Years*, Berlin–Boston, 79–95.
Lauffer 1971: Siegfreid Lauffer, *Diokletians Preisedikt*, Berlin.
Leach 1988: Eleanor Winsor Leach, *The Rhetoric of Space. Literary and Artistic Representations of Landscape in Republican and Augustan Rome*, Princeton.

Lemoine 1991: Fannie J. Lemoine, *Parental Gifts: Father-Son Dedications and Dialogues in Roman Didactic Literature*, in: «Illinois Classical Studies» 16.1–2, 337–366.

Levi 1933: Mario Attilio Levi, *Ottaviano capoparte. Storia politica di Roma durante le ultime lotte di supremazia*, vols. 2, Firenze.

Lévy 1980: Carlos Lévy, *Media Academia (Part. or. XL, 139)*, in: «L'Antiquité Classique» 49, 260–264.

Lévy 1992: Carlos Lévy, *Cicero Academicus. Recherches sur les Académiques et sur la philosophie cicéronienne*, Roma.

Lévy 2011: Carlos Lévy, *Rhétorique et philosophie dans les* Partitiones oratoriae, in: Marc Baratin, Carlos Lévy, Régine Utard and Anne Videau (eds.), *Stylus: la parole dans ses formes. Mélanges en l'honneur du professeur Jacqueline Dangel*, Paris, 245–263.

Lévy 2012: Carlos Lévy, *Philosophical Life versus Political Life. An Impossible Choice for Cicero?*, in: Walter Nicgorski (ed.), *Cicero's Practical Philosophy*, Notre Dame (IN), 58–78.

Lévy 2022: Carlos Lévy, *Cicero and the Creation of a Latin Philosophical Vocabulary*, in: Jed W. Atkins and Thomas Bénatouïl (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero's Philosophy*, Cambridge, 71–87.

Lewis 1986: Anne-Marie Lewis, *Latin Translations of Greek Literature: The Testimony of Latin Authors*, in: «L'Antiquité Classique» 55, 163–174.

Licandro 2017: Orazio Licandro, *Cicerone alla corte di Giustiniano. "Dialogo sulla scienza politica" (Vat. gr. 1298). Concezioni e dibattito sulle formae rei publicae nell'età dell'assolutismo imperiale*, Roma.

Lintott 2008: Andrew Lintott, *Cicero as Evidence: A Historian's Companion*, Oxford–New York.

Livieratos 1883: Eustathios K. Livieratos, *Κικέρωνος οἱ τέσσαρες κατὰ Κατιλίνου Λόγοι καὶ ὁ Ὑπὲρ Ἀρχίου τοῦ ποιητοῦ σχολιασθέντες καὶ μεταφρασθέντες*, Athens.

Lo Monaco 2012: Francesco Lo Monaco, *Cicerone palinsesto*, in: Paolo De Paolis (ed.), *Manoscritti e lettori di Cicerone tra Medioevo e Umanesimo*, Cassino, 1–20.

Lomiento 1993: Liana Lomiento (ed.), *Cercidas*, Roma.

Long 1995a: Anthony A. Long, *Cicero's Plato and Aristotle*, in: Jonathan G. F. Powell (ed.), *Cicero the Philosopher*, Oxford, 37–62.

Long 1995b: Anthony A. Long, *Cicero's Politics in De Officiis*, in: André Laks and Malcolm Schofield (eds.), *Justice and Generosity: Studies in Hellenistic Social and Political Philosophy*, Proceedings of the Sixth Symposium Hellenisticum, Cambridge, 213–240.

Long 2003: Anthony A. Long, *Roman Philosophy*, in: David Sedley (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy*, Cambridge, 184–210.

Lord 1964: Louis E. Lord, *Cicero – In Catilinam I-IV, Pro Murena, Pro Sulla, Pro Flacco*, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Lord Lyttelton 1775: George Lord Lyttelton, *Observations on the Life of Cicero*, 2nd ed., London.

Loukos 1997: Christos Loukos, *Γύρω από την παύση του Πατριάρχη Γρηγορίου του ς΄ (1840). Νέες μαρτυρίες*, in: «Ο Ερανιστής» 21, 326–336.

Lu 2021: Ximing Lu, *The Ciceros in Athens: Study Abroad and Roman Politics*, Dissertation, Madison.

Luciani 2013: Sabine Luciani, Tempora *et Philosophie dans le* De Officiis *de Cicéron*, in: «Vita Latina» 187–188, 39–59.

Luibheid 1970: Colm Luibheid, *The Luca Conference*, in: «Classical Philology» 65, 88–94.

Lull 1919: Betsey Thomas Lull, *Cicero's attitude toward individual Greeks as shown in his letters and orations*, Dissertation, California.

MacCormack 2013: Sabine MacCormack, *Cicero in Late Antiquity*, in: Catherine Steel (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, Cambridge, 251–305.

Magnino 1963: Domenico Magnino (ed.), *Plutarchi Vita Ciceronis*, Firenze.

Mai 1822: Angelo Mai (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis De re publica quae supersunt*, Roma.
Malaspina 2008: Ermanno Malaspina, *Ephemerides Tullianae – Cronologia di Cicerone in rete*, https://tulliana.eu/ephemerides/home.htm (seen: 24.05.2023).
Mamoni 1983: Kyriaki Mamoni, *Ο Ελληνικός Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως: ο Βενιζέλος και η Μικρασιατική εκστρατεία (από το αρχείο Κ. Μισαηλίδη)*, in: «Δελτίο Κέντρου Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών» 4, 277–297.
Manfredi 1995: Manfredo Manfredi, *Lessico a Cic. In Cat. I 5*, in: Manfredo Manfredi (ed.), *Dai papiri della società italiana*, Omaggio al XXI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Berlino 13-19 Agosto 1995, Firenze, 5–9.
Manuello 2006: Patrick Manuello, *Omero nella produzione letteraria di Cicerone*, Dissertation, Genova.
Marconi 1994: Giampietro Marconi, *Tanta Vis Admonitionis Inest in Locis (Cic. De fin. 5,2)*, in: «Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale» 36.1/2, 281–305.
Marinone/Malaspina 2004: Nino Marinone and Ermanno Malaspina, *Cronologia Ciceroniana. Seconda edizione aggiornata e corretta con nuova versione interattiva in cd-rom*, Roma–Bologna.
Marrou 1948: Henry–Irénée Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*, Paris.
Marsh 1927: Frank B. Marsh, *The Policy of Clodius from 58 to 56 B.C.*, in: «Classical Quarterly» 21, 30–36.
Marsh 2013: David Marsh, *Cicero in the Renaissance*, in: Catherine Steel (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, Cambridge, 306–317.
Marsh 2014: David Marsh, *The Experience of Exile Described by Italian Writers: From Cicero through Dante and Machiavelli down to Carlo Levi*, New York.
Maslowski 2003: Tadeusz Maslowski (ed.), *M. T. Cicero, Scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 17, orationes in L. Catilinam quattuor*, München–Leipzig.
Mason 1974: Hough J. Mason, *Greek terms for Roman institutions*, Toronto.
Mataragkas 1891: Panagiotis Mataragkas, *Κικέρωνος οἱ τέσσαρες Κατὰ Κατιλίνα λόγοι μεταφρασθέντες μετὰ σημειώσεων*, Athens.
Matthaiou 2021: Sophia Matthaiou, *Φιλολογικές σπουδές και Κλασική Φιλολογία στην Ελλάδα. Μια εθνική επιστήμη*, Athens.
Mavrelos 2020: Nikolaos Mavrelos, *Latinitas Graecorum: Latin Language Used by Greeks and Greek Identity in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Texts*, in: Ioannis Deligiannis, Vasileios Pappas and Vaios Vaiopoulos (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium III: Post-Byzantine Latinitas. Latin in Post-Byzantine Scholarship (15th-19th centuries)*, Turnhout, 345–359.
May 2002: James M. May, *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*, Leiden.
May 2017: James M. May, *M. Τύλλιος Κικέρων. Η Τέχνη της Πειθούς. Ένας διαχρονικός οδηγός βασισμένος στη σοφία του σπουδαιότερου ρήτορα της Ρωμαϊκής Αυτοκρατορίας* [*How to Win an Argument: An Ancient Guide to the Art of Persuasion*], transl. Christos Barouxis, Athens.
Mazzucchi 1982: Carlo Maria Mazzucchi, *Menae patricii cum Thoma referendario De scientia politica dialogus iteratis curis quae exstant in codice Vaticano palimpsesto*, Milano.
McConnell 2014: Sean McConnell, *Philosophical Life in Cicero's Letters*, Cambridge.
McDermott 1971: William C. McDermott, *Q. Cicero*, in: «Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte» 20, 702–712.
McDermott 1972: William C. McDermott, *M. Cicero and M. Tiro*, in: «Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte» 21, 259–286.
McElduff 2013: Siobhán McElduff, *Roman Theories of Translation: Surpassing the Source*, New York.

McLaughlin 2016: Martin L. McLaughlin, *La Storia del Ciceronianismo, centotrenta anni dopo*, in: Fabio Stock and Paola Tomè (eds.), *La filologia classica e umanistica di Remigio Sabbadini*, Pisa, 189–199.

McNamee 2007: Kathleen McNamee, *Annotations in Greek and Latin texts from Egypt*, New Heaven.

Mecella 2019: Laura Mecella, *Latinismi e cultura letteraria nei frammenti di Pietro Patrizio: per un'indagine sul De cerimoniis e sugli Excerpta Historica Constantiniana*, in: Alessandro Garcea, Michela Rosellini and Luigi Silvano (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium I: Late Antiquity and Beyond*, Turnhout, 361–375.

Megas 1995: Anastasios Megas, *Μαξίμου Πλανούδη τοῦ Ὑπομνήματος εἰς τὸ "Ὄνειρον τοῦ Σκιπίωνος" τοῦ Μακροβίου*, Thessalonica.

Megas 1996: Anastasios Megas (ed.), *Βοηθίου Παραμυθία της Φιλοσοφίας*, Thessalonica.

Megas 1998: Anastasios Megas (ed.), *Οβιδίου Μεταμορφώσεων βιβλία ΙΕ΄*, Thessalonica.

Mendels 1986: Doron Mendels, *Greek and Roman History in the Bibliotheca of Photius – a Note*, in: «Byzantion» 56, 196–206.

Merchant 1890: Franciscus Ioannes Merchant, *De Ciceronis Partitionibus oratoriis commentatio*, Berlin.

Michalopoulos 2003: Andreas Michalopoulos, *Ovid in Greek: Maximus Planudes' translation of the double Heroides*, in: «Classica et Mediaevalia» 54, 359–374.

Michalopoulos 2018: Andreas Michalopoulos, *Hope dies last at Tomis*, in: Georgios Kazantzidis and Dimos G. Spatharas (eds.), *Hope in Ancient Literature, History, and Art*, Berlin–Boston, 183–196.

Michalopoulos/Michalopoulos 2020: Andreas Michalopoulos and Charilaos Michalopoulos, *Modern Greek Translations of Latin Poetic Quotations in the Θέατρον Πολιτικόν (Theatrum Politicum)*, in: Ioannis Deligiannis, Vasileios Pappas and Vaios Vaiopoulos (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium III: Post-Byzantine Latinitas. Latin in Post-Byzantine Scholarship (15th-19th centuries)*, Turnhout, 237–256.

Michel 1982: Alain Michel, *La théorie de la rhétorique chez Cicéron: éloquence et philosophie*, in: Walther Ludwig (ed.), *Éloquence et rhétorique chez Cicéron*, Genève, 109–147.

Miller 1914: Anna B. Miller, *Roman Etiquette of the Late Republic as Revealed by the Correspondence of Cicero*, Lancaster.

Miller 1975 : Walter Miller, *Cicero, De officiis*, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Missiou 2012: Vassiliki Missiou, *Περί Μεταφράσεως Ποιητών: θεωρητικές τοποθετήσεις Ελλήνων ποιητών του 19ου και 20ου αιώνα και η επίδρασή τους στο μεταφραστικό τους έργο*, Dissertation, Thessalonica.

Mitchell 1991: Thomas N. Mitchell, *Cicero the Senior Statesman*, New Haven–London.

Mommsen 1854–1856: Theodor Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, vols. 3, Berlin.

Montanari [3]2016: Franco Montanari, *Σύγχρονο Λεξικό της Αρχαίας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας* [*Vocabolario della lingua greca*], tranls. Maria Andronikou, Daniel Iakov, Ioannis Kazazis, Stephanos Matthaios, Evina Sistakou, Christos Tsagalis, and Dimitrios Christidis, Athens.

Moreau 1987: Philippe Moreau, *La Lex Clodia sur le bannissement de Cicéron*, in: «Athenaeum» 65, 465–492.

Moroni 2008: Brunella Moroni, *Lettori di Cicerone nella cancelleria imperiale tra IV e V secolo*, in: Paola Francesca Moretti, Cristina Torre and Giuseppe Zanetto (eds.), *Debita dona. Studi in onore di Isabella Gualandri*, Napoli, 349–371.

Moullas 1993: Panagiotis Moullas, *Ρήξεις και Συνέχειες. Μελέτες για τον 19ο αιώνα*, Athens.

Moustoxydis 1843: Andreas Moustoxydis, *Συνέχεια τοῦ εἰς τὸν ἀριθ. 1 σελ. 64 Καταλόγου τῶν ἑλληνιστὶ μεταφρασθέντων δοκίμων Λατίνων συγγραφέων*, in: «Ἑλληνομνήμων ἢ Σύμμικτα Ἑλληνικὰ» 2, 125–128.

Müller 1889: Carl Friedrich Wilhelm Müller, *M. Tullii Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia, pars IV*, vol. 1, Leipzig.

Munday 2001: Jeremy Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*, London.

Murray 1924: Augustus Taber Murray (transl.), *Homer, The Iliad*, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Murray 1978: Augustus Taber Murray, *Homer the Iliad with an English translation*, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Naber 1864: Samuel Adrianus Naber (ed.), *Photii patriarchae Lexicon*, vols. 2, Leyden.

Narducci 1997: Emanuele Narducci, *Perceptions of Exile in Cicero. The Philosophical Interpretation of a Real Experience*, in: «American Journal of Philology» 118, 55–73.

Narducci 2005: Emanuele Narducci, *Introduzione a Cicerone*, Roma–Bari.

Narducci 2009: Emanuele Narducci, *Cicerone: La parola e la politica*, Bari.

Νεώτερον Εγκυκλοπαιδικόν Λεξικόν Ηλίου, vols. 13, Athens 1980.

Nicholson 1992: John Nicholson, *Cicero's Return from Exile. The Orations Post Reditum*, New York.

Nikitas 1990: Dimitrios Nikitas, *Boethius De topicis differentiis καὶ οἱ βυζαντινὲς μεταφράσεις τοῦ Μανουήλ Ὀλοβώλου καὶ τοῦ Προχόρου Κυδώνη*, Athens–Paris.

Nikitas 1998a: Dimitrios Nikitas, *Ovidius allegoricus: Die neugriechische Übersetzung der Metamorphosen durch Spyridon Blantes (1798)*, in: W. Schubert (ed.), *Ovid. Werk und Wirkung*, München, 1005–1019.

Nikitas 1998b: Dimitrios Nikitas, *Τα Λατινικά του Λυκείου: Desiderata et proposita*, in: «Φιλόλογος» 94, 460–469.

Nikitas 2001: Dimitrios Nikitas, *Traduzioni greche di opere latine*, in: Salvatore Settis (ed.), *I Greci. Storia Cultura Arte Società*, vol. 3: *I Greci oltre la Grecia*, Torino, 1035–1051.

Nikitas 2012: Dimitrios Nikitas, *Μύθοι πάνυ ὠφέλιμοι καὶ τερπνοί: η πρώτη δημώδης Νεοελληνική μετάφραση των Μεταμορφώσεων του Οβιδίου από τον Ιωάννη Μάκολα (1686)*, in: Dimitrios Nikitas (ed.), *Laus et gratia. In memoriam Κωνσταντίνου Γρόλλιου*, Thessalonica, 103–142.

Nikitas 2017: Dimitrios Nikitas, *Τα Λατινικά στην τριτοβάθμια εκπαίδευση*, in: «Δωδώνη: Φιλολογία» 42–44, 273–288.

Nikitas 2020: Dimitrios Nikitas, *An Overview of Post-Byzantine Latinitas*, in: Ioannis Deligiannis, Vasileios Pappas and Vaios Vaiopoulos (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium III: Post-Byzantine Latinitas. Latin in Post- Byzantine Scholarship (15th-19th centuries)*, Turnhout, 23–44.

Nikitas 2023: Dimitrios Nikitas, *Heinrich Nikolaus Ulrichs: Ο Θεμελιωτής της Λατινικής Φιλολογίας στην Ελλάδα*, in: Aimilios Mavroudis (ed.), *Ἔτος ἦλθε περιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν ἑκατοστόν ...: Τιμητικός Τόμος για τον Καθηγητή - Ακαδημαϊκό Ν. Χ. Κονομή*, Athens, 387–416.

Nikolopoulos 1996: Panagiotis Nikolopoulos, *Περιγραφή χειρόγραφων κωδίκων της Εθνικής Βιβλιοθήκης της Ελλάδος αριθ. 3122–3369*, Athens.

Nocchi Macedo 2018: Gabriel Nocchi Macedo, *P. Oxy. 24.2401 and the history of Terence's text in antiquity*, in: «Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists» 55, 71–117.

Nocchi Macedo 2021: Gabriel Nocchi Macedo, *Ancient Latin poetry book. Materiality and context*, Ann Arbor.

Nogara 1975: Antonio Nogara, *Note sulla composizione e la struttura della Biblioteca di Fozio, patriarca di Costantinopoli. I*, in: «Aevum» 49.3–4, 213–242.

Nogara 1991: Antonio Nogara, *Una testimonianza sulle Epistole greche di Bruto nella Bibliotheca di Fozio*, in: «Aevum» 65.1, 111–113.

Noutsos 1982: Panagiotis Noutsos, *Nicolas Mavrocordatos et Cicéron*, in: «Δωδώνη» 11, 217–225.

O'Sullivan 2011: Timothy M. O'Sullivan, *Walking in Roman Culture*, Cambridge.

Olalla 2018: Pedro Olalla, *Περί πολιτικού γήρατος. Αναπάντητη επιστολή στον Κικέρωνα* [*De senectute politica. Carta sin respuesta a Cicerón*], transl. Aspasia Stamatopoulou, Athens.

Oliva 2022: Matilde Oliva, *Sovrapposizioni di identità e inversione di ruoli nelle* Partitiones oratoriae *di Cicerone*, in: Alberto Casadei, Marina Foschi Albert and Paolo Liverani (eds.), *Espressioni e poetiche dell'identità*, Atti del Terzo Seminario Tridottorale (Pisa 8–10 Ottobre 2020), Pisa, 141–154.

Pade 2014: Marianne Pade, *The Reception of Plutarch from Antiquity to the Italian Renaissance*, in: Mark Beck (ed.), *A Companion to Plutarch*, Malden (MA), 532–548.

Papaioannou 2008: Sophia Papaioannou, *Eugenios Voulgaris' Translation of the Georgics: An Introduction to the first Modern Greek Translation of Virgil*, in: «Vergilius» 54, 97–123.

Papaioannou 2018: Sophia Papaioannou, *Sing it like Homer. Eugenios Voulgaris's Translation of the Aeneid*, in: Susanna Braund and Zara Martirosova Torlone (eds.), *Virgil and his Translators*, Oxford, 151–165.

Papamichail 1932: Grigorios Papamichail, *Νεκρολογία Βασιλείου Αντωνιάδου*, in: «Θεολογία» 1.2, 191–192.

Papathomopoulos 1976: Manolis Papathomopoulos (ed.), *Μαξίμου Πλανούδη μετάφρασις τῶν Ὀβιδίου ἐπιστολῶν*, Ioannina.

Papathomopoulos 2000: Manolis Papathomopoulos, *La traduction Planudéenne des* Commentarii *de Macrobe*, in: «Ciceroniana» 11 [Atti dell'XI Colloquium Tullianum (Cassino – Montecassino, 26–28 aprile 1999)], 133–140.

Papathomopoulos *et al*. 1995: Manolis Papathomopoulos, Isavella Tsavari and Gianpaolo Rigotti (eds.), *Αυγουστίνου Περί Τριάδος: βιβλία πέντε και δέκα ἅπερ ἐξ τῶν Λατίνων διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετήνεγκε Μάξιμος ὁ Πλανούδης*, Athens.

Papathomopoulos/Tsavari 2002: Manolis Papathomopoulos and Isavella Tsavari (eds), *Οβιδίου Περὶ Μεταμορφώσεων ὃ μετήνεγκεν ἐκ τῆς λατίνων φωνῆς εἰς τὴν ἑλλάδα Μάξιμος μοναχὸς ὁ Πλανούδης*, Athens.

Pappas 2014: Vasileios Pappas, *Η μετάφραση του Breviarium ab urbe condita του Ευτροπίου από τον Νεόφυτο Δούκα και το Λεξικό των ενδόξων ανδρών του έργου*, in: «Byzantina Symmeikta» 24, 129–155.

Pappas 2015: Vasileios Pappas, *Justin Neograecus: Daniel Philippidis' translation of the Epitome of Philippics*, in: «Classica et Mediaevalia» 66, 321–339.

Pappas 2016: Vasileios Pappas, *Florus Neograecus: the translation of Daniel Philippidis*, in: «Analecta Malacitana Electronica» 41, 35–55.

Pappas 2018: Vasileios Pappas, *The first Modern Greek translation of Catullus' poems by Gustave Laffon*, in: «Thersites» 8, 1–33.

Pappas 2020: Vasileios Pappas, *The Translation of Justin's Epitome of Trogus by John Makolas (1686)*, in: Ioannis Deligiannis, Vasileios Pappas and Vaios Vaiopoulos (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium III: Post-Byzantine Latinitas. Latin in Post-Byzantine Scholarship (15th-19th centuries)*, Turnhout, 223–236.

Paschalis 2018: Michael Paschalis, *Translations of Virgil into Ancient Greek*, in: Susanna Braund and Zara Martirosova Torlone (eds.), *Virgil and his Translators*, Oxford, 136–150.

Patsiou 1993: Vassiliki Patsiou, *Μεταφραστικές δοκιμές και προϋποθέσεις στα όρια του Νεοελληνικού Διαφωτισμού*, in: «Ο Ερανιστής» 19, 210–234.

Pavano 1987: Annamaria Pavano, *Osservazioni sul Somnium Scipionis di Cicerone tradotto in greco da Massimo Planude*, in: «Sileno» 13, 175–196.

Pavano 1988: Annamaria Pavano, *Caratteri stilistici della traduzione planudea del Somnium Scipionis*, in: «Sileno» 14, 157–169.

Pavano 1989: Annamaria Pavano, *Corruttele vere e presunte nella traduzione planudea del* Somnium Scipionis, in: «Sileno» 15, 141–144.

Pavano 1992: Annamaria Pavano, *Maximus Planudes, M. Tullii Ciceronis Somnium Scipionis in Graecum translatum*, Rome.

Pecere 2010: Oronzo Pecere, *Roma antica e il testo*, Bari.

Pelling 1988: Christopher Pelling (ed.), *Plutarch: Life of Antony*, Cambridge.

Pellizzari 2019: Andrea Pellizzari, *La lingua degli Ἰταλοί. Conoscenza e uso del latino nell'Oriente Greco di IV secolo attraverso l'opera di Libanio*, in: Alessandro Garcea, Michela Rosellini and Luigi Silvano (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium I: Late Antiquity and Beyond*, Turnhout, 131–142.

Perrin 1914: Bernadotte Perrin (transl.), *Plutarch Lives: Theseus and Romulus, Lycurgus and Numa, Solon and Publicola*, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Perrin 1919: Bernadotte Perrin (transl.), *Plutarch's Lives with an English Translation*, vol. 7: *Demosthenes and Cicero. Alexander and Caesar*, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Petridis 1859: Dimitrios G. Petridis, *Μάρκου Τουλλίου Κικέρωνος Λαίλιος ἢ Περὶ φιλίας διάλογος ἐκ τοῦ Λατινικοῦ μεταφρασθείς*, Athens.

Petridis 1881: Dimitrios G. Petridis, *Στοιχειώδεις πρακτικαὶ ὁδηγίαι περὶ διδασκαλίας μαθημάτων ἐν τοῖς δημοτικοῖς σχολείοις*, Athens.

Petrochilos 1974: Nicholas Petrochilos, *Roman Attitudes to the Greeks*, Athens.

Pià-Comella 2020: Jordi Pià-Comella, *La réception française de Cicéron au 20e siècle : le cas Carcopino*, in: «Ciceroniana on Line» 4.2, 447–463.

Pina Polo 2017: Francisco Pina Polo, *Circulation of information in Cicero's correspondence of the years 59–58 BC*, in: Cristina Rosillo-López (ed.), *Political Communication in the Roman World*, Leiden–Boston, 81–106.

Pitcher 2008: Roger Pitcher, *The Second Philippic as a Source for Aristocratic Values*, in: Tom Stevenson and Marcus Wilson (eds.), *Cicero's Philippics*: *History, Rhetoric and Ideology*, Auckland, 131–139.

Politis 1991: Linos Politis, *Κατάλογος χειρογράφων της Εθνικής Βιβλιοθήκης της Ελλάδος αρ. 1857–2500*, Athens.

Polylas 1891: Iakovos Polylas, *Ποιητικὴ μετάφρασις*, in: «Ἑστία» 31, 148–150.

Powell 1995: Jonathan G. F. Powell, *Cicero's Translations from Greek*, in: Jonathan G. F. Powell (ed.), *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers*, Oxford, 273–300.

Powell 2006: Jonathan G. F. Powell (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis De re publica, De legibus, Cato Maior de senectute, Laelius de amicitia*, Oxford.

Pylarinos 2003: Theodosios Pylarinos, *Επτανησιακή Σχολή*, Athens.

Pylarinos/Vaiopoulos 2020: Theodosios Pylarinos and Vaios Vaiopoulos, *Life and Work of a Latin-taught Corfiot: Antonio Rodostamo (Ἀντώνιος Ροδόσταμος)*, in: Ioannis Deligiannis, Vasileios Pappas and Vaios Vaiopoulos (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium III: Post-Byzantine Latinitas. Latin in Post-Byzantine Scholarship (15th-19th centuries)*, Turnhout, 125–161.

Rackham 1942: Harris Rackham (transl.), *Cicero, De Oratore Book III, De Fato, Paradoxa Stoicorum, De Partitione Oratoria*, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Rackham 1951: Harris Rackham (transl.), *Cicero*, *De Natura Deorum, Academica*, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Rackham 1967: Harris Rackham (transl.), *Cicero, De finibus bonorum et malorum*, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Radiciotti 1997: Paolo Radiciotti, *Manoscritti digrafici grecolatini e latinogreci nell'antichità,* in: «Papyrologica Lupiensia» 6, 107–146.

Ramsey 2003: John Ramsey (ed.). *Cicero*: *Philippics I–II*, Cambridge.

Rauh 1986: Nicholas K. Rauh, *Cicero's Business Friendships: Economics and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*, in: «Aevum» 60, 3–30.

Rawson 1975: Elizabeth Rawson, *Cicero. A Portrait*, London.

Rawson 1978: Beryl Rawson, *The Politics of Friendship: Pompey and Cicero*, Sydney.

Rawson 1985: Elizabeth Rawson, *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*, London.

Reinhardt 2000: Tobias Reinhardt, *Rhetoric in the Fourth Academy*, in: «The Classical Quarterly» 50.2, 531–547.

Reynolds 1983: Leighton D. Reynolds, *De re publica*, in: Leighton D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford, 131–132.

Rising 2015: Thilo Rising, *Caesar's offer, Cicero's Rebuff, and the two Land Commissions of 59 B.C.*, in: «Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte» 64, 419–427.

Roberto 2003: Umberto Roberto, *Il Breviarium di Eutropio nella cultura greca tardoantica e bizantina: la versione attribuita a Capitone Licio*, in: «Medioevo Greco» 3, 241–271.

Roberto 2019: Umberto Roberto, *Sulla conoscenza del latino nell'Oriente romano nel periodo tra Maurizio ed Eraclio (584-641): il caso degli storici funzionari e di Giovanni di Antiochia*, in: Alessandro Garcea, Michela Rosellini and Luigi Silvano (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium I: Late Antiquity and Beyond*, Turnhout, 349– 360.

Robinson 1992: Douglas Robinson, *Classical theories of translation from Cicero to Aulus Gellius*, in «TEXTconTEXT» 7, 15–55.

Robinson 1994: Arthur Robinson, *Cicero's References to his Banishment*, in: «Classical World» 87, 475–480.

Robinson ^{2}2002: Douglas Robinson, *Western Translation Theory: From Herodotus to Nietzsche*, Manchester.

Rochette 1997: Bruno Rochette, *Le Latin dans le monde grec*, Bruxelles.

Rochette 2019: Bruno Rochette, *La traduction du latin en grec à Byzance: un aperçu général*, in: Alessandro Garcea, Michela Rosellini and Luigi Silvano (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium I: Late Antiquity and Beyond*, Turnhout, 297–312.

Romano 1964: Domenico Romano, *La cronologia delle* Partitiones oratoriae *di Cicerone*, in: «Atti dell'Accademia di Scienze Lettere e Arti di Palermo» 24.2, 5–45.

Rosellini/Yanes 2019: Michela Rosellini and Elena Spangenberg Yanes, *L'insegnamento di Prisciano*, in: Alessandro Garcea, Michela Rosellini and Luigi Silvano (eds.), *Latin in Byzantium I: Late Antiquity and Beyond*, Turnhout, 163–181.

Rosenstein 2007: Nathan Rosenstein, *Military Command, Political Power, and Republican Elite*, in: Paul Erdkam (ed.), *A Companion to the Roman Army,* Malden, 132–147.

Roulez 1834: Joseph Emmanuel Ghislain Roulez, *Ptolemaei Hefaestionis Novarum Historiarum annuncio variam eruditionem pertinentium excerpta e Photio*, Lipsiae et alibi.

Rowland 1972: Robert J. Rowland, Jr., *Cicero and the Greek World*, in: «Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association» 103, 451–461.

Rudd 1989: Niall Rudd, *Horace Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ('Ars Poetica')*, Cambridge.

Rundell 1979: W. M. F. Rundell, *Cicero and Clodius: The Question of Credibility*, in: «Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte» 28, 301–328.

Salanitro 1975–1976: Giovanni Salanitro, *Il codice zurighese e la versione greca di Teodoro Gaza del De Senectute ciceroniano*, in: «Helikon» 15–16, 319–50.

Salanitro 1987: Giovanni Salanitro (ed.), *Theodorus Gaza. M. Tulli Ciceronis Liber de Senectute in Graecum Translatus*, Leipzig.

Salati 2020: Ornella Salati, *Scrivere documenti nell'esercito romano. L'evidenza dei papiri latini d'Egitto tra I e III d.C.*, Wiesbaden.

Saltelis 1893: Themistocles Saltelis, *Στοιχειώδης Μετρικὴ τῶν παλαιῶν Ἑλλήνων κατὰ Hugo Gleditsch*, Constantinople.

Santoro 1992: Rosa Santoro, *La prima traduzione latina di Teodoro Gaza*, in: «Studi Umanistici» 3, 165–184.

Sathas 1868: Konstantinos N. Sathas, *Νεοελληνικὴ Φιλολογία. Βιογραφίαι τῶν ἐν τοῖς γράμμασι διαλαμψάντων Ἑλλήνων, ἀπὸ τῆς καταλύσεως τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Αὐτοκρατορίας μέχρι τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἐθνεγερσίας. (1453-1821)*, Athens.

Saylor 2002: Steven Saylor, *Την ώρα του Κικέρωνα* [*The Venus Throw*], transl. Maria Pappa, Athens.

Scappaticcio 2013: Maria Chiara Scappaticcio, *Papyri Vergilianae: l'apporto della papirologia alla storia della tradizione virgiliana (I-VI d.C.)*, Liège.

Scappaticcio 2015: Maria Chiara Scappaticcio, *Artes grammaticae*. *I testi grammaticali latini e bilingui greco-latini su papiro. Edizione commentata*, Berlin–Boston.

Scappaticcio 2017: Maria Chiara Scappaticcio, *Fabellae. Frammenti di favole latine e bilingui latino-greche di tradizione diretta (III-IV d.C.)*, Berlin–Boston.

Scappaticcio 2019: Maria Chiara Scappaticcio, *Papyri and LAtin Texts: INsights and Updated Methodologies. Towards a philological, literary, and historical approach to Latin papyri (PLATINUM Project – ERC- StG 2014 no. 636983)*, in: Alfonso Nodar and Sofia Torallas-Tovar (eds.), *Proceedings of the 28th International Congress of Papyrology*, Barcelona 2016 Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, 619–627.

Schamp 1982: Jacques Schamp, *A propos du Plutarque de Photios: notes et conjectures*, in: «Revue des Études Grecques» 95.452–454, 440–452.

Schamp 1995: Jacques Schamp, *Le Plutarque de Photios*, in: «L'Antiquité Classique» 64, 155–184.

Schmitt 1968: Wolfgang O. Schmitt, *Lateinische Literatur in Byzanz. Die Übersetzungen des Maximos Planudes und die moderne Forschung*, in: «Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft» 17, 127–147.

Schofield 2012: Malcolm Schofield, *Antiochus on Social Virtue*, in: David Sedley (ed.), *The Philosophy of Antiochus*, Cambridge, 173–187.

Schofield 2018: Malcolm Schofield, *Cicero on Auctoritas*, in: Jenny Bryan, Robert Wardy and James Warren (eds.), *Authors and Authorities in Ancient Philosophy*, Cambridge, 278–295.

Schwartz 1898: Eduard Schwartz, *Die Vert[h]eilung der Roemischen Provinzen nach Caesars Tod*, in: «Hermes» 33.2, 185–244.

Schwitter 2017: Raphael Schwitter, *Der tröstende Freund – Epistolares Rollenbild und kommunikative Verhaltensweise in Ciceros Epistulae ad familiares*, in: «Ciceroniana on Line» 1, 369–394.

Seager 1965: Robin Seager, *Clodius, Pompeius and the Exile of Cicero*, in: «Latomus» 24, 519–531.

Seager 1979: Robin Seager, *Pompey the Great: A Political Biography*, Oxford.

Sedley 1989: David Sedley, *Philosophical Allegiance in the Greco-Roman World*, in: Miriam T. Griffin and Jonathan Barnes (eds.), *Philosophia Togata: Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*, Oxford, 97–119.

Sedley 2003: David Sedley, *Philodemus and the Decentralisation of Philosophy*, in: «Cronache Ercolanesi» 33, 31–41.

Sedley 2012: David Sedley, *Antiochus as Historian of Philosophy*, in: David Sedley (ed.), *The Philosophy of Antiochus*, Cambridge, 80–103.

Severyns 1937: Albert Severyns, *Les "Vies parallèles" de Plutarque dans la Bibliothèque de Photius*, in: *Mélanges Desrousseaux*. Mélanges offerts à A.-M. Desrousseaux par ses amis et ses élèves, en l'honneur de sa cinquantième année d'enseignement supérior (1887-1937), Paris, 435–450.

Sfoini 1993: Alexandra Sfoini, *Τέσσερις αβιβλιογράφητες μεταφράσεις (16ος–18ος αι.)*, in: «Ο Ερανιστής» 19, 325–330.

Shackleton Bailey 1965–1970: David R. Shackleton Bailey (ed.), *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, vols. 7, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Shackleton Bailey 1971: David Roy Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero*, London–New York.

Shackleton Bailey 1977: David R. Shackleton Bailey (ed.), *Cicero: Epistulae ad Familiares*, vols. 2, Cambridge.

Shackleton Bailey 1980: David R. Shackleton Bailey (ed.), *Cicero: Epistulae ad Quintum fratrem et M. Brutum*, Cambridge.

Shackleton Bailey 1992: David R. Shackleton Bailey, *Onomasticon to Cicero's Speeches*, Stuttgart–Leipzig.

Shackleton Bailey 1995: David R. Shackleton Bailey, *Onomasticon to Cicero's Letters*, Stuttgart–Leipzig.

Shackleton Bailey 1996: David R. Shackleton Bailey, *Onomasticon to Cicero's Treatises*, Stuttgart–Leipzig.

Shackleton Bailey 1999: David R. Shackleton Bailey (ed. & transl.), *Cicero*, *Letters to Atticus*, vols. 4, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Shackleton Bailey 2001: David R. Shackleton Bailey (ed. & transl.), *Cicero, Letters to Friends*, vols. 3, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Signes Codoñer 2013: Juan Signes Codoñer, *El léxico jurídico griego desde Justiniano hasta hoy*, in: «Seminarios Complutenses De Derecho Romano» 26, 83–123.

Signes Codoñer 2019: Juan Signes Codoñer, Asymmetric Exchange: Latin Speakers Learning Greek and Greek Speakers Learning Latin in Late Antiquity. On the Evidence of Grammars and Bilingual Texts, in: Alessandro Garcea, Michela Rosellini and Luigi Silvano (eds.), Latin in Byzantium I: Late Antiquity and Beyond, Turnhout, 143–162.

Skarveli-Nikolopoulou 1994: Angeliki Skarveli-Nikolopoulou, *Μαθηματάρια των ελληνικών σχολείων κατά την Τουρκοκρατία*, Athens.

Skendi 1967: Stavro Skendi, *The Albanian National Awakening*, Princeton.

Smith 1896: Clement L. Smith, *Cicero's Journey into Exile*, in: «Harvard Studies in Classical Philology» 7, 65–84.

Smith 2015: William P. Smith, *Mors Honestissima: Cicero and Suicide Contemplation in the late Republic*, Dissertation, Florida.

Soubiran 1972: Jean Soubiran (ed.), *Aratea. Ciceron*, Paris.

Soutsas 1886: Konstantinos P. Soutsas, *Κικέρωνος ὁ Ὑπὲρ Τ. Ἀννίου Μίλωνος λόγος μεταφρασθείς εἰς τὴν καθωμιλουμένην πρός χρῆσιν τῶν γυμνασίων*, Athens.

Späth 2010: Thomas Späth, *Cicero, Tullia, and Marcus: Gender-Specific Concerns for Family Tradition?*, in: Véronique Dasen and Thomas Späth (eds.), *Children, Memory, and Family Identity in Roman Culture*, Oxford, 147–172.

Spencer 2010: Diana Spencer, *Roman Landscape: Culture and Identity*, Cambridge.

Springer 2018: Carl P. E. Springer, *Cicero in Heaven. The Roman Rhetor and Luther' Reformation*, Leiden–Boston.

Steel 2001: Catherine Steel, *Cicero, Rhetoric, and Empire*, Oxford.

Steel 2005: Catherine Steel, *Reading Cicero: Genre and Performance in Late Republican Rome*, London.

Steel 2013: Catherine Steel (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, Cambridge.

Steel 2018: Catherine Steel, *Re publica nihil desperatius: salvaging the state in Cicero's pre-civil war philosophical works*, in: Gernot Michael Müller and Fosca Mariani Zini (eds.), *Philosophie im Rom - Römische Philosophie? Kultur-, literatur- und philosophiegeschichtliche Perspektiven*, Berlin, 269–282.

Steinmetz 1989: Peter Steinmetz, *Beobachtungen zu Ciceros philosophischem Standpunkt*, in: William W. Fortenbaugh and Peter Steinmetz (eds.), *Cicero's Knowledge of the Peripatos*, New Brunswick–London, 1–22.

Stockton 1971: David L. Stockton, *Cicero: A Political Biography*, Oxford.

Stone 2008: Alan Martin Stone, *Greek Ethics and Roman Statesman: De Officiis and the Philippics*, in: Tom Stevenson and Marcus Wilson (eds.), *Cicero's Philippics*: *History, Rhetoric and Ideology*, Auckland, 214–239.

Stornaiuolo 2019: Antonio Stornaiuolo, *An unpublished manumissio inter amicos (P. Mich. Inv. 5688c)*, in: «Analecta Papyrologica» 31, 43–60.

Stover/Revello (forthcoming): Justin A. Stover and Veronica Revello, *Cicero, De re publica*, in: Justin A. Stover (ed.), *The Oxford Guide to the Transmission of the Latin Classics*, Oxford.

Stroup 2003: Sarah Culpepper Stroup, *The Personification of Textual Eloquence in Cicero's Brutus*, in: «Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici» 50, 115–140.

Stroup 2010: Sarah Culpepper Stroup, *Catullus, Cicero, and a Society of Patrons. The Generation of the Text*, Cambridge.

Stroup 2013: Sarah Culpepper Stroup, *Without Patronage: Fetishization, Representation, and the Circulation of Gift-Texts in the Late Roman Republic*, in: Michael L. Satlow (ed.), *The Gift in Antiquity*, Chichester, 107–121.

Tabaki 2018: Anna Tabaki, *Ιστορία και θεωρία της μετάφρασης. 18ος αιώνας – ο Διαφωτισμός*, Athens.

Tantalidis 1868: Ilias Tantalidis, *Βίος Στεφάνου Καραθεοδωρῆ ἰατροῦ, ὑπαγορευθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἡ. Τανταλίδου κατ' ἐντολὴν τοῦ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ἑλληνικοῦ Φιλολογικοῦ Συλλόγου*, Constantinople.

Tempest 2011: Kathryn Tempest, *Cicero: Politics and Persuasion in Ancient Rome*, New York–London.

Tempest 2020: Kathryn Tempest, *Cicero's Artes Liberales and the Liberal Arts*, in: «Ciceroniana on Line» 4, 479–500.

Tertsetis 1831 (?): Georgios Tertsetis, *Ὄνειρον τοῦ Σκιπίωνος μεταφρασμένο ἀπὸ τὸ λατινικὸν*, in Nt. Konomos (ed.), *Ο Γεώργιος Τερτσέτης και τα Ευρισκόμενα Έργα του*, Athens 1984, 877–881.

Testard 1962: Maurice Testard, *Le fils de Cicéron, destinataire du De Officis*, in: «Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé» 2, 198–213.

Thomas 1998: James David Thomas, *P. Ryl. IV 654: The Latin Heading*, in: «Chronique d'Égypte» 73, 125–134.

Traina 1961: Alfonso Traina, *Commento alle traduzioni poetiche di Cicerone*, Atti del I Congresso Internazionale di Studi Ciceroniani: Roma Aprile 1959, vol. 2, Rome, 141–159.

Traina 1970: Alfonso Traina, *Vortit barbare: Le traduzioni poetiche da Livio Andronico a Cicerone*, Roma.

Treggiari 2007: Susan Treggiari, *Terentia, Tullia and Publilia. The Women of Cicero's Family*, London.

Treggiari 2015: Susan Treggiari, *The Education of the Ciceros*, in: William M. Bloomer (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Education*, Chichester, 240–251.

Trivolis 1941: Dionysios N. Trivolis, *Eutropius historicus καὶ οἱ ῞Ελληνες μεταφρασταὶ τοῦ Breviarium ab Urbe condita*, Athens.

Tromaras 1999: Leonidas Tromaras, *Από το vortit barbare στο graece vertere: ελληνικές μεταφράσεις λατινικών κειμένων*, in: «Νέα Πορεία» 45, 286–306.

Trouard 1942: Sister Mary Alexaidia Trouard, O. P., *Cicero's Attitude towards the Greeks*, Chicago.

Tsakalotos 1893: Eustratios Tsakalotos, *Μάρκου Τυλλίου Κικέρωνος λόγοι ἐκλεκτοὶ*, Athens.

Tsouni 2018a: Georgia Tsouni, *The Emergence of Platonic and Aristotelian Authority in the First Century BCE*, in: Jenny Bryan, Robert Wardy and James Warren (eds.), *Authors and Authorities in Ancient Philosophy*, Cambridge, 263–277.

Tsouni 2018b: Georgia Tsouni, *Protreptic and Philosophical Dialogue: Cicero*, in: Olga Alieva, Annemaré Kotzé and Sophie Van der Meeren (eds.), *When wisdom calls: Philosophical Protreptic in Antiquity*, Brussels, 211–227.

Tsouni 2019: Georgia Tsouni, *Antiochus and Peripatetic Ethics*, Cambridge.

Tutrone 2013: Fabio Tutrone, *Libraries and Intellectual Debate in the Late Republic: The Case of the Aristotelian Corpus*, in: Jason König, Katerina Oikonomopoulou and Greg Woolf (eds.), *Ancient Libraries*, Cambridge, 152–166.

Tyrrell/Purser 1969: Robert. Y. Tyrrell and Louis C. Purser (eds.), *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero, Arranged according to its Chronological Order*, vol. 1, 2nd ed., Dublin.

Tzamos 1998: Stylianos K. Tzamos, *Συμβολή στην αποκατάσταση του κειμένου των Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis του Μακρόβιου με βάση τη μετάφραση του Μάξιμου Πλανούδη*, Dissertation, Thessalonica.

Vagenas 2000: Nasos Vagenas, *Η γλώσσα της Αθηναϊκής Σχολής*, in: Michael Z. Kopidakis (ed.), *Ιστορία της ελληνικής γλώσσας*, 3rd ed., Athens, 256–257.

Vaiopoulos 2010: Vaios Vaiopoulos, *Λατινικές μεταφράσεις ελληνικών έργων στη χριστιανική Δύση*, in: «Ιόνιος Λόγος» 2, 109–131.

van der Blom 2007: Henriette van der Blom, *Graecophile or Graecophobe? Cicero's choice between Greek and Roman exempla*, in: «The Classical Outlook» 84.4, 157–162.

van der Blom 2010: Henriette van der Blom, *Cicero's Role Models: The Political Strategy of a Newcomer*, Oxford.

van der Blom 2016: Henriette van der Blom, *Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, Cambridge.

Vendotis 1804: Georgios Vendotis, *Λεξικὸν δίγλωσσον τῆς Γαλλικῆς καὶ Ῥωμαϊκῆς διαλέκτου εἰς δύο τόμους διῃρημένον*. Συνταχθὲν παρὰ Γεωργίου Βεντότη. Νῦν δὲ τὸ δεύτερον ἐκδοθὲν παρά τινος φιλογενοῦς. *Τόμος Α΄. Γαλλικο-Ρωμαϊκός*, Vienna.

Vendotis 1837: Georgios Vendotis, *Λεξικὸν τῆς Γαλλικῆς γλώσσης Γ. Βεντώτη*, Μετασκευασθὲν μὲν τὸ πρῶτον ὑπὸ Γ. Ζαλίκη, νῦν δὲ ἐπιδιορθωθὲν καὶ μετὰ πλείστων προσθηκῶν αὐξηθὲν ὑπὸ λογίων ἀνδρῶν, ἐκδίδεται ὑπὸ Ἀνδρέου Κορομηλᾶ, Athens.

Verde 2022: Francesco Verde, *Peripatetic Philosophy in Context. Knowledge, Time, and Soul from Theophrastus to Cratippus*, Berlin–Boston.

Vesperini 2012: Pierre Vesperini, *La philosophia et ses pratiques d'Ennius à Cicéron*, Roma.

Viagkinis 1888a: Markos Viagkinis, *Μ. Τ. Κικέρωνος, Ὁ πρῶτος Κατὰ Ἀντωνίου εἴτε Φιλιππικὸς λόγος πρὸ χρῆσιν τῶν ἀνωτέρω γυμνασιακῶν τάξεων μετὰ συντομωτάτου βίου τοῦ συγγραφέως, εἰσαγωγῆς εἰς τοὺς Φιλιππικοὺς, γενικῶν παρατηρήσεων εἰς τὸν α΄. Φιλιππικόν, συντόμου ὑποθέσεως καὶ μεταφράσεως*, Athens.

Viagkinis 1888b: Markos Viagkinis, *Σημειώσεις εἰς τὸν Πρῶτον κατὰ Ἀντωνίου εἴτε Φιλιππικὸν τοῦ Μ. Τ. Κικέρωνος*, Athens.

Viagkinis 1889: Markos Viagkinis, *Μ. Τ. Κικέρωνος ὁ Δεύτερος κατὰ Ἀντωνίου εἴτε Φιλιππικὸς λόγος πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν ἀνωτέρων γυμνασιακῶν τάξεων μετὰ εἰσαγωγῆς, γενικῶν παρατηρήσεων εἰς τὸν Β΄ Φιλιππικόν, συντόμου ὑποθέσεως, διορθωμένου κειμένου καὶ μεταφράσεως*, Athens.

Viagkinis 1890: Markos Viagkinis, *Σημειώσεις εἰς τὸν Δεύτερον κατὰ Ἀντωνίου εἴτε Φιλιππικὸν τοῦ Μ. Τ. Κικέρωνος*, Athens.

Villemain 1823: Abel François Villemain (ed. & transl.), *La République de Cicéron*, d'après le texte iné dit, récemment découvert et commenté par M. Mai, bibliothécaire du Vatican. Avec une traduction française, un discours préliminaire, et des dissertations historiques, vols. 2, Paris.

von Albrecht 1995: Michael von Albrecht, *Storia della letteratura latina* [*Geschichte der Römischen Literatur*], transl. Aldo Setaioli, vol. 1: *Da Livio Andronico a Boezio*, Torino.

von Albrecht 2003: Michael von Albrecht, *Cicero's Style: A Synopsis*, Leiden–Boston.

Vournas 1982: Tassos Vournas, *Φιλική Εταιρία. α΄. το παράνομο οργανωτικό της, β΄. ο διωγμός της από τους ξένους*, Athens.

Waller 2011: Martin Waller, *Victory, Defeat and Electoral Success at Rome, 343-91 B.C.*, in: «Latomus» 70, 18–38.

Ward 2015: John O. Ward, *What the Middle Ages Missed on Cicero, and Why*, in: William H. F. Altman (ed.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Cicero*, Leiden–Boston, 307–326.

Weissbort/Eysteinsson 2006: Daniel Weissbort and Astradur Eysteinsson (eds.), *Translation, Theory and Practice: A Historical Reader*, Oxford.

Welch 1996: Kathryn E. Welch, *T. Pomponius Atticus: a Banker in Politics?*, in: «Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte» 45, 450–471.

Wernsdort 1825: Gregorius Gottlieb Wernsdort (ed.), *M. Tullii Ciceronis Orationes Philippicae in M. Antonium*, Leipzig.

Wescoat 2013: Bonna D. Wescoat, *Insula Sacra*: *Samothrace Between Troy and Rome*, in: Marco Galli (ed.), *Roman Power and Greek Sanctuaries. Forms of Interaction and Communication* (Tripodes 14), Athens, 45–81.

White 2010: Peter White, *Cicero in Letters: Epistolary Relations of the Late Republic*, New York–Oxford.

White 2015: Georgina F. White, *Copia verborum: Cicero's philosophical translations*, Dissertation, Princeton.

Wilkinson 1959: James K. Wilkinson, *Cicero's governorship of Cilicia*, Dissertation, Birmingham.

Williams 1965: W. Glynn Williams, *Cicero, The Letters to His Friends*, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Williams 2013: Charles E. J. Williams, *Pompey and Cicero: An Alliance of Convenience*, Dissertation, San Marcos, Texas.

Winstedt 1962: Eric O. Winstedt, *Cicero, Letters to Atticus*, Cambridge (MA)–London.

Wiseman 1970: Timothy Peter Wiseman, *Pulcher Claudius*, in: «Harvard Studies in Classical Philology» 74, 207–221.

Wisse 1989: Jakob Wisse, *Ethos and Pathos from Aristotle to Cicero*, Amsterdam.

Wisse 2002a: Jakob Wisse, *The Intellectual Background of Cicero's Rhetorical Works*, in: James M. May (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Cicero. Oratory and Rhetoric*, Leiden–Boston–Köln, 331–374.

Wisse 2002b: Jakob Wisse, *De oratore: Rhetoric, Philosophy, and the Making of the Ideal Orator*, in: James M. May (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Cicero. Oratory and Rhetoric*, Leiden–Boston–Köln, 375–400.

Wood 1988: Neal Wood, *Cicero's Social and Political Thought*, Berkeley.

Woolf 2015: Raphael Woolf, *Cicero*: *The Philosophy of a Roman Sceptic*, London.

Zambarbieri 2001: Mario Zambarbieri, *Omero nella cultura di Cicerone*, in: «Paideia» 56, 3–64.

Zetzel 1999: James Zetzel (ed. & transl.), *Cicero, On the Commonwealth and On the Laws*, Cambridge.

Zetzel 2003: James Zetzel, *Plato with Pillows. Cicero on the Uses of Greek Culture*, in: David Braund and Christopher Gill (eds.), *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome. Studies in Honour of T. P. Wiseman*, Exeter, 119–138.

Ziegler 1907: Konrat Ziegler, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der vergleichenden Lebensbeschreibungen Plutarchs*, Leipzig.

Ziegler 1969: Konrat Ziegler (ed.), *M. Tullius Cicero: De re publica*, 7th ed., Munich–Leipzig.
Ziegler 1971: Konrat Ziegler, *Plutarchus*, *Vitae Parallelae*, vol. 3.1, Leipzig.
Zioga 2015: Ioanna Zioga, *Η διδασκαλία των Λατινικών στη Μέση Εκπαίδευση*, Dissertation, Thessalonica.

List of Contributors

Ioannis Deligiannis is Associate Professor of Latin at Democritus University of Thrace. He holds a PhD from the University of Cambridge. His research interests include Cicero's political works, the history and reception of classical Greek and Latin texts and authors in the Renaissance and beyond, as well as Greek and Latin Palaeography and textual criticism. He has published a Greek translation and commentary of Cicero's *De re publica* (2015), *De legibus* (2017), and the *Post reditum* speeches (2021), and articles on Cicero's political thought. He has also published the book *Fifteenth-Century Latin Translations of Lucian's Essay on Slander* (2006), edited the volume *Investigating the Translation Process in Humanistic Latin Translations of Greek Texts* (2017), and co-edited (with V. Vaiopoulos and V. Pappas) the volume *Post-Byzantine Latinitas: Latin in Post-Byzantine Scholarship (15th – 19th cent.)* (2020).

Gabriel Evangelou is a Postdoctoral Researcher at the University of Cyprus. He holds a PhD from the University of Edinburgh and specialises in Cicero's letters. His monograph *Love, Friendship, and Expediency* (2022) investigates Epicureanism in Cicero's correspondence through a close study of his relationship with his loved ones and his allies. His research interests lie chiefly in the philosophical dimension of Cicero's works, the rhetoric of emotions, the use of invective as humour in Martial's epigrams, and the ethics of Plato, Aristotle, and Epicurus. He is currently co-editing a volume and a special issue on reconciliation in the Greco-Roman world.

Ximing Lu is a Visiting Assistant Professor of Classics at the University of Kansas. His research focuses on Roman literature and culture with particular interests in education, slavery, reception, and other topics with modern resonances across the globe. He was previously a Visiting Assistant Professor of Classics and Ancient Mediterranean Studies at Bucknell University. He received his PhD in Classics from the University of Wisconsin-Madison in May 2021 with a dissertation titled *The Ciceros in Athens: Study Abroad and Roman Politics*.

Fernanda Maffei has been a PhD student in Latin Literature at the University of L'Aquila since November 2019. She graduated with full marks and honours in 2017 from the University of Rome "La Sapienza". From February to July 2019, she was a research fellow at the University of Naples Federico II within the framework of the ERC Platinum project, in which she worked on literary and documentary Latin papyri and their digitisation for the project's database. She has participated in many national and international conferences and has been a visiting researcher at che CEDOPAL at the University of Liège from March to June 2022. Her research interests are Latin papyri, text transmission and Latin epic poetry; she is currently working on the creation of a Corpus of Cicero's papyri.

Matilde Oliva is a Lecturer in Latin Language at the University of Florence. She received her PhD in Latin Literature from the University of Pisa in 2023 with a dissertation on Cicero's *Partitiones oratoriae* (introduction, translation, and commentary). Her research interests are on Roman literature and thought, with a focus on late-Republican literature, rhetoric, and more particularly Cicero. She has published several articles, regarding, e. g., late bucolic poetry (Nemesianus), Greek and Latin bilingualism, rhetorical *exempla*, and Cicero's reception in Late Antiquity. Since 2020, she has been a member of the editorial board of the journal "Ciceroniana On Line".

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779-015

Tiziano Ottobrini, a graduate in Classics and Philosophy from the Catholic University of Milan, has earned a PhD in the History of Ancient Philosophy (Milan) and a PhD in Theoretical Philosophy (Bergamo) and pursued post-doctoral research at various Pontifical Universities (Rome). He is currently carrying out his research activity at the University of Bergamo, where he is investigating Robert Eisler's masterpiece on ancient cosmogony, titled *Weltenmantel und Himmelszelt.* His main focuses of interest are the philosophical matrix in Ancient Christian Literature (Greek, Latin and Syriac), the translation of Greek texts into Sahidic Coptic, mystagogy, post-Iamblichan Neoplatonism and Neoplatonic commentaries on Aristotle (especially Simplicius and John Philoponus).

Vasileios Pappas is Assistant Professor of Latin at the University of Ioannina. He has worked as Adjunct Lecturer at the University of Thessaly, the Hellenic Open University and the University of Cyprus. He has published two monographs in Modern Greek, one in English (*Maximianus' Elegies. Love Elegy Grew Old*, 2023), and several articles in international and Greek journals. His scientific interests include Latin love elegy, the Latin poetry of Late Antiquity, and the reception of Latin literature by Byzantine, post-Byzantine, and Modern Greek scholars. He is co-editor (with I. Deligiannis and V. Vaiopoulos) of the volume *Post-Byzantine Latinitas: Latin in Post-Byzantine Scholarship (15th – 19th cent.)* (2020).

Georgia Tsouni is Assistant Professor of Classics at the University of Crete. She holds a PhD from the University of Cambridge. Her research interests centre on Hellenistic and Roman literature and philosophy with a particular focus on ethics, political philosophy, the history of the Academy and the Peripatos and the reception of Greek philosophy in Rome (especially Cicero's philosophical dialogues). She has published the monograph *Antiochus and Peripatetic Ethics* (2019), a new critical edition and English translation of 'The Epitome of Peripatetic Ethics', which survives in the *Anthology* of Stobaeus in B. Fortenbaugh (ed.), *Arius Didymus on Peripatetic Ethics, Household Management, and Politics. Text, Translation, and Discussion* (2017), and numerous articles on the Hellenistic Academy, Aristotle, the Stoics and Cicero.

Index Locorum

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779-016

Index Nominum

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111292779-017

Previous Volumes of the Series

Traduire Cicéron au XVe siècle - Le ›Livre des offices‹ d'Anjourrant Bourré, CSRTR 1
Oliver Delsaux, 2019
ISBN 978-3-11-062030-6, e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-062136-5,
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-062139-6

La fine del mondo nel ›De rerum natura‹ di Lucrezio, CSRTR 2
Manuel Galzerano, 2020
ISBN 978-3-11-065962-7, e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-067466-8,
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-067468-2

Reading Cicero's Final Years.
Receptions of the Post-Caesarian Works up to the Sixteenth Century – with two Epilogues, CSRTR 3
Christoph Pieper and Bram van der Velden, 2020
ISBN 978-3-11-071506-4, e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-071631-3,
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-071639-9

Portraying Cicero in Literature, Culture, and Politics, CSRTR 4
Francesca Romana Berno and Giuseppe La Bua, 2022
ISBN 978-3-11-074842-0, e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-074870-3,
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-074888-8

›Amicus Lucretius‹.
Gassendi, il ›De rerum natura‹ e l'edonismo cristiano, CSRTR 5
Enrico Piergiacomi
ISBN 978-3-11-076721-6, e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-076808-4,
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-076811-4

Healing Grief.
A Commentary on Seneca's ›Consolatio ad Marciam‹, CSRTR 6
Fabio Tutrone
ISBN 978-3-11-100742-7, e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-101484-5,
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-101489-0

›Mos uetustissimus‹ – Tito Livio e la percezione della clemenza, CSRTR 7
Elisa Della Calce
ISBN 978-3-11-121237-1, e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-129264-9,
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-129281-6

www.degruyter.com