Collected Papers on Greek into Latin in the Context of Translation in Antiquity

Donna Shalev

John Glucker and Charles Burnett (eds.), *Greek into Latin from Antiquity until the Nineteenth Century*. [Warburg Institute Colloquia, 18]. London – Turin: The Warburg Institute – Nino Aragno Editore, 2012. xiii + 226. ISBN 978-1-908590-41-1.

This wonderful volume spans the deep and broad questions of the technique, theory and culture of translation with elegance matching its academic rigour. Countless collections have been spawned by theoreticians and practitioners of translation, under the spell of transitory fashions, hoarding and piling up attractive purple patches, jumping from Gilgamesh to Google Translate, or constructing *ab ovo*, *ad hoc*, and one-man-show theoretical tours de force to deconstruct the proverbial Tower of Babel. This volume, edited by John Glucker and Charles Burnett, has taken two languages, Greek and Latin, and their two textual and cultural traditions, and has successfully described and redescribed the fine-grained nuances in their scalar and incremental rainbow of hues. The individual articles in the volume under review examine test cases through varying combined prisms of time, place, genre, convention, context, and cultural setting from reception to patronage to paideia, without exception doing so in a laudably jargon-free, richly documented nature. The editors of the volume have managed to orchestrate a unison of high-standard research without drowning out the individual voices and accents of each contributor in treating his or her corpus or cross-section through appropriate perspectives and points of emphasis.

There is no article among those collected in this volume which follows entirely the same agenda, or covers the same corpus, but many of them complement others to form a rich and flexible web of questions, ideas, models, and case studies on a range of levels and dimensions of the counterpoint between Greek and Latin. In what follows I will mention in passing some of these ideas, models and studies and add questions which they raise for the reader.

One such question I will touch on in passing involves the parallels, analogues, and also discrepancies between the Greek — Latin relationship in translation and what has been written about relationships in translation of other literary languages; some of these other cases have been privileged with sociohistorical, geographical, and cultural approaches in surveys, monographs on individual authors and works, or chronological cross-sections, offering several curricula of translation which are worth comparing and contrasting. A most recent survey by G. Freudenthal and R. Glasner[1] synoptically

[1] Freudenthal, Gad, Glasner, Ruth. 2014. 'Patterns of Medieval Translation Movements'. In: Coda, E., Martini Bonadeo, C. (eds.), *De l'antiquité tardive au moyen âge. Études de logique aristotélicienne et de philosophie grecque, syriaque, arabe et latine offertes à Henri Hugonnard-Roche*. Paris: Vrin, pp. 245-252.

considers several models of translation movements, most saliently distinguishing those following a centralized pattern (2014: 250), with intermediary, such as Greek/Syriac-into-Arabic, and Arabic-into-Latin (via vernaculars), and those following a decentralized pattern, 'typical of two cultures sharing a common cultural canon' (2014: 251), such as Greek-into-Syriac and Arabic-into-Hebrew. Greek-into-Latin, which straddles a much longer chronological span than the cases covered in Freudenthal and Glasner's survey on medieval translation movements, clearly has affinities with the second pattern identified above, and not only shares a common cultural canon, but has many further points of osmosis, touched on in many of the articles in the volume under review, such as grecisms (discussed in the article of Rosén), "Greek in Latin", and *couleur locale* (discussed and implied respectively in the article of Zagagi and emerging from points raised by Nikitas, De Leemans and others), pseudo-translations and posed translations (raised in the article of Botley), transliteration (raised in the articles of Glucker and De Leemans), parameters of revision, translation, and paraphrase and their relation to ideology (Tóth and De Leemans), as well as other phenomena not explicitly covered by the articles in Glucker and Burnett's volume, such as bilingualism (implicit, e.g. in Zagagi's article), and Latin-to-Greek translation (but see Pade's passing mention [p. 178] of Demetius Cydones' elegant Greek versions of Latin, with reference [n. 31] to Nikitas' 2001 article on Greek translations from Latin). The profile of Greek-into-Latin also has affinities with the first pattern identified in the bird's-eye view exposed by Freudenthal and Glasner, in cases where it involves a translation '*à quatre mains*' with a vernacular intermediary,[2] as discussed in the article by Pade (pp. 176-177), mentioning recourse to Demotic Greek, Aragonese, and Tuscan vernacular intermediaries (pp. 176-177). Aside from the typology of translation movements, as suggested in the survey of Freudenthal and Glasner, important notions which may inform scholars of Greek-into-Latin are those of "translation complexes" and "translation grammars", introduced by Gerhard Endress and Dimitri Gutas in their work on Greek-into-Arabic,[3] but applicable for Greek-into-Latin, as I will discuss e.g., regarding the contributions of Nikitas and Rosén below, respectively. Other general notions include prestige languages, the tensions between sacred and profane, literal and flexible, technical and literary, and other spectra.[4] Just as general notions and subtle *differentiae* have been uncovered in

---

2 To borrow the term of the Arabic-into-Latin scholar Marie-Thérèse Alverney, 'Les traductions à deux interprètes, d'arabe en langue vernaculaire et de langue vernaculaire en latin', in: Contamine, G., *Traductions et traducteurs au Moyen-Âge*, pp. 193-206, quoted in Freudenthal, Glasner (2014: 250, n. 21).

3 Endress, Gerhard. 1997. 'The Circle of Al-Kindi'. In: Endress, G., Kruk, R. (eds.), *The Ancient Tradition in Christian and Islamic Hellenism*. Leiden, pp. 52-58. Gutas, Dimitri. 1998. *Greek Thought, Arabic Culture. The Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad and Early Abbasid Society (2-4th/8th-10th centuries)*. London: Routledge.

4 All of these notions, and more, are addressed in the first half of the article by Sebastian Brock covering a range of translation movements in antiquity, including several classic reflective and theoretical passages in the Latin, Later Greek, Syriac, Armenian and Arabic traditions (the second half of the article, pp. 74-87, comparatively integrates formal aspects of *verbum e verbo* translation technique in this cross section of cultures of the period: word order and formal correspondence; lexical features and technical terms; regular lexical

this volume, *Greek into Latin* may inform the study of these other cases, thus, conversely, models and patterns described in the fields of Latin-into-Celtic or Latin-into-Arabic, and other translation movements not involving Latin, may fruitfully inform the study of Greek-into-Latin. An exhaustive enumeration of all the work done on translation technique in these and other pairs or groups of literary languages would be well beyond the scope of a review, or even a review article; the works referred to so far are richly endowed with further references. I will content myself here to refer selectively to a few items from this vast literature, as their relevance to an issue emerges in one of the contributions in the volume edited by Glucker and Burnett. This volume is an outcome of lectures given at a conference *Greek into Latin*, held at the Warburg Institute in 2005. In the spirit of the library and activity of the Warburg Institute, and the work of Burnett on translation from Arabic into Latin,[5] I take the liberty to try to contextualize the varied and long-lived *curriculum vitae* of Greek-into-Latin with parallels, analogues and *differentiae* from other case histories; the contributions — arranged in the volume chronologically — will be treated in the review in thematic cross sections.

Cultural Acclimatization

Attitudes to translation aired by littérateurs, some of them important patrons, such as Boccaccio or Petrarch, are an angle paralleled in other translation movements; in this volume the articles of Pade, Botley and Petitmengin most saliently deal with this facet.

Pade's contribution, 'The Fifteenth-Century Latin Versions of Plutarch's *Lives*: Examples of Humanist Translation' (pp. 171-185), includes a very important discussion of the influential roles of Manuel Chrysoloras and of Coluccio Salutati as translators. Her contribution equally belongs with those of Glucker, Nikitas, and De Leemans as it does here, but her article also brings to the fore an aspect in the relations between Greek and Latin which holds its own pride of place, namely the attitudes of littérateurs to translation, their ideological commitment to the eloquence of the target language, and the status of an author in educational and intellectual milieux: all of these attitudes influence and motivate patronage and cultural excellence. The case of the humanist translations of Plutarch's *Lives* and the narrative of the emergence of a tradition of eloquent Latin translations, as well as of the ensuing influence on the development of Latin eloquence in non-translated humanist writing, is a paragon case with application to literary models, translation, stylistics, and cultured writing. Pade brings points on the trajectory from the beginnings of humanist Greek-to-Latin translations, under the tutelage of Chrysoloras, who began to teach Greek in Italy at the end of the 14th century, and culminating with the polished eloquent 15th century translations of Plutarch's *Lives*. Pade traces this monumental project from the early reception of Plutarch in antiquity, through its earliest Latin renditions, its place in the educational curriculum and then in intellectual humanist milieux. Pade's inclusion of the original phrasing in the correspondence between patrons, cultural agents, and translators brings us first-hand

correspondence; analogy). Brock, Sebastian. 1979. 'Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity'. *GRBS* 30. 69-87.

5 E.g., Burnett, Charles. 2001. 'The Coherence of the Arabic-Latin Translation Program in Toledo in the Twelfth Century'. *Science in Context* 14. 249-288.

testimonia of the motivations and policies of translation, revision, and standard-setting, and is as valuable for our study of motivations of translation as the testimonia in other forms, for example Greek-to-Latin remarks and *exempla*.

Salutati's act of revision is motivated by his quest to 'make Plutarch attractive and comprehensible' but equally to 'improve the Latin of Atumanus'. The polemic tone of Salutati's critique, citing his need to render Atumanus' half-Greek into Latin (p. 173), is compared by Pade to his reaction to the quality of Leontius Pilatus' Latin in his translations of Homer. Perhaps this reflects a spirit of the time, as seen in the comparably caustic critique by Guarino of Uberto Decembrio's Greek and Latin (which Guarino accuses of being inferior even to the Latin of Chrysoloras).[6] The mining of prefatory materials, correspondences, and annotations — and in Pade's contribution the generous citation of the original in footnotes — offers us sumptuous servings of critique which help us more fully comprehend the attitudes and agendas of practitioners and agents of the humanist translation movement. Pade attributes to the critique and advice by cultural agents such as Petrarch (directed at Leontius Pilatus) or Salutati (at Losch) a pivotal role in the changing conception of translation (p. 175). Pade places this within the context of a more general early humanist (re-)privileging of Latin cultural heritage, Latin language, and rhetorical standards. Two further vital developments are also detailed by Pade: (1) Greek-to-vernaculars-to-Latin (pp. 175-176), and (2) the institutional status given to the study of Greek, with the establishment of the Chair of Greek at Florence and the appointment of Manuel Chrysoloras, and his influence on the diffusion not only of Greek in early renaissance Italy, but specifically of his multi-dimensional view of translation (pp. 177-179), graduating from the traditional binary Gestalt of *ad verbum* vs. *ad sensum* to one involving a richer spectrum (*conversio ad verbum*, *conversio ad sententiam* and *immutatio* [p. 178]). Both of these developments, as detailed by Pade, have much to contribute to a comparison and contrast with parallel phenomena in other translation movements, as mentioned above (see also on Tóth's article further below).

The concern with the evolving humanist predilection for *conversio ad sententiam*, wedded with the ideology of *elegantia* (propagated by Valla [p. 175], but preached and practiced by many humanist cultural agents, patrons and translators), and attention to rhetorical standards in the '*traduzioni oratorie fedeli*' (as coined by the humanist Sabbadini [p. 178]), all go hand in hand with an interest in historiography and Pade shows (p. 178) that, as the 15th century unfolded, rendering the style of the Greek original involved not only clear Latin idiom and syntax, but also translation faithful to genre — i.e. imitating the style and phraseology of a Latin text within the same genre as the Greek original to be translated, e.g. Thucydides rendered in the Latin phraseology of Sallust (p. 179). As opposed to Thucydides, argues Pade, Plutarch has no such counterpart in classical Latin as a model and a field for the humanist translators to mine. Pade ingeniously traces passages from Classical Latin sources germane to or familiar to Plutarch which were used by translators such as Guarino as models for phraseology and

6 Hankins, James. 1987. 'A Manuscript of Plato's *Republic* in the Translation of Chrysoloras and Uberto Decembrio with Annotations by Guarino Veronese (*Reg. Lat*. 1431)'. In: Hankins, J., Monfasani, J.,. Frederick Purnell, J. ., (eds.), *Supplementum Festivum. Studies in Honor of Paul Oskar Kristeller*. Binghamton, NY: AMRCS, pp. 149-176, on p.151.

syntax in the service of an eloquent and "rhetorically faithful" Plutarchus Latinus. Pade closes her study (pp. 180ff) with an examination of terminological choice in the service of ideological translation, investing the translator not only with rhetorical and generic, but also cultural accountability.

Botley's learned study of the role of translation in reception, popularity, canon and survival, 'Greek Epistolography in Fifteenth-Century Italy' (pp. 187-205), reads like a sophisticated suspense narrative, rather than a catalogue, and we learn about the intellectual climate and consumer habits of epistolary literature in 15th century Italy: authors in the margin today were popular at the time (e.g. Marcus Brutus [p. 198]). Botley's corpus consists of epistolary literature by and large from pagan antiquity, surveyed under three categories: imaginary (pp. 187-191), genuine (pp. 191-194), and the largest, most popularly consumed, pseudonymous letters (pp. 194-202). The list of Latin translation of non-Christian Greek letters, chronologically arranged in the Appendix (pp. 204-205) is very useful.

The picture of the culture of the time is greatly enhanced by Botley's account of the relative reception of authors in the corpus. The works of Philostratus, Alciphron, Aelian and Aristaenetus came into their own during this period in sophisticated Latin renditions. It is very telling that a scientist such as Copernicus translated fictitious letters by Theophylact (p. 191): this astronomer's acquisition of Greek in Italy, tantalizingly mentioned in passing (p. 191 n. 20), piques the curiosity of the reader as to the diffusion of Greek among intellectuals, and in particular scientists, a century after the introduction of Greek into Italian academe; Petitmengin's account gives further instances of Latin translations in cultural contexts where they are rarely met today.

When turning one's attention to the discussion of 'genuine' letters, one does well to heed Botley's *caveat* at the outset of his survey (p. 187) that 'the majority of the letters considered in this article are fakes in one way or another — either forgeries or fictions'. Indeed even Libanius, whose diffusion in Latin is discussed in the section on 'genuine' letters, was used as a decoy for the mid-15th century manuscript hunter and renaissance man Francesco Zambeccari (p. 193): among his output of Libanius "translations", only a small proportion were genuine versions, the vast majority being his own inventions. Libanius was not appreciated as highly as other epistolary authors, which makes him all the more puzzling as the vehicle for letters posing as translations. At this juncture I would like to observe that in the Medieval Arabic tradition, one finds the related phenomena of works posing as translations, as well as leading translators — e.g. Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq — becoming magnets for attribution of translations of uncertain provenience.[7] The section on pseudonymous letters is rich in examples and vital bibliographical references, and I mention here only the case of the Platonic letters: having studied Bruni

[7] Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq is the translator designated, e.g., to a Hermetic text posing as a translation from Greek under the title 'Tale of Salāmān and Absāl', and has traditionally been printed with the epistles of Avicenna; scholars such as Henry Corbin and Joosse have treated many aspects of this text, including possible *Vorlagen*, but the general phenomenon of (Hermetic or other) Arabic texts posing as translations has not been fully explored. Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq is also the leading candidate to whom translations of uncertain attribution are referred; see, e.g., Ullmann, Manfred, 1971. 'War Ḥunain der Übersetzer Von Artemidors Traumbuch?'. *Die Welt des Islams* 13/3. 204-211.

in depth,[8] Botley clarifies the important point (p. 196) that although there was widespread contemporary debate on the authenticity of the corpus of Plato's Letters, a 'debate underway now for centuries', it began with Bruni, not Ficino. Likewise Botley emphasizes the much earlier doubting of the attribution of Phalaris' letters, doubt commonly attributed to Bentley, but in fact initially attested in expressions by Poliziano, and explained by Botley through Poliziano's *Sprachgefühl* and 'sure touch for style' (p. 202). Botley offers a battery of reasons for late exposures of forgeries in his corpus, involving an array of cultural attitudes, and I mention here only the one to do with language: 'new Latin dress … disguising the best clues of true origins … smoothing over the linguistic incongruities of the original Greek' (p. 204), concluding that not only did few scholars have Poliziano's mastery of the Greek language, but few scholars consulted the Greek.

Petitmengin, in 'La Publication de traductions latines d'oeuvres grecques dans la France du XIX^{e} siècle' (pp. 187-221), describes the cultural setting for the commission and promulgation of Latin texts in the 19th century, taking us through the obstacle course on the way to the reemergence of Latin translations as a desideratum and a standard pursued by the important publishers in France of the "Greek bookshelf" of the cultured classes. This is clearly also a study of the publishing house and the intellectual authority of its editors as cultural agents influencing a Greek-into-Latin translation movement. Counter-examples to this movement are also described, such as Littré and Darembourg's insistence on French translations of the Hippocratic corpus and other medical writers. At certain moments when French (or no translation at all) was preferred over Latin (infuriating the self-styled "nouveau Stephanus" Didot [p. 214]), cultural attitudes such as prestige, modernism, and national pride may have played a part alongside the desire to reach a wider readership. Petitmengin does not discuss the background to the Latin in Kuhn's edition of the *oeuvre* of another Greek medical author who is at the top of the list of prolific writers in Greek (or of collections such as Hercher's edition of the *Scriptores Erotici*, to name but one — admittedly at the margins of the canonical "Greek bookshelf"), but he does devote attention to endeavours outside France parallel to the case he is investigating, with regard to attitudes of certain influential publishers and philologists. Petitmengin gauges the state of affairs for the mid-19th century through the catalogues, correspondence, and other documentation from the Firmin-Didot Greek-and-Latin text series and those of Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* (barring the correspondence of Migne, which disappeared), bringing fascinating details about parallels and collaborations with editors in neighboring countries. The documentation from publishing houses and university presses which Petitmengin adduces for the period he discusses is an interesting case to be compared and contrasted with the correspondence of renaissance patrons, littérateurs and translators which were adduced in the articles of Pade and Botley. Other agents of culture which Petitmengin brings into the discussion, relevant to the onset of modernism, are journalists and political intellectuals, such as William Dickett (p. 209) and Bracke(-Desrousseaux) (p. 209 n. 10), whose interests led the former to bridge the gap between the glorious Greek past and the Greece of the

8 See e.g. Botley's chapter on Bruni (and reference to further scholarship) in Botley, Paul. 2004. *Latin Translation in the Renaissance. The Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti and Desiderius Erasmus*. Cambridge: CUP, pp. 5-62.

contemporary tourist, and the latter to the translate socialist texts. It would stand to reason that such a Greek-into-Latin translation movement could blossom most fragrantly in a climate where men of many callings were also philological activists. Yet, we are told (p. 215) that the French lycées of the 19th century gradually let the exercises of Latin verse and prose composition fall into disuse, and the excellence of individuals such as the prodigy Arthur Rimbaud in this art are exceptions rather than the rule. The article, and the volume, close with a quotation from a manifesto for translation into English, which Loeb put in the prefatory material of early volumes of his series. Petitmengin puts this manifesto into a 19th century French context, by identifying it as a response by Loeb to an urging by a *fin-de-siècle* French classicist, Salomon Reinach, for supercession of the Didot collection with a Classical Library in English.

Author and Audience

Neta Zagagi's article 'What Do Greek Words Do in Plautus?' (pp. 19-36) studies many aspects of Plautus' artistry, always firmly averring his deep and subtle command of the *Fabula Palliata*, his familiarity with the Greek tradition, and how he reconciles this with the limited access of his Roman public at large to Greek language and culture. It is a study of the relationship of the author's knowledge and that of his audience as much as one of the relationship between Greek and Latin dramatic traditions, motifs, and the use of Greek in Latin parlance — inasmuch as conventionalized, metrical stylizations of Greek or Latin conversation can reflect an approximation of Greek and Latin parlance. Zagagi's discussion of the significance of Greek words included by Plautus in his plays brings in factors of entertainment, realism vs. imagination, characterization, and above all else, the notion of polyphony, which she sees as much more than 'mere bilingualism' (p. 23). Within the wider phenomenon of polyphony, the more specific conventions and innovations of language transvestitism give voice to literary and cultural as well as purely linguistic preoccupations with characterization, tradition, society and the potential for deriving amusement. Polyphony is employed, *mutatis mutandis*, as far back as Timotheus or the *Book of Daniel*, and as recently as in contemporary writers. If we want to interpret Plautus' ναὶ γάρ — discussed by Zagagi (p. 27) not only through the translations by Nixon with the French *'bien sûr'* (*Bacch*. 1165) or '*c'est vrai*' (*Pseud*. 483f), we need look no further than an example in a germane context (one of the contexts which play an important role in Zagagi's discussion, as I will detail below) in Nabokov's account of a typical Paris streetwalker in chapter six of *Lolita* (staying within a *locus communis* of Plautine comedy in an entirely different genre): 'They all answer "dix-huit" — a trim twitter, a note of finality and wistful deceit…'. The narrator Humbert uses French partly to punctuate the voice of the streetwalker in her native tongue. Within Greek literature, more generally, description of stock characters hinges heavily on stereotypical "things said" and in habits of speech at large in Theophrastus' *Characters*; closer to Zagagi's question in genre but not necessarily in their aims and functions of using "*version originale*" are the Phrygians, Boeotians, Laconians and Persians given lines in Timotheus and Aristophanes in a stylized dialectal, or pidginized, form. In Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* a different strategy is used, but Zagagi's application of stereotypification is at work in many literary genres: if Plautine comedy is fundamentally distinct from Hellenistic New Comedy in that it 'operates in a uniquely

imaginative comic world' (p. 21), part of the corpus of Ancient Greek Novel, a genre which owes motival debts to Hellenistic New Comedy, operates in a world moving between many cultural poles, Greek, Egyptian, Ethiopian, Tyrian, and more.[9] If the Plautine Greek, with his stereotypical baggage, is labeled involving terms such as *pergraecari* or *congraecare* (see pp. 21-22, and esp. n. 22), the Heliodoran character is linguistically and ethnically labeled in terms such as ἑλληνίζειν, αἰθιοπίζειν et sim. for a range of cultural behaviours.[10] In both instances, involving fiction and literary representation of character and voice, this tagging is carried out in a sophisticated chiaroscuro of stereotype and unexpected reversal of audience or reader prejudices, in what Zagagi describes (p. 24) as an 'ironic space'. One fundamental difference is that Plautus does this with Greek words in the aim of polyphony, whereas an author such as Heliodorus achieves this through detail in the narratorial frames introducing direct or indirect speech (given by Heliodorus in elegant Greek rather than reproductions of "*version originale*") of characters engaged in what Colvin (n. 11 below) dubs 'linguistic converging' — detail such as pronounciation, level of proficiency, and mutual comprehension or gaps in communication, sometimes bearing a role in the unfolding of the plot. Returning to motifs of negative stereotyping, alongside the shared meretricial setting observed above, Zagagi's identification (symposium, madness, and intrigue, p. 27; the 'Greek-bazaar metaphor', p. 35) has some overlap with motifs enumerated in Colvin's *Dialect in Aristophanes*, as well as in exchanges between people of different ethnic and language groups in Heliodorus.[11]

Siebengartner, in 'Stoically Seeing and Being Seen in Cicero's *Aratea*' (pp. 97-115), examines an aspect of author-and-audience relations in an original and a translation. Siebengartner begins through the perspective of author variation (Hesiod vs. Aratus) within the Greek didactic verse tradition, taking account of grammatical category involved in address, and he touches on the nuances of 2nd person usage and tense (e.g. p. 98 n. 10 on prescriptive vs. temporal). In contrast with the *Works and Days*, the Greek of Aratus' *Phaenomena* invites the reader to identify with the addressee association easily made by the reader through the use of 'generalizing', 'un-specific' forms of direct address and a variety of optatives and future indicatives. Cicero's *Aratea* almost exclusively employs 2nd person futures, exhibiting a distinct lack of variety which Siebengartner correctly observes is 'beyond the merely statistical' (p. 98). Siebengartner takes us through synoptic analyses of passages to show Cicero's consistent translation of 3rd person, or 'unspecific' forms,[12] and of infinitives, into 2nd person Latin renditions,

---

9 Saïd, Suzanne. 1992. 'Les langues du roman grec'. In: Baslez, M.F., et al. (eds.), *Le monde du roman grec, actes du colloque international tenu à l'école normale supérieure* (1987). Paris: Éditions Rue d'Ulm, pp. 169-185.

10 See Casevitz, M. 1991. 'Hellenismos. Formation et function de verbes en –ίζω et leurs dérivés'. In: Saïd, S. (ed), *Ἑλληνισμός: Quelques jalons pour une histore de l'identité grecque*. Leiden - New York - Cophenhagen - Köln: Brill, pp. 9-16.

11 Colvin, Stephen. 1999. *Dialect in Aristophanes*. Oxford: OUP, 12 discusses commerce; Shalev, Donna. 2006. 'Heliodorus' Speakers: Multiculturalism and Literary Innovation in Conventions for Framing Speech' *BICS* 49. 165-191, at p. 185f brings instances of commerce and captivity following Colvin and earlier work (p. 185 n. 21).

12 Within the history of Latin, distinctions between personal, impersonal and apersonal as well as the nexus of temporal and personal orientation have been fruitful, e.g. in the discussion of

pointing out the metrically and prosodically emphatic positioning deliberately wrought by Cicero. Siebengartner's treatment is particularly instructive in the further steps he takes with the evidence for this deliberate 2nd person consistency — and, implicitly — the modal recalibration in Cicero's rendition of Aratus, which is not merely a rendition from Greek into Latin, but from a generalized addressee to an individualized one. Siebengartner invites the reader (101f) to consider a motivation less facile than the usual suspects such as 'added emphasis on audience', or 'more living, personal, emotional feel'; he argues convincingly for an appeal to the vision of the audience.

A fortiori, whether or not avoidance of Aratus' *variatio* is reflected by Cicero's consistent employment of verbs of vision to render vision as a more central theme, and 'the audience's viewing as a central action of the poem', tying in this theme with the title of Aratus' poem (*Phaenomena*), Siebengartner further details the difference of Cicero's version. In so doing, he argues, Cicero emphasizes the idea of agency of stars or constellations through active forms of verbs, as 'shining agents' (p. 109) with a much wider variety of verbs, in less economical, more lengthy detail. Siebengartner shows how knowledge of a translator's routine technique and departure from such routines may expose his literary priorities — e.g. in *Aratea* 320-331 where (a) the number of lines in Latin does not correspond with the Greek, and (b) metrtical *sedes* do not correspond in the original and the translation.

Tóth's article 'Rufinus's Latin Version of the *Historia Monachorum in Aegypto*' (pp. 117-129) hinges on ideology in the assessment of translation versions, and brings in theological questions which are less fully addressed in the other contributions, many of which involve non-Christian authors. Tóth compares content and message in versions (which is touched on in final sections of the contributions of Siebengartner and Pade as well, when they look at reemphasis of philosophical content as part of the act of translation). From the point of view of translation movements, this article brings a text which is comparable in the patterns of its tradition, diffusion and afterlife to texts such as the *Alexander Romance*, as is immediately recognized by the range of languages into which the text has been translated (detailed at the beginning of Tóth's article). Tóth's observations on the different degrees of translation are important, tie in with Pade's detailed presentation of Chrysoloras' tripartite taxonomy (see above), and echo remarks in passing in some of the other contributions to this volume. The spectra between translation and paraphrase are many, and ought to be taken into consideration in any discussion of translation, well beyond the *ad verbum – ad sensum* dichotomy. One such spectrum, applied in intertextual analyses — not only of literary texts — involves *imitatio*, *aemulatio* and *furtum*; another, adduced in the analysis of artistic style, includes copies, citations, adaptations, eclecticism, and assimilation; yet another spectrum, often

---

the *-to* imperative in Rosén, Hannah. 1999. *Latine loqui. Trends and Directions in the Crystallization of Classical Latin*. München: Fink, pp. 114-119. Likewise a functional and pragmatic analysis — with attention to generic conventions — of the array of linguistic means of expressing directive speech acts in Latin, is highly relevant to the means used by Cicero, namely Risselada, Rodie. 1993. *Imperatives and Other Directive Expressions in Latin: A Study in the Pragmatics of a Dead Language*. Amsterdam: Gieben.

raised in the context of logical works in medieval Arabic translations,[13] spans the varieties between translation and exegesis.

Patterns and Phraseology

Pade, at the end of her article on humanist translations of Plutarch's *Lives*, synoptically analyzes syntactic and phraseological features,[14] in addition to the discussion of techniques of individual translators; at the centre of her paper lie the humanists' ideals of style, *eloquentia* and rhetorical fidelity as part of a broader cultural context, both in their Latin translations and in their original Latin works. These are discussed in this review under that rubric.

The article 'Greek in Latin, Greek into Latin — Reflections on the Passage of Patterns' by Hannah Rosén (pp. 1-18) strongly focuses on 'a more complex interaction of Greek and Latin' — to borrow a notion formulated by Copenhaver,[15] who writes on much later periods of the special relationship between these two languages and the cultures they carry in tow. Although she begins with terminology, Rosén's discussion rapidly hones in on the study of patterns which are at the crossroads of phraseology, syntax, and stylistics. The method used to identify whether such patterns are true or pseudo-Grecisms is one which relies on linguistic constraints, and on accounts of diachronic, generic, pragmatic and other dimensions within each of the two languages. I begin with a "spoiler", namely a sobering assessment which nips in the bud the trigger-happy Grecism-hunters: 'no new language categories came into being by the impact of Greek, nor did Greek generate any brand-new syntactic pattern in Latin' (p. 13). It is not the history of a construction or its rate which is the crucial factor in identifying it as a true Grecism, but rather its autonomy and the relative absence or presence of constraints in the source and target languages. We are consistently shown how these and other high-focus criteria are applied in order to diagnose with a sharp resolution whether or not a pattern in translated Latin is indeed a full-fledged, systematic (vs. pseudo-, sporadic, or "phantom") Grecism. A Greek collocation considered the source of a Latin grammaticalized entity (φρενί as a model for *-mente*) is a classic example where one cannot rule out inner Latin developments (in this case semantic) which are parallel to inner Greek analogues. This well-known but arguably only apparent Grecism is only one example. Rosén brings many patterns which may reflect Greek phraseology that turn out to be genre-specific or even reflect individual style in an author; they may reflect a language-internal manipulation of arrangement in order to structure the message or discourse; they may reflect language-internal developments or constraints. All of these

13 See Gutas, Dimitri. 1993. 'Aspects of Literary Form and Genre in Arabic Logical Works'. In: Burnett, C. (ed.), *Glosses and Commentaries on Aristotelian Logical Texts*, London: Warburg, pp. 29-75, esp. 32-42 (*tafsīr*, *šarḥ*, *muḫtaṣsar*, *ǧawāmi' talḫīṣ*). See also the article '*tardjama*' by Gutas in the *Encyclopedia of Islam*[2].

14 For a *locus classicus* of such synoptic comparisons of phraseological technique in parallel Latin translations, see Blatt, Franz. 1938. 'Remarques sur l'histoire des traductions latines'. *Classica et Mediaevalia* 1/2. 217-242.

15 Copenhaver, Brian. 1987. 'Translation, Terminology and Style in Philosophical Discourse' in: Schmitt, C.B., Skinner, Qu., et al., *Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*. Cambridge: CUP, pp. 77-110, on p. 109.

and other factors, sometimes in combination, needed to be taken into account when making the diagnosis. Rosén's treatment of syntactic patterns is innovative, both because it takes into consideration syntactic patterns beyond case usage (pattern I, accusative prolepse — for a long time serving as the flagship for Grecisms; pattern II, AcI; pattern III, epitaxis,[16] and pattern IV, split sentences) and their sub-varieties (e.g. for epitaxis and split sentences: with no support, with anaphora, or with pronominal or proverb support), and because it takes a holistic and comparative view of a set of patterns on the syntactic level when discussing the degrees of Grecism, narrowing down the true members of this exclusive set through rigorous elimination of merely apparent cases or '*figurae Graecae* [which] do not generate new syntactic habits or patterns'. Accusative prolepse (p. 5) is shown to be an internally generated native Latin pattern and used early on for message structuring. AcI was also a topicalization device which evolved into an all-encompassing subordination tool (p. 6, and see reference to a more detailed description of this transition in Rosén's *Latine loqui* [pp. 154-157]); the situation of this pattern is more complex, and Rosén's holistic approach helps to pinpoint in which corpora AcI is forfeited in Latin for conjunctional clauses partly under Greek influence (e.g. *Vitae Patrum*, NT Latinity, Ammianus Marcellinus), or for ØcI as outright Grecisms. This special case, and split sentences under certain constraints, are the rare cases where Rosén admits candidates for genuine Grecism. But text-type is a very strong criterion, and Cicero offers not a single instance of ὅτι which is not rendered as AcI: the factor of internal evolution is again applied, and well worth heeding, as a lesson for all Grecism hunters: '…in the age of Cicero AcI was still too strong a construction for a takeover… no traces of Greek influence are detectable in Republican Latin' (p. 7). Epitaxis was sometimes considered Greek-inspired perhaps because it is more saliently identifiable in its Greek form with mostly pronominal support, but in fact the strict constraints of Greek epitaxis rule out a Greek origin for the 'early, widespread and highly productive' (p. 8) Latin syntactic pattern which typically comes almost exclusively with no support.[17] The syntactic sub-varieties (no support, anaphoric, with pronoun or proverb) are constraints which, when applied to epitaxis and to split sentences, blur the existence of a Latin pattern onto which a 'vigorous Greek structure' nested. This contrast of constraints in Greek vis-à-vis Latin, applied by Rosén here, is innovative in studies of Grecism, and rare in studies of translation technique and of Latin syntax.[18]

---

16 See also her 2008 paper 'Latin Epitaxis in Historical and Typological View' in: Calboli, Gualtiero (ed.), *Papers on Grammar*, X, Rome: Herder, pp. 205-242.

17 The so-called counterexamples in Latin, namely a handful of examples in Early Latin Comedy in the pronominal subtype 'occur only in one specific shape which may have taken root under Greek influence' (see p.10 for details) only strengthen the complex nature of Greek-Latin relations; Rosén correctly gives them as an example of a robust Greek structure finding a hospitable welcome in an existing Latin breeding ground. They are first adopted by Cicero for style (and, according to Powell, related to clausulae — see p. 10 n. 41 for details), and then to compensate grammatical lacunae where in Greek there is no epitaxis.

18 I am reminded of the typological taxonomy of preferred response strategies set out by H. Thesleff, 1960, *Yes and No in Plautus and Terence*, Helsinki, Societas Scientiarum Fennica: partial or complete anaphora (typical of Latin), substitution (typical of Romance, e.g. *si*), and addition (typical of Attic Greek).

Rosén's examination of the degree and quality of Greek influence on a series of patterns in the Latin language firmly argues that translated Latin is generally not 'translationese' and does not clash with the Latin norm; the syntax is not fertile with Grecisms, although it may seem so to the casual onlooker. Rosén shows how Latin copes with typological incongruities between a source and a target language, and in particular the strategies for coping with lacunae in Latin syntax, whether by relocation within the same category or set (e.g. Greek aspect > Latin tense) or, in lexical incongruity (e.g. Greek article > Latin lexical "palliatives" [à la Poncelet] such as *omnis*, *res*, etc.) — providing the rich literature on these strategies. Rosén offers (pp. 14-18) a "mini-grammar" of these coping strategies and relocations, with a particularly rich repertoire from analytically differing levels and sets — be they morphology, lexicon, syntax, sentence patterns, or particles. The integrated picture which emerges is the result of painstaking work, and re-examination of well-worn questions as well as highly innovative ground-breaking work: both kinds of work are needed in order to identify mechanisms to accommodate typological incongruities, as well as to map out the role of different tools in the languages (and sometimes tools existing in both languages but reserved for different tasks in either of the two). Some of the phenomena she charts were not yet published while this volume was in press, and I mention here the Latin use of forms of *coepisse* as an auxiliary to accommodate Greek aspectual nuance, on which new studies have been published subsequently.[19] This *Übersetzungsgrammatik*, which takes into account a range of Latin authors and applies generally, has analogues — for a single "translation complex" — in the study of medieval Arabic translation movements,[20] and in Latin has come closest perhaps in Poncelet's work on a selection of phenomena in Cicero pertaining to philosophical writing. It is, to my knowledge, unprecedented for Greek into Latin on a holistic scale and with a rigorously linguistic method.

Translators, and Their Policies, Technique and Identity

Almost all of the articles discuss to some extent the role of translator(s), at times through the prism of the cultural and intellectual milieu and the ideology, at times through the persona and influence, and at others through close attention to individual techniques and identities. In the Latin tradition alone, some giants of note are Terentius, Cicero, Jerome, Boethius, William of Moerbeke, Bruni, and Ficino. The work of Calchidius, and of Aristippus, Uberto Decembrio and a series of other humanist translators whose quality

19 In one article, Rosén brings evidence from Latin-to-Celtic translations: Rosén, Hannah. 2012. 'The Late Latin *coepi* + Infinitive Construction: Evidence from Translated Texts'. *Classica et Medievalia* 63. 189-215. In another article, she compares aspectual expression in Later Greek and in Latin, and examines a Latin *Vorlage* for later Greek texts: Rosén, Hannah, 2013. 'Two Phasal Verbs: Latin *coepi* and Greek *ebalon*/*ebala*, *ballo*/ *bazo*/*baro*'. *IF* 117. 119-172.

20 E.g. for the technique used by Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq and company in the complex of translations of Galen and Hippocrates' works, see Ruland, H.-J., 1978. *Die arabische Übersetzung der Schrift des Alexander von Aphrodisias über die Sinneswahrnehmung* [NAWG, philol.-hist. Klasse, 1978, IV.5], Göttingen. On the concept of translation complexes see Gutas, 1998 (n. 3 above), pp. 143-146.

has been the focus of debate by contemporaries and modern scholars alike, as well as the critical role of Manuel Chrysoloras (and earlier Greeks such as Atumanus) who cooperated in translations into Latin, also bring important angles on the bigger picture. The nexus of personality and leadership qualities,[21] drive for innovation, pursuit of an independent voice and pioneering attempts,[22] as well as tireless revision and striving for perspicuity, eloquence and fine form in the target language converge into a node of factors which plays itself out in the tension between *ad verbum* and *ad sensum* translations, not only among the translators into Latin: parallels may be found in the motivations of Saʿadiya Gaon, Maimonides[23] and other translators from Hebrew to (Judaeo-)Arabic, of Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq and his school, and in the other translation movements of antiquity. Three articles in the volume under review collect or examine testimonia which can help to better understand such motivations in the cases of Cicero's philosophical terminology, Boethius' *exempla logica*, and Moerbeke's revision policies of a work from the branch of natural philosophy.

John Glucker's article 'Cicero's Remarks on Translating Philosophical Terms – Some General Problems' (pp. 37-96) admits (p. 39) it is a 'first step in the direction of discussing the general nature of Greek-into-Latin remarks' (hence GLR) made by Cicero in the theoretical writings (philosophical and rhetorical) with more than 200 remarks. These form part of a more general discussion on the translation of abstract concepts, and in this sense differ from a previous minimalist collection referred to by Glucker (p. 37, n. 1: Christian Nicolas *Sic enim appello*). In an introductory background of previous treatments, Glucker's revival of the works of Clavel and Rose was for this reader a highly welcome exposure to unfamiliar but important work on this question.[24]

Glucker has definitively and fully combed through this corpus (philosophical and rhetorical works of Cicero) to produce a carefully lemmatized and classified inventory of GLRs, as well as a discussion of terminological innovation of Cicero and of methods and motivations of translations of Aristotle. Generally, too few classicists and linguists rely on the theoretical and exegetical sources of antiquity, not to mention self-reflective remarks, which are heuristically very challenging to collect. This collection by Glucker is an important addition not only for examining the 'point of view of Cicero's own practice, achievements, difficulties and doubts' as Glucker states, but with the conspectus (= Appendix A, pp. 58-91) and the index verborum of Greek and Latin terms (= Appendix B, pp. 91-96) it also is an important addition to a *Bekentnissliteratur* (so to

---

21 Prestige and authority are mentioned in self-reflective remarks in prefatory texts by translators from a range of translation movements: e.g. Ter. *Eun*. prol. 6; Cic. *De or*. 155; and, from another arena, Saʿadiya Gaon, introductions to the *Egron* lines 50-68 Allony, to the *Sefer ha-Galui* p.2 line 14 ff. tr. Harkavy.

22 A case in point is Chrysoloras, considered a pioneer and accorded *prōtos heuretēs* status due to his important achievements as a promoter of the introduction of Greek in Italy. Earlier activity is described in Wilson, N.G.. 1992. *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, London: Duckworth, ch. 2 (esp. p. 9).

23 See e.g. Baneth, D.H. 1952. 'Maimonides Translating His Own Writings As Compared to His Translators'. *Tarbiz* 23. 170-191 [Hebrew]; Twersky, I.. 1980. *Introduction to the Code of Maimonides (Mishneh Torah)*. New Haven: Yale, chapter 5 'language and style'.

24 Clavel, Victor-Émile, 1868. *De M.T. Cicerone Graecorum Interprete*, Paris. Rose, H.J., 1921. 'The Greek of Cicero', *JHS* 41. 91-116.

speak) which would be very rewarding in other corpora: for Plato's *oeuvre* (*mutatis mutandis*) one may loosely compare the discussion by Dalfen,[25] which is without a conspectus, is far from exhaustive, and focuses on a very different aspect of a philosophical author who is not a translator. In Dalfen's work, self-reflective remarks put into the mouths of Plato's characters corroborate the vital role of the larger dramatic and literary as well as philosophical context which, in Cicero's theoretical works, also involve literary layers which need to be taken into account.[26] In fact, along with a desideratum for a collection of Stoic terminology implicitly voiced by Glucker (p. 48), a desideratum I greedily add would be collections of self-reflective remarks (if they are to be found) in the epistolary and other sectors of the Ciceronian *oeuvre* as well,[27] including GLRs in those sectors, in which Greek also makes its appearance, if not for abstract terminology, still in a 'complicated relationship' with Latin, which is the underlying theme of the other articles in this volume. Turning our focus back to Glucker's corpus of theoretical works and the collection of *Übersetzungsbekentnisse* I would like to draw a parallel for the phenomenon which I agree is 'far from being common among theoretical works, [found] mainly in literature where the subject of the work is fairly new to the language' (p. 39) which Glucker compares (n. 9) to Modern Hebrew: namely the self-reflective remarks of the 10th century arch-translator (of a status and stature comparable to Cicero's for Latin – *mutatis mutandis*), Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq, in his Epistle on the translation of Galen's works.[28] Like the assessments of Glucker on the *in vivo* incremental nature of Cicero's GLRs (culminating on p. 41), those of Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq, and, I reckon, of Maimonides and subsequent medieval Hebrew translators, will prove to be analogously 'not entirely unmethodical', and 'more desultory and far less consistent...'. They are all testimonia from the workshops of the translators: their value is as great to students of translation technique and cultural transfer as they are to students and scholars of terminology and of the formation of conceptual worlds of the physicians-cum/vel-philosophers per se.

---

25 Dalfen, Joachim, 1989: 'Platonische Intermezzi – Diskurse über Kommunikation', *Grazer Beiträge* 16.71-123.

26 For literary "voice" and perspective, et sim., see e.g. Glucker's observation (p. 48) of Cicero speaking in his own persona.

27 I fully concur with Glucker's approach here, beginning with closed corpora; even Glucker admits (p. 58) to 'different translations of the same word in the two contexts [of philosophical and rhetorical writings]', and this difference may be compared with vagaries and variants of terminological translation in other parallel contexts elsewhere in translated corpora, e.g. in the medieval Arabic and Persian translations of the Aristotelian Organon, as shown by S. Afnan, 1957, 'Some Arabic and Persian Terms of Philosophy', *Oriens*, 10/1. 71-76, or, e.g. in the Peripatetic vs. other terminological traditions in Shalev, Donna. 2008, 'Speech Act Theory and the Ancient Division of λόγος'. In: Calboli, Gualtiero (ed.), *Papers on Grammar*, X, Roma: Herder, 243-275, following the lead of Endress, Gerhard, 1973. *Zwanzig Abschnitte aus der 'institutio theologica' in arabischer Übersetzung/Proclus Arabus*, Beirut, Steiner. See now also D'Ancona, Cristina, 2011. 'Platonic and Neoplatonic Terminology for Being in Arabic Translation', *Studia Graeco-Arabica* 1, 23-45.

28 Gottholf Bergsträsser, 1925. *Ḥunain ibn Isḥāq. Über die syrischen und arabischen Galen-Überseztungen*. [Abhandlungen für die Kunde der Morgenlande XVII.2.] Leipzig, with introduction, German translation and notes.

D. Nikitas' important contribution, '*Exemplum logicum Boethii*: Reception and Renewal' (pp. 131-144), is a sophisticated, innovative and thorough treatment of the use of *exempla* by Boethius, another giant in the pantheon of translators. It is central to the volume in that for the hard core of the *Organon* (not including the *Rhet*. and *Po*.), Boethius' translations 'make him the most important "founding father" of the Latin Aristotle' (p. 136, n. 37). We learn not only about Boethius's translation policies, but also about the complex relation between his activity as a translator and his activity as a writer of original exegetical and other works. This relation between the activity of an intellectual figure as a translator and as an original writer is a question which has bearing on many of the personae under investigation not only in the Greek-into-Latin dossier, but in other cases as well; not only those who are philosophers, but, for example, the physican Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq, whose terminological usage and phraseological style as a prolific medical writer would repay further research, especially in comparison with his method and influence as a translator of Galen from Greek.

If Glucker gleans notions and concepts of Cicero's policies from his Greek-Latin remarks, Nikitas studies Boethius' *modus cogitandi et operandi* from his choice, application and translation of *exempla logica*. Although Nikitas mentions cataloguing them, in his contribution to this volume he does not include such a catalogue — yet his extremely stimulating report frames his findings within a lucid, judicious and extremely instructive background of the phenomenon of examples in ancient technical treatises, within the tradition on which Boethius drew: After defining and illustrating for us the *exemplum logicum*, Nikitas presents Boethius' employment as a 'conscious methodological tactic' (p. 132), and cites self-reflective remarks by Boethius on the function and purpose of *exempla*. Nikitas traces this back stepwise, beginning with contemporary comments all the way to Aristotle (see n. 14, rich in references to the definitive studies of Minio-Paluello — who always gives an angle on translation — and of others. On pp. 133-135 Nikitas takes us back in time all the way to Aristotle. Aside from Düring's 1968 study on examples in Ari. *Top*., we are reminded (p. 133) of the lack of exhaustive and systematic study of *exempla logica* in Aristotle. I join my own voice to a chorus of students of ancient technical writing who mark this as a critical desideratum and yearn for its fulfillment. A cross-section of *exempla* was studied by D.M. Schenkeveld (along with *exempla grammatica*, *exegetica* and *progymnastica* and examples from a variety of other technical sources), in order to learn about conceptions and terms of locutional meaning and verbal mood in the Stoic and Peripatetic traditions. The medieval Arabic translation of Ari. *Rhet*. was also the object of a study in which Malcom Lyons collected the poetical quotations. Yet these are rare instances, and exhaustive corpus studies which catalogue and analyze the rationale of examples and other illustrative materials, and trace their fate in translation, are impatiently awaited.[29]

---

[29] Düring, Ingemar. 1968. 'Aristotle's Use of Examples in the Topics'. In: Owen, G.E.L. (ed.), *Aristotle on Dialectic: The Topics. Proceedings of the Third Symposium Aristotelicum*. Oxford: OUP, pp. 202-232. Schenkeveld, Dirk M. 1984. 'Stoic and Peripatetic Kinds of Speech Act and the Distinction of Grammatical Moods'. *Mnemosyne* n.s. 37/3-4. 291-353. Lyons, Malcom C., 2002. 'Poetic Quotations in the Arabic Version of Aristotle's *Rhetoric'*. *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 12/2. 197-216.

Nikitas modestly professes that the evolution of the *exemplum* with its many aspects and problems requires separate study, all the while offering us a *parergon* (pp. 134-135) within his own article, in the form of an integrative outline of three phases of this long process, pinpointing the Roman involvement in this development — based on his learned reading and on the results of mining Aristotle and a host of authors for their views on the concept, taxonomy, manner, various uses, and related concepts. Nikitas adduces passages, especially from Ari. *Rhet*. (but also *Top*., *Post. An*., and *Probl*.) on the παράδειγμα, its nature, function, relation to syllogism and enthymeme, and its taxonomy, including 'an ingenious distinction between examples to be used as aids for proof in a dialectical context and as evidence in a rhetorical context' (p. 134). Of huge value are Nikitas' identifications of Aristotelian epigones in this context, to round out phase 1 (Anaxim., Dion.Hal., and Alex. Aphrod.; with specific loci quoted in nn. 25-28). Phase 2, already loosened from Aristotelian apron strings, is represented by the theoreticians of rhetoric and grammar Trypho, Herodian, and Plb., with concrete definitions of the παράδειγμα. Nikitas places the central Roman writers firmly in this group (Cic., Quint., Rhet. Herenn.). Boethius caps phase 3 at its culmination.

Nikitas ultimately (esp. pp. 138ff) sets out to examine whether the many *exempla* in Boethius' logical and dialectical writings are entirely his own creations, or — to use an Aristotelian phrase which Nikitas introduces (p. 134) — τὸ αὐτὸν εὑρεῖν. For the present volume, it is of core relevance that Nikitas first considers *exempla* in Boethius' corpus of translations of Aristotle: I agree fully with Nikitas that although the *exempla logica* in Boethius' translations are 'not his own' '[they] are of great interest from the point of view of translation' (p. 136). The complexities considered (p. 136, n. 38) are fascinating. Nikitas' general observation on the tension between faithful translation and language, *realia*, and cultural transfer involved in 4th century BC Athenian Aristotle to 6th century AD Latin of Boethius,[30] has far-reaching applications, which may be seen in translations of Aristotle into medieval Arabic in translations of Christians such as Yaḥyā b. ʿAdī or Isḥāq b. Ḥunayn, and into medieval and renaissance Latin.[31] Nikitas describes a scalar spectrum of treatment of *exempla* from those 'not always literally translated' (p.136), through Romanized ones, to recourse to a pool of Aristotelian examples implanted into Boethius' original logical and dialectical treatises (p. 137). Nikitas humbly airs his desideratum (p. 137 n. 45) for a 'whole repertory of recurring and regular Aristotelian examples' and commentators of Boethius' period. I would not shy away from spelling out what I believe Nikitas implies, that there is a 'canon' of conventionalized examples,

30 'Generally speaking, within the usually faithful translation of Aristotelian works, concepts, events, persons and actions from Athens and Greece of the fourth century BC were transferred into the Latin language and Latin texts of the sixth century AD' (p. 136).

31 In an investigation of one example in Ari.*Rhet*. translated into Latin by William of Moerbeke in the 13th century, I found that the example was translated as faithfully as the surrounding text, whereas in the 10th century Arabic of Isḥāq b. Ḥunayn the example was less faithfully translated than the surrounding Aristotelian text; exegetical renditions of the same passage — not only by Averroes in Arabic, but even by the anonymous Greek exegete — were much less faithfully adapted, through religious transfer by references to Jesus, or through change of format, respectively. See Shalev, Donna. Forthcoming. 'Socrates Playing with Meletus: the Pedigree, Birth, and Afterlife of a Chreia'. *Journal of Latin Linguistics*, 14/1.

from which items are selected and applied. Nikitas gives some examples common to Greek and Latin commentators — an intricate case of the Greek-into-Latin transfer. Next on this scale, Nikitas adduces examples produced by Boethius himself, which are quintessentially Aristotelian in content. Then there are those *exempla* in Boethius with no parallel (direct or indirect) in Aristotle, derived from ideas widespread among Greek Aristotelians in late antiquity; in his commentary *In Top. Cic*., Boethius' *exempla* have Ciceronian orientation, and others with Roman influences, not always 'passively sticking to sources' (p. 139) — either Aristotelian or Ciceronian. Scholars of translation, as well as of other aspects of the relationship between Greek and Latin over the ages, will be greatly rewarded by reading this study in detail. those interested in the working of examples, or of other implanted *Bauformen* into sympotic, encyclopedic, or other compilatory texts, will learn much from the final part of Nikitas' article, which surveys and interprets the sources, applications, topicalities and artistry in Boethius' inlaying of his original work with original examples having a Greek background (pp. 139-140) and Roman content (pp. 141-143). *Couleur locale* is an important part of naturalization not just by literal translators, but by those with an agenda, by Roman patriots, Atticists, Christianizers, pagans, Islamic Neoplatonists and other adaptors and original writers.[32]

De Leemans' article, 'Remarks on the Text Tradition of the *De longitudine et brevitate vitae*, tr. Guillelmi' (pp. 145-169), places the discussion of another pivotal translator, William of Moerbeke, within the setting of another sector of the Aristotelian *oeuvre*, namely the *Parva Naturalia* corpus. On a rich bed of background on the tradition of the manuscripts, the corpus, and its place in the *Aristoteles Latinus*, De Leemans analyses Moerbeke's translation technique in the *De longitudine et brevitate vitae* in comparison and in contrast with an earlier Latin version made by James of Venice, to elucidate contemporary interpretation of *terminus technici* and of the phenomenon of revision. The elusive nature of Aristotle's natural philosophy, and its parallel track through Greek-into-Latin and via the Arabic tradition, as well as the complexities created by renaming of treatises such as the *De long*., offer a set of complications which may arguably outdo those of the tradition of the *Organon* in some sense. De Leemans ably exposes and clarifies these complexities, while usefully navigating the uninitiated through the confusions of accessibility (p. 147, n. 11). De Leemans' study addresses the phenomenon of revision in general as well as examining the *translatio nova* of the *De long*. and tackling the question of whether or not Moerbeke indeed revised James' *translatio vetus* (pp. 163-169). 'Insofar as … revisions have already been studied, it appears that Moerbeke did not write his revision down in an

32 A study such as wished for by Nikitas would include many parallels to what he has found in Boethius' translations and original writings; the discussions he has raised may be enriched even by a random encounter with examples in their setting, such as I have for example encountered in Ari. *Rhet*. (see previous note), and from a very broad range of texts, with special reference to *couleur locale*, e.g. in a 9th century grammarian from Jerusalem, Michael Synkellos, who introduces not only Biblical examples, but specifically topical ones clearly not part of the conventionalized pool: χρὴ δὲ γινώσκειν ὅτι διαφέρει τὸ ἐρωτηματικὸν τοῦ πευστικοῦ· τὸ μὲν γὰρ πευστικὸν πλείονος δεῖται λόγου οἷον "'"ποῦ ὁ Πέτρος; ἐν Ῥώμῃ,", "πόθεν ἐξῆλθεν; ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ". Donnet, Daniel. 1982. *Le traité de la construction de la phrase de Michel le Syncelle de Jérusalem*. Brussels: Institut historique Belge de Rome, §44.

entirely new ms. but rather inserted his corrections into a ms. of the *vetus*' (p. 148). In his quest to determine Moerbeke's role in the composition of the *translatio nova*, whether revising or translating anew (p. 152), De Leemans adduces (§4) five examples with rarer variants to usual translations, examples which teach us more about Moerbeke's technique. The translation issue to which De Leemans devotes most attention is transliteration — an issue which is discussed also e.g. by Zagagi and Glucker in this volume — an issue which also emerges in all of the translation movements, and whose general application De Leemans himself notes (p. 157). De Leemans suggests at least five reasons for recourse to transliteration as a choice or strategy by Moerbeke in the *De long*., two of which are particularly interesting: (1) aiming to protect the specific zoological character of technical terms (e.g. *entoma* rather than James' *incisa*); and, perhaps most interesting in the light of a more general concern for the quality of translation vis-à-vis other relations between original and receptor text (spelled out above in remarks on Tóth's article in this volume), (2) the observation that transliteration, along with close attention to rendition of particles and syntactic features, characterizes Moerbeke's 'wish to preserve one-to-one correspondence while translating rather than opting for description'. Following a thorough comparison of the techniques of Moerbeke and James, De Leemans begins his concluding remarks (p. 168) with what I am tempted to call the "transliteration technique" of Moerbeke: 'Moerbeke's habit of transliterating technical terms gives birth to a fascinating interpretative tradition.' Indeed, the question of elective — or even strategic — transliteration is a fascinating question, and belongs within the context of a long and persistent tradition of transliteration not only in Greek-into-Latin, but in many translation movements,[33] stemming sometimes from aporia, sometimes by choice, and sometimes by cultural habit; this is one of the many questions fruitfully analyzed and discussed in this volume time and again, questions which bear general applications for translation.

Common concerns reemerge in the individual articles of this volume, and successfully form an integrated web, without forfeiting the special concerns in each, which is its own entity: the cohesion of the volume's parts is not achieved by a superficial constraint symptomatic of collected volumes, where in extreme cases the editors force uniformity through a procrustean, inexorably predictable schematic template of length, rubrics, order of subtopics and sundry requirements, to the point that the contributions resemble soporific bureaucratic questionnaires posing as academic prose. Rather, the contributions in this volume fit together through a shared commitment to a penetrating and dynamic investigation of the mechanisms, subtleties, and complexities of the interrelationship between Greek and Latin from antiquity to the cusp of the modernism. Without exception, all of the contributions, each so individual,

33 In the Greek/Syriac-into-Arabic movement, examples abound: why, for example, does one type of text (an anecdote in *adab*, but also a passage from the *Organon*) translate κλέψυδρα with what is termed a *Synonymenhäufung* and another (a technical passage from Ari. *Phys*.) opt for transliteration? Discussions on transliterations in Greek-into-Arabic may be found, e.g. in Endress, 1973 (n. 27 above), or, e.g. for the Arabic-into-Latin tradition, in Jacquart, Danielle. 2001. 'Note sur les *Synonyma Rasis*'. In: Hamesse, J., Jacquart, D. (eds), *Lexiques bilingues dans les domaines philosophique et scientifique (Moyen-Âge – Renaissance)*. Turnhout: Brepols, pp. 113-121.

address not merely ‘side-by-side’ equivalences, but try to bring out imbalances, complementary distributions, processes, contexts, non-binary complications, translations as points on varying spectra, and narratives or analyses of rarely explored, or familiar but rarely understood, evolving relationships between Greek and Latin.

Hebrew University of Jerusalem