UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

JUNE 1 19 42

I hereby recommend that the thesis prepared under my supervision by CARL R. TRAHMAN

entitled THE LATIN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN THE GREEK WORLD

be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Rodney P. Robinson

Herbert Butterfield

Edward F. Hoffman

Form 668—G. S. and Ed.—1M—7-37

THE LATIN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN THE GREEK WORLD

A dissertation submitted to the

Graduate School

of the University of Cincinnati

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1942

by

Carl R. Trahman

A. B. Union College 1938

CONTENTS

PREFACE

Although a vast literature has accumulated on Rome's absorption of Greek culture, a tremendously important chapter in the history of the transmission of Greek civilization to modern Europe, the interesting, if less momentous, counterpart of this process--the effect that Roman culture had upon Greek-speaking peoples has received relatively little attention. Briefly, it is the purpose of this dissertation to investigate one phase of this influence: the extent to which Greek-speaking peoples, from their first contact with Rome to the time of Justinian, were acquainted with the Latin language and literature. Even this aspect is too broad to receive thorough treatment in a doctoral dissertation and definite limitations must be imposed. Before outlining the scope of this study, however, I propose first to review briefly the work that has been done in this field heretofore. This summary is concerned with books and articles--there have been none in English--which deal in detail and more or less directly with the subject; bibliographical details of these and other works that I have consulted with profit are listed in the bibliography.

The first two studies, of which I know, to treat of the use of Latin in the Greek-speaking provinces of the

Roman Empire, were Karl Friedrich Walch's "De lingua latina, lingua legitima" published in 1785 and Christian Heyne's "De usu sermonis Romani in administrandis provinciis a Romanis probato". Both of these essays, as their titles imply, investigate the maintenance of Latin as the official language throughout the Roman dominion, but neither is a thorough treatment of the subject; Heyne's article is barely twelve pages long. These two early works were followed in 1820 by Heinrich Dirksen's study "Uber den öffentlichen Gebrauch fremder Sprachen bei den Römern", also an inquiry into the legal status of languages in the Roman world, in which there is collected much evidence, mainly from the legal codes, on the use of Greek and Latin in official business and on the employment of official interpreters.

Although the studies of Walch, Heyne, and Dirksen contain considerable information about the Greeks' knowledge of Latin, it is in the nature of obiter dicta. The first work which dealt directly with foreign language study in antiquity was Friedrich Cramer's De Studiis quae veteres ad aliarum gentium contulerint linguas. This is of historical importance only, since it is so superficial as to be almost worthless. Cramer traced his theme throughout all antiquity, disposing of the foreign language studies of Persians, Greeks, Scythians, Carthaginians, Jews, Romans etc. in the space of

thirty-four pages!

Between 1835 and 1852 Karl Friedrich Weber wrote a series of four articles on Greek translations of Latin writings entitled De latine scriptis quae Graeci veteres in linguam suam transtulerunt. The first of these contains a brief account of Greek experience with Latin and then proceeds to examine bona fide translations as well as pasaages in Greek authors which might stem from Latin sources. The subsequent studies carry on the comparison of parallel passages in Greek and Latin literature down to the Renaissance.

The inadequacies of the monographs of Walch, Heyne, Dirksen, and Cramer prompted J. J. Lagus to write his Studia Latina Provincialium, a dissertation published in 1849 at Helsingfors. The parts of this study which deal with Greek-speaking peoples, pages 5-11 (Magna Graecia and Sicily) and 52-74 (the Greek East), contain many references to the ancient sources which had not been adduced before, but the author is more concerned with assembling a mass of evidence than in interpreting it. He himself realized that such a procedure did not make for interesting reading, since he says: "Studio autem brevitatis auctores citare quam transcribere satius duxi, etsi perhibere scio, eius modi commentationes quia magnum requirunt apud legentes librorum apparatum sicut arbores sine frondibus, iucunditate carere et gratia."(1

---

1) Op. cit., proemium, pp. 3-4.

Lagus, like the other scholars--except Weber--whom I have mentioned, handled the subject of my dissertation only as a part of a broader theme. In 1855 Emile Egger read before the annual meeting of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres a paper precisely on the subject, "De l'Etude de la langue latine chez les Grecs dans l'Antiquité." This is a suggestive essay, but not in the least an exhaustive treatment. Indeed, it is less informative, than the studies of Weber and Lagus, which Egger says that he had not seen. It has had, however, a wider circulation than any of its forerunners and has often been cited as an authority in its field.[1]

Nearly twenty years after Egger published his article, Alexander Budinszky brought out his Die Ausbreitung der lateinischen Sprache, a book whose purpose was to trace the spread of the Latin language throughout the whole Roman world. Budinszky was interested chiefly in the process by which Latin became the idiom of the West and by far the greater part of his book is concerned with that part of the Roman dominion. Greece

---

1) Writing in 1941, Walter Allen, Jr. (AJP 62 [1941], p.56) refers to this essay as the "very useful article of Emile Egger," but, aside from the fact that it has long been superseded, it is much too superficial to be so characterized.

and the Orient are allotted but twenty pages,[1] several of which are taken up with a summary of the growth of Rome's power in the East. What is said about the Greeks and Latin is entirely perfunctory.

Such was the status of investigation in 1881. No important work had appeared since the dissertations of Lagus and Weber, which had never had wide circulation. In recognition of the need for further research on the influence of the Latin language in the East, especially in the later Roman Empire, the Royal Danish Society of Sciences in 1885 offered a prize for a study of the "place of Latin as the language of the administration in the Roman Empire of the East from the time of Constantine the Great to the point where the Latin language was completely replaced by Greek, and on the relations existing between this use of Latin and literary and scholarly studies."[2] To my knowledge, this prize has never been awarded.

The work that, in spite of its faults, is still the only lengthy study that has been made up to the present of the influence of Latin in the Greek East from the time of the

---

1) pp. 227-246. The discussion of Latin in the East really begins on page 234. Magna Graecia and Sicily are treated on pp. 39-46.

2) Reported in Krumbacher, Geschichte der Byzantinischen Literatur[2] (Munich, 1897), p. 1136.

Republic to Justinian, is Leôn Lafoscade's "Influence du latin sur le grec," published in 1892. Because it deals solely with the Greeks' knowledge of Latin and because it is the most nearly complete treatment of the subject from a chronological standpoint, it has had a greater authority than it deserves, for, although he contributed a great many pertinent references, previously unnoted, from the ancient sources--especially late imperial--, Lafoscade not only distorted and misrepresented ancient evidence but also made statements for which he had no evidence at all. Before I say more on this, however, a word about his procedure is necessary. All the studies that had been published previous to Lafoscade's on the influence of Latin in the East had approached the problem, roughly speaking, from one of two points of view: the Roman or the Greek. Walch, Heyne, Dirksen, and Budinszky had investigated to what extent the Romans maintained and furthered Latin as the language of their provinces, while Weber and Lagus (in the part of his dissertation devoted to the East) were more concerned with the interest Greeks displayed in learning Latin. Lafoscade was the first to examine in a single work both aspects of the subject. This, it seems to me, is the proper procedure, for only by such a combination of the two points of view is it possible to give a complete picture of the knowledge of Latin in Greek lands.

Reviewing first the military and other official contacts of Romans with Greeks, Lafoscade decided that, as a part of a great and sustained effort to Romanize the East, the Romans attempted to make Greek-speaking peoples abandon their language for Latin. Thus, there was a definite "attack" of Latin on Greek. In spite of this attack, however, Greek continued to be the language of the East and therefore it must have possessed an extraordinary power of "resistance" which enabled it to triumph over Latin. This power of resistance was due in large measure to the sullen pride of the subject Greeks in their glorious past and to the vitality of Greek itself. Confronted by the fact that most of the important Greek writers of the Roman period not only extolled the greatness of the Roman Empire but were at pains to learn the Latin language as well, Lafoscade dismisses these figures as exceptions, who were outwardly resigned to the Roman domination, while in their hearts there was nothing but contempt for their masters. In like manner all Greek flattery of Romans can be explained as insincere adulation masking smoldering resentment.

This, in brief, is Lafoscade's line of argument. Using what evidence he had employed and other material as well, I arrived at conclusions which differ greatly from his, and in a sense my dissertation is a refutation of his position. I am not the first to question the validity of Lafoscade's thesis.

In a review of the work shortly after its publication, Théodore Reinach wrote: "--l'idée fondamentale de son travail, à savoir que les Romains auraient cherché systématiquement à imposer leur langue aux provinces grecques, me paraît inexact, on tout au moins excessive."(1 Another word of warning came from W. T. Arnold who, in citing Lafoscade as one of the "chief modern authorities on the whole question of the use of Latin in the Greek East," said that his "essay contains inaccuracies and should be used with caution."(2 Reinach and Arnold expressed dissatisfaction with Lafoscade's study, but no one has ever attempted a critical examination of his conclusions, and the work is still today, as it was when Arnold wrote, one of the "chief modern authorities" on the subject. We can see, for example, Lafoscade's influence in a work of 1936 which speaks of "the harsh measures resorted to by the Roman rulers for imposing their speech upon their Eastern subjects" and the Greeks' "stubborn and natural antagonism" to Latin.(3

---

1) Revue des Études Grecques 6 (1893), p. 141.
2) Studies of Roman Imperialism (Manchester, 1906), p.239.
3) P. S. Costas, An Outline ~~of the~~ History of the Greek Language with Particular Emphasis on the Koiné and the Subsequent Stages (Chicago, 1936), p. 77, n.1.

A few more studies remain to be noted. In 1902 Wilhelm Kubitschek wrote a short article, "Der Rückgang des lateinischen im Orient", in which he presented evidence indicating how the Latin legends of coins from the Roman colonies in the East were soon corrupted by the prevailing Greek idiom and finally were entirely replaced by Greek legends. Four years later Ludwig Hahn published his Rom und Romanismus im griechisch-römischen Osten, a book that was intended as merely the first part of an ambitious investigation of all phases of Roman influence in the Greek East brought about through such media as government, the army, commerce, law, coinage, religion, art, language, and literature.[1] Rom und Romanismus carries out this investigation, which was to go to the time of Justinian,[2] to the death of Trajan, examining all spheres of Roman penetration in the East. Considerable attention is paid the language question, especially to the lexical, syntactical, and morphological influence which Latin had upon Greek. It was not, however, until after the period covered in this book that Latin studies in the East reached their height, so that Hahn's work did not contribute a great deal to what was already known in this field.

---

1) Such is the project announced in the Vorwort of Rom und Romanismus and again in Philologus, Supplementband 10 (1905-07), p. 676.
2) And later--Hahn had the Royal Danish Society Prize in mind.

Hahn did not complete the great project he had inaugurated with Rom und Romanismus. His later work took the form of preliminary studies, spezialarbeiten as he called them. In 1907 he wrote a "skizze" entitled "Zum Sprachenkampf im römischen Reich bis auf die Zeit Justinians" which in part went over the same ground as his book and in which he followed the same all-embracing procedure. Five years later he contributed a short paper on the use of Latin in Constantinople to a volume of studies presented to Martin Schanz.

The most recent work which deals with the penetration of Latin in the East is Henrik Zilliacus' Zum Kampf der Weltsprachen in Oströmischen Reich, a dissertation published in 1935. Zilliacus confines his study to three departments: administration, law, and the army--during the period from the fourth century to A.D. 1000. There is nothing in it on the knowledge of Latin literature in the Greek world or on Latin as a language of literary expression in the East, the author being more interested in tracing the survival or disappearance of the Latin element in Greek. To a great extent different from mine in the period treated and the matter presented, this dissertation is neither thorough in its field nor without serious shortcomings, some of which have been pointed out in Franz Dölger's detailed and damaging review,[1] which concludes:

---

1) Byzantinische Zeitschrift, 36 (1936), pp. 108-117.

"Die Geschichte des Kampfes der Weltsprachen im öströmischen Reich ist noch zu schreiben!"

We have reached the end of our review of the work done to the present time. I wish to record here my indebtedness to the studies I have mentioned--especially to Lafoscade's--for many references in the ancient sources. I have rarely noted indebtedness of this kind in the text. In the first place I should be hard put to it to determine in some cases to whom the credit is ultimately due, since my predecessors have regarded the ancient sources as common property and have seldom acknowledged their own indebtedness. Second, my dissertation is based almost exclusively on my own examination and interpretation of primary sources, so that, while the works of other scholars have frequently guided me to these sources, almost as frequently have I used them in an entirely different connection and, indeed, arrived at conclusions quite different from those originally reached. Where I have adopted the view of another scholar, I have acknowledged it.

It can readily be seen even from my brief summary of the studies published so far on the Greeks and the Latin language, all of which--leaving merit out of the question--are either too general or too specialized in scope to do justice to the subject, that my dissertation is bound to have serious limitations. Some of them are self-imposed. To begin with I have restricted myself to an investigation of the extent to which Greeks consciously acquired a knowledge of the Latin language

and literature, and along with that a consideration of their reasons for doing so. Consequently I am only incidentally concerned with the linguistic influence Latin had upon Greek, for the fact that Greek took over certain Latin suffixes and many Latin military and administrative terms, while important for the history of the Greek language, can hardly be used as evidence of conscious learning of Latin on the part of the Greeks.[1] Greek with Latinisms is still Greek. Moreover, before the effect of Latin upon the Greek language can be fully evaluated,[2] there are needed special studies of Greek authers, and a complete survey of papyri,[3] official documents,[4] and the corpora of inscriptions[5] for Latinisms and transliterated Latin words.

---

1) At the present time countless Americans, who know no German, daily use such terms as blitzkrieg, panzer, stuka, and gestapo.

2) Such as Sickinger, De linguae Latinae apud Plutarchum et reliquiis et vestigiis (diss., Freiburg, 1883), and Götzler, De Polybi elocutione (diss., Würzburg, 1887).

3) The Latin element in Greek papyri has been studied by C. Wessely ("Die lateinischen Elemente in der Gräzität der ägyptischen Papyrusurkunden", Wiener Studien 24[1902], pp. 99-151), B. Meinersmann (Die lateinischen Wörter und Namen in den griechischen Papyri [Leipzig, 1927]), and F. Preisigke (Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden III [Berlin, 1931]).

4) Such as Ç. Triantaphyllides, "Lexique des mots latins dans Théophile et les Novelles de Justinian," Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes 92(1892), pp. 159-277.

5) A. Cameron's "Latin Words in the Greek Inscriptions of Asia Minor", AJP 52 (1931) is a preliminary study of the type needed in this field.

Since I was convinced early in my researches that I could render no proper account of the Latin studies of Greeks without giving due consideration to certain external influences which might have had effect in inducing Greeks to learn Latin, the first section of my dissertation, which I have entitled "Impulse from Rome", consists of a chronological survey of the Roman official attitude toward the Greek and Latin languages down to the time of Justinian and some paragraphs on the significance of the army, trade, colonies, and the Church as factors in spreading Latin in the East.

The second section, "The Greeks and the Latin Language," is substantially a catalogue, arranged chronologically, of Greeks who had some knowledge of Latin. It begins, however, with a discussion of the attitude of the Greeks during successive periods toward the Romans and the Latin language. Such a discussion seemed necessary not only becausedtheir opinion of Romans influenced the extent to which Greeks learned Latin but also because so much that is at best only partly true has been written of Greek "contempt" for the "barbarians" of the West. The main body of part II, consisting of an introduction dealing with the Greeks' experience with the Latin language as a whole and a treatment of the extent of the Greeks' knowledge of Latin in specific periods, follows. It was originally my intention to carry this survey

down to the time of Justinian and my collections of material were made with this end in view. Unfortunately, the pressure of time forced me to abandon this perhaps overambitious plan with the result that, while the first and third parts of this thesis consider the relevant evidence to the time of Justinian, the second reviews in detail only the period prior to A.D. 212. I have tried to compensate somewhat for my failure to achieve my original purpose by concluding with a few paragraphs on the character of Latin studies in the East in the Later Empire.

The final section of this dissertation is devoted to a study of the Greeks' knowledge of Latin literature. There are included remarks on the type of Latin work read by the Greeks, the fortleben of Latin authors in the East, and the vexed question of Greek imitations of Latin writers.(1 The Latin literary papyri which have been found up to the present time, of far greater interest than their small number would lead one to suppose, are considered for their bearing upon Latin studies in the East.

So much for the plan and scope of this thesis. The use of certain terms throughout remains to be explained.

---

1) So far as I know the literary side of the question has never before received serious treatment in a work of this kind, although the need for such studies has been recognized. In his review of Zilliacus' dissertation Dölger called for an investigation of the fate of Latin literature in the East (Byzantinische Zeitschrift 36 (1936), p.109.

The term Greeks is employed not only with reference to the inhabitants of mainland Greece or those parts of the Mediterranean region which were considered Greek before the conquests of Alexander, but it applies also to all Easterners and Westerners for whom Greek was their natural or usual tongue. It is thus equated with the term Greek-speaking. Similarly the expressions Greek East and Orient are considered equivalents, signifying all the regions permeated by Greek civilization in its Hellenistic form.

Finally, it is both a privilege and a pleasure to express my thanks at this time to all those who have encouraged and guided me during the years I have spent at the University of Cincinnati. I am particularly indebted to Professors Rodney P. Robinson, who first suggested to me the subject of this study as a field for investigation, and Hilda Buttenwieser for their penetrating criticisms and expert supervision of the whole work. In addition I am deeply grateful to them and to Professors R. K. Hack and Carl W. Blegen for the stimulation of their teaching and the benefit I have derived from my associations with them. I am under great obligation to Professor and Mrs. William T. Semple, whose generosity enabled me to begin and to continue my graduate studies, and to the American Academy in Rome, which awarded me one of its liberal Special Scholarships for the year 1941-42.

I IMPULSE FROM ROME

A. Introduction

It has often been noted that the peoples under her sway to whom Rome transmitted her language and other specifically Roman elements of her culture were those that had previously had little or no contact with civilization. The evolution of French and Spanish proves the truth of this observation for Western Europe, but it holds good for the East as well. The lands east of Italy within the borders of the Roman Empire that had been barbarous and not affected by Greek culture - Illyria and Pannonia,[1] Dacia,[2] and Galatia of the Asia Minor hinterland, insofar as it was civilized at all - became Roman in character. On the other hand, the Greek East, possessed of an important history and literature of its own, on the whole remained Greek, though under Roman rule for centuries.

This commonplace of history gives rise to some interesting questions which the first section of this

---

1) All the Balkan peninsula north of the Egnatian Way was Romanized. Cf. Velleius Paterculus II,110,5: in omnibus autem Pannoniis non disciplinae tantummodo, sed linguae quoque notitia Romanae plerisque etiam litterarum usus et familiaris animorum erat exercitatio. Cf. also Flavius Vopiscus, Aurelian 24: -atque haec Latine, ut homo Pannonius(Aurelian) intellegeret, verba dixisse.

2) Modern Roumania; both the name and the language of this country show the extent of Roman influence.

dissertation will attempt to answer. Did the Romans at any time seek to impose their language on the Greek-speaking world? Did they rigidly maintain Latin as the official medium throughought the Empire or was Greek ever placed upon an equal footing? The answers to these questions will require 1) an account of the history of the official relations of Greek and Latin from the time of first contact to the dissolution of the Empire, and 2) consideration of the influence of certain other factors - the army, colonies, trade, and the Church in spreading the Latin language in the Greek East. But before we begin our examination of the Roman official attitude toward Latin and Greek, it is necessary to survey briefly the political condition of the East under Roman rule and also the general attitude of Romans toward Greeks and Greek civilization.

One of the reasons why the Romans were able to rule their great empire successfully for several centuries is that they were willing and even glad to use existing systems of administration where they found them functioning efficiently. The great example of this policy is to be found in the East, where the Romans fell heir to the administrative organization of the Hellenistic monarchies, which were very easily adapted to Roman requirements. The program of Hellenization, begun by Alexander and his successors, was actually

continued and extended by the Romans.[1] From time to time they attempted to remedy some of the ills in their administration engendered by the old system, but these half-way measures alone show that they never contemplated a complete reorganization.

With these conditions prevailing there was naturally a large measure of autonomous local government in the East. To some small towns Rome probably meant no more than a new tax collector. As for the cities, it is difficult to discover just what the free, federated, and colonial meant in terms of governmental control and tribute exemptions, but many of them at one time or another were autonomous and tax-free.[2] In mainland Greece a large number of cities

---

1) Pompey's procedure in his settlement of Eastern affairs after the defeat of Mithradates was to annex the Hellenized coast-lands and leave the hinterland more or less undisturbed. Later, Augustus, when he concerned himself with the East, followed the same principle. The Euphrates was the eastern boundary for both Greek and Roman influence. See Stevenson, Roman Provincial Administration, p.29.

2) An Augustan edict dated 7/6 B.C., relating to Cyrenaica, provides an interesting commentary on the Roman practice of fostering local autonomy in the provinces. The ordinance stipulates that for all legal actions between Greeks, other than capital charges, Greek judges are to be assigned unless the defendant indicates a preference for Roman judges. It is evident that before this in Cyrenaica the practice had been to appoint Roman iudices, probably because in this region the Greeks lacked adequate political and administrative training. As they gained experience in administration, they were granted more and more control of their own affairs. (See J.G.C. Anderson, "Augustan Edicts from Cyrene", Journal of Roman Studies, XVII [1927], pp. 33-48). Also pertinent is the comment of Strabo about the cities of the Lycian League (Geogr. XIV, p.665): οὕτω δ'εὐνομουμένοις αὐτοῖς συνέβη παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις ἐλευθέροις διατελέσαι τὰ πάτρια νέμουσι.

enjoyed autonomy, more as a result of Roman disinterest - at least after the period of the Civil Wars, which had impoverished the land - than because of any sentimental considerations. At any rate Roman influence in the East did not filter through all strata of society as in the West;(1 rather, a new apex took the place of the old on the administrative pyramid.

So much for political background; now a word about the Roman attitude in general toward Greeks. Scholars are not yet agreed on the extent to which sentiment influenced Romans in their early relations with Greek lands. Nevertheless it is fairly clear that once Rome became interested in the Greek states, the Greeks were no longer really free, notwithstanding Roman proclamations to the contrary. And a study of the evidence leads me to accept the view that even during the first half of the second century B.C., when, if ever, Philhellenism affected their policies, the Romans were almost always hard-headed - that is, they adopted in each instance the course which they believed would best accomplish their practical purpose. Certainly, by the time Greece and Asia had been incorporated into the Roman provincial system and the Romans had had sufficient contact with contemporary Greeks to lose some of the earlier enthusiasm, Philhellenism played

---

(1 Even in the West the Greek cities of southern Italy and Sicily retained their Greek character after centuries of Roman rule. Strabo describes the Greek mode of life at Naples in his day, Geogr. V, 4,7. Cicero's Verrines give ample evidence for Syracuse and Sicily. We learn further of the persistence of Greek customs in the towns of Sicily from Dionysius of Halicarnassus, (Antiq. Rom. I, 21).

little part in administration. Instead, it expressed itself along cultural and antiquarian lines. We know of the low opinion many Romans had of Greeks by Cicero's time,[1] and Juvenal's vitriol[2] indicates that in some quarters this opinion persisted in his day.

This antipathy did not lessen the Romans' love for Greek literature and art. From the time of the Scipionic Circle to the fourth century after Christ a Roman was not considered educated who was not fluent in Greek.[3] Many Romans, especially in the period before there was an important Latin literature, preferred to write in Greek, either because they viewed Latin as an inferior language or because they longed for a larger audience than Latin would provide.[4]

---

1) Cicero's Pro Flacco testifies to this contempt for the Greeks of the day, Cicero in his orations naturally sought to win popular favor, so that they must in large measure reflect current view. On earlier anti-Greek feeling cf. Baldi, Die Gegner der griechischen Bildung in Rom, (Jahresber. Gymn. Burghaufen, 1876).

2) E.g. Sat. III, 58 ff. E.

3) A great deal of evidence, conveniently assembled, on the Romans' familiarity with Greek will be found in Snellman, De Interpretibus Romanorum, II, Testimonia Veterum, Graeci, nos. 89-216.

4) The early annalists, such as Fabius Pictor and L. Cincius Alimentus, wrote in Greek. Aulus Albinus, who in 151 B.C. wrote his histories in Greek and then in his preface to the work apologized for his soloecisms, drew the withering fire of the elder Cato (Plutarch, Cato Maj. 12; Gellius XI, 8; Macrobius, Saturn., Praef. 13). Lucilius (apud Cicero, De Fin. I, 3, 8) gives Mucius Scaevola's caustic reply to Titus Albucius, who would rather have been a Greek than a Roman. Cf. also Plautus, Asin, Praef. 11 and Trinum, Praef. 19: Plautus vortit barbare.

Later even the masters of the Latin language complained of its poverty[1] as compared with Greek. It became fashionable for young Romans to finish their education at Athens and other centers of Greek culture, and even at home education was largely Greek in flavor. Indeed, Quintilian recommends[2] that boys be taught Greek before Latin.

We have seen that the eminently practical Romans in general appropriated for their administration of the East the political system functioning there, without attempting to Romanize thoroughly, as in regions where no such system existed. We have noted also that from the second century B.C. onward Greek culture played a major part in Roman education. Such a political and cultural setting would seem neither to indicate that the Romans intended the Greek East to abandon Greek and to adopt the Latin language, nor to augur success if they had so intended. But we must not anticipate; it is the object of the following pages to discover precisely what the Roman official attitude toward the Latin and Greek languages was, and to determine whether in the course of time it underwent any great changes.

B. The Roman Official Attitude toward the Latin And Greek Languages

1. The Republic

The earliest reliable testimony which bears on the

1) Cf. Lucretius I,139;832;Cicero,Tusc. Disp. II, 35; Seneca, Epist.58;Quintil. Inst. Orat.I,5,58;II,14,1.
2) Inst. Orat. I,1,12.

Roman official attitude toward the Greek language shows that from the first the Romans had no intention of imposing the Latin tongue on the Greeks. All save one of the senatus consulta relative to Greek affairs which have come down to us from the Republican period - over twenty,[1] of which the earliest, dating from 189 B.C., is the first senatus consultum which we have - are preserved only in their Greek versions. The one exception, the S.C. de Asclepiade sociisque[2] of 78 B.C., contains part of the original Latin in addition to the Greek. This decree was found at Rome, the others in the Greek towns and cities to which they refer.

Common to all these inscriptions are certain peculiarities first noticed by Foucart[3] and thoroughly studied later by Viereck,[4] which prove beyond any doubt that the Greek decrees are official translations, made at Rome, and then sent to the East - perhaps without the Latin originals.[5]

---

1) All the decrees are listed in Pauly-Wissowa, Real Encyclopädie, Supplementband 6, Col. 808 ff; typical examples for language and style are in Dittenberger, Sylloge³ II, 612, 646, 664, 674, 679 II, 688, 705, 747, 764.
2) CIL I², 588.
3) Archives des Missions Scientifiques et Litteraires, Deuxième Série, Tome VII (1871), p.323.
4) In his Sermo Graecus quo senatus populusque Romanus magistratusque populi Romani usque ad Tiberii Caesaris aetatem in scriptis publicis usi sunt examinatur. Göttingen, 1888.
5) Mommsen's view, Ephemeris Epigraphica I, p.283 and Römisches Staatsrecht III, p.1006.

Even if the originals were sent, it apparently was not required that they be inscribed along with the Greek versions. The peculiarities are these: for the decrees themselves, the Greek used is the koine, although in some cases it is followed by a local dialect;[1] the Greek translates not only the sense of the Latin but Latin idioms, word for word, without any regard for Greek idiom; and the same phrases are used uniformly in all the documents to translate legal Latin formulae, indicating that a consistent terminology had been decided upon in Rome.[2] Since several Greek letters written by the Roman magistrates to Greek cities in the Republican period employ the same formulae as occur in the decrees, it is possible that there was an official glossary of terms to be used for all Greek communications.

The language of these decrees is interesting, but their importance to us is, as I have said, that they show that the Romans used Greek even in the earliest documents concerning Greek states. Now we may consider the one piece of evidence, a fragment of the Σύμμικτοι Συμποτικοί of Aristoxenus of Tar-

---

1) E.g. on the stone containing the SC de Astypalaea (105 B.C.), a decree in the Doric dialect follows the koine.

2) Cf. Boeckh CIG I, 1770 (Flamininus, ca. 195 B.C.); II, 3045 (Messala, ca. 193 B.C.); II, 3800 (Cn. Manlius Volso, ca. 188 B.C.); mI, 1543 (Q. Fabius Maximus, ca. 146 B.C.).

entum, quoted by Athenaeus in his Deipnosophistae,[1] which had been thus far advanced[2] in support of the contention that the Romans pursued a policy of ruthless Romanization of Greeks and sought to force them to abandon their language for Latin. The most recent editor of Athenaeus translates this passage as follows: "It so happened that although they were originally Greeks, they were completely barbarized, becoming Tuscans or Romans; they changed their speech and their other practices but they still celebrate one festival that is Greek to this day, wherein they gather together and recall those ancient words and institutions, and after bewailing them in one another's presence[3] they depart home".

Even before we examine this passage closely the vague expression "Tuscans or Romans" leads us to suspect it. But when we recall that Aristoxenus, who studied under Aristotle, was writing in the fourth century B.C., that the Romans were

---

1) XIV, 632 a: οἷς (the inhabitants of Posidonia, later Paestum) συνέβη τὰ μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς Ἕλλησιν οὖσιν ἐκβεβαρβαρῶσθαι Τυρρηνοῖς ἢ Ῥωμαίοις γεγονόσι, καὶ τήν τε φωνὴν μεταβεβληκέναι τά τε λοιπὰ τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων, ἄγειν δὲ μιάν τινα αὐτοὺς τῶν ἑορτῶν τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐν ᾗ συνιόντες ἀναμιμνήσκονται τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐκείνων ὀνομάτων τε καὶ νομίμων καὶ ἀπολοφυράμενοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ ἀποδακρύσαντες ἀπέρχονται.

2) First by Egger, Mémoires d' Histoire Ancienne, p.265, and then by Lafoscade, "Influence du Latin sur le Grec", Bibliotheque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes, 92 (1892), p. 153.

3) Gulick, Athenaeus (Loeb Classical Library), Vol. VI, p. 411.

active in southern Italy only shortly before they converted Posidonia into the colony of Paestum in 273 B.C., and that it was neither Tuscans nor Romans who were warring upon the Posidonians but Lucanians, it becomes clear that the passage[1] can not possibly be used with reference to the Romans. Whoever barbarized the Posidonians, it was not the Romans. They did not use force to spread their language in Italy or anywhere else. On the contrary, the people of Cumae, Livy tells us,[2] petitioned the Romans in 180 B.C. for the right to make Latin their official language.

The Romans never forced the Greeks to learn Latin, but, possessed of a genius for governing, they early appreciated the importance of maintaining their prestige throughout the Mediterranean world. Valerius Maximus, writing early in the first century after Christ, informs us that the Roman magistrates of old had conducted official business with Greeks in Latin, whether in Rome, Greece, or Asia; interpreters were

---

1) In his Teubner edition of Athenaeus Kaibel deleted ἢ Ῥωμαίοις at the suggestion of Wilamowitz. Gulick (op. cit. p. 410) made no changes in the text, because he felt that the words "or Romans" "seem no more inaccurate than calling Lucanians Tuscans". Yet for Lafoscade no doubt existed. Citing this reference (op. cit., p. 153), he filled out the picture vividly if fancifully: "les habitants de Paestum ont été forcés de se romaniser; mais au prix de quels regrets. Ils ne parviennent pas à oublier ce qu'ils ont perdu, et dans les fêtes qui se terminèrent toujours par des pleurs, ils essayent en vain de se donner l'illusion du passé."

2) XL, 42.

used if the Greeks did not know Latin; and in this way all peoples learned to respect the Latin languages.[1]

This passage in Valerius Maximus might seem to be in contradiction to the practice of redacting senatus consulta in Greek. The contradiction, however, is apparent rather than real, for in the one case we are dealing with written documents and in the other, if I correctly interpret Valerius' meaning, with decisions delivered viva voce by Roman magistrates. Valerius, writing in a period when all educated men knew Greek, may not have fully understood the reason for the magistrates' delivering their responsa in Latin. The original reason, I suspect, was not to give the Latin language its due meed of honor, or to keep the "pallium in subjection to the toga", but to maintain the dignity of Roman officials who had an imperfect knowledge of Greek. The

---

1) Valerius Maximus II, 2,2: Magistratus vero prisci quantopere suam populique Romani maiestatem retinentes se gesserint hinc cognosci potest, quod inter cetera obtinendae gravitatis indicia illud quoque magna cum perseverantia custodiebant, ne Graecis umquam nisi latine responsa darent, quin etiam ipsos linguae volubilitate, qua plurimum valent, excussa per interpretem loqui cogebant non in urbe tantum nostra, sed etiam in Graecia et Asia, quo scilicet Latinae vocis honos per omnes gentes venerabilior diffunderetur. Nec illis deerant studia doctrinae, sed nulla non in re pallium togae subici debere arbitrabantur, indignum esse existimantes inlecebris et suavitati litterarum imperii pondus et auctoritatem donari.

The Romans long remembered the humiliating scene at Tarentum (282 B.C.), when every mistake in Greek their envoys made called forth the hoots and jeers of the Tarentine assembly.[1] Once Rome was in a position to command the world's respect, her representatives could use Latin in dealing with Greeks and, doing so, they would not be risking their prestige. In the case of senatus consulta, the impersonal acts of a governing body, considerations of prestige were not important since the gravitas of individual magistrates was not imperilled.

There is evidence to show, in support of the statement of Valerius Maximus, that at least until the second half of the second century B.C., Roman dignitaries used their own language when treating with Greeks officially. Even when interpreters were employed, as was frequently the case, the magistrate read or published the Latin text of his proclamation first. It can not be determined with certainty whether Flamininus' famous declaration of Greek freedom was

---

1) Appian, Hist. Samn. 7,2: οἱ δὲ (Tarentines) τοὺς πρέσβεις μόλις ποτὲ ἐπὶ τὸ κοινὸν ἐπήγαγον, καὶ ἐπελθόντας ἐκλεύαζον εἴ τι μὴ καλῶς ἑλληνίσειαν. ἔσκωπτον δὲ καὶ τὴν στολὴν αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ ἐπιπόρφυρον.
Cf. Dionys. Hal., Antiq. Rom. XIX, Excerpt. 5.

read to the multitude gathered for the Isthmian Games of 196 B.C. in Latin or in Greek, or whether both languages were used.[1] We do know, however, that after the battle of Pydna Aemilius Paulus solemnly read the Roman terms to Perseus in Latin and this was then translated into Greek by the praetor Octavius.[2] It is interesting to note that previously Paulus, speaking in private capacity, had favored Perseus with a homily in Greek, intended to cheer him up.[3] This clearly illustrates the Roman insistence on Latin as the official language of its representatives at this period. Similarly, when the elder Cato addressed the Athenian people, he used an interpreter, although according to Plutarch[4] he might have spoken to them in their own language. There must have been a number of these interpreters attached to Roman official staffs in Greek lands. We know the names of some of them. Cicero mentions the

---

1) Polybius XVIII, 46; Livy XXXIII,32; Valerius Maximus IV,8,5. No Latin announcement would have given rise to the ovation that according to all accounts followed the herald's words. The "herald" was probably an interpreter, although this is not stated.
2) Livy XLV, 29,3.
3) Idem XLV, 8,6.
4) Cato Maior 12: ἀλλὰ δι' ἑρμηνέως ἐνέτυχε τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις συνηθεὶς ἂν αὐτὸς εἰπεῖν, ἐμμένων δὲ τοῖς πατρίοις καὶ καταγελῶν τῶν τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ τεθαυμακότων.

freedman Menander, who acted as interpreter for Roman legati going to Greece.[1] Aulus Valentius was one of Verres' interpreters in Sicily;[2] and Cicero refers to one of his own interpreters in a letter written from Phrygia.[3]

In Rome itself the same principle was in force. For example, we learn form Gellius' account of the embassy to Rome in 155 B.C. of the Greek philosophers Carneades, Diogenes, and Critolaus that the philosophers addressed the Roman senate in Greek with C. Acilius acting as interpreter, although the senators probably understood Greek.[4] The first Greek to speak in the senate without an interpreter, we are told,[5] was the rhetorician Apollonius Molo of Rhodes. This was probably in 81 B.C. when Molo served as Rhodian legate to Rome.[6]

As time went on, however, more and more official concessions were made to Greek. We hear that the father of the Gracchi, Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, addressed

---

1) Cicero, Pro Balbo 11.
2) Cicero, In Verrem II,3,37 (84).
3) Ad Fam. XIII,54.
4) Gellius VI, 14. According to Gellius, the philosophers had harangued a great crowd of Romans, in Greek of course and without interpreters, before speaking in the senate as official ambassadors.
5) Valerius Maximus II, 2, 3.
6) See Hillscher, "Hominum Litteratorum Graecorum ante Tiberii mortem in urbe Roma commoratorum Historia Critica", Philologus, Supplementband XVIII (1892),p.388.

the Rhodians in Greek,[1] and P. Licinius Crassus, who went to Asia in 131 B.C. and lost his life fighting Aristonicus in the following year, is praised by Valerius Maximus[2] because he pronounced court sentences in whichever of the five native Greek dialects the litigants used, thereby winning the respect and affection of the province. Some of these compromises came in for censure at Rome. Thus Cicero, although he had allowed Greek judges and courts in his own province of Cilicia,[3] violently attacked Antony for appointing Greek judges in the East.[4] Again Cicero scandalized Metellus by speaking in Greek to the senate of Syracuse, something that seemed quite sensible to Cicero.[5] Julius Caesar felt much as Cicero;[6] Cassius Dio writes of his speech to the Alexandrians: —καὶ τόν γε λόγον δι οὗ συνέγνω σφίσιν, Ἑλληνιστί, ὅπως συνῶσιν αὐτοῦ, εἶπε.

2. The Empire from Augustus to Diocletian

With the establishment of the principate there arose among the Romans a livelier appreciation of the vast

---

1) Cicero, Brutus 79.
2) VIII, 7, 6. It was probably when there were Roman magistrates who, like Crassus, had a thorough knowledge of Greek and were not likely to make ludicrous errors in speaking it, that Greek began to be used by the Romans in negotiations with Greeks.
3) Ad Attic. VI, 2,4.
4) Philipp. V, 5.
5) In Verrem II,4,66(147):-et (Metellus) ait indignum facinus esse quod ego in senatu Graeco verba fecissem; quod quidem apud Graecos Graece locutus essem, id ferre nullo modo posse.
6) LI, 16.

responsibility invested in the rulers of a great empire. The program of propaganda carried on by Augustus through the great writers of the age was designed to dispel the gloom of the last troubled years of the Republic, to instil again in the Romans the virtues of their ancestors, and finally to remind them of the great task that lay ahead in the administration of the Empire. Augustus himself set the example. He and his legate Agrippa, between them, spent almost ten consecutive years in the East, developing a system of provincial administration which in its essential features was to endure for centuries. As Stevenson[1] says: "Perhaps the chief claim of Augustus to greatness lies in the fact that without breaking with the past he introduced efficiency into a system which had worked badly, and did this so well that his successors merely modified in detail the structure which he had created."

The inauguration of the principate brought changes also in the official attitude toward Greek and Latin. There are many signs to indicate that by the beginning of our era the Roman world was recognized as bilingual. Although the senatus consulta redacted in Greek show that the Romans did not intend to force Greeks to learn Latin,

---

1) Op. cit., p. 96; cf. also pp. 30-32 and Arnold, op. cit., p. 192 ff.

they also show through their crude and unidiomatic Greek that the Roman senate, intent upon the preservation of traditional legal formulae, was not particularly concerned whether its decrees were so couched as to be completely understood by the Greeks.(1 Augustus and his successors, however, not only continued the practice of using Greek in matters relating to the East, but took pains to see that the Greek used was good. The Greek letters of Augustus which are extant are written in idiomatic, even in elegant Greek,(2 and we know that it was his habit, when Greek was required for state business, to set down his wishes in Latin and then to entrust the translation into Greek to someone else, because he did not feel competent to do it himself, in spite of his long training in Greek.(3 Some time very early in the Empire, perhaps even

---

1) Polybius tells a story which illustrates how the Aetolians made a decision that had serious consequences because they failed to grasp the significance of a technical term: οἱ δ' Αἰτωλοὶ--ἔκριναν ἐπιτρέπειν τὰ ὅλα Μανίῳ, δόντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν Ῥωμαίων πίστιν, οὐκ εἰδότες τίνα δύναμιν ἔχει τοῦτο, τῷ δὲ τῆς πίστεως ὀνόματι πλανηθέντες, ὡς ἂν διὰ τοῦτο τελειοτέρου σφίσιν ἐλέους ὑπάρξοντος. παρὰ <δὲ> Ῥωμαίοις ἰσοδυναμεῖ τὸ τ' εἰς τὴν πίστιν αὐτὸν ἐγχειρίσαι καὶ τὸ τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν δοῦναι περὶ αὐτοῦ τῷ κρατοῦντι (Polybius XX, 10.).

2) Cf. for example Dittenberger, Sylloge³ II, 768; 780; 785.

3) Suetonius, Augustus 89.

under Augustus, the office of ab epistulis Graecis was created,[1] a secretariat responsible for the Greek versions of official communications intended for Greek-speaking peoples.[2] The appointment of ab epistulis Graecis, corresponding to the ab epistulis for Latin dispatches, indicates that Greek was beginning to assume the character of the secondary official language of the Empire.

Bilingual inscriptions provide additional testimony of the progress Greek was making at this time toward equality with Latin in matters of administration. We know of inscriptions of this kind in the East that date from the period of Caesar and Antony, although for the most part they are from later times.[3] Josephus preserves a rescript of Caesar's to the Sidonians, which, by his command, was engraved on a bronze tablet in Greek and in Latin. From the same source[4] we learn the Antony ordered one of his decrees engraved in Latin and Greek and set up in the most conspicuous place in Tyre "so that it would be read by all." So Roman a ruler as Augustus ordered his Res

---

1) We first hear of a separate Greek secretariat in connection with Nero (Josephus, Antiq. Iud.XX, 183). Naturally this does not mean that the post was not created until then.

2) Cf. Notitia Dignitatum Orientis XVII, 4: Magister Epistolarum Graecarum (a later term) eas epistolas quae Graece solent emitti aut ipse dictat aut Latine dictatas transfert in Graecum.

3) Antiq. Iud.XIV, 191.

4) Op. cit. XIV, 319.

Gestae to be engraved on bronze plates and erected in Rome itself in Greek as well as in Latin. There is a further suggestion of the feeling that the world was both Roman and Greek in the story told of Augustus that, well-pleased with the homage he had received from Alexandrian sailors at Puteoli, he gave the rather arbitrary order that the Romans there should speak Greek and wear Greek dress and that the Greeks should use the Roman language and dress.[1] Not many years later Claudius referred to Greek and Latin as "both our languages."[2]

So far as Roman officialdom was concerned, Greek and Latin had reached by the first century after Christ a kind of "equilibrium." Lafoscade, who was the first to emphasize this point, has shown[3] that among Latin authors from Cicero onward the expression utraque lingua was current[4] and that among Greek authors, as early as Plutarch, we find ἡ ἑκατέρα γλῶττα when they are referring to both languages and ἡ ἑτέρα γλῶττα when it is a question of

---

1) Suetonius, Augustus 98.
2) Idem, Claudius 42: - Cuidam barbaro Graece ac Latine disserenti "Cum utroque" inquit "sermone nostro sis paratus".
3) Op. cit., p.117.
4) Cf. Cicero, De Officiis I,1,1; Horace, Carm. III,8,5; Pliny, Hist. Nat. XII,1; Statius, Silvae V,3,90; Quintilian, Inst. Orat. I,1,14; Suetonius, Augustus 89; Gellius XVII,5,3; Tertull. Orat. adv. Prax III.

Latin alone.[1] "Aux yeux de tous il n'y a au monde que deux langues, mais il en existe deux."[2] Considerations of prestige and political unity worked to keep Latin the first official language of the Empire, but Greek was unquestionably the second.

Having reviewed the status of the two languages at this time as a whole, we may consider for a moment the policy of certain of the emperors with regard to the use of Greek and Latin. At times there seems to be little consistency in their attitude, and some of their acts may have resulted from a desire to make a gesture or to satisfy a whim. Thus Tiberius, who would not use Greek in the senate, on one occasion begged pardon for using the Greek word monopolium, and on another ordered the Greek word ἔμβλημα, which had been used in a Latin decree, replaced by a Latin term or periphrasis.[3] The same emperor would not listen to a centurion's testimony because it was given in Greek, though he himself conducted many lawsuits in that language.[4] We learn that Claudius struck off the roll of jurors one of the chief men of Greece[5] and disenfranchised a Lycian

---

1) Cf. Plutarch, Lucullus 1; Philostratus, Vit. Soph. II, 10, 5; Libanius, Orat. I,234; Iohan. Chrys., Migne PG XLVII,368.
2) Lafoscade, op. cit., p. 118.
3) Suetonius, Tiberius 71.
4) Cassius Dio LVII,15,3.
5) Suetonius, Claudius 16.

elder, because not knowing Latin, they did not deserve to be Roman citizens.[1] Yet Claudius permitted Agrippa of Palestine and his brother Herod to address the senate in Greek,[2] and, himself devoted to Greek studies,[3] was served by a corps of Greek advisers. Nero's Philhellenism is well-known: in the proclamation of Greek liberty (A.D.67) he is called εἷς καὶ μόνος τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος αὐτοκράτωρ μέγιστος φιλέλλην γενόμενος.[4] We hear that he often addressed Greek audiences in Greek.[5]

The emperors who followed Nero were generally well-disposed toward the Greeks. By the time of Trajan Greek aristocrats from the East, a limited number of whom had been admitted into the Roman senate as early as Nero's reign, had begun to play an important part in the imperial government.[6] This is an interesting fact both from the Roman and from the Greek point of view, but it is the

---

1) Cassius Dio LX,17,4. Earlier Cicero had declared it the duty of all Roman citizens to know Latin (Brutus 140).
2) Cassius Dio LX,8,2.
3) Suetonius, Claudius 42.
4) Dittenberger, Sylloge[3] II, 814.
5) Cf. Suetonius, Nero 7 and 20.
6) Consult on this point C.S.Walton, "Oriental Senators in the Service of Rome," Journal of Roman Studies XIX (1929), pp. 38-66, and A.N.Sherwin-White, The Roman Citizenship (Oxford, 1939), p.202.

Roman that claims our attention now.[1] The senate was still, in the early part of the first century, an exclusive body which drew for members upon old Italian families. The fact that there were provincials, from the East as well as the West, in the senate by the time of Nero, indicates that Roman prejudice against Easterners, which had been aggravated during the Civil War when the East chose to support the losing side, was fast disappearing. As for the Greeks, they seem to have become bold enough to voice their complaints to the emperors. In the lecture that he gave to Vespasian on the duties of a ruler, Apollonius of Tyana urged that only men who sympathized with the Greeks and knew their language be sent to rule the Eastern provinces. There was recently a great deal of misunderstanding, he went on, between the governor of Greece and the people because the governor did not know Greek.[2]

The Greeks had no cause for complaint under the enlightened rule of the emperors of the second century, when there was attained that unity and prosperity that had long been awaited. It was perhaps Hadrian who first clearly conceived of the Empire "as a single well-compacted

---

1) The Greek point of view is treated below, p. 69 .
2) Philostratus, Vita Apoll. Tyan. V, 36.

state, internally homogeneous, and standing in clear relief against surrounding barbarism."[1] The world was Greek and Roman, civilization was Greek and Roman, and both were so called by the writers of the time.[2] Characteristic of Hadrian and his Reichsidee was his appointment of the Greek Arrian[3] as legate of the consular province of Cappadocia, the most important government post held by a Greek up to that time. It was also characteristic that he should inspire and encourage the Greek literary renaissance, whose products were a contribution to the common imperial culture. Not many years after Hadrian's reign, the good emperor Marcus Aurelius chose to express his inmost thoughts in Greek.

The Constitutio Antoniniana of 212, the decree by which Caracalla granted citizenship to the whole Empire, completed the unification of Greek and Roman elements which had been so long in progress.[4] It was necessary as a result of this decree, which made Roman law the law of the entire Empire, to make certain concessions to the Greek language, in respect to its use in the East in legal

---

1) Pelham, "Hadrian, a Note", Essays on Roman History, (Oxford, 1911), p.161.
2) See below, p.62f.
3) For Arrian, see below, p.101.
4) The indirect stimulation which the citizenship decree gave to Latin studies in the East is fully discussed below, pp.105ff.

proceedings, which may be noted at this point. These changes were made in the period between the age of the classical jurists (saec. II-III) and the time of Justinian, but it is difficult to date all of them precisely.[1] The jurist Gaius (fl. ca. A.D. 150) informs us that contracts legalized by the phrase Dari spondes; spondeo can be made only between Roman citizens; that this form can not be used by Greeks even if it be literally translated; but that contracts legalized by other expressions in Greek or in Latin are binding provided that the contracting parties understand the language used.[2] As time went on the requirements became even less rigid, since it is stated in Justinian's Institutes[3] that a contract made in any language and in more than one language is valid, with no stipulations regarding formulae. Old expressions lost their significance, the only requirement being that both parties understand the agreement.[4] Again Gaius rules that trusts written in Greek are valid, while wills must be made in

---

1) Although we may learn, for instance, from the Digests of Justinian of a ruling of Ulpian's regarding the use of Latin in legal matters in the provinces, we are unable to discover the time and circumstances of its passing. All we know is that it was in force early in the third century (Ulpian's floruit) and still valid in Justinian's time.
2) Gaius, Institutiones III, 93.
3) III, 15,1.
4) Institutiones II, 281.

Latin. This law, repeated by Ulpian,[1] held until the year 439, when it was officially provided that wills might be made in Greek,[2] but we know that Alexander Severus (died 235) had given permission at least to citizens in Egypt to make their wills in Greek not many years after the passing of the citizenship decree.[3] In addition we learn of an imperial decree of A.D. 397 permitting judges to give sentences in both Latin and Greek,[4] but a ruling of Tryphoninus, a jurist who flourished under Caracalla, stating that praetorians decrees had to be issued in Latin was still in force in Justinian's time.[5]

3. The Empire from Diocletian to Justinian

The third century was a time of crisis. Emperor followed emperor in dizzying succession and it seemed that the wonderful structure of the Antonines, undermined by the inroads of barbarians and the struggles among its

---

1) Fragm. Titul. XXV,9.
2) Novellae Theodosian. XVI,8.
3) Wessely, Studien Paleogr. XX, 35 (a Greek will). Two Greek wills found at Oxyrhynchus and dating from 276 and 331 declare that the testator "dictated the following will in the Greek language in accordance with the permission" (P. Oxy. VI, 907 and 990). Since Roman citizens are expressly forbidden to make Greek wills in a provision of the Gnomon Idios Logos, drawn up about A.D. 150, it would seem that when Greeks became citizens, permission had to be granted for Greek wills
4) Codex Justin. VII, 45,12.
5) Digesta 42, 1,48.

own armies, must surely fall apart. That it did not was largely due to the strength and character of the Illyrian armies and the emperors they sponsored. The Illyrian peoples were thoroughly Romanized; in them was embodied all that remained of "Roman patriotism, Roman virtue, and Roman self-sacrifice".[1] With Claudius (268-270), the first Illyrian emperor of a succession unbroken for more than a century, began the slow recovery that was consummated under the ministrations of Diocletian.

The first serious attempt to spread the knowledge of Latin in the Greek-speaking East was made by Diocletian as a part of his efforts to check the infiltration of non-Roman elements into the Empire. Indirectly, he encouraged the learning of Latin by rigidly maintaining it as the official lamguage,[2] by increasing in number the civil

---

1) Alföldi, CAH XII, p. 200.
2) The influence of Diocletian in this respect is strikingly illustrated by papyrus records from Egypt. During the first three centuries of the Empire not only was the business of administration in Egypt largely conducted in Greek, but Greek was used almost exclusively for the records of legal proceedings, even when Roman citizens were concerned. As a result of Diocletian's efforts, the sentences of judges and the description of the circumstances of trials had to be recorded in Latin, although the speeches of Greek plaintiffs and defendants were still recorded in Greek. See Jouguet, "Les Papyrus latins d'Egypte", Revue des Études latines 3 (1925), p. 42.

service,[1] and by granting special privileges to students of Roman law.[2] As a direct stimulant to Latin studies in the East he called the Latin rhetorician Lactantius and the grammarian Flavius to teach Latin to Greeks at Nicomedia in Asia Minor, which he had turned into a cultural center.[3] Apparently, however, although Diocletian insisted on Latin as the language of administration, he used no coercion upon Greeks to learn it, for in his notice on Lactantius, Jerome adds that this Christian worthy was forced to devote himself to writing, because, the country being Greek, there was a lack of pupils.[4] Greeks could plead their cases in the courts in Greek,[5] and a knowledge of Latin was not necessary for the ordinary pursuits of life.

Rome had ceased to be the imperial capital, even

---

1) Diocletian's division of the Empire into four major parts, under two Augusti and two Caesares each with his own court, and his subdivision of the provinces until their number was almost what it had been effected an important increase in the number of government posts"(Ennslin, CAH XII, ch. 11, "The Reforms of Diocletian"). The Greeks had been eligible for such positions since the issuing in 212 of Caracalla's citizenship decree.
2) Codex Justin. X, 50 (49),1; cf. X,47,1.
3) Jerome, De Viris Illustr. 80; Lactantius, Divin. Instit. V, 2,2.
4) Ibid.
5) Jouguet, op.cit., p.42.

by courtesy, after Diocletian had indicated his preference for Nicomedia. When in A.D. 330 Constantine officially declared Byzantium the capital, it was the consummation of the long-felt natural tendency toward the East as the center of the Empire. The magnificent new city was called New Rome, a name that has lingered in the ritual of the Greek Orthodox Church to the present day. It was in great part peopled with families from old Rome, if we are to trust our sources,[1] and even Roman senators were settled there.[2] Everything was done to make the new capital another Rome: buildings, temples, even streets received Roman names. The transfer of the capital gave impetus to the study of Latin in the East, and Constantine followed Diocletian in adding his encouragement. Latin professors, among whom were Tiberius Victor Minervius[3] and Ausonius' uncle Aemilius Magnus Arborius,[4] were called from the West. Eusebius[5] preserves in a Greek version a Latin prayer which the Emperor himself taught his soldiers. It was his custom to make official

---

1) Ps.-Codinus, Patria Constantinop. 63ff. (Scriptores Originum Constantinop., ed. Preger, II, p. 146f.).
2) Hesychius, Patria Constantinop. 40 (Preger, op. cit. I, p.17).
3) Ausonius, Commemoratio Professorum XVI.
4) Ausonius, op.cit. I.
5) Vita Constantini IV, 19-20.

announcements in Latin, which was then translated by interpreters.[1]

The successors of Constantine, with the exception of Julian, continued to maintain the prestige of Latin as the official language and promote it as a cultural medium. The sophist Libanius says the Constantius hated Greek literature, philosophy, and religion, claiming that he entrusted the highest positions to ignorant people and "barbarians".[2] Knowledge of Latin, he informs us in another place,[3] brings wealth and power; Greek is studied only for its intrinsic pleasure. We learn also from Libanius that in this period magistrates of Eastern cities were apparently expected to know Latin. In his forty-ninth oration, addressed to Theodosius I, he sarcastically declares, in the midst of one of his attacks on the new learning, that his uncle Phasganius (died 359; see Libanius, Epist. 96, ed. Foerster), who was an official of Antioch,

---

1) Eusebius, Vita Constant. III,13; IV, 32.
2) Libanius, Orat. LXII, 8ff.
3) Orat. I, 214: κακὸν δὲ ἕτερον θεισθὲν ἐπενεγκὸν τῇ τέχνῃ, φυγὴ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων φωνῆς, πλοῦς δὲ ἐπ' Ἰταλίας ζητούντων κατ' ἐκείνους διαλέγεσθαι. τοὺς γὰρ δὲ λόγους (Latin) τῶν λόγων (Greek) γένεσθαι δυνατωτέρους καὶ εἶναι μετ' ἐκείνων (Latin) δυνάμεις τε καὶ πλούτους, ἐν δὲ τοῖς (Greek) πλὴν αὐτῶν οὐδέν.

did not suffer any harm because he had to use an interpreter in conversing with Roman dignitaries; nor did they find that the city was governed the worse on account of his ignorance of Latin.(1

In connection with the fourth century policy of adhering to Latin in matters of administration, some attention must be devoted to two passages in the De Magistratibus of Iohannes Laurentius Lydus, a prominent figure in Justinian's court. This tract is an explanation of the workings of the imperial bureaucracy and makes use of Latin and Greek sources. The text of the first of the passages in question follows: Εἰ δέ τις καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῶν προρρήσεων στοχασμούς, οὓς τινες καλοῦσι χρησμούς, ἐν ἀριθμῷ λόγων παραλαβεῖν ὑπομένοι, πέρας ἔλαβε <τὰ> Φοντηίῳ τῷ Ῥωμαίῳ ῥηθέντα ποτέ. ἐκεῖνος γὰρ στίχους τινὰς δοθέντας δῆθεν Ῥωμύλῳ ποτὲ πατρίοις ῥήμασιν ἀναφέρει τοὺς ἀναφανδὸν προλέγοντας, τότε Ῥωμαίους τὴν τύχην ἀπολείψειν, ὅταν αὐτοὶ τῆς πατρίου φωνῆς ἐπιλάθωνται· καὶ τὸν μὲν λεγόμενον χρησμὸν τοῖς περὶ μηνῶν (De mensibus) γραφεῖσιν ἐντεθείκαμεν· πέρας δὲ μᾶλλον ἔσχε τὰ τοιαῦτα μαντεύματα· κύρου γάρ τινος Αἰγυπτίου---
--εἶτα παραβῆναι θαρρήσαντος τὴν παλαιὰν συνήθειαν καὶ τὰς ψήφους Ἑλλάδι φωνῇ προενεγκόντος, σὺν τῇ Ῥωμαίων φωνῇ καὶ τὴν τύχην ἀπέβαλεν ἡ ἀρχή.

(De Magistratibus II,12; repeated word for word in III,42)

---

1) Orat. XLIX, 29.

The second passage reads: Νόμος ἀρχαῖος ἦν, πάντα μὲν τὰ ὁποσοῦν πραττόμενα παρὰ τοῖς ἐπάρχοις, τάχα δὲ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις τῶν ἀρχῶν, τοῖς Ἰταλῶν ἐκφωνεῖσθαι ῥήμασιν· οὗ παραβαθέντος, ὡς εἴρηται – οὐ γὰρ <ἦν> ἄλλως – τὰ τῆς ἐλαττώσεως προὔβαινε. τὰ δὲ περὶ τὴν Εὐρώπην πραττόμενα πάντα τὴν ἀρχαιότητα διεφύλαξεν ἐξ ἀνάγκης, διὰ τὸ τοὺς αὐτῆς οἰκήτορας, καίπερ Ἕλληνας ἐκ τοῦ πλείονος ὄντας τῇ τῶν Ἰταλῶν φθέγγεσθαι φωνῇ, καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς δημοσιεύοντας. ταῦτα μετέβαλεν ὁ Καππαδόκης εἴς τινα ἡρῳδὴ καὶ χαμαίζηλον ἀπαγγελίαν

(De Magistratibus III, 68)

The two passages are much to the same effect. The oracle given to Romulus proclaimed that Fortune would desert the Romans whenever they forgot their native language; the trangression of the νόμος ἀρχαῖος , stipulating that all the acts of magistrates were to be issued in Latin, would be the beginning of the decline of Roman power. Now this oracle and law (or custom) are known to us only from these remarks of Lydus, and he is likewise our only source of information for Fonteius, his authority for the oracle. Therefore, no explanation of these passages can be more than conjectural, and, although they have been cited more than once, none has been attempted except for Zilliacus' comment

on the νόμος ἀρχαῖος : "Welches Gesetz hiermit gemeint war, und ob ein solches damals wirklich noch bestand, entzieht sich unserer Kenntnis, aber -- erscheint dies nur wenig Glaubhaft."[1] It seems to me, however, that much more than this can be said.

A comparison of the passages in Lydus with the passage in Valerius Maximus discussed above (p. //.) reveals several important differences in fact and spirit. Valerius Maximus says that magistratus prisci were at great pains to use Latin in their negotiations with Greeks everywhere in order to maintain the prestige of the Roman people and the Latin language. There is no mention of a law or an oracle requiring the use of Latin, and there is no threat that Roman power would wane if Latin were no longer used. In fact there is a tacit implication that the magistrates of Valerius' own day did not treat with Greeks in Latin, and we ourselves have seen that one concession after another was made to Greek from the time of the Republic to the time of Diocletian. On the other hand, Lydus specifically mentions Cyrus the Egyptian, who was an official in the government of Theodosius II, as the one who brought about the fulfillment of the oracle, and John the Cappadocian, one of Justinian's ministers, as the transgressor of the law.

We may well wonder whether the law and the oracle

1) Zilliacus, Zum Kampf der Weltsprachen im Oströmischen Reich, p. 30.

were as ancient as Lydus makes them out to be. Under what circumstances did they first appear? The following considerations seem to me to indicate that the oracle and the νόμος ἀρχαῖος were "discovered" by the imperial administration when Constantinople was made the capital of the Empire or shortly thereafter:

1) No such oracle or law was needed so long as the center of the imperial government was in the West where Latin was the prevailing language. Now it was Constantine's intention that Constantinople should be a New Rome; that Latin should remain the language of the administration; and that, in fact, the transfer of the capital should not cause a break in imperial tradition. Nevertheless, it was probably realized that a Latin capital and a Latin administration stood in constant danger of losing their Latin character in the Greek East; the experience of the Roman colonies in the East indicated that.[1] What was required if Constantine's purpose was to be achieved was something to prevent a rapid Hellenization of the central administration.

2) The character of the law and the oracle points to their being invented to fill such a need. Both were cloaked with the mists of time: the oracle was supposed

---

1) See below, p.45.

to have been given to Romulus, the founder of old Rome, - and in Latin; the law was a νόμος ἀρχαῖος , a vague and indefinite term, whose transgression- ὡς εἴρηται - would bring about Rome's decay. The fulfillment of the oracle also meant ruin for the Empire. In each case we see an appeal to tradition coupled with a terrible threat - the two forces that might retard Hellenization. It is even possible that the Fonteius from whom Lydus took the story of the oracle was its author. When did Fonteius live? We may readily discount Lydus' statement that Fonteius was one of Varro's sources.(1 The probability is that Fonteius drew upon Varro, since the works attributed to him by Lydus are all of an antiquarian nature: De Signis,(2 a treatise on thunder-divination,(3 and another apparently entitled De Etrusca Disciplina.(4 In the fourth century writing of this type had a great vogue, and it is tempting to place Fonteius' floruit in the time of the founding of Constantinople.(5 A scholar such as he, versed in antiquarian lore, could easily have produced the oracle given to Romulus.

---

1) De Magistratibus, proemium.
2) De Mensibus IV,2.
3) De Ostentis 39.
4) De Ostentis 3.
5) I.F.Schultze,(Quaestiones Lydianae I, p.38) suggested the fourth century as a possible date for Fonteius.

The one emperor of the fourth century who was not Roman in outlook was Julian, whose brief reign (361-363) was characterized by its Hellenic spirit, fostered by the Emperor himself. Thoroughly steeped in the Greek classics, Julian had a profound love for everything Greek. A pagan himself, he hoped to bring about a great revival in the worship of the old gods, which had by this time all but disappeared. He was the patron of Greek literature and learning; to Libanius, he seemed the savior of Greek culture.(1 According to Ammianus Marcellinus(2 Julian knew Latin fairly well, but he evidently had little use for the language. In one of his orations(3 he comments on the v sound that they (the Latins) use for the Greek beta, and he well sums up his attitude toward the tongue which was spoken throughout the entire West in a letter(4 he wrote from Gaul to two student friends in the East: -τὰ δ'ἐμά, εἰ καὶ φθεγγοίμην Ἑλληνιστί, θαυμάζειν ἄξιον. οὕτως ἐσμὲν ἐκβεβαρβαρωμένοι διὰ τὰ χωρία.

---

1) Libanius, Orat. LXII, 17.
2) XVI, 5,7:- super his aderat latine quoque disserendi sufficiens sermo. Cf. Eutropius, Breviarum X,16,3: -liberalibus disciplinis adprime eruditus (Julian) Graecis doctior atque adeo, ut Latina eruditio nequaquam cum Graeca scientia conveniret.
3) Julian, Orat. II, 72a.
4) Julian, Epist. 55,ed. Hertlein.

Whatever Julian's personal opinion about the relative merits of Greek and Latin, decrees and laws were still issued in Latin during his short reign.[1] What changes he would have effected had he lived to pursue his Hellenizing policy, are a subject for speculation. As it was, Latin remained the official language until the beginning of the seventh century, although Greek had begun to encroach upon it as early as the reign of Theodosius II (408-450). The reason for the growing disuse of Latin as the language of administration in the East is easy to see. After Julian and until the accession Justinian the Empire was no longer unified, except for the few years when Theodosius I (392-395) and Leo I (465-467) were sole emperors of East and West. It was natural and inevitable that Greek should replace Latin as the official language in the East in spite of imperial tradition, since the East was Greek.

As we have seen it was in the reign of Theodosius II that Cyrus of Panopolis in Egypt issued Greek decrees from the Capital, an innovation for which he is censured by Lydus a century or so later.[2] A decree of the same emperor, dated February 27, 425, establishing the University of Constantinople, ruled that its faculty should include three teachers of Latin

---

1) Cf. the laws of the Theodosian Codex from Julian's reign; an occasional Greek word will be found (cf. Cod. Theodos. XII, 7, 2.)
2) De Magistratibus II, 12.

oratory and ten Latin grammarians while there were to be five Greek sophists and ten Greek grammarians.[1] The smaller number of Latin teachers of rhetoric than Greek in the University and the Greek decrees of Cyrus mark the beginning of the official Hellenization of the eastern half of the Roman Empire.[2]

The great legal monuments of the age of Justinian--the Institutes, the Digests, and the Code--were originally issued in Latin, but the work of translation into Greek began almost immediately after their publication.[3] As for the Novels of Justinian, a corpus of 168 laws published from time to time during his reign and collected by jurists after his death, most of these were issued in Greek, since Justinian, though proud to call Latin his πάτριος φωνή , wanted his laws to be understood by the predominantly Greek population of his Empire.[4]

---

1) Codex Theodosianus XIV, 9, 3.
2) Cf. J. B. Bury, History of the Later Roman Empire I, p. 232.
3) Theophilus prepared a Greek paraphrase of the Institutes; Dorotheus translated the Digests; and the Code also was published in a Greek form. Cf. Bury's Appendix 10 to the fifth volume of his edition of Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (London, 1911).
4) Justinian Novels. XV, ed. Lingenthal:-- καὶ οὐ τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ τὸν νόμον συνεγράψαμεν ἀλλὰ ταύτῃ δὴ τῇ κοινῇ τε καὶ ἑλλάδι, ὥστε ἅπασιν αὐτὸν εἶναι γνώριμον διὰ τὸ πρόχειρον τῆς ἑρμηνείας.

By the time of the emperor Heraclius (610-642) Latin had ceased to have a place in the administration of the Empire of the East. According to Constantinus Porphyrogenitus,(1 Heraclius adopted Greek as the official language. Nevertheless the Byzantine emperors continued to call themselves the Emperors of the Romans, a title now without significance.(2 Latin words and phrases, sprinkled throughout the ritual of court ceremonies, were repeated for tradition's sake, without comprehension. During the centuries following Justinian there was little knowledge of Latin in the East. We are told, for instance, that a "certain Roman" in the days of Leo VI (886-911) saw a Latin inscription in a church in Constantinople and told its meaning to the Emperor, who rewarded him with a rich gift and bestowed on him the title of "Illustrious."(3

---

1) De Thematibus I, 2. Use of the title βασιλεύς for the Emperor occurs first in a document of A.D.629. It was also in the reign of Heraclius that Greek legends began to appear on silver coins.

2) See the stinging rebuke Pope Nicolas I (Epist. 86, Migne, PL CXIX, col. 932) addressed to the Byzantine emperor Michael (A.D. 865) who had termed Latin a "barbarous and Scythian tongue." The Pope reminds the Emperor that he calls himself Emperor of the Romans and uses Latin in court ceremonials though he does not speak the language. If there are any barbarisms in his Latin, continues the Pope, they must be due to poor translations. Cf. also Liudprand, Legatio Constantin. 51 (A.D. 968).

3) Ps.--Codinus, Patria Constantinop. III, 30 (Preger, op. cit. II, p. 225): Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς αὐτοκρατορίας Λέοντος τοῦ υἱοῦ Βασιλείου ἀνελθών Ῥωμαῖός τις τοῦ εὔξασθαι εἰς τοὺς ναοὺς τῆς πόλεως εἶδεν Ῥωμαϊκὰ γράμματα λίθινα ἐπὶ τοῦ πίνσοῦ, καὶ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν γνοὺς ἐγνώρισεν τῷ βασιλεῖ. καὶ δέδωκεν αὐτῷ χρῆμα καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν Ἴλλούστριον δοὺς αὐτῷ χάραγμα λίτρας λ.

It was only when the Crusades once more opened up relations with Western Europe that interest in Latin revived in the Orient. When we reach Maximus Planudes (ca. 1260-1330), the Byzantine savant who translated parts of Ovid, Cicero, and Caesar into Greek, we are looking more toward the Renaissance than to antiquity.

4. Conclusion

It is well before we consider the effect that other external forces might have had in inducing Greeks to learn Latin to recapitulate the main points which this survey of the Roman official attitude toward the Greek and Latin languages has attempted to bring out.

In the first place, it should be clear that the Romans did not, during the five hundred years from Flamininus to Diocletian, apply pressure on Greek-speaking peoples to learn the Latin language. The history of the official relations between the two languages during this half-millennium is a long series of concessions to Greek, starting with the earliest pertinent evidence we have--the senatus consulta in Greek; continuing through the Republic to the beginning of the Principate, when the Empire was recognized as bilingual; to the second century when the emperors encouraged the Greek literary renaissance; and into the third century when the citizenship

decree made Latin and Greek almost equal before the law. If it was true that the Romans were at pains, at least during the first half of the second century B.C., themselves to use Latin in dealing with Greeks as a matter of prestige, it was also true that they were very obliging in providing interpreters.

Diocletian's insistence on Latin as the language of administration and the measures he took to encourage Latin studies in the East were but a part of the greater program of Romanization undertaken to revitalize a tottering Empire. If this is remembered, and also the fact that the transfer of the capital to the Greek East, which actually dates from the time of Diocletian although officially the change was made by Constantine in 330, necessitated a greater vigilance to maintain Latin as the official language of the Empire than had been required while the capital was in the Latin West, it will be realized that even in the fourth and later centuries there was no attempt to compel Greek-speaking peoples to renounce their language for Latin. So long as the Eastern and Western halves of the Empire remained parts of an organic whole, it was plain common sense for the central administration to adhere to Latin, Rome's language from time immemorial, in the interests of unity and tradition. When the West was divorced from the East, Greek gradually replaced Latin in the administration of the

East, and without any great struggle.

In view of these facts, there seems to be no basis for assuming that there was at any time a "battle" between Greek and Latin in the East in the fundamental sense in which Lafoscade conceived it and as he expressed it in the following statements, which are typical of his point of view: "ce n'est donc pas du cote des Romains qu'il faut chercher les causes de cet insucces linguistique. Leur langue n'a pas manqué de vigueur dans l'attaque: c'est celle des Grecs qui en a montre plus encore dans la resistance,"[1] and again "Pourquoi le latin a-t-il echoué en face du grec? C'est que le grec avait une force de resistance superieure à la force d'attaque."[2]

There was no attack, and where there was no attack there could be no resistance. This point should be kept in mind when the pages of this dissertation which are concerned with the actual extent and importance of the Greeks' knowledge of Latin are being read. When Greeks learned Latin, in almost every case they learned it because they wanted to, or because they felt it was desirable for them to do so, and not because they were under any compulsion.

---

1) Lafoscade, op. cit., p. 140.
2) Lafoscade, op. cit., p. 157.

C. Trade, Colonies, the Army, and the Church as Factors In Spreading Latin in the Greek East.

Having considered in detail the most powerful external force that could have influenced the Greeks to learn Latin--the Roman government, we must now discuss other and less important means by which the spread of Latin in Greek lands might have been aided: trade, colonies, the army, and finally the Church.

1. Trade

"Ubicumque vicit Romanus, habitat."[1] There were Roman traders active in the East as early as the second century B.C., so active in fact that Mommsen[2] was led to attribute the destruction of Corinth in 146 B.C. to the influence of Roman merchants in Delos. Inscriptions and monuments discovered at Delos, which enjoyed a tremendous commercial prosperity from approximately 168 to 87 B.C., reveal that Ἰταλικοί and Ῥωμαῖοι were present there in great numbers during this period, and that powerful Roman commercial companies were in operation.[3] The fact that in 88 B.C. approximately eighty thousand Romans were slain on one day in the East at the order of Mithradates[4]

---

1) Seneca, Ad Helviam Matrem de consol. 7, 7.
2) History of Rome III, p. 274.
3) Consult Homolle, "Les Romains à Delos", BCH 8 (1884), pp. 75-158.
4) Val. Max IX, 1, extract 3,; Vell. Paterc. II, 18.

indicates how many Westerners had already been drawn there for purposes of trade.

It is doubtful whether the Roman traders, who tended to stick together, forming companies of their own, had much to do with spreading the knowledge of Latin among the Greeks. It is also doubtful whether they used Latin in dealing with Greeks. If we are to accept the view of Tenney Frank, most of the Occidentals in Delos, at least, came from the Greek cities of Southern Italy and Sicily and were neither Roman citizens nor Latin speaking.(1 He also believes that Caesar restored Corinth for commercial reasons and peopled it with Greek-speaking freedmen from Rome so that there would be no difficulty in the matter of language.(2

In the parts of the East, subject to Rome, where Greek culture had not spread, Roman traders must have had considerable influence in extending the knowledge of Latin. Priscus Panites, describing his mission to Attila's court (A.D. 448), tells of the surprise he felt at meeting a Scythian who spoke Greek: "For the subjects of the Huns, swept together from various lands, speak besides their own barbarous tongue either Hunni or Gothic, or as many as have commercial dealings with the western Romans, Latin, but none of them easily speak Greek, except captives

---

1) Frank, Roman Imperialism, pp. 284-286.
2) Frank, Economic History of Rome, pp. 348-349.

from the Thracian or Illyrian sea-coast."[1]

2. Colonies

A number of Roman colonies[2] was founded in the Greek East between the time of Julius Caesar and the time of Marcus Aurelius, but they were very few in comparison with the many Greek cities founded in the same period. These Eastern colonies were very different from those planted in regions which had been previously barbarous in that they were not expected to serve as *nuclei* for Romanization; they were for the most part superimposed on existing Greek cities with the Latin-speaking settlers forming an inconsiderable part of the population; and even the most Roman of them were rapidly Hellenized.

The reasons for founding colonies in the East were always practical. Army veterans and citizens from overpopulated areas were settled where there was land available for them. Thus, Julius Caesar peopled Corinth, which was *ager publicus*, from the lower classes at Rome.[3] Occasionally veterans would not be settled in colonies at all, but

---

1) Priscus, fragm.8, FHG, ed. Mueller, IV, p.86. See Bury, Later Roman Empire I, p.283.
2) This account of Roman colonies in the East is based largely on the discussion in Jones, The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian (Oxford,1940), pp.60-65.
3) Strabo, Geogr. VIII, p.381.

would be planted in Greek cities without being granted any separate corporate status.[1] Sometimes economic considerations influenced the founding of a new settlement: Nicopolis in mainland Greece was a Roman colony in name only, for it was peopled, as Dio tells us,[2] with the inhabitants of the run-down towns and cities of the neighborhood for the purpose of bringing back prosperity to that area. Similarly, a number of old and decaying towns of Achaea contibuted their populations to help in creating Patrae, a colony of which the Roman element was distinctly in the minority.[3] Finally, some colonies were also intended to be military outposts, planned to keep troublesome districts in check.[4]

Not even the most Roman of the colonies in the Greek East kept their Roman character for long. Corinth, for example, which at the time of its restoration by Julius Caesar was organized under the regular duumvirate form of government of Roman colonies,[5] is referred to less than

---

1) E.g. Vespasian settled 800 men at Emmaeus, near Jerusalem, in this way (Josephus, Bell. Iud. VII, 217).
2) LI,1: (Augustus) πόλιν τέ τινα ἐν τῷ τοῦ στρατοπέδου τόπῳ τοὺς μὲν συναγείρας τοὺς δ' ἀναστήσας τῶν πλησιοχώρων συνῴκισε, Νικόπολιν ὄνομα αὐτῇ ἔθους.
3) See Arnold, Studies of Roman Imperialism, p.197.
4) Of this character were Augustus' colonies in Pisidia.
5) Arnold, ibid.

a century and a half later as one of the most Hellenic of cities.[1] The Latin legends on coins from Eastern colonies rapidly were corrupted by the prevailing Greek idiom and Greek soon supplanted Latin on inscriptions.[2] Berytus alone seems to have withstood Hellenization; even in the later Empire it had a Latin character, due, no doubt, to the fact that it was the seat of the Empire's most famous law school.

In the light of these facts, it is hard to believe that Roman colonies helped appreciably to spread the knowledge of Latin in the Greek East.[3] As Jones says: "These settlements were clearly too few and far between seriously to modify the predominantly Greek culture of the regions in which they were planted, and in point of fact they for the most part gradually took the tone of their surroundings. ---The motives for Roman colonization in the East are not to be sought in any policy of cultural assimilation . They were strictly practical."

3. The Roman Army

The official language of the Roman army everywhere was Latin. Our information concerning the employment of

---

1) Dio Chrys., Orat. XXXVII (Corinthiaca), 26.
2) See Wilhelm Kubitschek, "Der Rückgang des lateinischen im Orient," Wiener Studien 24 (1902), pp.572-81.
3) Op. cit., p.61.

Latin in military matters in the East comes principally from two sources: the military papyri which have been found in Egypt and the military records uncovered at Dura-Europos, the recently excavated garrison town on the Euphrates river in Syria. The army records found at Dura are for the most part written in Latin[1] in contrast with the private business records which are predominantly Greek. In Egypt, while Latin remained the army's official language down into the sixth century, actually there are many papyri pertaining to military affairs in Greek.[2] This is not surprising since Egypt, a province widely different from the others in character, saw little of Romans.[3] The very fact that Latin military papyri have been found in numbers in Egypt where Latin was so little used provides strong confirmation of the army's conservatism in respect to its official language.

---

1) Rostovtzeff, Dura-Europos and its Art (Oxford,1938),p.5.
2) Stein, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Verwaltung Aegyptens unter roemischer Herrschaft (Stuttgart,1915), p. 173ff.
3) For an account of the unusual status of Egypt among Roman provinces, see Stein, op. cit., pp.79-131; cf. also Winter, Life and Letters in the Papyri, ch. I. Until Diocletian put it in the same class with the other provinces, Egypt was virtually the personal property of the Emperors.Roman senators were forbidden to go there and other Romans were never there in large numbers. The civil administration, in organization a carry-over from Ptolemaic times, was from the first mainly conducted in Greek by Greeks responsible to the emperor's personal representatives.

There are two ways in which Greeks might have learned Latin through the influence of the Roman army: Greek recruits might have gained a knowledge of the language during their terms of service, and Greeks at large might have picked up some Latin through the permanent quartering of army units in their towns and cities. As for the first, it is in general true that Greek-speaking peoples did not furnish a great many recruits to the army; their character was not such as makes good soldiers. The half-barbarous regions of Galatia and Cappadocia were the principal recruiting areas of the East, even in the first century after Christ.[1] Nevertheless, the Greeks who were in the army probably gained a working knowledge of Latin, and at least one of them, the veteran campaigner Ammianus Marcellinus, learned the language well enough to use it as a literary medium, although it may be that he studied Latin in school at Antioch before entering the army.[2] It is not unlikely, however, that the army sponsored some kind of systematic Latin instruction. A Latin grammar, dating probably from the first half of the third

---

1) Parker, The Roman Legions (Oxford, 1928), p.181ff. Cf. Tacitus (Annal. XIII, 35,4) concerning preparations for Corbulo's Eastern campaign in Nero's reign: habiti per Galatiam Cappadociamque dilectus.
2) The view expressed in the article on Ammianus by Seeck in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie I, 1851.

century, was turned up among papyri found at Karanis in Egypt.[1] The grammar is on the papyrus verso; on the recto is a military record of perhaps some fifty years earlier. The scribe of the grammar was experienced in writing the Latin book-hand and may have been attached to a military clerical office. The probability is that the grammar was designed for use as a school-book in the army.

There was always a number of legions stationed in the East.[2] But once the Romans had decided upon the Empire's frontiers, these armies had very little contact with the Greek-speaking population for any length of time. The frontier in Europe was far north of Greece, and in Asia along the Euprates, east of which Greek culture had at best only a precarious footing.[3] From the end of the first century onward, the armies which garrisoned the frontiers were generally local in origin and were seldom moved from

---

1) British Museum, Inventory no. 2723; P. Mich.4649. Cf. Milne, Literary Papyri in the British Museum, no. 184 and Dunlap, "Fragments of a Latin Grammar from Egypt," AJP 61 (1940),pp. 330-44.

2) Between the time of Augustus and Marcus Aurelius there were never fewer than six legions in Egypt and Asia. See Parker, op.cit., ch. V.

3) Greek culture and the use of the Greek language in the East were in the main centered in the cities. Even in the districts adjacent and subject to Asiatic Greek cities, native languages sometimes persisted. On the question of the survival of native languages in the East, see Jones, op. cit., pp. 288-95.

their border headquarters.[1] Within the frontiers peace reigned, and for long periods of time the peoples of Greece and the Asiatic coast very possibly saw no soldiers. Josephus informs us that not one of the five hundred towns of Asia had a garrison.[2] Writing in the second century, Aelius Aristides says that Rome has brought such a profound peace that the world knows of armies and wars only from the vague reports of campaigns against the Getae and the Libyans.[3]

Everything considered, it may be said that the Roman army, like trade and colonies, played a negligible role in spreading the knowledge of Latin in Greek-speaking regions. In Egypt, where there were probably more Greek-speaking soldiers than anywhere else, Greek was extensively used in the conduct of military affairs, an indication that the army, traditionally conservative, was willing to adapt itself to local conditions when it was advisable to do so. On the other hand, it was only natural that so mighty and famous an institution should leave its mark on the Greek language, and we find that a considerable number of Latin military terms- of which λεγεών, κεντυρία, and σούξ are

---

1) Parker, ibid. and ch. VI.
2) Bell. Iud. II, 366.
3) Aristides, Εἰς Ῥώμην 70.

the least technical- was taken over by Greek and survived well into Byzantine times. Consideration of such importations, however, does not lie within the compass of this dissertation.(1

4. The Church

If the army had little influence in extending the knowledge of Latin in the Greek East, the Church had none at all. The language of the Church was everywhere Greek until approximately the middle of the third century, when Latin began to be used in the West.(2 It was not to be expected that the Eastern clergy would forsake the language of the New Testament for a tongue that was not understood by their congregations. Indeed, the fact that the clergy in the East adhered steadfastly to Greek has been called the chief hindrance to the spread of Latin in the East.(3

Very few of the Eastern clergy at any time knew Latin. Constantine, it is true, addressed the Council of Nicaea (A.D.325) in Latin, but an interpreter stood by

---

1) Survivals of Latin military terms in Greek are fully treated in Zilliacus, op. cit.
2) Tertullian is the first great Christian Latin writer. The inscriptions on the tombs of the Popes in the Catacombs were first engraved in Latin ca. A.D. 250, and Greek was still used in the churches at Lyons, Autun, and Vienna in the third century. (Lafoscade, op. cit., p. 156).
3) Schmid-Stählin, Geschichte der griechischen Literatur II, p.946.

his side to translate his words into Greek.(1 Later, when he presided over a meeting of the bishops at the same council, he used Greek.(2 Greek bishops who attended the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431) requested that the letters of Pope Caelestinus to the Council be translated into Greek so that all might understand them.(3 In 454 Pope Leo I wrote to the bishop of Cos begging him to make an accurate Greek translation of a letter that he wished read to the people of Alexandria.(4

---

1) Eusebius, Vita Constant. III, 13: Ὁ μὲν δὴ ταῦτ' εἰπὼν Ῥωμαΐζ γλώττῃ, ὑφερμηνεύοντος ἑτέρου, παρεδίδου τὸν λόγον τοῖς τῆς συνόδου προέδροις. Cf. also Eusebius, op. cit. IV,32; Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. I, ch. 19 extr.
2) Eusebius, op. cit. III, 13.
3) Acta Concil. Oecumen. ed. Schwartz I,1^{3}, p. 55,ll. 1-6: Ἀρκάδιος καὶ Προέκτης οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι καὶ πρεσβυταὶ εἶπον. καθὼς ἐκέλευσεν ἡ ὑμετέρα μακαριότης, ἵνα εἰς τὴν πάντων γνῶσιν ἔλθῃ τὰ γράμματα τὰ προτεινέχθεντα, ἐπειδὴ πολλοί εἰσι τῶν ἁγίων ἀδελφῶν καὶ ἐπισκόπων ἡμῶν, οἵτινες Ῥωμαϊστὶ ἀγνοοῦσι, διὰ τοι τοῦτο καὶ Ἑλληνιστὶ ἡ προκομισθεῖσα ἐπιστολὴ μεταβέβληται. καὶ εἰ κελεύοιτε, ἀναγνωσθήσεται.
4) Leo I, Epist. ad Julianum Episcopum Coensem (Migne, PL LIV, 1081):- hoc fraternitati tuae laboris iniungo, ut eandem epistolam meam--diligenti interpretatione ex Latino in Graecum transferre digneris.

II THE GREEKS AND THE LATIN LANGUAGE

A. The Greek Attitude toward the Romans and the Latin Language

The assertion has been made many times by modern scholars, generally without any qualifications as to time or place, that the Greek Orient, submitting to the rule of the Western "barbarians" with dreary resignation, had nothing but contempt for Rome, the Romans, and the Latin language.[1] Recently this view, which has had the support of a long tradition, has been in great part discredited.[2] But there is more to be said against it than has been said. Therefore, it is not out of place to begin this section on the Greeks' knowledge of Latin with some general remarks on the popularity of the Romans in the East during successive periods.

The Romans seem to have been popular enough in the East during the early years of their intervention into Greek affairs. The cult of Roma as a goddess appeared in the Greek

---

1) I mention but a few who have repeated this dictum since Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire I, ch.II, ed. Bury (London, 1911), p.42; Budinszky, Die Ausbreitung der lateinischen Sprache (Berlin, 1881), p.236; Lafoscade, op. cit.(Paris, 1892), passim; Rohde, Der griechische Roman[3] (Leipzig, 1914), p.319 ff.; Kroll, Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur (Stuttgart, 1924), pp. 9-10; Highet, AJP 63 (1942), p. 102.

2) See Sherwin-White, The Roman Citizenship (Oxford, 1939). My summary of the Greek attitude toward the Romans owes much to this book, especially to part III.

city-states of Asia Minor by 195 B.C.[1] The enthusiasm which the arrival of Flamininus in Greece inspired among the Greeks finds expression in an epigram written by a contemporary, Alcaeus of Messene. Translated, the poem runs as follows: "Xerxes led a Persian army to the land of Hellas, and Titus led there an army from broad Italy; but the one came to set the yoke of slavery on the neck of Europe, the other to put an end to the servitude of Hellas."[2] Plutarch's account of Flamininus' reception in Greece is more vivid: "For they (the first Greeks to meet Flamininus) had heard the Macedonians say," he writes, "that a commander of a barbarian host was coming against them, who subdued and enslaved everywhere by force of arms; and then, when they met a man who was young in years, humane in aspect, a Greek in voice and language, and a lover of genuine honor, they were wonderfully charmed and when they returned to their cities they filled them with kindly feelings towards him and the belief that in him they had a champion of their liberties."[3]

It would appear that relations between Romans and Greek-speaking peoples remained fairly cordial, in spite of local wars, until about the end of the second century

---

1) Sherwin-White, op. cit., p.233.
2) Anthologia Graeca, XVI, 5. Perrin's translat
3) Plutarch, Flamininus 5 (Perrin's translation, Loeb Classical Library).

B.C. Inscriptions of this period from the East indicate that the Greeks really meant what they said in praise of Rome and her magistrates;[1] in these documents there is much more of sincerity than is to be found in the monotonous flattery of countless later inscriptions. The last part of the second century, however, witnessed the beginning of a temporary deterioration in Graeco- Roman relations. There were several reasons for this. First, the sack of Corinth in 146 undoubtedly shocked and angered the Greeks. To this may be added the less spectacular but none the less systematic looting and extortion carried on or countenanced by the governors sent out by the Senate. Second, the devastation that the Eastern campaigns of Sulla, and especially the Civil War somewhat later, left in their wake increased the ill-will.[2] Finally, the Greeks gradually realized that the Romans had no intention of setting the East free. Apollonius Molo of Rhodes gave an early expression to this feeling when he sadly remarked, while praising Cicero's oratory in 78 B.C., that the only glories left to Greece were culture and eloquence, and these also were to be given the Romans by Cicero.[3]

---

1) See, for example, Dittenberger, SIG[3] II, 694.
2) The sack of Corinth, the Roman love of money, and the brutality of generals such as Sulla are the three reasons for the growing dislike of Rome given in the Sybylline Oracles, Greek verses that reflect the temper of the times. Cf. Orac. Sybyll. III, 175ff.; 470-3; IV, 102ff.
3) Plutarch, Cicero 4.

The unpopularity of Romans in the Greek East was greatest in the years just before and after the beginning of the Christian Era. The estrangement of East and West is often indirectly referred to in the writings of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and to a lesser degree in the Geographica of Strabo and the Bibliotheca Historica of Diodorus Siculus.

Dionysius was a Greek who went to Rome in 30 B.C. and stayed there until 8 B.C. In the course of these twenty-two years he composed his Antiquitates Romanae, a history of Rome from legendary times down to the period covered by Polybius. Dionysius liked the Romans, living on intimate terms with the leading men of the state, and wrote his work partly to promote understanding of the Romans among the Greeks and partly out of gratitude for the kindness he had met with in Rome. He is therefore to be regarded as a kind of intermediary between Greek and Roman. Not representative of current Greek opinion, he nevertheless addressed himself to his own people.

In the apologia with which he begins the Antiquitates Romanae Dionysius follows Polybius in arguing that the Roman power is greater and more enduring than that of any empire in history. Furthermore, he goes on to say, he intends to prove that the Romans are not barbarians but Greeks. "For even now almost all the Greeks are ignorant of the early

history of Rome, since the great majority of them have been deceived by sundry false opinions which have their origin in idle talk. According to these stories Rome had as her founders nomads and vagabonds and barbarians, none of whom were free men, and that in the course of time she reached world domination, not through piety, justice and the other virtues, but through chance and the injustice of fortune which unfairly bestows the greatest blessings upon the least deserving. And indeed the more malicious are accustomed to rail openly at fortune for freely granting to the basest of barbarians the good things of the Greeks."[1] To correct these erroneous impressions Dionysius plans to give a true account of the founding of Rome. "By this means," he says, "I engage to prove that they (the Roman founders) were Greeks and came together from nations not the smallest nor the least considerable."[2] Then begins the labored account of Rome's founding by Greeks which fills up the first book of the Antiquitates. I give three more quotations taken from this book which illustrate their author's special pleading. At the beginning of I, 61 we read: "That the Trojans, too, were a nation as truly Greek as any and formerly came from the

---

1) I, 4 (adapted from Cary's translation, Loeb Classical Library).

2) I, 5. See also VII, 70. While Dionysius was not the first to claim a Greek origin for Rome, he was the only Greek, so far as I know, to use this legend in winning the Greeks' good will for Rome.

Peloponnesus has long since been asserted by some authors and will be briefly related by me also." He closes the first book with a recapitulation of the arguments for Rome's Greek origin. "Hence, from now on," he writes, "let the reader forever renounce the views of those who make Rome a retreat of barbarians, fugitives, and vagabonds, and let him confidently affirm it to be a Greek city."(1 And just below: "The language of the Romans is neither utterly barbarous nor absolutely Greek, but a mixture, as it were, of both, the greater part of which is Aeolic; and the only disadvantage they have experienced from their intermingling with these various nations is that they do not pronounce all their sounds properly. But all other indications of a Greek origin they preserve beyond any other colonists."(2

In the same vein are remarks made by Strabo and Diodorus Siculus, the most important Greek writers among Dionysius' contemporaries. Both these men were, like Dionysius, favorable to the Roman cause, Strabo being in fact an ardent devotee.(3 But they were also addressing their fellow Greeks in their writings. Therefore, what they have to say on Roman-Greek relations can be regarded in the same

---

1) I, 89.
2) I, 90.
3) Cf. for example Geogr. I, p. 9; III, p. 156; VI, p. 286 ff.

light as the comments of Dionysius. Their treatment of the sack of Corinth in 146 B.C. will serve as a good illustration of their attitude, since the memory of that display of Roman brutality still burned in the Greeks' minds. Even Polybius, great friend of the Romans, could not condone such violence. But Strabo declares that the Corinthians had given the Romans ample provocation for the treatment they received. They deserved their fate.(1 Equally anxious to soothe angry feelings, Diodorus goes about it somewhat differently, choosing to emphasize Julius Caesar's restoration of Corinth rather than to justify the sack of the city. Even so he seems to imply by this choice of words that the Romans had cause to do what they did. "For although his ancestors," he says, "treated the city rather harshly, he (Caesar) because of his gentleness, made good for their severity, preferring pardon to vengeance."(2

The Greeks for whose benefit these authors were writing could not express their dislike for the Romans by open rebellion. Therefore they resorted to innuendo and other petty tactics. They seem, for example, to have taken great satisfaction in the Parthian victories over the Romans. Perhaps it was, as C. S. Walton suggests,(3 to impress the oriental mind that Augustus laid much stress in his Res Gestae (chapt. 29) on his recovery of the Roman standards

---

1) Strabo, Geogr. VIII, p. 381.
2) Diodorus XXXII, fragm. 27 (ed. Müller).
3) "Oriental Senators in the Service of Rome", JRS 19 (1929), p. 39.

from the Parthians, and again on the homage that the Parthian chiefs were eager to pay him. At any rate Strabo's comments concerning the Parthians appear to be an answer to those Greeks who disparaged the Roman power. In his eulogy of the Principate, he remarks: "But as for the Parthians, although they have a common border with the Romans and also are very powerful, they have nevertheless yielded so far to the preëminence of the Romans and of the rulers of our time that they have sent to Rome the trophies which they once set up as a memorial of their victory over the Romans, and what is more, Phraates has entrusted to Augustus Caesar his children and also his children's children, thus obsequiously (θεραπευτικῶς) making sure of Caesar's friendship by giving hostages; and the Parthians of today have often gone to Rome in quest of a man to be their king and are now about ready to put their entire authority into the hands of the Romans."(1

Apparently the Greeks also delighted in comparing Augustus unfavorably with Alexander, who had subdued the very Eastern peoples whom the Romans failed to conquer. Jibes of this kind often were effective. Livy, who is not given to digressions, goes to considerable pains to reply to these "levissimi ex Graecis" and stoutly maintains that any of the Roman generals contemporary with Alexander was

---

1) Geogr. VI, p. 286 ff. (Jones' translation, Loeb Classical Library).

his match, not to mention Romans of other periods.[1] Similarly the elder Seneca complains of "insolens Graecia"[2] and there is Tacitus' well-known remark about the Greeks "qui sua tantum mirantur."[3] We hear of yet another means employed to show contempt for the Romans from the Borysthenicus of Dio of Prusa. Everybody in a Greek town, he says, wore his hair long in the ancient fashion except one man "who was the object of general derision and dislike. It was said that he shaved merely to flatter the Romans and to make a show of friendship to them."[4]

In the course of the first century after Christ the antagonism between East and West waned. By the time of the Antonines there was barely a trace of it left. The East had become actually enthusiastic about the Empire and took genuine pride in being included within its borders. All felt that there had been nothing in previous Greek history to approach it in power and grandeur. The Greeks said so without reserve.[5] This gradual growth in the East of loyalty to the Empire has been carefully traced in another work.[6] Two principal factors in producing the change in

---

1) IX, 17-18.
2) Controversiae, Praef. I, 6.
3) Annals II, 88.
4) Dio Chrys. 36, 17.
5) See Aelius Aristides' depreciatory remarks about fifth century Greeks, Εἰς Ῥώμην 40 ff. The Greeks were never great, he says, except in the realm of the spirit. This is a far cry from Apollonius Molo's "culture and eloquence--all that are left to us."
6) In Sherwin-White, op. cit., part III.

attitude were the long peace and the enthusiasm with which the Greek East took to emperor-worship. Other stimuli, such as the benevolent paternalistic Roman rule of the second century, have been discussed above (p.22f). At this point I should like to consider certain aspects and expressions of this change that have been either insufficiently emphasized or entirely unnoticed heretofore.

There is no more striking illustration of the disappearance of the Greeks' resentment and contempt for their Roman masters and the growth of their pride in the Empire during this general period than is provided by a study of the terms they use in speaking of the Romans. It will be remembered that many Greeks in the time of Dionysius of Halicarnassus looked upon the Romans as "barbarians" and upon Latin as a barbarous tongue.(1 With the passage of time, however, the Greeks began to speak of Roman-Greek civilization as opposed to the barbarism outside the Empire. Aelius Aristides,

---

1) According to Strabo, who quotes him, the Alexandrian savant Eratosthenes of the third century B.C. rebuked the Greeks for their classification of the world into two groups, Hellenic and Barbarian, and mentioned the Romans specifically as a nation not in the class of Barbarians:-οὐκ ἐπαινέσας τοὺς δίχα διαροῦντας ἅπαν τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πλῆθος εἴς τε Ἕλληνας καὶ βαρβάρους --- βέλτιον εἶναί φησιν ἀρετῇ καὶ κακίᾳ διαρεῖν ταῦτα. πολλοὺς γὰρ καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων εἶναι κακοὺς καὶ τῶν βαρβάρων ἀστείους καθάπερ Ἰνδοὺς καὶ Ἀριανούς, ἔτι δὲ Ῥωμαίους καὶ Καρχηδονίους οὕτω θαυμαστῶς πολιτευομένους.
It is attractive to think that Strabo quotes this with the Greeks of his day in mind.

the Greek sophist born in Mysia in A.D. 117, declares in his oration Εἰς Ῥώμην that the world, once divided between Hellenes and Barbarians, is now Roman and non-Roman.(1 This sentiment is echoed by the Bithynian Cassius Dio who says that he is including in his history of Rome everything that is worthy of mention ὥστε μηδὲν τῶν ἀναγκαίων μήτε ἐκείνων (Romans) τινὰ μήτε τῶν ἄλλων ποθῆσαι.(2

Latin and Greek, as I have previously shown, were considered the two great world languages by the Greeks as well as the Romans. The Alexandrian Origen in his work Contra Celsum, written in A.D. 248, in which he replies to the anti-Christian Ἀληθὴς Λόγος that Celsus had written seventy years before, probably in Alexandria, makes some remarks which strongly confirm what I have already said (supra p.19) of the equilibrium that the two languages had reached by this time. Celsus had claimed, according to Origen, that the Christians believe that prayers to the gods in barbarous languages are effective while prayers in Greek and Latin are not. Origen declares that this is entirely false. In the first place, he replies, we Christians have but one God--Jesus Christ. Second, Christians do not pray in barbarous languages, but Greeks use Greek and Romans use Latin.(3

---

1) Εἰς Ῥώμην 40 ff.
2) Cassius Dio, fragm. I, (ed. Melber).
3) Origen, Contra Celsum VIII, 37 (Migne, PG XI, 1593a).

The distinction, made both by Celsus and Origen, between Greek and Latin on the one hand and barbarous tongues on the other, is clear. We find the same distinction made by the Syrian historian Herodian, Origen's contemporary. In writing of Alexander Severus, Herodian says that Alexander, in contrast to Elagabulus, who worshipped with the neighboring barbarian kings and princes a god who had no statue--as is usual "with Greeks and Romans,"[1] received a true Greek and Roman education.[2]

Now there is a certain amount of evidence which, on the surface, appears to contradict what has been said above concerning the rapid improvement in the attitude of Greeks toward Romans during the early centuries of our era. If we accept this testimony at face value, the Greeks continued to despise Westerners as "barbarians" as long as they had any contact with them. A thorough examination of the circumstances involved will remove the apparent contradiction.

The earliest of this evidence is from the body of letters which has come down to us under the name of the half-legendary philosopher-mystic Apollonius of Tyana whose floruit was in the first century. Letters seventy-one and seventy-two of the collection express his anger with the Greeks for using Roman names such as Lucullus, Lucretius, Fabricius, and Lupercus instead of perpetuating the names of the old Greek

---

1) Herodian V, 3, 5.
2) Idem, V, 7, 5.

heroes, warriors, and statesmen. Philostratus, in his life of Apollonius, also refers to this rebuke περὶ τοῦ βαρβαρισμοῦ τούτου (1.

The next bit of evidence of this nature comes from the Deipnosophistae of Athenaeus. I quote it in full: "Thereupon Cynulcus asked for a drink of decocta (δηκόκταν) saying that he needed to wash away salty words with fountains of sweetness. To him Ulpian replied in high dudgeon, pounding the cushion with his fist: 'How long are you going to utter barbarisms without ceasing. Must it be until I leave the symposium and go home, unable to stomach your words?' And the other answered: 'Living at present, as I do, good sir, in imperial Rome, I naturally use the language of the country. And my justification is this. Even in the ancient poets and historians, those who wrote the purest Greek, one may find Persian words adopted because of their common use in the spoken language'" (2.

---

1) Philostratus, Vita Apoll. IV, 5. See, however, Lucian's ridicule of the historian who is such a purist that he writes the Greek equivalents of all Latin names, even when Romans bear them. Lucian gives several examples, adding that there are others "far more laughable" (De Hist. Conscrib. 21). On the other hand, the promiscuous use of Latin military terms in a Greek history comes in for Lucian's censure, not because he objects to the Latin language, but because of the hybrid effect this ostentatious display of learning produces (op. cit. 15).
2) Athenaeus III, p. 121 (Gulick's translation, Loeb Classical Library).

Finally, there is some testimony from the fourth and fifth centuries. In the Lives of the Philosophers of Eunapius (A.D.346-415) we read of a certain Roman proconsul, who presided at a trial between the two factions of rhetoricians at Athens, that "for a Roman, he was not uneducated or bred in a boorish and illiberal fashion."[1] From the same period date Libanius' many bitter remarks against the Latin language and Roman law,[2] and Synesius' request that his readers pardon him for "barbarizing a little bit" in his use of the Latin word vacantivi.[3] The Hellenizing policy of the Emperor Julian has already been treated (supra p.35). Last of all, Procopius of Gaza, writing at the beginning of the fifth century, confesses that he does not know what the Latin word consistorius means but its Roman harshness grates on his ears.[4]

Modern scholars have often considered this testimony, especially that of Libanius, as representative of enlightened and articulate Greek opinion. But all the writers cited above are of the same stamp: they are all purists in the matter of Greek style, and most of them have strong personal reasons for disliking Rome, Romans, and Latin. Apollonius of Tyana was accused of treason by Nero and Domitian, narrowly escaping

---

1) Eunapius, Vitae. Philosoph., p. 483.
2) See, for example, Libanius, Orat. I, 214; 234; II, 44; 74; X, 14; Epist. 566 (ed. Foerster).
3) Synesius, Epist. 67 (Migue, PG LXVI, 1428 C.)
4) Epist. 134 (Epistolog. Graeci, p. 565.)

death. Athenaeus, prince of pedants, is one of that class of Greek authors who did not write a word that was not to be found in classical Attic writers. I should say that the passage I have quoted above is not so much a condemnation of Latin as it is of all Greek that is not pure Attic.(1 Philostratus, Eunapius, Libanius, and Procopius earned their living teaching Greek rhetoric and literature; it was natural for them to despise Latin studies, especially since schools of Latin and Roman law were taking away their students.(2 As for Julian, not only did he early conceive a deep love for the Greek classics from his teacher Mardonius, who consorted with the professional Greek sophists, but he later became a close friend of Libanius. Synesius, like Julian, looked back to classical Greece with more than ordinary fervor; he prided

---

1) Whether the Ulpian who is quoted is the great jurist, as Kaibel concludes (Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae, Teubner, Leipzig, 1923, vol. I, Praef. VI ff.) or not (Rudolph's view, Philologus, Supplementband VI [1891-93], p. 114 ff), it is clear that the point of view taken throughout the whole work is that of Athenaeus. The famous men introduced into the dialogue from all walks of life all appear as erudite grammarians. The real Ulpian, whose great works were in Latin, would never have made the remarks put into his mouth in this passage.

2) Not all the sophists were so bitter on the subject of Latin. Themistius, certainly as famous as Libanius, declares (Orat. VI, init. delivered to Valens and Valentinian, A.D.364): "Since before this, Sires, the supposition never entered my mind that I should one day have need of the language now prevailing everywhere, I thought it would be sufficient to cultivate Greek, my native tongue. Now, however, if the opportunity were granted, I should gladly change places with those who know Latin, so that there would be no need for me to use a foreign tongue to you."

himself on his descent from the ancient Spartans--from Heracles himself.[1]

If the attacks of teachers of Greek on the Romans and the Latin language indicate anything at all, it seems to me it is just the opposite of what they have usually been adduced to prove. The very fact that the sophists found it necessary to inveigh against Latin shows that very many enlightened Easterners were attracted to Roman studies. Eunapius admits the truth of this for the fourth century when he says that Anatolius, prefect of Illyria (ca. A.D.345) was particularly fond of Greek studies "in spite of the fact that the general current was in other directions."[2] Lucian's Nigrinus and De Mercede Conductis (Dependent Scholar) give testimony for conditions two hundred years earlier. The Nigrinus satirizes life in bustling Rome, especially the wretched life of the flatterers attending rich patrons. "In ordinary men," Lucian remarks, "who have no pretence to education, this conduct, no doubt, is less to be blamed. But that men who call themselves philosophers should actually outdo the rest in degradation--this, indeed is the climax."[3] This theme is enlarged upon in the Dependent Scholar, an essay devoted entirely to these educated parasites. They have no one to blame, in Lucian's

---

1) Catastasis I, (Migne, PG LXVI, 1572 b).
2) Eunapius, Vitae Philosoph., p. 490.
3) Nigrinus 24 (Fowler's translation).

opinion, but themselves. It is their greed and their ambition that draw them to the houses of the rich. These Greeks, whom Lucian describes, probably as enlightened as any of their time, flung themselves at their Roman masters.(1

There were other enlightened Greeks besides professors and philosophers. As I have previously noted (p22), we begin to hear of Roman senators from the Orient in the first century after Christ. Later they appear in increasing numbers. It is interesting to observe that these senators were usually not men who had won fame before entering the service of Rome—that is, they were not senators honoris causa. For the most part they were Eastern aristocrats who as boys had begun their preparation for public life.(2 This means that educated Easterners chose to make service in the imperial administration their life's career, and were willing to undergo the requisite training in Latin and Roman law in order to begin such a career. These men, furthermore, were not regarded by their fellow-Greeks as renegades who, once in Rome, had broken all ties with their homelands.

---

1) It is a great mistake to endow the Greeks of Roman times with the virtues of their ancestors. They were capable of the basest flattery as hundreds of inscriptions honoring Romans show. They adopted Roman family names so freely that Claudius was forced to forbid foreigners to do so in the future (Suet., Claudius 25). Dio of Prusa tells us of the Rhodian practice of chiseling off the inscriptions on statues of ancient Greek worthies and rededicating them to Roman legates (Orat XXXI.)

2) Walton, op. cit., p. 41.

It seems, on the contrary, that they were held in high esteem by their countrymen as men who had made their mark in life.(1 When a father wants to encourage his son in his studies and stimulate his ambition, declared John Chrysostom in the fourth century, among the models of success that he bids him to emulate is the man, who, having been well schooled in Latin, is a great figure at the imperial court and sweeps all before him.(2

To conclude, the Greek-speaking peoples espoused Rome's cause almost from the founding of the Empire. There is hardly an important Greek author from Polybius onward who does not take pride in the Roman dominion. In fact Lucian ended his life as a high imperial official in Egypt, looking forward with pleasure to obtaining a governorship or a position of equal prestige.(3

Here I should like to call attention, in respect to the use of Latin and Greek, to a highly significant point. It will be recalled that some Romans in the second century

---

1) Walton, p. 54.
2) Iohan. Chrys., Adversus Oppugn. Vitae Monasticae III, 5 (Migne PG XLVII, 357): οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄλλο τί τῶν πατέρων ἔστιν ἀκοῦσαι διαλεγομένων πρὸς τοὺς παῖδας ὅταν αὐτοὺς παραπαλῶσιν ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν λόγων σπουδῆς, ἀλλ' ἢ ταυτὶ τὰ ῥήματα: --- πάλιν ἕτερος, ὦ δεινά, φησί, τὴν Ἰταλῶν γλῶτταν ἐκπαιδευθείς, ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις ἔστι λαμπρὸς καὶ πάντα ἄγει καὶ φέρει τὰ ἔνδον.
3) Lucian, Apologia 12.

B.C. chose to write their works in Greek. Indicative of the change that had taken place in the following centuries is the fact that the three most important pagan authors of the fourth century after Christ, Claudian, Ammianus Marcellinus, and Macrobius,[1] were Greeks who wrote in Latin. Indeed, this century produced no really important Greek authors , while of Latin there are at least half a dozen. And as in the second century B.C. Aulus Albinus preferred to write in Greek though he admitted his Greek was not good, so in the fourth century after Christ Macrobius, while begging the reader's indulgence for his imperfect Latin, nevertheless wrote in Latin. In his own words "- - - petitum impetratumque volumus ut aequi bonique consulant, si in nostro sermone nativa Romani oris elegantia desideretur."[2]

B. The Greeks' Knowledge of the Latin Language

1. Introduction

No one will deny that the Greek-speaking East while under Roman domination remained substantially Greek-speaking. Relatively few Easterners learned Latin and when they did, it was as a

---

1) There is some doubt as to Macrobius' nationality. He says he is not a Roman, but was born under another sky (Saturn. I, 11.). He bears a Greek name and it is very likely that he was a Greek; certainly he had an excellent command of the language.
2) Saturn. I, 11.

second or even, as in the case of Lucian, whose native tongue was Syrian, a third language. Perhaps the best evidence that the overwhelming majority of Greeks did not understand Latin is the fact that almost never do Greek authors, from Polybius to Procopius, introduce transliterated Latin words into their work without adding a Greek translation of the word or an explanation of its meaning.(1 And there is other testimony. "Nostri Graece fere nesciunt nec Graeci Latine"(2 wrote Cicero and expressed his recognition of Greek as the lingua franca of the time in these words: "Graeca leguntur in omnibus fere gentibus, Latina suis finibus exiguis sane continentur."(3 St. Jerome, writing four hundred years after Cicero in a time when the study of Latin probably reached its peak in the East, referred to Greek as the "- - sermone Graeco, quo omnis Oriens loquitur."(4

Granted that Greek held its place as the language of the East, certain statements in ancient authors which might lead one to believe that Latin became the idiom of the whole

---

1) I cannot agree with Costas (op. cit., p.77) who says with reference to Procopius: "--if he (Procopius) feels constrained to use them (technical and official Latin words), he invariably subjoins an explanation of their meaning in Greek, apologizing, as it were, for introducing extraneous elements into his work." Why should Procopius introduce such words only to apologize for them? The translations represent not an apology but a concession to his readers' ignorance of Latin.
2) Cicero, Tusc. Disput. V, 40 (116).
3) Pro Archia 10.
4) Comment. in Epist. ad Galatos II, 3.(Migne P.L. 26,382 C.)

civilized world must be taken only in a restricted sense. If the elder Pliny had the non-Greek and previously barbarous parts of the Empire in mind when he eulogized Rome as the "terra omnium terrarum alumna eadem et parens numine deum electa quae--totpopulorum discordes ferasque linguas sermonis commercio contraheret ad conloquia,"[1] it was just praise. But we cannot press too far Plutarch's remark that "practically all men now use the language of the Romans"[2] nor that of Augustine, who three centuries later spoke of Latin as the language of the world.[3] Furthermore, the claims of Latin poets that their poetry is read throughout the wide world[4] must be regarded as conventional boasts. When the younger Pliny says of his book of hendecasyllabics: "Legitur, describitur, cantatur etiam et a Graecis quoque quos Latine huius libelli amor docuit,"[5] he is paying it the most extravagant compliment he can think of.

Latin does not seem to have been easy for Greeks to

---

1) Hist. Nat. III, 5(6).
2) Quaest. Platon. X, 3:- οὐχ ὥσπερ ὁ λόγος πολλάκις ἐκείνων ἀπροσδεής ἐστιν· ὡς δοκεῖ μοι ὁ Ῥωμαίων, ᾧ νῦν ὁμοῦ τι πάντες ἄνθρωποι χρῶνται.
3) De Civitate Dei XIX,7. Augustine here emphasizes the convenience of a universal tongue for administration.
4) Cf. e.g. Ovid, Metam. XV,875; Trist. IV,10,128.
5) Epist. VII, 4,8.

learn.[1] Lucian hints at the trouble which educated Greeks attached to Roman houses had in mastering Latin. "Aren't you ashamed," he says to the dependent scholars, "vying with flatterers and noisy rascals, alone in such a great crowd of Romans, a queer sight in the philosopher's robe, and miserably murdering the language of the Romans."[2] It is very likely that it was partially because of difficulties encountered in learning Latin that the Easterners who aspired to positions in the imperial government started their careers when very young (<u>supra</u> p. .) and that Eastern youths spent a longer time than Western boys in the schools of Roman law.[3] St. Gregory the Thaumaturge tells us in his <u>Panegyric to Origen</u> (written A.D. 239) that when a young man he had spent years studying Latin and Roman law in Neocaesarea, his home in Pontus, and in Berytus,[4] yet admits that he still finds Latin difficult.[5]

Further corroboration of the difficulty which Latin presented to the Greeks is to be found in their experience

---

1) The first part of Lafoscade's neat antithesis (<u>op. cit.</u>, p. 145): "La facilite avec laquelle ils (the Greeks) s'adonnaient au latin egalait l'indifference qu'ils professaient a son regard" seems as far from the truth as the second half.
2) Lucian, <u>De Mercede Conductis</u> 24.
3) Schemmel, "Die Schule von Berytus," <u>Philologische Wochenschrift</u> 43 (1923), pp. 1236-40.
4) Migne, <u>PG</u> X, 1065.
5) <u>Ibid.</u> 1053.

with Latin literature, a subject which I intend to discuss in detail later. Although many Greeks, as we shall see, studied Latin, few became so proficient in the language as to read its literature with appreciation. Plutarch testifies to this.[1] After remarking in his life of Demosthenes that he learned Latin late in life and in a rather hit or miss fashion, he goes on to say: "But to appreciate the beauty and quickness of the Roman style, the figures of speech, the rhythm, and the other embellishments of the language, while I think it a graceful accomplishment and one not without its pleasures, still, the careful practice necessary for attaining this is not easy for one like me, but appropriate for those who have more leisure and whose remaining years suffice for such pursuits. Therefore, in this fifth book of my Parallel Lives where I write about Demosthenes and Cicero, I shall examine their actions and their political careers to see how their natures and dispositions compare with one another, but I shall make no critical comparison of their speeches, nor try to show which was the more agreeable or the more powerful orator. 'For useless', as Ion says, 'is a dolphin's might upon dry ground,' a maxim which Caecilius,[2] who goes to excess in everything, forgot when he

---

1) Demosthenes 2.
2) Caecilius of Calacte in Sicily, a Greek-speaking Jew who lived in Rome during the Augustan Age and wrote historical and literary works. See infra, p. [illegible].

boldly ventured to put forth a comparison of Demosthenes and Cicero. But really it is possible that if the 'Know Thyself' of the oracle were an easy thing for every man it would not be held to be a divine injunction!"[1]

The writer of the Περὶ Ὕψους, like the "fish out of water" Caecilius, ventures to compare the same great orators from a literary point of view[2] but not without misgivings, for he gives his judgment of Cicero's writings only after saying humbly: εἰ καὶ ἡμῖν ὡς Ἕλλησιν ἔφεσταί τι γιγνώσκειν. It seems to me that it is a like recognition on the part of Greek authors of their incompetence to enjoy and evaluate works they can read but imperfectly that accounts to a great degree for the fact that they for the most part pass over Latin literature in silence.

So much for general observations. I plan now to mention in chronological order the Greeks for whom a knowledge of Latin, however imperfect, may justly be claimed. It should be remembered that in this section we are interested mainly in determining as far as possible the extent to which Latin was known to Greek-speaking peoples and not in interpreting the evidence for its bearing on literary studies and related matters. Interpretations and conclusions

---

1) Plutarch, op. cit. 2-3 (Perrin's translation, Loeb Classical Library).
2) Περὶ Ὕψους 12. See infra, p.89 and 122.

of this nature will be found in the last section of this dissertation.

2. The Republic

A catalogue of Greeks whom we know to have learned Latin during the Republic and in fact during the the Empire until the third century after Christ, is a catalogue of Greeks who learned Latin in the West. They were either natives of Greek-speaking regions of the West- Magna Graecia, Sicily, or Southern Gaul- who learned Latin at home through their contact with the Roman element of the population[1] or Easterners who gained a knowledge of Latin at Rome by similar intercourse. This is not to say that there were no teachers of Latin in the Greek-speaking provinces during the early centuries of Roman rule, but it is probable that their students were Roman citizens only. For instance, Latin was certainly taught in Sicily in the first century B.C., for Cicero tells us that Q.Caecilius studied the language there.[2] We hear also of a certain Bruttius who apparently eked out a living teaching Latin rhetoric to young Roman students in Athens in the same period.[3] A half century

---

1) Diodorus Siculus is representative of Greeks who learned Latin in this way. See infra, p.[illegible].

2) Cicero, In Q.Caecil. 12,39. Cicero does not seem to have had a high opinion of provincial Latin. He says that even if Caecilius had learned Latin in Rome instead of Sicily, it would be an achievment if he showed up well in the law courts.

3) Cicero, Ad. Fam. XVI, 21.

later Valerius Probus[1] (fl. ca. A.D.56), who was to become the leading grammarian of his day, was reading Latin authors with his teacher in the Roman colony of Berytus.[2]

However many Latin teachers there were in the provinces, there is no clear case of a Greek learning Latin in the East before the third century of our era. It is true that the word Ῥωμαϊστής (a speaker in Latin) occurs in an inscription from Delos (ca. 167 B.C.)[3] listing musicians and actors of tragedy and comedy who took part in religious contests. But it is very likely that this contestant, the Ῥωμαϊστής, who recited - perhaps comic pieces[4] - in Latin, was a Roman honorary participant,[5] just as the Ποιητὴς Ῥωμαϊκός mentioned among those awarded prizes in a singing contest held at Aphrodisias in Caria and recorded in an inscription of uncertain date. In neither instance is it probable that a Greek is meant.

---

1) Surely a Roman citizen, since he was eligible for the post of centurion in the army (Suet., De Gramm. et Rhet. 24). His parents may have been among the original Roman settlers of Berytus, established as a colony in 14 B.C.
2) Suet., ibid. The authors read at this time in Berytus were considered old and out of fashion in the capital.
3) IG XI, fasc. II, 133, l. 81.
4) So Dörrbach, IG, ad. loc. cit.
5) Romans were numerous in Delos after Pydna. See supra, p. 42.

Greeks started to come to Rome after the Pyrrhic and Punic Wars and were drawn there in great numbers once the Romans had extended their power over the East. Hillscher[1] lists over 150 Greek men of letters who are known to have lived in Rome or visited there before the death of Tiberius. Originally Greeks came as slaves but, as Rome's power increased, more and more were attracted by the opportunities the great city had to offer.

Hermodorus of Ephesus is the first Greek mentioned in connection with the latin language, but the accounts told of him are vague and conflicting. Strabo[2] says that he seems to have written some laws for the Romans. The elder Pliny[3] is more explicit stating that "there was a statue in the Comitium of Hermodorus of Ephesus, the interpreter of the laws which the decemviri wrote." Finally, the jurist Pomponius[4] reports that "some have said that a certain Hermodorus of Ephesus collaborated with the decemviri on the XII Tables while an exile in Italy," thereby identifying him with the Hermodorus whose banishment by the Ephesians enraged Heraclitus.[5] If Hermodorus helped to write the laws of the Twelve Tables, then we have a Greek

---

1) Op. cit., p. 441.
2) Geogr. XVI, p. 642.
3) Hist. Nat. XXXIV, 5.
4) Digesta Justin. I, 2,2,4.
5) Diels, FV, Heraklitos 121.

who knew Latin in the fifth century B.C. The evidence is such, however, that no conclusion can be reached.

In the third century B.C. the Romans came into contact with the Greeks of lower Italy and Sicily. Among the Greek captives brought to Rome during the war with Pyrrhus (280-275 B.C.) was Livius Andronicus of Tarentum, the founder of Latin literature. His translations of the Odyssey into Saturnians served as a school text for generations. Andronicus, who must have been a child when he arrived in Rome, since he was still alive in 207 B.C.,[1] is the first of several Greek freedmen who so mastered Latin during their long stay in Rome that they wrote in that language, some even making important contributions to its literature.[2] Paired with Andronicus as a "semigraecus" by Suetonius[3] is his younger contemporary, Quintus Ennius, who was born in 239 at Rudiae in South Italy, a district in which both Greek and Oscan were spoken at this time.[4] Ennius was master of three languages; Gellius[5] tells us that "Quintus Ennius tria corda habere sese dicebat, quod loqui Graece et Osce et Latine sciret."

---

1) He wrote a state hymn in that year (Livy XXVII,37,7).
2) As Publilius Syrus and Phaedrus. See infra, p.
3) De Gramm. et Rhet. 1.
4) Cf. Paulus-Festus, De Signif. Verb., s.v. Bilingues Bruttaces: Ennius dixit quod Brutti et Osce et Graece loqui soliti sunt. Later Greek and Latin were the languages spoken in southern Italy. Cf. Horace (Serm.I,10,30): Canusini more bilinguis.
5) XVII,17,1.

It was not long after the Romans began to interfere directly in the affairs of the Greek states east of Italy that Greeks from these regions exhibited an interest in the Latin language. The pro-Roman Epirote chief Charops I, very likely motivated by political considerations, sent his grandson, later Cahrops II, to Rome ca. 190 expressly to learn the Latin language.[1] Another Greek to learn Latin at an early age was Alexander, the son of Perseus, who as a boy was taken to Rome with his father for Paulus' triumph in 167.[2] He seems to have mastered Latin thoroughly, for he became an undersecretary in the Roman administration.

By his own testimony the historian Polybius (ca.208-126 B.C.) knew Latin,and indeed it would be surprising if he had not learned the language of the people whose history he wrote and with whose leaders he was intimately associated for years. Concerning the first treaty between the Romans and the Carthaginians (509/8 B.C.) he says:"I have written below the most accurate translation that I could make of this treaty. For the ancient Roman language differs so much from that in use now that the most intelligent men after much study can make out only parts of it with great difficulty."[3] He had learned enough Latin not only to make

---

1) Polybius XXVII,15.
2) Plutarch, Aem. Paulus 37; cf. Livy XLV, 42.
3) Polybius III, 22. He translates other treatise in III,24; 25; and 27.

translations but to note the changes the language had undergone.

That is the meager sum of the relevant evidence prior to the first century before Christ. The last fifty years or so of the Republic witnessed a rapid growth of scholarly studies at Rome in which Greeks, almost all freedmen who found employment as teachers of young Romans, played no small part. While it is highly likely that these Greeks, practicing their profession in this Roman milieu, all gained a knowledge of Latin, we must consider only those about whom we have specific information.

Early in the century (ca. 90-80) the Syrian M. Pompilius Andronicus, having been an indifferent grammarian at Rome, retired to Cumae and devoted himself to literary pursuits. There he wrote among other things an opusculum entitled Annalium Enni Elenchi.(1 That is all we know of it, but it was probably a refutation or bitter criticism of the earlier author.(2 In the same period (ca. 80) we may place the activity of Staberius Eros, a freedman from Antioch, and Cornelius Epicadus, the freedman of Sulla. Staberius, who is called by the elder Pliny(3 the "conditor grammaticae"

---

1) Suet., De Gramm. et Rhet. 8.
2) So Hillscher, op. cit., p. 367.
3) H.N.,XXXV,17.

at Rome, was the teacher of Brutus and Cassius.[1] He wrote a treatise on analogy, De Proportione,[2] and in addition made copies, perhaps with commentaries, of works of older Latin authors which were highly prized in later times.[3] Epicadus[4] is said to have completed the memoirs which Sulla had left unfinished at his death.[5] There is no reason to doubt that these were in Latin,[6] nor that Epicadus finished them in that language, for he is cited as the author of De Cognominibus,[7] De Metris,[8] and another work which seems to have contained antiquarian lore.[9] We know next to nothing of a fourth grammarian of the time of Sulla, a certain Hypsicrates, to whom is attributed an etymological work apparently entitled Super his quae a Graecis accepta sunt.[10] If this treatise, used by Varro for his De Lingua Latina and Cloatius Verus

---

1) Suet., op. cit. 13.
2) Priscian, GLK II, p.385.
3) Fronto. Epist., Codex Ambros. 62.
4) The cognomen seems to indicate Illyrian origin. Cf. Schulze, Latein. Eigennam., p. 131, n.1.
5) Suet., op. cit. 12.
6) See the discussion in Peter, Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae I, p. CCLXXII.
7) Charisius, GLK I, p.110.
8) Victorinus, GLK VI, p.209.
9) Macrobius, Saturn. I,11,47.
10) Gellius XVI,12,5: Cloatius Verus--idque dixisse ait Hypsicraten quempiam grammaticum cuius libri sane nobiles sunt super his, quae a Graecis accepta sunt. See Funaioli, Grammaticae Romanae Fragmenta I (Leipzig, 1907), p.107.

for his Verborum a Graecis tractorum, maintained the general thesis that Latin was essentially Greek, Hypsicrates was the first of several Greek philologists to uphold this view.

Roughly contemporary with these scholars are the grammarians Ateius Praetextatus Philologus, Pompeius Lenaeus, and Curtius Nicia who were actice at Rome ca. 60. Ateius Praetextatus was a freedman born at Athens who became a very successful teacher in the capital. Suetonius tells us that he aided Sallust in writing his histories and quotes from one of his letters that"he was making great progress in Greek literature and some progress in Latin.[1] Charisius[2] mentions a work of his entitled An amaverit Didun Aeneas. Lenaeus,[3] a freedman of Pompey's, translated into Latin, at the request of his former master, Mithradates' collection of medical lore which Pompey had acquired among the spoils of his Eastern victories.[4] Also intimate with Pompey as well as with Cicero was Curtius Nicia of Cos,[5] who wrote a work on the satirist Lucilius.[6] Of Cicero's freedman Tullius Laurea we know only that in addition to writing Greek

---

1) Suet., op. cit. 10.
2) GLK I, p.127.
3) Suet.,op.cit.15.
4) Pliny, H.N. XXV, 2.
5) Cicero, Ad Attic. VII, 3,10.
6) Suet., op.cit. 14.

epigrams[1] he was also the author of a Latin poem[2] on the eruption of the hot springs on Cicero's Puteoli estate.

At Olympiad 186,1 (43 B.C.) Jerome's Chronicle has this entry: "Publilius mimografus natione Syrus Romae scenam tenet."[3] Publilius had come to Rome from Antioch as a boy-slave. His aptitude and talent were such that he was freed and carefully educated.[4] Greek by birth but Roman by education,[5] he introduced the mime into Italy, gaining a great reputation for his plays of this type. Although none of his mimes has come down to us complete, there are preserved some 700 lines of sententiae, clever sayings quoted by later authors. We read also in Jerome's Chronicle (Ol. 196,2.) of another Asiatic, Philistio, who was famous at Rome for his mimes at the beginning of our era.[6]

By piecing together bits of information from various sources we learn something of a rhetorician Voltacilius Pitholaus,[7] a Greek from Rhodes, who taught and wrote in the

---

1) Anth. Pal. VII,17; 294; XII, 24.
2) Preserved in Pliny, H.N. XXXI, 2(3).
3) Pliny, H.N. XXXV,17.
4) Macrobius, Saturn. II,7,6.
5) Pliny, H.N., ibid.
6) "Philistio mimografus natione Magnes Asianus Romae clarus habetur."
7) Suet.,op.cit. 27. The cognomen is uncertain. For the name and identity of this man, see R.E.Robinson's edition of the De Gramm et Rhet. (C.Suetoni Tranquilli De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus [Paris, 1925],p.44).

capital during the last years of the Republic. His literary style is spoken of with contempt by Horace as a hybrid mixture of Greek and Latin.[1] All that has come down to us of his writings is a Latin bon mot,[2] but Suetonius[3] mentions him among those who wrote maledicentissima carmina against Caesar.

We may put at ca. 30 the floruit of Diocles, called Tyrannio the Younger after Tyrannio his teacher, Philoxenus, and L.Crassicius Pasicles (Pansa). We gather from Suidas[4] that Tyrannion the Younger, captured during the struggle, between Antony and Augustus and taken to Rome where he was later freed, wrote, in addition to works on Homeric prosody and the parts of speech, the tract Περὶ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς διαλέκτου, ὅτι ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς, which apparently attempted to show that the Latin language derived from Greek. The fragments preserved of the Περὶ τῆς Ῥωμαίων διαλέκτου[5] of Philoxenus, an Alexandrian scholar who taught in Rome,[6] indicate that this work also held that Greek was

---

1) Cf. Horace, Serm. I,10,20ff.: 'At magnum fecit quod verbis Graeca Latinis/ miscuit'.O seri studiorum, quine putetis/ difficile et mirum, Rhodio quod Pitholeonti/ contigit. Identifying Pitholeon with Pitholaus, Bentley (ad loc. Hor.) suggested that Horace changed the name for metrical reasons.
2) Macrobius, Saturn. II,2,13.
3) Julius 75.
4) S.v. Τυραννιών, ὁ νεώτερος.
5) Collected in Funaioli, op. cit., p.443ff.
6) Suidas, s.v. Φιλόξενος.

the parent language of Latin. Crassicius, a freedman of Tarentine origin, having first tried his hand at writing mimes, later taught school at Rome, but his chief claim to fame was his commentary to Cinna's Zmyrna, reknowned for its recondite learning.(1

3. The Empire Until A.D. 212

The conditions under which Greeks had learned Latin during the Republican period continued to prevail so far as can be determined during the first two centuries of the Empire - that is, Greeks learned Latin in Rome or elsewhere in the West usually by direct contact with Romans. There was, however, this difference. Whereas nearly all the Greeks who learned Latin in Republican times had been freedmen, many of whom had so mastered the language during the long years of their association with Romans that they did not hesitate to compose in Latin and to comment on works of Latin literature, a greater proportion of the Greeks who learned Latin during the early Empire were free-born Greeks who went to Rome because it was the center of political, social, and literary activity. Considered as a group, they seem to have gained a much less perfect grasp of the language than the freedmen and rarely attempted to write in Latin or on

---

1) Suet., De Gramm. et Rhet. 18.

Latin literature.

Diodorus Siculus, born ca. 80 B.C. in Agyrium, Sicily, knew Latin, having learned it by mixing with Romans in Sicily, and used it in his researches for his huge Bibliotheca Historica, published soon after the battle of Actium. Of his knowledge of Latin he says: "I am from Agyrium in Sicily, and having acquired considerable experience in the language of the Romans through intercourse with the people on the island, I have recounted accurately all the deeds of this Empire drawing upon Roman commentaries and many years' observation."(1 Diodorus' contemporary, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (cf. also supra, p 56) was another Greek author to use Latin in connection with the composition of his historical works. He had ample opportunity to learn the language during his twenty-two years' stay in Rome (30-8 B.C.), and he declares that he not only learned the Latin tongue but also acquired a knowledge of the literature.(2

Intimate with Dionysius(3 was Caecilius,(4 a Greek-speaking Jew from Calacte in Sicily. Whether he first learned

---

1) I, 4.
2) Antiq Rom. I,7:-καὶ τὸν ἐξ ἐκείνου(the end of the civil war) χρόνον ἐτῶν δύο καὶ εἴκοσι μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος γενόμενον ἐνῴκουν διατρίψας, διάλεκτόν τε τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν ἐκμαθὼν καὶ γραμμάτων τῶν ἐπιχωρίων λαβὼν ἐπιστήμην.
3) Cf. Dionys. Hal., Ad Pompeium Gem. 3, 20.
4) Suidas, s.v. Κεκίλιος . Suidas says that some claimed Caecilius was of servile origin and that his name was formerly Archagathus.

Latin in Sicily or at Rome, where he taught rhetoric, we cannot tell, but he did know it, since Suidas, the principal authority on his life and works, mentions a Σύγκρισις Δημοσθένους καὶ Κικέρωνος among his writings. This was a literary comparison, as we learn from Plutarch (supra, p.75), and one of the pioneers in the field of comparative literature. It probably served as a model for the comparison of the two orators to be read in the Περὶ Ὕψους, a tract whose author and date of composition we do not know. It is now generally held, however, that this work was written by a Greek living at Rome sometime in the first century after Christ, soon after the activity of Caecilius, whose treatise Περὶ Ὕψους[1], no longer extant, suggested its form and content. Whoever its author, he must have known Latin to compare Greek and Latin writers.

Nicolaus of Damascus (ca. 64.B.C.-A.D. 1), trusted adviser of Herod and friend of Augustus, may have used Latin sources in composing his Universal History and other works such as his life of Augustus. At least one passage in the History, which we possess only in fragments, seems to be based on Caesar's Gallic Commentaries.[2] At any rate,

---

1) Cf. Περὶ Ὕψους, init.
2) Fragm. 89, FHG, ed. Mueller, III, p. 418. It is likely that Nicolaus in this passage, which describes the Gallic institution of the Solduríi is drawing upon Bell. Gall. III, 20ff. The two accounts are closely parallel.

the great geographer Strabo (63 B.C.-A.D.21), who spent part of his long life in Rome, where,as a young man,he studied under Tyrannio,[1] was acquainted with the Commentaries.[2] The translations of Latin words to be found in his Geography also point to a knowledge of Latin.[3]

Among the Rhetoricians whose sententiae are recorded in the elder Seneca's Controversiae and Suasoriae are at least two Greeks, L. Cestius Pius and Argentarius, who declaimed in Latin. Since Seneca, who was an octogenarian when he wrote, is quoting from memory rhetoricians no longer active,[4] they may be assumed to have flourished at Rome during the decades immediately preceding our era. This is borne out for Cestius, a Greek from Smyrna, by an entry in Jerome's Chronicle at 13 B.C.[5] Argentarius, whose praenomen Seneca does not mention but who is probably to be identified with Marcus Argentarius, the author of thirty-seven epigrams in the Greek Anthology,[6] was closely associated with Cestius and slavishly imitated him.[7] Though

---

1) Strabo, Geogr. XII,p. 548.
2) Geogr. IV,p.177:- οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ θεὸς Καῖσαρ ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν εἴρηκεν.
3) Cf. VI,p.258.
4) Controversiae I, praef. 2ff.
5) Cestius Smyrnaeus rhetor Latine Romae docuit.
6) This identification is convincingly argued by Stuart Small in his unpublished U. of Cincinnati doctoral dissertation (1942), an edition of the epigrams of Marcus Argentarius.
7) Seneca, Controv. IX, 3,13.

Greeks, both Cestius and Argentarius, by mutual agreement, were at pains to declaim only in Latin , being very proud of the fact that they could speak in Latin or Greek at will.[1] Nevertheless, Cestius, at least, was not so fluent in Latin as he might have been, for Seneca says of his delivery: "Soleo dicere vobis Cestium Latinorum verborum inopia ⟨ut⟩ hominem Graecum laborasse, sensibus abundasse; itaque quotiens latius aliquid describere ausus est, totiens substitit, utique cum se ad imitationem magni alicuius ingeni direxerat, sicut in hac controversia fecit."[2] The fact that both these Greeks did use Latin, however, argues for a long residence at Rome. How living among Romans occasionally tinged the Greek speech of Greeks with Latin characteristics is indicated in an interesting comment[3] which Seneca makes in reference to a certain Agroitas, a Greek from

---

1) Seneca, ibid.: Omnibus autem insistebat (Argentarius) Cesti vestigiis: aeque ex tempore dicebat, aeque contumeliose multa interponebat; illud tamen optima fide praestitit, cum uterque Graecus esset, ut numquam Graece declamaret illos semper admiraretur qui non fuerunt contenti unius linguae eloquentia, ⟨ac⟩ cum Latine declamaverant, toga posita sumpto pallio quasi persona mutata rediebant et Graece declamabat.

2) Controv. VII, 1,27.

3) Seneca, op. cit. II,6,12: Agroitas Massiliensis longe vividiorem sententiam dixit quam ceteri Graeci declamatores, qui in hac controversia tamquam rivales rixati sunt. Dicebat autem Agroitas arte inculta, ut scires illum inter Graecos non fuisse, sententiis fortibus, ut scires illum inter Romanos fuisse.

Massilia.

Another example of a Greek who felt competent not only to speak Latin but to write it as well is the fabulist Phaedrus.[1] Everything we know of his life is based on evidence in his Fabulae Aesopiae. It appears that he was a Macedonian[2] who was taken to Rome at an early age[3] as a slave, since the manuscripts call him the freedman of Augustus. He seems to have lived at least until A.D. 40.[4]

In the period from Augustus to Claudius there were several Greek scholars who wrote works on the Latin language. These treatises were in the tradition of the earlier studies of Hypsicrates, Tyrannio, and Philoxenus in that, as far as can be determined, they took the stand that Latin derives from Greek. Many of the etymologies to be read in the extant fragments in support of this hypothesis are fanciful, even ludicrous, but the hypothesis itself was a natural one and was shared by Greeks and Romans alike. It seems doubtful that these works on the relationship of the two languages were prompted by any desire to flatter the Romans or to make them regard Greeks with a lenient eye; the Romans

---

1) For a complete account of Phaedrus with bibliography, see Schanz-Hosius, Geschichte der römischen Literatur II, p.447.
2) Fabulae III, Prologue 15ff. and 51ff.; III, Epilogue.
3) He cites a line of Ennius that he says he had read as a boy, III, Epilogue 33.
4) Book III of the Fabulae is dedicated to Eutychus, the famous charioteer of Caligula's reign.

needed no incentive such as this to study the Greek language and literature. Indeed, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, as we have seen (supra, p.56), used the kinship of the two languages as an argument to win over the Greeks to the Roman cause. A preferable explanation is that the early Greek scholars in Rome, like Hypsicrates, were struck in learning Latin by certain obvious similarities between Latin and Greek words, an experience shared by all who learn a second language.

The first of the early imperial Greek writers on the Latin language to be considered is the scholar-prince Juba II of Mauretania, the ruler, as the elder Pliny says,[1] more to be remembered for his learning than for his reign. Born ca. 50 B.C., Juba spent a boyhood closely parallel to that of Alexander, the son of Perseus (see supra p.81). After the battle of Thapsus (46 B.C.) Juba was taken to Rome for Caesar's triumph. He was carefully educated in the capital and became the friend of Octavian, who placed him on the throne of Mauretania in 25. He ruled over 45 years, dying in A.D. 23 or 24. Juba must have known Latin from childhood. The fragments of his Ὁμοιότητες and Ῥωμαϊκὴ Ἱστορία[2] not only indicate a knowledge of Latin but

---

1) H.N. V, 1,16.
2) Collected in Funaioli, op. cit., p.451ff.

show that he believed Greek to be the parent tongue of Latin.

Under Tiberius the Greek grammarians Apion[1] and Seleucus[2] were active at Rome. Apion, an Alexandrian and the pupil of Didymus Chalcenterus, is credited with a treatise Περὶ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς διαλέκτου.[3] Seleucus wrote a work Περὶ Ἑλληνισμοῦ of which we have one fragment,[4] commenting on the Roman aspirate as expressed by the letter h.

It was probably Claudius Didymus, who flourished at Rome in the time of Claudius, and not the great Didymus Chalcenterus, who wrote both the Περὶ τῆς Ῥωμαίοις ἀναλογίας and the attack on Cicero's De Republica which are associated with the name Didymus in the ancient evidence.[5] Suidas attributes the Περὶ τῆς Ῥωμαίοις ἀναλογίας to Claudius Didymus but Priscian, who refers to it by this name[6] and also as De Latinitate, credits it simply to Didymus. That the work asserted that Latin derived from Greek we know from Priscian who says:[7] "-teste etiam Didymo,qui hoc ponit, ostendens in omni parte orationis et constructionis analogiam Graecorum

---

1) Pliny, H.N., praef. 25; Seneca, Epist. 88; Suidas, s.v. Ἀπίων.
2) Suetonius, Tiberius 56.
3) Athenaeus XV, p.680.
4) Athenaeus, IX, p. 398.
5) s.v. Δίδυμος, ὁ Κλαύδιος γραμματικός.
6) Priscian, GLK III, p.411.
7) GLK III, p.408.

secutos esse Romanos." All our information of the polemic against Cicero's De Republica comes from Suidas,[1] who lists among Suetonius' works; Περὶ τῆς Κικέρωνος πολιτείας ά· ἀντιλέγει δὲ τῷ Διδύμῳ, and the remark of Ammianus Marcellinus that Didymus Chalcenterus wrote six books in which he frequently criticized Cicero.[2]

We should like very much to know more of Didymus' criticism of Cicero and also of the work of two other Greeks of the first century who are said to have shown an interest in Latin literature. In the Consolatio addressed to Polybius, the freedman-favorite of Claudius,[3] Seneca bestows high praise on the translations Polybius had made of Homer into Latin and of Vergil into Greek.[4] To make such translations an excellent command of Greek and Latin was required, and the fact that Polybius was a freedman indicates that he had the opportunity, through his long association with Romans, to master the Latin language. For our informa-

---

1) S.v. Τραγκύλλος.
2) XXII,16,16: -inter quos Chalcenterus eminuit Didymus --qui in illis sex libris, ubi non numquam imperfecte Tullium reprehendit.
3) Suet., Claudius 28; Cassius Dio LX, 29.
4) Seneca, Dial. XI,8: -Tunc Homerus et Vergilius tam bene de humano genere meriti quam tu et de illis et de omnibus meruisti, quos pluribus notos esse voluisti quam scripserant, multum tecum morentur; 11:-agedum illa, quae multo tui labore celebrata sunt, in manus sume utriuslibet auctoris carmina, quae tu ita resolvisti, ut quamvis structura illorum recesserit, permaneat gratia--sic enim illa ex alia in aliam transtulisti, ut, quod difficillimum erat, omnes vitutes in alienam te orationem secutae sint.

tion of the second of these Greek men of letters, the poet Evodos,[1] we are forced to rely entirely on a tantalizing entry in Suidas[2]: Εὔοδος, Ῥόδιος, ἐποποιός, γεγονὼς ἐπὶ Νέρωνος, ὁ θαυμαζόμενος εἰς Ῥωμαϊκὴν ποίησιν· τούτου τὰ βιβλία οὐ φαίνεται.

At this time, when Greeks learned Latin, they still learned it in the West. We are told, for instance, of a wealthy Arcadian youth whose father did not give him a Greek education, but sent him to Rome during the reign of Domitian to learn ἦθη νομικά[3]. It is probable that it was in Rome that Josephus (ca. 37-102) learned his Latin, since he tells us in his autobiography that he spent much time there[4]. His works testify to his knowledge of the language: he cites Livy as a source[5] and the commentaries of Vespasian[6] and Titus[7].

Much has been written, chiefly in studies of his sources, on Plutarch's knowledge and use of Latin. Since my account pretends to be no more than a chronological survey of the Latin studies of Greeks, I shall be content to sum up in a few paragraphs the results of recent investigations on Plutarch's acquaintance with the language[8].

---

1) Possibly to be identified with the freedman Evodus whom Tacitus mentions in connection with the death of Messalina, A.D. 48 (Ann.XI,37).
2) S.v. Εὔοδος.
3) Philostratus, Vita Apoll. Ty. VII,42.
4) Vita, 422ff.
5) Antiq. Iud. XIV,68.
6) Vita, 342.
7) Vita, 358.

language.[1]

Plutarch himself tells us of the method by which he learned Latin.[2] The passage is interesting and worthy of quotation. After saying that a writer of history, whose work is based upon wide reading, should live in a large city where books are ready to hand, and where he can question men who remember details of recent great events, he continues: "But as for me, I live in a small city and I prefer to dwell there that it may not become smaller still; and during the time when I was in Rome and various parts of Italy, I had no leisure to practise myself in the Roman language, owing to my public duties and the number of my pupils in philosophy. It was therefore late and when I was well on in years that I began to study Roman literature. And here my experience was an astonishing thing but true. For it was not so much that by means of words ~~that~~ I came to a complete understanding of things as that from things I somehow had an experience which enabled me to follow the meaning of words."[3] This method may have seemed astonishing to Plutarch, but it was probably followed by most Greeks of his time who learned Latin.

---

1) My summary is largely based on Sickinger, De linguae Latinae apud Plutarchum et reliquiis et vestigiis (diss.) Freiburg,1883); Vornefeld, De Scriptorum Latinorum locis a Plutarch citatis (diss., Münster,1901); and Rose, The Roman Questions of Plutarch, (Oxford,1924), pp. 11-19.

2) Demosthenes 2.

3) Ibid. (Perrin's translation, Loeb Classical Library).

The words of Plutarch quoted in the preceding paragraph must not be construed to mean that he was unable to read Latin until after his retirement, for his works offer abundant evidence that he had a good working knowledge of the language, although by his own confession he was no authority on Latin literature and style.[1] He used Latin chiefly in his research for the Lives and other works. The Latin authors whom he cites most frequently are all prose writers- the elder Cato, Cicero, Caesar, Sallust, Varro, and Livy- who had information useful to him. He quotes two scraps of Latin poetry in translation, a line of Horace[2] and Cicero's cedant arma togae, concedat laurea linguae,[3] but it is possible that he did not take them from the poems themselves.[4]

---

1) See his remarks quoted above, p. 75.
2) Lucullus 39:- εἰς ὃ καὶ Φλάκκος ὁ ποιητὴς ἐπιπεφώνηκεν ὡς οὐ νομίζει πλοῦτον, οὗ μὴ τὰ παρορώμενα καὶ λανθάνοντα πλείονα τῶν φαινομένων ἐστί (Horace, Epist. I,6,45-6: exilis domus est, ubi non multa supersunt/ et dominum fallunt).
3) From Cicero's De Consulatu Meo in Comp. Dem. et Cic. 2: τὰ ὅπλα ἔδει τῇ τηβέννῳ καὶ τῇ γλώττῃ τὴν θριαμβικὴν ὑπείκειν.
4) Kiessling (ad Hor. loc. cit.) says of the Horace citation: "Dieses Geschichtchen von Lucullus ist aus Horaz in ein Anekdotenbuch des ersten Jahrhunderts etwa die dictorum urbane libri des Domitius Afer, cos. 39 und unter Nero gestorben, übergegangen, aus welchem dasselbe Plutarch im Leben des Lucullus 39 in folgenden Form wiederholt." The Line of Cicero Plutarch might have taken from Cicero's De Off. I,22,77, where it is quoted.

Although Plutarch read Latin principally for practical purposes and not for enjoyment, it should not be supposed that he turned to Latin works as a last resort, when he could find nothing on his subject in Greek. In cases where there were Greek sources available, as Polybius and Dionysius for the lives of Camillus and Marcellus, he uses Livy extensively. Furthermore, although he disclaims any ability to pronounce judgment on Latin authors, he ventures to disagree with those who saw a resemblance between the oratory of the elder Cato and Lysias,(1 to contrast the literary styles of the two Gracchi,(2 and to compare in general terms the oratory of Demosthenes and Cicero,(3 in spite of his resolve to refrain from such a comparison.

Plutarch makes mistakes in translating, but his mistakes are often due to subtleties or ambiguities in the Latin originals.(4 Following the usual ancient practice, he seldom gives a merely literal translation. In fact,

---

1) Cato Maior 7.
2) Tiberius Gracchus 2.
3) Comp. Dem. et Cic. 1.
4) Plutarch's failure to grasp the meaning of the word corpus resulted in his misunderstanding the following passage in Cicero (Pro Sestio 35): pulsus e rostris in comitio iacuit seque servorum et libertorum corporibus obtexit. Plutarch translated: ἐν τοῖς νεκροῖς ὡς τεθνηκότα κείμενον διαλαθεῖν, taking corporibus as dead bodies in which sense it is used just below, whereas the here the meaning is that Quintus effected his escape guarded by his loyal attendants.

a strictly literal translation in Plutarch, as Rose notes,[1] is very often an indication that he does not completely understand the source. He frequently writes transliterated Latin words into his text and occasionally errs in spelling and accent, but he is always careful to give the meaning of the word in Greek and frequently adds explanations of its origin.[2]

While Plutarch was still alive, two other Greeks were devoting time to Latin studies, but we know very little of their work. Suidas informs us the the sophist Zenobius, who taught in Rome during Hadrian's reign, translated Sallust into Greek,[3] but his is the only reference we have to this translation.[4] We are indebted to a single allusion also for our knowledge of the Περὶ Ῥωμαίων διάλεξις of the grammarian Herennius Philo of Byblos (born A.D. 64), although we are somewhat better informed on the life and activity of its author. He was apparently the freedman of Herennius Severus, who was consul suffectus sometime early in the second century, and he lived into the reign

---

1) Op. cit., p.15.
2) Sickinger, op. cit., p.7.
3) Suidas, s.v. Ζηνόβιος, σοφιστής, παιδεύσας ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρος -- Μετάφρασιν Ἑλληνικῶς τῶν Ἱστοριῶν Σαλουστίου τοῦ Ῥωμαικοῦ ἱστορικοῦ καὶ τῶν καλουμένων αὐτοῦ Βελῶν.
4) Etymologicum Magnum, s.v. Ἀλτήρ --- ὁ δὲ Φίλων ἐν τῇ περὶ Ῥωμαίων διαλέξει ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρτήρ κατὰ τροπήν.

of Hadrian. An inscription, found in Marseilles, which reads simply Ἀθηνάδης Διοσκουρίδου γραμματικὸς Ῥωμαϊκός,[1] tells of yet another Greek who taught Latin grammar. Egger, who first reported it,[2] dates it "vers le second siècle de l'ère Chretienne" from the character of the writing.

The man who best represents the ideal Roman citizen of the second century as conceived by Hadrian and his successors[3] is the historian Flavius Arrianus (fl. 140), in whom there were combined both Roman and Greek qualities. Born at Nicomedia, a Greek by descent with perhaps some Roman blood, and a Roman citizen by birth,[4] Arrian went to Rome some years before 130, when he was consul suffectus, and apparently filled the magistracies which led to the consulship. In 131 Hadrian made him legate of the consular province of Cappadocia, a post which he held for at least seven years. This appointment was a signal honor for a Greek at this time, for, although it was not uncommon, as I have pointed out before (supra, p.21), for Greeks of the second century to be admitted into the Roman senate, "there is no other instance, before the third century, in

---

1) IG XIV, 2434.
2) Op. cit., p.259.
3) See above, p.24.
4) Cf. Pelham, "Arrian as Legate of Cappadocia", Essays on Roman History, p.214.

which the command of Roman legions and the defence of a Roman frontier were placed in Greek hands."[1] For such a career a command of Latin was of course necessary, and Arrian had learned the language. When he was legate of Cappadocia he submitted formal reports to Hadrian in Latin concerning the state of the province and its frontiers. Though we do not have any of these official reports, the Periplus Ponti Euxini, an informal, supplementary account in Greek of his activities in 131, contains allusions to the earlier official memoranda as τὰ Ῥωμαϊκὰ γράμματα.[2]

Contemporary with Arrian was the Greek historian Appian of Alexandria (ca. 95-165), who also had a career, though not so distinguished as the provincial legate's, in the administration at Rome, becoming procurator under Marcus Aurelius.[3] He tells us that he pleaded cases in the Roman forum,[4] and his histories also provide evidence of his mastery of Latin, since he makes use of Latin

---

1) Pelham, op. cit., p. 212.
2) Cf. Periplus Pont. Eux., ed. Roos (Leipzig, 1928), 6,2; 10,1.
3) Appian, Hist. Rom., praef. 15: Τίς δὲ ὢν ταῦτα συνέγραψα, πολλοὶ μὲν ἴσασι καὶ αὐτὸς προέφηνα, σαφέστερον δ' εἰπεῖν Ἀππιανὸς Ἀλεξανδρεύς, ἐς τὰ πρῶτα ἥκων ἐν τῇ πατρίδι, καὶ δίκαις ἐν Ῥώμῃ συναγορεύσας ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλέων, μέχρι με σφῶν ἐπιτροπεύειν ἠξίωσαν.
4) Ibid.

authorities,[1] translates Latin into Greek,[2] quotes a line of Pacuvius,[3] and transliterates many Latin words adding their Greek meanings.[4]

It is clear that Lucian (ca. 125-ca. 195) knew some Latin, but it is hard to say how much. He visited Rome several times and had ample opportunity to learn Latin there and in Gaul, where for years he was a professor of rhetoric. The fact that he held a high government post in Egypt at the end of his life does not necessarily mean that he knew Latin well, for Greek was largely used for the conduct of official business in this province (see supra, p.47). In one of his essays, written when he was an old man, Lucian seems to imply that he was quite familiar with Latin. Apologizing for an apparent slip he had made in etiquette, he says at one point: "But you yourselves (Romans), if I am at all expert in Latin, in returning a salutation constantly use the equivalent of 'Health'."[5] As for Latin literature, Lucian may have had an acquaintance

---

1) Bell. Civil. II,70: στρατιὰ δ' ἦν, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, πολλῶν ἀμφίλογα εἰπόντων ἑπομένως μάλιστα Ῥωμαίων τοῖς τὰ πιθανώτατα γράφουσι περὶ τῶν ἐξ Ἰταλίας ἀνδρῶν.
2) Cf. Bell. Civil. IV, 8-11.
3) Bell. Civil. II, 146. Suetonius gives the original (Jul. 84).
4) Cf. Bell. Mithradat. 2.
5) Pro lapsu inter salutandum 13.

with Vergil's Aeneid, and imitations of other Latin authors have been found in his writings.[1]

A few lesser figures of the second century can be dismissed in a brief paragraph. Two Christian writers, Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch (died ca. 181), and Clement of Alexandria (born ca. 150), may have known some Latin. Theophilus transliterates and translates Latin words[2] and Clement cites Varro in writing of Roman antiquities.[3] Galen (131-ca.200), the great physician and man of letters, lived at Rome for some forty years in the best of society. It is probable that he knew Latin well, but his works, principally on anatomy and other scientific subjects, contain little evidence of his familiarity with the language. He does, however, now and then write Latin words and their Greek meanings into his text.[4]

The last part of the second and the first quarter of the third centuries was the age of the classical jurists, of whose work in systematizing and defining Roman law we know now mainly from the Digests of Justinian. Although there is very little information about the lives of these

---

1) See infra, p.132.
2) Cf. Migne, PG VI,1161.
3) Protrepticus IV, p.41.
4) Cf. De Usu Partium VIII,4 (628); De Victu Attenuante X, 77.

men, some of them are thought to have been Greeks. Mommsen[1] proposed an Eastern origin for Gaius (still living in 178), the earliest of this group, because his Institutes, which are extant, are concerned principally with provincial edicts and an explanation of the provincial status of the East. It has been claimed that the jurists Quintus Cervidius Scaevola and Tryphoninus were also Greeks, but, as in the case of Gaius, there is no clear proof. It is likely, however, that Papinian, L.Volusius Maecianus, and Modestinus were of Greek stock, since they wrote legal works in Greek as well as in Latin. As for Ulpian, he himself declares that he is from Tyre.[2]

4. The Character of Latin Studies of Greeks after A.D.212

To single out any one year as marking a great turning-point in the history of the Latin studies of Greeks may appear to be at once arbitrary and hazardous. Nevertheless I have become convinced that not only the heightened interest in Latin on the part of the Greeks to be observed in the later Empire but also the changes in character that that interest underwent stem from the issuing in A.D. 212 of the Constitutio Antoniniana, Caracalla's citizenship decree.

---

1) "Gaius ein Provincialjurist" Jahr bücher d. gemeinen Rechts III (1859), pp.1-15. This article appears in Mommsen's Gesammelte Schriften 2, p. 26ff.

2) Digesta Justin. L, 15,1.

The reason for the Constitutio Antoniniana, which granted citizenship to the whole Empire, is not entirely clear. Cassius Dio[1] declares that it was issued as a means of increasing the imperial revenue, but there is little or no evidence that it had any immediate effect on tax returns. A recent view, very plausible, is that it was merely the consummation of imperial policy during the preceding century; with one grand gesture Caracalla completed the political fusion of the Greek and Roman elements of the Empire.[2] Whatever prompted the decree, it had some important results. It made Roman law the universal code, supplanting the Hellenistic law of the Greek cities of the East, which the Romans had hitherto left almost intact.[3] That there was no intention, however, of requiring Greeks to learn Latin to carry on legal business is clear from the fact that 1) certain changes, noted above (p. 23), were made between the age of the classical jurists and Justinian which relax old rulings calling for the use of Latin in legal business and permit the use of Greek; and 2) soon after 212 the jurist Modestinus wrote his Greek treatise

---

1) LXXVIII, 9, 4-5.
2) Sherwin-White, The Roman Citizenship, p. 216.
3) We owe this discovery to the researches of Ludwig Mitteis, embodied in his book Reichsrecht und Volksrecht (Leipzig, 1891).

on Roman law Παραίτησις Ἐπιτροπῆς καὶ Κουρατορίας[1] (De Excusationibus), which explained the law to the Greeks to whom it now applied, while Papinian's work in Greek, the Ἀστυνόμικος, apparently written for the benefit of municipal officials in Greek cities, may date from after 212.

The changes to be noted in the character of the Latin studies of Greeks after 212 are these: Greeks learned Latin in the East; they learned it, generally speaking, in schools from teachers of Latin; and they learned it in much greater numbers than they had in times past. Although Caracalla's decree was not designed to produces these changes, it did so indirectly, since, bestowing the privileges as well as the obligations of Roman citizenship, it gave to ambitious Greeks the opportunity for careers in the imperial civil service and legal departments. And, while a knowledge of Latin was not necessary for the people at large in the East, those who wished to embark upon such careers had, of course, to study the language.

We first read of the teaching of Latin to Greeks in the East in the Panegyric to Origen (written A.D. 239) of Gregory the Thaumaturge, who tells us that he studied Latin and Roman law first in his native Neocaesarea in

---

1) Digesta Justin. XXVII,1.

Pontus and then for several years at Berytus, a πόλις Ῥωμαϊκωτέρα πως, καὶ τῶν νόμων τούτων πιστευθεῖσα παιδευτήριον.(1

When the law school at Berytus was established we do not know, but it was probably shortly after 212. At any rate, it became the most famous school of law in the Empire and kept that distinction until well into the sixth century, although in the course of time Roman law was also taught in the East at Antioch, Caesarea, Alexandria, Athens, Constantinople, and perhaps in other centers of learning. Certainly law was a popular study in the East. Libanius, who constantly grumbles at the inroads the study of Latin and law made upon his Greeks courses, says that students flocked to the law schools by the boatload.(2 Even he, staunch supporter of purely Hellenic learning, found it necessary to hire a teacher of Latin for his school at Antioch in order to keep in tune with the times.(3

There is other evidence indicating that Greeks began to study Latin in schools or in some other systematic fashion in the third century. The first part of this century is the date usually given for the composition of the Pseudo- Dosithean Graeco-Latin exercises, designed to

---

1) Greg. Thaum., In Orig. 5 (Migne, PG X, 1065).
2) Libanius, Orat. XLVIII, 22ff.; XLIII, 5.
3) Libanius, Epist. 539, ed. Foerster.

aid Greeks in learning Latin.[1] They consist of enumerations of constructions of Latin forms, lists of verbs, books of Interpretamenta (ἑρμηνεύματα) containing lists of words arranged alphabetically and according to meaning, and interesting daily conversations (καθημερίνη ὁμιλία). The earliest of the Latin literary papyri which have interlinear Greek translations, Greek scholia, or Latin words and their Greek translations arranged in parallel columns are also from the third century and later. Now the total number of Latin literary papyri found up to the present time is indeed small, but there is certainly some significance in the fact that the few which antedate the third century consist only of the Latin text, while those from later times, almost all from the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, have in addition to the Latin text Greek translations or glosses. They furnish proof that in the later Empire Latin authors were read by Greeks in the schools of Egypt and presumably elsewhere in the East.[2]

The considerations just discussed lead me to fix upon the third century, and more precisely the year of the citizenship decree, as the beginning of a new stage in the

---

1) These exercises comprise the third volume of the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum, Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana ed. Goetz (Leipzig, 1892).

2) The Latin literary papyri are discussed below, part III.

history of the Latin studies of Greeks. It is true that it was not until Constantinople became the imperial capital, nor until Diocletian, Constantine, and other fourth century emperors had lent their encouragement that the flood tide of Latin studies in the East was reached, but the way had been prepared, it seems to me, by Caracalla's decree.

III THE GREEKS AND LATIN LITERATURE

A. The Fate of Latin Authors in the East

On the whole Latin literature--as literature--had little effect on the Greeks. I have already set down what I think to be the reasons for this (p.136): the Latin language was hard for Greeks to learn and it was only those few who had years of experience with Latin who were able to read Latin literature with appreciation. Greeks of course read Latin works but their purpose was utilitarian. For the most part they went to Latin authors for information on Roman history, on Roman antiquities, and on husbandry. The works they read were chiefly prose works; even on the rare occasions when they cite Latin poets it is generally for the sake of the information they have to give them. Nevertheless, there were two Latin writers whose works were something more to the Greeks than mere storehouses of facts. Vergil and Cicero demand special attention.

1. Vergil

There is perhaps no greater testimony of the extent and depth of Vergil's influence than the fact that he alone of all Roman poets attained to a degree of popularity in the Greek East. Not only were Vergil's works translated into Greek in whole or in part, but they were read and studied in the original Latin in Greek schools, and he himself came to be considered by Greek Christians, as by Western Christians, a prophet of Christianity, his name becoming a synonym among

Greek Christian writers for a wise man and poet par excellence.

I have already mentioned (supra p.95) the translations which the freedman Polybius made of Vergil into Greek in the first century. Polybius' versions are referred to only by Seneca.(1 We cannot tell whether they were widely read or whether they were merely exercises. Since his translations into Latin were from Homer's epics, it is probable that it was the Aeneid, the great Roman epic, that Polybius turned into Greek. The Georgics were translated into Greek, it is uncertain when, by an epic poet Arrianus who is mentioned by Suidas:(2 Ἀρριανός, ἐποποιός, μετάφρασιν τῶν Γεωργικῶν τοῦ Βεργιλλίου ἐπικῶς ποιήσας. This translation may have been chiefly utilitarian. The Georgics are twice cited with reference to the sowing and harvesting of crops in works included in the Geoponica of Cassianus Bassus (saec. VI-VII), a compilation of earlier writings on husbandry.(3 The earlier of the citations is due to Sextus Julius Africanus of Jerusalem (saec. II-III),(4 the second was made by Didymus (saec. IVor V). It may be that Arrianus' translation was used as a source by Africanus and Didymus, although it is always possible that they read the Georgics in the original.

---

1) Dialog. XI, 8; 11.
2) S.V. Ἀρριανός
3) Geoponica II, 18, 12: Βεργίλιος δὲ ἐπαινεῖ νίτρῳ καὶ ὕδατι ἐπιψεκάζειν τὰ σπειρόμενα (Georgics I, 194)
4) Geoponica II, 14, 3: --τὸν δὲ σῖτον ἀπὸ Πλειάδων δύσεως ἥτις ἐστὶ τῇ πρὸ τριῶν εἰδῶν Νοεμβρίων. τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ὁ Οὐεργίλιος συναινεῖ (Georgics IV, 231 ff

There exists no complete list of the Latin literary papyri which have been found and published up to this time,[1] but, so far as I have been able to discover, the total to 1940 is just over thirty. Of the number, twelve are fragments of Vergil and the remainder consist of pieces of Cicero, Sallust, Livy, Lucan, Juvenal, Fenestella (?), and a miscellany including fables, a Latin-Greek glossary, a Latin grammar, and a description of works of art in Rome. Although all of these papyri are interesting, especially since so few Latin literary finds have been made, it is with the Vergilian fragments that we are concerned here.[2] One of the twelve pieces of Vergil consists of the first two lines of the fourth Georgic written six times and is obviously a school exercise. The remaining eleven are all from the Aeneid: one is a metrical reworking of the Aeneid I, 477-493,[3] similar to the Vergilian "themes" which appear in the Latin Anthology;[4] three are from codices of Vergil;[5] and seven, representing six codices or rolls, are Greek-Latin lexicons to the Aeneid.[6]

1) Partial listings are given in Stein, op. cit., p. 208, and Schubart, Einführung in die Papyruskunde (Berlin, 1918), p. 481.
2) P. Tebt. II, 686 (saec. II-III).
3) P. S. I. II, 142 (saec. III-IV).
4) Anthologia Latina I, ed. Riese, 244; 255.
5) P. Oxy. I, 31 (Aeneid I, 457-467; 495-507. saec.V); P. Oxy. VIII, 1098 (Aeneid II, 16-23; 39-46. saec.IV-V); P.S.I. I, 21 (Aeneid IV, 66-68; 99-102 . saec.V).
6) P. Oxy.VIII, 1099 (Aeneid IV and V represented. saec.V); P.S.I.VII,756 (Aeneid II,443-537. saec.IV-V); P.Milanesi I,1 and Aevum I(1927),p.49 (Aeneid I,588-748;II,443-537. saec.IV-V); P.Ryl.III,478 (belongs to the same codex as P.MilanesiI,1);Lowe, CR 36(1922),p.154(AeneidV,673-4.saec. VI init.);P.Fouad I,III,5(AeneidIII,444-68.saec.IV-V); Kraemer,Actes du V^e Congres International de Papyrologie, p.239(Aeneid I,II,andIV represented. saec.VI-VII[?]).

These Greek vocabularies to the Aeneid shed important light on the question of the knowledge of Vergil not only in Egypt, which, because of its dry climate has yielded most of the papyri so far found, but also in other regions of the East. Before we can draw any conclusions, however, something should be said of their character. All seven fragments are of the same type: they are not interlinear translations of the ordinary sort, with the Greek written above the the lines of Latin. In each case the Latin text, sometimes complete and sometimes excerpted, is arranged in a vertical column and the Greek translation is arranged similarly in a parallel column.

The uniform arrangement followed in all these papyri together with the numerous blunders which characterize the Greek translations makes it clear that the books of which they are fragments were designed to aid Greeks in learning Latin in the schoolroom. The only other Latin writer to be represented by papyrus Greek dictionaries of this kind is Cicero, although there is a fragment with Latin and Greek words similarly arranged which is perhaps a vocabulary to some unknown work. Now all of these dictionaries but one, which was discovered in Palestine, were found in Egypt. The earliest of them, a vocabulary to parts of Cicero's first Catilinarian, dates from the third century; all the Latin-Greek Vergil fragments are from the fourth and later centuries. These considerations indicate that at least

Vergil and Cicero were authors usually read by Greek students learning Latin from the third century onward.

Aside from the evidence of the papyri, there are several references to Vergil in later Greek literature which indicate his influence. In the De Saltatione Lucian refers to "the wanderings of Aeneas and his love for Dido"[1] without, however, mentioning Vergil or the Aeneid. The first criticism of Vergil's treatment of Dido known to us is expressed in an anonymous epigram of the Greek Anthology, concerning a painting of Dido. In Paton's translation it reads: "thou seest, O stranger, the exact likeness of far-famed Dido, a portrait shining with divine beauty. Even so I was, but had not such a character as thou hearest, having gained glory rather for reputable things. For neither did I ever set eyes on Aeneas nor did I reach Libya at the time of the sack of Troy, but to escape a forced marriage with Iarbas I plunged the two edged sword into my heart. Ye Muses, why did ye arm chaste Virgil against me to slander thus falsely my virtue?"[2] This epigram must have been written before the fourth century since it was translated by Ausonius (Epigr. 118) who added two distichs of his own.

---

1) 46: καὶ μεμνῆσθαι δὲ τούτων δεῖ μάλιστα, ἀπὸ τῆς ἁρπαγῆς εὐθὺς ἄχρι τῶν ἐν τοῖς νόστοις γεγενημένων καὶ Αἰνείου (τῆς) πλάνης καὶ Διδοῦς ἔρωτος.
whether its invention was due to Naevius or Vergil, the stories of Dido and Aeneas were probably first interwoven by Romans. See Pease, Virgil, "Aeneid" IV, p. 18ff.

2) Anthologia Graeca XVI, 151 (Paton's translation, Loeb Classical Library).

The account of Dido and Aeneas to be read in the Chronographia of Iohannes Malalas (ca. A.D. 491-578) was taken from the Aeneid, as Malalas tells us,[1] and this account was in turn the source of the version of the story in the Historiarum Compendium[2] of Georgius Cedrenus who does not mention Vergil. Neither in this nor in the four other instances when he uses Vergil[3] does Malalas turn to the Latin poet for anything more than factual information.[4] Similarly, the writer of the Chronicum Paschale[5] and Iohannes Lydus refer to Vergil merely as a source for Roman history, while Stephanus Byzantius[6] knew that Mantua was his birth place.

Vergil was one of the two Latin authors represented with statues in the Zeuxippus, a gymnasium at Byzantium erected at the time of Septimius Severus and destroyed by fire in the sixth century. The other, curiously enough, was Apuleius. This we learn from the description of the statues in the Zeuxippus written by Christodorus of Thebes in Egypt in the sixth century, a work that makes up the the second book of the Greek Anthology. Christodorus Writes of Vergil: "And he stood forth--the clear-voiced

---

1) Chronographia VI (Migne PG XCVII, 205).
2) Corpus Script. Hist. Byz. XIII, p. 245-6.
3) Migne PG XCVII, 228; 286; 335; 342.
4) Corpus Script. Hist. Byz. IV, p. 210
5) De Magistratibus I, 7; 12; 25; 34; 50; De Mensibus IV, 118. All references are to the Aeneid.
6) S.v. Μάντυα

swan dear to the Ausonians, Vergil breathing eloquence, whom his native Echo of Tiber nourished to be another Homer."[1] Of Apuleius he says: "Apuleius was seated considering the unuttered secrets of the Latin reflective Muse. Him the Ausonian Siren nourished, a devotee of ineffable wisdom."[2] Perhaps the remarks on both these poets were taken from the inscriptions on the statues, since they are extremely vague in both cases.

It is well known that Vergil was revered in the West centuries before Dante as a wise man, a magician and the prophet of the birth of Christ. It is not generally recognized that he had a similar reputation among the Greek Christians of the East in Byzantine times. Indeed, the earliest evidence we have that Vergil was looked upon as the prophet of the birth of Christ is the Greek translation and allegorical interpretation of the fourth Eclogue to to be found in Constantine's oration to the clergy which has come down to us among the works of Eusebius.[3] It is

---

1) Anthologia Graeca II, ll. 414-416: Καὶ φίλος Αὐσονίοισι λιγύθροος ἔτρεπε κύκνος | πνείων εὐεπίης Βεργίλιος ὃν ποτε Ῥώμης | θυμβριὰς ἄλλον Ὅμηρον ἀνέτρεφε πάτριος ἠχώ
Cf. Scholia Anth. Pal. ad loc.: εἰς ἄγαλμα τοῦ ποιητοῦ Βιργιλίου τοῦ γράψαντος τῇ τῶν Ῥωμαίων διαλέκτῳ τὴν καλουμένην αἰνέαδα

2) Anthologia Graeca II, ll. 303-305: καὶ νοερὴς ἄφθεγκτα Λατινίδος ὄργια Μούσης | ἥζετο παπταίνων Ἀπολλήιος, ὄντινα μύστην | Αὐσονὶς ἀρρήτου σοφίης ἐθρέψατο Σειρήν.

3) Constantini ad Sanctorum Coetum Oratio 19-21.

scarcely accurate to call this version of the Pollio a translation, for the matter and spirit of Vergil's original have been so changed by means of numerous additions and subtractions that it represents, as it stands in the Greek translation, a clear prophecy of Christ's coming.(1

Once this interpretation of the fourth Eclogue had shown the way, Greek as well as Western Christians were quick to regard the Latin poet with superstitious awe. Artemius of Antioch (died A.D. 363), in his Passio written in answer to the emperor Julian's attacks on Christianity, cites among other prophecies of Christ's appearance on earth "the poetry of Vergil the Roman which you call buchlic."(2 But the search for intimations of Christianity did not stop with the Eclogues. The famous episode of Orpheus and Eurydice (Georgics IV, 467-527) was also given a Christian interpretation by Greek hagiographers. P. P. Peeters has recently written(3 on one such interpretation which is to

---

1) This translation has been much studied in modern times. Rossignol, who subjected it to a minute analysis in his book Virgile et Constantin le Grand (Paris, 1845), concluded that the Greek translation was the work of Eusebius, who knew Latin fairly well, but there have been other views expressed.

2) Philostorgius, Artemi Passio (Die griechischen Christlichen Schrifsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderten XXI [Leipzig, 1913], p. 163.): καὶ πολλαὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας αἱ μαρτυρίαι -- καὶ ἡ τοῦ Βιργιλίου τοῦ Ῥωμαίου ποίησις ἣν ὑμεῖς βουκολικὴν ὀνομάζετε.

3) "Une Légende de Virgile dans L'Hagiographie grecque", Mélanges Paul Thomas (Bruges, 1930), p. 546.

be read in a Georgian translation of a Greek account of the Passion of a certain Alexandrian martyr Saint Pansophios, almost certainly a legendary figure. While in prison following a trial before an Alexandrian tribunal, Pansophios converses with another Christian Licinius and it is during their talk that Vergil is mentioned. Licinius says: "Tell me now of the Resurrection and the Judgment, since the pagans have also spoken of it. You know that Vergil has described the descent to Hell and the journey to the place of torments, and the voice of the Persians (Parsephone)[1] there and of riches (Pluto) and of the river of fire which flows over the whole earth and how they journeyed over the place of torments and entered the precinct where Orpheus is seated holding his lyre, and the whole world hears his voice. There is the gleaming light: every corporeal being receives his soul from this light, and when he dies, his soul returns to this light. If anyone has sinned he is given over for punishment. All this Vergil has told us." Asked by Licinius to interpret this episode, Pansophios first gives a fanciful account of Vergil's birth which is reminiscent of the accounts in the ancient Latin lives of Vergil and then continues : "Later wisdom and eloquence were given him to know the things of Heaven---Is not what Vergil said the same as that which the apostle Paul has

---

1) The author did not know what the name signified and tried to translate it.

taught us in his Apocalypse." When Vergil speaks of the precinct of Orpheus where Orpheus sits and is obeyed by every soul, explains Pansophios, he means the city of Christ where David sings.

The word βιργίλιος seems to have become current among Greek Christian writers in the meaning of poet, rhetor, or wise man, since the author of the Passion of St. Catherine of Alexandria writes of the saint's learning: αὐτὴ ἦν μεμαθηκυῖα πᾶσαν βίβλον ῥητορικὴν τῆς ἐκβιργιλίων καὶ δημοσθενικῶν δογμάτων ἐπιστήμης.(1 She had read all the writings of the βιργίλιοι, who, we learn, were numerous,(2 and those of the master himself: ὅσα ὁ Βιργίλιος ἔλεξεν(3

2. Cicero

Cicero is the only other Latin author whose influence upon later Greek writing warrants separate treatment. The work that seems to have evoked most Greek comment and criticism was the De Republica, in which Cicero expressed his theory of the ideal state. We have already noted (p.94) Didymus' polemic against the dialogue and Suetonius' answer to Didymus In the second or third century Aristides Quintilianus wrote his De Musica, the most detailed ancient treatment of music which we have, in which he took exception to the harangue

---

1) Viteau, Passions des saints Écatérine et Pierre d'Alexandrie, Barbara et Amysia (Paris, 1897), p. 7.
2) Viteau, op. cit., p. 29: καὶ παρεγένοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν ῥήτορες καὶ βιργίλιοι τὸν ἀριθμὸν πεντήκοντα.
3) Viteau, op. cit., p. 26.

against music made by one of the speakers in the De Republica. Unfortunatley the part of Cicero's dialogue which dealt with the function of music in the state is no longer extant, and we are therefore unable to examine the passage which called forth Aristides' criticism. Nevertheless Aristides gives us to understand that he does not believe that the views expressed on music in the De Republica are Cicero's own, for he says: "--the deliberate object of musical study is to direct the soul towards excellence. This is a fact which has been unobserved by many scholars and especially by the interlocutor who harrangues against music in Cicero's dialogue on the Commonwealth. For I should not presume to assert that Cicero expressed in that work his own feelings about music. No one indeed could confidently affirm that he maligned and blamed music as being an ignoble art."(1 Further echoes of the De Republica are to be found in the anonymous treatise Περὶ πολιτικῆς ἐπιστήμης published by Mai in 1827(2 and elucidated by Prächter three quarters of a century later.(3 Prächter believes that the author was a Greek Christian who lived in the East at the end of the fifth century or a little later. He knew Latin,

---

1) De Musica II, 6. (translated by Sabine and Smith, Cicero, On the Commonwealth, p. 241).
2) Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio II (Rome, 1827), 571ff.
3) "Zum Maischen Anonymus Περὶ πολιτικῆς ἐπιστήμης," Byzantinische Zeitschrift IX (1900), pp. 621-632.

since he cites Cicero.[1]

There is not much that can be said concerning the two Greek critical estimates of Cicero's oratory that have been preserved. The judgment of the author of the who compared Demosthenes and Cicero, seems sound enough, "Demosthenes' strength," he says, "is usually in rugged sublimity, Cicero's in diffusion. Our countryman with his violence, yes, and his speed, his force, his terrific power of rhetoric, both burns and scatters everything before him, and may therefore be compared to a flash of lightening or thunder-bolt. Cicero seems to me like a wide-spread conflagration, rolling along and devouring all around it: his is a strong, steady fire, its flames duly distributed, now here, now there, and fed by relays of fuel."[2] Plutarch's comparison of the two orators is less penetrating: he sets Cicero's display of his learning and erudition in his speeches against Demosthenes' natural and earnest delivery; Cicero's love of jesting and mirth against Demosthenes' sullen and morose disposition; and finally, Cicero's immoderate boasting against Demosthenes' modesty.[3] All in all, Plutarch really compares the orators' characters

---

1) Cf. Mai, p. 608: εὖ γὰρ ὀνομάζει Κικέρων Σωκράτη ἀρχηγὸν καὶ ἵνα πλέον ῥωμαίῳ καὶ αὐτός, πρίγκιπα τῆς ὅλης καὶ ἀληθοῦς φιλοσοφίας ἐπικαλῶν.
2) Περὶ Ὕψους 12 (Fyfe's translation, Loeb Classical Library).
3) Plutarch, Comp. Dem. et. Cic. 1.

and not their speeches.[1]

In the number of Latin Literary papyri fragments that have been found, Cicero ranks second only to Vergil. In fact, the oldest Latin papyrus that has been published is a scrap of the second Verrine[2] which dates from the closing years of the first century B.C. The same oration, the De Imperio Cn. Pompei, and the Pro Caelio were all included in a papyrus codex of the fifth century, fragments of which were found at Oxyrhynchus,[3] while still another fragment of the second Verrine from a sixth century codex was also unearthed at Oxyrhynchus[4]. Furthermore, the site of the ancient Hermopolis Magna has yielded two parchment fragments of the Pro Plancio[5] dating from the fifth century.

These are all exclusively Latin fragments. The two fragments of Latin-Greek vocabularies to Cicero, already mentioned, are both from the orations against Catiline, the earlier, In Catil. I, 6-8,[6] being from a codex of the third century, and the later, In Catil. II, 14-15,[7] from a manuscript

---

1) Of the same nature are the two other pieces of literary criticism in Plutarch, He contrasts the oratorical styles of the two Gracchi to illustrate the difference in their Characters (Tiberius Gracchus 2) and likewise sees in the elder Cato's oratory the revelation of his character (Cato Maior 7).
2) P. Iand., fasc. V, 90 (In Verrem II, 2, 3.)
3) P. Oxy VIII,1097 and X,1251 (De Imp. Pompei 60-71; In Verrem II,1,1-4 and 2,3; Pro Caelio 26-55).
4) P.S.I. I,20 (In Verrem II, 1,60-63).
5) Melanges Chatelain (Paris, 1910), p. 442.
6) Gerstanger, "Ein Neuer lateinischer Papyrus aus der Sammlung 'Papyrus Erherzog Rainer'", Wiener Studien 55, (1937), p. 95
7) P. Ryl. I, 61.

of the fifth century. Both books were designed for use in the schoolroom.

3. Other Latin Writers

Other Latin writers of whose work there was some knowledge is in the Greek East may be conveniently considered together. At least two authors besides Vergil were honored with Greek translations. Sallust was translated by Zenobius (see supra p.100) and the later references to his writings in Stephanus Byzantius[1] and Iohannes Malalas[2] may stem from this translation. The Breviarum of Eutropius (floruit A.D. 375), an epitome of Roman history, was twice translated into Greek,[3] once by Paeanius who was perhaps a younger contemporary of Eutropius,[4] and again by Capito Lycius, who lived, it would seem, a century later. The translation of Paeanius has come down to us almost intact, while that of Capito we possess in a fragmentary state. Eutropius is cited by Stephanus Byzantius[5] and Iohannes Malalas, the latter of

---

1) s.v. Ἄγιλις
2) Chronographia VIII (Migne PG XCVII, 325).
3) Both Greek versions of Eutropius are included in Droysen's edition of the Breviarum, Monumenta Germaniae Historica II (Berlin, 1878).
4) Cf. Suidas, s.v. Καπίτων, Λύκιος, ἱστορικός -- μετάφρασιν τῆς ἐπιτομῆς Εὐτροπίου, Ῥωμαϊστὶ ἐπιτεμόντος Λίβιον τὸν Ῥωμαῖον.
5) s.v. Καρχηδών.

whom tells us that he used the Greek translation.[1]

Greek historians and chronographers who wrote on Roman subjects consulted Latin sources. The Greek authors of the early centuries of Roman rule have been individually treated in the preceding section (supra pp.77-105.). It is enough at this point merely to mention some of the Latin writers used by Greek authors of the late Empire. Iohannes Lydus prided himself on his knowledge of Latin and cited a great many Latin sources of which, besides Vergil, Livy, Cicero, Varro Sallust, Cato, Suetonius, the elder Pliny, Caesar, Lucan, and Perseus are the most important. Malalas mentions Livy, Lucan Pliny, Suetonius, and Juvenal among others. Varro's De Re Rustica is referred to twice in the Geoponica.[2] In addition to allusions to Latin authors which occur in literary works, there have been found in Egypt three fragments of Sallust,[3] one with Greek glosses; a fragment of the first book of Livy,[4] and an epitome of several other books;[5] fifty lines of the seventh satire of Juvenal with Greek glosses;[6] and a scrap of

---

1) Chronographia VIII (Migne PG XCVII, 325): ὄντινα Περσέα (the Epirote) ὠνόμασε τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐκθέσει Εὐτρόπιος ὁ συγγραφεὺς Ῥωμαίων ἐν τῇ μεταφράσει αὐτοῦ.
2) V, 17, 9; XV, 2, 21.
3) P.S.I. I, 110; P. Oxy. VI, 884; Lehmann, Sitzber. Berl. Akad., Phil. Hist. Klasse 1934, 4.
4) P. Oxy. XI, 1379
5) P. Oxy. IV, 668.
6) Roberts, JEA 21- (1936) p. 199.

Lucan.(1

B. Criticism and Imitations of Latin Authors

Reading Latin literature as they did for information rather than for pleasure, the Greeks had very little to say of it in the way of literary criticism. Their comments on Vergil and Cicero have already been noted; there remains for discussion an interesting passage in the Noctes Atticae of Aulus Gellius, in which some of Gellius' Greek friends express their opinions of Latin literature.

The occasion is a birthday banquet given by a young man from Asia. Besides Gellius and his Greek friends, the company includes Antonius Julianus, a rhetor from Spain. After dinner the guests are entertained by trained singers who recited Greek love poetry--Anacreontic and Sapphic verses, and elegies. At this point Gellius continues: "Tum Graeci plusculi, qui in eo convivio erant, homines amoeni et nostras quoque litteras haut incuriose docti, Iulianum rhetorem lacessare insectarique adorti sunt tamquam prorsus barbarum et agrestem, qui ortus terra Hispania foret clamatorque tantum et facundia rabida iurgiosaque esset eiusque linguae exercitationes doceret, quae nullas voluptates nullamque mulcedinem Veneris atque Musae haberet; saepeque eum percontabantur, quid de Anacreonte ceterisque id genus poetis sentiret et ecquis nostrorum poetarum tam fluentes carminum delicias fecisset, 'nisi Catullus', inquiunt, 'forte pauca et Calvus itidem pauca. Nam Laevius

---

1) Milne, Catalogue of Literary Papyri in the British Museum, no. 42.

implicata et Hortensius invenusta et Cinna inlepida et Memmius dura ac deinceps omnes rudia fecerunt atque absona"[1]

Indignant at this attack, Julianus undertakes to defend Latin literature by quoting Latin amatory verses intended to show the Greeks that "nostros quoque antiquiores ante eos, quos nominastis, poetas amasios ac venerios fuisse."[2] The selection ends with some of the lines which Julianus recites from Valerius Aeditius, Porcius Licinius, and Quintus Catulus. We are not told of their effect upon the Greeks, although Gellius in his praise is extravagant.

Too much can be made of this passage. In the first place it cannot be construed as a sweeping denunciation of all Latin literature by competent critics. The poetry in question throughout, both Greek and Latin, is love poetry, which was the only poetry in which Gellius' friends were interested. Their criticism that, except for a few verses of Catullus and Calvus Latin poetry lacks grace and the charm of Venus and the Muse, makes it clear that only the Latin poets most Greek in spirit would please them. This is borne out by the fact that all the Latin poets whom they mention are <u>poetae novi</u>, who closely imitated Alexandrian models.

The terseness and sonority of Latin failed to impress the friends of Gellius but they called forth the admiration of some Greeks. Plutarch,[3] quoting the elder Cato, declares that

---

1) Gellius XIX, 9.
2) <u>Ibid</u>.
3) <u>Cato Maior</u> 12.

the Athenians were astonished at the speed and pungency of Cato's speaking, for what he had said in a very short time, his interpreter had taken a much longer time to repeat. Likewise the brevity and conciseness of the laws of the Twelve Tables were noted by Diodorus,[1] while Gregory the Thoumaturge believed the Latin language to be admirably suited to the exercise of authority and the expression of law.[2]

Imitation is a form of criticism, the question whether Greek authors imitated Latin authors has formed the subject of a lively philological debate that has been in progress for approximately a century and gives promise of continuing for another. Inasmuch as an investigation of the problem in all its aspects would require a large volume, all that I propose to do at this time is to outline its dimensions and to indicate its present status.

How heated is the controversy can be seen from a partial listing of scholars who have taken part in it at one time or another. Robert,[3] Kehmptzow,[4] Noack,[5] Paschal,[6] Becker,[7]

---

1) XII, 26.
2) In Origenem I (Migne PG X, 1053): νόμοι -- ἐκφραθθέντες δὲ καὶ παραδοθέντες τῇ Ῥωμαίων φωνῇ, καταπληκτικῇ μὲν καὶ ἀλαλονὶ καὶ συσχηματιζομένῃ τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τῇ βασιλικῇ.
3) Preller-Robert, Griechische Mythologie[4] III, 2, 1239
4) De Quinte Smyrnaei fontibus ac mythopoëia (diss.), Kiel, 1891, p. 46ff.
5) In Gottingische gelehrte Anzeigen 20 (1892), p. 798 ff.
6) A Study of Quintus of Smyrna (Chicago, 1904), p. 78ff.
7) Rheinisches Museum 68 (1913), p. 68.

Cataudella,[1] Keydell,[2] and Braune[3] have been among those to uphold the thesis that later Greek literature contains imitations of Latin literature; while Koechly[4], Norden,[5] Heinze,[6] Bassett,[7] Kroll[8] and Maas[9] have taken the opposite view. Unfortunately, writers rarely acknowledge their debts to predecessors so that deciding what is and what is not an imitation remains largely subjective. Thus Maas declares in his review of Braune's dissertation Nonnos und Ovid, that all Braune's attempts to show that Nonnus used Ovid are unconvincing and that there is no evidence of any Latin influence on Greek poetry,[10] while Keydell, reviewing the same study and writing with knowledge of Maas' review, concludes: "Überhaupt haben wir nun für jeden spätgriechischen Dichter---mit der Kenntnis lateinischen Literaturwerke zu rechnen."[11]

The scholars mentioned above and others have on various occasions claimed or denied, according to their

---

1) Athenaeum, N.S.5 (1927), p. 302.
2) Gnomon 11 (1935), p. 597.
3) Nonnos und Ovid (diss.) (Greifswald, 1935).
4) Quinte Smyrnaei Posthomericorum Libri (Leipzig, 1850), prol. XXVI
5) Neue Jahrb. f. kl. Phil. 7 (1901), p. 329.
6) Vergils epische Technik[3], p. 63ff.
7) AJP 46 (1925), p. 243ff.
8) Studien zum Verständnis der römischer Literatur (Stuttgart, 1924), p. 10.
9) Byzantinische Zeitschrift 35 (1935), pp. 385-387.
10) Byzantinische Zeitschrift 35 (1935), pp. 385-387.
11) Gnomon 11 (1935), p. 605.

point of view, that there were imitations to be found in Greek literature of the following Latin authors: Vergil, in Lucian, Quintus of Smyrna, Tryphidorus, Chariton, and Erykios (Auth. Pal. VI, 96); Horace, in Lucian, Maximus of Tyre, and Melinno; Ovid, in Lucian, Nonnus, and Musaeus; and Lucretius, Tacitus, and Pliny, in Lucian. Now in order to prove that a Greek writer imitated a Latin writer in a given passage, it must be established that the matter or ideas allegedly borrowed are unique with the Latin writer, and that both authors were not indebted to a Greek work no longer extant. This is extremely difficult to do both because Latin literature depends largely upon Greek models and because so much of Greek poetry has been lost to us. The difficulty is increased by the fact that in the great majority of cases where it has been claimed that the Greek imitates the Latin, the similarity between the passages lies in the treatment of Greek myths and legends. Consequently detailed analyses of such passages can never admit of any definite results.

If any Latin poet was imitated by a Greek poet, it was probably Vergil, since, as we have seen, he was the Latin author best known to the Greeks. In fact, most of the discussion of Greek imitations of Latin works has revolved around the alleged imitations of the Aeneid in the Posthomerica of Quintus of Smyrna and the Iliupersis of Tryphiodorus. It has been claimed that the account of

the Wooden Horse and Laocoon in Quintus' twelfth book (ll. 353-499) is largely influenced by Vergil's treatment of the same episode (Aeneid II, 21-249), and that Tryphiodorus is also drawing upon the second book of the Aeneid for his description of Sinon (Iliupersis 219 ff.). The similarities noted in each case, however, are similarities of incident, and since there were many versions of the fall of Troy current in antiquity we cannot be sure that Vergil was used either by Quintus or by Tryphiodorus.

The reminiscenses of Ovid that Braune[1] has seen in Nonnus' Dionysiaca are likewise open to question. Braune's case rests largely on four instances of similarity of incident: Dionysiaca XXXVIII, 108-434 with Metamorphoses I, 748-II, 400 (Phaethon); Dionys. IV, 285-463 with Metam. III, 1-130 (Cadmus); Dionys. V, 287-551 with Metam. III, 138-252 (Actaeon); and frequent references to Daphne throughout the Dionysiaca with Metam. I, 452-567. In each passage the subject-matter is mythological, and although the accounts of Ovid and Nonnus may differ from the other Greek versions which we have in certain particulars, there is still the possibility that both were using Greek works now lost.

We know very little of the lives of Quintus of Smyrna,

---

1) Op. cit.

Tryphiodorus, and Nonnus except that they probably lived between the fourth and sixth centuries, Quintus in Syria and Tryphiodorus and Nonnus in Egypt. Vergil papyri have been found both in Egypt and Syria, so that Quintus and Tryphiodorus might have been familiar with the Aeneid. We can not say even this much for Nonnus and Ovid. So far as I know, there is no trace of Ovid in the East, either in Greek literature or in the papyri, before the time of Planudes who made Greek translations of his work in the fourteenth century.

A better case can be made out for the alleged imitations of Latin poetry in Lucian. In the first place it is fairly certain that Lucian knew Latin. Second, the most striking reminiscenses that have been noted are of Juvenal and occur in pieces that satirize life in Rome or comment on Roman institutions: the Nigrinus, the De Mercede Conductis, (the Dependent Scholar), and the Saturnalia. But even here the connection cannot be proved, since Lucian visited Rome, and could observe for himself.

I have tried to make it clear that the entire question of imitation of Latin authors by Greek authors must be handled with the utmost cauthon. I should not go so far as to say with Keydell, whom I have quoted above, that we may expect to find imitations of Latin poetry in every late Greek poet, nor can I subscribe to the extreme view

of Wilhelm Kroll:[1] "Wo man Benutzung eines römischen Dichters durch Griechen behauptet hat, istdder Sachverhalt immer anders zu erklären: Quintus von Smyrna und Tryphiodor haben nichts Vergils Iliupersis gelesen, Lukian weder den Horaz noch dem Iuvenal, Maximos von Tyros nicht den Horaz."

---

1) Op. cit., p. 10

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

W.T.Arnold, Studies of Roman Imperialism (Manchester, 1906).

J.B.Bury, A History of the Eastern Roman Empire from the Fall Of Irene to the Accession of Basil I (London, 1912).

_____, History of the Later Roman Empire from the Death Of Theodosius I to the Death of Justinian (London, 1923).

A. Budinszky, Die Ausbreitung der lateinischen Sprache (Berlin, 1881).

P.S.Costas, An Outline History of the Greek Language with Particular Emphasis on the Koine and the Subsequent Stages (Chicago, 1936).

F.Cramer, De studiis quae veteres ad aliarum gentium contulerint linguas (Stralsund, 1844).

H. Dirksen, "Über den öffentlichen Gebrauch fremder Sprachen bei den Römern," Civilistische Abhandlungen I (Berlin, 1820), pp. 1-92.

J.E.Dunlap, "Fragments of a Latin Grammar from Egypt," AJP 61 (1940), pp. 330-344.

E.Egger, "De l'étude de la langue latine chez les Grecs dans l'antiquité," Mémoires d'histoire ancienne et de philologie (Paris, 1863), pp. 259-276.

E.Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ed. J.B.Bury (London, 1909-26).

T.R.Glover, Life and Letters in the Fourth Century (New York, 1924).

L.Hahn, Rom und Romanismus im griechisch-römischen Osten (mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Sprache) bis auf die Zeit Hadrians (Leipzig, 1906).

_____, "Zum Sprachenkampf im römischen Reich bis auf die Zeit Justinians", Philologus, Supplementband 10 (1905-07), pp. 675-715.

_____, "Zum Gebrauch der lateinischen Sprache in Konstantinopel," Festgabe für Martin Schanz, ed. Kabitzsch (Würzburg, 1912), pp. 173-183.

G.F.Hertzberg, Die Geschichte Griechenlands unter der Herrschaft der Römer I-III (Halle,1866-75).

C.Heyne, "De usu sermonis Romani in administrandis provinciis a Romanis probato," Commentationes Societatis Regiae Scientiarum Gottingensis Recentiores I (Göttingen, 1811).

A.Hillscher, "Hominum litteratorum Graecorum ante Tiberii mortem in urbe Romana commoratorum historia critica," Jahrbb. f. class. Phil., Supplement. 18 (1892), pp.353-440.

A.H.M.Jones, The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian (Oxford, 1940).

P.Jouguet, "Les papyrus latins d'Égypte," Revue des Études latines 3 (1925),pp.35-50.

W.Kroll, Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur (Stuttgart,1924).

K.Krumbacher, Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur (München, 1897).

J.J.Lagus, Studia Latina Provincialium (Helsingfors, 1849).

W.Kubitschek, "Der Rückgang des lateinischen im Orient," Wiener Studien 24 (1922),pp. 572-81.

L.Lafoscade, "Influence du latin sur le grec," Études de philologie néo-grecque, ed. Jean Psichari (Paris,1892), (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études 92), pp. 83-158.

J.Marquardt, Römische Staatsverwaltung I (Leipzig,1881).

L.Mitteis, Reichsrecht und Volksrecht in den östlichen Provinzen des römischen Kaisarreichs (Leipzig, 1891).

C.H.Moore, "Latin Exercises from a Greek Schoolroom," CP 19 (1924),pp. 317-328.

H.J.Rose, The Roman Questions of Plutarch (Oxford, 1924).

M.Rossignol, Virgile et Constantin le Grand (Paris, 1845).

O.Seeck, Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt I-VI (Berlin, 1897-1921).

A.N.Sherwin-White, The Roman Citizenship (Oxford,1939).

A.Sickinger, De linguae latinae apud Plutarchum reliquiis (Freiburg, 1883).

R.G.Sievers, Das Leben des Libanius (Berlin, 1868).

W.Snellman, De Interpretibus Romanorum I-II (Leipzig, 1919).

P.Viereck, Sermo Graecus quo senatus populusque Romanus magistratusque populi Romani usque ad Tiberii Caesaris aetatem in scriptis publicis usi sunt (Göttingen, 1888).

W.Vornefeld, De scriptorum latinorum locis a Plutarcho examinatur citatis (Münster, 1901).

K.F.Walch, "De lingua latina, lingua legitima", Opuscula I (Halle, 1785).

K.F.Weber, De latine scriptis quae Graeci veteres in linguam suam transtulerunt (Kassel, 1835-52; 4 parts), I (1835), II (1848), III (1850), IV (1852).

H.Zilliacus, Zum Kampf der Weltsprachen in Oströmischen Reich (Helsingfors, 1935).