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**ABSTRACT**

The thesis examines a selection of Latin authors, some who translated or adapted works from Greek originals, and others who coined new words or meanings in Latin. Its focus is on how these authors sought to expand the vocabulary of Latin literature and philosophy through the process of lexical innovation. With an emphasis on the works of Marcus Tullius Cicero, the thesis analyses the extent to which his literary achievements differed from those of his predecessors in the development of Latin as a philosophical language. The analysis is principally linguistic, but also socio-historical by placing authors in a chronological tradition of Latin translation and providing a survey of the attitudes of Roman authors towards Greek.

In Chapter One, I survey the translation of Homer’s *Odyssey* in Livius Andronicus, followed by Gnaeus Naevius and his *Bellum Poenicum* as well as his plays (*the Praetextae fabulae*) with the aim of analysing both authors’ lexical innovations and borrowing from Greek sources. Other early authors surveyed include Ennius in his *Annales* as well as his dramatic works adapted from Homer. I also examine the lexical innovations of Plautus partly through his adaptations of Menander’s comedies, and likewise Caecilius Statius and Terence and their experimentation with lexical innovation. The examination looks at, where possible, the Greek originals and compares the lexical patterns between the Greek and the Latin translation or adaptation (for instance, the use of compound words) or the use of loan words. Finally I examine the tradition of lexical innovation in the poetry and drama of Accius and Pacuvius.

In the second chapter on Cicero, I build on the results of my 2010 Honours thesis results (the 2010 study) which detailed neologisms from direct translations, loanshifts, loanblends, and direct borrowings from Greek originals. I analyse the semantic innovation of each by looking at the context and utility of the word in question. I then examine overall patterns of use by Cicero, particularly in his philosophical works, which were employed to translate Greek concepts into Latin.

In the third chapter, I discuss Cicero’s *Letters to Atticus* and compare the lexical innovation in the epistolary medium to his philosophical works with a discussion on his use of colloquial vernacular. I also examine his lexical innovations in Greek and query whether these innovations are Ciceronian originals, borrowings from literary Greek, or simply usages of Greek words from *Koine* Greek which were used at the time Cicero was writing.
The final chapter examines Cicero’s lexical innovations in the context of his contemporaries such as Lucretius and Varro, and also later authors such as Quintilian, Seneca the Elder, and Younger, Pliny the Younger, and Horace, and their attitudes towards lexical innovation in Latin.
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INTRODUCTION

1. Scope of Investigation
Quintilian, in his *Institutio Oratoria*, referred to Romans borrowing from the Greek language in the following way: ‘We use, by admission, Greek words when there is no equivalent in our language’.\(^1\) The statement highlights an important question in the development of Latin as a philosophical and poetic language: to what extent did Roman writers think about Latin as an adequate medium for their own thought? Further, if the influence of the Greek literary and philosophical traditions was so great on these authors, in what ways did they deal with its influence over Latin?

These questions raise the major theme of this thesis: lexical innovation; that is, the creation of neologisms and the experimentation with new meanings in existing words.\(^2\) In recent academic literature on the subject, commentary has often avoided a focus on this question or simply paid lip service to it, for reasons not entirely clear. There has been ample commentary analysing the amount of Greek in the works of specific Latin authors, however such analysis does not necessarily provide an account of these authors’ attitudes towards lexical innovation, the results of which very often give us a stronger perspective on their fundamental attitudes to the reception (or rejection) of Greek as a means of expressing new ideas in Latin.

The relationship between Greek and Latin, in particular bilingualism in the Ancient World, has become a well-researched topic recently.\(^3\) However, despite the widespread recognition of Latin as a dynamic medium and lasting preserver of Classical disciplines such as politics, architecture, science, and poetry, less attention has been paid to the importance of Latin as a transformative medium of Greek thought, and subsequently, the most important reinterpretation of Greek ideas for later Western thinkers, spanning far beyond the Scholastics of the Middle Ages.

The aims of this thesis are threefold: Firstly, to examine the ways in which Latin authors approached lexical innovation generally. For example, the survey of Ennius and Plautus looks at the ways in which these writers expanded Latin with different techniques such as the use of loan and compound words. The second aim is to understand the methods in which different Latin authors came to interpret and translate Greek thought through the use of various morphological practices in their native tongue.

---

1 1.5.58: ‘...et confessis quoque Graecis utimur verbis, ubi nostra desunt...’
2 A detailed examination of this definition is presented in Chapter 2.
3 As an example, the extensive work undertaken by Adams (2003a).
Finally, I examine how these authors used lexical innovation to reinterpret Greek thought, and how they came to terms with notions of linguistic ‘purism’ in Latin. In this respect, authors such as Livius Andronicus and Marcus Tullius Cicero are closely analysed in the context of the Greek sources from which they translated directly.

An important aspect of the following studies, which at first appears obvious yet needs to be highlighted nevertheless, is that the scope of the analysis is limited to formal or written innovations. As Adams writes:

One must always be sceptical about assertions to the effect that a certain linguistic innovation occurred, say, in the second century AD. All that we can assert with any justification about changes in a dead language is that certain innovations happen to turn up in writing for the first time at a certain date. Unless there is special evidence in a particular case we cannot know for how long before its first attestation a usage had been in existence…There are many salutary instances that could be cited of usages that have had to be redated as a result of new discoveries…

As a result, any investigation into lexical ‘innovation’ can only ever be as reliable as the recorded evidence upon which it is based. To this end, in Chapter One, innovation is broadly defined as any unique or first-attested Latin forms being investigated in early poetry and prose. In Chapter Two, the definition of ‘innovation’ is significantly narrowed to unique first occurrences (i.e. new words or new meanings) in the Ciceronian philosophical corpus which explicitly gloss or translate Greek philosophical terms. This is in part due to length limitations for Masters dissertations. A full examination of linguistic experimentation and innovation in Cicero’s corpus would be significantly longer and beyond the scope of this thesis. In the Third Chapter the parameters are widened again to include general unique or first occurrences in Cicero’s correspondence, specifically the Att, which potentially include colloquialisms or non-literary technical vernacular which appear for the first time in recorded prose, as opposed to unique ‘innovations’. In addition to Latin innovation, Cicero’s innovations in the Greek language to his friends are analysed with particular reference to Koine Greek and the language of the extant papyri. This provides a more nuanced insight into

---

4 Adams (2013), 25; for a discussion of the overlap between formal literary language and colloquial registers see also Clackson (2010), 10-11: „The nature of what is constituted as formal language is therefore dependent on what has been selected and accepted by members of the speech community, especially those members with personal power and prestige“.
Cicero’s attitude towards lexical innovation which, as we discover, was not purely confined to Latin. In the Fourth Chapter innovation is again broadly defined in an attempt to contrast contemporary and later authors’ views on lexical innovation to those of Cicero’s.

The investigation yields differing attitudes which fluctuate between strong embrace of and a reticence towards lexical innovation and experimentation in Latin. In attitudes falling under the latter category, lexical innovation was strongly tempered by a desire to promote Roman nationalism and preserve a consistent tradition for Latin literature, in addition to intelligibility issues regarding the expression of ideas and their audiences’ reception. At the core of this investigation is Cicero, one of the most prolific and well-preserved writers in Latin, who is examined through a linguistic analysis of his use and translation of Greek terms in his philosophical works and his methods of lexical innovation and borrowing in his epistolary works. The title suggests that as one of the ‘selected Latin authors’ who form part of this thesis, Cicero was one of the ‘well-known craftsmen of words’ (nobiles verborum opifices) in Latin when it came to lexical innovation and the expansion of its technical vocabulary, and the evidence certainly suggests this. Not only did Cicero experiment and introduce new Latin forms and meanings but he also provided Latin with new technical concepts which would allow it eventually to surpass Greek as the dominant philosophical language of the West. Comparisons are made between contemporary and later authors in the disciplines of philosophy (Seneca the Younger), rhetoric (Quintilian and Seneca the Elder), and poetry (Lucretius and Horace) in evaluating the extent to which the language was expanded in these areas to reinterpret the thinking of the Greeks.

2. Historical Attitudes in Rome towards the Greek language: Cato and Plautus
A useful starting point in this investigation is to survey Roman attitudes regarding the Greek language and its influence on Latin. Roman philhellenism was strongest around the 2nd century B.C., with various factors contributing to the rise of the Greek language within Roman academic and political circles. It began with the famous delegation of Greek philosophers in 155 B.C. consisting of Carneades, Critolus, and Diogenes. Each came to Rome representing different schools of Greek philosophy: the Academy, the Peripatetics, and the Stoa respectively. The delegation was a showcase of Greek rhetoric and philosophy which drew impressive crowds at the time, including men such as

---

5 The phrase derives from a description of Zeno of Citium in Cicero’s Tusc. 5.34 as: “ignobilis verborum opifex”. 
Scipio Aemilianus (185 - 129 B.C). Morford argues that historical anecdotes from writers such as Polybius, an admirer of Scipio, show that the increased presence of Hellenistic culture in Rome was marked by the influx of Greek wealth after the Roman general Lucius Aemelius Paullus’ victory at Pydna in Macedon around 168 B.C. He also acknowledges Livy’s comments about the return of the Roman army with ‘huge quantities of booty’ exhibited in the triumphal procession of Manilus Vulso from Asia Minor in 188 B.C. after his victory over Antiochus III ‘and the moral degeneration that followed’. Morford highlights a passage from Polybius in which Polybius himself, speaking to a young Scipio Aemilianus, says:

I myself would delightedly to do all in my power to help you to speak and act in a way worthy of your ancestors. For as those studies which I see now occupy and interest you, you will be in no want of those ready to help both of you; so great is the crowd of such men that I see flocking here from Greece at present.

Morford argues that Scipio’s approach to blending Greek and Roman learning represented a ‘coming generation’ where support for Greek wisdom by men of such social, political, and military prestige was crucial to the success of Greek intellectual innovations at Rome. Yet with such widespread philhellenism came dissenting opinions from Roman conservatives, chief among whom was Marcus Porcius Cato (the Elder, 234 B.C. - 149 B.C.) Cato’s anti-hellenism is well documented, and historians attribute this to his own Sabine origins which led him to project the old-time virtue that had made Rome great and purport ‘to incarnate it’. Cato’s antagonism is seen in the letter Ad Filium when he cautions his son about the Greeks: ‘When that race hands over their learning, everything is corrupted’. However, as Astin notes, there was a paradox to Cato’s hatred of the Greeks who, anxious to ‘know his enemy, was led to study Greek literature more intensely than many of the ‘undiscriminating philhellenes’ about him. So Cato’s familiarity with Greek literature became a platform for him to begin his own Latin prose writings, drawing upon Greek literary forms and even some...
detailed material from Greek sources which ultimately show a side of Cato which is not altogether anti-Greek at all: ‘…there was no fanatical general antihellenism…Cato was not automatically hostile to all things Greek and did not reject them as such’.  

Plutarch observed that when Cato visited the Assembly in Athens in 191 B.C. he delivered his speech entirely in Latin and directed an interpreter to translate. Plutarch adds that if he had wished, he could have addressed the Athenians in Greek. Sciarrino makes an important observation about this event by noting that in the speech, Cato quoted Demostenes’ Philippics (1.30) and in the process of translating it, the interpreter would have retranslated Cato’s translation of Demostenes: ‘As such, Cato would have impressed his Athenian listeners by presenting himself not only as a political leader but also as a self-sufficient and self-confident proprietor of their cultural patrimony’. So Cato’s attitudes towards the Greeks and their language were mixed but not altogether anti-hellenic. He had a grasp of Greek and had read their literature fastidiously, especially towards the end of his life. Indeed Horace even credits Cato, along with Ennius, as one who ‘sermonem patrium ditaverit et nova rerum nomina protulerit…’ It is worth asking whether the complex relationship Cato possessed in relation to Greece and its language reflects a wider relationship of the Roman upper classes and their mentality towards Greek language and culture. Astin looks broadly at the influence of Greece in Rome during the 2nd century B.C., arguing that the outcome was not the conquest of Rome by Greek culture but a ‘productive synthesis’ such that what emerged was a distinct and unmistakably Roman culture necessarily, ‘consciously, yet unselfconsciously shot through with Hellenic elements.’

2.1. Roman attitudes to Greeks in Plautine comedy

An interesting area of debate concerning Roman attitudes to Greeks is in the area of Plautine comedy, specifically the portrayal of Greeks and the use of Greek words in the comedies of Plautus. Lindsay remarked that ‘we cannot suppose that Graecisms were employed by Plautus…[simply] to embellish his style’. The following analysis aims to disprove at least part of this statement by looking to specific instances where Graecisms

---

13 Astin (1978), 169.
14 Plutarch, Cato Maior, 12.5; see also Livy 35.50.4. For further discussion of this speech, see Astin, 160ff; Cugusi and Sblendoria Cugusi, 258-9.
15 Sciarrino (2011), 139-140.
16 Plut. Cato Maior, 2.5; see also Cic. Academica, 2.5; De Senectute, 1.3, 7.26.
17 Horace, Ars Poetica, 52-54.
18 Cf. Horace, Epistles, 2.1.156-157: „Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artes intulit agresti Latio”.
19 Astin (1978), 181.
20 Lindsay (1907), 2.
were used, or Greek loanwords imported, to embellish Plautus’ comedic style. One example of Graecisms used as comedic fodder is found in Plautus’ linguistic puns on proper nouns. Seaman points to examples where Plautus names soldiers in his plays with Greek names,\(^\text{21}\) arguing: ‘Men who had served in the army in Greek areas must certainly have understood the humour in these names’.\(^\text{22}\) Similarly, Sturtevant and others note that Greek words appear in Plautine comedy with such frequency because a large amount of adult Romans had returned from military encampments in Greek towns and had brought home some Greek phrases including oaths, slang and commercial terms.\(^\text{23}\) In the prologue to Poenulus, if we believe that Plautus wrote it,\(^\text{24}\) he instructs the scorta (prostitutes) not to sit on the stage, the slaves not to block freemen, the nutrices (nurses) to tend to their babies domi (at home) rather than let them cry throughout the performances, and so forth.\(^\text{25}\) It would not be too bold to say that if his audiences were composed solely of members of the Roman elite, labelling them scorta and nutrices would certainly be highly offensive even in jest,\(^\text{26}\) and such insults would not go unpunished.\(^\text{27}\) Jocelyn argues that Plautus used Greek not for the servile classes, but to help present certain characters as speaking in a way one of the better placed and more sophisticated members of the contemporary Roman citizenry might have done ‘in a similar situation or real life’.\(^\text{28}\) He argues that instances where characters such as the Milphio of the Poenulus, the Pseudolus and the Harpax of the Pseudolus, or the Stichus of the Stichus switches into Greek reflect an upper-class usage and, ‘is part of a display of verbal wit’.\(^\text{29}\)

Adams disagrees when Jocelyn highlights a passage from the Captiui 880-883 where a series of Greek oaths are uttered by the sponger Ergasilus (equivalent to the Greek comedians’ ἀκλητος) to Hegio affirming the sighting of the latter’s son, Philopolemus. Jocelyn says that this passage, among a few others, has an importance

\(^{21}\) The names appear to be Plautine inventions themselves used as additional comedic tools, see Albrecht (1997), 190.

\(^{22}\) Seaman (1954), 116; e.g. Cleomachus (Bacch.), Pyrgopolinices (Mil.), Polymachaeroplagides (Pseud.) etc.

\(^{23}\) Brown, Sturtevant et al (1932), 79.

\(^{24}\) There are issues of authenticity with many of the Plautine prologues, e.g. Casina, 13; see also Duckworth (1994), 80 for a discussion of the authenticity of Plautus’ prologues.

\(^{25}\) Plautus, Poen. 17-35; Adams (2003a), 405 also makes a novel point when he says that specific terms in Latin suggestive of passive homosexuality are borrowed from Greek (catamitus, cinaedus, pathicus; also malacus in Plautus): ‘...herein is implicit an attitude that it was Greeks above all who were prone to such behaviour,’ and that those Romans with these tendencies should be caricatured by Greek words. On Greek as the language a sexual transgression, see references in O’Sullivan (2012), 357-358.

\(^{26}\) See also Albicker (2003), 31.

\(^{27}\) Cf. Plautus, at the denouement of Cist. 785: ‘qui deliquit vapulabit, qui non deliquit bibet’; see also Cicero, Pro Rosc. Com. 30f.

\(^{28}\) Jocelyn (1999), 172.

\(^{29}\) Jocelyn (1999), 185.
that is obscured by the statistical dominance of the utterances of slaves. He explains: ‘it is much easier to associate the use of Greek in this passage with the way gentlemen spoke to each other in the relaxed atmosphere of the conuiium’ than with the mundane dealings of slaves and their masters. Adams, citing Shipp, argues that there is a problem with this argument because some of the Greek of Plautus’ comedies is, in general, not Attic at all but sourced from a wider array of dialects such as Doric. Adams asserts that the expression υα ταυ Κόρας (‘Yes, by Cora!’) which Ergasilus uses himself on line 881 is also used by a woman from Sybaris in Magna Graecia in Aristophanes’s Wasps (1438). He suggests that the line is a Doric expression, evidenced by ἄ for Attic η; ‘this is not the type of Greek that an upper-class Roman educated in Greek would have used’. This is no doubt accurate, but one issue is simply the lack of supporting evidence from Plautus’ time; we do not know to what extent the upper classes of Rome actually used spoken Greek dialects or words therefrom.

Adams rightly concludes that there is no point in trying to locate the use of Greek and code-switching in one social class, since Greek was, paradoxically, both a lower-class and an upper-class language within the same society. A similar point had been made by Dubuisson in the context of a much later period, where he argued that the use of Greek was characteristic of the aristocracy but simultaneously remained the language of slaves. The problem with attempts to fix a code-switching milieu to a certain class is that it overlooks the objective of Plautus’ works; that is, the comedic effect upon an audience consisting of, undoubtedly, a mélange of the Roman populace. The use of class contrast as another comedic tool is not disputed, and the use of idiosyncratic language is also a part of Plautine comedy, yet the Greek puns and wordplay are pointless if we assume the audience, who viewed them during the ludi scaenici, consisted solely of upper-class citizens.

No single interpretation can be fully correct in drawing conclusions based on class. Whether the code-switching of Plautine characters is due to their social ranking or not, the key is to identify when it occurs and the purpose of its presence in the comedy. For example, the scene discussed above with the ἀσόμβολος or ‘freeloader’ named Ergasilus (making solemn oaths in Greek to Hegio to receive a free meal), here the

---

30 Jocelyn (1999), 189.
31 Shipp (1953), 105-112.
32 Adams (2003a), 351-352, n 100.
33 Adams (2003a), 352, n 100.
34 Dubuisson (1992), 189: ‘[l]’emploi du grec...est resté caractéristique de l’aristocratie...a l’autre bout de l’échelle sociale, le grec est resté la langue des esclaves’; see also Leiwo (1995), 51.
35 See Beare (1964), 174 where it is discussed that the ludi were put on at the expense of the magistrates and everyone from various social ranks could attend for free.
purpose is not simply to categorise the characters into social rank. There is no need to analyse the etymologies or phonetics of particular Greek dialects to understand Plautus’ intentions here. The phrase υἷ tavatar Kóραν may indeed be a Doric phrase capable of being traced back to Aristophanes, but how can one be certain that Plautus was even conscious of different dialects as social markers? In addition, Maltby’s 1995 study confirmed that the Greek of Plautus’ works would most likely have been the Greek of everyday Rome, not necessarily the dialect of his Greek originals.36 His study is important because it shifts the emphasis of Greek in Plautus as a medium prevalent in both upper and lower classes of Roman society, and Plautus’ use of it did not derive solely from his New Comedy models but rather, for humorous purposes and recognisable tropes which appealed to a cross-section of Roman society; that is to say, his audience.

Gilleland produced a statistical study of Plautine characters’ use of Greek words and some of the results will be helpful here. In terms of Plautine character types, Gilleland divided them broadly into a *parasitus* (sponger), *miles* (soldier), *leno* (pimp), and *servus* (slave) as well as miscellaneous other groups such as a *senex*, *ancilla*, *adulescens*, *lena*, *matrona*, *virgo*, and *meretrix*. Having collected the occurrences of Greek words throughout the plays, he finds that the average ratio of Greek words to total words used by characters was around 1:86.37 The data indicated that the spongers, soldiers, pimps, and slaves generally used an above-average amount of Greek words in the comedies, but not far behind were the *senex* (1:101) and other male characters such as aristocrats and slave-owners (1:90). Gilleland concludes that not all characters of low social standing used more words of Greek origin than the average.38

The evidence before us therefore is that Greek borrowings39 often appeared for humorous purposes and nothing more, designed to appeal to a broad cross-section of Plautus’ audience.40 To argue as Jocelyn and Adams have done, that Plautus employed Greek in his plays often to convey the social rank of his characters is partly true, but perhaps misses the point of Plautus’ comedic techniques. It was part of a colloquial language readily identifiable to his audience; a mark of mundanity rather than

---

37 Gilleland (1979), 158.
38 Gilleland (1979), 159.
39 Note that it is often difficult to classify some words of Greek origin as “borrowings” per se, for they might have been well incorporated into Latin by the time of Plautus; for further discussion see Kahle (1918), 6-9, 39ff.
40 For further discussion on this line of argument see recently Zagagi (2012), 36: “Unlike elitist epic, theatrical performances were directed at the widest possible public with all its implications: unconditional accessibility at fixed times, pure enjoyment without any effort, and in the case of the *Palliata*, comedies which deliver the everyday life of another society in terms accessible to all and sundry.”
exclusively of status. Unlike the epic poets and tragedians before him, Plautus was not interested in developing a Latin vocabulary to fill a literary egestas, instead he used Greek traditions and Greek words to enhance the comedy of his own dramas and provide colour and versatility to his idiosyncratic characters.

The conclusions which have been offered from this brief survey (specifically the commentary on Cato’s alleged anti-hellenism) are, for the most part, based on political and nationalistic factors. Evidence, such as the testimony of writers like Plutarch about Cato’s reservations concerning Greek philosophical influence in Rome, or his use of Latin in Athens itself, attests to these conclusions. As found in Cicero, such issues were important to Romans and deeply influenced their public attitudes towards the Greek language as shown to some extent in the debate on Plautus’ use of Greek. Gruen remarks that Cato sought to promote Roman culture and ideals by disassociating Greek from Roman national identity. He encouraged the younger generation to commit themselves to active duty in civic life and steer clear of Greek-dominated disciplines such as philosophy during their youth. This attitude explains seemingly anti-hellenic behavior, as when Cato sought to censure the Greek philosopher Carneades during a lecture in Rome. Roman attitudes towards the Greek language in the 2nd century B.C. can thus be seen as something of a confused paradox. As Sherk observed, Cato might have refused to speak Greek in Athens, despite his ability to do so, ‘but this was for the sake of outward appearances, calculated to preserve and uphold the majesty of Rome and her language’. Publicly, there was a strong belief that Roman nationalism and pride took priority over any Greek influence whatsoever. Privately though, men like Cato eagerly absorbed the learning of the Greeks. He immersed himself in Greek language from an early age, becoming further interested in it during his later years. This pattern would permeate into the behaviour of prominent Romans like Cicero years later.

---

41 Albicker (2003), 73.
42 Plutarch, Cato Maior, 22.4f.
43 Gruen (1992), 78-80.
44 See similar comments by Cicero in Academica, 1.11.
45 Plutarch, Cato Maior, 22.1; Pliny, Naturalis Historia, 7.112.
CHAPTER ONE: LEXICAL INNOVATION AND BORROWING PRE-CICERO

GREEK LEXICAL INFLUENCE IN EARLY LATIN LITERATURE

1.1. Creating Latin Epic Diction

Livius Andronicus (c. 280 B.C. - 200 B.C.) is credited as being the father of Latin poetry and so it is appropriate to begin our analysis with him. In his article on Livius, Sheets comments that, far from being the literary ‘amateur’ he was once considered, ‘[Livius] was in fact a careful stylist who was informed about Hellenistic poetics and sought to apply their precepts to his Latin creations’. Other commentators have indicated that Livius was beginning a tradition for Roman poetry instead of replicating the Homeric heritage before him: ‘Latin literature was Andronicus’ to begin’. The translation techniques and achievements of Livius were first explored by Leo, who described Livius as having created the preconditions for the national literature of Rome. Commentators have also raised the possibility of a patriotic motive in his translations of Homer’s Odyssey into the Latin Odissia, as Adams remarks: ‘As early as Livius...there can be seen an attempt to latinise some of the divine apparatus of epic’.

Unlike the corpus of later poets like Virgil, Ovid, or Horace, much less survives from Livius to draw any definitive conclusions, especially lexical ones. Skutch argues that literary criticism in the narrow sense ‘can find little scope in these scanty remains’. What can be elucidated from his surviving fragments are the linguistic techniques which have endured as testimony to the poet’s artistry. Goldberg rightly advised that literary criticism must ‘not be silent’ in the face of such fragmentary evidence, but rather the literary prowess of Livius, Naevius, and Ennius ought to be examined, for it was their pioneering innovations that made Latin Epic possible. The following analysis will focus on specific fragments of the Odissia and examine in detail the methods of Livius’ translation and the techniques he employed to ‘latinise’ the Homeric epic for a Roman audience.

---

48 Sheets (1981), 63.
50 Leo (1913), 60: “[Livius] hat er für eine neue nationale Literature die Vorbedingungen geschaffen.”
52 Skutch (1951), 174.
1.2. Archaisms or innovations?
The aim of this chapter generally is to uncover Latin authors’ attitudes towards the Greek language, specifically in the form of translation or adaptation, and the subsequent morphological or syntactical methods used to transform Greek thought into Latin. So in Livius, there are 46 fragments of Latin translation with which we are able to compare to Homeric Greek originals, a full list of which is provided in Appendix I.\textsuperscript{54}

Important in any discussion of Livius’ attitudes towards the Greek language is an analysis of the poet’s linguistic practices and techniques. By analysing the ways in which Livius turned Homer’s poetic and philological devices into Latin one might better understand the poet’s own literary preferences and tendencies. A common pattern that emerges is the struggle between labelling a particular word or construction as deliberately archaic or simply a poetic lexical innovation. Indeed Livius was writing at an early time in the development of the Latin literary vocabulary and so using the label ‘archaism’ is precarious. In this section, I propose to take specific and noteworthy lines from the fragments collected in Appendix I and subject them to linguistic analysis, thereby uncovering something of Livius’ lexical innovations in Latin with respect to the original Greek verse and also tentatively evaluating the nature of unusual or first-attested words as innovations or archaisms.

1.2.1. Virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum\textsuperscript{55}
In the opening of the \textit{Odissia} (fr. 1) Livius preserves much of the Homeric syntax and hyperbaton, whilst latinising μοῦσα to ‘Camena’. This translation of the Greek mythic names into Latin is prevalent throughout the fragments.\textsuperscript{56} Livius echoes Homer’s lofty style to augment the diction of his Latin translation, with the change of the Homeric ἔλλεπε into ‘insece’, which Fraenkel and Leo suggest is a deliberate lexical archaism ‘that adds a note of solemnity to the invocation’.\textsuperscript{57} Sihler discusses the etymology of \textit{insece} as an Old Latin imperative meaning ‘to go on, or continue the story’ (attributing it to Plautus, however there is no evidence that Plautus used the word in this way). No doubt a cognate verb corresponding to the Greek imperative of ἔλλεπε, both derived from the combination of the Indo-European preverb *\textit{en} with the root *\textit{sekʰw}*.\textsuperscript{58} Livius

\textsuperscript{54} Fragment numbers follow Warmington (1956-56).
\textsuperscript{55} Livius, \textit{Od}. fr. 1; cf Hom. 1.1: ἄλδξα κνη ἔλλεπε, κνῦζα, πνι ύη ξνπνλ.
\textsuperscript{56} Possanza (2004), 47-48 has listed the bulk of them.
\textsuperscript{57} Possanza (2004), 50.
\textsuperscript{58} Sihler (1995), 547; see also Sheets, 68 n 38 and Frisk, s.v. ἐλέπσ, Beekes (2013), s.v. ἐλ(λ)έπσ; see also \textit{TLL} s.v. inseco insequo: ‘verbum mancurn, vix seiuengendum a gr. ἑλ(λ)έπσι’.\textsuperscript{55} Livius
could not have understood the Indo-European ancestry of *insece* and ἔλλεπε, but it is clear that the former has been used in the same way as the Greek; both begin with the same prefix (*in-* and ἔν-) and both are derived from the same verbal root.⁵⁹

The question might be whether one could regard *insece* as simply a poetic device used at the time when Livius was translating.⁶⁰ There are no other instances of it before or after Livius except in Ennius.⁶¹ Kearns comments that it was very likely that *insece* ‘coexisted’ for a time with earlier forms ending in the labio-velar -*qu*, and forms such as *insece* (where the velar consonant had supplanted the labio-velar) were not restricted to ‘specific poetic environments’.⁶² Kearns also makes the point that words such as *insectio* ‘a narrative’ developed into the velar due to the awkward consonantal cluster of *in-seq-tio*, so verbs such as *insece* might have developed by analogy.⁶³

Another explanation might be that Livius turned to lexical innovation within Old Latin instead of simply using a word which, at the time, was outmoded. Whichever explanation one follows, it is clear that the use of such words was at least common in epic diction among writers like Livius and Naevius, yet soon became archaic among later authors. This could be because they were innovations and did not catch on with subsequent authors, or that such words were confined to epic poetry and did not resurface in other forms such as tragedy. If, on the other hand, one argues that they were archaisms and were ‘old-fashioned’ at the time when Livius himself was using them, then arguably one could reach the same conclusion; i.e. that Livius was receptive to using Homeric devices (including the use of unusual and rare words, or as Aristotle might term them, *glottai*) to augment the diction of his own translations.⁶⁴

1.2.2. Neque enim te oblitus sum Laertie noster⁶⁵ and Pater noster, Saturni filie

These lines indicate Livius’ unusual form of the vocative (Fr. 5) to amplify his epic diction. In fr. 2, these forms are used to translate the patronymic ‘Son of Cronos’ (Κρώνιδε) with the periphrasis: ‘Saturni filie’ as in: *Pater noster, Saturni filie* (ὦ πάτερ

---

⁶⁰ Mariotti (1952), 37 regards it as an archaism; see also Ronconi (1973), 14.
⁶¹ *Annals*, fr. 322: ‘Insece, Musa, manu Romanorum induperator…’
⁶² Kearns (1994), 44, citing Gellius (18.9.5f), who discussed the form *insecenda* in a speech entitled *On Ptolemy against Thermus* by Cato the Censor.
⁶³ Note Sheets (1981), 68 who argues that *insece* as being an Italic gloss: ‘Thus it would appear that Livius has here translated the Aeolic gloss ἔλλεπε of the first line of the *Odyssey* with an Umbrian gloss, *insece*’; see also de Vaan (2008), 304.
⁶⁴ See Aristotle, *Poet.*, 1457b1f and particularly 1459a where Aristotle states that the use of *glottai* and such: δὴ γὰς τὸ κή ἐλπηδω ὁ τὰς ἄντα τὸς κή ἀόδη θηβολ ἦλ ἦλ ἐμειπτελ ἢ τηπυκῆ.
⁶⁵ Hom. *Od.*, 1.65 (or possibly 14.144, or 20.205), see Possanza (2004), 51, n. 64.
Other examples can be found within the fragments and have been highlighted by Adams. Many of these devices are all Livius’ own additions which often makes identification of the Homeric original unclear. Fr. 5 could have been translating any of three lines in which Odysseus’ name appears in the genitive in the Odyssey: ‘πῶς ἂν ἔπειτ’ Ὄδυσσῆς ἐγὼ θείοι λαθοίμην’ (Od. 1.65), or ‘ἀλλὰ μ’ Ὄδυσσῆς πόθος αὐτοῦ οἰχομένου’ (Od. 14.144), or ‘μνησαμένω Ὄδυσσῆς, ἐπεὶ καὶ κείνον ὄνο’ (Od. 20.205). This might be seen as a strong indication of Livius allowing himself to amplify Homer’s patronymic originals for stylistic effect, and he was certainly not averse to removing the form of the original completely and substituting it with a Latin version (i.e. via circumlocution). Another explanation for Livius’ seemingly original additions here could be that, since Livius was writing pre-Aristarchus, he might have had access to a different text of Homer.

The form Laertie is also worthy of discussion. In many instances, Livius employed words commonly used in poetry to augment the style of his translation, such as insece in fr. 1 as discussed above, or topper (frr. 23-6, 33, 34-6) and the archaic first declension genitive -as ending (see below). The question is whether it can be assumed that such words were indeed ‘archaic’ at the time Livius was translating Homer or simply dialectal glosses? If one takes a word such as topper, as found in Livius multiple times, one finds that later writers such as Quintilian noted their specifically outmoded quality:

gratiam novitati similem parant. sed opus est modo, ut neque crebra sint haec neque manifesta, quia nihil est odiosius adfectatione, nec utique ab ultimis et iam oblitteratis repetita temporibus, qualia sunt topper et antegerio et exanclare...

The word was used also by Pacuvius and Accius in their tragedies, as well as Ennius in his poetry and Coelius Antipater in his histories. The adjective Laertius itself may not

---

67 Adams (2003b), 202; Adams (2003a), 372, n 142; see also Broccia (1974) 111f; and also Livius, Od. frr. 16, 17, 27, 30.
68 Possanza (2004), 51; see also Verrusio (1977), 73.
70 Many of these -as suffixes are found in the matro-/patronymic diction discussed above. Much of the remaining fragments survive because of stylistic or linguistic oddities picked out by later authors; e.g. Livius, Od. frr. 8 and 15 where Priscian and Festus respectively single out words which were „not in frequent use” (fr 8) or were „ancient” (fr 15).
71 Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria 1.6.40.
72 See OLD s.v.
be an archaism, but rather a coinage in a similar vein as *insece*. Aitchison argues, in the context of Homer’s patronyms (ending in -ιος), that they should ‘possibly be regarded as freaks’ rather than as archaisms.\(^73\) Possanza surmised that the adjective may have been coined by analogy to Homeric patronyms in a similar way. He states that, although Homer had no adjectival form in -ιος corresponding to the name Λαέξηεο, Livius found precedent for such a form in the other adjectival patronyms used for heroes such as Τειακώληνο and Νηληήτος.\(^74\) The form of the vocative singular *Laertie* therefore might have been a mere coinage as opposed to a direct use of an archaic word.\(^75\) In fact, based on various linguistic phenomena within the Italic languages, the development of the element -i- in open syllables (i.e. in the *filie* and *Laertie* type of vocatives used by Livius) might not have been an archaism at all but rather an innovation which simply did not survive into the classical language.\(^76\)

Dickey remarks that Livius’ unusual vocative *filie* could have been motivated by a desire to avoid the form *fili* ‘without depriving himelf entirely of a vocative for the word *filius*’.\(^77\) Dickey rationalises this theory in the context of an aesthetic shift in Latin speakers generally, away from –ie, apart from exceptional cases. The inherited –ie vocative ending became –i at an early period and those less common were normally avoided, which left the paradigm to be ‘regularised by the creation of vocatives in –ie for the words whose vocatives had formerly been avoided’.\(^78\) Dickey adds that, at first, these new forms were not fully accepted by purists. Whichever explanation for Livius’ –ie ending in fr. 5 (archaism or innovation), the end result was an unusual form which added an epic flavour to his poetry and sought to connect Latin’s fledgling poetic vocabulary with the archaic traditions of Homer’s originals.

### 1.2.3. Latonas, Monetas, and escas

There is a large amount of commentary on Livius’ unusual use of the first declension genitive feminine singulars in his poem with no evidence of it in the fragments of his tragedies or comedies. The peculiarity was noticed by Priscian in frr. 14, 27 and 30, and surfaced again in Naevius and Ennius.\(^79\) Yet in Naevius fr. 56, there is the line *magnae*

\(^73\) Aitchison (1964), 136.  
\(^74\) Possanza (2004), 50 n 63.  
\(^75\) See also Skutch (1985), 602: „Saturnie is more likely to be an analogical or Grecising innovation”; see also Leumann (1977), 424.  
\(^76\) See Livingston (2004), 6.  
\(^77\) Dickey (2000), 556.  
\(^78\) Dickey (2000), 562.  
\(^79\) See *Bellum Poenicum*, fr. 46 and 54; and *Annals*, 428 respectively.
metus tumultus pectora possidet”⁸⁰ which seems to indicate that the Classical genitive singular *a*-stem ending */ae/ was in use alongside the Old Latin */as/ around the same time as Livius had been composing the *Odissia*. This line however is strange because of the disagreement in gender between the qualifying adjective *magnae* (f) and the qualified noun *metus* (m)⁸¹ and Nonius points this out: *Metus masculini. Feminino Naevius:*⁸² The *editio princeps* prints “magnae”, but the manuscripts have “magni intus”.⁸³ Fraenkel remarks that Livius explicitly “excluded” the use of the archaic ending from his dramas onward, but this is a difficult claim to make considering the fragmentary evidence of the tragedies.⁸⁴ Verrusio argues that such unusual endings indicate that the language of Livius’ epic was not the language used in the early 2nd century B.C. but “deliberately archaic” to elevate the diction of his epic poetry.⁸⁵ The coincidence that this */as/* ending often appears in invocations and the naming of a paternal or maternal lineage is also revealing as it points to an archaism as opposed to a usage of a common genitive singular (however note also *fortunas* in fr. 54).

I discuss the development of the older genitive forms */as/* and */āī/* below in the context of Ennius’ poetry, yet some concluding remarks should be made here. Clackson and Horrocks note that the disyllabic form */āī/* “evolved into the regular diphthong */ai/*…by around 200 B.C.”⁸⁶ If we are to believe the attestations that have */ae* in Naevius then the development of */as/* > */āī/* > */ai/* > */ae/* had occurred in a very short time frame, even if Livius was deliberately archaising using */as/* in his epic. The more likely explanation is that the forms */as/* and the */ai/* coexisted together, with the latter eventually developing into */ae/*. Importantly, Lindsay notes that the older genitive in */āī/* began in masculine nouns such as *agricola* and *advena* and took its */ī/* from the genitive of the second declension.⁸⁷ Linguists also assert that the Italic dialect of Faliscan generally used the */āī/* genitive in masculine nouns⁸⁸ with some exceptions.⁸⁹ Perhaps seemingly anachronistic lines such as Naevius’ above (e.g. *magnae metus*)

---

⁸¹ Although see Adams (2013), 391: “*a*-stem nouns in general occur in all three genders, and some specific terms are of variable gender… /*metus*…is mainly masculine but is attested in early Latin as a feminine”; see also Leumann (1977), 355-356.
⁸² Warmington (1965-7), 2.70: Non. 214.7.
⁸⁴ Fraenkel (1931), 605.
⁸⁶ Clackson and Horrocks (2007), 103.
⁸⁷ Cf. Lindsay (1894), 379; see also Hehl (1912), n 171 for evidence of the */ai/* diphthong in Latin inscriptions.
⁸⁹ See Bakkum (2009), 122.
could be read as: magnai [-/ai/]

metus tumultus pectora possidit. This is simply conjecture, but in any case, the existence of other evolved forms of the genitive singular in -/ai/-ae points to the conclusion that Livius, on occasion, deliberately used an archaic form of the genitive in his epics and did not coin a new poetic form.

1.2.4. Argenteo polubro, aureo eglutro

Despite the overall trend of latinising the Homeric original, there are instances of Livius importing Greek words into his poetry: ‘argenteo polubro, aureo eglutro’ translating Od. 1.136-7: ‘χέρνιβα δ’ ἀμφίπολος προχόφο ἐπέρεπε φέρουσα / καλῇ χρυσεῖ, ο美国总统
ἀγγύριο λέβητος’. As Fraenkel observed, Livius simplifies the Greek by using ablatives.\[91\]

In fr. 6 however Livius clearly conflates the original but retains the Greek flavour and introduces a rhyme by turning the dative προχόφο ‘with a pouring vessel’ to the Latin form polubro, and λέβητος to the Latinised Greek form eglutro: ‘argenteo polubro, aureo eglutro’.\[92\] There is no doubt that, to a large extent, Livius was selective when deciding whether to latinise or retain the spirit of the original, more often than not siding with the former option. Fraenkel and Borccia have remarked that Livius sometimes expands the Greek original in a specific way to augment the tone of a Latin phrase or poetic device,\[93\] yet frequently omits a large portion of the Homeric verse.\[94\] The examples above however suggest that where he had a choice, Livius preferred simplification over augmentation and this seems to be consistent among the evidence in the rest of the fragments.\[95\]

Broccia argues that Latin had three ways of turning a Greek epithet (specifically compound poetic epithets) into Latin: 1) by suppressing it altogether, 2) by using a simple adjective, or 3) by circumlocution.\[96\] In addition to this, one could add that Livius

---

\[90\] For evidence of the -/ai/ suffix in early Latin, see Hehl (1912), 11f and discussion below.

\[91\] Fraenkel, (1932) 305; „...die beiden Geräte sind durch die Beiwörter golden - silbern nebeneinander gestellt, aber sie sind doch auch in verschiedener Funktion in die Handlung eingeordnet und daher in verschiedener Konstruktion in den Satz gefügt. Livius stellt sie vereinfachend beide im Instrumentalis nebeneinander: argenteo polubro, aureo eglutro”; see also Broccia (1974), 80.


\[93\] See Broccia (1974), 81: „...insieme alle semplificazioni, che intervengono nell’ambito della dizione formulare, s’incontrano d’altro canto anche ampliamenti del modello; e qui mi riferisco alle designazioni patronimiche che Andronico usa anche laddove esse non figurano nell’originale.

\[94\] Fraenkel (1932), 305; cf. Traina (1974), 23; note however that the fragmentary evidence is our only indication and perhaps other lines were culled by later grammarians.

\[95\] However cf. fr. 23-6 above.

\[96\] Broccia (1974), 80; „...qui gioverà aggiungere che le soluzioni più frequentemente adottate dall lingua poetica latina per rendere l’epiteto greco, specie composto, cioè la soppressione di esso, l’uso dell’aggettivo semplice, lo sviluppo perifrastico resteranno in certo modo paradigmatiche…” [emphasis added].
also used patronymic or matronymic devices in these situations with archaic grammatical forms to elevate the diction of his poetry, whilst avoiding compound epithets altogether. Livius used these techniques throughout his epic to lend it the requisite lofty flavour of the Greek original. For example, Livius does not translate the title of his poem to *Carmen Ulixis*, but retains *Odissia*, even if the Roman public certainly already knew of the Homeric original as the Ὅδυσσεα. Fraenkel supposes that the use of archaic and poetic structures was perhaps not something which was consciously chosen by Livius, but rather the original Homeric Greek gave way to the ‘quiet power of archaic Rome’. Conte suggests that Livius’ fragments reveal a notable desire to stay close to the original, where translating means both preserving what can be assimilated and altering what proves to be untranslatable: ‘either because of the limits of the linguistic medium or because of differences of culture and mind.’

These conclusions are slightly understating the matter, since there is also an argument to be made that Livius was not constrained by using the less-developed Latin of ‘archaic Rome’ compared to the ‘elated elegance’ of late-Homeric verse, as Fraenkel suggests, but instead had turned to innovation and allusion to evoke a latinised version of the Homeric language. Indeed, Livius had no qualms in condensing the language of the Homeric original into Latin for economy (which might also be attributed to the nature of the Saturnian metre). Fraenkel suggests that the narrow parameters of the Latin language ‘restricted the freedom’ of the early poets. However, it ought to be borne in mind that such limitations simultaneously fostered an innovative spirit within the early poets which would later influenced figures like Ennius to build not only a new poetic vocabulary for Latin but also harness the power of Greek as an influence on their own literary sensibilities. Broccia makes the point that Livius’ compositions had their own strengths, including an ability to stretch the Latin language to the extremes of intelligibility to ‘tap into the creativity’ of the Greek original. As he notes in an aside, this is after all, the reason for which translations can promote the enrichment and

---

98 Much of the remaining fragments survive because of stylistic or linguistic oddities picked out by later authors.
99 Mariotti (1952), 30: ‘...può sorprendere il fatto che, mentre Ὅδυσσεα diventava italicamente *Ulixes* odissea sia stato conservato il titolo nella formal originale, anche se questo era certo gia noto al pubblico colto romano’.
100 Fraenkel (1932), 303: ‘Die beschwingte Eleganz der spät-hömerischen Verse mußte der ruhigen Kraft archaischen Römbertums weichen’.
101 Conte (1994), 41.
102 See Broccia (1974), 80: ‘...ed è certo più ragionevole chiamare in causa la brevita del saturnio...”
103 Fraenkel (1932), 303: ‘...die engeren Grenzen mit denen die Gesetzlichkeit der römischen Sprache die Freiheit des Sprachkünstlers einschränkt”; see also Knoche, 333.
renewal of language. This is a view that ought to underpin all such investigations into the language of Livius’ translations.

In the Odissia, Livius demonstrates the power of Latin to become highly concise and allusive whilst remaining original. From the surviving fragments, the negligible use of Graecisms is perhaps an indication (although a shaky one) that Livius was pushing the boundaries of intelligibility, forcing his own hand to innovate. Livius’ reticence to give in to temptation and import Greek words *ad hoc* into Latin to provide the requisite exotic appeal to his poetry shows a tempered approach, exactly as Aristotle had discussed concerning the use of *glottai*. Kaimio notes words such as *anclare* for ἀντλέω; or *carchesium* from καρχαρίας; *cothurnus* from κόθορνος; *eclutrum* from ἐκλοντρον; *pharetra* from φαρέτρα, and in fr. 40: ‘*vestis pulla porpurea ampla*’ which translates ‗χλαίναν πορφυρέν οὐλήν ἐχε δίος [Οδουσσεύς]; ‘mostly appear in Livius’ tragedies. The loan word *porpureus*, from πορφύρεος, is additionally used for alliterative effect. Many of these Grecisms occur where there is realistically no Latin counterpart and two of them refer to vases - terms with a long tradition of borrowing prior to Livius.

The example of *anclare* above shows an unusual insight into the mind of Livius and his attitude towards Greek loanwords. The *OLD* defines the word as ‘to serve (wine)’ translating the Greek ἀντλέω although Livius used it as a poetic word ‘to pour out into’, *Trag.* fr. 31: *Florem anculabant Liberi ex carchesiis* ‘from goblets they were pouring out the flower of Liber). The source is Paulus Diaconus’ *Epitoma Festi* where he writes (8.25): ‘*anclare*, haurire, a Graeco descendit (*anclare* ‗to drain’ is derived from a Greek word)’. LSJ explains that the use of ἀντλέω in Greek is attributed to authors such as Herodotus and Theogenis however it occurs only as a noun in Homer:

---

104 Broccia (1974), 116: ‘e questa è, in fondo, la ragione per cui le traduzioni possono promuovere l’arricchimento e il rinnovamento linguistico...tale sforzo si acuisce al massimo, in Andronico, sino all’esaltazione di tutte le sue risorse, per l’inesistenza di una vera e propria tradizione a cui riferisi, per la completa mancanza di precedenti sul piano della Kultursprache.‘

105 Note that loanwords in the Odissia such as *struppus* for ζηξόθηνλ in fr. 12 (*Od.* 2.422-6) were already highly integrated into Latin at the time, see Biville (1990), Ch. 7.

106 See also *OLD* s.v. *anculo*; Livius, *Trag.* fr. 31, *Od.* fr. 45 see discussion above.

107 *Od.* fr. 45.

108 Livius, *Od.* fr. 41a-d.


110 Livius, *Od.* fr. 41a-d.


112 Kaimio (1979), 303, n 33: ‘One may compare the fact that quite early on most of the Etruscan words for vases were of Greek origin’; see also De Simone, 330.

113 LSJ defines ἀληίσ ἃ *to bale out bilge water* as derived from ἄλην νο ‘the hold of a ship’ (see Hesiod, *Thgn.* 673) but it had been used in the sense of *to pour out of* specifically in the context of wine in Pherecrates’ *Miners* (fragment in Edmonds (1957), 248-249): ...πη ξαρθ θόηθα τυ λνα κεί αλνο ἄλην ζ κιν / ήλη ναλ δη νδο ιξι ηηνι νπη ηξηνη πηεκ which was perhaps Livius’ inspiration.
Livius therefore may have recognised the Greek word’s pedigree as derived from poetry and adapted it to his epic and tragic vocabulary to express a ‘pouring or draining out’ in Latin. The only difference is that the foreign-sounding consonantal cluster of -tλ- is replaced with the more palatable -cl- in Latin. This is almost a direct loanword yet subtly altered to make the diction more acceptable to his Latin audience.

Despite this, there is no doubt that Livius had a sense of turning to Greek to add to the style and tone of his epic diction. Adams writes: ‘Latin poets...in elevated genres were probably more interested in using the sounds and inflections of Greek to evoke an exotic world’. Livius seemed to have kept a conservative attitude when it came to translation and avoided neologisms, but when necessary, or where the poet thought the work required it, he did innovate or borrow from the Greeks to strengthen his Latin vocabulary. However, Livius also tailored his translation to the sensibilities of his Roman audience. Sometimes this meant turning to the scholia to make the translation more intelligible, for example in frs. 28-9: *Nexebant multa inter se flexu nodorum* translates the Greek ὠξρείζζελ δὴ ἔπεηηα πνηὶ ρζνλὶ πνπιπβνηείξῃ / ταρφε’ ἀμειβομένο with the more familiar metaphor of ‘weaving rapidly between themselves in their exchanges’ as used in the scholia.

Adams claims that there is a connection between poets such as Livius and their translation methodologies to a deep-seated ‘linguistic nationalism’ derived from a so-called ‘linguistic insecurity caused by an unspoken sense that Greek might in some way be “superior” to Latin, and should be kept at arm’s length’. As evidence, one might turn again to Quintilian who, in discussing the inflection of Greek names in Latin, stated: ‘One would also praise the virtue of those who sought to strengthen the Latin

---

114 Od. 12.411, 15.479.
115 See Meillet (1977), 114.
116 Livius’ mindfulness of his Roman audience’s sensibilities shares parallels with Cicero which will be discussed below in Chapter Two, see in particular the discussion on his translation techniques in the *Timaeus*.
117 Adams (2003a), 372; but also see particularly n 142.
118 But see *quinquertiones* in Trag. fr. 40. Fraenkel (1932), 303: ‘Neubildungen hat er, wenn wir aus unserm geringen Material einen allgemeinen Schluss ziehen dürfen, überhaupt nicht gewagt’; see also Conte (1994), 41: ‘Thus, in response to the artificial and literary quality of Homeric Greek, that archaising, conservative tendency begins that will take on such importance in the history of Latin poetry’.
119 Dindorf, Σ 8.379: πιθόδω πε θυληρο ειδω ι τ ι νκο έλλαι ας ς ζ ζ ρκλνρα
language and who did not acknowledge the use of foreign practices’. These comments are indicative of ongoing concerns about the intrusion of Greek elements into Latin, a familiar suspicion as discussed above in the mixed attitude of Cato the Censor. This could be why later scholars concluded that Livius’ methods and principles in translating Greek were ‘not entirely consistent’. Like Cicero would later do in the field of philosophy, Livius was translating Greek at an early stage in Latin poetry and he often went to great and artificial lengths to avoid Grecisms. This is, I believe, more effectively explained by attributing such linguistic behaviour to intelligibility concerns more than ‘linguistic nationalism’, as Adams has suggested. One finds in Livius Camena\textsuperscript{124} for Musa; Morta\textsuperscript{125} for Moira; Moneta for Mnemosyne;\textsuperscript{126} the calques versutus\textsuperscript{127} for polytropon and quinquertiones\textsuperscript{128} for a pentathlon competitor, and this certainly demonstrates a preference for latinisation where possible. As Sanford noted, there was a decidedly ‘Roman flavor’ both in the choice of words, and in the turn of thought.\textsuperscript{129}

Adams’ claim that Livius’ translation points to some ‘linguistic insecurity’ in Latin needs to be further explored. The influence of the translation and its sheer ambition points to a desire to bring Greek literature to the Roman nobility in a Latin guise, and not simply out of an insecurity that Latin was ‘inferior’ to Greek. This was achieved by pioneering and innovation; techniques which would later inspire Cicero to tackle Greek philosophy and its store of difficult technical terminology to introduce them into Latin. Kaimio argues along similar lines to Adams (although without going as far as appealing to linguistic nationalism) that the translation was a natural, although more ambitious continuation of Livius’ former activity as ‘a Romaniser of Greek drama’, and that it was intended to open up a new genre for Roman literature, not primarily to help people with poor Greek to read Homer.\textsuperscript{130} Whatever the conclusion, it was clear by this early stage that Latin authors were not interested in simply importing

\textsuperscript{121} Quintilian, 1.5.60: ‘quin etiam laudet virtutem eorum, qui potentiorem facere linguam Latinam studebant, nec alienis egere institutis fabeantur’; cf. Varro, \textit{Lingua latina} 10.71: ‘E quis quae hic nothae fiunt declinationes, de his aliae sunt priscae, ut Bacchidēs et Chrysidēs, aliae iuniores, ut Chrysidĕs et Bacchidĕs, aliae recentes, ut Chrysidas et Bacchidas; cum his omnibus tribus utantur nostri, maxime qui sequuntur media in loquendo offendunt minimum, quod prima parum similia videntur esse Graecis, unde sint tralata, tertia parum similia nostris.’

\textsuperscript{122} Adams (2003b), 201.

\textsuperscript{123} Kaimio (1979), 303.

\textsuperscript{124} \textit{Od. Fr.} 1.

\textsuperscript{125} \textit{Od. Fr.} 10.

\textsuperscript{126} \textit{Od. Fr.} 30; For further comparisons, see Meillet (1977), 114-15.

\textsuperscript{127} \textit{Od. Fr.} 1.

\textsuperscript{128} \textit{Trag. fr.} 40.

\textsuperscript{129} Sanford (1923), 276.

\textsuperscript{130} Kaimio (1979), 273.
Greek into Latin. Instead, there was a desire to provide Latin with the philological means to interpret and emulate Greek poetry to give Latin the tools to create its own original literary traditions.

1.3. Greek Renovation in Naevius

While linguistic experimentation might have been limited in Livius’ epic, Gnaeus Naevius (c. 270 B.C. – 201 B.C.) was an influential source of coinages and philological innovation who would influence later authors such as Ennius and Plautus. Although set against the geopolitical context of the First Punic War, there is an unmistakable Greek flavour to both Naevius’ epic and tragic works. His nationalistic Praetextae Fabulae and his epic Bellum Poenicum include few Greek loan words, the majority appearing in the gigantomachia or ‘battle of the Giants’ episode.131

In his tragedies and comedies there is a larger amount of loanwords, with more found in the former than the latter.132 Kaimio comes to the conclusion that the occurrence of Greek words in Naevius’ drama is both less important and at the same time easier to explain than Naevius’ epic, where their absence is due to ‘deliberate avoidance’.133 Naevius follows Livius Andronicus’ attitude of keeping his poetry distinctly Latin in flavour however, much more than Livius, Naevius attempted to reinterpret the poetic and dramatic techniques of the Greek literary tradition in his own poetry.

1.3.1. Naevian διπλά όνόματα: ‘Imitatio’ of Greek Practices?

In the Bellum Poenicum, Naevius had to contend with the mythical and historical aspects of a new poetic language for Latin, derived entirely from a Greek tradition. Conte remarked that despite these difficulties, he managed to ‘outdo’ the richness of his influences.134 The texture of Naevius’ epic poetry was achieved by introducing new compounds and novel syntactic combinations to match the richness of Greek epic poetry’s well-known linguistic techniques such as compound epithets, while also avoiding mere mechanical reproduction.135 There are places where Naevius clearly innovates within establish limits, such as the phrase silvicolae homines ‘wood-dwelling men’, which he introduced perhaps by analogy from pre-existing models such as

---

131 Frr. 44-6: Runcus and Purpuraeus for the Greek Rhoetus and Porphyrian.
132 Meillet (1977), 115; Kaimio (1979), 303; Barchiesi (1962), 366.
133 Kaimio (1979), 304.
134 Conte (1994), 46.
135 Conte (1994), 46.
Yet there are also original Naevian formations which would influence later figures like Plautus, Pacuvius, and Ennius. In Book II, Naevius uses a compound in an epithet to Apollo (fr. 25-6): dein pollens sagittis inclutus arquitenens...Pythius Apollo. Naevius forms the compound of arquus ‘bow’ + present participle of teneo ‘to hold, wield’ to evoke the Homeric epithets such as δὸλοφρονέων (δόλος ‘cunning’ + present participle of φρονέω ‘to be minded’). Barchiesi notes that the compounds confer a ‘nobility’ that makes it suitable to epic, tragic and (due to the parodies of epic and tragedy diction) comedic media.

Naevius’ use of compounds is not limited to epic; for instance, in his tragedy Lycurgus: (Fr. 28) ite actutum in frondiferos locos ‘...go straightway into the leafy places’; (Fr. 32) bipedes volucres ‘two-footed flyers’; (Fr. 34) thyrsigerae Bacchae ‘wand-bearing Bacchants’ and (Fr. 35) suavisonum melos ‘sweet-sounding melody’. In the unassigned fragments from the comedies one also finds the unusual onomatopoeia (Fr. 15) tintinnabant compedes ‘the fetters were jingling’. It is no stretch to say that Naevius’ δηπιᾶ ὀλόκαηα are far bolder than Livius’ and indeed they serve as strong indications of a debt to the Greek literary tradition which would later be emphasised in the poetry of Ennius.

The Naevian innovation frondiferos ‘leaf-bearing’ has an exact correspondent in Pindar’s Odes (Ol. 8.101) in ψτιινθόξσλ ‘flourishing with leaves’. In thyrsigerae ‘wand-bearing’ there is a counterpart in Euripides’ Cycl. 64: οὐ τάδε Βρόμιος, οὐ τάδε χοροί / βακχεῖα τε θυρσοφώροι; and in suavisonum melos there is ἀδύθσλνο ‘sweet-voiced’ in Pratinas.

The occurrence of such compounds in the mythical portions of the Bellum Poenicum (and their subsequent disappearance in the historical portions) has been well documented. In the supposed Battle of the Giants episode of fr. 44-6, Fraenkel suggests that Naevius was echoing the Greek poetic technique of ekphrasis. If this is the case, the appearance of the mythical proper

---

137 ‘Then with arrows, the strong, bow-wielding, renowned archer [Pythian Apollo]...’
138 Il. 3.405, Od.10.339.
139 Ennius would later come up with signitenens in his tragedy Andromeda, 117, emulating the Naevian compound, see discussion below.
140 Barchiesi (1962), 381 specifically the use of participles in each compound.
141 See Erasmo (2004), 18: ‘Cicero compares Naevius’ poetry with that of his successor Ennius rather than with that of his precursor Livius, thus suggesting that Naevius’ style anticipated Ennius’ innovations more than it reflected Livius”’.
143 Barchiesi (1962), 247; see also Puccioni (1944), 242f.
144 i.e. the literary description of a visual work of art, e.g. Homer’s description of the Shield of Achilles in Il. 18.478-608. In relation to Naevius’ use of it, see Fraenkel (1954), 16: ‘Therefore the guess that the passage “Inerant signa expressa” comes from the description of a gigantomachy on a shield is as probable as can be expected in the circumstances’.
names, in conjunction with the epithet *bicorpes Gigantes*, is strongly evocative of Greek poetic practices.

1.4. Greek inspiration and Latin innovation in Ennius

The continuation and extension of Greek borrowing in Latin literature came to its height in Quintus Ennius (c. 239 B.C. – c. 169 B.C.) Ennius came from the region of Apulia south of Tarentum or Τάρας (as did Livius), a region occupied by the Messapians and well known for being immersed in Greek culture. It was not until around 204 B.C. that Cato the Elder brought Ennius to Rome after meeting him in the military.\textsuperscript{146} Suetionius consequently regarded writers such as Livius and Ennius as ‘semi-graeci’,\textsuperscript{147} and Ennius’ Greek roots\textsuperscript{148} become evident after analysis of his lexical innovations.

Skutsch’s opening comment regarding Ennius’ attitude to the usage of Greek in Latin is a useful start:

> It would be surprising if the poet who attaches Homeric endings to the names of Mettus Fufetius...and at the end of the line reduces *domum* to *do*...on the Homeric model, did not employ other Grecisms, especially in imitation of Homer.\textsuperscript{149}

Kaimio saw Ennius as falling within the tradition of Naevius, Terence and Andronicus who aimed to keep their poetry distinctly Latin, ‘free of the lexical intrusions’ of Greek.\textsuperscript{150} Meillet similarly points out that Ennius’ Latin usage is presented on the outside as wholly Roman only to cover an extremely close imitation of the Greek model,\textsuperscript{151} and that the Greek words Ennius use seem, for the most part, to be already ‘well established’ in Latin (and usually cannot be connected directly with the Greek

\textsuperscript{145} But see Barchiesi (1962), 276 who argues that the versatility of the opening words *signa expressa* is not immediate evidence of *ekphrasis*.
\textsuperscript{146} See Nep., *Cato* 1.4 and later reported in St. Jerome’s *Chronicon: Hieronym. Chron.* 1777; cf. Badian (1972), 156-161 who is skeptical of the story.
\textsuperscript{147} Suetonius, *De Grammaticis*, 1.1: „siquidem antiquissimi doctorum, qui iidem et poetae et semigraeci erant (Livium et Ennium dico, quos utraque lingua domi forisque docuisse adnotatum est)”.
\textsuperscript{148} Cf. Gellius, 17.17.1: „Quintus Ennius tria corda habere sese dicebat, quod loqui Graece et Osce et Latine sciret”; see also Suet. *GR.* 1.2.
\textsuperscript{149} Skutsch (1985), 66.
\textsuperscript{150} Kaimio (1979), 304: „In his tendency to avoid Greek words he associates himself with his predecessors, not only in the Annales, where Greek words are very rare, but also in the tragedies, in which only eleven Greek words can be found in over 400 lines.”
\textsuperscript{151} Meillet (1977), 117: „Ennius utilise des usage romains, il présente avec soin des dehors tout romains; mais c’est pour couvrir l’imitation la plus étroite des modèles grecs”.
While true at face value, these observations overlook the subtle workings of Greek literary (and linguistic) techniques behind Ennius’ poetic and tragic works. This highlights, yet again, the important role lexical innovation played in the development of Ennius’ poetic language.

Ennius’s proem to the *Annales* is vital in understanding Ennius’ self-understood role as a reincarnation of Homer. Having drunk from the Hippocrene and receiving instructions from the *Musae* on Mount Helicon, Ennius ventures to Mount Parnassus and falls asleep, when: ‘visus Homerus adesse poeta’.

Ennius positions himself not as a mere vessel of the Muses, but as a second Homer in the Pythagorean tradition of metempsychosis. Although Kaimio might conclude that Ennius’ diction follows in the tradition of Livius and Naevius as a ‘Latinising’ of Greek poetic tropes and customs, there is no doubt that Ennius felt an inseparable link between the gravitas of Homeric language and his own mission as Roman poet transcribing the social and political history of Rome *ab urbe condita* into something like a ‘Homer: Part II’ epic. Yet here is where Kaimio is correct; for in doing this, Ennius could not allow the Greeks to dictate how he was to construct his epic history of the Roman people, nor could he create a poetic vocabulary based solely on an Alexandrian-esque homage to the Greek literary giants who preceded him. He would have to come up with new means of expression within the boundaries of the Latin language.

As Conte remarked, ‘[t]he fragments we have paint a picture of a profoundly and boldly experimental poet’. Innovation in Ennius is coordinate with the poet’s acknowledgement of his Greek model, starting with the construction of the dactylic hexameter to replace the Saturnians of Livius and Naevius, and the frequent use of the penthemimeral caesura which would later become a hallmark of Virgilian verse. Ennius’ innovation from Homeric models can also be seen in the suffix -oeo in fr. 120 (from the Homeric second declension genitive singular -νην), which has been attributed to the necessity of the metre, as opposed to some deliberate linguistic peculiarity on
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152 Kaimio (1979), 304.
153 For a useful survey of the academic positions relating to the location of Ennius’ dream see Wasznik (1950), 232 who concludes Mount Parnassus as the probable location of the dream.
154 Fr. 3 in Skutch (1985), 70 (all fragment numbers are from Skutch’s edition hereafter).
155 For the tradition of Ennius’ descent from Homer see the scholia on Stat. *Theb*. 3.484 referenced in Skutsch (1985), 99. There are also connections with Hesiod in the *proem* and elsewhere in the *Annals*, see Boyle (1996), 1ff; Skutsch (1985), 98; also Fisher (2014), 1; 44; 110.
156 Fr. 12: ‘Latos per populos res atque poemata nostra / clara cluebunt’.
157 Conte (1994), 81.
158 See Skutch (1985), 46f for a discussion of Ennius’ poetic techniques; as Skutsch notes, this particular caesura is found in over 80 per cent of lines in Ennius, and only 45 per cent in Homer.
Ennius’ part. Such ‘innovation’ could also be construed as deliberate archaising, as discussed above with regards to Livius Andronicus.

Recently, Elliott remarked that Ennius, with little other than Greek poetic practice to look to, ‘seems to have imitated archaism, including archaisms specific to Homer,’ as an established aspect of Greek poeticism. She argues that Ennius transposes such practices into Latin, creating a diction ‘that declared its own poetic nature and general affiliation to Greek precedent.’ This imitation and subsequent introduction of Greek linguistic peculiarities into Latin poetic vocabulary was part of what would establish the link between Ennius’ work and the Greek literary heritage which underlies the works of Roman writers since Livius. These ‘archaisms’ would have been called as such in Greek, but appearing for the first time in Latin through Ennius, they became innovatory weapons for poets to add to Latin’s ‘linguistic arsenal’ in their attempts to emulate their literary forefathers in Greece, and to create their own traditions in Latin epic.

1.4.1. Ennian compound words and lexical innovation

One area where Ennius, like his predecessor Naevius and his contemporary Plautus, took up the challenge of expanding the diction of Latin poetry, was in his distinct use of compound words. The list I have compiled of Ennian compounds (see Appendix II) is not intended to be exhaustive, nor is every entry an example of Ennius’ own coinages (although a large number would no doubt have been originally introduced by Ennius). Instead, the list serves to highlight Ennius’ attitude towards expanding Latin’s vocabulary, and the sheer number of compound forms indicates a poet who saw lexical innovation to be closely connected with poetic invention.

Many of the compounds reflect a Roman epic tradition of using unusual words to amplify the vocabulary of the poem, such as signitenens ‘star-wielding/spangled’ discussed above, echoing the Naevian arquititenens. However, Coulter argues that the

159 Skutsch (1985), 272 discussing ‘Mettoeo Fufetioeo’ in fr. 120; cf. phrases like endo suam do and the Homeric ἡκέηνλ δῶ (II. 7.363, Od. 4.169).
160 Elliott (2013), 95.
161 Elliott (2013), 95.
162 Cf. Leumann (1947), 125-6 whose definition is confined to Ennius’ use of Latin words or formations which had fallen out of use by his time: „Ein Wort, das zu Ennius“ Zeit bereits aus der lebenden Sprache geschwunden ist, ist ein Archaismus des Ennius. In spätere Dichtung sind Archaismen meist Ennianismen: Ein sonst verschollenes Wort, das Vergil aus Ennius übernimmt, ist für Vergil ein Archaismus oder Ennianismus, ohne für Ennius schon ein Archaismus gewesen sein zu müssen...Ein Wort, das spätere Dichter aus Vergil übernehmen, ist für diese nur ein poetisches Wort, ganz gleichgültig, ob es für Vergil oder gar für Ennius ein Archaismus war”.
163 Cf. Poncelet (1957), 375 discussing Cicero.
164 Barchiesi (1962), 381; Skutsch (1985), 359.
Annales and tragedies ‘show a much freer use of compounds’ than his predecessors.\textsuperscript{165} This compounding was part of a tradition begun in Greece and the use of compounds in Greek epic and lyric poetry (by the grouping of concepts within a single word) broadened the expression of the Latin poetic vocabulary.\textsuperscript{166} Although earlier Latin literary figures like Livius did not use compounding to a large extent (compared to others like Naevius), Ennius saw the value of the Greek compounding tradition (and its use as an aid to linguistic experimentation and innovation) and freely used them to amplify the Latin epic vocabulary.\textsuperscript{167}

### 1.4.2. Ennius’s Tragedies

It is instructive to compare some of Ennius’ tragic fragments with their Greek originals and highlight his own techniques in the adaptations. In Ennius’ version of Euripides’ Medea (perhaps called the Medea exul),\textsuperscript{168} there is a translation which begins with the Nurse’s opening monologue (Warmington frr 253-61; Eur., Med. 1-8):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utinam ne in nemore Pelio securibus</td>
<td>Εἴθ’ ὄφελ’ Ἀργοῦς μή διαπτάσθησι σκάφος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caesae accidissent abiegnae ad terram trabes,</td>
<td>Κόλχων ἐς αἰαν κυανέας Συμπληγάδας,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neve inde navis inchoandi exordium</td>
<td>μηδ’ ἐν νάπτασι Πηλίου πεπέσαν ποτε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coepisset quae nunc nominatur nomine</td>
<td>τμηθέσα πεύκη, μηδ’ ἐρετιμῶσα χέρας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argo, quia Argivi in ea defecti viri</td>
<td>ἀνδρὸν ἄριστον οἳ τὸ πάρχοςον δέρος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vecti petebant pellem inauratum arietes</td>
<td>Πελία μετήλθουν. οὐ γὰρ ἄν δέσποι’ ἐμὴ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchis imperio regis Peliae per dolum;</td>
<td>Μήδεια πύργους γῆς ἐπέλυει’ Ἰδολκίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nam nunquam era errans mea domo efferret pedem</td>
<td>Ἴρωτι θυμὸν ἓκκλαγείς’ Ἰάσσονος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medea animo aegro amore saevo saucia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this opening we see a close parallel of Euripides’ original eight trimeters with some poetic expansion. The fragment is preserved in the anonymous Rhetorica ad Herennium 2.34 where the auctor incertus discusses examples of the vitiosa expositio or ‘defective proposition’ using the opening of a play attributed to Ennius. The auctor incertus states that the sequence of events in relation to the ‘origin’ of the troubles is simplified and made more logical by Ennius compared to Euripides’ original. The result has been

\textsuperscript{165} Coulter (1916), 161.
\textsuperscript{166} Cousin (1944), 114: „une ampleur plus vaste au semantisme de leur vocabulaire“.
\textsuperscript{167} See Leumann (1947), 121: „Aus homer und aus der tragödie nimmt Ennius sich die Berechtigung zur Neubildung von Komposita für die Verwendung also schmückende Beiwörter…”
\textsuperscript{168} See Cic. Fin. 1.2.4.
described as ‘unemotional’ by comparison and an example of false reasoning.\textsuperscript{169} Linguistically, there is a heightened rhetorical flourish in the Ennian iambics of the Nutrix’s monologue. Jocelyn makes the point that, though many of the words and forms used by Euripides in his version were quite absent from everyday Attic: ‘a few of Ennius’ [forms] must have been rare in contemporary Roman speech but none could be labelled purely poetic’.\textsuperscript{170}

Some of these rarities appear in situations where Ennius chooses to emulate the lofty diction of the Greek original. So in line 256 Ennius has: ‘...pellem inauratam arietis’ (the gilt fleece of the ram) which corresponds to Euripides’ τὸ πάγρξπζνλ δέρος in line 5. Jocelyn notes that *inauratus* is never found in the comedies, although *auratus* does occur three times.\textsuperscript{171} The word has an uncertain history. Warmington attributes it to Livius in an uncertain fragment from the *Hymni: erant et equorum inaurata tapeta*.\textsuperscript{172}

Whether or not Ennius was responsible for the coinage is too difficult to tell given the scant nature of the fragment,\textsuperscript{173} however what can be said is that the unusual word echoes the unusual counterpart in Euripides’ Greek: τὸ πάγρξπζνλ δέρος (‘golden fleece’). This noun δέρος is actually the poetic form of δέρμα (‘hide’, ‘skin’) which would be used later in the context of the ‘Golden Fleece’ by figures such as Apollonius of Rhodes and Diodorus Siculus.\textsuperscript{174} Since Ennius eschewed a standard Latin adjective like *auratus* arguably demonstrates the mind of a philologist-poet who sought a nuanced and unusual form to add to his poetry. A simple adjective for ‘golden’ would not suffice for such an important poetic image, and so came to use the rarer form to describe the ‘gilt fleece of the ram’.

Similarly, in a later fragment of the *Medea exul*, Ennius has the Nurse announce: ‘...proloqui / caelo atque terrae Medeai miserias’.\textsuperscript{175} Instead of *Medeae miserias* one finds the peculiar first declension genitive singular -/āī/ in the ‘miseries of Medea’.\textsuperscript{176} From an orthographic viewpoint, the manuscripts of Cicero have apparently modernised the ending in this line to -/ae/ in his *Tusculan Disputations* (3.26.63) however as Turnebus discovered, this would lead to a missing long syllable in the iambic line and

\textsuperscript{169} Drabkin (1937), 23-4.
\textsuperscript{170} Jocelyn (1967), 352.
\textsuperscript{171} Jocelyn (1967), 354.
\textsuperscript{172} Warmington (1956-57), 2.42: Hymni, dub. fr. 2.
\textsuperscript{173} Warmington’s source is the *Grammatici Latini* 4.542.5 in a commentary by Servius known as the *Explanatio in Artem Donati*.
\textsuperscript{174} LSJ s.v. δέξνο.
\textsuperscript{175} Ennius, *Med. ex. frr. 264-5*; cf. CIL I’, 439: *acetiatii*, 441: *belolai* etc.
\textsuperscript{176} This -ai suffix also occurs in Ennius, *Ann. frr. 14, 31, 124, 185, 195*. 
hence the restoration of the disyllabic /-āī/. This was a form of the genitive which occurred frequently in the *Annales* (see Skutsch, frs. 31, 113, 179, 200, 326, 510). As Clackson and Horrocks posit, a new form, the diphthong ending /-ai/ for the genitive singular, appeared around 200 B.C., and though the /-ai/ diphthong died out around 120 B.C., it had begun to be written as /-ae/ much earlier after 187 B.C. They also comment that an earlier form around the beginning of the 3rd century B.C. was in use, derived from the older /-as/ in the form of /-āā/ as a disyllable. This form is attested in the 3rd and 2nd centuries (and later in Lucretius and Virgil) in poetry ‘largely for metrical reasons’. It appears that /-āā/ began in masculine nouns such as *agricola* and *advena* and took its /-ī/ from the genitive of the second declension. Jocelyn observes that in tragedies, /-ae/ ‘appears to have been normal’, and in epic poetry /-ai/ and /-as/ occurred ‘quite frequently as well as /-ae/’. As Untermann noted, what exactly motivated Ennius to use /-āī/ in certain places and /-ae/ in others is difficult to say, but it was not solely for archaic pathos or metrical convenience. Clackson and Horrocks make the salient point that poetic forms such as the epic and tragedy show a particular tendency to deliberate archaism in morphology: ‘motivated in part by the model of Homeric Greek...but also the continuing metrical usefulness of archaic forms’ as discussed above.

Frobenius argued that the use of /-ai/ ending in Ennius, notably in the *Annales*, was due to Homeric imitation of the rare Doric genitive ending /-ao/ found in lines such as Il.21.86 (Ἀλταῦ). He claimed that such ‘alten Genetivs’ provided a ‘striking’ ending
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177 Adversaria, 19.5; for commentary on later scribes „modernising” seemingly archaic orthography in Ciceronian manuscripts, see Jordan (1879), 238-40, 246 and Untermann (1886), 1988.
178 Clackson and Horrocks (2007), 94; see also Baldi (2002), 318: „The phonetic chain by which /-āī/ becomes C. Lat. /-ae... appears to be something like /-āī > -āi > -ai > -ae/; cf. Lindsay (1894), 379 who compares the first declension a-stem to the fifth declension /-ēī > -ēi > -i/ (O. Lat. *fideī* > C. Lat. *fidei*; /-ēī > -ēi > -ei etc.).
179 Clackson and Horrocks (2007), 103: the /-as/ ending for the genitive occurs in Livius as noted above, and in Naevius: *Terras* and *fortunas*, and apparently in Ennius: *viás* where Untermann (1972), 218 argues it is used as an archaism. The manuscripts indicate *via* but Dionysius Lambinus writes *viiā* (see Warmington (1956-7), 1.72). For evidence of a disyllabic pronunciation in metrical inscriptions see Hehl (1912), 11: „Die wünschenswerte Aufklärung, seit wann die Endung /-ai/ nicht mehr zweisilbig, sondern einsilbig gesprochen wurde, geben uns auch die Inschriften nicht. Denn während wir in I 1202 (c): “Non aequo exsucto vitā es traditus morti” zweisilbige Aussprache haben, weisen auf einsilbige hin I 1007 pulcrai; VI 555 ripai; VI 5173 vitāi; XII 915 Romai; vitā...”
180 Clackson and Horrocks (2007), 103; see also discussion above in relation to Livius Andronicus.
181 Cf. Lindsay (1894), 379.
182 Jocelyn (1967), 364.
183 Untermann (1972), 217.
184 Clackson and Horrocks (2007), 103; see also Leumann (1945), 253, n 37 in the context of Plautus; note here the scansion of the line „caelo atque terrae Medeāī miserias” where the /-āī/ fits syllabically within the iambic trimeter.
185 Frobenius (1907), 6.
to a line in the hexameters (‘effektvoller Abschluss des Hexameters’).\textsuperscript{186} Drabkin takes issue with this explanation calling it ‘hardly satisfactory’ given the occurrence of the -/ae/ ending contemporaneous with the use of the -/ai ending.\textsuperscript{187} She argues that Frobenius’ explanation does not take into account instances of the genitive singulars such as Lunai (Ann. 14) and Medeai which do not occur at the end of the line but at the start and in the middle respectively.\textsuperscript{188} Drabkin says that the plethora of examples of the -/āi/ ending in Plautus occurring along side the -/ae/ ending ‘indicates that the transition of -/āi/ to -/ae/ had not yet been completely made’.\textsuperscript{189} However this argument, in my opinion, is equally unsatisfactory as it fails to take into account the contexts (within the narrative of the poem) in which the -/āi/ ending appears in Ennius (and Plautus for that matter).\textsuperscript{190} The following is an analysis of the genitive singulars which appear in Ennius:

\textbf{-ae genitive singular}

- qualem te patri\textit{ae} custodem di genuerunt! (\textit{Ann.} 117)
- aerato sonitu gale\textit{ae}, sed ne pote quisquam (\textit{Ann.} 393)
- Audire est opera\textit{e} pretium procedere recte (\textit{Ann.} 471)
- nobis unde forent fructus vit\textit{ae}que propagmen (\textit{Ann.} 475)
- Contempsit fontes quibus exerugit aquae vis (\textit{Ann.} 551)
- O lux Troi\textit{ae}, germane Hector (\textit{Alexander}, fr. 76)
- ex opibus summis opis egens Hector tu\textit{ae} (\textit{Andromache}, fr. 94)
- illis Lyaeus vitis inventor sacra\textit{ae} (\textit{Athamas}, fr. 129)
- Colchis imperio regis Pelia\textit{e} per dolum (\textit{Medea exul}, fr. 259)
- non quod domui vim taurorum et segetis armata\textit{e} (\textit{Medea exul}, fr. 283)
- ille me\textit{ae} tam potis pacis potiri (\textit{Unassigned} fr. 420)

\textbf{-ai genitive singular}

- Lunai portum, est operae, cognoscite, cives (\textit{Ann.} 14)
- Olli respondit rex Albai Longai (\textit{Ann.} 31)

\textsuperscript{186} Frobenius (1907), 6.
\textsuperscript{187} Drabkin (1937), 67; cf the discussion above in relation to Livius and Naevius where both -\textit{as} and -\textit{ae} forms appear around the same period.
\textsuperscript{188} Drabkin (1937), 67.
\textsuperscript{189} Drabkin (1937), 68.
\textsuperscript{190} The appearance of the archaic -\textit{āi} in Plautus does not necessarily mean the transition for -\textit{āi} to -\textit{ae} had „not yet been completely made” as Drabkin (1937), 68 argues. Indeed Plautus used archaic forms such as -\textit{āi} for -\textit{ae}, -\textit{um} for -\textit{orum} among others, to evoke a bygone era for comedic effect, adding a lofty tone to the dialogue of his characters: magnai rei publicai in \textit{Mil.} 103, see De Melo (2011), lxxi.
- Olli respondit suavis sonus Egeriai (Ann. 124)
- arbustum fremitu silvae frondosai (Ann. 185)
- terrai frugiferai (Ann. 564)
- caelo atque terrae Medea miserias (Medea exul, fr. 265)

In the Annales the -ai ending is as frequent as the -ae genitive singular however the -ae becomes more frequent in the tragedies than -ai.\(^{191}\) The other key point from these lists is that the -ai ending occurs predominantly in lines where unusual or poetic language is already heavily deployed. So the form of Lunai in Ann. 14 occurs in the proem where the poet is having his dream, and could have been a nod to the old poetic language of Homer, which is worth noting due to Ennius’ claim to have been Homer ‘reincarnated’ as discussed above. Frobenius points out that where -ai occurs there is generally a Homeric model. So in Ann. 31 for example: Olli respondit rex Albai Longai, Ennius is using a deliberately archaic form,\(^{192}\) replacing the i in ille for o to evoke the Homeric phrase τὸν δ’ ἠκείβεη’ ἔπεηηα formula (eg. Il.1.121, 131) ‘then he answered him’. As Parry noted, Homer invariably used the stock phrase whenever he wanted to express in words that fill the line up to the feminine caesura: ‘the idea of the predicate of a sentence whose essential meaning is “x answered him”, and these words can be considered a formula’.\(^{193}\) Similarly, Ennius deploys the phrase: Olli respondit more than once (eg. Ann. frr. 31 and 124) and both of these times the olle form is used and, tellingly, the -ai ending as well which takes the line to the most common Ennian caesura. Drabkin is right to point out that both the -ae and -ai forms of the genitive were contemporaneously used by Ennius and Plautus, but the -ai genitive is clearly used for poetic effect as opposed to a casual alternating between forms, and indeed in imitation of Homer as Frobenius rightly concluded, yet the ending was not used solely as a metaplasm, but also for linguistic effect.

As another example, Ennius deployed the -ai ending in conjunction with a coined compound in terrai frugiferai (Ann. 564) and similarly in arbustum fremitu silvae frondosai (Ann. 185). This is no coincidence and the literary effect cannot be explained away by metrical convenience. This was Ennius living up to his chosen title of dicti studiosus; paying close attention to the grammatical form of the word and evoking a bygone Homeric diction in Latin by reinterpreting Greek philological influences. Such

\(^{191}\) Cf. Naevius also; see Meillet (1977), 115; Kaimio (1979), 303; Barchiesi (1962), 366.
\(^{192}\) See Skutsch (1985), 64-66; also cf. the archaic olli with the archaic Homeric Greek anaphoric pronoun ἥλ, “him”.
\(^{193}\) Parry (1971), 14.
subtle linguistic artistry confirms Cicero’s observations of Ennius in *Brut.* 71: ‘...dicti studiosus...ait ipse de se nec mentitur in gloriano: sic enim sese res habet’.

The conclusion reveals the mindset of Ennius as not simply a translator of Greek, but an ‘opifex’ of the Latin language. Where he came across Greek linguistic techniques such as archaic or dialectic endings, he often turned to evoking similar philological inventiveness in his own works, giving it a flavour similar to Homer’s or Euripides’ original. This demonstrates a writer who was at ease with imitating and reusing Greek models, whether it meant importing Greek words and morphemes directly or simply evoking them by unusual Latin endings.

There are other neologisms to be found in Ennius’ tragedies which often had no Greek equivalent yet nevertheless followed on from a distinctly Greek tradition of raising the tone and style of the poet’s diction by lexical innovation within the parameters of known vocabulary.194 We find *augifico* in the *Andromacha* fr. 110 meaning ‘increase’ or ‘swell in number’, formed by analogy to pre-existing words such as *magnifico, aedifico, ludifico* and *sacrifico*, except with one difference: the first element of the compound is verbal rather than nominal. Such coinages have counterparts in the early literary language and appeared later in writers such as Cicero and Lucretius, which suggests *augificat* could simply be an archaic form reused or a neologism based on earlier literary compounds in *-ficus* beginning with a verbal element.195

In *Cresphontes* fr. 139, Nonnius notices the unusual neologism *nitidant* meaning *abluunt* or ‘they cleanse’ derived from *nitor*. Like Ennius, Naevius was also a pioneer of Latin’s poetic language of epic, yet did not go as far as Ennius in emulating and adapting the techniques of the Greeks. Despite the undoubted affinity with and emulation of his Homeric Muse, Ennius introduced the techniques derived from Homer’s verse to create a rich and unusual Latin vocabulary to explore various literary genres based on Greek traditions (epic, tragic and comic).197

Skutsch aptly points out that, despite the possibility of mere speculation, the fragments provide us with a possibility to reconstruct the attitude in which Ennius approached his task as one of deliberate subjection to the discipline of Greek form: ‘a re-working of the old form with the aid of the knowledge derived from later Greek

---

194 See *Hectoris Lytra*, fr. 186 tenacia, and *Medea exul*, fr. 263 eliminias.
195 Jocelyn (1967), 258.
196 For example: *contennificus, languificus, terrificus, horrificus*; see also Leumann (1977), 396.
197 See Kenney (1982), 62: ‘his was a knowledge of the Muses, a religious γλῶζ η ο, which was the hard-won result of practice and lucubration...Here speaks not Homer reincarnated, but the Latin Callimachus”.'
theory...It was a conscious attitude in the Father of Roman Poetry’. Greek, for Ennius, was not only important as a literary ancestor, but also a tool to reinvent Latin poetry through Ancient Greek notions of ‘philology’, as well as the importance of the scholar-poet. Ennius did not innovate and expand Latin morphology and syntax *ad hoc*, rather he used Greek to construct Latin’s early poetic tradition (predominantly linguistic in nature) which would exert significant influence over future Latin authors.

1.5. Comedy and Lexical Innovation: Plautus

Adams makes an important point when he observes that bilinguals in Rome were prepared to borrow morphemes from Greek for *ad hoc* coinages in Latin: ‘whether because of the utility of a Greek element, or because of its special semantic associations….or for humorous purposes’. In the context of comedy, Titus Maccius Plautus (c. 254–184 B.C.) clearly fell into this last category. It has been convincingly argued since Fraenkel that despite a lack of originality, Plautus was no mere translator of Greek New Comedy authors such as Menander, Demophilus, Diphilus and others, but rather an adaptor who kept to the basic plot outlines of his originals and transformed them into his own style. Martin notes that Plautus’ adaptations are about as close to the Greek originals as William Shakespeare’s *Comedy of Errors* is to his own *Menaechmi*. At any rate, an examination of exactly which scenarios led Plautus to innovate within the parameters of Latin (either by the usage or avoidance of Greek words) is instructive because it will demonstrate continuity in the parallel development of Latin literature and lexical innovation from Greek.

---

198 Skutsch (1968), 9.
199 Adams (2003a), 422.
200 Fraenkel (2007), 66: ‘Plautus is not a pedantic translator nor a schoolmaster, but a clever man of the theatre...’; also 218: ‘...[I]n the sections which have previously been considered Plautine innovations, there were indubitably original models which have escaped the attention of scholars. It must however also be said as a general principle that all such assumptions...must be regarded with the greatest skepticism. In the light of everything we know, we have no right to see Plautus as a dramatist. We must not imagine he was capable of taking from different parts of dialogues which actually carried the stage action forward...and weaving these together into new unified dialogues, or thinking up elements of a main plot by himself”.
201 Cf. Leo (1912), 95: ‘[Plautus] missed the call of the tutelary spirit who wanted to make him into a poet, and he remained a translator, much to the detriment of Roman literature”.
202 Fraenkel (2007), 274: ‘My view of Plautus is rather of an artist who was quite content to remain within his limits when the aim as to knock up a whole play as quickly as possible; he developed wings only when he elaborated individual details, looked with fresh eyes at everyday things, connected concepts remote from each other and made each word, sentence, and line ring...The Greek works are to give him what he can make use of...But he feels no sense of obligation towards them”.
203 Martin (1976), 3: ‘The extent to which Plautus departs from his Greek models seems to vary considerably from play to play...”
1.5.1. Plautus’ use of Greek

Before Cicero, Plautus is the Latin author with the largest amount of extant works, 21 comedies out of his total output of around 50, comprising roughly 21,500 verses. Plautus often used Greek words in the dialogues of slaves and people of low rank.\textsuperscript{204} As Kaimio observed: ‘This is naturally related to Plautus’ artistic aims and his specific purpose – to amuse the audience’.\textsuperscript{205} Whilst the scattering of Greek through Plautus’ earlier plays were no doubt for amusement of the audience, as he became more developed as a playwright, he used concentrations of Greek words in certain places. By this means, tedious scenes were enlivened, and elements alien to the plot, even if technically they had no excuse for intruding, as Hough notes, they at least were the more amusing for the greater chic of the lines.\textsuperscript{206} The central theme behind these observations is the target audience of Plautus’ comedic innovations and wordplay. Unlike Livius, Naevius or Ennius, Plautus had no reason to be careful about how much Greek intruded upon his work and there was no apparent ‘nationalism’ or divine Homeric ‘re-incarnation’ in his works. For Plautus, Greek was exploited not just because of a certain egestas or linguistic poverty in Latin, but for a very specific literary effect. Hough observed that, although the ‘egestas’ might account for Plautus using words such as tragoedia, triobolus, petasus, halophanta, ‘it is apparent that this same ‘egestas’ has been invoked on behalf of many words which have Latin synonyms used elsewhere by Plautus’ (e.g., eleutheria for libertas; architec for faber).\textsuperscript{207}

In Plautus, the use of Greek and its transferral into Latin could be seen as largely for comedic purposes or word-play. Oksala argues that Plautus was no ‘purist’ in his use of Greek words within his plays, and there was certainly no tendency to ‘cleanse’ Latin of Greek elements, but on the contrary, he used expressions of Greek origin sine scrupulis provided they meet his comedic intentions.\textsuperscript{208}

\textsuperscript{204} See Leo (1895), 95, 427, where Greek appears in the mouths of „Sklaven und Personen niederer Schicht”, see Bacch. 1162; Cat. 880-884; Cas. 728-731; Mil. 438; Most. 973; Persa 159; Poen. 137; Pseud. 211, 443, 483-488, 653-654, 712, 1010; Stich. 707; Trin. 187, 419-420, 705-708; Truc. 551-577; however note the use of Greek by others and aristocratic characters in Bacch., 1162, Cas. 729, and Trin. 187.
\textsuperscript{205} Kaimio (1979), 301; see also Adams (2003b), 203.
\textsuperscript{206} Hough (1934), 363.
\textsuperscript{207} Hough (1934), 363.
\textsuperscript{208} Oksala (1953), 22, „Plautus stellt sich also zu dem Sprachmaterial griechischer Herkunft in keiner Weise puristisch. Bei ihm kann man auch nicht die geringste Tendenz zur Reinigung des Lateins von griechischen Elementen bemerken, sondern im Gegenteil, er gebraucht Ausdrücke griechischen Ursprungs sine scrupulis wenn sie nur seinen Absichten entsprechen.”
1.5.2. Compound words in Plautus as comedic device

A list of compounds in Plautus can be found compiled in Appendix III, which are distributed unevenly over his plays, occurring more in lyrical passages than in senarii. 209 This is most likely due to the different temperaments of senarii verses as opposed to passages with musical accompaniment such as the lyric verses where the words were less part of the character’s narrative, lending themselves more to poetic and emotive expression. 210 Duckworth remarks that they provided for Plautus’ audiences a form of musical comedy which helped ‘to hold their attention by its gaiety and vivacity’. 211 Such dramatic moments would lend themselves to innovative language and this included the deployment of unusual compound words.

Plautus’ abundant use of compound words, as compiled in Appendix III, displays a unique sense of humour where the author freely coined a new Latin word (or sent-up a pre-existing compound from epic poetry), even with no Greek original, if it had a comedic pay off. For example, Palaestrio’s angry aside which accuses women of acting falsely. The tirade repeats and amplifies the same insult with the compounds falsiloquum, falsificum, and falsiurium. 212 Similarly in the case of Toxilus in the Persa, where, at line 755, he utters the Ennian line: ‘cum bene nos, Iuppiter, iuvisti, dique alii omnes caelipotentes’ the compound is clearly a parody on the religious oaths similar to those found in Homer. One can turn to Aristotle’s discussion of strange (γι῵ζζαη) and compound words (δηπιᾶ ὀλόκαηα) in Rh. (1404b) in the context of poetry:

On which account it is necessary to make our discourse ‘strange’; for men admire what is remote, and that which is admirable is pleasant. In poetry many things create this and there it is fitting; for the subject and most of the people spoken of are not commonplace.

---

209 Observed by Coulter (1916), 162; see also Bain (1979), 25: ‘...it is possible to observe some distinctions of tone between the language of [Plautus’] senarii and of his long lines (classified by the ancients as cantica) and lyric. Long lines and lyric are generally more dignified and apt to include tragic diction and figurative language more often than senarii’.

210 Cf. unusual words appearing in lyric passages of Greek tragedy, Eur. Ion, 157 and 1154: ρξπζή ξεηο, Iphigenia in Tauris, 128: μνησια νο, see also Breitenbach (1934), 227ff; note also Aristophanes’ parody of Euripidean tragedy in Thes. 855ff. Such examples can also be seen in modern times in musicals such as Mary Poppins (1964) where unusual and fanciful words such as supercalifragilisticexpialidocious form part of the musical routines as opposed to the narrative scenes. Duckworth (1994), 370 notes that these lyric verses in Plautus total around one-seventh of the 21,500 extant in his works which is high compared to other comedic writers like Terence who has only two short songs in the Andria (481-484 in bacchiacs, 626-638 in cretics) and one in the Adelphoe (610-617 in mostly dactylo-trochaics).

211 Duckworth (1994), 375.

212 See also Puccioni (1944), 379: ‘Plauto non solo inventa vocaboli per scopi artistici, ma anche si serve di quelli dell’uso comune per creare figure di parole e di suono: è una manifestazione del suo genio comico e musicale...’
Because such a compound, usually reserved for epic or dithyrambic poetry, comes from the mouth of a mundane slave (who is contradictorily also a defender of moral and ethical values to preserve his love with a girl), there is a higher level of irony and those in the audience who noticed such language of epic poetry perhaps would have found extra humour in it. This adds an affected air of hyperbole to the monologue which is humourous for the audience. Thus coinages and compounds in Plautus serve the dual purpose of being both tropes from the Greek comedic tradition and also ironic and humorous devices designed to amuse the audience by building layers of comedic subtext into the scene.

1.5.3. Plautus’ translations or adaptations
To label the dramatic adaptations of Plautus as ‘translations’ of any kind should be done cautiously, especially when such scant Greek originals of the New Comedy survive today. However much commentary has been made on the parallels between fragments of Menander and Plautus’ plays. Leo in his Platinische Forschungen saw Plautus as an author who, though ingenious with language, was largely unoriginal in his comedies. Similarly, Fraenkel argued that Plautus was not capable of ‘true dramatic invention’. The surviving fragments from Menander’s Dis exapaton have been recognised as corresponding to the Plautine version in the Bacchides, and Handley has compared lines 11-30 of Dis exapaton to lines 494-525 of the Bacchides. Goldberg notes that Menander’s original provides a glimpse into Plautine methods of adaptation and lends ‘new solidity to what has long been a somewhat ephemeral exercise’. It is beneficial to examine the differences and similarities between the two passages to discover Plautus’ linguistic methods in adapting his Greek originals:

---

213 See O’Sullivan (1992), 38 n 77.
214 For some examples in Greek comedy, see Aristophanes, Lys. 448, 457-8, 824, 1001; see also Robson (2006), 63-65.
216 Leo (1895), 87: „Seine Komödien sind nicht sein, und sie waren schöner und besser ehe er sie zu eigen machte”; 185: „Plautus hat, neben einer so hoch gesteigerten Kunst des stilmässigen Ausdrucks, die eigentliche dramatische Fähigkeit...nicht entwickeln können”.
218 Handley (1968), 22-23; see also Lefèvre (2001), 141f.
219 Goldberg (1990), 191.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Menander’s <em>Dis exapaton</em></th>
<th>Plautus’ <em>Bacchides</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (ΜΟΞΧΟΥ ΠΑΘΡ)  
[σ]ό δ’ ἐκείνον ἐκκάλει  
[ ι]' γε, ναυθέτει δ’ ἐναντίον  
αὐτῶν τε σύσσων, οἰκίαν 9' ὀλίγον φίλου.  
Lambda, προέγομεν.  
(ΛΥΔΟΥΣ) εἰ δὲ κάμη καταλύποις—  
(M.π) προέγομεν· ἴκανος οὖτος.  
(Αυ) αὐτῷ, Σώστρατε,  
χρήσαι πικρῶς, ἔλαυν’ ἐκείνον τὸν ἄχρα[τή].  
<ἀ>παντὸς αἰσχροὶ γὰρ ἡμᾶς τοὺς φίλους.  | PHIL. Mnésiloche, hoc tecum oro, ut illius animum atque ingenium regas;  
serva tibi sodalem et mihi filium. MNES. Factum volo.  
LYD. Melius est, me quoque una si cum illo relinqueres.  
PHIL. Adfatim est. LYD. Mnésiloche, cura, ei, concastiga hominem probe,  
qui dedecorat te, me amicosque alios flagitiis suis.  
Phil. In te ego hoc onus omne impono. Lyde, sequere hac me. L. Sequor. |

| (ΣΩΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ)  
[η]ὴ ’στιν οὖτος φρούδος. εναλη[  
τοῦτον καθέξει. Σώστρατον  
προήγομασ.  
ἀρνήσθητι μὲν, οὐκ ἀδήλην ἐστὶ μοι—  
ἰταμή γὰρ—εἰς μέσον τε πάντες οἱ θεοὶ  
ῄζουσι, μη τοῖνον [.].νο[  
κακὴ κακῶς τοῖνον—δ[π]ήγαγε,  
Σ[ώστρατε].  
ίπωσ σε πείσειν δοῦλοι|  
[ε]γὼ μάλαθ’, ὡ δ’ ο[ξ] κενόν  
συμπεσισσίτω  
ἔρχοντα μηδ[έν] τῇσ πατρὶ  
τὸ χρην· πιθαν[ειομένη] γὰρ παύσεται  
ὅταν τοῦτ’ αἴσθητα[τ], τὸ τῆς  
πα!ρομιᾶς,  
νεκρῶι] λέγουσα [μᾶθον. ἄλλ’ ἢ ἡ[  
[j]μ [δ]ὲ[  
ἔλθαν ἐπ’ ἐ]κείνον.  | MNES.  
Inimiciorem nunc utrum cremad magis  
sodalenne esse an Bacchidem, incertum admodumst.  
ilium exoptavit potius? habeat. optumest.  
ne illa illud hercle cum malo fecit suo;  
nam mihi divini numquam quisquam creduat,  
ni ego illum exemplis plurumis planeque — amo.  
ego faxo hau dicet nactam quem derideat.  
nam iam domum ibo atque — aliiquid surrupiam patri.  
id isti dabo. ego istane multis uliscar modis.  
adeo ego illum cogam usque ut mendicet — meus pater.  
sed satine ego animum mente sincera gero,  
qui ad hunc modum haec hic quae futura fabulor?  
amo hercle opinio, ut pote quod pro certo sciam.  
verum quam illa unquam de mea pecunia  
ramenta fiat plumea propensor,  
mendicum malim mendicando vincere.  
umquam edepol viva me inridebit. nam mihi  
decretumst renumerare iam omne au  
rum patri.  
igitur mi inani atque inopi subblandibitur  
tum quom blandiri nihil pluris referet,  
quam si ad sepulcrum mortuo narres logos.  
[sed autem quam illa unquam meis opulentii  
ramenta fiat gravior aut propensor,  
mori me malim excruciatum inopia.]  
profecto stabilest me patri aurum reddere. |
Observe that Plautus mirrors the poetic and unusual qualities of the original Greek in the Latin, so as to give a heightened sense of comedy to the language, yet also alters the sequence of action. Questa observes that the translation in lines 512-525 proceeds faithfully from Menander almost ‘to the letter’ until the end of Sostratos’ monologue. All that can be observed in relation to linguistic peculiarities are tentative connections at best, due to the nature of the evidence before us, but nonetheless some are revealing in themselves. For instance in line 23 we find a word play on κακός ‘evil’ describing the female with whom Sostratos is concerned: κακὴ κακοῦ τοῖνον, literally ‘[she’s] evilly evil’. The repetition and word-play here is found in Plautus (512-15) as well when Mnésilochus exclaims: ‘But sooner than let any cash of mine make her a fraction of a feather-weight the heavier, I’d prefer to defeat a beggar by begging [mendicum malim mendicando]. By God! She shan’t give me the laugh in this world, never!’ The two different grammatical forms produce a word play which amplifies the comedy in the same way as κακὴ κακοῦ amplifies Sostratos’ exclamation.

In line 517: ἰγίτυρ μι ἰναὶ ἁτικ ἰποκ ἰποκ ὅπιτιἰα ἵπποτα (Then she will feign flattery on me, being empty and helpless) Plautus uses the neologism compound subblandibitur which the OLD defines as ‘to fawn on in an insidious manner’ attributed first to Plautus. As Handley notes: ‘[Plautus’] rare compound verb subblanditur - perhaps he even coined it - looks very apt to confirm our conjectural restoration of the word for ‘persuasive pleading’ πιθαν[ειποκ]η here’. In Menander lines 25-6: ἥ δ’ ὀ[ξ κενὸν σὺ]παισάτῳ / ἔχοντα μη[δὲν (Then let her persuade me! / being empty with nothing) there appears the aorist imperative παισάτῳ compounded with σμ- which might have been calqued by Plautus directly into the neologism sub-blandibitur (cf. σμ- with sub-). A few lines down in 27 we see again the verb πιθανειποκ[ει] also derived from πιθοκ[ειδοκ] ‘to persuade’ > πιθοκ (LSJ s.v. πιθοκ) which Handley (above) suggested was the inspiration for subblandibitur. It ought to be acknowledged that the Greek form in Menander (σμ-) has been restored based on the Latin in Plautus and so at best one can only hypothesise as to whether the Greek influenced Plautus’ innovation here. Yet if we accept that the restorations by Handley of the Greek are accurate, then Plautus can be seen as merging the notions of trickery and persuasion into one either for σμπαισάτῳ or πιθανειποκει and conceptually calquing via the use of a single unusual Latin word for comedic effect.

---

220 For a discussion of Menander’s use and manipulation of unusual language, see Sandbach (1969), 113ff.
221 Compare this to the translation of Euripides by Ennius in the Medea exul as discussed above.
222 Questa (1970), 197.
223 Handley (1968), 12.
1.6. Caecilius Statius and Terence

Both Caecilius (c. 220-230 - 168 B.C.) and Terence (c.195/185–159 B.C.), like Plautus before them, sought to adapt Greek plays into Latin. Terence endeavored to elevate Roman comedy from the farcical Plautine era of ‘rude woodcuts as it were of popular fun and low life to the finished line engravings of classic dialogue’.\footnote{Hough (1947), 18.} Hough comments that ‘there are 116 occurrences of 60 Greek words’ in Terence’s six plays, with the following data generated:\footnote{Hough (1947), 18: “Greek words” are not defined by Hough specifically, but from the data, this includes direct loans (without transliteration) and also calques.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (B.C.)</th>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Diff. Words</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Hec.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1: 206 lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>And.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1: 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Heaut.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1: 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Phorm.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1: 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Adel.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1: 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Eun.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1: 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here the trend seems to be an increased usage over time. Hough observes that comparing the Greek of Terence’s contemporary in Plautus with that in his own comedies is difficult as the former, ‘caring little for the purity either of language or of atmosphere, but straining every effort to obtain humorous effect, introduced much actual Greek and many more loan words’.\footnote{McCullough (2001), 259.} Even President John Adams once remarked that Terence had ‘simplicity and an elegance that [made] him proper to be accurately studied as a model’.\footnote{Clackson and Horrocks (2007), 187.} Terence was not in the business of linguistic innovation nor borrowing from Greek, but preferred a conversational tone easily understood by his Roman audience. Clackson and Horrocks comment that: ‘The shift towards a less extravagant and more elevated form of expression initiated by...Terence...gathered momentum in the first century B.C.’\footnote{Clackson and Horrocks (2007), 187.} yet amongst Roman writers generally the drive towards ‘pure’ Latinity, inspired in part by Greek ideas and ideals, constantly came into conflict with the overtly ‘Grecising tendencies’ of many...\footnote{Parry (1857), xviii.}
writers as they sought to establish literary varieties of the language on the basis of Greek adjectives.\textsuperscript{229} As Hough notes, one should be cautious when assuming that Terence merely continued Plautus’ technique of ‘obtaining humorous effect by foreign words’.\textsuperscript{230} Nevertheless, there are some instances of linguistic peculiarity but this is rare compared to Terence’s predecessors. So, like Ennius and Plautus, Terence uses the archaic first declension -\textit{ai} genitive, but only twice, both times from characters who play a \textit{senex} or old man, in \textit{Andr}. 439 by Simo, and in \textit{Heaut}. 514-15 by Chremes. Indeed, many archaic constructions both morphological and syntactical are placed in the dialogue of old people.\textsuperscript{231}

Caecilius was the bridge between the Plautine era and Terence’s renovated form of Roman comedy. There are about forty titles of Caecilius extant, of which all \textit{palliatae} and either lost or fragmentary. Most retained the original Greek titles such as \textit{Gamos} (The Marriage) and \textit{Ex hautou hestos} (He Stands on His Own) but some have both Latin and Greek titles, \textit{Obolostates} / \textit{Faenerator} (The Usurer). In Aulus Gellius’ \textit{Attic Nights}, Gellius discusses Caecilius’ adaptations from Menander. He says that despite the initial charms of his adaptations, when compared to the originals they were very much ‘dull and paltry’.\textsuperscript{232} Gellius also gives us a useful starting point (although in a denigrating context) that Caecilius dramatically altered the Latin versions of Menander’s plays: ‘quantum stupere atque frigere quantumque mutare a Menandro Caecilius visus est’.\textsuperscript{233}

Caecilius’ \textit{Plocium} is an adaptation of Menander’s \textit{Plokion} (The Necklace) preserved in Gel. 2.23.9f (presented in \textbf{Appendix IV}). There is a distinct Romanisation of social setting and characterisation where Caecilius emphasises the personal relationship and attitudes between the husband and his wife. There is also a Romanisation of the characters, for instance with the use of the word \textit{concilia}, a word which is most often associated with Roman assemblies (an arena populated primarily by male citizens), to describe the language of the wife’s prating with her neighbours. The second fragment changes the original and ends with a joke evoking the laughter of the audience. It is a scene in the scene, and enlivens the dialogue with Plautine-esque farcical elements. However, in terms of lexical innovations, Caecilius has significantly less than those found in Plautine comedy, a trend which continues into Terence’s plays. There is some recycling of Plautine innovations such as \textit{aerumna} and \textit{aetatula} but nothing strikingly original. The verb \textit{devomo} in the line ‘ut devomas vult, quod foris

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{229}] Clackson and Horrocks (2007), 187.
\item[\textsuperscript{230}] Hough (1947) 19-20
\item[\textsuperscript{231}] See Karakasis (2005), 61.
\item[\textsuperscript{232}] Gellius, \textit{Att}. 2.23.2-3: „oppido...iacere atque sordere”.
\item[\textsuperscript{233}] Gellius, \textit{Att}. 2.23.7.
\end{itemize}
potaveris’ is a Caecilian innovation from the affix *de- + vomo* which expresses a greater intensity and vividness in the husband’s vomiting.\textsuperscript{234}

After evaluating Caecilius’ diction more widely in his fragments, one notices that he followed in the footsteps of his predecessor Plautus. However Caecilius’ general tone was more measured, and less prone to lewd and vulgar jokes. In any case it should be stressed that we have far fewer remaining fragments of Caecilius, as compared with Plautus and Terence, so such observations should be noted with caution. However it is possible to glean some lexical innovations in the plays of Caecilius, with a few *hapax eiremena*. These include a number of abstracts in *-tas* (such as *pulchritas* in *Harpazomene* fr 50,\textsuperscript{235} *luculentitas* in *Hymns* fr. 61, *similitas* and *dulcitas* in *Syracusii* fr. 206-7). Among the *hapaxes* the only form in *-tudo* is *ineptitudo*, introduced to amplify (together with alliteration) an insult addressed to one who has forgotten his manners (fr. 56): *homo ineptitudinis cumulatus, Cultum oblitus es?*

Caecilius also introduced Greek loanwords, as in *Pausimachus* fr. 127: *molochina ampelina* a transliteration of κνιόρηλνο and ἀκπέιηλνο. Thus given the opportunity, Caecilius will freely innovate, however only to augment the effect of a metaphor or expression, and only in very rare cases when the action allows it, unlike Plautus who used loanwords and compounds almost exclusively for comedic effect. The trend continued into Terence who very rarely resorted to innovation, instead keeping his dramatic language simple and relatively plain.

### 1.7. Pacuvius, Accius: Further use of compounding in Latin poetry

Ennius had paved the way for tragedians to experiment in Latin with various poetic practices and lexical innovation. Marcus Pacuvius (c. 220 B.C. – c. 130 B.C.) was a tragic poet, and whose importance amongst early Latin tragedians would later be recognised by authors like Cicero,\textsuperscript{236} who sought to expand Latin’s morphological capabilities in the genre of poetry. This was a trend which had begun with Livius and Naevius to a smaller extent, but more broadly developed in Ennius. Lines such as ‘Nerei repandirostrum incurvicervicum pecus’ contained experimental compounds based on unusual adjective + noun forms (*repandus* + *rostrum*, *incurvus* + *cervix*) which would draw scorn and satire from later writers.\textsuperscript{237} Schierl comments that Pacuvius’

\textsuperscript{235} In place of *pulchritudo*. All fragments from Warmington (1956-57).  
\textsuperscript{236} Opt. Gen. 1.  
\textsuperscript{237} Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.5.67; Cicero *Brut.* 258; see also Lucilius’ parody of the line in fr. 235 in Warmington (1956-57), 3.72: „lascivire pecus Nerei rostrique repandum“.
‘Wortungetüme’ or ‘verbal monstrosities’ were extreme examples of his style, but ultimately representative of the time in which the moulding of the Latin literary language upon Greek originals began in earnest. In a similar way, Lucius Accius (170 B.C. - c. 86 B.C.) sought to extend the possibilities of Latin poetic vocabulary by introducing novel word-forms into his poetry. The fundamental problem of what Lucretius would later call the *egestas* of Latin (compared with Greek) is illustrated most strongly in Latin’s inability to convey abstract notions, as Poncelet highlights in the context of Cicero’s philosophical works. In this regard, both Pacuvius and Accius were forced to grapple with introducing original abstract substantives by resorting to innovation and linguistic experimentation to fill the void.

In *Appendix V* lexical innovations in Pacuvius and Accius have been categorised into various sub-headings illustrating the ways in which these writers introduced new forms into Latin and the prevalent methods (affixation, compounding, etc.) A noteworthy aspect is the number of entries formed from abstract suffixes such as *-tas* and *-tudo*, and inchoative verbs in *-esco* formed from substantives. There is also a large number of compound forms used by both Pacuvius and Accius continuing the techniques popularised by Ennius in his epic and tragic poetry.

A question which arises is: in which circumstances did these particular poets tend to introduce novel word forms? An illustration can be found in a passage of Accius’ *Medea sive Argonautae* where a shepherd, who has never seen a ship before, describes it on first sight coming from the sea: ‘Tanta moles labitur / fremibunda ex alto ingenti sonitu et spiritu’ (frr. 381-382). The compound *fremibunda* is the word-form which stands out in this fragment and not surprisingly, is not found in Latin before Accius. Ribbeck suggests Accius drew inspiration for his work from Apollonius of Rhodes’ *Argonautica*. The fragment certainly has parallels to a specific scene from the plot of Apollonius’ poem where shepherds in the meadows around the mouth of the Ister (Danube River) spy the Argo and the Colchian ships coming in from the sea. Apollonius describes the fear of the shepherds as they see the ship as if it were a great monster (*θήρα*) coming forth from the cavernous ocean (*οἶα τε θήρας / ὀσσόμενοι πόντου*).

---

238 Schierl (2006), 30: „Pacuvius’ Wortungetüme sind ein Extremfall, aber letztlich repräsentativ für eine Zeit, in der sich durch Übersetzungen griechischer Vorlagen die lateinische Literatursprache auszuformen und zu etablieren begann“.  
239 Lucr. 1.832.  
240 Poncelet (1957), 375.  
241 See also D’Anto (1980), 42: „Da notare inoltre che gli scrittori latini, in generale, e ancora di più i poeti drammatici che avevano modelli greci davanti, hanno dovuto far ricorso a termini astratti, per la nota mancanza di essi nella propria lingua“.  
242 Preserved in Cicero, *N.D.* 2.89.  
243 See Ribbeck (1849), 27ff.
The adjective κεγαθήηεο, (full of hollows, cavernous) qualifying πόληνο, is an unusual compound word with a similar poetic effect as Accius’ fremibunda (full of noise). The word μεγακήηηηης seems to have had its genesis in Homer and appears in the Odyssey with πόληνο referring to the ‘cavernous sea’ and in the Iliad referring to Achilles as a large metaphorical dolphin (δειθις μεγακήηηηης) trapping smaller fish in the coves and anchorages. In Accius’ passage he uses the compound fremibundus ‘full of noise’ to evoke the large mass (moles) coming from the sea with the ‘noise’ imagery being Accius’ innovation. To evoke his own poetic imagery in Latin, Accius was clearly in favour of turning to lexical and metaphorical innovation in his adaptations of Greek source material.

244 Apollon. 4.317-318.
245 Od. 3.158: ...δε ξένοι κεγαθήηηηα πόλην, the compound κεγαθήηηηηα seems to be derived from either θεηώη (full of hollows) or θῆηηο (a sea monster), see LSJ s.v.
246 Il. 21.22-24: ωὸ δ’ ὑπὸ δειθις ἔνοι κεγαθηήηηηοιρζῆρυ αἰ ὶ νη/ θεύγηηηηο πηκ πηκ η κέληο/ εὐόξκηηηηη/ δεη δη ὡη εο. Interestingly, the use of the dolphin as a metaphorical device is also used by Accius in frs. 393-394: „sic citati atque alacres rostris perfremunt / delphini” which seems to be the first use of the Greek loanword in Latin (TLL s.v. delphinus). Whether Accius borrowed the metaphor directly from Homer here (where he perhaps would likely have come across the unusual κεγαθήηηηηη adjective as well) is unknown.
CHAPTER TWO: CICERO’S LINGUISTIC CONTRIBUTIONS TO LATIN THROUGH HIS PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS

‘It is easy to forget how much of the familiar modern accounts of the Hellenistic philosophers is derived from Cicero and no-where else’.  
- A.E Douglas

2.1. Introduction

Cicero is one of the most studied of all Classical authors and it is a testament to him that we owe a large portion of our knowledge of Western philosophy to the academic endeavours captured toward the end of his life in 45-44 B.C. In this chapter it is hoped that the reader may gain an understanding of Cicero’s lexical innovations in translating Greek philosophy into Latin through an analysis of lexical data which I compiled as part of an earlier 2010 study into Cicero’s translations from Greek to Latin. With the results of this data, I expand upon my previous analysis of Cicero’s innovations and discuss the ways in which Cicero formed new Latin words or meanings to convey technical Greek ideas.

Jacob Grimm once said in a eulogy for the great textual critic Karl Lachmann that there exist only two types of philologist: Those who deal with words for the love of things, and those who deal with things for the love of words. Indeed much of the scholarship dedicated to this particular area over the past half-century falls into the former category. This is not a derogatory observation, simply a description of the scholarship that has tended to focus on a broad commentary of Cicero’s translations from Greek and a great deal of speculation as to his motives, with few investigating his linguistic contributions in any philological detail, especially in English.

By ‘philological detail’ is meant the use of modern technology and search functions combined with a type of old-fashioned academic spadework in extracting and compiling individual word-forms and subjecting them to linguistic and even scientific

---

1 Douglas (1962), 42.
2 According to results from L’Annee Philologique over the period 1924-2011, Cicero returned 3979 results, Homer 3880, Plato 7177, and Aristotle 6024.
3 Philology in the 19th century embodied a broader concept of the study of „classical scholarship” generally to include non-linguistic elements as well, see Lloyd-Jones (1982), x.
4 Grimm (1864), 150.
5 Detailed surveys of Cicero’s translations of Greek models in his philosophical works can be sourced from the studies of Hochdanz (1880), Thiaucourt (1885), Saltzmann (1885), Nägelbach (1888), Atzert (1908), Fischer (1914), Liscu (1930), Gaffiot (1934), Humbert (1940), des Places (1942), and McElduff (2013).
analysis. After all, the Germans refer to it as the ‘science of antiquity’ or *Altertumswissenschaft*. This is not say that there have not been significant contributions in this particular field, and scholars such as Jones, Poncelet, Lambardi, Hartung, and Widmann have all provided valuable insights into Cicero’s methods of translation in his philosophical works, many of which form the basis of this investigation.

2.2. Sources
For the purposes of this chapter, Cicero’s philosophical works will form the basis of the analysis. It should not be overlooked however, that Cicero also translated other works such as the poem of Aratus, the *Phaenomena*, and parts of Homer’s *Iliad*. His philosophical works, however, provide a much more substantial (though by no means complete) account of Ciceronian thought and translation. As Douglas noted: ‘we have more first-hand information about the composition of Cicero’s philosophical works than about any other ancient writings of comparable scale and importance’.

2.3. Defining Cicero’s ‘lexical innovation’
The theme of ‘lexical innovation’ throughout this chapter ought to be defined rather precisely. Conceptually, the idea of creating new words to add to the existing vocabulary is self-evident as a definition for lexical innovation yet, as will be seen, it is important to understand that in Cicero’s case he was not simply coining new words from nothing when confronted with a Greek concept. In modern linguistics, studies in the field of word-formation generally focus on various mechanisms of lexical innovation such as affixation, compounding, acronyms, blending, back-formation, and many others. This study does not intend to circumvent the methods developed in modern linguistics in this field and so I adopt, in part, the definition of lexical innovation as one of ‘novelty’ as used by Renouf and Bauer (2000): ‘Our definition is a surface textual one: we identify novelty by deeming a word to be a novel usage when it occurs for the first time...in our chronologically processed data’. To this I add the

---

6 For a survey of Cicero’s poetic translations see Jones (1959), 28-31.
7 *Iliad*, 299-330 in *Div.* 2.63 and others are examined below. See also Jones (1959), 29.
8 Douglas (1965), 135.
9 See generally Sornig (1981), Bauer (1983), Renouf (1984), and Allan (2009), 628f.
concept of semantic or loan shift (also called an ‘extension’) where an existing word is given a novel meaning.\textsuperscript{11}

Studies such as those by Baayen and Neijt (1997), Renouf and Bauer (2000), and Kaunisto (2013) have examined the contexts in which lexical innovation occurs in various systems. Baayen and Neijt discuss the idea of ‘contextual anchoring’.\textsuperscript{12} They cite various instances of Dutch words in -heid (cognate with English -hood) in journalistic contexts and conclude that \textit{hapax legomena} are more likely to require contextual anchoring than higher-frequency words. Similarly Renouf and Bauer list different methods in which neologisms can be introduced into a language, focusing on a corpus of ten years of text in the British newspaper, the \textit{Independent}. They divided these methods into two categories: a) overt or conscious help such as inverted commas, introductory and following phrases, glosses; and b) unconscious help, such as root or base repetition, collocation, lexical signals, and others.\textsuperscript{13} Kaunisto follows similar categories, dividing his data into groups based on affixes such as -\textit{ability}, -\textit{able/-ible}, -\textit{dom}, -\textit{ee-}, -\textit{esque} and others.\textsuperscript{14} In this investigation, I have limited my study of Cicero’s lexical innovation to ‘overt’ or ‘conscious innovation’ as discussed in the methodology below, confined to introductory or following phrases which expressly reference a novel word.\textsuperscript{15}

\textbf{2.4. Cicero as a lexical innovator}

According to two sources, one uncertain, Cicero seems to take an unwelcoming view to the process of ‘manufacturing’ new words. In one fragment from the \textit{Academica}, Cicero apparently has an interlocutor say:

\begin{quote}
Such seem to be all the things that I have thought fit to entitle ‘probable’ or possessed of verisimilitude; if you want to call them by another name I make no objection, for it satisfies me that you have already well grasped my meaning,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{11} See Bowker and Pearson (2002), 214: ‘Neologisms can also be formed in another way, however, by assigning a new meaning to an existing word’; Bussman et al. (1996), s.v. neologism.
\textsuperscript{12} Baayen and Neijt (1997), 569.
\textsuperscript{13} Renouf and Bauer (2000), 232f.
\textsuperscript{14} Kaunisto (2013), 100f.
\textsuperscript{15} Powell (1995), 293: ‘One should not forget the obvious point that Cicero could not resort to the device of inverted commas to show that he was using a word in a new or special sense’, discussed below.
that is, the things to which I assign these names: for the wise man ought not to
be a artisan of vocabulary (vocabulorum opifex) but a researcher into things.\textsuperscript{16}

In the \textit{Tuscalan Disputations}, Cicero refers to Zeno of Citium disparagingly as an
‗ignobilis verborum opifex‘ or ‗obscure artisan of words‘.\textsuperscript{17} These sources suggest
\textit{prima facie} that perhaps Cicero was not inclined towards lexical innovation when
translating Greek philosophical concepts into Latin. In \textit{Fin.} 3.3 however, Cicero says in
the introduction to Brutus: ‘...But the Stoics, as you know, affect a very subtle or rather
crabbed style of argument; and if the Greeks find it so, still more must we, who have
actually to create a new vocabulary, and to invent new terms to convey new ideas‘.\textsuperscript{18}
Cicero intimates that there is an obligation (\textit{parienda}) on Latin authors in the field of
philosophy to come up with new terms.\textsuperscript{19} Cicero stresses that philosophy is the ‘Science
of Life‘ (\textit{ars vitae}) and cannot be discussed in simple language ‘taken at random from
the Forum‘ (\textit{disserens arripere verba de foro non potes}) but, like other technical
disciplines like agriculture, must be explained by new technical terms ‘to denote the
things with which it is occupied‘.\textsuperscript{20}

My \textit{2010 study} of Ciceronian translations of Greek terms focused on instances
of direct translation; that is, where Cicero explicitly acknowledges a Greek technical
term as glosses it in Latin. There are indeed other innovations or words/meanings
appearing for the first time in the Ciceronian corpus but are not explained or
contextualised from a Greek original. These have been omitted from the study but their
number is comparatively few and do not significantly change the results.\textsuperscript{21} On the other
hand, there are many instances of direct translation throughout his treatises and a simple

\begin{footnotes}
\item[16] Fr. 19 from \textit{Augustin. c. Academicos} 2.26; see Rackham (1933), 460: „alia mihi videntur omnia quae
probabilia vel veri similia putavi nominanda; quae tu si alio nomine vis vocare, nihil repugno; satis enim
mihi est te iam bene accepisse quid dicam, id est quibus rebus haec nomina imponam; non enim
vocabulorum opificem sed rerum inquisitorem decet esse sapientem“.
\item[17] \textit{Tusc.} 5. 34. The title of this thesis is a reference to this phrase but in the context of Latin authors who
engaged in similar practices of lexical innovation.
\item[18] „Stoicorum autem non ignoras quam sit subtile vel spinosum potius disserendi genus, idque cum
Graecis, tum magis nobis quibus etiam verba parienda sunt impionendaque nova rebus novis nomina“.
\item[19] Cf. \textit{Orat.} 62.211: „in omnibus hoc fit artibus ut, cum id apellandum sit quod propter rerum
ignorationem ipsarum nullum habuerit ante nomen, necessitas cogat aut novum facere verbum aut a simili
mutuari.“ This notion of „necessity“ to coin new words or meanings is important as it seems to set the
Grundnorm for Cicero in any situation where he was compelled to introduce a new term into Latin.
\item[20] \textit{Fin.} 3.6: „Quin etiam agri cultura, quae abhorret ab omni politiore elegantia, tamen eas res in quibus
versatur nominibus notavit novis. Quo magis hoc philosopho faciendum est; ars est enim philosophia
vitae, de qua disserens arripere verba de foro non potest."
\item[21] See Powell (1995), 291: „In fact, Cicero does not typically use his own inventions without explanation.
Often he explains their meaning, certainly on their first occurrence but sometimes subsequently as well,
with reference to the very Greek words that they are supposed to supersede; or rather, the Greek and Latin
words elucidate each other. The Greek word, the newly created Latin word, and the surrounding context
together act as a three-pronged method of explanation, often in fact very efficient”; cf. Glucker (2012), 40
on the concept of innovations „without birth-pangs“ discussed below.
\end{footnotes}
textual search of the PHI texts is a useful way to isolate examples. The use of linguistic markers as search terms such as ‘Graece’, ‘quasi’, ‘ut dixit’, ‘dicere’, ‘appellemus’ etc. is an efficient way in which such glosses can be conveniently searched for and pinpointed. By 2012 however, Glucker’s article on this exact topic helpfully compiled a collection of ‘GLRs’ or ‘Greek into Latin remarks’ by Cicero, all of which I had previously discussed in the 2010 Study. Glucker divides his study into five sections:

1. The first mention of a Greek term and its translation; 2. Groups of Greek terms and remarks on their translation; 3. Cases where Cicero’s comments require a certain familiarity with Greek; 4. Verbum e verbo expression and others similar to it, used by Cicero in his remarks; and 5. Ad sensum translations, with or without their being explained by Cicero.

Glucker observes generally that there are cases where Cicero translates a Greek term literally, etymologically, or simply by the ‘sense’. In the last case, he further divides terms into categories where Cicero provides an explanation for why a literal translation is inadequate (e.g. morbus and malitia),22 and where he does not (enuntiatio, pronuntiatio, decretum). It was useful to compare the results of my data collected in 2010 with some of the terms discussed by Glucker, however it is obvious that Glucker did not intend his list to be comprehensive or detailed but merely ‘a first step towards more detailed research’ into this area.23 Importantly for observations in this dissertation, Glucker mentioned the concept of Ciceronian innovations ‘without birth-pangs’ as he termed it:

But, unlike some Ciceronian translations, where we have Cicero himself pointing out the Greek terms he translates...we are not ‘present at the birth-pangs’ of [terms such as] probabile and veri simile and are not told by Cicero in an extant work what the Greek original/s is/are.24

These types of translations ‘without birth-pangs’ are absent from the 2010 study and this present discussion. The primary reason why I chose not to examine these types of words is that the methods of the translations (while likely lexical innovations of Cicero’s part) cannot be ascertained from the extant works and so serve little use for an analysis of Ciceronian attitudes and practices regarding lexical innovation generally. In

---

22 Glucker (2012), 54f.
23 Glucker (2012), 57.
24 Glucker (2012), 40.
any case, Glucker’s work is a useful complement to the present discussion for anyone interested in Cicero’s remarks on translations from Greek generally.

Cicero approached the problem of turning Greek thought into Latin expression with various strategies. Hartung and others\(^{25}\) have neatly summarised the options open to Cicero when confronted with Greek concepts. These methods are adapted largely from Cicero’s own stated methods of translation in \textit{Fin}. 3.15. He could:

a) use a Greek term as such;

b) use a Greek loan word in a Latinised form with Latin characters;

c) use Latin words which were exact counterparts of the Greek terms and well known in this sense;

d) use Latin words which were transferred from another area of meaning;\(^{26}\) or

e) form new Latin words.

So, for example, where a Greek might use a prepositional phrase or participle to communicate a complex idea, for Cicero, Latin could still match it if the appropriate vocabulary was introduced. Kaimio suggests that Cicero ‘certainly does not ignore methods a) and b)…but he clearly prefers even e) to a) and b)’.\(^{27}\) Jones comments that: ‘It is clear from Cicero’s practice and statements that distortion of the Latin usage was not permitted, and that consequently word-for-word translation was not thought necessary or desirable’.\(^{28}\) There can be no doubt that Cicero went further than simply providing ‘equivalents’ for Greek ideas. It is true in this sense that Cicero was not particularly interested in catering for the appetites of those well versed in Greek already,\(^{29}\) and where he felt unable to provide a satisfactory equivalent \textit{verbum e verbo} he was able to use Latin phrases to convey the Greek idea.\(^{30}\) This is echoed in his approach to translation generally. As noted by McElduff, Cicero distinguished himself from the practice of literally translating Greek works and thought ‘not only by style of translation, but also by his critical abilities’.\(^{31}\) Cicero states in \textit{Fin}. 1.6 that he is not


\(^{26}\) \textit{Fin}. 1.13: ‘\textit{erit enim notius quale sit pluribus notatum vocabulis idem declarantibus}’.

\(^{27}\) Kaimio (1979), 310.

\(^{28}\) Jones (1959), 27; see also Gellius, 1.10.4: Caesar in \textit{De Analogia}: ‘\textit{ut tamquam scopulum, sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum}’.

\(^{29}\) Although see Glucker (2012), 48f, and 51: ‘I suggest that Cicero’s remarks about the Greek terms he translated into Latin were intended mainly for such erudite readers as Brutus, Balbus and Varro (and, indeed, Atticus himself).’

\(^{30}\) Atzert (1908), 12: ‘\textit{Cicero non verbum ex verbo vertit, sed sententiam exprimit}’; see discussion below under \textit{Hendiadys} for more examples.

\(^{31}\) McElduff, 109.
merely translating literally from Greek but using his own judgment and adding new arrangements of style, and hence ‘should be read’. Cicero expanded and experimented to provide Latin with an arsenal of vocabulary to keep up with and even counter the influence of Greek philosophical terminology. An interesting perspective comes from *de Orat.* where Cicero recounts his experience of translating Greek speeches in Latin of the ‘most eminent orators’:

The result of reading these was that, in rendering into Latin what I had read in Greek, I not only found myself using the best words - and yet quite familiar ones - but also coining by analogy certain words such as would be new to our people, provided only they were appropriate...  

It is difficult to imagine Cicero changing this practice with respect to his philosophical works, although as Glucker noted, his methods of translation were ‘more desultory and far less consistent than those of a modern writer composing, quite consciously, a well-organised and well-planned corpus’. Horsfall noted that it was far easier to write about philosophy in Latin after Cicero had essentially created the vocabulary in which to do it. Lévy is highly laudatory of Cicero’s achievement in expanding Latin’s philosophical vocabulary, labelling it ‘exemplary’. Similarly, Laurand writes that later grammarians were astounded at the terminology of Cicero’s era. In this sense, Cicero was a true pioneer, although he could not have expected his prose works to resonate so far into the future, effectively creating a permanent vernacular not just for Roman but Western philosophy as well. However, the argument that Cicero perhaps had reservations about the extent of his innovation is important. An examination of Cicero’s glosses from Greek sourced from his philosophical treatises, especially specific

---

32 McElduff, 109.
31 1.155: ‘...quibus lectis hoc adsequebar, ut, cum ea, quae legeram Graece, Latine redderem, non solum optimis verbis uterer et tamen usitatis, sed etiam exprimerem quaedam verba imitando, quae nova nostris essent, dum modo essent idonea.”
34 Glucker (2012), 41.
35 Horsfall (1979), 81.
36 Lévy (1992), 106: „Exemplaire aussi par sa précision, par la rigueur apportée au choix des termes. Exemplaire parce que Cicéron n’a pas voulu constituter un jargon qui ne serait que la caricature du grec”.
37 Laurand (1934), 1.30: „À mesure que la langue se modifiait, les expressions employées du temps de Cicéron étonnaient de plus en plus les grammairiens”.
38 Cf. Powell (1995), 290: „Cicero was not to know that Latin would eventually oust Greek as the language of philosophical discourse in the West. Nor was [it]...the “conquest of the abstract”...It was a deliberate assault on cultural territory that had previously been occupied by the Greeks.”
39 See Reiley (1909), 15: „We see the fine conscience of the scholar in his feeling for the right word...the meticulous hesitation of the open-minded Academic in the absolute acceptance of any precise term...[but] when we see the results in the aggregate, his work looks a bit like a glossary rather than an effort to free the Roman reading public from the Greek”.
technical vocabulary, yields a man who is often hesitant, or at least exhibits a pretense to his audience of a writer who preferred conservative and incremental change to Latin’s philosophical vocabulary. Cicero realised that innovation was not restricted to coined or unfamiliar words, but he also had at his disposal existing words which could be imbued with a new meaning altogether. In fact Cicero was not averse to using Greek words which had been naturalised by use, as he states in *Fin.* 3.5: ‘However those words, which by the practice of past generations we use as Latin... though these were able to have been spoken in Latin, since they have been naturalised by use, we may consider them as being our own.’ Yet as Powell commented, Cicero could not simply resort to using inverted commas to demonstrate to the reader that he was using a word in a new sense.

Where Cicero is ‘feeling his way’ for a new Latin word for a Greek term, he gives the impression of being unconvinced of the appropriateness of his final choice and sometimes cycles through multiple terms before deciding on one. This is frequently indicated by linguistic markers such as *quasi,* *ut ita dicam* etc. or the use of the subjunctive mood. An example is *indolentia,* which is equivalent to the Epicurean notion of ἀπνλία ‘freedom from pain’. Cicero never explicitly glosses *indolentia* as his translation of this Greek term but often uses it in conjunction with *voluptas* (ἡδνλή), a well-established Latin word. So he writes: ‘qui res expetendas vel voluptate vel indolentia metiuntur’ and ‘...num propterea idem voluptas est quod, ut ita dicam, indolentia?’ In other places he is more comfortable using hendiadys or circumlocution to describe the Greek concept, all of which might be described using Rener’s ‘doublet’ label such as ‘vacuitas doloris’, ‘liberatione et vacuitate’, ‘dolore detracto’,

---

41 *quamquam ea verba, quibus instituto veterum utimur pro Latinis...quamquam Latine ea dici poterant, tamen, quoniam usu percepita sunt, nostra ducamus*; cf. Cicero’s *Part. Orat.* 5.16 on the difference between „nativa” words and „reperta” ones.  
42 Powell (1995), 293.  
43 Puelma (1980), 155, n 39 states that these linguistic markers also indicate Cicero’s reluctance to use outright innovations: „Ciceros Scheu vor den inusitata bekundet sich in den immer wieder bei neuartigen Lehnuertragungen gebrauchten abschwachenden ut ita dicam, quasi, quidam…”; cf. Blatt (1938), 227 who saw them differently as „périphrases prudentes, par lesquelles les traducteurs jadis introduisaient des expressions nouvelles pour se mettre à l’abri d’une critique malveillante (les *quasi, ut ita dicam* d’un Ciceron)”.  
44 *De Off.* 3.12: „...who measure the desirableness of things by the standard of pleasure or of absence of pain”.  
45 *Fin.* 2.11: „...surely it does not therefore follow that what I may call the negation of pain is the same thing as pleasure?”  
46 Rener (1989), 110.  
47 *Fin.* 4.69.  
48 *Fin.* 1.37.  
49 *Fin.* 1.37.
There are other times when an innovation appears with a phrase seeking permission to validate his choice of word, such as *acervalis* (for *σωρίτης*) in *Div. 2.11*: ‘quem ad modum *soriti* resistas, (quem si necesse sit, Latino verbo liceat acervalem appellare)’.

Despite such hesitation, those learned Romans, both of Cicero’s time and after his death, would pay respect to his linguistic achievements and would at least be able to compare directly his achievements by measuring the implementation of his new philosophical vocabulary against the Greek originals. Plutarch emphatically declared that it was Cicero’s work which accomplished the translation of Greek philosophical dialogues and the appellations of dialecticians and natural philosophers into Latin:

...for he is, so they say, the first person who, for the Romans, referred to by name “appearance” and “agreement” and “suspension” and “grasping”, as well as “atom”, “indivisible”, “void” and contriving partly by metaphors and partly by new and fitting terms to make them intelligible and familiar.

Scholars have had various opinions on the success of Ciceronian innovation and translation. Jones began an analysis of Ciceronian translations in his philosophical treatises in 1959. He concluded that Cicero did not make Latin an adequate medium for abstract thought, and his failure was due to ‘his reverence for his own language which he shrank from defacing and overwhelming with neologisms’. This is almost directly in accord with a large-scale work on Cicero’s translations from Plato by Poncelet two years earlier who concluded that Cicero was limited by Latin’s inherent ‘lack of abstraction’. Poncelet points out that Cicero inherited a philosophical vocabulary from

---

50 Fin. 1.37.
51 Fin. 1.37.
52 Fin. 1.38.
53 See discussion below under *Hendiadys* for further examples.
54 Puelma (1980), 153-4: “Die gebildeten Römer, an die er sich richtete und die seinem Unternehmen der Schaffung einer philosophischen Kunstprosa des Lateinischen skeptisch gegenüberstanden, konnten hier am besten Wort für Wort, Satz um Satz die lateinische Umsetzung am griechischen Original messen und so Ciceros sprachschöpferische Leistung im direkten Vergleich würdigen”.
55 Plutarch, *Lives* (*Cicero*) 40.2: ἐθεῖλο γάξ ἐζ η η λ ὥο θαζ η λ ὁ θαὶ η ηλ θαηάι εςηλ, ἔηη  δὲ ηὴλ ἄη νκνλ, η ὸ ἀκεξέο, η ὸ θελὸλ θαὶ ἄι ι α πνι ι ὰ η ῶλ η νη νύη σ λ ἐμνλνκάζ αο πξῶη νο ἢ κάι η ζ ηα Ῥσ καίνη ο, ηὰ κὲλ κεηα θν ξαῖο, η ὰ δ” νἰθεη όηεζ η λ ἄι ι αη ο γλώξη κα θαὶ πξνζ ήγνξα κεραλεζ άκελνο.
56 Jones (1959), 33; cf. Traglia (1971): „Pochi termini sono rimast, ma ciò non toglie che ... essi rappresentino un tentativo di originale creazione e adattamento linguistico da considerare non solo nella storia del sistema, masoprattutto - nell’individualita letteraria del traduttore.”
57 Poncelet (1957), 375: „Le latin ne transmet pas le sens, mais l’esprit en action“.
his forbears which was poor ‘in both number and quality’.  

58 These views seem to echo the Lucretian notion of the _patrii sermonis egestas_.  

59 However, despite Poncelet’s reservations for Latin as a philosophical language, he failed to consider Cicero’s lexical contributions to Latin, specifically Latin technical vocabulary.  

Cicero’s innovations received mixed reception in posterity. Rener observed that some survived and were incorporated into the thesaurus of the language, ‘while others faded away without a trace’.  

61 His influence on later writers will be more fully evaluated in Chapter Four, however it is the contention of this chapter that Cicero, as a translator, cannot be separated from Cicero as an innovator and pioneer of linguistic change who presided over a significant expansion of Latin language ( _augentem linguam Latinam_ ).  

62 He also began a fundamental conceptual change in Roman thinking through the introduction of Stoic, Academic, Peripatetic and Epicurean doctrines from their Greek predecessors.  

### 2.5. Cicero and the tradition of lexical innovation in Latin  

Up to this point we have concerned ourselves with early Latin poets and their efforts to create Latin versions of distinctively Greek literary traditions such as epic, tragedy, and comedy. For the early poets such as Livius and Naevius, the aim of renovating and translating Greek literary traditions into Latin was partly achieved through novel word-formations and lexical innovation. Commentators like Kaimio argued that Livius’ translations in particular were intended to ‘open up a new genre’ for Roman literature.  

63 Developing these early approaches, Ennius turned to innovation and expansion of Latin morphology and syntax. This experimentation was not done on a whim, but rather Ennius used Greek as the scaffolding upon which he could build Latin’s early poetic diction which would later exert significant influence over Classical Latin literature. For Cicero then, his place in this tradition must have been apparent to him, and he would have been conscious of the relative successes and failures of his predecessors. He did not make a secret of his belief that Latin was the more effective medium for the

---

58 Poncelet (1957), 363: ‘se voit condamné à utiliser au mieux…l’arsenal de moyens pauvres en nombre et en qualité, que lui fournit le latin de ses ancêtres’.  

59 Lucr. 1. 832.  

60 See Powell (1995), 288: ‘Poncelet’s work may have been salutary as an antidote to the perhaps excessive reverence for Ciceronian Latin that used to prevail in educated circles; but his concentration on the mechanics of language [grammatical criticism] to the exclusion of all other considerations makes it impossible to treat his work as more than a provocative contribution to the debate.’  

61 Rener (1989), 105.  

62 Speaking about the need to add the term _moralis_ to Latin in _Fat._ 1: ‘sed decet augentem linguam Latinam...’  

63 Kaimio (1979), 273.
articulation of philosophical ideas, and his opening defense of Latin in *Fin.* 1.4 – 1.10 is a powerful expression of his own motives in translating Greek concepts and innovating new terms in his native language. Even more revealing is the passage in *Fin.* 1.6 where Cicero makes the claim that what he and others are attempting to do is not merely to ‘translate’ but to add their own criticism to the great philosophical texts of Greece. ‘What ground have they,’ he asks, ‘for ranking [the writings of] Greece above those [compositions] that are at once brilliant in style and not mere translations from Greek originals?’ For Cicero, it was ‘astonishing’ that people had said they could not abide the *Medea* of Ennius or the *Antiope* of Pacuvius, but enjoyed the original plays of Euripides: ‘It seems to me,’ he proclaimed, ‘that no one can be sufficiently well read who is ignorant of our native literature’. Cicero goes on to outline to Brutus his mission statement:

...so it is assuredly incumbent on me also to use my best endeavors, with such zeal, enthusiasm and energy as I possess, to promote the advancement of learning among my fellow citizens...it is my business to serve either those who desire to enjoy literature in both languages, or those who, if they have their own, do not feel any great need for theirs [Greek’s].

Like Livius before him, Cicero was a writer seeking to bring the traditions and ideas of the Greeks to Romans but through Latin itself. He also says that he will not object to everyone reading his works, differentiating himself from others such as the satirist Lucilius who claimed that he wrote for the ‘moderately learned’ instead of for great scholars.

2.6. The Greek tradition of lexical innovation in philosophy
An understanding of why and how Cicero introduces novel words and meanings within the Latin language in forging a new philosophical lexicon would be incomplete without

---

64 *Fin.* 1.6: „Quid habent cur Graeca anteponant iis quae et splendide dicta sint neque sint conversa de Graecis?“
65 *Fin.* 1.5: „Mihi quidem nulli satitis eruditi videntur quibus nostra ignota sunt“.
66 *Fin.* 1.10: „...debo profecto, quantuncumque possum, in eo quoque elaborare, ut sint opera, studio, labore meo doctiores cives mei...et iis servire, qui vel utrisque litteris uti velint vel, si suas habent, illas non magnopere desiderent“.
67 See *De Orat.* 2.25.
acknowledging similar processes which had been on-going within the Greek language.\textsuperscript{68} Even more importantly, the challenges of loanwords and borrowing which were ever-present to Cicero, were not major considerations for the Ancient Greek thinkers because the vocabulary of philosophy was, as Kotzia puts it, the ‘historical product of Greek civilisation’.\textsuperscript{69} This meant that neologisms and genuine innovations were dominant linguistic tools amongst early Greek thinkers.

According to Epicurus’ view, the use of innovation and alteration of meanings of pre-existing words was not encouraged: ‘...whereas our own usage does not flout linguistic convention, nor do we alter words with regard to the objects of perception...’\textsuperscript{70} Wigodsky summarises that, for Epicurus, the introduction of new words was permissible for abstract ideas, coined on the basis of analogies with perceptible objects or actions, however ‘when no such analogies offered themselves, he remained content with common usage’.\textsuperscript{71} Similarly, in a commentary on Aristotle’s \textit{Categories}, Dexippus\textsuperscript{72} writes an account of how Greek philosophers arrived at certain terminology and provides an interesting parallel to the discussion of Cicero’s methods above:

There is, then every necessity for philosophers either to employ strange terminology quite distinct from ordinary speech, since they are exponents of matters unknown to the general public, or they must use ordinary speech, and make an extended use of words originally coined for another purpose. For since names are established to be symbols and signs of things, it will necessarily be the case that, for things that are generally familiar, there should already be names established which mean those things, while such things as are the objects of (specialised) knowledge demand the coinage of terms by specialists.\textsuperscript{73}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{68} Cf. Philodemus’ discussion in \textit{On Rhetoric} 4 col. xv 15-18 (Sudhaus (1892), 175, 180) of metaphorical language in the conveyance of philosophical terms in Greek.
\textsuperscript{69} Kotzia (2001), 1089.
\textsuperscript{70} \textit{On Nature} 28 fr. 8 col. v 1-10 in Sedley (1973), 48: νύθ ἔμσ ηδ λ [ε]ἰζηκέλσ λ 1 ἐμασ λ ἡκῶλ.
\textsuperscript{71} Wigodsky (1995), 63; cf. Cicero’’s comments differentiating translation through \textit{verbum e verbo} and translation using existing common terms, i.e. the \textit{consuetudo} usage (Tusc. 3.7).
\textsuperscript{72} A Greek Neoplatonic philosopher who wrote commentaries on both Plato and Aristotle, active around the 4th century A.D.
\textsuperscript{73} Trans. Dillon, 6.10-6.16: ἀλάγθε δὴ πᾶς η νῖο θηινζ όθν η ο ἢ ρξῆζ ζαη  μέλαη ο ι έμεζ η  θαὶ ηῶλ ζ πλήζσ λ ὀλνκάη σ λ ἀπει ι νη ξη σ κέλαη ο, ἐπεὶ γὰξ ζ ύκβνι α θαὶ ζ εκεῖα η ῆλ πξαγκάη σ λ η έζεη ηαη  ηὰ ὀλόκαη α, η νῖο κὲλ πᾶζ η  γλσ ξίκνη ο ἀλάγθε ἦλ ἤδε θεῖζ ζαη  ὀλόκαη α ἃ η αῦηα ζ εκαίλεη, ὅζ α δ” ἐπηζη εκνλη θὰ η ῆλ πξαγκάη σ λ, παξὰ η νῖο ἐπηζηκόδσ λ ἀπηζη ηδ ἐμ ζζ η.
In this discussion, Dexippus mentions the two categories of ‘innovations’ as I have set out above in my definition of the term: ‘Strange words’ (i.e. neologisms) and new meanings in established words (similar to loanshifts). Kotzia makes an important observation in the distinctive approaches of Plato and Aristotle to creating a new philosophical vocabulary when he notes that Plato opted to create his technical terms ‘out of words taken from the standard vocabulary. Aristotle, by contrast, makes equal use of both possibilities’. Dexippus gives an example from Aristotle:

Thus Aristotle too sometimes resorts to strange words [μελνθσλεῖ] in his imposition of terminology, as in the case of his coining of the word ‘entelechy’, while in other instances he transfers words from common usage [συνήθεια] to signify and present the case of the term ‘category’; for whereas κατηγορεῖν is normally used to mean ‘accuse under an indictment (aitia)’, the philosopher has extended the meaning to a simple signification in speech that sometimes is (predicated) of something else.

These examples are paralleled in Cicero, who seems to fall into the Aristotellean category, as discussed below.

2.7. Analysis of Cicero’s lexical innovations in his philosophical works

In the first chapter of this thesis I analysed various early Latin poets and their attitudes to lexical innovation and borrowing in Latin. For Cicero however, the situation is more nuanced due to the prolific nature of his writings and the amount of extant text we have of his. To this end I aimed not only to examine Cicero’s attitudes to lexical innovation but also his specific methods when confronted with a Greek word which needed to be conceptualised and translated into Latin. From my earlier 2010 study, part of that

---

74 Cf. Kotzia (2001), 1092: „There are two possibilities open to the philosopher who wishes to express the concepts of his inquiry. He can coin words himself, or he can use words from the standard vocabulary and give them new meanings”. Loanshifts are discussed in more detail below but in this instance, Greek philosophers were not loaning concepts from another language and imbuing native words with new meanings (as Cicero would do), but rather they were augmenting existing Greek words to encompass brand new concepts and denote new ideas or terms (see the example of θαηεγνξεῖλ in Aristotle, discussed by Dexippus).

75 Kotzia (2001), 1097.

76 Dillon translation modified, 6.16-6.25: νῦν ο νῦλ, έι Ο Αξηε γνξείλ ο ι έμεσ ον ηθη σο δη θαηεγνξείλ ο ηνο ειο δη δαζ ηαι ίαλ πξάγκαη νο κεηα θέξεη , ην άζ θηιόζ νθνο η ηνη ν θεη κέλνπ κεηή λεγθελ ο θηιόζ νθνο η νῦ ἐπὶ ηνῦ θαη ά η η λνο ἁπιῶο ζ εκαίλνλη όο η η  δη ἰη έμεσ ον.
research focused on the compilation of ‘innovations’ in Cicero’s philosophical works which I have included in Data Set A of Appendix VI.\(^{77}\) In this compilation, only instances where Cicero a) directly and explicitly glossed, b) translated, or c) transliterated a Greek word\(^{78}\) in his philosophical works were recorded, the source stated and the meaning in that context displayed with recourse to firstly the TLL where possible, then the OLD in all cases. From that study I concluded that Cicero’s methods of word-formation were consistent with the regular word-formation tendencies of Classical Latin. The substantives in -tio provide a good example.\(^{79}\) Cooper argues that these words fulfilled many verbal functions in both Classical Latin and the sermo plebeius, standing for an infinitive, a gerund, and most frequently in questions, in place of a simple verb, either transitive or intransitive.\(^{80}\) Relevantly, Benveniste cited the semantic opposition between abstract suffixes such as –tio and –tus traced back to Indo-European. Benveniste notes that *-tu- and *-ter- denoted the action of the verb as subjective; that is, as being permanently associated with the subject. The *-ti- and *-or-elements, however, denoted objective action that was not essential to the subject.\(^{81}\)

Cooper notes that Cicero was the first and last classical writer to make an extended use of these -tio substantives,\(^{82}\) although he was not the first writer in Latin to use them so extensively, for instance, he cites 94 instances of -tio substantives in Plautus.\(^{83}\) Paucker noted 1450 uses of the -tio/sio suffix in Latin writers, of which 860 were found in Cicero and Caesar alone.\(^{84}\) Olcott observed that the use of these types of abstracts extended to ‘every department of life and thought...whose neologisms bore their meaning on their face’.\(^{85}\) In terms of the mechanics of word formation, the consonants of the stem and suffix undergo the same changes as in the supine,\(^{86}\) so in Cicero abscessio < *abscedtio or comprehensio < *comprehendtio follows the same patterns as in Plautus incensio < *incendtio etc.\(^{87}\) It is unsurprising therefore to find

---

\(^{77}\) This list has been heavily revised, updated, and augmented for this thesis.

\(^{78}\) This is essentially where Cicero used a loan word from Greek and transliterated it into the language. A full discussion on Cicero’s use of loan-words and their statistical occurrence in his philosophical works compared to his earlier writings and speeches is beyond the scope of this investigation, however Oksala’s study provides a good overview, and I have previously written on Cicero’s specific use of loan-words compared to his lexical innovations in my 2010 study.

\(^{79}\) For discussions of other suffixes, which appear in the list below, in the context of Latin word formation, such as -tor, -sor, -trix, see variously Paucker (1874) and (1884), Nägelbach (1888), Olcott (1898), Bader (1962), Cooper (1895), and Watmough (1995).

\(^{80}\) Cooper (1895), 3.

\(^{81}\) Benveniste (1948), 112; see further, Langslow (2000), 280-281.

\(^{82}\) See also Nägelbach (1888), 222.

\(^{83}\) Cooper (1895) , 3.

\(^{84}\) Paucker (1884), 8; see also Langslow (2000), 279, n 32.

\(^{85}\) Olcott (1898), 3.

\(^{86}\) For more examples, see Arnold (1855), 24f.

\(^{87}\) Plaut. Rud. 508; for more examples see Cooper (1895), 5f.
Cicero exploiting this abstract suffix used by earlier writers, as well as popular within the colloquial vernacular, for his own innovations. In addition to Data Set A was another arrangement: Data Set B which provided a glimpse at similarities between Ciceronian innovations and the processes of Ciceronian word-formation by organising Cicero’s innovations into categories of lexical similarity.\(^{88}\) It is now appropriate to examine what these patterns are and how they fit into the larger scheme of Cicero’s lexical expansion of Latin.

### 2.7.1. Calques, Loanshifts, and Loanblends in Cicero

Linguists define calquing as:

\[\text{Consisting of translating morphologically complex foreign expressions by means of novel combinations of native elements that match the meanings and the structure of the foreign expressions and their component parts.}\] \(^{89}\)

Compounding, as a means of innovation, was not so readily acceptable in Latin as in Greek, as Adams argues, using the example of Cicero’s translation of ἐπιμολογία: ‘Cicero coined *ueriloquium* as what he calls a *verbum ex verbo* rendering of ἐπιμολογία, but he “shrank from” using it because of the *nouitatem verbi non satis apti*…and adopted instead *notatio*’.\(^{90}\) However calques from Greek into Latin are found in Cicero’s philosophical works, note in Data Set B in Appendix VI the -tas suffix for example. Most of those entries which end with this suffix have a corresponding morpheme in the Greek: medietas (from μεσότης) > medius + -tas\(^{91}\) and qualitas (ποιότης) > qualis + -tas. This fits in with the existing Latin tradition of calquing from such authors as Ennius and Plautus. In the former case, by way of example, the word altiuolantum in the Annales is noted as a calque of the Greek ὑπερέηεο.\(^{92}\) In the latter, the word falsidicus could be seen as a calque of ῥειδολόγος.\(^{93}\)

In the compound solivagus ‘solitary’ (translating Plato’s ἐρήμος) we find a poetic compound similar to montivagus (Lucr. 1.404, 2.597, 2.1081; *Tusc.* 5.79), multivagus (Statius, *Theb.* 1.499; Seneca, *Herc.* 533), fluctivagus (Statius, *Theb.* 1.271,

---

\(^{88}\) Both Data Sets A and B can be found in Appendix VI below.

\(^{89}\) Hock and Joseph (1996), 264.

\(^{90}\) Adams (2003a), 460; see Cicero *Top.* 35.

\(^{91}\) For the syncope and raising of vowels for euphony such as anxietas, medietas, pietas, societas etc., see Baldi (2002), 270 and Porter (2002), 92.

\(^{92}\) Fr. 75.

\(^{93}\) See Capt. 671. Also see Adams (2003a), 460 for further examples of pre-Ciceronian calques.
9.305, 9.360, Silv. 2.1.95, 3.1.84), pervagus (Ovid, Ars. 2.18), omnivagus (Cicero, N.D. 2.68), and harenivagus (Lucan 9.941). In the case of multivagus the adjective appears to correspond to the Greek adjective πολυπλανής, and also montivagus with ὀρειπλανής. Here Cicero is translating only ἔρημος which lacks the -πλανής element, so Cicero’s adjective is hardly a calque but rather a poetic augmentation of the Platonic original.  

Haugen and Mithun note the difference between calquing and loanshifts:

A loan translation, also called a calque, consists of a morpheme-by-morpheme translation of a morphologically complex expression from the source language...a loanshift represents a purely semantic transfer, consisting entirely of native material whose meaning has been shifted to encompass an introduced concept.

Loanshifts or ‘semantic shifts’ in Cicero are common and indeed Cicero was far more likely to use a consuetudo or ‘familiar’ Latin word and imbue it with a semantic neologism or novel meaning than to invent one or calque one directly. One example is the noun artifex used to render Plato’s δεκηνπξγόο. The Latin word is not new and Plautus had frequently employed it in the sense of a ‘professional’ or ‘practitioner’ (Cas. 356) but never to mean an actual ‘creator’ or ‘producer’ in Cicero’s theological sense. Such loanshifts are similar to English ones, as Haugen and Mithun give the example of heaven which originally simply meant ‘sky’ in Scandinavian languages but had been imbued with a theological meaning as Christianity became widespread.

Loanblends (also known as vox hibrida) also appear a few times in Cicero. Haugen and Mithun define a loanblend as: ‘...a combination of native and borrowed morphological material, such as English washable, formed from the native root wash and the borrowed suffix -able, which had come into English on loanwords from Latin and French’. In Cicero’s case, a Latin noun loaned from Greek such as architectura...
(rendering ἀρχιτέκτονια) is an expansion of a pre-existing loan word architecton (from ἀρχιτέκτον) ‘master builder’, frequently attested in Plautus (Mil. 3.3.45: Am. prol. 45; Most. 3.2.73; Poen. 5.2.150). However the loanword has been augmented through the native Latin abstracting suffix -tura to shift the meaning towards ‘the art of building’. 98

2.7.2. -ia suffix
This suffix generally forms nouns denoting abstracts derived from adjectives. Cicero uses this suffix on a few occasions generally corresponding to the Greek -ία ending: convenientia (ὅκνινγία) and evidentia (ἐλαξγεία). Cicero derives the term excandescentia from the perfect participle of the durative excandesco ‘to grow hot’ adding -ia to indicate an ‘eruption or flaring up of anger’.

2.7.3. -tio suffix
When we look over the generated categories of lexical entries in Data Set B in Appendix VI, it is no surprise to see the high abundance of verbal abstracts formed via the suffix –tio. The OLD defines the suffix as: ‘Form[ing] verbal substantives to denote the action of the verb (cantio, oratio)’. Cicero’s construction of these verbal substantives, like his nouns in the agency suffix -tor, mainly involved taking the supine form and appending –tio. This is in keeping with the standard Latin word formation that had preceded him. For instance, the word erratio had been coined by Plautus in his Rudens through the same process, erro + -tio. Similarly, Terence had coined delectatio (delecto + -tio) in Hau. 988.

Cicero’s method is illustrated in the innovation anticipatio, ‘a previous notion or preconception’. This word echoes the Lucretian anticipo (5.659) and is built from the elements of anticipo + -tio, a ‘pre-captured-ness’ in the mind, which accurately reflects the translated Greek idea of πρόληψις ‘taking beforehand’, itself an Epicurean innovation. 99 Here Cicero is not merely forming abstractions by appending suffixes; rather, he is working conceptually and his innovations are not limited simply to Latinising Greek morphemes. 100

Under the –tio heading in Data Set B in Appendix VI one can see that 8 of the 23 entries correspond to the Greek suffix: -σι(ζ). Another three entries also correspond

---
98 Another example is machinatio (καραλά) where the loan element (καραλ-) has been combined with the native Latin -tio suffix.
99 See Sedley (1973), 14-15, 34, 58 and 60.
100 For a detailed list of phrases and other devices Cicero employs to transfer Greek concepts into the Latin language see Reiley (1909), 12.
to the -μα suffix (e.g. sumptio > λῆμμα). Goodwin defines them as follows:101 the -σι(ζ) suffix denotes action, and -μα denotes the result of an action, all of which Cicero has decided to represent with –τιο.102 Such examples illustrate the mechanics of Ciceronian innovation and we may conclude that Cicero refrained from introducing arbitrary neologisms ad hoc into the Latin language. Cicero does not ignore the Greek technical meaning either when he transforms his source into its corresponding Latin concept.

2.7.4. Participles

In the interesting case of indissolutus the term takes the form of a past participle, i.e. ‘not dissolved’, but fulfills the function of a negative adjective: ‘not dissolvable, indestructible, etc.’ as if the -τυς ending imitates the -τός ending in Greek, which itself can have a perfect passive meaning but more often indicates capability.103

2.7.5. -bilis suffix

Cicero employs this suffix with verbal adjectives such as comprehendibilis (from καταληπτός). The OLD defines the suffix as ‘formed from vbl. bases to denote ability, either directly or with thematic vowel.’ The main use of this suffix is with verbal adjectives in a passive sense corresponding to the Greek -το-ζ.104 Entries such as indissolubilis (ἄληπτος) and tractibilis (ἁπτός) fall under this category. It is also interesting to note that none of these formations in –bilis are found in Cicero’s rhetorical works.105

2.7.6. -tas suffix

The OLD defines this suffix as ‘usually from adjectives to denote abstracts; occasionally from substantives’. This morpheme seems cognate with the Greek –της, –τητος (qualitative abstracts) from Proto-Indo-European *-teh₂t-. Pike argues that a PIE suffix *-tat- perhaps existed as the precursor to -της, -tas: ‘The individualising and abstracting functions found in [PIE] *-tat- strongly suggest that the suffix is a sort of

101 Goodwin (1879), 186.
102 For further discussion on the -κα suffix in Greek tragedy and comedy see Peppler (1916), and for the -ζηθ suffix see Handley (1953). Peppler (1916), 460, 464 notes that authors such as Euripides and Aeschylus ‘took great liberties with [forms in -κα] and used them in a variety of meanings’ and coinages in -κα were frequent among such authors, as well as for comic effect in Aristophanes, and later became regular in Koine Greek.
103 See Goodwin (1879), 167.
104 See also Widmann (1968), 199 for a wider survey of verbal adjectives in Cicero’s translations.
105 Widmann (1968), 199.
secondary t-stem formation to an abstract in *-<i>teh</i><sub>2</sub>-*<sup>106</sup> Cicero clearly uses the -<i>tas</i> suffix in his innovations, mostly to echo the Greek suffix -<i>ηεο</i>. Entries in Data Set B in Appendix VI such as <i>levitas</i> (λειό<tt>ηεο</tt>) > <i>levis</i> + -<i>tas</i> and <i>medietas</i> (μεσο<tt>ηεο</tt>) > <i>medius</i> + -<i>tas</i> fall into this category.

2.7.7. Hendiadys

An interesting aspect of Cicero’s hesitance in finding an exact Latin term to correspond with a Greek one is found in his use of hendiadys, for instance in Data Set A in Appendix VI under the word ‘adsensio’ one finds Cicero translating: (Luc. 37) ‘De adsensione atque adprobatione, quam Graeci συγκατάθεσιν vocant’. Also for the Stoic <i>τέλος</i>, Cicero proposes (Fin. 1.42) <i>extremum</i> (which is the first time this word is used with this philosophical meaning), as well as other common terms such as <i>ultimum</i>, <i>summum</i> and <i>finis</i>.<sup>107</sup> Rener suggests the notion that Cicero employed the ‘doublet’ at times where he felt in doubt as to conveying an exact <i>verbum e verbo</i> translation.<sup>108</sup> There is a well-known passage in Fin. 3.55 where Cicero seeks to explain the Greek term <i>τελικά</i>:

That division follows, such that some of the good things are “those which pertain to that end” (this I name, what are called <i>τελικά</i>; for let us establish this method, as it pleased, to say with several words what we cannot with one, such that the matter may be understood) however another is “efficiency”, which the Greeks call <i>ποιητικά</i>, and some are both.<sup>109</sup>

Similarly, in the <i>Timaeus</i> translation, Cicero coins the word <i>consumptio</i> yet chooses not to use an outright equivalent to the Greek φθισις: (Tim 18) ‘se ipse (mundus) consumptione et senio alebat sui’, which in the original Greek was: (Tim 33c) αὐτὸ γὰρ

---

<sup>106</sup> Pike (2011), 230; see also Pike (2011), 228: ‘In the individual languages, *-*<i>tāt</i>- continued to evolve. Latin -<i>tās</i> was generalised to -<i>itās</i> (abstracted from its use with thematic bases), which then became one of the more productive abstract-forming suffixes in the language, forming qualitative abstractions to both thematic and athematic adjectives. But the older abstracts that can clearly be identified in Latin show that plain -<i>tās</i> could be used until relatively late in the language...”

<sup>107</sup> Cf. Seneca, Ep. 95.10 using <i>decreta</i>, <i>scita</i>, and <i>placita</i> to translate δόγκαη ἃ.

<sup>108</sup> Rener (1989), 110: ‘As a rule, doublets with semantically different components are found in Cicero whenever he was evidently in doubt as to the exact meaning of the original word in that particular context... There seems to have been an unwritten rule that doubtful cases involving important subject matter were to be left to the reader to resolve, once the translator has given him the alternative expressions”.

<sup>109</sup> Sequitur ilia divisio, ut bonorum alia sint ad illud ultimum pertinentia (sic enim appello, quae ἔπιθα dicitur; nam hoc ipsum instituamus, ut placuit, pluribus verbis dicere quod uno non poterimus, ut res intellegatur), alia autem efficientia, quae Graeci ποιητικά, alia utrumque.
ἑαπηῶ ηξνθὴλ ηὴλ ἑαπηνῦ θζίζηλ παξέρνλ. Here Cicero uses both his coined noun, and another more frequently-used noun (senium) to convey the notion of Plato’s φθίςις. Other examples of hendiadys can be found in his use of ‘praesensio’ to convey ‘μαντικῆ’: (Div. 1.1) ‘quam Graeci appellant μαντικῆν id est praesensionem et scientiam rerum futurarum’. Cicero appears to be feeling his way through translating a Greek concept by using a phrase instead of a verbum ex verbo approach. For example, he translates the Aristotelean notion of συμπάθεια by: ‘qua ex coniunctione naturae et quasi concertu atque consensu, quam σμπάθειαν Graeci appellant’. The phrase ‘coniunctione naturae’ would seem sufficient, yet he displays some hesitation of the accuracy of his translation and thus adds a hendiadys of extra nouns to reinforce the Greek idea to his Latin readers.110

2.8. A Survey of Cicero’s translation techniques in the Timaeus
Cicero’s translation of Plato’s difficult and ‘obscure’ Timaeus111 survives in fragments. Only one fifth is rendered into Latin (27D to 47B of Stephanus’ edition). Unfortunately, it also exhibits two lacunae, one after section 28 (where there is no translation for Plato’s 37c-38c) and one after section 48 (where there is no version of 43B-46A). As Coleman-Norton writes: ‘It must be admitted that the appeal of the Timaeus (whose fifty-two sections extend through sixteen pages of Teubner text) is not great’.112 As Hochdanz explains:

Atque philosophum Romanum Timaeum Platonis non propter placita ipsa transvertendum curavisse, iam ex consilio, quo omnino res philosophicas tractabat, condulcere possemus, etiamsi certos locos, ex quibus sententia Ciceronis de huius dialogi obscuritatis et inconstantia elucet, non haberemus.113

The names of Plato’s original characters and the dialogue format itself have been discarded in Cicero’s version. The existence of a preface similar to other prefaces in Ciceronian works with no reference to Plato is strange. Long suggests that Cicero may have regarded the Timaeus as a work on Pythagoreanism, ‘intending his translation of it

110 Almost as a commentator instead of a translator, see Seele (1995), 35: „Die Übersetzung eines griechischen Begriffes durch eine paraphrasierend - erklärende Wendung, wobei der Übersetzer sich implizit als Kommentator betätigt.“
111 St. Jerome wrote of the Timaeus as an „obscurissimus ... liber ... qui ne Ciceronis quidem aureo ore fit planior” (Comm. in Amos 2.5, 283).
112 Coleman-Norton (1939), 216.
113 Hochdanz (1880), 9.
to be part of a never completed exposition of that philosophy’. Powell argues that the existing prologue seemed to imply that the dialogue was to have been transformed into the mouths of Roman characters: ‘…[A] procedure which was bound to result in considerable incongruity…and seems exceedingly disingenuous besides…’ Powell ultimately concludes that perhaps this is the reason Cicero left the translation incomplete and says: ‘Altogether the Timaeus of Cicero has the air of an abortive effort’. However, this does not preclude Cicero’s Timaeus from becoming a useful tool in this current investigation into his translation methods. Moreover, the surviving Timaeus translation allows the reader to glimpse the attitudes of Cicero at the coal-face when forced to translate the difficult and abstract Greek concepts contained within the metaphysics of Plato’s original dialogue.

There are two main studies of Cicero’s translation of Plato’s Timaeus one by Poncelet (1957) and a later one by Lambardi (1982). Poncelet is harsh on Cicero’s inability to translate accurately Plato’s text and puts this down to the inherent ‘concrete’ nature of Latin compared with the abstract nature of Greek syntactically and semantically. Lambardi disagrees and points out, based on a previous study by Michel, that Cicero’s ‘art’ was to produce a rhetorical, literary work instead of a technical translation teeming with obscure jargon. Disler makes the observation: ‘Surprisingly, rhetorical considerations played a minor role in Cicero’s terminology translation decisions’. As will be discussed at length below, and has been highlighted successfully by Michel and Lambardi, Cicero’s translations were almost entirely based on rhetorical techniques, tricks, and customs which aided in conveying Greek ideas to Latin readers. Most notably, this is seen in his translation of the Timaeus. His rhetorical techniques as well as other specific translation methods are discussed below.

Near the beginning of Cicero’s translation of Plato’s Γέλεζηο chapter (Tim. 28a), there is point where Plato writes: ὅην κὲλ νὖλ ἂλ ὁ δεκηνξγὸο πξὸο ηὸ θαηὰ ηαὐηὰ ἔρνλ βιέπσλ ἀεί (Then, if the demiurge holding his gaze on that which is unchanging).

---

114 Long (1995), 46; see also Giomini (1975), xvi-xvii.
118 Disler (2004), 106; yet cf. 60ff, and 195: „Cicero was first and foremost not a philosopher but an orator. This is reflected in the eloquence of all his writings including his translations. As a true orator Cicero was cognizant of his audience’s preferences and desires”.
119 Michel (1961): „…la conduite de l’argumentation n’est pas la même dans les deux cas : le philosophe cherche avant tout la rigueur de pensee, la correction des syllogismes ; l’orateur, à la logique, préfère souvent la psychologie; il souhaite surtout satisfaire son public, dont il doit combler l’attente et stimuler l’attention…. L’enseignement oratoire de Cicéron cherche à réconcilier l‘éloquence et la philosophie”.

Cicero translates it (Tim. 4) as: ‘Quocirca si is qui aliquod munus efficere molitur eam speciem, quae semper eadem, intuebitur…’ (Wherefore if he who is striving to effect some handiwork, will look closely at that sort, which is always the same...) In Plato the subject here is clearly ὁ δημιουργός but in Cicero at this early stage of the translation, he either has no intention of naming a ‘creator’ or simply has not settled on a term so resorts to the circumlocution: ‘is qui aliquod munus efficere’.

By section 6, Cicero is forced to come up with a Latin equivalent. This corresponds to Plato 28c where he describes the Creator as: τὸν...πουητήν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ...παντὸς which Cicero (avoiding the hendiadys) translates as: ‘quasi parentem huius universitatis’. Just a few lines down Plato writes: πρὸς πότερον τὸν παραδειγμάτων ὁ τεκταινόμενος αὐτὸν ἀπηργάζετο (‘following which model did the archiectect construct it?’) Cicero turns ὁ τεκταινόμενος into fabricator: ‘ille fabricator huius tanti operis utrum sit imitatus exemplar.’ Now one may ask why he decided to innovate a new meaning for fabricator? The word is found elsewhere in Latin yet not with this specific ‘theological’ meaning. He had the option of using well-established terms such as architectus or architecton found earlier in Plautus’ Truc. 3 and Mos. 760 respectively. Cicero had used architectus in his earlier oration S. Rosc. 132 in the sense of ‘deviser’: ‘omnium architectum et machinatorum unum esse Chrysogonum’. Instead he decided to innovate a new meaning. Another opportunity for Cicero comes a few lines further down, Plato at 28a writes: εἰ κὲλ δὴ θαιόο ἐζηηλ ὅ ὁ δημιουργός ἀγαζόο, δῆινλ ὡο πξὸο ηὸ ἀίδηνλ ἔβιεπελ (‘if this cosmos is fair and the demiurge good, it is clear that he looked to the eternal’). Cicero, having avoided finding a Latin equivalent for δημιουργός earlier in the chapter, translates it as: ‘Atqui si pulcher est hic mundus et si probus eius artifex, profecto speciem aeternitatis imitari maluit.’ Now artifex had been used previously by Plautus in the sense of a ‘professional’ or ‘practitioner’ (Cas. 356) but not in the sense of a deistic ‘creator’ or ‘producer’. So forced to come up with multiple names for the same entity of ‘Creator’, Cicero eschewed direct importing from Greek and introduced a new meaning for an already established term.  

In Tim. 13 Cicero comes across the Greek concept of ἀναλογία ‘proportion’ in Plato’s Tim. 31c. In the Platonic dialogue, Timaeus argues that the universe is brought together as one, and self-proportion or analogy (ἀναλογία) is the fairest of bonds

---

120 See Panagl (1986): “Auf diesem Hintergrund einer tastenden Annäherung an das griechische Original ist es gut zu verstehen, dass Cicero den zentralen, beinahe schon zum Terminus geronnenen Begriff des δημιουργοῦ bei Platon im Zuge dieses Übersetzungsfragmentes kontextsensitiv auf fünf verschiedene Arten wiedergibt”.
(δεσμῶν δὲ κάλλιστος) by which to create the unity of the world (31c). Cicero makes an unusual decision here: ‘Id optime adsequitur, quae Graece ἀνάλογία, Latine (audendum est enim, quoniam haec primum a nobis novantur) comparatio pro portione dici potest’. He says that in Greek, the term for the ‘best bond’ is ἀνάλογία however, he goes on to say that the risk must be taken (audendum est) since this is the first time the word comparatio is coined and used with pro portione: ‘haec primum a nobis novantur’.

Cicero says directly to the audience that he is daring to innovate and that while he may be hesitant, the task is one of obligation (note the gerundive). Compare this to a passage in Fin. 3.17 where he says: ‘However, acts of cognition (rerum cognitiones), which it is permitted for us to call them ‘comprehensiones’ or ‘perceptiones’ or - if these words are not pleasing or intelligible - καταλήψεις.’

In Tim. 23, Cicero comes across the Greek notion of the ‘mean’ in Plato. Cicero obviously understood the importance of the term to Platonic cosmological theory and subsequent philosophers like Aristotle as well, and so his hesitancy to introduce a new Latin equivalent is palpable. In the passage, he settles on the phrase ‘bina media’ or ‘two means’ to translate Plato’s: δόστε ἐν ἑκάστῳ διαστήματι δύο εἶναι μεσότητας.

Satisfied with that, he could have moved on without hindrance to the reader, but he goes out of his way to make a point: ‘For I would not dare to say ―medietas‖, which the Greeks call κεζόηεο, but let it be understood as if I had said it thus, for it will be more clear’. When Cicero says he would ‘not dare’ to use the neologism medietas yet he does anyway, we see Cicero the orator at work using one of his favourite techniques known as praeteritio or where ‘the announcement of the intention to leave certain things implies the mentioning of these things’.

Cicero’s overly polite expressions demonstrate that inventing new words and introducing them ad hoc into his translation at this stage of the Timaeus was not just a linguistic concern but an acceptability one as well. What Cicero is doing - like a Shakespearean aside, clarifying the actions of a character on stage during the performance - is gently elucidating these difficult concepts by dropping innovations in his translation qualified with polite language and

---

121 “...quam vel comprehensiones vel perceptiones vel, si haec verba aut minus placent aut minus intelleguntur, θαηαιήςεηο appellemus licet”; cf. also the use of quasi in Tim. 47 introducing a new diminutive form of cuneus ‘wedge’ which makes the introduction of the new term more palatable for his readers „as if/like little pegs/wedges”: „crebris quasi cuneolis illiquefactis unum efficiebant ex omnibus corpus”.

122 Deinde instituit dupla et tripla intervalla explere partis rursus ex toto desecans; quas in intervallis ita locabat ut in singulis essent bina media (vix enim audeo dicere medietates, quas Graeci κεζόηεο appellant, sed quasi ita dixerim intellegatur, erit enim planius)... „Then he began to fill up the double and triple intervals, cutting back portions from the whole; which he placed in the intervals so that in every one there were two means. (For I would not dare to say “medietas”, which the Greeks call κεζόηεο, but let it be understood as if I had said it thus, for it will be more clear).

123 See Lausberg (1960), §882f.
expressions for the benefit of his Latin audience. Cicero admits that μεσότητες can be translated as ‘bina media’ or ‘two middles’ but the word he prefers (although he would not dare force it upon the reader), is actually medietates, because it is ‘more clear’, but this is only his opinion. His translation was by no means a private hobby, a past-time for him which he could amuse himself. The preface, with its conspicuous lack of reference to Plato, combined with the asides to his readers in areas where he is forced to innovate in Latin, give the text a very ‘made-for-public consumption’ feeling. Cicero in his translation could have freely glossed his way through Plato’s dialogue: ‘μεσότητες, i.e. bina media…etc’ but there is a glimpse of a man who perhaps hoped his neologisms would become productive, who hoped there was a chance that the technical abstractions of the Greeks could be understood by a Roman audience through his philosophical and philological interpretation into Latin.

This brings us back to the accuracy of Powell’s comment of Ciceronian translation as a ‘deliberate assault on cultural territory that had previously been occupied by the Greeks’. The observation is affirmed by previous statements by Cicero who proclaimed his mission earlier in book three of Fin. (3.5) saying that: ‘even in the richness and copiousness of our vocabulary, we are not surpassed (vinceremur) by the Greeks’. Yet if he urged his audience ‘to establish this point, not only in our own arts, but in those too which we have derived from them’ then why would Cicero indulge in asides to his readers asking them to excuse his usage of medietas instead of bina media or asking permission to use comprehensiones or perceptiones? The answer might simply be hesitancy, an attitude which undoubtedly saw the need for Latin lexical innovation, yet was not always certain as to how to achieve it. One cannot speculate too much as to Cicero’s psychology in this area and it is nothing but dangerous to try with such a lack of extant material.

At this point, it is appropriate to re-examine Cicero’s methods of translation and Kaimio’s comment that Cicero ‘certainly does not ignore methods a) and b) [using a direct Greek loanword or transliterating it into Latin]…but he clearly prefers even e) [forming a new word] to a) and b)…this reveals the mentality of the pioneer of Latin literature’. On this note, we have come full circle, from the data compiled in this chapter to Kaimio’s above statement, whatever viewpoint one takes on Cicero’s ‘purism’ towards Greek translation into Latin, there is the fundamental notion of this

---

125 See above discussion, also Hartung (1970), 20-23.
126 Kaimio (1979), 310.
man being a pioneer, an innovator, or perhaps the ‘Opifex’\textsuperscript{127} Maximus’ of the Latin language.

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{127} See \textit{Ac.} 2. fr. 11, \textit{Tusc.} 5.34.
\end{flushright}
3.1. Introduction

In a letter to Atticus dated 31 May 45 B.C. from Tusculum, Cicero wrote:

I love a man who takes all learning for his province, and am delighted to find you so enthusiastic about so rarefied a study. But that is you all over. Knowledge is your desire, the only food of the mind. But pray, what bearing has any of this stuff about grave and acute on the sumnum bonum [τέλος]?²

This passage reveals a great deal within a few lines. Firstly, that for Cicero, Titus Pomponius Atticus (112/109 BC – 35/32 BC) was an intellectual partner and equal, a man with whom Cicero could discuss his philhellenism. Atticus’ command of Greek was said to be equivalent to that of a native speaker’s,³ and it should come as no surprise that there is a larger proportion of Greek words in the Att. than the Fam.⁴ Secondly, Cicero was more than comfortable in using technical Greek terms (in this case τέλος) and as we shall see, even inventing Greek words for puns and codes in correspondence with Atticus.

Before examining individual words which appear in Cicero’s letters, I want to focus on two passages in particular, dealing with the Greek concepts of ἐποχή (suspension of judgment) and καθήκον (duty). The first concept is discussed in the oft-cited passage in Att. 13.21.3⁵ where Cicero begins with a summary of his personal affairs and then: ‘nunc ad rem ut redeam’ from which he promptly turns his attention to finding the correct Latin equivalent for ἐποχή. After a long-winded anecdote about an observation he made of rowers on a vessel near his villa, he concludes that the original word ‘sustinere’ was more appropriate than Atticus’ suggested inhibere. He argues:

---

¹ Ἀττ. 12.6.2.
² ἀμο enim πάληα θη ι εηδ ήκνλα teque istam tam tenuem ζεσ ξίαλ tam valde admiratum esse gaudeo. esti tua quidem sunt eius modi omnia. scire enim vis; quo uno animus alitur. sed, queso, quid ex ista acuta et gravi refertur ad η ειό ο…” (Shackelton Bailey’s translation).
³ Nepos, Αττ. 4: sic enim Graece loquebatur, ut Athenis natus uidetur”.
⁴ Baldwin (1992), 2 gives the general figures of over 700 for Att. and around 100 for the Fam. I have used the Perseus under PhiloLogic database and calculated over 1000 unique Greek word forms in the Att. and over 300 in the Fam. which would give the proportions as 6% in the Att. and 1% in the Fam. As will be discussed below, the label „unique word forms” is not a representation of different individual words on the PhiloLogic’s reckoning but computes them based on their varying forms (e.g. adscriberes, adscribis, adscribit, etc.)
⁵ See Palmer (1954), 128-129; Conte (1994), 243-244.
For when ordered *inhibere* the rowers don’t hold up the vessel, they row backward. Now that is a meaning as remote as possible from *epoche*. So please let it be in the book as it was.

Similarly, in *Att.* 16.11.4 (45 B.C.) Cicero discusses the Stoic concept of καθήκον or ‘appropriate behaviour, duty’:

To me there is no doubt that, what the Greeks call καθήκον we call *officium*. Now, why should you doubt this being also applicable to the language of public life? Don’t we speak of the *officium* of consuls, of senate, or of an imperator? It is eminently applicable: if not, suggest some other word.

In a letter the following year, Cicero remarked: ‘As to your question about the title, I have no doubt about *officium* representing καθήκον—unless you have something else to suggest—but the fuller title is *de Officiis*. We do not have Atticus’ thoughts on the matter but it seems that yet again both he and Cicero disagreed on the Latin equivalent for a Greek term. These two examples give us an insight into the careful and deliberate process from which Cicero introduced Greek concepts into Latin.

### 3.2. Cataloguing potential lexical innovation in the *Letters to Atticus*

There has been very little scholarly effort to measure and compile Cicero’s innovations in the Letters. The reason seems to be that the task itself is quite an undertaking and the results can never be certain due to the paucity of pre-Ciceronian Latin, especially prose. Tyrrell and Purser noted this when listing some of the *hapax eiremena* in Cicero’s letters:

There are many in the letters which we may hold to be due to chance, that is, we feel that, had we larger remains from antiquity, we should probably have other

---

6 Shackelton Bailey (1966), 254 prints ἐποήρῃ however as has been suggested to me by Dr Neil O’Sullivan, although the critical apparatus lists the Greek form appearing “commonly” (vulgo) written in the manuscripts, some of them have the form *epoche* which could suggests Cicero perhaps wrote the original in Latin transliteration.

7 *Att.* 13.21.3: „Non enim sustinent sed alio modo remigant. id ab *epoeh* [ἐποήρῃ] remotissimum est. qua re facies ut ita sit in libro quem ad modum fuit” (Shuckburgh (1900) translation).

8 „...mihi non est dubium quin quod Graeci θαζῆθνλ, nos officium. id autem quid dubitas quin etiam in rem publicam praeclare caderet? nonne dicimus consulum officium, senatus officium, imperatoris officium? praeclare convenit; aut da melius” (Shuckburgh (1900) translation).

9 *Att.* 16.11.4: „quod de inscriptione quaeris, non dubito quin θαζῆθνλ officium sit, nisi quid tu aliud; sed inscriptio plenior de officiis” (Shuckburgh (1900) translation).
instances of their employment. It would be uninstructive to supply any list of such words (not elsewhere found in classical Latin)…

They do provide a fair number of such hapax legomena however, and in the paragraphs before, proceed to list many Latin words which they call ‘strange’ which appear for the first time in Cicero’s letters. One cannot help but detect beneath the brisk coverage of this important area of Ciceronian scholarship, that Tyrrell and Purser detected the tip of the iceberg, so to speak, and had neither the time nor the space in their Introduction to enter into a detailed linguistic survey of Cicero’s innovation within the Letters. What is also unavoidable is that Tyrrell and Purser use the words ‘strange’ or ‘curious’ at least six times over the course of but four pages dedicated to this area of unique Ciceronian words in their 132-page-long introduction.

Such uncertainty opens up broader questions such as: How free and familiar did he feel, from a linguistic perspective, with his friends? How much of the sermo plebeius or other non-literary technical registers did Cicero use in his correspondence? And (the overarching theme of this thesis) to what extent did Cicero feel the need or desire to use lexical innovation? In his philosophical works the rules were different; there were Greek concepts which had no Latin counterpart, and for which Cicero’s hand was forced, as it were, to fashion new words or to borrow pre-existing Latin or Greek words. In his correspondence, Cicero had a much greater freedom due to the private nature of his audience and also due to his recipients often being his intellectual peers, and so there was less of a need to clarify or explain new concepts from Greek.

The following data have been extracted from Cicero’s letters to Atticus (Att.) and include potential innovations in Latin (i.e. words which appear for the first time in Latin, or established words with a novel meaning)\textsuperscript{11} and potential colloquialisms which may have been drawn from other registers in the language. The methodology for this list has been quite exhaustive using a two-stage approach: The first was to consult well-known scholarship such as Tyrrell and Purser’s and Shackleton Bailey’s indexes and investigate those words which had been singled-out in those commentaries as ‘unusual’, ‘strange’ or expressly identified as hapaxes or first-time usages. I also consulted older works such as Sanders’ on ‘außergewöhnlich’ or ‘unusual’ words in Cicero’s letters, Font’s dissertation on the use of Greek in Ciceronian vocabulary, and Menna’s work on

\textsuperscript{10} Tyrrell and Purser (1904-1933), 1.89.
\textsuperscript{11} Note here the obvious difference from the data collected from Cicero’s philosophical works which were classified as „innovations” only where a Greek original was explicitly mentioned. This criterion was not possible for the Letters, which makes the data in this respect less definitive as to what is a true „innovation” or simply a colloquialism; see discussion below.
aspects of Ciceronian vocabulary and syntax in the letters, all of which provided useful companions to Tyrrell and Purser and Shackleton Bailey. Sanders’ work is more philological and focuses on explicit instances of words which are either hapaxes or some other uncommon form. Since his monograph does not focus on Ciceronian innovation or ‘coinages’ per se, nor is it immune from some errors, being published in 1902, I have not relied on it to a large extent however it does provide a basis for the second step. I have made extensive use of the online resource of Perseus under PhiloLogic which provided a complete digitised list of Latin and Greek words used in Cicero’s letters (just over 15,000 unique words).

For example, below is a screenshot from the Perseus under PhiloLogic website which lists alphabetically individual words which occur in unique contexts along with word frequencies and total word counts:

"Unique contexts’ are simply unique forms of a word, for example the verb abicere above is the verb itself but there are other forms of its conjugation computed as unique forms (abiciamus, abieci, etc) and their frequencies have been calculated separately. From these data I added words to my catalogue which, after being checked against the corpus in the PHI texts, appeared to have been used by Cicero for the first time chronologically as a (speculated) coinage (bolded and italicised) or for the first time chronologically with a new meaning in the TLL or OLD (simply bolded). There are a few Greek loanwords, which, for the most part, were probably written in the Greek alphabet anyway (hence not technically innovations at all) and I have indicated these with an asterisk (*). This and other limitations will be discussed below. Meaning numbers have been distinguished where multiple meanings are listed in either the TLL

---

12 For example, see discussion below of imaguncula and planguncula.
or OLD. Note where some entries have no meaning presented in the TLL this is due to a lack of a definition given in the TLL itself.

Data Set C – Potential innovations and colloquialisms in Cicero’s Att.

actuaria, n.
TLL: ab actus. Quod facile agit vel agitur...omittitur navis; OLD: A fast passenger vessel having both sails and oars; Att. 5.9.1.

actuariola, n.
TLL: ab acturaria diminutive. Naviculae genus; OLD: Dim. of actuaria; Att. 10.11.4; 16.3.6; 16.6.1.

adprobator, n.
TLL: -oris, m.; OLD: One who approves; Att. 16.7.2.

aemulator, n.
TLL: ab aemulari. 1. Qui aemulatur, qui studiose imitatur, sectator; OLD: One who emulates, an imitator; Att. 2.1.10.

agripeta, n.
TLL: -ae, m. [ab ager et petere Th.]; OLD: One who goes in search of land, a settler; Att. 15.29.3 (Shackleton Bailey 408.3.4). Also found in N.D. 1.72.

anagnostes,* n. (ἀναγνώστης)
TLL: -ae m. Gloss. ἀναγνώστης; OLD: A slave trained to read aloud; Att. 1.12.4.

atriolum, n.
TLL: ab atrium. Deminutive; OLD: A small ante-room; Att. 1.10.3; see also Q. fr. 3.1.2.

aphractus, n. (ἀφράκτος)
TLL: navis aperta; OLD: An undecked or open ship; Att. 5.12.1; 5.13.1; 6.8.4.
avolo, v.
TLL: ab a et volare, gloss. ἀφίππαμαι...cf. impress; OLD, 2: To rush off, flee; Att. 9.10.3.

barbatulus, adj.
TLL: adi. a barbatus deminutive; OLD: Having a small beard; Att. 1.14.5, 1.16.11.

candidatorius, adj.
TLL: ad candidatum pertinens; OLD: Of or belonging to a candidate for office; Att. 1.1.2.

captiuncula, n.
TLL: a captio deminutive; OLD: a legal quirk or snare; Att. 15.4.7.

celeripes, adj.
TLL: adi. [a celer et pes, cf. ταχύπονυς. Th.]; OLD: Swift-footed; Att. 9.7.1.13

cerula, n.
TLL: a cera deminutive; OLD, 1: A red crayon, red pencil; Att. 15.14.4.

circumvectio, n.
TLL: a circumvehi, 2. Res nautica, res mercatoria; OLD, 2: Transport of goods from place to place; Att. 2.16.4.14

classicula, n.
TLL: a classis, deminutive; OLD: A small fleet; Att. 16.2.4.

---

13 Tyrrell and Purser (1944) have a quote from Ribbeck, Trag. inc. 218 (CXX): „rapite agite ruite celeripedes“. The source is the grammarian Censorinus, De musica et de metrica epitoma disciplinarum, Sallman (ed.) line 84: „pyrrichius: rapite, agite, ruite celeripedes“. The author is not given, but Ribbeck suggests it derives from an uncertain fragment of Pacuvius (Ribbeck (1871-1873), 1.310: „cf. Pacuvi inc. fab. IV. coroll. LXVII“, Tyrrell and Purser (1904-1933), 4.142 draw attention to the possible corruption of Και ι η ππίδεο (Callippides), the proverbial „slow-coach“ (Suet. Tib. 38), and compare the word used in Att. 13.12.2. Tyrrell and Purser also raise the possibility that it is a veiled reference to a tragic actor named Callippides. Shackelton-Bailey’s critical apparatus has Z with „celeriter pes“. In any case, it seems here more likely a Ciceronian innovation or pun.

14 There is also the meaning of „circular course, revolution“ which appears for the first time in Tim. 29.
**commissio, n.**
*TLL:* a committere. 1. *i.q. ludorum sim. celebratio; OLD:* The commencement, holding, of games or other contents; *Att.* 15.26.1, 16.5.1.

**commotiuncula, n.**
*TLL:* a commotio deminutive; *OLD:* A mild agitation or upset; *Att.* 12.11.

**concallesco, v.**
*TLL (s.v. concallesco):* a con- et callum vel callere; *OLD (s.v. concallesco):* To become hardened (with practice); (transf.) to become dull or insensitive; *Att.* 4.18.2 (54 B.C.); also found later in *N.D.* (c. 45 B.C.) 3.25.

**consalutatio, n.**
*TLL:* a consalutare. *actus salutandi; OLD:* A greeting; an exchange of greetings; *Att.* 2.18.1.

**consolatorius, adj.**
*TLL:* ad consolandum aptus; *OLD:* Consoling, consolatory; *Att.* 13.20.1; cf. *consolator* in *Fam.* 6.4.3; *Tusc.* 3.73.

**convector, n.**
*TLL:* 1. *a con et vector, i. socius itineris; OLD:* A fellow traveller, a fellow passenger, *Att.* 10.17.1.

**curiositas,**
*TLL:* a curiosus; *OLD:* Excessive eagerness for knowledge, inquisitiveness, curiosity; *Att.* 2.12.2.

**decemscalmus,** [*σκαλμός*] adj.\(^{15}\)
*TLL:* a decem et scalmus; *OLD:* Having ten rowlocks, ten-oared; *Att.* 16.3.6.

---
\(^{15}\) This is only partly a loanword transliterated into Latin but has been classified as such for the purposes of this compilation.
delegatio, n.
*TLL: a delegare. Gloss. ἀποκλήρωσις ἐκταγή; OLD: The assignment to a third party of a creditor’s interest in, or the debtor’s liability for, a debt; Att. 12.3.2.

deliciolae, n.
*TLL: a deliciae diminutive; OLD: A little sweetheart, darling; Att. 1.8.3.

deversoriolum, n.
*TLL: a deversorium diminutive. Traditur etiam di-, cf. deversorium. i.e. hospitiolum; OLD: A (small) place to lodge or stay in; Att. 14.8.1.

devitatio, n.
*TLL: a devitare; OLD: Evasion, avoidance; Att. 16.2.4.

dextella, n.
*TLL: a dextra diminutive; OLD: A (little) right hand; (in quot., trans.); Att. 14.20.5.

dialogus, -os,* n. (διάλογος)

eiectio, n.
*TLL: i.q. actus eiciendi...expulsio, exactio (praecipue e civitate); OLD, a: Expulsion from one’s country, banishment; Att. 2.18.1 (59 B.C.); cf. Cic. De domo sua, 51 (57 B.C.)

---

16 This appears in both Latin and Greek alphabets in the *Att*. The only two times it appears in Greek letters seems to be in reference to Varro’s work entitled δῆμο γγυο (Att. 15.13.3) and by way of a joke (see Shackleton Bailey, (1965-1970), 3.200) at Pompey’s expense: „nos Tarenti quos cum Pompeio διάλογος de re publica habuerimus ad te perscribemus” (5.5.2); cf. „Varro, de quo ad me scribis, includetur in aliquem locum, si modo erit locus. sed nosti genus dialogorum meorum” (4.16.2); „ut etiam atque etiam consideres velim, placeatne tibi mitti ad Varronem quod scirpimus. etsi etiam ad te aliquid pertinet. nam scito te ei dialogo adiunctum esse tertium” (13.14.1); „In Varrone ista causa me non moveret ne viderer θηηέλνμνο (sic enim constitueram neminem includere in dialogos eorum qui viverent)” (13.19.3); „at ego inquam census prius quam proficiscarisis. ita patri quoque morem gesseris. faciam inquit ut censes. hic dialogus sic conclusus est” (13.42.1).
erogatio, n.
TLL: 1a. i.q. sumptus, impensa, impendium: stricto sensu de impensis publicis ex aerario factis; OLD, 1: Requisition for payment (from), hence, expenditure, outlay (of public or private funds); Att. 15.2.4.

extremum, n.
TLL: BbaI. sensu mere temporali, usu vario, Att. 9.9.3, BbaI: in locut. impersonali; OLD, 4b: (usu. pl.) a desperate situation; desperate measures; Att. 11.14.7.

Favoniaster, n.
Shackleton Bailey suggests ‘a bad copy of Favonius’, Att. 12.44.10.

febricula, n.
TLL: a febris diminutive...A. de hominibus; OLD: A slight fever, a fever; Att. 6.9.1.

imaguncula, n.
TLL: ab imago diminutive; OLD: A small image, statuette; Att. 6.1.25.

impetratio, n.
TLL: ab impetra...i.q. adeptio. Expratio. Permissio sim.; OLD: The action of obtaining one’s request; Att. 11.22.1.

impugnatio
TLL: I. i. q. actio impugandi, oppugnandi: A sensu strictiore et corporali, i. q. oppugnatio, obluctatio; OLD: An armed assault; Att. 4.3.3.

inhibitio, n.
TLL: ab inhibere. i.q. actus inhibendi, prohibitio sim.: 1. Technice in re nautica; OLD: (naut.) The action of backing water; Att. 13.21.3.

\[
\begin{align*}
17 & \text{Shackleton Bailey, (1965-1970), 5.335: cf. Antoniaster in the lost pro Vareno (fr. 10, Schoell)’; see also Shackleton Bailey (1960), 60-61.} \\
18 & \text{Sanders (1901), 6; Wharton (1889), 7; Banks (1873), 178, reads planguncula „puppet“ from πια γγώλ.} \\
& \text{< πια ζζα ("plango") but Shackleton Bailey has imaguncula with the critical apparatus reading:} \\
& \text{Victorius: iam gun- W: langun- Ω. Banks (1873), 178 writes: πι αγγώλ, a wax-doll, called by Theocr.} \\
& \text{ii.11, σηγός, and by the Attics, θόξα. It is derived from πι αζζα - planguncula is the term used by Cicero} \\
& \text{Att. [6.1.25], inventa sunt quinque planguncula matronarum.”}
\end{align*}
\]
**ioculator, n.**
*TLL: ab inoculare...i.q. homo iocularis; OLD: A jester, humorist; Att. 4.16.3.*

**laureola, n.**
*TLL: a laurea deminutive...l. i.q. parva laurea vel ramus lauri sc. triumphalis; OLD: A small laurel branch, sprig of bay (esp. as used to announce a victory); (prov.)...i.e. to look for fame where it is most easily found; Att. 5.20.4 (January 51 B.C); see also Fam. 2.10.2 (December 51 B.C.)

**librariolus, n.**
*TLL: a. 1. librarius deminutive. i.q. scriba; OLD: A scribe, copyist; Att. 4.4.6.*

**lintriculus, n.**
*TLL: a linter deminutive. i.q. scapha, linter brevissima (per hyperbolen); OLD: Dim. of linter [a small light boat]; Att. 10.10.5.*

**lucrativus, adj.**
*TLL 1a: vocantur – a quaecumque contingunt postpositis aliis occupationibus, somno sim.; OLD, 2: (leg.) Serving simply to enrich a person, i.e. costing nothing; Att. 7.11.1.*

**membranula, n.**
*TLL: a membrane deminutive; OLD, 2: A piece of parchment; Att. 4.4A.1.19

**memoriola, n.**
*TLL: demin. a memoria. i.q. memoria, μνήμη (in sermone familiari); OLD, 1: The memory; Att. 12.1.2.20

**mercedula, n.**
*TLL: a merces demin...agri locate; OLD, 2: A rent; Att. 13.11.1.*

---

19 Cicero uses the diminutive (s.v.1) again to form a new version of an existing word (*membrana*) which he follows up with: „quos vos Graeci, ut opinor, ζ η ι ι ύβνπο appellatis“.

20 N.B.: There is evidence in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* of this word existing in the vernacular (*CIL VI, 13102, 13188, 33840*). Dating is imprecise, but some estimates of the inscriptions (*CIL VI 13102*) are around 3/4 century A.D (Solin (1982), 752) others estimate the inscription in *CIL VI* as anywhere between the late 1st century B.C. to late 2nd century A.D. (Joshel (1992), 16).
muginor, v.
TLL: a mugio tractum videtur; ad terminationem cf. natinor simil. translate i.q. cunctanter agitare; OLD, 2: To hum and haw, shilly-shally; Att. 16.12.

?muratus, adj.
TLL: (s.v. muro) i. q. muro cingere, firmare [dubious attestation]21 OLD: Surrounded by walls; Att. 4.16.7.

myrothecium,* n. (μυροθήκιον)
TLL: i.q. (parvum) receptaculum unguentorum; OLD: A box of unguent; Att. 2.1.1.

nauseola, n.
TLL: N/A; OLD: A slight attack of sickness; Att. 14.8.2.

negotiolum, n.
TLL: N/A; OLD, a: A little business or affair; Att. 5.13.2, 16.11.8; see also Q.fr. 3.4.6.

nervulus, n.
TLL: N/A; OLD: Energies, vigour; Att. 16.16c.13.

noctuabundus, adj.
TLL: N/A; OLD: Performing, travelling, etc., by night; Att. 12.2.1.22

---

21 TLL states this as dubious and says: „pars codd.; miratos, munitos cett.”; see also critical apparatus in Shackleton Bailey (1965) 2.112: „NRbs: mir- OMdm: munitos E“.
22 Shackleton Bailey has obelised the word in his version. The context of the word is as follows: „Cum complicarem hanc epistulam, noctuabundus ad me venit cum epistula tua tabellarius…” Reid (1898), 130 suggests Cicero wrote noctu vagabundus as a jocular imitation of ἀποθητικήν αγθηνό. The Greek compound is found only in Aeschylus (Ag. 12, 330 and Ch. 524, 751) and carries a similarly middle force, see LSJ Supp. s.v. Shackleton Bailey rejects Reid’s interpretation and says the word itself is „impossible”((1965-1970), 5.308) since there could be no verb noctuare, suggesting nocturnabundus as the answer. Watt (1962), 118-119, also dismisses noctuabundus as impossible and says it is „quite unlike the other neologisms in Cicero’s Letters”. He suggests noctu <cuncta>-bundus (cf. Quadrigarius, Ann. 1, fr. 10b cunctabundus) which qualifies the subject of complicarem (i.e. Cicero himself) instead of the courier (tabellarius). The word is not a verbal derivative and this seems to be Shackleton Bailey’s difficulty with it, yet we do find another conjectural adjective in -bundus (Plaut. Stich. 288) which is not derived from a verb: lixabundus > lixa + -bundus. OLD and TLL suggest it is perhaps derived from the conjecture *lixor. Shackleton Bailey could be correct that noctuabundus is a corruption of another form (e.g. nocturnabundus) yet there is evidence to suggest, in either case, that it could have been a Ciceronian innovation.
obiurgatorius, adj.
TLL: ab obiurgare, cf. obiurgator. i.q. ad obiurgandum pertiens; OLD: Reproachful, censorious, critical; Att. 13.6.3; cf. obiurgator in Agr. 3.11, N.D. 1.5.

obnuntiatio, n.
TLL: ab obnuntiare. i.q. actio obnuntiandi vel res obnuntiata; OLD: The announcement of unfavourable omens; Att. 4.17.4; see also Q. fr. 3.3.2, and Div. 1.29.

pacificatio, n.
TLL: a pacificare. i.q. actio pacificandi; OLD: The making of a peace, settlement; Att. 7.8.4 (50 B.C.), 9.11.2; see also Fam. 10.27.2 (43 B.C.)

pacificator, n.
TLL: a pacificare. i. qui pacem facit, paci servit (apud Cic. Non sine contemptu) 1. Cum gen.; OLD: A peacemaker, pacifier; Att. 1.13.2; 10.1.2. See also Cic. Phil. 12.3: ‘nos pacificatoria legatione implicatos putant’.

pacificus, n.
TLL: a pax et facere, nisi retrograde a pacificare. Legitur singulis locis apud Cic. Att...IA1a de animantibus, adi. De deo, hominibus ipsis, vario usu.; OLD: Making or tending to make peace; Att. 8.12.4.

paginula, n.
TLL: ‘a pagina deminutive. i.q. (parva) pagina, 1. Spectat potius ad spatium...; OLD: A column of writing; Att. 4.8a.2.

pannosus, adj.
TLL: a1. Pannus...1aa usu originario cum respectu vestimentorum (sed v. quae sub b monuimus)...propri...de hominibus, qui pannis induti sunt (sc. respiciuntur pauperes, infimi sim.); OLD: Dressed in rags; consisting of rags, tattered; Att. 4.3.5; cf. CIL IV 4768 (unknown date).

peramice, adv.
TLL: i.q. amicissime; OLD: Very amicably, in a very friendly way; Att. 14.12.2.
perbelle, adv.
TLL: a per et belle. *i.q. bellissime; OLD: Very charmingly; Att. 4.4a.1; see also Fam. 16.18.1.

pereruditus, adj.
TLL: a per et eruditus *i.q. admodum eruditus (per ironiam Cic. Att. ); OLD: Very learned, erudite; Att. 4.15.2.23

perfidelis, adj.
TLL: a per et fidelis. *i.q. valde fidelis; OLD: Entirely trustworthy; Att. 2.19.5.

perincommode, adv.
TLL: *i.q. admodum incommode; OLD: Very unfavourable or disadvantageous; Att. 1.17.2.

perlectio/pellectio, n.
TLL: a per et legere. *de scriptura; OLD: Reading through, perusal; Att. 1.13.1.

perinlustres/perillustres, adj.
TLL: a per et illustris. *i.q. admodum illustris: de homine; OLD: Held in great honour; very noteworthy; Att. 5.20.1.

permansio, n.
TLL: a permanere. *i.q. actus permanendi vel status permanens...1b generatim...cum respectu loci; OLD, 1: Continued residence in a place; Att. 11.18.1.

pernecessarius, adj.
TLL: a per et necessarius. *i.q. admodum necessarius...2a de eis, qua (qui) sunt magnae necessitates...de tempore, cui inest magna necessitas; OLD, 2: (of an occasion) Highly critical; Att. 5.21.1.

23Note Cicero’s phrasing: “...Clodius et homo pereruditus, ut aiunt” which might suggest it was an adjective in use before Cicero.
perodiosus, adj.
*TLL: a per et odiosus...i. q. valde odiosus, per molestus; OLD: Very troublesome or vexatious; Att. 10.17.2; 13.22.4.*

perpauper, adj.
*TLL: a per et pauper. i. q. valde pauper; OLD: Very poor, very hard up; Att. 6.3.5.*

perststudiosus, adj.
*TLL: a per et studiosus. i. q. valde studiosus; OLD: Very devoted or attached (to); Att. 5.20.10 (51 B.C.); see also *Tusc. 5.63 (45. B.C.)*

petiturio, v.
*TLL: a petire. fere i.q. petitionem magistratus cupere; OLD: To be eager to be a candidate for office; Att. 1.14.7, cf. Att. 1.17.11.*

philologia,* n. (φιλολογία)
*TLL: fere i.q. studium litterarum, doctrina, eruditio sim.; OLD: Literary study, the pursuit of learning; Att. 2.17.1 (59 B.C.); cf. Fam. 16.21.4 (44 B.C.)*

piscinarius, adj.
*TLL: a piscina. i.q. ad piscinam pertinens: 2. Pro subst. masc. de eo, qui piscinam possidet nimisque colit...; OLD: Of or belonging to fishponds; (masc. as sb., humorously) a ‘fishpond-fancier’; Att. 1.19.6, 1.20.3.*

plebecula, n.
*TLL: a plebes demin. Fere i.q. plebs villis...1a generatim res piciuntur incolae...urbis Romae; OLD: The populace, mob, common people; Att. 1.16.11, 16.8.2.*

praevideo, v.
*TLL: a praet videre...I. notione praeverbii originaria i. q. antea videre; OLD, b: To realise beforehand, foresee; Att. 6.9.5.*
pragmaticus,* adj. (πραγματικός)

TLL 3a: ‘vario usu: de animantibus, sc. rerum peritis’ (Att.2.20.1), 3ba: ‘de rebus: in universum, sc. respiciuntur quaelibet res, negotia (neutr. pro subst. Cic.), (Att. 14.3.2); OLD, 1: Experienced in affairs, worldly-wise; (Att. 2.20.5), cf. adverbial form in Q. fr. 2.15.2: πραγματικός.24

prensatio, n.

TLL: a prenare. i.q. actio prensandi, sc. eius, qui ambit in magistratu petendo; OLD: The soliciting of support, canvassing; Att. 1.1.1.

prorogatio, v.

TLL 1a: i.q. actio prorogandi...cum respectu temporis...strictius de productione, continuatione...; OLD, 2: Postponement (of a date); Att. 13.43.1.

Pseudocato, n.

TLL: N/A; OLD, An imitation Cato; 1.14.6; cf. Pseudodamasippum in Fam. 7.23.3.

Pulchellus, n.

TLL 2: a pulcher deminutive. i.q. (quadamtenus) pulcher...convicisco: de P. Clodio Pulchro; OLD: (depreciatory or condescending dim. of Pulcher) Pretty; b. (as a contemptuous nickname for P. Clodius Pulcher); Att. 1.16.10 (61 B.C.), 2.1.4, 2.22.1; see also Fam. 7.23.2 (46 B.C.)

refractariolus, adj.

TLL: N/A; OLD: Depreciatory dim. of refractarius ‘concerned with contradicting or rebutting’; Att. 2.1.5.

regusto, v.

TLL: N/A; OLD, b: (fig.) to sample again, have further experience of; Att. 4.19.1, 13.13, 14.3, 13.48.2.

24 Cf. LSJ: s.v πραγματικός, ἅ, ὃ, fit for action or business, businesslike, statesmanlike, later Greek for πραγματικός, ἦς, ἐς, ἀληθικός, Plb. 7.11.2, 7.12.2, al.; pragmatici homines, men of the world, men of affairs, Cic.Att. 2.20.1 wise and prudent men, Vett. Val.17.22; πραγματικός, ἐν πράγματι τοιούτῳ ἀληθικός, Andronic. Rhod. p. 574 M; Adv. πραγματικός Cic.QF 2.14.2”. There are grounds to assert that in two separated instances in his letters to Atticus (14.3.2 and 2.20.1), Cicero borrowed the Greek term πραγματικός and transliterated it into Latin using it in the sense of „suited to practical action“. In other instances, he used the borrowing in the sense of „pleader’s assistant“ which would later become the preferred meaning.
remigatio, n.
TLL: N/A; OLD: The action of rowing; Att. 13.21.3.

restillare, v.
TLL: N/A; OLD: N/A; a conjecture *restillarunt, *hapax according to Shackleton Bailey (see 4.367), Att. 9.7.4.

ripula, n.
TLL: N/A; OLD: Contemptuous dim. of ripa [the shelving margin of a river or sim., a bank]; Att. 15.16a.

ruminatio, (perh. rumitatio), n.
TLL: N/A; OLD, 2: (transf. or fig.): The chewing over (of plans) in the mind; Att. 2.12.11.

sedecula, n.
TLL: N/A; OLD: A little seat; Att. 4.10.1.

semiliber, adj.
TLL: N/A; OLD: Half-free; Att. 13.31.6.

servula, n.
TLL: N/A; OLD (s.v. servola): A (young) female slave, slave-girl; Att. 12.3.4.

subcontumeliose, adv.
TLL: N/A; OLD: In a rather insulting way; Att. 2.7.3.

subdiffido, v.
TLL: N/A; OLD: To have slight misgivings; Att. 15.20.2.

subdoceo, v.
TLL: N/A; OLD: To give supplementary teaching to; Att. 8.4.1.
**submolestus**, adj.
*TLL: N/A; OLD: Rather irritating or annoying; Att. 16.4.4.*

**subinanis**, adj.
*TLL: N/A; OLD: Somewhat empty-headed; Att. 2.17.2.*

**subterranus**, adj.
*TLL: N/A; OLD: 1. Underground, subterranean; Att. 15.26.4.*

**subturpiculus**, adj.
*TLL: N/A; OLD: Involving a hint of dishonour; Att. 4.5.1.*

**Sullaturio**, v.
*TLL: N/A; OLD: To be eager to behave like Sulla (i.e. to imitate his violent methods); Att. 8.3.32, 9.10.8.*

**tocullio**, v. (*perh. from τοκυλλήν*)
*TLL: N/A; OLD: Contemptuous term for a usurer; Att. 2.1.12.*

**tyrannoctonus**, n. (*τυραννοκτόνος*)
*TLL: N/A; OLD: One who kills a tyrant, a tyrannicide; Att. 12.22.1, 14.6.2, 14.15.1, 14.21.3, 16.15.3.*

**tyrotarichos**, n. (*τυροταρίχος*)
*TLL: N/A; OLD: A dish of cheese and salt fish, representative of a plain diet; Att. 4.8.1, 14.16.1.*

**Vestorianus**, adj.
*TLL: N/A; OLD: N/A; Shackleton Bailey suggests ‘of Vestorian notoriety’ relating to his quarrel with Vestorius, Att. 14.14.6.*

---

25 Shackleton Bailey (1965-1970), 1.352 suggests this could be derived from *ηρος* *τιλι*; for further discussion on the -io and -ισλ relationship see also Adams (2013), 569; Adams (2003b), 562; Leumann (1977), 364-365.

26 For transliteration of the Greek cf. Shackleton Bailey, 6.218 and Tyrrell and Purser (1904-1933), 5.257.

27 Cf. Apicius *De re coquinaria*, 4.2.17: „Patellam tyrotaricham ex quocumque salso volueris: coques ex oleo, exossabis. et cerebella cocta, pulpas piscium, iocuscula pullorum, ova dura, caseum mollem exalcutum, haec omnia calefacies in patella. teres piper, ligusticum, origanum, rutae bacam, vinum, mulsum, oelum. patellam ad lentum ignem <pones> ut coquatur. ovis crudis obligabis, adordinabis, cuminum minutum asparges et inferes” (c. 390 – c. 450 A.D.)
There is no doubt that a large proportion of potential Ciceronian ‘innovations’ occurs in his letters to Atticus, but the reality is that the colloquial vocabulary in use at the time must have been used heavily, which would significantly reduce the total number of innovations compiled. This might be surprising, since one might expect Cicero to display more innovation and creativity in the relatively informal and private context in which his communications with Atticus took place. However one reason for the low number of innovations could be that where the mot juste was required, code-switching to Greek could easily ‘fill the gaps’ and innovation as a tool of transforming a Greek concept into Latin was not as necessary (as in, for example, the philosophical treatises).

Similarly, as noted at the outset of this section, Atticus was almost the equivalent of a native Greek speaker in Athens who would easily be able to comprehend Cicero’s dropping Greek puns or slang into his letters. Compare this to his audience in the philosophical works and one finds a completely different set of parameters which forced Cicero to innovate more often and with more care.

So in which circumstances exactly did Cicero resort to using Greek in his letters? As Steele and Adams have pointed out, compounds ‘bulk large’ among such instances and their prominence ‘accords with the greater facility of the Greek in compounding’. This topic will be discussed in detail below, however an interesting corollary of this topic is the circumstances in which Cicero experimented with new forms in Latin. The difference here will be that there are no Greek originals on which to base the innovations, as Cicero is often not so much translating but genuinely inventing for the sake of comedy or some other purpose specifically for Atticus. The data above provide some clues, and from my methodology above I have categorised Cicero’s Latin innovations:

---

29 Adams (2003a), 338; Steele (1900), 391; see also Livy, 27.11.5: „faciliore ad duplicanda verba Graeco sermone”; and Quintilian, Inst. 1.5.70: „res tota magis Graecos decet, nobis minus succedit”.
30 In his survey of word formation in the sermo plebeius, Cooper (1895) constructs his data in a similar fashion under certain suffixes providing examples of Ciceronian use for the first time; his lists has been of
Data Set D:

Diminutives (Asterisks indicate diminutives which have a distinct meaning from their base)

- actuariolum > actuarius + -ulus
- barbatulus > barbatus + -ulus
- captiuncula > captio + -cule
- *cerula > cera + -ula
- classicula > classis + -cule
- commotiuncula > commotio + -cule
- *deliciola > delicia + -ola
- dextella > dextra + -la
- febricula > febris + -cule
- imaguncula > imago + -cule
- laurieola > laurie + -ola
- librariolus > librarius + olus
- lintriculus > linter + -culus
- membranula > mebrana + -ula
- memoriola > memoria + -ola
- mercedula > merces + -ula
- nauseola > nausea + -ola
- negotiolum > negotium + -lum
- nervulus > nervus + -ulus
- paginula > pagina + -ula
- plebecula > plebs + -cule
- Pulchellus > pulcher + -llus
- raudusculum > raudus + -cule
- refractariolus > refractarius + -olus
- ripula > ripa + -ula
- servula > serva + -ola
- subturpicultus > sub- + turpis + culus
- vindemivola > vindemia + -ola
- vulticulus > vultus + -culus

Loanwords

- anagnostes (ἄλαγλωζ ηεο)
- aphractus (ἄθξ αθηνο)
- dialogus (δη άι νγνο)
- myrothecium (κπξνζήθην λ)
- philologia (θηινι νγία)
- philologus (θηιόι νγνο)
- pragmaticus (πξερκαηφόο)
- toccullio (from *η νθπι ισ λ, dim. of *η ὑπι ι νο)
- tyrannoctonus (ηπξαλλνθηόλνο)
- tyrotarichos (*η πξνη άξη ρνο)

Puns/Names/Miscellaneous

- Prae- prefix

Favoniaster > Favonius
Pseudocato > Cato
Pulchellus > P. Clodius Pulcher
Sullaturio > Sulla
decemscalmus (ζ θαι κόο) > decem +

much help when cross-referencing my data, however it is not without significant drawbacks, particularly in his definition of „Vulgar Latin”, see Adams (2013), 528-531, and 578.
### Agency suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Form</th>
<th>Greek Transliteration</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aemulator</td>
<td>aemulor + -tor</td>
<td>agripeta (ἀεμύλος) &gt; ager + petere (cf. θιῆ ξνπρνο)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>candidatorius</td>
<td>candidatus + -torius</td>
<td>θιῆ ξνο + ξεργο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consponsor</td>
<td>con- + spondeo + -tor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consolatorius</td>
<td>consolor + -torius -ius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convector</td>
<td>con- + vego + -tor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ioculator</td>
<td>ioculor + -tor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obiurgatorius</td>
<td>ob- + iurgo + -torius -ius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pacificator</td>
<td>pacifico + -tor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Semi-calques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Form</th>
<th>Greek Transliteration</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aemulator</td>
<td>aemulor + -tor</td>
<td>agripeta (ἀεμύλος) &gt; ager + petere (cf. θιῆ ξνπρνο)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>candidatorius</td>
<td>candidatus + -torius</td>
<td>θιῆ ξνο + ξεργο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consponsor</td>
<td>con- + spondeo + -tor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consolatorius</td>
<td>consolor + -torius -ius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convector</td>
<td>con- + vego + -tor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ioculator</td>
<td>ioculor + -tor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obiurgatorius</td>
<td>ob- + iurgo + -torius -ius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pacificator</td>
<td>pacifico + -tor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Changed part of speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Form</th>
<th>Greek Transliteration</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>muginor</td>
<td>deponent from mugio (active to deponent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muratus</td>
<td>past. part. muro (?participle to verb)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### -tio/-tas suffix and misc. affix/suffix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Form</th>
<th>Greek Transliteration</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abrogatio</td>
<td>abrogo + -tio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumvectio</td>
<td>circum- + vedor + -tio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concallesco</td>
<td>con- + callum/callere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consalutatio</td>
<td>con- + saluto + -tio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curiositas</td>
<td>curiosus + -tas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delegatio</td>
<td>delego + tio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deuitatio</td>
<td>devito + -tio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eiectio</td>
<td>eicio + tio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erogatio</td>
<td>erogo + tio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impugnatio</td>
<td>impugno + tio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inhibitio</td>
<td>inhibere + -tio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### per- prefix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Form</th>
<th>Greek Transliteration</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>peramice</td>
<td>per- + amice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perbelle</td>
<td>per- + belle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pereruditus</td>
<td>per- + eruditus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfidelis</td>
<td>per- + fidelis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perincommode</td>
<td>per- + incommode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfectio</td>
<td>per- + lectio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permansio</td>
<td>per- + mansio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pernecessarius</td>
<td>per- + necessarius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perodiosus</td>
<td>per- + odiosus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perpauper</td>
<td>per- + pauper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

31 Note: There is no recorded evidence in the TLL or OLD of muro existing before muratus.
perinlustris/perillustris > per- + inlustris  perstudiosus > per- + studiosus

**sub- prefix**

subcontumeliose > sub- + contumeliose
subdiffido > sub- + diffido
subdoceo > sub- + doceo
submolestus > sub- + molestus
subinanis > sub- + inanis
subterraneus > sub- + terra + -aneus
subturpiculus > sub- + turpis + culus

From the data, some conclusions can be drawn about Cicero’s innovations and the contexts in which they appeared in the *Att.* Predominantly they were original innovations based on well-known (colloquial) word-formation techniques (e.g. the use of *per-, sub-* and other affixes), or they were direct imports from Greek (which may or may not have been transliterated at all), or they were innovations for jocular purposes or puns to refer to well-known personalities. Albrecht makes the comment generally:

> It is not always possible to tell which of the relevant words were created by Cicero, even if they are first attested in his works. We can be more confident in this regard concerning instantaneous and jocular creations such as *sullaturio, proscripturio, pseudocato, appietas, lentuli-tas, σηστιωδέστερος, facteon.*

Hence we find a significant portion of them as diminutives and pun-names. There are also a large bulk of substantives which have been introduced using common affixes such as *per-, sub-* or *-tio* for effect or emphasis. There is one calque, or rather semicalque, which seems to have been based on a Greek concept regarding land-owners (κληρονομοί) but nothing as detailed as his philosophical works. What we would call the ‘true’ inventions are quite few in number and are built on standard Latin suffixes such as *semiliber* ‘half-free’, or *petiturio* ‘to be eager to be a candidate for office’. One could ask whether or not Atticus was reluctant to coin new words or meanings as well and so led to a relatively small amount reciprocated in Cicero’s letters, or perhaps, as discussed above, where a gap needed to be filled in Latin’s *egestas*, Cicero (and by implication

---

32 Albrecht (2003a), 53; note that the scope of the data above is limited to the *Att.* whereas some of her examples in this quotation are also sourced from the *Fam.*
Atticus) was happy simply to insert a Greek word or phrase. In either case, a conclusion can be drawn that Cicero was much less burdened with an imperative to innovate in the epistles to fill a lacuna in Latin terminology, and whether this translated into a clear lack of desire to innovate as much as in the philosophical texts (where the burden of filling the gaps in Latin was much greater) is debatable and not pertinent in this context.

Many factors contributed to Cicero’s choice to create or *fingere* Latin words to develop Greek concepts in his own tongue (for a native audience). These have been well discussed in this investigation so far. Similarly in the letters, the circumstances of each one, and the choices he made, can only be inferred (by date, recipient, conversation topics, etc.) or hypothesised. The question remains whether he felt as confident to innovate in Greek with Atticus or not. We should acknowledge that there is significantly more Greek papyri evidence available to us today than it was in Rose’s time. For the most part it seems that Cicero was comfortable confining his linguistically adventurous spirit to comedic or punning purposes, or simply for descriptive effect in his letters to Atticus, rather than conveying complex Greek concepts into Latin.

3.3. Innovations or Colloquialisms?

Colloquial language is one other possibility which has not been properly discussed and which has important ramifications for the study of Ciceronian lexical innovations in the letters. The use of spoken Latin in Cicero’s philosophical works cannot be supported to a large extent as the survey above has demonstrated. Largely Cicero worked within very strict parameters when it came to conveying Greek concepts in Latin. The imperative to innovate and coin a new philosophical vocabulary is evidence that, even if there was a stock of spoken Latin to communicate Greek philosophy, Cicero did not decide to use it in his published treatises. However, when it came to his personal correspondence between friends and family, the situation changed and scholars have documented the large amount of potential ‘colloquial’ vernacular in Cicero’s epistles. Cicero himself described his correspondence with Atticus as ‘familiar conversations’. Cicero wrote his friend, the Epicurean Papirius Paetus, saying:

> But, after all, what do you think of my style in letters? Don’t I talk to you in the ‘vulgar tongue’ [*sermo plebeius*]? Why, of course one doesn’t write always

33 See also Cooper (1895), xxxii.
34 See Abbott (1891) and (1911), 40; also Vossler (1954) 56f; Menna (1955) *passim*; Albrecht (2003), 52, n 244.
35 „sermo familiaris“, *Att.* 1.9.1.
in the same style. For what analogy has a letter with a law-suit or at a public meeting? Nay, even as to law-suits, it is not my practice to handle all in the same style. Private causes and such as are of slight importance we plead in simpler language; those that affect a man’s civil existence or reputation, of course, in a more ornate style: but letters it is our custom to compose in the words of everyday life.  

So whilst many of the possibly ‘coined’ forms found in his letters do not appear elsewhere in written Latin, they might have been commonplace in the colloquial registers (e.g. the *sermo plebeius/sermo cotidianus*) and other non-literary technical registers at the time (e.g. architectural jargon). Defining what ‘plebian Latin’ is becomes difficult, as it was the spoken language of the people, not the literary one. It also had multiple variations which were not neatly delineated between one dialect and another. Indeed, Adams remarks that the word ‘colloquialism’ is a term which has been ‘used loosely by classicists’. He defines colloquialism as: ‘a current, and possibly “popular” usage usually excluded from other higher literary genres except to achieve a special effect’. A glance at early authors such as Plautus reveals that he managed to preserve some of the dialect that constituted the *sermo plebeius* and one need only compare the diction between a work such as the *Mostellaria* and Caesar’s *Commentarii de Bello Gallico* to notice the difference. Adams further adds some criteria to his definition:

The identification of a colloquialism...depends largely on its distribution in extant Latin: a usage with a typical ‘colloquial’ distribution in Republican Latin might occur in Plautus, Terence, possibly farce and/or mime, and Cicero’s letters and/or earliest speeches. If it then remains rare in literature but turns up in the Romance languages, it might seem to fit the bill nicely...There are,
however many factors that can determine the restricted distribution of a usage apart from any colloquial quality that it might have.  

Peck describes the *sermo plebeius* as a dialect of Latin which coexisted and eventually widely diverged from Classical Latin, however:

The two are not separate languages, although too often erroneously so termed; nor, on the other hand, is the *sermo plebeius* in any sense either the parent or the offspring of the classic speech. They are rather two kindred dialects, which, while steadily diverging, trace their origin to a common source in the speech of early Rome.

In the case of Cicero’s letters to Atticus, it was definitely a written form of communication and not ‘spoken’ *per se*, however the familiarity led to a very different register from the classical literary Latin that he had employed in his speeches or philosophical works. Hofmann states that, in letters to friends or ‘social equals’ discussing aspects of everyday life, we expect to find the *sermo familiaris* register used heavily.

One area of interest in this regard is the diminutives extensively used by Cicero throughout his correspondence. Hofmann argues that diminutives were a part of colloquial language and intimate conversation. Indeed, given the variety of contexts found within Cicero’s letters, many often jocular and witty, it is not surprising to find linguistic features of the *sermo cotidianus* such as diminutives. Hofmann states that diminutives were always primarily within the conditions of the *sermo cotidianus*, and that as such they often resulted in the vocabulary of the colloquial vernacular ‘teeming’ with ἄπαξ ἔρημενα. Chahoud explains that Hofmann intended to describe ‘not a productive conversational feature, but a tendency of informal language towards

42 Adams *et al* (2005), 7, n 8.
43 Peck (1898), 1448 s.v. *sermo plebeius*; see also Bonnet (1890), 31, n 1; Stolz (1894), 23; and Schwan (1909), 42.
44 Hofmann (1978), ii; cf. Monsuez (1952) and (1953).
45 Hoffmann (1978), 139: “diese affektischen Nuancen sind vor allem der Umgangssprache eigen und haben hier ihren sitz besonders in der kosenden Anrede”; see also Wölfflin (1876), 154.
46 Stinner (1849), 6: „Nomina tum deminutiva maxime esse quotidiani sermonis inter omnes satis constat. Minime mirum igitur, quod remissius illud magna ex parte et iocosum ac ludicrum vel etiam dicax et acerbum genus sermonis, quale Ciceronis permultae epistolae exhibent, hac inprimis verborum quasi festivitate ac varietate distinctum et frequentatum est.”
47 Hofmann (1978), 140: „...immer zunächst innerhalb der affektisch betonten Verhältnisse der Umgangssprache.”
48 Hofmann (1978), 140: „Daher die vielen ἄπαξ ἀξικέλα, von denen die Umgangssprache wimmelt...”
expressive innovation...’ 49 Chahoud makes the important point that ‘imitation of everyday language may result in the invention of word-types associated with everyday language, but belonging to the literariness of the particular text, not to spoken idiom’. 50 This is an important point to know, for it would be naïve to assume that Cicero was writing to Atticus in the same way as he would speak to him in person. Peck notes:

...the sermo plebeius, with its expressive slang phrases and hardy neologisms, became a more and more convenient source to draw upon, so that with each generation a larger proportion of plebeian forms and constructions found their way upward into the cultured speech.

Hakamies also observes Cicero’s fondness for the diminutive and its use to his close friends which may have been a matter of style and attitude as opposed to simply usage of the colloquial vernacular. 51 For instance, if one looks at the nomina personalia suffix -tor in the sermo plebeius, the semantic function of the suffix generally falls into two categories: a) terms of contempt and b) designating followers of the various trades and handicrafts. Cooper remarks: ‘That designations of artisans, etc., should be more frequent in the language of the people than Classic Latin, seems hardly to need an argument’. 52 Cicero seems to deploy the suffix in both senses: derogatory (aemulator, ioculator) 53 and designating a role or agency (convector, consponsor).

However, it is often not helpful to categorise generally such word-forms as ‘diminutives’ because in many cases, some diminutives stand in an unpredictable relation to the meaning of the base. Adams notes that diminutives cannot simply be classified en masse as ‘colloquial’ or ‘vulgar’, as they have sometimes been treated, ‘in discussing diminutives in any text one must begin by considering each example as a special case, before resorting to generalisations’. 54

One example in the context of Cicero is cerula, a noun likely to have been used in the common vernacular as opposed to coined by Cicero. The word cera ‘wax’ (from

49 Chahoud (2010), 63.
50 Chahoud (2010), 64.
51 Hakamies (1951), 46f. Note also that multiple diminutives in the letters are drawn from non-literary technical registers as well, such as the entries classicula, librariolus, lintriculus, lucrativus, and membranula.
52 Cooper (1895), 51.
53 See also „circulator” in the Fam. 10.32.3: TLL: 1. is qui circumcuneundo arte exercet, praestigiator, qui homines circum se colligit... a cum certa notione actionis vel praestigiarum eius; OLD: An itinerant performer or vendor who gathers impromptu groups round him.
which is derived cerula ‘a kind of crayon’), contains a discrete and different meaning from the diminutive form and if it had been a Ciceronian innovation its meaning would likely have been quite unintelligible to Atticus. Thus entries listed above with a substantial and discrete semantic shift after taking their diminutive form are less likely to be ‘innovations’ at all on Cicero’s part and more likely to be colloquialisms.

Another point worth examining is the substantives in the suffix -tio (circumvectio, prensatio, etc). Commentators observe that the verbal derivatives in this category were also formed in plebeian Latin ‘from any and every verb at will’…”55 many of which Cicero used in his letters, early writings, and Philippics from the sermo cotidianus.56

However, whilst the epistolary medium was informal in register and no doubt lent itself to a smattering of vocabulary from the plebeian dialect (especially to his close friends and family), it was not devoid of literary creativity.57 Cicero’s penchant for inventing words was not limited by letter-writing, and as Hall says: ‘in this sermo cotidianus Cicero feels at liberty to coin new words, deploy colloquial expressions and utilise conversational sentence-structures’58. He could be just as innovative in coining a humorous diminutive for Atticus’ benefit as he could if he were writing a poem. Yet as Cooper stresses, we are not in a position to determine in any given case whether a word is a neologism, or a borrowing from the sermo plebeius.59 This is generally true, but I believe many of the novel formations we find in Cicero’s Letters to Atticus were indeed introduced precisely because of the colloquial setting. However, instead of spoken, it was through the medium of letter-writing which allowed him to drop in Greek words and Latin coinages for humorous or hyperbolic effect. This might just be a form of conversation within the sermo plebeius more generally, but even so, it is a particular subcategory of that dialect which is unique to Cicero and which confirms his penchant

---

55 Cooper (1895), xxiv and 3, n 2; see also Goelzer (1884), 24: “Le Latin obéissait déjà inconsciemment à cette loi dont nous voyons les effets dans les langues romanes, où chaque verbe est capable de donner naissance à un nom d’agent”.
56 Cooper (1895), 3; for statistics on Cicero’s use of –tio see Langslow (2000), 279, n 32.
57 Cf. Demetrius Πεξὶ ἑξκελείαιο (On Style, Rhys Roberts’ translation), §227: “In every other form of composition it is possible to discern the writer’s character, but in none so clearly as in the epistolary” (θαὶ ἐξ ἡμικλὲν ἐμ ι ἐμ ἅντε ἐν μί τῷ γνη παλαμνιδετί ἐμ ἦσεν ἡγίστι θυγατρίνην, ἐμ νόθολοδε νῦν κενθίκαν, ὕοι ἐπηζην γη κ ἐμ ῶολοκαίτι θαὶ ἐμ ἀργ γακαμαθείς ἐμ ἰπτο ἀτοὶ.” and §231: “A letter is designed to be the heart’s good wishes in brief; it is the exposition of a simple subject in simple terms” (θηὶς ἐξ ὅλες γας ἐμ Ἰν ξηπελασθή ἐπηζην ἢ θυγατρίνην, ἐμ κεξί ἀτοὶ ἐμ ἀργ καμαθτο ἐμ ἰπτο ἀτοὶ). 58 Hall (2009), 11. 59 Cooper (1895), xxxiv-xxxv.
for lexical innovation. This explains the large number of diminutive as well as compound forms with prefixes such as *per-* and *sub-* in the letters to Atticus.

Cicero often relaxed his form of conversation and frequently used words directly from technical, non-literary registers when discussing everyday matters. This particular passage, from a letter to his brother Quintus, illustrates the point (those words which I assert are borrowings from non-literary vocabulary are italicised):

As to the place in which they say that you write word that a small entrance hall (*atriolum*) is to be built, I liked it better as it is. For I did not think there was space sufficient for an entrance hall (*atriolum*); nor is it usual to have one, except in those buildings which have a larger court; nor could it have bedrooms of that kind attached to it...In the bath I have moved the hot chamber (*assum*) to the other corner of the dressing-room (*apodyterium*), because it was so placed that its steam-pipe (*vaporarium*), from which the heat emanates, was immediately under the bedrooms. A fair-sized (*subgrande*) bedroom and a lofty winter one I admired very much, for they were both spacious and well situated—on the side of the promenade (*ambulatio*) nearest to the bath.

The passage serves as a caution as to just how far one blurs the lines between ‘innovation’ in literary Latin and Cicero simply using vocabulary from a technical register. Many of these words appear for the first time in literary Latin yet could not have been coined by Cicero on the spot, since they refer to objects of everyday life and the motive behind it would be random at best considering the concentration of them in the one paragraph (which would effectively render the passage unintelligible). They read as if a property agent were selling the house to a prospective buyer with a ‘fair-sized’ (*subgrande*) bedroom and a newly installed *vaporarium* (steam-pipe) in the

---

60 Interestingly, note Adams (2007), 205 and Adams (2013), 862 and the discussion of Consentius’ observation “quod uitium plebem Romanam quadam deliciosa nouitatis affection corrumpit” (*GL* 5.392.16-17). It is clear that phonological or lexical innovation in spoken Latin was popular among lower classes, but amongst the educated literary elite, the correspondence between Cicero and Atticus indicates that, in terms of written Latin, innovation was also simultaneously alive and well in that register of the language.

61 *ad Quint. Fr.* 3.1.2: quo loco in porticu te scribere aiunt ut *atriolum* fiat, mihi ut est magis placebat. neque enim satis loci videbatur esse *atriolo* neque fere solet nisi in iis aedificiis fieri in quibus est atrium maius nec habere poterat adiuncta *cubicula* et eius modi membra... *in balneariis assa* in alterum *apodyterium* angulum promovit propter quod quid erant posta ut eorum *vaporarium*, ex quo ignis erumpit, esset subiectum *cubiculis subgrande cubiculum* autem et hibernum alterum valde probavi quod et ampla erant et loco posita *ambulationis* uno latere, eo quo est proximum balneariis.

62 Cooper (1895), 166-167: “...it cannot be too strongly emphasised that the ever increasing number of diminutives is chiefly recruited from the words denoting objects of every-day life and of common interest”; see also Lorenz (1876), 57-64.
assum (sauna). Compare this to the vocabulary later preserved in Petronius’ Satyricon in the Cena Trimalchionis scene (26-78) where a freedman begins talking about everyday activities, using similar terms such as cubiculum, triclinium, and balneum. These types of words form a subject matter that was not typically part of classical ‘literary’ Latin and were used mostly for technical terminology, in this case, about basic architectural descriptions which Cicero happily discussed with his brother.

The conclusion is one of uncertainty but need not affect the data to a large degree. All the evidence suggests is that Cicero undoubtedly drew from the colloquial sermo cotidianus and from technical, non-literary registers to converse with his close friends through his letters. However the evidence also shows us a man who occasionally fashioned new words, and the written environment, combined with the private nature of his audience, provided significant potential for lexical innovation. The question would then lead us to hypothesise about which ‘innovations’ listed in the data above are actually original to Cicero or simply borrowed from the spoken vernacular.

One way of hypothesising might be to examine each entry and place it in context, looking for criteria such as density of so-called ‘plebeian’ or ‘technical’ vocabulary, as I illustrated above in the passage from a letter to Quintus, and to examine whether such a context would lend itself to a comic or hyperbolic tone where a neologism would not seem out of place. In any case, this would be guesswork as to motives, a practice from which, throughout this thesis, I have tried to avoid. It is, however, reasonable to assert that Ciceronian vocabulary in his letters to Atticus contains a mixture of some innovatory word-forms for comic and hyperbolic effect, as well as a large amount sourced from everyday colloquial registers as well as technical non-literary ones.

3.4. Lexical Innovation in Greek in the Letters

A further question which comes out of the preceding survey of Cicero’s lexical innovations in Latin throughout the Letters to Atticus is whether he indulged, to the same extent, in lexical innovation through the medium of the Greek language. Linguistic scholarship in the last two to three decades on Cicero’s use of Greek in his

63 Petronius, Satyr. 41; for the importance of this scene to the preservation of the sermo plebeius see Cooper (1895), xx.
64 With the exceptions of cubiculum (see OLD s.v.) and balnearius (see Adams (2013), 540, 545).
65 See Hine (2005), 221f for a discussion of the „synonym test“: „...the absence of a word from a text is not significant unless some synonym or equivalent is used in the text“.
66 Importantly, the use of technical terms from colloquial Latin by Cicero (such as property and architectural terminology in the example above) does not indicate the usage of a „lower register“ or „plebeian“ character, rather it simply demonstrates another source of vocabulary which is non-literary in subject matter, from which Cicero might have drawn in the more familiar context of his letters.
letters has grown almost entirely in the domain of bilingualism or ‘code-switching’. Earlier European dissertations in the late 19th and early 20th centuries such as Font’s and Sanders’ were brief yet thorough in their examinations of noteworthy Greek and Latin vocabulary in the *Letters*, however very little was elaborated on the matter thereafter.\(^67\) Studies such as Cugusi’s, Jocelyn’s, Wenskus’, Adams’, Dubuisson’s, and Dunkel’s examined the circumstances at which Cicero and others switched between Greek and Latin primarily in personal correspondence between friends and family. As Jocelyn states: ‘The use of Greek asserts a degree of intimacy’.\(^68\) Prominent among these studies is Adams’ discussion of Cicero’s code-switching in his letters where he concludes that the motivation of Cicero’s code-switching centers upon a pretentiousness or ‘showing-off’.\(^69\) The limitations of such a judgment are discussed in detail below, however they provoke further questions. For instance, if the case was that Cicero and others sought to impress each other by switching into Greek, then what type of linguistic registers were they inclined to use? Dubuisson has noted that typically they were higher registers corresponding to their upper-class education often using literary and rhetorical Greek as opposed to the everyday vernacular.\(^70\)

The difficulty with these conclusions becomes clearer after a survey of the actual instances of Greek used by Cicero. There are ample amounts of quotations from Homer and other Greek poets,\(^71\) proverbs and idioms, and such instances seem to confirm Adams’ view that Cicero’s use of Greek was indeed to vaunt his knowledge of the language and literature. However the scenario changes once focus is shifted to those individual Greek words first attested in Cicero’s *Letters*. Indeed, literary Greek features prominently in words which are first attested in Cicero but interestingly, many of the first-attestations also seem to occur in Greek papyri; i.e. in the everyday language of Greece and even later in Egypt. As we will discover, the notion that Cicero’s Greek was simply a highfalutin example of bilingual dabbling does not tell the whole story.\(^72\)

---

\(^67\) We should not ignore the valuable commentaries, many of which touch upon linguistic discussion of Cicero’s Greek, in Tyrrell and Purser and Shackleton Bailey.  
\(^68\) Jocelyn (1999), 187.  
\(^69\) Adams (2003b), 345.  
\(^70\) Dubuisson (1992), 193f.  
\(^71\) e.g. *Fam.* 3.15.  
\(^72\) *Contra* Adams (2003b), 319-320: „But while Cicero uses a good deal of contemporary Greek, that is not the whole story...Many of Cicero’s Greek words consist of philosophical, literary, rhetorical, medical or scientific terms: that is, they are suggestive of high Greek culture and technical disciplines”. This is true, but there is a misrepresentation that Ciceronian code-switching was a form of pretense for the benefit of his readers. There is a good deal of technical vocabulary deployed, but equally we find a substantial amount of Greek attested in papyri which militates against the argument that Cicero preferred to confine himself to higher registers of Greek.
This survey seeks to examine ‘innovation’ in Cicero’s use of Greek throughout the *Att.* and the *Fam.*. The data used in this analysis are primarily based on those compiled by Rose (1921) yet have been substantially updated. Rose’s list contained numerous errors and was compiled before the publication of the ninth edition of LSJ and so the limitations were extensive. Nevertheless, the list has proved useful as a basis for this section of the thesis and Rose’s figures of roughly 44 Greek words which appear only in Cicero’s letters, and 68 which appear for the first time in his letters, needs to be reassessed. Therefore, the scope of this analysis is smaller with a selective discussion of some individual Greek terms which serve to highlight the trends of Ciceronian innovation in Greek throughout the letters, as opposed to an exhaustive survey of every potential Ciceronian innovation in Greek.

An innovation here, as has been defined in Chapters One and Two, is a new word or new meaning of an existing word first-attested in Cicero and not evidenced elsewhere as an existing use (neologisms, loanshifts, loanblends, and borrowings). In the context of this study, ‘common use’ refers to either a usage in contemporary or later Greek authors or a usage within the Greek everyday vernacular or Koine Greek (*Kοινὴ διάλεκτος*). The only potential evidence we have of this type of usage is the papyri and various later texts (up to and including such works as the *New Testament* or the *LXX*).

The lack of sufficient extant papyri to give us a detailed vocabulary of vernacular Greek is clearly one the major shortfalls of this study. It is my view, however, that since such a study has not yet been properly carried out on this subject, especially one relying on papyrological evidence as well as literary Greek evidence, the endeavour will be a useful contribution to this area of Ciceronian scholarship.

### 3.4.1. Methods

Using various methods, detailed below, I analysed Cicero’s Greek words in the same manner as his Latin innovations above, using the *Perseus Project Texts* under

---

73 *Epistulae ad Atticum, ad Familiaria, ad Quintum fratrem*, and *ad Brutum.*
74 As an illustration, the term ἀδη αθν ξία appears in Rose’s list as a word appearing only in Cicero’s letters, which is incorrect due to evidence of it in fragments from Aristo the Stoic (*Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, 1.83) and Chrysippus (*Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, 3.9); there are also some Greek entries which are misspelled such as Σεζ ηη σ δέζ η εξνλ for Σεζ ηη σ δέζ η εξνλ.
75 For detailed discussion in this area, particularly orthography issues with the Greek in Cicero’s letters, I would highlight an upcoming project by my supervisor Dr Neil O’Sullivan examining particular Greek words and their textual interpretations.
76 For a historical survey of *Koine* Greek in the „continuum“ of the Greek language see Lee (1985), 8-9, Browning (1983), 27-57; Kaspomenos (1958), 305ff; for a useful discussion on the distinction (or lack thereof) between Atticistic Greek and *Koine* see Horsley (1989), 41ff and Frösén (1974), 10-11, I will be following Horsley’s dates attributed to *Koine* as dating „from roughly IV BC through to the fifth century [A.D.].“ (Horsley (1989), 41).
77 Including some ostraka, see s.v. ἰ ῳπηζγο in Appendix I.
PhiloLogic database (Perseus under PhiloLogic) and investigated the extent to which Greek forms which appeared for the first time in Cicero’s letters (or appeared as hapaxes) were able to be classified as innovations on Cicero’s part, or perhaps were part of the Greek vernacular of the time: Koine Greek. A form of data collection for this survey involves a collation of first-attested Greek words or meanings in Cicero, mostly drawn from previous scholarship in the works of Rose and Steele. In Rose’s study of Cicero’s Greek, he uses the notation ‘C’ for a word found only in Cicero (i.e. a hapax), and ‘C₁’ for a word which occurs for the first time in his works. Both of these types have been included in the collected data but not necessarily adjudicated as an innovation. These first-attested forms are then pinpoint-referenced and defined from LSJ, DGE, Lampe, and LBG where necessary, with attestations from the papyri or literary Greek supplied where possible. LSJ lists some attestations in papyri, however with recent online developments in the field of papyrological study I have found it expedient to turn to digital databases of non-literary Greek such as the Duke Databank of Documentary Papyri, the Heidelberger Gesamtverzeichnis der griechischen Papyrusurkunden Ägyptens, and Trismegistos.

The results of this survey will aim to show that the Greek spoken by Cicero was, from the evidence before us, of a high quality and that he had knowledge of literary Greek as well as the spoken vernacular. In support of this point, Rose reminds us that Cicero commonly wrote, spoke, and disputed in Greek, had Greek correspondents, had lived for years in Greece, was the close friend of Greeks, and of the ‘largely Hellenised Atticus’. There is also this fact which is important to bear in mind: if one examines Rose’s compilation, for example, there is a realisation that many of the first attestations of Cicero’s resurface in abundance among later Greek authors. There is only one explanation for this; namely that those words which appear in Cicero’s letters, and resurfaced centuries later, are not the result of those later authors reading Cicero’s correspondence and reproducing those unique words, but far more likely, they simply drew those words (as Cicero must have done) from the Κοινὴ διάλεκτος. Finally, the conclusion of this section demonstrates that Ciceronian originality and ‘innovation’ in

---

78 Rose (1921), 92.
79 http://papyri.info
80 http://www.rzuser.uni-heidelberg.de/~gv0/gvz.html
81 http://www.trismegistos.org/
82 Rose (1921), 92.
83 Cf Steele (1900), 405: “A few words used by Diodorus and Strabo have been given as used first by Cicero, though the words must have been part of the current vocabulary”.
Greek throughout the letters was not extensive, being confined mainly to humour and encoded language.

3.4.2. Previous studies

Steele’s *obiter dicta* from his 1900 article give us a framework on which to begin this investigation:

…[W]e may safely assume that there is little or no originality in the Greek of the Epistles, excepting, perhaps where Cicero has formed punning Greek adjectives and nouns from the names of men.  

Over twenty years later, Rose was inclined to a similar view: ‘A very large percentage of [the Greek in Cicero’s letters] is Hellenistic...for that he should coin them is most unlikely…’  

Seventy years later, Baldwin’s article offered to recast the ‘raw statistics of Steele and Rose into more human and individual terms’. He also offered to tackle ‘bigger issues’ such as questioning Steele’s observation about originality, whether Cicero used Greek ‘merely to show off their command of that tongue’, and ‘to what extent was their impulse *patrii sermonis egestas*’.  

Unfortunately Baldwin’s study is limited to speculation about Cicero’s relationship with various correspondents and his conclusions provide no closure to the issues he raised in his introduction:

The above enquiry has provided statistics and offered suggestions, if not always conclusions…At all events, one is left with the feeling that Cicero was not the only Roman who would have agreed with Samuel Johnson: ‘Greek, Sir, is like lace; every man gets as much of it as he can’.

As amusing as this denouement might be, it leaves us none the wiser as to the originality of Cicero’s Greek. At best, Baldwin’s article gives us an insight into the Greek interactions between Cicero and his friends and family, but it does not speak to Ciceronian innovation. The task from here, therefore, is to take up those ‘bigger issues’

---

84 Steele (1900), 391.
85 Rose (1921), 115.
86 Baldwin (1992), 1.
87 See conclusion for the discussion of Adams” views which are of a similar nature.
88 Baldwin (1992), 1.
Baldwin has raised and question the observations of Steele and Rose. As Adams remarked in 2003:

In my opinion there is scope for a detailed study of the element of *koine* in Cicero’s Greek. Too often it is merely asserted to be an important component, without detailed discussion and definition, and without a statistical account of its place in relation to more literary or technical terminology.\(^{90}\)

This survey will hopefully address some of those concerns as well. The process will involve a look at the extant Greek papyri and to develop a theory as to where exactly in his letters Cicero would innovate in Greek.

### 3.4.3. Puns, Humour, and Insults

This particular area of Greek usage in Cicero is fertile ground for discovering Cicero’s originality. Quite apart from other contexts, Cicero’s innovations for the purpose of puns or humour form the largest body of innovations in his *Letters*. Below are Greek words in Cicero’s letters which fulfill this description:

\[\text{ἀδικαίαργος\text{, LSJ: } n. ‘unjust ruler’; DGE: n. ‘unfair boss, pun on of Dicaearchus’; 2.12.}\^{91}\]

\[\text{ἀκύθηρος\text{, LSJ: adj. ‘charmless, banausic’; DGE: ‘graceless, charmless’; Fam. 7.32.2 (an }\alpha\text{-privative compound modeled on }\text{ἀναφρόδιτος).}\^{92}\]

---

\(^{90}\) Adams (2003b), 322, n 52.

\(^{91}\) All references to the *Att.* are simply noted with numbers only.

\(^{92}\) LSJ note Κυθεραία or Cythereia is the surname of Aphrodite, based on Κυθερία which is a city in Crete. However Steele (1900), 405 notes that the word as used by Cicero in the letter to Volumnius Eutrapelus might well be a derogatory pun involving his freedwoman and well-known *Mima* called Volumnia Cytheris (also known as Lycoris). This is supported by the fact that Cicero mentions his penchant for puns and *double entendres* in the same paragraph. Cicero’s distaste for Cytheris and her relationship with Mark Antony later becomes evident in *Att.* 10.10.5 and 10.16.5. Another possible argument to support Steele here (albeit tenuous) is that, in his letter to Eutrapelus, he refers to a section of his *de Orat.*, in which Caesar Strabo discusses forms of jokes, but erroneously attributes the section instead to Marcus Antonius Orator (the grandfather of Mark Antony). If this was indeed a subtle hint or reminder to Eutrapelus of Cytheris’ scandalous social behaviour, this would assume that Cicero had knowledge of Mark Antony and Cytheris’ relationship around 50 B.C. which is debatable (Traina (2001), 91, argues based on *Att.* 10.10.5, that Mark Antony and Cytheris became involved c. 49 B.C.) In any case the neologism is odd and seems to carry additional innuendo in its context.
'Αππιάς; 'Αππιάδα,\textsuperscript{93} LSJ: n. ‘acc. of Appias (’Αππιάς), guardian of the city’; 
\textit{Fam.} 3.1 (a pun on Polias ‘guardian of the city’ which was a cult title of Athene and the name of the recipient of the letter, Appius, governor of Cilicia).

Πεντέλοιπος, LSJ: n. ‘remaining out of five, last of five’, 14.21.3, 15.2.4 (a sobriquet referring to Aulus Hirtius), however see discussion below.

φαλαρισμός, LSJ: n. ‘tyranny, like that of Phalaris’, 7.12.2, cf. 7.12.2 (characterising Caesar’s rule).\textsuperscript{94}

Σηστιωδέστερος, LSJ: adj. ‘Sestian’, 7.17.2 (a pun on the name of Roman Senator Publius Sestius).

τρισαρεοπαγίτης, LSJ: n. ‘an Areopagite thrice over, i.e. stern and rigid judges’, 4.15.4 (an ironic term referring to the judges who tried Sufenas, Cato and Procilius for matters relating to electoral fraud which benefitted Pompey and Crassus).

υπεραττικός, LSJ: adj., ‘excessively Attic’, 15.1A.2 (a pun on Atticus’ surname, also referencing the ‘Atticizing’ style of oratory both men admired).\textsuperscript{95} 
The word and an adverbial form of it appear later in Lucian.\textsuperscript{96}

It would be safe to conclude that most of these are genuine Ciceronian innovations for the sake of humour or derision.\textsuperscript{97} Those of Cicero’s correspondents who came across his innovations would no doubt have reacted with a smile as opposed to feeling nonplussed since they would have been acquainted with the person being subjected to the pun. However even Steele is reticent to give Cicero any credit here:

\textsuperscript{93} This reading is a conjecture by Shackleton Bailey; see Shackleton Bailey (1977), 1. 360-361.
\textsuperscript{94} Cf. \textit{Off.} 2.26.
\textsuperscript{95} Shackleton Bailey (1970), 6.378.
\textsuperscript{96} \textit{Lexiphanes}, 25: ὃν θαλαμήσαντα κατηγορηθη, \textit{Demonax}, 26: ἃλλα γνώλ. ἐξετρέφαζ̄κατ’ αὐτῷ ὑπεξάηη· ἀρα οὖν γνωλ. ἐξαμελεῖται ἠμαθώς ἀπέκτησεν.
\textsuperscript{97} Cicero’s penchant for pillorying his adversaries was not limited to his speeches.
Cicero seems to have made a few puns on the names of some of his friends...yet there were other punsters then, and it must be borne in mind that the Epistles give us about all that is left of such language in Cicero’s day.  

To be sure, this is a real possibility especially with entries such as φαλαρησμός (which probably originated from Atticus), however entries above such as 'Αππάς, Σησπωδέστερος, and ύπεραττικός can be eliminated as not being punned by somebody else due to the very intimate and personal nature of the contexts (the first referring to Cicero’s recipient Appias, the second referring to a Roman politician with whom Cicero was well acquainted, and the third specifically punning on Atticus’ name). Others such as τρισαρεσσατίας and άκόθηρος also seem to have been innovated by Cicero entirely for the occasion.

The ironic compound τρισαρεσσατίας seems to be a Ciceronian invention, but similar formations are evidenced elsewhere. Among the papyri, it was a frequent occurrence to use the double comparative τρισ- + adjective ‘more -er’, especially when referring to Gods or similarly important figures. So we find τρισμέγειτος ‘more greater’ i.e. ‘thrice-great’ in reference to the Egyptian God Thoth. In this case, the noun Ἀρεσσατίας is used in a descriptive sense to mean very ‘stern’ or ‘serious’, which seemed to be a colloquial meaning. In an earlier letter to Atticus, Cicero describes the Senate as being like the Ἄρειος πάγος: ‘Nothing is firmer, more severe, or more powerful’. The tone in the compound τρισαρεσσατίας is ironic, and Cicero sarcastically remarks that those judges who tried Sufenas, Cato, and Procilius (and who acquitted all but the latter) were ‘thrice’ as strict as the ‘Areopagite judges’ in Athens.

### 3.4.4. Encoding

Another area where one finds Cicero innovating Greek words or meanings is in the area of veiled language or ‘encoding’. There has been much scholarship on Cicero’s use of
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98 Steele (1900), 405.
100 Gignac (1981), 2.158; this practice existed in Classical Greek as well but Gignac notes it was a more common practice in the Greek of the papyri.
101 „Thrice-greatest”, title of the Egyptian Hermes (Thoth), CP Herm. 125ii, 8; OGI 716; Ph. Bybl. ap. Eus. PE 1.10; Corp. Herm. passim; (The Egyptian title is translated κέγη ζ η νο θαὶ κ. θαὶ k. in Wilcken Chr. 109.6); see also Gignac (1981), 2.158 for more examples.
102 1.14.5: „Romanae autem se res sic habent. senatus Ἀξενπαγίηεο; nihil constantius, nihil severius, nihil fortius”.

---
Greek as a form of protecting sensitive information, usually of a political nature. As Adams points out: ‘There was a concern about the security of letters in antiquity, in the absence of a formal postal system, and here Cicero expresses his fear that letters may betray him’. As Cicero wrote to Atticus:

About politics I will write briefly to you: for I am now afraid lest the very paper should betray me. Accordingly, in future, if I have anything more to write to you, I shall clothe it in covert language.

The examples scholars list of this ἀιιεγνξία or ‘covert language’ include pseudonyms and the use of literary language to veil the meaning from the carrier of the letter. As Font notes:

De quibus plurimis vocabulis graecis discernenda videntur ea quae non ex vulgari aut ex communi usu exhauriuntur, sed ex poetis epicis lyricisve ita excerpta sunt, ut is qui Graiorum tantummodo familiarem sermonem didicerit neque idem litteris graecis sit imbutus, eorum vim neque odoretur: δάκαξνο, μπλαόξνπ, ζακά, ἀιύσλ, ἑπηάινθνο.

It should be no surprise then that some apparent innovations occur in those passages where Cicero is deliberately being obscure. So in Att. 6.4.3 Cicero is writing about Philotimus, his wife’s freedman who may have been in charge of dispatching the letter. He says:

My wife’s freedman — you know who — seemed to me, from a remark he casually let slip (ἀινγεπόκελνο) the other day, to have cooked his accounts (πεθπξαθέλαη ηὰο ςήθνπο) as to the purchase of the property of the Crotonian

---

104 Adams (2003b), 329; cf. Nicholson (1994), 34: „But even when there was nothing urgent to communicate or when conditions made it unsafe to commit anything of significance to paper, Cicero still craved frequent exchanges of letters...”
105 All Latin text from Cicero’s Letters is from Shackleton Bailey’s edition unless otherwise noted: „de re <publica> breviter ad te scribam; iam enim charta ipsa ne nos prodat pertimesco. itaque posthac, si erunt mihi plura ad te scribenda, άτι εγνέξιαν obscurabo”; see also 2.19.5: „in iis epistulis me Laelium, te Furium faciam; cetera erunt ἀλλαξένης, αἱέρθινο”; see also 6.7.1.
107 Font (1894), 45.
tyrant-slayer (Κροτωνιάτου τυραννοκτόνου)...examine thoroughly the
matter and make the remainder completely secure (ἐξασφαλίσαι).

Then later in a follow-up letter (6.5.1-2):

My wife’s freedman, as in our meetings and conversations he continually
stuttered and seemed at a loss, appeared to me to have done some cooking
of the accounts (ὑπὸ τι πεφυρακέναι τὰς ψήφους) of the Crotonian...When
leaving the city of the seven hills (ἄστο ἐπτάλοφος) he handed in an
account of [?] minae owed to Camillus...110

Rose lists the forms of ἀλογεύομαι, ὑποφυράω, and ἐπτάλοφος as first appearing in
Cicero and this is confirmed by LSJ and DGE with no papyri evidencing a similar
usage. There is the possibility that such rare words might have been used in the
vernacular Greek of the papyri but because Cicero wanted to obscure his words from a
letter-carrier who would probably be able to understand such lower registers of
Greek,111 this makes the likelihood more probable that they were innovations, or at least
obscure literary Greek. Dunkel suggests that the ‘mysterious’ nature of Greek and the
common perception of Greek being the ‘proper language of conspiracy’112 explain why
he would use it for security even though Greek was the slave population’s lingua
franca. Dunkel comments: ‘Of course slave Koiné need not have been particularly
subtle...and in any case Cicero took the additional precaution of using code-names’.113

We might add literary or poetic language and obscure language (the two are not
mutually exclusive), in the form of innovations.

The compound ἐπτάλοφος is a clear calque of Septimontium, a Latin form
attested in Varro’s De Lingua Latina114 and a reference to Rome which would probably
only be detected by reader with an understanding of Roman history and geography.115

The form ἐξασφαλίζομαι ‘make secure’, seems to occur first in Cicero and Rose has it

109 ἤμι δακανόμη κντ ὡ ἀπειεύζ εέγο (νίζξα δι 1 ἐγο) ἐδμε κνηξπξεσιλ, ἐμ ὧλ ὡ γενεόκελν
παξεμζ λεγα, πεθπεαθελακνο εί θν πο ἡμ ἀλ ἠμ ἠμ ὑπαξρόηλ ἠμ ἠμ Κἐγνη λήηνπ
πεζαλνδήνξαν...προδη οὴ πεξζ θεζα κελν ἡ 1 νπε ἐκμε θι ι ἄρη

110 ἤμι μπανάζειν ἤμι ἐκμε εκς εξνο εδμε κνηξπξαλ βαηρξιζδ σ θαι ἤι ἠπ ἠμ ἠμ ὑπαξρόηλ ἠμ ἠμ Κἐγνη λήηνπ...ἐμ ἄζ ἄζο


112 See also Dubuisson (1992), 193 and von Albrecht (1973), 1275.


114 5.41, 6.24.

115 Cf. Plutarch, Aetia Romana et Graeca, 2.280d.
as such, but it is attested in a letter dated around 710 A.D. and occurs frequently in later authors such as Galen, Strabo, and Josephus suggesting that it was in some use throughout the vernacular.116 Similarly, τυραννοκτόνος ‘tyrant-slayer, tyrranicide’ is an unusual code-name referring to Milo seemingly first-attested in Cicero and Rose does not list it explicitly as first attested in Cicero, labelling it a Hellenistic word.117 It would not be out of place here if it were a Ciceronian innovation for Atticus’ benefit but the evidence suggests that it was not a Ciceronian invention.

Another form, tyrranicidium, poses an interesting problem. Tyrrell and Purser commented that the Latin form does not appear until Seneca’s De Ira 2.3 and suggest that the word should be printed as the accusative plural in Greek: τυραννοκτόνους.118 If it was printed as a Greek word,119 there is no evidence for its existence in Greek before Cicero and the closest use is by Diodorus Siculus’.120 However, there is an abundance of similar τυραννοκτ- compounds such as τυραννοκτονικός,121 τυραννοκτονία,122 τυραννοκτόνιος,123 and τυραννοκτόνεω124 attested in later authors as well as the Platonic forms τυραννοδιάδοσις and τυραννοποιίς.125 Many of those used the form τυραννοκτόνος also.126 Cicero also used similar forms, which are first attested in his Letters, such as ἐντυραννεύομαι ‘to be under tyranny’. This form is unattested elsewhere, and the ἐν- prefix perhaps denotes ‘to exercise...upon’.127

That Cicero likely did not coin the form τυραννοκτόνος is evidenced from one other fact, namely Diodorus Siculus’ use of the word. As Muntz says, ‘[i]t is unknown whether or not Diodorus was familiar with the writings of Cicero directly, although he was living in Rome at approximately the right time’.128 Stylianou notes that the earliest date attributable to Diodorus Siculus’ composition of Book 16 (in which the compound occurs) is around 43 B.C.129 whereas Cicero had used the word in a letter dated 50 B.C. and elsewhere.130

---

116 SB 3, 7241: ἀι ι ὰ ηὰ κάι η ζ ηα | η νύη νπο ἐμαζ θαι η δόκελνο δεόλη σ ο; see also LSJ s.v.
117 Rose (1921), 112.
118 Tyrrell and Purser (1904), 5.257.
119 Shackleton Bailey (1970), 6.218 writes it in Latin and states the the MSS have Roman script and termination: ‘though this is nothing to go by’; cf. Tyrrell and Purser (1904), 5.257.
120 16,14.4, 16.65.5, 16.65.8.
121 App. BC 4.94.
123 Sch. Hermag. in Rh. 7(1).400 W.
125 Pl. Thg. 125a; Pl. R. 572e.
126 Plu. 2.256f, Luc. Tyr. 1, Lib. Decl. 43.32.
127 See Tyrrell and Purser (1904), 1.303; cf. Shackleton Bailey (1965), 1.379.
128 Muntz (2008), 195.
130 Att. 14.6.2, 14.15.1, 14.21.3, 16.15.3; Fam. 12.22.1
There is little doubt that it was improbable that Diodorus Siculus read Cicero’s correspondence and consequently hit upon the word, and then used it in his works. Cicero himself had only mentioned the thought of properly publishing his letters in 44 B.C. to Atticus (having raised with the idea in 46 B.C. with Tiro).\textsuperscript{131} The evidence therefore indicates that the form predated Cicero’s usage,\textsuperscript{132} and I would conclude that the reason it appears as a codeword here in reference to Milo is because it would have had a literary flavour, at least a source in some literary composition, as opposed to being taken directly from the vernacular,\textsuperscript{133} and this would align with the theory that Cicero used pseudonyms and literary language to obscure the meaning of his encoded passages.

\textbf{3.4.5. Compounds}

There are some unusual compounds which Rose has listed as appearing for the first time in Cicero, and I want to go through some of these and determine which of them are more likely to be Cicero’s own innovations. Forms such as ἀπξνζθώλεηνο ‘not accosted’ seem to be simply α-privatives of well-established adjectives like προσφόνητος and a glance at LSJ shows a similar form, ἀπροσφόνητι ‘without accosting’, appearing in Aesop who was writing in the 6th century B.C. These forms could hardly be attributed as Ciceronian originals. Similarly ἀπξνζδηόλπζνο must have simply been a compound derived from the proverbial οὐδὲν πρός Δίονυσον.\textsuperscript{134} Other forms are not so readily explicable, such as ἀνθηρογραφούμαι which is a simple compounds of separate elements (ἀνθηρός + γράφεσθαι = ‘to write in a florid style, to be embellished’). This particular compound does not recur until the 12th century in the Archbishop Eustathius of Thessalonica’s commentaries on Homer.\textsuperscript{135} Compare this to another superlative compound in -γράφος perhaps first attested in 13.18 referring to Varro: ‘homo πολυγραφώτατος’,\textsuperscript{136} presumably a reference to Varro’s prolific publications. The superlative seems to be added for rhetorical exaggeration reinforcing his question to Atticus, i.e. how did Atticus know that Varro wanted the Academica dedicated to him if he had not written anything to that effect to Cicero in his prolific writings? A first century B.C. Greek author Athenaeus Mechanicus uses the term\textsuperscript{137} and

\textsuperscript{131} See Fam. 16.17.1 and Att. 16.5.5.
\textsuperscript{132} Unless both authors invented the form independently, which I would assert is quite improbable.
\textsuperscript{133} There is no evidence of ἀπξνζδηόλπζνο- compounds in the papyri however as discussed above, they were common in literary Greek.
\textsuperscript{134} Preserved in Zenobius, 5.40; see Seaford (1984), 12.
\textsuperscript{135} Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem, 991.8.
\textsuperscript{136} Note that the form πνι πγξάθνο is also attested in Philodemus, Ind. Sto., 32 (PHer. 1018).
\textsuperscript{137} De machinis 6.2.
Diogenes Laertius later uses the nominative πνιπγξάθνο referring to the philosopher Zeno of Sidon. 115 The form μακροψυχία appears in a letter to Atticus about Pompey and variant forms are attested in later papyri leading to the conclusion that this was not necessarily a Ciceronian innovation. 116 The reading is somewhat disputed with Tyrrell and Purser printing μικροψυχία,140 however the manuscript reading was defended by Sjögren to μακροψυχία. 114 If not a Ciceronian coinage, the compound seems to have been formed by analogy in the Greek spoken vernacular to the already well-established μικροψυχία ‘littleness of soul, meanness of spirit’. 114

In a letter to his brother Quintus, Cicero uses the compound μουσοπάτακτος or ‘Muse-struck [person]’ which Shackelton-Bailey notes as a hapax legomenon and compares with μουσόληπτος143 (‘Muse-inspired’) and νυμφόληπτος144 (‘caught by nymphs’). 145 In addition to these should be added compounds, such as μουσοδόνημα found in Eupolis,146 or μουσόφθαρτος ‘slain by the Muses’ in Lycophron. 147 It is noteworthy that there is a large amount of compounds in καθξό and it seems Cicero has innovated this compound in a similar way.

Rare words and technical terms are also found in the letters to Tiro, many of them of a medical nature due to Tiro’s illness, as Baldwin notes: ‘Cicero’s use of the Greek technical vocabulary is not at all gratuitous’. 148 Baldwin notes that the term κακοστόμαχος first appears in Cicero and occurs later in the medical writer Aetius. 149 Other medical terms in Cicero’s advice to Tiro include πένως, ἀκοπία, περίστατος σύμμετρος, τρῆσις, and εὕλωσια κοιλίας of which the second is first attested in Cicero,

---

140 Tyrrell and Purser (1904), 4.129: ‘M has καθξνςπρί αλ but this is, no doubt, an error, as κεγαι νςπρ ία, is the form in use, and irony is out of place here’.  
141 Sjögren (1910), 36; Shackleton Bailey explains: ‘If Pompey thought of retiring so far, it was not for refuge but to gather forces pour mieux sauter, as C. well recognised...καθξνςπρί αλ can now be supported by καθξνς ρέσ, καθξόςπρο ο = “(be) patient, dilatory” in papyri, and may fairly be rendered „length of view” (not = κεγαι νςπρ ία, as commentators used to think). Pompey was planning a long war from distant bases, if the rumours were to be believed”.  
142 Isoc. 5.79; D. 18.279; Arist. EN 1125a33; Men. Georg. Fr.3; Longin. 4.7.  
143 Phld. Mus. p.86 K; Plu. Marc. 17. 2.452b; cf. κνπζνι επη ένκαη , “to be possessed by the Muse”, Aristid. 2.13 J. ap. Phot. Bibl. 411 B.  
146 Eup. 245.  
147 Lyc. 832.  
149 8.45; LSJ s.v. list many other uses; cf. also θνη ντ πζ ία attested first in Cicero (10.13.1) but appearing as part of a phrase „πζξι θνη ντ πζαλ γύλεςζεη’, indicating that it was some sort of medical phraseology.
yet to assign him credit for its invention is incorrect considering the custom of using Greek terms in medical prescriptions. Hoffer’s study of recurring motifs in Cicero’s letters focuses on the medical terminology used by Cicero which also appears in political contexts. He notes that words such as εὐζηνκάρσο and θαθνζηόκαρνο are used in metaphorical contexts (εὐ) as well as medical ones (κακο): ‘The shared terminology reflects a shared conceptual basis…’ Interestingly, many such phrases are used in recurring expressions, or ‘epistolary leitmotifs’ as Hoffer calls them; phrases which are casual and ‘often improvisatory’. Hoffer outlines three criteria for these recurring epistolary motifs: They are generally repeated, marked, and allusive. By ‘marked’ he means that they are marked by some use of language:

...such as the use of literary or other quotations, Greek, striking metaphors, or a divergent linguistic register such as colloquial or technical language, often with what appears to be a jocular tone.

Apart from the first criterion of repetition, the last two criteria seem to match a pattern of use in the deployment of ‘innovations’ in Cicero more broadly; i.e. they occur in contexts of allusive or encoded language, either colloquially or in a literary/technical register, and are very often puns or humorous jokes.

The compound πεντέλοπος, formed in a similar fashion to ἐπτύλοφος, appears in two letters within a short timeframe (11-18 May 44 B.C.) and is a sobriquet for Aulus Hirtius, to whom Cicero was acquainted and gave oratory lessons. Tyrrell and Purser suggest παντόλοιχον ‘our friend Sweet-tooth’, saying that the interpretation of πεντέλοπος ‘can hardly stand’, although why Hirtius would be designated a nickname referring to a penchant specifically for desserts seems equally unlikely. They do acknowledge the possibility that πεντέλοπος could refer to Hirtius, Pansa, Balbus, Lentulus Spinther, and Philippus, saying: ‘It is easy to see that Hirtius might be spoken of as the only one still faithful to Puteoli of the five who at one time constituted a little

---

150 See Tyrrell and Purser (1904), 1.86 and 5.223; also Adams (2003b), 340-341.
151 Hoffer (2007), 96ff.
152 Hoffer (2007), 97.
154 Hoffer (2007), 100.
155 Hoffer (2007), 100.
156 Whether they were “close” is debatable, see 14.12.22, 14.20.4, 14.21.4, 15.5.1, 15.61, Suet. de Clar. Rhet. i.
157 Tyrrell and Purser (1904), 5.301, there is no evidence in the Att. to point to Hirtius being fond of sweet food however see discussion below about his fondness for dining.
The manuscripts seem to be consistent however in writing πεντέλοιπον, as Sjögren’s critical apparatus suggests, with at least nine manuscripts having that form, and many of those are part of the older manuscript tradition. Reid argued that πεντέλοιπος was ‘incapable of defence’ and that the more likely phrase was πας το λοιπόν: ‘Cicero may be repeating with mockery...a phrase which Hirtius, the arch-dinner-giver, often addressed to his friends’. Shackleton Bailey suggests that πεντέλαμον ‘five-gullet’ has an obscure origin but the context suggests that it had some reference to food and drink: ‘Hirtius was a famous gourmet’. There is some merit to this argument, as there is a running gag in Cicero’s letters to the Epicurean L. Papirius Paetus about Hirtius’ predilection for providing dinners. In a passage discussing various dishes, one of which is first attested in Cicero (tyrotarichus ‘salted fish and cheese’), he humourously remarks:

Hirtius and Dolabella are my pupils in rhetoric, but my masters in the art of dining. For I think you must have heard, if you really get all news, that their practice is to declaim at my house, and mine to dine at theirs.

In a later letter to Paetus he mocks: ‘But think of my audacity: I even gave Hirtius a dinner, without a peacock however. In that dinner my cook could not imitate him in anything but the hot sauce’. The conclusion seems to be that Cicero has coined a humourous sobriquet for Hirtius at his expense for the benefit of Atticus, a trend which is common in the Att.

Cicero uses the adjective γυμνασιώδης ‘fit for the gymnasium’ in a letter to Atticus referring to furniture (ornamenta) for a lecture hall at Tusculum. The formation is simple enough and seems to have been coined here by simply adding the -ώδης suffix indicating ‘content, quality, and resemblance, among other things’. There are no similar forms attested in literary Greek nor the papyri but the Greek form is disputed in some of the recce. The form gymnasiode is written in the margins of an

---

158 Tyrrell and Purser (1904), 5.301.
159 Sjögren (1910), 2.102, some later editions have πας το λοιπόν however note Sjögren’s comment regarding this interpretation: ‘sed reclamante codice ueteri, in quo πεντέλαμον πελη έιν ηη πνλ legebatur’.
160 Reid (1901), 262.
162 Fam. 9.16.7: ‘Hirtium ego et Dolabellam dicendi discipulos habeo, cenandi magistros; puto enim te audisse, si forte ad vos omnia perferuntur, illos apud me declamitare, me apud illos cenitare’.
163 Fam. 9.20.3: ‘sed vide audaciam; etiam Hirtio cenam dedi, sine pavone tamen. in ea cena cocus meus praeter ius fervens nihil <non> potuit imitari’.
164 Att. 1.6.2; see also 1.9.2.
165 See Buck and Peterson (1948), 708-715.
older edition of Lambinus dated to the 16th century and gymnasio appears in various manuscripts from the Ω archetype. The form gymnasio would also make sense in the context (dative ‘for the gymnasium’) and Cicero also makes reference to his gymnasia at Tusculum elsewhere written in Latin characters. In any case, Sjögren and Shackleton Bailey have settled on γυμνασιώδης and since the Greek form is unattested anywhere else, it is likely to be a Ciceronian innovation.

The simple compound φανοπροσωπέω ‘to show one’s face’, which seems to have been coined by Cicero, appears twice in the Att. Shackleton Bailey and Tyrrell and Purser make no mentioned of the unusual nature of the word. There is a similar compound σεμνοπροσωπεῖν in Aristophanes’ Clouds as well as in the Anthologia Graeca. Another similar compound, εὐπροσωπέω ‘to make a good show’, is attested in 2nd and 1st century-B.C. papyri (both official letters) as well as later in Paul’s Letter to the Galatians. There are some compounds in φανο-, for instance φανομηρίς ‘showing the thigh, with bare thigh’, and φανόπους, ‘with shining feet’, however none used in the conversational sense of Cicero’s φανοπροσωπέω ‘to show one’s face, put in an appearance’. This would suggest, as LSJ conclude, that the word is a Ciceronian coinage.

There are multiple α-privative forms which appear to be Cicero’s own innovations, two of which seem to mean similar things. The adverbs ἀγοητεύτως ‘without guile’ and ἀκολακεύτως ‘not flatteringly’ are both first attested in Cicero (later in Philo) and I am of the opinion that they must have been first used by Cicero in a colloquial sense, however not as original coinages. The adjectival form ἀκολάκαντος appears in Plato (with a slightly different meaning) and many other authors post-Cicero. The form ἀγοητεύτως appears later in Plotinus. Shackleton Bailey translates both as sans blague, while Tyrrell and Purser has ἀκολακεύτως as ‘without any soft sawder’, and ἀγοητεύτως as sans phrase ‘without mincing words’. The sentence: ‘audi igitur me hoc ἀγοητεύτως dicentem’ (12.3.1) ought to translate to: ‘So listen to me here frankly’; i.e. ‘I’m going to be straight with you’ and in the case of ἀκολακεύτως tamen sic ut nihil eum existimem lecturum libentius’

---

166 See Sjögren (1910), 1.12.
167 Div. 1.5.8, Tusc. 2.3.9; see Shackleton Bailey, 1.282.
168 Compounds with -πξόζ σ πνο/πξνζ σ πέσ are common, e.g. ἀκθηπξόζ σ πνο, ἀλζεξ νπξόζ σ πνο, ἀπνπξνζ σ πίδνκαη , αὐη νπξόζ σ πνο, καθξνπξόζ σ πνο.
169 De migratione Abrahami, 86.5-6: κπξίνη  γὰξ ἀλόζσ ο θαὶ ἀθν άθευη σ ο πξνζ ειζό λη εο ἀξεη ῇ θαὶ η ὸ γλήζ η νλ αὐηῆο ἐλαπγαζ άκελνη  θάι ι νο...
170 Plato, Laws 729a: ἡ γὰς ἤλ λέσ λ ἀθνι άθεπην νύζ ι α, ἤπλ δ’ ἀλαγθαίσ λ κὴ ἐλδεήο, αὕηε παζ ἕλ κνπζηθση άηε θαὶ ἀξίζ ηε; see also Them. Or. 2.27b, 6.97b; Max. Tyr. 23.1, 31.6; Jul. Or. 2.86b; Ph. 1.449.
171 See 4.4.44.
(13.51.1), it seems to be: ‘And so I wrote “unflatteringly”, but in such a way that I think nothing will be more pleasing for him [Caesar] to read’. There are two possibilities: a) Cicero coined the adverbial forms of these adjectives to be used colloquially in each instance, or more likely b) Cicero is using both terms in a way used colloquially by Greeks in everyday conversation.

3.4.6. Conclusions

Adams’ remarks on Cicero’s code-switching into Greek are important:

To some extent code-switching of this type is an artificial game played by two intimates using what is in effect a secret language...Both parties must have the same attitude to such pretentiousness.\footnote{Adams (2003b), 345.}

The logical question here is: What pretense, specifically, is Cicero and Atticus attempting to put on and for whom are they putting it on? Adams reinforces the point when he says: ‘The game is abandoned...when there is an external crisis which causes the code-switcher to lose his taste for showing off’.\footnote{Adams (2003b), 345.} The picture here is of two men attempting to exemplify their respective knowledge of Greek for each other’s own pleasure. This is certainly true of the largery use of Greek in Cicero, especially in Cicero’s use of literary quotations from Greek poetry, which could be construed as Cicero flaunting his acquaintance with such literature to his friends. Yet specifically confined to innovations or at least, Greek words which appear to have been coined or introduced by Cicero, perhaps the picture is not as clear cut.

Atticus was practically a Greek and his knowledge of Greek led Cornelius Nepos to praise him: ‘sic enim Graece loquebatur, ut Athenis natus videretur’.\footnote{Nepos, \textit{Att.} 4.} Cicero makes jokes about Atticus’ philhellinism, even referring to him as ‘a Greek’ in places.\footnote{See 4.4A.1: “quos vos Graeci…appellatis”.} The assertion that Cicero, who himself possessed a strong grasp of Greek, was flaunting his knowledge of Greek to someone like Atticus is perhaps a little unfair, at least in the narrow context of lexical innovation. However like Cicero’s use of Latin first-attestations in his \textit{Letters to Atticus} as discussed above, when it came to individual instances of Greek words which Cicero himself might have invented, it was predominantly a case of humour between close friends in private, as well as carefully encoding information for each other’s benefit.
Many words which Rose lists as first attested in Cicero are more likely usages from *Koine* Greek or simply technical terms (such as medical prescriptions or manuscript terminology). Many forms of those attestations are found in papyri or literary Greek in later centuries. This study demonstrates that Cicero was not completely averse to innovation in Greek, and indeed reveled in it when it came to making jokes about well-known political figures or mutual acquaintances. He also seemed to turn to innovation when it came to sensitive information, or using ‘veiled language’ to convey confidential gossip. However in general, this conclusion must be a qualified confirmation of Steele’s observation over a hundred years ago:

...If we had the mass writings of the New Comedy and of the vocabulary current in Athens at the time of Cicero [sc. *Koine* Greek], we should probably have all the Greek words used in the Epistles.\(^{176}\)

The same observation could perhaps be made almost word for word in relation to Cicero’s Latin innovations in his *Att.* as analysed above, with some minor modifications:

...If we had the vocabulary current in Rome at the time of Cicero [sc. the *sermo plebeius*], we should probably have [almost] all the Latin innovations used in Cicero’s Epistles.

\(^{176}\) Steele (1900), 391.
4.1. Lucretius and Cicero

A comparison between Lucretius’ lexical innovations and Cicero’s has been surveyed in depth in my 2010 Study and I will not repeat the data here. Instead I have provided some of the findings from that study in Appendix VIII.

Compared to Cicero, Lucretian philosophical vocabulary did not survive as well in later authors and only those with specific interests in Epicureanism (such as 17th-century thinker Pierre Gassendi) would later employ some of his terminology. Clay dismisses the notion that Lucretius’ attempts at expressing Epicurean doctrines in Latin failed because he did not succeed in expressing them with clarity. Instead he claims that it was because ‘he was not able to impress his means of expression on Romans who wrote philosophy. His poetry seemed too sweet a coating, his philosophy too bitter draught’.¹ This seems to be the more likely reason. However it would be naïve to assume that Cicero had remained uninfluenced by Lucretius.

In the 2010 study I collected Lucretius’ lexical innovations and compared them to innovations in Cicero’s Aratea poetic work, specifically to contrast Ciceronian and Lucretian compounding.² I observed that where Cicero could deploy suffixes such as –ātīō/-ītīō extensively in prose, this would not fit in verse and Lucretius was forced to adopt different endings such as first declension –ura for –itio: pŏsĭtūră for positio in 1.685, flēxūră for flexio in 4.312, fōrmātūră for formatio in 4.552. Another aspect of this -ura verbal derivative is its relatively rare appearance among Cicero’s vocabulary. According to Cooper,³ roughly 19% of occurrences of -tura substantives in Latin occur in Cicero of which only one seems to have been used in his innovations (architectura).⁴

In addition to this vocabulary employed by Lucretius to describe, for example, the behaviour of atoms in Epicurean philosophy, he also furnished himself with a range of metrically convenient phrases for the atoms themselves,⁵ including: rerum

¹ Clay (1967), v.
² See Appendixes VII and VIII.
³ Cooper (1895), 27.
⁴ For an inventory of Latin words in –ura see Zellmer (1976) with a discussion of the -ura suffix in the context of various registers, including technical and scientific discourse as well as the sermo plebeius.
⁵ Cf. the formulaic epithets of Homeric verse illustrated by Parry (1971), e.g. πόδαο ὤθυο, „swift-footed”, ζπκνι ένλη α, „lion-hearted” for Achilles. In Lucretius, these formulaic phrases seem to be used for a similar purpose to such Homeric epithets, e.g. for metrical convenience to fit the dactylic hexameter. There are no less than 11 instances of the phrase semina rerum in Lucretius; 8 instances of the phrase rerum primordia; and 2 instances of the phrase genitalia corpora.
*primordia, materies, genitalia corpora, semina rerum and corpora prima.* Cicero on the other hand seems to have preferred the ‘whittle down to a single term’ approach by using only a handful of single words: *atomus, corpuscula, and individua.*

As noted in my 2010 study, the problem with comparing Lucretius to Cicero and their influence on Latin, is that both ‘were craftsmen of very different trades’, the former a poet-philosopher, the latter an Academic writer (who at a young age tried his hand at poetic translation) whose philosophical works exists solely in prose. In any case, it is always possible to quibble over the influence either had on the expansion of Latin as a philosophical language, yet it is not always possible (nor, I think, necessary) to come to a definitive conclusion. It is more important to recognise their combined, immeasurable influence in the area of philosophical knowledge and their subsequent legacy in Western thought.

### 4.2. Cicero’s Varro and Latin innovation by analogy

Cicero represents Marcus Terentius Varro (116 B.C. - 27 B.C.) in his *Academica* as one who sometimes seeks to avoid Greek words in Latin philosophical discussions. In *Ac*. 1.24, Cicero has Varro beseech his audience for permission (strikingly like Cicero often did himself when introducing a new Latin word) to use the word *qualitas*, because:

> [A]s we are dealing with unusual subjects you will of course allow us occasionally to employ words never heard before, as do the Greeks themselves, who have been handling these topics for a long time.

Cicero has his other speaker Atticus promptly give his blessing: ‘Indeed we will...you shall be permitted to employ even Greek words if Latin ones happen to fail you’. However Varro is determined: ‘That is certainly kind of you, but I will do my best to speak Latin’, yet he makes a pertinent exception:

---

7 If we limit ourselves strictly to the later philosophy Cicero studied, as opposed to the astronomy of Aratus in his youth. Indeed Sedley (1998), 44 suggests the proper comparison (at least ideologically) to be made with Lucretius is „not with Cicero, but with Empedocles.” Yet for our purposes, confining ourselves to the expansion of the Latin *language*, the comparison provides more than ample insight into the philological methods of both authors.
8 „dabitis - enim profecto ut in rebus insitatis, quod Graeci ipsi faciunt a quibus haec iam diu tractantur, utamur verbis interdum inauditis.”
9 *Ac*. 25: „“Nos vero” inquit Atticus; “quin etiam Graecis licebit utare cum voles, si te Latinae forte deficient”. “
Exception in the case of words of the sort now in question, so as to employ the term *philosophy* or *rhetoric* or *physics* or *dialectic* which like many others are now habitually used as Latin words.\(^\text{10}\)

In Varro’s *De lingua Latina* (9.20), he writes: ‘As for a word that is new and has been introduced according to reason [*ratione*], we ought not for this to shun giving it a hospitable welcome’.\(^\text{11}\) Varro then uses a series of metaphors to justify the use of new words in Latin. He compares new words to vessels brought from Greece that have, in their popularity, replaced old-fashioned Roman pots and cups. Varro argues for the acceptance of new words according to the principle of ‘analogy’. He says that long-standing custom is not a hindrance to novelty in garments, buildings, and utensils when it is a question of use.\(^\text{12}\) He asks: ‘are not old laws often annulled and succeeded by new laws?’\(^\text{13}\) Dufallo argued that Varro bases the comparison on the observation that many Romans prefer Greek cultural products to those ‘of ancient custom’ (*antiquae consuetudinis*), however not all Romans did. Duffalo says Varro’s practical observation cannot erase the traditional view of the corrupting influence of Greek ‘luxury’: ‘If words could be compared to aspects of material culture, so too, they could be regarded as symptoms of excess’.\(^\text{14}\) As Farrell noted, it was possible to use Greek too much, however, the *egestas* of Latin, when placed in the context of traditional Roman virtues of ‘simplicity’ and ‘moral uprightness’, could emerge as a ‘positive advantage’.\(^\text{15}\) Contrast Varro’s attitude to those of Cicero’s about the deployment of Latin vocabulary as often as possible:

For as we ought to employ our mother-tongue, lest, like certain people who are continually dragging in Greek words, we draw well-deserved ridicule upon ourselves, so we ought not to introduce anything different into our actions or our life in general.\(^\text{16}\)


\(^\text{11}\) „Verbum quod novum et ratione introductum quo minus recipiamus, vitare non debemus.”

\(^\text{12}\) „Nam ad usum in vestimentis aedificiis supellectili novitati non impedit vetus consuetudo...”

\(^\text{13}\) „An non saepe veteres leges abrogatae novis cedunt?”

\(^\text{14}\) Dufallo (2005), 93.

\(^\text{15}\) Farrell (2001), 51.

\(^\text{16}\) *Off*. 1.111: „Ut enim sermone eo debemus uti, qui innatus est nobis, ne, ut quidam, Graeca verba inculcantes iure optimo rideamur, sic in actiones omnemque vitam nullam discrepantium conferre debemus.”
Does this attitude extend to neologisms which can be argued as ‘different’ (Cicero uses the word *discrepantia*, which seems to an innovation in itself!)\(^\text{17}\) to Latin readers? A clue to Varro’s own view on neologisms can be found in a fragment of his *Ad Marcellum De Latino Sermone* in Gellius. Varro apparently preferred to use the word *aeditumum* instead of *aedituum* because the latter was a ‘recenti novitate fictum’ (recent invention) where as the former was ‘antiqua origine incorruptum’ (of antique origin uncorrupted).\(^\text{18}\) If such a quote is accurate, then we have Varro reported to be saying\(^\text{19}\) that ‘incorrupta’ words ought to be given primacy. Cicero neatly highlights such a tension between attitudes in the exchange between his fictional Varro and Atticus in the *Ac.* 25-26. In the dialogue, Varro explains that even among Greeks, the word *poiotes* (πνηόηεο), ‘is not a word in ordinary use, but belongs to the philosophers’ to which Varro appends: ‘and this is the case with many terms’.\(^\text{20}\) Cicero, practised in the art of persuasion from his oration days, deploys a type of *commoratio* where we repeats and dwells on this issue of Latin’s lack of an adequate philosophical vocabulary throughout this portion of the *Academica*. The effect is that Varro’s hesitations about using new words to convey the technical Greek concepts are politely welcomed repeatedly by Atticus, and yet Varro returns to the same hesitation despite having been given permission several times. Varro laments:

> But the dialecticians’ vocabulary is not of the common tongue, they use words of their own; and indeed this is a feature shared by almost all the sciences: either new names have to be coined for new things, or names taken from other things have to be used metaphorically.\(^\text{21}\)

This evokes a passage from Cicero’s *de Oratore* where he wrote:

\(^{17}\) See *OLD* s.v. *discrepantia*, also Lewis and Short s.v. *discrepantia*: *J. discordance, dissimilarity, discrepancy* (a *Ciceron.* word): “rerum et verborum”…\(^\text{*}\)

\(^{18}\) Gel. 12.10.4: “M. Varro in libro secundo *Ad Marcellum De Latino Sermone* “aeditumum” dici oportere censet magis quam “aedituum,” quod alterum sit recenti novitate fictum, alterum antiqua origine incorruptum”; cf. *LL*, 7.12; see also Adams (2005), 78.

\(^{19}\) Note above the use of reported speech in the subjunctive: “sit…”

\(^{20}\) *Ac.* 25: “*qualitates* igitur appellavi quas πνη όη εηαο Graeci vocant, quod ipsum apud Graecos non est vulgi verbum sed philosophorum, atque id in multis…”

\(^{21}\) *Ac.* 25: “dialecticorum vero verba nulla sunt publica, suis utuntur. et id quidem commune omnium fere est artium; aut enim nova sunt rerum novarum facienda nomina aut ex aliis transferenda.”
In matters of vocabulary there are three methods which the orator may use to add lustre and distinction to his style: he may employ archaisms, or neologisms, or metaphors.\textsuperscript{22}

Although these views are not actually Varro’s per se, Cicero is using Varro’s own tempered attitude towards Greek words and Latin neologisms to highlight his own belief that Latin needs to expand its current vocabulary to match and better explain the concepts of the Greeks. Cicero has Varro argue further:

This being the practice of the Greeks, who have now been engaged in these studies for so many generations, how much more should be conceded to us, who are now attempting to handle these subjects for the first time?\textsuperscript{23}

With such a declamation, Atticus emphatically replies:

Indeed, Varro!...I think you will actually be doing a service to your fellow-countrymen if you not only augment their store of facts, as you have done, but of words also.\textsuperscript{24}

Note the striking anaphora of affirmative phrases in Atticus’ dialogue: ‘Nos vero’ at 25 and ‘Tu vero...Varro’ in 26. Such constant reminders are devices carefully placed by Cicero to impart an unwavering acceptance (in the reader’s mind as well as the speakers in the dialogue) that such a practice of introducing new words is not only welcomed but necessary, which leads Varro to say: ‘Then on your authority we will venture to employ new words, if we have to’.\textsuperscript{25} The conclusion here is illustrative of both Cicero’s version of Varro and the real-life Varro, who are somewhat hesitant attitude to words ‘recenti novitate ficta’ and those which were of ‘antiqua origine incorrupta’. The real-life Varro recognised that, like in garments, buildings, and utensils, innovation in language is just

\textsuperscript{22} De Orat. 3.152: „Tria sunt igitur in verbo simplici, quae orator adferat ad inlustrandam atque exornandam orationem: aut inusitatum verbum aut novatum aut translatum.”
\textsuperscript{23} Ac. 25: „quod si Graeci faciunt qui in his rebus tot iam saecla versantur, quanto id nobis magis concedendum est, qui haec nunc primum tractare conamur?”; cf. Fin. 3.5 where Cicero states: „Quod si in ea lingua quam plerique uberiorem putant concessum est ut doctissimi homines de rebus non pervagatis insitutis verbis uterentur, quanto id nobis magis est concedendum qui ea nunc primum audemus attingere?”
\textsuperscript{24} Ac. 26: „Tu vero” inquam “Varro bene etiam meriturus mihi videris de tuis civibus, si eos non modo copia rerum auxeris, ut effecisti, sed etiam verborum.”
\textsuperscript{25} Ac. 26: „Audebimus ergo” inquit “novis verbis uti te auctore, si necesse erit…”
as important when it comes to a question of use. Cicero seems to have agreed, at least indirectly through his dialogues, and this shared attitude is surely illustrated in Cicero’s deliberate construction of the dialogue between Varro and Atticus in *Ac.* 25-6.

4.3. Quintilian and Cicero’s Influence

In the *Institutio Oratoria* Quintilian proclaims at 8.3.35 that: ‘We must be daring, for I cannot agree with Celsus when he forbids orators to coin new words’. Similarly in 1.5.70, Quintilian discusses the role of compound words and says that such forms are better suited to Greek than to Latin (*sed res tota magis Graecos decet*). He argues that he does not think this is due to the nature of the Latin language:

> The reason rather is that we have a preference for foreign goods [*alienis*], and therefore receive κυρταγχην with applause, whereas we can scarce defend *incurvicervicus* from derisive laughter.

When it comes to oratory, Quintilian was mindful that: ‘current words [*verba usitata*] are the safest to use, we coin new words not without danger’. When he says ‘we’ he is referring to Roman authors and orators, for as he says at 8.3.30:

> The coining of new words is...more permissible in Greek, for the Greeks did not hesitate to coin nouns to represent certain sounds and emotions, and in truth they were taking no greater liberty than was taken by the first men when they gave names to things.

Quintilian acknowledges that the coining of new words from Greek can be seen to be harsh but may be ‘softened’ (*molliri*) over time, and he uses the example of Cicero to highlight his point:

---

27 ‘...audendum itaque; neque enim accedo Celso, qui ab oratore verba fingi vetat.’ The reference is to Cornelius Celsus (25 B.C. - 50 A.D.)
28 ‘nobis minus succedit, nec id fieri natura puto, sed alienis favemus; ideoque cum θπξηαύρελα mirati simus, incurvicervicum vix a risu defendimus.’
29 ‘usitatis tutius utimur, nova non sine quodam periculo fingimus’.
30 ‘fingere...Graecis magis concessum est, qui sonis etiam quibusdam et affectibus non dubitaverunt nomina aptare, non alia libertate quam qua illi priores rebus appellationes dederunt.’
Of the coining of words by expansion and inflection we have examples, such as the Ciceronian *beatitas* and *beatitudo*, forms which [Cicero] feels to be somewhat harsh, though he thinks they may be softened by use.\(^{31}\)

Quintilian also observes that if one were to come across a ‘grammariam who loves antique things’ (*grammaticus veterum amator*), he would insist on absolute conformity to Latin practice.\(^{32}\) He would also praise the ‘patriotism of those who aimed at strengthening the Latin language and asserted that we had no need of foreign practices’.\(^{33}\) He indirectly notes the early poets, such as Livius Andronicus, when he says: ‘So too we get the Latinised genitives *Ulixi* and *Achilli* together with many other analogous forms’.\(^{34}\) However, the issue for Quintilian is that lexical innovation is not just a fashionable practice but a necessary reality for Latin writers in bridging the gap between Latin and Greek vocabulary. He writes at 1.5.58: ‘…[w]e too use, by admission, Greek words when there is no equivalent in our language’.\(^{35}\) He argues:

Many new words have been coined in imitation of the Greeks...some of which...are regarded as unduly harsh. But I see no reason why we should treat them with such contempt, except, perhaps, that we are highly self-critical and suffer in consequence from the poverty of our language. Some new formations do, however, succeed in establishing themselves.\(^{36}\)

For Quintilian, like Cicero, the idea of neologisms in Latin literature as well as oratory was a necessary function of the evolution of their language.

Where an innovation was called for, Quintilian goes to some lengths to stress that the word should be gently introduced through phrases which seek the permission from the audience. This seems to be a rhetorical practice (Føgen calls it a type of

\(^{31}\) 8.3.32: „At tractu et declinatione talia sunt, qualia apud Ciceronem beatitas et beatitudo; quae dura quidem sentit esse, verumtamen usu putat posse molliri”; see Cic. *N.D.* 1.34.95.

\(^{32}\) 1.5.59: „ac si reperias grammaticum veterum amatorem, neget quidquam ex Latina ratione mutandum…”

\(^{33}\) 1.5.60: „quin etiam laudet virtutem eorum, qui potentiorem facere linguam Latinam studebant, nec alienis egere institutis fatebantur.”

\(^{34}\) 1.5.63: „sic genitivus Ulixi et Achilli fecit, sic alia plurima”.

\(^{35}\) „...et confessis quoque Graecis utimur verbis, ubi nostra desunt, sicut illi a nobis nonnunquam mutuantur”

\(^{36}\) 8.3.33: „multa ex Graeco format nova ac plurima...quorum dura quaedam admodum videntur...quae cur tantopere aspernemur nihil video, nisi quod iniqui iudices adversus nos sursum ideoque paupertate sermonis laboramus. quaedam tamen perdurant.”
captatio benevolentiae)\textsuperscript{37} which has been adopted from the Greeks, as Quintilian explains:

But if we are going to appear to have invented something a little risky, we must take certain measures in advance, [prefacing it by phrases] such as “so to speak,” “if I may say so,” “in a certain sense,” or “if you will allow me to make use of such a word.” The same practice may be followed in the case of bold metaphors, and it is not too much to say that almost anything can be said with safety provided we show by the very fact of our anxiety that the word or phrase in question is not due to an error of judgment. The Greeks have a most elegant saying on this subject, advising us ‘to be the first to blame our own hyperbole.’\textsuperscript{38}

This practice was common in Cicero’s philosophical treatises where he (or his characters in the dialogues) asks his audience for permission to coin new words to convey the Greek concept. For example, in turning ὁκνινγία into Latin, he has M. Cato saying: (\textit{Fin.} 3.21) ‘quod ὁκνινγίαν Stoici, nos appellemus convenientiam, si placet…’ Similarly in \textit{Fin.} 4.72, Cicero has a hypothetical Zeno posing the word \textit{reiectanea} in Latin: ‘autem, morbum, egestatem, dolorem, non appello mala, sed, si libet, reiectanea’.\textsuperscript{39} Such examples indicate that Cicero often respectfully introduces an equivalent concept in his own language to his Latin readers by the pretense of showing his ‘anxiety that the word or phrase in question is not due to an error of judgment’ as Quintilian described.

Quintilian’s attitudes towards lexical innovation strongly echo Cicero’s. As discussed in the preceding chapter, Cicero was open to experimentation with new words but only when the situation demanded it, that is, where innovation was obligatory or at

\textsuperscript{37} Fögen (2011), 457 argues this is a type of “temporary” term for the Greek concept in Latin, however perhaps it is better thought of as a polite introduction of a new term which Cicero prefers but is hesitant to coin \textit{ad hoc}. After all, Cicero was first and foremost a brilliant orator and such techniques to win over his audience must have been deployed when it came to convincing his readers of the most apt Latin term or phrase for a Greek concept.

\textsuperscript{38} 8.3.37: “sed, si quid periculosius finxisses videbimus, quibusdam remediis praemunieinendum est: Vt ita dicam, Si licet dicere, Quodam modo, Permittite mihi sic uti. quod idem etiam in is. quae licentius translata erunt, proderit, nihilque non tuto dico potest, in quo non falli iudicium nostrum sollicitudine ipsa manifestum erit. qua de re Graecum illud elegantissimum est, quo praecipitur πξνεπηπιήζ ζ εηλ  η ῇ ῇ. The Greek phrase comes from Aristotle, \textit{Rhet.} 3.7.9.

\textsuperscript{39} The conversation at 4.72 continues with: „Ista,” inquit, „quaedixisti, valere, locupletem esse, non dolere, bona non dico, sed dicam Graece πξνεγκέλα, Latine autem producta (sed praeposita aut praecipua malo; sit tolerabilius et mollius)”, which seems to indicate Cicero is implying a preference for the “softer” sounding words \textit{praeposita} and \textit{praecipua}; see Madvig (1963), 588; and Hartung (1970), 164ff for further discussion on Cicero’s translation technique here.
least a necessary step finding the most appropriate word in Latin. Cicero did not accept
the criticism that Latin was possessed of an ‘egestas’ compared to the technical
vocabulary of the Greeks, although this view was and would be a minority one. Cicero
criticised the Greeks on their expression of certain philosophical terms in the *Tusculan
Disputations* when he talked about the apparent distinction between ‘unsoundness of
mind’ and ‘frenzy’ in Greek:

> [Sanity and insanity] are much better expressed by the Latin words than the
> Greek… Why the Greeks should call this mania, I do not easily apprehend; but
> we define it much better than they, for we distinguish this madness (*insania*),
> which, being connected with ‘unsoundness’, is more extensive, from which we
distinguish *furor*. The Greeks want to call it that, but they have no one word that
will express it: what we call *furor*, they call μελαγχολία as if the reason were
affected only by a black bile, and not disturbed as often by a violent rage, or
fear, or grief.

Cicero makes the point that Latin here has a more accurate ‘semantic distinction’
between *furor* and *insania*. Where Latin can explain *furor* by a ‘perturbation of reason
by passions and emotional states’ (rage, fear, or grief) the Greeks resort to a physical
explanation based on the early medical theory of humourism.

At the beginning of the *Tusculan Disputations* Cicero says to Brutus that he has
decided to expound in Latin all the skills which relate to the ‘right way of living’ (*quae
ad rectam vivendi viam pertinenter* - i.e. philosophy). He says that he is writing about
philosophy in Latin because ‘each of our (Roman ancestors) discovered everything
more wisely than the Greeks, or what they had borrowed from them they improved

---

40 Cf. *Tusc.* 2.35: „O verborum inops interdum, quibus abundare te semper putas, Graecia!“; Lucretius
would state on multiple occasions the *egestas* of Latin compared to Greek, as discussed above; Boetius
would later disagree with Cicero’s assertion (*Contra Eutychen* 3.55): „neque enim verborum inops
Graecia est ut Marcus Tullius alludit“; see Adams (2003a), 339-40 on the struggle in the 1st century B.C.
to fill the void between Greek and Latin in terms of technical vocabulary compared to the liberal use of
Greek in other media (such as Cicero’s letters); see also Kitto (1951), 28: „the Greek vice in language is a
kind of bogus clarity, the drawing of distinctions which are not there’; and Douglas (1962), 49: „[this]
vice of language must reflect vice in thought’.

41 Cf. this turn of phrase to Lucretius“: *patrii sermonis egestas*.

42 *Tusc.* 3.11: „Itaque nihil melius, quam quod est in consuetudine sermonis Latini… Graeci autem καλία
unde appellant, non facile dixerim; eam tamen ipsam distinguimus nos melius quam illi. Hanc enim
insaniam, quae iuncta stultitiae patet latius a furore disiungimus. Graeci volunt illi quidem, sed parum
valent verbo: quem nos fuorem, κακά γρηγορία illi vocant; quasi vero atro bili solum mens ac non saepe
vel iracundia graviore vel timore vel dolore moveatur”.

43 See Fögen (2000), 103: „versuchte Cicero nachzuweisen, dass im Lateinischen oft eine genauerer
semantische Unterscheidung daher möglich sei…“
upon..."44 Further down, he notes that when it came to study and every literary genre, Greece used to surpass Rome, but he adds sardonically: ‘it was easy to surpass [Rome] when there were no competitors’.45 In Fin., Cicero makes his views clear:

And though we have often said—that in spite of some complaints not only of the Greeks, but of those men also who would prefer being accounted as Greeks to being thought our own countrymen—that we are so far from being conquered by the Greeks in the abundance of our words, that we are even superior to them in that particular; we must labour to establish this point, not only in our own arts, but in those too which we have derived from them.46

For Cicero, lexical innovations were a required vessel for the transference of Greek philosophy to Rome but where he resorts to hyperbole is his view that Latin is superior to Greek in its copia or ‘abundance’. A better interpretation is that Latin did not have the interpretive resources to equal Greek when it came to philosophy, but had the potential to surpass it (which it eventually did by the Medieval period).

The creation of new philosophical terms would allow Latin to rival Greek at its most famous discipline. Most significantly, the creation of a Latin philosophical vocabulary as a replacement of Greek philosophical vocabulary was a powerful act of independence from Greek’s intellectual hegemony. Such a sentiment stretched back to the times of Cato the Censor as discussed in the Introduction, and his ambivalent attitude towards Greek influence on younger Roman intellectuals. Meillet recognised that Cicero, in this respect, fell into a recognised tradition of Latin linguistic purism dating back to Ennius.47

44 Tusc. 1.1: „...sed meum semper iudicium fuit omnia nostros aut invenisse per se sapientius quam Graecos aut accepta ab illis fecisse meliora...“
45 Tusc. 1.3: „in quo erat facile vincere non repugnantes“.
46 Fin. 3.5: „et quoniam saepe diximus, et quidem cum aliqua querela non Graecorum modo, sed eorum etiam, qui se Graecos magis quam nostros haberi volunt, nos non modo non vincit a Graecis verborum copia, sed esse in ea etiam superioriores, elaborandum est ut hoc non in nostris solum artibus, sed etiam in illorum ipsorum adsequamur...“ cf. Powell (1995), 289: „Cicero in his letters could invent words...without any apology. Greek words, too, were freely used in letters. On the other hand, in the speeches Greek is avoided almost entirely...The philosophical works represent the mean between these two extremes”; see also Oksala’s ((1954), 133) discussion of this issue of „purity“ in the case of Caesar: „obwohl sie mit der griechischen Kultur gut vertraut waren, die Entwicklung der lateinischen Sprache im Sinne der eigenständigen puristischen Linie kraftvoll förderten.”
47 Meillet (1966) 195 and 202: „A lire Ennius on est frappé d’y trouver si peu de mots empruntés au grec. Le poète s’est proposé de faire en latin, avec les seules ressources du latin, tout ce que faisaient les poètes grecs. [...] Pas plus qu’Ennius, Pacuvius et Accius ne multiplient les emprunts au grec. La langue aristocratique de Rome devait rester purement latine...Pacuvius et Accius visent à tirer du vocabulaire latin toutes les ressources qu’il offre...“
In *Fin.*, Cicero has the fictional Cato discuss Zeno’s penchant for coining new words where necessary and implying that the Greeks, despite their copious vocabulary, often resorted to innovation for new concepts, yet such a licence was not granted in Latin:

Hence arose the distinction, in Zeno’s terminology, between πξνεγκέλνλ and the opposite, ἀπνπξνεγκέλνλ - for Zeno using the copious Greek language still employed novel words coined for the occasion, a licence not allowed to us with the poor vocabulary of Latin; though you are fond of saying that Latin is actually more copious than Greek.\(^\text{48}\)

The implication, it has been suggested, is that Romans should be allowed to invent new words just as the Greeks were allowed to in Zeno’s time.\(^\text{49}\) Compare this to Quintilian’s statement that whilst many new words coined in imitation of the Greeks were regarded as ‘unduly harsh’, he saw no such reason why Romans should treat them with the same contempt. In this respect, Quintilian would reaffirm Cicero’s attitudes towards lexical innovation and further encourage Latin writers to reduce Greek’s linguistic dominance over rhetorical and philosophical terminology.

4.4. Seneca the Elder: Balance of innovation in the *Controversiae*

As Fairweather’s survey\(^\text{50}\) has concluded, Seneca the Elder (54 B.C. - 39 A.D.) did not express a definitive opinion on the use of neologisms in Latin or by orators generally, although there are some passing remarks which are illustrative of an attitude which did not altogether disapprove of them. In his *Controversiae* 7.6.21 he writes:

Hispō Romānīus dixerat: “However and to call this rapist who bides his time a husband?” This word [*serotinus*] was not made use of by the ancients. The same word was signified by Gavius Sabinus, but by paraphrase, so as to be without reprehension, when he says that public revenge had not yet been consummated upon all of the slaves: “There remains a rapist in our home”.\(^\text{51}\)

---

\(^{48}\) *Fin.* 3.51, Rackham (1914) translation: Hinc est illud exortum, quod Zeno πξνεγκέλνλ, contraque quod ἀπνπξνεγκέλνλ nominavit, cum utteretur in lingua copiosa factis tamen nominibus ac novis, quod nobis in hac inopi lingua non conceditur; quamquam tu hanc copiosiorem etiam soles dicere.

\(^{49}\) See Hutchinson (2013), 159.

\(^{50}\) Fairweather (1981), 198-200.

\(^{51}\) HISPO ROMANIVS dixerat: maritum autem ego istum vocem raptorem serotinum? Verbum hoc, quasi aput antiquos non usurpatum, quibusdam displicebat. eiusdem verbi significacione, ut extra
Seneca observes that Hispo Romanius’ use of serotinus was not made use of by the ancients and was displeasing to some (displiceo) and writes that Gavius Sabinus used a circumlocution to avoid ‘reprehension’. In Contr. 2.2.7 he highlights the sententia of one of his teachers, Marullus:

Marullus, our teacher, used a little boldly a word which, nonetheless forced out enough of the sense, when he said that the wife had understood the lie of her husband: “She herself reacted [relusit] at the insconsiderate joke of her husband”.52

As Fairweather notes, the passage:

...is indicative of a certain tolerance towards neologisms on Seneca’s part that, though he thinks it bold to use such a word, he considers that it expresses the meaning intended well enough.53

Seneca was critical of the over-use of poetic metaphors in prose, where he uses the example of Musa in Contr. 10.9:

For how could a man say for jets of water: “They rained upwards to the sky,” [caelo repluunt] and spraying perfume: “scented rain,” [odoratos imbres] for a neat garden: “chiseled forest” [caelatas silvas], and for a ?painted bough, “surging wood” [nemora surgentia]?54

Seneca also criticised Arellius Fuscus in Cont. 2.1 for an ‘uneven style’ (summa inaequalitas orationis) and a habit of ‘beyond a rule, he permitted himself to use all words, while indeed elegant, freely’.55 However Seneca seems to be more tolerant to the use of innovations in Latin than he is against them. After his critique of Musa’s coined poetic metaphors, he says: ‘Yet I am not from these very harsh critics, who set out

reprehensionem esset, usus est GAVIVS SAVINVVS, nondum esse consummatam adversus servos publicam vindictam: etiamnunc in domo nostra residuus raptor est.
52. MARVLLVS praeceptor noster licenter verbo usus est satis sensum exprime, cum diceret uxorem intelleixisse mariti mendacium: et ipsa adversus temerarios mariti iocos relusit.”
55. “…in descriptionibus extra legem omnibus verbis, dummodo niterent, permissa libertas”.
narrow rules: I think much must be forgiven to talent, but defects must be forgiven, not monstrosities’.  

Indeed there are some words in Seneca which appear for the first time in Latin and are simply neologisms based on older roots:


It is fair to say, therefore, that Seneca the Elder’s attitude, like many writers since Cicero, was one of balance - to have an ingenious passage of rhetoric one must not simply conform to narrow rules, but equally one must not permit oneself to go beyond them too far, turning defects into monstrosities. As Fairweather remarks: ‘It seems hardly likely, then, that [Seneca] would have agreed entirely with any scholastic ban on new formations’.  

**4.5. Horace and poetic neologisms**

In *Ars Poetica* (18 B.C.), Horace asks why contemporary poets should be denied the ability to create words when writers such as Cato and Ennius were able to ‘enrich’ their *sermonem patrium*:

Why should the Romans grant to Plautus and Caecilius a privilege denied to Virgil and Varius? Why should I be resented, if I have it in my power to acquire a few words, when the language of Cato and Ennius has enriched our native tongue, and produced new names of things?  

---

56 ‘Nec sum ex iudicibus severissimis, qui omnia ad exactam regulam dirigant: multa donanda ingeniis puto; sed donanda vitia, non portenta sunt.


58 *Ars*. 53-58: ‘...quid autem / Caecilio Plautoque dabit Romanus ademptum Vergilio Varioque? ego cur, adquirere paucia / si possum, invideo, cum lingua Catonis et Enni / sermonem patrium ditaverit et nova rerum nomina protulerit?’
Horace does not use the trope of *egestas* in the Latin language, and he is aware that earlier writers such as Ennius and Cato have already enriched the language, however coining new words where needed could make Latin richer. Horace says that new words can be fashioned (*fingere*, 59 *Ars*. 50) to show indications of hidden things by recent signs (*Ars*. 49: *indiciis monstrare recentibus abdita rerum*), indeed Horace may even be deploying a neologism of his own in giving *indicium* a specific philological meaning as a ‘linguistic sign’. 60

Compare this to Lucretius’ statement of the difficulty with ‘Graiorum obscura reperta’ (‘the Greeks’ dark discoveries’, 1.136–37). Lucretius says that his neologisms will be used ‘to open clear light to the mind’ (*clara...praepandere lumina menti*, 1.144). In lines 52-3 Horace asseverates that: ‘...new and lately-formed words will have authority, if they descend from a Greek source, with a slight deviation.’ 61 Brink argues that here Horace cannot possibly mean that only neologisms derived from a Greek model are acceptable, for if that were the case, coinages he uses such as *ampullatur* (*Ep*. 1.3.14) and *dominantia nomina* (*Ars*. 234) would be valid, but something like *cinctutis* (*Ars*. 50) would not. 62 Dufallo argues that Horace’s poetic imagery suggests that arguments (later summarised by Quintilian in *Inst*. 12.10.33) for the poetic ‘mellifluousness of Greek’ may, in part, be responsible for Horace’s choice of water-imagery. Dufallo states the metaphor implies Greek words exist ‘in nature (they spring from a *fons*), and their use is less an entirely new production than a modulation of what nature offers’. 63 While that is one view, this metaphor is striking as it seems to echo a tradition of translation begun well before Cicero. A tradition whose attitude is that simple transliteration or direct importing of Greek loanwords ought to be looked upon with disdain. If a Greek word were to be incorporated into Latin verse (or prose, although this medium was less strict) it usually had to be Latinised in some form either by a calque or completely new translation, retaining the original meaning of the Greek loanword, i.e. only a slight deviation (*parce detorta*). In the next passage (60-63), Horace constructs an elaborately poetic metaphor for his theory of the language change:

---

59 *Fingere* as a verb is well-established as equivalent to ‘coining’ a new word, see *TLL*, 6.683.9ff.
60 *TLL* s.v. *indicium*, 7.1.1150.34; see also Brink (1982), 142: ‘For [Horace] new words are a means of “revealing”, *monstrare*...intellectual territory unperceived, although his topic is not philosophy…”
61 ‘...et nova fictaque nuper habebunt verba fidelis, si / Graeco fonte cadent parce detorta”.
62 Brink (1982), 140.
63 Dufallo (2005), 95.
As leaves in the woods are changed with the fleeting years; the earliest fall off first: in this manner words perish with old age, and those lately invented flourish and thrive, like men in the time of youth.\textsuperscript{64}

Horace summarises:

Many words shall grow again, which now have fallen off; and many which are now in esteem shall fall off, if it be the will of custom, in whose power is the decision and right and standard of language.\textsuperscript{65}

The images are vivid but so too is his conviction that the introduction of new words, be they from Greece or invented by Romans themselves, is a necessary step to the evolution of language. Horace portrays critics’ resistance to neologisms in Latin\textsuperscript{66} as recent attitude which had not applied to the greats of the past yet is now unfairly turned into an ill-conceived standard to which contemporary poets are held.\textsuperscript{67} Horace respected the power and sound of Greek words in poetry yet was cautious to compare this to the merits or flaws of Latin. Horace focused on the \textit{usus} of neologisms and how they could contribute to poetic innovation under the right conditions. His metaphors described the life cycle of ‘accepted’ words and the inevitable decline of new words which do not find favour with other writers, yet reinforces the necessity of lexical innovation, in his case within the realms of poetry, to shine a metaphorical light on those difficult and obscure concepts.\textsuperscript{68}

\textbf{4.6. Seneca the Younger and Cicero: The philosophical vocabulary ‘egestas’ in Latin}

In one of Seneca’s letters to Lucilius, it is clear that even in Seneca’s time in the early first century A.D. there is some doubt as to whether the Latin \textit{essentia} was an

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{64}“\textit{ut silvae foliis privos mutantur in annos,/ prima cadunt, ita verborum vetus interit aetas, / et iuvenum ritu florent modo nata vigentque.” \\
\item \textsuperscript{65}“multa renascentur quae iam cecidere cadentque / quae nunc sunt in honore vocabula, si volet usus, quem penes arbitrium est et ius et norma loquendi”; cf. Il. 6.146-149.
\item \textsuperscript{66} Cf. above those critics mentioned in Seneca the Elder’s \textit{Controversiae}.
\item \textsuperscript{67} See Reinhardt (2012), 515. In the time between Horace all the way up to later poetry such as Dante Alighieri’s \textit{La Divina Commedia}, poets increasingly understood the power of linguistic experimentation, particularly lexical innovation and neologisms in expressing what was previously uncontemplated. They began to reject the anti-innovation mindset which Horace had criticised, as Botterill (1996), 160 describes Dante: „When Dante coins a neologism, he wins, and celebrates, a victory over silence and meaninglessness”. \\
\item \textsuperscript{68} Cf. \textit{Ars}. 49.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
appropriate term to equate with the Greek idea of οὐσία. His despair at Latin’s linguistic egestas or ‘poverty’ is lamented in Letter 58 of his Letters to Lucilius, ‘How scant of words our language is, nay, such poverty (egestas), I have not fully understood until today.’

Seneca goes on to tackle the question of Being in the context of Plato. The passage in focus is quite long but I believe it to be very revealing about Roman attitudes towards interpreting Greek thought:

I desire, if possible, to say the word *essentia* to you and obtain a favourable hearing. If I cannot do this, I shall risk it even though it put you out of humour. I have Cicero as authority for the use of this word, and I regard him as influential (*locupletem*). If you desire testimony of a later date, I shall cite Fabianus, careful of speech, cultivated, and so polished in style that he will suit even our nice tastes. For what can we do, my dear Lucilius? How otherwise can we find a word for that which the Greeks call οὐσία, something that is indispensable, something that is the natural substratum (*natura continens fundamentum*) of everything? I beg you accordingly to allow me to use this word *essentia*. I shall nevertheless take pains to exercise the privilege, which you have granted me, with as sparing a hand as possible; perhaps I shall be content with the mere right. Yet what good will your indulgence do me, if, lo and behold, I can’t express in Latin that which made me cry out against [the poverty] of our language?

Seneca asks in such an elaborate way permission from Lucilius to use the semi-calque *essentia*, yet never uses the term again in his letters. Gummere suggests in a footnote to his translation that Seneca is really saying in the last few sentences of this passage: ‘I must not use other imported words to explain *essentia*, which is not a native Latin word, but invented as a literal translation of οὐσία.’ What I want to draw attention to here is

---

69 Seneca, *Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales*, 58.1: „Quanta verborum nobis paupertas, immo egestas sit, nunquam magis quam hodierno die intellexi“.

70 Papirius Fabianus, a philosopher and rhetorician during the 1st Century A.D. Seneca places his philosophical works next to those of Cicero, Asinius Pollio, and Livy the historian. Both Seneca and Seneca the Elder seem to have known, and certainly greatly esteemed, Fabianus.


72 Gummere (1917-1925), 58.6, n 8.
the obviously hesitant Roman attitude towards translating Greek technical terms into Latin philosophy *ad hoc*. As we have seen in multiple instances with Cicero, Seneca expresses genuine misgivings about simply importing the word *essentia* into Latin to translate *ousia*. This may be because he is worried about how other scholars would view his linguistic trespass (i.e. calquing a Greek word into the Latin language directly might be seen as unpatriotic or ignoble in the face of some Latin linguistic purism); or perhaps it was because Seneca was worried whether or not *essentia* had the correct correspondence and scope to encompass the notion of *ousia*. In either case, the answer is not relevant for the purposes of this investigation because Seneca’s attitudes here reflect a fundamental tension which can be traced back to Livius Andronicus in early Latin poetry; namely the hesitation in using foreign or Greek words in front of a Roman audience. Yet when Romans talked about *fingere* or ‘coining’ new words, according to Dalzell:

[T]hey did not usually mean words made up out of whole cloth, like ‘quiz’ or ‘blurb’ in English. More often than not they meant words derived from Greek and introduced into Latin for the first time.\(^{73}\)

However, like Cicero, Seneca attempts to stay firmly within the Latin linguistic tradition when it comes to his writings on Greek philosophers, but he does not hesitate to introduce Greek terms when it is philosophically appropriate provided the idea is enunciated clearly within Latin. Inwood argues that Seneca reacted against the strategy of translating Greek terms into Latin ‘isomorphically’ or symbolically, he says: ‘Seneca preferred to work his ideas out in Latin, in Latin terms, because that is the language he thinks in’.\(^{74}\) Two examples can be found in Seneca’s works, the first in his *Epistulae Morales*: 9.2:

We are bound to meet with a double meaning if we try to express the Greek term “lack of feeling” (ἀπάθεια) summarily, in a single word, rendering it by the Latin word *impatientia*. For it could be understood to signify the opposite to that which we wish it to have.\(^{75}\)

---

\(^{73}\) Dalzell (1996), 81.

\(^{74}\) Inwood (2005), 20.

\(^{75}\) “In ambiguitatem incidendum est, si exprimere “apátheian” uno verbo cito voluerimus et impatientiam dicere; poterit enim contrarium ei quod significare volumus intellegi.”
In the *De Tranquilitate Animi* (2.3) Seneca comes across Democritus’ concept of εὐζπκία which he calls *tranquillitas*. Seneca realises this is not a direct calque or loan from the Greek original but justifies his innovation:

> For it is not necessary to imitate and to transport words to their [original] form; the concept itself, from which it is derived, must be signified by some name, which ought to have the force of the Greek appellation, but not the outward appearance.\(^\text{76}\)

Seneca’s resistance to direct calquing or ‘isomorphic’ translation of Greek philosophical concepts marks him apart from his predecessors in the same field such as Cicero. Where Cicero will ask for permission to innovate (but do it anyway) and find his way through Latin’s own stock before attempting to fashion a neologism, Seneca went out of his way to work creatively within Latin. The flip-side to this, as Inwood points out, is that:

> On the one hand, we can be much closer to Senaca’s own intellectual creativity than we would otherwise be, but on the other he is less easy than Cicero to coordinate with the Greek background which we sometimes seek when reading Latin philosophy.\(^\text{77}\)

### 4.7. Ciceronian influence in the Epistles of Pliny the Younger

In a letter to the soldier Sabinus, the Roman lawyer Gaius Plinius Caecilius Secundus compares himself to Cicero in regards to letter writing:

> ...I did not have sufficient material to write. For nor was I in the same situation as Tully was, whom you point out to me as an example. He not only possessed a most copious genius, but the times wherein he lived furnished a variety of noble occasions for exercising it. As for myself, you know (without my telling you) to what narrow limits I am confined; unless you perhaps want me to send you rhetorical treatises, and what I might call, *armchair* letters. But nothing seems to

\(^{76}\) “Nec enim imitari et transferre verba ad illorum formam necesse est; res ipsa, de qua agitur, aliquo signanda nomine est, quod appellationis Graecae vim debet habere, non faciem.”

\(^{77}\) Inwood (2005), 20.
me more out of place, when I imagine you in the midst of arms and encampments... \textsuperscript{78}

Like Seneca the Younger,\textsuperscript{79} Pliny (61 A.D. - c. 113 A.D.) was well aware of the epistolary tradition stretching back to Cicero and he made it a point to emulate him where possible. Marchesi asserts: ‘In short, Cicero is audible everywhere in Pliny, but often as a sort of background music’.\textsuperscript{80} Other commentators have observed subtle differences in both writers’ approaches: ‘Pliny is highly selective in his choice of Ciceronian motifs for imitation and reworking; he is also very subtle, of course, to the degree that it is often difficult to pin down the Ciceronian inheritance’.\textsuperscript{81} Scholars have long noted the influence of epistolary tropes and techniques in Pliny inherited from Cicero,\textsuperscript{82} yet no one to my knowledge has examined Pliny’s imitation of Ciceronian lexical innovation. The following list of innovations in Pliny is derived from Gamberini’s excellent although slightly incomplete survey\textsuperscript{83} of the author’s style and diction and provides a very useful basis for comparison. I have amplified Gamberini’s data with my own additions. Neologisms are in \textbf{bold italics} and loanshifts (i.e. existing words given new meanings) are in \textbf{bold} only:

**Lexical innovations in Pliny the Younger**

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{actiuncula} (9.15.2)
  \item \textit{aposphragisma} (10.74.3)
  \item \textit{bellatorius} (7.9.7)
  \item \textit{cenatiuncula} (4.30.2)
  \item \textit{cryptoporticus} (2.17.16; 5.6.27; 7.21.2; 9.6.31; 9.36.3)
  \item \textit{exscribo} (4.28.1; 5.16.9)
  \item \textit{gestator} (9.33.8)
  \item \textit{haesitabundus} (1.5.13)
  \item \textit{haesitator} (5.10.2)
  \item \textit{inaresco} (2.4.4)
  \item \textit{inoffensum} (6.4.2)
  \item \textit{monstrabilis} (6.21.3)
  \item \textit{peracerbus} (6.5.6)
  \item \textit{percopiosus} (9.31.1)
  \item \textit{perdecorus} (3.9.28)
  \item \textit{pertribuo} (Ep. Tra. 10.86b)
  \item \textit{praecursorius} (4.13.2)
  \item \textit{reformator} (8.12.1)
  \item \textit{sinisteritas} (6.17.3)
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{78} Plin. \textit{Ep.} 9.2: „…ne nec materia plura scribendi dabatur. Neque enim eadem nostra condicio quae M. Tulli, ad cuius exemplum nos vocas. Illi enim et copiosissimum ingenium, et par ingenio qua varietas rerum qua magnitudo largissime suppetebat; nos quam angustis terminis claudamur etiam tacente me perspicis, nisi forte volumus scholasticas tibi atque, ut ita dicam, umbraticas litteras mittere. Sed nihil minus aptum arbitramur, cum arma vestra cum castra…“


\textsuperscript{80} Marchesi (2008), 214: „By applying some degree of ingenuity, in almost every letter [Pliny] penned one may find a theme or a turn of phrase that has at least a remote antecedent in Cicero“.

\textsuperscript{81} Gibson and Morello (2012), 75.

\textsuperscript{82} See Guillemin (1929), 114-115; Marchesi (2008), 207ff and 252-257.

\textsuperscript{83} Gamberini (1983), 508-509; I have omitted definitions and usage examples in this list since Gamberini’s discussion of many of these innovations does not need to be repeated here.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>defremo (9.13.4)</th>
<th>musteus (8.21.6)</th>
<th>supervivo (2.1.2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>descensio (5.6.26)</td>
<td>nitesco (2.17.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enodis (5.17.2)</td>
<td>obiectus (2.17.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The similarities become obvious from a quick glance back at the Ciceronian innovations in Chapter 3. Like Cicero, Pliny formed his innovations from diminutives (*actincula* and *cenatiunca*), agency suffixes in -or and -orius (*bellatorius, gestator, haesitator, praecursorius, reformator*), compounds (*supervivo*), -tas and -tio suffixes (*descensio, sinisteritas*), and compounds in *per-* (*peracerbus, percopiosus, perdecorus, pertribuo*). The suffix -*bundus* rears its head again in *haesitabundus*, direct loans (*aposphragisma > ἀποσφράγισμα, baptisterium > βαπτιστήριον*), and architectural loanblends in *cryptoporticus* (*κρυπτός + porticus*) and *sphaeristerium* (*σφαιριστήριον*) make multiple appearances. Gamberini describes the vocabulary and syntax of Pliny’s *Letters* as a type of ‘refined colloquialism’ and from the discussion in Chapter 3 above on Cicero’s extensive use of vocabulary from the *sermo plebeius*, it should come as no surprise that many of the word-forms found in Cicero’s epistles recur in Pliny’s.

Gamberini makes an important observation, in accord with the survey of Ciceronian innovation in Chapter 3 above, that although ‘it should...be remembered that neologisms are a not insignificant feature of the whole [Plinian] corpus’ equally it must not be forgotten that ‘not a small proportion of words [classified as pure neologisms and predominately poetic words] consists of words plain, colloquial, or vulgar’. Thus we can reach the same conclusion as we did for Cicero above: that although Pliny no doubt resorted to innovation on a number of occasions throughout his *Letters*, it is perhaps going too far to attribute all such first attestations to his own inventiveness. A better conclusion would be to acknowledge Pliny’s acceptance of lexical innovation in moderation, combined with borrowing from the lower registers of Latin which conveyed a sort of colloquial, as well as rhetorical, style to his epistolary works.

---

85 Gamberini (1983), 452 and 493.
CONCLUSION

In the opening of his *De natura deorum* Cicero wrote: ‘In the first place I thought that I ought to expound philosophy to my fellow country-men in the interests of the republic’.\(^{86}\) This expresses the attitude of a man who was not simply driven to philosophy by *otium* or ‘leisure’ later in life, but it is as if he were obligated (*explicanda*) out of some civic duty. In introducing Greek thought into Latin, Cicero saw himself as performing a duty to his fellow Romans. Critics labelled him a populariser on the one hand, and a linguistic purist on the other. He had a marked respect for the Greek language and it was his lifelong goal to bring Latin to the same level of refinement and intellectual facility. Yet no work on such subject matter can hope to map out the entirety of Cicero’s linguistic and philosophical achievements, nor the varied nature of his methods. Since much of Latin literature before Cicero is available to us now in so fragmentary a state, this places limits on how definitive any conclusions can be in the context of Latin literature as a whole.

In Chapter One, I provided a context of ‘lexical innovation’ from the earliest times up to Cicero. This involved examining various linguistic practices such as compounding and calquing in authors such as Livius Andronicus, Gnaeus Naevius, and Quintus Ennius, among others. I demonstrated that Latin lexical innovation was not a new phenomenon confined to Cicero, but was rather an ongoing practice since the epic poets through the influence of Greek literary traditions, from which Latin’s were solely derived. In this sense, authors such as Cicero simply formed part of a tradition, albeit with a more ambitious and technical scope. Instead of emulating Greek poetic practices as Livius, Naevius, and Ennius had done in their works, Cicero was attempting to introduce Greek thinking via novel Latin terminology, predominantly in the discipline of philosophy.

Based on compilations from my 2010 study, with recourse to secondary sources such as the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* and the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, a sizable portion of Latin words were uncovered in Chapter Two sourced from Cicero’s extant philosophical works which satisfied two main criteria: 1: a) where Cicero had explicitly introduced completely new Latin words or b) new meanings and usages for existing Latin words; and 2: where the Latin innovation was explicitly derived from a ‘direct translation’ of a Greek original. With these criteria framing the examination *ab initio*

---

\(^{86}\) *N.D* 1.7: ‘...primum ipsius rei publicae causa philosophiam nostris hominibus explicandam putavi’. 
with a focus placed solely on Cicero’s philosophical, the scope of the investigation was narrowed considerably. The investigation demonstrated that Cicero was also pragmatic in the coining of Latin terminology for Greek philosophical concepts and did not wholly adopt the attitude of a Latin purist, nor did he resign himself to importing Greek words *ad hoc*, but aimed to find a balance in which the philosophical thought of the Greeks could be suitably expressed in a manner which was simultaneously comprehensible to Latin readers and faithful enough to the Greek terminology.

In Chapter Three, the philological aspects of Cicero’s letters were examined in some detail with a focus on his correspondence with Atticus. The conclusions were not definitive and Cicero’s use of the *sermo plebeius* or other informal registers of Latin obscured any observations of ‘how much’ innovation actually occurred in his letters. Further possibilities of Cicero’s potential innovations in Greek (and conversely, his use of *Koine* Greek in his correspondence) were also canvassed. The conclusions suggested that Cicero generally resorted to lexical innovation for humour and puns more than anything else. Perhaps he did use the ‘vernacular’ and non-literary technical forms of Latin and Greek as vehicles to form new words, in the same way as users of the *sermo plebeius* might have done at the time, but such speculation can never be confirmed due to the scant records of the everyday vernacular.

In Chapter Four, contemporaries such as Varro and Lucretius, and later authors such as Seneca the Elder and Younger, Horace, and Quintilian provided illustrative comparisons to Cicero’s own attitude towards lexical innovation. The survey was not intended to be an exhaustive analysis of every author after Cicero and their own instances of possible lexical innovation, rather it was a comparison of attitudes which seem to fluctuate from acceptance of neologisms and loanwords, to an outright suspicion of such practices. An interesting case was Lucretius, whose literary medium of poetry was very different from Cicero’s prose, and so his own attitude towards innovation was severely affected by the mode in which he composed his work.

This study has its obvious limitations when it comes to the scope of investigation. In Chapters Two and Three for example, only the philosophical works and the Atticus correspondence of Cicero were examined for lexical innovation, yet it seems these areas alone have not received as much attention they deserve from past scholarship on Cicero, and I believe it is time for a more detailed investigation of his contribution to the Latin language by examining his entire corpus. Where one finds detailed style analyses and linguistic examination compiled from Lucretius’ single
poem in works such as Bailey’s authoritative introduction to *De rerum natura*, hardly anything of this nature has appeared on the vast collection of Cicero’s works in classical scholarship to equal such works in sheer scope or detail. In addition, this thesis has focused mainly on lexical aspects of Ciceronian innovation, further analyses of syntax and grammar would also no doubt prove fruitful and only some studies have touched on this aspect to varying degrees in the past. A thorough philological survey of Cicero’s corpus would add much value to the study of Ciceronian literature and the Latin language generally, and it is hoped that my modest contribution here may pave the way for a broader analysis of his works in the future. A broader study of Cicero’s use of Greek in his letters, especially in the area of orthography, compared with later Latin writers in the epistolary medium, would be a welcome addition to the current scholarship in this field, especially with the rise of searchable manuscript databases and digitised papyri.

The methods employed in dealing with ‘innovation’ have varied for different reasons throughout this thesis. As outlined in the introduction, the differences in defining the scope of ‘innovation’ were largely based on external factors such as the prescribed length of the thesis and the amount of available extant evidence, which varied from author to author. In Chapter One, the focus was on fragmentary early Latin poetry, which made it obviously difficult to single out definitively ‘innovations’ as opposed to merely archaic, poetic, or unusual vocabulary. In Chapter Two, the definition of an innovation was significantly narrower and more specific with a focus being on direct glosses of Greek philosophical terms by Cicero due to the relatively well-preserved nature of his corpus which compelled specialisation.

At the time of writing *De natura deorum* Cicero made this triumphant statement: ‘In the matter of style however I believe that we have made such progress that even in richness of vocabulary we are not surpassed (*vinceremur*) by the Greeks’. This last verb brings out the essence of what I hoped to elucidate at the core of this thesis: Cicero’s efforts represent more than just a love of language, of words, of invention and discovery – it is the triumph of a man who revered his mother-tongue yet was deeply

---

87 Bailey (1947), 1.132-171.
88 The scholarship is surprisingly lacking, particularly in English, and later German studies such as Liscu’s (1930), Widmann’s (1968), and Hartung’s (1970) are but rare examples of the subject being tackled in any kind of depth.
89 E.g. see Hartung’s (1970) excellent overview.
90 I note the forthcoming work from my supervisor Dr Neil O’Sullivan in this area of the Ciceronian corpus.
91 *N.D* 1.8: ‘Quo in genere tantum profecisse videmur, ut a Graecis ne verborum quidem copia vinceremur’.
influenced by Greek thought and language, much like his predecessors. Like the early Livius Andronicus and later Lucretius in relation to poetry, Cicero set out to Latinise Greek philosophy for his fellow Romans; a feat which he went some way in successfully achieving. Cicero’s contributions to the expansion of the Latin language should not be simply confined to his lexical choices. His efforts towards the end of his life were not simply linguistic in nature, but conceptual as well, providing Latin with the means to interpret and eventually surpass Greek as the language of philosophical discourse in the Western world.
APPENDIX I - FRAGMENTS FROM LIVIUS ANDRONICUS’ ODISSIA

Fragment sources are from the text presented in Warmington (1956-1957).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livius Andronicus’ Odissia</th>
<th>Homer’s Odyssey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 1 Virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum</td>
<td><em>(Od. 1.1)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 2 Pater noster, Saturni filie</td>
<td><em>(Od 1.45)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frr. 3-4 Mea puer, quid verbi ex tuo ore supra fugit?</td>
<td><em>(Od. 1.64)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 5 Neque enim te oblitus sum, Laertie noster</td>
<td><em>(Od. 1.65)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 6 argenteo polybro, aureo eglutro</td>
<td><em>(Od. 1.136-7)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 7 tuque mihi narrato omnia disertim</td>
<td><em>(Od. 1.169)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 8 Quae haec daps est? Qui festus dies?</td>
<td><em>(Od. 1.225-6)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 9 ... matrem procitum plurimi venerunt</td>
<td><em>(Od. 1.248)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 10 quando dies adveniet quem profata Morta est.</td>
<td><em>(Od. 2.99-100)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 11 [aut] in Pylum deveniens aut ibi ommentans</td>
<td><em>(Od. 2.317)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 12 tumque remos iussit religare struppis¹</td>
<td><em>(Od. 2.422-6)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The Latin heavily abbreviates the Homeric original of Telemachus ordering his crew to fasten the sail of the ship: „And then he ordered them to tie the oars with straps”, but this may be due to Isidorus picking and choosing which line was most relevant to his purpose in highlighting „struppis”.
| Fr. 13 | ibidemque vir summus adprimus Patroclus | *(Od. 3.110)* |
| Fr. 14 | atque escas habeamus mentionem | *(Od. 4.213)* |
| Fr. 15 | partim errant, nequinont Graeciam redire | *(Od. 4.495)* |
| Fr. 16 | sancta puer Saturni... regina | *(Od. 4.513)* |
| Fr. 17 | apud nimpham Atlantis filiam Calipsonem | *(Od. 4.557)* |
| Fr. 18 | Igitur demum Ulixi cor frixit prae pavore | *(Od. 6.141-2)* |
| Fr. 19 | utrum genua am الوقترئهفس virginem oraret | *(Od. 6.295-6)* |
| Fr. 20-1 | ibi manens sedeto donicum videbis | *(Od. 6.629-9)* |
| Fr. 22 | simul ac dacrimas de ore noegeo detersit | *(Od. 8.88)* |
| Fr. 27 | venit Mercurius cumque eo filius Latonas. | *(Od. 8.322-3)* |
| Fr. 28-9 | Nexeβαντ multa inter se flexu nodorum dubio | *(Od. 8.378)* |
| Fr. 30 | nam divina Monetas filia docuit | *(Od. 8.480-1)* |
| Fr. 31-2 | Inferus an superus tibi fert deus funera, Ulixes? | *(Od. 10.64)* |
| Fr. 33 | Topper facit homones ut prius fuerunt, | *(Od. 10.395)* |
| Fr. 34-6 | Topper citi ad aedis venimus Circai; simul ἄγενως carnis portant ad navis, multam ancillae; vina isdem inserinuntur. | *(Od. 12.16-19)* |
| Fr. 37 | parcentes praemodum | *(Od. 12.321)* |
| Fr. 38 | sic quoque fitum est | *(Od. 13.40)* |
| Fr. 39 | quoniam audivi, paucis gavisi | *(Od. 16.92)* |
| Fr. 40 | vestis pulla porpurea ampla | *(Od. 19.225)* |
| Fr. 41 | cum socios nostros Ciclops impius mandisset | *(Od. 20.19-20)* |
| Fr. 42 | inque manum suremit hastam | *(Od. 21.433)* |
| Fr. 43-4 | ...at celer hasta volans perrumpit pectora ferro | *(Od. 22.91-3)* |
| Fr. 45 | carnis vinumque quod libabant anclabatur | *(Od. 23.304-5)* |
| Fr. 46 | deque manibus dextrabus | *(Od. 24.534)* |
This compilation is based on data taken primarily from Skutsch (1985). The list is my own and catalogues the innovations (compound forms) in Ennius.

* Appendice Ann. 394.
* aequipero Ann. 131; Epigrammata, fr. 2.
* altisonus Ann. 575, Andromache, fr. 102; Varia, fr. 34.
* altitonans Ann. 554.
* altivolans Ann. 76.
* augifico Andromache, fr. 110.
* bellicrepus [Ann. fr. dub. 13 Skutsch].
* belligerans Ann. 187.
* bellipotens Ann. 198.
* bilinguis Ann. 543.
* bipatens Ann. 58.
* blandiloquentia Medea exul, fr. 275.
* caelicola Varia fr. 9.
* crebrisurus [Ann. incert. frag. 623 Skutsch]
* dentefaber Ann. 319.
* doctiloquus [Ann. incert. frag. 593 Skutsch]
* dulcifer Ann. 70.
*flammifer Alcmæon, fr. 32.
* frugifer Ann. 564.
* laniger Satires, fr. 24.
* mortifer Telamo, fr. 322.
* omnipotens Ann. 447; Hectoris Lytra, fr. 187
* quadriiugus Andromache, 92.
* quadrupedans Hectoris lytra, fr. 189.
* quadrupes Ann. 256.
* regificc Andromache, fr. 105.
* sapientipotens Ann. 198.

References are all to Warmington (1956-57) except where specified, the list is based on Coulter (1916), 168-172 however there are multiple corrections and additions on my part.
saxifragus [Ann. fr. dub. 12 Skutsch].
signitenens Andromeda, 117.
suaviloquens Ann. 304.
velivolans Alexander, fr. 71,
velivolas Andromache, fr. 85; Ann. 376.
APPENDIX III - LEXICAL INNOVATION IN PLAUTUS

The list of proposed Plautine compounds has been compiled through my own research, and are all most likely Plautine innovations.

albicapillus Mil. 631.
anceps Men. 858, Poen. 25, 78; Rud. 1158.
armiger Cas. 257; Cas. 55, 270.
benedico Asin. 745.
benefactum Trin. 323.
beneficus Bacch. 395.
benevolens Bacch. 475, 553; Cas. 435; Cist. 23; Epid. 78; Merc. 887; Mil. 1351; Ps. 699; Trin. 46, 356, 637, 1148, 1177; Cist. 586.
bilibris Mil. 854.
bisulcis (-us) Poen. 1034.
blandidicus Poen. 138.
bustirapus Ps. 361.
caelipotens Pers. 755.
capreagenus Epid. 18.
carnificina Capt. 132; Cist. 203.
carnificius Most. 55.
centuplex Pers. 560.
conduplico Ps. 1261.
confidentiloquus Trin. 201.
Conterebromnius Curc. 446.
contortiplicatus Pers. 708.
Crucisalus Bacch. 362.
Crurifragius Poen. 886.
dannificus Cist. 728.
dannigerulus Truc. 551.
delenificus Mil. 192.
deludifico Rud. 147.
deludificor Most. 1033.
dentifrangibulus Bacch. 605
eludificor Most. 1040.
falsidicus Capt. 671; Trin. 770.
falsificus Mil. 191.
falsiurus Mil. 191.
falsiloquus Capt. 264; Mil. 191.
ferricrepinus Asin. 33.
ferriterus: Trin. 1021.
ferritribax Most. 356.
fidicina Stich. 380
flabellifera Trin. 252.
fumifico Mil. 412.
fumificus frag. inc. 1.
furcifer Amph. 285, 539; Asin. 485, 677; Capt. 563, 577; Cas. 139; Mil. 545; Most. 69, 1172; Poen. 784; Ps. 194, 361; Rud. 717, 996.
furtificus Epid. 12; Pers. 226; Ps. 887.
fustitudinus Asin. 33.
gerulifigulus Bacch. 381.
laetificor Aul. 725.
laetitificans Pers. 760.
lapidicina Capt. 736, 944, 1000.
largiloquus Cist. 122; Mil. 318.
levifidus Pers. 243.
locuples Cist. 492, Epid. 153; Rud. 293; Trin. 565.
loripes Poen. 510.
lucrifer (?lucrificus) Pers. 515, 516.
lucrificabilis Pers. 712.
ludificabilis Cas. 761.
ludifico Amph. 585.
ludificor Amph. 565.
magnanimus Amph. 212.
magnificus Mil. 923; Rud. 515.
magnifico Men. 371; Stich. 101.
magnificus Astin. 351, Bacch. 966; Curc. 579; Ps. 194.
maledicax Curc. 512.
maledicens Merc. 410.
maledico Amph. 572.
maleficius Asin. 483.
maleficius Bacch. 280; Cas. 783; Mil. 194; Ps. 195a, 939a; Rud. 1247; Trin. 551.
malesuadus Most. 213.
malevolens Bacch. 615; Capt. 583; Stich. 394.
manifestarius Aul. 469; Bacch. 918; Mil. 444; Trin. 895.
mendaciloquus Trin. 769
merobibus Curc. 77.
misericors Amph. 297; Rud. 585.
morigerus Amph. 842, 1004; Capt. 966; Cas. 463, 896; Cist. 175; Curc. 157, 169; Epid. 607; Men. 202; Most. 398; Ps. 208.
multibibus Cist. 149; Curc. 77.
multigeneris Capt. 159; Stich. 383.
multiloquus Cist. 149; Ps. 794.
multiplex Epid. 529.
multipotens Bacch. 652, Cas. 841, Trin. 820.
munerigerulus Ps. 181.
munificus Amph. 842
muricidus Epid. 333.
noctuvigilus Curc. 196.
nucifrangibulum Bacch. 598.
noxiousus Aul. 525.
opificina Mil. 880.
opiparus Capt. 769; Mil. 107; Pers. 549; Poen. 132.
Parcepromus Truc. 184.
pedisequus Mil. 1009; Aul. 501; Asin. 183; Aul. 807.
parcepromus Truc. 184.
planiloquus Truc. 864.
princeps *Amph*. 204, 256; *Mos*. 237; *Pers*. 1.
puerpera *Amph*. 1092; *Truc*. 414, 478.
pultiphagus *Most*. 828.
quadrilibris *Aul*. 809, 821.
quadrilmulus *Capt*. 981; *Poen*. 85.
quadrilmus *Capt*. 8, 876, 1011.
quadrupedans *Capt*. 814.
quadrupedus *Asin*. 708.
quadruplex *Curc*. 619.
quadrupulus *Truc*. 762.
quinquennis *Poen*. 85.
sacrilagus *Ps*. 363; *Rud*. 706.
salsipotens *Trin*. 820.
salutigerulus *Aul*. 502.
sandaligerula *Trin*. 252.
scrofipascus *Capt*. 807.
scrupeda frag. fab. cert. 100.
scutigerulus *Cas*. 262.
semidoctus *Asin*. 227.
semisomnus *Curc*. 115.
Psemisonarius *Aul*. 516.
septempedalis *Curc*. 441.
septuennis *Bacch*. 440; *Men*. 24, 1116; *Merc*. 292; *Poen*. 66.
Sescentoplagus *Capt*. 726.
sexennis *Poen*. 902, 987.
siccocus *Ps*. 77.
simplex *Pers*. 559.
simplus *Poen*. 1362.
sociofraudus *Ps*. 362.
speculoclarus *Most*. 644.
spissigradus *Poen*. 506.
spurcicus *Capt*. 56.
spurcificus *Trin*. 826.
stultiloquus *Pers*. 514.
stultividus *Mil*. 335.
subbasilicanus Capt. 815.
subblandior Bacch. 517, 876; Most. 221; Asin. 185; Cos. 586.
tervereficus Bacch. 813.
trifurcifer Aul. 326; Rud. 734, 735.
trigeminus Capt. 90; Mil. 717.
trimus Rud. 744.
triparcus Pers. 266.
triplex Ps. 580, 704, 1025.
triveneifica Aul. 86.
turpilucricupidus Trin. 100.
umbraicoles Truc. 611.
umanimans Truc. 435.
umanimus Stich. 731.
universus Trin. 171, 1047.
unoculus Curc. 392, 394.
Unomammius Curc. 445.
urbicapus Mil. 1055.
vanidicus Trin. 275.
vaniloquus Amph. 379.
veneficus Rud. 1112; Amph. 1043; Pers. 278; Ps. 872; Rud. 987; Epid. 221; Most. 218, Truc. 762.
verscapillus Pers. 230.
versipellis Amph. 123, Bacch. 658.
vestiplica Trin. 252.
viripotens Pers. 252.
### Appendix IV - Caecilius' Adaptation of Menander

As preserved in Gel. 2.23.9f.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Menander, Plokion</th>
<th>Caecilius, Plocium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἐπ᾽ ἀμφίτερα νῦν ἡπίκληρος ἦ καλὴ μέλλει καθευδῆσαι. Κατεύργασται μέγα καὶ περίπληστον ἑργὸν ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας ἐξέβαλεν τὴν λυπόδουσιν, ἢ ἐβουλεύον, ἵν᾽ αποβλέψῃ πάντες εἰς τὸ Κραββόλης πρόσωπον ἢ τ᾽ εὔχαριστον οὐσ᾽ ἐμῇ γνῷ δέσποινα. Καὶ τὴν ὄψιν, ἢν ἐκτίμησο, ὅνος ἐν πιθήκοις, τοῦτο δὴ τὸ λεγόμενον ἐστὶν. Σωματὶ βούλημα τὴν νόκτα τὴν πολλὰν κακὰν ἀρχηγήν. Ὁμὶο Κραββόλην παβέθει ἐμ᾽, ἐκκαθίσκα τάλαντα προδικα καὶ τὴν μὴ ἔχουσιν πηχίας ἐπ᾽ ἐστὶ τὸ φροντίδα ποὺ ὑπόστατον; μᾶ τὸν Δία τῶν Οἰλίμπων καὶ τὴν Ἀθηνὴν, σοῦμας, παύσικαρὸν σωματομάχον δὲ καὶ λόγον.</td>
<td>Is demum miser est, qui aerumnam suam nescit occultare ferre: ita me uxor forma et factis facit, si taceam, tamen indicium. Quae nisi dotem, omnia, quae nolis, habet: qui sapiet, de me discet, qui quasi ad hostes captus liber servio salva urbe atque arce. Quae mihi, quidquid placet, eo privatu vim me servatum. Dum ego eius mortem inhio, egomet vivo mortuas inter vivos. Ea me clam se cum mea ancilla ait consuetum, id me arguit, ita plorando, orando, instando atque obiurgando me obtudit, cam uti venderem; nunc credo inter suas equalis et cognatas sermonem serit: 'quis vestrarum fuit integra aetatula, quae hoc idem a viro impetrat suo, quod ego anus modo effeci, paelice ut meum privarem virum?′ haec erunt concilia hodie, differor sermone miser…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ἔρσ δ᾽ ἐπίκληρον Λάμιαν᾽ σῶκ εἵρηκά σοι τοῦτό; ἐπ᾽ ἀρ᾽ οὐχίς κυρία τῆς οἰκίας καὶ τῶν ἀγρίων καὶ τὰ πάντων ἀντ᾽ ἐκεῖνῆς ἔχομεν. Ἀκολούθως, ὡσ χαλεπῶς χαλεπῶτατον ἐπανά δ᾽ ἀργαλέα στειν, σῶκ ἐμοί μόνον, νῦρ, πολο μᾶλλον θυγατρὶ—Πρέγιμο άμαχον λέγεις. —Εἰδοῖδα. | …Sed tua morose uxor, quesco, est? - Quam rogás? Qui tandem? - Taeet mentionis, quae mihi, Ubi domum adveni, adesi, extemplo savium Dat ieiuna anima. - Nil peccat de savio. Ut devomas vult, quod foris potaveris… |

| Ω ό τρίς κακοδαίμον, ὡς τὸν πένης γαμεῖ καὶ παιδοσυμεῖ. Ὑς ἀληγοστός ἐστ᾽ ἄνηρ, ἐς μῆτε φυλακῆν τῶν ἀναγκάσων ἔχει, μῆτ᾽, ἂν ἀποχή εἰς τὰ κοινὰ τοῦ βίου, ἑπαμφείσαι δύνατο τοῦτο χρῆσαιν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν ὀκαλλίστῳ καὶ ταλαιπώρῳ βίῳ χεωμαζόμενος ἤβ, τῶν μὲν ἀναρχῶν ἔχων τὸ μέρος ἀπάντων, τῶν δ᾽ ἀγαθῶν μέρος. ἄπερ γὰρ ἐν ὑλῆν ἀπαντᾷ νοοθετῶ. | …is demum infortunatus est homo, Pauper qui educit in egestatem liberos, Cui fortuna et res ut est continuo patet. Nam opulento famam facile occultat factio. |
APPENDIX V - LEXICAL INNOVATIONS IN ACCIUS AND PACUVIUS

Entries in *italics* represent innovations from Pacuvius and those non-italicised belong to Accius. The compilation is derived from my own research.

**Substantive abstracts in -tas**

acritas (fr. 480)
angustitas (fr. 507)
*concorditas* (fr. 193)
*discorditas* (fr. 183)
dulcitas (fr. 648)
*famulitas* (fr. 71)
*grandaevitas* (fr. 169)
*initas* (fr. 3)
magnitas (fr. 212)
nitiditas (fr. 217)
ponderitas (*Pragmatica*, fr. 2)
solitas (fr. 348)
*tristitas* (fr. 60)
vicissitas (fr. 604)

**Compounds**

aericrepitans/acricrepantes (fr. 206)\(^3\)
caprigenus (fr. 451)
cornifrons (fr. 2)
crispisulcans (fr. 239)
fallaciloquus (fr. 44)
*flexanimus* (fr. 187)
*grandaevitas* (fr. 169)
horrificabilis (fr. 632)
hostificus (fr. 39)
*incipur* (fr. 23)
incurvicervicus (fr. 235)

\(^3\) The reading is uncertain, but if the former is correct the Latin could be a calque.
indecorabiliter (fr. 220)
indelictus (fr. 376)
ingratificus (fr. 358)
inhorresco (fr. 355)
obnexus (fr. 221)
obscuricus (fr. 37)
obvallus (frr. 70, 71)
orbifico (fr. 410)
praegrado (fr. 68)
repandirostrus (fr. 235)
tabificabilis (fr. 410)
tardigradus (fr. 4)
taurigenus (fr. 451)

Abstracts in -tudo
acritudo (fr. 473)
anxitudo (fr. 120)
castitudo (fr. 593)
desertitudo (doubtful, see Warmington 2.598)
geminitudo (fr. 56)
gracilitudo (fr. 51)
honestitudo (fr. 461)
laetitudo (fr. 27)
maestitudo (fr. 631)
miseritudo (fr. 42)
oxitudo (fr. 129)
orbitudo (fr. 141)
paenitudo (fr. 337)
perperitudo (Pragmatica, fr. 6)
prolixitudo (fr. 129)
sanctitudo (fr. 596)
squalitudo (fr. 334)
taetritudo (fr. 560)
tarditudo (fr. 270)
testudo (fr. 10)
triportenta (Ex incertis fabulis, fr. 1)
vanitudo (fr. 127)
vastitudo (fr. 338)

**Verbs in -esco**
fragesco (fr. 9)
matresco (fr. 136)
pergrandesco (fr. 428)
sanctesco (fr. 130)
vastesco (fr. 603)

**Adjectives in -bilis**
aeternabilis (fr. 229)
aspernabilis (fr. 559)
avorsabilis (fr. 125)
ex(s)ecrabilis (fr. 257)
horrificabilis (fr. 632)
impetibilis (fr. 47)
ingenodabilis (fr. 37)
odibilis (Didascalica, fr. 7)

**Miscellaneous adverbs**
CELERANTER (fr. 82)
cupienter (fr. 546)
debititer (fr. 228)
famulanter (fr. 647)

**Miscellaneous adjectives**
exspes (fr. 360)
fremibundus (fr. 382)
globosus (fr. 38)

---

invisitatus (fr. 333)
labundus (fr. 574)
repotialis (fr. 201)
pinniger (fr. 555)
reciprocus (fr. 554)
sonipes (fr. 657)
saeptuosus (fr. 7)
tenebricus (fr. 131)
viperinus (fr. 552)
volutilis (fr. 542)

**Miscellaneous verbs**
appetisso (fr. 127)
*conduplico* (fr. 356)
merto (fr. 86)
misero (fr. 160)
or bifico (fr. 410)
percito (fr. 361)
*praegrado* (fr. 68)
*redampruo* (fr. 96)
*restibilio* (fr. 372)
succusso (fr. 281)
suppo (fr. 578)
taetro (fr. 612)
verrunco (fr. 320)

**Substantive abstracts in -tia**
errantia (fr. 479)
faventia (fr. 504)

**Miscellaneous nouns**
delitor (fr. 186)
extispex (fr. 404)
grummus (fr. 498)
*manticulator* (Unassigned, frr. 47-51)
plaga (fr. 74)
quadrurbs (Unassigned, Warmington (1957), 2.599)
raudus (fr. 277)
serilia (fr. 278)
stabilimen (fr. 174)
terricula (fr. 315)
trabica (Unassigned, fr. 4)
tripudio (fr. 213)
ungulus (fr. 59)

Greek loanwords

adytus (fr. 618)
alcyon (fr. 31)
aula (fr. 101)
camter (fr. 68)
delphinus (fr. 394)
aether (fr. 110)
bracchium (fr. 59)
clamys (fr. 190)
coma (fr. 175)
dracontem (fr. 599)
euhie (fr. 205)
hymenaues (fr. 120)
lampas (fr. 308)
lembus (fr. 249)
machaera (Didascalica, fr. 13)
mysteria (fr. 529)
pausa (fr. 278)
pelagus (fr. 384)
poema (Didascalica, fr. 14)
polis (fr. 24)
prologium (fr. 28)
sceptrum (fr. 589)
sicinnista (Unassigned, fr. 7, Warmington (1957), 2.590)
spira (fr. 79)
subina (fr. 292)
taenia (fr. 471)
theatrum (Uncertain, fr. 3)
thyrsus (fr. 209)
tyrrannus (fr. 144)
APPENDIX VI - CICERONIAN INNOVATIONS FROM PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS

The following data is primarily based upon my 2010 study but have been substantially updated and added to during the course of this thesis. There are two sets of data that make up Appendix VI, the first being the definitions and sources of the entries (A), the second being the entries divided into lexical categories (B). The numbers beside each definition in (A) follow the conventions of the TLL and OLD respectively, yet in all cases where applicable, I have listed “1: etc.” as the primary meaning even if the TLL or OLD do not give a number (as it is the only meaning of the word). The format of each entry follows this paradigm:

Abscessio, n. (v. ἄπειμι)

\[ A \] TLL, 1: ‘vocabulary a Cicerone ut uidetur formatum, ab ecclesiasticis receptum pro graeco ἀποστασία’; OLD, 1: Removal, loss; (Tim. 44) cum…ad corpora tum accessio fieret, tum abscessio; (Tim. 42a) τὸ μὲν προσίσι τὸ δὲ ἄπισι τοῦ σώματος αὐτῶν.

Key:
A) description/definition in the TLL
B) definition in the OLD
C) Cicero’s Latin translation of the Greek original
D) the Greek original (with Stephanus reference in quotations specifically from the Timaeus).

All entries have their part of speech described and their Greek original listed adjacent. Entries:

- in **bold** indicate loanshifts (semantic neologisms) where an existing Latin word has been imbued with a new meaning
- in **bold italics** indicate new words (neologisms/coinages) introduced by Cicero through various methods discussed further below.
- with an asterisk (*) refer to simple direct transliterations of Greek loan words as distinguished from translations with Greek glosses. In cases of loan words, the earliest Greek usage has also been noted where applicable.
- with a dagger † indicate loanblends.
Finally, where a definition could not be obtained from the TLL, due to its incomplete nature, this has been noted with ‘N/A’.

The method by which these data have been accumulated involved a process of collating various instances of direct translation. The aim throughout was to discover, in the context of a direct Greek translation or loan, either a) a completely novel coinage of a word in Latin, or b) a completely novel usage/meaning of an existing Latin word (also known as a semantic shift or extension). This necessarily involved examining reference works such as the Oxford Latin Dictionary (OLD), the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae (TLL), or the Classical Latin Texts from the Packard Humanities Institute (PHI) and ascertaining whether the word was used before Cicero at all, or never before Cicero with that particular meaning. The latter point is obviously not as precise as hoped, and many times the meaning in the OLD does not correspond exactly to that in the TLL, yet if Cicero’s use is the earliest attested in both cases, the word has been recorded with the relevant meanings distinguished.

As a demonstration, according to the OLD, the words essentia or indolentia may have their earliest attestation in Cicero, yet the focus of this paper is gauging Cicero’s contribution to the Latin language and this can only be done accurately if his methods are examinable. Precisely how Cicero coined indolentia is not relevant because we do not have Cicero citing a Greek original to base it on, and thus would amount to speculation. Yet one can quite confidently say that he coined a term such as aegrotatio because he wanted to convey the Stoic idea of ἀρρωστήματα, as the TLL defines it ‘2: ‘de animo [malis]’ and the OLD, 1: (usu. w. animi) an unhealthy moral condition, morbid desire or passion’. Here the evidence for this innovation can be found clearly in his Tusculan Disputations where one finds the Latin translation and the Greek original, ‘deinde aegrotationes, quae appellantur a Stoicis ἀρρωστήματα’ yet in the TLL this meaning is a secondary one, whereas the OLD defines it as the primary meaning. So by this brief example there is both the ability and the evidence to assert how Cicero coined this new word or new meaning and in what context, and although the meanings may not agree in both reference works, the data below should be viewed as a cumulative whole and such individual cases do not affect the results to a significant extent. These limitations are more time-consuming than critical, and it should be noted that the compilers of the TLL and OLD have catalogued each Latin entry for an entirely different purpose for the premise of this thesis, and as such, the data from these sources

5 In the case of loanwords: a new introduction of a Greek word.
6 Tusc. 4.23.
has a healthy lack of built-in bias in that respect. The entries in the data below are obviously not comprehensive, but they provide enough insight into Cicero’s translation techniques and lexical innovation without compromising the general validity of the results.

**Data Set A**

**Abscessio, n. (v. ἀπειμι)**
*TLL*, 1: ‘vocabulum a Cicerone ut uidetur formatum, ab ecclesiasticis receptum pro graeco ἀποστασία’; *OLD*, 1: Removal, loss; *(Tim. 44)* cum...ad corpora tum accessio fieret, tum abscessio; *(Tim. 42a)* τὸ μὲν προσίοι τὸ δ’ ἀπίοι τοῦ σώματος αὐτῶν.

**Absolutio n. (n. τελείωσις)**
*TLL*, 4: ‘perfectio: in universum, caeli’; *OLD*, 1: finishing, completion; *(Tim. 41)*, tria genera nobis reliqua sunt eaque mortalia, quibus praetermissis caeli absolutio perfecta non erit; *(Tim. 41B, 14)* θνητὰ ἢτι γένη λοιπὰ τρία ἀγένητα· τούτων δὲ μὴ γενομένων οὐρανος ἀτελῆς ἐσται.7

**Acervalis adj. (n. σωρίτης/σωρείτης)**
*TLL*, 1: ‘adi. ab acervus [1: de rebus aliis super alia cumulatis]; *OLD*, 1: Characterised by piling up (trans. Gk. σωρίτης); *(Div. 2.11)* quem ad modum soriti8 resistas, (quem si necessse sit, Latino verbo liceat acervalem appellare).

**Adprobatio n. (n. συγκατάθεσις)**
*TLL* s.v. approbatio, 1: ‘probatio, assensio...in sermone philosophorum’; *OLD*, 1b: (in Stoic phil.) the assent given by the mind to what it perceives; *(Luc. 37)* De adsensione atque adprobatione, quam Graeci συγκατάθεσιν uocant.

**Adsensio n. (n. συγκατάθεσις)**
*TLL* s.v. assensio, 2: ‘in philosophorum sermone. de assentiendo visis ab assentior [de homine visis adsentiente]’; *OLD*, 3: (in Stoic phil., transl. Gk. συγκατάθεσις) The assent

---

7 Where the Greek was in the negative, Cicero altered his adaptation here by using *absolutio perfecta non erit* instead of ἀη ει ήο.
8 Here the Greek gloss is unavailable, although Cicero’s direct loan into Latin points to the original Greek term with enough accuracy.
given by the mind to natural impulses; (Luc. 37) De adsensione atque adprobatione, quam Graeci συγκατάθεσιν uocant.⁹

**Aegrotatio n. (n. ἄρρωστήμα , -ατος)**

*TLL, 2: ‘de animo [malis]’; OLD, 1: (usu. w. animi) an unhealthy moral condition, morbid desire or passion; (Tusc. 4.23) deinde aegrotationes, quae appellantur a Stoicis ἄρρωστήματα.*

**Aenigma* n. (n. αἴνιγμα)**

*TLL, 2: ‘inde in phrasibus et translate de quibuslibet rebus obscuris’; OLD, 1: An obscure expression or saying, riddle, enigma; (Div. 2. 132) non...aenigma est sed res aperta; (A. Pr. 610) οὐκ ἐμπλέκων αἰνίγματ’, ἀλλ’ ἀπλῶ λόγῳ.*

**Aequilibritas, n. (n. ἰσονομία)**

*TLL: ‘ab aequilibris’; OLD, 1: Equal proportion, equilibrium; (N.D. 1.109): confugis ad aequilibritatem (sic enim ἰζνλνκίαλ si placet appellemus).*

**Aestimatio n. (n. ἀξία)**

*TLL, 4: ‘per analogiam significationis pretium significat in philosophia i.q. ἀξία’; OLD, 7: Moral worth, value; (Fin. 3.34) Nam cum aestimatio, quae ἀξία dicitur.*

**Alabaster† n. (n. ἀλάβαζηορ)**

*TLL, 2: ἀλάβαζη ρνο vel -ον gemma. certae gen. masc. formae: alabaster, vas de gemma’; OLD, 1: A conical box for perfume; (Ac. 2. fr. 8) alabaster plenus unguenti; (Hdt. Hist. 3.20) … καὶ ψέλα καὶ μύρου ἀλάβαστον καὶ φοινικῆς οἶνου κάδον.*

**Alttrix n. (n. τροφός)**

*TLL, s.v altor, 1: ‘i.q. nutrix, cf. de lupa’; OLD, 2: (of the earth) b (of plants etc) Nourisher, sustainer; (Tim. 37) iam vero terram altricem nostram; (Tim. 40B) γῆν δὲ τροφόν μὲν ἡμετέραν.*

---

⁹ Cf. the other innovation *adsensus* in Luc. 39, for the technical difference see Lévy (1992), 102 contra Liscu (1930), 122 and Hartung (1970), 72.

¹⁰ Notice Cicero feeling his way here, or perhaps putting on the pretense of asking the reader for permission to introduce a new term: „...si placet appellemus“.

¹¹ Cf. *Fin. 3.20*: Aestimabile esse dicunt (sic enim, ut opinor, appellantus)...quam illi ὧμωλ vocant.
Anapaestus† n. (n. ἀνάπαιστος)
TLL, 1: ‘Gloss. pes metri’; OLD, 1: (of a metrical foot) consisting of two short and one long syllable; (Tusc. 3.27) nec adhibetur ulla sine anapaesist pedibus hortatio; (Arist. Poet. 1452b23) χορικοῦ δὲ πάροδος μὲν ἡ πρώτη λέξις ὡλη χοροῦ, στάσιμον δὲ μέλος χοροῦ τὸ ἀνευ ἀναπαίστου καὶ τροχαίου...

Antecessio n. (n. προχώρησις)
TLL: ‘de tempore et causa’; OLD, 1: A going in front or forward; (Tim. 37) quae...in orbibus eorum conversiones quaeque antecessiones eveniant; (Tim. 40c) καὶ [περὶ] τὰς τὸν κύκλων πρὸς ἑαυτῶς ἐπανακυκλῆσεις καὶ προχωρήσεις.

Anticipatio n. (n. πρόληψις)
TLL, 1: ‘Gloss. πρόληψις’; OLD, 1: A previous notion, preconception; (N.D. 1. 43) quod genus hominum quod non habeat sine doctrina anticipationem quandam deorum, quam appellat πρόληψιν Epicurus id est anteceptam animo rei quandam informationem.

Appetitio n. (n. ὀρμή)
TLL, 2.1: ‘rerum communiter explet notionem...ὀρμή Stoicorum’; OLD, 2a: a natural or instinctive desire, appetite (for), impulse (towards); (Fin. 4.39) appetitionem, quam vocant ὀρμήν.

Architectura† n. (n. ἀρχιτεκτονία)
TLL, 1: ‘ars et scientia aedificandi’; OLD, 1: The art of building architecture; (Off. 1.151) quibus...artibus...non mediocris utilitas quaserit ut medicina, ut architectura; cf. (Biton, 49.2) ἐστὶ δὲ τὸτο κατασκευασμένον ἐν Θεσσαλονίκη ὑπὸ Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Ἀβυδηνοῦ. εἶχε δὲ καταβολὴν τῆς ἀρχιτεκτονιᾶς τοιαύτην.12

Aristolochia† n. (n. ἀριστοτόλογεια)
TLL, 1: ‘ἀριστοτόλογα herba’; OLD, 1: The name of a genus of plant with medicinal properties esp. useful in childbirth; (Div. 1.16) quid aristolochia ad morsus serpentium possit; (Thphr. HP 9.20.4) ἢ δὲ ἀριστοτόλογα παχεῖα καὶ ἐσθιομένη πικρὰ τῷ χρώματι μέλαινα καὶ εὐόσμος.

12 Around 3/2 B.C., see OCD, s.v. Biton.
Artifex n. (n. δημιουργός)
*TLL*, 1A3: ‘de deo sive natura mundum fabricantibus’; OLD, 6: *A maker, creator, producer*; (Tim. 6) Atqui si pulcher est hic mundus et si probus eius artifex, profecto speciem aeternitatis imitari maluit; (Tim. 28a) εἰ μὲν δὴ καλός ἔστιν δῶε ὁ κόσμος ὁ τε δημιουργὸς ἀγαθός, δῆλον ὁς πρὸς τὸ άίδιον ἐβλεπεν’.

Aspectabilis adj. (adj. ὄρατός)
*TLL*, 1: ‘ab adspectare…vertens gr. ὄρατόν’; OLD, 1: *Able to be seen, visible*; (Tim. 12) animal unum aspectibile…effecit (deus); (Tim. 30d) ὁ θεὸς ὁμοίωσαι βουληθεὶς ζῶον ἐν ὄρατόν.

Auloedus† n. (n. αὐλῳδός)
*TLL*: ‘αὐλῳδός’; OLD: *One who sings to the flute*; (Mur. 13.29) ut aiunt in Graecis artificibus eos auloedos esse qui citharoedi fieri non potuerint; cf. (Pl. Leg. 700d) ‘...καὶ αὐλῳδίας δὴ ταῖς κιθαρῳδίαις μιμούμενοι’.

Cantharis* n. (n. κανθαρίς)
*TLL*, 1: ‘scarabaeus vel vermiculus venenatus’; OLD, 1: *The blister-beetle or Spanish fly, used in medicine and as a poison*; (Tusc. 5.117) magnum vero inquit effecisti si cantharidis vim consecutus es; cf. (Arist. HA 531b25) οἶον μηλολόνθη καὶ κάραβος καὶ κανθαρίς καὶ οἵς τοιαῦτα ἄλλα.

Citharoedus† n. (n. κιθαρῳδός)
*TLL*: ‘κιθαρῳδός’; OLD: *One who plays on the cithara, accompanying it with the voice (diff. from citharista by the accompanying singing)*; (Mur. 13.29) ut aiunt in Graecis artificibus eos auloedos esse qui citharoedi fieri non potuerint; cf. (Pl. Leg. 700d) ‘...καὶ αὐλῳδίας δὴ ταῖς κιθαρῳδίαις μιμούμενοι’.

Clepsydra* n. (n. κλεπσύδρα)
*TLL*, 2: ‘vas aquarum, quam iudices habent propter horas nocturnas...speciatim: usus rhetorum’; OLD, 1: *A water-clock, clepsydra (used for measuring the time allowed to speakers)*; (de Orat. 3.138) hunc (sc. Pericles) non declamator aliqui ad clepsydram latrare docuerat; cf. (Ar. V. 93) ὁ νόος πέτεται τήν νύκτα περὶ τήν κλεψύδραν.

---

13 The form in αὐι ῳδόο is found pre-Cicero in the *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* 457.19 (Thespiae) around the 3rd century B.C., see LSJ s.v. αὐι ῳδόο. See also Almazova (2008), 5-34 on the history and meaning of the term.
Coagmentatio n. (adj. συστατός)
TLL, 1: ‘i.q. coniunctio, copulatio: de effectu coniungendi’; OLD, 1: The state of being fitted or joined together; (Tim. 17) omnis enim coagmentatio corporis vel caloris vi vel frigoris vel aliqua impulsione vehementi labefactatur et frangitur et ad morbos senectutemque compellitur; (Tim. 33a) catavno|ön ως συστάτω σώματι θερμά καὶ ψυχρά καὶ πάνθ’ ὁσα δυνάμεις ἑσχηράς ἦχε περιστάμενα ἐξωθέν καὶ προσπέπτοντα ἄκαιρως λύει καὶ νόσους γῆρας τε ἑπάγοντα φθίνειν ποιεῖ.

Colligatio n. (n. δεσμός)
TLL, 2: ‘i. quod colligat, instrumentum colligandi’; OLD, 2: Something that binds or connects, a bond, tie; (Tim. 23) sesquealteris…intervallis…sumptis ex his colligationibus; (Tim. 36a) ἐπιτρίτων καὶ ἐπογοδὸν γενομένων ἐκ τούτων τῶν δεσμῶν ἐν ταῖς πρόσθεν διαστάσεσιν.

Cometes* n. (n. κομήτης)
TLL, 1C: ‘Epitheta: Gloss. κομήτης…nomen generis stellarum crinibus cincti propter figuram et raritatem inter prodigia numerati’; OLD, 1: A luminous body in the sky having a train or tail, a comet or meteor; (Const. Fr. 2.15) vidisti et claro tremulos ardore cometas; cf. (Arist. Mete. 343b5) ἐπὶ δ’ ἄρχοντος Αθήνησιν Εὐκλέους τοῦ Μόλωνος ἐγένετο κομήτης ἀστήρ.

Commetior v. (v. συμμετρέω)
TLL, 1: ‘i.q. una metiri, metiendo comparare’; OLD, 1: To measure; (Tim. 33) neque nomen appellant neque inter se numero commetiuuntur; (Tim. 39c) οὔτε ὀνομάζουσιν οὔτε πρὸς ἄλληλα συμμετροῦνται σκοποῦντες ἄριθμοῖς.

Comparatio n. (n. ἀναλογία)
TLL, a 1: ‘comparare, legitur inde a Cic. per totam latinitatem’; OLD, 3b: Relationship (of position), proportion; (Tim. 13) Id optime adsequitur, quae Graece ἀναλογία, Latine (audendum est enim, quoniam haec primum a nobis novantur) comparatio pro portione dici potest; (Tim 31c) δεσμῶν δὲ κάλλιστος δὸς ἂν αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ συνδούμενα ὅτι μάλιστα ἐν ποιῇ, τούτῳ δὲ πέρυκεν ἀναλογία κάλλιστα ἀποτελεῖν.
Comprehendibilis adj. (adj. καταληπτός)
TLL, 1: ‘qui sensibus vel cogitatione percipi potest’; OLD, 1: Able to be grasped by the senses or intellect; (Ac. 1.41) id autem visum cum ipsum per se cerneretur, comprehendibile—feretis haec? ‘nos vero’ inquit; ‘quonam enim alio modo καταληπτόν diceres’

Comprehensio n. (n. κατάληψις)
TLL, 2B: ‘de actione non corporali...per sensus vel cogitationem’; OLD, 5b: Something that is perceived, a perception; (Luc. 31) mens hominis, amplexetur maxime cognationem et istam κατάληψιν, quam, ut dixi, verbum e verbo exprimentes comprehensio dicemus.

Concentio n. (n. ἁρμονία)
TLL, 1: ‘a concinere [1: simul canere, concludere]’; OLD, 1: Unison singing or utterance; (Tim. 27): Et corpus quidem caeli aspectabile effectum est; animus autem oculorum efluit optatum, est autem unus ex omnibus rationis cognitionisque, quae harmonia Graece; (Tim. 36e) καὶ τὸ μὲν δὴ σῶμα ὁρατὸν οὐρανοῦ γέγονεν, αὐτὴ δὲ ἀδρατος μὲν, λογισμὸ δὲ μετέχουσα και ἁρμονίας ψυχῆ.

Concursio n. (n. παραβολή)
TLL, 2: ‘de non animantibus...a concurre [Gloss. in unum veniunt, congruent, conveniunt, congredi]’; OLD, 1c: (astrol.) a conjunction (of stars); (Tim. 37) inter ipsos deos concursiones; (Tim. 40c) χορείας δὲ τούτων αὐτῶν και παραβολάς ἀλλήλων’

Consequens part. (adj. ἐπιγεννηματικός)
TLL: s.v consequor; OLD, 1; Following in time, subsequent; (Fin. 3.32) quod (consequens) illi ἐπιγεννηματικὸν appellant.

Consequor v. (v. ἐπικαταλαμβάνει)
TLL, 2A: ‘sequendo apprehendere’; OLD, 2b: to overtake in time, catch up with; (Tim. 32) mensis generata, quando luna lustrato suo cursu solem consecuta est; (Tim. 39c) μείζ δὲ ἐπειδ’ σελήνη περιελθοῦσα τὸν ἑαυτῆς κύκλον ἢλιον ἐπικαταλάβη.
Consumptio n. (n. φθίςις)

*TLL*, 1B: ‘de actu exhauriendi’; *OLD*, 1: Process of consuming or wearing away; (Tim. 18) se ipse (mundus) consumptione et senio alebat sui; (Tim. 33c) αὐτὸ γάρ ἐαυτῷ τροφήν τὴν ἐαυτοῦ φθίσιν παρέχων.

Convenientia n. (n. ὁμολογία)

*TLL*, 1a: ‘i.q. cohaerentia, coniunctio, concordia’; OLD, 1: Agreement between persons, arrangement, convention; (Fin. 3.21) quod ὁμολογίαν Stoici, nos appellemus convenientiam, si placet.

Corporatus part. (n. + part. σῶμα ἔχων)

*TLL*, 2b: ‘v. sub. corporo [part. perf. pass. pro adi. corporatus i. q. corporeus]’; OLD, 1: Endowed with a tangible body; (Tim. 10) quando quidem cernitur et tangitur et est undique corporatus; (Tim. 28b, 8) ὁρατὸς γάρ ἀπτός τέ ἔστιν καὶ σῶμα ἔχον.

Corporeus n. (n. σωματοειδῆς)

*TLL*, 2: ‘quod corpus est, corpore indutum est’, OLD, 3: Relating to the body, bodily, physical; (Tim. 26) tum denique omne quod erat concretum atque corporeum substernebat animo interiusque faciebat atque ita medio medium accommodans copulabat; (Tim. 36e) μέτα τούτο πάν τό σωματοειδὲς ἐντὸς αὐτῆς ἐτεκταίνετο καὶ μέσον μέση συναγεγόν προσήρμοτεν.15

Corpus n. (n. σῶμα)

*TLL*, 4C2a: ‘quaevis unitas vel tortum...de atomis, elementis’; OLD, 11: A concrete object (and not something insubstantial); (geom.) a solid body; (abst.) solid character or appearance, substance; (Tim. 50) animus...sensum omnem effugit oculorum; at ignis, aqua...corpora sunt eaque cernuntur; (Tim. 46d) τούτῳ δὲ ἀόρατον πῦρ δὲ καὶ ὀόδωρ καὶ γῆ καὶ ἄηρ σῶματα πάντα ὀρατὰ γέγονεν.

---

14 The word *consumptio* by itself is not a direct rendering of θζίζηο but is part of a hendiadys: „...consumptione et senio alebat sui”. Cicero’s use of hendiadys to translate Greek terms is discussed below.

15 Cf. *corporeus* TLL s.v.: 1. *quod ad corpus pertinet, corporis; quod corpus afficit*: Varro *Men*. 547 “anima corporeum corticem facile reliquit”; perhaps Varro used the term before Cicero but the evidence is scarce and makes it difficult to date the *Satires*, although see *Ac*. 18 (45 B.C.) In any case, I will leave this entry as a Ciceronian innovation until further evidence can definitively establish that Varro’s work pre-dated Cicero’s *Timaeus.*
**Cuneolus n. (n. γόμθος)**

*TLL:* ‘a cuneus deminutive’; *OLD:* A small wedge, a pin; *(Tim. 47)* crebris quasi cuneolis illiquefactis unum efficiebant ex omnibus corpus; *(Tim. 43a)* ...πυκνοίς γόμφοις συντήκοντες, ἐν ἑξ ἀπάντων ἀπεργαζόμενοι σῶμα ἐκαστὸν.

**Decretum n. (n. δόγμα)**

*TLL,* 1: ‘sub. decerno [3.2A t.t. usus latior: philosophiae, praecepta principalia significans, sententia, doctrina]’; *OLD,* 1: An idea held with conviction, dogma, principle, opinion; *(Ac. 2.29)* decretum (sentitis enim iam hoc me δόγμα dicere).

**Defenstrix n. (n. σωτηρία)**


**Dialecticus† n. (n. διαλεκτικός)**

*TLL,* 1: ‘i.q. ad disputationem, disserendi artem pertinens’; *OLD,* 1: Related to a process of reasoning (esp. the dialectical method of the Academy), logical, dialectical; *(Div. 2. 122)* Quaero etiam, si velim scribere quid aut legere aut canere vel voce vel fidibus aut geometricum quiddam aut physicum aut dialecticum explicare; *(Pl. Rep. 534e)* ...ὁσπερ θρηγκὸς τοῖς μαθήμασιν ἡ διαλεκτικὴ ἡμῖν ἐπάνω κείσθαι.

**Dissimulatio/dissimulantia n. (n. εἰρωνεία)**

*TLL,* 1B ‘i.q. artificium simulationis cum in agendo tum in loquendo, quo quis figens se aliquid nescire vel alia quacumque simulatione usus aliter agit vel loquitur ac sentit…figura rhetorica’; *OLD,* 2: (Socratic) irony; *(Luc. 15)* ea dissimulatione quam Graeci εἰρωνεῖαν vocant.

---

16 The feminine *hapax* here suggests that Cicero’s unique use of the term is not impossible to believe, cf. Cicero’s other *hapax:* *perturbatrix* OLD: ‘One who throws into confusion’ in *De Leg.* 1.39 where the masculine form *perturbator* was not attested until the 5th century A.D. Sulp. *Sev. Chron.* 2.49.2 or *altrix* above; see Keil (1864), 12-13 for a discussion on manuscript differences in writing *defensatrix* or *defensatrix* in the context of Virgil’s use of the term *auctor.*
Effector n. (n. δημιουργός)
TLL, 1b: ‘i.q. is qui efficit...in theologia: gentilium’; OLD, 1: One who creates or causes, an author or originator; (Tim. 40) quorum operum ego parens effectorque sum; (Tim. 41A) δόν ἐγὼ δημιουργός πατήρ τε ἔργων.

Effectrix n. (n. δημιουργός)
TLL, 1: ‘i.q. quae efficit’, OLD, 1: Fem. of effector; (Tim. 37) diei noctisque effectricem eandemque custodem; (Tim. 40c) φύλακα καὶ δημιουργόν νυκτός τε καὶ ἡμέρας ἐμπεισάδατο.

Efficiens pres. part.17 (adj. ποιητικός)
TLL, 1: ‘s.v efficio [3: qui efficere solet, efficax]’; OLD, 1: (usu. phil.) That produces or gives rise to something; (of a cause) efficient (rather than accessory); (Fin. 3.55) efficientia, quae Graeci ποιητικά appellant.

Empiricus† n. (adj. ἐμπειρικός)
TLL, 1: ‘i.q. ad experientiam spectans’; OLD, 1: A doctor who relies on observation and practice rather than on scientific theory; (Luc. 122) medici…aperuerant (corpora) ut viderentur, nec eo tamen aiunt empirici notiora esse illa; cf. (Aristotle HA, 532b20) Ἡδη γὰρ φασί τινες τῶν ἐμπειρικῶν ἀλέων…18

Enuntiation n. (n. ἀξίωμα)
TLL, 2A: ‘spectatur effectus enuntiandi...i.q. sententia, dictum’; OLD, 2b: (quasi-concr.) a phrase, expression; (log.) and assertion; (Fat. 1.28) enuntiationum quae Graeci ἀξίωμα appellant.

Ephorus † n. (n. ἔφορος)
TLL, 1: ‘i.q. inspector (non nisi techn. de magistratibus...’); OLD, 1: One of five Spartan magistrates who exercised a supervisory power of the kings, an ephor; (Leg. 3.16) ephori Lacedaemone...a Theopompo oppositi regibus.

---

17 Cf. First attestations efficientia in N.D. 2.95 and Fat. 19; also efficienter in Fat. 34.
18 Cicero is not translating Aristotle but is using it for the first time in Latin presumably, as a term for one who uses experience rather than scientific theory. In Aristotle ἐκπειρασθεῖσα did not have scientific connotations, but had the adjectival meaning of „experienced” (LSJ s.v. ἐκπειρασθεῖσα). Galen et al. would later use it in a specific scientific sense like Cicero.
Evidentia n. (n. ἐναπγεία)
TLL: ‘ab evidens (vox a Cic. ad ex. gr. ἐναπγεία formata)’; OLD, 2: The quality of being evident to the mind, obviousness; that which is evident; (Luc. 17) quod nihil esset clarius ἐναπγεία ut Graeci, perspicuïtem aut evidentiam nos si placet nominemus fabricemurque, si opus erit, verba.

Excandescentia n. (n. θόμωσις)
TLL, 1: ‘i.q. actus vel qualitas statusve in iram excandescendi’; OLD, 1: The eruption or flaring up of anger or sim; (Tusc. 4.21) ut…excandescentia…sit ira nascens et modo existens, quae θόμωσις Graece dicitur.

Extremum, n., finis, n., summum, n., ultimum, n. (n. τέλος)
TLL, neut. pro subst. 2αγ, s.v. extremus: ‘respectu rei proficientis: fere i.q. eventus’; OLD, 4: The ultimate pitch or degree (of a quality, condition); (Fin. 1.42) quoniam autem id est vel summum bonorum vel ultimum vel extremum - quod Graeci τελός nominant.

Fabricator n. (n. τεκταινόμενος)
TLL, 1: ‘qui arte fabri adhibita aliquid conficit’; OLD, 1: A maker, fashioner; (Tim. 6) ille fabricator huius tanti operis utrum sit imitatus exemplar; (Tim. 28c) πρός πότερον τῶν παραδειγμάτων ὣ τεκταινόμενος αὐτὸν ἀπηργάζετο.

Fatum n. (n. εἰμαρμένη)
TLL, 1: s.v. fata...; OLD, 4: Fate (regarded as the force which moulds events), destiny; (esp., abl.) by fate; (Div. 1.125): Fieri igitur omnia fato ratio cogit fateri. Fatum autem id appello, quod Graeci εἰμαρμένη, id est ordinem seriemque causarum, cum causae causa nexa rem ex se gignat.19

---

19 Cf. also Cicero’s other innovation of confatalis (Fat. 30). He does not give the Greek equivalent however it has been suggested that ζ πλεικαξέλα was the original term, however the suggested Greek equivalent does not occur in the Stoa (LSJ: s.v. ζ πλεικαξέλα, Aristid. Or. 24 (44).56; ζ πλεικαξέλα jointly determined by fate, Plu. 2.569f, cf. Lyd. Mens. 4.81); see also Meijer (2007), 225, n 1154.
Genealogus† n. (n. γενεάλογος)
TLL, 1: ‘i.q. qui lineas generationum componit’; OLD, 1: A genealogist; (N.D. 3.44)
Quod si ita est, Caeli quoque parentes di habendi sunt Aether et Dies eorumque fratres et sorores, qui a genealogis antiquis sic nominantur.

Geometrica† n. (n. γεωμετρική)
TLL, 1: ‘i.q. geometria...Gloss. mensura terrae, terrae mensuratio, quia docet mensuram terrae’; OLD, 1: Geometry; (Inv. 1. 36) occupatio, ut philosophiae, poeticae, geometricae; cf. (Plato Gorgias, 450d) οἱ ἡ ἄριθμητικὴ καὶ λογιστικὴ καὶ γεωμετρικὴ καὶ πεπεντικὴ γε καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ τέχναι.

Gyrus† n. (n. γῦρος)
TLL, 1bγ ‘i.q. orbis, circulus...in imagine ab equitatione petita’; OLD, 1: a circular course on which horses were trained or raced; (Off. 1.90) homines secundis rebus ecfrenas...tamquam in gyrum, rationis et doctrinae duci oportere.

Helica† n. (from n. ἑλίκη)
TLL, 1: ‘i.q. spira, gyrus, volumen’; OLD, 1: A convolution, spiral; (Tim. 31): omnis enim orbis eorum quasi helicae inflexione vertebat; (Tim. 39B) πάντας γὰρ τοὺς κύκλους αὐτῶν στρέφουσα ἐλίκα, cf. (Aristotle PA, 680b) Ἐστι δὲ τοῖς στρομβίδεσιν ἐν τῇ ἑλίκῃ τοῦτο, τοῖς δὲ μονοθύροις ἑντὸς πυθεμένι...

Hydraulus† n. (n. ὑδραυλὸς)
TLL, 1: ‘i.q. organum aquaticum’, OLD, 1: A water-organ; (Tusc. 3.43) Hydrauli hortabere ut adiat voces potius quam Platonis?

---

20 From TLG, this form of the word is only found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Antiquitates Romanae, 1.13) and Diogenes Laertius (1.115), both of whom wrote post-Cicero. However the word is most likely derived from Plato’s use of it in his Cratylus: εἰ δὲ ἐκεκλήκελ ηὴλ Ἡζ η όδνπ γελεαι νγίαλ here with the meaning of “tracing a pedigree, genealogy” s.v.

21 This is a conjecture, other manuscripts have „felicitate”, see Plasberg (1908), 180: „helícis Victorius helicæ ex eiusdem coniectura t (et licet dubitari) felicitate AVB”; TLL s.v. helix: „dub.: Cíc. Tim. 31 omnis ... orbis eorum siderum quasi -is (Victorius; helicæ [i. ἑλίϰης] Baiter-Halm, al.; felicitate trad. ...) inflexione vertebat...”

22 Here it is not possible to identify a Greek source pre-Cicero. The earliest use in Greek, by reference to the TLG, is from Hero of Alexandria (born c. 10 A.D.)
Iambus† n. (n. ἴαμβος)
TLL, 1: ‘i.q. pes metricus...de rationibus metricis’; OLD, 1: A metrical foot of one short followed by one long syllable, an iambus; (de Orat. 3.182) iambum et trochaem frequentem segregat ab oratore Aristoteles.

Ichneumon* n. (n. ἵνεύμον)
TLL, 1: ‘quadrupes (Herpestes ichneumon)’, OLD, 1: The ichneumon, Herpestes ichneumon [a mongoose]; (N.D. 1.101) de ichneumonum utilitate...dicere; cf. (Aelian, De Natura Animalium 6.38) ἀκούω δὲ τὸν ἴνεύμονα τῆς ἀσπίδος τῷ ὧν ἄφανίζειν, οίονει τοῖς ἑαυτοῖς παυσίν ὑπεξαίροντα τοὺς μέλλοντας ἀντιπάλους.

Impulsio n. (n. δύναμις)
TLL, 1A: ‘proprie de actione corporea i.q. pulsus, ictus, attactus...de animantibus et part. corp’; OLD, 1: A push, thrust; (Tim. 17) omnis enim coagmentatio corporis vel caloris frigoris vi vel aliqua impulsione vehementi labefactatur; (Tim. 33a) πάνθ᾽ ὅσα δυνάμεις ἱσχυρὰς ἕχει περιστάμενα ἔξωθεν.

Incisum past part. (n. κόμματα)
TLL: s.v. incisus ab. 2. incidere i.q. actio incidendi; OLD, 1: (rhet.) A short phrase or member of a sentence; (Orat. 223) illa duo quae κόμματα Graeci uocant, nos incisa dicimus; deinde tertium κόλον illi, nos membrum’

Indifferens pres. part. (adj. ἀδιάθορον)
TLL, 1Aα: ‘in serm. phil. de rebus inter bona et mala i.q. ἀδιάθορον’; OLD, 1: (phil. of things) Neither good nor bad, indifferent; (Fin 3.53) quod sit indifferens cum aestimatione mediocri; quod enim illi ἀδιάθορον dicunt. 23

Indissolubilis adj. (adj. ἀλυτος)
TLL, 1: ‘i.q. immortalis’; OLD, 1: Indestructible, imperishable; (Tim. 40) inmortales vos quidem esse et indissolubiles non potestis; (Tim. 41a) ἀθάνατοι μὲν οὐκ ἐστὲ οὐδ᾽ ἀλυτοὶ τὸ πάμπαν.

23 Seele (1995), 29: „Cicero bildet hierfür... zwar die Lehnübersetzung indifferens, die ebenso wie das Wort der Ausgangssprache aus Privativpräfix, Proposition und Nominalform des Verbs zusammengesetzt ist: ἀ-δη-άθον ξύλ; in-di(f)-ferens...”
**Indissolus** adj. (adj. ἄλυτος)**24**

*TLL*, 1: ‘*ab in et solutus sec. gr. ἄλυτος...*i.q. *indissolubilis*, OLD, 1: *Indestructible, imperishable*; (Tim. 40) quorum operum ego parenst effecturore sum, haec sunt indissoluta me invito; (Tim. 41a) ὃν ἐγὼ δημιουργὸς πατήρ τε ἐργὸν δι’ ἐμοῦ γενόμενα ἄλυτα ἐμοῦ γε μὴ ἐθέλοντος.

**Individuus** adj. (n. ἅτομος)

*TLL*, 1A1: ‘*i.q. indivisibilis...de atomis q.d. ex doctrina Democritus*, OLD, 1b: *an atom (in the atomic theory of Democritus)*; (Fin. 1.17) atomos...id est corpora individua**25 propter soliditatem.

**Infinitorio** n. (adj. ἀπειρία)

*TLL*, 1: ‘*ab infinitus ad vert. Gr. ἀπειρία*’; OLD, 1: *Infinitude, boundlessness*; (Fin. 1.21) infinitio ipsa, quam ἀπειρίαν vocant.

**Ironia†** n. (n. εἰρωνεία)

*TLL*, A1: ‘*definitur, explicatur...sensu philosophico, de Socrate...fere i. q. dissimulatio sapientiae ea quae fit ad auditorem illudendum*’; OLD, 1b: *Simulated ignorance, Socratic irony*; (Luc. 15) Socrates...de se ipse detrahens in disputatione plus tribuebat is, quos volebat refellere; ita cum aliud dicerat atque sentiret, ... uti solitus est ea dissimulatione quam Graeci εἰρωνείαν vocant; (Luc. 74) Quid Plato? qui certe tam multis libris haec persecutus non esset nisi probavisset, ironiam enim alterius, perpetuam praesertim, nulla fuit ratio persequi.

**Lapathum†** n. (n. λάπαθον)

*TLL*, 1, s.v. lapathus: ‘*nomen plantae, quae latine rumex appellatur*’; OLD, 1: *A plant of the genus Rumex, sorrel.* (Fin. 2.25) Nec lapathi suavitatem acupensei Galloni Laelius anteponebat; cf. (Epicharmus, fr. 161 in Kaibel (1899), 120) δὲ δὲ τις ἡγοθεὶν ἐκοικε μάραθα καὶ κάκτους φέρειν, / ἱφυν, λάπαθον, ὀτόστυλλον, σκόλιον, σερίδ’, ἀτράκτυλον, πτέριν, κάκτον ὄνοπορδον.

**24** The word takes the form of a past participle but Cicero often uses this form in the same way as an adjective in -bilis (cf. indissolubilis), cf. comprehensa (Ac. 2.99) and comprehensibilis (Ac. 1.41).

**25** Here it appears Cicero uses the term as an adjective with corpora but elsewhere uses it as a noun, Luc. 55: ‘ex illis individuis, unde omnia Democritus gigni affirmat...’; *DND* 3.12.29: ‘pe individuum quidem, nec quod dirimi distrahive non possit...’
Levitas n. (n. λειότης)
TLL, 1a: ‘respicitur superficies corporum’; OLD, 1: Smoothness, evenness; (De Orat. 3.99) in ipso tactu esse modum et mollitudinis et levitati) and (Tim. 49) id fit cum speculorum levitas hinc illincque altitudinem adsumpsit; (Tim. 46c) τοῦτο δὲ ὅταν ἢ τῶν κατόπτρων λειότης ἔνθεν καὶ ἔνθεν ὑψη λαβοῦσα.

Machinatio† n. (n. μαχανά)
TLL, 1A: ‘i.q. actus, facultas, ratio machinandi, construendi, inveniendi, constructio, institutio’; OLD, 1: The fact or art of making machines or other contrivances; (N.D. 2.123) data est quibusdam (bestis) etiam machinatio quaedam atque sollertia.

Medietas n. (n. μεσότης)
TLL, 2B1b ‘incorp.: a spectiatim: in serm. mathem. de numeris inter binos limites sive extremitates certa lege atque ratione interiectis’; OLD, 1: The central point or part, also an intervening part; (Tim. 23): Deinde instituit dupla et tripla intervalla explere partis rursim ex toto desicans; quas in intervallis ita locabat ut in singulis essent bina media - vix enim audoe dicere medietates, quas Graeci μεσότητας appellant; (Tim. 36a) μετά δὲ ταύτα συνεπληροῦτο τὰ τε διπλὰσία καὶ τριπλάσια διαστήματα, μοίρας ἐτι ἐκεῖθεν ἀποτέμνων καὶ τιθεὶς εἰς τὸ μεταξό τούτων, ὡστε ἐν ἐκάστῳ διαστήματι δύο εἶναι μεσότητας.

Membrum, n. (n. κῶλον)
TLL: 1bαII speciatim: in arte rhetor. technice i.q. κῶλον; OLD, 5c: (rhet.) a member of a period, clause (transl. of Gk κῶλον); (Brut. 162) ...in membra quaedam quae κόλα Graeci uocant, dispertiebat orationem libentius (Orat. 223) illa duo quae κόμματα Graeci uocant, nos incisa dicimus; deinde tertium κόλον illi, nos membrum’

Melancholicus† n. (n. μελαγχολικός)
TLL, 1A1: ‘i.q. melancholia affectus: de hominibus’; OLD, 1: Having an atrabilious temperament, melancholic; (Tusc. 1.80) Aristoteles...ait omnis ingeniosos melancholicos esse.

Morbus n. (n. πάθος)
TLL, 2bα: ‘de moribus vitiosis vel animi passionibus...doctrinae philosophorum’; OLD, 2b: (phil., as transl. Of Gk. πάθος); (Tusc. 3.7) haec enim fere sunt eius modi, quae
Graeci πάθος appellant; ego poteram ‘morbos’, et id verbum esset e verbo, sed in consuetudinem nostram non caderet.\(^{26}\)

**Mulierositas n. (n. φιλογυνία)**

*TLL*, 1: ‘i.q. mulierum cupiditas’; *OLD*, 1: Excessive fondness for women; (Tusc. 4.25) ceteri morbi…ut mulierositas, ut ita appellam eam quae Graece φιλογυνία dicitur.

**Mutabilis adj. (adj. σκεδαστός)**

*TLL*, 1a: ‘praevalente sensu facultatis mutandi…corporaliter…de rebus’; *OLD*, 1: Liable to change, changeable, fluctuating; (Tim. 27) cum materiam mutabilem arripuit; (Tim. 37a) ὅταν οὖσίαν σκεδαστήν ἔχοντός τινος ἐφάπτηται.

**Narthecium† n. (n. ναρθήκιον)**

*TLL*: ναρθήκιον (qua voce gr. significari vid. alia…) significatur receptaculum medicamentorum; *OLD*, 1: A medicine chest, box for ointments; (Fin. 2.22) doloris medicamenta illa Epicurea tamquam de narthecio proment. Cf. (Gal. 10.998) ναρθήκια λεῖα μετρίως ἁληλλομένα κατά τῶν ἱσχυν ῥορίων ἐπαράσσουσιν.

**Notatio n. (n. ἐξημολογία)**

*TLL*: N/A; *OLD*, 4: The explanation (of a term) according to its derivation (used by Cicero to render Gk. ἐξημολογία); (Top. 2.10) multa etiam ex notatione sumuntur. Ea est autem, cum ex vi nominis argumentum elicitur: quam Graeci ἐξημολογίαν vocant, id est verbum e verbo, veriloquium.\(^{27}\)

**Opinabilis adj. (adj. δοξαστός)**

*TLL*, 1a: ‘spectat ad rationem incertam, veritatem mancam…in doctrina Platonica (sc. de rebus quae sensibus percipiantur, mutabiles sunt sim.)’; *OLD*, 1: Based on opinion (rather than knowledge); (Ac. 1.31) hanc omnem partem rerum opinabilem appellantabat; (Tim. 3) alterum quod adfert ad opinionem sensus rationis expers, quod totum opinabile est, id gignitur et interit nec umquam esse vere potest; (Tim. 28a) ...τὸ δ’ αὖ δόξῃ μετ’ αἰσθήσεως ἀλόγου δοξαστόν, γιγνόμενον καὶ ἀπολλόμενον, ὅντως δὲ οὐδέποτε ὅν.

\(^{26}\) N.B. that Cicero is not satisfied with the „word for word” translation from Greek here, he later opts for perturbationes; nam miseri, invide, gestire, laetari, haec omnia morbos Graeci appellant, motus animi ratione non obtemperantes; nos autem hos eosdem motus concitati animi recte, ut opinor, perturbationes dixerimus, morbos autem non satis usitate, nisi quid aliud tibi videtur” (Tusc. 3.7); see Glucker (2012), 49 and 57.

\(^{27}\) See also Isidore, *Orig.* 1.28.1: ‚ἐτυμολογιαν Cicero annotationem nominavit‘.
Parvitas n. (n. σμικρότης)
TLL, 1A1: ‘i.q. status parvi cuiusdam, exiguitas sim...rerum variarum’; OLD, 1: Smallness, minuteness; (Tim. 47) uincis...talibus, quae cerni non possent propter parvitatem; (Tim. 43A) ἀλλὰ διὰ σμικρότητα ἀοράτους πυκνοῖς γόμφοις συντήκοντες.

Perceptum n. (n. θεώρημα)
TLL: 1B (sensibus vel mente) sentiendo, comprehendo sim. (nonnumquam inter A et B vix discerni potest, cum actio sentiendi saepius ita describatur, ut vis excipiendi, recipendi perleceat; OLD, 1: A general idea, proposition, principle; (Fat. 11;15) si est diuinatio, qualibusnam a perceptis artis proficisitur? (percepta appello quae dicuntur Graece θεωρηματα).

Perspicuitas n. (n. ἐναπγεία)
OLD, 3: The quality or fact of being self-evident; (Luc. 17) quod nihil esset clarius ἐναπγεία ut Graeci, perspicuitatem aut euidentiam nos si placet nominemus fabricemurque, si opus erit, verba.

Praecipuus adj., praepositus part., productus part., promotus part. (perf. part. προάγοι)28
TLL, 1Ac, s.v. praecipuus: ‘comparatione non expresse illustrata...appendix ad a et b: neutr. pro subst.’ s.v. praepositum, 1: ‘secundum aestimationem (sc. in doctrina Stoicorum de eo, q.d. προηγμένον’; OLD, 1: (Stoic phil.) A thing which, while not absolutely good, is advanced above the point of indifference; (Fin. 3.52), προηγμένα, id est producta, nominentur, quae vel ita appellemus—id erit verbum e verbo—vel promota et remota vel, ut dudum diximus, praeposita vel praecipua, et illa reiecta.

Praesensio n. (n. μαντική)
TLL: 1a. i.q. actio vel effectus praeentiendi, praesagitio...pertinet ad futura (ad latentia, nondum manifesta)...accedit gen.); OLD, 1: An awareness beforehand,
foreknowledge, presentiment; (Div. 1.1) quam Graeci appellant οντικήν id est praesensionem et scientiam rerum futurarum.

**Principatus n. (n. ἡγεμονικόν)**

*TLL: N/A; OLD, 6: (phil., as a transl. of Gk. ἡγεμονικόν) The governing part, guiding principle; (N.D. 2.29) omnem...naturam necesse est...habere aliquem in se principatum...autem id dico quod Graeci ἡγεμονικόν vocant.*

**Qualitas n. (n. ποιότης)**

*TLL: N/A; OLD, 1: A distinguishing quality, characteristic; (Ac. 1. 24-7) qualitates igitur appellavi quas ποιότητας Graeci vocant.*

**Reiecta**[^29] n. (past. part. of reicio), *remota part. (past. part. ἀποπροηγμένα)*

*TLL: N/A; OLD: (In Stoic phil., as a category of ἀδιάθορα) Things which, while not absolutely bad, fall beneath the level of indifference; (Fin. 3.15) ...‗proegmenis’ et ‘apopregmenis’ concedatur. Quamquam haec quidem ‗praeposita‘ recte et ‗reiecta‘ dicere licebit; (Ac. 1. 37) quae pluris aestimanda ea [Zeno] praeposita appellabat, reiecta autem quae minoris.*

**Seselis* n. (n. ζέζελις)

*TLL: N/A; OLD: Any one of several umbelliferous plants, hartwort, also a drug prepared from it; (N.D. 2.127) ceruae...paulo ante partum perpurgant se quadam herbula quae seselis dicitur; cf. (Hp. Acut. 7.30) ἢ μέλανι ἐλλεβόρῳ ἢ πεπλίῳ, μέλανι μὲν δαύκου ἢ σέσελι ἢ κύμινον ἢ ἀννησον ἢ ἄλλο τι τῶν εὐωδέων μίσγοντα...*

**Soliditas n. (adj. στερεοειδής)**

*TLL: N/A; OLD: 2: Density and firmness of texture; (Tim. 15) sed cum soliditas mundo quaereretur; (Tim. 32B) νῦν δὲ στερεοειδή γὰρ αὐτὸν προσῆκεν εἶναι.*

**Solivagus adj. (adj. ἔρημος)**

*TLL: N/A; OLD: 1: Wandering by oneself, not gregarious, solitary; (Tim. 20): deinde eum circumdedit corpore et vestivit extrinsecus caeloque solivago volubili et in orbem...*

[^29]: Cf. See also the neologism reiectanea (Fin. 4.72): “...autem, morbum, egestatem, dolorem, non appello mala, sed, si libet, reiectanea”.

incitato complexus est; *(Tim. 34b)* καὶ κύκλῳ δὴ κύκλον στρεφόμενον οὐρανόν ἕνα μόνον ἔρημον κατέστησεν.

**Sophisma** n. (n. σόφισμα)

*TLL*: N/A; *OLD*: A specious but invalid argument, sophistry; *(Luc. 75)* aculeata quaedam sophismata (sic enim appellantur fallaces conclusiunculae); cf. *(Pl. Rep. 496a)* ἀρ’ ὀχύ ὡς ἀληθὸς προσεχόντα ἀκοῦσαι σοφίσματα, καὶ οὐδὲν γνήσιον οὐδὲ φρονήσεως [ἀξίου] ἀληθινῆς εἴχόμενον.

**Sophistes** n. (n. σοφιστής)

*TLL*: N/A; *OLD*: 1: a sophist; *(Orat. 96)* hoc totum e sophistarum fontibus defluxit in forum; cf. *(Pl. Prot. 311e)* Σοφιστήν δὴ τοι ὄνομάζουσι γε, ὦ Σώκρατες, τὸν ἄνδρα εἶναι, ἔφη. ³⁰

**Stigmatias** n. (n. στιγματίας)

*TLL*: N/A; *OLD*: A person bearing tattoo-marks (a sign of disgrace); *(Off. 2.25)* o miserum, qui fidi lorem et barbarum et stigmatiam putaret, quam coniugem; cf. *(Aristoph. Lys. 331)* …στιγματίας θ’, ἀρπαλέως / ἀραμένῃ ταίσιν ἐμαῖς / δημότισιν καμιέναις / φέρουσι’ ὅδιωρ βοηθῶ.

**Sumptio** n. (n. λήμμα)

*TLL*: N/A; *OLD*: 2: (log.) A statement taken as true; *(Div. 2.108)* demus tibi istas duas sumptiones (ea quae λήμματα appellant dialectici, sed nos Latine loqui malumus).

**Temperatio** n. (n. κρατήρ)

*TLL*: N/A; *OLD*: 1: the mixing of substances in due proportion, blend, composition; *(Tim. 42)* deinde ad temperationem superiorem revertit; *(Tim. 41D)* καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸν πρότερον κρατήρα. ³¹

---

³⁰ Note, the term *sophista* occurs in testimonia from Donatus, ad Ter., *Eun.*, 2.3.11 who attributes it to Lucilius; the Greek term ζ νθη ζ η ήο was used much earlier, e.g. in Herodotus (2.49) among others *(Aesch. PV 62)*.

³¹ Plato uses it in the concrete sense of a „mixing vessel” cf. *Phaedo* 111d: ἤ πνι ὑ κελ ὀδηγᾷ ὑ εἰλ. ἔμι ὁ η σ' ἐκ ὄ τη τη νπο ὄξεις ἕτο Θαπτηζαο...
Theologus† n. (n. θεόλογος)
TLL: N/A; OLD: One who discourses on the gods; (N.D. 3.53) Ioues tres numerant i qui theologi nominantur; cf. (Aristotle, Met. 1000a9) οἱ μὲν οὖν περὶ Ἡσίοδον καὶ πάντες ὁσοὶ θεολόγοι μόνον ἐφρόντισαν τοῦ πιθανοῦ τοῦ πρὸς αὐτοὺς.

Tractabilis n. (n. ἀπτός)
TLL: N/A; OLD, 1: Able to be handled, tangible; (Tim. 13) corporeum…et aspectabile idemque tractabile omne necesse est esse; (Tim. 31b) σωματοειδὲς δὲ δὴ καὶ ὅσιον ἀπτόν τε δεῖ τὸ γενόμενον εἶναι.

Tyrannis* n. (n. τυραννίς)
TLL: N/A; OLD, 1: The position or rule of a tyrannus; (Inv. 2.144) Alexandrum, qui apud Phereces in Thessalia tyrannidem occuparat; cf. (Hdt., Hist. 8.137) Τοῦ δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου τούτου ἐβήδμος γενέτορ Περδίκκης ἐστί ὁ κτησάμενος τῶν Μακεδόνων τὴν τυραννίδα τρόπῳ τοὐδέ.

Veriloquium n. (n. ἐπιμολογία)
TLL: N/A; OLD: Argument from the true meaning of a word; (Top. 35) Ea est autem, cum ex vi nominis argumentum elicitur; quam Graeci ἐπιμολογίαν appellant, id est verbum ex verbo veriloquium.32

Unigena adj. (adj. μονογενής)
TLL: N/A; OLD, 1: Produced as the sole one of its kind; (Tim. 31B) ut hic mundus esset animanti absoluto simillimus hoc ipso quod solus atque unus esset, idcirco singularem deus hunc mundum atque unigenam procreavit; (Tim. 12) : ἓνα οὖν τὸ δὲ κατὰ τὴν μόνωσιν ὁμοιον ἦ τὸ παντελεῖ ἥφι διὰ ταῦτα οὔτε δύο οὔτε ἄπειρους ἐποίησεν ὁ ποιῶν κόσμους ἄλλ’ εἰς δὲ μονογενῆς οὐρανὸς γεγονὼς ἐστὶν καὶ ἓτ’ ἐσται.

Universitas n. (n. τὸ πᾶν)
TLL: N/A; OLD, 1c: (spec.) the sum of things, the universe; (Tim. 6) illum…quasi parentem huius universitatis; (Tim. 28c) τὸν μὲν οὖν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦτο τοῦ παντός.

32 Cicero did not feel this coinage was appropriate, saying (Top. 35): nos autem novitatem verbi non satis apti fugientes genus hoc notationem appellamus, quia sunt verba rerum notae.
The compilation in **Data Set B** below divides the data in **Data Set A** into categories of lexical similarity:

**Data Set B**

- **-ia suffix**
  - convenientia (ὅμολογία) > conveniens + -ia
  - evidentia (ἐναργεία) > evidens + -ia
  - excandescentia (θύμωσις) > excandescens + -ia

- **-tio suffix**
  - abscessio (ἄπειμι) > supine of abscedo + -tio
  - absolutio (τελειοσίς) > supine of absoluo + -tio
  - adprobatio (συγκατάθεσις) > supine of adprobo + -tio
  - adsensio (συγκατάθεσις) > supine of adsentio + -tio
  - aegrotatio (ἀγροστήματα) > supine of aegroto + -tio
  - aecstitatio (ἀεκτίματο) > supine of aestimo + -tio
  - antecessio (προχώρησις) > supine of antecedo + -tio
  - anticipatio (προλήψις) > supine of anticipo + -tio
  - appettitio (ὀρμή) > supine of appeto + -tio
  - coagmentatio (σοστάτω σώματι) > supine of coagmento + -tio
  - colligatio (δοκιμάς) > supine of colligo + -tio
  - comparatio (ἀναλογία) > supine of comparo + -tio
  - comprehensio (κατάληψις) > supine of comprehendo + -tio

- **-bilis suffix**
  - comprehendibilis (καταλληπτός) > comprehendo + -bilis
  - indissolubilis (ἄλλωτος) > in + dissoluuo + -bilis
  - mutabilis (σκίδωστος, τρεπόμενος) > muto + -bilis

- **-tas suffix**
  - levitas (λείότης) > levis + -tas
  - medietas (μεδότης) > medius + -tas
  - mulierositas (μυληρούσια) > mulierosus + -tas
  - parvitas (παρφάτης) > parvus + -tas
  - perspicuitas (ἐναργεία) > perspicuus + -tas
  - qualitas (ποιότης) > qualis + -tas
  - soliditas (στερεοειδής) > solidus + -tas
  - universitas (τὸ πᾶν) > universus + -tas

- **-alis suffix**
  - acervalis (σορίτης) > acervus + -alis

  - concentio (ἄρμονία, συμφωνία) > supine of concano + -tio
  - concursio (παραβολή) > supine of concuro + -tio
  - consumptio (φθόνος) > supine of consumo + -tio
  - dissimulatio (ἐσλονεία) > supine of dissimulo + -tio
  - enuntiatio (περιφονεία) > supine of enuntio + -tio
  - impulsio (δύναμις) > supine of impello + -tio
  - infinitio (ἀπεξία) > supine of finio + -tio
  - notatio (ἐνυμολογία) > supine of noto + -tio
  - praesensio (μαντική) > praesentio + -tio
  - sumptio (λήμματα) > supine of sumo + -tio
  - temperatio (κρατήρ) > supine of tempero + -tio

- **-tor/-trix suffix**
  - opinabilis (δοξαστός) > opinor + -bilis
  - tractabilis (ἀπτός) > tracto + -bilis
  - altrix (προφός) > supine of alo + -tix
  - defenstrix (προφιπρία) > supine of defendo + -tix
  - effector (δημιουργός) > supine of efficio + -tor
  - effectrix (δημιουργός) > supine of efficio + -tix
  - fabricator (τεκτανόμονος) > supine of fabrico + -tor
Participle formation (pres. and past.)
consequens (ἐπηγελλεκαηηθόο) > pres part of consequor
corporatus (σῶμα ἔχων) > perf part of corpore
decretum (ἄργιμα) > perf part of decerno
efficiens (ποιητικός) > pres part of efficio
incisum (κόμματα) > perf part of incido

Indifferens (ἀδυνάτωρ) in- + pres part of differo
Indissoluta (ἄλωτον) > in- + perf part of dissolvo
Perceptum (θεώρημα) > perf part of percipio
Praepositum (προάγω) > perf part of praepono
Productus (προάγω) > perf part of produco
Reiecta (ἀποκρημμένα) > perf. part. of reicio

Calques
antecessio (προχώρησις) > supine of antecedo + -tio
Anticipatio (πρόληψις) > supine of anticipe + -tio
Commeterior (συμμετριά) > con- + metior
Comprehendibilis (καταληπτικός) > comprehendo + -bils
Concentio (ἄρμονία, συμφωνία) > supine of concano + -tio
Corporœus (σῶματοςίδης) > corpus + eus

Productus (προάγω) > perf part of produco
Qualitas (πλῆρος) > qualis + -tas
Unigena (μονογενής) > unus + genus
Veriloquium (ἐπημολογία) > verus + loquus + -ium

Loan Words and Loanblends
aenigma (αἴνημα)
alabaster (ἀλάβαστρον)
anapaestus (ἀνάπαστος)
arquitetura (ἀρχιτεκτονία)
aristolochia (ἀριστολοχία)
auloedus (αὐλοεδός)
cantharis (κανθαρίς)
citharoedus (κιθαροδός)
clepsydra (κλεψύδρα)
cometes (κομήτης)
empiricus (ἐμπειρικός)
ephorus (ἐφόρος)
genealogus (γενεάλογος)
geometrica (γεωμετρική)
gyrus (γύρος)
helica (ἡλίκη)
ahydrus (δόραουλος)
ichneumon (ἰχνεύμων)
ironia (ἰρωνία)
lapathum (λάπαθων)
machinatio (μαχινάτο)
melancholicus (μελαγχολικός)
narthecium (ναρθηκίου)
neselis (σέσελις)
sophisma (σοφίσμα)
sophistes (σοφίστης)
stigmatias (στιγματιὰς)
theologus (θεόλογος)
tyranos (τυραννίς)
Miscellaneous

artifex (δημιουργός) > ars + facio
consequor (ἐπικαταλαμβάνω)
opus (σῶμα)
cuneolus (γόμφος) > cuneus + -olus
extremum (τελός) > exter + -emus
fatum (εἴμαρμενή) > neut. of fatus in pass. sense.
membrum (κόλον)
morbus (πάθος)
principatus (ἡγεμονικός) princeps + -atus
solivagus (ζηρημος) > solus + vagus
APPENDIX VII - CICERONIAN POETIC COMPOUNDS

This list is for comparison purposes to those compounds found in Lucretius (Appendix VIII). Key: (C.) = Cicero’s translation (based on fragments in Courtney (1993); (A.) = Aratus’ original. I have listed the TLL definition and the OLD definition where possible, in all other cases the definition comes from the OLD. A dagger (†) indicates there is no Greek equivalent and Cicero introduced this word for effect. Two daggers (††) indicate Cicero has compounded the word where the original Greek was not a compound. In general, Cicero’s adaptation of the original source material is very free, especially with the large amount of redundant adjectives, but the Latin and Greek are presented together as approximate parallels.

Aestifer† (aestus + -fer)

TLL, 1: ‘aestum movens: de sole et sideribus’, OLD, 1b. (of a constellation) that brings hot weather (C. 111) aestiferos ualidis erumpit flatibus ignes; (A. 329-31) ἀστέρι βέβληται δεινῷ γένυς, ὃς ρα μάλιστα / ὀξέα σειράει… (C.320) aestifer est pandens feruentia sidera Cancer. (A. 545) Τὸ ἔνι Καρκίνος ἐστὶ…

Anxifer† (anxius + -fer)

TLL, 1: ‘Gloss. Maestificum, maestiferis (?) maestis’, OLD, 1: Bringing or causing mental anguish, harassing, worrying (Tusc. 2. 21) nunc, nunc dolorum anxiferi torquent vertices (Sophocles, Trach. 1088-9) δαίνοτα γὰρ αὖ πάλιν, / ἤλπεθε, ἐμσξκήθελ.

Auctifer† (augeo + -fer)

TLL, ‘cf. c. auctus et ferre’, OLD, 1: Productive, fruitful (Fat. frag. 3 from Augustin. de civ. dei 5.8) illi quoque versus Homerici huic sententiae suffragantur, quos Cicero in Latinum vertit: ‘tales sunt hominum mentes, quali pater ipse / Iuppiter auctiferas lustravit lumine terras.’ (Od. 18.136-7) τοῦς γὰρ νόος ἐστὶν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων / οἶνον ἐπ᾽ ἡμαρ ἄγησι πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεόν τε.

Auriger† (aurum + -ger)

TLL, 1: ‘cf. aurum et gerere i.q. aurifer’, OLD, 1: Bearing gold. In this sense, Cicero uses it to describe the golden horns of the bulls, ingredients of Roman divination and
sacrifice.  

**Biformatus**† (bi + ppl. of *formo*)

*TLL*, 1: ‘a bi- et forma vel formare’, *OLD*, 1: (of a monster) consisting of two parts of different kinds, two-formed (*Tusc*. 2. 20) Moles Gigantum, non biformato impetus/ Centaurus ictus copori inflixit meo (*Trach*. 1059) ἅτρατός Γιγάντων οὕτε θήρειος βία.

**Clarisonus**†† (clarus + -sonus, from καθαρός)

*TLL*, 1: ‘a clarus et sonus…de vocis claritate’; *OLD*, 1: Loud or clear-sounding; (C. 27) hunc a clarisonis auris Aquilonis ad Austrum; (A. 507) Τὸν πόματον καθαροῖο παρερχόμενος βορέαο.

**Corniger**†† (cornu + -ger, from κεφαός)

*TLL*, 1a: ‘de bestiis…generatim et de bubus”; *OLD*, 1: Having horns or antlers (C. 167) Corniger est valido conixus corpore Taurus; (A. 167) Πάρο ποσί δ’ Ἡλιόχου κεφαὸν πεπηεόηα Ταῦξνλ καίζζαη.

**Horrisonus** (*horreō* + *sono* + -us)


**Ignifer**† (ignis + -fer)

*TLL*, 1: ‘proprie i.q. ignem, flammis ferens, ignitus... de aethere, caelo’; *OLD*, 1. Bearing or containing fire; (C. 88) igniferum mulcens tremebundis aethera pinnis; (A. 313-14) σχεδόθεν δὲ ὁ ἄλλος ἄηται / οὗ τόσσος μεγέθει...

**Luctificus** (luctus + -ficus)

*TLL*, 1: ‘significatur quod sive luctum efficit sive luctus plenum, luctuosum est...res vel divinitates noxiae, infestantes *sim. (sc.* praevalente vi activa)’; *OLD*, 1: That causes sorrow, dire, calamitous; (*Tusc*. 2. 25, fr. 193 of Aeschylus’ lost play *Prometheus Unbound*) luctifica clades nostro infixa est corpori.

---

33 Jocelyn (1973), 106.
**Mollipes** (mollis + pes)

*TLL*: ‘a mollis et pes; cf. e. g. levipes’; *OLD*, 1: Tender-footed; *Prognostica* (C. 10) mollipedesque boues, spectantes lumina caeli; (A. 954-5) Καὶ βόες.../ οὐρανὸν εἰσανιδόντες ἀπ’ αἰθέρος ὀφθαλμοῖς.

**Semifer** (semi + ferus)

*OLD*, 1: (of creatures born from the union of a human being with an animal, a wild animal with a tame, etc.), half-wild; (C. 59) corpore semifero magno Capricornus in orbe / quem cum perpetuo vestiuit lumine Titan; (A. 285-6) αὐτὸς ὁ γε πρότερος καὶ νεώθι μᾶλλον / κέκλιται Αἰγόκερως, ἵνα τε τρέπετ’ ἡλίου ἓς.

**Spiniger** (spina + -ger)

*OLD*, 1: Covered with thorns; (C. 178) spinigeram subter caudam Pisticis adhaesit; (A. 397-8) ὁ δὲ κυανέου ὑπὸ Κήτεος οὐρῆ.

**Squamifer** (squama + -fer)

*OLD*, 1: Equipped with scales, scaly; ?sparkling; (C. 328) exim squamiferi serpentes ludere Pisces; (A. 547) Ὄδροχος, δόο δ’ αὐτῶι ἐπ’ Ἰχθύες ἀστερόντες.

**Stelliger** (stella + -ger)

*OLD*, 1: Star-bearing (C. 238) orbes stelligeri portantes signa feruntur (A. 465-6) Σήματα δ’ εἰ μᾶλα πᾶσιν ἐπιρρήθην περίκειται / πολλά τε καὶ σχεδόθεν πάντῃ συνεφερμένα πάντα.

**Signipotens** (signum + potens from ἀστέριος)

*OLD*, 1: Ruling over the constellations; (C. 475) cedit Equus surgens. At contra signipotens nox / cauda Centaurus retinens ad se rapit ipsa; (A. 694-5) ἀντία δ’ Ἰππου / ἐξ οὐρῆς Κένταουρον ἑφέλκεται ἀστερίη νός.

**Triceps** (tri + -ceps, from τρίκρανος)

*OLD*, 1: Having three heads; (Tusc. 1.10) triceps...Cerberus; (Tusc. 2. 22, from Sophocles’ *Trachiniae*) tricipitem eduxit Hydra generatum Canem; (Trach. 1098) Ἀιδοῦ τρίκρανον σκύλοκ’ ἀπρόσμαχον τέρας.

---

34 Although the text is disputed, the *squamifer* seems to correspond to ἀπό ηήξοντο meaning „like a star, sparkling“ (see LSJ s.v.)
**Tristificus† (tristis + -ficus)**

*OLD*, 1: Causing despondency; *Prognostica* (C. 4) saxaque canis nium spumata liquore / tristicas certant Neptuno reddere uoces; (A. 910-11) …ακταί τ᾽ εἰνάλαι ὁπότ' εὐδίωι ἱχήσεσαι γίγνονται.

**Umifer† (umeo + -fer)**

*OLD*, 1: Laden with moisture *Prognostica* (C. 11) naribus umiferum duxere ex aere sucum (A. 955) ἀπ᾽ αἰθέρος ὀσφρήσαντο.

**Vastificus† (uastus + -ficus)**

*OLD*, 1: That ravages or lays waste (*Tusc*. 2. 22, from Sophocles’ *Trachiniae*) Erymanthiam haec uastificam abiecit beluam (*Trach*. 1097) Ἕρμανθόν τε θήρα.
Compounding in Lucretius

A survey of compound words in Lucretius reveals unmistakeable influences from Ennian innovation, but Lucretius himself also indulged in his own original compounding. A complete list can be found in Bailey’s excellent survey, yet he also makes comment in relation to Cicero’s compounding in the *Phaenomena* translation: ‘Cicero...showed that he accepted the tradition of compound words and suggested not a few to Lucretius’. In Cicero’s translation of Aratus’ astronomical poem (composed some twenty years before Lucretius was active), he indulged in coining compound words as well as reusing words from earlier Latin poets. Many of his original compounds re-emerged in Lucretius also:

*Ciceronian innovations (compounds) from the Aratea found in Lucretius* (cf. Appendix VII)

*igniferum* - line 88 (Lucr. 2.25; 5.459, 498; 6.379).
*aestiferos* - line 41 (Lucr. 1.663; 5.613, 642; 6.721).
*signiferum* - line 318 (Lucr. 5.91; 6.481)
*squamigeri* - line 328 (Lucr. 1.162)

It has been argued by many scholars whether Lucretius decorates his philosophical concepts with poetry or vice versa yet whatever his style may be, his aims were to represent his beliefs through a poetic framework and this meant using poetic techniques (such as compounding), being a fundamental part of both the Latin and Greek literary traditions. A look at some examples in *De rerum natura* will give us an insight in how Lucretius deploys his compounds, compared to Cicero.

At the start of the work, Lucretius provides an ornately woven genesis to his poem:

Mother of Aeneas, delight of Gods and men,
Dear Venus, beneath the gliding signs of heaven,

---

36 Bailey (1947), 1.133.
who to the ship-bearing (navigator) sea, who to the fruit-bearing (frugifer) earth you give your presence...  

In line 3 there is a symmetrical piece of hexameter where two compound adjectives have been deployed for archaic effect: navigator and frugifer. The former compound is an innovation on Lucretius’ part, yet frugifer recalls Ennius’ terrai frugiferai (Ann. 510). Indeed, there are parallels here to Cicero’s later translation (Fat. fr. 3, from St. Aug. De Civ. Dei. 5.8) of Homer (Od. 18.136-7) with the phrase ‘auctiferas... terras.’ One might conclude here that Lucretius (like Cicero had done as a young poet in his Aratea and would continue to do in his adult years) is placing himself firmly in a poetic tradition spanning from Homer to Ennius and then to Cicero.

Both Cicero and Lucretius share habits when they formed compounds. Ciceronian compounds in -fer from the Aratea such as aestifer and ignifer reappear in Lucretius where he takes the practice further with at least eleven separate compounds derived from the -fer suffix. There are also similarities in compounds such as alipedes (6.765) recalling mollipes in Cicero’s Prognostica. Similarly, compounds in –ger are common in both Cicero and Lucretius most likely derived from Ennius’ use of the suffix.

Further compounds found in Lucretius such as altitonans (5.745) and altiuolans (5.433) can be traced backed to Ennius (Ann. 554 and 76 respectively) and later used by Cicero (De Consulato suo fr. 2.36). Compare Lucretius’ raucons (2.619) with Ennius’ altisonus (Trag. 88) which is also later used by Cicero (Div. 1.106). Compounds with their roots in fac- such as auctificus (2.571) horrificus (3.906) laetificus (1.193) largificus (2.627) tabificus (6.737) terrificus (2.632) seem to show influence from earlier writers such as Plautus (beneficus in Bac. 395, veneficus in Epid. 221, damnificus in Cist. 728, and fumificus in Mil. 412), Accius (ingratificus fr. 358) and Terence (mirificus in Ph. 871) to name just a few, many of which were later

---

38 1.1-4: Aeneadum genetrix, hominum divomque voluptas, / alma Venus, caeli subter labentia signa / quae mare navigerum, quae terras frugiferentis / concelebras...
39 Skutsch (1985), 118.
40 Murley (1947), 336-346.
41 falciferos (III.642), floriferis (III.11), frondiferas (I.18), frugiferentis (I.3), glandiferas (V.939), horriferum (V.218), luciferam (V.726), mortifer (VI.1138), roriferis (VI.864), sensifer (III.272).
42 Prog. 10: mollipedesque boues, spectantes lumina caeli.
43 spiniger (Ph.178) squamiger (Ph.328), stelliger, (Ph.238).
44 barbigeras (V.900) cornigeras (II.368) lanigerae (II.318) morigera (V.80) navigerum (I.3) pinnigeri (V.1075) saetigeris (V.970) squamigerum (I.162).
45 Coulter (1916), 164.
46 Skutsch (1985), 122.
47 Skutsch (1985), 76.
48 Jocelyn (1967), 86.
employed by Cicero.⁴⁹ This largely confirms the observations above of both writers falling into a recognised epic tradition in Latin of poetic word-formation.

**Innovations in Lucretius**

Many of Lucretius’ innovations were *hapax legomena*, yet the focus here will be those words later adopted by Cicero.⁵⁰ For instance, Lucretius’ Third Declension neuter substantives in –men such as *clinamen* (2. 292) (cf. C.’s *declinatio*, *inclinatio* and *clinatus*) and *vexamen* (5. 340) (cf. C.’s *vexatio*). Likewise, Fourth Declension abstract substantives in –us such as *adhaesus* (3. 381) (cf. C.’s *adhaesio*), *commutatus* (1. 795) (C.’s *commutatio*), *concilium* (1. 183) (cf. C.’s *concretio*), *concursum* (1. 384) (cf. C.’s *concurso*), *contagium* (3. 345, 740, 6. 379) (cf. C.’s *contagio*), *emissus* (4. 205) (cf. C.’s *emissio*), *opinatus* (IV. 465) (cf. C.’s *opinatio*), and *refutatus* (3. 525) (cf. C.’s *refutatio*). Also, adverbs in –ter such as *praecipitanter* (3.1063) (cf. C.’s *praecipuus* Fin. 3.52). Interestingly, Lucretius’ loan word *homoeomeria* (1.830) (ὁκνηνκέξεηα) is translated by Cicero with a phrase *particulas, similes inter se, minutas*. (Ac. 2.118)⁵¹, others such as *astrologi* (V. 728) from ἀζηξνιόγνο are echoed by Cicero (*de Orat.* 1.69).

To compare the two writers further, it is helpful to see how each dealt with introducing Latin terms to translate the original Greek one.⁵² Since there are only three Greek words directly glossed in Lucretius (all of which are in fact loan words), there is the Greek evidence in Cicero exclusively.⁵³ This is because only Cicero could cite the Greek term he was translating directly (thanks to the flexibility of prose). This proves useful in comparing the two and gives us clues as to which Greek words Lucretius was translating:

**Cicero and Lucretius translations of Greek originals**


⁴⁹ *beneficus* Mur. 70; Mil. 20; *mirificus* Att. 2.14.2; *veneficus* Catil. 2.7, *Off*. 3.73.

⁵⁰ This list is derived form the collected compounds found in Bailey, 133 and Reiley 26.

⁵¹ As Reiley (1909), 23 notes on this word: ὁκνηνκέξεηα proves too much for the powers of Lucretius and he frankly admits it, 1.830-834. The honors are decidedly with Cicero. He shuns altogether the *sesquipedale verbum*.

⁵² For a detailed discussion and comparison of phrases used by Lucretius and Cicero, see Reiley (1909), 20-24.

⁵³ There are three direct translations one can find in Lucretius: *harmonia*, *homoeomeria* and *prester*. 
εἴδολα, Cic. imagines, Fin. 1.21; spectra, Fam. 15.16; similia, N.D. 1.105; fluentes visiones, N.D. 1.109. Simulacra et imagines, N.D. 2.76, Lucretius uses imagines and simulacra ‘according to the demands of the metre’.54

ἐλάχιστον, Cic. minimum. Fat. 22. Lucr. 2 minimum 244.

ἡδονή, Cic. voluptas, Fin. 2.12. Lucr. uses voluptas, but his reference to the Greek is uncertain, e.g., 2.3. He must have had Epicurus’ definition of ἡδονή in mind when he wrote 2.18, 19: ‘[natura] mente fruatur / iucundo sensu cura semota metuque’.

κόσμος, Cic. mundus, Tim. 10; Lucr. 1.1054; 2.181. The Stoic and Epicurean mundus formed two distinct concepts. The μετακόσμος where the gods dwell, whence flow the imagines, is translated by Lucretius with the phrase sedes sanctas in mundi partibus ullis, 5.147. Cicero neatly turns this into intermundia. Fin. 2.75, N.D. 1.18.

πρόληψις, Cic. notitia, notio, Ac. 2.30; N.D. 1.43, 44, 45; Lucretius renders πρόληψις by notities when speaking of the conception of the gods produced in the mind by the efflux of the εἴδολα, 5.182, 1047.

σοφία, Cic. sapientia, De Off. 1.153. Lucr. sapientia 5.10.

σφαῖρα, Cic. globus, N.D. 2.47. Lucr. globus 5.69, 472, 665.

σφαιροειδής, Cic. globosum, Tim. 6. globosum Lucr. 2.469.

54 Reiley (1909), 17.
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