Classical Quarterly **47** (i) 215–226 (1997) *Printed in Great Britain*

TRANSLATION IN AULUS GELLIUS

In the last twenty years, the study of translation has emerged as a discipline in its own right.[1] Scholars in various fields have turned their attention to the linguistic, philosophical, and ideological issues involved in the 'carrying over' of ideas from one language into another. This new discipline has a natural affinity with Latin philology, since the Romans may be regarded as pioneers in the art of translation in the West.[2] At present, however, we have only begun to study what they really thought about translation and how they went about doing it. In the present paper,[3] I will re-examine a valuable but under-appreciated witness: Aulus Gellius, author of the *Attic Nights*.[4] Some of Gellius' brief essays contain translations from Greek, and a few of them were prepared specifically as exercises in the *ars interpretandi*. By studying them, we learn how the questions associated with translation were addressed by a Roman litterateur of the Antonine period.

I. *EXERCITATIO*

Why did the Romans translate Greek literary works? Under what circumstances did translators work? *More suo*, Gellius approaches these questions through an anecdote about his school days in Athens (17.20.1). His teacher, the Academic philosopher Lucius Calvenus Taurus, was commenting on Plato's *Symposium* and had come to the famous speech of Pausanias about good and bad *eros* (180e–181a). He paused to admire Plato's style, its 'brilliance' and 'brief and smooth numbers' all symmetrically rounded off (§4).[5] Turning to Gellius, whom he had nicknamed *rhetoriscus*, Taurus asked, 'habesne nobis dicere in libris rhetorum vestrorum tam apte tamque modulate compositam orationem?' (§5). The philosopher went on to insist that style should be subordinate to content (§§5–6), but this did not discourage his rhetorically-minded pupil: 'haec admonitio Tauri de orationis Platonicae modulis non modo non repressit, sed instrinxit etiam nos ad elegantiam Graecae orationis verbis Latinis adfectandam' (§7). Comparing himself to animals who blindly imitate what they have seen and heard, Gellius presents what he calls a 'shadowy outline' of Plato ('lineas umbrasque', §8). Since the Greek has already been quoted in full, the reader has the

[1] Cf. S. Bassnett-McGuire, *Translation Studies* (Revised Edition, London and New York, 1991), xi–xix and 1–11.

[2] Cf. Bassnett-McGuire (n. 1), 43, and W. Wilss, *Übersetzungwissenschaft. Probleme und Methoden* (Stuttgart, 1977), 29–32.

[3] This paper includes material presented at the annual meetings of the American Philological Association (1991) and the Classical Association of the Middle West and South (1995). I owe particular thanks to the referee, Dr. Leofranc Holford-Strevens, for several corrections and suggestions.

[4] It is hoped that these observations will supplement the work of L. Gamberale, *Traduzione in Gellio* (Rome, 1969), and P. Steinmetz, 'Gellius als Übersetzer', in *Zum Umgang mit fremden Sprachen in der griechisch-römischen Antike,* edd. C. Müller *et al.*(Stuttgart, 1992 = *Palingenesia* 36), 201–11. For a general appreciation of Gellius' life and work, see L. A. Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius* (London, 1988); see also S. Beall, Civilis Eruditio: *Style and Content in the* Attic Nights *of Aulus Gellius* (Diss. California, Berkeley, 1988).

[5] 'Videsne . . . *ἐνθύμημα* crebrum et coruscum et convexum brevibusque et rotundis numeris cum quadam aequabili circumactione devinctum?' I use (with slight adjustments in punctuation) P. Marshall's corrected OCT text (1990); I have often adapted the translation of J. C. Rolfe (Loeb, rev. edn 1946).

opportunity to compare the two texts and to evaluate the skill of the translator.[6]

Gellius emphasizes the occasional nature of his version of Plato. This is not to say, however, that there was anything unusual about translating Greek passages 'exercendi gratia' (17.20.L); on the contrary, Gellius takes for granted the long-established tradition of translation as a rhetorical exercise.[7] For the Romans, education in the art of speaking was based on a series of graded literary exercises. One of the more advanced and comprehensive of these was translation from Greek to Latin, in verse as well as in prose. It was endorsed by Cicero (*De or.* 1.155), Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.5.2–3) and Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 7.9.2). Cicero indicates that it was typically undertaken by young men (*adulescentes*),[8] and in Gellius' day it formed part of the regimen set by Fronto for the youthful Marcus Aurelius (p. 152).[9] Pliny, however, recommended translation to an adult friend, Fuscus, who wished to make the most of his leisure time. Pliny's advice is consistent with the view of both Cicero and Quintilian that *exercitatio* should not cease with the completion of formal studies; reading and occasional writing should be part of the orator's daily regimen.[10] In this anecdote, Gellius confirms that translation was practised as a 'post-graduate' exercise, for he would have completed his formal rhetorical training before studying philosophy with Taurus.[11] It is also clear that during the redaction of his work, many years later, he continued to take pleasure in his translations and considered them worthy of publication.

Among the various standard exercises in style, translation was thought to possess special advantages. As Quintilian saw it, translators acquire the wealth of subject matter (*rerum copia*) and refinement in execution (*ars*) which characterize the best Greek works; they also work with a variety of rhetorical figures.[12] Pliny's letter mentions a further benefit: by its very difficulty, translation compels the student to examine more carefully the virtues of the source text (*Ep.* 7.9.2).[13] Thus, translation was valued by the Romans as a 'complete workout' in literary style. Gellius, however, indicates that one could also focus the exercise on particular aspects of the original text. Taurus' comments reflect a somewhat limited appreciation of Plato for his 'density' (*enthymema crebrum*) and rhythm (*numeri*). Gellius makes it clear that these virtues specifically determined his method of 'delineating' the Greek.

[6] The anecdote may be partly or wholly fictitious. The lemma of a lost chapter (8.8) mentions difficulties encountered while translating 'quosdam locos platonicos' into Latin; the version presented in 17.20 might actually have formed part of this more comprehensive exercise. Holford-Strevens, however, argues that Gellius would not have created *ex nihilo* a situation in which he was made to look a fool. See his *Aulus Gellius,* 49, and 'Fact and Fiction in Aulus Gellius', *LCM* 7.5 (May 1982), 66–7.

[7] See H. Richter, *Übersetzen und Übersetzungen in der römischen Literatur* (Diss. Erlangen-Coburg, 1938), 69–76; also Gamberale (n. 4), 59–63.

[8] *De or.* 1.155; *De nat. deorum* 2.104; *De off.* 2.87.

[9] I follow the pagination of the Teubner edition of Van den Hout (Leipzig, 1988).

[10] Cic. *De or.* 1.147; Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.4.

[11] Cf. Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius* (n. 4), 12. Like many Romans, Gellius had come to Athens 'ad capiendum ingenii cultum' (1.2.1). Philosophy functioned as a sort of finishing course, and Taurus had good reason to suspect that Gellius had enrolled in his class 'eloquentiae unius extundendae gratia' (17.20.4).

[12] 'Et manifesta est exercitationis huiusce ratio. Nam et rerum copia Graeci auctores abundant et plurimum artis in eloquentiam intulerunt et hos transferentibus verbis uti optimis licet: omnibus enim utimur nostris. Figuras vero, quibus maxime ornatur oratio, multas ac varias excogitandi etiam necessitas quaedam est, quia plerumque a Graecis Romana dissentiunt' (*Inst.* 10.5.3).

[13] '. . . simul quae legentem fefellissent, transferentem fugere non possunt'.

Setting aside their practical advantages, the Romans regarded literary exercises as a kind of honest relaxation. Pliny describes casual verse-writing as a 'game', but he adds that such are the pastimes of great men: 'hi lusus non minorem interdum gloriam quam seria consequuntur. . . . Itaque summi oratores, summi etiam viri sic se aut exercebant aut delectabant, immo delectabant exercebantque' (*Ep.* 7.9.10, 12). Pliny's combination of *delectatio* and *exercitatio* anticipates Gellius' theme of *delectatio in otio atque in ludo liberalior* (*Praef.* 16).[14] Gellius refers not only to the enjoyment he hopes to give his readers, but also to his own pleasure in composing the *Attic Nights*: 'commentationes hasce ludere ac facere exorsi sumus' (*Praef.* 4).[15] It is therefore not surprising that he treats his translation of Plato almost as a sporting proposition. Taurus' rhetorical question ('habesne nobis dicere . . . ?') has the ring of a challenge, and we perceive Gellius' eagerness to take it up.

It follows, however, that the emphasis on *delectatio* resulted in certain restrictions on the type of passage one might choose for translation. Speaking of rhetorical exercises generally, Pliny emphasizes the need for variety: 'ut enim terrae variis mutatisque seminibus, ita ingenia nostra nunc hac nunc illa meditatione recoluntur' (*Ep.* 7.9.7). Variety of this sort implies brevity, and for this reason Pliny explicitly recommends that verse compositions be short (§9). This principle would apply to translation as well, and Gellius, for his part, confined his efforts to short, self-contained passages such as *enthymemata*, *sententiae*, stories, and letters.[16] The fragmentary character of such versions would normally have made them unsuitable for publication; this may account for the fact that we possess so few examples of prose translation from the classical period.[17] We are fortunate that the miscellaneous character of the *Attic Nights* enabled Gellius to include samples of this important but ephemeral genre.

There remains one further respect in which Gellius' *mise-en-scène* of 17.20 is arguably typical of Roman literary translation. The notion of translation as a gentleman's sport naturally suggests that of *aemulatio graecorum*; the original Greek author can be viewed as the 'adversary' in a contest of style. In making this observation, however, we find ourselves immersed in a current scholarly controversy. Some modern writers have asserted that Roman translators did not regard themselves as 'servants' of the source text, and that, on the contrary, they regularly tinkered with

[14] Cf. the funerary inscription of M. Pomponius Bassulus (*CIL* 9.1164; *CLE* 97; E. Courtney, *Musa Lapidaria* [Atlanta, 1995] IIc 63): 'ne more pecoris otio transfungerer, Menandri paucas vorti scitas fabulas et ipsus etiam sedulo finxi novas'. See Richter (n. 7), 91. On Gellian *otium*, see Beall (n. 4), 34–8, and 100–6.

[15] It has been observed that Gellius' *commentationes* sometimes reproduce the exercises mentioned by Pliny, Quintilian, and the rhetorical handbooks. Translation and paraphrase are well represented; other passages invite a formal comparison with the *progymnasmata* of the rhetorical schools (especially the *chreia*), or with other forms of occasional composition. See René Marache, 'La mise-en-scène des *Nuits Attiques*: Aulu-Gelle et la diatribe', *Pallas* 1 (1953), 84–95, and the introduction to his edition of the *Nuits Attiques* (Paris, 1967), xxxi-vi; see also Beall (n. 4), 119–28.

[16] *Sententiae* and purple passages: Plato (17.20, cf. 8.8), Aeschines (18.3). Letters: Philip to Aristotle (9.3, discussed below), Alexander to Aristotle and back again (20.5). Stories: Arion and the dolphin, from Herodotus (16.19, discussed below); Androclus and the Lion, from Apion (5.14); the death of Alexander's horse, from Chares (5.2). Gellius also summarized and partially translated speeches of Favorinus (12.1, 14.1) and Musonius (5.1). For a more exhaustive list and commentary on Gellius' translations, see Gamberale (n. 4), 71–172.

[17] For a summary of extant and lost translations, see Richter (n. 7). It is worth noting that a much-discussed text, Cicero's *Timaeus*, may not have been intended for publication as a translation at all. See J. G. F. Powell, 'Cicero's Translations from Greek', in *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers*, ed. J. G. F. Powell (Oxford, 1995), 280–1.

the Greek in the hope of surpassing their classic models.[18] This blanket assertion has recently been challenged by Frederick Rener, who points out that such an approach would have frustrated the stated aims of the exercise.[19] How, indeed, could translators have benefited from struggling with the lexical and stylistic details of the source text if they felt entitled to modify these details at will? Rener does not deny, of course, that Roman writers did sometimes freely adapt their Greek sources; Vergil and the comic poets prove that imitation could serve as the basis for truly original work. But Rener maintains that this sort of composition, which he calls *imitatio*, was reserved for the literary 'master' and should not be confused with the ordinary practice of translation as an exercise in style (pp. 306–13).

Rener does well to correct the prevailing overemphasis on the freedom of Roman translators. However, his distinction between literary *imitatio* and the less original, scholastic form of the exercise may not be as useful as it appears. One problem, which Rener recognizes, is that the Romans themselves did not make this distinction. Indeed, one might say that their fluid notion of translation precluded any systematic theory of the art. Gellius furnishes some good examples of this problem. When he evaluates the 'translations' of classical writers such as Vergil, Caecilius, and Sallust, he concerns himself for the most part with general problems of literary imitation. Sometimes, however, he descends to specific problems of verbal equivalence. At 9.9.15, for example, he cites the negative judgment of Probus on Vergil's rendering of γέγηθε (*Od.* 6.106) with *pertemptant* (*Aen.* 1.508).[20] Gellius and his sources evidently viewed *imitatio* as a flexible process, whose approximation to translation in the strict sense depended on the adapter's intention at a given moment. Gellius cites words and phrases which Vergil undeniably 'translated' from Homer, even if the surrounding passages cannot be considered 'translations'; he and other Roman critics were understandably reluctant to impose rigid distinctions on Vergil's fluid technique. This broad conception of translation is also reflected in Gellius' terminology. He uses *vertere*, sometimes combined with *aemulari*, to describe both original paraphrases and literal translations.[21]

Thus the Romans treated various forms of imitation as instances of 'translation'; conversely, they seem to have regarded all sorts of translation, including the scholastic exercise, as opportunities for emulation. In one of the anecdotes of Seneca the Elder (*Cont.* 9.1.13), Fuscus translated (*transtulisse*) a Greek epigram for the sake of practice (*exercitationis causa*) without assuming that this ruled out competition with his model: 'do operam ut cum optimis sententiis certem, nec illas surripere conor sed vincere'. Gellius appears more modest in his approach to Plato (17.20.8), but his attitude is fundamentally the same. Outwardly, he depreciates his effort by saying, 'proinde nos ea, quae in Platonis oratione demiramur, non aemulari quidem, sed lineas umbrasque facere ausi sumus'. His modesty notwithstanding, Gellius assumed that rivalry with Plato was thinkable, and perhaps even expected. After all, the chiding of Taurus ('habesne nobis dicere . . . ?') amounted to saying, 'match this, if you can'. While claiming to have declined the challenge, Gellius relates the entire anecdote in

[18] E.g. Wilss (n. 2), 30; Richter (n. 7), 41–2, and Franz Blatt, 'Remarques sur l'histoire des traductions latines', *Classica et mediaevalia* 1 (1938), 217–20.

[19] F. M. Rener, Interpretatio: *Language and Translation from Cicero to Tytler* (Amsterdam, 1989), 298–306.

[20] Lexical equivalence is the criterion also at 9.9.9–10, 11.4.4, 17.10.13ff.; more general issues are raised at 2.23, 2.27, 3.16.3–5, 12.1.20, 13.27.

[21] 2.23.1, 3; 11.4.3; cf. 17.20.L, where (as will become clear below) a more literal and 'scholastic' exercise is understood. See Rener (n. 19), 309–10.

such a way that we may say with Gamberale (p. 62, n. 20), 'la dichiarazione di modestia non risponde infatti alla precisione del tentativo di tradizione'.[22] We will also see that Gellius could not resist the temptation to 'improve' upon Plato's composition. In sum, the atmosphere of the chapter is one of courteous rivalry, not only between Gellius and Plato, but also between rhetoric and philosophy and between Latin and Greek. Emulation of this kind, in Gellius' view, is the spice of liberal studies.[23]

At this point we may summarize what we have gleaned from Gellius' anecdote in 17.20 and other indications in the *Attic Nights*. First, he presents translation as a literary exercise which is diverting, as well as improving, and seasoned with the challenge of *aemulatio graecorum*. He confirms Rener's point that translators who wished to improve their skills would not completely dispense with fidelity in the modern sense; they set themselves the task of 'carrying over' some essential feature of the Greek text. Nevertheless, because they undertook translation as an exercise, not as a service, faithfulness became the means to an end, not a duty. Gellius' anecdote points to a fundamental tension between fidelity and 'rivalry'. This tension resolved itself, as we shall see, in a flexible technique, ranging from close imitation to virtual paraphrase. Thus Gellius warns us that the reality of Roman translation was more complex than the Romans themselves, in their offhand theoretical remarks, would have us believe.[24] To understand their approach, we must study the translations themselves.

II. *FIDES*

Modern scholars, such as Gamberale and Steinmetz, tend to evaluate Gellius' translations according to their 'faithfulness' to the original text.[25] As an example of one approach, they cite his version of a letter allegedly written by Philip of Macedon to Aristotle (9.3.5–6):

Ἴσθι μοι γεγονότα υἱόν.	Filium mihi genitum scito.
Πολλὴν οὖν τοῖς θεοῖς ἔχω χάριν,	Quod equidem dis habeo gratiam,
οὐχ οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ γενέσει τοῦ παιδός,	non proinde quia natus est,
ὡς ἐπὶ τῷ κατὰ τὴν σὴν ἡλικίαν	quam pro eo quod eum nasci contigit
αὐτὸν γεγονέναι·	temporibus vitae tuae.
ἐλπίζω γὰρ αὐτὸν	Spero enim fore
ὑπὸ σοῦ τραφέντα καὶ παιδευθέντα	ut eductus eruditusque a te
ἄξιον ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἡμῶν	dignus existat et nobis
καὶ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων διαδοχῆς.	et rerum istarum susceptione.

This is regarded as one of Gellius' most 'literal' translations.[26] The first sentence

[22] Other examples of conventional modesty are *Praef.* 4, 10; 12.1.24, 14.1.32. In 10.22.3, however, Gellius actually does decline to render Plato's Greek with the excuse that it is beyond the reach of 'all Latinity'.

[23] Cultural partisanship is evident in the dialogue between Antonius Julianus and *graeci plusculi* on the merits of Greek and Latin elegists (19.9.7–9). The sympotic setting of the dialogue is typical of Gellius' promotion of liberal *otium*, in which erudite games also had their place (18.2.1–6); cf. Beall (n. 4), 35–6, 132–5.

[24] It is impossible as well as misleading to construct a 'Roman theory' of translation on the basis of simple formulae such as Cicero's 'nec tamen exprimi verbum e verbo necesse erit' (*De fin.* 3.15), even if the idea is echoed by Horace (*Ars poetica* 133–4) and Gellius himself (9.9.1). Cf. Powell (n. 17), 278.

[25] So Steinmetz (n. 4), 210: 'ihre Bandbreite (i.e., that of Gellius' versions) reicht, ohne daß dies besonders vermerkt wird, von einer wörtlichen Wiedergabe über gewisse Nuancierungen der wörtlichen Wiedergabe bis zu einer recht freien Nachgestaltung der Vorlage'. Cf. Gamberale (n. 4), 66–7.

[26] Gamberale (n. 4), 100–4; Steinmetz (n. 4), 208.

certainly justifies this description: the Latin words and syntax correspond exactly with the Greek, and *genitum* is even cognate with γεγονότα. In the next sentence, θεοῖς ἔχω χάριν is rendered verbatim with *dis habeo gratiam*. In other places, however, we find that Gellius has chosen to modify the original wording for the sake of a smoother Latin version. He has not imposed upon Latin the etymological word play we find in the sequence γεγονότα . . . γενέσει . . . γεγονέναι, for Latin has no exact equivalent of γένεσις. The same principle applies to syntax: where the original has a prepositional infinitive phrase (ἐπὶ τῷ κατὰ τὴν σὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτὸν γεγονέναι), a construction wholly alien to Latin, Gellius employs a causal clause ('quod eum nasci contigit temporibus vitae tuae'). Gellius never allows the original structure to interfere with good Latin usage. To do so would be inconsistent not only with his individual literary pretensions,[27] but also with the usual object of the exercise: training in good style.

Nevertheless, to concentrate on vocabulary and syntax, as Steinmetz and Gamberale usually do, is to miss an important dimension of Gellius' own sense of literature and translation. Aristotle's correspondence, for example, appealed to him not merely for its edifying content (9.3.4), but also for its 'slender thread of elegant brevity' ('brevitatis elegantissimae filum tenuissimum', 20.5.10). We are reminded here of Taurus' critique of Plato (17.20.4). For Gellius, it seems, style was virtually everything, and he was particularly fascinated by artifice in structure and rhythm—the latter understood primarily as 'the natural articulation of the sentence into smaller segments and segments of segments in constant interplay, with peaks and troughs of emphasis, but combining into a whole'.[28] He concentrated on this feature of Philip's letter, reproducing in Latin the linear arrangement and relative length of the original Greek members:[29]

	syllables
Ἴσθι μοι γεγονότα υἱόν.	9
Filium mihi genitum scito.	10
Πολλὴν οὖν τοῖς θεοῖς ἔχω χάριν,	10
Quod equidem dis habeo gratiam,	11
οὐχ οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ γενέσει τοῦ παιδός,	12
non proinde quia natus est,	9
ὡς ἐπὶ τῷ κατὰ τὴν σὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτὸν γεγονέναι.	18
quam pro eo quod eum nasci contigit temporibus vitae tuae.	19
ἐλπίζω γὰρ αὐτὸν	6
Spero enim fore	5
ὑπὸ σοῦ τραφέντα καὶ παιδευθέντα	11
ut eductus eruditusque a te	10
ἄξιον ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἡμῶν	9
dignus existat et nobis	8
καὶ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων διαδοχῆς.	10
et rerum istarum susceptione.	10

[27] Steinmetz (n. 4), 210.

[28] Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius* (n. 4), 44. Note Gellius' somewhat more condensed way of putting it: 'verba . . . numeris coagmentisque verborum scite modulateque apta' (17.20.L).

[29] My segmentation is based on T. N. Habinek, *The Colometry of Latin Prose* (Berkeley, 1985), with the understanding that colometry involves a subjective judgement about where *possible* boundaries should *in fact* have been observed in the pronunciation of a text. I assume elision in

By following the Greek so closely, Gellius has preserved figures which contribute directly to the rhetorical *vis* of Philip's letter. Important ideas are arranged antithetically, and the antitheses are marked by initial repetition (anaphora) and the nearly identical length of successive cola (parisosis). Gellius' rhetorical preoccupations account, at least in part, for his use of the phrases *proinde quia* and *pro eo quod*, where the conjunctions alone might have been sufficient. *Proinde* and *pro eo*, because they share the prepositional element *pro-*, maintain the anaphoric arrangement of the Greek. They also help to pad out the cola in which they stand, so that the length of the Latin members approximates that of the original. Other examples of this padding are *quod equidem* (for *ergo*, or some other brief equivalent), *existat* (for *sit*), and *rerum istarum* (for *rerum* alone). With these words Gellius preserved the 'charming brevity' of the letters from the excessive terseness which exactly equivalent Latin expressions might have introduced.[30] In general, then, we can say that Gellius followed Philip closely without always translating literally. While retaining the formal structure of his model, he altered its syntax and modulated its vocabulary in the interest of smoothness and stylistic equivalence. This is an approach which might be described today as 'mimetic'; Gellius elsewhere designates it by the special verb, *effingere*.[31]

This approach can be contrasted with his handling of Herodotus' story of Arion and the dolphin.[32] An extract illustrates the freedom with which he rendered this popular tale:

Herodotus (1.24.1)	Gellius (16.19.5–7)
τοῦτον τὸν Ἀρίονα λέγουσι, τὸν πολλὸν τοῦ χρόνου διατρίβοντα παρὰ Περιάνδῳ, ἐπιθυμῆσαι πλῶσαι ἐς Ἰταλίην τε καὶ Σικελίην, ἐργασάμενον δὲ χρήματα μεγάλα θελῆσαι ὀπίσω ἐς Κόρινθον ἀπικέσθαι.	Is inde a rege proficiscitur terras inclutas Siciliam atque Italiam visere. Ubi eo venit auresque omnium mentesque in utriusque terrae urbibus demulsit, in quaestibus istic et voluptatibus amoribusque hominum fuit. Is tum postea grandi pecunia et re bona multa copiosus Corinthum instituit redire. . . .

Gellius follows the Greek closely enough to indicate that Herodotus, and not some later version, was his source.[33] It is also clear, however, that he wished to convert the simple language of the Greek into his own 'mannered' style. We recognize his typical

the Latin where possible, but only where marked in the Greek, as later Greek was more tolerant of hiatus. See M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), 164, and W. S. Allen, *Vox Latina*, 2nd edn (Cambridge, 1978), 78–82 and esp. 128.

[30] Even the clausulae of the Greek are echoed in Latin, although not always in the same places; the most common are the *clausula quarta* (e.g. θεοῖς ἔχω χάριν, *dis habeo gratiam*) and the *dispondaeus* (e.g. παιδευθέντα, *eruditusque a te*). A more elaborate form of indirect imitation can be seen in the versions of 20.5, where Gellius follows the Greek in effecting a rhythmic 'responsion' between two letters; see Beall (n. 4), 163–7.

[31] On 'mimetic' translation see L. Kelly, *The True Interpreter* (New York, 1979), 192. On Gellius' use of *effingere*, see Gamberale (n. 4), 99–100.

[32] Gamberale (n. 4), 181–6; Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius* (n. 4), 43; Beall (n. 4), 168–86.

[33] On the various extant versions of this story, see Yvette Julien, 'Fronton: Histoire d'Arion. Du mythe à l'affaire judiciaire', in *Au miroir de la culture antique: mélanges offerts au président René Marache par ses collègues, ses étudiants et ses amis* (Rennes, 1992), 323–6.

fondness for synonymous doublets, exemplified here by *voluptatibus amoribusque* and *grandi pecunia et re bona multa copiosus.*[34] We observe other devices which are similarly redolent of pre-classical prose. *Is* and other demonstrative pronouns and adverbs frequently serve as connectives, and there is an archaic abundance of spatial and temporal adverbs (*inde*, *eo*, *istic*, *tum*, *postea*).[35] Gellius added these features on his own authority. To complicate matters further, Gellius consulted another Latin version, prepared by his illustrious contemporary, M. Cornelius Fronto (p. 241).[36] Gellius' debt to the African master is illustrated by the following passage, in which Arion pleads with the pirates for his life:

Herodotus (1.24.2)

τόν δέ συνέντα τοῦτο λίσσεσθαι, χρήματα μέν σφι προϊέντα, ψυχὴν δέ παραιτεόμενον.

Fronto (p. 241, 8–9)	Gellius (16.19.10)
Eos precibus fatigat aurum omne sibi haberent, unam sibi animam sinerent.	Tum illum ibi pernicie intellecta pecuniam ceteraque sua, ut haberent, dedisse, vitam modo sibi ut parcerent, oravisse.

Fronto had refined Herodotus' simple narrative by rendering the Greek participles as rhyming verbs in an indirect command (*haberent . . . sinerent*); he had also strengthened the antithesis by juxtaposing in a chiastic arrangement *aurum omne* and *unam . . . animam*. Gellius took the elaboration one step further, rendering Herodotus' participles as infinitives (*dedisse . . . oravisse*) and conflating them with Frontonian subjunctives (*haberent . . . parcerent*). In this way, he amplified the antithesis and the attendant figures of structural parallelism and homoeoteleuton. Thus, Gellius' version must be considered more than a translation, but also more than a paraphrase of Herodotus. The language of Herodotus and the style of Fronto are combined and then transformed according to Gellius' own stylistic principles. This exercise illustrates very well the place of *aemulatio* in Roman literary translation and the potential independence of the translator.

III. *AEMULATIO*

The two exercises we have seen represent the two poles of Gellius' method: modified literalism at one end, and virtual paraphrase at the other. The role of *aemulatio* is obvious in the second example; Gellius defines his own style by deliberate contrast with that of Herodotus and Fronto. In the remainder of this paper, however, we will study an example of the way in which formal imitation and stylistic rivalry can be combined in a single exercise. The relevant passage is Gellius' version of Pausanias'

[34] See R. Marache, 'La préface d'Aulu-Gelle: couples et séries de synonymes ou de mots analogues', in *Letterature comparate, problemi e metodo: studi in onore de Ettore Paratore* (Bologna, 1981), v. 2, 785–91; cf. F. Hache, *Quaestiones archaicae* (Diss. Breslau, 1907), 21–5, and O. Gorges, *De quibusdam sermonis Gelliani proprietatibus observationes* (Diss. Halle, 1883), 58–61. On the use of this figure in ancient authors, see M. von Albrecht, *Masters of Roman Prose*, tr. N. Adkin (Leeds, 1989), 7–8. Hendiadys in Gellius is not, however, always a purely stylistic device, but may be used to clarify the original, as in *NA* 15.26. See Alberto Cavarzere, 'Gellio traduttore e la definizione aristotelica di sillogismo', *Maia* NS 39 (1987), 213–5.

[35] Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius* (n. 4), 36–7; Hache (n. 34), 13–16, 38–9.

[36] On the genesis, style, and originality of Fronto's version, see Julien (n. 33), 326–33. On Gellius' dependence on Fronto, see Beall (n. 4), 168–86.

enthymeme in the *Symposium*, introduced by the anecdote examined in the first part of the paper.[37] As we saw, Gellius presents this as a 'delineation' of certain features of Plato's style, specifically the 'brilliance' and 'well-roundedness' of the syllogism. By referring often to Plato's *numeri* and *moduli*, he indicates that he was chiefly attracted to the rhythmic pattern of the argument. We can see how closely he has followed this feature when we set out the Greek and Latin texts colometrically, as follows:

Plato	Gellius
1. *Πᾶσα γὰρ πρᾶξις ὧδε ἔχει·*	Omne omnino factum sic sese habet;
2. *αὐτὴ ἐφ' αὑτῆς πραττομένη*[38]	neque turpe est,
3. *οὔτε καλὴ*	quantum in eo est,
4. *οὔτε αἰσχρά·*	neque honestum;
5. *οἷον <ὃ> νῦν ἡμεῖς ποιοῦμεν,*	velut est quas nunc facimus ipsi res,
6. *ἢ πίνειν*	bibere,
7. *ἢ ᾄδειν*	cantare,
8. *ἢ διαλέγεσθαι.*	disserere.
9. *οὐκ ἔστι τούτων*	Nihil namque horum
10. *αὐτὸ <καθ' αὑτὸ>*	ipsum ex sese
11. *καλὸν οὐδέν,*	honestum est;
12. *ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ πράξει,*	quali cum fieret
13. *ὡς ἂν πραχθῇ*	modo factum est,
14. *τοιοῦτον ἀπέβη.*	tale exstitit;
15. *καλῶς μὲν γὰρ πραττόμενον*	si recte honesteque factum est,
16. *καὶ ὀρθῶς*	
17. *καλὸν γίγνεται,*	tum honestum fit;
18. *μὴ ὀρθῶς δὲ*	sin parum recte,
19. *αἰσχρόν.*	turpe fit.
20. *οὕτω δὴ καὶ τὸ ἐρᾶν*	Sic amare,
21. *καὶ ὁ Ἔρως*	sic amor
22. *οὐ πᾶς ἐστιν καλὸς*	non honestus omnis
23. *οὐδὲ ἄξιος ἐγκωμιάζεσθαι,*	neque omnis laude dignus,
24. *ἀλλ' ὁ καλῶς προτρέπων ἐρᾶν.*	sed qui facit nos ut honeste amemus.

The argument in Greek consists of five periods. The first four, which constitute the premise, all have about the same structure: a long colon followed by three short ones. In the third period (lines 9–14), the initial long member (9–11) can itself be divided into three smaller units of roughly equal length. The conclusion of the argument (20–4) reverses the usual pattern by building to a crescendo. We can see at a glance how closely Gellius' version imitates these patterns: note in particular the third period, where *οὐκ ἔστι τούτων/ αὐτὸ <καθ' αὑτὸ>/ καλὸν οὐδέν* (9–11) is exactly rendered in Latin as 'nihil namque horum/ ipsum ex sese/ honestum est'. The degree of structural coincidence is more than one expects in a translation which aims both at accuracy and elegance of speech. To prove this, we may compare other Latin versions of the same passage, such as those of Marsilio Ficino and Theodore of Gaza:[39]

[37] Gamberale (n. 4), 155–60; Steinmetz (n. 4), 206–8.

[38] I am inclined to accept Gamberale's suggestion (n. 4, 158–9) that *πραττομένη* was not in Gellius' own text of Plato.

[39] For the text of Th. Gaza's version in the *editio princeps* of Gellius *ad loc.* (Rome, 1469), I am indebted to L. A. Holford-Strevens.

Plato	Gellius
9. οὐκ ἔστι τούτων	Nihil namque horum
10. αὐτὸ <καθ' αὑτὸ>	ipsum ex sese
11. καλὸν οὐδέν;	honestum est;
12. ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ πράξει,	quali cum fieret
13. ὡς ἂν πραχθῇ	modo factum est,
14. τοιοῦτον ἀπέβη.	tale extitit.

Ficino	Th. Gaza
Nullum ex his	Non enim est horum
se ipso	honestum per seipsum
turpe vel honestum.	quicquid
	sed in actione,
Sed agendi modus	ut quidem est actum
certum tribuit cognomentum.	eiusmodi evenit.

Neither of the Renaissance translators, even when following the Greek quite closely, succeeds to the extent that Gellius does in retaining the rhythmic patterns of the original. Indeed, his desire to imitate Platonic *numeri* sometimes causes him to reject the most natural Latin equivalent and substitute an unusual expression, such as *ipsum ex sese* and *quali modo*. Gellius also modifies the original word order and syntax. For example, when he renders ἐν τῇ πράξει (12) as a brief and unemphatic temporal clause, *cum fieret*, he inserts it between *quali* and *modo*, so that, when *cum fieret* is combined with *quali*, the length of the entire colon is adequate to the desired structure. As in his rendering of Philip's letter, we note here Gellius' skilful manipulation of the idioms of his own language to fit the structure and rhythm of another.

From the foregoing, we can see that Gellius' version of Plato is another successful essay in stylistic imitation. But we have also seen that the introductory anecdote is animated by a spirit of *aemulatio*. Although Gellius explicitly binds himself only to 'equalling the elegance' of the master's style, we might have expected him to follow Quintilian's advice and to aim a little higher. In fact, there is evidence that he did so—not surprisingly, in the matter of rhetorical structure. Attentive readers will note that the 'well-roundedness' and 'brilliance' of Pausanias' argument is due in part to the repetition and careful placement of the words πρᾶξις and πράττειν: πᾶσα γὰρ πρᾶξις ὧδε ἔχει . . . ἐν τῇ πράξει, ὡς ἂν πραχθῇ, τοιοῦτον ἀπέβη. In Pausanias' clever formulation, there is really no such thing as a good or bad *deed*, but *in the doing* one can *do* well or badly. This statement sounds more plausible in Greek because 'deed' and 'doing' can both be rendered by the same word: πρᾶξις. The phrase ἐν τῇ πράξει effects a deceptively smooth transition from the idea of action as *thing* to that of action as *process*. Thus, we may be a little surprised by Gellius' choice of *factum* to render this important noun. Although it is sometimes equivalent to πρᾶξις, *factum* cannot be used equivocally; it means 'deed' and not 'doing'.[40] *Actio*, the term chosen by Ficino and Gaza, would seem more felicitous in this respect.[41] Gellius, however, was chiefly interested in copying and even elaborating the repetitive pattern of the argument, and he found *factum* better suited to his purpose. As it happens, the verb *fio*

[40] Cf. J. H. H. Schmidt, *Handbuch der lateinischen und griechischen Synonomik* (repr. Amsterdam, 1968), 301, 305.

[41] Ficino has 'Actionis cuiuslibet haec est conditio . . . '. Gaza, standing somewhat closer to Plato's line, has 'omnis enim actio sic sese habet . . . '. *Actio* in this sense is frequent in Cicero and Seneca; see *TLL* 1.439.

can be used to render both the stative verb *γίγνομαι* and the passive of the transitive verb *facio*. Thus, Plato's fourth period is rendered in Latin as follows:

15.	*καλῶς μὲν γὰρ πραττόμενον*	si recte honesteque factum est,
16.	*καὶ ὀρθῶς*	
17.	*καλὸν γίγνεται,*	tum honestum fit;
18.	*μὴ ὀρθῶς δὲ*	sin parum recte,
19.	*αἰσχρόν.*	turpe fit.

The argument is neatly tied together with a new equivocation, as if to say that what has been *done* respectably is thereby *made* respectable. Perhaps Gellius thought that this new equivocation would compensate for his virtual mistranslation of *πρᾶξις*. In any case, he recognized that *factum*, coordinated with *fieri*, would amplify the repetition and the consequent impression of a 'packed' and 'well-rounded' argument. For him, this constituted the chief virtue of the Greek, and he could not resist the opportunity to elaborate it.

Even if we disregard such small 'improvements', however, there remains a more profound connection between *aemulatio* and Gellius' method of stylistic equivalence. Let us recall the situation that prompted him to translate Plato. Taurus had challenged Gellius as a *rhetoriscus* to find something comparable to Plato's style in the books of 'his rhetors' (17.20.5). Gellius responded with a Latin translation. The situation brings to mind another chapter (16.1), in which Gellius quotes a Greek dictum he learned from the great moralist, Musonius Rufus. He praises this saying in language remarkably similar to that which Taurus applied to Plato: 'vere atque luculente dictum verbisque est brevibus et rotundis vinctum' (§1). But rather than translate the dictum himself, he cites a parallel remark by Cato the Elder, who was much admired in Gellius' day as a paradigm of old Roman virtue and a master of plain, vigorous speaking.[42] The two *sententiae* may be juxtaposed as follows:

Musonius	Cato
ἄν τι πράξῃς καλὸν μετὰ πόνου,	si quid vos per laborem recte feceritis,
ὁ μὲν πόνος οἴχεται,	labor ille a vobis cito recedet,
τὸ δὲ καλὸν μένει·	bene factum a vobis,
	dum vivitis,
	non abscedet;
ἄν τι ποιήσῃς αἰσχρὸν μετὰ ἡδονῆς,	sed si qua per voluptatem nequiter feceritis,
τὸ μὲν ἡδὺ οἴχεται,	voluptas cito abibit,
τὸ δὲ αἰσχρὸν μένει.	nequiter factum illud
	apud vos semper manebit.

Musonius' lines are a typical example of the 'pointed' style, which depends less on the elegance of the words used than on their artful arrangement. We observe in this case an effective use of verbal repetition and structural parallelism. Gellius obviously admired this sort of composition, perhaps in part because it was practised by his friend and mentor, the Greek sophist Favorinus.[43] Cato's lines reflect a comparable, if less subtle, rhetorical sensibility with measured clauses and repetition both of key words and of sound (*recedet . . . abscedet*; *abibit . . . manebit*). Cato's Latin does, however, proceed at a more deliberate pace, in part because of the typically archaic use of the demonstratives *ille* and *illud*. While conceding this point,[44] Gellius tacitly

[42] R. Marache, *La critique littéraire de langue latine et le développement du goût archaïsant au 2e siècle de notre ère* (Rennes, 1952), 281–6.

[43] On Gellian imitation of Favorinus' style, see Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius* (n. 4), 76, and Beall (n. 4), 187–93.

[44] 'Quae etsi laxioribus paulo et longioribusque verbis comprehensa est praequam illud

proves that Cato could at least hold his own as a stylist with the best latter-day Greek moralists.[45] As a former protégé of Fronto and an admirer of ancient style, Gellius must have been gratified by this discovery. It may also have encouraged him to continue this peculiar rivalry on his own.

I say this because, as we look back upon our two examples of 'mimetic' translation, we see that Gellius' style stands in somewhat the same relation to Plato's and Philip's as Cato's did to the style of Musonius. Although it follows the structure of the Greek quite closely, Gellius' Latin marches rather than walks. This happens because Gellius, like Cato, has divided his sentences into clauses rather than phrases, and he has also imitated the more abundant and exact coordination of archaic Latin. We observe this, for example, in the use of *tum* after a conditional clause (17.20.9, line 17),[46] and in the construction *qui facit nos, ut honeste amemus* (line 24), in which the subject of the subordinate clause is attracted to the main clause.[47] In his version of Philip's letter we have already noted the use of *proinde quia* and *pro eo quod*, where the conjunctions alone would be sufficient; such extended phrases are typical of Cato's style.[48] Archaic prose is also characterized by the repetition of unemphatic words.[49] Looking back at his version of Plato, we see that Gellius imitates this feature in his development of *factum* and *fieri*, especially in the repetition of *fit*. Thus, while Gellius exactly reproduces certain features of the style of Plato and Philip, he does so in a Catonian mode. To put it another way, he has developed the rivalry implicit in 16.1 by showing that the *gravitas* of Cato can indeed be combined with the precision and rhythm of the Greeks. The passages selected are ideally suited to this purpose, for they possess the unusual combination of simplicity and artistry which is required for such a demonstration.

We are now able to assess Gellius' value as a witness of translation as practised by the Romans. He exemplifies the type of literary translation recommended by Quintilian and practised, *inter alios*, by Cicero and Fronto. Its object was to improve one's own Latin style by imitating Greek authors. Gellius supports Pliny's representation of translation as more than a juvenile exercise; it served adults as a respectable diversion as well as a method of practice. He also confirms that *aemulatio* was not restricted to serious literature, such as Vergil's poetry, but animated the work of amateur translators as well. Above all, Gellius shows us his tablets, as it were, and gives us our best idea of what translation as an exercise ordinarily looked like in practice. His short pieces indicate the variety of approaches a translator might take and how they changed according to the needs and inspiration of the moment. They point to the classical preoccupation with literary form and with details of structure and rhythm. Incidentally, they indicate the literary trends with which Gellius was familiar and the cosmopolitan and experimental atmosphere on which he thrived. From Gellius, we gain an impressive picture of the variety and subtlety of translation among his countrymen.

Marquette University STEPHEN M. BEALL

Graecum, quod diximus, quoniam tamen prior tempore antiquiorque est, venerabilior videri debet' (§3).

[46] *Pace* Gamberale (n. 4), 146. Another instance of the 'felicitous' juxtaposition of archaic Latin and Greek is 4.5.5–7, where the proverb 'malum consilium consultori pessimum est' is traced to Hesiod, *WD* 166.

[47] Cf. Hache (n. 34), 14.

[48] Hache (n. 34), 40–1; cf. Gamberale (n. 4), 159.

[49] Hache (n. 34), 15.

[50] Cf. Albrecht (n. 34), 5–7.