Language and Cicero's Philosophical Programme

Cicero Philosophus

Jack Noutch

May 2022

In the third book of his *De Finibus*,footnote Cicero congratulates his conversation partner, Cato, who is expounding the Stoic doctrine. Cicero admires the clarity of Cato's language, and he says to him:

> *itaque mihi videris Latine docere philosophiam et ei quasi civitatem dare.*
>
> "In fact I feel you are teaching philosophy to speak Latin, and naturalising her as a Roman citizen."
>
> *Fin.* 3.40[1]

This is not just praise for his friend. Cicero's compliment, "teaching philosophy to speak Latin," is an apt description of a key part of his own philosophical programme, both for the works in rhetorical and political treatises of the mid-50s, and the later works written during the height of Caesar's dictatorship,

[1] Latin and English translations are taken from the Loeb library for quotations of all texts in this essay, unless stated otherwise.

between 46–44BC. In desiring to set out for his compatriots a wide range of philosophy, Cicero at all times was drawing on Greek sources, directly or indirectly, and this required translation into a language that many considered unsuited for philosophy.[2] As such Cicero's task included the practical difficulty of finding—or making—the language in Latin suitable for philosophy first conceived in Greek; but in the face of criticism from friends and competition from rivals, he was also obliged to defend his position with a theory of language and translation. Rarely are the elements of this theory expressed explicitly by Cicero.[3] But language, and the philosophy of language, was itself a battle-ground in late Republican Rome, and considering his own philosophical programme, it was a battle-ground Cicero could not avoid.[4]

In particular, Cicero perceived a threat from the Epicurean school, whose followers, like himself, also saw the worth of translation, and so were writing philosophical works in Latin.[5] But Cicero fundamentally disagreed with the tenets and purposes of the Epicureans. His antagonism towards the school's

[2]Lucretius famously acknowledges the *patrii sermonis egestas* (*DRN.* 1.136, 832, 3.260); and Cicero also defends his programme from such criticisms at *Acad.* 1.15, *Fin.* 5.96, and *ND.* 1.8.

[3]It is rare enough that Jonathon Powell believes that Cicero "had no sophisticated 'theory of translation.'" Powell 1995b, 299. I do not expect to explore the depth of sophistication of Cicero's ideas on language in this essay, but I do wish to argue that Cicero had some deeply held beliefs about what language and translation is and about what they are for.

[4]Elizabeth Rawson sets out some of the key players in the debates on grammarian/linguistic ideas in Rawson 1985, 117–31. She notes a movement away from mere functional language education to an interest among educated elites, cultivated partly by the social changes which Rome and its empire underwent in the 1st century BC.

[5]Nathan Gilbert identifies five Epicurean teachers and writers whose work seems to have come about in the first half of the first century BC: M. Pompilius Andronius, a Syrian-born teacher of grammar, known from *Gram.* 8; Gaius Amafinius, whose Epicurean works in Latin Cicero critcises at *TD.* 4.6-7; Rabirius, associated with Amafinius at *Acad.* 1.5–6; Catius Insuber, author of a work named *De Rerum Natura et De Summo Bono*, criticised by Cicero in correspondence with Cassius (*Fam.* 15.16 and 15.19); Egnatius, who wrote a *De Rerum Natura* in verse; and most famously, the poet Lucretius, whose six-book verse *De Rerum Natura* survives; Gilbert 2015, 35–71.

philosophy is widely accepted.[6] But in addition to the inconsistency of the Epicurean physics and ethics, as he perceives it, Cicero reserves a particular criticism for the Epicureans: that their very language is unphilosophical. The passage quoted above continues in an attack on this very point:

> *Ne tu, inquam, Cato, verbis illustribus et id, quod vis, declarantibus! itaque mihi videris Latine docere philosophiam et ei quasi civitatem dare. quae quidem adhuc peregrinari Romae videbatur nec offerre sese nostris sermonibus, et ista maxime propter limatam quandam et rerum et verborum tenuitatem. scio enim esse quosdam, qui quavis lingua philosophari possint; nullis enim partitionibus, nullis definitionibus utuntur ipsique dicunt ea se modo probare, quibus natura tacita adsentiatur. itaque in rebus minime obscuris non multus est apud eos disserendi labor.*
>
> "'Indeed, Cato,' said I, 'your language is lucidity itself; it conveys your meaning exactly. In fact I feel you are teaching philosophy to speak Latin, and naturalizing her as a Roman citizen. Hitherto she has seemed a foreigner at Rome, and shy of conversing in our language; and this is especially so with your Stoic system because of its precision and subtlety alike of thought and language. (There are some philosophers, I know, who could express their ideas in any language; for they ignore Division and Definition altogether, and themselves profess that they only seek to commend doctrines to which nature assents without argument. Hence their ideas being so

[6] See, for instance, Stokes 1995, which discusses at pp. 145–6 some of the views held by scholars on Cicero's relationship to Epicureanism. The debate focusses on how faithful a source Cicero is for the school, and one of the reasons for disagreement is the difficulty of disentangling Cicero's own, sometimes prejudicial views.

far from recondite, they spend small pains on logical exposition.)"

Fin. 3.40

The *quosdam* Cicero refers to are the Epicureans, which we can tell because he elsewhere characterises them as uninterested in what he thinks of as supremely important philosophical discipline of logic (referred to here through its specific roles of *partitio* and *definitio*; see, e.g. *Fin.* 1.7). But interestingly, Cicero links this deficiency with the Epicurean expectation that they should be able to express philosophy in whichever language they choose. It is not obvious why this should be a criticism in the modern day, in which the essential equivalence of languages is taken for granted. Compare, however, the comment he has about Stoic philosophy, whose "subtlety alike of thought and language" is the reason it has taken so long to be Latinised. Does Cicero think, in contrast to the Epicureans, that philosophy can only be studied in some languages? And if so, how does he defend against the implication that Latin is in fact not a worthy medium for philosophy in the place of Greek?

Cicero is adamant that Latin is no worse, and perhaps better than Greek for philosophy. This is clear from the defences he mounts in several works against those who profess the opposite. In the preface to the *Tusculan Disputations* (1.1–6), he justifies writing philosophy in Latin because the Romans have excelled Greece in all kinds of disciplines. The implication is that philosophy is only the latest in a series of studies that the Romans will outperform their Greek counterparts. The *De Natura Deorum* (1.7–8) also professes that conducting philosophy in Latin is a service to the republic, and that his programme thus far has had some success in that others have taken up his challenge to follow his

lead. Now, he says, not even the Greeks have a better philosophical vocabulary! (*quo in genere tantum profecisse videmur, ut a Graecis ne verborum quidem copia vinceremur. ND.* 1.8) The opening of the *De Finibus* (1.1–13) gives the fullest defence of writing philosophy in Latin, and Cicero fends off four sets of critics. The third of these groups is the one most relevant to our consideration as Cicero describes certain persons who "learned in Greek literature and contemptuous of Latin, will say that they prefer to spend their time in reading Greek." (*et hi quidem eruditi Graecis litteris, contemnentes Latinas qui se dicant in Graecis legendis operam malle consumere.*) To these, he points out the inconsistency of their position since they enjoy other Latin literature, even of a lesser writer like the "iron writer" Atilius (*ferreus scriptor*), in addition to and to supplement Greek literature. Additionally, he curries their patriotism, by suggesting that even the act of mere translation of Plato and Aristotle, without any development or commentary, would be an act of service. (*Fin.* 1.7; we will come back to this passage and consider its Cicero's view here in contrast to his treatment of Epicurean writers.)

It is worth pointing out that Cicero does not just imagine the criticism he describes. Yelena Baraz argues that we should take the critics Cicero enumerates seriously; they are not imagined by Cicero, or written in just so he can knock them down.[7] She points, for instance, to similar anxieties expressed in other texts of Cicero, and of Sallust. On the point of a preference for Greek over Latin writers, we can also identity Atticus, Cassius, and perhaps Varro as likely persons to fall into this camp. Cicero allays Atticus' concerns of writing philo-

[7]Baraz 2012, 22.

sophy in Latin in a letter of Summer 45BC. (*Att.* 12.52)[8] Cassius criticises the same Epicurean Latinists as Cicero does in his letter of early 45BC, spattering his letter with his preferred Greek terminology. (*Fam.* 15.19) Varro is depicted in *Acad.* 1.4 as believing that educated Romans prefer original Greek texts. Within Cicero's own milieu, among his literary peers, there is a certain amount of winning over to be done.

As we have seen, Cicero attempts to answer his peers with his consideration of translation as service to the republic. Indeed, in each of the responses given in the passages mentioned above (*TD.* 1.1–6; *ND.* 1.8; *Fin.* 1.7) Cicero responds to the concerns over Latin philosophy in patriotic terms. Moreover, his philosophical programme is shot through with a new Roman dress to the philosophy coming from Greece. The dialogue form is maintained,[9] but the conversation partners, even when the setting is non-contemporary, are Roman. Take, for example, *De Oratore*, in which, through the voice of Scaevola, Cicero very explicitly alludes to the plane tree of Plato's *Phaedrus*. (*De Orat.* 1.28) Yet the dialogue is situated in a very definite setting, in 91BC, when the Social War was causing the crisis that was the reason the *dramatis personae* found themselves at Tusculum. The persons in the dialogue were esteemed politicians of their day. (Crassus, Scaevola and Antonius were all prominent orators.)[10] Additionally, the topoi used by Cicero to prove his philosophical points are Roman.

[8] *de lingua Latina securi es animi. dices, qui talia a conscribis? ἀπόγραφα sunt, minore labore fiunt; verba tantum adfero quibus abundo.* ("As for the Latin language, set your mind at ease. You will say—'What, when you write on such subjects?' They are translations. They don't cost so much trouble therefore; I only contribute the language, in which I am well provided.") This is also the infamous passage which saw Cicero judged as a "mere transcriber" of Greek philosopher. Powell 1995a, 8 puts this worn-out argument to bed.

[9] Cicero's use of the philosophical dialogue was probably one of his innovations. Powell 1995a, 31.

[10] *Cicero, On the ideal orator* 2001, 13ff.

In *De Finibus* 2.17, Cicero challenges the Epicurean Torquatus with Roman instances of vice and virtue, which he believes the Epicurean creed cannot account for; there is the scandalous Publius Sextilius Rufus, who betrayed an oath to administer a will for his own gain, and the courageous Scipio Africanus who risked great danger to entice Hannibal back to Africa. Cicero can justly say that he is not a "mere transator" of Greek philosophy, and that he is adding to the philosophical tradition for the benefit of his compatriots. Those without Greek can now become familiar with philosophy; those with Greek and familiar with his forerunners can read him for interest of his innovations, among which is this thorough Romanisastion.

What though, of the language itself? Can Latin support philosophy when so much of the vocabulary must be innovated? To return to the conversation between Cato and Cicero in *De Finibus* 3, the difficulty of speaking about Stoic ideas was brought up at the start of their dialogue. (3.15) Even in Greek, Cato contends, Stoic technical vocabulary seemed unendurable until habitual use (*consuetudo*) made it acceptable. Still, rejoins Cicero—if Zeno was permitted to use novel words, why should not they? Several terms are explicitly translated through their conversation, e.g. καταλήψις becomes *comprehensio* (3.17), and ὁμολογίς becomes *convenientia* (3.21), and κακία becomes *vitium*. (3.40) It is this last one which prompts Cicero's praise with which this essay began.

Is Cicero's praise for the coining of words such as *vitium* self-praise? Did Cicero decide on new terms, put them in the mouths of his dialogue's conversation partners, and then express how excellent the words were? Such a reading would fit with a not untypical judgment of Cicero's big-headedness. But it does not work with the form of Cicero's dialogues, which are, like Plato's are pop-

ulated by real persons, sometimes contemporaneous, sometimes of a previous era. Complimenting persons for innovations that were not his own would be a risky business. Cato was dead by the time of his appearance in the *De Finibus*, which was published in 45BC, a year after Cato's suicide in Africa. But the dedicatee of the *Academica*, Varro, was certainly alive and kicking at its publication in the same summer of 45BC. In the *Academica*, Cicero attributes to Varro the invention of the term *qualitas* to render the the Greek ποιότης. (*Acad.* 1.24–25) As Powell supposes, "it would be a dubious compliment to Varro thus to attribute to him a coinage that was really Cicero's own, and it is surely easier to assume that this was Cicero's way of acknowledging that Varro had invented the word."[11] Moreover, a passage like the one we have discussed in the *De Finibus* purports to explain Cicero's method of collecting useful Latin terminology; he tells Cato: *quare attendo te studiose et, quaecumque rebus iis, de quibus hic sermo est, nomina inponis, memoriae mando; mihi enim erit isdem istis fortasse iam utendum.* ("So I am following you attentively, and am committing to memory all the terms you use to denote the conceptions we are discussing; for very likely I shall soon have to employ the same terms myself.") I see no reason not to take this statement at face value, as it is entirely plausible that Cicero, like any good thinker, would note down material from conversations for use in his later work. This would suggest that Cicero's neologisms need not necessarily be thought of just as his own creations—he may have heard instances of certain words in ephemeral contexts which he then formalised in his own writing. And consequently, we should not always impute self-aggrandizement for Cicero's compliments to his interlocutors. Certainly for the compliment to Cato over *vitium* for κακία,

[11] Powell 1995b, 295.

we should judge Cicero's as attributing honour to Cato, not to himself, for the philosophical use of the word.

We have seen how Cicero answered the set of his critics who believe that Latin cannot sustain philosophical enquiry. Not only is it proper to attempt it, and a service to the republic, but the coining of new words is no different to the neologisms required by original thinkers in Greek, and there is evidence to suggest that Cicero's new language has been built in the community of his philosophically-minded peers. Interestingly, Cicero expressed sympathy with those who judge Latin philosophy poorly because of "certain illiterate and uncouth productions which are bad Greek books in worse Latin versions." (*inculta quaedam et horrida, de malis Graecis Latine scripta deleterius. De Finibus* 1.8.) Since even Greek Epicurean writers, in Cicero's estimation, are poorly written for a lack of interest in style, it is likely that this barb is aimed at the Epicureans. Is there anything beyond this that prevents such writers are prevented from being like the lowly but acceptable *ferreus scriptor* Atilius?

Amafinius is the named Epicurean that, together with his *aemuli* ("rivals" or "imitators"), at *Tusculan Disputations* (4.6) receive Cicero's displeasure. One might have expected a certain respect for Amafinius, considering his similar desire to Latinise and translate philosophy.[12] But Cicero again has concerns not only about the content of the doctrines, but also the lack of sophistication in the language it was written in. In fact, he is alarmed that the writings of Amafinius and those who followed after him "took all Italy by storm" (*Italiam totam occupaverunt*). Cicero supposes three possible reasons for the popularity

[12]Epicurean thought emphasised not only clarity, but also an effort to profess their philosophical truth to non-philosophers of little learning.Garcea 2012, 115–6

their work: it was easy to understand; it was attractive for its idolisation of pleasure; it was the only philosophy in the marketplace of ideas. (*Tusc.* 4.6) The first of these, as we saw in *De Finibus* was a demerit against the Epicurean school as a marker of a simple philosophy that dealt only with surface-level ideas. Whereas for the Epicureans it is a boon that their philosophy is easily understood, even by unlearned persons, for Cicero this is a mark of the very deficiency of their ideas. (*Tusc.* 4.7)

Amafinius appears in two other places: he is briefly mentioned in *Acad.* 1.2 and *Fam.* 15.19. In the former, Amafinius (and his associated Epicurean Rabirius) is impugned by Cicero's character of Varro for writing philosophy that is only surface level; its ordinary language (*vulgaris sermo*) belies a lack of philosophical thinking due to a denial of the verbal arts of rhetoric and logic. (*Acad.* 1.2) This continues the theme we have already seen. But Varro's continues by picking up on a particular instance of Amafinian Latin vocabulary: *corpuscula*, which Varro notes are the word he uses for atoms (*ita enim appellat atomos—Acad.* 1.6) The implication seems to be Varro's (or perhaps more correctly, Cicero's) disapproval of the term.

What is wrong with the transcription? Gilbert puts forward the view that Amafinius' translation "was not a bad choice."[13] He argues that the only substantial criticisms made by Cicero against Amafinius, as opposed to the Epicurean school more generally, is in fact Amafinius' use of the word *corpuscula*. "But since Cicero himself found recourse to this translation, this criticism is far from decisive evidence for the low quality of Amafinius' Epicurean treatise."[14] Sedley

[13]Gilbert 2015, 48.
[14]Gilbert 2015, 51.

also asserts that Cicero occasionally resorted to using *corpusculum*.[15]

Other than the passage from the *Academica* , *corpusculum* appears four times in Cicero's works. In all four instances he uses the term to refer specifically to Epicurean atomism, and his tone is disparaging. The first is from the *Tusculanae Disputationes*, at the end of an explanation for the various conceptions of what the soul consists of. (1.18–22) Cicero pays particular attention to the terms the philosophers used for the soul. So, he notes that "some think the soul is the actual heart [*cor*], and so we get the words 'senseless' [lit. 'without heart', *excordes*], 'feeble-minded' ['wanting heart', *vecordes*], and 'concordes' ['of one heart', *concordes*]." And he points out (erroneously)[16] that Aristotle gave the soul a new term: ἐνδελέχεια. As an afterthought to the general summary, Cicero includes Democritus' view (that is, the atomist from whom Cicero sees Epicurean physics as derivative):

> *Democritum enim, magnum illum quidem virum, sed levibus et rotundis corpusculis efficientem animum concursu quodam fortuito, omittamus.*
>
> "There is, it is true, Democritus, a man of undoubted power, but as he makes the soul consist of minute smooth round bodies brought together in some sort of accidental collision, let us pass him over."

Cicero is being a little snide; there is the indefinite use of *concursu quodam fortuito* and the hyperbaton between *Democritum* and its governing verb *omittamus*. Since the wider passage paid such close attention to the terms philosophers used for "soul", we should add to this that Cicero's use of *corpusculis*

[15]Sedley 1998, 38.
[16]Aristotle's term was ἐντελέχεια, see *De an.* 2.1, 412a27.

is intended as a joke. It is the Latin term in Epicurean circles, but otherwise it sounds less cosmic and more comic.[17] Cicero's three other uses of *corpusculum* appear in *De Natura Deorum* 1.66, 1.67 and 2.94. They are all attacking the Epicurean physics, but he does so by formulating an argument along Epicurean lines—complete with Epicurean terminology—that fails to hold together. Consequently, Cicero cannot be said to use *corpusculum* as a word for atomic theory in his own philosophy, except to ridicule the Epicurean viewpoint.

In a letter to Cicero of early 45BC, Cassius calls Amafinius and his like *mali verborum interpretes*. ("poor translators of terms" *Fam.* 15.19.2) His view may have been influenced by Cicero's opinion, but if we accept the probability that this is a genuine judgment of Cassius, we can draw several inferences. First, this goes a little way to corroborating Cicero's opinion that Amafinius' language was poor. Second, Cassius is clearly familiar with Amafinius' work, and presumably read some of it. Third, which we have already mentioned, we can safely put Cassius in the bracket of an intellectually-minded Roman who preferred to read philosophy in Greek, not Latin.[18]

In the same correspondence, Cicero and Cassius share an intellectual humour over a translation of Epicurean εἴδωλον, the atom-think films that objects emit and by which we perceive things. A recently-deceased Epicurean and Insubrian Gaul, Catius, had used the word *spectrum* to translate the Greek term,

[17]The non-atomist use of the word seems have referred to the human body, and its use appears to have been reserved for non-serious language, undoubtedly aided by its diminutive *-culum* ending. (*OLD, s.v.* 'corpusculum', 1) When Plautus used the word in *Cas.* 843 he made full comic use of the ending, as one character addresses another as *o corpusculum malacum!* ("O my soft bodikins!"), just as another had called him *corculum, melculum, velculum* ("my sweetheart, my honey-muffin, my ounce of Spring"). Perhaps this explains the disdain Cicero had for *corpusculum* in scientific discourse.

[18]Noted also by Gilbert 2015, 54–63.

and Cassius ends up agreeing that Catius (together with Amafinius) is a "bad translator". (*mali verborum interpretes*. *Fam.* 15.19.2) So, why is Latin *spectrum* a bad translation of Epicurus' εἴδωλον? Happily, there is a nine-page article with exactly that title by Sean McConnell.[19] McConnell, drawing on an earlier explanation from Don Nardo,[20] sets out five reasons why Cicero may be taking issue with the translation: first, *spectrum* is a unnecessary neologism; second, there are better Latin equivalents such as *imago* and *simulacrum*, as used by Lucretius and Cicero; third, instrumental derivational suffix *-trum* makes the word sound like it should be in the farmyard; fourth, *spectrum* does not reflect the resemblance between object and image implicit in εἴδωλον; fifth, despite the morphology, the word does not properly convey the instrumental role of εἴδωλον in sense-perception and thought. Cicero and Cassius are not just criticising the translation (and, in Cicero's case, the underlying physics); they are making a joke of Catius' choice of word. For this, it is the third reason which holds most weight, because the suffix renders the register of the word inappropriate. The rustic feel of the suffix comes from its connotated word-forms such as *aratrum* and *feretrum*, and this reading is supported by Cassius' response about *rustici Stoici*. Additionally, as McConnell notes, Varro identifies *specio*, the root of *spectrum*, as being an archaic term, used in his time only in ritual auguries. (*Ling.* 6.82)

So, it appears that Cicero does make two kinds of criticisms against Amafinius and his like: first, that the philosophy is shallow, necessarily because Epicureanism rejects the use of logic to consider matters of greater subtlety; second,

[19]McConnell 2018.
[20]Nardo 1972.

that the Latin terms used to translate are poorly chosen, probably because the register of the words is inappropriate for philosophy.

Before concluding, there is one more writer whom I would like to briefly consider alongside Cicero as challenging his programme of translation. That writer is Caesar, sometimes also considered an Epicurean or with Epicurean tendencies.[21] Caesar wrote the *De Analogia*, now fragmentary, a grammatical work, which, by its title and some of the content, appears to have engaged in the anomalist/analogist debate. The work was completed probably in the Summmer of 54BC, in reply to Cicero's *De Oratore* of the previous year.[22] In fact, Caesar dedicated the work to Cicero. In *Brut.* 261 Cicero recalls part of the dedication:

> *ac si, ut cogitata praeclare eloqui possent, nonnulli studio et usu elaborauerunt—cuius te paene principem copiae atque inuentorem bene de nomine ac dignitate populi Romani meritum esse existumare debemus—hunc facilem et cotidianum nouisse sermonem nunc pro relicto est habendum?*
>
> "And if, to the task of giving brilliant expression to their thought, some have devoted study and practice—and we must recognize that you have deserved well of the name and prestige of the Roman people as almost the pioneer and inventor of this resource—yet are we now to consider that the knowledge of this easy and everyday speech may be neglected?"

Caesar's emphasis on *facilis et cotidianus sermo* is a marked difference from Cicero's preference for oratorical eloquence. It is also in the Epicurean vein that

[21] E.g. Bourne 1977 and Willi 2010.
[22] Garcea 2012, 24–6.

Amafinius may have been criticised for by Cicero. A famed quotation from the *De Analogia* shows part of the difference: *tamquam scopulum, sic fugias inauditum atque insolens uerbum.* ("Avoid, as you would a rock, every unheard and unusual word." Gell. *NA.* 1.10.3–4) Whilst this is no absolute obstacle to neologisms, it does help to explain the simplicity of Caesar's commentaries.[23] Caesar puts an Epicurean emphasis on readability where Cicero would insist on oratorical decoration.

De Analogia was written, according to Suetonius (*Iul.* 56.5), on the return to his army after administering justice in Cisalpine Gaul. It has therefore been seen as motivated from Caesar's interaction with the new Gaulish subjects of Rome.[24] However, Andreas Willi interprets Caesar's position, through Cicero's comments at *Brut.* 261, as using analogy to help determine between competing ideas of *consuetudo* ("accustomed use") in language. The *De Analogia*, in Willi's judgment, is not trying to set out how to determine what in fact was part of *consuetudo*. As such he rejects arguments that saw Caesar as promoting a "fundamentalist" language programme for assimilating the newly-subjected Gauls to correct Latin; "the uneducated provincial still had to know what opinions were available through *consuetudo*, and even the staunchest defender of *Romanitas* was given no means to prevent *consuetudo* from adopting 'un-Roman' elements."[25] Both statesmen, then, were concerned with the social implications of a purity of language, either for reasons of assimilation in the case of Caesar, or for self-definition against base, un-Roman influences, for Cicero.[26]

[23]Caesar was in a certain sense the 'most colloquial of Latin authors", in the sense which led him to use only 1,300 lexemes in *Bellum Gallicum*; Willi 2010.

[24]Garcea 2012, 3–7.

[25]Willi 2010, 236–7.

[26]Garcea phrases it well; in the case of "Cicero's nationalism," the language programme was

To conclude, Cicero philosophical programme was one of translation, but also one in which he had to wrestle with competing ideas about the status of Latin, and of language. The challenge came both from his milieu, but he also saw the Epicurean writers as rivalling his programme of bringing philosophy to a Roman context. Cicero's purpose was patriotically-motivated, and his views on the proper language and means of translation were informed by this. Cicero "translated from Greek into Latin because he believed that thought needed to take place within the common heritage of a common language, in this case, Latin."[27] But Cicero's "project was not, as commonly thought, to create a completely new philosophical language in Latin, but rather to show that the Latin language as it was, with a few additions here and there, could function as a philosophical language in its own right."[28]

Bibliography

Baraz, Yelena. 2012. *A Written Republic: Cicero's Philosophical Politics*. PUP, Princeton.

Bolduc, Michelle. 2020. *Translation and the Rediscovery of Rhetoric*. Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies Toronto.

Bourne, Frank C. 1977. 'Caesar the Epicurean'. *The Classical World* 70 (7): 417–432.

"a means for ideological persuasion and self-profiling." For "Caesar's linguistic statism" it was "an instrument for controlling the new multi-ethnic situations arising from the most recent conquests". Garcea 2012, 13

[27]Bolduc 2020, 94.

[28]Powell 1995b, 297.

Cicero, On the ideal orator: (De oratore). 2001. In collab. with May, James M. and Wisse, Jakob. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garcea, Alessandro. 2012. *Caesar's De Analogia: Edition, Translation, and Commentary*. OUP Oxford.

Gilbert, Nathan. 2015. 'Among Friends: Cicero and the Epicureans'. PhD thesis, University of Toronto.

McConnell, Sean. 2018. 'Why is Latin spectrum a Bad Translation of Epicurus' ΕΙΔΩΛΟΝ?: Cicero and Cassius on a Point of Philosophical Translation'. *Mnemosyne* 72 (1): 154–162.

Nardo, D. 1972. 'Spectra Catiana'. In *Dignam dis a Giampaolo Vallot (1934-1966), Silloge di studi suoi e dei suoi amici*, 115–158. Venice.

Powell, J. G. F. 1995a. 'Cicero's philosophical works and their background'. In *Cicero the Philosopher*, ed. by Powell, J. G. F., 1–36. OUP Oxford.

— . 1995b. 'Cicero's translation from Greek'. In *Cicero the Philosopher*, ed. by Powell, J. G. F., 273–300. OUP Oxford.

Rawson, Elizabeth. 1985. *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*. Johns Hopkins Baltimore.

Sedley, D. N. 1998. *Lucretius and the transformation of Greek wisdom*. Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press.

Stokes, Michael, C. 1995. 'Cicero on Epicurean pleasures'. In *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers*, 145–170.

Willi, Andreas. 2010. ‘Campaigning for utilitas: style, grammar and philosophy in C. Iulius Caesar’. In *Colloquial and Literary Latin*, ed. by Dickey, Eleanor and Chahoud, Anna, 273–300. CUP Cambridge.

Word count: 4,689