Studia Philologica Valentina
Vol. 17, n.s. 14 (2015) 257-272 ISSN: 1135-9560

Modern Greek Translations (1686-1818) of Latin Historical Works

Traducciones griegas modernas (1686-1818) de obras históricas latinas

Vasileios Pappas
University of Cyprus

Data de recepció: 13/02/2015
Data d'acceptació: 03/06/2015

1. Introduction

Even before the Fall of Constantinople (1453), many Latin works have been translated in Greek and Modern Greek language.[1] This translative tradition continues in the post-Byzantine era; many scholars with deep knowledge of Latin language and literature are engaged in writing in Latin as well as in translating Latin texts.[2] In this paper we will focus our attention especially in translations of Latin historiography. The presentation will be brief; it includes the report of the titles of these works and the attempt to answer – through the authors themselves's words – to this question: for what reason they treated specifically with translations of Latin historical works?

[1] D. Nikitas, «Traduzioni greche di opera latine», in S. Settis (ed.) *I Greci. Storia Cultura Arte Società* 3, *I Greci oltre la Grecia*, Turin, 2001, pp. 1035-51.

[2] These works exist in the website of anemi (<http://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/?lang=el>). The pages of the passages are given in footnotes. The pages which are without enumeration are included into parenthesis. For the post-byzantine Latinitas of Greek scholars, see Δ. Νικήτας, «Μεταβυζαντινή Latinitas: Δεδομένα και ζητούμενα», ΕΕΦΣ ΑΠΘ, (Τμήμα Φιλολογίας) 10 (2002-2003), pp. 34-46. For the translations of 18th century of foreign works in Modern Greek, see Γ. Κεχαγιόγλου, «Οι έντυπες νεοελληνικές μεταφράσεις του 18ου αι. Παρατηρήσεις και αποτιμήσεις», *JÖB* 32/6 (1982), pp. 229-237.

2. Ioannis Makolas

The first Greek scholar who translates a Latin historical work is **Ioannis Makolas**.[3] *Logios Hermes*,[4] a Modern Greek literary Journal of the 19th century, which a Greek scholar named Anthimos Gazis was editing in Vienna, mentions that Makolas was born in Athens in 1661 and was a professional merchant. He translated Justin's *Epitome* of Pompeius Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae* in Modern Greek language, some of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and published – together, in one book – his works in Venice in 1686, at the Publishing House of Michael Angel Barbon.[5] Such brief information about this unknown Greek scholar are given by *Logios Hermes* incidentally, commenting on the translation of Justin's *Epitome* of Pompeius Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae* by Demetrius – Daniel Philippides in 1817 and indicating the existence of an older Modern Greek translation of this work by Ioannis Makolas, which the posterior translator ignored.[6]

Makolas' translation also includes some myths form Ovid's *Metamorphoses* translated from Latin language to colloquial Greek by the same translator with expenses of the very kind Sir Michael Peroulis from Athens. The book was printed for the benefit of the studious men and was corrected with greatest care. At the end,

[3] For Makolas' translation see: <http://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/php/pdf_pager.php?rec=/metadata/8/8/a/metadata-165-0000018.tkl&do=115088.pdf&pageno=1&pagestart=1&width=399&height=612&maxpage=398&lang=el>.

[4] *Logios Hermes* [=*῾Ερμῆς ὁ Λόγιος*], volume 8, issue 2, 15 January 1818, p. 30, note (*): «*῾Ιωάννης ὁ Μάκολας ἐγεννήθη κατὰ τὸ 1661 ἔτος ἐν ᾽Αθήναις· ἦτον ἔμπορος κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα· μετέφρασεν ἐκ τοῦ Λατινικοῦ, ἐκτὸς τῆς ρηθείσης ᾽Ιστορίας, καὶ τοῦ ᾽Οβιδίου τὰς μεταμορφώσεις καὶ ἐξέδωκεν ἐν Βενετία κατὰ τὸ 1686 παρὰ τῷ Μ. ᾽Αγγέλῳ τῷ Βαρβωνίῳ· ἦτον δὲ, ὅτε ταῦτα μετέφρασεν, 25 ἐτῶν. Πότε ἀπέθανε, καὶ ἂν μετέφρασε καὶ ἄλλα ἢ συνέγραψεν, ἀγνοοῦμεν*».

[5] This is the publishing House of Venice Barbon, who had as typographical mark a surmullet (in Venetian dialect barbon mean surmullet); see E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des Grecs aux dix-septième siècle*, 2nd vol., Paris 1962, p. 430.

[6] *Logios Hermes* [= *῾Ερμῆς ὁ Λόγιος*], volume 8, issue 2, 15 January 1818, p. 30, note (*): «*ἔλαθε δέ, ὡς φαίνεται, ἢ ἐλησμόνησεν ὁ Κύριος Δ.* [= Mister D., namely Demetrius Daniel Philippides] *νά προσθέσῃ, ὅτι τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου ὑπάρχει καί ἄλλη μετάφρασις πάλιν εἰς τήν νῦν ᾽Ελληνικήν παρά ᾽Ιωάννου Μάκολα ᾽Αθηναίου(*) καί ἐπιγράφεται: ᾽Ιουστίνου ᾽Ιστορία μεταφρασθεῖσα ἐκ τῆς Λατινίδος φωνῆς εἰς ἁπλήν φράσιν παρά ᾽Ιωάννου Μάκολα τοῦ ᾽Αθηναίου. ᾽Ενετίησιν, αχπστ΄. παρά Μιχαήλ τῷ Βαρβωνίῳ*». For further information for Ioannis Makolas and his translations, see Δ. Νικήτας, «*Μύθοι πάνυ ὠφέλιμοι καὶ τερπνοί*: η πρώτη δημώδης νεοελληνική μετάφραση των *Μεταμορφώσεων* του Οβιδίου από τον Ιωάννη Μάκολα (1686)», in Δ. Νικήτας (επιμ.), *Laus et gratia. In memoriam* Κωνσταντίνου Γρόλλιου, Θεσσαλονίκη 2012, pp. 103-142.

there is one *Christian Teaching*, «much-needed for everybody» as Makolas declares.[7] The book numerates 16 first pages without numbers and 382 with Arabic numeration.

From the book's frontispiece we learn that: 1) Makolas mentions only the name of the *epitomator* Justin, and not Pompeius Trogus, 2) he does not mention the title of the original work (*Historiae Philippicae*), 3) he declares that it is about his own translation and he does not follow any other foreign translation from Latin[8] and 4) he announces that this edition was complited thanks to the financial support of his patron, Michael Peroulis.[9]

Makolas refers to the reasons that made him translate in Modern Greek[10] Justin's *Epitome* in the beginning of his book, that is in his dedicative epistle,[11] to his benefactor[12] and in his address to the readers.[13] The reason why this scholar worked on a translation of a historical work is given in the epislte: history pleases men and it provides them with education and prudence. Furthermore, it activates them and keeps them afar from laziness.[14]

In this epistle, Makolas underlines the usefulness of his book, which, apart from Justin's *Epitome of Philippics*, includes twelve myths of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and one *Christian Teaching* (Διδασκαλία Χριστιανική) at the end. The Greek nation will gain precious knowledge from his work, as good books are scarse.[15]

---

[7] For the title of this work, follow the link which is cited above, in p. 256, n. 3.

[8] We have to underline that the phenomenon of copying or variety of foreign work's translations without declaring the first translator's identity and misappropriation from another one later writer must be a very common practice during 17th, 18th and 19thcenturies. For example, Zaharias Mauroudis' translation entitled *Epistle of Julia, Caesar August's daughter to Ovid the exiled poet* (1808), which proved that it was non a translation from Latin language, but revision or copy of a translation of a French work, Dorat's *Lettre de Julie à Ovide* in Modern Greek, which was held from another Greek scholar of 18th century – but previous of Mauroudis – Thomas the Rhodian; see Κ.Δ. Πηδώνια, «Ο Ζαχαρίας Μαυρουδής και τα έργα του» (ανάτυπο από Α*φιέρωμα στον Ι.Μ. Παναγιωτόπουλο*), Θεσσαλονίκη 1990.

[9] Athenian merchant who lived and worked in Venice. He was president of the Greek Confraternity there. Peroulis was a real Maecenas for Makolas.

[10] We must note that Makolas' translation is written entirely in this language.

[11] In pp. (3)-(6).

[12] In pp. (4)-(5).

[13] In pp. (7)-(10).

[14] In p. (3).

[15] In pp. (3)-(4).

Makolas is more analytical with regard to the usefulness of Roman historiography in his address to his readers. He characterizes Trogus' *Philippics*, although a work of Roman historiography, as benefaction of the Greeks ancestors. The translations of Justin's *Epitome of Philippics*,[16] of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*[17] and his *Christian Teaching*,[18] which are incorporated in his book, aim to «*common benefit and pleasure of studious men*».[19] The main scope of Makolas' book is the benefit of the Greek nation, which lacks of this kind of books. His purpose is namely didactical and pedagogic.[20] In his address to the readers, Makolas confesses the tremendous labor that he exerted for this book in order to translate in Modern Greek these Latin works, as he is «*mostly beginner and inexperienced in Latin language*».[21] At the end, Makolas pleads for the anonymous reader's clemency, as *captatio benevolentiae* imposes and closes this note with his signature: «*Ioannis Makolas the Athenian, humble slave of your politeness*».[22]

3. Spyridon Vlantes

The second Greek scholar who translates a Latin historical work is **Spyridon Vlantes** (1765-1830). He translates in 1801 – in Modern Greek, also – Cornelius Nepos' *De viris illustribus*.[23] He added some necessary notes and published the book in Venice in 1801 at the Publishing House of Panos Theodosiou from Ioanni-

[16] In pp. 1-307.

[17] In pp. 308-364. The twelve myths of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* are the following: Pyrrhamus and Thisbe (pp. 308-311), Daphne (pp. 311-314), Phaethon (pp. 315-324), Phaethon's sisters (pp. 325-326), Cygnus (pp. 326-327), Narcissus and Echo (pp. 327-330), Arachne (pp. 331-334), Niobe (pp. 334-339), Procne, Philomena, Tyreus and Itys (pp. 339-346), Orpheus, Jupiter and Ganymedes, Yacinthus (pp. 346-348), Ajax and Ulysses (pp. 349-360) and Iphigenia (pp. 360-364).

[18] In pp. 365-382. We must note that *Christian Teaching* has dialogical form, between a hypothetical teacher and a hypothetical student.

[19] In p. (9).

[20] In pp. (7)-(10):

[21] In p. (9)

[22] In p. (10).

[23] Cornelius Nepos' *De viris illustribus* has translated another Greek scholar also, Georgios Zaviras. Unfortunately this translation, as the most of his works, remained unpublished. See Κ. Σάθας, Βιογραφίαι τῶν ἐν τοῖς γράμμασι διαλαμψάντων Ἑλλήνων ἀπὸ τῆς καταλύσεως τῆς βυζαντινῆς αὐτοκρατορίας μέχρι τῆς ἑλληνικῆς ἐθνεγερσίας *(1453-1821)*, Αθήνα 1868, p. 540.

na.[24] Vlantes' translation enumerates pp. 7 (without enumeration) + pp. 32 (α' – λβ') + p. 1 (without enumeration) + 1 picture + pp. 271 (with Arabic enumeration) + p. 1 (without enumeration).

Why Vlantes translates a Latin biographical – historical work? The answer to this question is reveiled by the work's typographer, Panos Theodosiou, in his dedicate epistle to the brotherhood of Zosimades.[25] He praises the community of Zosimades and refers to their abundant contribution to the Greek nation. He parallels the works of the ancient Greek rulers and generals narrated in Nepos' book with these famous Modern Greek benefactors from Epirus. Zosimades were the sponsors of Vlantes' translation, which has didactical purpose: to offer the highest historical *exempla* to his compatriots and thus to arise «*new Thrasibylos, new Timoleons and new Epaminonds*».[26]

Zosimades were national benefactors. They founded schools, libraries and contributed to the edition of new and old books. One of these books is Vlantes' translation of Nepos' *Lives*. And this work, therefore, is their contribution to the Greek enslaved nation.[27] In this translation, as in Makolas', the benefit that the Greek nation will obtain by reading a Latin historical work translated in Modern Greek is especially emphasized. Nepos' book, as Theodosiou underlines, is full of Greek virtuous men's deeds.[28]

4. Neophytos Doukas

After Makolas and Vlantes, the third Greek scholar who translates a Latin historical work is **Neophytos Doukas** (born between

[24] For the title of this work, see in p. (1) of the book: <http://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/php/pdf_pager.php?rec=/metadata/3/8/7/metadata-39-0000323.tkl&do=83841.pdf&lang=el&pageno=1&pagestart=1&width=320.16%20pts&height=508.08%20pts&maxpage=320>.

[25] Panos Theodosiou and his father, Demetrius Theodosiou from Ioannina were famous Greek typographers in Venice. See Κ.Π. Στάικος – Τρ.Ε. Σκλαβενίτης, Πεντακόσια χρόνια έντυπης παράδοσης του Νέου Ελληνισμού *(1499-1999)* – Οδηγός της Έκθεσης, Αθήνα 2000, p. 22. For Theodosiou's dedicative epistle to Zosimades see pp. (1)-(7) of Vlantes' translation.

[26] In pp. (3)-(8).

[27] In pp. (6)-(7).

[28] For a detailed examination of Vlantes' translation, see Δ.Ζ. Νικήτας, «Cornelius Nepos Neograecus: Η μετάφραση των Βίων του Νέπωτα από τον Σπυρίδωνα Βλαντή 1810», στο Δημητρίῳ στέφανος. Τιμητικός τόμος για τον καθηγητή Δημήτρη Λυπουρλή, Θεσσαλονίκη 2004, pp. 241-274.

1760-1762, dead in 1845). In 1807, he publishes his dubbing in Modern Greek language of the ancient Greek translation by Paeanius of Eutropius' work *Breviarium ab urbe condita*.[29] Doukas' work is, we would say, the translation of the Greek translation. On the left page of the book, Doukas edits Paeanius ancient Greek translation, while on the right page he cites his own translation in Modern Greek. This practice does not mean that Doukas was unaware of the Latin language. On the contrary, it seems that he was a great Latinist, as is evidenced by his wise footnotes, and by the fact that, when Paeanius' translation abruptly stops, Doukas continues to translate Eutropius' Latin text, both in ancient and Modern Greek language, directly from the prototype.[30]

Doukas' book is divided into two volumes. The first is printed in Vienna of Austria, at the Publishing House of Georgius Vendotes in 1807.[31] This volume enumerates pp. 23 (α' - κγ') + 2 white pages + pp. 390 (with Arabic enumeration) + p. 1 (without enumeration) + 1 white page. The second volume is a dictionary of famous men who are contained in Eutropius' history, anthologized and edited by Neophytos Doukas. The second volume is printed in Vienna of Austria, at the Publishing House of Ioanna Schraemvl, in 1807.[32] This volume enumerates pp. 371 (with Arabic enumeration) + p. 1 (without enumeration) + 1 white page.[33]

---

[29] For Paeanius, Capiton and Neophytos Doukas as translators of Eutropius' *Breviarium ab urbe condita*, see Δ. Ν. Τριβόλης, *Eutropius historicus* καὶ οἱ Ἕλληνες μεταφρασταὶ τοῦ *Breviarium ab urbe condita*, Αθήνα 1941, pp. 128-66; D. Nikitas, «Traduzioni …», pp. 1036-38.

[30] See Τριβόλης, *Eutropius historicus…*, pp. 143-148, and of course, Doukas' own translation in p. 340 and note (*).

[31] For the title of this volume, see in p. (3): <http://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/php/pdf_pager.php?rec=/metadata/f/4/b/metadata-39-0000302.tkl&do=83704.pdf&pageno=3&width=295&height=508&maxpage=793&lang=el>. Georgius Vendotes or Ventotes was a famous Greek scholar, typographer and editor in Viennaof 18th century. For him, see Β. Παππάς, «Η μετάφραση του *Breviarium ab urbe condita* του Ευτροπίου από τον Νεόφυτο Δούκα (Α΄ τόμος) και το Λεξικό των Ενδόξων Ανδρών του έργου (Β΄ τόμος)», Βυζαντινά Σύμμεικτα 24 (2014), p. 130, n. 6.

[32] For the title of this volume see in p. (415): <http://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/php/pdf_pager.php?rec=/metadata/f/4/b/metadata-39-0000302.tkl&do=83704.pdf&pageno=415&width=295&height=508&maxpage=793&lang=el>. For the Publishing House of Schraemvl family, see Δ. Γκίνης – Β. Μέξας, Ελληνική Βιβλιογραφία *(1800-1863)*. 1ος τ., *s.v.* «Schraemvl», Αθήνα 1939.

[33] For an analytical description of those two volumes, see Φ. Ηλιού, Ελληνικὴ Βιβλιογραφία, τ. 1ος, Αθήνα 1997, p. 210 and p. 215.

At the beginning of Doukas' book, in the part that is entitled *Salutation to the readers*[34] which is written in archaic Greek language,[35] the translator, having emphasized the very important pedagogical role of history,[36] refers to the two main reasons that made him translate this work of Roman historiography in Modern Greek language: 1) the ethnological affinity between Greeks and Romans[37] and 2) he wanted to donate it to the youth of gymnasiums and for the benefit of the enslaved Greek nation in general (and for that reason he enriched the translation with many footnotes, drawn from foreign editions).[38] From this last declaration of Doukas, we deduce that: a) the studying youth of Doukas' era found it difficult to understand Paeanius' text in ancient Greek language and needed a translation of it in Modern Greek, and b) this Greek scholar, although a fanatic archaist,[39] does not hesitate to abandon his linguistic believes temporarily, in order to become more comprehensive to the young men of the high schools.[40]

5. Daniel Philippides

The last post-Byzantine scholar who translates works of Latin historiography is **Demetrius – Daniel Philippides** (born between 1750-1755, death in1832). In 1817 he edits his translation of the *Epitome of Trogus' Philippics* by Justin (in Latin, *Historiae Philippicae*, a work which, as we sought, has translated by Ioannis Makolas too)[41] and in the next year (1818), he edits his translation of Florus' *Epitome of Roman history* (in Latin, *Epito-*

[34] «Τοῖς ἐντευξομένοις χαίρειν».

[35] pp. ια'- κα'.

[36] In p. ια'.

[37] In p. ιγ'-ιδ'. Daniel Philippides also considered Romans as a nation relative with Greeks (see his translation of Justin's *Epitome of Trogus' Philippics*, p. 44, n. 1: «*Οἱ 'ρωμάνοι καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦταν τρόπον τινὰ μία ἀποικία ἑλληνικὴ· ἀναθήματα ἔπεμπαν εἰς τοὺς Δελφοὺς· ἡ φιλία μὲ αὐτοὺς ἐθνικὴν συγγένειαν δείχνει*). The idea of affinity between Greek and Latin language is old enough: Dionysius from Halicarnassus (*Roman Archaeology* 1.5.1) and Diodorus from Sicely (7.5) thought that Latin language is a mixture of Greek and one barbaric language and that is related with Aeolic dialect also.

[38] In p. ιδ'.

[39] See Κ.Θ. Δημαράς, Νεοελληνικός διαφωτισμός, Αθήνα 1977, p. 345.

[40] For Doukas' translation of Eutropius, see Β. Παππάς, «Η μετάφραση του *Breviarium ab urbe condita...*», pp. 129-155.

[41] See above, pp. 256-258.

me rerum romanarum).[42] The language of those two translations is common; once again, the Modern Greek language. In these two books, Philippides concentrated the entire history of known ancient nations: Greeks, Romans, Carthaginians, Assyrians, Scythes, Persians etc.[43]

A. TRANSLATION OF *EPITOME OF TROGUS' PHILIPPICS*

Trogus' translation is published in 1817 in Leipzig at the Printing House of Tauchnitz. The book enumerates pp. 8 (without enumeration) + pp. 624 (with Arabic enumeration) + pp. 21 (with enumeration, *The Epilogue*).

The title[44] provides us with enough information: the name of the Roman author, the title of his book, the language of the original work, the language of the translation (aeolodorique, which means the Modern Greek of this era), the place, the Publishing house[45] and the year of the translation's edition. However, we read here that this is the first translation of Trogus' *Philippics*, which is wrong; we have seen that Makolas' translation preceded, in 1686, an information about which Philippides was unaware, as it seems.[46] We observe that Philippides does not sign these works by his real name, as he did in others, but with a pseudonym thath testifies his identity: he calls himself a*popeirografos of Romania*, which means exactly *the writer of Apopeira and Romania*, i.e. the writer (Greek suffix –γράφος) of the books

[42] For the titles of these works, see <http://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/php/pdf_pager.php?rec=/metadata/b/6/d/metadata-145-0000015.tkl&do=83553.pdf&lang=el&pageno=1&pagestart=1&width=345&height=569&maxpage=663> and <http://anemi.lib.uoc.gr/php/pdf_pager.php?rec=/metadata/b/6/d/metadata-145-0000015.tkl&do=83553.pdf&lang=el&pageno=1&pagestart=1&width=345&height=569&maxpage=663 respectively>.

[43] For an analytical description of Philippides's translations, see Β. Παππάς, Η λατινομάθεια του Δημητρίου – Δανιήλ Φιλιππίδη *(† 1832):* οι μεταφράσεις του Τρόγου και του Φλώρου, Διδ. διατριβή, Θεσσαλονίκη 2010, pp. 44-243.

[44] See above, n. 42 (the first link).

[45] The Publishing House of Tauchnitz (Karl Christoph Traugott Tauchnitz) started working in 1796 at Leipzig. It was famous for the editions of classic Greek and Latin authors. See Encyclopaedia *Britannica*, *s.v.* «Karl Christoph Traugott Tauchnitz», vol. 26 (1985), p. 452.

[46] See above, p. 256 and note 6.

'Απόπειρα 'Αναλύσεως τοῦ Νοουμένου,[47] and *'Ιστορία* και *Γεωγραφικόν τῆς Ρουμουνίας*.[48]

Philippides lists the reasons that mad him translate Trogus' *Philippics* in the introduction of the book.[49] He addresses the readers in the second singular person[50] and informs them for the Latin work which he has translated; he gives information about the title of the book, the author's name and the time when he lived. He also indicates that the main subject of *Philippics* is, as is evident from its name, the Macedonian dynasty from the early ages until the zenith of its power. This work, however, contains stories of other nations too, and especially of the Greeks, who fight eternally among themselves in civil wars. It is a «universal history», it includes the whole of the historical knowledge of Trogus's era, and aims, therefore, to the maximum benefit for each reader.[51]

Then, Philippides adresses to the reader and invites him to study carefully his book and find for himself the quality of Justin's work: he concludes that the *epitomator* brought many chances to Trogus' original book, as he ommited valuable information. According to Philippides, Justin worked as a grammatician and not as a historical writer and also he used Trogus' history for demonstrating his rhetorical ability. Despite this – Philippides comments – Justin's work is very important, because through this epitome we discover the contents of Trogus' lost work and those of another lost book, as well as Trogus' main source, *Philippics* of the Greek historian Theopompus. From this last author, Trogus took the title and the contents of his history and extened it to the end of the Macedonian dynasty. Philippides

[47] In Greek language, «ἀπόπειρα» means «*attempt*».

[48] With this pseudonym Philippides signs his translations of Trogus and Florus also. Thus, we could say that in these two works he cites with his signature to two prototype works of his, namely the *'Απόπειρα 'Αναλύσεως τοῦ Νοουμένου* and the *Ἱστορία και Γεωγραφικόν τῆς Ρουμουνίας* (works edited 1n 1816). It seems that, in order to cover his real name with this pseudonym – quotation, Philippides was quite proud for these three works and he intended to «advertise» them by this method.

[49] In pp. (5)-(8) (without enumeration). The Greek title of this section is «*Προλεγόμενα*».

[50] With his usual salutation «*friend*» (in Greek, «*φίλε*»). See p. (5) (without enumeration), p. (8) (without enumeration), p. 4, note 1, p. 10, note 1, p. 11. note 1, p. 163, note 1 etc.

[51] In pp. (5)-(6) (without enumeration).

completes this section emphasizing the dependence of Roman literary works on Greek prototypes.[52]

Philippides also states the reasons why Greek scholars should know the Latin language. First of all, Roman writers are a kind of «complement» of the ancient Greeks who have survived in literary tradition. According to him, a Greek scholar who does not know Latin is *de facto* unable to know the whole history of his nation, as Latin historical works compensate the gap which exists due to lost Greek historical works «*by the fire*».[53] At this point of the book, the didactical aspect of Philippides' translation is clearly revealed, and also his quality as «teacher» of Greek nation: Trogus' translation aims to the education of the Greek nation and the upgrade of its life. Secondly, the scientists benefit extremely from the knowledge of the Latin language, especialy those who engage with physical sciences. Thirdly, according to Philippides, every Greek scholar must know the Latin language because it greatly helps in learning Italian and French. For all these reasons, he decided to translate Trogus' *Philippics*.[54]

Trogus' translation by Philippides was not republished; a fact which proves that it was not an endearing book. However, the positive review of Philippides' book published by *Logios Hermes* a year later (1818) in no way forsaw the future oblivion of this work.[55]

B. TRANSLATION OF FLORUS' *EPITOME OF ROMAN HISTORY*

Florus' translation is published in Leipzig, at the Publishing House of Breitkopf and Härtel in 1818. The book enumerates pp. 32 (without enumeration) + pp. 290 (with Arabic enumeration) + pp. 21 (*The Epilogue*).

---

[52] In pp. (6)-(7) (without enumeration).

[53] Philippides's phrase is «ἐξ᾽αἰτίας τῆς πυρκαϊᾶς». Apparently he means the fire of the Alexandria's Library.

[54] In p. (7) (without enumeration).

[55] *Logios Hermes*, volume 8, issue 2, 15 January 1818, pp. 27-30. See especially pp. 27-28 (after the description of Philippides's book): «Τὸ γένος χρεωστεῖ πολλὰς χάριτας εἰς τὸν μεταφραστήν Κύριον Δημήτριον *(Δανιὴλ)* Φιλιππίδην, ὅτι ἐκοινοποίησεν εἰς αὐτὸ τὰ Φιλιππικὰ τοῦ *Π.* Τρόγου, εἰς γλῶσσαν καταληπτὴν εἰς ὅλους, μέρος τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ἱστορίας καθ᾽αὐτὸ πολλῆς σπουδῆς ἄξιον, καὶ εἰς τὸ ὁποῖον τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν γένος ἔχει κατ᾽ἐξοχὴν κλίσιν. Τῆς μεταφράσεως *ἡ* γλῶσσα κ΄ φράσις δημώδης μὲν, ἀλλ᾽ὄχι εὐκαταφρόνητος, καὶ *ἡ* ὀνοματοθεσία ὄχι ἀτυχής. Εἰς πολλὰ μέρη τοῦ κειμένου εὑρίσκει τις καὶ σημειώματα, τὰ ὁποῖα ἀποβλέπουν τὸ πραγματικὸν μέρος μᾶλλον παρὰ τὸ λεκτικὸν· δι᾽αὐτῶν σκοπὸν εἶχεν *ὁ* μεταφραστής, καθὼς *ὁ* ἴδιος τὸ λέγει εἰς τὸ προοίμιον, νὰ δώσῃ νύξιν εἰς τὸν ἀναγνώστην εἰς τὸ νὰ προσέχῃ εἰς τὸν κατὰ πρῶτον λόγον σκοπὸν τῆς Ἱστορίας».

The title[56] provides us with enough information: the name of the Roman author, the title of his book, the language of the original work, the language of the translation (aeolodorique), the place, the Publishing house[57] and the year of translation's edition. Once again, Philippides subscribes with his familiar pseudonyum, «*apopeirografos of Romania*».[58]

Philippides analyzes the reasons why he translated Florus' historical work in his «*Introductory prologue of the translator*».[59] At the beginning of the preface, the translator deals with the rise of Roman Empire and exposes the reasons why a Greek scholar or student must study Roman history, which, of course, must follow the study of history of his own homeland. Besides, Philippides worked on Greek history during the previous year (1817) as he translated Trogus' *Philippics*, a work which moslty deals with Greek history. According to Florus – Philippides comments – the Roman history resembles with human age: the reader can see a nation to be born, to flourish and finally to decline. The translator supports that the main reason for the study of Roman history is the humble origin of the Roman people, which makes its brilliant evolution more admirable.[60] Philippides points out that the ancient writers (Greek and Roman) disagreed on the year of the foundation of Rome. He cites for this the testimonies of the Greeks Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Diocles from Peparithos, who was, as he writes, the prototype of Fabius Pictor's Roman history.[61]

Philippides speaks of the kinship of the Greek and Latin language, perception which he expressed in Trogus' translation also.[62] He underlines the relationship of the Latin language with the

[56] For the title of this work, see above, p. 262, n. 42 (the second link).

[57] The Publishing House of Bernhard Christoph Breitkopf and Gottfried Christoph Härtel in Leipzig. See *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 2, *s.v.* «Breitkopf und Härtel», Leipzig 1876.

[58] See above, p. 263 and n. 48.

[59] «*Εἰσαγωγικός πρόλογος τοῦ μεταφραστοῦ*», *from the p. (5) (without enumeration) to the numbered p. 32.*

[60] In pp. (5) (without enumeration) – 6 (numbered).

[61] See Plutarch's *Lives*, *Romulus* 3.1.2-5: «πρῶτος εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐξέδωκε Διοκλῆς Παπαρήθιος, ᾧ καὶ Φάβιος ὁ Πίκτωρ ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις ἐπηκολούθηκε».

[62] See *The Epilogue* of Trogus'*Philippics*, p. 6: «*τὰ λατινικὰ πλησιάζουν μάλιστα εἰς τὴν αἰολικήν*».

Aeolic dialect,[63] an issue that occupied him significantly [64] as well as the modern scholars.[65] According to Philippides, Florus' translation is a very important work, due to the evolution of ancient Rome is the new Rome (*nova Roma*), i.e. Constantinople. It should be noted that the connection of Rome with Constantinople, and thus of Roman with Byzantine history was a common belief among Byzantine historians.[66] Philippides too, as a true post-Byzantine scholar, connects the Roman with the Byzantine and with the history of his own era also, since he relates the capital of the Roman Empire with the rich Constantinople of his time. He characteristically writes that, if there was not the ancient Rome, the glorious capital of the Ottoman Empire would never exist.[67] In order to give a clearer picture to the reader for understanding the magnitude of change caused by the founding of Rome, Philippides cites a long list, where, combining once again Rome with Constantinople, he refers (in reverse chronological order) the rulers of the two cities starting from those of new Rome, the Ottoman sultans, continuing with the Byzantines emperors, then with the Latins emperors (in the Latin Empire of Constantinople, 1204-1261), again with the Byzantines and he ends the list with the Roman emperors of old Rome reaching to Augustus' era, which is the last period in Florus' work too.[68] Philippides provides valuable information in the footnotes for the most sultans and emperors (Greeks and Latins).[69]

---

[63] In p. 13.

[64] See Β. Παππάς, Η λατινομάθεια… , pp. 151-54.

[65] See *e. g.*, L.H. Strevens – A. Vardi, *The worlds of Aulus Gellius*. Oxford, 2004, pp. 44-45: «Soon, however, the employment of grammatical Greek patterns for the description of Latin linguistic structures admitted the theory that Latin was a kind of Greek, specifically a sort of Aeolic dialect. Both Greek grammarians living and teaching in Rome (Hypsicrates of Amysos, Philoxenus of Alexandria, Terentius Tyrannio, Claudius Didymus, L. Ateius Praetextatus Philologus) and native Latin grammarians (Santra, Clodius Tuscus, Cloatius Verus) wrote on this subject between the beginning of the first century BC and the middle of the first century AD».

[66] The connection between Rome and Byzantium is obvious from the title of Nicephorus Gregoras' work *Roman History*. See A. Alföldi, *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome*, Oxford, 1948; H. Hunger, Βυζαντινή λογοτεχνία (ελληνική μετάφραση: Τ. Κόλλιας), 2ος τ.., Αθήνα, 1992, pp. 61-364; Φ. Δημητρακόπουλος, Βυζάντιο και νεοελληνική διανόηση στα μέσα του δέκατου ένατου αιώνος, Αθήνα 1996, pp. 144-146.

[67] In pp. 19-21.

[68] In pp. 20-30.

[69] See *e.g.*, pp. 22-23, n. 6, where he writes for Mahmud II, the conqueror of Constantinople, for his successors and for the genealogy of the Ottomans.

This is a very interesting section of the introduction, where Philippides «modernizes» the ancient Rome in order to be understood by the reader of the translation which proves that the establishment of the Roman Empire impacted his daily life, as it is responsible for the creation of his contemporary cities and commercial channels. Philippides also intends to show how a small group of robbers, fugitives and refugees (ancient Rome) could be strengthened and developed into a rich and cosmopolitan European capital (Constantinople). The founding of Rome, then, is a momentous event with impact on Philippides' era too. The translator with that catalogue confirms the common belief of scholars, that Byzantine history is a phase of the Roman, formed under the influence of ancient Greek and Roman culture, and the Christian faith. Moreover, he emphasizes the fact that the culture of Constantinople is a blend of Greek, Roman and Ottoman influence.

Conclusions

Summarizing, we observe that all these translations of Roman historical works have common elements between them: a) they are written in Modern Greek language of each era (17th – 19th centuries), b) they all are translations of epitomes or anthologies and, most importantly, c) all these translations were probably used as didactical books that aimed to the historical and moral education of the Greek youth, but also at their national consciousness.

Greek scholars of the 17th, 18th and 19th centurie had early realized the extreme importance and the usefulness of Latin historical works for the enslaved Green nation. For them, Roman historiography is a great part of the Greek history and its continuity. At the same time, post-Byzantine scholars published and translated ancient Greek historians.[70] The loss, however, of some Greek historiographers (e.g. Theopompus) made the Greek scholars who knew Latin language feel the need to fill the gap of Greek history by their translations of Roman historiographers, who had drawn their material from lost ancient Greek authors. In conclusion, post-Byzantine scholars translated some works of Roman historiography for two main purposes: to offer the enslaved and deprived Greek

[70] Neophytos Doukas translated Thucydides (1805) and he edited Arrian's work (1809), Vlantes edited Xenophon's work (1811), Coraes edited Xenophon's (1825) and Arrian's (1827) works etc.

nation the opportunity to learn the history of other nations (e.g. Romans, Persians, Carthaginians, Assyrians, Scythes etc.) and to complete its knowledge of its own ancient history.[71]

Bibliography

Alföldi, A. (1948). *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome*, Oxford.

Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie (1876), vol. 2, *s.v.* «Breitkopf und Härtel», Leipzig.

Γκίνης Δ. – Μέξας, Β. (1939). Ελληνική Βιβλιογραφία *(1800-1863)*. 1ος τ., *s.v.* «Schraemvl», Αθήνα.

Δημαράς, Κ.Θ. (1977). Νεοελληνικός διαφωτισμός, Αθήνα.

Δημητρακόπουλος, Φ. 1996. Βυζάντιο και νεοελληνική διανόηση στα μέσα του δέκατου ένατου αιώνος, Αθήνα 1996.

Encyclopaedia *Britannica*. (1985), vol. 26 *s.v.* «Karl Christoph Traugott Tauchnitz», Edinburgh.

Ηλιού, Φ. (1997). Ελληνικὴ Βιβλιογραφία, τ. 1ος, Αθήνα.

Hunger, H. (1992). Βυζαντινή λογοτεχνία (ελληνική μετάφραση: Τ. Κόλλιας), 2ος τ.., Αθήνα.

Κεχαγιόγλου, Γ. (1982). «Οι έντυπες νεοελληνικές μεταφράσεις του 18ου αι. Παρατηρήσεις και αποτιμήσεις», *JÖB* 32/6, pp. 229-237.

Legrand, E. (1962). *Bibliographie hellénique ou description raisonnée des ouvrages publiés par des Grecs aux dix-septième siècle*, 2nd vol., Paris.

Nikitas, D.Z. (2001). «Traduzioni greche di opera latine», in S. Settis (ed.) *I Greci. Storia Cultura Arte Società* 3, *I Greci oltre la Grecia*, Turin, pp. 1035-51.

—, (2003) «Μεταβυζαντινή Latinitas: Δεδομένα και ζητούμενα», ΕΕΦΣ ΑΠΘ, (Τμήμα Φιλολογίας) 10 (2002-2003), pp. 34-46.

—, (2004). «Cornelius Nepos Neograecus: Η μετάφραση των Βίων του Νέπωτα από τον Σπυρίδωνα Βλαντή 1810», στο Δημητρίῳ στέφανος. Τιμητικός τόμος για τον καθηγητή Δημήτρη Λυπουρλή, Θεσσαλονίκη, pp. 241-274.

—, (2012). «*Μύθοι πάνυ ὠφέλιμοι καὶ τερπνοί*: η πρώτη δημώδης νεοελληνική μετάφραση των *Μεταμορφώσεων* του Οβιδίου από τον Ιωάννη Μάκολα

[71] See *e.g.*, p. (8) (without enumeration) of Trogus's translation by Philippides: «*...τοὺς παλαιοὺς λατίνους συγγραφεῖς πρέπει νὰ τοὺς ἐννοῇ τινὰς, ὡς ἕνα συμπλήρωμα τρόπον τινὰ τῶν ἑλληνικῶν βιβλίων ὁποῦ μᾶς ἔμειναν*».

(1686)», στο Δ.Ζ. Νικήτας (επιμ.), *Laus et gratia. In memoriam* Κωνσταντίνου Γρόλλιου, Θεσσαλονίκη, pp. 103-142.

Παππάς, Β. (2014). «Η μετάφραση του *Breviarium ab urbe condita* του Ευτροπίου από τον Νεόφυτο Δούκα (Α΄ τόμος) και το Λεξικό των Ενδόξων Ανδρών του έργου (Β΄ τόμος)», Βυζαντινά Σύμμεικτα 24, pp. 129-155.

—, (2010). Η λατινομάθεια του Δημητρίου – Δανιήλ Φιλιππίδη *(† 1832):* οι μεταφράσεις του Τρόγου και του Φλώρου, Διδ. διατριβή, Θεσσαλονίκη.

Πηδώνια, Κ.Δ. (1990). «Ο Ζαχαρίας Μαυρουδής και τα έργα του» (ανάτυπο από Α*φιέρωμα στον Ι.Μ. Παναγιωτόπουλο*), Θεσσαλονίκη.

Σάθας, Κ. (1868). Βιογραφίαι τῶν ἐν τοῖς γράμμασι διαλαμψάντων Ἑλλήνων ἀπὸ τῆς καταλύσεως τῆς βυζαντινῆς αὐτοκρατορίας μέχρι τῆς ἑλληνικῆς ἐθνεγερσίας *(1453-1821)*, Αθήνα.

Στάικος, Κ.Π. – Σκλαβενίτης, Τρ.Ε. 2000. Πεντακόσια χρόνια έντυπης παράδοσης του Νέου Ελληνισμού *(1499-1999)* – Οδηγός της Έκθεσης, Αθήνα.

Strevens, L.H. – Vardi, A. (2004). *The worlds of Aulus Gellius*. Oxford.

Τριβόλης, Δ.Ν. (1941). *Eutropius historicus* καὶ οἱ Ἕλληνες μεταφρασταὶ τοῦ *Breviarium ab urbe condita*, Αθήνα.

Pappas, Vasileios, «Modern Greek translations (1686-1818) of Latin historical works», *SPhV* 17 (2015), pp. 257-272.

ABSTRACT

In this paper we present the five translations of Latin historical works which were made by four post-Byzantine scholars (Ioannis Makolas, Spyridon Vlantes, Neophytos Doukas and Daniel Philippides) in the period of 1686 to 1818. Makolas translated Pompeius Trogus' *Epitome Philippicorum*, Vlantes Cornelius Nepos' *De viris illustribus*, Doukas dubbed in simple language the ancient Greek translation of Eutropius' *Breviarium ab urbe condita* by Paeanius and Philippides translated Pompeius Trogus' *Epitome Philippicorum* and Florus's *Epitome rerum Romanarum*. The titles of the books are presented and the reasons why these scholars translated those particular works are highlighted. These post-Byzantine translations are written in vernacular language, swarm with interesting footnotes and were used for ethical and pedagogic purposes.

KEYWORDS: post-Byzantine Latinitas, Makolas, Vlantes, Neophytos Doukas, Daniel Philippides, Pompeius Trogus' *Epitome Philippicorum*, Cornelius Nepos' *De viris illustribus*, Eutropius' *Breviarium ab urbe condita*, Florus' *Epitome rerum Romanarum*.

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Σ' αυτή την εργασία παρουσιάζουμε τις πέντες μεταφράσεις λατινικών ιστορικών έργων που πραγματοποιήθηκαν από τέσσερις μεταβυζαντινούς λογίους (Ιωάννης Μάκολας, Σπυρίδων Βλαντής, Νεόφυτος Δούκας και Δανιήλ Φιλιππίδης) στο διάστημα 1686 έως 1818. Ο Μάκολας μετέφρασε το *Epitome Phillipacorum* του Πομπηίου Τρόγου, ο Βλαντής το *De viris illustribus* του Κορνηλίου Νέπωτα, ο Δούκας παρέφρασε στη δημοτική ελληνική γλώσσα την αρχαία ελληνική μετάφραση του *Breviarium ab urbe condita* του Ευτροπίου από τον Παιάνιο και ο Φιλιππίδης μετέφρασε το *Epitome Philippicorum* του Πομπηίου Τρόγου και το *Epitome rerum Romanarum* του Φλώρου. Παρουσιάζουμε τους τίτλους των βιβλίων και υπογραμμίζουμε τους λόγους για τους οποίους αυτοί οι λόγιοι μετέφρασαν αυτά τα συγκεκριμένα έργα. Αυτές οι μεταβυζαντινές μεταφράσεις είναι γραμμένες στην καθομιλουμένη γλώσσα, είναι διανθισμένες από πολύ ενδιαφέρουσες υποσημειώσεις και χρησιμοποιούνταν για ηθικοπαιδαγωγικούς σκοπούς.