ROMAN LITERARY ATTITUDES TO TECHNICAL TERMS*
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Ancient theoreticians have virtually nothing to say on literary attitudes to technical terms. Yet it is commonly pointed out by modern scholars that Latin writers with stylistic pretensions deliberately avoid technical or official terminology. This paper seeks to explore the reasons for the apparently cautious treatment of technical terms in Latin authors of the late Republic and early Principate. Were such terms intrinsically suspect, considered unworthy of the higher genres of literature, simply because of their technical nature? Or were they handled with circumspection for other literary reasons?

The historians certainly go out of their way to avoid standard Roman terminology. Sallust’s ‘studious variation’ of such terms is noted by Syme. Livy has several alternatives for ‘comitia consularia’, and Tacitus even paraphrases ‘leges annales’ (Ann. 2.36.3). Poets, too, vary and paraphrase official Roman terms.

However, this evasion cannot be put down to dislike of technical terms per se. Desire for variety obviously accounts for much. Without risk of obscurity, writers could achieve ‘varietas’ by paraphrasing or varying well-known official terminology. For historians, an element of ‘aemulatio’ was also involved. In varying standard Roman terminology Tacitus, for example, was following the stylistic model of Sallust. What is more, periphrasis could be employed solely for a decorative stylistic effect, particularly in poets (Quint. 8.6.60), — quite apart from the obvious metrical advantages variation might provide. Roman official terms, awkward and hackneyed, furnished an opportunity for poet and formal prose writer alike to achieve ‘ornatus’ in avoiding them. In short, there was nothing intrinsically un-literary about Roman technical terms. The very terms which writers vary and paraphrase so ingeniously in fact appear starkly in these same authors.

Nor is it only Roman technical terminology which is circumvented in this way. Periphrasis is also employed to render foreign technical terms.

The Persian practice of ‘proskynesis’ greatly interested Latin authors. Both poets and prose writers mention it, and they must certainly have
known the Greek term. (It appears in Nepos Con. 3.3). Yet all, except for Nepos, avoid a technical term and prefer to describe the practice, or allude to it in non-specific language. Vague circumlocutory phrases like ‘Persica salutatio’ (Just. Epit. 15.3.3; Val. Max. 7.2 ext. 1, of respect paid to Alexander the Great), and expressions incorporating the verbs ‘adorare’, ‘adulari’, ‘venerari’ or ‘procumbere’, circumvent technical terminology. Single descriptive words like ‘venerari’ (Curt. 8.5.22), ‘observare’ (Verg. G. 4.212), ‘adorari’ (Just. Epit. 12.7.1). ‘adoratio’ (Curt. 8.5.14), ‘obsequium’ (Curt. 8.5.13) or ‘adulari’ (Sen. Ira 3.7.1) are sufficient to evoke the idea of ‘proskynesis’. Fuller descriptions also occur.

‘Proskynesis’ was a technical word, but there is nothing to suggest that this was a consideration in avoiding it. It was of course a Greek word, and suspect for this reason (see below), but this does not adequately explain why an institution referred to so often should be so consistently rendered by periphrasis and description. So great is the variety of expressions in different authors, and even in the same author, that one may conclude that ‘proskynesis’ was seen almost as an open invitation for a writer to test his ingenuity in providing original variations. In so doing he also secured ‘ornatus’.

Another instance is the Jewish Sabbath. For classical Latin authors, Jews were part of the contemporary Roman scene. Their idiosyncrasies, including observation of the Sabbath, were well-known. Indeed, so familiar was this Jewish practice that periphrasis of the technical term could again be employed without obscurity. Tacitus predictably chooses this option. He has ‘septimus dies’ (Hist. 5.4.3) for the Sabbath. In Ovid we find ‘septima sacra’ (Ars Am. 1.76) and ‘septima feste’ (Ars Am. 1.416), and in Juvenal ‘septima lux’ (14.105). Persius mentions ‘Herodis dies’, probably to be interpreted as the Sabbath (5.180). ‘Dies Saturni’ also occurs.

In spite of the contempt for Jews expressed by Latin authors, and in spite of the fact that ‘sabbata’ was a Hebrew word, the term is not avoided for these reasons. It was not a ‘sordidum verbum’. It occurs widely in classical writers of prose and verse. ‘Sabbata’ was clearly not paraphrased because it was technical. It was in fact the ‘proprium verbum’ for a Latin writer to use. As with Roman official terminology, periphrasis of a foreign technical term is not occasioned by suspicion of technical terms per se, but by stylistic considerations such as ‘ornatus’ and ‘varietas’.

As with standard Roman terminology, periphrasis of foreign technical terms occurs only where the institution concerned was well-known. ‘Proskynesis’ was synonymous with oriental despotism and the Sabbath with Jews. Without fear of obscurity, such terms were circumvented, not because they were technical or even foreign, but because periphrasis offered positive literary advantages.

Clearly technical terms had their place, and were in fact essential in
technical treatises. Beginning with Ennius’ work on gastronomy, a burgeoning mass of pioneering technical literature was produced at Rome. Each author was required to formulate his own new technical vocabulary, for example Nigidius Figulus on natural science and astrology, Lenaeus, Pompey’s freedman, who translated Mithridates’ writings on pharmacology (Plin. *HN* 25.7), and Aemilius Macer on snakes and herbal remedies. In fact, any writer concerned to express his meaning accurately required exact terminology, the ‘proprium verbum’, as Quintilian says (8.4.15).

For such authors technical terminology was unavoidable, but the technical terms they use are treated with the utmost caution. Latin ones are frequently hedged about with apologetic phrases (e.g. Lucr. 3.99: ‘verum habitum quendam vitalem corporis esse’; 265: ‘sed quasi multae vis unius corporis exstant’; Cic. *Acad.* 1.24: ‘Id corpus et quasi qualitatem quandam nominabant’; 2.17: ‘perspicuitatem aut evidentiam nos, si placet, nominamus . . . ’; *Tim.* 7.23: ‘bina media [vix enim audem dicere medietates . . . ’).25

The explanation for this is to be sought, not in the technical nature of the words, but in a passage of Quintilian (8.3.37):

> ‘Sed, si quid periculosius finxisse videbimur, quibusdam remediis præmuniendum est: “Ut ita dicam, Si licet dicere, Quodam modo, Permittite mihi sic uti.”’

Words like ‘qualitas’, ‘perspicuitas’ or ‘medietates’, which Cicero treats with such caution in the examples cited above, were ‘nova verba’, ‘ficta verba’ — neologisms, coined because the source material was Greek, and Latin equivalents did not exist.

Neologisms, used with discretion,27 conferred distinction upon style (Cic. *De Or.* 3.152; *Part. Or.* 72), but their use was not without danger. If acceptable, they lent ornament, if not, they were ridiculed (Quint. 1.5.71).28 Like archaisms, neologisms were ‘verba insita’ or ‘insolentia’ or ‘inaudita’, and feeling against them, in prose particularly,29 was strong in purist circles (Gell. *NA* 11.7.1: ‘Verbis uti aut nimis obsoletis exculcatisque aut insolentibus novitatisque durae et inlepidae par esse delictum videtur. Sed molestius equidem culpatisque esse arbitror verba nova, incognita, inaudita dicere quam involgata et sordentia’).30

Yet for writers introducing new, particularly technical, subject matter hitherto untreated in Latin, the neologism was clearly of practical importance. Where words simply did not exist, it was an obvious recourse to coin them.31

Complaints about the lexical poverty of Latin began with Lucretius, who laments the ‘patrii sermonis egestas’32 when faced with the practical problems of rendering Epicurean terms in Latin for the first time. Cicero faced the same difficulty of non-existent Latin terms when discussing philosophy and rhetoric.33 He complains of the ‘inopia’ of Latin (*Fin.* 3.51 cf. 15; *Orat.*
Marouzeau sees the reason for these complaints as arising out of the fact that literary language at this stage had not developed to its full powers of expression. In particular, it was lacking in abstract nouns. This is true, but the complaints continue well beyond the time of Cicero. In looking for resources to express the terms of Plato, Seneca laments, 'quanta verborum nobis paupertas, immo egestas sit numquam magis quam hodierno die intellexi. Mille res inciderunt cum forte de Platone loqueremur, quae nomina desiderarent nec haberent, quaedam vero cum habuissem fastidio nostro perdidissent' (Ep. 58.1). As he says, 'quae philosophia fuit facta philologica est' (Ep. 108.23). It is noteworthy that charges of lexical poverty occur when the writer is declaring his need for neologisms. They can be seen in fact as excuses or justification for new coinages.

A purist writer treating new material therefore faced a dilemma over neologisms — he needed to find words to render terms for which no Latin existed, yet general feeling against over-bold coinages was strong. Indeed, Quintilian pleads for a less rigid attitude, and actually blames the lexical poverty of the language on excessive fastidiousness ('quae [nova verba] cur tantopere aspernemur nihil video nisi quod iniqui iudices adversus nos sumus ideoque paupertate sermonis laboramus' [8.3.33 cf. 35]). Cicero pleads that, even in Greek, philosophy uses a special vocabulary of 'insitata verba: quanto id nobis magis est concedendum qui ea nunc primum audemus attingere' (Fin. 3.2.4–5).

The best a writer could do was hope that usage might soften the term. It might even, if successful, pass into the language as an accepted word, for, as Quintilian says, 'nam et quae vetera nunc sunt, fuerunt olim nova' (8.3.34). Generally, however, such efforts were likely to meet with failure (Quint. 8.3.31: 'Nostri autem in iungendo aut derivando paulum aliquid ausi vix in hoc satis recipiuntur'):

The writer handling Greek source material who might feel uncomfortable with neologisms was of course free to use Greek technical terms. Here again there were problems. Attitudes to Greek were ambivalent. Roman writers were obliged to acknowledge Greek as a literary language in many ways superior to their own. They appreciated the greater euphony and charm of Greek (Quint. 10.1.100), its greater flexibility ('facultas') in the formation of compounds and new words, and its richness of vocabulary compared to the deficiencies of Latin. Latin, says Gellius, simply cannot compete in expressiveness (NA 10.22.3; 12.1.24).

Though the superiority of Greek may be conceded at one level, it provokes a retaliatory, chauvinistic response. Latin writers emphasize positive stylistic features of Latin which are different from those of Greek, and compensate for the inadequacies of Latin. Cicero even goes so far as to claim the superiority of Latin, particularly in the expression of subtle philosophical ideas. There was also a tendency to criticize Roman authors.
who wrote in Greek, which went back to Cato’s criticism of Aulus Postumius’ history in Greek.\footnote{44} It was considered one’s patriotic duty to write in Latin.\footnote{45}

There was opposition too to the use of Greek in the official sphere. This chauvinistic feeling is evidenced by the use of interpreters on embassies to Greece where the negotiators themselves probably knew sufficient Greek (\textit{Cic. Balb.} 28; \textit{Plut. Cat. Mai.} 12.4f.), and by Valerius Maximus’ statement that the ‘prisci magistratus’, when negotiating with Greeks even in Greece and Asia, took pains ‘ne Graecis umquam nisi Latine responsa darent’ to maintain their position of superiority. Interpreters, he says, were always used to curb the volubility of the Greeks (2.2.2). This passage should be taken with a pinch of salt. The slur on Greek garrulosity, a standard jibe,\footnote{46} smacks of prejudice and propaganda. Valerius Maximus was probably directing his remarks to Tiberius, to whom his work is dedicated, and who was manifestly opposed to the use of Greek in the Roman Senate.\footnote{47}

This same chauvinistic feeling enabled Metellus to accuse Cicero of an ‘indignum facinus’ in speaking Greek in the Greek senate at Syracuse (\textit{Cic. Ver.} 2.4.147). It also prompted Tiberius to apologize in the senate for his use of ‘monopolium — quod sibi verbo peregrino uenendum esset’, and to order the alteration of the Greek word ξύγλημα in a senatorial decree — ‘commutandum censuit vocem et pro peregrina nostratem requirendam aut, si non reperiretur, vel pluribus et per ambitum verborum rem enuntiandam’ (\textit{Suet. Tib.} 71).

Yet for practical purposes of administration Greek was widely used in the eastern provinces. There was a tension between official expediency and notions of Roman ‘dignitas’.

Also, while Greek was the language of culture, and Philhellenism had strong adherents,\footnote{48} it was, during the late Republic and early Empire, the language of large numbers of slaves and freedmen at Rome,\footnote{49} and feeling against the language of the vulgar was strong.\footnote{50}

Attitudes to Greek technical terms reveal the same ambivalence. For the technical Latin writer who lacked suitable terms in his own language, a pragmatic approach to Greek terms was adopted. Literary protestations about their permissibility abound.\footnote{51}

Yet it was certainly considered preferable to use Latin words,\footnote{52} and there was strong feeling against the mixing of Greek and Latin in more formal prose writing.\footnote{53} Albucius the orator was criticized for his use of Graecisms, as Cicero notes with approval.\footnote{54} He was made a laughing stock for, as Cicero says, ‘ut enim sermonem eo debemus uti qui innatus est nobis, ne, ut quidam, Graeca verba inculcantes iure optimo rideamur’ (\textit{Off.} 1.111). Certainly Cicero’s own speeches are conspicuously devoid of Greek, and even Greek loan-words are used sparingly.\footnote{55} Even quotations from Greek authors should be translated in formal works rather than cited in the orig-
inal, for, says Cicero before translating a verse of Epicharmus, 'scis enim me Graece loqui in Latino sermone non plus societ quam in Graeco Latine' (Tusc. 1.15). According to Cicero, a writer with stylistic pretensions approached Greek technical terms cautiously. Such words are generally couched in a kind of distancing formula, incorporating the verbs 'vocare', 'appellare' or 'dicere' (e.g. Cic. Brut. 275: 'verborum et sententiarum illa lumina quae vocant σύκιματα'). The same treatment is meted out, not only by technical writers, but by any formal writer, as far back as Ennius (e.g. Ann. 140 [Skutsch]), who wishes to incorporate a foreign technical term (Greek or non-Greek) (e.g. Plin. HN 5.99: 'dividitur in praefecturas oppidorum quas νόμους vocant'; Tac. Ann. 3.43.3: 'gladiaturae destinati quibus more gentico continuum ferri tegimen: crupellarios vocant'). Cicero is careful to treat even a well-known Greek word like 'aer' with circumspection (Nat. D. 2.91: 'nomen est aer [Graecum illud quidem sed perceptum iam tamen usu a nostri; tritum est enim pro Latino]'. Acad. 1.26: 'itaque aer [hoc quoque enim utimur (iam) pro Latino]': cf. Lucr. 4.132). The reason for such caution is not the intrinsic technicality of the terms, but the fact that they are not Latin.

There remains a class of technical terms which do, on the face of it, appear to be treated with caution simply because they are technical. Though they are not foreign words, we find them couched in 'dicunt'/'appellant'/'vocant'-type formulas:

- e.g. Nep. Thr. 3.2: 'legem tulit ne quis ante actarum rerum accusaretur, neve multaretur eamque illi oblivionis appellarent' (the law άρνησθαι);
- Liv. 42.66.5: 'ex ala quam sacram vocant' (Macedonian royal guard) (ιπποτήρια);
- Curt. 3.3.13: 'proximi ibant quos Persae Immortales vocant' (= Greek θάνατος, Persian 'anušiya?');
- Tac. Germ. 6.5: 'centeni ex singulis pagis sunt idque ipsum inter suos vocantur et quod primo numerus fuit iam nomen et honor est' (on the German 'Hundertschaft', the German name for which was 'hunthar')

Yet in these cases, the writer is not reacting defensively to the fact that he is using technical vocabulary; he is calling attention to the fact. He is attempting to translate literally into Latin a foreign technical term in his source, and wishes to underline that he is using a regular Latin word in an unusual and technical sense, to render some foreign technical term of similar meaning. His primary concern is with clarity, and with the comprehension of the reader. As Quintilian points out, technical words of any kind ('verba ... artium propria') (8.2.13) ran the risk of being misunderstood by the layman.
What then are we to conclude about Roman literary attitudes to technical terms? Ancient theoreticians say nothing to suggest that technical words or phrases were intrinsically unacceptable. Avoidance is due to a wide variety of literary considerations, from a desire for 'varietas' or 'ornatus' to metrical convenience in poets. The cautious treatment of technical terms which do occur is not primarily due to the fact that they are technical. They may be handled circumspectly because they are neologisms, foreign words or potentially unclear. While it may be true that 'In grosse Verlegenheit kamen daher technische Schriftsteller, die nach den Kunstregeln schreiben wollten', such writers were struggling with literary precepts which did not include technicality per se.

NOTES

* My thanks to Tim Leary, and to an anonymous referee, who commented helpfully on an earlier draft.


3. Following the Cambridge History of Classical Literature 2 (ed. E.J. Kenney and W.V. Clausen, Cambridge 1982), I regard the early Principate as ending with Gellius and Fronto. I am not here concerned with later authors or Christian technical terms.


5. 'consulum comitia' (Liv. 3.20.8: 4.7.8, 16.6, 54.8); 'comitia consulum' (6.42.9; 34.54.1); 'comitia consulis creandis' (28.38.6; 35.24.3).

6. On this phenomenon in Tacitus, with further examples, see E. Norden, Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance 1, Leipzig 1898, 331; Syme (above, n.2) 343f.; Kroll (above, n.2) 113.

7. Hor. Carm. 1.7.27: 'Teucro duce et auspice Teucro', for the technical 'ductu auspiciisque Teucri'; (Nisbet-Hubbard ad loc. give further examples in Horace); Ov. Tr. 5.1.32: 'Martis campus' (cf. Tac. Ann. 1.8.6); Luc. 1.602: 'septemvirque epulis festus'.

8. For this explanation in relation to Tacitus see Goodyear (above, n.2) 342,344. Where repeated subject matter required continued use of a particular term, alternatives would naturally be sought. This accounts for variation of the standard expression for consular elections in an annalistic work like Livy's (n.5 above).

9. There was usually no doubt about what was meant. Syme however quotes Tac. Ann. 11.23.1: 'ius adipiscendorum in urbe bonorum' (for 'latus clavus') as a case where lack of precision obscures the meaning (above, n.2, 344).
10. See Kroll (above, n.2) 113; A.D. Leeman, *Orationis Ratio: The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators Historians and Philosophers* 1, Amsterdam 1963, 348–52.


12. e.g. Sall. *Jug.* 39.2: ‘nomine Latino’, cf. 84.2; Liv. 4.13.5; 7.17.10, 21.1, 26.12; 9.44.2; 10.11.10, 13.2, 47.5; 24.43.5; 42.28.4; 43.11.6: ‘comitia consularia’, cf. ‘consulum comitia’ (4 times); ‘comitia consulum’ (twice); ‘comitia consulibus creandis’ (twice) (above, n.5).


15. Curt. 3.2.17: ‘suo more veneratae sunt’ (cf. the parallel passages in Greek authors: Diod. Sic. 17.37.5: προσκύνησαν; Arr. 2.12.6: προσκυνήσας).

16. Curt. 5.10.13; 8.5.21: ‘procumbere suo more’.

17. The last four examples relate to respect to Alexander the Great.


24. Note that in the case of Juvenal, ‘sabbata’ appears at 14.96 followed eight lines later by ‘septima lux’ (14.105). In the same poem Ovid has two different approximations of the term (*Ars Am. 1.76, 416*).


26. On ‘nova verba’ see Lausberg (above, n.11) 281f.


28. This was the case with archaisms too. See Gell. *NA* 11.7.4.


Kroll (above, n.2) 101-3. Celsius forbade neologisms for orators (Quint. 8.6.36). Sallust was attacked for his ‘verborumque fingendi et novandi studium’ (Gell. NA 4.15.1 cf. 1.15.18, quoting Valerius Probus). Sisenna too was fond of the ‘novum verbum’ (Gell. NA 11.15 cap. cf. Cic. Brut. 259). Cicero contemptuously refers to neologisms in two of his opponents (Pianc. 12.30; Phil. 13.43). His own speeches are almost entirely devoid of neologisms (Laurand [above, n.25] 68-70). On forces militating against their use see Norden (above, n.6) 184-9; Kroll (above, n.2) 102.

31. Cic. Acad. 1.24.25; 2.17; Nat. D. 1.44; Fin. 3.4-5.
33. On Cicero’s difficulties in creating a satisfactory philosophical vocabulary in Latin see Leeman (above, n.10) 1, 206-9.
35. Cic. Nat. D. 1.95; Quint. 1.5.71; 8.3.32.
36. Hor. Sat. 1.10.23f.; Quint. 12.10.27–33. Quintilian expressly grants poets greater licence in the use of Greek because of its euphony (12.10.33). Kroll (above, n.2), 9 believes that Roman authors writing in Greek were directly influenced to do so by the advantage of Greek in this respect.
37. Sen. Constant. 4 pr. 7; 10.4.23.
38. Liv. 27.11.5; Quint. 15.70.
39. Quint. 8.3.30, 6.31f.
40. Cic. Acad. 1.14; Tusc. 2.25; Quint. 12.10.34f.; Plin. Ep. 4.18.1; Gell. NA 2.26.5,7; 11.16.1.
42. Fin. 1.10; 3.5; Nat. D. 1.8.
43. Tusc. 2.35; 3.7; 10.11.22f.; 4.10; Fin. 3.38; Sen. 45; Fam. 9.24.3. See Petrochilos (above, n.41) 27f.; Wardman (above, n.41) 143f.
44. Polybios cites Cato’s remarks with approval (39.1.4–9). The same anecdote appears in Nep. fr. 55 (Male.); Plut. Cat. Mai. 12.6; Gell. NA 11.8.1 and Macrobi. Sat. 1 pr. 11. See also Pers. 1.69f.; Plin. Ep. 4.3.5.
46. Petrochilos (above, n.41) 35–7.
48. On Rome and Hellenism see Kaimio (above, n.47), 41–58. On the extent to which Philhellenism at Rome affected the choice of Greek in literature see Kaimio op. cit. 266–8.
49. Kaimio (above, n.47) 183f.
50. Cic. Acad. 1.25; Liv. 27.11.5; Quint. 8.3.17,18; Gell. NA 1.22.2; 2.20.4.
51. Cic. Fin. 3.15; Vitr. De Arch. 5.4.1; Plin. HN 16.17; 30.44; Quint. 1.5.58; 3.6.97.
52. At Cic. Acad. 1.25, for example, Atticus grants permission to Varro to use Greek words when he cannot find Latin ones, but Varro replies, ‘enitar ut Latine loquar’.
53. Quintilian expressly grants poets greater licence in the use of Greek, because of its euphony (12.10.33). Cicero’s letters to Atticus provide ample evidence that Greek was perfectly acceptable in private correspondence.
54. Lucil. 84–93 (Warmington); Cic. De Or. 3.171; Orat. 149; Fin. 1.8f. Cicero calls him ‘doctus etiam Graecis vel potius plane Graecus’ (Brut. 131).
55. Factors besides style may have been in play. Cicero may well have wished to avoid antagonizing Roman jurors by ostentatious displays of Greek learning.
56. For examples of Cicero putting this principle into practice see appendix to the Loeb edition of *Tusculan Disputations*. Also the list of verse translations in Soubiran’s Badé edition, *Aratea fragments poétiques* (p. 56). Some genres seem to have admitted freer verbatim quotations from Greek. Menippaean Satire (as exemplified in Varro), and excerpted works like Gellius’, appear to admit more licence in the use of extended passages of Greek. History preserved the rule with great strictness. In biography, if Suetonius is any yardstick, a writer was freer to quote verbatim, though Suetonius’ practice may reflect his personal inclination and use of sources. (See G.B. Townend, ‘The Sources of the Greek in Suetonius’, *Hermes* 88 [1960] 98–120).

57. Foreign (non-Greek) words are treated in the same way. See B. Bell, ‘Roman Literary Attitudes to Foreign Terms and the Carthaginian “Sufetes”’, *AClass.* 32 (1989) 30f.

58. On these ‘Immortals’ see Hdt. 7.8.3; Atkinson’s commentary on Curt. 3.3.13.

59. See Anderson ad loc. On the ‘Hundertschaft’, here described by Tacitus as select groups of German infantrymen chosen by tribal subdivisions (‘pagi’), see H. Delbruck, *Kriegkunst, Geschichte der Kriegskunst im Rahmen der politischen Geschichte* 2, 22ff.

60. The practice of Greek writers who wish to use a Greek word in a particular technical sense is similar. They too draw attention to the term by couching it in a distancing formula (e.g. Pol. 5.24.1: τοῦ ἐκ τοῦ λεγομένου παρὰ τῶν Μακεδόνων ἄγχατος; 65.2: τοῦ καλομενοῦ παρὰ τῶν βασιλεύσιν ἄγχατος [cf. Liv. 42.51.4]; 31.3.7; App. Syr. 22.168). On the use of existing Latin words in a changed or specialized meaning to render Greek technical terms see Cic. *Acad.* 1.25; Leeman (above, n.10) 1, 208.


62. Kroll (above, n.2) 112.
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