

Florus Neograecus: Daniel Philippides' translation of the *Epitome rerum Romanarum*

Vasileios Pappas

(vasilispappas81@yahoo.com)

UNIVERSITY OF THESSALY

Resumen

En este artículo, presentamos los contenidos de la obra del erudito Daniel Filipides (1750-1755 / 1832), sus técnicas de traducción, así como extensos comentarios de contenido diverso (filológico, histórico, moral, pedagógico, científico, etc.).

Abstract

In this paper, we present the contents of scholar Daniel Philippides' work (1750-1755 / 1832), his translation techniques, as well as the extensive comments of variable content (philological, historical, moralistic, pedagogical, scientific, etc.).

Palabras clave

Floro
Epitome rerum Romanarum
Daniel Filipides
Traducción
Latinidad posbizantina
Historiografía romana

Keywords

Florus
Epitome rerum Romanarum
Daniel Philippides
Translation
Post-byzantine Latinitas
Roman historiography

AnMal Electrónica 41 (2016)
ISSN 1697-4239

INTRODUCTION

Florus

The full name of Florus is Lucius Annius (or Julius) Florus (von Albrecht 2001, vol. 2: 1620-1621). He lived in the 2nd century AD and wrote the historical work with the full title *Epitome de T. Livio bellorum omnium annorum DCC libri duo* probably during the end of Hadrian's reign. Florus describes the Roman wars from the founding of Rome until Augustus' era¹. Florus' sources are Livy, Sallust, Seneca (doubtful

¹ It is known that the quotations in Florus' text are double, as older editors (C. Salmasius, Heidelberg 1609, J. Freinsheim, Strasburg 1632, J. G. Graevius, Utrecht 1680 and C. A. Duker,

whether it is the Older or the Younger), from whom it seems that he inspired the division of the history in periods that correspond to the stages of human age (von Albrecht 2001, vol. 2: 1622), and Julius Caesar. His style, which resembles to poetry, reminds us of Virgil and Lucan. Regarding the genre of Florus' work, it is true that it combines the historiography with panegyric elements, as it seems like a panegyric for the Roman people and their achievements. That is why sometimes the chronology is not correct and the historical events are distorted². Finally, Florus' work is characterized by an intense rhetorical style, a fact that is indicated by his translator, Daniel Philippides³.

Critics have noted the big influence of Florus to Ammianus Marcellinus, Festus, Orosius, Malalas etc. Florus was appreciated by Petrarch, Scaliger, Montesquieu, Leopardi etc. The *Epitome rerum Romanarum* was a favorite schoolbook from the Middle Ages until the 18th century, a fact that absolutely justifies its translations (F. N. Couffeteau († 1623) translates it in French, while it might be translated in Greek in the Byzantine period)⁴.

Leiden 1722, and Philippides in his translation) divide the work in four books, while the modern editors divide it in two (e.g. Forster, 1984). The quotations of this paper are double too. The division in four books precedes and then the division in two books (into parenthesis) follows.

² Florus' chronological errors are highlighted by Philippides in his footnotes. For example, see Philippides' translation, p. 41, note 1: «Τοῦτο τὸ κεφάλαιον δὲν ἔχει τὸν τόπον του ἐδῶ», p. 271, note 2: «Τὸ ἀμβρακικὸς κόλπος λάθος ἐδῶ· δὲν ἔχει τὸν τόπον του» etc.

³ For example, see Philippides' translation, p. 48, note 2: «Ρητορεύει καὶ ἐδῶ ὁ Φλόρος καὶ μεταχειρίζεται ὑπερβολαῖς κατακόρων», p. 49, note 3: «Ρητορικώτερον διηγείται ὁ Φλόρος ταῖς μάχαις τοῦ Πύρρου μὲ τοὺς ῥωμαίους» etc.

⁴ For Florus' life, work and influence, see Münscher, s.v. «Florus», *RE* 12 (1909), 2761-2771; von Albrecht 2001, vol. 2: 1620-1631. The editions of Florus' work - before the translation of Philippides - were: the *editio princeps* without date or place (probably in Paris around 1470), the edition by Aldus Manutius in 1521 in Venice, by E. Vinetus in Poitiers in 1554, by C. Salmasius in Heidelberg in 1609, by J. Freinsheim in Strasburg in 1632, by J. G. Graevius in Utrecht in 1680, and by C. A. Duker in Leiden in 1722. In this paper I follow the edition of Forster (1984).

Daniel Philippides

The scholar Demetrius-Daniel Philippides (born between 1750/55, death in 1832) from Milies of Pelion in Greece (Valaorites 1960: 177-180; Oikonomides 1978-9: 200-290; Pappas 2010: 7-34; Pappas 2014b: 121-154), representative of the Modern Greek Enlightenment and cousin of Antimos Gazes and Gregorius Konstantas (with who he wrote his most famous work, the *Neoteric Geography* in 1791), demoticist and member of Katartzes' intellectual circle (Dimaras 1940: 197-234), translates the *Epitome rerum Romanarum* of Florus from Latin in Modern Greek language. Philippides publishes his translation in Leipzig in 1818. Last year (1817), he has edited his translation of Justin's work, entitled *Epitome Historiarum Philippicarum*; that is the epitome of *Philippics*, Pompeius Trogus' lost work. The fact that Philippides published these two translations one after another, and the existence of several references to the first work into the second⁵, proves that the translator considered these historical works as a unit, i.e. as a book in two volumes. The first includes the history of various ancient civilizations (Assyrian, Median, Scythian, Persian and mainly Greek), while in the second volume the Roman history is described. In these two translations Philippides concentrates the history of all antiquity. Their unity is proved by their similar structure (prologue, footnotes, and epilogue) and by the common translative techniques applied by Philippides⁶.

⁵ For example, see Florus' translation, p. 33, note 1: «ὀμίλησα ἀρκετὰ εἰς τὰ Φιλιππικὰ τοῦ Τρόγου», p. 97, note 5: «Διάβασε ἐκεῖνα ὅπου σημειῶνω εἰς τὰ Φιλιππικά δι' αὐτό», p. 102, note 4: «'Ἰδὲ εἰς τὰ Φιλιππικά τί μέγαλον λόγον εἶπε ὁ μέγας Σκιπίων» etc.

⁶ Philippides informs his friend, Barbié du Bocage (see Koumarianou 1966: 177, epistle 98), for Florus' translation and the reasons that made him translate this work in Modern Greek language: «J' ai traduit en éolodorique (le grec dit moderne) du latin, τὸν ῥήτορα μᾶλλον ἢ ἱστορικὸν Florus. Si je le fais imprimer, je vous eenverrai un ou deux exemplaires. Ce n' est pas que j' ai choisi Florus comme le meilleur abrégiste de l' histoire romaine; on pourrait en faire une meilleure et plus ἀρμόδιον à notre temps, mais par respect pour l' antiquité».

TRADITION OF LATIN HISTORICAL WORKS TRANSLATED IN MODERN GREEK

Even before the Fall of Constantinople (1453), many Latin works have been translated in Greek and Modern Greek language (Nikitas 2001: 1035-1051). 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 (Tromaras 1999: 286-306; Nikitas 2002-2003: 34-46). Florus' translation by Daniel Philippides belongs to a more specific literary tradition - that of post-Byzantine translations of Latin historical works (Pappas 2015: 257-272). These translations have three common features: a) they are all written in the Modern Greek language, b) they are translations of epitomes or anthologies, and c) they probably were used as schoolbooks, aiming mainly to the historical and moral education of Greek young students (Pappas 2010: 43). The first post-Byzantine scholar who translated a Latin historical work was Ioannis Makolas, an Athenian merchant. He published in 1686 in Venice his translation of Justin's *Epitome of Trogus*, i.e. the same work that Philippides translated in 1817. In Makolas' translation some of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* are incorporated and a *Christian Teaching* (Nikitas 2012: 103-142). It seems that Philippides ignored or scorned Justin's translation by Makolas, a fact that was noted by the reviewer of Philippides' translation in *Logios Hermes*⁷. In 1801 Spyridon Vlantes published his translation of Cornelius Nepos' *De viris illustribus*⁸. In 1807 Neophytos Doukas published Paeanius' Greek translation of Eutropius' *Breviarium ab urbe condita*, while he added in the right pages of the book his own translation of Paeanius' text in Modern Greek language. Doukas' book consists of two volumes; the first concludes Paeanius' and Doukas' translations, and the second is entitled *Λεξικὸν τῶν ἐνδόξων ἀνδρῶν* and it is actually an extent list of historical

⁷ *Logios Hermes*, vol. 8, issue 2, 15 January of 1818, p. 30: «ἐλαθε δὲ, ὡς φαίνεται, ἡ ἐλησμόνησεν ὁ Κύριος Δ. νὰ προσθέσῃ, ὅτι τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου ὑπάρχει καὶ ἄλλη μετάφρασις πάλιν εἰς τὴν νῦν Ἑλληνικὴν παρὰ Ἰωάννου Μάκολα Ἀθηναίου καὶ ἐπιγράφεται: Ἰουστίνου Ἱστορία μεταφρασθεῖσα ἐκ τῆς λατινίδος φωνῆς εἰς ἀπλὴν φράσιν παρὰ Ἰωάννου Μάκολα τοῦ Ἀθηναίου.

⁸ For Vlantes' translation, see Nikitas 2004: 241-274. It seems that another Greek scholar of the 18th century, Georgios Zaviras, translated Nepos also, but his translation remained unpublished. See Sathas 1868: 540.

personalities of the first volume⁹. Finally, Daniel Philippides publishes in 1817 his translation of Justin's *Epitome of Philippics* and in 1818 his translation of Florus' *Epitome of the Roman History* (Pappas 2010: 44-243).

PHILIPPIDES' TRANSLATION OF FLORUS

Information for the book

Philippides' translation is entitled: *Φλόρου έπιτομή τών Ρωμαϊκών. Νύν πρώτον έκ τοῦ ῥωμαϊκοῦ εἰς τήν αίολοδωρικὴν έλληνικὴν διάλεκτον μεταφρασθεῖσα και έκδοθεῖσα παρὰ τοῦ άποπειρογράφου τῆς Ρουμουνίας και προσφωνηθεῖσα. Έν Λειψία παρὰ τῷ Βράϊτκόπφ και Έρτελ 1818*¹⁰. The book counts 32 pages that contain the introduction (5 pages without enumeration and 27 numbered by Arabic numbers) + 290, which contain the text of the translation (with renewed Arabic enumeration) + 21 that contain the epilogue of the book (with renewed Arabic enumeration).

Thus, the title informs us fully about the book's identity: the name of the Roman author, the title and the language of the prototype, the language of the translation, and the place-year-publishing house¹¹ of it. It informs us for the book's originality too, as it highlights the fact that it is the first time that Florus' work is translated in Modern Greek. We observe, however, that Philippides does not sign his

⁹ We have two Greek translations of Eutropius' work; the first belongs to Paeanius (around 380 AD) and the second to Capiton (around 600 AD). For these translations and that of Doukas, see Trivoles 1941: 128-166. For an analytical examination of Doukas' translation, see Pappas 2014a: 129-155.

¹⁰ In p. 1 without enumeration. The text of Florus' translation by Philippides comes from the anemi [website of the University of Crete](#). In this paper the quotations of Florus' translation will be in this form: regarding the pages of the introduction, I note the abbreviation «Intr.» and the number of the page in which each time I quote. Similarly, regarding the pages of the translation, I note «Trans.» and the number of the page(s), and regarding the epilogue, I note «Epil.» and the number of the quoted page(s). For example, Intr. p. 1, Trans. p. 36, etc. Also, regarding the not numbered pages, I note them into parenthesis, for example, p. (1), (2), etc.

¹¹ The Publishing House of Bernhard Christoph Breitkopf and Gottfried Christoph Härtel in Leipzig. See *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 2, s.v. «Breitkopf und Härtel».

work by his name but with his pseudo name (Ἐπιχειρογράφος τῆς Ρουμανίας), a practice which follows in the translation of Trogus too¹².

The language of all parts¹³ of Philippides' book is the aeolodorique, i.e. the Modern Greek of his era. This term was established by Athanasios Christopoulos in 1805¹⁴. According to his theory, the Modern Greek language was a mixture of elements of ancient Aeolian and Dorian idioms¹⁵. The scholar from Milies composed all of his translations in this language¹⁶. This fact proves that the readership of Philippides' translations was not an erudite one, but people who could not understand the ancient Greek language, probably the Greek young students¹⁷.

¹² By this way Philippides quotes to his three prototype works, namely the *History of Romania* (Leipzig 1816), the *Geography of Romania* (Leipzig 1816) and the *Attempt of analysis of thinking* (Leipzig 1817). Thus, the phrase «Ἐπιχειρογράφος τῆς Ρουμανίας» means the author of the works *Ἀπόπειρα* (= Attempt) and *Ρουμανία* (= Romania), as Philippides used to call together the two works related to the history and geography of Romania, a country where he lived and worked for many years.

¹³ The phrase «all parts» of the translation is important, because it was a usual practice of demoticist scholars to translate foreign works in the Modern Greek language, but to compose the prologues-introductions or the dedicatory letters to their benefactors of these books in Attic dialect. For example, cf. pp. V-VI of Philippides' translation of Lalande's *Abrégé d'astronomie* (Vienna 1803), where the translator composes a dedicatory letter to the ruler of Moldavia, Alexander Mourouzis in Attic dialect, and pp. ε'-ι' of Eutropius' translation by Doukas, where the translator addresses to his patron, Silvestro, in Attic dialect too.

¹⁴ In his work entitled *Γραμματικὴ τῆς Αἰολοδωρικῆς, ἥτοι τῆς ὀμιλουμένης τωρινῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων γλώσσης* (Vienna 1805).

¹⁵ Cf. *Γραμματικὴ τῆς Αἰολοδωρικῆς*, pp. 5-6: «...ἡ γλῶσσα μας εἶν' Αἰολοδωρικὴ· καὶ τῆ ἀληθείᾳ...ἀπὸ τὴν Ἀττικὴν καλλίτερη, ὡς συντομώτερη, τακτικώτερη, κ' ὀμαλώτερη ἀσυγκρίτως, καθὼς ἡ γραμματικὴ τῆς τὴν δείχνει σαφέστατα. Ἦμπορεῖ δὲ ὁμως νά μ' εἰπῆ τινὰς, ἄραγ' ἔχει καμμίαν ὀμοίότητα μὲ τὴν Δωρικὴν, κ' Αἰολικὴν; ἄπειρην».

¹⁶ While he composed his prototype works (*Ἱστορία τῆς Ρουμανίας, Γεωγραφικόν τῆς Ρουμανίας* and *Ἀπόπειρα ἀναλύσεως τοῦ νοουμένου*) in Attic dialect.

¹⁷ Cf. Doukas' words in the prologue of Eutropius' translation, p. ιδ': «Ταύτης δ' οὖν τῆς ὠφελείας εἰδὼς στερουμένους τοὺς Ἑλληνας, προθυμῆθην ἐκδοῦναι τὴν βίβλον, μεταφράσας αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν συνήθη διάλεκτον, ἵνα τῆ τε νεολαίᾳ ἐν τοῖς γυμνασίοις ἔτι χαρίσωμαι».

Perhaps for this reason he dedicates the book to the brothers Ioannis Balsa and Alexander Panayiotis Balsa, who were his students in Iasi of Romania¹⁸.

The «Introductory prologue of the translator»

The introduction of Philippides' translation is entitled *Εἰσαγωγικός πρόλογος τοῦ μεταφραστοῦ* («Introductory prologue of the translator») and enumerates 28 pages and 32 footnotes¹⁹. This part of the book is divided into six sections. In the first section, the translator deals with the foundation of Rome and sets out the reasons why a Greek should study Roman history, after, off course, the Greek history, with which he dealt in the last year (1817), since he translated Justin's *Epitome of Philippics*, a work that most of its part concerns the Greek history. The history of Rome is like the levels of a man's age (structure of Florus' history): by this one can see a nation get born, flourish and finally decline. According to Philippides, the main reason for studying Roman history is the humble origin of the Roman people, a fact that makes its evolution even more admirable²⁰. Our scholar notes that ancient authors (Greeks and Romans) disagreed on the year of foundation of Rome citing, for that reason, Dionysius from Halicarnassus and Diocles from Peparithos, who was - according to Philippides - the model for the Roman historian Fabius Pictor²¹. He also speaks for the affinity of the Greek language with Latin, a belief that he also expressed in Justin's translation²². He also cites Justin's testimony about the origin of the Romans quoting the Latin text²³ and translating it²⁴, i.e. he

¹⁸ In p. (3): «Τοῖς εὐγενεστάτοις ἐταίροις Ἰωάννη Γεωργίου Μπάλσα καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ Γεωργίου Παναγιώτῃ τοῖς φίλοις τῶν λόγων καὶ τῆς ἱστορίας». For further information about Balsa family, see Pappas 2010: 17-18.

¹⁹ Intr. pp. (5) - 32.

²⁰ Intr. pp. (5) - 6.

²¹ Cf. Plutarch, Lives 3.1.2-5: «πρῶτος εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐξέδωκε Διοκλῆς Παπαρήθιος, ᾧ καὶ Φάβιος ὁ Πίκτωρ ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις ἐπηκολούθηκε».

²² Cf. the *Epilogue* of Justin's translation, p. 6: «τὰ λατινικὰ πλησιάζουν μάλιστα εἰς τὴν αἰολικὴν».

²³ It is the passage 2.6.4 from Justin's *Epitome*.

²⁴ The translation of Justin's text which Philippides quotes to the translation of Florus has very few differences with the translation of Justin in 1817. Cf. the translation of Justin, pp.

refers to his own translation²⁵. Finally, based on an incident that took place a few days ago in his contemporary Italy, expresses once again his view that the first inhabitants of ancient Rome were mainly fugitives and robbers («ληστροσυνάθροισμα»)²⁶. At the same time, he notes the speed by which the news were made known worldwide, following the theory of the conservation of place names according to their national names²⁷.

In the second section²⁸, Philippides deals with the evolution of the Roman political system. He describes how the Roman people began to install a political system having as its leader the most capable man, i.e. Romulus. According to the translator, human vanity and the custom of attribution a divine origin in individual people (e.g. Aesculapius, Hercules, and Achilles) are responsible for the mythical legend that is attached to this leader (the god Mars as his father, the myth of the she-wolf, etc.)²⁹. Then, the translator refers to the first Roman political status, the kingdom. He writes about the creation of the senate, the patricians and the plebeians, and he cites the testimony of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. He analyses this system, commenting that the king could be elected by the patricians, but the validation of this election was done by the people. All the authorities were in the

43-45: «ἐπειδὴ αὐτοὶ ἀναίβηκαν εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν κολοφῶνα τῆς δόξης, ἀρχίζοντας ὄχι ἀπὸ ρυπαραῖς ἀρχαῖς, καθὼς ἄλλοι. Μόνοι καυχῶνται τόσον διὰ τὴν αὔξησίν τους, ὅσον καὶ διὰ τὴν ἀρχαιότητά τους, μήτε ἀπ' ἐδῶ καὶ ἀπ' ἐκεῖ μαζωμένα ἀποπλύματα λαῶν ἔδωσαν ἀρχὴν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ἀλλ' εἶναι αὐτόχθονες τοῦ ἐδάφους ὅπου κατοικοῦν, καὶ τὸ κατοίκημά τους εἶναι καὶ ἡ γένεσις».

²⁵ Intr. pp. 6-8.

²⁶ Intr. pp. 8-10.

²⁷ It should be noted that Philippides was very sensitive to this issue, as one of his main principles was the maintaining of the morphology and the pronunciation of the words of the foreign languages, and especially of the proper names. He follows this theory to all of his works (prototype and translations). For example, cf. Justin's translation, pp. 14-15, note 2 (for the town Varcēs): «Ἡ λέξις εἶναι παραφθαρμένη διὰ τὴν μανίαν ὅπου εἶχαν νὰ ἀλλάζουν τὰ κύρια ὀνόματα καὶ νὰ τὰ μεταγλωττίζουν, καὶ νὰ μὴ τὰ ἀφίνουν καθὼς λέγονται εἰς τὸν τόπον», *History of Romania*, p. 158 (for the German nation): *Θήσομεν ὄριον τῆς λυσοορμῆς τῶν πάλαι δαῦτζων τὸν Τισσὸν», Geography of Romania*, p. 38 (for Germany and France respectively): *μέχρι Δάυτζλανδ...καὶ Φράνσης ἀφίκοντο», etc.*

²⁸ Intr. pp. 10-13.

²⁹ Intr. pp. 10-11.

hands of the patricians. The king could decide for a war, but it (like in the case of peace) must be validated by the Roman people. Philippides calls this status “a mixed democracy” («δημοκρατία συγκερασμένη»). It was a remarkable political system and it was an admirable fact that a barbarian nation adopted it. He wonders about the fact that Plato (in his *Πολιτεία*) and Aristotle (in his collection of regimes, from which only the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* survived) do not mention anything about the Roman regime³⁰. Then, the abuses of the kings contributed to the change of the Roman regime from kingdom to republic. The annual election of consuls was established, while the power of the senate was limited by the dangerous for the democracy institution of the *tribunatus*³¹. Therefore, in this section he deals with both regimes of Rome (*regnum* and *res publica*). Philippides describes the regime of *imperium* in the sixth section of the introduction³². The source from which he draws all this information is the *Roman Antiquity* of Dionysius from Halicarnassus³³.

Philippides demonstrates fully his excellent Latin knowledge in the third section of the introduction³⁴. Now he studies the kinship of Latin language with Greek, and more specifically with the Aeolic dialect. It seems that the affinity between Latin and Greek language was a theme that had occupied the translator long ago³⁵. He notes that the first dwellers of Italy came from Greece, or, as he writes, from «Aeolis» («Αἰολίδα»). He enumerates the first settlers of Italy (Arcades led by Evander, Epeioi from Elis, Trojans led by Aeneas, etc.). Other Greeks colonists follow, who inhabited in the southern Italy (*Magna Graecia*)³⁶. For this reason, Latin language includes numerous Greek words in its vocabulary. According to the translator, the Latin language is a Roman dialect that was spoken by a mixed population in central Italy. The Latin dialect is the old Latin language and resembles

³⁰ Intr. pp. 11-12.

³¹ Intr. pp. 12-13.

³² Intr. pp. 31-32.

³³ For example, for the divine origin of Romulus, see Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.2.3.6-4; for the proclamation of Romulus as a king, see *Ant. Rom.* 2.6.1.3-4; for the patricians, see *Ant. Rom.* 2.8.3.1-5; for the foundation of the senate, see *Ant. Rom.* 2.12.3.1-7, etc.

³⁴ Intr. pp. 13-17.

³⁵ See Pappas 2010: 151-154. Cf. his *Απόπειρα ἀναλύσεως τοῦ νοουμένου*, p. 56: «καὶ νῦν ἀγαθῆ τύχῃ δύο ἔχομεν μόνας τὰς κοινότερας καὶ σπουδαστέας τοῖς σοφοῖς, τὴν παλαιὰν ἑλληνικὴν, καὶ τὴν συγγενῆ αὐτῇ λατινικὴν, ἧν ἡ σπουδὴ τῆς μιᾶς εὐκολύνει τὴν τῆς ἑτέρας».

³⁶ Intr. pp. 13-15.

with the Aeolic dialect. The Roman dialect is derived from Latin, and has incorporated many Greek words³⁷. Philippides' sources for this section of the introduction are Strabo³⁸, Plutarch³⁹, and Dionysius from Halicarnassus⁴⁰.

In the fourth section of the introduction, Philippides describes the increase of the Roman population and refers the conquests of Rome. The Romans united the neighboring peoples and made them citizens of their state. The gates of their city were open to all, a fact which makes perfect sense, if you consider that the Romans themselves were a mixture of colonists, refugees, fugitives and bandits⁴¹. The growth of the population brought increase of the military power, and, therefore, more conquests. The Romans dominated Italy and then continued their conquests abroad (Carthage, Sicily, Africa, Spain, Greece, Minor Asia, France, Belgium, Switzerland, Britain, Romania, etc.). Philippides closes this section by making an anachronistic thought: if the powerful Roman Empire would survive in his era, it would conquest all the famous cities of Europe (London, Munich, Strasbourg, Madrid, etc.)⁴². For this part of the introduction, the sources of Philippides are the work of Florus, which follows, Justin's *Epitome of Philippics*, which he translated in the previous year (1817), and - as it is evident from his footnotes - Julius Caesar and Livy⁴³.

In the fifth section⁴⁴, Philippides analyses the theory that the evolution of the old Rome is the new one (*nova Roma*), i.e. the Constantinople (Mango 2002: 1). We should note that the connection between Rome and Constantinople, and therefore

³⁷ Intr. pp. 15-17.

³⁸ Cf. Strabo 8.1.2, where he deals with the dialects of Peloponnese. Also, cf. the Epilogue of Justin' translation by Philippides, p. 6: «...ή πλέον έξαπλωμένη ήταν ή αίολική, και αί λοιπαίς, αίολικαίς, μεταβαλόμεναις όλίγον, ήταν. Διάβασε τόν Στράβωνα διὰ ναιδής».

³⁹ For example, cf. Plutarch, *Lives* 22.3.4-5: «ώς στρατὸς έξ' Ὑπερβορέων έλθὼν έξωθεν ήρήκοι πόλιν Ἑλληνίδα Ρώμην».

⁴⁰ Cf. *Rom. Ant.* 1.29.1-4, 2.1.2 and 3.10.3-6, where he deals with the first Greek colonists in Italy, and with the affinity which exists between Latin and Aeolic dialect.

⁴¹ Intr. pp. 17-18.

⁴² Intr. pp. 18-19.

⁴³ See Pappas (2010: 229-243). It seems that Philippides was not aware of Tacitus' historical works (*Histories, Annals*), since he does not mention them in any of his two translations from Latin. However, he knew Sallust - he quotes once to him, cf. in the translation of Florus, p. 139, note 3: «(ιδε τήν δημηγορίαν αύτην είς τόν Σαλλούστιον)».

⁴⁴ Intr. pp. 19-30.

between Roman history and Byzantine, was not of course Philippides' prototype theory. It was a settled idea of the Byzantine historians and of Byzantine citizens in general, if we think that they called themselves "Romans"⁴⁵. Philippides too, as a genuine post-Byzantine scholar, connects the Roman with the Byzantine history, and with the history of his own time, as he connects the capital of the Roman Empire with the rich Constantinople of his era. He writes that if there was not Rome, today there would not be the great capital of the Ottoman Empire, where the trade flourishes⁴⁶. In order to reveal to the reader the magnitude of the change that caused the founding of Rome, he cites a long list, where –combining Rome with Constantinople– indicates in reverse chronological order the rulers of these two cities starting with those of the new Rome, the sultans. Then the Byzantines follow, the Latins (1204-1261), again the Byzantines, while at the end he completes this list by referring to the Roman emperors of the old Rome ending with Augustus, by whom Florus' work ends too⁴⁷. Philippides offers valuable information for most sultans and emperors (Greek and Latin) in his footnotes⁴⁸. This is a very interesting section of the introduction, where Philippides "modernizes" the existence of ancient Rome in order to make the reader of the translation understand that the establishment of the Roman state has directly affected his daily life, and is responsible for the creation of contemporary cities and commercial stations. He also wants 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 very important event with an impact on the time of Philippides⁴⁹. By this list the translator fully confirms the common belief between scholars that Byzantine history is a phase of Roman, formed under the influence of ancient Greek and Roman culture and the Christian faith (Ostrogorsky 2014: 84).

⁴⁵ The connection between Rome and Constantinople is evidenced by the titles of the Byzantine historical works too; cf. the *Roman History* of Nicephorus Gregoras. For the connection between Rome and Constantinople, see Alföldi 1948. For the connection between Roman and Byzantine historiography, see Hunger 1992: 61-364.

⁴⁶ Intr. pp. 19-21.

⁴⁷ Intr. pp. 21-30.

⁴⁸ For example, see in numbered pp. 22-23, note 6, where he deals with Mehmed II (the Conqueror), his successors and the genealogy of the Ottomans.

⁴⁹ Intr. pp. 20-30.

Furthermore, he stresses the fact that the culture of Constantinople was a mixture of Greek, Roman, and Turkish influence.

The sixth and last section is the epilogue of the introduction⁵⁰. Here Philippides examines the third regime of Rome, the *imperium*. Thus, he connects the sixth section of the introduction to the second, in which he dealt with the first two Roman regimes, the reign and the republic. He talks about the first emperor, Augustus, who created the Roman Empire, having, off course, the army's support. Philippides believes that Octavian became an absolute monarch, not due to his bravery and wisdom, but thanks to the Fortune and his hypocritical character. The Greek scholar informs the reader that Augustus was supposedly the defender of the republic and had the senators as his advisers, but essentially he was a powerful *dictator*, a title which himself renounced and asked to be called "first of the senate" and emperor (*princeps senatus, imperator*). A long series of (able and unable) emperors begun from Augustus⁵¹. Philippides' sources for this part of the introduction are Plutarch⁵², Dio Cassius⁵³, and perhaps Suetonius' *Lives of Caesars*⁵⁴.

In the end of the introduction, Philippides repeats some information about the three Roman regimes and then deals with the Roman author whose work he translates, Florus. He informs the reader that Florus' work describes the situation of the Roman state from Romulus to Augustus. He comments that Florus addresses a Roman readership who knew the history of their own nation. For that reason he often has an obscure style and sometimes he overtakes some facts briefly. Thus, in order to overcome this difficulty, Philippides enriched his translation with many informative footnotes. According to Philippides, the well-educated Greeks can study the history of Rome by the Greek historians who wrote about it (Dio Cassius, Dionysius from Halicarnassus, Polybius, etc.). He adds that Florus' style is poetical and rhetorical; the genre of the Roman work, although belongs to the historiography, resembles to an oration by which Florus praises the achievements of the Roman people⁵⁵.

⁵⁰ Intr. pp. 31-32.

⁵¹ Intr. pp. 31-32.

⁵² Cf. Plutarch, *Lives*, Galva, Otto, etc.

⁵³ Cf. *Roman History*, book 53 (for Augustus), book 66 (for Domitian), book 77 (for Antonius Pius), and book 79 (for Elagabalus).

⁵⁴ Where Suetonius narrates the lives of emperors from Augustus to Domitian.

⁵⁵ Intr. p. 32.

This is the final section of the introduction. In all parts of it Philippides shows off his wide education in Latin language and literature, Roman historiography and culture.

The translation

After the introduction, the translation of Florus' work follows. For the main part of the book (290 pages), Philippides renews the Arabic enumeration of its pages⁵⁶. It is entitled *Φλόρου έπιτομή τών 'ρωμαϊκών* (= *Florus' Epitome of Roman history*). The Roman historian divides his work into four books, a practice which the translator also follows. Thus, in the first book Florus deals with the time before the first Punic war⁵⁷, in the second narrates the Roman history up to the destruction of Numantia⁵⁸, in the third he reaches to the eve of the conspiracy of Catiline⁵⁹ and in the fourth he examines the facts until Augustus⁶⁰. The Latin text does not exist, while Philippides' footnotes (on interpretative, textual, philological, geographical, etc. issues) abound in the book - in left and right page too. Each chapter is numbered (with Greek enumeration) and its Latin title is translated in Modern Greek. For example, the ninth chapter of the first book is entitled *Κεφ. θ' Περί τής μεταβολής είς δημοκρατίαν*⁶¹, the tenth chapter of the same book *Κεφ. ι' Τυρρηνικός πόλεμος μέ τόν Πορσέναν*⁶², the eleventh chapter of the second book *Κελτελληνικός πόλεμος*⁶³, etc.

⁵⁶ Trans. pp. 1-290.

⁵⁷ Trans. pp. 1-62.

⁵⁸ Trans. pp. 63-134.

⁵⁹ Trans. pp. 134-220.

⁶⁰ Trans. pp. 221-290.

⁶¹ Trans. p. 21. I should note that regarding the Latin prototype I quote with double quotation, according to the established method for Florus' work, as modern editions divide his work in two books, while the oldest, which are followed by Philippides, in four. The division in four books is preceded, and then follows that of the two books into parenthesis. Thus, for the ninth chapter of the first book of the translation, I quote 1.9 (1.3). The Latin title of it is *De mutatione rei publicae*.

⁶² Trans. p. 24. See. 1.10 (1.4), *Bellum Etruscum cum rege Porsenna*.

⁶³ Trans. p. 104. See 2.11 (1.27), *Bellum Gallograecum*.

It is a fact that every translation is not possible to be absolutely exact (regarding the grammar, syntax, and the author's style) to the prototype, since all languages (related or not) differ. This matter becomes more complex when the translation is made from a synthetic language (Latin) in one analytical (Modern Greek) (Kakrides 1966; Kentrotis 1996). Philippides follows several techniques in his translation: additions of words and phrases⁶⁴, omissions of words and phrases of the prototype⁶⁵, «conjunction translative pairs»⁶⁶, translation of two or more words with

⁶⁴ See 1.9 (1.3.18): «*et ne specie arcis offenderet, eminentis aedis suas in plana submitit*», which Philippides translates (Trans. p. 22): «'Ακόμα διὰ τὰ μὴ πειράζεται ὁ δῆμος, ὡς ἀπὸ ἓνα εἶδος ἀκροπόλεως, ἀπὸ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ὀπίκρνονταν εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν (καὶ κτυποῦσε πάρα πολλὰ εἰς τὰ ὄμματα τοῦ ἐλευθέρου δήμου)»; 1.12 (1.6.12-14): «*...magistrum, urbis proditorem, cum his quos adduxerat pueris vincitum sibi ultro remisisset*», with its translation (Trans. pp. 30-31): «τὸν διδάσκαλον τὸν προδότην (τῶν παιδιῶν καὶ ἀκολούθως) τῆς πόλεως, μὲ τὰ παιδιὰ ὀποῦ ξεπλάνεσε, τὸν ἔπεμψε ὀπίσω χειροδεμένον, (καὶ μαστιζόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν παιδῶν) καθὼς ὡς προδότην τὸν ἔπρεπε», etc.

⁶⁵ See 1.1 (1.1.25-27): «*hoc fuit tempus viris armis incitatissimum, ideoque quis adolescentiam dixerit*», which Philippides translates (Trans. pp. 2-3): «'Ο ἡρωισμὸς ἐδῶ καὶ ἡ ἀρεομανία ἦταν εἰς τὸν ἀνώτατον βαθμὸν»; 2.15 (1.31.61-63): «*...domibus ac templis suis sponte hostes in miserant; ut, quatenus urbs eripi Romanis non poterat, triumphus arderet*», with its translation (Trans. p. 116): «...οἱ ἐχθροὶ μὲ τὴν θέλησίν τους ἔβαλαν εἰς τοὺς οἴκους των καὶ εἰς τοὺς ναοὺς των»; 4.11 (2.21.16-18): «*positisque castris in Epiro omne litus Actiacum, Leucada insulam montemque Leucaten et Ambracii sinus cornua infesta classe succinxerat*», with the Modern Greek translation (Trans. p. 271): «Στρατοπέδευσε εἰς τὴν Ἡπειρον· τὸ νησι τὴν Λεύκαν, τὸ ἀκρωτήριον Λευκάτην, τὰ κέρατα (ταῖς ἄκραις τοῦ ἀμβρακικοῦ κόλπου, τὰ ἐξῶσε ὄλα μὲ ἐχθρικὸν στόλον», etc.

⁶⁶ This translative technique was analyzed by Kopanos regarding Planudes' translations, see Kopanos (1974): 19-34. In his paper Kopanos distinguished the «translation pairs» in two categories: a) «tautological» or «synonyms», when the words forming the pair are synonyms or near-synonyms together, and b) «descriptive» when by using two words for the translation of one word of the prototype the translator «aids the reader's imagination in reviving the details of the energy of the verbs or in completing the image and the content of the names» (Kopanos 1974: 30). The first scholar who used the term «descriptive» for this translative technique was Kakrides (1969): 79. See 1.6 (1.1.177): «*summaque regis sollertia ita est ordinata res publica*», which Philippides translates (Trans. p. 16): «διάταξε, διακόσμησε, μὲ τόσην ἀγκύνοισαν καὶ ἐπιτηδειότητα τὴν δημοκρατίαν»; 2.12 (1.28.28-29): «*quasi templa et arae possent defendere*», with the Modern Greek translation (p. 107): «ὡσὰν τὰ ἡμποροῦσαν τὰ

one word⁶⁷, conversion of indirect into direct speech⁶⁸, reversal of the order of the words or phrases⁶⁹, analysis of participles (in subordinate and main clauses, adverbs, etc.)⁷⁰, conversion of the clauses into participles⁷¹, other kind of clauses⁷² and noun

ὑπερασπίσουν ναοὶ καὶ βωμοὶ καὶ θυσιαστήρια»; 3.23 (2.11.7-8): «*nam cum iure belli Sulla dictator proscrisisset inimicos*», with the translation (Trans. p. 219): «Ὁ Σύλλας μὲ τὸ δίκαιον τοῦ πολέμου ὡς νικητῆς καὶ δικτάτορας καταδίκασε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς του», etc.

⁶⁷ See 1.1 (1.1.72-73): «*spolia insuper opima de rege Acrone Feretrio Iovi manibus suis rex reportavit*», which Philippides translates (Trans. p. 7): «τὰ γδύματα...ἀκόμα τοῦ...Βασιλέως αὐτοχειρὶ τὰ προσφέρνει ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς τὸν φερέτριον Δία»; 3.19 (2.7.2-3): «*quis aequo animo ferat in principe gentium populo bella servorum?*», with its translation (Trans. pp. 199-200): «Ἄλλὰ τίς ἠμπορεῖ πράως νὰ ὑποφέρῃ τὸν πρῶτιστον καὶ κύριον τῶν ἐθνῶν δῆμον δουλικούς πολέμους»; 4.12 (2.33.19): «*Aracelium oppidum magna vi repugnant*», with the Modern Greek translation (Trans. p. 285): «τὸ Ἀράκιλλον ἄστὺ ἀντέχει εἰς τὸν Καίσαρα καρτερώτατα», etc.

⁶⁸ See 1.10 (1.4.23): «*valere liberosque esse iussit*», which Philippides translates (Trans. p. 26): «νὰ ζῆτε, εἶπε, καὶ νὰ εἶστε ἐλεύθεροι ῥωμαῖοι»; 3.21 (2.9.93-94): «*donec admonente Fufidio vivere aliquos debere ut essent quibus imperarent*», with the Modern Greek translation (Trans. p. 215): «Τέλος ἐνθύμισε τὸν Σύλλαν ὁ Φουρδίκιος λέγοντας, ἀλλὰ πρέπει δὲ νὰ μείνουν τινὲς, διὰ νὰ ἔχῃς τίνας νὰ προσταζῆς».

⁶⁹ See 2.16 (1.32.25-26): «*aeris auri argentique venae in commune fluxerunt*», with Modern Greek translation (Trans. p. 118): «καὶ φλέβες κοινῶς ἔρρεαν ἀπὸ χρυσὸν, ἄργυρον, χαλκὸν»; 4.7 (2.17.16-17): «*Caesar cum Antonio in Cassium Brutumque succingitur*», with its translation (Trans. p. 259): «ὁ Καῖσαρ καὶ ὁ Ἀντώνιος ἐτοιμάζονται νὰ πηγαίνουν ἐναντίον εἰς τὸν Βροῦτον καὶ εἰς τὸν Κάσσιον»; 4.7 (2.17.40-41): «*non in re, sed in verbo tantam esse virtutem!*», which Philippides translates (Trans. p. 262), etc.

⁷⁰ See 2.2 (1.18.47-48): «*mersa aut fugata hostium classe*», which Philippides translates (Trans. p. 66): «ἀφ' οὗ καταβύθισε ἢ καταφυγάδευσε τὸν στόλον τῶν ἐχθρῶν»; 2.2 (1.18.54-55): «*alter consulum interceptus Asina Cornelius; qui simulato conloquio evocatus atque ita oppressus*», with its translation (Trans. pp. 66-67): «ὁ ἓνας ἀπὸ τοὺς δύο ὑπάτους ὁ Ἀσίνιος Κορνήλιος εἰς τὸ ἀναμεταξὺ πιάσθηκε κραγμένος εἰς μίαν τάχα συνομιλίαν, καὶ οὕτω φονεύθηκε»; 3.6 (1.41.2-3): «*sublatisque commerciis, rupto foedere generis humani*», with the Modern Greek translation (Trans. p. 162): «κόπηκε τὸ ἐμπόριον, ἡ συνθήκη καὶ ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου γένους καταπατήθηκε», etc.

⁷¹ See 1.1 (1.1.90-91): «*cum contionem haberet ante urbem apud Caprae paludem*», with its translation (Trans. p. 8): «ἐκκλησιάζοντας πρὸ τοῦ ἄστεος κοντὰ εἰς τὴν λίμνην Καπραίαν»; 2.14 (1.30.10-12): «*igitur dum haec ipsa contemnit, populus Romanus...contentus*», with the Modern Greek translation (Trans. p. 110): «Ὁ δῆμος λοιπὸν τῶν ῥωμαίων, περιφρονῶντας

phrases⁷³, change of the adjective degrees⁷⁴, change of voice⁷⁵, change of singular and plural numbers⁷⁶, and the elimination of figures of speech⁷⁷.

ὄλα αὐτὰ, εὐχαριστεῖται...»; 3.16 (2.4.13-14): «*cum iam tertium annum dominaretur*», which Philippides translates (Trans. p. 193): «ἐξουσιάζοντας πλέον τρίτον ἐνιαυτὸν», etc.

⁷² ⁷² See 1.1 (1.1.68): «*quia non inpetrabantur, manu capta sunt*», with its translation (Trans. p. 6): «ἀπαρνήθησαν εἰς αὐτοὺς· ἀρπάχθησαν»; 3.12 (1.47.37): «*dum spectaculis indulget*», which Philippides translates (Trans. p. 186): «ἔτρεφαν τὴν εἰς τὰ (ἀπάνθρωπα) θεάματα κλίσιν του», etc.

⁷³ See 1.10 (1.2.6-7): «*ita res poposcit, ut ferox populus deorum metu mitigaretur*», which Philippides translates (Trans. p. 20): «τὰ πράγματα τέτοιον ζητοῦσαν εἰς ἑνὸς ἀγρίου λαοῦ ἡμέρωσιν μὲ τὴν θεοφοβίαν»; 2.15 (1.31.57-58): «*imitata reginam quae Carthaginem condidit*», with translation (Trans. p. 116): «μιμῶντας τὴν βασίλισσαν τὴν κτίστραν τῆς Καρχηδόνας»; 3.6 (1.41.42-43): «*non ex fiducia, sed quia oppressi erant, ausi videbantur*», with its translation (Trans. p. 165): «ὄχι ἀπὸ θάρρους των, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ στενοχωρίαν τους, φάνηκαν τολμηροί», etc.

⁷⁴ See 1.1 (1.1.85-86): «*hunc rex sapientissimus statum rei publicae inposuit*», with its translation (Trans. p. 8): «ὁ φρόνιμος βασιλεὺς κάμνει αὐτὴν τὴν διάταξιν»; 3.13 (2.1.9-10): «*quid tam aequum quam inopem populum vivere ex aerario suo?*», which Philippides translates (Trans. p. 188): «ἐπειδὴ τί ἄλλο δικαιότερον ἀπὸ τὸ νὰ λαμβάνη τὸ δίκαιόν του ἀπὸ τὴν γερουσίαν ὁ λαός;», etc.

⁷⁵ See 1.7 (1.1.182-184): «*hic regnum avitum, quod a Servio tenebatur, rapere maluit quam exspectare*», which Philippides translates (Trans. p. 17): «Τοῦτος τὴν βασιλείαν ὅπου τὴν εἶχε ὁ Σέρβιος, θέλησε καλλίτερα νὰ τὴν ἀρπάξη, παρὰ νὰ τὴν προσμείνη»; 2.5 (1.21.8-9): «*itaque Gnaeo Fulvio Centimalo duce late domantur*», with the Modern Greek translation (Trans. p. 76): «Οὔτω λοιπὸν πῆγε εἰς αὐτοὺς ὁ Κεντίμαλος Φούλβιος καὶ τοὺς ὑποτάττει ὄλους»; 3.11 (1.46.28-29): «*filium ducis paene in conspectu patris idem telis operuerunt*», with its translation (Trans. p. 182): «Ὁ υἱὸς του σχεδὸν εἰς τὴν ὄψιν τοῦ πατρὸς κατατοξεύθηκε», etc.

⁷⁶ See 1.12 (1.6.22): «*adactus miles sua sponte iure iurando*», which Philippides translates (Trans. pp. 31-32): «ὑποχρεώθηκαν οἱ στρατιῶται θεληματικῶς μὲ ὄρκον»; 1.13 (1.7.53-54): «*nec diebus modo, sed noctibus quoque omnia experti*», with its translation (Trans. p. 37): «καὶ ὄχι μόνον τὴν ἡμέραν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν νύκτα δοκίμαζαν τὴν ἀνάβασιν μὲ κάθε τρόπον»; 4.8 (2.18.40-41): «*ab hostium arbitrium sub percussore moriturus*», with the Modern Greek translation (Trans. p. 264): «διὰ νὰ ἀποθάνη μὲ ἐχθρῶν προσταγὴν ἀπὸ φονεῖς», etc.

⁷⁷ See 1.1 (1.1.43-44): «*sic repertos apud arborem Faustulus regii gregis pastor tulit in casam atque educavit*», with the Modern Greek translation (Trans. p. 4): «Οὔτω ταύρηκε ὁ βασιλικὸς βοσκὸς κοντὰ εἰς ἕνα δένδρον· τὰ ἔφερε εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν του καὶ τὰ ἀνάθρεψε»; 1.16 (1.11.27-28): «*nec facile appareat materia quattuor et viginti triumphorum*», which Philippides

We observe that by most techniques Philippides aims to the simplification of Florus' often dense style (e.g. by the additions, the "conjunction translative pairs", the elimination of figures of speech). Moreover, he adds to his translation the feature of liveness, which is missing from the prototype (e.g. by the conversion of indirect into direct speech). The translator makes changes to the prototype without causing any substantial alteration of its meaning. Philippides' main purpose for using all these techniques is the analysis of the Latin language, in order to make Florus' book accessible to his contemporaries⁷⁸. Thus, Philippides' translation can be read as a stand-alone work of literature, without being dependent and being bound by the original. In other words, Philippides' translation is accurate to the prototype, but it is autonomized (Pappas 2010: 186-211).

The footnotes

Philippides' translation has many footnotes. In fact, it is very surprising that, while Florus' work is smaller than that of Justin⁷⁹. Phillipides' comments are more in the posterior translation. Their number amounts to 305 (32 in introduction, 269 in the main text and 4 in the epilogues), while those in the translation of Justin amounted to 299. In the text there are exhibitors in Arabic numerals in parentheses, which refer to the corresponding footnotes' numbers. Unlike Justin's translation, the enumeration of the footnotes is not renewed in every page, but in each chapter. Their extent varies; there are several footnotes in one, two or three lines⁸⁰, while the majority is medium-sized⁸¹. There are also few extensive ones⁸². The kind of the

translates (Trans. p. 43): «καὶ δύσκολα καταλαμβάνει τινὰς ἀπὸ ποῦ εἰκοσιτέσσερες θρίαμβοι»; 2.6 (1.22.167-168): «*plerisque oppidis et regionibus excusseramus*», with its translation (Trans. p. 89): «τὸν ἀποτινάξαμεν ἀπὸ πολλὰ φρούρια καὶ ἀπὸ πολλὰ μέρη», etc.

⁷⁸The use of the aeolodorique dialect also contributes to this purpose.

⁷⁹ This translation counts 663 pages.

⁸⁰ For example, see Trans. p. 50, note 3, p. 72, note 7, p. 174, note, 5 etc.

⁸¹ For example, see Trans. p. 51, note 4, p. 109, note 2, pp. 150-151, note 6, etc.

⁸² For example, see Trans. p. 79, note 3, pp. 171-172, note 2, pp. 253-254, note 1, pp. 289-290, note 15.

footnotes varies, as there are interpretative comments⁸³, notes on ethics⁸⁴, science⁸⁵, ethnology⁸⁶, and politics⁸⁷, quotations in Greek authors⁸⁸ and in his translation of Justin⁸⁹, and footnotes in which Philippides deals with the Latin language and literature⁹⁰. Finally, there are several footnotes regarding the Roman author⁹¹.

The epilogue

This section is the last part of Philippides' book. It is entitled 'Επιλεγόμενα (= epilogue) and has its own enumeration (with Arabic numbers)⁹². Its subtitle is «Μάθησις κοινῶς τί εἶναι, καὶ πῶς πρέπει νὰ γίνεται» (= what is learning, and how

⁸³ For example, see Trans. p. 10, note 2, where Philippides informs the reader for the Palladium and Numa's shields, and explains the characterization of the shields as «*imperii pignora*»; Trans. p. 85, note 8, where he interprets the noun «*thesaurus*», etc.

⁸⁴ In these footnotes Philippides deals mainly with praises of Roman leaders. For example, see Trans. p. 29, note 4 (for Cincinnatus); Trans. p. 122, note 5 (for Lucullus), etc.

⁸⁵ For example, see Trans. p. 124, note 1, where he informs us about the geographical place of Numantia in Portugal ; Trans. p. 205, note 6, where he deals with the nature of a volcano; Trans. p. 285, note, where he informs us for the plant «*smilax*», etc.

⁸⁶ For example, see. Intr. 25, note 15, where he informs us about the genealogy of the Hungarian nation; Trans. p. 288, note 13, where he deals with the people of China, etc.

⁸⁷ For example, see Trans. p. 8, note 8 (for the regime of the first inhabitants of Rome); Trans. p. 187, note 1 (for the role of «*tribunatus*» and «*senatus*»), etc.

⁸⁸ For example, see Trans. p. 9, note 9, where he quotes to Dionysius from Halicarnassus; Trans. p. 51, note 4, where he quotes to Plutarch; Trans. 122, note 7, where he quotes to Strabo, etc.

⁸⁹ For example, see Trans. p. 1, note 1; Trans. p. 97, note 5; Trans. p. 231, note 7, etc.

⁹⁰ For example, see Trans. pp. 18-19, note 3, where he analyzes the etymology of the Latin word «*Capitolium*»; Trans. pp. 171-172, note 2, where he cites a passage from Caesar's *De bello gallico* translated by himself, etc.

⁹¹ Philippides criticizes Florus mainly for his rhetorical style, his chronological errors, and his political preference in Augustus. For example, see Trans. p. 46, note 2; Trans. p. 113, note 6; Trans. p. 130, note 1, etc.

⁹² Epil. pp. 1-21.

must be done). Here Philippides analyzes his pedagogical believes⁹³. Thus, he completes the epilogue of his translation of Justin⁹⁴. The epilogues of Philippides' two translations from Latin are essentially one common unity, which was divided and inserted in two different books.

In Florus' translation there is not a catalogue of typographical errors (*παροράματα*), or an *index nominum et locorum*, or even a catalogue of subscribers, a quite common phenomenon in the books of this era⁹⁵.

Philippides' translation was never published again, a fact demonstrating that it was not a popular book. Finally, it is worth noting that for this book a review was not published, as in the case of Justin's translation⁹⁶.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- M. von ALBRECHT (2001), *History of Roman Literature*, Vol. 2. Modern Greek translation by D. Nikitas, Rethymno, University of Crete (in Greek).
- A. ALFÖLDI (1948), *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- R. ARGYROPOULOU (1985), «Les conceptions Pédagogiques de Daniel Philippidès (à propos des Épilegomènes à la traduction de D. Philippidès du *Précis d' Histoire Romaine* de Florus», Greek announcements in the 5th International Conference of Studies of South-East Europe, Belgrade 11-17 September 1984, pp. 93-98.
- C. TH. DIMARAS (1940), «The linguistic theory of D. Katartzes. His unpublished works», *Athina* 50, pp. 197-234 (in Greek).

⁹³ For example, see Epil. pp. 4-20, where Philippides expresses his opinions for the teaching of physics, astronomy, geography, history, etc. in young students. For Philippides' pedagogical theories, see Argyropoulou (1985): 93-98.

⁹⁴ In the Epilogue of Justin's translation (Epil. pp. 1-34) Philippides analyzes his believes about the Modern Greek language and the education in Greece.

⁹⁵ For example, cf. Philippides' translation of Lalande's *Astronomy*, vol. 2, pp. VIII-XVI, entitled: «Κατάλογος τῶν συνδρομητῶν κατὰ Ἀλφάβητον» (= Alphabetical catalogue of the subscribers) and in pp. α'-β' (without number), entitled: «Κατάλογος τῶν τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως συνδρομητῶν». (= Catalogue of the subscribers from Constantinople).

⁹⁶ See *Logios Hermes*, vol. 8, issue 2, 15 January 1818, pp. 27-30.

- N. DOUKAS (1807), *Eutropius' Epitome of Roman History*, Vienna (in Greek).
- N. DOUKAS (1807), *Dictionary of the famous men in Eutropius' history*, Vienna (in Greek).
- FLORUS, *Epitome of Roman History*. Translated by E.S. Forster. 5th edition. Loeb Classical Library, Massachusetts & London 1984, Harvard University Press.
- H. HUNGER (1992), *Byzantine Literature*, Vol. 1. Modern Greek translation by K. Synelli-T. Kollia-G.Makri-I. Vassi, Athens, Educational Institute of the National Bank of Greece.
- TH. KAKRIDES (1966), *The problem of translation*, Athens: Bookshop of Hestia (in Greek).
- G. KENTROTIS (1996), *Theory and act of translation*. Athens: Diaulos (in Greek).
- V. KOPANOS (1974), «Pairs in parataxis in Maximus Planudes' translations», *Scientific Yearbook of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki* 13, pp. 19-34 (in Greek).
- A. KOYMARIANOY (1966), Daniel Philippides- Barbié du Bocage - Anthimos Gazes, *Correspondence (1794 - 1819)*, Athens, Study Group of Greek Enlightenment (in Greek).
- I. MAKOLAS (1686), *Historical book called Justin*, Venice (in Greek).
- D. NIKITAS (2001), «Traduzioni greche di opere latine». In S. Settis (ed.), *I Greci. Storia Cultura Arte Società*, 3, *I Greci oltre la Grecia*, Turin, pp. 1035-1051.
- D. NIKITAS (2002-2003), «Post-byzantine Latinitas: Data and requests», *Scientific Yearbook of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki* (Department of Philology) 10 [Proceedings of the 7th Panhellenic Symposium of Latin Studies], pp. 34-46 (in Greek).
- D. NIKITAS (2004), «Cornelius Nepos Neograecus: the translation of Nepos' *Lives* by Spyridon Vlantes in 1810». In A. Vasileiades-P. Kotzia-Aem. Mauroudes-D. Christides (eds.) *Stephanus for Demetrius*. Honorable volume for the Professor Demetrius Lypourlis, Thessaloniki, University Studio Press, pp. 241-274 (in Greek).
- D. NIKITAS (2012), «Very beneficial and pleasant myths: the first folk Modern Greek translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* by Ioannis Makolas (1686)». In D. Nikitas (ed.), *Laus et gratia. In Memoriam of Constantine Grollios*, Thessaloniki, University Studio Press, pp. 103-142 (in Greek).
- D. V. OIKONOMIDES (1978-1979), «Daniel Philippides' life and work», *Mnimosini* 7, pp. 200-290 (in Greek).

- G. OSTROGORSKY (2014), *History of the Byzantine state*. Vol. 2. Modern Greek Translation by I. Panagopoulos. Enriched edition. Athens, Patakis.
- V. PAPPAS (2010), *The Latin knowledge of Demetrius-Daniel † 1832: the translations of Trogus and Florus*. Thessaloniki, PhD Thesis (in Greek).
- V. PAPPAS (2014a), «The translation of Eutropius' *Breviarium ab urbe condita* by Neophytos Doukas (vol. 1) and his Dictionary of the famous men of the work (vol. 2)», *Byzantina Symmeikta* 24, pp. 129-155 (in Greek).
- V. PAPPAS (2014b), «Daniel Philippides from Milies of Pelion: a scholar and a scientist», *Archive of Thessalian Studies* 19, pp. 121-154 (in Greek).
- V. PAPPAS (2015), «Modern Greek Translations (1686-1818) of Latin Historical Works», *Studia Philologica Valentina* 17, pp. 257-272.
- D. PHILIPPIDES (1803), *Lalande's Epitome of Astronomy*, Vienna (in two volumes) (in Greek).
- D. PHILIPPIDES (1816), *History of Roumania*, Leipzig (in Greek).
- D. PHILIPPIDES (1816), *Geography of Roumania*, Leipzig (in Greek).
- D. PHILIPPIDES (1817), *Attempt of analysis of thinking*, Leipzig (in Greek).
- D. PHILIPPIDES (1817), *Epitome of Pompeius Trogus' Philippics*, Leipzig (in Greek).
- D. PHILIPPIDES (1818), *Florus' Epitome of Roman history*, Leipzig (in Greek).
- L. TROMARAS (1999), «From *vortit barbare* in *Graece vertere*: Greek translations of Latin texts», *Nea Poreia* (October-December), pp. 286-306 (in Greek).
- K.N. SATHAS (1868), *Modern Greek philology. Biographies of Greek scholars from the fall of the Byzantine Empire until the Greek revolution (1453-1821)*, Athens (in Greek).
- D.N. TRIVOLIS (1941), *Eutropius historicus and the Greek translators of Breviarium ab urbe condita*, Athens (in Greek).
- N. VALAORITES (1960), «Daniel Philippides», *Pali*, 2-3, pp. 177-180 (in Greek).