A Partial Interlinear Translation of the *Iliad* from the Fifteenth Century

**Adam Foley**

In the Biblioteca Nazionale of Naples is a large manuscript of the scholia antiqua on Homer’s *Iliad*. The scholia end on f. 310v, after which follows a partial interlinear translation of the *Iliad* that has been unexplored by scholars. The translation covers the first two books of the *Iliad*. It dates to the middle decades of the fifteenth century (ca. 1425–1476) and seems to have offered a student in the initial stages of Greek acquisition an exercise for improving his understanding of the *Iliad*.

The translation exercise was carried out in two phases. The

---


2 For the date see the description of the codex in Formentin, *Catalogus codicum graecorum* 47–49.

3 Both translations seem to have been made independently of the manuscript and then inserted at a later date, because the text does not proceed in a linear manner. The first proceeds as follows: f. 312r–v = *Il. 2.1–2*, ff. 313r–315v = *Il. 2.102–236*, f. 316rv = *Il. 2.395–449*, f. 317rv–v = *Il. 2.29–63*, f. 318rv

---
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first phase was a grammatical exercise that helped the student improve his understanding of Greek. In this phase, a sample of which is in the Appendix below, the student parsed every Greek word in the text from the first two books of the Iliad and wrote the Latin equivalent of each word in between the lines of the Greek text. He then equipped this translation and grammatical commentary with a series of marginal glosses, in which he addresses textual and historical questions, for example, about the conjugation of certain Greek verbs or the peculiar features of animal sacrifice in Homeric times. In the second phase, a sample of which is in the Appendix, the student re-wrote the same portion of text as in the first, except this time he presented the text in a more elegant form without the grammatical commentary that suffocates the text in the first phase. From the second exercise it seems that the student wished to create something of a working copy of the Iliad to read in Greek at his leisure with the help of his own interlinear glosses in Latin.

These two translation exercises belong to the initial period in the history of Homer’s reception in the Italian Renaissance. Leontius Pilatus (1310–1365) had produced an ad verbum Latin translation of both epics in the 1360s, which inspired a generation of humanists to try their hand at a less literal rendering. Manuel Chrysoloras (ca. 1350–1415) arrived in Italy in the spring of 1397 and taught Greek to the first generation of Hellenists, while also inculcating in them a taste for literary translation. As scholars have often noted, however, many translators

---

4 For a now dated but useful and comprehensive overview see Agostino Pertusi, Leontio Pilato fra Petrarca e Boccaccio: Le sue versioni omeriche negli autografi di Venezia e la cultura greca del primo umanesimo (Venice/Rome 1964); for a more recent study see Valeria Mangraviti, L’Odissea Marciana di Leonzio Pilato tra Boccaccio e Petrarca (Rome/Barcelona, 2016).

after Chrysoloras contented themselves with re-working the literal translation of Pilatus. In 1964 Agostino Pertusi referred to such re-workings as *retractationes*. At first glance, the Naples translation seems to belong to this class of ‘translation.’ There are at least five such reworkings of Pilatus in the fifteenth century. Among them, Roberto Weiss had already drawn attention to a reworking of the *Iliad* completed around 1410 in a manuscript now in the Bodleian Library (*Can.lat. 139*), while Pertusi discovered an anonymous *retractatio* of Pilatus’ translation of the *Odyssey* dated to 1398 (*Venice, Marc. XII 23 [3946]*)

One could argue that Pier Candido Decembrio’s translation of five books of the *Iliad* in the early 1440s (*Milan, Ambros. D 112 inf.*) also belongs to this category of ‘translation.’ There is also the anonymous *retractatio* of Pilatus’ *Iliad* completed for Cardinal Francesco Gonzaga in 1477 copied in one of the most splendid manuscripts of the century (*Vat.gr. 1626*).

---


7 Pertusi identifies four, while I follow Ernst Ditt, “Pier Candido Decembrio: Contributo alla storia dell’umanesimo italiano,” in *MIL* 24 (1931) 21–108, here 28, who claimed that Decembrio’s translation was “la seconda edizione riveduta della traduzione del Pilato” and therefore another *retractatio*. See also Marianne Pade, “Leonzio Pilato e Boccaccio: le fonti del De montibus e la cultura Greco-latina di Leonzio,” in *Quaderni Petrarcheschi: Petrarch e il Mondo greco* 12 (2002) 257–276, here 259, who identifies seven manuscripts of Pilato’s translation of the *Iliad* and thirteen of his *Odyssey*, of which the latest dates to 1527, in addition to the many *retractationes* made from them.

8 On f. 5r of the Bodleian MS. there is a colophon that reads “Apud montem libanum per me fratrem Andream Aligem de Reate anno salutis 1410”; for this MS. see Roberto Weiss, “An Unknown Fifteenth-Century Version of the *Iliad*,” *The Bodleian Quarterly Record* 7 (1934) 464. For the Marciana MS. see Ezio Franceschini and Agostino Pertusi: “Un’ignota Odissea latina dell’ultimo trecento.” *Aevum* 33 (1959) 323–355, as well as Pertusi, *Leonzio Pilato* 531 ff.

From the comparative analysis that follows, however, the precise relationship that the Naples translation has with these *retractationes* supports the conclusion that the translation of the *Iliad* at the end of the manuscript was an independent attempt on the part of a student in the beginning stages of Greek to translate Homer as a private exercise in Greek grammar and therefore bears no significant relation either to the scholia contained in the same manuscript or to any other Latin translation of Homer. There is some evidence that the student had various sources available, as his glosses seem at times indebted to, among others, Eustathius’ commentary on Homer and Hesychius’ glossary as well as scholia not contained in the same manuscript. As the folio pages were inserted in a haphazard manner at the end of this codex, it is probable that the translator never set eyes on the scholia contained therein.

*The first translation exercise*

The first exercise (ff. 312r–329v) includes the second half of the first book of the *Iliad* (1.245–502) and the first half of the second book (2.1–493). Without any literary pretensions, this initial sketch seems to have provided our translator with a means of learning the rudiments of Homeric Greek. First, the student wrote out the Greek text. Then he underlined each word as it appears in the *Iliad*. After each Greek word he then wrote declined forms of the same word, starting from the nominative singular and moving his way through the other forms, demonstrating how to derive the oblique form of the word as it is found in the text. For example, the first line of the second book of the *Iliad* reads as follows:

\[
\text{"Allloi mën ὄο θεοί τε καὶ ὀνέρες ἔπωκορυσταῖ}
\]

The rest of the gods and horse-marshalling men

The translator underlined each word as it is found in the text, and then wrote out the declined forms in the space that follows (f. 312r):

\[
\text{"Allloi ὁ ἄλλος τοῦ ἀλλου ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων οἱ ἄλλοι. μὲν ὁ ὄο θεοὶ ὁ θεός τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων τε καὶ ὀνέρες ὁ ἄνηρ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἄνδρες ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων}
\]
οἱ ἀνέρες καὶ ἄνδρες. ἵπποκορυσταὶ ὁ ἵπποκορυστής στοῦ. ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων οἱ ἱπποκορυσταῖ.

Ἄλλοι, the other, of the other, nominative plural (is) the others. μὲν ὅς θεός, the god, of the god, present plural gods. τε καὶ ἄνερες, the man, of the man and men, present plural men (ἄνερες) and men (ἄνδρες). ἵπποκορυσταὶ, marshaller of chariots, of the marshaller, present plural marshaller of chariots.

In addition to this rudimentary grammatical commentary, the student attempted to translate the Greek text into Latin. As can be seen from the sample of this first exercise in the Appendix, the student put the Latin equivalent of each word in between the lines of the Greek text.

The initial two lines in the first phase of the student’s inter-linear translation read as follows:

alii

στοῦ. ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων ὁἱ ἵπποκορυσταὶ

In addition to this rudimentary grammatical commentary, the student attempted to translate the Greek text into Latin. As can be seen from the sample of this first exercise in the Appendix, the student put the Latin equivalent of each word in between the lines of the Greek text.

The initial two lines in the first phase of the student’s inter-linear translation read as follows:

alii

στοῦ. ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων ὁἱ ἵπποκορυσταὶ

A few observations about the tendencies of this translator can be made from this brief passage alone. First is the tendency found in Pilatus’ translation of Homer and the earliest retractationes to translate every Greek particle, even those such as μὲν (quidem) and ὅς (autem) that cannot be translated and therefore do not have a Latin equivalent. Second is his tendency to include two alternative renderings, as when for ἵπποκορυσταί he writes “armigeres id est equos armantes” or for παννύχιοι “nocturni,
id est, tota nocte.” Third, the gloss “equos armantes” bears resemblance to the reading ἵππους ὀπλίζοντες found in Hesychius’ glossary, which raises the question of the sources that the student had at his disposal. Before discussing the nature of this translation and its relation to other translations of Homer from the early fifteenth century, a word on the second, more polished phase of translation is in order.

The second translation exercise

The second translation takes up ff. 333r–355v and includes II. 1.483–611 and II. 2.1–3.301. In this section the translator wrote out the Greek text without interruption and omitted all grammatical commentary in Greek. The presentation therefore appears simpler and more elegant than the first exercise. Unlike in the first sketch, the title of the second book is written in red ink: ἀρχή τῆς βῆτα Οµήρου ῥαψωδίας (“The beginning of Book Two of Homer”). Likewise, the traditional title of the ὑπόθεσις or argumentum to Book 2—Βῆτα δ’ οὐνειρον ἐχει, ἄγορην καὶ νῆας ἀριθμεῖ (“Book 2 includes a dream, an assembly, and the catalogue of ships”)—is written in red along with the initial letter of each book. This time the student included the Latin equivalent of some Greek words in between the lines but not all of them. The first four lines of the second book in this phase of his translation read as follows (f. 335r):

utique
nunc viri equites armati

ἂλλοι μὲν ῥα θεοὶ τε καὶ ἄνερες ἵπποκορυσταί
dormiebant tota nocte Jovem non tenebat dulcis somnus
εὐδόν παννύχιοι, Ἰὰ δ’ οὐκ ἔχε νῆδυμος ὕπνος,
sed hic Iupiter cogitabat secundum animum ut Achilles
ἀλλ’ ὅ γε μερηρίζε κατὰ φρένα ὡς Ἀχιλῆα
honoraret destrueret plures super navibus
τιμήσῃ, ὀλέσῃ δὲ πολέας ἐπὶ νησίων Ἀχαιών.

From this comparison of the first and second phases of translation, the most noticeable feature is a certain plasticity of word choice. The student seems to have always kept a variety of possible translations open to consideration. For ἵπποκορυσταί he

---

Hesych. I 837 ἵπποκορυσταί: ἵππους ὀπλίζοντες/ἱππικοί.

---
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wrote “armigeres, id est, equos armantes” in the first translation, while in the second “equites armati.” The second noticeable feature is that the translator does not include the Latin equivalent of every Greek word in the second translation. This leniency on his part suggests that he was not aiming to produce a definitive translation of the Iliad with a fixed Latin text. Rather, it seems that these two translations were either a student exercise carried out in the classroom under the supervision of a Greek instructor or a private study done at home. In either case, they were probably intended to help the student improve his facility with the Greek language on the one hand while helping him to comprehend the Iliad better for private enjoyment on the other.

Marginal glosses

After finishing the grammatical commentary and interlinear translation in the first phase, the translator then equipped the text with a series of marginal glosses. A comparison of these glosses with the corresponding passages in the scholia help to determine whether he had recourse to the scholia contained in the same manuscript, and, if not, what other sources he may have had at his disposal. There are fourteen glosses, which can be organized loosely into two categories of exegesis: grammatical and historical-contextual. Of the fourteen there are an equal number in each category. These glosses can be further divided thematically according to the subject matter that attracted the commentator’s attention. The four major themes that dominate the marginal glosses are tmesis, which seems to have troubled our translator’s comprehension of the text, the ritual sacrifice of animals in antiquity, the speech of Achilles to Thetis (Il. 1.365–412), and Homeric maritime vocabulary. Of these glosses, those pertaining to animal sacrifice are particularly helpful in determining whether the translator consulted the scholia contained in the same manuscript.

11 It should be noted that this, too, may be indebted to Hesychius or an intermediary source that included glosses from Hesychius, as the word equites seems to come from ἱππικοί.
Historical contextual exegesis: animal sacrifice

The student seems to have taken a keen interest in issues of animal sacrifice. Towards the end of the first book of the Iliad, the Achaians decide to offer a hecatomb to Apollo to appease his wrath and bring an end to the plague. Before Odysseus boards the ship, the text reads (1.309–310): ἐς δ᾽ ἐκατόμβην / βῆσε θεῷ (“He drove on board a hecatomb for the god”). Our commentator glosses the word ἐκατόμβη as follows (f. 325r):

Est sacrificium centum bovum, scilicet, monetarum in quibus erat sculptus bos. ἐκατόμβη.

[A hecatomb] is a sacrifice of a hundred oxen, that is, a hundred coins on which an ox is depicted, ἐκατόμβη.

Thus the student proposes that the ancient Greeks substituted a hundred coins (monetae), on which the image of an ox was stamped, for a hundred oxen (boves) in the sacrifice of a hecatomb. It is likely that for this interpretation the commentator drew on a scholiwm to Il. 2.449, which is not in the Naples manuscript:12

Hecatomb] worth the value of a hundred oxen or a hundred coins. For since the ancients regarded the ox as sacred, on one side of the coin they engraved an ox and on the other the face of the king.

From this gloss it can be said with certainty that the translator had access to at least one other source for his interpretation of the Iliad.13

---

12 Genevensi gr. 44: ἐκατόμβουος· ἐκατόν βοῶν άξιος τιμής ἦτοι νομίσματον· οἱ γὰρ ἄρχαιοι, ὑπερτιμῶντες τὸν βοῦν ὡς ἱερὸν, ἐνεχάραττον τῷ ἑνὶ μέρει τοῦ νομίσματος βοῦν, τῷ δὲ ἐτέρῳ τῷ βασιλέως πρόσωπον. Cf. schol. Il. 2.449 (I 108 Dindorf): ἐκατόμβουος· ἐκατόν βοῶν τιμής άξιος, ἢ ἐκατόν χρυσῶν νομίσματον. οἱ γὰρ ἄρχαιοι, ὑπερτιμῶντες τὸ ζῶον τὸν βοῦν, διὰ πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἱερὸν ἔστιν, ἐνεχάραττον τῷ μὲν ἑνὶ μέρει τοῦ νομίσματος βοῦν, τῷ δὲ ἐτέρῳ τῷ βασιλέως πρόσωπον.

13 Cf. a similar gloss in the margins of Raffaelo Maffei’s translation of the first two books of the Iliad: in Vat.Capp. 169, f. 324r, at Il. 2.449 (πάντες ἐν- πλεκέες, ἐκατόμβουος δὲ ἐκαστος, translated: “adfabre stabant bubus quoque singula centum”) in the left margin is: “Monetae generis Athenis bovem habentis.”
When the hecatomb is carried out the Achaians wash their hands, take up barley grains, and, after praying to Apollo, sprinkle them over the heads of the sacrificial victims. *Il.* 1.449 reads χερνίψαντο δ’ ἔπειτα καὶ σύλοχύτας ἀνέλοντο (“Then they washed their hands and took up barley oats”). Next to this line the gloss reads (f. 328v):

Nota quod primi homines faciebant sacrificium bovis cum glandinibus et post aliusd tempus cum ordeo et illud vas in quo ponebatur ordeum vocabatur σύλοχύτης et isto tempore etiam greci quando portant nove [sic] nuptas ad domum mariti emittunt super caput ordeum.

Note that at first men used to make a sacrifice of an ox using kernels and after some time using barley and that the vessel in which the barley was placed was called an σύλοχύτης, and that, also at that time, when the Greeks take newly wedded wives to the home of their husbands, they [i.e. the Greeks] sprinkle barley over her head.

Here the commentator notes a transition in the ritual of animal sacrifice from the earlier use of small kernels (*glandes*) for sprinkling over the victims to the use of barley (*ordeum*).14 The word for barley oats in the text is σύλοχύτας, a word found only in the plural, a compound of σύλαί (“barley corns”) and the verb χέω (“to pour”). The commentator glosses the word in its non-existent singular form (σύλοχύτης) and mistakes it for illud vas (“that vessel”) in which the barley oats were stored. He made this mistake either by inference from etymology (σύλαί and χέω mean “to pour barley oats”) or because he mistook it for σύλοχοεῖον or σύλοχόιον which is a compound noun with the same derivation and according to Hesychius means “the vessel in which the sacred barley was kept.”15 For this reason in the inter-linear translation above the word σύλοχύτας reads vas in quo erat sacrificium (“the vessel in which the sacrifice was kept”).


15 Hesych. O 1759 σύλοχοεῖον: ἀγγεῖον, εἰς ὃ οἱ ὁλαὶ ἐμβάλλονται πρὸς ἀπαρχὰς τῶν θυσίων.
The translator’s possible use of the scholia: A different hand.

The *scholia antiqua* contained in Naples II D 45 clearly derive from a date earlier than the interlinear Latin translation and commentary found at the end of the codex. The Greek scribe who wrote these scholia also annotated the text with a series of marginal glosses of a largely philological nature by inserting missing passages and linking them to the main body of the text using signs of cross-reference. To answer the question whether the student whose work is found at the end of this codex may have consulted the scholia while translating the *Iliad*, the first clue would be to find traces of a hand other than that of the original Greek scribe in the margins of the scholia. An even more secure indication would be the intervention of a Latin hand, particularly in that part of the scholia which treats those passages from the *Iliad* that the student translated.

There are, in fact, traces of a hand other than that of the original Greek scribe and they occur in connection with scholia that, though they do not treat those verses of the *Iliad* that are translated at the end of the codex, occur early in Book 1. Three glosses in total are in a different hand than the original Greek scribe; two are in Greek and one in Latin.\(^\text{16}\)

The one and only gloss in Latin in this codex of scholia occurs on f. 11rv where the scholiast commented on *Il. 1.63* (ὦ καὶ ὄνειροπόλον, καὶ γάρ τ᾽ ὄναρ ἐκ Διός ἐστιν). The Latin gloss, however, is not on the *Iliad* but on a line from the *Odyssey* quoted by the scholiast. The scholiast quotes *Od. 19.563* (ἂν μὲν γὰρ κεράεσσι τετεύχαται, αἱ δ᾽ ἐλέφαντι), where Penelope responds to Odysseus still in disguise as a beggar. She claims that dreams are difficult to interpret, and their meaning is never clear. There are two gates of shadowy dreams, says Penelope, one fashioned of horn (κεράεσσι) and the other of ivory (ἐλέφαντι). The scholiast quotes this line from the *Odyssey* when discussing Achilles’ call in *Iliad 1* to consult a seer or priest or some interpreter

---

\(^{16}\) These annotations are on f. 11rv and 13r. The two in Greek consist in only the substitution of a letter such as ἀφέξει instead of ἐφέξει (f. 13r) and are therefore insignificant.
of dreams to explain the causes of Apollo’s wrath. The scholiast writes that dreams come from Zeus for everything they say is true—there are two gates of shadowy dreams: “one is fashioned of horn and the other of ivory.” In the left-hand margin next to this quotation is written cornua, eburnea: porte somniorum (“of horn, of ivory: the gates of dreams”). Though this could indicate that the translator had consulted the scholia, this gloss does not seem to have been written by the same hand as the translator whose work was inserted at the end of this codex. Furthermore, as will be shown in the following section, there are indications that the translator consulted some scholia but not those contained in Naples II D 45.

The translator’s word-choice

Another method of determining whether the translator consulted the scholia contained in this codex is to examine the choice of words in his translation for parallels with the scholia. Il. 2.11–12 reads θωρηξάει ἑκέλευσε κάρη κομώντας Ἀχαιοὺς / πανσυδίη (“He ordered the flowing-haired Achaians to get armed with all speed”). These same two lines are then repeated at Il. 2.28–29. The adverb πανσυδίῃ (“with all speed”) is tricky and can be translated in several ways. The word comes from σεύω, “to put in quick motion, drive,” and in the middle voice “to run, rush, dart or shoot along.” With the addition of παν- as a prefix, it has come to mean “in all haste” or “with all speed.” However, there is another interpretation that takes the word to mean πανστρατιᾷ (“with the whole army”). In the ύπόθεσις or argumentum to Book 2 on f. 41r of the scholia there is a gloss on the meaning of this word: πανσυδίη, ὁ ἐστὶ σὺν πᾶσῃ στρατιᾷ (“πανσυδίη, that is, with the whole army”).

When we turn to the back of the codex we find this ambiguity reflected in both translation exercises. The word πανσυδίη occurs twice, at Il. 2.12 and 2.29. The student worked through these passages in both translation exercises, which means that we can see how he translated it on four separate occasions. The first is at Il. 2.12 (f. 312r):
Here the translator offers three possible meanings of the word, distinguishing between the *ad verbum* sense and its other more metaphorical meanings. In the literal sense it means *simul omnes* (“all at once”), but it can also mean *toti exercitus* (“of the whole army”), and finally *precipitatus* (“headlong” or “precipitately”). The words *toti exercitus* seem to be a translation of σὺν πάσῃ στρατίᾳ (“with the whole army”) found at f. 41r of the scholia and therefore could offer an indication that the translator did in fact consult the scholia in this codex for his translation.

Yet when he encountered the word again at *Il. 2.29* he offered only one reading, the “*ad verbum*” translation *omnes simul* (“all at once”). This preference for the literal meaning of *πανσυδίῃ* in his first translation exercise may reflect the intentions that the student had in this phase of the project. The first phase, as was noted above, was a grammatical exercise intended to help the student learn the basics of Homeric Greek. At this stage a literal translation would have been more useful as he was interested only in the grammatical forms of each word and their primary, not their secondary, meanings. This may also explain why in the second, more polished translation exercise he abandoned the *ad verbum* rendering and in both instances chose *toti exercitus*.

At this point it is useful to compare the readings contained in the Naples MS. with other early humanist translations of the *Iliad*. The first Latin translation of the *Iliad* since antiquity was that of Leontius Pilatus in the 1360s (*PIL*). His *ad verbum* rendering was initially an interlinear translation quite like that found in Naples II D 45 but was later copied out into an all-Latin codex and circulated independently of the Greek text. It eventually formed the basis of many different Latin versions of Homer, which Agostino Pertusi has called *retractationes* of Pilatus. One such *retractatio* is in the Bodleian Library (*BODL*). Another is Pier Candido Decembrio’s (*DEC.*) translation of five books of the *Iliad* in a manuscript at the Biblioteca Ambrosiana. Finally, there is the anonymous re-working of Pilatus in *Vat.gr. 1626* (*VAT*):
HOMER: πανσυδίῃ
NAP. 1: omnes simul ad verbum est vel toti exercitus / precipitatus
NAP. 2: toti exercitus
PIL.: totaliter
BODL.: cum toto exercitu
DEC.: passim
VAT.: cum toto exercitu

From this comparison we can identify four clusters of meaning for the word πανσυδίῃ. The first meaning signifies the simultaneity of the action and is conveyed in the words omnes simul and totaliter (NAP. 1, PIL.). The second includes the idea of an army, as in toti exercitus and cum toto exercitus (NAP. 1, NAP. 2, BODL., VAT.). The third—precipitatus (NAP. 1)—has more to do with the speed of the motion. The fourth conveys the diffusion of that motion as we see in passim (DEC.).

Of these readings, that contained in the Bodleian manuscript exhibits the greatest similarity with the reading toti exercitus. In fact, the words cum toto exercitu seem to be an exact translation of σὺν πάσῃ στρατιᾷ. This fact alone indicates that this reading could be found in other sources and therefore our translator did not necessarily have to consult the scholia in Naples II D 45 for his understanding of πανσυδίῃ. Despite the marginal gloss in Latin at f. 41r (cornua, eburnea: porte somniorum) and despite the correspondence between σὺν πάσῃ στρατιᾳ and toti exercitus, the evidence for the translator’s dependence on the scholia contained in this manuscript is in fact minimal.

When we compare some of the marginal glosses examined above to the corresponding passages in the scholia, we in fact find nothing in common between them. For example, the translator glosses the word ἔκατόμβη as a “sacrificium monetarum in quibus erat sculptus bos.” The Naples MS. scholium on this line (Il. 1.309) simply reads: ἐς δ’ ἔκατόμβην· εἰς αὐτὴν δὲ καὶ τελείαν θυσίαν ("on (the ship) a hecatomb: on it a complete sacrifice"). Here nothing suggests the idea that a hecatomb consisted of a hundred coins each stamped with the image of an ox. As we saw above, the translator also interpreted οὐλοχύται rather oddly as “illud vas in quo ponebatur ordeum” or “vas in quo erat sacrificium.” The scholium on this line (Il. 1.449) reads
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οὐλοχύτας· Οὐλάς. Εἰσὶ δὲ κριθαί μετὰ ἄλλων μεμιγμέναι, ὡς ἐπέχεον τοῖς ἱερωργομένοις ζώοις πρὸ τοῦ θύεσθαι ἦτοι πολύ-πληθεῖς χάριν ἢ μνήμην ποιούμενοι τῆς ἀρχαίας βρώσεως.

οὐλοχύτας] Barley oats. They are barley corns mixed together with others that they used to pour over the victims offered before the sacrifice either in giving thanks on account of great abundance or in remembrance of the old manner of eating/old diet.

The scholiast then cites Theophrastus’ On Discoveries, where he claims that “before men learned how to grind Demeter’s fruit, they ate the barley groats intact”:

Ὡς γάρ φησί Θεόφραστος ἐν τῷ περὶ εὑρήματον, πρὶν ἢ μάθωσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀλεῖν τὸν Δημητριακὸν καρπόν, οὕτω σῶς αὐτὰς ἔσθιον, ὅθεν οὐλάς αὐτάς φησιν ὁ Ποιητής.

Here there is nothing about the vessel in which the barley was stored or the practice of throwing barley corns over the head of a newly wedded wife. From these examples alone, it can be concluded with a fair amount of certainty that our translator did not in fact consult the scholia contained in this manuscript when doing the two translation exercises found at the end of the codex. Rather, it seems that he had other sources available, including the glossary of Hesychius and the commentary of Eustathius.

Possible correspondences with other translations of Homer

At this point it has been shown that the student probably did not consult the scholia contained in the same codex. If he did there is little evidence of influence especially on his interpretations of the ritual sacrifice of animals, for which he drew on different scholia. This negative evidence raises the question of what sources he did consult. It is possible that the translator had at his disposal one of the other early ad verbum translations of the Iliad from the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. The comparison above between our translator’s rendering of the word πανσυδίῃ and that of Pilatus, the retractatio at the Bodleian, and Pier Candido Decembrio showed that the Bodleian and the Naples manuscripts were the only ones to interpret this word in

17 Text 730.3–5 Fortenbaugh/Gutas.
the military context as either *toti exercitus* or *cum toto exercitu*.

Of the other four early humanist translations of Homer completed by Pilatus, Decembrio, the translator of the Bodleian manuscript, and the anonymous Vatican translation, the partial interlinear translation at Naples has the most in common with the Bodleian manuscript. This is not to say that there is any dependence of one on the other, or even on a third source in common, but only that the question of textual dependence is worth pursuing.

**Agreement between Naples and Bodleian: epithets, adjectives, and adverbs**

The dutiful rendering of every word was a staple of the earliest phase of humanist translations of Homer, which, from the middle of the 1360s to the 1430s did not move beyond a word-for-word rendering. It was not until the 1430s that translators such as Leonardo Bruni (1370–1444) drew inspiration from ancient models of translation and broke away from the literalist tendency. Often mistaking adjectives for heroic epithets, Bruni omitted many of them from his translation believing that they were irrelevant. Ancient Roman authors who translated portions of the *Iliad* often did the same, preferring to convey the sense of the epithet indirectly through the connotations of the other words that make up the line. Ausonius (ca. 310–ca. 395), for example, translated the first few lines of the second book of the *Iliad* in his *Periochae*. There he rendered the adjective παν-νύχιοι (“all night long”) as *tranquilla obscuri munera somni* (“the tranquil gifts of dark slumber”). When the same adjective

---


19 For an edition and commentary see Peter Thiermann, *Die Orationes Homeri des Leonardo Bruni Aretni* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 126 [1993]).
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occurs again at *Il.* 10.1–2, Ausonius translated it *cetera somno sopita iacebat turba ducum* (“the rest of the commanders lay lulled to sleep”).

No such poetry can be found in the earliest literal translations of Homer in the Renaissance.

When our translator encountered the same adjective παννύχιοι at *Il.* 2.2 both he and the translator of the Bodleian manuscript rendered it with the adjective *nocturni,* whereas Pilatus preferred to use the temporal expression *tota noce*:

HOMER: παννύχιοι  
NAP. 1: nocturni / tota noce  
NAP. 2: tota noce  
PIL.: tota noce  
BODL.: nocturni  
DEC.: nocturni  
VAT.: per totam noctem

In both cases there is an attempt to render a discrete unit of meaning (παννύχιοι) in one language with the equivalent in another language (nocturni). Rather than diffusing the sense of “all night long,” as Ausonius had done, through the connotations of the other words in the line or simply omitting the word altogether as was Bruni’s tendency, these early translators diligently conveyed each word as a discrete packet of meaning.

When the epithet “swift” (θοαί) is applied to ships at *Il.* 2.8 the translators of the Naples, Bodleian, and Vatican manuscripts render it as *veloces,* while Pilatus and Decembrio preferred *citas*:

HOMER: θοαί  
NAP. 1: veloces  
NAP. 2:  
PIL.: citas  
BODL.: veloces  
DEC.: citas  
VAT.: veloces

The ancient Roman translator of Homer, Gnaeus Matius, provides a counter-example to this literal tendency. Applying a technique similar to that of Ausonius above, Matius rendered the same word θοη at *Il.* 12.463 as follows:


22 Fr. 4.1 Courtney, quoted by Priscian *Inst.gram.*, II 334 Keil; cf. *Ilias Latina 794 aduolat interea, Danaum metus, impiger Hector, and 413 celer aduolat.*
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Here the translation does not make sense without the hemistych that precedes it. Like Ausonius, Matius conveys νυκτὶ θοῇ (“swift night”) by transferring the swiftness from night to Hector using the verb *advolat*, while conveying the epithet φαίδιμος with *CELERISSIMUS*. When we compare this with the translation of Lorenzo Valla (1407–1457), we find a much more prosaic *VOLUCRI NOCTI*. This tendency poses a considerable contrast with the verse rendering by Niccolò Della Valle (1444–1473) of *II. 24.1*, where he uses a technique of transference similar to that of Ausonius and Matius. Here he renders θοᾳξ ἐπὶ νῆας as *ad naves festinat*—instead of “to the swift ships” we have “swiftly to the ships.”

The translator of the Naples and the Bodleian manuscripts also agreed in part on the meaning of the adverb ἀτρεκέως. Whereas Pilatus and Decembrio translated it as *palam*, and in the margin of his copy of Pilatus’ translation Petrarch glossed it as *clare*; the Bodleian translator rendered it as *vere* and the Naples translator as *veriter* or *veraciter*.

When we compare this to the translation done by the ancient Roman author Livius Andronicus (ca. 284–ca. 205 BCE), we

---


24 *Vat.lat.* 1567, f. 75v [f.77v].


26 For Petrarch’s gloss, see Paris, *Bibl.Nat.* 7880.1, f. 10r: in the right-hand margin next to the line *omnia valde palam contionaberis ut precipio* (*II. 2.10*) Petrarch wrote “clare: sine solitis ambagibus.”

---
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find a very different interpretation. Rendering Od. 1.169 he translated ἄτρεκέως as disertim: 27

ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπὲ καὶ ἄτρεκέως κατάλεξον
tuque mihi narrato omnia disertim.

Though Pilatus translated ἄτρεκέως as palam at this line in his translation of the Odyssey, he chose veraciter along with the Naples and the Bodleian manuscripts (“sed eya michi hoc dic, et vera-citer narra”), while Francesco Griffolini in his prose rendering of the same simply omitted it altogether (“sed age dic, oro”). 28

In addition to the examples discussed above, there are many more instances of harmony between the Naples and the Bodleian manuscripts in the rendering of epithets, adjectives, and adverbs. One particularly striking example is their translation of οὖλον as perniciosum in contrast to Pilatus’ and Decembrio’s quite anomalous dulcem or dulce. Likewise, the translators of the Naples and the Bodleian manuscripts agreed on the epithet πτερόεντα as velocia, while Pilatus preferred pennosa and Decembrio the more poetic per inane volantibus. For the adjective δαΐφρονος we find prudentis or habentis bellicosam scientiam in the Naples manuscript, and prudentis in the Bodleian translation, while Pilatus translated it as scientifici and Decembrio as prudentis ac bellicosì. What the analysis of these correspondences demonstrates is that the translator of the Naples manuscript belonged to the first phase of ad verbum humanist translations of Homer in the early fifteenth century. This phase in the translation differed both from ancient techniques of translation, exemplified by Ausonius, Matius, and Livius Andronicus, as well as later oratorical and poetic modes of translation found in the works of Bruni, Niccolò Della Valle, and Francesco Griffolini, and therefore forms a distinct period in the history of Homer’s reception in the Renaissance. However, the evidence of harmony between the Naples manuscript and other retractationes is not strong enough to infer

27 Fr.7 Warmington, quoted by Nonius Marc. (De comp.doctr. II 819 Lindsay).

28 Bernd Schneider and Christina Meckelnborg, Odyssea Homeri a Francisco Griffolino Aretino in Latinum translata (Leiden 2011) 62.
anything more than the coincidental correspondence between certain words and phrases.

Divergence between Naples and the other retractationes: verbs and participles

The samples provided in the Appendix show enough divergencies from other re-workings of Pilatus to warrant the claim that these translations were made independently of the others. Though there is greater agreement in general between the Naples and the Bodleian manuscripts than there is between either manuscript and the translations of Pilatus and Decembrio, the number of divergences outnumber those of agreement by about ten. These divergences are equally important for our understanding of the Naples translation and shed light on the translator’s sources, technique, and understanding of Greek.

The greatest number of divergences can be found in the rendering of verbs and participles. In some instances, the Naples translation exhibits more in common with Pilatus and Decembrio than with the Bodleian translation. For example, the Naples translator chose to render αἱρήσοµεν with either capere or destruere, while the Bodleian translator preferred the nonsensical accipere:

HOMER: ἔλοι
NAP. 1: capiet / destruet
NAP. 2: caperet / destrueret
PIL.: capiet
BODL.: accipiet
DED.: capiet
VAT.: expugnabit

When we compare Cicero’s translation of the same verb (αἱρήσοµεν) in Odysseus’ speech at Il. 2.329, we find a completely different approach (Div. 2.64):

τῷ δεκάτῳ δὲ πόλιν αἱρήσοµεν εὐρυάγυιαν
quae decumo cadet et poena satiabit Achivos

Instead of maintaining the same person and number (“We will capture”), Cicero switches to the third person and, along with it, changes the subject of the verb (“The city will fall”). He thus rearranges the entire syntax of the line, translating it, as he
claimed, not as an interpres but as an orator. Not even Valla does this in his rendering of the same line. Rather, he maintains the same syntax as the Greek (“decimoque anno urbem expugnatam evertemus”). In fact, neither Janus Pannonius (“expugnabimus”) nor Angelo Poliziano (“expugnabimus”) departs from the syntax of the Greek line as Cicero had recommended, and therefore both remain much closer to the ad verbum tendency than they would have liked to admit. The only one to have departed from Greek syntax was Raffaele Volteranno (1451–1522), who translated the line “At decimo nostris tandem expugnabitur armis.”

Finally, the verb προσφωνεῖν (“to address”: Il. 2.22) provides a point of divergence between all four translations. The Naples translator mistook it for vocare (“to call”), while Pilatus translated it erroneously as vociferare (“to cry out”) and Decembrio as fari (“to say”):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Homer</th>
<th>Naples 1</th>
<th>Naples 2</th>
<th>Pilatus</th>
<th>Bodleian</th>
<th>Vatican</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>προσφώνεε</td>
<td>vocabat</td>
<td>vocabat</td>
<td>vociferabat</td>
<td>alloquutus fuit</td>
<td>fatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hom.: προσφώνεε</td>
<td>Nap. 1: vocabat</td>
<td>Nap. 2: vocabat</td>
<td>Pil.: vociferabat</td>
<td>Bodl.: alloquutus fuit</td>
<td>Dec.: fatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vat.: allocutus est</td>
<td>De.: alloquutus fuit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only the Bodleian and Vatican versions give a correct translation. Decembrio was in the habit of translating the formulaic ὡς ἐφατο using the sic fatus formula found in Vergil, Lucan, and Statius, and seems here to have believed that προσφωνεῖν meant the same thing. Ausonius likewise rendered προσέφη as fatur (Il. 9.1) and Bruni translated it as locutus est (Il. 9.307).


Vat.lat. 1567, f. 9v.

For Pannonius’ translation of Nestor’s speech in the first book of the Iliad entitled “Calchantis de excidio Troiai,” see Sevilla, Bibl.Colombia y Capitular, 7-1-15, f. 104v; for Poliziano’s translation of the same see Vat.lat. 3298, f. 8v.

Vat.Capp. 169, f. 322v.

Green, The Works of Ausonius 689; Thiermann, Die Orationes Homeri 82.
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**Conclusion**

What the foregoing analysis demonstrates is that sometime in the early to middle decades of the fifteenth century (c. 1425–1476) a student of Greek took up the task of reading Homer’s *Iliad*. He made it at least as far as the first two books with the intention of proceeding further, but in all likelihood his reading came to an end around Il. 2.449. His study of the *Iliad* developed in two phases. In the first phase he wrote out the Greek text, surrounding each word in an elementary grammatical commentary, while writing a Latin translation in between the lines. In the second phase he copied the same portion of text without interruption, intending to create a more readable version of the *Iliad* with his own interlinear Latin translation. Both phases of the translation exercise are characterized by a certain plasticity of word choice, such that it is quite likely the text was meant for private use rather than official presentation. The marginal glosses that accompany the first phase of the student’s project were therefore probably intended for his eyes only. Some of these glosses, particularly those regarding animal sacrifice, present readings that diverge enough from the scholia contained in the same manuscript that it is likely that the translator relied on a different source altogether. Furthermore, the confusing organization of the folio pages at the end of Naples II D 45 suggests that they were inserted in a hasty manner after the fact without having any connection with the scholia contained in the same manuscript.

When we compare the translation to other *ad verbum* translations from the early fifteenth century, we find similarities only in the word-for-word procedure but not in content. Those correspondences that can be detected between the Naples and the Bodleian manuscripts result rather from the fact that the *ad verbum* method constrains the translator to a small number of choices for each word. When there are only so many distinct Latin terms that could possibly be used to render a particular Greek word, there is bound to be some consensus among otherwise unrelated literal translations. It is therefore likely that this translation was carried out independently of the other *ad verbum*
translations of Homer completed by Leontius Pilatus, Pier Candido Decembrio, the translator of the Bodleian manuscript, and the anonymous retractatio at the Vatican Library. What this study has not answered, however, is the more pressing question of attribution. Unfortunately, from the information contained in this manuscript it is impossible at this point to venture a guess at who the translator may have been. We must therefore await a future study that will put us on better footing in this regard.

APPENDIX: Iliad 2.1 ff.

First Translation Exercise

First Transl. Exc. 2.1

464 A PARTIAL INTERLINEAR TRANSLATION OF THE ILLAD
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ἐφῆψαι κήδεα estus pernitiosum somnium
<i>καὶ μιν φωνήσας</i> τοῦ φωνήσαντος ἔπεα τὸ ἐπος τοῦ ἔπος ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ alata et velocia
tῶν πληθύντων τὰ ἔπεα περιέντα τὸ περῶν τοῦ περιέντος ἡ dicebat ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων τὰ περιέντα προσπόδα προσαυδαῖο ὁ
παρατατικὸς προσπόδαιον προσπόδαεις προσπόδαια βάσκι βάσκω.
προστατικῶν βάςκε βασκέτω. ιθὶ προστατικὸν ιθὶ ἵτω ὄουλ ὁ ὄουλος
tοῦ ὄουλο ἡ κλητικὴ ὁ ὄουλ ὄνειρε ὁ ὄνειρος ὅ πουθ ὁ ὁθη ἡς
super naves grecorum ad tentorium ἐπὶ νῆσα Ἀχαιῶν ὁ ἐξ ἐλθὼν τοῦ ἐλθὼντος ἡς κλησίνη ἡ κλησίνη ἡς
Ἀγαμέμνων Ατρείδαο ἀτρείδης. δου τὸ παῦ τοῦ παντὸς μάλα veriter dicere ἀτρεκέως ἀγορεύμεν ἀγορεύω. εὐεις. εὐεῖ. καὶ τὸ ἀπαρέμφατον ut iubeo
ἀγορεύειν καὶ ποιητικὸς ἀγορεύμεν ὡς ἐπιτέλλοι λλεις. λλει
armare ipsam precipe 11 ὡθηζει ἀπαρέμφατον ἐς κελευκεν κελευκάτῳ προστατικὸν capitis ornantem silicet pulchros
καρηκομόυντας ὁ καρηκομόν τοῦ καρηκομόντος. ἡ αἰτιατική τῶν
grecos πληθύντων τοὺς καρηκομόμωντας. Ἀχαιῶς
simul omnes ad verbum est
vel toti exercitus precipitatus nunc enim coniunctio est capiet pro destruct
12 παναυβίὴν νῦν γάρ κεν ἐλοι ἐλω. εὐκτικόν ἐλοι.
civitatem platus vias habentem ἐλοις. ἐλοι πολλὴν ἡ πολις. τῆς πόλεως εὐρυάγυαιν ἡ εὐρυάγυαιν ἡς
troianorum non enim amplius dupliciter celestes ἐπαυβιήν τὸ δοῦμα τοῦ δούματος ἐχοντες ὁ ἐχων τοῦ ἐχοντος οἱ ἐχοντες
13 ἔρων ὁ τρως τοῦ τρῶος οὐ γάρ ἐτε ἑμφρυς ὀλυμπια τὸ ὀλυμπιον. οὐ
domos habentes δωματ. τὸ δοῦμα τοῦ δούματος ἐχοντες ὁ ἐχων τοῦ ἐχοντος οἱ ἐχοντες
immortales intellexunt vel consulat persuasit id est ficit declinare
11 ὡθήνατοι ὁ ὡθάνατος. τοῦ φράζονται φράζομαι τὸ γ᾽ τῶν πληθύντων
φράζονται ἐπέγναμεν ἐπιγύμπτο μὲλλὼν ἐπιγυμπτὸ ὁ ἀόριστος
14 ἔργον ὁμης. ἐργα ἐργα. τρώσσασι. ἔρημοι. τρώσσασι. δὲ
omnes Juno observans troianis autem ἐπέγναμαι. ψας. ψεν ἐπανατα. 157 Ἡρη. ῥης. λισσόμενη. νης. ἐρας. δὲ
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καὶ φάτο. βῆ βῶ ὁ βόριστος ἔβην ἔβη καὶ βή. δ' ἁρά ὀνείρος
enim pro postquam sermonem pro verbum audīvit id est adiverat
ἐτεὶ τῶν μύθων ὁ μύθος. θοῦ ἅκουσε ἰκάνῳ ὁ ἀρίστος
ἡκουσα ὁσ. ἐ. 17κραπάλιμος δ' ἵκανε ἰκάνῳ. ὁ παρατατικός ἦκανον.
velox super naves grecorum iverat
νες. ἰκανε. θοὺς ἐπὶ νῆσος Ἀγαίων. 18βῆ ἀρίστος ἔβην. βῆς. βή.
δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' Ἀτρείδην Ἀγαμέμνονα· τὸν δὲ ἐκίνησε κυκάνῳ ὁ βαρύστος
ἐκίνησε. ε. ν. 19ἐυδοκα. ὁ εὐδοκα. τοῦ εὐδοκα. ἐν κλίσῃ. περὶ δ' 
divinus effusus est ἐωμβρόστος .ου. κέχυσθ' χέομαι. παρατατικός ἔχεχυμην .σο. κέχυτο .ε.
somnium staterat ὑπνος. ὑπνοι. 20στή ὁ ἀρίστος ἦστιν θέση καὶ στή.
super caput Neleus 
δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἢ κεφαλῆς. λῆς. Νηλήϊῳ ὁ Νηλήϊος .ου.
υἱὸς ὁ υἱεύς. υἱεός. υἱεὶ καὶ υἱι. ἐοικός τοῦ ἐοικότος
qui simili maxime semum

21Νέστορι ὁ Νέστορ, τοῦ Νέστορος. τὸν ᾧ μάλιστα γερόντων ὁ γέρων,
tοῦ γέρωντος. ἡ γενετική τῶν πληθύντων τῶν γέρωντων.
honorabat 
22τ' τιμ. ὁ παρατατικός έτιον. έτιε. έτει καὶ τίε. Ἀγαμέμνον·
cui simiipulum vocabat
τῶν μίν ἔεισάμενον .ου. προσεφώνει προσφωνέω. ὁ παρατατικός

proseφωνεν (-ουν), προσεφώνευς (-εις), προσεφώνευς (-ειν). ὁ θεϊος .ου.
somnium dormis feli
όνειρος .ου. 23εὔδεις εὔδω εὔδεις Ἀτρέως ὁ Ἀτρέως τοῦ Ἀτρέως ὦ ὕιε

ὁ ὕιος τοῦ ὕιου δαίφρονος ὁ δαίφρον δαίφρονος. ἵπποδάμιον ὁ

ἵπποδαμος τοῦ ἱπποδάμου καὶ ἱωνική ἵπποδαμίου 25ο. λαοί ὁ λαὸς
tοῦ λαοῦ ἡ ὀνομαστική τῶν πληθύντων οἱ λαοί τ' ἐπιτετράφαται
epitrepomai ὁ παρακείμενος τέτραμαι .ψαι τέτραπται ἐπιτετραμμένοι
eiσὶ καὶ ἱωνικὴ ἐπιτετράφαται τὸ γ' τῶν πληθύντων καὶ τόσα τὸ τόσον

cura est non oportet
totam nocem dormire consiliarium
παννύχιον. παννύχιον .ου εὐδεῖν ἀπαρέμφατον θεούρον

virum pro hominem

ὁ βουληφόρος .ου. ἄνδρα ὁ ἄνηρ τοῦ ἄνδρος τὸν ἄνερα καὶ ἄνδρα
nunc autem mei intellige velociter Iovis

26τὸν δ' ἐμεθεν σελίκιτ ἐμοῦ ζήνες προστατικόν ὁκα διὸς ὁ ζεὺς
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ubi nuncius sum armare
toi diuó dé toi o áγελος . lou éimi ei ésti 28θωρῆξαι ἀπαρέμφατον
te imperavit pulchros
s' ekéleusen keleúvo o óριστος ékéleusa . sa . se . kárh koumòntas
grecs qui tui longe ens multum curat an
Áchaióús 27óς sev pro sou aneúthen eów éontos méga kîdetai ἂν’
317r
misera tur omnes simul nunc enim an capies
éleaîrei. 29πανσυδίη épírrhmeta nín yár kev éloi éloi éloi éloi
civitatem ampliam
pólin euρuάγμιan ē euρuάγμιa . ας
Second translation exercise
άρχη τῆς βήτα όμῖρου πανσυδίας
Βήτα δ’ ονειρον έχει. άγορην και νήας άρισμεί
utique
nunc viri equites armati
Ἀλλοι μέν ρα θεοί τε και άνέρες ιπποκορυσταί
dormiebant tota nocte. Jovem non tenebat dulcis somnus
εύδον παννύχιοι, Δία δ’ ουκ έχε νηδύμος ύπνος,
sed hic Jupiter cogitat secundum animum ut Achilles
ἄλλ’ ο γε μερμήριζε κατά φρένα ός Άχιλλη
honoraret destrueret plures super navibus
tiμῆση, όλση δε πολέας επί νησιν Άχαιων.
hic autem sibi Iovi optima videbatur
иδε δε οι κατά θυμόν άριστη φαινετο θουλη,
I. 2.5
mittere ad perniciosum somnium
πέμψαι επ’ Άτρείδη Άγαμέμνονι ούλον ένειρον.
Istum somnium vocans Iuppiter verba velocia declamavit
και μιν φωνήςας έπαι περόντα προσηύδα·
vade vide perniciose somnie ad
βάσκ’ ίθι ούλε ονειρε θους επι νήας Άχαιων.
iens somnium sui ad Atridis
ελθον έξ κλίσιν Άγαμέμνονος Άτρείδαο
valde vel dicere sic
omne multa veraciter dic ut precípio
πάντα μᾶλ’ άτρεκέως άγορευέμεν ός επιτέλλω·
illum scilicet aga<memnon>
armari precipe habentes capita comata grecos
θωρῆξαί ε κέλευε καρηκομώντας Άχαιως
capeχ vel destruet aga<memnon>
tot exerccitus an habentem latam viam
πανσυδίη· νῦν γάρ κεν ἐλοὶ πόλιν ευρυάγμιαν
dinceps amplius
inconcorditus habentes
Τρώων· ου γάρ έτ’ άμφις Όλυμποι δόμιματ’ έχοντες
consultunt vel loquuntur declinavit vel persuasit
immortales summi dii inclinavit omnes deos
Ωθάνατοι φάζονται επέγναμεν γάρ ἄπαντας
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deprecans obsecrans mala iminet pro iminent

"Ηρη λιοσουμενη, Τρώουσι δε κηδε' εφηται αιτητοι.

sic locutus est Iupiter

ivit sopnus postquam scilicet verbis audiverat

"Ως φατο, βη δ' ὁρε' ονειρος επει τον μυθον άκουσεν·

velociter applicuit

carpallimos δ' ίκανε θος ετι νηας άχαιων.

igidur qui aga<memnon> invenit

βη δ' ὁρε' επ' Ατρειδην Άγαμέμνονα· τον δε κηχανεν
dormientem divinus occupabat agamemnonem

ευδοντ' εν κλιση, περι δ' άμβροσιος κεχυθ' ύπνος,
stetit deus sopnii

igidur capitis filio nilei filius scilicet fetus

στη δ' ἄρ' υπερ κεφαλης Νηπηιω νυ εοικως

quem nostorem

quidem honorabat

Νέστορι, τον ρα μαλιστα γεροντων τι' Άγαμέμνονων·

huic nosteri fetus vocabit divinins

istum aga<memnonem>

tω μιν εισιαμενος προσπεφωνε θειος ονειρος·
dormis filii habentis bellicosam scientiam

boni equitus

eυδεις Ατρεος υιοι δαφρων τι' Άγαμέμνων·
on decet quam totam noctam dormire consiliarum

ου χρη πανυχιον ευδειν βουληφορον άνδρα
dormis filius habentis capitis comata

andri vel

cui aga<memnon> subicitur pro subicuntur cogitat curat

populi conversi sunt id est subieci sunt tanta vel suis curare debit

ω λαοι τ' επιτετραφαται και τοσσα μεμηλε·

nunc autem sum

vων δ' εμεθεν εξυνε ωκα· Διος δε του άγγελος ειμι,
qui iupiter existens multum et

tui longe curat miseretur

ος σευ ανευθεν εων μεγα κιδηται ηδε ελεαρει.

armari preciperet habentes capita comata

ϑωρηξαι σε κελευσε καρηκουμωντας Άχαιως

inconcorditus habentes

caperet

toti exercitus an si destruet habentem latam viam

πανσυδη- νων γαρ κεν έλοις πολιν ευρυάγυαι

deinceps

inconcorditus habentes

Τρωων· ου γαρ ετ' άμφις Ωλυμπια δωματ' εχοντες

consultunt

vel loquauntur inclinavit

immortales summi dii

Ωθονατοι φραζονται· επεγναμην γαρ άπαντας
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Juno deprecans troianis mala iminet pro iminent
"Hēρ ύλοσομένη, Τρόιεσσι δὲ κήδε' ἐφῆπται
tu aga<memnon> tene
tuis ne oblivio
ἐκ Διός· ἀλλὰ σὺ σήσιν ἐχε φρεσί, μηδὲ σε λήθῃ
tenēcat cum dulcis demiserit
αἱρεῖτω εὑτ' ἂν σε μελίφρων ύπνος ἀνήῃ.
vocans sopnus reliquit
poeta loquitur recessit aga<memnon> ibi
Ὡς ᾖρα φωνῆς σὺ ἀπεβήσετο, τὸν δὲ λήτ' αὐτοῦ
que adimpleri
cogitantem super utique non futuri causa
τὰ φρόνεοντ' ἂν θυμὸν ἄρ' σὺ σῇσιν ἔχε
σφρείσει, οδέ σε λήθη
teneat cum dulcis demiserit
αἱρείτω εὖτ' ἄν σὲ µελίφρων ύπνος ἀνήῃ.
vocans sopnus                                    reliquit
poeta loquitur recessit aga<memnon> ibi
Ὣς ἀρ σῇσιν ἔχε
2.35
f. 336v
cogitat super
θήσειν ἄρ' ἐπ' ἐμελλεν ἄρ' ἀλγεά τε στοναχάς τε
fortes pugnas
Tρωσὶ τε καὶ Δαναοῖσι διὰ κρατερὰς υσινας.
exsurrexit ex sopni divina occupabat vox
cogitabat super
agamemnon capere diei ipsi
φῆ γὰρ ὁ γ' αἰρήσειν Πριάμου πόλιν ἡματι κεῖνοι
demens erat summus aga<memnon>
sciret consulabat
non hæc quæ opera
νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὰ ἢδει ἂ ρα Ζεὺς µήδετο ἐργα.
deinceps meditabatur dampna suspitia
facere cogitat super
θήσειν ἄρ' ἐπ' ἐμελλεν ἄρ' ἀλγεά τε στοναχάς τε
fortes pugnas
Tρωσὶ τε καὶ Δαναοῖσι διὰ κρατερὰς υσινας.
exsurrexit ex sopni divina occupabat vox
cogitabat super
agamemnonem
ἔγρετο δ' ἐξ ὕπνου, θείη δὲ µιν ἀµφέχυτ' ὀµφή·
sedebat
sedebat
ἔξετο δ' ὀρθωθείς, µολαχὸν δ' ἐνδυν χιτῶνα
novam magnam circum ponebat vestem
καλὸν νηγάτεον, περὶ δὲ µέγα βάλλετο φάρος·
pedibus sub fortibus induit sotularis
ποσὶ δ' ὑπὸ λιπαροῖσιν ἐδήσαστο καλὰ πέδιλα,
de humeris posuit ensem fixum clavis
super argenteis vel argentatum
ἄµφι δ' ἀρ' ὅμωσιν βάλετο ξίφος ἀργυρόπηλον·
2.45
cepit patrium incorruptibile semper
έιλετο δ' σκῆπτρον πατρώιον ἀφῆτον αἰει
huic sceptro ad habentum camissias [sic] enca
cum ivit supra scilicet toraces
σὺν τῷ ἐβη κατὰ νήας Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτῶνον·
eous dea lucis processerat longum celum
utique iverat
"Ηῶς µὲν ρα θέα προσβῆσετο μακρὸν "Ολυµπον
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Παρὰ δὲ πρῶτον μεγαθύμων ἵπποι γερόντων
iuxta navi in pilo nati

Νεστορέῃ παρὰ νηῒ Πυλοιγενέος βασιλῆος
hic agammon assiduam ordinabat
hos convocans prudenter preperabat
tou ὁ γε συγκαλέσας πυκινὴν ἀρτύνετο Βουλή·

hii quidem predicaverunt isti surrexerunt valde velociter
οἱ μὲν ἐκήρυσσον, τοῖ δὲ ἱγείροντο μάλ’ ὦκα·
sed pliebat sedere

tene sic dicens

ἐκ Διὸς· ἀλλὰ σὺ σήσιν ἐχὲ φρεσίν· ὡς ὁ μὲν εἶπόν
recessit volans autem dulcis sopnus dimisit

δοκαὶ ἀποπτάμενος, ἐμὲ δὲ γλυκὺς ὑπόνος ἀνήκεν.
ducite si quomodo armentus filios

ἀλλ’ ἀγετ’ αἱ κέν παχ θορῆξομεν νιὰς Ἀχαιῶν·
primum ego verbis experiar prout divina iusticia

priosta δ’ ἐγὼν ἐπεσεν πειρήσομαι, ή θέμις ἐστί,
multis transtris
fugere cum habentibus multa transtra precipio
καὶ φεύγειν σὺν νησί πολυκλήσι κελεύσω.
vos alterutrum alter impedire pro
impedit
υμεῖς δ’ ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος ἥρπτευεν ἐπέσεσιν.
hic ago<memnon>
certe sic sedit surrexit
"Ἦτοι ὁ γ’ ὃς εἰπὼν κατ’ ἄρ’ ἔξετο, τοῦτι δ’ ἄνέστη
qui quidem erat nomen fluvii a flumine
nomen civitatis nestoris sic dicto vel arenose
Νέστωρ, ὃς ῥὰ Πύλοιο ἤνας ἦν ἡμαθόντος,
qui isit bene sciens conscientus est postea dixit
ὁ σφιν ἐν φρονέοιν ἁγορήσατο καὶ μετεέπειν:
duces et reges
ὁ φιλὸι Αργείων ἥητορες ἥδ’ μεδόντες
siquidem quis sopnium alter dicebat pro dixit
ei μὲν τις τὸν ὄνειρον Ἀχαιῶν ἄλλος ἕνιστε
fari putaremus
mendacium loquamur vel recedimus magis
ψεύδος κεν φαίμεν καὶ νοσφιζοίμεθα μᾶλλον·
nunc autem vidit multum optimus gloriatur esse

vūn δ’ ἰδεν ὃς μέγ’ ἀριστὸς Ἀχαιῶν εὐχεταί εἶναι·
sed si quomodo armavimus filios
ἀλλ’ ἀγετ’ αἳ κέν πως θωρῆξομεν ύπας Ἀχαιῶν.

exivit ire
sic igitur vocans nestor ambulare
"Ὡς ἀρᾳ φονήσας βουλής εἴηρχε νέεσθαι,
isti obediverunt pastori sive regi
greci surrexerunt que
οἱ δ’ ἐπανέστησαν πειθοντε τε ποιμένι λαῶν
reges movebantur
σκηπτούχοι βασιλῆες ἐπεσεσσόντο δε λαοί.
caterva frequentum
tanquam procedit apum densarum
ἡὕτε ἔθνεα εἰςι μελισσῶιν ἀδινῶιν
lapidis concavi semper nuper venientum
πέτρης ἐκ γλαφυρῆς αἰεὶ νέον ἐρχομενῶιν,
tanquam racemus
botrus volant super floribus vernalibus
βοτρυδὸν δὲ πέτονται ἐπ’ ἀνθεῖσιν εἰαρινοῖς:

quetdam hinc satis volant quedam hic
αἳ μὲν τ’ ἐνθα ἄλις πεποτήσαται, αἳ δ’ τε ἐνθα
sic istorum gentes multa navium
ὡς τὸν ἔθνεα πολλὰ νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιῶιν
litoris coram longi ordinati ambulabant
阂νος προπάροιθε βαθείς ἐστιχῶντο
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simul ordinate ad conscientem
totum simul in istis divina vox surrexit

ἰλαδὸν εἰς ἀγορὴν· μετὰ δὲ σφίσιν ὄσσα δεδήει
nec proficisci

movens divinus nuncius isti autem congregabantur

ότρυνονσ’ ἵναι Διὸς ἄγγελος· οἳ δ’ ἀγέροντο.
turbata fuit conscio sub suspirabat

τετρήξει δ’ ἀγορή, ὑπὸ δὲ στεναχίζετο γαῖα

sedentum tumultus autem erat novem illos

λαῶν ἵζόντων, ὕμαδος δ’ ἦν· ἐννέα δὲ σφεας

precones vocantes impediebant vocis

vociferantes quando clamoris

κήρυκες βοῶντες ἐρήτυον, εἰ ποτ’ ἀὔτῆς

continet illustrium regum

σχοίατ’ ἀκουσεῖαν δὲ διοτρεφέων βασιλῆων.

sollicitudini sedit tenebat

σπουδὴ δ’ ἐξετο λαῶς, ἐρήτυθεν δὲ καθ’ ἔδρας

quiescentes clangoris

παυσάμενοι κλαγγῆς· ἀνὰ δὲ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
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