

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*.¹ The scholia end on f. 310^v, 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*.²

The translation exercise was carried out in two phases.³ The

¹ Ms. Naples, *Bibl.Naz.* II D 45 (21.5 × 29 cm) probably derives from the fifteenth century and contains the scholia on ff. 2r–310v). For a description of the manuscript see P. Baffi, “Catalogus mss. Graecorum Bibliothecae Regiae Neapolitanae,” in J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca graeca* V (Hamburg 1796), 783 no. 133, where it is attributed to the fourteenth century: “*Scholia* breviora, sive potius glossae in *Homeri* Iliadem. Cod. chart. saec. XIV”; F. Napolitano, M. L. Nardelli, and L. Tartaglia, “Manoscritti greci non compresi in cataloghi a stampa,” *Quaderni della Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli* SER. IV 8 (1977) 11–32, here 19; L. Pernot, “La collection de manuscrits grecs de la maison Farnèse,” *MEFR* 91 (1979) 457–506, here 481, and “Le manuscrits grecs,” in *Le Palais Farnèse* I.2 (Rome 1981) 695 n.4; S. J. Voicu and S. D’Alisera, *I.M.A.G.E.S. Index in manuscriptorum graecorum edita specimina* (Rome 1981) 436; M. R. Formentin, *Catalogus codicum graecorum Bibliothecae Nationalis Neapolitanae* II (Rome 1995) 47–49.

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. 312^{r-v} = *Il.* 2.1–2, ff. 313^r–315^v = *Il.* 2.102–236, f. 316^{r-v} = *Il.* 2.395–449, f. 317^{r-v} = *Il.* 2.29–63, f. 318^{r-v}

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.⁴ 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.⁵ As scholars have often noted, however, many translators

= *Il.* 2.450–493, f. 319^{r-v} = *Il.* 2.64–101, ff. 320^r–322^v = *Il.* 2.237–394, f. 323^{r-v} = blank, ff. 324^r–329^v = *Il.* 1.245–502. The second is organized: ff. 333^r–335^r = *Il.* 1.483–611, ff. 335^r–355^v = *Il.* 2.1–3.301.

⁴ For a now dated but useful and comprehensive overview see Agostino Pertusi, *Leonzio 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).

⁵ Antonio Rollo, "Problemi e prospettive della ricerca su Manuele Crisolora," in R. Maisano and A. Rollo (eds.), *Manuele Crisolora e il ritorno del greco in Occidente* (Naples 2002) 31–85.

after Chrysoloras contented themselves with re-working the literal translation of Pilatus.⁶ 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.⁷ 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]).⁸ 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).⁹

⁶ Robin Sowerby, “The Homeric ‘Versio Latina,’” *ICS* 21 (1996) 161–202, has demonstrated the influence of Pilatus on Latin translations all the way up to the late seventeenth century.

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 Petrarqueschi: Petrarca 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. 5^r 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.

⁹ Antonio Iacobini and Gennaro Toscano, “Illustrare Omero nell’Italia del Quattrocento: Sanvito, Rhosos e Gespare da Padova nell’Iliade vaticana,” in F. Flores d’Arcais and F. Crivello (eds.), *Come nasce un manoscritto miniato: Scriptoria, tecniche, modelli e materiali* (Modena 2010) 63–80.

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. 312^r–329^v) 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:

Ἄλλοι μὲν ῥά θεοὶ τε καὶ ἀνέρες ἵπποκορυσταὶ

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. 312^r):

Ἄλλοι ὁ ἄλλος τοῦ ἄλλου ἢ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων οἱ ἄλλοι.
μὲν ῥά θεοὶ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων τε καὶ
ἀνέρες ὁ ἀνὴρ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἄνδρες ἢ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων

οἱ ἄνδρες καὶ ἄνδρες. ἵπποκορυσταὶ ὁ ἵπποκορυστῆς .στοῦ. ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων οἱ ἵπποκορυσταὶ.

Ἄλλοι. the other, of the other, nominative plural (is) *the others*. μέν ῥα θεοί. the god, of the god, present plural *gods*. τε καὶ ἄνδρες. the man, of the man and men, present plural *men* (ἄνδρες) 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
Ἄλλοι ὁ ἄλλος τοῦ ἄλλου ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων οἱ ἄλλοι.
 quidem autem dei que et viri
μέν ῥα θεοί ὁ θεὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων τε καὶ
ἄνδρες
 ὁ ἀνὴρ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἄνδρες ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων οἱ ἄνδρες
 armigeres id est equos armantes
 καὶ ἄνδρες. ἵπποκορυσταὶ ὁ ἵπποκορυστῆς .στοῦ. ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν
 dormiebant
 πληθύντων οἱ ἵπποκορυσταὶ. εὔδον εὔδω καὶ ὁ παρατατικὸς εὔδοντος
 nocturni id est tota nocte
 τῶν πληθύντων εὔδον. παννύχιοι ὁ παννύχιος .ου ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν
 Jovem
 πληθύντων οἱ παννύχιοι. Δία ὁ Ζεὺς τοῦ Διὸς τῷ Δίῃ τὸν Δία ἡ
 autem non habuit dulcis
 αἰτιατικὴ. δ' οὐκ ἔχε ἔχω, ἔχον, ἔχεις, ἔχε. νήδυμος ὁ νήδυμος .μου.
 sompnus
ὑπνος ὑπνου.

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 μέν (*quidem*) and ῥα (*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.¹⁰ 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. 333^r–355^v and includes *Il.* 1.483–611 and *Il.* 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: ἀρχὴ τῆς βῆτα Ὁμήρου ῥαψωδίας (“The beginning of Book Two of Homer”). Likewise, the traditional title of the ὑπόθεσις or *argumentum* to Book 2—Βῆτα δ’ ὄνειρον ἔχει, ἀγορὴν 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. 335^r):

utique			
nunc	viri	equites	armati
Ἄλλοι μὲν ῥα θεοὶ τε καὶ ἀνέρες	ἵπποκορυσταὶ		
dormiebant tota nocte Jovem non tenebat dulcis sompnus			
εὐδὸν παννύχιοι, Δία δ’ οὐκ ἔχε νήδυμος ὕπνος,			
sed hic Iupiter cogitabat secundum animum ut Achillem			
ἄλλ’ ὅ γε μερμήριζε κατὰ φρένα ὡς Ἀχιλλῆα			
honoraret destrueret plures super navibus			
τιμῆσιν, ὀλέσῃ δὲ πολέας ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν.			

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 ἵπποκορυσταὶ he

¹⁰ Hesych. I 837 ἵπποκορυσταί· ἵππους ὀπλίζοντες/ἵππικοί.

wrote “armigeres, id est, equos armantes” in the first translation, while in the second “equites armati.”¹¹ 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 ἵππικοί.

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' ἑκατόμβην / βῆσε θεῶ (“He drove on board a hecatomb for the god”). Our commentator glosses the word ἑκατόμβη as follows (f. 325^r):

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

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

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 scholium 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: ἑκατόμβοις· ἑκατὸν βοῶν ἄξιος τιμῆς ἦτοι νομισμάτων· οἱ γὰρ ἀρχαῖοι, ὑπερτιμώντες τὸν βοῦν ὡς ἱερὸν, ἐνεχάραττον τῷ ἐνὶ μέρει τοῦ νομίσματος βοῦν, τῷ δὲ ἑτέρῳ τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως πρόσωπον. Cf. schol. *Il.* 2.449 (I 108 Dindorf): ἑκατόμβοις· ἑκατὸν βοῶν τιμῆς ἄξιος, ἢ ἑκατὸν χρυσῶν νομισμάτων. οἱ γὰρ ἀρχαῖοι, ὑπερτιμώντες τὸ ζῶον τὸν βοῦν, διὰ πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἱερὸν ἐστίν, ἐνεχάραττον τῷ μὲν ἐνὶ μέρει τοῦ νομίσματος βοῦν, τῷ δὲ ἑτέρῳ τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως πρόσωπον.

¹³ Cf. a similar gloss in the margins of Raffaello Maffei's translation of the first two books of the *Iliad*: in *Vat. Capp.* 169, f. 324^r, at *Il.* 2.449 (πάντες εὐπλεκέες, ἑκατόμβοις δὲ ἕκαστος, 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 οὐλοχύτας ἀνέλοντο* (“Then they washed their hands and took up barley oats”). Next to this line the gloss reads (f. 328^v):

Nota quod primi homines faciebant sacrificium bovis cum glandinibus et post aliud tempus cum ordeo et illud vas in quo ponebatur ordeum vocabatur οὐλοχύτης 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 οὐλοχύτης, 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 οὐλοχύτας, a word found only in the plural, a compound of οὐλαί (“barley corns”) and the verb χέω (“to pour”). The commentator glosses the word in its non-existent singular form (οὐλοχύτης) and mistakes it for *illud vas* (“that vessel”) in which the barley oats were stored. He made this mistake either by inference from etymology (οὐλαί and χέω mean “to pour barley oats”) or because he mistook it for οὐλοχοεῖον or οὐλοχόιον 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 οὐλοχύτας reads *vas in quo erat sacrificium* (“the vessel in which the sacrifice was kept”).

¹⁴ Cf. Eustath. *Il.* I 203.5–27 van der Valk: τοῦ βαλανηφαγεῖν καὶ τῆς τῶν δρυκάρπων ἀπαλλαγέντες τροφῆς εἰς ἡμέρον βίον τὸν ἐκ τῶν σπορίμων μετέπεσον.

¹⁵ Hesych. O 1759 οὐλοχόιον: ἀγγεῖον, εἰς ὃ αἱ ὀλαὶ ἐμβάλλονται πρὸς ἀπαρχὰς τῶν θυσιῶν.

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.¹⁶

The one and only gloss in Latin in this codex of scholia occurs on f. 11^v where the scholiast commented on *Il.* 1.63 (ἦ καὶ ὄνειροπόλον, καὶ γὰρ τ' ὄναρ ἐκ Διὸς ἐστίν). 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 (αἶ μὲν γὰρ κεράεσσι τετεύχεται, αἶ 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. 11^v and 13^r. The two in Greek consist in only the substitution of a letter such as ἀφέξει instead of ἐφέξει (f. 13^r) 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 θωρήξαι ἐκέλευσε κάρη κομόωντας 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 πανσυδίη (“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 ὑπόθεσις or *argumentum* to Book 2 on f. 41^r of the scholia there is a gloss on the meaning of this word: πανσυδίη, ὃ ἐστὶ σὺν πάσῃ 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. 312^r):

simul omnes ad verbum est
 vel toti exercitus
 precipitatus
 πανσυδίη

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 στρατιᾷ (“with the whole army”) found at f. 41^r 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 πανσυδίη 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:	πανσυδίη
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 πανσυδίη. 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 exercitu* (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 πανσυδίη. Despite the marginal gloss in Latin at f. 41^r (*cornua, eburnea: porte somniorum*) and despite the correspondence between σὺν πάσῃ στρατιᾷ 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 ἑκατόμβη as a “sacrificium monetarum in quibus erat sculptus bos.” The Naples MS. scholium on this line (*Il.* 1.309) simply reads: ἐς δ' ἑκατόμβην· 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

(f. 33):

οὐλοχύτας· Οὐλάς. Εἰσὶ δὲ κριθαί μετὰ ἀλῶν μεμιγμένοι, ἃς ἐπέχεον τοῖς ἱερουργουμένοις ζώοις πρὸ τοῦ θύεσθαι ἥτοι πολὺ-πληθείας 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*,¹⁷ where he claims that “before men learned how to grind Demeter’s fruit, they ate the barley groats intact”:

Ὡς γὰρ φησι Θεόφραστος ἐν τῷ περὶ εὐρημάτων, πρὶν ἢ μάθωσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀλεῖν τὸν Δημητριακὸν καρπὸν, οὕτω σῶας αὐτάς ἥσθιον, 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 πανσυδίη 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*. This agreement between the two manuscripts invites us to investigate this question of dependence further.¹⁸

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.¹⁹ 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 *παννύχιοι* (“all night long”) as *tranquilla obscuri munera somni* (“the tranquil gifts of dark slumber”).²⁰ When the same adjective

¹⁸ In the analysis that follows I consult the following manuscripts without indicating the folio page in each instance: Paris, *Bibl.Nat.* 7880.1; Milan, *Ambros.* D 12 inf.; Naples, *Bibl.Naz.* II D 45; Oxford, Bodleian Library, *Can. lat.* 139.

¹⁹ For an edition and commentary see Peter Thiermann, *Die Orationes Homeri des Leonardo Bruni Aretino* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 126 [1993]).

²⁰ R. P. H. Green, *The Works of Ausonius* (Oxford 1991) 679; cf. *Ov. Trist.* 3.185 *placidi carpebant munera somni*.

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”).²¹ 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 nocte*:

HOMER: *παννύχιοι*
 NAP. 1: *nocturni* / *tota nocte*
 NAP. 2: *tota nocte*
 PIL.: *tota nocte*
 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 *citae*:

HOMER: *θοαί*
 NAP. 1: *veloces*
 NAP. 2:
 PIL.: *citae*
 BODL.: *veloces*
 DEC.: *citae*
 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 *θοή* at *Il.* 12.463 as follows:²²

²¹ Green, *The Works of Ausonius* 682.

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*.

ὃ δ' ἄρ' ἔσθορε φαίδιμος Ἴκτωρ
 νυκτὶ θοῆ ἀτάλαντος ὑπόπια·
 Celerissimus advolat Hector

Here the translation does not make sense without the hemistych that precedes it. Like Ausonius, Matius conveys νυκτὶ θοῆ (“swift night”) by transferring the swiftness from night to Hector using the verb *advolat*, while conveying the epithet φαίδιμος with *celerissimus*.²³ When we compare this with the translation of Lorenzo Valla (1407–1457), we find a much more prosaic *volucris nocti*.²⁴ This tendency poses a considerable contrast with the verse rendering by Niccolò Della Valle (1444–1473) of *Il.* 24.1, where he uses a technique of transference similar to that of Ausonius and Matius. Here he renders θοῶς ἐπὶ νῆας as *ad naves festinat*—instead of “to the swift ships” we have “swiftly to the ships.”²⁵

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*,²⁶ the Bodleian translator rendered it as *vere* and the Naples translator as *veriter* or *veraciter*.

HOMER: ἀτρεκέως
 NAP. 1: veriter
 NAP. 2: veraciter
 PIL.: palam / clare
 BODL.: vere
 DEC.: palam
 VAT.: valde congrue

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

²³ Cf. Edward Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford 1993) 101: θοῆ corresponds to Matius’ *advolat*, and *celerissimus* does not come from the syntactically equivalent φαίδιμος but rather from θοῆ.

²⁴ *Vat.lat.* 1567, f. 75^v [f.77^v].

²⁵ Florence, *Bibl.Riccard.* 741, f. 148^v.

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

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 veraciter 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 οὐδλον as *periculosum* 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 δαίφρονος we find *prudētis* or *habētis bellicosam scientiam* in the Naples manuscript, and *prudētis* in the Bodleian translation, while Pilatus translated it as *scientifici* and Decembrio as *prudētis ac bellicosi*. 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 divergencies 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 αἰρήσομεν 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 (αἰρήσομεν) in Odysseus' speech at *Il.* 2.329, we find a completely different approach (*Div.* 2.64):

τῷ δεκάτῳ δὲ πόλιν αἰρήσομεν 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*.²⁹ Not even Valla does this in his rendering of the same line. Rather, he maintains the same syntax as the Greek (“decimoque anno urbem expugnata[m] evertemus”).³⁰ 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.³¹ The only one to have departed from Greek syntax was Raffaele Volteranno (1451–1522), who translated the line “At decimo nostris tandem expugnabitur armis.”³²

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”):

HOMER: προσεφώνεε
 NAP. 1: vocabat
 NAP. 2: vocabat
 PIL.: vociferabat
 BODL.: alloquutus fuit
 DEC.: fatur
 VAT.: allocutus est

Only the Bodleian and Vatican versions give a correct translation. Decembrio was in the habit of translating the formulaic ὡς ἔφατο 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).³³

²⁹ For an overview of Cicero’s theory of “oratorical” translation see Siobhán McElduff, “Living at the Level of the Word: Cicero’s Rejection of the Interpreter as Translator,” *Translation Studies* 2 (2009) 133–146.

³⁰ *Vat.lat.* 1567, f. 9^r.

³¹ 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. 104^r; for Poliziano’s translation of the same see *Vat.lat.* 3298, f. 8^v.

³² *Vat.Capp.* 169, f. 322^{r-v}.

³³ Green, *The Works of Ausonius* 689; Thiermann, *Die Orationes Homeri* 82.

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

vita autem sompnium habet congregationem et naves numerat 312^r
 Βῆτα δ' ὄνειρον ἔχει. ἀγορήν. καὶ νῆας ἀριθμεῖ
 alii
¹Ἄλλοι ὁ ἄλλος τοῦ ἄλλου ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων οἱ ἄλλοι.
 quidem autem dei que et viri
 μέν ῥα θεοί ὁ θεὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων τε καὶ ἀνέρες
 ὁ ἀνὴρ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἄνδρες ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων οἱ ἀνέρες
 armigeres id est equos armantes
 καὶ ἄνδρες. ἰπποκορυσταὶ ὁ ἰπποκορυστῆς .στοῦ. ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν
 dormiebant
 πληθύντων οἱ ἰπποκορυσταί. ²εὔδον εὔδω καὶ ὁ παρατατικὸς εὔδοντος
 nocturni id est tota nocte
 τῶν πληθύντων εὔδον. παννύχιοι ὁ παννύχιος .ου ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν
 Jovem
 πληθύντων οἱ παννύχιοι. Δία ὁ Ζεὺς τοῦ Διὸς τῷ Δίῃ τὸν Δία ἡ αἰτιατικὴ.
 autem non habuit dulcis sompnus
 δ' οὐκ ἔχε ἔχον, ἔχες, ἔχε. νῆδυμος ὁ νήδυμος .μου. ὕπνος ὕπνου.
 sed hic
³Ἄλλ' ὄ γε τοῦ γε. ἀντωνυμία μερμήριζε μερμηρίζω ὁ παρατατικὸς
 id est in mentem
 ἐμερμήριζον .ζες .ζε. κατὰ φρένα ἡ φρήν τῆς φρενὸς τῇ φρενὶ τὴν φρενὰ
 ut Achillem honoraret
 ὡς Ἀχιλλῆα ὁ Ἀχιλεὺς τοῦ Ἀχιλέως τὸν Ἀχιλλῆα ⁴τιμῆσι τιμάω. ὑποτακτικὸν
 destrueret autem multos
 ἐὰν τιμήσω .σης .ση. ὀλέσει ὀλέσω. ἐὰν ὀλέσω .σης .ση. δὲ πολέας ὁ
 super navibus
 πολὺς τοῦ πολλοῦ ἐπὶ νηυσὶν ἡ ναὺς τῆς νηὸς ἡ δοτικὴ ταῖς ναυσὶ καὶ
 grecorum haec autem sibi in animam optimum
 νηυσὶ Ἀχαιῶν ⁵ἦδε τῆσδε δέ οἱ ὅς οὔ οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν ὁ θυμὸς .μου ἀρίστη
 aparebat consilium
 .στης φαίνεται φαίνομαι ὁ παρατατικὸς ἐφαινόμην .νου ἐφαίνετο βουλή
 mittare super atride
 .ης ⁶πέμψαι ἐπ' Ἀτρείδῃ ὁ Ἀτρείδης .δου .δη Ἀγαμέμνονι ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων

Ἀγαμέμνωνος .νί. ^{pernitiosum} οὐλον .οὐλος .ου ^{somnium} ὄνειρον ὁ ὄνειρος .ρου .ρη .ον
 et ipsum vocans verba
⁷καὶ μιν φωνήσας τοῦ φωνήσαντος ἔπεα τὸ ἔπος τοῦ ἔπεος ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ
 alata et velocia
 τῶν πληθύντων τὰ ἔπεα πετερόντα τὸ πετερόντος τοῦ πετερόντος ἡ
 dicebat
 ὀνομαστικὴ τῶν πληθύντων τὰ πετερόντα προσηύδα προσηυδάω ὁ
 -ουν -ας -α vade
 παρατατικὸς προσηύδαον προσηυδάεες προσηυδάε ⁸βάσκ βάσσω.
 προστακτικὸν βάσκε βασκέτω. ⁱἴθι ^{pernitiosum} προστακτικὸν ἴθι ἴτω οὐλε ὁ οὐλος
 o somnium veloces
 τοῦ οὐλου ἡ κλητικὴ ὦ οὐλε ὄνειρε ὁ ὄνειρος .ρου θαός ἡ θεοὶ .ἡς
 super naves grecorum veniens ad tentorium
ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν ὁ ⁹ἐλθὼν τοῦ ἐλθόντος ἐς κλισίην ἡ κλισίη .ἡς
 omnia valde
Ἀγαμέμνωνος Ἀτρεΐδαο ἀτρεΐδης .δου ¹⁰πάντα τὸ πᾶν τοῦ παντός μάλα
 veriter dicere
ἀτρεκέως ἀγορευέμεν ἀγορεύω .εὔεις .εὔει. καὶ τὸ ἀπαρέμφατον
 ut iubeo
 ἀγορεύειν καὶ ποιητικῶς ἀγορευέμεν ὡς ἐπιτέλλω λλεις λλει
 armare ipsum precipe
¹¹θωρήξαι ἀπαρέμφατον ἐ κέλευε κευάτω προστατικὸν
 capita ornantes scilicet pulchros
καρηκομόωντας ὁ καρηκομών τοῦ καρηκομόοντος. ἡ αἰτιατικὴ τῶν
 grecos
 πληθύντων τοὺς καρηκομόωντας. Ἀχαιοὺς
 simul omnes ad verbum est
 vel toti exercitus
 precipitatus nunc enim coniunctio est capiet pro destruet
¹²πανσυδίη γὺν γάρ κεν ἔλοι ἔλω. εὐκτικὸν ἔλοι.
 civitatem platas vias habentem
 ἔλοις. ἔλοι πόλιν ἡ πόλις. τῆς πόλεως εὐρύαγυιαν ἡ εὐρύαγυια .ας
 troianorum non enim amplius dupliciter celestes
¹³Τρώων ὁ τρῶς τοῦ τρωός οὐ γάρ ἔτι ἀμφὶς ὀλύμπια τὸ ὀλύμπιον .ου
 domos habentes
δῶματ' τὸ δῶμα τοῦ δώματος ἔχοντες ὁ ἔχων τοῦ ἔχοντος οἱ ἔχοντες
 immortales intellexunt vel consulant
¹⁴ἀθάνατοι ὁ ἀθάνατος .του φράζονται φράζομαι τὸ γ' τῶν πληθύντων
 persuasit id est fecit declinare 312v
 φράζονται ἐπέγναμψεν ἐπιγνάμψω ὁ μέλλων ἐπιγνάμψω ὁ ἀόριστος
 omnes Juno observans troianis autem
 ἐπέγναμψα .ψας .ψεν ἅπαντας ¹⁵Ἥρη .ρης. λίσσομένη .νης. Τρώεσσι δὲ

estus suspense sunt
κῆδεα τὸ κῆδος τοῦ κήδεος ἐφήπται. ἐφάπτομαι. ὁ παρακείμενος ἐφήμαι
 sic dixerat pro sic fatus est
 ἐφήμαι ἐφήπται. ¹⁶Ὡς φάτο. φῆμι. ὁ μέσος ἀόριστος ἐφάμην ἔφασο ἔφατο

καὶ φάτο. βῆ βῶ ὁ β ἄοριςτος ἔβην ἔβης ἔβη καὶ βῆ. δ' ἄρα ὄνειρος
 enim pro postquam sermonem pro verbum audivit id est audiverat
 ἐπεὶ τὸν μῦθον ὁ μῦθος .θοῦ ἄκουσε ἀκούω ὁ ἄοριςτος
 ἤκουσα .σας. σε. ¹⁷καρπαλίμως δ' ἴκανε ἰκάνω. ὁ παρατατικός ἴκανον.
 veloces super naves grecorum iverat
 νες. ἴκανε. θοῶς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν, ¹⁸βῆ ἄοριςτος ἔβην. βης. βῆ.
 super Atriden hunc invenerat
 δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' Ἀτρείδην Ἀγαμέμνονα· τὸν δὲ ἐκίγανε κιχάνω ὁ βᾶοριςτος
 dormientem in tentorio circum
 ἐκίγανον. ες. νε. ¹⁹εὔδοντα. ὁ εὔδων. τοῦ εὔδοντος. ἐν κλισίῃ. περὶ δ'
 divinus effusus est
 ἄμβρόσιος .ου. κέχυθ' χέομαι. παρατατικός ἐχεχύμην .σο. κέχυτο .ες.
 sompnius staterat
 ὕπνος. ὕπνου. ²⁰στή ὁ ἄοριςτος ἔστην ἔστης καὶ στή.
 super caput Neleus
 δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἢ κεφαλῆ .λης. Νηληϊῶ ὁ Νηληϊός .ου.
 filio similians
 υἱὸς ὁ υἱεύς, υἱέος, υἱεὶ καὶ υἱί. εἰκώς τοῦ εἰκότος
 quidem maxime senum
²¹Νέστορι ὁ Νέστωρ, τοῦ Νέστορος, τόν ῥα μάλιστα γερόντων ὁ γέρων,
 τοῦ γέροντος, ἢ γενετική τῶν πληθύντων τῶν γερόντων.
 honorabat
²²τί' τίω. ὁ παρατατικός ἔτιον, ἔτιες, ἔτιε καὶ τίε. Ἀγαμέμνων·
 cui ipsum simulatus vocabat
 τῷ μιν εἰσιδάμενος .νου. προσεφώνεε προσφωνέω. ὁ παρατατικός
 divinum
 προσεφώνεον (-ουν), προσεφώνεες (-εις), προσεφώνεε (-ενν). ὁ θεῖος .ου.
 sompnium dormis fili
 ὄνειρος .ρου. ²³εὔδεις εὔδω εὔδεις Ἀτρέος ὁ Ἀτρεύς τοῦ Ἀτρέος ὦ υἱέ
 prudentis equos domantis
 ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ υἱοῦ δαίφρονος ὁ δαίφρων δαίφρονος. ἵπποδάμοιο ὁ
 cui populus
 ἵπποδάμος τοῦ ἵπποδάμου καὶ ἰωνική ἵπποδάμοιο ²⁵ῶ λαοὶ ὁ λαὸς
 recommissi pro conversi
 τοῦ λαοῦ ἢ ὀνομαστική τῶν πληθύντων οἱ λαοὶ τ' ἐπιτετράφεται
 ἐπιτρέπωμαι ὁ παρακείμενος τέτραμμα .ψαι τέτραπται ἐπιτετραμμένοι
 tanta
 εἰσὶ καὶ ἰωνική ἐπιτετράφεται τὸ γ' τῶν πληθύντων καὶ τόσα τὸ τόσον
 cura est non oportet
 .σου μέμηλε μέλω ὁ παρακείμενος μέμηλα .λας .λε ²⁴οὐ χρῆ
 totam noctem dormire consiliarium
παννύχιον ὁ παννύχιος .ου εὔδεν ἀπαρέμφατον βουληφόρον
 virum pro hominem
 ὁ βουληφόρος .ρου. ἄνδρα ὁ ἀνὴρ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τὸν ἀνέρα καὶ ἄνδρα
 nunc autem mei intellige velociter Iovis
²⁶γῶν δ' ἐμέθεν scilicet ἐμοῦ ξύνες προστακτικὸν ῶκα διὸς ὁ ζεύς

tibi nuncius sum armare
 τοῦ διὸς δέ τοι ὁ ἄγγελός .λου εἰμι εἶ ἐστὶ ²⁸θωρήξαι ἀπαρέμφατον
 te imperavit pulchros
 σ' ἐκέλευσε κελεύω ὁ ἀόριστος ἐκέλευσα .σας .σε. κάρη κομόωντας
 grecos qui tui longe ens multum curat an
 Ἀχαιοὺς ²⁷ὅς σεῦ προ σοῦ ἀνευθεν ἔων ἔόντος μέγα κήδεται ἦδ' 317^r

miseretur omnes simul nunc enim an capies
 ἐλεαίρει. ²⁹πανσυδίη ἐπίρρημα νῦν γάρ κεν ἔλοις ἔλοιμι ἔλοις ἔλοι
 civitatem ampliam
 πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν ἢ εὐρυάγυια .ας

Second translation exercise

ἀρχὴ τῆς βῆτα ὁμήρου ραψωδίας f. 335^r

Βῆτα δ' ὄνειρον ἔχει. ἀγορὴν καὶ νῆας ἀριθμεῖ

utique
 nunc viri equites armati
 Ἄλλοι μὲν ῥα θεοὶ τε καὶ ἄνδρες ἵπποκορυσταὶ
 dormiebant tota nocte Jovem non tenebat dulcis sompnus
 εὐδον παννύχιοι, Δία δ' οὐκ ἔχε νήδυμος ὕπνος,
 sed hic Iupiter cogitabat secundum animum ut Achillem
 ἀλλ' ὅ γε μερμήριζε κατὰ φρένα ὡς Ἀχιλῆα
 honoraret destrueret plures super navibus
 τιμήσει, ὀλέσει δὲ πολέας ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν.
 hec autem sibi Iovi optima videbatur
 ἦδε δὲ οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀρίστη φαίνεται βουλή, II. 2.5
 mittere ad perniciosum sompnum
 πέμψαι ἐπ' Ἀτρείδῃ Ἀγαμέμνονι οὐλον ὄνειρον·
 istum sompnum vocans Iuppiter verba velocia declamavit
 καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
 vade vide perniciose sompnie ad
 βάσκ' ἴθι οὐλε ὄνειρε θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν·
 iens sompnum sui ad Atridis
 ἔλθων ἐς κλισίην Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρείδαιο f. 335^v

valde vel dicere sic
 omne multa veraciter dic ut precipio
 πάντα μάλ' ἀτρεκέως ἀγορευέμεν ὡς ἐπιτέλλω· 2.10
 illum scilicet aga<memnon>

armari precipe habentes capita comata grecos
 θωρήξαι ἐκέλευε καρηκομόωντας Ἀχαιοὺς
 caperet vel destruet aga<memnon>
 toti exercitus an habentem latam viam
 πανσυδίη· νῦν γάρ κεν ἔλοι πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν
 deinceps amplius

inconcorditus habentes
 Τρώων· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἀμφὶς Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
 consulunt vel loquuntur declinavit vel persuasit
 immortales summi dii inclinavit omnes deos
 ἀθάνατοι φράζονται· ἐπέγναμψεν γὰρ ἅπαντας

deprecans obsecrans		mala iminet pro iminent	
Ἦρη λισσομένη, Τρώεσσι δὲ κήδε' ἐφῆπται.			2.15
sic locutus est Iupiter			
	iviti	sopnus postquam scilicet verbis audiverat	
Ὦς φάτο, βῆ δ' ἄρ' ὄνειρος ἐπεὶ τὸν μῦθον ἄκουσε·			
	velociter	applicuit	
καρπαλίμως δ' ἴκανε θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν,			
	igitur	qui aga<memnon> invenit	
βῆ δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' Ἀτρείδην Ἀγαμέμνονα· τὸν δὲ κίχανεν			
	dormientem	divinus occupabat agamemnonem	
εὕδοντ' ἐν κλισίῃ, περὶ δ' ἀμβρόσιος κέχυθ' ὕπνος.			
stetit deus sopni			
	igitur	capitis filio nilei filius scilicet fetus	
στῆ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς Νηληϊῶ υἱὶ εἰοκῶς			2.20
	quem nestorem		
	quidem	honorabat	
Νέστορι, τὸν ῥα μάλιστα γερόντων τῷ Ἀγαμέμνον·			
	huic nestori	filius fetus vocabat divinius	
	istum aga<memnonem>		
τῷ μιν εἰσιδάμενος προσεφώνεε θεῖος ὄνειρος·			
	dormis	filii habentis bellicosam scientiam	
		boni equitis	
εὕδεις Ἀτρέος υἱὲ δαΐφρονος ἵπποδάμοιο·			
	non decet quam totam noctam dormire consiliarum		
οὐ χρῆ παννύχιον εὕδειν βουληφόρον ἄνδρα			
	andri vel		
	cui aga<memnon>	subicitur pro subicuntur cogitat curat	
	populi	conversi sunt id est subiecti sunt tanta vel suis curare debet	
ᾧ λαοὶ τ' ἐπιτετράφονται καὶ τόσσα μέμηλε·			2.25
	mei	audi statim tibi	
	nunc autem		sum
νῦν δ' ἐμέθεν ζύνες ὤκα· Διὸς δέ τοι ἄγγελός εἰμι,			
	qui iupiter	existens multum et	
	tui longe	curat miseretur	
ὃς σεῦ ἀνευθεν ἐὼν μέγα κήδεται ἠδ' ἐλεαίρει.			
	armari	preciperet habentes capita comata	
θωρήξαι σε κέλευσε καρηκομόωντας Ἀχαιούς			
		caperet	
	toti exercitus	an si destruet habentem latam viam	
πανσυδίη· νῦν γάρ κεν ἔλοις πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν			
	deinceps		
		inconcorditus habentes	
Τρώων· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἀμφὶς Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες			2.30
	consulunt		
	vel loquuntur	inclineavit	
ἄθάνατοι φράζονται· ἐπέγναμψεν γὰρ ἅπαντας			
	immortales summi dii		

Juno deprecans trojanis mala iminet pro iminent
 Ἥρη λισσομένη, Τρώεσσι δὲ κήδε' ἐφήπτα
 tu aga<memnon> tene

tuis ne oblivio
 ἐκ Διός· ἀλλὰ σὺ σῆσιν ἔχε φρεσί, μηδέ σε λήθη
 teneat cum dulcis demiserit
 αἰρείτω εὐτ' ἄν σε μελίφρων ὕπνος ἀνήη.
 vocans sopnus reliquit

poeta loquitur recessit aga<memnon> ibi
 Ὡς ἄρα φωνήσας ἀπεβήσето, τὸν δὲ λίπ' αὐτοῦ
 que adimpleri 2.35

cogitantem super utique non futuri causa
 τὰ φρονέοντ' ἀνά θυμὸν ἄρ' οὐ τελέεσθαι ἔμελλον·
 cogitabat

agamemnon capere diei ipsi
 φῆ γὰρ ὅ γ' αἰρήσειν Πριάμου πόλιν ἤματι κείνῳ
 demens erat summus aga<memnon> f. 336^r

sciret consulabat
 non haec quae opera
 νῆπιος, οὐδὲ τὰ ἦδει ἄρα Ζεὺς μήδετο ἔργα·
 deinceps meditabatur dampna suspiria

facere cogitabat super
 θῆσειν γὰρ ἔτ' ἔμελλεν ἐπ' ἄλγέα τε στοναχάς τε
 fortes pugnas

Τρωσί τε καὶ Δαναοῖσι διὰ κρατεράς ὕσμινας.
 exsurrexit ex sopni divina occupabat vox 2.40

agamemnonem
 ἔγρετο δ' ἐξ ὕπνου, θεῖη δὲ μιν ἀμφέχυτ' ὀμφή·
 sedit surgens mollem induit camissiam [sic]
 sedebat

ἔζετο δ' ὀρθωθείς, μαλακὸν δ' ἔνδυε χιτῶνα
 novam magnam circum ponebat vestem
 καλὸν νηγάτεον, περὶ δὲ μέγα βάλλετο φᾶρος·
 pedibus sub fortibus induit sotularis
 ποσσὶ δ' ὑπὸ λιπαροῖσιν ἐδήσατο καλὰ πέδιλα,
 de humeris posuit ensem fixum clavis

super argenteis vel argentatum
 ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὅμοισιν βάλετο ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον·
 cepit patium incorruptibile semper 2.45
 εἴλετο δὲ σκῆπτρον πατρώϊον ἀφθιτον αἰεὶ

huic sceptro ad habentum camissias [sic] eneas
 cum ivit supra scilicet toraces
 σὺν τῷ ἔβη κατὰ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων·
 eous dea lucis processerat longum celum
 utique iverat
 Ἥως μὲν ῥα θεὰ προσεβήσето μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον

Jovi lucem dictura	immortalibus	
Ζηνὶ φῶς ἐρέουσα καὶ ἄλλοις ἀθανάτοισιν·		
hic aga<memnon> dulcisonis		
autem preconibus vel dulcisonantibus precipiebat		
αὐτὰρ ὃ κηρύκεσσι λιγυφθόγοισι κέλευσε	2.50	
preconizare conscionem habentes capita comata		
κηρύσσειν ἀγορήνδε κάρη κομόωντας Ἀχαιοῦς·		
hii quidem predicaverunt isti surrexerunt valde velociter		
οἱ μὲν ἐκήρυσσον, τοὶ δ' ἠγείροντο μάλ' ὤκα·		
sedit vel faciebat sedere		
primus magnanimorum venerandorum vel senum		
Βουλὴν δὲ πρῶτον μεγαθύμων ἴξε γερόντων		
iuxta navi in pilo nati		
Νεστορὴν παρὰ νηϊ Πυλοιογενέος βασιλῆος		
hic aga<memnon> assiduam ordinabat		
hos convocans prudentem preperabat		
τοὺς ὅ γε συγκαλέσας πυκινὴν ἀρτύνετο βουλὴν·	2.55	
audies amici divinus in sompnum adverbali-ter		
Ἀγαμέμνον λογίται μὲν μοι ἐνὶ νύκτι·		
κλῦτε φίλοι· θεῖός μοι ἐνὶ νύκτι ἦλθεν ὄνειρος		
per noctem divino		
divinam per venit		
ἀμβροσίην διὰ νύκτα· μάλιστα δὲ Νέστορι δίφ		
speciem magnitudinem membrum proximum		
eīdós te μέγεθός τε φυήν τ' ἄγχιστα ἐφκει·		
stetit		
sompnum super dixit		
στῆ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς καί με πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν·		
dormis o filii		
εὔδεις Ἀτρεὺς υἱὲ δαΐφρονος ἵπποδάμοιο·	2.60	
οὐ χρεὶ παννύχιον εὔδειν βουληφόρον ἄνδρα,		
ὦ λαοὶ τ' ἐπιτετράφαται καὶ τόσσα μέμηλε·		
νῦν δ' ἐμέθεν ζῦνες ὤκα· Διὸς δέ τοι ἄγγελός εἰμι,		
ὃς σεῦ ἀνευθεν ἐὼν μέγα κήδετα ἠδ' ἐλαίρει·		
θωρήξαι σε κέλευσε κάρη κομόωντας Ἀχαιοῦς	2.65	f. 336 ^v
πανσυδίη· νῦν γάρ κεν ἔλοις πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν		
Τρώων· οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἀμφὶς Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες		
ἀθάνατοι φράζονται· ἐπέγναμψεν γὰρ ἅπαντας		
Ἥρη λισσομένη, Τρώεσσι δὲ κήδε' ἐφῆπται		
deus sompni		
ἐκ Διός· ἀλλὰ σὺ σῆσιν ἔχε φρεσίν· ὥς ὃ μὲν εἰπὼν	2.70	
recessit volans autem dulcis sompnus dimisit		
ᾧχετ' ἀποπτάμενος, ἐμὲ δὲ γλυκὺς ὕπνος ἀνήκεν.		
ducite si quomodo armentus filios		
ἀλλ' ἄγετ' αἶ κέν πως θωρήξομεν υἱας Ἀχαιῶν·		
primum ego verbis experiar prout divina iusticia		
πρῶτα δ' ἐγὼν ἔπεσιν πειρήσομαι, ἢ θέμις ἐστί,		

- multis transtris
 fugere cum habentibus multa transtra precipio
 καὶ φεύγειν σὺν νησι πολυκλήϊσι κελεύσω·
 vos alterutrum alter impedire pro
 impedite
 ὑμεῖς δ' ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος ἐρητύειν ἐπέεσσιν. 2.75
 hic aga<memnon>
 certe sic sedit surrexit
 Ἴητοι ὄ γ' ὡς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἔζ'ετο, τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη
 qui quidem erat nomen fluvii a flumine
 nomen civitatis nestoris sic dicto vel arenose
 Νέστωρ, ὅς ῥα Πύλοιο ἀναξ ἦν ἡμαθόντος,
 qui istis bene sciens conscionatus est postea dixit
 ὁ σφιν ἐν φρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν·
 duces et reges
 ὦ φίλοι Ἀργείων ἡγήτορες ἡδὲ μέδοντες
 siquidem quis sopnium alter dicebat pro dixit
 εἰ μὲν τις τὸν ὄνειρον Ἀχαιῶν ἄλλος ἔνισπε 2.80
 fari putaremus
 mendacium loquamur vel recedimus magis
 ψεῦδος κεν φαίμεν καὶ νοσφιζοίμεθα μᾶλλον·
 nunc autem vidit multum optimus gloriatur esse
 νῦν δ' ἴδεν ὅς μέγ' ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν εὐχεται εἶναι·
 sed si quomodo armavimus filios
 ἀλλ' ἄγετ' αἶ κέν πως θωρήξομεν υἱας Ἀχαιῶν.
 exivit ire
 sic igitur vocans nestor ambulare
 Ὡς ἄρα φωνήσας βουλῆς ἐξήρχε νέσθαι,
 isti obediverunt pastori sive regi
 greci surrexerunt que
 οἱ δ' ἐπ'ἀνέστησαν πείθοντό τε ποιμένι λαῶν 2.85
 reges movebantur
 σκηπτοῦχοι βασιλῆες· ἐπεσσεύοντο δὲ λαοί.
 caterva frequentum
 tanquam procedit apum densarum
 ἡὔτε ἔθνεα εἰσι μελισσάων ἀδινάων
 lapidis concavi semper nuper venientum
 πέτρης ἐκ γλαφυρῆς αἰεὶ νέον ἐρχομενάων,
 tanquam racemus
 botrus volant super floribus vernalibus
 βοτρυδὸν δὲ πέτονται ἐπ' ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖσιν·
 quedam hinc satis volant quedam hic
 αἱ μὲν τ' ἔνθα ἄλις πεποτήται, αἱ δέ τε ἔνθα· 2.90
 sic istorum gentes multa navium
 ὡς τῶν ἔθνεα πολλὰ νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιάων
 litoris coram longi ordinati ambulabant
 ἡϊόνος προπάροιθε βαθείης ἐστιχόωντο

simul ordinate ad conscionem totum simul in istis divina vox surrexit ἴλαδὸν εἰς ἀγορὴν· μετὰ δὲ σφισιν ὅσσα δεδήει nec proficisci	f. 337 ^r
movens divinus nuncius isti autem congregabantur ὄτρύνουσ' ἰέναι Διὸς ἄγγελος· οἱ δ' ἀγέροντο. turbata fuit conscio sub suspirabat τετρήχει δ' ἀγορῆ, ὑπὸ δὲ στεναχίζετο γαῖα sedentum tumultus autem erat novem illos	2.95
precones vocantes impediabant vocis vociferantes quando clamoris κήρυκες βοόωντες ἐρήτυον, εἴ ποτ' αὐτῆς contineat illustrium regum σχοίατ', ἀκούσειαν δὲ διοτρεφέων βασιλῆων. sollitudini sedit tenebat σπουδῇ δ' ἔζετο λαός, ἐρήτυθεν δὲ καθ' ἔδρας quiescentes clangoris παυσάμενοι κλαγγῆς· ἀνά δὲ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων	2.100

December, 2017

The University of Pennsylvania
adamtoddfoley@gmail.com