Acta Ant. Hung. 41, 2001, 369–379

ZSIGMOND RITOÓK

ILIAD 2, 299–330 TRANSLATED BY JANUS PANNONIUS

Summary: The paper offers a critical edition of Janus' translation, a comparison of this translation with Cicero's translation of the same passage and an analysis of its place among the translations of the period.

Key words: Cicero, Janus Pannonius, Homerus, Iliad 2, 299–330, translation.

The text has been preserved only in a codex in Sevilla (Biblioteca Colombina y Capitular 7-1-15) and it was discovered by J. Hamm.[1] The editio princeps was published by J. Horváth.[2] His text has been reprinted by S. V. Kovács in the bilingual edition of the works of Janus Pannonius.[3] Horváth, however, misread certain passages of the manuscript, namely lines 13, 14, 16, 20 and 32. The correct readings are due by Á. Ritoók-Szalay.

Ferte animis et adhuc durate in tempus, amici
ut pateat, si uera canit uel inania Calchas,
pectoribus siquidem facile retinemus et omnes
uos estis testes, quos nondum fata tulerunt
siue here seu pridem. Phrygibus cum dura ferentes
ac Priamo Graie complebant Aulida classes,
nos uitreum ad fontem sacrata altaria circum
sancta precabamur mactatis numina tauris
pulchra sub platano, caput unde liquentibus undis.
Hic ingens ima uisum prorumpere ab ara
prodigium, rubri species horrenda draconis,
Iuppiter aethereas quem miserat ipse sub auras.
Tum ferus ad platanum magno mox agmine fertur.

[1] HORVÁTH, M.: Vorbericht über einen Janus Pannonius Kodex in Sevilla. *Acta Lingu. Acad. Sc. Hung.* 22, 1972, 95–106.

[2] In his paper: Janus Pannonius ismeretlen versei a Sevillai-Kódexben [Les poésies inconnues de Janus Pannonius dans le codex de Seville]. *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 78, 1974, 611–612: the edition, 603–604: some comments.

[3] *Janus Pannonius összes művei* [Collected works of Janus Pannonius]. Budapest 1987[2], 244–246.

0044-5975 / 2001 / $ 5.00

Passeris hic alte densis sub frondibus octo
pendebat foetus, mater quos nona fouebat.
Deuorat hos miserum stridentes cerula pestis,
at circum uolitans flebat sua pignora mater.
Hanc etiam prensa strepitantem corripit ala.
Ast illum pullis pariter cum matre comesis
qui modo protulerat deus, idem in secla reliquit,
nam lapidem fieri iussit Saturnia proles.
Nos uero incerti stetimus tam mira tuentes.
Dira ut monstra igitur sacra inuasere deorum,
talia continuo profert oracula Calchas:
"Quis stupor attonitas mentes turbauit, Achiui?
Nobis hoc magnum portendit Iuppiter omen,
fama sed euentus seros eterna sequetur.
Quippe ut hic octonos consumpsit in arbore pullos,
nona fuit genetrix, que pignora parua crearat,
sic et nos illis totidem bellabimus annos,
at decimo latam Priami expugnabimus urbem."
Ille autem ut cernit, sic exitus omnia complet.[4]

7 *fonteum*: corr. Horváth 19 *comesit*: corr. tacite Horváth 20 *reliquit*: supra *liquit* scriptum *condit* (i. e. *recondit*) 26 *protendit*: corr. supra u. ms. 29 *creatur*: del. et corr. ms.

The mediocre quality of the first Latin translations of Homer in the Renaissance can hardly be attributed to the interpreters' inadequate knowledge of Greek.[5] The outstandingly erudite L. Valla tackled the task of the translation of Thucydides, i. e. of a much more difficult text successfully, while his translation of the Iliad is an inornate, uninspired prose.[6] The difficulty arises from the difference between the Homeric language and the style of Roman epic and artistic prose.

[4] This text was printed for the first time by BARTÓK, I.–JANKOVITS, L.–KECSKEMÉTI, G. (eds): *Humanista műveltség Pannóniában* [Humanist culture in Pannonia]. Pécs 2000. 29–30. I would here like to express my gratitude to the editors for their kind permission to reproduce the text.

[5] As regards the early translation of Homer, G. FINSLER's work, *Homer in der Neuzeit*. Leipzig 1912, 16; 22; 26–30; 33–34, is indispensable, although it needs supplements. It would be most desirable to treat the whole subject anew.

[6] I quote a few sentences from the passage in question according to the edition *Homeri... Ilias per Laurentium Vallensem Romanum e graeco in latinum translata*. Liptzk (Leipsic) 1512. *Quare socii tolerate quaeso paulisper ad destinatum usque tempus, ut sciamus an uera Calchas an falsa uaticitaus sit nobis in Aulide, cum domo ueniebamus ad perniciem Priami ac Troianorum, quemadmodum probe reminisci uos arbitror. Omnes enim illuc affuistis, qui hic adestis praeter illos, qui proximis diebus iam diem suum obierunt. Forte nos ibi ad aram sub opaco platano positam, unde riuus gelidae aquae oriebatur, diis immortalibus hostias ferebamus. Cum ecce ibi monstrum horrendum ingensque draco districto maculis tergo, ab ipsius arae imo prosiliit. (Ita namque Iouis imperium ferebat) ... Tum Calchas diuini consilii conscius et interpres: Quae tanta inquit, uos Achiui admiratio subiit? Hoc uobis Iuppiter optimus maximus pro signo rerum futurarum dedit. Manet nos sera quidem et ualde sera, sed immortalis gloria.* He sometimes completely rewrites the Greek text in order to bring it nearer to Roman conventions. I quote the beginning of the poem: *Scripturus ego quantam exercitibus Graiis cladem exercitaue-*

Homeric language is rather paratactic, it is near to the style later called continuous or running (εἰρομένη), while the language of Latin artistic prose is – under the influence of Greek rhetoric – hypotactic, periodic. Those, then, who translated Homer in prose, had the choice of two possibilities: either to adhere to the Homeric framing of language and to write a displeasing and clumsy Latin prose, or to render Homer in an elegant Latin, but to depart from the original and to rewrite it. Vergil's language is certainly more paratactic,[7] but there are difficulties also in a translation in verse.

Greek can form compounds almost without restraint and epic language makes copious use of this possibility, especially in the case of attributes. Latin dislikes composite attributes of the Homeric kind and even though Ennius created some following Homeric patterns, these lived on as Ennianisms and the practice was not followed. It is, then, understandable that Latin translators, especially ones who kept to the verse form, omitted Homeric attributes and attributive structures in many cases. — Homeric language is formulaic. A certain formularization can be observed in Latin epic language too, but this is of a different character and comes to pass under the influence of different factors.[8] The two sorts of formularity cannot be regarded as correspondent. — Greek epic describes recurrent (typical) events or situations using recurrent, identical expressions. Latin epic language avoids such repetitions under the influence of rhetoric according to which variety is pleasing and the same event should not be recounted in the same way again.[9] — Latin epic poetry on the other hand is fond of alliterations, while these hold no importance whatsover for Homer. — Finally: the Greek hexameter is more dactylic than the Latin one. While holodactylic hexameters are not rare with Homer, i.e. they do not have any metrical meaning, two spondees are the average in Latin hexameter, and a holodactylic hexameter is striking, suggests some sort of haste.

Pushing to extremes one could say that the more Homeric a Latin translation would style itself, the less it would meet the requirements of fine Latin style or, to be more precise, the requirements of the fine Latin hexameter language as canonized in Vergil's and Ovid's poetry and vice versa: the more elegant the hexameter language is which the interpreter makes use of, the less Homeric his translation will be. I have analyzed elsewhere how Janus Pannonius wrestled with these difficulties in his

---

rit Achillis furens indignatio, ita, ut passim aues feraeque cadaueribus heroum ac principum pascerentur, te Calliope uosque aliae sorores, sacer musarum chorus, quarum hoc munus est proprium et quae uatibus praesidetis, inuoco oroque ut haec me edoceatis, quae mox docere ipse alios possim, primum quaenam origo indignationis ac materia fuit. Let me, nevertheless, quote also some words from the translation of Leontius Pilatus (Paris. Bibl. Nat. Cod. Lat. 7880 vol. I fol. 14^{v}): *Sustinete, amici, et expectetis usquam ad annum, ut sciamus, si uerum Calcas uaticinatur uel et nos bene enim iam hoc scimus in sensibus, estis autem omnes testes, quos non Parcae mortem ferentes abstulerunt* [*abstulerunt in mg.*] *heri pridieque quando in Aulida naues Achiuorum congregabantur mala Priamo et Troianis ferentes*... (There is a slightly different version of the translation in Cod. Lat. 7881.)

[7] Cp. JACKSON KNIGHT, W. F.: *Roman Vergil*. Harmondsworth 1966, 231, 408.

[8] For what follows cp. my paper, Verse-Translations from Greek by Janus Pannonius. *Acta Antiqua Acad. Sc. Hung.* 20, 1972, 261–263.

[9] Arist. Rhet. 1371 a 25–28; EE 1236 a 16; EN 1154 b 28; Rhet. Her. 4, 5.

translation of the encounter of Glaucus and Diomedes.[10] In this paper I intend to examine the other translation by him. This will be of interest probably also because this passage of the Iliad has been translated by Cicero, too.[11] I shall first discuss this.

One may suspect at a glance that this translation is rather free, even without reading through it since it renders the 32 lines of the original in 29. This assumption is fully verified by comparing the Latin text with the Greek. Characteristic Homeric attributes and attributive structures – νήπια τέκνα (311), Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης (319), κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοί (323), μητίετα Ζεύς (324) πόλις εὐρυάγυια (329) – remain untranslated. (Althoguh τέκνα in vs. 317 is translated with *teneros uolucres* which is equivalent to νήπια τέκνα.) Cicero does not translate recurrent or nearly recurrent lines (313 = 331; 317 ≈ 326) in the same way. The slower rhythm, too, mentioned above, can be observed: while the 32 lines of Homer contain – the last, catalectic feet not counted – 39 spondees, an average of 1.2, Cicero's 29 lines have 70, an average of 2.4.

No less instructive is the examination of language and contents. Cicero, as mentioned above, did not translate recurrent lines identically, as the literary taste of his age required. I believe that there might have been another reason too for the omission of attributes and attributive expressions than the difficulty to express them in Latin. Janus tried to render at least some Homeric locutions and attributes – not without success – in his other translation, as did some of the later translators too, and it is hardly credible that Cicero would not have been able to do the same, the more so, because the translation of texts of Greek orators was a usual exercise to develop style. In *De oratore* (1, 155) he has Licinius Crassus saying the following: "*...adsequebar, ut cum ea, quae legeram Graece, Latine redderem, non solum optimis uerbis uterer et tamen usitatis, sed etiam exprimerem quaedam uerba imitando, quae noua nostris essent, dum modo essent idonea.*" By "imitating words" he could also have made new locutions as he did in the case of the technical terms of philosophy, the more so, because at least some of the attributes he did not translate are not fully without function. Zeus the "conceiver" gives a portent which signifies the fulfilment of the plan he conceived and in this context even that can be of some importance that he is the son of the "crooked-minded" Cronus. The explanation is to be sought somewhere else.

First of all in the language. In his meticulous analysis H. Ahrens has shown that nearly all of the phrases and locutions in Cicero's translation probably derive from archaic Latin poetry, principally from Ennius' *Annales*.[12] Cicero, then, obviously intended to render Homer into the language of the Roman epic. The language of the Roman epic was not the same as the language of Cicero's age, it was more archaic, and neither was the language of Greek epic the same as the Greek spoken by

[10] Cp. note 8, 264–269.

[11] De diu. 2, 63–64 = fr. 23 Morel–Büchner (I shall quote the text according to the numeration of lines in this edition). Cp. also *M. Tulli Ciceronis De divinatione*. Ed. by A. S. Pease. Darmstadt 1963 (originally Univ. of Illinois Studies 1920, 1923).

[12] AHRENS, H.: *Cicero als Übersetzer epischer und tragischer Dichtung der Griechen*. Diss. Hamburg 1961, 3–76.

Cicero. However, Cicero was not led by such historical considerations. For him this somewhat archaic Latin was the language of the grand style: by using this language the *epicus color* could have been given to the tale, while loan translations of Greek epic expressions would have been considered modernistic violations of this style. At the same time, he transformed the paratactic Homeric structures into hypotactic ones, conforming to the rhetoric taste of his age; indeed, as Ahrens has convincingly demonstrated, he framed the last lines into a neat *peroratio*.[13]

The way Cicero proceeded with Homer's text is also elucidated by his remarks on translating Greek orators:[14] "... *nec conuerti ut interpres, sed ut orator, sententiis isdem et earum formis tamquam figuris, uerbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis. In quibus non uerbum pro uerbo necesse habui reddere, sed genus omne uerborum uimque seruaui. Non enim ea me annumerare lectori putaui oportere, sed tamquam appendere*" (Opt. gen. 14). *Genus uerborum*: this means the choice of words which give the *epicus color*, as mentioned above, *uis* and *uerba ad nostram consuetudinem apta*, however, means something else. In his recasting of Plato's Timaeus Cicero speaks of some divinities *quos Graeci* δαίμονας *appellant, nostri, opinor, Lares, si modo hic recte conuersum uideri potest* (11). In other words, the translator has to find not only the adequate Roman style, but also the adequate Roman notion and he has to render the Greek into the world of these notions. Examples for this can be found also in his translation of Homer.

Homer does not specify the profession of Calchas explicitly, he only says μαντεύεται. Cicero states plainly that he is an *augur* and this is not simply the Latin name of a kind of soothsayers, it denotes also the members of a Roman sacerdotal body (of which Cicero was also a member). Cicero, however, went even further in Romanizing the Greek text. Homer says (300) "whether Calchas foretold the truth or not". Cicero says: "if the prophesies contain valid or vain commencements" (*fata ... ratosne habeant an uanos pectoris orsus*, 2–3). *Ratus* and *uanus* are technical terms of the augurs, denoting prophesies which come true and which do not.[15]

This goes to show that Cicero's main concern was not the accurate translation of the Homeric words and phrases, but rather the conversion of the Greek epic text into a Roman one in accordance with Roman epic tradition and Roman notions, a real *interpretatio Romana*, even at the cost of inaccuracies. *Sententiis isdem*, but *uerbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis*.

With this we come to the problem of the Renaissance translators. An interesting case is A. Poliziano who translated four books of the Iliad (2–5) at roughly the same time as Janus the passage from Book 2.[16] Poliziano lengthened each book by

[13] *Op. cit.*, 39.

[14] For the following cp. TRENCSÉNYI-WALDAPFEL, I.: De Cicerone poetarum Graecorum interprete. *Atti del I Congresso Internazionale di Studi Ciceroniani*. Roma 1961, vol. II, 161–174, esp. 164–172.

[15] Pease ad loc.; AHRENS, *op. cit.* (note 12) 13–14; for the augural use of *uanus* see also Ov. Met. 2, 597; 3, 349.

[16] *Prose volgari inedite. Poesie latine e greche edite e inedite di Angelo Ambrogini Poliziano. Racc. e ill. da Isidoro del Lungo*. Firenze 1867. Repr. Hildesheim–New York 1976, 431–523, this passage: 442–443 (lines 308–332 of the translation). In line 332 there seems to be a mistake (*tarda et*

several lines and transformed the Homeric text into a lovely Vergilian one. The most interesting is, however, the translation of this passage: Poliziano simply takes over Cicero's translation with slight modifications, giving it, where possible, a more Vergilian flavour. *Omnes memori portentum mente retentant*, says Cicero (4). Poliziano (311): *tenent omnes portentum mente repostum*, a recollection obviously of Aen. 1, 26: *manet alta mente repostum*. Vs. 10 ends with Cicero in *fons unde emanat aquai*. Poliziano felt it necessary to eliminate this archaic form and archaic verse ending:[17] *fons lucidus unde fluebat* (317), making by this the translation also closer, so far as it renders the attribute of the spring (ἀγλαόν), similarly in the next line he preserves – unlike Cicero – the detail that the back of the serpent is red: *immanem tergoque rubente draconem*. I cannot give the reason of the alteration in line 319 where Cicero's translation is even nearer to the original (Cicero: *terribilem, Iouis ut pulsu penetrarat ab ara*, Poliziano: *terribili Iouis ut lapsu penetrarat ab ara*). In verse 331 (Cicero 24) he makes the hexameter more elegant by reversing the order of the two first words, in accordance with the taste of ages after Cicero.[18] For Poliziano, then, the standard was not archaic, but classical Latin poetry, and it is not Ennius, but Vergil whom Poliziano wants to emulate with his text. Although the compliance with the new stylistic norm may result in a more accurate translation, too, this is not the primary motive.

Janus Pannonius' translation is a novelty in this respect, reflecting a new translatory attitude: a strive for accuracy – as far as it is possible. He too leaves Homer's peculiar attributes untranslated, but he alludes to it once, he renders "the city with broad streets" to "broad city" (31). Recurrent or partly recurrent lines are not identically translated either, but as if he would indicate the repetition somehow (I shall come back to this point). His hexameters are not so dactylic either as Homer's – there are 75 spondees in 32 lines, meaning an average of 2.3, but the effort is clearly perceptible: to speed up and to slow down the rhythm in accordance with the contents (13 and 10 resp.). Finally: Janus endeavours sensibly to translate a complete line with a complete line: in one case he makes three lines from two Homeric ones (308–9 = 10–12), but he instantly compensates it (311–313 = 14–15).

Tiny signs of the rivalry with Cicero can be observed and it seems more than probable that Janus' motive to translate this very part was just his wish to compete with the great Roman. Similarly to Cicero, Janus uses two opposite attributes concerning the prophesy of Calchas, yet not two technical terms, but *uera*, the exact equivalent of the Greek ἐτεόν on the one hand, and *inania* on the other that corresponds to the Ciceronian *uanus*, but is not a technical term, though used in connection with augury (V. Fl. 6, 729). The *rubri species horrenda draconis* (11) echoes the Ciceronian *immani species tortuque draconis* (11), but the red colour of the serpent is kept and the word *species* has the sense not only of 'form', but also of 'species'. Likewise Ciceronian reminiscences can be felt in line 1 by *ferte*, in line 20 by *qui* –

---

sera ait: hiatus), but the manuscript tradition of Cicero's translation too is faulty at this point (*tarda et sera animis*).

[17] AHRENS, *op. cit.* (note 12), 39.

[18] NORDEN, P. (ed.): *Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI.* Leipzig–Berlin 1916², 435–436.

idem or in line 26 by *nobis hoc* (Janus, unlike Poliziano, lets it be). All these are, however, trivialities, the expression of honour towards the great predecessor. As a translator Janus goes his own way.

Before I enter upon the examination of this "own way", I would like to note a matter that is more interesting in terms of Homeric textual criticism. The word ἀρίζηλον in line 318 – the reading of all manuscripts known to us – was controversial as early as the Alexandrian scholars. This was the version of Zenodotus who understood it as 'very conspicuous'. It was Aristarchus, as it seems, who read ἀίζηλον and interpreted it as 'invisible'. Cicero translated this version, indeed, he made it emphatic by translating ἀίζηλον – ἔφηνεν with *ediderat* – *abdidit*.[19] Janus' translation – *in secla reliquit* – shows that either his copy had the version we know only from Apollonios the Sophist: ἀείζηλον, or in the belief that ἀίζηλον was an itacistic error (in his age everybody read Greek itacistically!) he took it for ἀείζηλον. In any case, the translation (*in secla*) furnishes a further testimony for ἀίζηλον / ἀείζηλον. (The correction *recondit* seems to point to the first. Or is it Cicero's influence?) And now let us turn to the translation.

Janus is well aware that Latin hexameter language is an artificial language and that it is not enough to know the customary expressions, one also has to know how to vary and join them in a novel way, to give new colours and new sense to customary phrases by putting them in an uncustomary context and, in the case in question, to comply with the Homeric text. He gives proof of remarkable resourcefulness in the choice of words, as well as in the use and joining of traditional locutions, translating exactly and evoking the world of Roman poetic language at once.

Ἴδμεν ἐνὶ φρεσίν is the Greek text of vs. 301. Φρήν means midriff and mind, its Latin equivalent is *praecordia* which fits into the hexameter only in the nom. and acc. case and is therefore here unserviceable. Cicero has *mens*. Janus says *pectus*. This, though not often, also means stomach in poetic language (Ov. Met. 6, 663; Man. 5, 133) and mind (Verg. Aen. 1, 661; also in prose: Cic. Att. 13, 12, 4). The double meaning has no function here since the meaning is unambiguously 'mind', the use of *pectus* shows the almost autotelic inventivness of Janus in choosing the proper word and, at the same time, *pectore retinere* can be considered the poetic equivalent of *memoria* or *animo retinere* used in prose (Cic. S. Rosc. 33; Tusc. 1, 17; etc.).

This, however, is not the only example of the nicety in choosing the proper word. "Why have you become dumb, Achaeans of longhaired heads" (325) is the Greek text. Janus' version: *Quis stupor attonitas mentes turbauit, Achiui?* Κάρη κομόωντες remains untranslated, the whole line is recast: this time we cannot speak in high terms of Janus' accuracy. The more remarkable is his choice of words. As a parallel to *attonitas mentes* a passage of Tibullus comes to mind (1, 9, 47), as well

[19] Schol. AT ad loc.; Apoll. Soph. 16, 28 s. v. ἀίδηλον; for further data cp. M. L. West's recent edition. Translators apparently did not know what to do with the word and simply omitted it. Only Andreas Divus (*Homeri Ilias ad verbum translata Andrea Divo Iustinopolitano interprete*. Salingiaci 1540) and H. Eobanus Hessus (*Homeri Iliados... libri XXIIII. Helio Eobano Hesso interprete*. Basiliae 1549) rendered it: *hunc ... clarum fecit deus* (Andreas Divus) and *conspicuum posuit* (Hessus) resp., i. e. they read the vulgate text: ἀρίζηλον. Recent editors (Mazon, van Thiel, West) have taken ἀίζηλον in the text.

as a passage from Ovid (*attonitus sensus*: F. 2, 769). Janus, then, works as always with full command of the Roman poetic language. What is surprising, however, is the use of *stupor* (in the original there is no 'stupefaction'). Not because *stupor* and *attonitus* occur together in Apuleius (Met. 1, 8; 2, 13; 3, 32), but because ancient grammarians and lexicographers explain *attonitus* by *stupore diffusus*.[20]

I would also like to mention in passing that the translation of ἐπὶ χρόνον (299) with *in tempus* (299) seems to be a simple calque, though the sense 'for a time' can be justified with two passages: Sall. Hist. fr. 3, 38; Tac. Ann. 14, 20, 2.

Another case is the translation of τέκνα. In Homeric language it means human children in the majority of cases, but not exclusively. Janus renders the formula νήπια τέκνα at its occurrences (311 and 15 resp.) with *foetus*, later, however, in the almost identical lines 317 and 326 (19 and 28) he uses *pullus* which practically always means the young of an animal; finally, in the fully identical lines 313 and 327 (Janus' 17 and 29 resp.) he employs *pignus*. Thus, though in accordance with the taste of his age, Janus did not translate repeated lines identically, but by translating an important word identically, he indicates, as it were, the repetition. Nor is it entirely without interest to mention that *pignus* denotes children or descendants of human beings only, especially in poetic language. By using this word Janus gives a more human colouring to the fate of the birds, as they represent the fate of human beings, namely of the Trojans. He thus makes explicit what is implied in Homer's text, since, as I have mentioned, τέκνα mainly denotes human children.

That Janus uses the phrases of Roman poetry is hardly surprising, in view of the taste of his age. The question is whether he does this in order to make a show of his knowledge or to choose the most appropriate expression. In the translation of vs. 302 Janus uses a Vergilian phrase: *fata tulerunt* (E. 5, 34). This matches κῆρες ... φέρουσαι to such an extent that it probably arose as an imitation-translation of this very Homeric phrase.[21] Janus, then, found the classical passage here the most appropriate. This is not natural: other translators render κῆρες with *Parcae*, though Cicero, too, uses *fata*.[22]

By quoting a passage of a classic, nevertheless, the whole situation can also be conjured up in which the phrase was originally used. Homer says: "when the ships of the Achaeans congregated at Aulis" (303–304). Janus: *cum ... Graie complebant Aulida classes* (5–6). Certainly, he could have translated the passage more accurately (e. g. *Graiae conuenere Aulida classes*), but he used an Ovidian expression: *Aulidaque Euboicam complerunt mille carinae* (Met. 13, 182). Was this in order to show how well he knows Ovid? Maybe. Or perhaps because the passage was hovering at

[20] Gloss. IV 481, 34; GL VIII 297, 22–23 (Albinus). This only sums up what is to be read with Servius (Aen. 3, 172: *Attonitus est stupefactus, nam proprie attonitus dicitur, cui casus uicini fulminis et sonitus tonitruum dant stuporem*) now so, epitomized. Isid. Et. 10, 19 too goes back to this, though he does not mention *stupor*. Janus might have taken his knowledge either from Servius or from some compilation for schools. Nevertheless, as Dr. L. Jankovits pointed out to me, Schol. A to Il. 2,320 notes that θαυμάζομεν stands for ἐκπληττόμεθα. Would Janus have known this too?

[21] This passage is cited as a parallel as early as Chr. G. Heyne's commentary and in several commentaries since.

[22] E. g. Leontius Pilatus, V. Obsopoeus (Homericae Iliadis libri duo, secundus et nonus, latinitate donati per Vincentium Obsopoeum. Norimbergae 1527), Andreas Divus.

the back of his mind, together with the locution *litora complere* that is repeatedly used by Vergil (Aen. 3, 71; 676)? This cannot be refuted either, since the translation of ἦκε φόωσδε (309) became *aethereas ... miserat ... sub auras* (12) obviously, because praeposition + *auras* (so also *sub auras*) is rather frequent, and likewise *Saturnia proles* was framed undoubtedly on the model of *Saturnia terra* (Enn. Ann. 21 Sk.; Ov. F. 5, 625), *Saturnia tellus* (Verg. G. 2, 173; Aen. 8, 329), *Saturnia virgo* (Ov. F. 6, 383) etc. unintentionally, under the influence of formularized verse-endings. Still, a third possibility cannot be excluded either. The Ovidian words quoted above are to be read in the flashback upon the sacrifice of Iphigenia and so the time-clause, neutral in itself, may hint also at the sacrifice at the cost of which the Greeks could bring destruction on the Trojans.

A similar case is as follows: Vergil uses the locutions *agmine certo* (Aen. 2, 212) and *agmine longo* (3, 90) in connection with the serpents that attack Laocoon and with the other serpent that emerges from Anchises' grave. The locution *agmine* + attribute might have been considered, then, a constant element in describing the appearance of serpents – at least since Vergil and the words *magno agmine* got into Janus' text on this account (13). They have no equivalent in the Greek text, but conjure up the Vergilian situation in Book 2 of the Aeneid.

Finally, the phrase *Phrygibus ... dura ferentes* (5, κακὰ ... φέρουσαι 304) seems to be a varying imitation. I cannot cite any example for the locution *dura ferre* in this sense, in addition *fero* in the sense of 'to cause' is rather rare. The locution was framed by Janus who translated the Homeric text word for word, but at the same time hinted at a well-known Vergilian passage: *Danaos ... dona ferentis* (Aen. 2, 49). By this hint Janus' passage gains a deeper sense: these hard things (*dura*) will appear as gifts (*dona* and, who knows, even Greek δῶρα is to be included) and the gift will prove hard.[23]

Janus, however, not only applies, not only varies traditional elements, but also combines them in a novel way, sometimes successfully, sometimes rather artificially. I shall discuss this latter first. In vs. 9 of Janus' translation we read ... *caput unde liquentibus undis*. *Caput* meaning source is not rare with poets as well as prose-writers, but the source of what is meant is always given by a proper or a common noun. The use of the word in itself is rather strange.[24] *Liquentibus undis* (ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ 307) is a customary locution (Ov. Am. 2, 16, 5; Met. 8, 457). The conjunction of words *caput unde* appears in a well-known passage of the Georgics (4, 368), thus Janus seems to have combined the two locutions, framing an elliptic structure similar to Aen. 1, 6: *genus unde Latinum*. Yet while the solemn pathos of the elliptic structure is appropriate with Vergil, it is out of place in the translation.

The other combination at the end of line 16 is more successful: *cerula pestis*, though in the original there is no trace of it. *Caerul(e)us* is a frequently adopted attribute of serpents (Verg. G. 4, 482; Aen. 2, 381; 7, 347; Ov. Met. 3, 38; 12, 13 just

[23] *Dura ferentem* occurs once in a passage of Horace (Ep. 2, 1, 145) but in the sense of 'bearing hard things' and *dura ferre* means 'to abide hard things' elsewhere too (Ov. Met. 9, 545; Sen. De const. 6, 3).

[24] I take *liquentibus undis* for an abl. qual. Janus' usage could be defended by taking it for dativ: 'a source for clear waters'.

of the serpent at Aulis; etc.), *pestis* too occures more than once as apposition of snakes (Lucr. 5, 26; Verg. G. 3, 419), Lucanus calls serpents *gelidae pestes* in one passage, without saying explicitly that they are serpents (9, 844, cp. also 614). Janus joins these two elements in a novel way, befitting the Roman poetry following Hellenistic models – but not the Homeric style. The more beautiful the Latin hexameter-language, the less Homeric…

A feature of a nice Latin hexameter is proper sounding, and Janus' translation does not lack of this either. This is served by not showy, but numerous alliterations (6: *complebant classes;* 9: *pulchra sub platano*; 10–11: *prorumpere prodigium*; 13: *magno mox*; 19: *pullis pariter*; 29: *pignora parua*), by tone-painting (1: *r* sounds; 16 *r* and *s* sounds); by the consonance of *mira* and *dira* (22–23, the portent is wonderful and dreadful at once),[25] or by the word-play *ferus – fertur* (13): It goes well with the *ferus* animal that it *fertur*, for *fertur*, though formally passive, does not mean some being helplessly carried, but rather a vehement motion, a rushing on (among others) the enemy. Thus *fertur* is, besides the play on words which has no trace in the original, a very close translation of ὄρουσεν (310).

Janus' translation, however, is not only important because of this ingenious tackling of difficulties, but mainly because of his novel understanding of what closeness in translation means. Cicero rendered the Homeric text into the language of the Ennian epic and into the world of Roman notions. Poliziano changed this in so far as he held the world of Vergil's language for standard and model instead of that of Ennius. This, however, meant the embellishment, sometimes almost the rewriting of Homer. The second Book of the Iliad consists of 877 lines, with Poliziano it consists of 897, the 461 lines of Book 3 are with him 466; Book 4 has 544 lines, in Poliziano's translation it has 635; the 969 lines of Book 5 grew into 1052 in the Latin translation. This manner of translation lived on even in the 16th century. V. Obsopoeus who translated Books 2 and 9 of the Iliad, inflated the 32 lines of this passage into 38.[26]

Translators of Homer in prose did not amplify in this way, they rather abridged the original (attributes are omitted), while those who strove to translate accurately not only on the level of the sentences, but also on that of words and locutions, and attempted to render peculiar Homeric attributes,[27] did so in a laboured and clumsy Latin.

Janus translated in verse. Being a poet, like Poliziano and, to a certain extent, Cicero, he was aware of the fact that form is an organic part of a poetic composition. This meant, of course, that he had to yield to the rules of the elegant Vergilian and

[25] This time it is Janus who uses a technical term: in connection with omens *dirus* means 'sinister', 'portentous': Cic. Leg. 2, 21, cp. Ov. Met. 5, 550; Plin. N.H. 10, 16, 34–35; 18, 1, 4; Tac. Hist. 3, 56, 1; Ann. 12, 43, 1; Suet. Aug. 92; etc.

[26] Cp. note 22. I quote a few lines from his translation: *Quapropter durate, uiri, tolerate labores / Mutatoque animo ad tempus consedite saltem, / Ut nos num Calchas praedixit uera, queamus / Noscere, seu falsa delusit uoce Pelasgos*. The translation shows some Ciceronian reminiscenses, but it is rather wordy.

[27] Let me quote a few examples from Leontius' translation: *Croni filius obliqui consilii; comosi Achiui; consultor Iuppiter; ciuitatem amplos calles habentem* (the other version *amplicallem*!); Eobanus Hessus in his verse translation: *crine graues Danai; prudens Iuppiter;* Andreas Divus: *Saturni filius uersuti; comati Achiui; consiliarius Iuppiter*.

Ovidian hexameter, and he could not resist the temptation to adopt their kind of artistry, rather than the different one of Homer. Nonetheless, he did not amplify the original and, as far as it was possible within the given limits, in the majority of cases he remained near to the original on the level of locutions too, like those who translated Homer in prose. This is a concept of translation that comes close to the modern one: To say the same and in the same way as the original, not more, not less. Janus was among the first, if not *the* first, to proceed according to this principle in translating this passage of Homer and, more consistently and on a higher level in his translation of the encounter of Glaucus and Diomedes. He was surpassed only by Poliziano in his translation of the fifth hymn of Callimachus, some seventeen years after the death of Janus.

Eötvös Loránd University
Dept. of Latin Philology
H-1364 Budapest P.O. Box 107