

Toward a New Interlinear Gloss of De Rerum Natura

Post by "Cassius" of June 4, 2021 at 8:33 PM

Tonight I finally finished correlating my online copy of Bailey to the paragraph / line number divisions in the Loeb edition. That means that for the remainder of the Lucretius podcast I should be able to be a little more precise in referring to "line numbers."

But the reason I make this post is directed at Joshua: I still don't have a feel for whose translation I really think is "most literal."

I get the idea in comparing the Smith to Bailey that there's a lot of "paraphrasing" going on and that we might have a lot of simply looking at Bailey and using a different wording. I don't have a feel yet for whether the word choice of Bailey or Smith is really closer to the Latin word form and word order, which is what I would prefer. I have always suspected that Monro was the closest of all, but I am not sure there either. And the 1743 edition significantly predates Monro, but despite its age in many instances reads (to me) more smoothly than Munro, which I find counterintuitive.

So Joshua as you make progress in your interlinear edition, after a couple of pages it might be very helpful to try to gauge which public domain translation is most helpful to you in aligning the Latin with an understandable English word. To me that would be one of the benefits of at least starting on the interlinear - it might give us once and for all a basis to classify the different translations as to which is "closest" to the Latin.