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LANE'S LATIN GRAMMAR.


A book of the size of Lane’s Grammar—nearly 600 pages—printed in small type and packed with examples, is no small subject for review. This book is known to have been partly in type for several years, and has been eagerly looked for by American scholars, to whom Professor Lane stood as perhaps our very first Latinist. The posthumous issue of his grammar under the editorship of Professor M. H. Morgan—a work of great labour, of real pietas from grateful pupil to beloved teacher—is the first opportunity the general public of Latinists has had of coming into contact with Professor Lane’s quality. His grammar will now make him many another grateful pupil. My study of it for some weeks in the preparation of this review, has given me at least a sympathy with the merits it displays, though I do not feel myself a competent critic of so ripe a work. Besides, which of us has not some grammar of his youth to which he clings more or less loyally, as they say a certain devout painter kept an ugly little Byzantine Madonna to say his prayers to, even after the time of Raphael?

Nor do I feel it quite possible for any one to reach an impartially critical standpoint. We look into new books to see if they confirm our old beliefs. Horace, as well as another, has pricked this weakness of the critic:

si quedam nimis antique, si pleraque dure dicere credit eos, ignave multa fatetur, et sapit et necum facit et Iove indicet aequo.

Epis. ii. 1, 66-68.

A Latin grammar is not merely a book, it is a property, always from the publisher's point of view, and sometimes from the compiler's. Professor Lane was not a compiler, and he did not view his grammar as a property. Therefore the book is too unequal as well as too voluminous, I fear, to prove a good property for its exploiters: abit omen.

If I may begin with a general weakness, it is the confusion, in the treatment of the forms, of the comparative (prehistoric) and the historical points of view. Professor Lane, if I read him aright, had in mind to write a historical grammar, but in some way, probably from his interest in quantitative problems, felt constrained to incorporate certain comparative results. His incursions into this domain are, to put it mildly, belated. He talks of -e being shortened in the abl. sg. of consonant stems, of a shortened dat.-ablv. ending-bis; the voc. serve he gets by weakening from servo; he goes from providens to prudens by way of prudens: at yields st in estis ‘ye eat,’ but st in fossor: the impv. ending-mino has lost an -s. There is very much of this sort of thing, and one might cry out with Calverly about ‘the brave rhymes of an elder day.’ I say this in sorrow, not in flippancy.

Professor Lane nowhere mentions a form not Latin, not even, if I mistake not, an Umbrian or Oscan form. In the syntax, no hint of Greek influence is given, save for the mihi est cupienti type. With this method of treatment I have no quarrel, though I should prefer more attention to Greekish idioms, but an author should accept the special limitations of his general attitude. Why mention n-adulterinum in anything but a minute study of phonetics? Why print any construct forms like *vegho *magior? Why specially account for the long -o of servorum and say nothing of the -o of servo? Wherefore even from *esum, ea from *ia, luxuria from luxuries, loco from loco?

As a teacher of Latin, I have considered it profitable to teach students but three points of linguistic interest. The ‘common’ vowels are all explicable by the law of brevis brevians, and bene beside optimi; modi, siti beside tuti, veri; volo, amo but odio, laudo—such examples prove the case sufficiently.

I teach rhotacism from pairs like gero: gestus, oneris: omnis, with mention of the double forms like lares: lares. Our English was: were pair is also worth mentioning. Professor Lane’s treatment of this subject would not make it clear, I fancy, to any one who did not know it already. The third point is the passage of -i- to -e-; and this has been well explained by Professor Lane, but without enough insistence on the identity of the rec-tus and quaes-vus types.

The subdivision of 5th declension nouns into two classes seems not likely to prove of any practical pedagogic utility, but the classi-
fication of verbs as I, root-verbs and verbs in -ere, II, verbs in -are, -ere, -ire, is not only 'scientific,' but will perhaps be helpful for purposes of instruction. What uninstructed student, though, would understand why sero is put in the (reduplicated) root class? I must believe that the complicated lists of verbs (pp. 146-166) are useless. What is wanted is a simple classification of the various types of irregularity, with a few common verbs to establish each class, and then an alphabetical list of verbs, perhaps apart in a cheap, strong form, like the Verbi Latini of the Hoepli manuals.

Professor Lane derives narrare from *gnar-igare and nuper from *novomper. He fails to explain gratulari from *gratitulari, like opitulari,—strangely enough, for he very aptly describes hapalolalis as 'avoidance of a stuttering sound' (126).*

What is the basis for classifying -ire in longe as a neuter adverbial ending, sometimes treated, as in repente (705)? We ought to have some justification for the diphthongal -us of cui, instead of the usual and, in my opinion, correct cui; and an example for num 'now,' which I would gladly accept, granted evidence, is to seek.

What class of readers had Professor Lane in mind when he explains nobis as belonging to the idf locative type? In one at least of the divergences from up-to-date phonetics, viz. in the explanation of the 'juxtaposed' nolo and malo I must declare my sympathy with Professor Lane's method. Such 'squeezes,'—like our goodbye howdy, sounds etc., Latin non, hercle, pol,—seem to me past control by normal phonetic investigation.

In closing my notice of those sections of the grammar dealing with sounds, structure and forms, it needs to be said how valuable is the material furnished by the lists of inscripitional and early forms annexed to the paradigms; and the teacher of dramatic metres will be grateful for such printing as rect rei in the paradigms.

I must lament, however, that the grammar has printed potential renderings for the subjunctive paradigms, all the more as Professor Lane here sins against light (see his exhibition of steriling common sense on this point at 717). No wonder the Freshmen in our colleges come up with this misleading association of moods.

Before treating the syntax in detail the general looseness of statement which characterises it may be noted. All scholars know how hard definition is. Still, to make all the statements about verbs strictly applicable to action verbs only (passim, but see 1557 seq., 1594 seq.), and to include both persons and things under locations like that which (e.g., 1239, 1255) makes easier writing than understanding. At 721 we read of 'the second person of what is spoken to.' What are we to understand by 'the principal cases, which have more complete inflection than the secondary (1112). Why tell a student that in ductori for a leader . . . -is is the inflection ending meaning for? Why say (785) 'there are a dozen verbs' in making a statement of an exact number? Who, without previous knowledge or a mental contortion, would understand the meaning of 2334; futurum fuisse ut with the impf. subj. is often used in the passive instead of the fut. ptc. with fuisse? Why say a form is not used when it is not in existence (726), or include in a tabular classification members not provided for in the descriptive classification preceding (54 after 51-53)?

The syntax is exceeding full of examples, and these, for all their number, must have been culled with loving care. We see the saving American salt of common sense so often. To teachers of grammar I would recommend 1231: 'But it must be remembered that, as the genitive connects substantives in a loose way, the same construction may sometimes be referred to more than one head.'

Among the many notes I have made in reading the syntax I call attention to the following.

Touching the Accusative: I miss for the cognate type the most telling examples, nec mortale sonans (Aen. 6,50) to be followed by nec vox hominem sonat (ib. 1, 328),—at least it is my conviction that the more violent instances of an idiom, if from an author read early and by all pupils, should be presented in a grammar. The examples for the Greek accusative might also have included Aen. 2,273 and 1, 228. My impression is, however, that examples from the Aeneid seem to have been avoided by Professor Lane. Either under 1152, or later under the abl. of measure of difference, the example millibus passuum sex Caesaris castris sub monte

---

1 The references are to sections.

2 E.g., the contrasting examples in 1056, 1058, and in 1473: at 2075 (Pl. Ep. 116, 381); the fine example for suboblique quod, Pl. B. 755 (2319). Only one instance of 'stript' Latin, the jejunus Rhodanus root—cited at 1062, to fix the sentence-type—has been noted.
consedit (B.G. 1, 48, 1) ought to be accounted for, especially in contrast with the (O.O.) example hostes sub monte consedisse milia passuum ab ipsius castris octo (ib. 1, 21, 1). At 1165, we might be told that, before Ovid, essequeus occurs only in the instance cited. At 1169 apropos of celat, a fine opportunity is neglected of teaching the doctrine of identity in construction of opposites, for celat 'hides from' can be explained best as the opposite of doceot, 'shows to, teaches.' Similarly the tortum hosti detraxit type (1209) ought to be explained by the opposition of 'takes away' and 'gives to.' So we should have been spared the association in one rule of this common prose idiom and the sporadic poetical use of the dative with verbs of 'wading off.'

Touching the Dative: We ought to be expressly told somewhere that the dative is a person case. The general treatment of this case is attractive; I refer particularly to the classification into I, Essential Complement, and II, Optional Complement. The explanation of the dative of agent as possessive is specious, I think, and why is the dative of the person viewing or judging dubbed 'Dative of Relation'? If it is worth the while to tell us the construction of obviam ire,—and I think it is,—on what principle are we referred to the lexicon for the usage of consulo?

Touching the Genitive: Matter pertaining to the objective and subjective uses, and their adjective equivalents, occurs at 1040, 1046, 1232 seq., 1260 seq., but they are compared, and that without any insistence, only at 1227. Contrasted with the admirable clearness of Riemann's treatment (Syntaxe Latina, § 48), there is marked pedagogic weakness here. Why is ad vestrum omnium caedem (1235) given as an example of the apposition of adj. and gen. in subjective relation? Why classify the summus mons type under the genitive? §1273 seems a little loose: 'In poetry and late prose, the gen. is used very freely with many adjectives of various meanings, often merely to indicate what they apply to.' Such a statement I have orally made to my pupils, but the examples here printed hardly justify their separation from § 1264, for callidior and vetus (cf. vetricor) are like peritus, maturus and serus not alien to plenus and agenus. Plautus's sanus mentis aut animi is clearly to be explained as his desipiebant mentis, correctly described at 1359. The discussion of referunt and interest is not satisfying. Without a cross reference back to 816,—and I will say in passing that a lack of such backward references is a serious mechanical defect of the grammar—the student would be at a loss before referunt in Terence. Apropos of the absence of interest from early Latin, some notice should have been taken of Plautus's in remat, of which interest is the semantic legitimate,—all the more as there is a tantalizing possibility that in remat may have got as far as in’rest by phonic process. In 1292, under the heading 'Verbs of Participation and Mastery,' we have the Delphic note that credo sometimes takes the dative of the person and the genitive of the thing. The passages, none of which is cited, are Pl. Am. 672, As. 459, 854 (aceredo), B. 504, Truc. 307. The genitives which occur are omnium rerum (As. 459), duorum rerum (Truc. 1c), which I regard as genitives of value of the non huius facio type; and divini (the other places), which is likewise a gen. of value of the magni aestimat type. At 1295, we might expect all of 'three or four' examples to be cited, and why are we not told that this gen. of exclamation is Greekish?

Touching the Ablative: 'The abl. with facio and sum denotes that with which or to which something is done' (1815), but, without insisting that the examples are all of persons, why is the idiom classified as abl. of source, and not rather, like the abl. with utor, as instrumental? At 1318, under the abl. of Cause, Influence or Motive: 'The person by whom the action of a passive verb is done, is denoted by the ablative with ab.' True enough in fact, however awkwardly put, but we should get a truer explanation by comparing 'There was a man sent from God whose name was John.' In the idiom oppido, domo recipere, and in construction with confanes, fretus the locative ablative is claimed, incorrectly, I think. The case is not clear for putting the absolute under the abl. of Attendance. The absolute is a composite of many ablative functions (see also Dettweiler in the Handbuch der Erziehungs- und Unterrichtslehrb., III., p. 88; and Cauer's Grammatica Miliiana, p. 142). At 1379 the explanation of opust clamayde, 'there is a job with a cloak, i.e., we need a cloak' is far from convincing. The natural construction of opust seems to be retained for us by Plautus (Mo. 412) in the phrase id videndumst, id viri doctist opus, and I am fain to believe that opust has got its constructions by imitation of usus. Might we not expect our grammars to tell us that the futures of usus are usus veniet (Poen. 727, S., 475)
and usu venerit (B. 363, Ci., 147, Merc. 518).

To be sure no ablative occurs with these futures. At 1419—20 we ought to be told that tenus with the ablative is probably an encroachment on finit, of absolute origin—all the more as the rendering of laborum tenus by the length of the line so artfully carries with it the doctrine of tenus.

Touching Verb Syntax in General: The description of the relative question quines is extremely neat (1505), and the 'Infinitive of Intimation' is a happy rhetorical description of the Historical Infinitive (1535). The subdivision Intermediate Coordinate Sentences presents a not infelicitous name for certain (semi-) paratactic types. At 1701 I miss the telling example negat quis, negro; ait, ait (Terence, Eur. 252), and at 1709, beside Plautus's taceam optumumst it might be well to cite Caesar B.G. ii., 10: constiutuerunt optimum esse domum...reverti et, quorum in fines primum Romani exercitum introdixissent, ad eos defendendos unique convenirent.1

Touching the Subjunctive : Professor Lane's classification (I. Subjunctive in Declarations, with the sub-classes of A. Wish, B. exhortation etc., C. Willingness etc. II. Subjunctive of Action Conceivable) shows rather his individual dislike of accepted terminology than individuality in his treatment, unless indeed the term Action Conceivable betrays an attitude of revolt to the Potential. With this attitude, if I may express my individual skepticism, a skepticism forced upon me from the Latin authors at first hand, I am in hearty sympathy.3 The potentiality of the subjunctive is, in my opinion, nothing more nor less than the potentiality of the indicative, which Lane presents very fully in §§ 2305–7. The velim-types are adequately explained by a theory of attraction from the idea to the mood.4 On the diocet, dixerit quis types I have already expressed an opinion in this Review (Vol. xii., 298). The chemical affinity between the subjunctive and 2nd person points to an imperative origin, for the imperative is the mood of the 2nd person. A definite 2nd person easily becomes gnomie.5 I have also suggested (above, Vol. xi., 344) that certain exclamatory subjunctives owe their origin to partial obliquity. Here the partial obliquity connotation of the German imperatival auxiliary, sollen, furnishes an instructive parallel. The same verb sollen, also serves as a potential auxiliary. In Old English also, so could be is common in this sense of German sollte.

In the example sunt item quae appel- lantur alices I do not see how appellentur could stand (1823), and in Horace's inter- dorum volgus rectum videt, est ubi pecat the rhetorical balance of videt and pecat is the only point to call attention to.

Professor Lane contributes no new light to the cum-controversy, and it is something of a shock to be told (1864) that what we have been taught to regard as a typical case,—cum Athenis essem,—is exceptional. At 1870 we are not told that memini cum also takes the subjunctive. Why is not uidi cum with the indic. also mentioned (e.g. Plautus, B. 469)? That cum 'since' with the subjunctive is a secondary development seems probable from a consideration of quoniam. From the subjunctive in wishes the qui-clause may easily have developed, through purpose to ten- dency and result, whence characteristic; our English infinitive has all these uses. Assuming a similar development for cum, the causal use would be subsequent to the characteristic. The concessive use might have originated with a concessive subjunctive in parataxis. The natural propriety of non for some of these sentence types would account for its introduction, especially where the positive type was much commoner than the negative (see also Bennett, l.c., pp. 18 seq.) Thus I sketch the aspect to myself of the older views of cum and qui, which are still to be preferred, in my opinion, to Dittmar's universal polemic solvent.

1 Another, but in my opinion, less probable explanation is to be seen in most editions. The shift from infinitive to subjunctive (with ut) dependencies is not uncommon in Plautus (see Schnoor's Zum Gebranich von ut bei Plautus, footnotes 42).


3 Elmer's remarks on this point (Cornell Studies, vi.) have been discussed in this Review by the editor (vol. xiii. 66).


5 Bennett's examples of the videtis type (Cornell Studies, ix. 41 seq.) fall into two classes—with transitions: (1) where two verbs balance in relative (conditional) sentences, and (2) in exclamatory sentences, where renderings like 'I'd have you see, I wish you might see,' are very pat. I trust I shall not be understood as objecting to potential renderings for Latin subjunctives where they are obviously convenient, but rather to any tendency to foist upon the primitive line of prehistoric syntax, from such scant and scattered evidence, a potential,—in fear lest some subsequent feat of sleight-of-hand and derring-do (may) derive awful consequences for historical syntax.
At 1896 Caesar’s use of *quam quo* (B.G. 2 21 3) in a clause of disproportion is deserving of mention as before Livy. A propos of *ut* ‘where’ (1936), it would be well to mention, along with the Plautus editions, B.G. 7 46 5, where, though most of the editions fail to state it, *ut* conquievat may well mean where he was napping.¹ For pedagogic reasons mention should be made in the treatment of parenthetic *ut*, of the example from the Manilian Law, § 20, where *dicis* is expressed. At 1968 it was well to give so many instances of explanatory *ut* from Caesar, but the Plautus usage is neglected (e.g. Mo. 27–8).

Touching conditionals: Scholars must be grateful for the 35 pages of examples, though to some of these exception is easy to take. The group labelled apodosis in the perfect (2027) contains four exclamatory perfects, and the remaining apodosis belongs, in my opinion, to the unreal type: the example iam tum senex erat si senectus verecundos facit (2028) is an instance, not of a true condition, but of what I will call, for lack of a better name, *si inversum*. In 2075 the example si hère haberem polliceris is very neatly juxtaposed with *si h. habeam pollicerar,—continued in 2076 by pol si mihi sit, non pollicear : scio, dares.

Touching the Infinitive: The examples for the purpose construction are numerous and thankworthy. At 2186 the important word *futuro* is omitted in the discussion of verbs of hoping. The Vergilian example (Aen. 1, 37) of the exclamatory infinitive, even if solitary, deserved mention (2216), and one of the not very numerous Plautine examples, too; and this rule ought to precede the probably paratactic accusative and infinitive after verbs of emotion (2187).²

Touching the Gerundive: This form precedes the Gerund, according to the speculations of latter years, and the voice difficulty is beautifully met by translations like ‘the occupation of land-tilling’ for *studium agri colendi*. The highly instructive example, Cic. ad Fam. 9.25; nunc ades *ad imperandum* uel ad pareandum potius; sic enim antiqui loquebantur, ought certainly to have been cited (cf. also Sallust, 

¹ See Bryan’s *Latin Prose based on Caesar*, p. 73.

² This suggestion is at least as old as Barth’s *de infinit. op. scen. poetarum latinarum*, p. 11 (Leipzig, 1881), and has been pressed into service by Ditmar (I.e. § 490) for the entire accusative and infinitive construction. The ‘Infinitive of Intimation,’ with its subject made the object of the verb of saying, might be regarded as a transition stage: see also F. W. Thomas, above, vol. xi. 375 seq.
room will disappear when students learn when to render *nego* by 'but not,' (1445), and *viz., parum, minus, male,* etc. by 'not' (1451). It gives comfort to a student of Plautus to know that Professor Lane felt *misua facio as dimisi* (1606).¹ The future perfect is now a rapid future (1629) and now a postponed future (1630). Parentheses are asynchronous (1642), though our attention is not called to the forward position of verbs in certain types of asyndeton (2125–6).

The truth seems to be that Professor Lane was dominated by his feeling for style, and his was not a mere theory, but an art of style. The proper translation was all important to him, to such an extent that he says of explanatory *cum* for instance (1874): 'In this use *cum* passes from the meaning of *when to that, in that,* or *in or by with verbal in -ing.' Of course no such change in the meaning of *cum* occurs; what occurs is a change in rendering, to make English and Latin idioms conform. He even gives us comments on his renderings like 'or less clumsily,' and not a few alternative renderings (e.g. 1531, 1571, 1715, 1874).

What a translator of Latin he was. If he had but given us a version of Plautus. His grammar is worth the scholar's perusal if but for his renderings of the examples.² Translation is, after all, the greatest thing in the study of language. If our teachers of the classics would take pains to translate well themselves, and to teach this art to their pupils, and not let them pitchfork their Greek or Latin idioms over into impossible uncouth English, then, and not till then, will the future of the classics in the modern scheme of education be assured. I speak, not as a Pharisée, but as a Publican and chief of offenders. The mental exercise of seizing a thought in a complicated foreign dress, divesting it of all its old clothure, and then adorning it anew in our own good English attire, seems to me the best of all training in the use of language; and, as thought has never yet dispensed with language, the best of all training in the processes of thought.

This notice is already overlong, but I am sure I shall be pardoned for adding some examples of Professor Lane's quality as a translator, and first, of some renderings that seem to me at least to be affected: persuasit nox 'the witchery was night' (1066); postremam aciem 'rereward line' (1069); histrionic 'actor man' (1077); stilus optimus dicendi magister 'pen is the best, etc.' (1078); aera per teneral 'through liter sky' (1082); laborantes 'sore bested' (1535); Juuv. 10, 22 rendered by 'the poure man when he goth by the weye, before the thevës he may singe and playe': § 2241 'shill-I-shalt-I-ing'; § 2270 'and eke for to be seen'; § 1970, angusto mari 'in cramped sea-room,'—reminiscent of Capt. Mahan, perhaps. On the other hand, let us look at the following: matercula 'an anxious mother, poor Mamma, dear Mamma'; lacrimula, 'a wee tear, a crocodile tear' (269); bellaria 'goodies, bonbons' (309); examussin to a T. (542); superbio 'am stuck up'; iustitia 'square-dealing'; Horace, Epod. 15, 1: 'twas night, and in a cloudless sky, bright rode the moon amid the lesser lights'; ib. Epis. 1 6 37 'both birth and shape [looks] the almighty dollar-gives'; Cicero, Fam. 9 2 1, at tibi repente, cum minime expectarem, venit ad me Caninius mane 'but bless you, sir, when I least dreamt of it, who should drop in on me all at once but Caninius, bright and early'; scyphis pugnare Thracum est 'to fight with bowls is Vandal work'; negavit moris esse Graecorum 'he said it was not manners among the Greeks'; contentio honorum 'scramble for office'; non modo 'I won't say' (1681); postulante nescio quo 'on motion of what's his name'; fertur 'tries to charge' (1481). Some of these renderings are beyond most scholars and nearly all pupils, I refer more particularly to the rhyme and verse renderings, but some of them, the manner of some of them, is within the reach of the average, e.g., præcipit unum omnes pereuter Indutiomarum 'he says they must all concentrate their attack on Indutiomarus.'

I indicate in conclusion a few points that should receive attention in a subsequent edition: The indicative type of deliberative question, occasional in Plautus, and surviving in Virgil (Aen. 4 554) is not mentioned; neither is the *potin ut* type of question. Such idioms as suavitas verni temporis, a telling example of which is Aen. 6 238: *tuta laecu nigro nemorumque tenebris,* should be provided for, as well as its contratype, suaves odores for suavitatis odorum.³ The difficult genitive of Caesar's

---

¹ I have always explained *exercitium instructum habet* by 'he has his army drawn up,' and *exercitium instructum* by 'he has drawn up his army.'

² We have in America no book like Cauer's admirable *Die Kunst des Ubersetzens,* and, so far as I know, there is none in English.

³ Not a quoted example, but representing, I am sure, genuine usage.

---
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quas (sc. naves) sui quisque commodi fecerat is not explained. In 1957 perdidierimus is a mistaken measurement, and few will follow Professor Lane in writing pontem montem. The last example under 1845 is more simply classified at 1853, and the abl. of route (1576) belongs somewhere after 1377. Misprints are very rare, but dissimilimus occurs at 1998. The index, which I have had occasion to use a good deal, is very full and accurate.

I wish in closing to repeat my conviction of the great value of Professor Lane's work for Stylistic teaching, and even more for its actual translations, which exhibit, in an uncommon degree, control of both Latin and English idioms.

EDWIN W. FAY.

AUSTIN,
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS,
April 10, 1900.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE NEW EDITION OF PAULY'S ENCYCLOPAEDIA.

In No. 1 of the Classical Review, 1900, p. 76, Dr. J. E. Sandys writes in a notice of my article 'Die thrakische Chersonesos,' in Vol. III. of Pauly-Wissowa's Real Encyclopedia, Col. 2279:—'We find mention of the speech of Demosthenes on Halonnesus, whereas the extant speech bearing that name is now... assigned to Hagesippus, although Demosthenes is known to have taken part in the debate.' If Dr. Sandys had read the col. 2245 in my article he would have found that in the twelfth line I have expressly declared that the speech related as a Demosthenic one is of a pseudo-demosthenic origin. Among the chronological data, however, I had to remark that in 343 a speech of Demosthenes was really spoken, of which Libanius expressly says ῥηθεῖς.

Dr. L. Bürchner.
MUNICH, June 16th, 1900.

VERSIONS.

AN IDYLL IN ENGLISH AND GREEK.

O what a pain is love! how shall I bear it? She will be constant prove, I greatly fear it. She so torments my mind that my strength faileth,
And wavers with the wind as a ship saileth: Please her the best I may, she loves still to gainsay:
Alack and well-a-day! Phillada flouts me.
At the fair yesterday she did pass by me, She looked another way and would not spy me:
I woo'd her for to dine, but could not get her;
Will had her to the wine—he might not treat her,
With Daniel she did dance, on me she looked askance,
Oh! thrice unhappy chance; Phillada flouts me.
Fair maid! be not so coy, do not disdain me! I am my mother's joy; sweet! entertain me!

ἄ δυσερός μὲν ἔρος· πῶς μὴν φέρω; ἣ Γαλάτεια
μὴ τι παλιντράπελος δέδοις μάλα· νῦν ἀνέχαρ
οἴστρυ θυμόν έμου καί τό σθένον ἐξαιλπάσκει.
εἰκή ναί τις τίς φέρομαι πνευμαί ταλασσάς.
σαίνω γ' ὅτι μάλιστα· τί δὲ πλέον; οὐ δέχεται δὴ·
φεῖν κακοδαιμονίας· τῷ δ' οὐ μελεί, οὐ μᾶ Δί' οἰδέν.

Χθύμη μὲν παρέβα με παννυχίης ἀντιάσασα
οὐδ' ἐθέλεν ποδοφύνην· ἐπεὶ δ' ἐκλέαν ποτὶ
dείγων ἐπτού· ἀνανυμάνα, ξεινίζε δὲ μιν Διοκλείδας
οὐκ ἄκουσαν ἐκών· ἄ δ' αὐτὸν ἀρκελεύνην
ἀρχαίται κήρ' ἐδέ τάλαν τάλαν ὅμμασί λοξῶς·
φεῖν κακοδαιμονίας· τῷ δ' οὐ μέλεί οὐ μᾶ Δί' οἰδέν.

μὴ τῷ τόσον χαρίσσα μόρα διαθρύττει, μὴ μὲν ἄν
ωδ' καταφρονήσας· τὰς ματρὸς γ' εἴχομαι ἰμέν
χάρμα· τῷ δ' οὐ μέλετος γλυκερωτέρα, αὐθ' ἀτιτάλ-
λοις
κατά τῶν φαλένὸν· ἄ γάρ τοι ἐπὶν θάνη τιθεὶς