Lane's Latin Grammar
A Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges by George M. Lane
Review by: Edwin W. Fay
The Classical Review, Vol. 14, No. 6 (Jul., 1900), pp. 316-322
Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/696088
Accessed: 04/02/2014 14:21

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Cambridge University Press and *The Classical Association* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical Review*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 128.83.205.53 on Tue, 4 Feb 2014 14:21:30 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

LANE'S *LATIN GRAMMAR.*

A Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges. By GEORGE M. LANE, Ph. D., LL.D. Emeritus Professor in Latin in Harvard University. Harper & Brothers: New York and London, 1898. Pp. xv. + 572. Price $1·50.

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 quaedam nimis antique, si pleraque dure
dicere credit eos, ignave multa fatetur,
et sapit et *mecum facit* et Iove iudicet 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: *absit 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 *-ĕ* being shortened in the ablv. sg. of consonant stems, of a shortened dat.-ablv. ending *-bŭs*; the voc. *serve* he gets by weakening from *servo*; he goes from *providens* to *prudens* by way of *proidens*: *dt* yields *st* in *estis* 'ye eat,' but *ss* 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 *-ō-* of *servorum* and say nothing of the *-ō* of *servo*? Wherefore *sum* from **esum*, *ea* from **ia*, *luxuria* from *luxuries*, *loco* from **locao*?

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 *bĕnĕ* beside *optimē*; *modŏ*, *citŏ* beside *tūtō*, *vērō*; *volŏ*, *amŏ* but *cēdō*, *laudō*—such examples prove the case sufficiently.

I teach rhotacism from pairs like *gero*: *gestus*, *oneris*: *onus*, with mention of the double forms like *lares*: *lases*. 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 *-tt-* to *-ss-*, and this has been well explained by Professor Lane, but without enough insistence on the identity of the *rec-tus* and *quas-sus* types.

The subdivision of 5th declension nouns into two classes seems not likely to prove of any practical pedagogic utility, but the classi-

This content downloaded from 128.83.205.53 on Tue, 4 Feb 2014 14:21:30 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

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 uninitiated 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 **nouomper*. He fails to explain *gratulari* from **grati-tulari*, like *opi-tulari*,—strangely enough, for he very aptly describes haplolalia as 'avoidance of a stuttering sound' (126).*[1]

What is the basis for classifying *-ē* in *longē* as a neuter adverbial ending, sometimes shortened, as in *repentĕ* (705)? We ought to have some justification for the diphthongal *-ui* of *cui*, instead of the usual and, in my opinion, correct *cuī*; 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 *nobīs* as belonging to the *ibĭ* 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 howdye, zounds* 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 inscriptional and early forms annexed to the paradigms; and the teacher of dramatic metres will be grateful for such printing as *rĕī rēī* 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 sterling 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 1587 seq., 1594 seq.), and to include both persons and things under locutions like '*that which*' (e.g., 1232, 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 . . . *-i* 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.[2] 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 ablv. of measure of difference, the example milibus passuum sex a 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, 331); the fine example for suboblique *quod*, Pl. B. 735 (2319). Only one instance of 'stript' Latin, the jejune *Rhodanus fluit*—cited at 1062, to fix the sentence-type—has been noted.

This content downloaded from 128.83.205.53 on Tue, 4 Feb 2014 14:21:30 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

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, *exsequias* 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 *docet*, 'shows to, teaches.' Similarly the torquem 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 'warding 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 Latine*,[2] § 48), there is marked pedagogic weakness here. Why is *ad vestram 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. *veterator*) are like *peritus*, *maturus* and *serus* not alien to *plenus* and *egenus*. Plautus's sanus mentis aut animi is clearly to be explained as his desipiebam mentis, correctly described at 1339. The discussion of *refert* 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 *re fert* in Terence. Apropos of the absence of *interest* from early Latin, some notice should have been taken of Plautus's *in remst*, of which *interest* is the semantic legatee,—all the more as there is a tantalizing possibility that *in remst* may have got as far as *in*^{d}*rest* by phonetic 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 (*accredo*), B. 504, Truc. 307. The genitives which occur are *omnium rerum* (As. 459), *duarum rerum* (Truc. l.c), 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 ablv. with *facio* and *sum* denotes that with which or to which something is done' (1315), but, without insisting that the examples are all of persons, why is the idiom classified as ablv. of source, and not rather, like the ablv. with *utor*, as instrumental? At 1318, under the ablv. 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 *confisus*, *fretus* the locative ablative is claimed, incorrectly, I think. The case is not clear for putting the absolute under the ablv. of Attendance. The absolute is a composite of many ablative functions (see also Dettweiler in the *Handbuch der Erziehungs-* und *Unterrichtslehre*, III., p. 88; and Cauer's *Grammatica Militans*, p. 142). At 1379 the explanation of opust chlamyde, '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 *usust*. Might we not expect our grammars to tell us that the futures of *usust* are *usus ueniet* (Poen. 727, S., 475)

This content downloaded from 128.83.205.53 on Tue, 4 Feb 2014 14:21:30 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

and *usus uenerit* (B. 363, Ci., 147, Merc. 518)? To be sure no ablatives occur with these futures. At 1419—20 we ought to be told that *tenus* with the ablative is probably an encroachment on *fini*,—of absolute origin,—all the more as the rendering of *labrorum tenus* by 'the length of the lips' so artfully carries with it the doctrine of *tenus*.

Touching Verb Syntax in General: The description of the relative question *quine* 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, nego; ait, aio (Terence, Eun. 252), and at 1709, beside Plautus's taceam optumumst it might be well to cite Caesar B.G. ii., 10: constituerunt optimum esse domum...reverti et, quorum in fines primum Romani exercitum introduxissent, ad eos defendendos undique convenirent.[1]

Touching the Subjunctive[2]: 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 *dicat, 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 imperatival origin, for the imperative is the mood of the 2nd person. A definite 2nd person easily becomes gnomic.[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, *sceolde* is common in this sense of German *sollte*.

In the example sunt item quae appellantur alces I do not see how *appellentur* could stand (1823), and in Horace's interdum volgus rectum videt, est ubi peccat the rhetorical balance of *videt* and *peccat* 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 tendency 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 Gebrauch von *ut* bei Plautus,' footnote 42).

[2] Bréal in his *Commencements du Verbe, Mém. Soc. Ling.* vol. xi. 273 *seq.*, presents general points of view for the (Latin) subjunctive of convincing simplicity.

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

[4] See Morris in *Am. Jr. Phil.* xviii. 285.

[5] Bennett's examples of the *videas* 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 limbo 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.

This content downloaded from 128.83.205.53 on Tue, 4 Feb 2014 14:21:30 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

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. Apropos of *ut* 'where' (1936), it would be well to mention, along with the Plautus examples, B.G. 7 46 5, where, though most of the editions fail to state it, *ut* conquieverat 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 *dico* 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 hercle haberem pollicerer is very neatly juxtaposed with si h. habeam pollicear,—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 *future* 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 parendum potius; sic enim antiqui loquebantur, ought certainly to have been cited (cf. also Sallust, *Jug.* 62, 8.) No notice is taken of the gerundive with *est* in the active sense (cf. Brix on Trin. 1159). The explanation of the *vestri adhortandi causa* type by levelling is not bad, but it seems rather forced to account for *istorum adhortandi causa* as due to a subsequent dissociation of *adhortandi* from *vestri*.

Touching the Participle: Cicero was not the earliest author to use the combination of *facit*, *inducit*, *videt*, etc. with the present participle in predication (see Tammelin, *de participiis priscae latinitatis* § 47). Special mention might have been made of the interesting *chlamydem undantem fecit* of Plautus (Ep. 431), as well as of the type *eos laetantis facio* (*ib.* S. 407).

Touching Oratio Obliqua; § 2231 states the rule for converting an impf. subj. apodosis according to the formula, *esset* becomes *futurum esse*. The case for *futurum fuisse* seems to me the stronger. *See* Vassis in the *Revue de Philologie*, XI. 42 *seq.*; Riemann *Syntaxe Latine*, § 241; Riemann, et Goelzer, *Grammaire Comparée*, etc. p. 616.

Touching Prosody: This excellent chapter is the work of another of Professor Lane's pupils, Professor H. W. Hayley. I miss here a statement of the frequency of the bucolic diaeresis in Horace's hexameters, and wish the rythmic, if hackneyed, Schiller-Coleridge illustration for the elegiac stanza had been given instead of the harsh verses of Tennyson (2574).

My study of Professor Lane's grammar has left me with a profound regret that he did not write a book on the Comparative Stylistic of Latin and English. When shall we have another scholar so competent to do it? The value of the grammar is great in this regard. Such innovations in terminology as Infinitive of Intimation and Annalistic Present have value for the study of style, rather than for the lower syntax. Examples of 'loose construction,' (1146, 1426, etc.), the massing of constructions possible after verbs of fearing (1959), the remarks on the person range of proper names (1301), on the sphere of collective singulars (1099), on the value of the quicquid, quantum est formulae (1259, with the unfortunate omission of examples from Catullus, who seems to me to have shown a weakness for this idiom), on the rendering of sundry locutions (*e.g.*, 1368, 1966*b*),—all this has great value for the study of style. Professor Lane would never have countenanced in English that trying locution 'than whom no better ever lived' (cf. 1562). One torment of the class-

[1] See Bryan's *Latin Prose based on Caesar*, p. 73.

[2] This suggestion is at least as old as Barth's *de infin. ap. scaen. poetas latinas*, p. 11 (Leipzig, 1881), and has been pressed into service by Dittmar (*l.c.* § 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. 373 *seq.*

This content downloaded from 128.83.205.53 on Tue, 4 Feb 2014 14:21:30 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

room will disappear when students learn when to render *neque* by 'but not,' (1445), and *vix, parum, minus, male*, etc. by 'not' (1451). It gives comfort to a student of Plautus to know that Professor Lane felt *missa facio* as *dimisi* (1606).[1] The future perfect is now a rapid future (1629) and now a postponed future (1630). Parentheses are asyndetic (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 Pharisee, 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); histrio 'actor man' (1077); stilus optimus dicendi magister 'pen is the best, etc.' (1078); aera per tenerum 'through lither sky' (1082); laborantes 'sore bestead' (1535); Juv. 10, 22 rendered by 'the poure man when he goth by the weye, before the thevës he may singe and pleye': § 2241 'shill-I-shall-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 exspectarem, 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., praecipit unum omnes peterent 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. 4 534) 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 lacu nigro nemorumque tenebris, should be provided for, as well as its contratype, suaves odores for suavitas odorum.[3] The difficult genitive of Caesar's

[1] I have always explained *exercitum instructum habet* by 'he has his army drawn up,' and *exercitum instruxit* by 'he has drawn up his army.'

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

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

This content downloaded from 128.83.205.53 on Tue, 4 Feb 2014 14:21:30 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

quas (sc. naves) sui quisque commodi fecerat is not explained. In 1957 *perdiderīmus* is a mistaken measurement, and few will follow Professor Lane in writing *pōntem mōntem*. The last example under 1845 is more simply classified at 1853, and the ablv. of route (1376) 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 Encyclopaedia*, Col. 2279:—'We find mention of the speech of Demosthenes on Halonnesus, whereas the extant speech bearing that name is now . . . assigned to Hegesippus, 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 Libanios expressly says *ῥηθείς*.

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 inconstant 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 intreat 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!

ἆ δυσέρως μὲν ἔρως· πῶς μιν φέρω; ἆ Γαλάτεια
μή τι παλιντράπελος δείδω μάλα· νῦν ἀνιᾷ γὰρ
οἷστρῳ θυμὸν ἐμὸν καὶ τὸ σθένος ἐξαλαπάσδει.
εἰκῆ ναῦς τις ὅπως φέρομαι πνοιαῖσι θαλάσσας.
σαίνω γ' ὅττι μάλιστα· τί δὲ πλέον; οὐ δέχεται δή·
φεῦ κακοδαιμονίας. τᾷ δ' οὐ μέλει, οὐ μὰ Δί' οὐδέν.
χθιζὴ μὲν παρέβα με πανηγύρει ἀντιάσασα
οὐδ' ἔθελεν ποθορῆμεν· ἐπεὶ δ' ἐκάλευν ποτὶ δεῖπνον
ἔπτυσ' ἀναινυμένα, ξείνιξε δέ μιν Διοκλείδας
οὐκ ἀέκοισαν ἐκών· ἆ δ' αὖ Δανάου προκαλεῦντος
ὀρχεῖται κἠμ' εἶδε τάλαν τάλαν ὄμμασι λοξοῖς·
φεῦ κακοδαιμονίας· τᾷ δ' οὐ μέλει οὐ μὰ Δί' οὐδέν.
μὴ τὺ τόσον χαρίεσσα κόρα διαθρύπτεο, μή μευ
ὧδε καταφρονέοις· τᾶς ματρός γ' εὔχομαι ἦμεν
χάρμα· τὺ δ' ὦ μέλιτος γλυκερωτέρα, αἴθ' ἀτιτάλλοις
καὐτὰ τὸν φιλέονθ'· ἆ γὰρ τοι ἐπὴν θάνῃ εὐθὺς

This content downloaded from 128.83.205.53 on Tue, 4 Feb 2014 14:21:30 PM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions