

# Dead-Lettered Latin

Paul L. New, Jr.

MA Linguistics

first published: 2024-08-11

last published: 2024-09-01

p 10, SA, 3	Da v̄eniam puella <sub>ē</sub> . – Terence
	Give pardon to <the> girl.
4	Clementia tua, multa <sub>m</sub> s v̄ita <sub>m</sub> s conservat. – C̄icero
	Clemency thyne, many lives conserveth.
5	Multam pecuniam deportat.
	Much wealth takes <he/she> away.
6	Fortunam et v̄itam antiqua <sub>ē</sub> s patria <sub>ē</sub> s saepe laudas, sed recusas. – Horace
	Fortune and life of <the> antique father-land often laudest <thou>, yet rejectest.
7	Me v̄itare turbam iubes.
	Me to avoid <a/the> crowd biddest <thou>.
8	Me p̄hilosophia <sub>ē</sub> d <sub>o</sub> . – Seneca
	Me to philosophy do I give.
9	P̄hilosophia est ar <sub>t</sub> s v̄ita <sub>ē</sub> s. – C̄icero
	Philosophy is <the> art of life.

some sentences from p. 10 of Wheelock's 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, which I have been using to practice with

I here want to share my efforts at my personal (i.e., non-credit, untutored) study of Latin using an innovative method of my own devising. Latin is famous -- or infamous -- for having many grammatical endings which seem intimidating if your first language (for example English) doesn't have nearly as many endings. It's not just that Latin uses endings a lot, but also that the endings are not as straightforward as they could be, because of changes which occurred in the history of Latin and its ancestors -- changes which frequently obscured the original order. My innovation is to write older forms underneath Classical Latin forms, to help revisualize the ancient order, such as you see above in the sentences with the "two-story" writing. I have been calling this "dead-lettering". The question remains whether dead-lettering will help me later get onboard standard-written Classical Latin, or to the contrary, become a crutch which hinders my progress in doing so. Standard-written Classical Latin -- especially without the macrons (as it most typically is found) -- seems very challenging to me: maybe I don't have enough hours in the day to be able to achieve a high level of mastery of it.

Regardless of whether dead-lettering should prove valuable as a set of training-wheels, is it possible that my invented orthography might be viewed as desirable by, and find a reception among, a small set of Latin-enthusiasts who actually prefer to see Latin written this way? Assuming it should offer some value to the study of Latin, would my special, etymological orthography also then find a use in the study of Sanskrit and other ancient languages?

### Why Latin may Feel Difficult to some Students

Latin is a dead language. If you are studying a *living* language with a complicated set of endings, such as Russian, you have options of study such as trying to acquire the endings from listening to radio, television, internet videos, etc., rather than analyzing. But for a dead language, it won't be surprising if you are faced with a textbook containing tables like this one ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Latin\\_grammar](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Latin_grammar)), along with "advice" such as "memorizing these *now* will pay rich dividends" or "commit these to memory right away":

Case ↕	feminine		masculine		neuter	
	1 sg.	1 pl.	2 sg.	2 pl.	2n sg.	2n pl.
Nominative	puella	puellae	dominus	dominī	bellum	bella
Genitive	puellae	puellārum	dominī	dominōrum	bellī	bellōrum
Dative	puellae	puellīs	dominō	dominīs	bellō	bellīs
Accusative	puellam	puellās	dominum	dominōs	bellum	bella
Ablative	puellā	puellīs	dominō	dominīs	bellō	bellīs
Vocative	puella	puellae	domine	dominī	bellum	bella

declensions of "puella" 'girl', "dominus", 'lord, master', and "bellum", 'war', listed at Wikipedia

Assuming you have a language-background, as I do, and know the terminology ("nominative", "vocative", etc.), it's still not easy. First, though tables like these are good for reference, I question whether using a table like this to acquire actual mastery of a language is realistic. Second, some of the forms have more than one meaning/function. Third, the ablative has multiple meanings/functions because it had collapsed together with two or three other cases before the time of Classical Latin. Last, most Latin literature doesn't use the macron, causing even more of the forms to appear the same on the page. Let's go through these points in more detail.

My first point is that the tables are useful for lookups, as the student will need to consult them hundreds of times; but one possible better way of gaining true mastery of the forms would be having the student begin with one case (I think the nominative), in all declensions, practicing hundreds of sentences with that (ex: *Cattus bellus est*, '<the> cat is handsome'). After the students had gained real competence using the nominative singular and plural in all five declensions, masculine, feminine, and neuter, then I would suggest introducing perhaps the accusative, and spending perhaps a month or more with just these two cases. After that, I would slowly move forward over a period of three or four years (yes!) with the other cases. (Verb-forms could be introduced one at a time over these three or four years.) I am thinking of classroom-study here. The cases would then be gotten "horizontally" (one case in all declensions) instead of vertically (all cases, one declension at a time). This case-by-case approach would offer the additional benefit of allowing the student to get the *concept* of each case (as many Latin-students don't know the concepts of the cases when they first begin studying), and to build legitimate competence with the cases -- not just memorizing the endings in the tables for a test, and then immediately forgetting them.

Regarding the second point, of the same form having more than one meaning/function, notice that "puellae" appears four times in the above table:

\* gen. sg. 'of the girl'

\* dat. sg. 'to the girl'

- \* nom. pl. 'girls' (subject/doer)
- \* voc. pl. 'girls' (addressing)

Several other forms, such as "puellīs" and "dominō" also have more than one meaning/function. So this idea that we can "memorize" the endings and their meanings/functions the way we memorized other facts throughout our education, such as names of countries and their capitals, is problematical for a low-level student, as there isn't a one-for-one correspondence.

Third, the ablative in Latin has the meanings 'from', 'at', 'in', 'by', and 'with'. (This is because three or four cases had collapsed together before the time of Classical Latin.) Pre-Classical Latin still had a locative case, which merged together with the ablative before Classical Latin. It is believed that very far in the past, long before Classical Latin, there was an instrumental case which also merged with the ablative. In the O-stem singular, the dative is the same as the ablative because the old "-d" which was once the ablative-singular ending dropped off before Classical Latin. And in the plural of all the declensions, the dative is the same as the ablative, too, and is postulated to have been so for thousands of years. As a low-level Latin-student, I find the ablative difficult. Another possible way we could draw the table of cases would be by listing the locative and instrumental as cases separate from the ablative, but with the same form in the O-stem singular and in the plural. This would expose to a greater extent the true difficulty faced by a beginner in Latin, but could ease that burden by being so exposed.

Last, on top of these difficulties, if you pick up most Latin literature (Classical, Medieval, or other), you'll find no macrons, so that "puellā", for example, is written "puella", which makes even more cases look the same.

Hence, there's no one-for-one correspondence between endings and meanings: we cannot "memorize" that "-is" means 'to (plural)', because it also can mean 'from', 'in', 'at', 'by', or 'with' (plural). So that's a major fallacy of "memorizing" such tables. I would hope that once a student becomes skilled at Latin, he or she would see a word such as "puellae", and, because of context, quickly discern which meaning/function is intended, the way an English-speaker does with "bear", which can be a noun referring to the animal, or a verb with several possible meanings. But, as someone who has been teaching ESL (English as a Second Language) for three decades, I wouldn't teach a beginning ESL-student all the meanings of "bear" on the first day of class. In short, there are several reasons that Latin (especially the case-system) may intimidate beginning Latin-students.

### **My Goals in Studying Latin, and my Strategy**

As for me, I am a lone practitioner who doesn't currently have a tutor. (I have studied Latin in class, but years ago.) One of my main goals in studying Latin was to try to "conquer" this seemingly difficult case-system, really get it thoroughly understood. I wanted to apply my knowledge from two degrees in Linguistics, which the average Latin-student doesn't have, toward this task. What was the origin of the complexity we see in Classical Latin cases? Can we unravel it, and gain better understanding and mastery of it if we study how it got to that point? If we study *Pre-Classical Latin* and hypothetical reconstructed languages such as Proto-Celto-Italic and Proto-Indo-European (PIE), we might gain some insights which can help us unravel this seemingly formidable complexity. If case-endings began as independent words which became stuck onto the ends, as Linguistics assumes, we might attempt to make a list of the original endings, and try to understand the Classical Latin endings via the evolution from the original forms from long before Classical Latin up until Classical Latin. Latin was already thousands of years removed from PIE, the hypothetical ancestor of Gothic, Latin, Greek, Hittite, Persian, Tocharian, Old Church Slavonic, and many other languages; this explains why some of the transparency had already been lost by the time of Latin.

What were the original case-endings in PIE? Scholars of PIE disagree on many points; but based on scholars such as Meier-Brügger (2003) and Fortson (2004), cited by Carlos Quiles and Fernando López-Menchero in their *Grammar of Modern Indo-European, Third Edition* (pp. 176 & 178), here are perhaps what the original endings might have been in late-stage PIE:

	singular	plural
nom. ('doer')	-s (neuter: -m, -)	-es (neuter: -a)
gen. ('of')	-es	-om/-em
dat. ('to')	-ei	-bhos
acc. ('done to')	-m	-ns (< m + s) (neuter: -a)
abl. ('from')	-d	-bhos
loc. ('in'/'at')	-i	-su/-si
instr. ('by'/'with')	-bhi	-bhis (bhi + s)
voc. (addressing)	-e	= nom.

We don't have direct proof of this paradigm: it is deduced from observations of the oldest descendant-languages, such as Hittite, Sanskrit, Ancient Greek, etc.

These endings are not very symmetrical. First, all the scholars I have read believe that the dative and ablative plural already had the same ending even in PIE. Also, if "-ei" was dative singular, and "-s" was plural, then I would have expected \*"-eis" for dative plural. But as far as I know, there is no evidence for \*"-eis" for dative plural. In addition, if ablative singular had "-d", we might have expected \*"-ds" for ablative plural; or if ablative plural was "-bhos", we might have expected \*"-bho" for ablative singular. As far as I know, we have no evidence of those. Another point is that if "-es" was nominative plural, we might expect "-e" for nominative singular; but instead, we have "-s". Furthermore, why is there "-es" for nominative plural and also for genitive singular? Were they related somehow, as some believe (partitive/plural); or was it a coincidence, a phonological accident having endowed them with the same form? And if genitive singular was "-es", why was genitive plural "-em" or "-om", and not something like \*"-eses"? Regardless of this perceived lack of symmetry, by virtue of being so short, *this paradigm is committable to memory!*

How did things get so much more complicated by the time of Classical Latin? Part of the answer is the creation of stem-vowels: notice how Latin has "puellam", which is the root "puell" + stem-vowel "-a-" + accusative singular "-m", or how "domus" has the root "dom" + stem-vowel "-u-" ("o" in Pre-Classical Latin) + nominative singular "-s". These stem-vowels are believed to have been added during PIE; the addition of these stem-vowels caused some phonological changes, complexifying the endings, so, theoretically, if "-es" was genitive singular and nominative plural, when stem-vowels were added, the "-e" dropped; and the stem-vowels stretched out double to occupy their slot. We can see the result of this thousands of years later in Classical Latin: we have "fructūs", 'of the fruit', which theoretically represents "fruct" + "-u-" + "-es". The "e" in "es" dropped; and the "u" stretched out to be long. Instead of macrons, stretch-arrows might help visualize this process better:

1. fruct + u + es
2. fructues
3. fructuꞤs

This "two-story" representation with the stretch-arrow at the top, and the E below, is attempting to show that the E dropped; and the U stretched out long to fill the slot of the lost E.

Between the time of the breakup of PIE into its daughter-languages and the time of Classical Latin, more and more changes occurred, obscuring the hypothetical original order of things. For example:

\* for nominative plural and genitive singular of the O-stems, we find "-ī" instead of the expected

\*"-O<sub>g</sub>S".

This apparently had been the somewhat less unexpected

"-O<sub>g</sub>ī"

in Pre-Classical Latin. Apparently, the plural "-i" from the pronouns got drafted into the 2nd declension of nouns (and adjectives). We don't know when this happened; the same form is found in Ancient Celtic, so some Linguists believe that Celtic and Italic constituted one branch (Cello-Italic (or Italo-Celtic) of Indo-European before later splitting apart from one another). However, I happen to have made some preliminary efforts studying the Baltic language Latvian (sic), so became aware that it, too, features "-i" in nominative plural for example in "vardi", 'words'). I have never read that Baltic is closely related to Celtic or to Italic, within the family of Indo-European languages. This sort of observation is good food for thought, and can foster an interest in the field of Historical Linguistics or Indo-European Linguistics. If you have any interest along these lines, once you start reading, and getting on-board with the literature, you might find, as I have, that you have a hard time putting it down.

\* more recently, the A-stems, by analogy to the O-stems, also changed from "-a<sub>g</sub>s" to "-a<sub>g</sub>i", and then to "-a<sub>g</sub>ē". This is more recent, because there are examples of the old form "-a<sub>g</sub>s", such as in the expression "pater<sub>g</sub> familiā<sub>g</sub>s", which retained the older form even into Classical Latin.

\* also fairly recently before Classical Latin, some of the O's in the O-stems changed to U, giving us the familiar endings "-us" and "-um". Note that there already were forms "-us" and "-um" in the the U-stems (Venus, Venum). To keep these apart, for my own studies, I write "Marc<sub>g</sub>s" and "Ven<sub>u</sub>s", showing the U has replaced the O in the O-stems, but the U in "Venus" was original.

\* the hypothesized PIE consonant-cluster "bh" was lost by the time of Classical Latin. Some were simplified to "b"; others became "ph", and then "f". So "-bhos" > "-bus". (Also, the O became U.)

\* the ablative merged with two or three other cases, which to me makes it a challenging case:

\* there was no sign of a separate instrumental case even in hypothesized Italo-Celtic. It evidently long ago merged with the ablative.

\* shortly before Classical Latin, the locative case merged with the ablative.

In other words, the ablative wound up being ALI (ablative/ locative/ instrumental or (in the O-stem singular and in the plural) even DALI (dative/ ablative/ locative/ instrumental). I find this difficult to process, and in my

own personal notes, am writing implied prepositions such as <ad> and <cum> when the Romans didn't write them. To me, simply using the labels "ALI" and "DALI" rather than "ablative" goes some way in helping me comprehend this portion of the grammar, as I associate the term "ablative" with 'from'.

\* Before the locative merged with the others, the plural had apparently become "-is" ("-i" singular + plural "-s"). When they merged, the A-stems and O-stems took the locative plural "-is" for the new combined DALI. However, the other three declensions took the "-bus" for the new merged plural DALI.

\* the ablative singular "-d" dropped before Classical Latin. You can find it in Plautus and in some other Pre-Classical writers.

\* the presumed "n" in accusative plural "-ns" had dropped by Classical Latin. I am unaware of any direct evidence of it even in Pre-Classical Latin or in Latin's sister-languages Oscan or Umbrian. The preceding vowel lengthened to fill the slot of the lost N (originally accusative M). The long vowel before the S in the accusative plural is evidence that something dropped; and in some other branches of Indo-European, there *is* proof of NS in the accusative plural.

These were just some of the changes which caused Classical Latin to inherit some loss of transparency in forms.

But with my "dead-lettering" (two-story writing showing older forms on bottom with newer forms on top), we can still refer to the following conceptualization of case-endings ancestral to, and a reference-point for, the case-endings of Classical Latin:

	singular	plural
nom. ('doer')	- (1) -s (neuter: -m, -)	-es (neuter: -a)
gen. ('of')	-es	-es + -um (1, 2, & 5) -um (3, 4)
dat. ('to')	-ei	<ad> -is (1, 2) <ad> -bus (3, 4, 5)
acc. ('done to')	-m	-ms (neuter: -a)
abl. ('from')	<de> -d	<de> -is (1, 2) <de> -bus (3, 4, 5)
loc. ('in', 'at')	<in> -d	<in> -is (1, 2) <in> -bus (3, 4, 5)
instr. ('by', 'with')	<cum> -d	<cum> -is (1, 2) <cum> -bus (3, 4, 5)
voc. (addressing)	-e (2) = nom. (others)	= nom.

This table isn't very long or complicated: if you can learn this table, then you can read Classical Latin nouns and adjectives written with my two-story "dead-lettering" annotations. If your goal is to read Classical Latin as it was originally written (no dead-lettering and no macrons), then my hope would be that my dead-lettering approach might help you as a novice to get started, and later to move beyond it. As I said at the onset, I am not sure it is realistic for me to aim to read Latin in its original form, so I may content myself with dead-

lettering indefinitely. I also appreciate how the dead-lettering paints a richer picture than the standard orthography, since I am interested in language-change and -history.

Let's go through the table, so I can be sure to explain clearly how to interpret it.

### **nom. sg.: the nominative is the form of the subject or doer**

\* puella: this is the subject- or doer-form of 'girl'. The "-a" is *not* technically the nom.-marker; technically, it is the stem-vowel. 1<sup>st</sup>-declension (=A-stem) nouns and adjectives do not have a nom.-marker in Classical Latin.

\* amic<sub>us</sub>, virtu<sub>s</sub>, fruct<sub>us</sub>, rēs: these are nom. sgs. of the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> declensions. They have "-s", showing they are subjects or doers.

\* pater<sub>s</sub>, mus<sub>s</sub>, homo<sub>ns</sub>: these are examples of Szemerényi's Law: the nom. sg. "-s" was apparently lost at some point in the history of PIE when certain sounds came before it, such as "r", "n", and "s"; also, "n" was lost after "o", meaning we lost both the "n" and the "s" from nom. sgs. which must have once ended with "-ons". But my dead-lettering notates these lost letters for myself and other beginners in Latin.

\* donum: this is a "neuter" noun. In Latin and other Indo-European languages, many inanimate objects and abstract nouns used the same form for the nom. and the acc. Many of these nouns cannot be doers (though they can be subjects of state-verbs such as "be"). They also can be metaphorical doers, as in "tempus- fugit", 'time flies'. Yet some inanimate objects and abstract nouns in both Latin and in other Indo-European languages did have nom. forms, so were not classified as neuters.

\* tempus-: at first, I thought this was a 2<sup>nd</sup>-declension masculine nom. sg., but it turns out that it is neuter, and that the "-us" is part of the root, not an ending, and only coincidentally looks like the "-us" in "amic<sub>us</sub>": it has *no* ending. In my orthography, I am writing endingless neuters with a hyphen after them, to help myself keep them apart from O-stem and U-stem masculines and feminines.

- \* puella<sub>es</sub> 'girls (doers)' -or- 'girl's; of the girl'
- \* puella<sub>e</sub> 'to the girl'
- \* vir<sub>es</sub> 'men (doers)' -or- 'man's; of the man'
- \* viro<sub>e</sub> 'to the man'
- \* porta<sub>m</sub>s 'gates (done to)'
- \* tempus- 'time' (hyphen to show endingless neuter)
- \* sine poena<sub>q</sub> 'without penalty'

### **Some Additional Notes not Related to Case-Endings**

1. I am using Wheelock's 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition for my private study, which was my textbook when I studied Latin in the early 1990's at the university. I am not necessarily trying to advocate this text, which does contain some sexist language which may shock or offend some (including me); it is simply the book which I already had, and have had all these years.

2. I wanted to use Classical pronunciation (H pronounced, V pronounced as English W, J pronounced as English Y, C always as K, G always hard as in English "go", PH as P, TH as T, CH as K, QU as KW). In my personal notations, I began placing circles over all those letters, to try to help myself remember to pronounce them as in Classical Latin. Why a circle? Arches and domes and circles can hold up to a lot of weight and wind and other stresses. The metaphor I was making was 'unchanged, unaffected, unaltered'.

3. Some adverbs which could be mistaken for declined nouns or adjectives have really caused me confusion, and thrown me. For this reason, I am writing adverbs in italics if I believe I can mistake them for another part of speech.



4. Verbs: I am also using dead-lettering in verbs. Since Spanish is my second language, and since it has maintained its complex verbal morphology (though lost its case-endings), I expected the verbs to give me little trouble in Latin. However, I was surprised to find this not to be the case: Latin is not just an archaic form of Spanish with a case-system: more changes than I realized have occurred from Classical Latin to Spanish.

5. I sometimes use dead-lettering in the roots of words as well as with case-endings and verb-endings.

6. My purpose in marking prior forms ("dead-lettering") is *not* to revive faithfully Pre-Classical Latin, but to help understand Classical Latin; so any changes which had occurred, but which do not appear to help understand Classical Latin are omitted from my notations. For example, the Classical Latin genitive plural "-(ā/ōr)um" was "-om" in Pre-Classical Latin. Notating this, however, does not appear to be worth the effort, as I don't see how this particular change explains anything helpful about Classical Latin. I am glossing over other details as well which do not appear to be helpful in understanding Classical Latin, but which a scholar with a different emphasis might not wish to discount.

I placed the first sentences at the beginning of this page. Here are some more:

10	Sanam formam vitā <sup>o</sup> tenete. – Seneca
	<A> sane form of life may ye have.
11	Immodica ira creat insaniam.
	Immodest ire createth insanity.
12	Debemus iram vitare.
	We must ire avoid.
13	Nulla avaritia sine poenā <sup>o</sup> est. – Seneca
	No avarice without penalty is.
14	Me <cum> saev <sup>o</sup> is caten <sup>o</sup> is onerat. – Horace
	Me by/with cruel chains loadeth <he/she>.
15	Rotam fortunā <sup>o</sup> non timent. – Cicerō
	<The> wheel of fortune to no extent do they fear.



p 17 SA	1	Debetis, amicis, de populo Romano cogitare. – Cicero Ye must, friends, of <the> populace Roman to think.
	2	Maecenas, amicis Augusti, me in numero amicorum habet. – Horace Maecenas, friend of Augustus, me in number of friends haveth.
	3	Libellus meus, vitam virosum monet. – Phaedrus Little book mine, lives of men adviseth.
	4	Pauci viri sapientiae student. *dat., not gen. – Cicero Few men "to" (in) wisdom are interested.
	5	Fortuna adversa, virum magna sapientia non terret. – Horace Fortune adverse, <a> man of great wisdom to no extent terrifieth.
	6	Cimon, vir magna fama, magnam benevolentiam habet. – Nepos Cimon, man of great fame, great benevolence haveth.
	8	Nulla copia pecuniae, avarum virum satiat. – Seneca No copious amount of money, an avaricious man sateth.
	9	Pecunia, avarum irritat, non satiat. – Pub. Syrus Wealth, <an> avaricious man irritateth, not sateth.
	10	Secrete amicis admone; lauda palam. – Pub. Syrus In secret, friends admonish <thou>; praise <thou> <them> in <the> open.

p 21 SA	1	Fortuna est caeca. – Cicerō Fortune is blind.
	2	Si pericula sunt vera, infortunatus es. – Terence If <the> dangers are real, unfortunate art <thou>.
	3	O amice, virus bonus es. – Terence O friend, <a> man good art <thou>.
	4	Non bella est fama tui filii. – Horace Not pretty is <the> fame of thy son.
	5	Errare est humanum. – Seneca To err is human.
	6	Nihil est omnino beatum. – Horace Nothing is wholly blessed.
	7	Remedium irae / irae (gen. or dat.?) est mora. – Seneca (Perplexity didn't know whether it's gen. or dat.) <The> remedy to/of ire is delay.
	9	Magistri parvis puertis, crustula saepe dant. – Horace School-masters to little boys, cookies often give.
	10	Puellam meam magis quam oculos meos amo. – Terence Girl mine more than eyes mine do I love.
	11	Da mihi multa basia. – Catullus Give me many kisses.

	12	Infinite est numerus stultorum. – Ecclesiastes Infinite is <the> number of <the> stupid.
	13	Praeclara sunt rara. – Cicerō <The> remarkable are rare.
	15	Malus sunt in nostro numero, et de exitio bonorum virorum cogitant. Bonis adiuuate; conserveate populum Romanum. – Cicerō <The> bad are in our number, and of destruction of good men think. <Of> <the> good men, help ye; conserve ye <the> populace Roman.
p 24 DP	1	Officium liberate virate semper vacabit

p 25 SA	1	Invidiam populæ Romanæ non sustinebis. – Cicerō
		<Thy> envy/dislike of <the> populace Roman to no extent shalt thou sustain. (Perplexity says the envy/dislike is on the part of the Roman populace, putting the person addressed or advised in danger. If this is true, it makes more sense than my interpretation, which was that the person addressed had the envy/dislike for the Roman populace.)
	3	Angustus animus pecuniam amat. – Cicerō
		<The> narrow soul, money loveth.
	4	Supera animos et iram tuam. – Ovid
		Rise above spirits and ire thine.
	6	Da veniam filio nostro. – Terence
		Give favor to son ours.
	7	Propter adulescentiam, filii mei, mala vitæ non videtis. – Terence
		Because of youth, sons mine, <the> bad of life to no extent do ye see.
	8	Amabo te; cura filium meum. – Cicerō
		I shall love thee; care <for> son mine.
	9	Vita est supplicium. – Seneca
		Life is punishment.
	10	Satisne sanus est? – Terence
		Not satisfactorily sane is <he>? (Perplexity.ai)

	11	Si quādo satis pecuniā hābebo, tum me philosophiā dabo. If when <a> satisfactory amount of wealth I shall have, then myself to philosophy shall I give.
	12	Semper gloria et fama tua manebunt. – Virgil Always glory and fame thine shall remain.
	13	Virōs bonos et peritos, aspera verba poetarum culpabit. – Horace (perplexity.ai says poets were associated with harsh language, which seems strange to me) <A> man good and expert, harsh words of poets shall blame.
p 26 dialog		<b>Persian:</b> Caelum, propter numerum sagittarum non videbitis. <The> sky, because <of> <the> number of <our> arrows, to no extent shall ye see.
		<b>Spartan:</b> In umbrā, igitur, pugnabimus. In <the> shade, then, shall we fight.
		<b>Leonidas:</b> Pugnate magnis cum animis, Lacedaemonii: hodie apud inferos fortasse cenabimus. ("Lacedaemonii" is another word for 'Spartans', and is 2 <sup>nd</sup> -declension (Lacedaemonius) – perplexity.ai) Fight ye with great spirit, Spartans: today among <the> dead perhaps we shall dine. Note: this is the first time I've seen a Latin Prep. phrase split by its preposition. I believe I saw it in MIE, and questioned it, and was told that Latin had done it. As if

p 29 SA	3	Possumusne in malis insidiis esse salvos? – Cicero Possible are we not in bad treacheries to be safe?
	8	Sine deo, animus non potest bonus esse. – Seneca Without god, <the> soul to no extent possible is good to be.
	9	Vestra vita mors est. – Cicero Your life, death is.
	11	Nec vitia nostra nec remedia tolerare possumus. – Livy Neither vices ours nor <their> remedy to tolerate able are we.
	12	Ubi leges valent, ibi populus potest valere. – Publius Syrus Where laws strong are, there <the> populace can be strong.
		see.
p 33 SA	5	Bonus, propter amorem virtutis, peccare oderunt. – Horace <The> good, because of love of virtue, to sin hate.

I currently have no Latin-tutor, so I'm double-checking my translations with Google Translate and Perplexity.ai. However, when they have a different translation than I have for a sentence, I'm not blindly taking their word for it (as either one of them can be incorrect), but rather carefully checking my own translation via Wheelock and Cassell's Latin-English Dictionary of 1987.

