

whole, the inscriptions have been insufficiently studied, and in one paragraph about them (p. 111) Γ with short limb is printed with an ordinary *gamma* Γ. More should be said of the dialects in a book of this compass, and they should be discussed separately; Prof. Ridgeway's attractive theory, of the points in common between Old Attic and Aeolic, might have been mentioned. A few further points may be indicated. 'τ, for which Attic often has σ,' is not accurate (p. 2); Attic σι=τι. The supposition that the modern Greek newspaper jargon is a 'process of purification' (p. 8) is a ludicrous travesty of the truth. The proper phonetic distinction of breathed, voiced, and aspirate, should be substituted for 'smooth, hard, and rough' (p. 13): the last seems to be an unfortunate choice. In 31. 2 the distinction between *ζγγονος* (= *ἐν*-) and *ζγγονος* (= *ἐκ*-), which are both found, should have been stated; the former alone must have had the nasal sound, the latter being *eggonos*. The order of the mutes (p. 14) should be made to correspond to their place, moving forward from the throat: gutturals, dentals, and labials. Under crasis, space might be found for *μοῦστί, σοῦστί, and θοιμάτιον*. *οῦ* final accented does not take -κ before a vowel in prose (p. 25). The modifications of final sounds in external combination might have been illustrated from inscriptions: *τῆμ πόλιμ, Cretan παρπὸδ δέ*, etc. 'Internal' should be inserted in § 135. 1 before 'position'; the statement is not true of a short final in position.

W. H. D. R.

Lectures on Classical Subjects. By W. R. HARDIE, M.A. Macmillan & Co. 1903. Pp. x, 348. 7s. net.

THESE lectures the author remarks, are not addressed to the professional scholar, who 'will not find much, if anything, that is new to him in this volume.' The first five pass in review some of the more important passages in the ancient authors which illustrate their feeling for Nature, their beliefs about immortality and the supernatural, the legend of an Age of Gold, and the Vein of Romance in Greek and Roman Literature. Two deal with the language and the metrical form of poetry. The last three are on Literary Criticism at Rome, the Revival and Progress of Classical Studies in Europe, and Aims and Methods of Classical Study.

Professor Hardie has the skilful lecturer's eye for the interesting aspect of his subject, and he is not afraid of a generalisation. It would be easy to pick out statements which in a treatise would need qualification. But that is not the point. At a time when Classical Studies are attacked as useless, it is well that books of this kind should be written for the general reader who remembers a little of his Greek, and understands the meaning of culture. The junior student, also, who has forced his way through the thorn-hedge of grammar, is sometimes glad to breathe an ampler air. The professional teacher will find, if not profound reflections, at least not a few suggestions that will interest him.

F. M. CORNFORD.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TEN COMMANDMENTS FOR CLASSICAL STUDENTS.

IN a recently published book, *Lehrs' Kleine Schriften* (p. 476), is given a set of ten commandments for philologists; this code, however, by the very nature of the educational situation in Germany, is hardly adequate for English and American students. We suggest the following:—

1. Thou shalt have no other gods before Syntax.

2. Thou shalt not set up unto thyself modern authorities: thou shalt bow thyself down before the original sources, and them only shalt thou serve.

3. Thou shalt not take the name of the latest German in vain; for the reviewers will not hold him guiltless that taketh the name of a German in vain.

4. Remember thine author: peradventure he is not spurious.

5. Honour prose composition, when thou teachest: that thy pupils may rejoice and thy pile of exercise books increase before thine eyes.

6. Thou shalt not murder thy native language.

7. Thou shalt read the journals.

8. Thou shalt pronounce proper names : moreover, thou shalt pronounce them fluently.

9. Thou shalt not bear false witness against the text of a poet by filling up the lacunae therein, until thou shalt have trans-

posed the verses and turned them end for end.

10. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's horse.

CORA M. PORTERFIELD.

MAYWOOD, ILLINOIS.

REPORT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.—HILARY TERM, 1904.

ON February 5th a paper was read by Mr. WARDE FOWLER in support and amplification of the view put forward in Heinze's *Virgil's Epische Technik* (Berlin, 1903) that Virgil meant the character of Aeneas to grow during the action of the poem. Aeneas is always *pious*, but his *pietas* is only realised at its highest point in the last six books, and only as the result of the descent into Hades, and especially of the 'Heldenschau' in the Sixth Book, which is thus the pivot on which the whole story turns, and the crisis of the hero's life. In the first five books he shows manifest signs of weakness, e.g. in i. 92 foll., and even of *violentia* in ii. 314 foll., 594 foll., of forgetfulness of his divine mission in Bk. IV., where there is an undoubted reference to the narrow escape of the Empire from destruction at the hands of Antony and Cleopatra. In the Fifth Book the character improves, becoming more typically Roman; but even up to the latter part of Bk. VI. Aeneas is continually looking backwards instead of forwards—not yet fully realising that nothing that he has yet achieved is the real work of his life. In the last six books he never looks back or hesitates; and though the characterisation is not strong, and the real interest lies elsewhere, the poet meant his hero in these books to reach the heroic type of the Aeneas of the *Iliad*, in combination with the Roman qualities of *pietas* and *humanitas*.

On February 12th a paper was read by Professor COOK WILSON on the Problem of the Greek Modes. Through the accident of being asked by Professor Bywater to consider a passage in Aristotle's *Politics* (1276. a. 35) for another purpose, the writer had come across a piece of evidence which seemed inconsistent with any current theory of the Greek Modes. By some strange mischance this passage, as well as another—important but much less explicit—from Theon of Smyrna (Hiller, p. 48, l. 12), seemed to have been quite overlooked in the controversy, and it contained information of a kind supposed entirely wanting in the classical period about the internal constitution of a Mode.

It was contended that the passages usually quoted from Plato, Aristotle, Athenaeus, and Plutarch, while confirming Monro's view that a difference in pitch was essential to the difference between the Modes, proved that the Modes must also have differed in the arrangement of their intervals, i.e. as scales. The quotation in Athenaeus from Heraclides Ponticus was of special importance, and the exact drift of it seemed to be generally misunderstood. The result obtained from these passages was confirmed by the new evidence from Aristotle, which seemed to necessitate that the Modes differed as scales, and *inter alia*

could not be different species of the octave of the same compass. They must differ both in pitch and in interval, and thus somehow unite the characteristics of both keys and scales. Octaves taken at different positions in the same Perfect System would differ in this way; but such octaves as Westphal's would not do, because in an order of pitch contrary to the tradition about the Modes. That order had been supposed by Westphal to apply only to pure keys and not to the Modes at all; for it probably seemed that, if two systems were said to differ in pitch by a tone, &c., they must differ by this interval throughout and thus be different keys of the same scale, and hence the distinction would be inapplicable to octaves at different parts of the same Perfect System. It was suggested that this difficulty might be got over by supposing that the interval of pitch between two such octaves was measured by the interval between two notes in them occupying relatively the same given position in order in each of them; and similarly for a system of octaves.

It was shown that, if this was so, the traditional order of pitch given for the Modes, $11\frac{1}{2} 11\frac{1}{2}$, would be best accounted for by supposing that the fifth note from the bottom of the modal octave, the true paramese in the central and standard octave and the *thetic* in the rest, was the note measured from. This would lead to a system of modal octaves in the traditional relations of pitch, such that the Dorian coincided not with the *e-e* octave, which has the intervals of the later so-called Dorian species of octave, but with the *f-f* octave. This not only agreed with the statement in Plutarch that the tetrachord hypaton was excluded from the Dorian Mode, and with his record of the interval of the Mixolydian—the only notice of the kind in a reliable author—but was further confirmed by the fact that it gave a simple solution of a standing puzzle—the story in Plutarch of the treatment of the Mixolydian Mode by a certain Lamprocles. Further, the system of Modes, when taken in connexion with an hypothesis based on Ptolemy about the manner in which the later modal names for the species of octave and for the keys arose, would also give a simple solution of another puzzle, which has occasioned much speculation, the ancient notation for the Hypolydian key; for this would be a necessary consequence of the position assigned to the Dorian Mode. The general relation of these Modes to one another seemed again to make fully clear the meaning of the criticism attributed to Heraclides Ponticus in Athenaeus.

The passage from Aristoxenus i. 37 was discussed. The transposition in it, proposed by Westphal, was defended by a curious circumstance in the text itself, which seemed to have been overlooked; on the other