

bread, fish, water, are different from the classical words, but they come from words which were in use in classical times. The great mass of the vocabulary is ancient. The cases of the nouns have dwindled to three; indicative and subjunctive have been confused; the infinitive and participle have almost disappeared; declensions and conjugations have been intermingled and levelled by analogy. There is more of periphrasis in the syntax. The pronunciation of vowels and consonants has generally shifted; accent has changed its quality. There are two languages in Greece: that of the people and that of the newspapers. The latter is an artificial monstrosity, a mixture of ancient words dragged out of obscurity, scraps of ancient syntax misunderstood, ancient inflexions tacked on to modern words, French phrases literally translated, and modern colloquial. For some reason the "educated" Greek thinks it patriotic to use this jargon. A great deal of the popular literature, ballads, tales, &c., is printed, but not always with proper care, and a knowledge of the spoken language is essential. Local dialects differ greatly, but all contain something and some contain much, that is supposed to be extinct. The changes in modern Greek have been brought about by the following: (1) change of accent from tone-pitch to stress, (2) consequent loss of quantity, and (3) shifting of vowel and consonant sounds. The language was practically complete in its modern form by the 11th century. Examples of the principles which now rule the syntax of modern Greek (e.g. auxiliary conjugation) can be found in the ancient language; and there are many survivals of ancient words and forms in the modern language, especially in outlying districts. The most archaic dialect is the Zakonian, spoken in the N.E. of the Peloponnese; next to this come the Acarnanian, and the dialects of Crete, Rhodes, Cos, and smaller islands out of the track of tourists or trade. Some of these dialects actually retain peculiarities of the ancient local dialects: Zakonian has  $\bar{a}$  for  $\eta$ ,  $\tau$  for Att.  $\kappa$  or  $\sigma$ ,  $ov$  for  $v$ ,  $\sigma$  for  $\theta$ , intervocalic  $\sigma$  drops, final  $s$  becomes  $\rho$ . The modern language sometimes helps to interpret the ancient, especially the Greek Testament. It has in itself great capacities if a creative genius could only be found to use them.

---

## EASTER TERM, 1905.

### FIRST MEETING<sup>1</sup>.

At a Meeting of the Society held in Dr Sandys' house on Thursday, May 11, 1905, at 4.45 p.m., the President (Mr BURKITT) in the Chair:

I. Mr I. ABRAHAMS, M.A., of Christ's, was elected a member of the Society.

<sup>1</sup> Reported in the *Cambridge University Reporter*, May 23, 1905.

II. Dr JACKSON read a paper on *Nicomachean Ethics* vi i § 5. 1139<sup>a</sup> 3—5.

In the *Classical Review* for February last, Mr L. H. G. Greenwood maintains that this passage, *πρότερον μὲν οὖν ἐλέχθη δὴ εἶναι μέρη τῆς ψυχῆς, τό τε λόγον ἔχον καὶ τὸ ἄλογον*, affords “a strong but hitherto unnoticed argument” that this book belongs to the Nicomachean treatise and not to the Eudemian: for, while (1) “the Nicomachean first book speaks of τὸ ὀρεκτικόν as ἄλογον in the first place (1102<sup>b</sup> 13), and only afterwards allows it, and then with some reservation (οὐ κυρίως), some title to be called part of the λόγον ἔχον,” (2) “the Eudemian second book on the other hand refers to it from the first as λόγον ἔχον, with only a slight reservation in favour of the Nicomachean view (1219<sup>b</sup> 28).” Now, (3) “here,” in *N.E.* vi i = *E.E.* v i, Mr Greenwood continues, “there is no suggestion that the ὀρεκτικόν could possibly be considered as anything but ἄλογον, which goes a little beyond even the Nicomachean passage, but is entirely inconsistent with the Eudemian.”

But (a) the very same sentence of the *Nicomacheans* which for the first time describes the ὀρεκτικόν as ἄλογον, describes it as λόγον ἔχον in the qualified sense: (b) the very same sentence of the *Eudemians* which describes the ὀρεκτικόν as λόγον ἔχον, distinguishes between λόγον ἔχον in the strict sense (“exercising reason”) and λόγον ἔχον in the qualified sense (“obedient to reason”), and implies that, except in the qualified sense, the ὀρεκτικόν is ἄλογον; and (c) in the *Eudemians*, generally, as in the *Nicomacheans*, the ὀρεκτικόν is habitually spoken of as ἄλογον, and not as λόγον ἔχον. Indeed (d), of necessity, in both treatises the ὀρεκτικόν is primarily ἄλογον, because in both the distinction between intellectual and moral virtue rests upon the psychological distinction between that which “exercises reason” and that which is “obedient to reason”: and in both treatises it is only at the outset, where it is necessary to distinguish between Plato’s use of the word ἄλογον and Aristotle’s, that the ὀρεκτικόν is spoken of, even in a qualified sense, as λόγον ἔχον.

Consequently, when in *N.E.* vi i = *E.E.* v i the ὀρεκτικόν is described as ἄλογον, the description is in perfect accord with the doctrine of both treatises, so that Mr Greenwood’s argument can do nothing for the settlement of the controversy about the books which are common to both<sup>1</sup>.

III. Dr JACKSON discussed an oracle in Procopius *de bello Gothico* i 7 (see Gibbon, ch. xli, Bury’s edition iv pp. 307, 536).

Having in A.D. 533, 534 subjugated Africa, Belisarius in 535 occupied Sicily, and in 536 invaded Italy. In the interval between the campaigns of 535 and 536, a Roman general named Mundus

<sup>1</sup> This paper appeared also in the *Classical Review* for July, 1905 (vol. xix. p. 299).

and his son Mauricius lost their lives fighting against the Goths in Dalmatia. This circumstance enabled the Romans to explain an oracle which said that, when Africa was in the hands of the Romans, the world (*mundus*) and its offspring would perish. Procopius gave the oracle in its original Latin: but the scribe, not understanding it, in part has substituted Greek letters for the Latin characters, and in part has attempted a rough facsimile. See Obsopoen, *Sibyllina Oracula*, p. 431. Maltretus in his edition of Procopius, 1662, reads the Latin sentence as *Africa capta, Mundus cum nato peribit*: and Cobet, in *Mnemosyne* v 364, gives, independently and confidently, the same interpretation. But (1), as Comparetti has perceived, the last nine characters look more like *peribunt* than *peribit*, and (2) the word ἀδόμεινον, which Procopius uses of the oracle, suggests that the Latin original was a verse. Read then, not AFRICA CAPTA MUNDUS CUM NATO PERIBIT, but AFRICA CAPTA SEDET MD' NAT'Q PERIBUNT, i.e. *Africa capta sedet: Mundus natusque peribunt*. For *Africa capta sedet*, compare Roman coins which, with the legend IUDAEA CAPTA, show a female figure seated at the foot of a trophy or a palm tree. See Madden's *Jewish Coinage*, p. 185 ff.

IV. Mr HICKS read a note on Aristotle *de anima* i ii § 3, 403 b 31—404 a 9. He examined the various grounds on which Rodier pronounces the entire passage almost unintelligible, and the proposals of Madvig and Diels to omit certain clauses. He admitted that the Greek commentators have failed to explain satisfactorily the illustration from ξύσματα, but he contended that they had missed the point of the comparison. It is not minuteness or partial invisibility which constitutes the resemblance; for, in so far as they are visible at all, ξύσματα are unlike atoms, which are at all times and under all conditions imperceptible to sense. The real likeness is in restless mobility (404 a 19, 406 b 20) and endless multitude: in Milton's phrase, the atoms are

‘shapes as thick and numberless  
As the gay motes that people the sunbeams.’

## MICHAELMAS TERM, 1905.

### FIRST MEETING<sup>1</sup>.

At a Meeting of the Society held in Mr Nixon's rooms in King's on Thursday, October 26, 1905, at 4.15 p.m., the President (Mr BURKITT) in the Chair:

I. Dr CONWAY read a paper on the well-known difficulties in the text of Livy's description of the Roman army in the Latin

<sup>1</sup> Reported in the *Cambridge University Reporter*, November 7, 1905.