The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Πηγxs1F75—Πηγxs1F71δi

W. R. Paton

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 03 / March 1894, pp 93 - 94

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00187530, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00187530

How to cite this article:

W. R. Paton (1894). Πηγ—Πηγδi. The Classical Review, 8, pp 93-94 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00187530

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

to present no difficulty at all, and especially as a specimen of popular talk. At all events this was adopted in the chronology of Eusebius as extracted from Syncellius (vol. ii. p. 81), ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ δευτέρου ἔτους Δαρείου ἕως ἔκτου ἀνεπληρώθη διὰ χειρῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ζοροβάβελ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ἰωσεδέκ ἐν μὲν ἔτεσιν ὅλοις ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἔτους Κύρου.

(3) We are so accustomed to speak of Herod's temple, and some Rabbinical expressions lay so much stress upon the splendour of the Herodian structure, that modern readers take it almost for granted that this, and no other, must have been meant when the Jews of our Lord's time pointed to 'this temple.' But it is highly probable that they would be very unwilling indeed so far to detach themselves from the building of their forefathers (hallowed as it was by the prophecies of Zachariah and Haggai) as to admit that the temple was a new one. Herod's careful avoidance of such

a suggestion of novelty has been noticed above, and—although in later days when the structure, new and old, was completely obliterated, Talmudical traditions might dwell fondly on the glories of the temple just before its destruction—it is not likely that the Pharisee would be less zealous than Herod in affirming that the whole temple of their forefathers still existed, repaired but not reconstructed.

However, this *a priori* argument is of little importance as compared with the evidence of facts, which, whether linguistic or historical, seem to show that the modern Herodian theory is less satisfactory than the one advocated above: and the arguments for the latter are independent of the question whether the dialogue under consideration is to be regarded as having the accuracy of a short-hand report or as being history dramatized.

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

Πηγή—Πηγάδι.

I WRITE what follows with a half conviction that I am telling people what they know already, but there is some little hesitation on the subject in Liddell and Scott's Lexicon.

The sources of water here during the summer months are:

(1) Springs issuing from the rock and often conveyed to roads or villages by covered channels. Where springs are not thus conveyed to roads, roads are conducted to springs. Many a time have I been puzzled by a road going up-hill where it need not, and in most cases I have found that it went to find a spring. Of course in many places where springs are abundant a village or town has grown up, and the road goes to find the town, not the water. Notable instances are Stratonicea, the chief town of this part of Caria in ancient times, and Moughla (whence I write), the present seat of government, both of which owe their origin to the abundance of their springs.

(2) Rivers formed by a confluence of such springs.

(3) Wells.

(4) Tanks constructed to receive the winter rains.

The Greek word for a fountain gushing from the rock is *κρήνη* (or *κρουνός*), and this words doubtless covers the artificial dis-

charge of a spring when it is conducted in a covered channel to a roadside or village fountain. In fact the last is the main sense of *κρήνη*, as springs rarely or never spout from the rock itself, but must be artificially contained conducted and released if we are to fill a pitcher from them with ease. The Greek for well is *φρέαρ*. I do not know if tanks made to receive rain water, now so common in this part of Turkey wherever there is no other supply, existed in antiquity or, if they did, what they were called.

What I am anxious to know is the exact significance of the word *πηγή*. At the present day *πηγάδι* is a well, *βρύσις* is a spring, both *κρήνη* and *φρέαρ* being rejected. With the substitution for *κρήνη* of the more expressive *βρύσις* I will not concern myself. It is doubtless a result of that effort to make language more individual—to make words more one's own property—which finds its clearest expression in the creation of diminutives. For the extrusion of *φρέαρ* in favour of *πηγάδι* I would suggest the following explanation.

Πηγή means a spring, where the water bubbles up, as distinguished from *κρήνη* or *κρουνός*, the place whence the water gushes out (see *Il.* X 147). In this country the sources of running streams are wont to be all close together. I recently saw

near Keramus a burn with fish in it and turning mills, which gladdened my heart after a sojourn in the riverless country west of this. I was told that its source was at some hours' distance and that it came out of a big rock. When I went there to see, I found there were many little springs all close together and each one distinguished from its near neighbour in coolness and flavour. These are the *πηγαὶ ποταμῶν* and the explanation of the plural given in Liddell and Scott is either meaningless or misleading. I have since observed that running streams in this country are almost invariably formed by [numbers of springs rising in close proximity. The little children who scramble about the Greek river-god (the Nile and Tiber) are not his tributaries but his *πηγαί*, coming, as children should, to help him in his eternal labour of pouring

the water from his urn, but forgetting, as children will, their task for love of him who set it. Or perhaps we should think of him as sitting *within* the rock and pouring from his urn one continuous stream which it is the duty of its little ministrants to distribute to the sunlight each by its own channel.

If *πηγή* means 'spring,' 'source' and nothing else, it is easy to see how it came to mean 'well' and expelled *φρέαρ*, supposing that the transition was made in a country where wells were the chief source of water. It could hardly, I think, have been made in a country where springs and perennial streams were as numerous as they are here; but possibly, as regards this, the history of the English word 'well' may give me the lie.

W. R. PATON.

THE LONG SONANTS.

IN Vol. vi. p. 189 I ventured to advance a physiological explanation of the nasal and liquid sonants. Briefly stated this explanation is as follows: the phenomena of the nasal and liquid sonants result from the transference of *m*, *n*, *r*, *l* to an easier vocal plane. Thus, in pronouncing *ένθος*, the *n*-sound is produced by the forcible impact of the tongue upon the teeth, while, if we pronounce *e-path-on* with merely a rapid and transient impact of the tip of the tongue upon the alveolar region, the resultant sound is hardly to be distinguished from *e-path-on*. Hence *ἐπαθον*. Again, when we say *dérko*, the *r* is naturally alveolar because the accent resting upon the first syllable ensures the normal articulation of the rough liquid; but when we say *drakón*, the *r*, in order to be more quickly pronounced, tends to be more coronal or cerebral in its character, that is, the tongue vibrates close to the hard palate. To illustrate from English phonology, the *r* now moves in much the same plane as the *r* of *pretty*, and

δέρκομαι : *δρακ-ών* :: *pert* : *pretty*.

But the vocal idiosyncrasy of each I.E. language assumes slightly different planes of utterance for the purpose of rapid articulation. And so *r* = *r*, *áp*, *pa*, Lat. *or*, Goth. *aur* (= *or*), &c. In fine, the quality of the vowel-coefficient is a guide to the determination of the plane of utterance.

I concluded my essay with the remark that this theory had a direct bearing upon the question of the *long sonants*. For all that a long sonant would mean is that there is a more prolonged maintenance of the characteristic sound in this easier plane of utterance. If this be so, the existence of a long sonant is inherently probable. But its abstract probability may be more directly inferred.

It seems to be generally admitted that the Low-Grade (*Tief-Stufe*) form of a root is based upon the primitively expiratory nature of the accent. Thus *πετ-* in *πέτ-ομαι* becomes *πτ-* in *ἐ-πτ-όμην*, when the accent leaves the verbal root. And this is sufficient for the explosive sounds which from their nature are abruptly terminated. But as regards the combinations of vocalic sounds it is obvious that there may be a varying degree of Prolongation. Thus *eu* and *ũ* are not the only possible alternatives; there may be an intermediate stage *ẽ*. For example, we have a triple form of the root *bheũ* : *bháv-ami*, *φῦ-ω*, and *φῦ-ή*. Similarly we have *eĩ*, *ĩ*, *ĩ*. In general, then, diphthongs have two monophthongal correlates. Thus :

eu : *ũ* : *ẽ*
eĩ : *ĩ* : *ĩ*

If now we admit that *m*, *n*, *r*, *l* are, like *u* and *i*, either consonants or sonants according to their syllabic functions, it will follow from