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](#)

The Modern Greek Word νερξs1F79

Albert Thumb

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 09 / November 1894, pp 398 - 399

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00188912, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00188912

How to cite this article:

Albert Thumb (1894). The Modern Greek Word νερξ. The Classical Review, 8, pp 398-399
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00188912

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

eighths or a third of a tone apiece, besides other chromatic and enharmonic scales with more complicated intervals.

5. As regards the alleged notes for instruments, he follows the usual system in giving *g* for Ζ. But he gives *f* for Γ, whereas Γ was a note between *e* and *f*; and he also gives *b* for Δ, thereby involving the enharmonic scale with intervals of a quarter of a tone apiece.

6. He transcribes the music into the no-

tation that is now in use; and this is associated with an octave of twelve equal intervals. But in Greek music the intervals were not the same; so the notes are not exactly in their places.

The comparisons with modern music appear to be illusory. They are not founded on the ancient music as it stands, but on a transcript which twists it into modern shape.

CECIL TORR.

NOTE ON THE HOMERIC HYMN TO HERMES V. 33.

In the current *Hermathena*, in a review of Goodwin's *Homeric Hymns* among other conjectures I have put forward one (on *Hermes* v. 33) which has been fortunate enough to command the assent of many of my friends. I avail myself here of the courtesy of the Editor of the *Classical Review* to make a slight improvement on it. The note ran thus:—

In v. 33 there is, as it seems to us, room for a certain conjecture, though, strange to say, the needfulness of a correction has not struck any of the editors. *Hermes*, addressing the tortoise out of whose shell he afterwards fashioned the lyre, exclaims:—

πόθεν τόδε, καλὸν ἄθυρμα,
αἰόλον ὄστρακον ἑσσί, χέλυσ ὄρεσι ζώουσα;

But 'how came it that thou art a shell?' is unmeaning. Read *ἑσσο* for *ἑσσί*. The tortoise was not the shell much more than a man is his great-coat. One is reminded of the joke ascribed to Mr. Gilbert when in reply to 'You wear a great-coat?' he said, 'No, I never was.' But 'thou art clothed with this shell' at once recalls the *λάϊνον ἑσσο χιτῶνα* of Γ 57.

The punctuation given above, which is that of most editions, compels us to give to *πόθεν* the sense of *qui fit ut*? not of *unde*? Now this sense of *πόθεν* is posthomeric.

This is not a serious objection, for every reader of the hymns knows that they abound in posthomeric usages. But a slight change of punctuation improves the construction; read:—

πόθεν τόδε καλὸν ἄθυρμα;
αἰόλον ὄστρακον ἑσσο χέλυσ ὄρεσι ζώουσα.

'Whence this pretty plaything? Curiously wrought (or, sheeny,) is the shell wherewith thou art clothed upon, thou tortoise of the field.' The punctuation which I now recommend is, I find, that of Gemoll's edition.

It would be quite impossible with the ordinary punctuation to take *πόθεν ἑσσί* together = *unde es*? To this *τόδε* is fatal; *τοῦτο* would be awkward, but *τόδε* would not be Greek, unless we could write *πόθεν ὅδε σοφὸς Εὐριπίδης* (or *ὅδε σοφὸς Εὐριπίδης*) *εἶ*; Besides, the coupling together in apposition of *ἄθυρμα, ὄστρακον, χέλυσ*, would be ungraceful to the point of unintelligibility. The words *αἰόλον ὄστρακον ἑσσί* would of necessity supply the predicate.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

THE MODERN GREEK WORD *νερό*.

In a note in the *Classical Review* of March (p. 100) Mr. A. N. Jannaris says that the modern Greek word *νερό* has no connexion with the ancient *νηρό*, *Νηρεὺς*, but is nothing but a phonetic modification of *νεαρόν* 'fresh,' *sc.* ἔδωρ. I should like to point out that Prof. Krumbacher at Munich, three years ago, proposed the same etymo-

logy. In the edition of the *Colloquium Pseudo-Dositheanum Monacense* inserted by Krumbacher in the *Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, W. von Christ dargebracht (München, 1891), p. 362 *seqq.* (in a note to 'πίωμεν νερόν ἐκ τοῦ βανκιδίου bibamus recentem de gillone'), we find the explanation of *νερόν* from *νεαρόν*

supported by good arguments. Further Mr. Hatzidakis, discussing the etymology in a criticism of Krumbacher's paper (*Ἀθηνᾶ* iv. 466), completes the arguments of Krumbacher, showing that the contraction of *ea* to *η* (*νεαρόν*—*νηρόν*—*νερόν*) is attested by ancient authority. Moreover Hatzidakis

refers to Korais' *Ἀτακτα*, iv. 349 and Sophocles' well-known *Lexicon*. Both these writers suggest (though without arguing the question) that *νερό* may possibly be identical with the ancient Greek word *νεαρόν*.

ALBERT THUMB.

Freiburg-*i.*-B.

EUR. *ION* 1276.

ὁ δ' οἴκτος ὁ σὸς ἐμοὶ κρείσσων πάρα
καὶ μητρὶ τῇ 'μῇ.

These words should naturally mean 'But pity for thee is stronger in my heart and that of my mother,' a sense absolutely irreconcilable with the context. Ion is threatening Creusa with instant and certain death:

ἀλλ' οὔτε βωμὸς οὔτ' Ἀπόλλωνος δόμος
σώσει σ'.

are the words immediately preceding; and there is no sign of relenting in what follows.

In order to make the line fit into its context, editors are reduced to translating (as Paley) 'The feeling of pity for you is stronger for myself and my mother,' a rendering adopted also by Dr. Verrall in his poetical version. But it is hard to see how the words can possibly be so construed. I would suggest the Epic *οἶτος*, used by Sophocles (*El.* 167) and Euripides (*I.T.* 1091, where Dind. has *οἰκτρόν*) in lyric passages, with the sense 'But thy doom is present as a mightier desire (than reverence for Apollo) with me and my mother.'

FRANK CARTER.

DELBRÜCK'S COMPARATIVE SYNTAX.

Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. VON KARL BRUGMANN und BERTHOLD DELBRÜCK. Dritter Band. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen.* VON B. DELBRÜCK. Erster Theil. Strassburg. Karl J. Trübner. 1893. M. 20.

THIS is a book to which it is out of place here to apply the general language of eulogy. The time will come when it will be interesting and proper to call attention to the qualities which distinguish Delbrück among the great scholars who have built up the science of comparative grammar. At present our business is simply to give such an account of the work as will be of service to those who intend to study and use it.

The author begins with a sketch of the history of syntax. Three periods are distinguished. The first is that of the ancient Greek grammarians. The second begins with the twelfth century, when education in western Europe derived its substance

from the doctrines of the Church, and its formulas from a Latinized version of Aristotle. Here we find the early history of such terms as 'subject,' 'predicate,' 'governing,' 'concord,' &c. After the Renaissance the growth of philosophy led to the conception of 'universal grammar,' and to such theories as that of the derivation of the grammatical cases from local relations ('where,' 'whence,' 'whither'). The third period is that of the modern science of language, founded by Bopp, whose treatment of the infinitive in his *Conjugationssystem* (1816) may be regarded as the beginning of comparative syntax. Since that time the most marked change in the method of comparative grammar has been the limitation of its first aims. To Bopp and even to G. Curtius it seemed possible not merely to reconstruct the original or 'Indo-germanic' language but to explain the formation of that language from its elements. The latter of these aims is now recognized as hopeless: indeed the comparative method is inapplicable