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 $\nu\epsilon\pi\varsigma$

A. N. Jannaris

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 03 / March 1894, pp 100 - 101

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00187578, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00187578

How to cite this article:

A. N. Jannaris (1894). The Modern Greek Word $\nu\epsilon\pi\varsigma$. The Classical Review, 8, pp 100-101
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00187578

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The comment once written into the text, *laurent* becomes *lauemus* (as *dicitur* became *diceris* in 161), and the rest is patchwork.

682—3. Desiste dictis nūnciam miserām me consolāri

Nisi quid re praesidi ādparas,
Trachālio, acta haec rēs est.

These verses are clearly out of place. (1) They are impossible as an answer to Trachalio's: Ah, desine: Nimis inepta's. (2) They come too soon in the conversation: Trachalio has had no time to make any definite proposal. (3) They are appropriate when his *bono animo's* (679) has been followed by *bonum animum habete* (687). (4) They are fitly answered by the advice of a practical character: adsidite hic in ara (688). (5) In their present position they break the connexion of thought: Certumst morirei quam etc. is an explanation of Quae vis vim mi adferam ipsa adigit, and *must be assigned to the same speaker*, whether Palaestra or Ampelisca I leave, at present, undecided. The passage is restored if 682, 3 are placed after 687 and given to the same speaker. We are then able to recover the reading of 684 with some degree of certainty.

Read (680)

AM. (or PA.) Sí modo id líceat, uis ne opprimat :

Quae uis uim mi adferam ipsa adigit.

TR. Ah, desine :

Nimis inepta's.

AM. (or PA.) Certumst morirei quam hūnc pati [uim fácere] lenonem in me.

Many other passages suggest themselves for comment. I briefly note: (253*) The difficulty seems to have been caused by *amabo*, which got out of place. Continue the cretics :

Sed quid hoc óbsecrōst? PA. Q uid uides?

AM. Fānum amabó uidesne hóc? PA.

Ubist?

then as Fleckeisen. Creticus trimeter follows creticus tetrameter (252), as in *Curculio* 100, 101 (Fl.). (711) At etiam minitatur audax. Read as a question; so *Tri.* 991 At etiam maledicis? and often. (856) *A portu*, the conjecture of Acidilius, would seem most appropriate. The *adulescentes* had gone seaward (157). (1115) The excellent conjecture *pro oratione* should hardly give place to the *pro portione* of MSS.

Students of Plautus owe Professor Schoell thanks for his admirable apparatus criticus; their gratitude will hardly extend to all his numerous conjectural emendations. See *tela teneam* (779) and *pecu alui* (1307).

W. G. FIELD.

THE MODERN GREEK WORD νερό.

IN turning over the leaves of the *Classical Review* of 1891, I lighted upon two notes on the derivation of the modern Greek word νερό. One, by Mr. J. B. Bury (p. 232b), connects the word with νηρός and Νηρέυς in the relation of ξερός to ξηρός, but denies that νηρόν could give νερό. In the other (p. 338a), Mr. Walter Leaf rejects Mr. Bury's opinion on the ground of such analogies as πληρώνω to πλερώνω and φιλάργυρος to φιλάργερος. I beg leave to observe that the connexion of νερό with νηρός and Νηρέυς, though appealing to the principle of the Erasmian pronunciation (η=ε), as well as to the ambition of present Greeks, since it carries their language back to primitive antiquity, rests on a pure fallacy. Similarly the example φιλάργερος cited by Mr. Leaf from Mr. Psichari's Ταξίδι is foreign to the purpose, since it is not a popular word. It is a mere fiction of Mr. Psichari for the genuinely colloquial and very common term

ἀκριβός *parsimonious*—so used already in Byzantine Greek—or for the less common σφιχτός (*i.e.* σφιγκτός) *close*. As to the disputed word νερό, it is nothing but a phonetic modification of νεαρόν (*scil.* ἵδωρ), used as a substantive like θερμόν (*i.e.* ἵδωρ) *warm drink, broth*; ἀλογόν (*i.e.* ζῶον) for ἵππος *horse*; ἄσημον (*i.e.* ἀργύριον), now ἀσήμι *silver*; συκώτιν (*i.e.* ἥπαρ) '*ficatum*', now συκώτι *liver*; ἄσβεστος (*i.e.* τίτανος), now ἄσβέστης *quick-lime, lime*, and many others. Of the identity of νερό with νεαρόν we have an express testimony already in Ammonios the grammarian, who states *s.v.*: νεαρόν νεαλοῦς καὶ προσφάτον διαφέρει νεαρόν μὲν γάρ ἐστι τὸ νεωστὶ κοιμισθέν ἵδωρ. To the same, if not still earlier, period belong the following instances taken from the *Hermeneumata Pseudo-Dositheana* (ed. G. Goetz, 1892) p. 87^b (*Herm. Amploniana*, MS. IX. century) 'γδωρ aqua; psychron frigida; chearon (for χλιαρόν) tepidum; neron

recente; zeston feruentem; synceraston calda aqua'; and *Colloq. Monacensia* *ib.* 653^a 'βάλει νερόν mitte recentem; πρόσθεσ ἀκρατον adice merum; *ib.* πίνωμεν νερόν ἐκ τοῦ βαυκιδίου bibamus recentem de gillone.' Further examples from Byzantine authorities: *Apophth. Patrum* (ed. Migne t 46), p. 205 B καὶ ἀνέστη τις πρεσβύτερος μέγας δοῦναι τὸ κανκάλιον τοῦ νεροῦ. Leont. Neap. (ed. Migne t. 93) V.S. p. 1713 C, ἐκεῖ θερμόν καὶ νερόν καὶ ὠδε νερόν καὶ θερμόν. Porph. Adm. 77, 13, Βερούτζη ὃ ἐστὶ βράσμα νεροῦ. *Et.*

M. 597, 43 sq. ναρὸν τὸ ὑγρόν... Σοφοκλῆς Τρωίῳ: Πρὸς ναρὰ δὲ κρηναῖα χωροῦμεν ποτὰ. οὕτω Φιλόξενος καὶ ἴσως ἡ συνήθεια τρέψασα τὸ A εἰς E λέγει νερόν (cp. *Et. G.* 406, 23). That the etymological part of the last remark is a pedantic fiction of the *Et. M.* needs no special comment, since every student of this authority knows too well his absurd passion to connect every platitude with classical Greek.

A. N. JANNARIS.

JAMES' APOCRYPHA ANECDOTA.

Texts and Studies, Vol. II. No. 3. *Apocrypha Anecdota*, edited by MONTAGUE RHODES JAMES, M.A. 6s. net.

THE general excellence of the series to which it belongs is fully maintained by Mr. James' *Apocrypha Anecdota*. Here is a volume of no less than thirteen apocryphal works compiled, as the editor states, without anything like a continuous or wide investigation from three British and two French libraries (Bodleian, British Museum, Cheltenham, Bibliothèque Nationale, Trèves). One can heartily sympathize with the editor's regret that so few professed theologians appear to have any liking for research in the field of apocryphal literature. Nor indeed is there any necessity why such research should be undertaken solely by the theologian. If some portion of the time which is at present wasted by men of ability over hack-work editions of Cicero's speeches or Virgil's *Aeneid* were devoted to the scholarly study of patristic literature, what enormous gains would result alike to classical scholarship and our knowledge of the history of the Empire! Of course if linguistic style be the criterion which determines the range of his pursuits, the classical student had perhaps better keep away from the present *Anecdota* lest the Greek of the *Apocalypsis Mariae* or the Latin of the *Visio Pauli*, like Jerome's Hebrew, injure his powers of composition. The language of several of these *Apocrypha* represents an interesting stage of transition between ancient and modern Greek. Curious words like *κουβουκλείων*, *ἀκούμβιτος*, *κογχοστάτης*, *χανότης* meet us at every turn.

The book opens with a complete Latin version of the *Visio Pauli*. Tischendorf's belief that the existing Greek text is

mutilated at the end is probably incorrect, as the present version, as well as the Syriac, concludes with the appearance of Elijah and Elisha.

One may perhaps regret that the editor has seldom attempted to discuss in any way the historical setting of pieces like the *Visio Pauli* and the *Acta Xanthippae et Polyxenae*, which furnish us with some internal indications of locality and date. In the case of the former document we find at the commencement: *Quo tempore palam facta est? Consule Theodosio Augusto minore et Cynegio*. Both the Greek MSS. used by Tischendorf read, in place of 'Cynegio,' *Κωντιανοῦ*, for which Tischendorf suggests *Γαρτιανοῦ*. This is not in itself a very probable conjecture, but it is at any rate an attempt to place the date of the book under the reign of the elder Theodosius who shared the consulship with Gratian in 380. On the other hand it seems almost certain that the Latin version has preserved the correct form of the second consul's name. Cynegius (Quinegius) was consul in 388 with Theodosius the Great. Now it is easy to see whence the error *Theodosio Aug. minore* arose. The MS. from which the present copy of the *Visio Pauli* was made read, no doubt, *consule Theodosio II. et Cynegio*,—the Roman numerals referring, quite correctly, to the Emperor's second tenure of office,—and the scribe, misunderstanding the significance of the number, wrote down *minore*. Any doubt as to which Theodosius originally figured in the date is set at rest by Sozomen's statement (vii. 19), —τὴν δὲ νῦν ὡς ἀποκάλυψιν Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου φερομένην... πλείστοι μοναχῶν ἐπαινοῦσιν ἐπὶ ταύτης δὲ τῆς βασιλείας (i.e. of Theod. I.) ἰσχυρίζονται τινες ταύτην ἠρῆσθαι τὴν βίβλον. The fact that the Syriac version