The Classical Review

Additional services for **The Classical Review:**

Email alerts: Click here
Subscriptions: Click here
Commercial reprints: Click here
Terms of use : Click here

Latin *Nōrma* again

E. R. Wharton

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00185907

How to cite this article:
E. R. Wharton (1892). Latin *Nōrma* again. The Classical Review, 6, pp 258-259 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00185907

Request Permissions : Click here

evidence of Ϝ is very weak (cf. Solmsen *l.c.*). The only passage that speaks strongly in support of it is B. 332 ἄστυ μέγα Πριά-μοιο ἔλωμεν, but, unless there is other evidence outside the verb, this single passage will hardly turn the scale in favour of Ϝ; Fick reads Ϝαλώῃ. It is otherwise with ἔλωρ, ἑλώρια ; here Ϝ is either demanded or permitted by the metre, except in *v.* 208 μή πώς μοι ἔλωρ, as Solmsen remarks, 'eine gewiss nicht alte partie.' But it is by no means certain that ἔλωρ and ἑλεῖν are connec-ted. In fact ἔλωρ has a distinct and specific meaning of its own in which ἑλεῖν does not share. It is not for nothing that Greek commentators explained ἔλωρ by ἕλκυσμα ; its associations lie with ἕλκειν rather than with ἑλεῖν, cf. A. 4 αὐτοὺς δὲ ἑλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν with P. 558 ταχέες κύνες ἑλκήσουσιν, X. 336. The only passage where ἔλωρ shows any clear approximation in meaning to ἑλεῖν is *v.* 208, a passage suspicious for other reasons ; ἔλωρ then cannot be urged as a strong proof that ἑλεῖν had once Ϝ. ἔλωρ has been well compared by L. Meyer *Vgl. Gram.*[2] 156 with Lat. *uellere* (also *uoltur*), √*uel*, of which ἕλκω may be an extension.[1]

[1] This would be impossible if Fick *Vgl. Wb.*[4] i. 552 be right in separating ἕλκω altogether from Lith.

In the case of ἑλεῖν, as we have seen, the evidence is against initial Ϝ, and points to *i* or *s*. ἑλεῖν may, then, very well be compared with Ir. *tellaim* 'take away, steal,'= *to-sellaim*, cf. *do-sella, Leabhar na h-Uidhri* 73ᵛ 14, *madudéll ni*, si quid furatus est, *Würzb. Gl.* 22ᵇ7. *sellaim* may stand for **sel-nāmi*.[2] This does not overturn Osthoff's comparison with *saljan ;* it rather goes to support it, for Ir. *sellaim* on the one hand can hardly be separated from *saljan*, and on the other ap-proaches very closely in meaning to Gr. ἑλεῖν.

J. STRACHAN.

vetkù and putting it with Lat. *sulcus*. But the words agree so closely both in form and in meaning that they can hardly be separated. Brugmann *Grundriss* i. 147 (cf. also ii. 476) explains the initial of ἕλκω from the influence of ἑλκ-, ὀλκ- cognate with *sul-cus*. In that case the shorter Ϝελ- of Ϝέλωρ has remained unaffected. As to the breathing of ἔλωρ no stress can be laid upon it : it is evident that in later times the word survived only as an archaism, and it may very easily have been invested with the rough breathing through association with ἑλεῖν or ἕλκειν.

[2] Before *-nāmi* a weak form of the root might have been expected. This is probably to be found in *tallaim* 'take away, steal' which can hardly be separated from *tellaim : tallaim* might be explained from *to-salnāmi* (*s-al = səl*-). By the side of *sal*- there appeared in certain parts of the verb *sel*-, and level-ling set in in one direction or the other.

LATIN *NORMA* AGAIN.

SOME points in Mr. H. D. Darbishire's ex-haustive criticism (*C. R.* vi. pp. 147—9) of my derivation of *nŏrma* call for remark.

It is unjust to say that Prof. Havet ' loosened the laws of Latin etymology ' when he suggested that in Latin the com-bination *n + m* in non-compound words becomes *rm*, and thus at once obtained the simplest and most obvious deriva-tion possible for *carmen* and *germen*, as from *canō* and *genō* respectively. The rule has no exceptions, though from the nature of the case it has few instances : roots ending in *n* are rare (Whitney gives only twenty-four such in Sanskrit), and it is only in *carmen* and *ger-men* that such roots are in Latin combined with a termination beginning with *m*.— There was no reason why *anima* should lose its *i* : why my *nōnima did so I have already explained, it was in order to get a disyllable like the other technical terms with the same ending, *fŏrma* and *grōma*.—Mr. Darbishire has quite misunderstood me if he

thinks that I supposed the hypothetical *canmen etc. to have ever actually existed for a moment : my contention is just the reverse, that the combination *nm* in non-compounds was unpronounceable to a Roman, and that therefore he substituted *rm* for it.

In Latin inscriptions down to about B.C. 100 (Corssen, pp. 8--9) C and G and, when A follows, C and K are used indifferently. During that period the supernumerary letters G and K would no more be considered integral parts of the Latin alphabet than the Etruscan K, found occasionally in in-scriptions-(Deecke in *Encyclopaedia Britan-nica*) but not recognised in the Etruscan abecedarium which we possess, was con-sidered an integral part of the Etruscan alphabet. After B.C. 100 the use of C for G, and of K for C, was confined to abbreviations, and the Latin alphabet consisted of twenty-one letters (Cic. *N.D.* 2, 93), arranged doubtless as in our alphabet : G fell into the place which, in the Latin alphabet as compared with the Greek, was vacant before

H (Z not being admitted into the Latin alphabet till after Quintilian's time,[1] and then, as a foreign letter, relegated to the end), while K was put, as in Greek, between I and L.

My derivation of *norma* has the advantage of involving no 'change of sense' at all: on my view *nōna*, at the time when *norma* was formed, meant L as distinctly as *sexta*[2] meant

[1] Quint. 12, 10, 27 jucundissimas ex Graecis literas non habemus, vocalem alteram, alteram consonantem.

[2] Quint. 12, 10, 29 illa (litera) quae est sexta nostrarum. Mr. Darbishire says that here 'the

F, and its derivative *nōnima naturally meant, if I may coin the corresponding English word, 'an L-er,' an instrument shaped like L, what our carpenters call an L-square. Mr. Darbishire's derivation of *norma* from the root of *nōscō*, as 'the line to be known,' requires a good deal of explaining: a right angle is not a line, and 'to be known' means nothing

E. R. WHARTON.

sense was clear from the context': by which he must mean 'from the example,' *frangit*.

GREEK ΣΥ- FROM TY-.

FINDING side by side Dor. τύ, Lesb. and Ion.-Att. σύ—Boeot. τῦκον, Ion.-Att. σῦκον— Ion.-Att. τύρβη (Lat. *turba*), Att. συρβηνεύς —Dor. τυρίσδω (Theocr. 1. 3), Ion.-Att. συρίζω: or again Sk. *vātulas* 'mad,' Hom. ἀ(F)ήσυλος 'wicked' — Sk. *catúras* (Acc.) Lith. *keturì*, Hom. πίσυρες Lesb. πέσυρες: we should naturally, but for a preconceived opinion, see here in συ- a dialectic representative of τυ-. So, comparing *sup-* in ὕπνος with *svep-* in Ags. *svefn*, we should see in σύρμα, σύρω a *tur-*, Ablaut of *tver-* in Sk. *tvar-* 'hasten,' O.H.G. *dweran* 'mix'; and in the termination -συνο- (*e.g.* γηθόσυνος, γηθοσύνη) a -*tuno-*, Ablaut of -*tvono-* in Sk. -*tvanám* (*e.g.* vasutvanám 'wealth').

To these eight apparent instances of συ- from τυ- I would make three additions: (1) ἁλοσύδνη, *Il.* 20. 207, *Od.* 4. 404, = *ἁλο-τύδ-νη 'of the sea wave' (Middle Irish *tond* 'wave,' Lat. *tundō* 'beat'), with the same stem as in ἁλό-θεν, *Il.* 21. 335. The word can hardly be ἁλοσ-ύδνη 'of the sea water,' Fick, *Wörterbuch*,[4] 1. 546, since this would presuppose a combination ἁλὸς ὕδωρ, which is not Homeric (it is only in the *Odyssey* that ὕδωρ is used of the sea, and then only in the combinations ἄνεμός τε καὶ ὕδωρ, 3. 300, and ἁλμυρὸν ὕδωρ), and the only Homeric compound beginning with a genitive (Ἕλλης πόντος is scarcely a compound) is the isolated οὐδενός-ωρα 'caring for no one,' *Il.* 8. 178. (2) δασύς = *δṇτ-ύς as Lat. *densus* = *dṇt-tós, Albanian *dent* 'make thick.' G. Meyer explains δασύς as *δṇτ-σύς: but there is no termination -σύ-. (3) συχνός 'long, numerous ' = *τυχνός 'ordinary' (cf. τυχών), a Litotes for 'sufficient, considerable.'

But in the great majority of words τυ- is as constant in Lesbian and Ionic-Attic as in

Doric; and hence philologists have agreed to explain away the few cases in which it seems to become συ-. The forms τῦκον and τυρίσδω indeed they ignore: the connexion of *vātulas* and ἀήσυλος, reasonable as it is, they deny (Wackernagel, *K. Z.* 24. 609) without suggesting anything better. The -σ- of πίσυρες, πέσυρες they would deduce from the -σσ-, representing -*tv-*, of πέσσυρες,[1] τέσσαρες, without explaining why the latter never in Attic became *τέσαρες. The σ- of σύ they hold is borrowed from the oblique cases[2] (Brugmann, *Grundriss*, 2. 440), that of -συνο- from a supposed byform -σένο- (or rather -σσενο-) representing -*tveno-* (do. 2. 70 n.); and so, I suppose, the σ- of συρβηνεύς from a byform *σερβ- representing *tverb-*, and that of σύρω from a byform *σερ- representing *tver-*. As to σύ, it is difficult to see (1) why *τύ had its consonant transformed by the influence of σέ, σέο, σοί instead of having it preserved by the influence of τοί (locative of σύ, *Grundriss*, 2. 447), which in Homer is nearly as common as all the other oblique forms put together (in *Il.* 1–3 I count 23 instances of σύ, 42 of τοί, 46 in all of σέ, σέο, σοί); or (2) why, if 'Analogy' works by any laws at all, σέ, &c., made *τύ into σύ, but μὲ τόν τοῦτον, &c. did not make ἐγὼ ὁ οὗτος into *γώ *τός *τοῦτος. As to the other three instances, it is unfortunate that the supposed *γηθόσενος, *σέρβη, *σείρω have died out and left no trace of their existence:

[1] Aeolic (Hesychius), with the 'Aeolic' *v* for *o*, G. Meyer, *Gr. Gr.*[2] 62. I would explain it as = *πέτϜορες, standing to *πέτυρες (πέσυρες) as Lith. *ketveri* to *keturì*.

[2] I.e. *tv-* is represented by σ- in σέ, σέο, σοί, as apparently also in the obscure words σαργάνη, σεῦτλον, σηλία, σήμερον, σίλφη, which have byforms (also Attic) ταργάνη, &c., G. Meyer, 263.