

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 Derivation of Latin *Nōrma*

E. R. Wharton

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 1-2 / February 1892, pp 11 - 12
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00184483, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00184483

How to cite this article:

E. R. Wharton (1892). The Derivation of Latin *Nōrma*. The Classical Review, 6, pp 11-12
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00184483

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

της (judges). Δίκη[η ἔρημος κατεδικάσθη ἦν ἐγράψατο.

1. 5. Δημέας Διοδώρου Ἄλεξανδ]ρεὺς τῆς ἐπιγονῆς τῶν οὐπω ἐπηγμ[ένων εἰς δῆμον
.. κατὰ Ἡγήμονος.

1. 6. ασιδῶρου] καὶ (?) τοῦ Ζωπυρίωνος τοῦ Μοσχίωνος μακεδόν[ος τῆς ἐπιγονῆς κατὰ συγγραφῆν.

These restorations are drawn partly from XXVII. 2, partly from XXVIII. 1.

We find in XXVII. 2 δίκη ἔρη]μος κατεδικάσθη ἦν ἐγράψατο Δημέας Διοδώρου Ἄλ[εξανδ]ρεὺς. Prof. Mahaffy begins . . . λος κατεδικάσθη and ends with και, not Ἄλ. But I

read -μος, and in XXVIII. 1. 3 I find δίκη ἔρημος κατεδικάσθη, Prof. Mahaffy δίκη ἐριλλος: in 1. 8 of the same where Prof. Mahaffy prints ἐριλλος κατεδικάσθη I see ἔρημος κατεδικάσθη. I get the last line from XXVII. 2. This I reconstitute as follows:

1. 8. δίκη ἔρημος κ]ατεδικάσθη ἦν ἐγρά[ψατο Δημέας Διοδ.

1. 9. ὄρου τῆς ἐπιγονῆς τῶν οὐπω ἐπηγμένων εἰς δῆμον κατὰ Ἡγ]ημονος ασιδῶρου.

I get κατὰ συγγραφῆν at the end from XXVIII. 1 and 2.

W. WYSE.

THE DERIVATION OF LATIN *NORMA*.

WHAT the Roman carpenter called a *norma* the English carpenter calls an L—square: it is formed by setting two straight lines at a right angle to each other. Engravings of the *norma* may be seen in the Dictionary of Antiquities: it was of various kinds, the essential point in each being the right angle. In 'Etyma Latina' I have suggested that the Latin instrument was named, as the English one is, from its resemblance to the letter L.¹ I shall here show (1) that the L of certain Italian alphabets had like our L a right angle; (2) that in some Italian alphabets L was the ninth letter and would therefore according to ancient usage be called *nōna*; and (3) that **nōnima*, the derivative of *nōna*, would naturally become *nōrma*.

(1) The early Italian L had an acute angle: the right-angled L appears in Latin inscriptions from about 200 B.C. (Fabretti, *Palaeographische Studien* p. 67), in New Umbrian (Bücheler, *Umbrica* p. iv.), on the Oscan 'tabula Bantina,' and in Faliscan, Paelignian, and Picentine inscriptions (see the tables in Zvetiaeff, *Inscriptiones Italiae Mediae Dialecticae*).

(2) L was the ninth letter in the Etruscan alphabet (Deecke, *Encyclop. Brit.* 3, viii. p. 638), the genuine Faliscan alphabet (Deecke, *Falisker* p. 229), and the Venetian alphabet (Pauli, *Altitalische Forschungen* iii. p. 186). Its place in the earlier Roman alphabet is not known with certainty, the earliest Latin *abecedarium* (Corssen, *Aussprache*² i. p. 12) not being anterior to the

time of Cicero. G appears first in an inscription dating from some time after 290 B.C. (Seelmann, *Aussprache des Latein* p. 342-3), but cannot have been generally recognised till much later, since C is still used for it in an inscription of about 100 B.C. (*Corpus Inscr. Lat.* i. 207): K, as a mere variant for C before A in abbreviations, formed no real element of the alphabet: thus L may well have been reckoned the ninth letter of the Roman alphabet (A B C D E F H I L) down to classical times.—The Italian stonemasons were fond of cutting *abecedaria*, such as we have for most of the dialects, and hence the alphabetical order of the letters was much more familiarly known to the Italians than it is to us: Quintilian (12, 10, 29) denotes F by the simple appellation *sexta* (sc. *littera*), and on the same principle L, if it stood in the ninth place, would naturally be called *nōna*. In like manner the Athenians distinguished their ten lawcourts not by numerals but by the letters from A to K: the Alexandrians designated the twenty-four books of *Iliad* or *Odyssey* by the letters of the alphabet: St. John, *Rev.* 22, 13, uses A and 'first' as convertible terms.

(3) On the analogy of other technical terms—*fōrma* 'outline,' *grōma* 'surveyor's pole'—the derivative of *nōna* would be **nōnima*,² or, contracting (so as to get a

² The collocation *nm* is allowed only in compounds, e.g. *in-mittō*, the two elements of the compound being regarded as semi-independent. So we have *ad-ripiō*, though in simple words the collocation *dr* is forbidden.—The collocation *nm* is unpopular in English also, *Martinmas* becomes in Shakspeare *Martlemas*.

¹ So the Greeks, Schol. Ar. *Nub.* 178, compared the διαβήτης or pair of compasses to the letter Λ.

disyllable like *fōrma* and *grōma*), **nōnma*. And this, by Havet's law, *Mém. Soc. Lang.* vi. 31, 2, would necessarily become *nōrma*, as **can-men* (*canō*) became *carmen* and **gen-men* (*genō*) became *germen*.¹ The other

¹ These derivations are simpler than Corssen's connexion of *carmen* with Sk. *çásmān-* 'praise,' and of *germen* with Sk. *gárbhas* 'embryo': the root-vowel of *çásmān-* is *e* (Lat. *cēnsēō*, Brugmann, *Grundriss* i. p. 292) not *a*, and the root of *gárbhas* does not appear elsewhere in Latin (certainly not in *gremium*). Further, according to Brugmann (*ut supra* p. 429), whose view has certainly not yet been disproved, **casmen* would in Latin become **cāmen*, not *carmen*: for which reason also we cannot derive *germen* from *gerō*, as this would only give **gesmen*, **gēmen*.

derivations suggested for *nōrma* are impossible: that it goes with Sk. *nar-* 'to guide,' a root invented by Pāṇini to derive *nāras* 'man' from, or that it is a loan-word representing either *γνώμων* or *γνωρίμη*. It is true that *γνώμων* according to Liddell and Scott (they give no instance) meant a carpenter's square; but the Latin form of *γνώμων* could only be **gnōmō* or **nōmō*, leaving both the *r* and the termination of *nōrma* unaccounted for. And why the carpenter's square should be called 'well known,' which is all the meaning that can be extracted from *γνωρίμη*, is not apparent.

E. R. WHARTON.

LUDWICH'S EDITION OF THE *ODYSSEY*, AND SEYMOUR'S EDITION OF THE *ILLIAD*.

Homeri carmina recensuit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit ARTHURUS LUDWICH. Pars Altera. *Odyssea*. Volumen Prius, 1889. Volumen Alterum, 1891. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.

THIS new critical edition of the *Odyssey* marks a step in the progress of Homeric textual study, but no one sees more clearly than the editor himself that it is far from finality. But it is the first advance which has been made since the publication of La Roche's edition in 1867-8. That the advance is substantial, if not at once understood from the name of the editor, can easily be shown.

The list of MSS. quoted by each is in itself sufficient proof. La Roche uses fifteen, Ludwig twenty-three. But these twenty-three include a large amount of new material of a better class than La Roche's. Only eight of La Roche's are found worthy of a place in Ludwig's list. Of those which are common to both, Ludwig in no case depends on La Roche's collation, as may indeed be supposed. In fact he has made his own collation of all but five of his list—a work of vast labour, especially in the hands of so accurate a collator as we know Professor Ludwig to be. The seven of La Roche's which Ludwig rejects are all of late date, four or five of them being of the 15th century, and only a part of one, the Marcianus 647 containing the last fifteen books, as old as the 13th. This fragment by the way seems to deserve attention, and I am a little surprised to find that Ludwig makes no mention of it in his Prolegomena.

Of the fifteen new MSS. of which collations are given, one is the Berlin papyrus ascribed to the 8th century. This is unfortunately a very small fragment, containing only parts of some eighty lines of the 14th book. Then come two MSS. in the Laurentian Library at Florence, both ascribed to the 10th century—as old as the Ven. A of the *Iliad*, and older than any other known complete MS. of either poem. One of these is not mentioned at all by La Roche in his *Hom. Textkritik*; and Ludwig gives but little account of it. Indeed he is throughout his Prolegomena very sparing of descriptions of his MSS. and of several says nothing at all. This is an omission which I cannot but think is to be regretted. But it appears that only two of his MSS. belong to the 14th century, four to the 15th, and two, which are quoted only at second hand, to the 16th. Fifteen are earlier than the 14th. It is clear therefore that his materials are even more in advance of La Roche's in quality than in quantity.

In the region of scholia Ludwig is of course an acknowledged master; no one is so well qualified to bring the results of ancient and particularly of Alexandrian criticism to bear on the Homeric text. So far as the Aristarchean scholia are concerned—and these are of course critically the most important elements in the correction of the text—Ludwig's work may be regarded as final until some hitherto unknown material is discovered. When his gigantic task of the formation of a complete critical corpus of the whole of the *Odyssean* scholia is ended—if indeed one man can end it in a