pritchan [leg. *apstail rophritchand*] *do genntibh* "after the example of Paul (the) apostle who preached to the Gentiles" *ibid.*; *ni etarscarann a mhe[n]ma fri peedaibh* "his mind does not separate from sins" *ibid.*; *is inann do neoch acas no haittreband ina athardha* "it is the same to any one as if he was residing in his fatherland". This is the reading of the Highland Society's MS. In the Book of Lismore we have the un-pasalised form ... *no aittrebad* ... The nasalised Middle-Irish form is now *-ann, -eann*, is called the consuetudinal present, and is used impersonally. The explanation above given of the Cornish nasalised forms will perhaps meet with more favour if we remember that in Irish the third sing. imperat. active is nothing but the third sing. of the secondary present. That in Celtic nasalisation of *t* occasionally occurs, will appear from the Irish conjunction *es, is* 'and', which can only be explained as = the Ohg. *e-n-ti, i-n-ti* = the Skr. prep. *āti*, Gr. *ἐντι*, Lat. *et*. In *es, is*, as in *filus* 'they are' Zeuss, G. C. 1007, 1009, the *t* has first become *s*, and then, according to Irish phonetics, the *n* has been lost or assimilated. So in Greek *-οῖσι*, the termination of the third pl. pres. indic. act., stands for *-οῖσι*, and this for *-οῖσι* = Skr. *-anti*.

W. S.

XIX.—MISCELLANEOUS REMARKS SUGGESTED BY
RITSCHL'S PLAUTUS, ESPECIALLY ON THE FOR-
MATION OF THE LATIN PERFECT. BY PROF. T.
HEWITT KEY.

Professor Ritschl has done so much good service in the cause of Latin Literature by his labours upon Plautus and Roman Comedy in general, that adverse criticism is of necessity painful; and the more so, as the justification of any dissent from his views naturally requires a considerable expenditure of words, while the acknowledgement of his merits, just in proportion as that acknowledgement is wide, must

be comparatively brief. In such cases a hasty comparison of the two sides in the account may at first leave the impression that the balance is unfavourable. Such a result would be greatly at variance with the feelings of the present writer; and it is for this very reason that the paper commences with this warning against erroneous conclusions.

Still it cannot be denied that on a careful examination grave doubts may well be entertained as to much that is found in the edition of Plautus, which the Professor commenced in 1848 and is still conducting. If the great English scholar of the eighteenth century has subjected himself to just censure for innovations in the text of Horace and Terence ill-supported by manuscripts, Ritschl has taken far greater liberties in the same direction, while in accuracy and profundity of scholarship he cannot bear comparison with Bentley. On the other hand we owe to the German an advantage which the English scholar did not concede to us. Bentley is ever apt to quote only those manuscript authorities which tend to support his proposed emendations. Ritschl has amassed the readings, even though at first sight of trivial variety, of not a few of the best MSS. of his author, without any reference to his own predilections. It is thus from his own quiver that a critic of his text must draw his arrows.

In the first place then exception may, I think, fairly be taken to a practice which runs through his pages of attaching to his own conjectures an initial **R** in the same thick type which he employs for the designation of his MSS., as **A**, **B**, **C**, &c., so that a careless reader of his annotations is led to treat these conjectural changes, as of the same character with readings for which there is traditional authority; or rather to give an undue preference to the progeny of the editor's brain, as the symbol **R** has always precedence over the other initials. What with omissions, insertions, changes, and transpositions of words, and not unfrequently of lines, his text differs from what the MSS. sanction, by a very considerable per-centage. But if the text of the plays be thus in not a few instances untrustworthy, it is

of the highest advantage for the purposes of precise criticism, that the variations of readings are detailed with a minuteness almost unexampled in classical authors; and thus even when Ritschl may be thought to have failed in extracting the genuine text, he has still supplied future editors with the best materials for the purpose; the best at least to be found, until the time arrives, and we may hope that it is not far distant, when the agency of the photograph may be used for taking copies of the best MSS., and the multiplication of them be effected by the process now employed with such success and economy in the reproduction of maps by the Ordnance authorities at Southampton. When peace then has once more sway in Italy, we may hope that the literary treasures of Rome, Florence and Milan may by this means be effectually placed within reach of the scholars of other lands.

A few examples of hasty corrections made by Ritschl in defiance of his manuscripts shall now be given. It may be remembered that in the *Trinummus* the suborned agent who pretends to have brought money from Charmides in a foreign land, falls in with the actual Charmides at Athens, and under the belief that he is an impostor who is personating Charmides, bids him at once give up the attempt. Here Ritschl, and Fleckeisen copying him, give us:

Proin tute itidem ut chärmidatu's, rüsum te dechärmida.

'At once then, just as you have put on the character of Charmides, so please to uncharmidez yourself'. But the MSS. only authorize:

Proin tu te itidem ut charmidatus es, rusum recharmida.

And as regards the verb *recharmida*, Ritschl at once rejects it on the ground, as he puts it in the preface (p. lxxv), that such a compound with *re* can only mean 'rursus induere Charmidis personam'. Now a little examination of the Latin vocabulary might have placed before him not a few examples, which justify the original reading, as *re-fig-* 'unfix', *re-teg-* 'uncover', *re-signa-* 'unseal', *re-sera-* 'unbolt', *re-clud-* 'unlock', *re-glutina-* 'unglue', *re-gela-* 'thaw', *re-cing-* 'ungird', *re-canta-* 'exorcise what has been charmed', *re-tex-* 'unweave',

re-fod- 'take up again what has been buried', *re-laxa-* 'unloose', *re-pignera-* 'take out of pawn', *re-plumba-* 'unsolder', *re-vela-* 'unveil', *re-tend-* (arcum) 'unstring', *re-fell-* 'undo-ceive', *red-ordi-* (r) 'unweave', *re-fibula-* 'unbuckle', *re-vinci-* 'unbind' (Colum.), *re-vorr-* 'unsweep' so to say, *re-torque-* 'untwist', *re-secra-* 'undo what is expressed by obsecra-', *re-cuti-* 'skin' (i. e. 'unskin'), whence *recutito-* part., *re-cid-* implied in the adj. *recidivo-* 'springing up again after felling', as the shoots from the stump of an oak &c. I may here note that although *re-tex-* has in our dictionaries many meanings attached to it, the idea of 'unweaving' is the only one which really belongs to the verb. *Retorque-* has the notion 'untwist' in the last book of the Aeneid, where Juno "mentem laetata retorsit", i. e. 'smoothed again a soul so long by passion wrung'. On the other hand it would be a task of some difficulty to get together an equal number of verbs which by composition with *de* attain to the same idea of reversal. *De-teg-* 'uncover' is one example of such use. On the other hand the Latin language has a prefix *in*, corresponding to the Greek *ανα*, with the same power in the verb *ignosc-* (in + gnosc-) 'unknow' so to say, i. e. 'forget', like the Breton *an-kouna* of the same origin and power. In my paper (Trans. for 1854, p. 41) on the European representatives of the preposition *ανα* I spoke of this verb as the sole example in the Latin language, where this *in* denoted reversal of former action. I have since found that the compound verb *in-concilia-* obtains its peculiar meaning in precisely the same way. But as the Latin Dictionaries of the present day are wholly at fault in the treatment of this verb, a few words on the subject may be serviceable. It may well startle a student to find two such very different meanings assigned to this verb, as 1. 'to win over to one's side, to conciliate', and 2. 'to make an enemy of, to turn against one'. But the simple truth is that the verb neither has nor could have either of these meanings. The true meaning is one of peculiar character, but given with all accuracy by Forcellini, yet unknown to our modern lexicographers, *si dis placet*, who affect however to have

always corrected their translations by a due reference to the great Italian Lexicon. As the simple verb *conciliare*, formed with all accuracy from *con* and *cilia* 'small hairs', signified strictly 'to felt (wool)', so *inconciliare* is properly 'to unfelt', if the word may be allowed, that is to separate again the woolly fibres which had been previously united in the process of felting. Thus we have a most expressive metaphor, somewhat like our own 'unravelling' and available generally for the idea of breaking up, dissolving, what had been closely united. The word occurs in at least four passages of Plautus, and in all this idea is most appropriate, due allowance being made for this comic poet's love of bold metaphors. The process of felting is no longer carried on under our eyes, as it was under the eyes of Romans in the age of Plautus; we shall therefore have a more intelligible, yet at the same time equivalent metaphor, if we use in its place the phrase 'to make oakum' of him or it, 'to tear to rags'. In the *Trinummus* 1. 2. 99, and the *Mostellaria* 3. 1. 85 the accompanying accusatives are persons, and the idea is breaking them up as regards their property. In the *Baccides* 3. 6. 22—*inconciliare copias omnis meas*—the idea is substantially the same; and in the *Persa* 5. 2. 53 *non inconciliat quom te emo*, may be rendered by 'he does not tear up' that is 'annul my purchase of you', *quom* in the older writers often having the power of *quod*. C. O. Müller indeed in his edition of Festus, v. *inconciliasti*, finds an objection to the doctrine that this verb is the opposite of 'concilia-' in that the prefix *in*, which denotes negation (*abnuitionem*), is never attached to verbs, except in the participial form. This is a point for which I have myself contended in speaking of the verb *i-gnosc-*; but the difficulty vanishes, if the *in* be that other particle which represents the Greek *ava-*, Germ. *ent-*, Eng. *un-* before verbs, which must be carefully distinguished from the negative prefix. This in Greek takes the form *av*, not *ava*, in German the form *un*, not *ent*. It is a mere accident that in the Latin and English the particles have at times slipped into an identity of form. The Dutch, Danish, Swedish, and Welsh again distinguish them, as

may be seen in the Table I have given in the paper just referred to (p. 49).

But to return from the digression thus caused by Ritschl's misinterpretation of the fictitious verb *recharmida-*, a more striking instance of persevering rashness can scarcely be found than in the determination with which the editor persecutes the name *Pamphilippus* in the *Sticus*. The word occurs in the body of the play just six times, but in the first passage (2. 2. 71), the Palimpsest differing from all the other MSS. has:

Vidistin uirum sororis Pamphilum Non Non adest—
and it is true that the transcriber by the breaks left after *Pamphilum* and the first *Non* intended as elsewhere to denote a change of speaker. The other MSS. give us:

Vidistin uirum sororis Pamphilippum? Non adest?

Now it is quite clear that this last reading is in itself thoroughly satisfactory, and secondly, that, if it be desirable to divide the line into three portions, as in the Palimpsest, the object may be effected, as some one has proposed, by the reading:

Vidistin uirum sororis Pamphilippum? Non. Adest?

But rather than admit one of these simple solutions of the difficulty, he prefers to alter the five other passages in an arbitrary manner, so as to substitute the favoured *Pamphilum*, and this with all the MSS. including the Palimpsest itself against him, and he even attempts to strengthen his argument by throwing suspicion on *Pamphilippus* as an irrational form, forgetting one would suppose the numerous adjectives so compounded, which may be seen in any tolerable Greek lexicon.

A whole class of words in which Ritschl hesitates unduly to follow the guidance of his MSS., consists of Greek words adopted into Latin. The Editor himself has properly noted that such accusatives as *Calchan*, and such vocatives as *Megaronide* were in all probability unknown to Plautus, who seems to use exclusively for these purposes *Calcham* and *Megaronides*. In truth the Greek words which this poet employs, are first naturalized and assume something of a

Roman dress. *Πλατεία*, for example, with its long penult becomes for Plautus, and indeed for Terence also, *platēa*, and so easily passes through the Italian *piazza* into the French and Norman-English *place*. (Plaut. Trin. 4. 1. 21; Ter. Eun. 2. 3. 52, Ad. 4. 2. 35, Ph. 1. 4. 38.) Similarly *γυναικειον* takes in Latin comedy the shape of *gynaecēum* or rather *cinaecēum* (Most. 3. 2. 68 and 72; and 3. 3. 5). A Greek writes *Πλυρικη*, but the metre of the Trinummus (4. 2. 10) requires and the Ambrosian codex actually gives *Hilurica*, that is *Hilūrica*, pronounced *Hil'ricā*, in the line:

Hiluricā faciēs uidetur hōminis; eo ornatu aduenit—

where the long final *a* is thoroughly consistent with the early habit of the language (see Corssen's *Aussprache ... der Lateinischen Sprache*, Vol. I. p. 330), and, as regards the initial aspirate and single liquid, no better confirmation could be desired than the line in the Mercator 2. 1. 10:

Istrōs Hispanos Māssiliensis Hīlurios.

Here Ritschl indeed gives *Ilurios*, still without the *h* in direct opposition to his three best MSS.

Nor can we see any just reason why the editor should so frequently write in Greek characters words which his MSS. present in Latin characters, much less why he should run into the inconsistency of printing in the same line *παλιν* and *euge*, his MSS. having simply *palin*. These two words probably passed into the Latin vocabulary from the Greek theatre as seen in Italy, much in the same way as the stage has introduced among us the foreign words *encore* and *bravo*. Again in Trin. 3. 1. 24 he most unnecessarily gives us the far less suitable phrase, *haut ei euscheme astiterunt*, where the MSS. have, what is letter for letter correct, *haut ineuscheme astiterunt*, 'not an ungraceful posé that', the adverb being the Latin form of the Greek *ανευσχημως*, the change of *αν* to *in*, of *ως* to *ē*, and the loss of the aspirate being precisely what the idiom of the Latin language called for. *Clamidem* too, supported by all the MSS. in Mercator 5. 2. 7, to say nothing of the same form occurring in many other passages, might well have had precedence over *chlamydem*. Similarly one may with reason prefer among the proper

names *Carmides* (so the Palimpsest in Trin. 3. 3. 16), *Filto* (so the same authority *ibid.* 2. 2 and 2. 4, the more so as this form accounts for the erroneous reading *filio* in the MSS. in 2. 4. 105 and 115); *Sticus*, rather than *Stichus*, throughout the play so-called. Oddly enough he has himself yielded to the authority of his MSS. in Mercator 5. 2. 84, and with a wise boldness printed *sonam* for *zonam*.

Let me also briefly note the unwillingness of Ritschl to admit in Plautus the form *patēr* before a vowel, like the Greek *πατηρ*, when already Virgil has three examples of such long quantity, and when his Ambrosian MS. (Trin. 3. 2. 19) has

Tibi patēr auósque facilem fécit et planám uiam.

to say nothing of other passages. In truth *πατηρ* represents *πατερς*, where the final sibilant is the ordinary representative of the nominative. Precisely in the same way *χειρ* stands for *χερς*, a form which actually occurs in a pentameter quoted from Timocreon by Hephaestion (*περι μετρων* 1):

ὃ συμβουλευειν χερς απο, νους δε παρα.

But I pass from these somewhat trivial matters to a question of more importance, the light thrown on the formation of the perfect tense by readings recorded in this edition. But here some preliminary remarks seem to be required. That reduplication prevailed to a very considerable extent in the formation of perfect tenses is of course not to be denied. The evidence of the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and Gothic languages is decisive on this point. At the same time one may justly doubt whether it be in any way by virtue of the reduplication that the perfect tense obtained the power belonging to it. In not a few languages the repetition of the simple adjective serves as a superlative, for instance in the Hebrew. The Breton too from *mád* 'good' has *mád mád* 'best', from *fall* 'bad', *fall fall* 'worst'; and our own Shakspeare found an expressive superlative in *wonderful wonderful*. So again the French have the term *bon-bons*, translated by English children into the corresponding *goodie-goodie*. This is thoroughly intelligible, for as the

simple adjective 'good' makes its selection out of all that is good, bad, or indifferent, so a second selection may well be made out of the category 'good', and thus we arrive at any rate at a class of 'very good'; and by a similar process, may hope to attain to the very highest degree of goodness, or the beau idéal represented by 'best'. This being the case then there may seem at first to be a natural connection between the superlative among adjectives and the perfect in verbs; but such assumption would be little better than a play upon words, as the term perfect applied to the verb simply means 'finished', without any laudation of the act. The work in fact may have been of very bad quality. All we know is that it is over. Then again, when we look to facts, we find that reduplication is no way confined to perfects. The Greek verbs *μιμν*-, *πιπτ*-, *γινν*-, for example, and the Latin *sist*- and *gign*-, are not the less reduplicative, because they exhibit a vowel *i*, while the perfects have a short *e*, for an ascent to the earlier forms would no doubt give us in both cases a mere repetition of the root syllable. Thus *momordi*, *spopondi*, *scicidi*, *tutudi*, coexist with *tetendi*. The Greek again in the imperfect tenses has reduplicated verbs, such as *ολολυζ*-, *ακαχιζ*-, *παμφαιν*-, *παιφασσ*-. So in the Gothic again we find such reduplicated perfects as *háiháit* 'called', *skáiskáid* 'separated', *stáistáut* 'struck'. In the early stages of language there seems to have prevailed a general fondness for repetition, but without attaching to it any grammatical idea. Thus in South America we find a river *Biobio*, a lake *Titi-caca*, a rodent animal *tuco-tuco*. So too the New-Zealander's vocabulary swarms with substantives, adjectives, and verbs of such formation, as *áko-áko* 'split', *ákidki* 'urge', *átíáti* 'drive away', *mínamína* 'desire'; *ángeánge* 'thin'; *háuháu* 'brisk', *korokoro* 'loose', *míngomíngo* 'curly'; *mótumótu* 'embers', *éniémi* 'a tree', *kirikiri* 'gravel', *mátimátí* 'toe'. Our own ears also are familiar with such forms as *talkie-talkie*, and we seem to find them of especial value in our dealings with barbarous races. Not unlike this is the familiar formation seen in *wishy-washy*, *fiddle-faddle*, *tittle-tattle*; or again in the Latin substantives

ciconia beside *conia*, *cucumis*, *cucurbita*, *susurrus*, *tintinnabulum*, and in the verb *titilla-re*.

From all this it seems to be a reasonable inference that reduplication was not in the outset employed to denote any relation of time, such as that expressed in the term perfect. I propose now to make some remarks on the formation of the Latin perfect by way of supplement to what I have written on this subject in the pages of our Proceedings; and I am led to do so at this moment, because I find some new evidence in the Plautian readings as recorded by Ritschl. In the year 1832 in the Journal of Education, IV, 354, 355, I had occasion to speak of the Latin perfect, and there suggested, what very possibly others had suggested before me, that *uerri*, *uerti*, *uelli*, *uisi* had originated in reduplicated forms *ueuerri* &c. Again in the Penny Cyclopaedia (Auxiliary verbs) I contended that the verb *es* 'be' entered into the formation of all Latin perfects, active as well as passive. In 1844 in a 'Rejoinder' to a pamphlet by the Rev. J. W. Donaldson, I entered more fully into this question, and again in our Proceedings IV, 34. My last remarks on the subject were given (May 13, 1853) *ibid.* VI, 72. I will here simply repeat that in my opinion the commonest and oldest as well as simplest mode of denoting the relations of time is by the employment of prepositions with the respective powers of 'from', 'at or in', and 'to'. Thus *je viens de diner* denotes a past act, *I am a-dining* is the old English form of the present imperfect, *I am to dine* is in familiar use as a future; and these phrases owe their definition of time chiefly to the three little prepositions, *de*, *a*, and *to*. As *a* in 'a-dining' is the remnant of an Anglo-Saxon preposition, so the Gaelic employs *ag* 'at' in its present imperfect, as *ta iad ag iarraidh* 'they are a-asking'. (See our Proceedings VI, 69.) In the same paper I drew similar arguments from other members of the Keltic family, and I should have done well to note the familiar fact that as the Breton for example forms its imperfect participle by prefixing a preposition to the infinitive, *och ober* 'faisant', so the French language also has the form—*en disant ces mots*

il sortit—where *en* is added, because what is now called a participle, *disant*, was at first a verbal substantive like the Latin gerund *dicendum*, so that *en disant* strictly represents *in dicendo*.

But to return to the Latin perfect, it needs no words to show that the final syllables of *feceram*, *fecero*, *fecerim*, *fecissem*, *fecisse*, represent with great accuracy the simple tenses of the verb *es* 'be', as *eram*, *ero*, *sim* (old form *esim*), *essem*, *esse*. But this being the case the analogy will not be complete unless we account for the differences, which are only too marked between the endings of the present perfect *feci* &c. and the several forms of *sum* &c. Two of these indeed are all we could desire. *Fec-istis* corresponds to *estis*; and if *fecistis* as a plural is justified, the singular of the same person may well be *fecisti*. Again if *fecerunt* with its long penult has something discordant with *ēsunt* (*sunt*), we are entitled to fall back upon *fecērunt*, for examples of such short penults are not unknown in the poets of the Augustan age, and are yet more common, the higher we ascend in the literature. Thus Ritschl might well have followed the guidance of what he thought he found in the Palimpsest (2. 2. 61):

Maliuoli perquisitores auctionum perierunt—

for the perfect of the indicative better accords with the tone of the context than the future *perierint*; and by the way he need not have defied his MSS. by writing *maleuoli* in place of *maliuoli*, in which the *i* is as thoroughly entitled to hold its ground as in *maligni*, *benigni*, two words of exactly similar formation.

Still there is a difficulty which overhangs the theory for which I am contending. If *fecērunt* be older than *fecerunt*, we have what is *prima facie* a violation of the law which governs the changes of words. The passage from long to short vowels is a common occurrence, and indeed but an instance of the general principle that man is ever endeavouring to abridge his labour. My defence of the anomaly is this, that the five forms which preceded the third person of the plural, having, as will soon be made to ap-

pear, a long syllable in the place that corresponds to the penult of *fecerunt*, there was a natural tendency to extend the principle beyond its due limits, and so *fecērunt* got established. We have what is precisely parallel in the Greek past perfect, *ετετυφειν*, -εις, -ει; -ειτον, -ειτην; -ειμεν, -ειτε, which led almost irresistibly to *ετετυφεισαν*. Yet we know that the older and more correct form was *ετετυφεισαν*, and indeed as *εσαν* of the Greek substantive verb had undergone no contraction, the short *ε* is alone to be justified by its formation. The same applies to *ēsunt*, as seen in *fec-ērunt*. The Italian too by the accent of its form *fécero* confirms the doctrine.

From the plural of the third person I go back to the singular; and here my theory suggests a form *fecist*, while practice seems to present us with *fecit* alone, and if our grammars be trustworthy with a short final. A due search however will not merely guide us to the very form *fecist*, but also establish on the surest ground that the third person of the Latin perfect ended originally in a long syllable *fecit*. First as to the latter point, Ritschl, it is true in p. 185 of the Prolegomena to the Trinummus, treats with a sort of contempt the doctrine that the final of *vendidit* may be long (apage igitur uendidit), and accordingly he commends Becker for correcting the line of the Capt. prol. 9:

Eumque hinc profugiens uendidit in Alide,

by the reading:

Eumque hinc profugiens uenum dedit in Alide.

Such a collocation of words gives us unhappily what is altogether unmetrical, for whether *uenum dedit* be written as one word, or as two, the accent must be on the *um* of *uenum*.

As there happen to be a good dozen passages in Plautus, where the perfect, in spite of Ritschl's dogma, ends in a long *it* before a vowel, he was likely to find abundant exercise for his ingenuity in the way of transpositions and insertions for the purpose of reducing to order the rebellious passages, but I need not enter into particulars as to the means he employs, for in one of the more recently edited

plays (Pseudulus, Praef. 14 and again at v. 311) he has given up the point and confessed that Fleckeisen has at last satisfied him that the *it* of perfects may be long. It was time he did, for the passages in the Latin poets, including Virgil, Horace, and Ovid, which present us with such forms as *perrupit*, *rediit*, *praeteriit*, &c., would have required the most liberal use of Ritschl's innovations. Corssen in his work, *Aussprache &c. der Lateinischen Sprache*, Vol. I, p. 353, has given an extensive yet far from complete list of the instances, including ten from Plautus, two from Terence, four from Virgil (*enituit* Georg. 2. 211, *petiit* Aen. 10. 67, *illisit* 5. 480, *subiit* 8. 363), two from Horace (*perrupit* Carm. 1. 3. 36, *subiit* Sat. 1. 9. 21), seven from Ovid, *fuît* and *fuêt* from the metrical epitaphs of the Scipios. In addition to these he quotes from inscriptions of authority the efficient evidence of *REDIEIT* and *PERIIT*. It is no slight confirmation of this doctrine that the third preterite in Sanskrit has for the singular *akarsh-am*, *akarsh-îs* (or *-îh*), *akarsh-it*, and that this tense is evidently formed throughout by the addition of the Sanskrit verb for 'I am' &c. to *a-kar-sh-*, in which *kar* alone represents the base of the verb. Thus the tense is the accurate analogue of the Greek $\varepsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\pi\text{-}\sigma\text{-}\alpha$, of which more presently.

But if the proofs of the length of the final vowel in *fecit* be thus abundant, we have also proof that its justification lies in the assumption of an old *fecist*, for the earliest specimens of the French language not unfrequently exhibit perfects in *st*. Thus Raynouard in his *Grammaire Comparée* (p. 372) quotes:

Qui du latin la trest et en romant la mist—

where the first verb stands for *traist*, the preterite of *traire*, in the sense of 'drew'; and Diez (2. 200 &c.) confirms what Raynouard quotes by numerous examples, as *chausist*, *faulsist*, *vausist*, *vousist* from verbs in *loir*, as also by *dist*, *prist*, *rist*, *sist*, *traist*, *arsist*, *remansist*.

In the first person plural, if *sumus* is to enter into the formation, we ought to have *fecismus*, but we find *fecimus*. Here the Latin language offers no explanation, and thus I

was driven on a former occasion to seek aid from one of the Slavic family, viz. from the Illyrian. Thus in our Proceedings IV, 37 I quoted the present and perfect tenses of the verb *vidi-ti* 'to see', as:

pres.: *vidim, vidis, vidi; vidimo, vidite, vide.*

perf.: *vidyeh, vidye, vidye; vidyesmo, vidyeste, vidyeshe*, while *ye, yesmo, yeste* are severally the third sing. and first and second plur. of the Illyrian verb 'to be'.

This argument may be thought far fetched. My next shall be drawn from the daughters so-called of the Latin. The very word *fecimus* appears in Ital. as *facémmo*, in Span. as *hizímos*, two words which by their accents speak strongly in favour of an old Latin *fecismus*. Still more decisive is *feismes* of old French (Diez 2. 201), backed as it is by *tráismes, deismes* (ibid.). When Diez adds to the last word 'with an intrusive *s*' (mit eingeschobenem *s*), he shows that he is an unwilling witness; and I am glad to find his admission that the forms with this *s* are more numerous in old French than those without it. In this matter I value his evidence more than his theory.

But if a plural *fecismus* be thus theoretically established, it follows at once that the singular must have been in earlier times *fecism*, which would naturally pass through *fecim* to *fecī*, for the loss of an *s* before *m*¹, so common in the languages derived from Latin, was also well known to the Latin itself, as in *cāmena-*, *remo-*, *pomoerio-*, *dumo-* (beside *dusmoso-*). The loss of a final *m* in the first person of verbs is what we are familiar with in *facio, fecero, γράφω, ἐγράφω, γέγραφα*. I now repeat what I said above, that the tongue after passing through *fecism, fecisti, fecist, fecismus, fecistis*, would naturally slip into the utterance of *fecērunt* rather than the legitimate *fecērunt*.

The part which the verb *es* 'be' plays as a suffix in the formation of the Latin perfect having been fully examined, the next step is to take into consideration the element which

¹ Note that the Greek *εἰμι*, Gothic *im*, and English *am* drop the radical *s* before *m* in the very verb under discussion.

is found to intervene between the root syllable and the same suffix. In *scripsi* we find an *s*, in *amaui* and *colui* a *u*, in *feci* and *memini* nothing whatever. Reserving the consideration of the *u* in *amaui* and *colui*, I venture to re-affirm the doctrine that the *s* in *scripsi* is of prepositional power, and in fact identical with the case-ending of the genitive in nouns. Thus *scripsi* will stand for *scripsism*, that is for *scrib-s-is-m*, with the sense of 'I am from writing', or 'I have just written'. Without some representative of the idea *from*, my theory would be altogether without meaning, for it is not in the power of the verb 'I am' to perform this office; indeed we have already seen that this verb is just as much employed in the formation of the present 'I am a-writing' and of the future 'I am to write'. I may confirm this argument by the evidence of the Sanskrit future *kartasmi*, in which the terminal letters are admitted on all hands to be identical with the Sanskrit verb *asmi* 'I am'. Again we find a similar *s* in the Greek aorist *εγραψα* (*εγραψ-σ-αμ*); but then it has generally been taught that the Latin *scripsi* is rather an aorist than a perfect. No doubt such is practically the sole employment of the Greek tense *εγραψα*, and not unfrequently *scripsi* is used with the same power. Yet the latter is of course also a perfect; and I claim this as being its earlier sense, partly because the theory I am supporting gives a satisfactory explanation of the way in which it attained such meaning, and still more because in savage life the consideration of both past and future would naturally be limited for the most part to the recent past and to the early future. For these uses the forms 'I am from writing' and 'I am to write' are admirably adapted, not so for the distant past or future. At the same time, a term for time only just past having been once formed, may well, by an extension of meaning so common in language, come at last to be employed as an aorist.

If I should fail to discover in all perfects the genitival *s* so essential to my theory, I might well appeal to the fact that this element is very apt to disappear. Thus the Latin genitives *musae*, *domini*, *Achilli*, *diei*, as well as the pro-

nouns *mei*, *tui*, *sui*, have all lost the distinctive consonant. So the French *lundi* bears no trace whatever of a genitival suffix, though we know it to be derived from *lunae dies*. Similarly the Greek term *Πελοπον-νησο-* should have a genitive in the first part, and in fact has one, for the final *ν* of *Πελοπον* is a substitute for an *σ* caused in part by assimilation to the following consonant. Yet this *ν* very commonly supplants the genitival *ς* without any such excuse. Thus our *sunday* grew out of an older *son-en-day* or, as the Scotch wrote, *son-oun-day*, like the numerous derivatives in the German language, as *sonnen-blume* 'sun-flower'. *Oxford* again is a corruption of *Oxen-ford*.

But I shall not be satisfied with thus avoiding the difficulty. It is true that in such forms as *feci* we see no trace of the assumed suffix. This however is at once accounted for when we have before us the fuller forms, such as *fecism*, *fecisti*, *fecist*, for the loss of the desired *is*, before a syllable of exactly the same shape, is not only likely but in some measure a necessity. It is precisely in this way that the Latin language presents us with the forms: *sumpse* Naev., *despex* Plaut., *iusse* Ter., *inuasse* Lucil., *abstraxe* Lucr., *subduxe* Varr., *uixet* Virg., *erepsemus* Hor., *affixet* Sil., *scripse* Aus. I ought here to note that this view suggests an explanation of *fecerunt* with a long penult, inasmuch as *fec-is-es-unt* might first lead to *fecissunt*, and then to *fecērunt*. The explanation however would altogether fail in the case of *scripsērunt*; unless indeed, as may well have been the case, a false analogy from the justifiable *fecērunt* led to the extension of the long penult.

The evidence of *εγραψα* was but now called in aid, but the Greek perfects also bear indisputable traces of the same formation. As *ε-τετυφ-εσαν*, and *ε-τετυφ-ην* of the past perfect have suffixes identical with *εσαν* and *ην* of the past tense of the substantive verb, the former representing the Lat. *erant*, while *ην*, contracted from *εαν*, represents the Lat. *eram*; and as *τετυφα*, i. e. *τετυφ-αμι*, has a suffix not unlike the verb *εμι* and precisely the same as our English *am*—so also the aspirate in *τετυφ-* may fairly be accepted

as the representative of the desired *s*, in accordance with the ordinary habit of the language.

But the case of *περιληκ-α* and verbs of similar form presents a new difficulty, but one which in the end will, it is thought, be found to confirm the doctrine here maintained. In the first place the aorists *εδωκα*, *εθηκα*, *ηκα*, exhibit the same guttural, and so far add to the probability of the theory which would assign to the first aorist and to the perfect a common origin. Buttmann, it is true, seems to consider this *κ* as a merely intrusive letter (see his *Gramm.* § 107, *Anm.* 17, note, p. 510); but this is a more convenient than trustworthy mode of eliminating difficulties. The *κ* no doubt had its office to perform, and I had first thought that the just explanation was to divide the word *πε-φιλ-ηκ-α*, so that *ηκ* should be the fuller and more correct form of the suffix seen in the verb *φιλ-ε-* 'love', just as *ver-ec-* is proved to be the older form of the Latin verb *vere-ri* 'to fear', by the derivative *ver-ec-undo-* and by the guttural of the modern words *fr-igh-t* and *fur-ch-t*, while the perfect participle *a-fr-ai-d* has again lost the guttural. Similarly *trabe-* 'a tree or beam' is shown to have once had a guttural both by the Latin *trabec-ula*, and by the Greek *τραφηκ-*. But a fuller consideration of the problem has resulted in the belief that *κ* of *περιληκα*, the aspirate of *τετυφα*, and the sibilant in *εγραψα* and *scripsi* are but varieties of the same element, viz. of the genitival suffix. This will be thought by many a rash interpretation, and those who reject every thing that has not received the imprimatur of the German school of philology, may perhaps designate it as a 'jeu d'esprit'. These critics will perhaps drop a little of their sarcasm, when they find that I am going to draw upon the *Vergleichende Grammatik* for part of my evidence. In § 269 of this work the Slavic genitive in *go*, as *to-go*, falls under consideration, and on the principle that the Slavic language readily interchanges sibilants with gutturals, it is inferred by Bopp that this suffix *go* represents the Sanskrit suffix *syā* of the same case. Schleicher on the other hand, and Miklosich, are quoted in the same

passage for the explanation that the guttural in question is a hardening of the semivowel *y* in the same suffix. The Latin and Greek languages indeed seem not to have known the initial *s* of this suffix *syā*¹, but merely *io* or *ios*, as seen in *λογο-ιο*, *quo-ius*, and so lend some support to this second explanation.

But even a third theory may be propounded, viz., that as a suffix *ios*, afterwards *is* and *os*, gives a better explanation of all the Greek and Latin, and of some of the Sanskrit genitives, the guttural we have before us may represent the final *s* rather than any initial *s* of the genitival case-ending. Be this as it may, it is admitted by three of the leading philologists of the continent, that in one member of the Indo-European the consonant of the genitival suffix assumes the sound of a guttural. Nor is this a solitary case. The all-honoured Sanskrit also presents a *k* in the plural genitive of the pronominal declension, *asmākam* 'of us', *yushmākam* 'of you'. A comparison of these cases with the instrumental and dative of the same number, *asmā-bhis*, *asma-bhyam* &c., tells us pretty plainly that as the *dathu* or base of the pronoun is *asmat* &c., and as *s* and *am* are suffixes of plurality like *s* and *um* in the Lat. *no-bis*, *equa-bus*, *equa-rum*, so the *k* and the *k* alone of *asmākam* &c. represents the *s*. Bopp, it is true, would fain derive these two Sanskrit forms from the possessive *asmāka* &c., as seen in the Veda-dialect, but this is to reverse the stream of derivation, unless indeed he be prepared to say that the Lat. adj. *cuius*, *-a*, *-um* is the parent of the Lat. gen. *cuius*. The theory which ascribes the *k* of *asmākam* to a genuine genitival suffix is again confirmed by the suffix *chu* of Slavic pronouns. Thus Bopp himself (§ 278) identifies the Slavic *tě-chŭ* 'horum' with the Sanskrit *tě-sam* of exactly the same power. Further the preposition *εκ* of the Greek language, so well calculated to fulfil the office of a genitival suffix, may itself be traced till it disappears in a

¹ Bopp's reference to *σημοσιο-* the adj. avails him not, as this is only a softening of a form *σημοσιο-* from the subst. *σημοτα-*.

mere sibilant. Thus it first takes a fuller form $\varepsilon\zeta$ or *ex*, and then in not a few cases loses its guttural. Thus the Latin *expanso-*, *extenso-*, *excurr-ere*, *exsecra-re*, *exhala-re*, *exi-re*, become severally *spaso*, *esteso*, *scorrere*, *esecrare*, *scialare*, and *escire* or *uscire*. The last verb enters the French as *issir* (obs.) or *ussir* (*reussir*). Again the Latin substantives *exitu-* and *textu-* pass through the French *issue* and *tissu* into the English *issue* and *tissue*. This consideration adds to the probability that the guttural and sibilant suffixes of the genitive may have a common origin in some form of which the preposition $\varepsilon\chi$ is itself one representative.

Enough then has perhaps been said in support of the doctrine that $\pi\epsilon\gamma\iota\lambda\eta\chi\alpha$ and $\epsilon\delta\omega\chi\alpha$ have in the guttural a substitute for the more common *s* of the genitival suffix.

The *u* of *colui*, *amaui* &c. claims our next consideration. I formerly threw out the idea that this *u* belonged to the substantive verb, and no doubt the verb *esse* had once an initial digamma. At any rate my own conviction on this point will remain, until the doctrine be upset which treats *esse* 'to eat' and *esse* 'to be' as identical, the first of the two meanings being the original. *Esca* 'food' and *uescor* 'I eat', go far to establish the claim of *esca* to a digamma; and the same is established for *esse* 'to be' by the German *wes-en* 'existence' and our English preterite *was*, as well as the German *war*. Notwithstanding this evidence I now hold that the *u* of *colui* &c. cannot justly be so explained, and for this reason. I am bound to claim some representative of the genitival suffix for *colui* as well as for *feci* and *scripsi*; but if the *u* of *colui* be the first letter of the substantival verb, it becomes pretty well impossible to account for the loss of the first *is* in the theoretic *col-is-uis-m*; for the compression of the two sibilants into one would have carried away the *u* also. I prefer therefore a very different theory, viz., that the genitival *s* first passed into a guttural, as in $\epsilon\delta\omega\chi\alpha$, $\pi\epsilon\gamma\iota\lambda\eta\chi\alpha$, and then into a *u*. The latter change is abundantly familiar to the Latin, as in *niv-is* from *nix*, *conniveo* beside *connixi*, *vivo* beside *vixi*, *Davo-* beside *Daco-*. Those who hesitate to give their sanction to this

doctrine will perhaps have their scruples removed, when they call to mind the fact that the modern Italian gives us *culse*, *valse*, *volsse* for the Latin *caluit*, *ualuit*, *uoluit*.

But what has just been said, as well as some previous remarks, suggest an enquiry of some moment. I am here again appealing to the modern dialects, as I did in an earlier part of the paper to the accent of the Italian *fa-cémmo*, and *fécero*, and the Spanish *hizimos*, and again to the appearance of a sibilant in the old French *fismes* &c. But is it reasonable to draw arguments in this way from languages which are themselves derived from the Latin, and so cannot honestly have come by aught which they have not inherited from their ancestor? The just answer I believe to be, that they are not strictly derivatives from the Latin, but rather from an under current of the old Italian language, which coexisted with the Latin of the higher classes in Roman Society, and which as a spoken language had a far wider domain than the language of books. The corruption of language is far more rapid in the drawing-room and the counting-house than in country districts where time is accounted of less moment. Thus our own provinces have for the most part fuller forms of sound than the favoured dialect of society; and thus also the bustling life of the Athenian led to a habit of contracting words which the Ionic of the country outside of Athens needed not, and much less the broad speech of Lacedaemon. This conservative tendency of the rustic mouth has no doubt at times something to balance it in that refinement of more civilized life which with occasional prudery rejects such forms as *aint*, *wont*, *I'm*, for the theoretically more correct 'is not', 'will not', 'I am'; but these, if I may call them, affectations, generally die out. I must further admit that when once the language of books becomes a dead language, and such is generally its fate, then all further power of contraction is lost; nay not unfrequently words which during the life of the language of books were in fact pronounced with a brevity beyond the written forms, resume almost of necessity the full pronunciation of every letter, much as

Talma, for example, in the play of Marie Stuart always called himself *Lei-ces-ter*, and a Londoner amuses a Scotchman by talking of Kircud-bright-shire instead of Kircúbri-shire. For these reasons I do not hesitate at times to attach more value to the evidence of the modern Romanic languages than to the classic writers of Rome.

But I revert to the theory that *fēci* is but a compression of a reduplicated *fefaci*, and to evidence in support of the view which the notes of Ritschl's edition afford. When I suggested in the Journal of Education (see above) that the perfect *uerri* &c. was compressed from *ueuerri* &c., I was perhaps so far incorrect, that I ought rather to have kept in view the old mode of spelling the word with an *o*, rather an *e*; and then treating *uor* as the root syllable, I should have given *uorr-* as the lengthened form, due to the imperfect tenses *uorro*, *uorrebam*, *uorram*, *uorrere*, and *ueuori* as the reduplicated perfect, which under compression would become first *ueuri*, and then by assimilation *uerri*. This premised I would request attention to two varieties of spelling which occur in the MSS. of Plautus. In the Sticus 2. 2. 50 the parasite on hearing of the arrival of Epignomus from abroad with vast wealth there acquired, takes an active part in getting the house ready for his reception, saying:

Hércle nero cápiam scopas átque hoc conuorrám lubens—

but soon after (2. 2. 67) at the news that the traveller had brought with him from abroad a good supply of parasites of his own, cries broken-hearted:

Reuórram hercle hóc quod conuerri modo—

‘I'll unsweep faith all this that I have just been sweeping’,

thus anticipating Dickens in his picture of the crossing-sweeper, who in this way ‘shut up shop’ every evening. In the line just quoted we had the future *reuorram* with an *o*, the perfect *conuerri* with an *e*, for I have copied strictly what is found in all the best, if not absolutely all the MSS. *Conuorri* in Ritschl's text is avowedly the alteration of the Editor in defiance of the MSS.

I next quote a passage from the Trinummus (3. 1. 15):

Prœpœmodum quid illic festinet sêntio et subolêt mihi:
Vt agro euortat Lêsbonicum, quândo eueritit aédibus—

Ritschl gives in his note: euortat *libri omnes*; eueritit *item omnes*; and then in his text writes an *o* in both forms, *euortat* and *euortit*. In the same play (2. 4. 133) *uorterit* stands in Ritschl's text, and incorrect as it no doubt is, may plead the sanction of one good MS.; but the Palimpsest again gives us *uerterit*.

Again in Pseud. 2. 3. 16 the text has *uortit* as an aorist; but again: "*libri omnes uertit*".

I turn to the Mercator and there find the compound with *prae* in three passages, which, if we take Ritschl for our guide, are severally (vv. 113, 377, 379):

Abige âbs te lassitûdinem: caue pigritiae praeuôrtier—
Ôtium non ést: mandatis rébus praeuorti uolo—
Réi mandatae omnis sapientis primum praeuorti decet—

But *praeuortier* in the first line is an arbitrary substitution by the editor for what all the MSS. have, viz. *praeuerteris*. Why the change was made, it is difficult to see. Was he afraid of the subjunctive? but the verb *caue* is habitually used with a subjunctive; indeed the infinitive seems only admissible in certain legal forms. Was it the perfect that he distrusted? *Caue dixeris* in Plaut. and Ter., and *caue faxis* in both Terence and Horace might have quieted all scruples on this head. Or lastly did he deem a reflective verb essential? I have already shown in the pages of our Society that the verbs *reuort-* and *deuort-* in the best Latin writers are always reflective in the imperfect tenses *reuortor*, *reuortebat*, *reuortar*, and inf. *reuorti*; never reflective in the perfect tenses, the simple form of the verb being then alone admissible. These two compounds of *uort-* would no doubt be found to obey the same law with *uort-* and *praeuort-*, as regards the vowels *e* and *o*. Unhappily the editors of our texts do not examine the MSS. with sufficient care in these little matters. Still I have no doubt that Cicero was an observer of the distinction, when I find that the Medicean MS. of Cicero's letters to Atticus has *deuorterer* in 8. 7, and *deuerterat* in 10. 16. 5. Indeed the only branch

of the rule in the ten other passages of Cicero that I have been able to note, is *deuenterentur* in the Or. pro Fonteio 5.

Another example in point is perhaps found in the case of the verb *uota-re*, as the old writers seem to have written what we are more familiar with in the form *uetare*. Nonius ascribes to Plautus in the *Asinaria* a perfect *uotitum est*, and the Palimpsest gives us in Trin. 2. 4. 73 *uotet*, in opposition, it is true, to all the other MSS., yet its authority in such a case is sufficient to outweigh them all. On the other hand we have *uetuit* in the Mercator 1. 1. 10, so far as the readings are reported; and *haruspex uetuit* in the Phormio of Terence.

In any future reading of the Plays of Plautus and other of the older writers, whose text is duly reported, I shall be careful to note such forms. Meanwhile I am bound to state that the Sticus in 2. 2. 27 has:—Hoc egomet, tu hoc conuerre—on the authority of the MSS. in general and perhaps of the Palimpsest. Ritschl has here given us *conuerre*, somewhat inconsistently it would appear. Yet he may perhaps be right. Just as we say *pry-thee* (from *pray*), and old authors wrote even *preethee*, owing to the *umlaut* caused by the vowel-sound of *thee*, and as the Latin has *uelim*, *uelle*, and I may add the imperative *uel* 'or' (i. e. *uele*), all with an *e* in opposition to the *o* of *uolo*, *uolumus*, so the imperative of *conuorrr-* may have been *conuerre*. Still I suspect that Plautus wrote *conuorre*.

These considerations fully account for the prevalence of an *e* in the perfect, such a form as *fe-fac-i* being first reduced to *fef'ci* and then to *fēci*. Precisely in the same way I contend that the reduplicated *dedisti* not unfrequently passed through a shortened form *dedsti* to *dēsti*; and *dederunt* to *dedrunt*, if not to *de'runt*. The suppression of the middle vowel in *dederunt* is practically exhibited in those inscriptions of Pesaro which have *dedrot* or *dedro* (or *DIDRO*) for *dederont*. See Corssen as above 1. 260. But the metres of the Comic poets place the matter pretty well beyond dispute. Thus with the abbreviated pronunciation of *dedisti* &c. we have all we could wish in the four *senarii*:

Trin. 1. 2. 90: Dédistin argentum?—Factum, neque facti piget.

— 1. 2. 92: Dédistin hoc facto gládium qui se occideret.

Most. 3. 1. 115: Sed árraboni has dédit quadragintá minas.

Ter. Ad. 3. 4. 54: Is quód mi de hac re déderit consilium, id sequar.

and so in the five octonarii:

Curc. 2. 3. 66: Dédistin argentum? inquam. Immo apút tarpessitám
situmst.

Men. 4. 3. 18: Túte ultro ad me détulisti, dédisti eam donó mihi.

Amph. 2. 2. 129: Dédisse dono hodié qua te illi donatum'sse dixeras.

Trin. 4. 2. 57: Ábipson istas ácepisti?—E mánibus dédit mi ipse ín
manus.

Rud. 4. 4. 127: Ét bulla aureást, patér quam dédit mi natalí die.

As also in the Iambic tetrameter of Terence, Eun. 5. 8. 15:

Illúmne qui mi dédit consilium ut fácerem, an me qui ausús siem.

So many examples might well have allayed the doubts of the German editor, but in spite of this he refuses all assent to the doctrine that these forms are entitled to a shortened pronunciation; and accordingly he calls in aid all his ingenuity so as to doctor every offending line either by cancelling some little word or by transposition, as may be seen in the Prolegomena to the Trinummus p. 125 &c. Yet occasionally he seems to repent of his rash changes, and accordingly the line from the Mostellaria, which he had corrected after his fashion in the said Prolegomena (p. 125), when he comes to edit the play itself, is allowed to stand precisely as the MSS. have it. As I have referred on several occasions already to the Romanic languages by way of supporting what has been stated, so here too it may be noted that in Italian *dedisti* and *dedistis* have taken the shape *desti* and *deste*, and that the tense corresponding to *dedissem* has throughout compressed the first two syllables into *dess-*; and even *dederunt* besides its ordinary representative *diédero* has in poetry the shorter forms *diero* and *dier*. Again the Spanish gives us for the tense which corresponds to the Latin *dedi*: *di*, *diste*, *diò*; *dimos*, *distes*, *dièron*; as also *dièra* for *dederam* &c., *dièsse* for *dedissem* &c. Similarly in Portuguese we find what is still nearer our assumed pronunciation of the Latin; viz. for the tense *dedi* &c., *dei*, *dèste*, *deo*; *démos*, *déstes*, *dérão*; *déra* for *dederam* &c., *dèsse* for *dedissem* &c.

I have read Corssen's explanation of such shortened syllables in the Latin language, yet I cannot but think that his whole theory of 'irrational', that is incommensurable, syllables is a groundless refinement.

I close the paper with a remark, which, though not belonging to the Latin perfect, is yet suggested by what has been said above. The doctrine of the perfect has its counterpart in the theory that the future should present a form *to*. This preposition so familiar to ourselves had its representative in the Latin language, as I have pointed out in a former paper. As our own *at* and *to* are substantially the same word, being both of them abbreviations of an older *adu*, so the former is undoubtedly represented by the Latin *ad*. It is therefore not improbable that *to* also may have been known to the old Latin, and accordingly I find it in the future imperatives *scribito*, *scribitote*. Madvig has distinctly pointed out that these forms are exclusively used of the future, as opposed to the present *scribe*, *scribite*. Again the Sanskrit *kartāsmi* 'I shall do' has between the base *kar* and the substantive verb *asmi* a syllable *ta*, which I should be disposed at once to claim for my preposition, but for the theory supported by Bopp and others, that this tense is formed by prefixing to the said verb 'I am' *karta*, the nominative of the noun *kartri* 'doer', as proved by the third person, which dropping the substantival verb altogether, is represented by the three nominatives S. *kartā*, D. *kartarau*, P. *kartaras*. Bopp also deduces the Latin participle *daturus* from the sb. *dator* 'a giver'. After all may not the true explanation be consistent with both views. As regards the Latin language I long ago contended that the so-called suffix *tor* of agents really contained two suffixes, of which *or* alone represented 'man', being substantially identical with the ordinary noun *vir* 'man'. Thus *da-t-or* may mean 'a man to give'; and assuredly 'I am the man to give' constitutes a far more intelligible future than 'I am a giver'. I would also note that the simple phrase 'to let' is with us expressive of a future.

P.S. To the twenty six verbs quoted above (p. 174) as having in the prefix *re-* an equivalent for our *un-*, may be added some fifteen others, *recan-* = *recanta-*, *redargu-* 'disprove', *referu-* (Cic. Brut. 91) 'become cool again', *refrena-* 'unbridle', *religa-* (Catul., Lucan.) 'unbind', *relin-* 'unwax' so to say, *re-ne-* 'unspin', *renuda-* 'unbare', *repect-* 'uncomb' so to say or 'dishevel', *resolu-* 'unbind', *restring-* (Plaut. Capt.) 'open', *resuto-* 'unsewn', *retura-* (compared with *obtura-*) 'uncork, open', *reuolu-* 'unroll'.

XX.—A QUERY ON THE PHRASE *DIAMETRICALLY OPPOSED*. BY R. F. WEYMOUTH, ESQ.

Probably few students of the English language, who have any acquaintance with Logic, would judge it to be very unlikely that the adjective *diametrical* and its derivative adverb, as they are commonly used, are borrowed from the logicians, and in their original sense have exclusive reference to "contradictory" propositions. At any rate this seems highly probable. *Ἡ διάμετρος* (sc. *γραμμῇ*) of the Greek mathematicians, was not only a certain line in a circle or a sphere; but also, and much more commonly, the diagonal of a parallelogram. So the term is used by Plato, Aristotle, Euclid, and others. Now the logicians invented a "schema oppositionum", in which the universal affirmative (A) and the particular negative (O), and again the universal negative (E) and the particular affirmative (I), were exhibited at the opposite extremities of the *διάμετροι* of a square. Thus these "contradictories" were *ἐκ διαμέτρου ἀντικείμεναι*, *ex diametro oppositæ*.