

## CORRESPONDENCE.

## ON MR. WALKER'S 'PHILOLOGICAL NOTES.'

SIR,—Mr. Walker's suggestions are very ingenious, but I am afraid that some of them are scarcely tenable.

(1) He supposes that *φέρω* is \* *φέροα*, and \* *φέροα* is an Indo-European *bhero-izn*, with 'secondary' personal termination. It is quite true that 'secondary' terminations could be used almost anywhere, but I do not think that even Dr. Wackernagel has proved that they could be used in the present indicative. But supposing that they could, the 1st person in *-ō* is firmly fixed as Indo-European by the converging testimony of the Teutonic languages (*nīma*, pointing back to a long final vowel in I.-E.), Lithuanian (*vezū*), and isolated forms even in Bactrian and Sanskrit (Curtius, *Verbum* I. 42, who gives the evidence though he does not accept the conclusion, and Brugmann in Iwan-Müller's *Handbuch* II. 72). Mr. Walker might answer that the I.-E. *-ō* is *-ōm* with the *m* dropped, just as undoubtedly the I.-E. nominative of the word 'ox' was *uksō*, *uksōn*, and *uksōns* according to circumstances. Very well, but why does he go out of the way to find a different origin for *φέρω*? And how does he account for the long vowel in his supposed *-ōm*? But further, if we allow him the I.-E. *bhero-izn*, it is quite true that it would become \* *φέροα*; but then it would have had to remain \* *φέροα* into historical times. Can Mr. Walker produce any case where an intervocalic semi-vowel has vanished without leaving a hiatus visible somewhere in our extant Greek? For I hope he does not continue to believe that *ἐφίλησα* is \* *ἐφιλε-με-σα* (Meyer, *Griech. Gramm.*, 1st ed. p. 59). As to *δεῖδω*, the hiatus-form is represented by *δεῖδια*, which is obviously \* *δεῖδωα*; and moreover there is no necessity for *δεῖδω* to conceal a perfect at all. It may be a present, *δεῖω* for *δωεῖω*, like *τεῖω* (better spelling) for *γειω*, and the scribes may have put in the second *δ* on the analogy of *δεῖδια* and *δεῖδιμεν* when those forms were well established. Altogether, therefore, there seems no reason for disturbing the prevalent view that *φέρω* is an almost unaltered Indo-European word.

(2) Mr. Walker's third person plural in *-si* is much

more attractive, because it accounts for a real difficulty, the apparent intrusion of the 'primary' *-nti* into a series of 'secondary' persons. I hope it may be right, and I would suggest another bridge from *-σι* to *-ασι* besides Mr. Walker's. The 3rd plural of *γέγονα*, according to Mr. Walker, would be \* *γέγα-σι*, whereas the plural of \* *πέφωνα* (as the word must have been) would be \* *πέφαν-σι* (the *α* and the *ν* being both irreducible parts of the root). There is at once a series, \* *γσι*, \* *γέγασι*, \* *πέφασι*, and room for any quantity of analogy. Only we are forgetting the vanishing of *σ*. Are we to say, as we say for *-οισι* and *-ήσα*, that in the *σ*-less period people dutifully said \* *γέγαῖ* and *πέφαῖ*, but when intervocalic sibilancy was re-licensed they restored the *σ* on the analogy of \* *γσι* and \* *πέπραξι*? (When Mr. Walker says \* *πέφουξι*, he makes the *κ*-perfect too old, or the *-σι* termination come down too late.) As to *vidēre*, has Mr. Walker considered the claims of the Sanskrit 3rd plural middle in *tasthūrē*, etc.? (Fick in *Gött. Gel., Anz.* 1883, p. 591.)

(3) I do not quite understand Mr. Walker's remarks about the terminations of the perfect, the aorist, and the imperfect in Sanskrit. He says, 'If we confine our view to the Latin and Greek languages, no one would hesitate to identify the endings of the Greek aorist with those of the perfect. . . . But neither is there anything in Sanskrit which forbids us to identify the two sets of terminations. The truth is that Sanskrit has travelled along another path, and has given all its aorists in the main the terminations of the imperfect.' Does Mr. Walker mean that the Sanskrit aorist once had *-tha* in its 2nd singular, and *-a* in its 3rd person singular? That would be slightly supported by *ἦσθα*, but it would require overwhelming evidence from other sources besides. Or is he only thinking of the 3rd plural, and maintaining that the thematic aorist originally had *-us*, like the unthematic aorists and the perfect? I suspect that the latter is his meaning, but I wish he had stated it more explicitly.

T. C. SNOW.

## MR. PAGE ON CRITICAL EDITIONS OF THE CLASSICS.

I THINK some of the readers of the CLASSICAL REVIEW must have been a little startled at Mr. Page's eloquent denunciation of critical editions in the last number. It would be interesting to know whether his condemnation applies to editions of Shakespeare and of the Greek Testament, as well as to Horace and (we must presume) to such books as Munro's *Lucretius* and Ritschl's *Plautus*. To use his own figure, I should have thought that, as 'the weary traveller' would prefer an oasis with a well

cleared out and bricked in, to one in which the spring was wasted in sand and mud, so any reader of a classical author would prefer a pure text to one full of corruption, and smothered with the voluminous notes of the conscientious editor, vainly striving to make sense out of nonsense. To my mind the restorer of a genuine text deserves at least as much gratitude and honour from scholars, as the digger of a well from the inhabitants of the desert.

M. A.