

**Platt, James, jun. 1882–1883. Letters from James Platt junior to Eduard Sievers.  
Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig, Nachlass Eduard Sievers, NL 203/4/1/352 to 365.  
Digital images and transcription (Stephen Laker, Transcriber) [Data set].**

**Table of Contents**

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>LIST OF SOURCES USED BY PLATT .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>LETTER 1 (13/11/1882) 203/4/1/352.....</b>	<b>4</b>
TRANSCRIPT OF LETTER 1 .....	13
<b>LETTER 2 (20/11/1882) 203/4/1/353.....</b>	<b>16</b>
TRANSCRIPT OF LETTER 2 .....	24
<b>LETTER 3 (25/11/1882) 203/4/1/354.....</b>	<b>26</b>
TRANSCRIPT OF LETTER 3 .....	30
<b>LETTER 4 (6/12/1882) 203/4/1/355.....</b>	<b>31</b>
TRANSCRIPT OF LETTER 4 .....	37
<b>LETTER 5 (18/12/1882) 203/4/1/356.....</b>	<b>39</b>
TRANSCRIPT OF LETTER 5 .....	45
<b>LETTER 6 (23/12/1882) 203/4/1/357.....</b>	<b>47</b>
TRANSCRIPT OF LETTER 6 .....	51
<b>LETTER 7 (28/12/1882) 203/4/1/358.....</b>	<b>53</b>
TRANSCRIPT OF LETTER 7 .....	55
<b>LETTER 8 (3/1/1883) 203/4/1/359.....</b>	<b>56</b>
TRANSCRIPT OF LETTER 8 .....	62
<b>LETTER 9 (10/1/1883) 203/4/1/360.....</b>	<b>64</b>
TRANSCRIPT OF LETTER 9 .....	68
<b>LETTER 10 (1883) 203/4/1/361.....</b>	<b>69</b>
TRANSCRIPT OF LETTER 10 .....	77
<b>LETTER 11 (17/1/1883) 203/4/1/362.....</b>	<b>79</b>
TRANSCRIPT OF LETTER 11 .....	81
<b>LETTER 12 (25/1/1883) 203/4/1/363.....</b>	<b>82</b>
TRANSCRIPT OF LETTER 12 .....	90
<b>LETTER 13 (29/1/1883) 203/4/1/364.....</b>	<b>92</b>
TRANSCRIPT OF LETTER 13 .....	94
<b>LETTER 14 (3/2/1883) 203/4/1/365.....</b>	<b>95</b>
TRANSCRIPT OF LETTER 14 .....	99

## Introduction

Images of James Platt junior's letters to Eduard Sievers are reproduced with the permission of Leipzig University Library (Creative Commons licence CC0 1.0; see <https://www.ub.uni-leipzig.de/forschungsbibliothek/open-digitization-policy>). I have transcribed the letters to allow for easier reading. Underlining is used irregularly by Platt to indicate cited wordforms from Old English (or other languages) or to emphasise particular words or thoughts of his own. Missing letters lost to a hole punch are given in square brackets in cases where they are not immediately obvious. Punctuation (e.g. commas or lack thereof) has not been altered. Letterheads with addresses are not written out in full. The transcribed sheets are numbered as according to Letter number, Sheet number, and TIFF image number received from Leipzig University Library; these appear in the transcript in square brackets in blue type (e.g. [L5/S4/034] = Letter 5, Sheet 4, TIFF 034). In some instances, the numbering of the TIFF images does not match the chronological order of the sheets of the actual letters, so I have ordered the images according to what seems to me the correct (see e.g. Letter 10). On rare occasions, some words in the letters are underlined in turquoise or grey crayon. Probably these highlights were made by either Sievers or Henry Sweet, but this cannot be determined with certainty (note that Sweet borrowed the letters from Sievers in early February 1883, see Van Baalen 2018: 304). For further discussion of these letters, see Amos van Baalen's article 'A Curious Case of Plagiarism in the Nineteenth Century: James Platt Jr and the Philological Society' in *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* volume 78 (2018) and my article 'James Platt junior's Contributions to Old English Grammar' in *Transactions of the Philological Society* (forthcoming).

Stephen Laker

Fukuoka, 16 December 2025

### List of sources used by Platt

- Ancient Laws = Thorpe, Benjamin. 1840. *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England* (etc.). 2 vols. London: Record Commission.
- Ælf. Gram. = Zupitza, Julius (ed.). 1880. *Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Blick. Glosses = Blickling Glosses, in O.E.T.
- B.T. = Bosworth, Joseph & T. Northcote Toller. 1898. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [NB. Only a part of Toller's revision of Bosworth's dictionary had been published at the time of Platt's letters.]
- Chron. = Thorpe, Benjamin (ed.). 1861. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, According to the Several Original Authorities*. 2 vols. London: Longman.
- C.D. / Cod. Dip. = Kemble, John M. 1839–1848. *Codex diplomaticus aevi saxonici*. 6 vols. London: Sumptibus Societatis.
- Gram. = Sievers, Eduard. 1882. *Angelsächsische Grammatik*. Halle: Niemeyer.
- Hept. = Thwaites, Edward. 1698. *Heptateuchus* (etc.). Oxford: Sheldonian.
- Hom. / Ælf. Hom. = Thorpe, Benjamin (ed.). 1844. *The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church. The First Part, Containing the Sermones Catholici, or Homilies of Ælfric*. London: Ælfric Society.
- Kent gl. = Zupitza, Julius. 1877. Kentische Glosses des neuen Jahrhunderts. *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum* 21. 1–59.
- Leechd. = Cockayne, T. Oswald. 1864–1866. *Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Starcraft of Early England. Being a Collection of Documents, for the Most Part Never Before Printed, Illustrating the History of Science in this Country Before the Norman Conquest*. 3 vols. London: Longmans.
- Legends of Holy Rood = Morris, Richard (ed.). 1871. *Legends of the Holy Rood, Symbols of the Passion and Cross Poems*. (Early English Text Society o.s. 46). London: Trubner.
- Liber Psalmorum = Thorpe, Benjamin (ed.). 1835. *Libri Psalmorum versio antiqua Latina; cum paraphrasi Anglo-Saxonica, partim soluta oratione, partim metricè composita; nunc primum e Cod. MS. in Bibl. Regia Parisiensi adservato*. Oxford: E Typographeo Academico.
- Liber Scintillarum = Platt Jr was editing this manuscript for the Early English Text Society (EETS) at the time of writing letters to Sievers, but he gave up on the task due to the affair with Sweet and Sievers. An EETS edition of the manuscript was later published by Ernest Wood Rhodes in 1889.
- Narr. / Narrat. = Cockayne, T. Oswald. 1861. *Narratiunculae Anglice conscriptae. De pergamenis exscribebas notis illustrabat eruditio copiam*. London: Smith.
- O.E.T. / O.E. Texts = Sweet, Henry (ed.). 1885. *The Oldest English Texts*. Early English Text Society, o.s. 83. London: Trübner. [Platt and Sievers both had access to a pre-published version of this book.]
- Oros. = Bosworth, Joseph (ed. and transl.). 1858. *King Alfred's Anglo-Saxon Version of the Compendious History of the World by Orosius*. London: Longman. [Sweet's edition was published in 1883.]
- Poesie / Grein = Grein, Christian W. M. 1964. *Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Poesie in kritisch bearbeiteten Texten und mit vollständigem Glossar*. Cassel / Göttingen: Wigand.
- Shr. / Shrine = Cockayne, T. Oswald. 1864. *The Shrine: A Collection of Occasional Papers on Dry Subjects*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Wt. / Wright = Wright, Thomas (ed.). 1857. *A Volume of Vocabularies*. Privately printed.
- Zeuner = Zeuner, Rudolf. 1881. *Die Sprache des kentischen Psalters*. Halle: Niemeyer.

203/4/1/352

Platz

James

London.

77. & 78. St. Martin's Lane, W.C.

~~26. 27. 28. & 29. Cranbourn Street, W.C.~~

~~& 7. Great Newport St.~~

Professor Rivers.

Dear Sir

13/11/1882.

My friend Henry Sweet  
has given me your address  
& I beg to enclose you a few  
of the remarks suggested to  
me on reading your excellent  
"Grammatische". If you desire  
to correspond further on any of  
these points I shall be glad  
to hear from you or I shall  
be glad to hear from you  
& correspond with you occasionally  
in any case. I will send you  
as soon as I get them <sup>copy</sup>  
of some "aufsätze" Kälbing has  
printed in the "Englische Studien"  
for me & of anything else  
I do in the future. You will see



from them (& from ~~enclosed~~)  
 that I study A. S. in the <sup>newest</sup>  
school which we owe to your  
germanys & which is so little  
 known here that Sweet told  
 me I & he were the only two  
 men who work this way in  
 England.

I am going to  
 edit an A. S. text for the Early  
English Text Soc. — the "Liber  
Scintillarum" — given me by  
 my friend Furnivall to do  
 & will let you know how I  
 get on. Zupitza recommended  
 it to me as a good text to do.

I hope to get a review  
 of your "Gram." in our  
 "Athenaeum" but unfortunately  
 we have so few chances of  
 printing anything of the  
 kind in this country.

yours faithfully  
 James Platt. jun.

Pages

263/4/1/352

20, 165

the red in Ælfred is most likely short - Sweet & I have come ~~independently~~ to that conclusion - Ælfryd occurs in the Dialogues of Gregory (M.S.) cf. brīht - fep - wold & other shortenings in names

66

like lp to ld so pl becomes dl as in nūdl for instance Psalter has still pl (see Zeuner)

82

like dæg dagas go two long roots mæg mágas (rarely mægas) & mæd (not the fem. mæd but a masc. in the charters for example Cod. Dip. II 18) mādās (Cod. Dip. I 261)

85

calu is only used in nom. & acc. I have never seen gen. or dat. alof supplies those two cases

feoru is certainly a wo stem (feorwe dat. beechd. II 132) deaw is both masc. (Ælf. 82.) & neut. (Ælf. 82.)



88 *līgetu* *īlfetu* are errors of  
yours *līgetu* is neuter pl.  
not fem. sg. *īlfetu* is a  
late W.S. error for *īlfete*  
(the oblique cases are *in - an*)

92, 93 you have added the fem.  
gen. *īas* in note but have  
forgotten *īs* ~~*īas*~~ (*pāre - Hall. 7XII*)  
*īs* (<sup>*pāre*</sup> Dent. XI) *cīs* & *eowes*  
(these two in Ives' laws)

92, 165 besides *gecynd* &c. *gebyrd*  
*gemyht* *gesceapt* *xrist* &  
*lyft* are neut. as well as fem.

94 there are gen. and dat. *hāda*  
& gen. *felda* in Bede  
also the pls. *xppla* *hearga*  
are n-decl. forms  
in the fem. *nosu* has  
gen. & dat. *in - a* & you  
have also forgotten the dat.  
*plōra* (like *velda* *worda* &c.)

- \* the words *hnytte* study  
 gen. dat. *hnytte styde*  
 pl. *hnytte styde* - *durn*  
 also has *dyre* in gen. &  
 dat. & cp. *sealwyda* chron. 878
- 96 *rā slā* are wrong *rā*  
 stands for *rāga* which  
 occurs in *Sechid.* & is  
 more. The fern. is *rāge*  
*slāge* is the only form  
 I know of for the other
- 97 the gen. of *bāc* & is only  
 rarely & incorrectly *bēc*  
 properly *bāce gāte burge* &  
 cp. *mannes* with dat. *mann*  
*mōdor* with dat. *mēder*  
 (but fern. *mēder* like *bēc*  
 Nam. I 66)
- 98 add to your list *gyrch* dat.  
 & pl. *gyrch* & also *grūt*



- dat. grift but pl. with  
 added a grifta (as ~~if~~  
 +menn - as would be, the  
 opl. grift with the regular  
 fern. pl. a added)
- 97 not only éage éare but also  
 wange are neut. n-decl  
 alop has not only nom. & gen.  
 but also dat. & acc. & gen. pl.  
 alopa (taws) in printed text  
 it is neut. (Leech. II 20) not <sup>max.</sup>
- 103 rich certainly does not make  
 rines regularly only riiges
- 106 ang not ange is the nom.  
 parallel to erge like hang  
 to strange  
 the apparent cases of ange  
 in frein are adverbs the  
 use of adverbs in the phrase  
 him was - on his side &c.  
 being an idiom common in old.



- 109 like *hædre* to *hæder* <sup>352</sup>  
 I take *sefe* to be from  
*æfor*
- 118 you have forgotten the  
 Fern. gen. & dat. *gehwære*  
 (see *frein* for examples)  
 beside *gehwæres*  
 also you must add the  
 compounds *læchwá* *læchwile*  
*læchwæper* &c.
- 131 *seon* makes <sup>+</sup>*sáh* <sup>+</sup>*siwon*  
*siwen* (Goth. <sup>+</sup>*saihw* ~~*sihw*~~  
<sup>+</sup>*saihwum* <sup>+</sup>*saihwans*) cf.  
*seon* *seah* *sawon* *sewen*  
*asiwen* *seehd.* II 124  
*biseon* = *bisiwen* as *gléo*  
 = *gliw* cf. also *siwen-ige*
- 133 you omit the *sg.* verbs  
*cedran* <sup>(a)</sup>*cwedran* <sup>(a)</sup>*cwinca*

gedran in your list  
of this class

152 there is a real west Sax.  
mutated ~~conf.~~ of dōn  
dé in Diplom. 131 x Leech.

III 38

166 here & elsewhere you make  
prefix a- long —  
but A. S. ā is rig. ai  
(except in 'aw) — then  
again the rig. low German  
ā for ar is preserved  
in A. S. before nouns &  
adj. where it was accented  
as æ' dialectal é that  
is the correct A. S. representative  
of original ā

'erist (dial. erist) x arisan  
 are just like b'igeng x <sup>begin</sup>  
 x the modern English  
 preserves the quantity of  
 both in pairs like

- calum (x'cumba) arise  
 byway become -  
 then again ar-xfuan  
 where A. S. preserved the r  
 before the vowel was often  
 incorrectly analysed by the  
 "volks-etymologie" as a-rxfuan  
 • x a rxfuan derived from it  
 besides xfuan - this  
 could not have been done  
 if a had been long.  
 I have explained this to  
 Sweet x he agrees with me.

([L1/S10/010], probably the back of Sheet 9, is blank and not reproduced here.)



## Transcript of Letter 1

[L1/S1/001]

[LETTERHEAD]

13/11/1882

Professor Sievers.

Dear Sir

My friend Henry Sweet has given me your address & I beg to enclose you a few of the remarks suggested to me on reading your excellent “Grammatik”. If you desire to correspond further on any of these points I shall be glad to hear from you or I shall be glad to hear from you & correspond with you occasionally in any case. I will send you copy [the position of word ‘copy’ is unclear, SL] as soon as I get them of some “aufsätze” Kölbing has printed in the “Englische Studien” for me & of anything else I do in the future. You will see

[L1/S2/002]

from them (& from enclosed) that I study A.S. in the newest school which we owe to your Germany & which is so little known here that Sweet told me I & he were the only two men who work this way in England.

I am going to edit an A.S. text for the Early English Text Soc. — the “Liber Scintillarum” — given me by my friend Furnivall to do & will let you know how I get on. Zupitza recommended it to me as a good text to do.

I hope to get a review of your “Gram.” in our “Aethenaeum”, but unfortunately we have so few chances of printing anything of the kind in this country.

Yours faithfully

James Platt, jun.

[L1/S3/003]

Pages

20, 165

the red in Ælfred is most likely short — Sweet & I have come independently to that conclusion — Ælfryd occurs in the Dialogues of Gregory (MS.) cp. -briht, -ferþ -wold & other shortenings in names  
66

Like lp to ld so pl becomes dl as in nædl for instance Psalter has still pl (see Zeuner)

82

like dæg dagas go two long roots mæg mágas (rarely mægas) & snæd (not the fem. snæd but a masc. in the charters for example Cod. Dip. III 18) snádas (Cod. Dip. I 261)

85

ealu is only used in nom. & acc. I have never seen gen. or dat. aloþ supplies these two cases

teoru is certainly a wō stem (teorwe dat. Leechd. II 132)

déaw is both masc. (Ælf. Gr.) & neut. (Hept.)

[Some words/characters at the bottom right of the page are cut off and thus illegible in the image, SL]

[L1/S4/004]

88

lígetu ielfetu are errors of yours lígetu is neuter pl. not fem. sg. ielfetu is a late W.S. error for ielfete (the oblique cases are in -an)

92, 93

you have added the fem. gen. éas in note but have forgotten æs sæs (þære - Matt. xxii) sæs (þære Deut. xi) cús & eowes (these two in Ines laws)

92, 165

besides gecynd &c. gebyrd genyht gesceaft ærist & lyft are neut. as well as fem.

94

there are gen. and dat. háda & gen. felda in Bede also the pls. æppla hearga are u- decl. forms in the fem. nosu has gen. & dat. in -a & you have also forgotten the dat. flóra (like felda forda &c.)

[\[L1/S5/005\]](#)

& the words hnutu studu gen. dat. hnyte styde pl. hnyte styde – duru also has dyre in gen. & dat. & cp. Sealwyrda Chron. 878

96

rá slá are wrong rá stands for rága which occurs in Leechd. & is masc. the fem. is ræge sláge is the only form I know of for the other

97

the gen. of bóc &c. is only rarely & incorrectly béc properly bóce gáte burge &c. cp. mannes with dat. menn módor with dat. méder (but gen. méder like béc Hom. I 66)

98

add to your list furh dat. & pl. fyrch & also grút

[\[L1/S6/006\]](#)

dat. grýt but pl. with added a grýta (as  $\mathfrak{H}^+$  menn – as would be, the pl. grýt with the regular fem. pl. a added)

97

not only éage éare but also wange are neuts. n-decl. aloþ has not only nom. & gen. but also dat. & acc. & gen. pl. aloþa (Laws) in printed texts it is neut. (Leech. III 20) not masc.

103

rúh certainly does not make rúwes regularly only rúges

106

aug not auge is the nom. parallel to enge like str[o]ng to strenge

the apparent cases of auge in Grein are adverbs the use of adverbs in the phrase him wæs - on his móde &c. being an idiom common in A.S.

[\[L1/S7/007\]](#)

109

like hádre to hádor I take æfre to be from áfor

118

you have forgotten the fem. gen. & dat. gehwære (see Grein for examples) beside gehwæs also you must add the compounds lóchwá lóchwile lóchwæper &c.

131

séon makes  $^+$ sáh  $^+$ siwon siwen (Goth.  $^+$ saihw ~~sihwum~~  $^+$ saihwum  $^+$ saihwans) cp. séon séah sáwon sewen asiwen Leechd. II 124 biséon = bisiwen as gléo = gliw cp. also siwen-ige

133

you omit the stg. verbs ceorran (a) cweorran (a) cwincan

[\[L1/S8/008\]](#)

georran in your list of this class

152



there is a real West Sax. mutated conj. cf. dón dé in Diplom. 131 & Leech. III 38

166

here & elsewhere you make prefix a- long – but A.S. á is orig. ai (except in áw) – then again the orig. Low German á for ar is preserved in A.S. before nouns & adj. where it was accented as æ dialectal é that is the correct A.S. representative of original á

[\[L1/S9/009\]](#)

árist (dial. érist) & arisan are just like bígeng & begán & the modern English preserves the quantity of both in pairs like

oakum (æcumba) arise

byway                      become –

then again ar-æfnan where A.S. preserved the r before the vowel was often incorrectly analysed by the “volksetymologie” as a-ræfnan & a ræfnan derived from it besides æfnan – this could not have been done if a- had been long. I have explained this to Sweet & he agrees with me.

[\[L1/S10/010 is a blank sheet\]](#)

[L2/S1/011]

203/4/1/353

London,

77. & 78. St. Martin's Lane,

26, 27, 28. & 29. Cranbourn Street, W.C.

& 7. Great Newport St.

Prof. R. Sievers.

20/11/1882.

Dear Sir

I have to thank you  
for your kind & instructive  
letter & make a few other  
remarks that may be of use  
to you.

Strong verbs.

you have cidan in Gram. but  
I only know it as weake pr. cidde.  
you have cridan with ? against  
it but the pr. pl. cridun Matt.  
21.35 seems to place it beyond  
doubt.

Your letter gives medcan with ?

probably because you only know  
the mealc you mention as proof  
of its being strong. I therefore  
direct your attention to the mealc  
Shrine 61.

you should write hwésan (not  
hwósan) from the 3d. pers. sg.  
hwést teach. III 122 cf. also  
hwósta. wépan is the  
same class - both -fan verbs -  
+ hwósfan + wépfan.

hwínan is a probable strong verb  
you have forgotten - also what  
is scrwen in the poetry?

A clear strong verb you omit  
to notice is stenan present  
tense in Liber Paludum (Thyph)  
p. 90 pres. asten for astan  
(like stal from stelan) Sweet's O.E.T.  
page 122 (Bibl. Glosses).



The rán you speak of from  
rínan = rignan is very interesting.  
 Can you give me the reference  
 where you found it?

I have observed several differences in  
 the E. & late A.S. especially in  
 genders i.e. when a noun has  
 2 or 3 genders I find they did  
 not exist at the same time but  
 were different in early & late A.S.

Thus the dic you mention is M  
 in early, F only in late A.S.

Ance is early, anora late.

elpend ielpend early, ielp late.

(I explain this thus - elpend occurred  
 mostly in elpen(d)ban. The

"etymologic" root elpen(d)

as gyld-en & divided it

elp-enban. Hence the new noun

ielp ylp.

mid.

The rule might be that perm. wá

stems retain the -u after shorts  
as in sionu not after longs as  
in this mīd which is the correct  
nom. Elf. Gr. 313. In the Slighe  
case there is a fluctuation between  
w forms & others without w  
formed direct from the nom.  
Thus (all from cod. Dip. III)

<u>on mīd</u> 194	<u>on mīduwa</u> 52, 405
<u>on mīde</u> 416	<u>Fire mīdwan</u> 36, 165
<u>mīde gen.</u> 53	
<u>pa mīde</u> 53	

The a in mīda (O.E.T.) mīduwa  
(above) is puzzling. Is Fire mīdwan  
a later -an for old -a as sometimes  
happens (duran for dura)?  
Or ~~has~~ mīda mīduwa lost -u?

calu.

I am sure the I stem is the  
explanation of this. In fact  
I ought to have been fuller in  
my first letter but had written



203/4/1/353

London,

77. &amp; 78, St. Martin's Lane,

26, 27, 28. &amp; 29, Cranbourn Street, W.C.

&amp; 7, Great Newport St.

20 Jan / 1882.

about the word with full references  
 in my paper which will appear  
 in the next "Englische Studien"  
 and of which I meant to (x mile)  
 send you a copy. You are wrong  
 in speaking of the "nom." ~~x~~ calop  
 in your gram. and it was  
 a slip of mine to refer you to  
 tech. III 20 for the acc. as that  
 is a dat. The truth is that  
calop does not occur in nom.  
 acc. sing. or more correctly  
calu is the nom. acc. sing. of  
calop gen. dat. Referring you  
 to my paper for full details

I give here only one reference  
(Seech. II 268) ~~to show~~ which is  
good as showing at once gender  
"declension of calu". It is

"Do healfne bollan calod  
to & gehæte þæt calu."

The clut in Thomsen  
had escaped my notice & I had  
also forgotten O. N. clpr which  
cannot be the oldest Scandinavian,  
as the clut shows.

Along with calu I have  
mentioned in my paper that  
hæle seems to be a similar þ  
stem. Hæle as you will see in  
frein is purely a singular.

(The "pl." <sup>in</sup> Béowulf he gives is  
a singular). Hælep would be  
the correct plur. of hæle & hælep  
in the sing. is a later mistake.



Another discovery proved  
in the same paper is that  
léo both m x F inserts n  
in the dat. sing. x pl. (but  
not in the other cases) regularly  
thus léonan pl. léonum,  
or when weak decl. (as sometimes  
happens) léone pl. léonum,  
(léonan sg. flos. Frag. 110 léone Alg. f. 309)

### úhte

so you have it (doubtless after  
 Goth. úhtwó ) gr. 62. It is  
 masc. in A. S. (pám úhtan  
Alg. Ham. 74).

### háp

"f." p. 89. I know it only  
as  masc. C. D. III 264 x  neut.  
 C. D. III 392. I don't think it

sounds as q. at all. The cognates are no guide for A.S. genders in many cases.

ange.

You are right. The "angere" in tye is doubtless angere = engere & the only other case I know of may be explained the same way; it is angene in the following somewhat obscure (& very late) passage (Shrine, "Blom").

"Onfoh me nu pinne  
angene peawa."

Hoping to hear from  
you again

Yours truly

James Hall Jun.

## Transcript of Letter 2

[L2/S1/011]

[LETTERHEAD]

20/11/1882

Prof. E. Sievers.

Dear Sir

I have to thank you for your kind & instructive letter & make a few other remarks that may be of use to you.

Strong verbs.

You have cídan in Gram. but I only know it as a weak pr. cídde. You have cnídan with ? against it but the pr. pl. cnidun Matt. 21-35 seems to place it beyond doubt.

Your letter gives meolcan with ?

[L2/S2/012]

probably because you only know the milciþ you mention as proof of its being strong. I therefore direct your attention to the pr. mealc Shrine 61.

You should write hwésan (not hwæsan) from the 3d. pers. sg. hwést Leech. III 122 cp. also hwosta.

wéþan is the same class – both -jan verbs – +hwésjan +wópjan.

Hwínan is a probable strong verb you have forgotten – also what is scerwen in the poetry?

A clear strong verb you omit to notice is stenan present tense in Liber Psalmorum (Thorpe) p 90 praet. asten for astæn (like stæl from stelan) Sweet's O.E.T. page 122 (Blickl. Glosses).

[L2/S3/013]

The rán you speak of from rínan = rignan is very interesting. Can you give me the reference where you found it?

I have observed several differences in the E. & Late A.S. especially in genders i.e. when a noun has 2 or 3 genders I find they did not exist at the same time but were different in early & late A.S.

Thus the díc you mention is M in early, F only in late A.S.

Ancor is early, ancra late. Elpend ielpend early, ielp late. (I explain this thus – elpend occurred mostly in elpen(d)bán. The “volksetymologie” took elpen(d) as gyld-en &c. & divided it elþ-enbán. Hence the new noun ielp ylp.

mæd.

The rule might be that fem. wá

[L2/S4/014]

stems retain the -u after shorts as in sionu not after longs as in this mæd which is the correct nom.

Ælf.Gr. 313. In the oblique cases there is a fluctuation between w forms & others without w formed direct from the nom. Thus (all from Cod. Dip. III)

on mæd 194

on medwa 52, 405

on mæde 416

ðære mædwan 36, 165

mæde gen. 53

þa mæde 53

The a in méda (O.E.T.) médwa (above) is puzzling. Is ðære mædwan a later -an for old -a as sometimes happens (duran for dura)? Or has méda médwa lost -n?

ealu.



I am sure the t stem is the explanation of this. In fact I ought to have been fuller in my first letter but had written

[L2/S5/015]

[LETTERHEAD]

20/11/1882

about the word with full references in my paper which will appear in the next “Englische Studien” and of which I meant to (& will) send you a copy. You are wrong in speaking of the “nom.” of ealoþ in your Gram. and it was a slip of mine to refer you to Leech. III 20 for the acc. as that is a dat. The truth is that ealoþ does not occur in nom. acc. sing. or more correctly ealu is the nom. acc. sing of ealoþ gen. dat. Referring you to my paper for full details

[L2/S6/016]

I give here only one reference (Leech. II 268) ~~to show~~ which is good as showing at once gender & declension of ealu. It is

“Do healfne bollan ealoð to & gehæte þ ealu.”

The olut in Thomsen had escaped my notice & I had also forgotten O.N. olþr which cannot be the oldest Scandinavian, as the olut shows.

Along with ealu I have mentioned in my paper that hæle seems to be a similar t stem. Hæle as you will see in Grein is purely a singular. (The “pl.” in Béowulf he gives is a singular). Hæleþ would be the correct plur. of hæle & hæleþ in the sing. is a later mistake.

[L2/S7/017]

Another discovery proved in the same paper is that leo both M & F inserts n in the dat. sing & pl. (but not in the other cases) regularly thus léonan, pl. léonum, or when weak decl. (as sometimes happens) léone pl. léonum, (léonan sg. Glos. Frag. 110 léone Ælf.Gr. 309)

úhte

so you have it (doubtless after Goth. úhtwó) p. 62. It is masc. in A.S. (þám úhtan Ælf. Hom. 74).

hæþ

“f.” p. 89. I know it only as masc. C.O. III 264 & neut. C.O. III 392. I don’t think it

[L2/S8/018]

ange.

You are right. The “augere” in Lye is doubtless ængere = engere & the only other case I know of may be explained the same way; it is angene in the following somewhat obscure (& very late) passage (Shrine, “Blooms”).

“onfoh mie nu þinne angene þeawa.”

Hoping to hear from you again.

Yours truly

James Platt jun.

[L3/S1/019]

203/4/1/354

London,

77. & 78. St. Martin's Lane,

26, 27, 28. & 29, Cranbourn Street, W.C.

& 7. Great Newport St.

Dear Prof. Sievers 25/11/1882.

I take the liberty of making a few more remarks in the hope of being useful to you.

As you have not got the "Shrine" I give full quotation for mealc p. 61 line 19.

"Corn farse & f windwede &  
ewa mealc & fa cealgas to  
curn ladda."

It is trans. with accus. ewa.

You have no good quotation for cinan either it would seem from your last letter. There is tócinen Mon. I 336.9.

The place in Liber Paludorum  
 where stenan is present is this  
 (p. 90 Ps. 37. 8) is grymetige  
 & stene. We might imagine  
stenan instead of <sup>+</sup>stinan & adan  
 instead of <sup>+</sup>astan ~~of~~ being from  
 the analogy of the other words of  
 the class. So for instance cowan  
 makes part. cwen & not cūwen  
 as <sup>+</sup>huggwans would lawfully  
 require. Analogy is a great  
 factor in language.

Other <sup>certain & probable</sup> strongs I do not  
 see in your lists are

= slincan (pr. pl. sluncon Narr. 14)

slingan? scradunga 20

clifan? (C.P. 360

slingan.

clifan? grein glossary to Poetrie.

P. 166 you put down scitan  
 (cacare) as certain (that is without  
 any ?). Do you have a



reference to prove this I should like to know it as I do not find the verb at all & only know the nouns scitta? sittle? scitel in the seeddoms from this root.

To hale I have just learnt that the same idea occurred to Paul also.

Referring to changes of gender the case of the 2 neuter pls. lác & wic becoming fem. sgs.

(lác Hom. I 402 wic Hom. I 584) is interesting. (An old example is bác). The pa lác must have brought it about.

Another point you may not have noticed is the reduction of tán to tá (v. weak) just as glán became plá. Tá occurs Hom. I 246 II 254.

Finally I think you would like  
to hear of a discovery of mine  
— the fem. "moivering" icge  
(Dutch egge in diefegge, female thief).

I have dryicge (from dry) shrine 56  
hunticge (from hunte) Narr. 38  
what from? oericge (explains mimma) Shr. 140  
byrdicge (glories phumaria) Wt. 287  
& lastly Sweet points out to me

walcrigge O.E.T. 62 as a  
corruption of walcyrge through  
analogy of this icge. Have  
you observed the ending & have  
you any further examples?

I see barricge O.E.T. 45  
carricge O.E.T. 97 also but they  
may not belong here. I cannot  
make out the Latin & have not  
seen Sweet since I observed them  
to ask him.

yours truly  
James Hall Jun.

### Transcript of Letter 3

[L3/S1/019]

[LETTERHEAD]

25/11/1882

Dear Prof. Sievers

I take the liberty of making a few more remarks in the hope of being useful to you.

As you have not got the “Shrine” I give you full quotation for mealc p. 61 line 19.

“Com ðærsc & þ windwode & ewa mealc & ða cealfas to cuum lædde.”

It is trans. with accus. ewa. You have no good quotation for cínan either it would seem from your last letter. There is tó cinen Hom. I 336.9.

[L3/S2/020]

The place in the Liber Psalmorum where stenan is present is this (p. 90 Ps. 37.8) ic grymetige & stene. We might imagine stenan instead of <sup>+</sup>stinan & astan instead of <sup>+</sup>aston ~~for~~ being from the analogy of the other verbs of the class. So for instance céowan makes part. cowen & not cúwen as <sup>+</sup>kuggwans would lawfully require. Analogy is a great factor in language.

Other certain & probable strongs I do not see in your lists are

slican (pr. pl. scluncon Narr. 14)

slingan ? Scréadunga 20

clífan? C.P. 360

bringan

slíþan ? Grein glossary to Poesie.

P. 166 you put down scítan (cacare) as certain (that is without any ?). If you have a

[L3/S3/021]

reference to prove this I should like to know it as I do not find the verb at all & only know the nouns scitta? scitte? scitel in Leechdoms from this root.

A[s] to hæle I have just learnt that the same idea occurred to Paul also.

Referring to changes of gender the case of the 2 neuter pls. lác & wíc becoming fem. sgs. (lác Hom. I 402 wíc Hom. I 584) is interesting. (An old example is bóc). The þa lác must have brought it about.

Another point you may not have noticed is the reduction of tán to tá (v. weak) just as flán became flá. Tá occurs Hom. I 246 II 254.

[L3/S4/022]

Finally I think you would like to hear of a discovery of mine – the fem. “movierung” -icge (Dutch - egge in diefegge, female thief).

I have                    drýicge (from drý) Shrine 56

huncicge (from hunta) Narr. 38

what from?           scericge (explains mima) Shr. 140

byrdicge (glosses plumaria) Wt. 282

& lastly Sweet points out to me walcricge O.E.T. 62 as a corruption of wælcyrge through analogy of this -cge. Have you observed the ending & have you any further examples? I see barricge O.E.T. 45 [&] cearricge O.E.T. 97 also but they may not belong here. I cannot make out the Latin & have not seen Sweet since I observed them to ask him.

Yours truly

James Platt jun



[L4/S1/023]

203/4/1/355

London,

77. & 78, St. Martin's Lane,

26, 27, 28. & 29, Cranbourn Street, W.C.

& 7, Great Newport St.

Professor Sievers. 6.12.1882.

Dear Sir

I have made an interesting discovery which I thought you would like to hear — the addition of 4 new nouns to the fem. cons. or "bóc" declension, all place-names, viz. Cent I Tenet Wilt. I have sent a paper to Wülcher with full quotations for each word showing the genitives end in e (Je Wülcher) dat.

of Cent on Cent To Cent on i  
pám éalonde on Tenet pám  
éalonde on Wilit pám éalonde  
 acc. Cent i Tenet Wilit.

These words I find all  
 feminine except Tenet which  
 I have no quotation for showing  
 gender yet it must have  
 been like the rest. Breten  
Lunden & Lindess (the country  
 of the Lindesware) I also find  
 as fem. In Cod. Dp. I also  
 find the<sup>a</sup> word for "Mercia"  
 and as fem. sing. ealre  
Mierce although usually  
 the pl. name of the people is  
 used.

Have you made any

observations on this interesting  
subject of place names?  
I suppose they were not  
all germ. Angel was probably  
masc. as Bede latinises  
it as Angulus. Normandig  
is ment. in Chron. but then  
that is late.

Another point is personal  
names. I find that germ.  
in burg make dat. acc. burge  
(not byrig burg). Hence I  
suppose masc. in man (like  
Cadmon Suderman Norþman)  
made dat. mannne instead  
of men but I have no  
quotations.



Wülcher tells me we shall now soon have the second part of the "Poésie" and he will give a list of the M.S. accents in it. It was a great mistake to leave them out as he notifies other very minute points.

What signs do you use for correcting printers' proofs? The English you doubtless know use D (originally d for Latin dele) on the margin to show a ~~word~~ lined through in the text (thus ~~text~~) is to be omitted or a ~~letter~~ word (thus ~~text~~). Additions are placed over a sloping line and the caret placed in the text to show

203/4/1/355

London,

77. &amp; 78. St. Martin's Lane,

26, 27, 28. &amp; 29, Cranbourn Street, W.C.

&amp; 7, Great Newport St.

6/12/1882.

where they come in this

x/ set  
^so also stops , / ; / : / but the  
period usually . and the  
inverted commas " " insteadof / and " / " / and  
the hyphen or dash - / insteadof - / . Italics are indicated  
by underlining, small capitals  
by two lines, capitals by three.If you do not know these  
things they will be interesting

To you & perhaps you can  
tell me the German equivalent.

Yours truly

James Platt jun.

([L4/S7/029] and [L4/S8/030] are blank, so not reproduced here.)



## Transcript of Letter 4

[L4/S1/023]

[LETTERHEAD]

6/12/1882

Professor Sievers.

Dear Sir

I have made an interesting discovery which I thought you would like to hear – the addition of 4 new nouns to the fem. cons. or “bóc” declension, all place-names, viz. Cent I’ Tenet Wiht. I have sent a paper to Wülcker with full quotations for each word showing the genitives end in e (I’e Wihte) dat.

[L4/S2/024]

of Cent on Cent tó Cent on I’ pá é álonde on Tenet pá é álonde on Wiht pá é álonde acc. Cent I’ Tenet Wiht.

These words I find all feminine except Tenet which I have no quotation for showing gender yet it must have been like the rest. Breten Lunden & Lindess (the country of the Lindesware) I also find as fem. In Cod. Dip. I also find ~~the~~ a word for “Mercia” used as fem. sing. “ealre Mierce” although usually the pl. name of the people is used.

Have you made any

[L4/S3/025]

observations on this interesting subject of place names? I suppose they were not all fem. Angel was probably masc. as Bede latinises it as Angulus. Normandig is neut. in Chron. but then that is late.

Another point is personal names. I find that fems. in burg make dat. acc. burge ([no]t byrig burg).

Hence I suppose masc. in man (like Cædmon Sudeman Norþman) made dat. manne instead of men but I have no quotations.

[L4/S4/026]

Wülcker tells me we shall now soon have the second part of the “Poesie” and he will give a list of the MS. accents in it. It was a great mistake to leave them out as he notifies other very minute points.

What signs do you use for correcting printers’ proofs? The English you doubtless know use [DELE SYMBOL] (originally d for Latin dele) on the margin to show a ~~word~~ letter lined through in the text (thus [THE WORD TEXT WITH A LINE THROUGH IT]) is to be omitted or a ~~letter~~ word (thus [THE WORD TEXT WITH A LINE THROUGH IT]). Additions are placed over a sloping line and the caret placed in the text to show

[L4/S5/027]

[LETTERHEAD]

6/12/1882

where they come in thus

x/    teˆt

so also stops , /; / : but the period usually [DOT WITH A CIRCLE AROUND IT] and the inverted commas “ ” instead of ‘ ’ and “ / ” / and hyphen or dash /- / instead of -/. Italics are indicated by underlining, small capitals by two lines, capitals by three. If you do not know these things they will be interesting

[L4/S6/028]

to you & perhaps you can tell me the German equivalents.

Yours truly

James Platt jun.

[L4/S7/029 and L4/S8/030 are blank]

[L5/S1/031]

203/4/1/356

London,

77. & 78. St. Martin's Lane,

26, 27, 28. & 29. Cranbourn Street, W.C.

& 7. Great Newport St.

18/12/1882.

Professor Sievers.

Dear Sir

Thanks for your letter.  
In reply to your question I have  
no quotations for brang.

For your new "gram"  
you should add I think great  
to the adj. like strang with  
mutate compar. & superl. grētra  
is found Narrat. 14 & I have  
never seen any grētra or grētesta.  
Do you know any other adj.  
of this kind since the "gram"?

I was right about gem.  
wā stems dropping -v in nom.  
& therefore often in oblique cases  
side by side with -w. forms.

L's (nom. l's Cod. Dip. 5 319) goes



just like mid gen. læsse & læse?

I have now I think cleared up the hyrnetu ielpetu mystery. There are 3 nouns which always have nom. -u gapu spadu protu & always -an in oblique cases - at least I know no other forms. hyrnetu ielpetu I also find with nom. -u (except the lake -e nouns in Elf. Gram. p. 307) and oblique cases -an. (Ielfetesang in the Poety I explain as a comp. word). I take these 5 words as instances of germ. N-stems in -ō like the Gothic -ō & O.N. -α which clearly come from -ō whereas A.S. -e O.N.G. O.S. -α cannot be -ō but only -e (see ~~be~~ Möller in "Beiträge" for further on this point but he did not know of the occurrence of -ō in A.S.).

The only diff. between A.S. & Goth. O.N. is that A.S. has the correct -u for -ō while Goth. O.N. have (not g. -a O.N. -u as would be correct ~~but~~) -ō -a from -ō + consonant therefore then from oblique cases.

Another discovery I have just made is a real A.S. dual. Kluge's noan durū are used as sgs. his breost might from the form as well be pl. but my word is a clear dual.

It is sculdru (never sculdras) pl. of sculdor masc. (see Lech. II 198).

I am also now clear about petian which used to puzzle me; peccan is the same word but pecc. only occurs where peti- occurs hence not in 2.3 pers. sg. which are always petast petap & not in imp. which is petā. I take



þecc (which occurs chiefly in late  
 N.P.) to be phonetic for the slurred  
 pronunciation of ty in þeti  
 as ch cp. orccard for ortgeard  
 (that is orch for orty) & English  
chensday for Tyusday (Tuesday).  
 The verb seems one of the 3rd class  
 Goth. -an o.x.g. -en like hyccan  
hogde so þetian þette. We should  
 expect þettan þatte but analogy  
 has been at work. þetian owes  
 the i to þetast &c. like þolgian  
 after þolgast &c.

Do you know any nouns  
 that change gender in pl. besides  
 the dear cases of ést f. éstas m.  
 & þenn n. þennas m. (no  
ésta éste or þenni <sup>pl.</sup> & no ést m. or  
þenn m.). þegl lake has m. sg.  
 & n. pl. (Ely. Gram. p. 86) but early  
 is both genders in each number.



203/4/1/356

London,

77. &amp; 78. St. Martin's Lane.

26, 27, 28. &amp; 29. Cranbourn Street, W.C.

&amp; 7. Great Newport St.

187.12/1882.

Do you understand the Latin  
 glosses baruina to barricge  
 O.E. Texts 45 & senon to  
cearricge 97? Sweet appears  
 not to. I can only refer senon  
 doubtfully to Lat. schoenium  
schoenobates v. & translate  
cearricge "dancer" or "tumbler"  
 comparing the vb. cirran.  
 Supposing there 2 to be -icge  
 words I have now 9 examples  
 of this form. ending viz.

<u>galdricge</u>	} all in O.E. Texts
<u>walericge</u>	
<u>barricge</u>	
<u>cearricge</u>	

byrdicge "embroiderer"  
drijicge "witch"  
 & hanticge "hunter"  
scer(n)icge "mimic"  
sealticge "dancer"

Cosijn writes (I communicated  
 them to him) that driecge &  
 the contracted labbei klapperi  
 (ei = ege) are the only Dutch  
 literary forms but igge ege  
 are common in the dialects  
 (especially W. Flemish) & in  
 Mid. Dutch igge is common  
 e.g. clappigge makerigge  
meesterigge waesterigge wasserigge.

Yours truly  
 J. Platt jun.

## Transcript of Letter 5

[L5/S1/031]

[LETTERHEAD]

18/12/1882

Professor Sievers.

Dear Sir

Thanks for your letter. In reply to your question I have no quotations for brang.

For your new “Gram.” you should add I think gréat to the adj. like strang with mutate compar. & superl. gríetra is found Narrat. 14 & I have never seen any gréatra or gríatesta. Do you know any other adj. of this kind since the “Gram”?

I was right about fem. wá stems dropping -u in nom. & therefore often in oblique cases side by side with -w- forms. Læs (nom. læs Cod. Dip. 5 319) goes

[L5/S2/032]

just like mæd gen. læswe & læse ?

I have now I think cleared up the hynetu ielfetu mystery. There are 3 nouns which always have nom. - u fapu spadu protu & always -an in oblique cases – at least I know no other forms. Hynetu ielfetu I also find with nom. -u (except the late -e noms. in Ælf. Gram. p. 307) and oblique cases -an. (Ielfetesang in the Poetry I explain as a comp. word). I take these 5 words as instances of fem. N-stems in -ô like the Gothic -ô & O.N. -a which clearly come from -ô whereas A.S. -e O.H.G. O.S. -a cannot be -ô but only -ê (see alsø Möller in “Beiträge” for further on this point but he did not know of the occurrence of -ô in A.S.).

[L5/S3/033]

The only diff. between A.S. & Goth. O.N. is that A.S. has the correct -u for -ô while Goth. O.N. have (not G. -a O.N. -u as would be correct) but) -ô -a from -ô + consonant therefore t[a]ken from oblique cases.

Another discovery I have just made is a real A.S. dual. Kluge’s nosu duru are used as sgs. his bréost might from the form as well be pl. but my word is a clear dual. It is sculdru (never sculdras) pl. of sculdor masc. (see Leech. II 198).

I am also now clear about fetian which used to puzzle me; feccan is the same word but fecc only occurs where feti- occurs hence not in 2,3 pers. sg. which are always fetast fetap & not in imp. which is feta. I take

[L5/S4/034]

fecc (which occurs chiefly in late A.S.) to be phonetic for the slurred pronunciation of ty in feti as ch cp. orceard for ortgeard (that is orch for orty) & English chewsday for Tyusday (Tuesday). The verb seems one of the 3rd class Goth. -an O.H.G. -ên like hycgan hogde so fetian fette. We should expect fettan fætte but analogy has been at work. Fetian owes the i to fetast &c. like folgian after folgast &c. Do you know any nouns that change gender in pl. besides the clear cases of ést f. ésta m. & fenn n. fennas m. (no ésta éste or pl. fenn & no ést m. or sg. fenn m.). Segl late has m. sg. & n. pl. (Ælf. Gram. p. 86) but early is both genders in each number.

[L5/S5/035]

[LETTERHEAD]

18/12/1882

Do you understand the Latin glosses baruina to barricge



O.E. Texts 45 & senon to cearricge 97? Sweet appears not to. I can only refer senon doubtfully to Lat. schoenum schoenobates &c. & translate cearricge “dancer” or “tumbler” comparing the vb. cirran. Supposing these 2 to be -icge words I have now 9 examples of this fem. ending viz.

gealdricge

wælcricge

barricge

cearricge

all in O.E. Texts

[\[L5/S6/036\]](#)

byrdicge “embroideress”

drýicge “witch”

þ hunticge “huntress”

scer(n)icge “mima”

sealticge “dancer”

Cosijn writes (I communicated them to him) that dievegge & the contracted labbei klappei (ei = ege) are the only Dutch literary forms but igge ege are common in the dialects (especially W. Flemish) & in Mid. Dutch igge is common e.g. clappigge makerigge meesterigge troesterigge wasscrigge.

Yours truly

J. Platt jun.

[\[L5/S7/037 and L5/S8/038 are blank\]](#)

Platt, J. jun.  
London,

203/4/1/357

77. & 78. St. Martin's Lane,

26, 27, 28. & 29. Cranbourn Street, W.C.

& 7. Great Newport St.

Dear Professor Rivers

23/12/1882.

Thanks for pointing cert out. You must be right & I had not noticed it. Also about ea you are doubtless right but you say gen. dat. ie. I only know the dat. Have you gen? The gen. ias would be parallel to cis with dat. cy.

Your grithra is from the same place as I quoted. I did not think of quoting from the "Anglia" text.

I was just going to point out the compar. of the 4 cardinal points as I saw they were omitted in your "grammar" when your letter came! I am pleased to be able to give you reference for earka C.D. III 444. Supra occurs Teich. III 252 & 270 C.D. III 408 & super supra C.D. V 148 or also norpra chron. 100 <sup>against</sup> nypra as you state. You must also add to gram. ytra which glosses p. 263 beside your itra.

Another addition to be made is

wurde is the neuter wo stems. For gender see Leech. II 206 for decl. II 182.

Dire riadan säs occurs not only Pros. I.1 but Deuteronomy XI.

Doubtless you are right about zierlen. I don't think I ever told you any etymology of nateshwön. Leech. III 76

I actually found what I took to be the original viz. näto'peshwön (? = tp as in gescentu &c.). Nihterne dagperne I also

explain I think satisfactorily. Nihterne is for nihtperne & cp. dagperlic = daghwæperlic.

Then nihterne dagperne are therefore adverbial phrases niht hwæperne daghwæperne.

I anticipate your objection that niht is gem. I believe it became masc. in certain collocations with dag by analogy. Cp. the gen. nihtes which in ones nihtes Chron. 616 & pres emnihtes Leech. III 240 is clearly not gem.

Sorry I cannot agree to give up my idea about gaper &c. & I hope to convince you! I shall be glad to hear from you again on this point. First I must state I have found 3 more words I assign to this class — certainly more (frequent in Leech. more wealmore geldmore)



x probably ganu (pleuridelys) liracu (throat).  
Your objections seem weak.

1) I know hyrnylla in Exodus but  
at best it is very late x unreliable; perhaps  
it is a case of lost n; compare the  
accus. ane spada legends of Holy Rood 13.  
The only cases (oblique) of ielpetu I know  
of are in -an always excepting ylpetesang  
which I still look on as comp. I never  
claimed ligetu for this class at all &  
do not now as I have no -an forms  
but on the contrary strong ones. Therefore  
ligetrese is no argument as it may  
come from liget the neuter nominative.  
ylpetesang is like ihhtesang x many  
other comps. (ligettas by the way occurs  
not only where you say, Bede, but also  
Lech. III 274 x Ancient Laws II 400).

2) I don't see spada. Where do you  
find it? At any rate it may be an  
error; there are ~~some~~<sup>many</sup> recorded cases  
of confusion between a x n, neuter  
plurals often.

3) You say other words have strong  
& weak forms "parallel". This does not  
apply to these as they've always weak  
in oblique cases x mostly (very few  
exceptions) -n in noun. sing. The

said few exceptions - viz. -e in nom. sing. - are easily explained by the overwhelming majority of -e nouns. In n-decl. & on the other hand the -u cannot be explained by any analogy, therefore (by a very safe rule to follow) it is probably genuine. I said there were no exceptions to the oblique cases in -an. your abuton pa mannes pro comes from - where? Chron. for year 1137 side by side with plurals like purnes "thumps" classical pūman! I think you will admit it is out of the argument!

4) As to the point that n-decl. nouns have "protected" vowels so that A.S. should have -a not u I can only point to Goth. -a O.N. -i in nom. masc. which can only come from original final -ē not -ē protected by nasal. ē protected would be Goth. -ē as in gen. pl. & O.N. -a.

What is Wright 58 & Wright 58 & Wright 58 "scriptorium" Wright 58 & Wright 58 "prolet" Aldh. 406 (Haupt)? Some of these apparently foreign words are very hard to explain. I think prass is Latin pretium cp. masse for change of e to a. What do you think of it? Yours truly J. Platt jun.

## Transcript of Letter 6

[L6/S1/039]

[LETTERHEAD]

23/12/1882

Dear Professor Sievers

Thanks for pointing Cert out. You must be right & I had not noticed it. Also about éa you are doubtless right but you say gen. dat. ré. I only know the dat. Have you gen? The gen. éas would be parallel to cús with dat. cý.

Your grýtttra is from the same place as I quoted. I did not think of quoting from the “Anglia” text.

I was just going to point out the compass, cf the 4 cardinal points as I s[a]w they were omitted in your “Grammar” when your letter came! I am pleased to be able to give you reference for éastra C.D. III 444. Súpra occurs Leech. III 252 & 270 C.D. III 408 & corrector sýpra C.D. V 148 so also norþra Chron. p. 100 against nyrþra as you state. You must also add to Gram. ýtra Blick. Glosses p. 263 beside your útra.

Another addition to be made is

[L6/S2/040]

cwudu to the neuter wo stems. For gender see Leech. II 206 for decl. II 182.

Dære réadan sæs occurs not only Oros. 1.1 but Deuteronomy XI.

Doubtless you are right about fierlen [*fyrlen* ‘remote’? SL]. I don’t think I ever told you my etymology cf náteshwón. Leechd. III 76

I actually found what I took to be the original viz. nátópæshwón (t = tþ [as] in gescentu &c.). Nihterne dægþerne I also explain I think satisfactorily. Nihterne is for nihþerne & cp. dægþerlic = dæghwæþwerlic. Then nihterne dægþerne are therefore adverbial phrases niht hwæþerne dæghwæþerne.

I anticipate your objection that niht is fem. I believe it became masc. in certain collocations with dæg by analogy. Cp. the gen. nihtes which in anes nihtes Chron. 616 & þæs emnihtes Leech. III 240 is clearly not fem.

Sorry I cannot agree to give up my idea about faþu &c. & I hope to convince you! I shall be glad to hear from you again on this point. Firstly I must state I have found 3 more words I assign to this class — certainly moru (frequent in Leechd. moru, wealmoru, feldmoru)

[L6/S3/041]

& probably fanu (fleurdelys) hracu (throat). Your objections seem weak.

1) I know hyrnytta in Exodus but at best it is very late & unreliable; perhaps it is the case of lost -n; compare the accus. áne spada Legends of Holy Rood 13. The only cases (oblique) of ielfetu I know of are in -an always excepting ylfetesang which I still look on as comp. I never claimed lígetu for this class at all & do not now as I have no -an forms but on the contrary strong ones. Therefore lígetræsc is no argument as it may come from líget the neuter nominative ylfetesang is like úhtesang & many other comps. (Lígettas by the way occurs not only where you say, Bede, but also Leech. III 274 & Ancient Laws II 400).

2) I don’t see spada. Where do you find it? At any rate it may be an error; there are ~~some~~ many recorded cases of confusion between a & u, neuter plurals often.

3) You say other words have strong & weak forms “parallel”. This does not apply to these as they’re always weak in oblique cases & mostly (very few exceptions) -u in nom. sing. The



[L6/S4/042]

said few exceptions – viz. -e in nom. sing. – are easily explained by the overwhelming majority of -e noms. To n-decl. & on the other hand the -u cannot be explained by any analogy, therefore (by a very safe rule to follow) it is probably genuine. I said there were no exceptions to the oblique cases in -an. Your abuton þa mannes þr[ote] comes from – where? Chron. for year 1137 side by side with plurals like þumbes “thumbes” classical þúman! I think you will admit it is out of the argument!

4) As to the point that n-decl. noms have “protected” vowels so that A.S. should have -a not -u I can only point to Goth. -a O.N. -i in nom. masc. which can only come from original final -ê not -ê protected by nasal. ê protected would be Goth. -ê as in gen.pl. & O.N. -a.

What is pisleferhús “scriptorium” Wright 58 & pliclitere “proretâ” Aldh. p. 406 (Haupt)? Some of these apparently foreign words are very hard to explain. I think prass is Latin pretium cp. mæsse for change of e to a. What do you think of it?

Yours truly

J. Platt Jun.

[L7/S1/043]

203/4/1/358

London.

77 & 78, St. Martin's Lane.

26, 27, 28 & 29, Cranbourn Street, W.C.

Telegraphic Address.  
CRANBOURNE, LONDON.

87, Great Newport St.

~~28.12~~ 1882.

Dear Prof. Sievers

I enclose you <sup>abzug</sup>  
just received. It ~~is~~ has  
several errors unfortunately  
& is not so well done as  
I should like as I foolishly  
allowed a German friend  
to correct the proofs instead  
of having them sent to me  
as I shall in future. Rain  
is wrong. It is not reihlich  
but mass. as I explained

in one of my letters  
to you the gem. being  
ruge.

Yours truly  
J. Platt jun.



## Transcript of Letter 7

[L7/S1/043]

[LETTERHEAD]

28/12/1882

Dear Prof. Sievers

I enclose you abzug just received. It is has several errors unfortunately & is not so well done as I should like as I foolishly allowed a German friend to correct the proofs instead of having them sent to me as I shall in future. Rán is wrong. It is not rehkuh but masc. as I explained

[L7/S2/044]

in one of my letters to you the fem. being ræge.

Yours truly

J. Platt jun.

[L8/S1/045]

203/4/1/359

London,

77. & 78. St. Martin's Lane,

26, 27, 28. & 29, Cranbourn Street, W.C.

& 7, Great Newport St.

Dear Prof. Sievers 3/1/1883.

Thanks for reference for gen.  
ie. I have not "encript" oros.  
 yet as I am waiting for Sweet's  
 edition. Of course this gen. is like  
bic as opposed to bice & the late  
mieder gen. for müdder which I think  
 I pointed out to you before.

Another reference for père r's  
 has turned up - Mark I.

What you say about heofon  
 early m. becoming late f. by analogy  
 connection with eorpe f. had occurred  
 to me - in fact I am writing a  
 paper for the "Anglia" on this &  
 a large number of similar cases of  
 change of gender in late A.S. from  
 some analogy with another word.  
 Hitherto dictionaries have put two

(or three) gends. to words without stopping  
to ask whether I was not early x I late  
or I used in singular x I in plural.  
The following are a few of my  
examples - without references - of  
each class.

<u>hodd</u>	early n.	late m.	analogy of <u>mápm</u> m.
<u>holt</u>	n.	m.	<u>wudu</u> m.
<u>cowde</u>	n.	f.	<u>heord</u> f.
<u>rust</u>	n.	f.	<u>pin</u> f.
<u>gráp</u>	n.	m.	<u>bearn</u> m.
<u>lác</u>	n.	f.	<u>spring</u> f.
<u>swelgend</u>	f.	{ m. & n. (characters)	<u>wál</u> m. & n.
<u>wormsm</u>	n.	m.	<u>gund</u> m.
<u>ád</u>	m.	n.	<u>bál</u> n.
<u>hyll</u>	m.	f.	<u>dün</u> f.
<u>portic</u>	m.	n.	<u>geat</u> n.
<u>brim</u>	n.	m.	<u>wæg</u> m.

x so on. Swelgend especially good  
as it takes the 2 gends. of wál

<u>þ wam</u>	<u>wammas</u>
<u>þ pen</u>	<u>penmas</u>
<u>þ gles</u>	<u>glesas</u>
<u>se stef</u>	<u>stapu</u>
<u>seo heort</u>	<u>heortas</u>
<u>seo list</u>	<u>listas</u>
<u>seo eht</u>	<u>ehtas</u>
<u>seo wíht</u>	<u>wíhtas</u>

{ gen. wíhtas  
once in  
gen. }



203/4/1/359

London,

77. &amp; 78. St. Martin's Lane,

26, 27, 28, &amp; 29, Cranbourn Street, W.C.

&amp; 7, Great Newport St.

1883.

On the same page sinum dat.  
to sinu occurs matching your  
sinu.

Oriadru was known to me.  
Another is lāw sq. Dipl. 509

lāwru Ritual 19 tech. I pref. LXXIII.

lāwru is very interesting. I  
suppose seara "vorper" gram.

300 is neut. pl.

Wintres was specially welcome  
to me as I had no reference  
for masc. pl. only neut. (tū  
wintru chron. 887 shows it is  
really neuter) & now I can  
place the word in a list I.

made for my gender paper  
of masc. singulars with plurals  
both masc. & neuter. Examples

all masc. in sing.	<u>God</u> of course	-as	-u
	<u>amber</u>		
	<u>cynnel</u>		
	<u>liget</u>		
	<u>fungel</u>		
	<u>Spend</u>	-as	teech. <del>III</del> 200 -u <sup>thru</sup>

I knew ean pl. Duru also has  
weak obl. cases dat. duran Mark  
I 33 au. Chron. p. 27.

The Liber Scint. I am editing  
has interesting forms. There  
is imperf. unipesta to unipe M.  
folio 36 cp. your siftum. Dat. sg.  
fynd 89a fynd 88a. There is an  
-endras pl. (wealdendras) 98a. Where  
abouts in the Sept. are the 2 you  
said you found there? I do not  
find them. Then the Lib. Scint.

has an interesting tendency to  
keep neuter pl. -u after long  
thus gēdu 6a hordū 87b  
forēdu 100a.

Referring to what you say  
of gen. gen. -es there is an  
early example in Parker Chron. 894  
francesces.

With specan cf. Elfric's  
prætig for prætig.

Under adverbs mention full  
as the regular adv. to full (not full  
which seems not to occur).

With siere seaxe rare -an  
but gen. -na put -sæte re  
chron. under sumd - wil - dorn -.

Under pract. praes. verbs  
put the parts. (like you gewiten)  
ge-runnen chr. 1046 ge-munnen  
Othcl. 254. Do you know any  
from other pr. pt. verbs (e. g.  
from purpan magan)?

Like smierwan smierede



goes an lw word wielwan wielede.

I have found another dual.  
 Masc. stap pl. stapen the 2 banks  
 of a ~~river~~ river.

You speak of sealh iw as  
 if fern. They are masc. (sealh O.E.  
 Texts 113 iw [I.D. III 218]). A ~~word~~  
wo-stem omitted by you is slu  
 "tench" germ. schleie.

How do you explain bröpor  
-u pl? Is the -u due to analogy  
 of neuter double pls. like wäpn -u  
winter -u &c? Bröpor seems the  
 best form of the pl. But that cannot  
 be cons. as there is no "mutant".

Thanks very much for sight  
 of enclosed. Can-defrion is especially  
 interesting. Perhaps Doforan and  
Andeferan were originally Defrion  
 or something of that sort & then  
 Anglicised. I believe they never occur  
 in any other form of ending.

I think it probable that gen. -e is right  
 for I Wilt & well-known names like those.

yours truly J. Platt.

## Transcript of Letter 8

[L8/S1/045]

[LETTERHEAD]

3/1/1883

Dear Prof. Sievers

Thanks for reference for gen. ré. I have not “excerpiert” Oros. yet as I am waiting for Sweet’s edition. Of course this gen. is like béc as opposed to bóce & the late méder gen. for módor which I think I pointed out to you before.

Another reference for þære sæs has turned up – Mark V 1.

What you say about heofon early m. becoming late f. by analogy connection with eorþe f. had occurred to me – in fact I am writing a paper for the “Anglia” on this & a large number of similar cases of change of gender in late A.S. from some analogy with another word.

Hitherto dictionaries &c. have put two

[L8/S2/046]

(or three) gends. to words without stopping to ask whether 1 was not early & 1 late or 1 used in singular & 1 in plural. The following are a few of my examples – without references – cf. each class.

<u>hord</u>	early n.	late m.	analogy of	<u>máþum</u> m.
<u>holt</u>	n.	m.		<u>wudu</u> m.
<u>ewode</u>	n.	f.		<u>heord</u> f.
<u>súsl</u>	n.	f.		<u>þín</u> f.
<u>gráf</u>	n.	m.		<u>bearu</u> m.
<u>lác</u>	n.	f.		<u>offrung</u> f.
<u>swelgend</u>	f.	m. & n. (charters)		<u>wæl</u> m. & n.
<u>worsm</u>	n.	m.		<u>gund</u> m.
<u>ád</u>	m.	n.		<u>bæl</u> n.
<u>hyll</u>	m.	f.		<u>dún</u> f.
<u>portic</u>	m.	n.		<u>geat</u> n.
<u>brim</u>	n.	m.		<u>wæg</u> m.

& so on Swelgend especially good as it takes the 2 gends. of wál.

<u>þ wam</u>	<u>wammas</u>
<u>þ fen</u>	<u>fennas</u>
<u>þ glæs</u>	<u>glæsas</u>
<u>se stæþ</u>	<u>stapu</u>
<u>séo heorr</u>	<u>heorras</u>
<u>séo list</u>	<u>listas</u>
<u>séo ést</u>	<u>éstras</u>
<u>séo wróht</u> (gen. <u>wróhtes</u> once in Grein)	<u>wróhtas</u>

[L8/S3/047]

[LETTERHEAD]

1883

On the same page sinum dat. to sinu occurs matching your sinerum.

Bréadru was known to me. Another is læw sg. Dipl. 509 læwru Ritual 19 Leech. I pref. LXXIII.

Screreru is very interesting. I suppose sceara “forfex” Gram. 2[9]0 [the first number looks like a 3 rather than a 2 but the reference appears to be to §290 in Sievers’ Gram., SL] is neut. pl.

Wintras was especially welcome to me as I had no reference for masc. pl. only neut. (tú wintru Chron. 887 shows it is really neuter) & now I can place the word in a list I

[\[L8/S4/048\]](#)

made for my gender paper of masc. singulars with plurals both masc. & neuter. Examples

All masc. in sing.

God of course    -as -u

amber                ”

cyrnel                ”

líget                 ”

tungol                ”

alfend                -as Leech. III 200 -u Shrine 43

I know éan pl. Duru also has weak obl. cases dat. duran Mark I 33 acc. Chron. p. 217.

The Liber Scint. I am editing has interesting forms. There is superl. smóþesta to sméþe MS. folio 3b cp. your sóftum. Dat.sg. fýnd 89a frýnd 88a. There is an -endras pl. (wealdendras) 98a. Whereabouts in the Hept. are the 2 you said you found there? I do not find them. Then the Lib. Scint.

[\[L8/S5/049\]](#)

has an interesting tendency to keep neuter pl. -u after longs thus gódu 6a hordu 87b færeldu 100a.

Referring to what you say of fem. gen. -es there is an early example in Parker Chron. 894 Exancestres.

With specan cp. Ælfric’s pætig for pratig.

Under adverbs mention full as the regular adv. to full (not fulle which seems not to occur).

With Mierce Seaxe rare -an but gen. -na put -sæle see chron. under Sumor- Wil- Dom- &c.

Under praet. praes. verbs put the parts. (like your gewiten) ge-unnen chr. 1046 ge-munen Blick. 254.

Do you know any from other pr. pt. verbs (e.g. from purfan magan)?

Like smierwan smierede

[\[L8/S6/050\]](#)

goes an lw word wielwan wielede.

I have found another dual. Masc. stæþ pl. stapu the 2 banks of a ~~riber~~ river.

You speak of sealh iw as if fem. They are masc. (sealh O.E. Texts 113 iw C.D. III 218). A ~~real~~ wo-stem omitted by you is [s]l<sup>iw</sup> “tench” Germ. schleie.

How do you explain bróþor -u pl? Is the -u due to analogy of neuter double pls. like wápn -u winter -u &c? Bróþor seems the best form of the pl. But that cannot be cons. as there is no “umlaut”.

Thanks very much for right of enclosed. Cen-defrion is especially interesting. Perhaps Doferan and Andeferan were originally Defrion or something of that sort & then Anglicised. I believe they never occur in any other form of ending. I think it probable that gen. -e is right for I’ Wiht & well-known names like those.

Yours truly

J. Platt.



[L9/S1/051]

203/4/1/360

London,

77. & 78, St. Martin's Lane,

26, 27, 28, & 29, Cranbourn Street, W.C.

& 7, Great Newport St.

Dear Professor Sievers 10/1/1883.

In further reply to your letter I think your remark about the "gram. Wechsel" in hoch very interesting as I find on referring to my notes the decl. I have "belege" for is perfectly regular viz.

nom. acc. hoch

gen. hories

dat. horne

acc. gen. hor (h) as

dat. horwum

This is just like sio(ha)n seah  
sáwon sewen & séon = †sihan  
sáh siwon siwen the accent

being on rest in nom. acc.  
 & on ending in oblique cases.  
 Doubtless earh goes the same.  
 The only references I have are  
 for earh nom. acc. (Guin) and  
 dat. pl. arwan = carwan Chron.

I approve as you do of  
 Sweet's e & o distinguished from  
e = i o = u. Why not distinguish  
 W.S. æ = ā dial. ē as ē  
 & W.S. ē = ē as ē?

I have been looking over  
 the Chronicle to see its usage  
 as to British place names.  
 my idea that the better known  
 names took A.S. declension  
 seems justified. These words  
 would then present a parallel  
 to Latin words which when  
 fully naturalised take native

but when not common retain  
 Latin inflections. Besides  
 the ſ Wilt genitives in -e  
 we must accord regular flexion  
 to Breten (this is the nom. in  
 Bede see B.T. & also occurs once  
 as oblique case by your rule  
 see B.T.) oblique generally -e.  
Lunden may also safely be  
 postulated as nom. & oblique  
Lundene Lundenne. The Welsh  
 is Prydain Shundain &  
 I suppose these names would  
 come rather from British  
 than Latin although it is  
 said the more civilised Britons  
 spoke Latin in Bede's time  
 hence his reckoning it as  
 a language. Exferu which  
 often occurs as oblique case



(in the chron. as well as your examples) must be nom. in the more generally used obl. cases in -e. I am not clear whether Temes Humber or Temesse Humbre would be the correct nouns. The oblique Temesan Humbrian seem to require nouns. in -e which were either used uninflected as obl. cases or inflected like tunge &c. The whole question is very important & I must investigate further & hope you will do the same. It would be important to get the Welsh names for these places rivers &c. as far as possible.

Yours truly  
James Hall Junr.

## Transcript of Letter 9

[L9/S1/051]

[LETTERHEAD]

10/1/1883.

Dear Professor Sievers

In further reply to your letter I think your remark about the “Gram. Wechsel” in horh very interesting as I find on referring to my notes the decl. I have “belege” for is perfectly regular viz.

nom. acc.	<u>horh</u>
gen.	<u>horwes</u>
dat.	<u>horwe</u>
n.a. pl.	<u>hor(h)as</u>
dat.	<u>horwum</u>

This is just like séo(ha)n seah sáwon sewen & séon = <sup>+</sup>síhan sáh siwon siwen the accent

[L9/S2/052]

being on root in nom. acc. & on ending in oblique cases. Doubtless earh goes the same. The only references I have are for earh nom. acc. (Grein) and dat. pl. arwan = earwum chron.

I approve as you do of Sweet's ē o distinguished from e = i o = u. Why not distinguish W.S. æ <sup>+</sup>á dial. é æ [READ æ WITH HOOK UNDERNEATH, SL] & W.S. é = æ [READ WITH æ WITH ACCENT ON TOP AND HOOK UNDERNEATH, SL] as é [READ é WITH HOOK UNDERNEATH, SL].

I have been looking over the Chronicle to see its usage as to British placenames. My idea that the better known names took A.S. declension seems justified. These words would then present a parallel to Latin words which when fully naturalised take native

[L9/S3/053]

but when not common retain Latin inflections. Besides the I' Wiht genitives in -e we must accord regular flexion to Breten (this is the nom. in Bede see B.T. & also occurs once as oblique case by your rule see B.T.) oblique generally -e. Lunden may also safely be postulated as nom. to oblique Lundene Lundenne. The Welsh is Prydain Llundain & I suppose these names would come rather from British than Latin although it is said the more civilised Britons spoke Latin in Bede's time hence his reckoning it as a language. Sæfern which often occurs as oblique case

[L9/S4/054]

(in the chron. as well as your examples) must be nom. To the more generally used obl. cases in -e I am not clear whether Temes Humber or Temese Humbre would be the correct noms. The oblique Temesan Humbran seem to require noms. in -e which were either used uninflected as obl. cases or inflected like tunge &c. The whole question is very important & I must investigate further & hope you will do the same. It would be important to get the Welsh names for these places rivers &c. as far as possible.

Yours truly

James Platt Jun.

[L10/S1/055]

203/4/1/361

London,

77. &amp; 78. St. Martin's Lane,

26, 27, 28. &amp; 29. Cranbourn Street, W.C.

&amp; 7. Great Newport St.

Dear Prof. Sievers 1883.

you must be right about  
brune (which in fact occurred  
 to me after I last wrote you)  
 & the rest (brune is long if  
 we are to judge from Engl.  
 bear-hound).

I now see my way clear  
 about the ending -ene in syden  
 & the -u by which syfete  
syfnete are "moviert" from  
 the mass. - t words. This is  
 no exception to the rule of which  
giren sawd are examples.  
 It is not old â at all but  
î for ia just as in cowe



peowu & the brádu ieldu class.  
 It is thus perfectly regular  
 that it should be kept. The oblique  
 cases being: old ja should  
 have double nn tt & this seems  
 mostly the case (gydenne ulfelle &)  
 but of course never in the nom.

The nom. hyfi is very  
 interesting & must be c instead  
 of re as in neru &c. after short  
 syllable i stem. I do not  
 remember any occurrence of  
 the nom. elsewhere. I have  
 a pl. hyfa "beligt."

life is neut. (purh nuel  
life teek. II 94) so if as seems  
 most likely spre is re-stem  
 it is the only short neuter i-stem.

Putting hyfe <sup>(masculine)</sup> as cons.  
 on the strength of hupbân  
hupsean only is perhaps rather

bold. Might not these be like  
swōtmete angwergl (from enge)  
andhéapdu (from ende rather than  
 from the preposition and). Have  
 you other evidence for the cons.  
 decl. of this word? Pl. is lypos.

From a remark in  
 your last about léonum  
 I saw you did not understand  
 that I assign to léo the  
 following unique decl. as the  
regular as it is the only "belegt"  
 one.

<u>léo</u>	<u>léon</u>
<u>léon</u>	<u>léona</u>
<u>léonan</u>	<u>léonum</u>
<u>léon</u>	<u>léon</u>

That is nom. gen. acc. stem léo-n  
 dat. stem léon-n

Examples are given for léonan  
 & an apparently strong dat.  
 sg. léone in my "Eng. Stud."  
 paper & the dat. pl. léonum is



common. Since I wrote that paper I have found further proof of my view in the fact that the proper name Séo (the pope) is declined same way

Séo nom. chr. 814 Dipl. 117

Sion gen. chr. 813

Séone dat. chr. ~~chr.~~ 797 Dipl. 116

The word is therefore unique.

Céo I do not know any oblique forms for. Séo is strong (Nom. I 390 Đá séo) as well as weak

(e.g. Dent. xxxII 10). Add to your

list héo "ursa" gram. 309

probably n. stem. Also tá

"too" but "lot" from tán

as glá from glán Blick. 121

Nom. I 246 II 254.

Filmen has séo filmen

& acc. filmene Lech. II 242.



Still more remarkable are filmen  
help & apparently plân which have  
 all cases fern. except gen. dat.  
 sing. which are m. or n.

I have courses filmenes pâm filmenes  
omnes helpe rûmlicum helpe  
micelan(-um) helpe glânes &  
glâne dat. never occurs with any  
 -re adjective or anything to show  
 it is fern.

You must be right about scés  
 &c. Kluge added the dat under  
 the e I suppose as I did not  
 put it. I did not see proof.

Emnilt is perhaps neut.  
 as you suggest. I have large  
 collections of borrowed Latin  
 words which take the gender  
 of the A.S. equivalent which  
 is something similar. Doubtless  
 you have noticed them. Nomen  
 is used in A.S. as m. (nama)  
firmamentum as m. (rodoz)

præteritum as q. (tid) modus  
n. (gemet) & so on. 361

As to the -u - -an words I think we can now be in perfect agreement. I give up the idea that the -u is ō & revert to my original idea that it is from the -u of gifu &c. ~~as you believe~~. What you say about premu hnutu cown is very convincing & also the fact that all my words padu &c. are short syllables. In fact I believe there are no short syllabled gem. n-stems in the -e at all. I cannot remember any just now so I think we must make a rule that while longs like urne tunge retain the -e the shorts all take -u. Looked at in this light my



discovery is even more <sup>367</sup>  
interesting than before.

I may cede to you the  
nouns. - ande - prok in epinal  
though plantnames being  
almost exclusively -e nouns.  
the analogy would amount  
to the -e. The seed. have  
mostly - more - prok in seprok  
esprok feldmore wealdmore  
although they never have more  
prok but only moren proke when  
uncompounded. Cp. druffunge  
f. from prung m.; dolhrine  
weak f. from rūn strong  
rebe f. from ribe m.; & other  
cases of words slipping into  
the -e nouns. when used as  
plantnames.

The oblique cases you really  
are wrong about. your



- probe from Brow. Taller is not  
acc. but nom. (The seedd. mostly  
use nom. for acc. in recipes).

Are spada & pure braca

Kent. gl. <sup>18</sup> & 21 are the only  
cases I know of <sup>without -n</sup> ~~where~~ & there  
- n seems to be lost as the  
~~weak~~ <sup>strong</sup> would be spade braca.

Hyndet relfet & the -en  
in mynece refence gydenen  
pignene I think now must  
be as you say strong. Perhaps  
it was kept to mark more  
distinctly the idea of the word being  
germ. especially as there may  
have been more hyndet relfet  
as O.K.G. elbig hornuz. ylfetten  
& gydenan &c. do occur as oblique  
cases but only late I think.  
Elf. Gram. 307 has ylfette hyndette.  
These & the -an cases may be due  
to confusion between the -n of these words  
& that of spade &c. yours truly  
J. Platt jun.

## Transcript of Letter 10

[L10/S1/055]

[LETTERHEAD]

1883

Dear Prof. Sievers

you must be right about bune (which in fact occurred to me after I last wrote you) & the rest (húne is long if we are to judge from Engl. hoar-hound).

I now see my way clear about the ending -enu in gydenu &c. & the -u by which iel fetu hynetu are “moviert” from the masc. -t words. This is no exception to the rule of which firen sáwol are examples. It is not old â at all but î for ia just as in eowu

[L10/S2/056]

beowu & the brædu ieldu class. It is thus perfectly regular that it should be kept. The oblique cases being old ja should have double nn tt & this seems mostly the case (gydenne iefette &c.) but of course never in the nom.

The nom. hyfi is very interesting & must be e instead of u as in neru &c. after short syllable i stem. I do not remember any occurrence of the nom. elsewhere. I have a pl. hyfa “belegt”.

Sife is neut. / purh smæl sife Leech. II 94) so if as seems most likely spere is u-stem it is the only short neuter i-stem.

Putting hype (masc.) as cons. on the strength of hupbán hupseax only is perhaps rather

[L10/S3/057]

bold. Might not these be like swótmete angnægl (from enge) andhéafdu (from ende rather than from the preposition and). Have you other evidence for the cons. decl. of this word? Pl. is hypos.

From a remark in your last about léonum I saw you did not understand that I assign to léo the following unique decl. as the regular as it is the only “belegt” one.

<u>léo</u>	<u>léon</u>
<u>léon</u>	<u>léona</u>
<u>léonan</u>	<u>léonum</u>
<u>léon</u>	<u>léon</u>

That is nom. gen. acc. stem léo-(n)  
dat. stem léon-(n)

Examples are given for léonan & an apparently strong dat. sg. léone in my “Eng. Stud.” paper & the dat. pl. léonum is

[L10/S4/058]

common. Since I wrote that paper I have found further proof of my view in the fact that the proper name Léo (the pope) is declined same way

<u>Léo</u>	nom. Chr. 814 Dipl. 117
<u>Léon</u>	gen. Chr. 813
<u>Léone</u>	dat. Chr. 797 Dipl. 116

The word is therefore unique. Céo I do not know any oblique forms for. Séo is strong (Hom. I 390 ῥά séo) as well as weak (e.g. Deut. XXXII 10). Add to your list héu “ursa” [last two words somewhat unclear, SL] Gram. 309 probably n-stem. Also tá not “toe” but “lot” from tán as flá from flán Blick. 121 Hom. I 246 II 254.

Filmen has séo filmen & acc. filmene Leech. II 242.

[L10/S5/062]

Still more remarkable are filmen help & apparently flán which have all cases fem. except gen. dat. sing. which are m. or n.

I have éowres filmenes þám filmene sumes helpes rúmlicum helpe micelan (= um) helpe flánes & fláne dat. never occurs with any -re adjective or anything to show it is fem.

You must be right about scéo &c. Kluge added the dot under the e I suppose as I did not put it. I did not see proof.

Emniht is perhaps neut. as you suggest. I have large collections of borrowed Latin words which take the gender of the A.S. equivalent which is something similar. Doubtless you have noticed them. Nomen is used as A.S. as m. (nama) firramentum as m. (rodor)

[L10/S6/061]

praeteritum as f. (tíd) modus n. (gemet) & so on.

As to the -u -an words I think we can now be in perfect agreement. I give up the idea that the -u is -ô & revert to my original idea that it is from the -u of gifu &c. s[a]me as you believe. What you say about fremu hnutu eowu is very convincing & also the fact that all my words spadu &c. are short syllables. In fact I believe there are no short syllabled fem. n-stems in the -e at all. I cannot remember any just now so I think we must make a rule that while longs like sumne tunge retain the -e the shorts all take -u.

Looked at in this light my

[L10/S7/059]

discovery is even more interesting than before.

I may cede to you the noms -more -prote in Epinal though plantnames being almost exclusively -e fems. the analogy would account f[or] the -e. The Leechd. have mostly -more -prote in escprote eoforprote feldmore wealmore although they never have more prote but only moru protu when uncompounded cp. clufþunge f. from þung m. dolhrúne weak f. from rún strong, r[i]bbe f. from ribb n., & other cases of words slipping into the -e fems when used as plantnames.

The oblique cases you really are wrong about. Your

[L10/S8/060]

-prote from Bosw. Toller is not acc. but nom. (The Leechd. mostly use nom. for acc. in recipes).

Áne spada & þínre hraca Kent gl. p. 18 & 21 are the only cases I know of ~~where~~ without -n & there -n seems to be lost as the ~~weak~~ strong would be spade hr[a]ce.

Hyrnetu iefetu & the -enu in mynece nefenu gydenu þignenu I think now must be as you say strong. Perhaps it was kept to mark more distinctly the idea of the word being fem. especially as there may have been masc. hyrnet iefet as O.H.G. elbiz hornuz. ylfett[a]n gydenan &c. do occur as oblique cases but only late I think Ælf. Gram. 307 has ylfelle hynetete. These & the -an cases may be due to confusion between the -u of these words & that of spadu &c.

Your truly

J. Platt jun.



[L11/S1/063]

203 / 4 / 1 / 362

London.

77 & 78. St. Martin's Lane.

26. 27. 28 & 29. Cranbourn Street. W.C.

Telegraphic Address.  
CRANBOURNE, LONDON.

8. 7. Great Newport St.

17 / 1 / 1883.

Dear Prof. Sievers

My objection to hype  
was too hasty. On reflection  
I see you were right. The  
history of the word as I  
should explain it is as  
follows. Original sing. hupe  
dual hupe A. S. hype (or hype  
may be pl., since both original  
hupe x hupes would yield hype)  
The dual being the only  
part generally used the old  
sing. became obsolete. Then hype

was mistaken for an i-pl.  
like byre and a new ring  
made on the analogy of  
byre to pl. byre &c.

Referring again to places  
I see the Chron. not only  
uses undeclined cases for  
continental names (like at  
Paris, on Leind, &c.) but even  
for native A.S. names (thus  
on Burh at Burh &c. often,  
at Wetmide, & so on).

When are we going to  
have the general Teutonic  
grammar which has been  
for some time promised  
us from your pen?  
Yours truly  
J. Platt

## Transcript of Letter 11

[L11/S1/063]

[LETTERHEAD]

17/1/1883

Dear Prof. Sievers

My objection to hype was too hasty. On reflection I see you were right. The history of the word as I should explain it is as follows. Original sing. hup dual hupe A.S. hype (or hype may be pl., since both original hupe & hupes would yield hype). The dual being the only part generally used the old sing. became obsolete. Then hype

[L11/S2/064]

was mistaken for an i-pl. like byre and a new sing. made on the analogy of byre to pl. byre &c.

Referring again to places I see the Chron. not only uses undeclined cases for continental names (like æt Paris, on Gend, &c.) but even for native A.S. names (thus on Burh æt Burh &c. often, æt Weðmór, & so on).

When are we going to have the general Teutonic grammar which has been for some time promised us from your pen?

Yours truly

J. Platt jun.



[L12/S1/065]

203/4/1/363  
 excuse this hurried  
 letter. I am quite  
 upset to think you  
 should think so badly  
 of me.  
 London,  
 77. & 78. St. Martins Lane,  
 26, 27, 28. & 29, Cranbourn Street, W.C.  
 & 7, Great Newport St.  
 25/1/1883.  
 Dear Professor Livers  
 I am sorry you should  
 have written to me so hastily.  
 The facts - which you must  
 kindly read in mere justice  
 to myself - are these.  
 Wülcher sent me the  
 proof quite lately in a great  
hurry as the "Anglia" was  
 just going to press & asked  
 if I would kindly alter as  
little as possible & return at  
once. I must confess I was

torn by doubts as to how I  
 should act. I ought to have  
 asked advice, but I wanted  
 to act at once. I just altered  
as few points <sup>as possible</sup> so as to fit my  
 original explanation to the  
 one I had accepted. Then I  
 returned the proof. I decided  
on receiving abzüge to send  
you one at once and apologise  
for not mentioning your  
name on account of the  
great increase of alteration in  
the proof it would <sup>have made</sup> ~~make~~  
 ask if I could not do you  
 justice in a nachtrag or  
 something of the kind. The fact



is I have not had much experience yet in this line. I had no idea the "Anglia" was out till your letter reached me. I thought I should get the abzüge before we left appeared so as to write to you before you saw the paper.

I am sure you will see that I acted if foolishly at least not with the slightest intention to offend you. In fact if you look at the thing closely you will see that, for the mere sake of ~~me~~ <sup>(not very important)</sup> taking the credit of one thing <sup>to</sup> myself, it would have been



absolutely against my interest  
 as well as a mean and  
 ungentlemanly thing to <sup>purposely</sup>  
<sup>spend your</sup> omitting your name. You know  
 from the letters I have written  
 you that I am in no wise  
 chary about imparting my  
 own discoveries &c. to others  
 they may be a help to. I  
 had looked forward to a long  
 continuance of our pleasant  
 intercourse, to seeing you when  
 some day I may visit your  
 country — surely this unfortunate  
 little mistaken ~~poli~~ act of  
 mine shall not stand between  
 us. If you like you need  
not mention my name to  
 the trifling contributions you

have received from me. That  
 will pay me back for my  
 offence to you. In fact I  
never expected you to acknowledge  
 them at all - at most  
 only the best. (I may add  
 that brego should be put  
 down as "erstatter nom." of  
 an n-stem. Icel. bragi - the  
 st. cases do not occur but would  
 be + bregan - also I have found  
 another like spadu, it is peru  
 st. cases peran in Icelhd. II  
 - & there is a suby. dyge  
 to dugan like pyrpe &c.  
 in Icelhd. which I have  
 temporarily mislaid my  
 reference for but will find  
 it for you). What I should



203/4/1/363

London.

77 &amp; 78. St. Martin's Lane.

26. 27. 28 &amp; 29. Cranbourn Street. W.C.

Telegraphic Address.  
CRANBOURNE, LONDON.

87. Great Newport St.

18

like you to do now - if  
 not asking too much -  
 is not to couch your note  
 to the "Anglia" in such  
 words as to incriminate  
 me in a crime I never  
dreamed of committing. But  
 it in my name if <sup>not</sup>  
 can (as I meant to <sup>make a hash of</sup> at  
 first) & you will be doing  
 a good <sup>only just</sup> action to  
 Yours Truly  
 J. Platt junr.



P.S. I hope you have not <sup>363</sup>  
 written to Wülcher before getting  
 this explanation as I do not  
 wish to be misrepresented  
 to my friends in the "Anglia"  
 as <sup>purposely</sup> committing <sup>such</sup> an action;  
 they would not believe it,  
 it is true; but then there  
 are strangers who do not  
 know me well - like yourself.  
 Perhaps you can tell me  
 what you write to Wülcher.  
 I may add that this one  
 case of the u-nouns is the  
only one of your kind  
communications that I have  
 utilised in any way (except  
 just putting in Cert which  
 you have not perhaps noticed  
 & which you should add to  
 your note in the "Anglia" as

203/4/1/363

London.

77 &amp; 78, St. Martin's Lane.

26, 27, 28 &amp; 29, Cranbourn Street, W.C.

Telegraphic Address.

CRANBOURNE, LONDON.

87, Great Newport St.

18

starting from you). I have  
not alluded to any other of  
 your communications in  
 my other papers (those for  
 heft II "Angl." "Engl. Stud." &  
 "Beiträge"). I did not like  
~~alluding~~ using ~~the~~ your help  
 in this case but it seemed  
 wrong to publish what I had  
 got to look on as a wrong  
 explanation (I mean my original  
 one). The whole thing is  
 due to my inexperience  
 & indecision of character & the  
 hurry of my business life (as I am  
 not free from business worries like you are)

## Transcript of Letter 12

[L12/S1/065]

Excuse this hurried letter. I am quite upset to think you should think so badly of me.

[LETTERHEAD]

25/1/1883

Dear Professor Sievers

I am sorry you should have written to me so hastily. The facts – which you must kindly read in mere justice to myself – are these.

Wülcker sent me the proof quite lately in a great hurry as the “Anglia” was past going to press & asked if I would kindly alter as little as possible & return at once.

I must confess I was

[L12/S2/066]

torn by doubts as to how I should act. I ought to have asked advice, but I wanted to act at once. I just altered as few points as possible so as to fit my original explanation to the one I had accepted. Then I returned the proof. I decided on receiving abzüge to send you one at once and apologise for not mentioning your name on account of the great increase of alteration in the proof it would ~~make~~ have mad[e] & ask if I could not do you justice in a nachtrag or something of the kind. The fact

[L12/S3/067]

is I have not had much experience yet in this line. I had no idea the “Anglia” was out till your letter reached me. I thought I should get the “abzüge” before the heft appeared so as to write to you before you saw the paper.

I am sure that you will see that I acted if foolishly at least not with the slightest intention to offend you. In fact if you look at the thing closely you will see that, for the mere sake of ~~one~~ taking the credit of one (not very important) thing of yours to myself, it would have been

[L12/S4/068]

absolutely against my interest as well as a mean and ungentlemanly thing to purposely offend you by omitting your name. You know from the letters I have written you that I am in no wise chary about imparting my own discoveries &c. to others they may be a help to. I had looked forward to a long continuance of our pleasant intercourse, to seeing you when some day I may visit your country – surely this unfortunate little mistaken act of mine shall not stand between us. If you like you need not mention my name to the trifling contributions you

[L12/S5/072]

have received from me. That will pay me back for my offence to you. In fact I never expected you to acknowledge them at all – at most only the best. (I may add that brego should be put down as “erstartr nom.” of an n-stem. Icel. bragi – the obl. cases do not occur but would be <sup>+</sup>bregan – also I have found another like spadu, it is peru obl. cases peran in Leechd. II – & there is a subj. dyge to dugan like pyrfe &c. in Leechd. which I have temporarily mislaid my reference for but will find it for you). What I should

[L12/S6/071]

[LETTERHEAD crossed out]

like you to do now – if not asking too much – is not to couch your note to the “Anglia” in such words as to incriminate me in a crime I never dreamed of committing. Put it in my name if you can (as I meant to make a nachtrag at first) & you will be doing a good & only just action to



Yours truly

J. Platt jun.

[L12/S7/074]

P.S. I hope you have not written to Wülcker before getting this explanation as I do not wish to be misrepresented to my friends in the “Anglia” as purposely committing such an action; they would not believe it, it is true; but then there are strangers who do not know me well – like yourself. Perhaps you can tell me what you write to Wülcker. I may add that this one case of the u-nouns is the only one of your kind communications that I have utilised in any way (except just putting in Cert which you have not perhaps noticed & which you should add to your note in the “Anglia” as

[L12/S8/073]

[LETTERHEAD crossed out]

starting from you). I have not alluded to any other of your communications in my other papers (those for heft II “Angl.” “Engl. Stud.” & “Beiträge”). I did not like ~~alluding~~ using ~~the~~ your help in this case but it seemed wrong to publish what I had got to look on as a wrong explanation (I mean my original one). The whole thing is due to my inexperience & indecision of character & the hurry of my business life (as I am not free from business worries like you are).

[L13/S1/069]

203/4/1/364  
 London,  
 77 & 78, St. Martin's Lane,  
 26, 27, 28 & 29, Cranbourn Street, W.C.  
 87, Great Newport St.  
 P.S. As to Cosign's  
 help as to Dutch igge  
 words I have he  
 allows me to give  
 where particularly  
 without reference.  
 Telegraphic Address,  
 CRANBOURNE, LONDON.  
 29/1/1883.  
 Dear Professor Sievers!  
 Thanks for your kind  
 letter. Wülcher has a small  
 paper (on Benn Jenuas &c.) for  
 heft II so I have sent an  
 "anmerkung" which I think  
 will satisfy you & asked him  
 to print it at beginning or  
 end of that paper (so as to  
 be conspicuous, you see, not  
 hidden away in a corner).  
 I mentioned that you had  
 told me you wrote to him before  
 you understood & would probably

write again retracting your  
 first letter. This you will  
 doubtless do. I am glad to  
 hear you are going to print  
 your notes in "Beiträge". If  
 you had waited for second  
 edition of "Gram." 2 years  
 someone would perhaps have  
 forestalled you in some points  
 during all that period! I  
 will not write with any more  
 suggestions till your paper  
 is out. I think I told you  
 that my paper in "Engl.  
 Stud." kept it contains some  
 of the points I drew your  
 attention to in my letters  
 (e.g. mågas læs Ælfred dyge)  
 but I suppose that will not  
clash with your paper - Still you  
 ought to know & I'm not sure if I told  
 you before. Yours truly J. Platt Jnr.



## Transcript of letter 13

[L13/S1/069]

P.S. As to Cosijn's help as to Dutch igge words I ~~have~~ he allows me to give these particulars without reference.

[LETTERHEAD]

29/1/1883

Dear Professor Sievers!

Thanks for your kind letter. Wülcker has a small paper (on fenn fennas &c.) for heft II so I have sent an "anmerkung" which I think will satisfy you & asked him to print it at beginning or e[n]d of that paper (so as to be conspicuous, you see, not hidden away in a corner). I mentioned that you had told me you wrote to him before you understood & would probably

[L13/S2/070]

write again retracting your first letter. This you will doubtless do. I am glad to hear you are going to print your notes in "Beiträge". If you had waited for second edition of "Gram." 2 years someone would perhaps have forestalled you in some points during all that period! I will not write with any more suggestions till your paper is out. I think I told you that my paper in "Engl. Stud." heft II contains some of the points I drew your attention to in my letters (e.g. mágas léo Ælfrēd dyge) but I suppose that will not clash with your paper – still you ought to know & I'm not sure if I told you before.

Yours truly

J. Platt jun.

[L14/S1/075]

203/4/1/365

London, 3/2/83.

Dear Professor Sievers

I am sorry to find you wrote to Sweet before getting my explanation. He has not been very friendly with me lately as I have been too frank in arguing against some of his theories and he took the chance of bringing the matter privately into the council of the Philological Society. I did not know of this till Thursday night and I had by that time destroyed your letter to me acquitting me of this mean thing. Hence I had no evidence to show the council that my story of your being satisfied was true. At the same time Sweet brought forward 2 other points to strengthen his charge but those I was able to refute. viz.

1) he had heard from me - like you - that Corijn told me about igge in Dutch so - like you - he suggested - I had intended



to take the credit. I quite cleared myself<sup>2</sup>  
 of this charge ~~showing~~ Corry was quite satisfied  
 about my not quoting his name - ~~which~~  
 and I also pointed out how absurd it would  
 have been, if I had meant to steal Corry's  
 idea, for me to tell Sweet & you & several  
other friends - as I did - that Corry told  
me these things!

2) Sweet's other point was that I quoted  
 from his "O.R. Texts" but had previously told  
 him I would not. I showed him that  
 my promise was that I would not print  
 "discoveries" - e.g. if the icge words only  
 occurred in "O.R. Texts" I should never  
 have printed anything about them  
 because that would be a "discovery"  
 made by the help of the "Texts" only.  
 But I never promised to Sweet that  
 I would not make "quotations" from  
 the "Texts" to support "discoveries"



made in other bodes. Thus, as the <sup>203/4/1/365</sup> 3  
icge was discovered by me in other  
 bodes long before "O. & T." came before  
 me I was quite justified in giving  
 2 points from "O. & T." along with  
others from other bodes. I ought  
 to have mentioned perhaps that welering  
 was pointed to me by Sweet (gealdridge  
 I found myself) but I had already  
given Sweet credit for that in a  
 paper in the Phil. Society's Transactions  
 so I did not think it necessary to  
repeat the reference to him in the "Anglia".

The council I hear - I  
was not there - acquitted me of these  
 2 points but as Sweet had your letter  
 to him & I had not got your letter  
 to me they said they wanted a  
 note from you before acquitting



me of the part of the charge referring<sup>4</sup>  
 to the u-words. So I write to ask  
 you to write me (or Sweet) that you  
 are satisfied. I may mention that  
 (just as in Cosign's case) I told Sweet  
 himself (last Friday week, the 19<sup>th</sup>, after  
 the Phil. Society's meeting) & other friends  
 that you helped me with the u-words.  
 How could I have done that if I had  
 meant to take the credit?

This absurd thing, although satisfactory  
 shared up, would do no credit to me  
 (or Sweet) if known so the Council  
 have agreed not to tell anyone of it  
 — even Cosign is to know nothing  
 as he is quite unaware that anyone has  
 been championing the imaginary wrong to  
 him — so I ~~also~~ trust you will also not  
 let the affair go beyond yourself. Yours truly  
 J. Platt

## Transcript of Letter 14

[L14/S1/075]

London, 3/2/83

Dear Professor Sievers

I am sorry to find you wrote to Sweet before getting my explanation. He has not been very friendly with me lately as I have been too frank in arguing against some of his theories and he took the chance of bringing the matter privately into the council of the Philological Society. I did not know of this till Thursday night and I had by that time destroyed your letter to me acquitting me of this mean thing. Hence I had no evidence to show the council that my story of your being satisfied was true. At the same time Sweet brought forward 2 other points to strengthen his charge but those I was able to refute viz.

1) he had heard from me – like you – that Cosijn told me about igge in Dutch so – like you – he suggested I had intended

[L14/S2/076]

to take the credit. I quite cleared myself of this charge as showing Cosijn was quite satisfied about my not quoting his name – ~~which~~ and I also pointed out how absurd it would have been, if I had meant to steal Cosijn's idea, for me to tell Sweet & you & several other friends – as I did – that Cosijn told me these things!

2) Sweet's other point was that I quoted from his "O.E. Texts" but had previously told him I would not. I showed him that my promise was that I would not print "discoveries" – e.g. if the icge words only occurred in "O.E. Texts" I should never have printed anything about them because that would be a "discovery" made by the help of the "Texts" only. But I never promised to Sweet that I would not make "quotations" from the "Texts" to support "discoveries"

[L14/S3/077]

made in other books. Thus, as the icge was discovered by me in other books long before "O.E.T" came before me I was quite justified in quoting 2 forms from the "O.E.T" along with others from other books. I ought to have mentioned perhaps that wælcricge was pointed to me by Sweet (gealdrice I found myself) but I had already given Sweet credit for that in a paper in the Phil. Society's Transactions so I did not think it necessary to repeat the reference to him in the "Anglia".

The council I hear – I was not there – acquitted me of these 2 points but as Sweet had your letter to him & I had not got your letter to me they said they wanted a note from you before acquitting

[L14/S4/078]

me of the part of the charge referring to the u-words. So I write to ask you to write me (or Sweet) that you are satisfied. I may mention that (just as in Cosijn's case) I told Sweet himself (last Friday week, the 19th, after the Phil. Society's meeting) & other friends that you helped me with the u-words. How could I have done that if I had meant to take the credit?

This absurd thing, although satisfactorily cleared up, would do no credit to me (or Sweet) if known so the Council have agreed not to tell anyone of it – even Cosijn is to know nothing as he is quite unaware that anyone has been championing the imaginary wrong to him – so I ~~also~~ trust you will also not let the affair go beyond yourself.

Yours truly

J. Platt jun.