

FAI 18/1120

- Sube dnd. 1870.

My dear Müller,

I shall be in Oxford for
Trinity Monday, staying with
Stubbs, where I should like to
have a talk with you. I got
hold of the fasc-^{end} of your lec-
ture in Fraser yesterday, which
I had only time to glance at,
but which set me a-thinking.
I suppose it is you who are re-
vising Cox in Sat. Rev. I had

only time to get about half way
through before I left home —
I am moving about, and am just
now with Macmillan at Foot-
ing. You know I go all lengths
with you and him about the gods
above, but I am but a proselyte
of the gate as to heroes. I have
made out that both my Harolds
are clearly solar heroes: they
answer all Fox's requirements to
the letter. The book is wonderfully
ingenious and often very pecu-
liful, but I fear he has damaged
it for the world at large by his
mixture of statement and contro-

versy. I hold that he should have
put out his own notions clearly,
and have thrust all those whom
he has to quote, whether to con-
firm or to confute, into Appendix.
Do you go with him about dog
dog and higer? Surely river
is not a genuine Greek word,
and, if dog has a Greek cognate,
is ~~not~~ it not taken. Iw's a
kindred beast like wulf and
vulpes.

Your second letter came this
morning (June 3rd) along
with the proof of a fourth Mac.



million article in which I am
following up the subject by adding
my that very curious book
Cooks Neglected Fact in English
History.

June 4th. I am obliged to you
by deputy. my right hand for
some time past has been
almost disabled from writing.
Cox. makes the same complaint
and I dictate whatever I can.
I will run through the remarks
in your former letter.

(1) I certainly find Tautonicus
as a later form supplanting
Theotiscus, but I could not
without great searching in
Pertz pretend to say when



Somerleaze,

Wells,

Somerset.

Latin form came in. Stubbs I believe puts it earlier than you do. But am I wrong in thinking that both are really the same word? Teut. is wonderfully like the form Tiutsch with which I am familiar in my Swiss books. It may be that this likeness is incidental and that those who introduced the form Teutonius did it by mistake. If so, all the more reason for talking about Dutch where one can't be

wrong.

(2) Walnut is undoubtedly
Welsh nut, they are always
called Welsh nuts in Prov.
cosetshiri and seemingly
French nuts in Devonshire,
on which Earle has a
Curious note in his edition
of the Chronicles.

(3) I have always been puzzled
about Father and Mother
the modern form being right
as compared with the French
the old one being right
as compared with High Dutch.

But what is the evidence
for I having been sounded
like θ. There are several
other words as father where
we seem to have thickened
the pronunciation in the
same way. Strangford
used to say that the soft-
sound of θ was a corruption
altogether.

(4) I meant to say, that
the change in local names
has been as you say, from
Low (or for three) to High. I
have just been amused
by finding in Bentley's



J

I

H

G

F

E

D

C

B

rite

book, where he talks about
the Cattas as he calls them
& adds, "its semblance gu'is
occupant equivalent
de la Kiper." It plainly did
not come into his head, that
his Cattas and Kiper were
the same word.

Once more about Fentoneus
surely I have seen such a
form as Theotoneus which
at once connects Fentoneus
and Theotiscus. Surely, Theotiscus
and Theotiscus stand in the
same relation to one another
as Franconia and Francin
and all the other cases where
you have a double form

with and without the
one syllable.

About the Iberians I should
be best pleased if I could
to avoid committing myself
to any theory whatever
I only want a name to mark
off the non-Aryan people of
South Western Europe, of
whom the Basques are
surely the remnant, from
the Aryans who followed
them. I am open to use
any name or names you
may give me, or to call
them simply non-Aryan, if
that will be better. Anyhow

it is funny that I should
have used as a reduction ad
absurdum. the very view which
Buxley was just at the same
time putting forth seriously.
Since I began this letter
you has told me that
you did not write the review
of Cox in the Saturday Review
as indeed I might have
learned from the paper which
appeared yesterday, but
neither he nor I know who
or even guess who did write it.
Also I have been both pleased
and surprised at receiving
a letter from the Chancellor.
Saying that I am to be
made a D.C.L. at Cambridge

orator which will bring me
back to Oxford again. As I want
as many as possible of my own
people to see the light I shall
be obliged to any one who can
do any thing for me in the
way of ladies tickets, things of
which I suppose I have rubles
up me than any one who
has had to do with
the place.

I go back to Cox, the Saturday
Reviewer complains of me having
out Harriet by the way. I don't
know any thing about Harriet
by the way I have a dinner invitation
of I want to visit, and a strong
desire to know something
of the Co. ex. ny. Bog whom Walter
Potts so strangely made

English folk of the 11th century
play to. I warned Cox when
he began that if he called
it Aryans by the way he must
not make it exclusively
Greek - or even Greek, Teutonic
and Indian - but must take
in a great many things of
which I had the knowledge,
nor I imagine he had either.
For this I suppose he has had
no time, the wonder is dragged
to death as he is by the Longmen
he has found to do anything
at all.

Yours very truly
Edward Freeman