the Scandinavian word agrees more closely both in sense and form with the English than the other, I submit that the balance of probability is in favour of the former as the proximate originant.

Upon a future occasion I hope to be able to extend the investigation to words which appear for the first time in Semi-Saxon, and were probably adopted into the Saxon from the Danish, and also to those which appear both in Low German and Scandinavian, but are absent from our Anglo-Saxon Dictionaries. For this however, as for many other subjects, *otium Divos rogo*.

V.—TRACES OF THE ITALIC IMPERFECT IN THE KELTIC LANGUAGES. BY DR. C. LOTTNER.

Latin does not know of any augment, but forms its imperfect by the addition of *ā* to the root, as is clearly seen in *er-ā-s*, *erāmus*, *erātis*, while in the other persons the *a* has become shortened. Again, the more common termination of the imperfect *bam*, &c. is nothing but an imperfect of the root *fu*, formed on the same principle as *eram*, but no longer used as an isolated form. The original form must have been *fuam*, *fuās*, *fuat*, *fuāmus*, &c., which became *bam*, *bās*, &c. in Latin, while in Oscan the *f* was retained, as may be seen in the only imperfect as yet discovered *fufans*, 'erant' = an hypothetical Latin *fu-bant*. The *m* of the first person singular in Latin and the *ns* of the third person plural in Oscan, being the identical terminations of the subjunctive in both these languages, show that the said Italic forms have the secondary set of terminations, called in Greek grammar the termination of the historical tenses.

A similar preterite is found in Lithuanian with the characteristic vowel *ō*, this being the common representative of the original *ā* in that language. Thus from the root *suk* = to turn, *bu* = to be (inf. *suk-ti*, *bu-ti*), we get the following preterites:

32 TRACES OF THE ITALIC IMPERFECT IN THE KELTIC

sing.	1.	<i>suk-a-u</i>	<i>bu(v)-a-u</i>
	2.	<i>suk-a-i</i>	<i>bu(v)-a-i</i>
	3.	<i>suk-o</i>	<i>bu(v)-o</i>
dual.	1.	<i>suk-o-ra</i>	<i>bu(v)-o-ra</i>
	2.	<i>suk-o-ta</i>	<i>bu(v)-o-ta</i>
	3.	<i>suk-o</i>	<i>bu(v)-o</i>
pl.	1.	<i>suk-o-mē</i>	<i>bu(v)-o-mē</i>
	2.	<i>suk-o-tē</i>	<i>bu(v)-o-tē</i>
	3.	<i>suk-o</i>	<i>bu(v)-o</i>

The terminations are here the same as those of the present tense, because the Lithuanian no longer observes the difference between the two sets.

To turn to the Keltic. I shall remark by way of introduction, that in the Keltic languages the original *ā* is sometimes retained, and sometimes changed to *ô*, which latter vowel is again liable to shortening, and to alteration into *u*. The last we observe, for instance, in the datives in *-u* of bases ending originally in *ā*, turned into *ô* in old Gaulish. The dative singular of this class of bases ends in *āi* in Zend, *oi* in Oscan, *ui* in Lithuanian, *ô* in Latin, *u* in Gaulish, Prussian, Slavonian.

The clearest traces of *ā*-preterites we have in the Keltic verb substantive, namely:

				Compare		
	OLD IRISH	WELSH	BRETON ³	LATIN	OSCAN	LITHUANIAN
s. 1.	(<i>b</i>) <i>bá, eram</i>	<i>bu-m</i>	<i>o-a-nu</i>	<i>b-a-m</i>		<i>bu(v)-a-u</i>
2.	(<i>b</i>) <i>bá¹</i>	<i>bu-o-st</i>	<i>o-a-z</i>	<i>b-á-s</i>		<i>bu(v)-a-i</i>
3.	(<i>b</i>) <i>ba, bu, bo</i>	<i>bu</i>	<i>o-a</i>	<i>b-a-t</i>		<i>bu(v)-o</i>
pl. 1.	(<i>b</i>) <i>bá-mmar</i>	<i>bu-a-m</i>	<i>o-a-mp</i>	<i>b-á-mus</i>		<i>bu(v)-o-mé</i>
	(<i>b</i>) <i>bo-mmar</i>					
2.	(<i>b</i>) <i>bu-id</i>	<i>bu-a-ch</i>	<i>o-a-ch</i>	<i>b-á-tis</i>		<i>bu(v)-o-té</i>
3.	(<i>b</i>) <i>ba-tur</i>	<i>bu-a-nt²</i>	<i>o-a-nt</i>	<i>b-a-nt</i>	<i>-fa-us</i>	<i>bu(v)-o</i>

¹ Not yet found in old Irish, modern Irish *bā-t* (O'Donovan), the *t* being the suffixed pronoun *tú*. There is however in old Irish another second person sing. *dorroega* 'degisti' (Fiac. 26), which warrants the assumed form. So perhaps also *rachuala* 'audivisti' (Zeuss 49).

² Modern Welsh; *bun, buost, bu, buant* also old Welsh. For the first person in old Welsh the form *buum* occurs, but Zeuss 539 is no doubt right in considering this a mistake for *buam*.

³ Modern Br. In the old language we find *ron* (Z. 450) 'erat', evidently for *bua*.

These forms speak for themselves; and I shall only add that the initial *b* of the old Irish is never aspirated, but on the contrary often written *bb*, nay even *p*, when the verbal particle of the preterite (*vo*) is prefixed, which is usually the case. This *bb* stands for *bv*, *bu*, retained in Welsh. In the latter language the second person singular has been seduced by the example of the common preterites, the characteristic of which is *s*, to assume the same, while in the third pers. sing. the *a* is dropt, though still retained in the old Breton *vo-a* for *bua*. The plural of the old Irish has deponential forms.

There are other *i*-preterites in old Irish, recognizable by the *u* of the third person, namely *arachuiliu anman duini* 'who has depraved the soul of man'; *asnin-dedur* (Z. 580) 'was expressed', (in which *dedur* seems a medial form presupposing an active preterite *dedu*), and above all the preterite of *t-ogu* 'eligo', which is this:

sing.	2. <i>do-rroega</i>	3. <i>do-rroigu</i>
pl.	2. <i>do-rroigaid</i>	3. <i>do-rroigatar</i> .

But the most ancient form of this kind is the *ieuru*, *iôru*, repeatedly occurring on the Gaulish inscriptions in the sense of 'fecit',—compare the old Irish *uar* (*ô*, *û* is frequently resolved into *ua* in old Irish) in *fodr-uar* 'effecit', *dorôrta* 'facta sunt' (Z. 28)¹.

The absence of the personal termination in the third pers. sing. as early as the Gaulish inscriptions, proves beyond doubt that this termination was merely *t*, and consequently that the Keltic, like the Italic, gave to its *i*-preterite the secondary terminations. This is confirmed by the want of any termination in the second pers. sing. in old Irish, a want equally remarked in the subjunctive, while the present indicative ends in *i* or has an *i*-infection, intimating a lost final *i* (which was developed out of *ihî*, for *isi*).

I have only to add in conclusion that all the facts adduced in this short Paper, as far as they are not already

¹ This comparison we owe to Dr. Siegfried.

contained in Zeuss's grammar, have been furnished to me by Mr. Whitley Stokes, to whose learning therefore any thing of real value is due which the present essay may contain.

VI.—ON THE FORMS AND ORIGIN OF THE PRONOUNS OF THE FIRST AND SECOND PERSONS. BY DR. C. LOTTNER.

Though linguistic science is unable to give any thing like satisfactory testimony on the question of the historical unity of mankind, yet in another, and in a far higher sense, it can establish the oneness of our race. It can prove the *ideal* unity of human nature, of which the sought-for historical unity is indeed but the shadow and the symbol. This it does by showing that, throughout the strange tumult of discordant voices, ever and anon we perceive the same psychological laws at work, leading nations widely different in origin along the same path in the formation of their languages. It was in this sense that Buschmann pointed out the similarity of the words meaning father and mother in nearly all the languages of the globe. It was in this sense that Pott in his 'Zählmethoden' proved the fact that, with few exceptions, all nations choose for the base of their numeral systems the number of the fingers of either one hand or both, or else of the fingers and toes taken together (5, 10, 20). It is still in this sense that I would call attention to the remarkable coincidences to be observed in the pronouns of the first and second person, which are—it will be seen—of such a nature as to afford ample proof of the identity of the human mind throughout the globe, while on the other hand they fail utterly to establish identity of origin.

PART I.

I shall first notice the phonetic similarity prevailing in