

for "childis play", p. 11; "I dighte" repeated, p. 33, where most probably the latter should be "Aplight"; "thought tha he be" for "though that he be", p. 46; "knytht" for "knyght", p. 48; "lemyn", p. 107,

They lemyd lyght As Any lemyn,
to rhyme with "neuyn", "seuyn", and "heuyn", where the rhyme and the sense alike demand "leuyn" = levin, lighting; in p. 116 also

They lemyd lyght as Any leme,
where the rhymes are the same as in the stanza last quoted; p. 119, "beche" for "beseche"; and very numerous other passages which readily admit of conjectural, and in most instances certain, emendation.

XXVI.—THE FAMILY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE
FINNISH AND INDO-GERMANIC LANGUAGES MAINTAINED. BY HENSLEIGH WEDGWOOD, ESQ.

In a paper on Sister families of languages published by Dr. Lottner in a late No. of our Transactions (Pt. I. 1860) he alludes to the supposition of a family relationship between the Finnish and Arian classes of language, and asserts very confidently that "except the numerous early loans, which are what we must expect among neighbouring nations, both grammar and dictionary are altogether different" in the two classes. By what test he tries the question, frequently a very thorny one, whether a form common to two classes of language is directly borrowed by one of them, or whether it may be part of a common inheritance, he does not inform us, but he seems to be mainly led by the *a priori* conviction that where the early numerals are wholly different, there can be no radical identity in the body of the language. Now it is certainly not easy to imagine how an entire difference of numerals could arise among tribes descended from a common stock, in which the gift of speech was so fully developed as to leave traces of common forms

clearly to be recognised in each of the descendants; but surely the early history of language is a subject on which we are far too ignorant to allow us to lay down any positive canons as to the limits of possible divergence. We must keep our mind open to the light through whatever cracks it may shine upon us, and try the question of a common descent by the intrinsic probabilities of the case to which the evidence applies, irrespective of the difficulties arising in other classes of phenomena.

In arguing with Dr. Lottner a preliminary difficulty occurs to persons who, like myself, believe that all words originally sprung from the attempt to represent natural sounds. Now Dr. Lottner seems to hold that as natural sounds are everywhere the same, the resemblance of words in different languages framed in imitation of those sounds can afford no argument for the family relation of the languages in which they appear. He accordingly rejects in a summary manner the evidence of every word tainted with a suspicion of onomatopoeia, and practically rules that the question is one which those who believe in the imitative origin of language, are, by the very nature of their belief, precluded from examining. He fails to observe that the same objection would apply, whatever be the principle in which language is supposed to have originated, short of a miraculous gift of the Creator. So long as language is supposed to arise from natural causes in the mental and physical constitution of man, it must be a not improbable supposition, that the same causes acting on a like nature should occasionally give rise to words which, although really formed independant of each other, might have the same kind of resemblance as if descended from a common stock. So long therefore as the natural origin of language is admitted, however vague may be our conception of the principles in which it has taken its birth, the same reasons which render it impossible (in Dr. Lottner's opinion) to argue for the family relationship of languages from the resemblance of any forms in which we can detect an imitative origin, would apply with equal force to cases where we

have no specific theory for the derivation of the resembling forms, and the question would be wholly removed from all possibility of elucidation by intrinsic evidence. In like manner the principle of Dr. Lottner would remove a large share of grammar from the field of possible comparison. Being convinced, from an extensive survey of language, that the widespread use of *M* and *T* as the radicals of the pronouns of the first and second persons respectively arises from causes common to the race of man, he pays little attention to inflections marked by those characteristics, and broadly asserts that there is no coincidence in the grammar of the Finnic and Indo-Germanic tongues beyond some similarity in the personal endings of the verbs arising from the cause above-mentioned. But surely the analogies pointed out by Professor Key (Philolog. Proceedings II. 181) amount to a good deal more than this. Compare the first and second persons plural of the Greek and Latin verb, *τυπτομεν*, *τυπτετον*, *regimus*, *regitis*, with the dual and plural imperfect of the Lap *etset*, to love:

etsimen	etsime	regimus
etsiten	etsite	regitis, (<i>Imperative</i> regite)
etsika	etsin	regunt

The Fin *minun*, *sinun*, of me, of thee (Gr. *σν*), also mine, thine, shew a far closer relation to *mine* and *thine*, G. *meiner* and *deiner*, than that of a common dependance on the radicals *m* and *s* (or *t*) respectively. The remarkable agreement (pointed out in the same place by Professor Key) between the Lap formation of the superlative in *umus* (*ânek*, short; *ânekub*, shorter; *ânekumus*, shortest) and the Latin in *umus*, *imus*, as in *postumus*, *infimus*, has perhaps lost weight from the agreement being so exact. The same may probably be said of Lap. *mocum*, *tocum*, *socum*, with the signification of Lat. *mecum*, *tecum*, *secum*, where we may also observe that the place of the preposition *cum*, with, (identical in the two languages) is an anomaly in the Latin grammar, while it accords with the regular order of the Finnish languages.

The enclitic *ek* or *ke* gives emphasis to the Lap demon-

stratives exactly as *ce* in Latin. *Mon*, I; *monnek*, I indeed; *tat*, this; *tatek*, *hicce*, this here. The same element seems to have already been appended to the simple pronominal root in *hic*, accus. *hunc*, in the latter of which it follows *n* for *m*, the proper characteristic of the accusative. In like manner *tunc* would be the emphatic form of *tum*, then, originally an accusative of the demonstrative root *ta*, and would thus correspond to Lap *tabke* (for *tamke*), the accusative of *tatek*. In Fjellström's way of spelling, the accusative *duöm* or *duöb* of *duot*, that, comes still closer to Lat. *tum*.

The union of the enclitic *ke* with *kå*, who, gives *kåke*, some one, corresponding to Lat. *quisque*, every one; leading to the inference that the enclitics *ce* and *que* are fundamentally the same. The agreement is equally striking between Fin. *kukaan* (*ku*, who?), any one, and Lat. *quisquam*; Magy. *ki*, who; *kiki*, every one, with Lat. *quis*, *quisquis*. Fin *itse*, self, may be compared with Lat. *ipse*; the same equivalence of *ps* and *ts* being seen in Esthon. *laps* or *lats*, a child. Lap. *ima*, yes, certainly, is almost identical with Lat. *imo* of the same meaning, while Lap. *jam*, therefore, then, is used in a way very similar to Lat. *jam*, now. *Pâte jam*, come then; *mi le jam tat*, what then is this?

In the general vocabulary no one doubts that a multitude of words has been directly borrowed from the Scandinavian nations to which the Finnish race was subject, but, independent of these undisputed adoptions, a mere survey of the dictionaries shews numerous agreements with the languages not only of their immediate neighbours of Scandinavian and Slavonic race, but with the Celtic, Teutonic, and in a remarkable manner with Latin and Greek. To assert that all these agreements are the result of early loans, without a shadow of evidence from the nature of the words compared, is simply to beg the question in favour of a foregone conclusion. If the family relationship of languages can ever be established by agreements in vocabulary in the face of a wide difference in grammatical structure, it must be by a series of examples such as those I have collected

in a paper published in our Transactions for 1856. From these I propose to select a few instances and to add others in which any presumption of borrowing on the part of the Finnish dialects is *primâ facie* rebutted by the fact, that the Finnish forms afford an explanation of those with which they are compared in the Indo-Germanic languages, and which are without derivation in their own domain.

The A.S. *æg*, in composition, signifies ever, all; *æghwa*, every who, *æghwather*, *ægther*, every one of two, each, either; and it was in early English also used with ordinary nouns. “Yif *ei mon* other *ei wummon* misseith ow”, If any man or any woman speak ill of you—Ancren Riwe 124. The Finnish tongues use *iggâ*, *ikkâ*, in the same way; Esthon. *iggâ-mees*, *iggâ-üks*, every man, every one; Lap. *ikke kâ* (the exact equivalent of A.S. *æghwa*), whoever, *ikke mi*, whatever, *ikke kus*, wherever. Moreover, the element which appears only as a timeworn fragment in A.S. *æg* or in Swed. *e* (*eho*, whoever; *ehuru*, however &c.) is in the Finnish languages a substantive word; Fin. *ikâ*, Esthon. *iggâ*, Lap. *hägga*, signifying lifetime, age, endurance, and giving rise to numerous derivatives, among which may be mentioned Esthon. *ik*, *ikka*, ever, *iggaw*, Fin. *ikâwâ*, as explaining A.S. *ece*, everlasting. Nor can the Finnish forms above mentioned have been borrowed from Goth. *aivs*, Lat. *ævum*, Sansk. *ayus*, lifetime, age, although there can be little doubt that they are radically identical with them.

It is so obvious a metaphor to speak of a ship ploughing the sea and leaving behind it a shortlived furrow, known as the wake of the ship, that we do not hesitate to identify E. *wake* with Esthon. *waggo*, Fin. *wako*, a furrow, although the metaphorical use of the term does not seem to be known in those languages. The Fr. *sillon*, a furrow, is the regular term for the wake of a ship.

The E. *wicked*, which is without connections in the Germanic or Romance languages, finds its explanation in Lap. *wikke*, fault, blame, *wikkalats*, guilty; Fin. *wika*, bodily defect; moral fault, guilt. We trace the conception to the original image in Esthon. *wigga*, a spot, blot, failing, defect, injury.

If we form a conjecture as to the sensible image which has given rise to Goth. *gamotjan*, to meet; O.N. *mót*, a meeting, opposite; E. *meet*, no more probable derivation could be suggested than from a word signifying face. To meet, to face, to confront, come face to face, are synonymous expressions. Now the meaning thus required for the derivation of *meet* is found in Lap. *muoto*, face, countenance, likeness, image. The idea is further developed in Fin. *muoto*, appearance, form, mode or manner, where we see that the same radical image explains another sense of O.N. *mót*, which also signifies type, model, mode or manner, and thus the Finnish etymon at the same time furnishes a clue to the origin of Lat. *modus*. Fin. *monella muotoa* or *muodolla*, in many manners; *samalla muotoa*, in the same manner. Here *moni*, many, and *sama*, same, might be suspected of being borrowed, but *samalla*, in what is called the adessive case, or *samassa* in the inessive, are elliptically used to signify at the same moment, together, giving a striking explanation of Lat. *simul*, which like so many of the adverbs has no obvious meaning in the language itself.

The name of the eel, the common type of slipperiness, may be plausibly explained from Esthon. *illa*, spittle, slime, Fin. *iljá*, slimy, slippery, in accordance with the analogy of W. *llyswen*, an eel, from *llysw*, slime; although the name for eel is not formed from that root in the Finnish languages. Perhaps the Sw. *hal*, Bav. *hál*, slippery (to which *cel* is referred by Serenius), may be the same word. Compare Sw. *hicka*, Esthon. *ikkitama*, to sob; Lap. *haletet*, *aletet*, to fly.

The G. *hund*, E. *hound*, can hardly be a really different word from Esthon. *hunt* or *hundi*, a wolf, the derivation of which is preserved in the verb *hundama*, to howl.

Fin. *karsta*, soot, and thence dirt, refuse, explains G. *garstig*, nasty, filthy; Lap. *aletet*, to fly, Lat. *ales* (*alit*-), a bird; Fin. *kalkkata*, to clang, Gr. *χαλκος*, brass, "sounding brass". Fin. *lentää*, to fly, *linto*, a bird, *lento-orawa*, a flying squirrel, shew the origin of G. *lind-wurm*, a dragon

or serpent, supposed to be furnished with wings and to grow to an enormous size—Küttner.

Equivalents of Lat. *muto*, to change, are found in many of the cognate languages; O.H.G. *muzon*, Gael. *muth*, to change, W. *mudo*, to change place or remove. It would be a striking coincidence if these were unconnected with Esthon. *mudama*, *muudma*, to change; Fin. *muutaa*, to change place or form, to move, to alter, verbs of which the native origin is manifest in Fin. *muu*, Esthon. *mu*, other, according to the analogy of G. *ändern*, Gr. *ἄλλασσω*, to alter, from G. *ander* and Gr. *ἄλλος*, other. Magy. *más*, other; *másit*, to change.

G. *narr*, a buffoon or person who makes sport in order to make others laugh, a laughingstock, a fool, finds its explanation in Fin. *nauraa*, to laugh, to deride; Esthon. *naarma*, to laugh; *naratama*, to smile; *narus pannema* (to put to laughter), to deride; *nar*, a fool, buffoon.

The agreement of Gr. *μωκος*, mock, mockery, with the English word shews that the origin of the expression may be sought at a very distant period in the history of language. Now the instinctive type of mockery may be seen in the child pulling faces or making mouths at those who are obnoxious to him, and we might therefore expect the word to be derived from a depreciatory term for a mouth, such as we find in Esthon. *mok*, snout, mouth, lips.

The probability of true relationship between forms in widely separated dialects is greatly increased when we find that a root in one of the stocks compared explains a variety of forms, apparently unrelated among themselves, in the other, as in the case of Lap. *muoto* above mentioned. Another case of the same kind is seen in Fin. *palata*, to roll, to return, whence is formed Lap. *pale*, in the sense of It. *volta*, a turn, a time, from *volgere*, Lat. *volvere*, to roll. Lap. *akta palen*, once, at one time; *tatte palest*, from that time; *peive palen*, in the day time; *mo palen*, in my presence, when turned towards me. Hence may be explained Lat. *palam*, openly, in the presence of all, while Fin. *palata*, to return, would afford the most natural deri-

vation of Gr. *παλιν*, again. But in addition to these the Lap. *tai pali*, literally, those times, is used in the sense of formerly, agreeing in a remarkable manner with Gr. *παλαι*, and at the same time corroborating the ordinary derivation of Lat. *olim* from *ole* or *olle* for *ille*; *in illo* tempore—Voss. The only difference would be an ellipse of one half of the expression in the Latin and of the other in the Greek.

If any one is inclined to regard all these coincidences as matter of pure chance, he would do well to compare the amount of agreement in vocabulary between the Finnish dialects and Latin and Greek apparent on a mere inspection of the dictionaries, with the whole body of analogies which have yet been pointed out between the Indo-Germanic and Semitic tongues.

XXVII.—CAMBRICA, see p. 204 et seq.

(ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.)

- P. 204. *tidicones adiamor*. Here, as Dr. Siegfried thinks, *ti* may be 'thy', *dicones* a substantive meaning 'power', or 'satisfaction', and *adiamor* the 1 pers. plural pres. indic. of a deponent verb = the modern *addiaw* 'to strive after'.
- P. 205. *i nadaut* may be "in which was formed"—taking the verb to be 3^d sg. pret. *passive*.
- P. 206. *enderic* (gl. vitulus). Pughe derives *enderig* from *terig* 'ardent'. *Heruid* is in M. Breton *heruez*. The suffix in *duiu-tit* is the Latin *-tūt*, Goth. *-dups*.
- P. 207. *dafraud atuis* (gl. subtrahet igni). The *a* here is the Cornish and Breton *a* 'from'. Welsh has only *o*.
- arta* (gl. restat) seems identical with the O. Ir. *artáa* (superest) Z. 477, *ar-un-taa* (superest nobis) Z. 495, 577, from the prep. *ar* and the verb subs. *tá*. See the note on *itau* in the next page.