

horses and cattle in exactly the same fashion, and the writer has more than once been called the father of his own horse by natives who saw nothing ludicrous or disrespectful in this mode of speaking.

To be sure, this must sound "absurd" to others than Mr. Boyle; but "psychologically the Indian differs from the white man immeasurably more than he does physically. His habits of thought are totally unlike ours". This remark is not mine; it comes from the genial author of the above mentioned monograph himself, and it has seldom been my good fortune to find so much truth condensed in so few words.

It is because of this undeniable fact that, brought up as I now seem to have been among our Indians, and having unconsciously adopted many of their ways of thinking, I could never bring myself to accept the late Dr. Brinton's interpretations of aboriginal myths. To me his comments and explanations are simply the lucubrations of a highly cultivated Aryan intellect, something quite different from the gropings of the infantile Indian mind. I feel certain that our Dénés, at least, could never have woven the marvelous abstractions and devised the ingenious symbolisms which he lends the poor American aborigine.

But to return to our "Carrier dog". In the first place, we should not fail to note the persistence of philological forms over sociological particularities, and thereby establish once more the superiority of the former over the latter from an ethnographical standpoint. The Carriers have long ceased to burn their dogs as if they were human beings, but the practise connected with that custom, that of calling father or mother (or indeed grandfather or grandmother, as the case may be) those who to us are simply their masters, has survived and will probably last as long as the Carrier dialect lives.

This peculiar way of treating domestic animals has left its impress on the language to such an extent that words having a relation to their names are granted the plural proper to personal nouns. Thus, while a Carrier may say that he has killed, for instance, two bears, *nankhe sæs*, he will change the *nankhe* into *nane* when he states that he possesses, let us say, two dogs, *nane pikhe*. The same is true of the few genuine adjecti-