

natural to an English person, the two forms are foreign to each other in the Pacific islands. Take again the word for egg: it is *muntiro* in Liang, *mantirhui* in Morella, *munteloa* in Batumerah, *momátiro* in Lariki, but in all these cases the first syllable stands for *mano*, a bird. All of these dialects, therefore, are Melanesian and not Malay. It is very common among uncivilized people to call the fingers the children of the hand. Were this the case in Malay-Polynesian, the word children would come first as in the Tongan *cow-nimá*, the company of the hand, in which *cow* is company and *nima* hand. But in Teor fingers are *limin-tagin*; in Larika *lima-hato*; in Cajeli *limam-kokón*; in Liang *rima-kuhatu*; in Amblaw *lemnati-kokoli*. In these cases the first word is pure Malay, *lima* or *rima*, the hand, but the construction is that of a people who had not submitted to Malay syntax.

It may be objected that this Melanesian syntax is found not only in Haidah, but also in a very large number of American aboriginal languages. This is true. It is the order in Iroquois and Dacotah, Cherokee and Choctaw, Shoshonese and Zuni, Aztec, Peruvian and Chileno. It is also the Turanian order in Europe and Asia, counting out the Chinese and their monosyllabic associates. But these other American, and the European and Asiatic postponers, have not, like the Haidahs, a Melanesian-Malay vocabulary. Their words are, with a few exceptions that tend to show the unity of all speech, quite different from those of the Queen Charlotte Islanders. The Haidahs have articles, definite and indefinite. The Turanians proper of Europe, Asia and America, have none. But the Algonquins have, and the Malay-Polynesians and the Caffres of Africa, and also the Melanesians. Whether the latter borrowed them from the Malays or not who can tell? The Haidah articles are *nung* and *lth*, and the Australian are *uni* and *gáli*. The Haidah thus presents a peculiar philological study as a purely Turanian language, in syntactical order, that has borrowed extensively from the Malay vocabulary, and that, probably from the same source, has differentiated itself from other Turanian languages by the appropriation of a spurious article. Its postpositional particles are not without analogy to the Japanese and cognate tongues, but their affinities are all with those of the Melanesian area, and in particular with those of far distant Australia. In Australian speech we probably have the Melanesian at its purest and, unfortunately, at its scantiest.

Commerce has carried the Malay numerals all over the Pacific into almost every Melanesian habitat except Australia. The original Melanesian type, of which the Haidah is a rescript, is lost; even Australia, which only counts as far as four, does not know it. It has to be picked up in fragments scattered over the whole insular area. A reference to the appended vocabulary will show that the chief affinities of the Haidah numerals are with those of Timbora, or Tambora, and Sumbawa, con-