

actual historical value of linguistic criteria is so real and this value so little appreciated among Americanists generally, that it seemed pedagogically advisable, if not theoretically warranted, to somewhat overdo the emphasis on them. As for the claims of physical anthropology to more detailed consideration, I must here, too, confess that I feel too keenly my limitations in this regard to do more than briefly indicate a few possibilities. The incidental light thrown on culture history or on former movements of population by the data of physical anthropology is certainly worthy of a careful methodological treatment.

In answer to a third possible criticism, I must emphatically point out that I do not consider any single one of the inferential criteria that I have set up as necessarily valid in a specific case. An argument, *e.g.*, based on the associations formed by a culture element or on its geographical diffusion or on its linguistic representation may be entirely convincing in the handling of one problem, yet appear far-fetched or even totally inapplicable in the handling of another. Everything depends upon the specific conditions of a given problem. And, needless to say, any one criterion is never to be applied to the exclusion of or in opposition to all others. It is a comfortable procedure to attach oneself unreservedly or primarily to a single mode of historical inference and wilfully to neglect all others as of little moment, but the clean-cut constructions of the doctrinaire never coincide with the actualities of history.

If any general point should have come out more clearly than another in the course of our discussion, it is the danger of tearing a culture element loose from its psychological and geographical (*i.e.*, distributional) setting. No feeling of historical perspective can be gained for any culture element without careful reference to these settings. Another way of bringing out this point is to emphasize the necessity of historically evaluating or weighting a culture element or linguistic datum before it is employed for comparative purposes. The failure adequately to weight ethnological and linguistic data, but to rely largely on the counting of noses, is to an equal extent responsible for the historical vagaries of a Frazerian evolutionist and for those of his counterpart, the Graebnerian diffusionist.