

the sign of passivity. Who can possibly maintain that a system of such forms, gathered about a root, exhibits the results of experience, of developed acuteness, in thought and speech, any less clearly than the analytic forms of our English conjugation? The two are only different methods of expressing the same 'array of determinatives.' The first synthetic mental act, on the contrary, is truly represented by the bare root: There all is, indeed, confused and indiscrete. . . . M. Renan, in short, has made a very strange confusion of analytic style of expression with mental analysis: All expression of relations, whether by means that we call synthetic or analytic, is the result and evidence of analysis." *

This reasoning thoroughly dissipates the position taken by Dr. Lieber in support of the doctrine of holophrasis. Although written in view of the languages of the Indo-European family, it applies with equal force to the languages of the American aborigines, the word-sentences of which are the same in kind with those of the former.

The comparison of linguistic forms to ascertain probable linguistic affinity can be used with extreme caution and to a limited extent only. The information and data for such a study must be accurate and trustworthy in an unexceptional degree; even then its results must, in a measure, be necessarily of doubtful value, since the scientific method of the science of language demands that no human nature different from the one we know be made a factor in the problem, and the human organism, under like conditions, acts with more or less uniformity.

Linguistic classification by means of morphologies—grammatic and syntactic accordances alone, like that by the genetic method—the historically traceable identity of elements—is, of course, incompetent and of no force to affirm or to deny identity or possible correspondences among the ultimate elements of some or all linguistic groups—accordances antedating all, even partial, grammatic development, because its right to be rests on the development of the parts of speech and their flexions—the derivative and the syntactic processes; beyond these, the tokens of the grammatic period, it cannot take us. This is of course true, because in every language the earliest records of men can carry us back only to a point far distant from the genesis of its peculiar structure and still more distant from the beginnings of human speech.

* *Op. cit.*, pp. 285, 286.