

however informs us of very interesting facts respecting the composition of the tenses of the verbs, as compared with the Hebrew forms, and it is more of these interesting facts that we would desire.

Again, while N. O. is quite right on scientific grounds to condemn M. Renan's unphilosophical reference of certain analogies to chance, it may not be quite right to object as he does, to what M. Renan has to say on the subject of onomatopœia, and in which he but coincides with such eminent modern critics as Gesenius, Fürst, etc. N. O. is doubtless acquainted with the original Hebrew text of the Scriptures. Can he, then, ignore the remarkable prevalence of Onomatopœia, more especially in the early books of the Sacred Volume? And need we remind him that this prevalence of onomatopœia in the early history of the language is of no small value in discussing the question of the primitive language—"unité primordiale du langage" which, says N. O., is treated by M. Renan as "*ridicule chimère, et mythe le plus bizarre.*" We are not quite clear as to whether the reviewer holds the Hebrew to be the primitive language of man; but for his Algonquin "*kokoc, kokoko, kackacipinesi, kakaki, makaki, etc.,*" how many examples could we cite, not only in the Hebrew, but in the later Latin family of languages. Here are a few: Hebrew קקל, lackack, English, he licked; Italian leccare; French lécher: so in Greek λεχεῖν, German lecken. Next Hebrew קרא, kara; English, he cried; Italian, gridare; Fr. crier; Ger. schreien. Our limited space, however, compels us to leave this topic here. Scarcely more satisfied are we with the meagre list of quadriliteral and quinquiliteral Iroquois roots which N. O. opposes to a yet shorter list of Hebrew and other similar roots, as an offset to those "*dont M. Renan fait un si pompeux étalage.*" We shall wait for the more elaborate effort which we desire to see from the reviewer before we fully give in our adhesion to the following important claims: "*Concluons donc qu'en matière d'onomatopées, les langues américaines ne le cèdent à aucune, et que parmi elles, l'iroquois se distingue par des tendances à revêtir la forme quadrilitère.*"

Similar objections may be raised to comparisons of Algonquin with Greek and Latin, as '*enim,*' above referred to, or the root "*tang*" in the verb to touch, or another which has been suggested as a parallel,—the prevalence of the root "*ouk,*" or "*oik,*" in the sense of house or dwelling. More especially would such objections