

in these *Transactions* four years earlier. Whether this ever came to his notice is more than I can say; but not only did the famous anthropologist know of my humble person (we had exchanged some correspondence), but he refers to me in the very incriminated paper.

Nor should it be forgotten that the essence of a language consists less in its vocabulary than in its grammar and syntax, its peculiar structure and morphology. Its words are its body, but its soul rests in its grammar.

An anthropologist of the French materialistic school, A. Hovelacque, has the following in his work on *La Linguistique*:

"Si l'aptitude spéciale à la connaissance pratique des langues n'est point une science, l'étymologie, par contre, telle qu'elle est pratiquée le plus souvent, ne peut être regardée ni comme une science ni comme un art. L'étymologie, par elle-même, n'est qu'une jonglerie, une sorte de jeu d'esprit, si bien que le grand ennemi de l'étymologiste, son ennemi implacable, c'est le linguiste. En un mot, l'étymologie par elle-même et pour elle-même n'est que de la divination; elle fait abstraction de toute expérience, néglige les difficultés et se contente des apparences spécieuses de ce qui n'est qu'à peine probable ou à peine vraisemblable".¹

By *étymologie* the French author means in the above passage word-assimilations.

Perfectly applicable to amateur or over enthusiastic philologists, his observations, if understood without qualifications, could be considered as exaggerations at the expense of the terminological school. They are prompted by excesses on the part of many of its champions; but they are themselves open to the charge of being an excess the opposite way. *In medio stat virtus*, and there is not the least doubt that terminological comparisons, when properly conducted, can be of much value.

At all events, it is a remark which has by this time acquired the force of an ethnological axiom that of all the anthropological sciences comparative philology is the one whose conclusions have the most weight when it is a question of tracing the origin or parentage of a race.

Witness the case of the Sanscrit roots used by both the blackish peoples of southern Asia and the blonde nations of northern Europe; witness, nearer home, the monosyllabic radicals of the Déné tongue which we now find on the lips of the timid Hare of the northern wastes and the fierce Apache of the South; of the progressive Chippewayan and Carrier of British America and the conservative Navaho of the southern States—and this in spite of the fact that several alien stocks intervene between the two sections of that important aboriginal family.

Prompted by this consideration and moved by the thought that said family could not be autochthonous in America, I published some

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 16; Paris, sans date (reimpression).