Crawford supposes the Hindoo migration to the Malay archipelago to have begun in the thirteenth century, and it is supposed that this and the subsequent Mahometan invasions caused large displacements of population. That the expulsion of the Haidahs was posterior to the rule of the Hindoos seems evident, from their possessing the Sanscrit surya, as the name of "the sun," in the form tzoore. It is also possible that the Haidah kung, the moon, is a form of the Sanscrit chandra abbreviated. Malay domination has stamped itself upon the language in the word for man, orang, olang, which is the Malay's peculiar property, and which the Maidah but faintly disguises in eetling and ihlinga. Other Malay terms, such as perampuan, woman; kapala, head; mata, eye; telinga, ear: tangan, lima, hand; ruma, house; bumi, tanah, earth; api, fire; baik, good; jahat. bad, etc., are conspicuous by their absence, while the Papuan and Australian forms are exceedingly numerous. The absence of labials in Haidah, the place of which is taken generally by the sound of w, sometimes by an aspirate, and but rarely by the liquid m, exhibits phonetic decay not uncommon in American dialects, and renders perplexing, at first sight, the identity of compared words. Another source of difficulty is the combination tl, which is not characteristic only of Aztec speech. In most cases it appears to be an expedient for an original l or r, as in cetting for orang. This is a mere matter of dialectic variation, as appears from a comparison of the various forms of Caucasian speech. Thus, in Lesghian, the Avar word for night is rable, but in Andi it is retto. The sun again is beri in Akush, and mitli in Andi. The Nicaraguan dialect of the Mexican reveals the same equivalency, the Aztec Nahuatl being its Nahuar.

What stamps the Haidah as a Melanesian language is its grammatical construction in which it differs entirely from the Malay and the Polynesian proper. These latter are preposing languages, which does not simply mean that they make use of prepositions, but that they also place the governing word before its genitive, the temporal index before the verbal root, and, generally speaking, the abstract before the concrete as in Semitic and Indo-European speech. The Melanesian languages, in general terms, do the very opposite, and are thus postpositional, in all of which respects the Haidah agrees with them. A comparison of Mr. Harrison's Haidah grammar with Threlkeld's Australian one does not indeed reveal identity of structure, which would be remarkable, but it exhibits so many and such striking points of resemblance as to show that the two languages belong to one and the same family. In the Malay archipelago the presence of the same syntactical order may easily be detected, even within the compass of a brief vocabulary. Now, the Malay calls the middle of the night tangah malam, in which tangah is middle and malam is night; but the native of Teor terms a finger-nail limin-kukin, in which limin is hand and kukin is nail. While both seem