

tures common to I. E. and Turanian. On the other hand the Dakota shows on the surface striking contrasts to Turanian languages. The numerals are eminently dissimilar. The Dakota, like I. E. languages, varies both root and suffix in forming words, and uses both prefixes and suffixes. In Turanian languages the suffix only is varied, and prefixes are scarcely at all used.

It seems to me therefor that it is not unscientific to inquire whether the similarities of the various Dakotan languages to various European languages, modern and ancient, so often remarked are or are not accidental. It is very easy to see that the Dakota resembles the English in vocabulary much more than it resembles the Chippewa. The similarities of the Dakota suffixes, pronouns and prepositions to those given by Bopp, and the general resemblance of Dakotan languages to Sanskrit, Gothic, etc., in vocabulary, made me certain of relationship before I ever saw Fick's dictionary. Yet as I turned over his pages I was amazed at the similarity of the I. E. roots to the Dak roots. The Slav Teut bases of Fick seem to me most similar to the Dak. I am certain that neither the Teutonic or Graeco-Italic dictionaries resemble the Dakota as much as do the European, Indo. European and Aryan dictionaries. The I. E. consonants are represented in Dakota, Santee and Titon dialects, and in Minnetaree in accordance with the following table. I omit representatives concerning which I am doubtful. I have too little material on the other languages to justify me in including them.

I E	k	g	gh	p	bh	m	w
S	k, h, kh, sh*	k, h†	gh, kh, zh	p	m, b, w	m	w, p
T	k, h, g†, khsh	k, g†	gh, kh, zh	p	b, w	m, b†	w, p
M	k, h, gh , sh	k	gh	p	m§ (b, w) p		
I E	t	d	dh	n	r, l¶	y¶	s
S	t, n	t, d, n	d	n	n, d	y, z	s, sh, z, zh, t
T	t, n	t, l, n	l	n	n, l	y, z	s, sh, z, zh, t
M	t, d	t	d§ (l, n, r)		ts	ts, sh, t	