

taken such a keen interest. But my inmost convictions bid me declare, at the risk of appearing too self-confident, that the doctor's verbal identifications are, with a very few and unimportant exceptions, absolutely groundless. The reader will please remember his several failures, which I have already pointed out as resulting from the violation of fundamental laws of comparative philology. I may well pass over those assimilations which are attempted with words that are not roots. Let me add that a very large number of the terms he gives as Déné seem utterly extraneous to that linguistic family. Think, for instance, of such vocables as *telamachkur* for fish, *payyamay* for man, *alcorn* for rain, *ktckchuly* for cold, *ttshukulak* for eagle, *sku-tsukaisla* for girl, etc. Verily, any Russian or Bantu word taken at random would probably look more Déné.

Among such words of Dr. Campbell's Vocabulary as are undoubtedly Déné, many merely approximate in meaning the English term given as synonymous. Thus *tayuz* is the equivalent, not of the English "boy," but of the Latin *vir*; *siskay* means "my child" instead of "daughter" in general; *gunsun* should be translated "good," not "strong"; *teshintlan* corresponds, not to the word wood, but to the phrase "many sticks," and probably proceeds from some writer who had recourse to an interpreter during his intercourse with the natives. From such writers deliver the comparative philologist! Their mistakes are legion. Other words, as *beye*, *bitsi*, *paput*, etc., mean respectively *his* son (not child in general), *his* heart (or rather his head), *his* belly, etc. They are deceitful in that, their pronominal prefix being taken as an integral part of the word, it concurs in suggesting identities that do not exist. In the Vocabulary in question the pronouns of the first and of the second persons are interverted. *Shi* means *I*, not *thou*, and I would be curious to learn where Dr. Campbell picked the word *hwe*, which he quotes as an equivalent for either of the two aforesaid pronouns.

And yet with all those and many other inaccuracies for which I am, far from holding him responsible, how many real identifications do we find through the whole list? Three, perhaps four, apart from the synonymous terms for father and for mother, which are about homonymous in well nigh all languages. I know of more numerous genuine analogies between Chinese and Déné words. Yet it is in the face of such pitiful results that our author triumphantly proclaims that "the argument for the original unity of the Dénés and the Tungus is as convincing as that which joins the Indo-Europeans or Aryans in one family!"\* With all due respect to such a veteran as Dr. Campbell, I, for one, must be allowed

\* "The Dénés of America Identified," etc., p. 206.