

All this doubtless has a certain plausibility so long as it is tested solely by the faulty and equivocal works of the pioneers in American Indian philology; but, by the light of the facts of language which are gradually being made available, these polysynthetic dogmas are being dissipated.

Dr. Brinton's definition of polysynthesis is clearly defective and incomplete. There is an omission of the name or names of the elements subject to "juxtaposition," and also of the term co-ordinate with "juxtaposition" and expressive of a *process* contrary or co-relative to that of "juxtaposition," two very important omissions in a definition designed to "clearly differentiate the distinction between polysynthesis and incorporation, *dimly* perceived by Duponceau." But, as Dr. Brinton was merely recasting and remoulding the first section of Duponceau's definition of a polysynthetic construction of language, the omitted process, judging from this fact and from other parts of Dr. Brinton's essay, is that affirmed by Duponceau to consist in the "intercalation" or "interweaving together the most significant sounds or syllables of each simple word" and the various "parts of speech, particularly by means of the verb." The alleged process of intercalation or interweaving together of vocal elements has already been shown to be mere hypothesis and unfounded in the known facts of Indian languages. Moreover, Dr. Brinton tells us that agglutination and collocation differ from polysynthesis in not using "words, forms of words and significant phonetic elements which have no separate existence apart from such compounds." If this statement were substantiated by facts, it would pass unchallenged; but it is to be doubted that "agglutination and collocation" do not employ, in the polysynthetic sense, "words, forms of words," which have no existence outside of compound forms. Even in the English, which is agglutinative in some of its forms, such nouns as *sooth* and *wise* are practically obsolete in current speech, although in use in compound forms; hence, must it be inferred that they never had an independent existence in the language? Not at all. In the obsolescence of words and forms they will maintain an existence in certain quaint or striking phrases or compounds when they have lost their adaptability for current and new formations.

It may be stated that "significant phonetic elements" form no part of the linguistic material of Indian languages any more than they do of that of the Indo-European languages. Words and sounds