people, spite of its dialectic peculiarities, will enable the philologist to shed light on many points of etymology and construction in the languages of Europe and Asia to which it is related. Take, for instance, the world totolh-tetl, an egg. Its meaning is clear, for totolh is tototl a fowl, and tetl denotes a stone. By a simple postposition of the nominative, therefore, the Aztec word for egg means the stone of the bird. In Yukahirian the word used is nonten-daul. Now nonda means a bird in Yukahirian, a form doubtless of the Lesghian onotsh, and the Japanese ondori, a fowl; but daul, which is just the Aztec tetl, does not now designate a stone in that language. The form has undergone change and is now kell, but there can be no doubt that daul or tol was once the Yukahirian name for stone, as it now is the Mizjeji, Corean and Choctaw form. The Basque word, which I have not found any explanation of among the Basque etymologists, is arrolchia or arroltz. Here the order of the Aztec and the Yukahirian is inverted, for arri denotes a stone, and ollo or oilo, a fowl. The final chi or zi before the article a, is the mark of the genitive which is now aco or eco. Hence, literally translated, arrolchia is "stone fowl of the." The Iroquois has entirely lost the etymology of his word onhonchia, in which the Basque r and l have been replaced by n; and the same is the case with the Peruvian, who, by following his usual practice, like the Lesghian, of removing the initial vowel, and simply changing the l to n, makes the word runto. The Circassian kutarr is probably of the same composition, for kut should represent kuttey, fowl, and arr, though not now a Circassian word, was so at the time when Circassians and Basques were one people, and derived their respective tribal and local names, Chapsuch and Guipuzcoa, from the Hittite land of Khupuscai. It is interesting to note, as exhibiting the vicissitudes of language, that the Corean, who calls a stone tol or tor, retains arr, the primitive term, to denote an egg, just as the Aztecs frequently employed tetl to express the same without any prefix.

There is a Basque word, the derivation of which puzzles the lexicographers, although some have ventured to derive the only Basque term denoting a boy from the Latin. It is mutil, or with the article mutilla. In Lesghian, motshi is a boy, in Japanese, musuko, in Sonoro, te-machi; but, as a rule, the m of these languages is replaced in others of the Khitan family by an ordinary labial. A similar difficulty in Basque attends the connected word illoba, which may