

forms a favourable condition for dialectic differentiation, it is not necessarily directly proportionate to the latter. Yet the chronological value of the facts of linguistic distribution, particularly when emphasis is placed on remoter time perspectives, depends on the linguistic differentiation implied in such distribution. Let us glance at a few American examples.

The Algonkin languages proper¹ are spoken over a vast territory reaching from the Atlantic to the Rockies and from Hudson bay to the Ohio valley. In this area are (or were) spoken a large number of distinct languages and dialects (*e.g.*, Naskapi, Montagnais, Cree, Micmac, Abenaki, Ojibwa, Menomini, Fox, Shawnee, Delaware, Natick, Miami, Arapaho, Cheyenne, Blackfoot). There can be no doubt that a very great lapse of time (probably several millennia) must be assumed to account for the geographical distribution and dialectic differentiation of the Algonkin languages proper. As compared with the Algonkin area, that of the Penutian languages of California (Yokuts, Miwok-Costanoan, Maidu, Wintun),² though large, is quite restricted. Are we justified in assuming from this that the movement of Algonkin peoples³ from a relatively small area occupied by a people of homogeneous speech greatly antedated the analogous movement of Penutian peoples? Not unless we can show that the differentiation of the Algonkin languages is not less profound than that of the Penutian languages. As a matter of fact, the morphologic and lexical differences that obtain between even the most divergent Algonkin languages, say Chey-

¹ That is, without the inclusion of the remotely related Yurok and Wiyot of California.

² This is the Penutian stock as defined by Dixon and Kroeber. I have collected evidence to show that it extends into Oregon, embracing Takelma, Coos, and Lower Umpqua, possibly certain other languages. For the sake of simplicity, however, I here use the term Penutian in its more restricted Californian sense.

³ This and similar terms ("movement of people of such and such speech") do not by any means imply that all or even most of the present population speaking dialects of the stock have of necessity primarily descended from a relatively homogeneous group speaking the hypothetical prototype of the stock. A language may spread to neighbouring peoples without any great displacement of population. Linguistic displacement due to cultural contact is here included under "movement of tribes of related speech." In actual fact, to be sure, I believe it may be shown that far-reaching movements of population were quite frequent in aboriginal America. I doubt if linguistic displacement was as typical a process in America as in the old world, though it is by no means unknown (thus, the Tlingit-speaking Tagish were originally an Athabaskan tribe; the Nootka-speaking Ho-pa-cas'ath were originally a Salish tribe; the Tewa of Hano are adopting Hopi as their language).