

a *new* manner of compounding words from various roots, so as to strike the mind at once with a whole mass of ideas; a *new* manner of expressing the cases of substantives, by inflecting the verbs which govern them; a *new* number (the particular plural) applied to the declension of nouns and conjugation of verbs; a *new* concordance in tense of the conjunction with the verb. We see not only pronouns, as in the Hebrew and some other languages, but adjectives, conjunctions, and adverbs combined with the principal part of speech and producing an immense variety of verbal forms." *

This alleged *new* manner of compounding words, the so-called polysynthetic scheme, has already been shown to be erroneous and unfounded in fact, since the morphologic processes of those Indian languages which have been critically analyzed do not correspond or accord with the theoretical processes distinctive of the scheme, nor do the morphologic processes prevailing in one tongue accord with those common to another in so marked a degree as to warrant the inference that they are based on a common principle or ground-plan differing essentially from fundamental principles common to languages of the old hemisphere. Concerning the *new* manner of expressing the cases of nouns by inflecting the verbs which govern them, it may be said that it is not true of the Iroquoian tongue; besides, such a process would imply that there exists a provision for what is still undeveloped and non-existent in many of the Indian languages—a nominal case-ending; the fact being, in most instances, that the noun is in apposition with an objective pronoun forming an integral part of the person-endings of the verb; by this means the relation of the noun to the action of the verb is indicated. In other instances the position of a noun in a word-sentence determines its "case;" in others it is determined by the pronoun with which it is in apposition. In regard to a *new* number, the particular plural, it will suffice to say that it is both Asiatic and European, and to that extent not a distinctive trait of the American Indian languages. It is thus evident that this array of new methods and novel means is the product of misapprehension and insufficient investigation. Duponceau's fundamental error lay in the fact that he attempted to classify all known Indian tongues under a hypothetical system based chiefly on a superficial study of Algonquian morphologies, before he had made a thorough investigation of the morphologies of the other Indian tongues involved. His whole

*Transactions, p. xxxviii.