

cerning which Latham says: "In each of these vocabularies Malay words form the greater proportion. In each of them, however, are also found Australian vocables." Sumbawa, to which Timbora belongs, is in the very heart of the Malay archipelago, and most of its numerals are Malay in character. Those that are not accord with the numerals of the Haidahs. I am aware that there are some comparative philologists who regard the common possession of a numeral system as one of the most convincing proofs of a common origin. This is a great mistake. The original Celtic numerals have been replaced by the Latin. The Arabic have diffused themselves in Africa, the Sanscrit in India, and the Malay in Polynesia. In the intercourse of half-civilized or savage peoples with their superiors, no words are more easily lost. Whether the numerals of the Haidahs represent those of ancient Melanesian speech or not, they are an evidence that Malay influences were not sufficiently strong to impose upon them its arithmetical system.

Of more importance than these are particles, such as the postpositions, of which a list of twenty-six is appended. These are Australian as well as Haidah, and, were we in possession of lists of similar parts of speech from Sumbawa and its vicinity, links might be found to unite the far distant vocabularies. The same is true of pronouns, of which, unfortunately, my collection is small. Nevertheless it will be found to exhibit traces of kinship between the compared languages such as to render complete the cumulative argument for their original unity. I have before me Adelung's "Mithridates," Klaproth's "Asia Polyglotta," Hunter's "Non-Aryan Languages of India and High Asia," the "San Kokf Tsou Ran To Sets," and many more recent collections of Asiatic vocabularies, in which I have searched in vain for such traces of linguistic affiliation as I have found between the Haidah and the Melanesian of the Malay-Polynesian area. That the resemblance is fortuitous is an impossibility to any one who has made an exhaustive study of languages, however improbable it may appear at first sight to link Australians and Queen Charlotte islanders as members of the same family.

There is linguistic evidence of no mean order that many American families of man came to this continent by way of the Pacific islands. Such are the Mbaya-Abipones of the Gran Chaco; the Tupi-Guaranis of Brazil; the Caribs, the Huastec-Maya-Quiches of Central America, and the Algonquins of the north. All of these are of Malay-Polynesian origin except the Tupi-Guaranis, and they are Melanesian, like the Haidahs. The difficulty of a comparatively savage people traversing a wide ocean is an argument that should not weigh against the demonstration of language. The people of Easter Island came within eighteen hundred miles of the American coast, but, supposing them to have started from the Philippines, their route was one of eight thousand miles. Even recently, in comparatively small canoes, the islanders of the South Seas