

Technical and Bibliographic Notes/Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distortion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary material/
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Only edition available/
Seule édition disponible
- Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata, slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the best possible image/
Les pages totalement ou partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

	10X		14X		18X		22X		26X		30X	
	12X		16X		20X		24X		28X		32X	

T
tr

T
P
C
f

THE USE AND ABUSE OF PHILOLOGY.

BY THE REV. FATHER A. G. MORICE, O.M.I.

(Read March 4th, 1899.)

WE frequently hear in scientific circles of craniometry and other anthropological measurements; our literature is full of descriptions of the manners and customs of different peoples; their social organization is detailed and their psychological attainments studied, while the archæologist never tires of submitting the claims of his favorite science to our consideration. Yet, when it is a question of determining with precision and without fear of error the ethnic differences upon which is based the distribution of mankind into distinct races, philology alone is entitled to unqualified confidence and respect. In other words, philology is the best, nay, the only safe criterion of ethnological certitude.

This proposition I have repeatedly formulated, and my first intention, on being asked to contribute my mite towards the fund of information which is to become the Memorial Volume, was to try and put it beyond the possibility of cavil. Proofs of the fallibility of the other branches of ethnological science are many and weighty. They could readily be presented for the appreciation of the indulgent reader. Circumstances however, have arisen whereby I have been led to abandon, or at least postpone, such a course in favor of more timely considerations.

Let it suffice, just now, to state by way of an *a fortiori* argument that, not only is language the best criterion of racial differentiations, but it can even be represented as greatly subserving the ends of history through archæology and mythology. Had not Champollion and Sir Henry Rawlinson previously familiarized themselves with the dialects of ancient Egypt and Assyria, those hieroglyphic and cuneiform inscriptions which for ages had puzzled legions of savants would still wait for a philologist equal to the task of deciphering them. And why is it, I may ask, that the researches of the American, French and German scientists relative to the Maya and other aboriginal characters have not yielded more practical results? Let Dr. D. G. Brinton answer for me. In the case of the former, it is largely, he says, "because none of the interpreters have

made themselves familiar with the Maya language." * Hence it becomes apparent that there are cases when archæology can see but through philology's eyes.

On the other hand, more than once the identity of two single words or names in the course of myths proves of the greatest moment in suggesting the relation or affinity of the two nations among whom the myths obtain. Such homonymy may become an incentive to further researches which may ultimately be crowned with the most satisfactory results. Sometimes an antiquated phrase, a few archaic words no more understood may prove a most valuable clue in tracing out unsuspected racial affinities. In such cases, therefore, philology is also a useful aid to mythology.

But if the importance of its services is hardly susceptible of exaggeration, it must be confessed that philology is a double-edged weapon, inasmuch as, in the hands of an injudicious inquirer, it may bring forth nothing but futile and imaginary results. More, perhaps, than any other cognate science, its degree of usefulness depends on the amount of discernment displayed by the scholar. Hence the necessity of strict and well-observed rules in establishing linguistic comparisons. Most of my readers possess facilities for reference which I am far from enjoying in my retreat among the natives of Northern British Columbia. Yet I fancy that it may not be suggestive of too great presumption on my part simply to note in a cursory way those self-evident principles the ignoring of which I have personally remarked as leading to false and unwarranted conclusions, especially with regard to the American aboriginal tongues. These may sound as so many truisms to scientists within reach of well-filled libraries; but it seems to me that the repetition of such truisms may be of use to readers liable to reproduce the errors I shall presently denounce.

In the first place, it is of the greatest moment to carefully distinguish in a language that which is essential from that which is merely accidental. And here, at the outset, we are confronted by two antagonistic schools: the lexical and the grammatical; the one relying chiefly on words for proofs of racial affinities, while the other attaches more importance to grammatical forms. We will not undertake to scrutinize the merits or demerits of either; similarity of grammar can hardly be said to be the result of accident, nor could the identity of words in two different languages when these words are sufficiently numerous. The analogy

* "The American Race," p. 17, note. This was written before Dr. Le Plongeon's famous discoveries in Central America. But, unless I am mistaken, the latter's interpretations of the same are altogether too marvellous and fantastic to be of much scientific value.

of grammatic process is easily discerned and hardly requires any preventive from error; therefore, what we are presently concerned with is words; how can their identity be safely established?

Language is the expression of thought and, as such, it is an aggregate of significative articulations. Therefore, in attempting linguistic comparisons, the student should, in the first place, observe principally the sound of the words. In languages possessing an abundant literature, as the European and the Asiatic, the orthography is of no importance whatever, unless it be considered as a means of discovering the origin of the words. Thus the German *vater* and the English *father*, though possibly different to the uneducated reader, are nevertheless one and the same to the scholar, who knows the phonetic value of the German *v*. Likewise, in comparing terms from American idioms, it is of the utmost importance to penetrate oneself with the particular orthography of the writer, as a word which appears different to the eyes may sound identical to the ear. Thus the Navajo *tana*, "man," may have exactly the same sound as the *déné* of the missionaries among the Northern Déné tribes.

Hence, while noting down foreign words or attempting linguistic comparisons, philologists could not too carefully precise the value of the letters used or, when extra signs or diacritical marks are found necessary, they could not too minutely explain the peculiar characteristics of their alphabet.* Instead of this, we occasionally come across writers who not only ignore themselves such all-important phonetic peculiarities, but do not even scruple to do away with such of them as they meet in others' writings. The most glaring instance of this unscientific carelessness which I have noticed of late is that of Dr. J. Campbell. The absence in his Déné vocabulary† of the apostrophe or other corresponding sign, inverted letters, capitals, accent or diacritical marks destroys the last vestige of genuineness in many words which were originally but dubiously Déné. I am wedded to no particular graphic system, nor do I think my own alphabet any better than that of others; but I hold that you cannot, without additional signs or graphic peculiarities, render with twenty-five letters an aggregate of more than sixty very different sounds.

And this seems to be the place to recall a common-sense rule which imposes itself on the transcriber of a foreign tongue: always write in such a way that all the letters be pronounced and that they constantly have the same value. It is useless to insist on such a self-evident principle.

* The reader will find my alphabet explained in my paper, "Déné Roots," *Trans. C. I.* vol. III, p. 153.
† *Transactions Canadian Institute*, vol. V., p. 214 of 217.

If we now pass from the articulations considered as sounds to the artificial means of expressing them, we notice two kinds of letters of very unequal linguistic importance, the consonants and the vowels. In some languages, as the Semitic, the former only are used* to express ideas, whilst, in the majority of even the other stocks, the importance of the vowels is also but secondary. Thus the English "stone," is derived from the Saxon *stan*, which is *steen* in Dutch, *stein* in German and *sten* in Swedish. "Bean" is a Saxon word the equivalent of which is *boon* in Dutch, *bohne* in German and *böna* in Swedish. Likewise *tsa* is the Carrier synonym for "beaver," which becomes *tse* and *tsi* among the Loucheux, *tso* with the Rocky Mountain tribes and *tsu* in Alaska. *T'si* (with a lingual explosion) means "canoe" in the dialect of several tribes; *t'se* has the same signification in TsiKoh'tin, and so it is with the *t'su* and the *t'so* of the Hare and other Indians.

Now the following entry appears in Dr. Campbell's lately published Déné and Tungus vocabulary:

Grass—(Déné) klo, klos, kklbh. (Tungusic): orcho, oroktø; orat.

Here evidently the basis of comparison lies entirely with the letter *o* which, being a vowel and, as such, very changeable in Déné, could not by any means afford a solid ground for assimilation. This vowel is so little immutable even in connection with the equivalents for "grass" (where it seems at first glance to be more persistent than in other words), that a portion of the Carrier tribe, while keeping the root *t'jo* as a synonym for grass, change it into *t'ja* in the compound noun *t'ja-kwət* (grass-on, i.e., prairie.)

Therefore a word of vocalic inflection totally different from that of a heterogeneous race may be identical therewith if its consonantal elements are analogous. As evidence of this proposition I need only adduce the native word for "hog," in the language of three very distinct American families, viz., the Iroquois, the Algonquin, and the Déné. The main body of the Iroquois call it by onomatopœia *kwiskwis*, and those of Sault Ste. Marie say *kweskwes*. The Algonquins of Eastern Canada have altered its name into *kokoc*, and those of the western plains, the Crees, call the animal *kukus*, while the peculiar law of the sequence of vowels proper to their language has prompted the Carriers to soften the word into *kokus*. This example makes it plain that the trans-Rockies tribe has derived its name of the hog, through a successive linguistic filiation wherein the principal consonants have remained intact, from the original

* "Were used" would perhaps be more correct since the invention of the vowel points by the doctors of Tiberias, but these additions to the consonants can hardly be considered as genuine letters.

kwiskwis, a word invented on the opposite side of the continent to imitate the grunt of the animal thereby designated.

Another legitimate deduction from this example which applies to many other cases is that the only permanent, and therefore the really important, consonants are those which commence a word or at least a syllable.* Non-initial consonants, though generally more immutable than the vowels, have but a relative importance.

The consonants are then the most important element in the formation of words. But even among them there are some which are convertible with others to such an extent relatively to the various dialects that they are practically one and the same. This convertibility may manifest itself in three different ways: first, within the same dialect, as is the case with *d* and *t*, *g* and *k*, etc., within each of the Déné idioms which cannot detect the slightest difference between, say, *ta* and *da*, "lip"; *ku* and *gu* "worm," etc. Secondly, between related dialects or dialects belonging to the same linguistic group so that, though not changing the sense of the word, it indicates the nature of the idiom; such are the aforesaid letters with regard to most Aryan languages compared with one another; for instance "dance" is *tanz* in German; the Latin *dens* is *tand* in several germanic tongues, etc. Consonants of this second class, besides those already mentioned, are many and varied. Thirdly, we might extend this convertibility to another category of consonants, a category wherein cognate consonants in words from heterogeneous stocks, as the Aryan and the Turanian, do service in connection with words originally the same. Such are the *p*, *b*, and *f* of the Sanskrit (Aryan) *pita*, "father," the Syriac (Semitic) *batara*, the Zend or old Persian (Aryan) *fedre* and the Déné (American) *pa*, *pip*, etc., all of which terms have the same signification. To be brief; some consonants are convertible with corresponding letters within the same dialect, others' commutability manifests itself from dialect to dialect, while others again are commutable from stock to stock, that is between unrelated languages.

The German philologist, Jakob L. Grimm, was the first to formulate the law which bears his name and which regulates the interchange of consonants in the corresponding words of the different Aryan languages. American phonetics are quite peculiar, as is well known, and in connection therewith Grimm's law not only does not cover the whole ground, but in several instances it is positively at fault. A prerequisite to safe comparisons between words from stocks of the old and of the new worlds would then seem to be the acquisition of some principle

* For an apparent exception, see my paper "Déné Roots," Trans. C. I. vol. III, p. 131.

determining the commutability of the consonants in the languages from which the compared words are extracted. As far as the Déné languages are concerned, the complete list of commutable consonants will be found, in a tabulated form, in the Grammar which is to precede my great Carrier dictionary. Pending the publication of either, even a conscientious philologist may be satisfied with the instances of such convertibility noted in a previous paper, "Déné Roots."*

While, as we have seen, some apparently different consonants are essentially the same, others, which seem co-affin and related, are so hopelessly distinct that they cannot possibly admit of commutation. Here I refer more particularly to the American languages which are celebrated for the delicacy of their phonetic elements. Perhaps none surpass the Déné in this respect. These have three *t*, seven *k* or guttural consonants, etc. all so strictly distinct that their phonetic peculiarities are often the only means of differentiating the meaning of words which, to the careless observer, would otherwise appear identical. Thus in Carrier *ta* means "lip," *tha*, "three" (things), and *'ta* "feathers." Edge (of a cutting tool) is *Ka* in the same dialect, arrow is rendered by *'kra*,† *kra* is an interjection, etc. As it is with simple consonants, even so it is when the articulation to express is double or multiple. *Tsi* in Carrier is the equivalent for "head," while *'si* means "intestines," and *'si* is the word for "canoe." These examples might be multiplied almost *ad infinitum*.

We have in Déné two sets of words wherein the *th* sound (Petitot's *t'*) is radical and characteristic in all the different dialects. They are synonyms for water and are proper to all words expressive of things even distantly related to water (*thú*, *thó*; *tha* in composition, *thér*, bottom of the water, etc.) and the various equivalents of the adjective "three" (*tha*, *that*, *thane*, *thank*, etc.) In the latter words the *th* (= *t + h*) is the means of distinguishing them from the number "four," all the Déné equivalents of which begin with a simple *t*. Dr. Campbell could have learned as much by a mere glance at my published Vocabulary of Déné roots; Petitot is no less explicit in his polyglot Dictionary. Therefore I am at a loss to understand why the former should have destroyed the identity of all those words by taking away the differentiating *h* and writing *to*, *toh*, etc.‡

It was with no smaller amount of astonishment that I came, some time ago, upon a comment on two American myths wherein the author

* Transactions of the Canadian Institute, Vol. III., p. 150.

† The *r* of this and the following word is so faintly pronounced that I regard *kr* as expressing a single articulation.

‡ See the Appendix.

—the Abbé Petitot—attempts to establish the identity of a fabulous nation called *Tsequil* with a prehistoric race surnamed “women” by the Northern Dénés on the ground that *tsequi*, he says, means women in Déné, while the original sense of *Tsequil* appears to be “petticoated men.”* Now, the author must know just as well as I do that *tsequi* means women in no Déné dialect, and he ought to be aware that the difference between that pretended word and *tsequi*,† the real equivalent of “women,” is as great in Déné as that between, say, day and night. Hence his would-be identification falls to the ground through utter disregard for the value of consonantal articulation.

It would be harsh to call this philological bad faith; much more probably it is only blindness caused by an inordinate love of linguistic assimilations,‡ just as the sentence immediately following in his text seems to be due to misinformation. Speaking of the Déné language, he says that “il a été reconnu appartenir à la même famille que le toltèque.”§ In the first place, many well-informed Americanists speak no longer of the Toltecs who, they declare, never existed as a nation, and therefore had no distinctive language;¶ and then if by *tolteque* the author means, with some apparently mistaken ethnologists, the dialect of some ancestors of the Aztecs, he should certainly know that the idiom of the latter has no more affinity with the Déné than that of the Caribs or of the Fuegians.

In the same publication the author endeavours to identify the *tsaa*, *tsade* of some northern Dénés with the *tsau* of the Egyptians. *Omnis comparatio claudicat* is an axiom well known to the schoolmen, but which should never apply to linguistic comparisons. Yet I dare say that the above not only “hobbles,” but even cannot stand at all, for two reasons. First, *tsaa* or *tsade* should be written as it is pronounced, not as may be convenient in the interest of the thesis. Now the author knows so well that this should be *t'saa* or *ttsaa* (the apostrophe or the double t denoting the lingual explosion), that he spells it himself according to the second orthography in his published dictionary. This exploding sound is so important from a philological standpoint that, while even consonants are liable to occasionally disappear altogether through the gradual alterations customary with all living languages, this American character-

* *Six Légendes Américaines identifiées à l'histoire de Moïse, etc.*, Paris, A. Henuyor, p. 720

† The apostrophe indicates the lingual explosion proper to many American idioms.

‡ It could not be construed as due to any typographic error, as identical appreciations of similarly altered words are to be found elsewhere in the course of the work referred to.

§ *Six Légendes, etc.*, p. 720.

¶ See “The American Race,” by Dr. D. G. Briston, p. 129.

istic is inevitably retained.* Secondly, this attempt at linguistic identification must also be qualified a failure because *tsaa*, even if supposed to signify "headgear" as in the case in question, cannot be compared to *tsau*, which is the Egyptian for "crocodile."

From this last remark we may deduce this corollary: in all philological comparisons, both words, while homonymous, should also be synonymous. This is so evident that we need not insist. There is no lack of homonymous terms in all languages, and if the philologist's business was merely to discover consonances, his task would certainly not be a very arduous one. It must be admitted, however, that there are some cases when this synonymy of homonymous words needs be but relative. As illustrative of the appropriateness of this qualification, I may point to the etymology of the English word "loafer," which is said to come from the German *laufer*, a runner, which is itself derived from *laufen*, to run.

Passing from the letters to the words themselves, we cannot help noticing that some of the latter are more ancient, more immutable, and simpler than others; they reappear under a similar—though not necessarily identical—form in divers cognate dialects; in a word, they are the roots of the language. These are the essence of a dialect and, as far as practical, with them only should comparisons be attempted. But in this case care should be taken to choose only equally radical words for the purpose of identification. A living language is subject to inexorable laws of growth and mutations, and any resemblance between a modern accidental term and an old root of a different tongue must be the result of purely fortuitous coincidence.

A rule of analogous import demands that test words be compared, as far as possible, only with synonyms from one of the oldest forms of the language, not from one of its modern derivative idioms. To render this principle clearer by contrast, I shall give an instance of an evident violation of the same. Rev. C. Petitot, in an essay on the Déné languages,† gives the consonance between the Déné word *adi*, "he has said," and the French *a dit*, as in some way confirmatory of the unity of race between the American and the European nations from whose vocabulary the two words are extracted. Now, it seems to me that the

* In another paper, "Déné Roots," published in the Transactions of the Canadian Institute (Vol. II.), I have called attention to the absence of diacritical marks denotive of this explosion in the texts of the "Mountain Chant" by Dr. W. Matthews, hinting at the same time that, as the words which lack it are otherwise quite identical with their northern Déné equivalents, this most important peculiarity had possibly escaped the transcriber, and giving my reasons for this surmise. A copy of the paper sent to Dr. Matthews and accompanied by a note pointing to that passage failed to elicit a declaration that his rendering of the Navajo texts was faultless. Shall we apply in this case the maxim: *Qui tacet consentire videtur?*

† Paris, 1876, x. xvi.

comparison, to be of any ethnologic value, should be between the Déné word—supposing it to be a root—and the synonymous term in the original language from which modern French is derived. The French of to-day say *a dit*, when their ancestors said *hā dict*; but between the formation of the dialect of the latter and the abandonment of its parent, Latin, an important change had taken place whereby two distinct verbs, *habere* and *dicere*, had been combined in one, so that the Déné *adi* should be compared, not with the modern French phrase, but either with its original two verbs, *Habet Dictum*, or with the exact Latin synonym, *dixit*, which then lacks the equivalent for the first syllable of the American term.

We may classify root-words under two heads: There are those which are roots by reason of their standing from a grammatical point of view, and those which owe their position as immutable words to their signification, or rather to the importance in all languages of the objects they represent. By the first class I mean especially the numerals and the pronouns, which, it is well-known, generally have a kind of family air in cognate dialects. As to the pronouns, I think that hardly any qualificative reservation is necessary; but it is not so with all the numerals. By "all" I should be understood as referring only to the first ten numbers where the system is decimal. Thus in the Northern Déné dialects the words for seven, nine and even ten have no linguistic importance; but the first four numbers especially are of the greatest moment as a means of detecting philological affinities.

All the other roots are comprised within my second class as defined above. These are either monosyllabic or polysyllabic. In the first case their degree of immutability is generally greater, while with the second, except in the Semitic languages, which are remarkable for the trilaterality of their radicals, there is very often allied to the original root, a sort of increment, accretion, or accidental alteration of a primitive element, which it is, of course, very important to discern. This remark applies not only to really ancient roots of simple import, but also, especially in the Aryan languages, to such words as were originally one throughout the whole stock, but which have grown distinctive of the particular nation by which they are used. In other words, in all such terms there is the radical and what may be considered a mere accident, whatever may be its place in the structure of the word. Of course in such cases the radical only has any weight in the balance of the comparative philologist; the accidental part of the word has no other value than that which may result from its being the means of identifying the particular dialect to which it belongs.

As I have said, the place of these varying and relatively unimportant forms may change with the linguistic group of which the radical may be characteristic. They constitute the desinence of the words in the Aryan languages. A few examples will, I think, be of use as a means of illustrating the above propositions. Here are a few words with an identical radical followed by different desinences.

Latin.	Spanish.	Italian.	English.	French.
Lacon-icus	-ico	-ico	-ic	-ique
Confl-ictus	-icto	-itto	-ict	-it
Prodig-iosus	-ioso	-ioso	-ious	-ieux
Declamat-orius	-orio	-orio	-ory	-oire
Ard-or	-or	-ore	-our	-eur
Barbar-ismus	-ismo	-ismo	-ism	-isme
Confus-io	-ion	-ione	-ion	-ion
Atten-tio	-cion	-zione	-tion	-tion
Paral-ysis	-isis	-isia	-ysis	-ysie
Leg-alis	-al	-ale	-al	-al
Sensib-ilis	-le	-ile	-le	-le
Principal-iter	-mente	-mente	-ly	-ement

This list could, of course, be almost indefinitely extended, especially if we were to make it comprise some words the real root part of which is slightly altered in a few dialects as, for instance, *CONstans*: Italian, *COSTante*; *VIRTus*: French, *VERTu*, etc. Here then we have words the initial part of which is identical in all the languages represented, while the desinence varies with the dialect. It is unnecessary to observe that the essence of the word is contained in the former, the rôle of the latter being simply to differentiate the dialect. My reason for associating the English forms with the above will become more apparent when it is remembered that that idiom, though more generally ranked within the Germanic subdivision of the Aryan linguistic group, nevertheless contains an almost complete vocabulary of Italic or Romance words, from among which all the above are selected. Practically, there are as many Latin words with unchanged radical and desinential forms digested, as it were, and assimilated according to the requirements of the peculiar organism of each dialect.

But the radical part of a word is not always so easily discernible. Its place and characteristics may vary according to the linguistic family—not the particular dialect—to which the word belongs. It is the task of the philologist to discover and locate this radical and, in such cases mere superficial studies would naturally prove inadequate to ensure success, inasmuch as it happens that this immutable element has no fixed place in the structure of words of even the same dialect. Thus in

Carrier the root of *tone*, "man," is the second syllable, while in *t'sèKè*, "woman," it is the first*.

Therefore, in trying to assimilate, for instance, the latter word to synonyms from a heterogeneous linguistic stock, its desinence would not be of any more value than the prefix of the former.

It is, no doubt, to Dr. Campbell's inability to discern those radicals in the Déné terms that we must ascribe some of his failures in word identifications. Thus, to reproduce but a few, he compares the Déné

<i>tatsi</i> , wind,	with the Tungusic	<i>tit</i>
<i>hongzil</i> , summer,	" "	<i>anganal</i>
<i>koutlan</i> , all,	" "	<i>gandzi</i>
<i>tedhay</i> , salt,	" "	<i>tak</i>
<i>kluu</i> , dog,	" "	<i>ninakin</i>

If those parts of the words I have italicized are not Dr. Campbell's ground for his attempts at assimilation, I would ask, where is the resemblance? But I must state with regret that those are precisely the unimportant portions of the words in Déné, leaving as the real root the other half which lacks all points of similarity with the Tungusic equivalents. Thus the root for wind in *all* the truly Déné dialects is *t'si* (not *tsi*, which means head). Examples: *nít'si*, wind; *thít'si*, the wind commenced to blow; *hweít'si*, taken away by the wind; *hwosáít'si*, brought in by the wind; *kən nít'si*, cut by the wind; *yáít'si*, scattered by the wind; *ijánaóít'si*, heaped up by the wind, etc., etc. In the word *hongzil*, which is not a noun meaning summer, but a verb corresponding to the phrase: it is warm, the ultimate root is *sil*, *sál*, heat, inflected by the prefix *hon* into *zil*. *Hon* is merely the sign of the impersonal verb *am*, as such it is common to *all* the adjective verbs, instead of being the radical part of the word for "summer." Equally disparaging remarks could be presented relatively to the other words. But enough of this. Had Dr. Campbell consulted with any degree of care my vocabulary of the Déné roots,† he would have been told in each particular case where the real, immutable part of the word lies.

It were hardly necessary to add to the preceding rules of comparative philology that all lexical comparisons should be made directly between actual words of different languages, not mediately through a possible translation of one of the two words, especially if that translation be into a dialect of another family. In the French work already referred to as containing unwarranted linguistic identifications,‡ the author thus assimi-

* As is evident from the words *tít'si*, dog-female and *yo-t'si*, progeniture-female (daughter).

† Transactions Canadian Institute, vol. III.

‡ *Six Légendes Américaines*, etc., p. 620.

lates to the Moses of the Bible the hero of a Déné legend called *Ni-otssintani*. The Arabic name of Moses is *Moussa*; now *Ni otssintani* means "l'enfant *Mousse*" in French; hence the identity of the two personages! Such deplorable play with the words needs only to be quoted to be condemned. It is certainly calculated to bring more discredit than honour on comparative philology, and, at the same time, it is not a flattering evidence of man's potentialities as a "reasoning animal."

This leads me to ask whether Dr. Campbell is serious when, in answer to his own question: Are the names of the Déné tribes Tungusic? he compares such evidently non-Déné terms as Navajo, Llanero, Coyotero, Mescalero, Jicarilla, etc., with Tungus words of supposedly similar sound and declares that those "fifty-seven resemblances"—including, of course, the consonances between Tungusic and Mexico-Spanish names—"clear the way for more definite evidence."*

I have had more than one occasion, in the course of the present essay, to refer to Dr. J. Campbell's paper on "the Dénés of America identified with the Tungus of Asia."† This is certainly a most remarkable production. Indeed the boldness of its conclusions is more than wonderful. I will not venture to scrutinize one by one the appositeness of its several propositions. I must even confess my inability to follow the erudite author into the flights of imagination which he gravely gives as so many uncontroverted points of history. As we go on reading his last pages, we seem to be whirled about amidst a bevy of strange looking names, and, before we have had time to wonder at the audacity of an assertion, we have a still bolder one flung in the face, until our breath is fairly taken away. All I have been able to gather from the author's asseverations is that the ancestors of my Dénés, after having assisted at the defence of Troy, followed, to the number of 5,000, Alexander the Great in his triumphal march through the East, and then, reverting to the West, made, under the name of Huns, the remnants of the Roman Empire tremble at the sight of their valour and inhuman atrocities. They were not then, it seems, the poor, hare-like timid Indians who are now afraid of their own shadow. No wonder that Dr. Campbell finds my inoffensive Carriers a degenerate race!

But, if Dr. Campbell is satisfied with his conclusions, I am not to grudge him that meed of contentment. All I must remark here is that they surely do not flow from his premises, as far at least, as the philological part of his essay is concerned. Nobody would be more ready than myself to welcome the solution of a problem in which I have long

* "The Dénés of America," etc., p. 175.

† Trans. C. I., Vol. v., part 2.

taken such a keen interest. But my inmost convictions bid me declare, at the risk of appearing too self-confident, that the doctor's verbal identifications are, with a very few and unimportant exceptions, absolutely groundless. The reader will please remember his several failures, which I have already pointed out as resulting from the violation of fundamental laws of comparative philology. I may well pass over those assimilations which are attempted with words that are not roots. Let me add that a very large number of the terms he gives as Déné seem utterly extraneous to that linguistic family. Think, for instance, of such vocables as *telamachkur* for fish, *payyamay* for man, *alcorn* for rain, *ktckchuly* for cold, *ttshukulak* for eagle, *sku-tsukaisla* for girl, etc. Verily, any Russian or Bantu word taken at random would probably look more Déné.

Among such words of Dr. Campbell's Vocabulary as are undoubtedly Déné, many merely approximate in meaning the English term given as synonymous. Thus *tayuz* is the equivalent, not of the English "boy," but of the Latin *vir*; *siskay* means "my child" instead of "daughter" in general; *gunsun* should be translated "good," not "strong"; *teshintlan* corresponds, not to the word wood, but to the phrase "many sticks," and probably proceeds from some writer who had recourse to an interpreter during his intercourse with the natives. From such writers deliver the comparative philologist! Their mistakes are legion. Other words, as *beye*, *bitsi*, *paput*, etc., mean respectively *his* son (not child in general), *his* heart (or rather his head), *his* belly, etc. They are deceitful in that, their pronominal prefix being taken as an integral part of the word, it concurs in suggesting identities that do not exist. In the Vocabulary in question the pronouns of the first and of the second persons are interverted. *Shi* means *I*, not *thou*, and I would be curious to learn where Dr. Campbell picked the word *hwe*, which he quotes as an equivalent for either of the two aforesaid pronouns.

And yet with all those and many other inaccuracies for which I am, far from holding him responsible, how many real identifications do we find through the whole list? Three, perhaps four, apart from the synonymous terms for father and for mother, which are about homonymous in well nigh all languages. I know of more numerous genuine analogies between Chinese and Déné words. Yet it is in the face of such pitiful results that our author triumphantly proclaims that "the argument for the original unity of the Dénés and the Tungus is as convincing as that which joins the Indo-Europeans or Aryans in one family!"* With all due respect to such a veteran as Dr. Campbell, I, for one, must be allowed

* "The Dénés of America Identified," etc., p. 206.

to totally dissent from such a conclusion, for, in the Aryan languages, all the principal roots are practically identical, while in the present case, I fail to see how they could well be more dissimilar. For the benefit of such of my readers as have not made special studies in that branch of science, let me quote just only one word, the numeral "three" in the dialect of the seven principal groups into which the Aryan family is usually divided. The reader may then revert to the would-be analogies suggested by my opponent in his Déné-Tungus Vocabulary, defective as it is, and then judge between us.

English.	Slavic.	Lithuanic.	Celtic.	Latin.	Greek.	Iranian.	Sanskrit.
<i>three</i>	<i>tri</i>	<i>tri</i>	<i>tri</i>	<i>tres</i>	<i>treis</i>	<i>thri</i>	<i>tri</i>

Other Aryan roots exhibit generally quite as marked family traits, and Dr. Campbell should be the last not to know it.

Coming nearer home in search of genuine linguistic assimilations, I may instance, as a contrast with Dr. Campbell's identifications, the case of the Navajo Indians. Physically those aborigines have little in common with our Dénés; their psychological characteristics are quite distinct; their mythology has not, to my knowledge, a single point of similarity with the Déné folklore, and sociologically they are still more different. Yet philologists have not been long in detecting their perfect identity with the Northern Dénés. And no wonder; for their language abounds in clear and real, not nebulous or uncertain, analogies with the dialects of my Indians. For the benefit of some too easily satisfied ethnologists, let me remark that in the "Mountain Chant" which contains the only continuous Navajo texts I have ever seen, you find, side by side with some terms proper to that tribe, or borrowed from adjacent stocks, no less than 72 words which, in spite of what may be defective rendering, are easily recognizable here, Stuart's Lake Mission, B.C., at a distance of perhaps 2000 miles from the nearest Navajo. To form a just idea of the proportion of really genuine Déné with local or loaned words, it should be borne in mind that those texts are composed of only a few words very often repeated. In fact, the proportion of truly Déné words in that "Chant" cannot be less than 75 per cent. Of course, such a large percentage is not necessary for the legitimate identification of two ethnographical divisions of mankind; a third or a fourth of that amount is more than sufficient. But where is the philologist who is ready to risk his reputation by asserting his willingness to be satisfied with two or three per cent. of related terms to determine the original identity of two separated branches of the human family?

✓ Of Dr. Campbell's assimilation of the Othomi with the Déné, I shall

only say that, in my opinion, his own Vocabulary makes it evident that there is absolutely no connection between the two stocks. As I am here confronted with the opposite declaration, viz., that in the doctor's second Vocabulary "the Othomi is placed opposite Tungus and Déné equivalents *to the complete identification* with these tongues,"* I must be excused for respectfully asking to be shown one single Othomi word related, however distantly, to our Déné idioms other than the monosyllable *da*, which is probably a chance synonym for "eye." All the other words are hopelessly non-Déné. On the other hand, a majority of Campbell's Othomi verbs are monosyllabic, a condition quite impossible in Déné, where a verb must be at least dissyllabic, being composed, in its simplest form, of a radical desinence preceded by a pronominal element expressive of tense and person.

A parting word, and I close this already too long essay. *In medio stat virtus*; enthusiasm should never betray the comparative philologist into exaggerations or rash assertions which, sooner or later, he will have to withdraw. I have before me a printed statement to the effect that "of the Déné tongue it is no exaggeration to say that 50 per cent. of its radicals are pure archaic Chinese." Having noticed that bold assertion reiterated in a standard publication, I ventured to call the author's attention to its manifest exaggeration, with the result that it was privately withdrawn, though it remains unchallenged to this day in the Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada.†

APPENDIX.

The phonetics of the Déné languages are not easy, and many of their most important sounds will frequently escape the attention of even a professional linguist. Such an experienced analyzer of American idioms as Dr. Franz Boas is a witness to the truth of this assertion when he states in his Report on the Ts'ets'a'ut tribe that "the Tinneh phonetics are difficult" (*Tenth Rep. on the N. W. Tribes of Canada*, p. 66). Of the Déné verb he asserts that it "is exceedingly difficult to understand" (*Ibid*). Under these conditions errors in transcribing words heard for the first time are to be expected as a matter of course, even from clever philologists, since their vocabularies and texts are more the work of their interpreter than the result of their own acquired science. Hence animadverting thereupon, instead of giving offense, should almost, it seems to

* "The Dénés of America Identified," etc., p. 206. The italics are mine.

† Trans. R. S. C., Sec. II., 1897, p. 89.

me, be expected as a natural occurrence. Dr. G. M. Dawson was so much of this opinion that he spontaneously sent me for corrections his Vocabularies of the Thajthan and the Ti-tco'-tina dialects (*Annual Report Geol. Survey, Canada, 1887*). Unhappily my work in that connection having been of a private nature, Dr. Dawson's every error has been faithfully reproduced in the reprint by Dr. Boas of the first named Vocabulary. To these circumstances are undoubtedly attributable several of Dr. Campbell's mistakes, though a careful perusal of my own Vocabulary and accompanying notes, published at a later date, would have prevented most of them. Such being the case, and to avoid the recurrence of similar errors, I have thought it of use to note the principal faults to be found in Dr. Dawson's Vocabularies. I do not vouch for the perfect accuracy of the words not mentioned, nor indeed for those parts of the corrected words left unaltered. I merely correct evident and *essential* errors. Apart from such corrections, Dr. Dawson's spelling remains intact. For the sake of briefness I give the faulty words under their corrected form only.

<i>English.</i>	<i>Thajthan.</i>	<i>Titcōtina.</i>	<i>Remarks.</i>
Father	ethe'-uh	atha'-a	Not <i>my</i> father, but father (vocative). Same remark applies to synonyms of mother.
My head	estsi		
My neck	es'kōs		
My foot	eskuh'	eskia'	
My bone	est'sen'	est'sun'-uh	
Village	kē-yē'	kon'-a	This last word means "house," not "village."
My husband	eskuh-lē'-na	ske-lē-nā	The <i>sine</i> which in Dawson's Vocabulary precedes this word, and the three that follow immediately, means <i>ego, I, me</i> , and recalls to mind the Chinook <i>naika</i> , probably used by the enquirer towards his interpreter. It is altogether foreign to the words wherein it is incorporated in Dawson's Vocabulary.
Daylight	ye-ka'		
Wind	it'si'	i't'si'	
Fire	koñ	kun	
Water	thoo	thoo	
Ice	thenn	thun	
River	thoo-dēsā	thoo-za-za	This last word means literally: little water.
Leaf	e'tāne'	a'tōna	
Grass	'klōāh	'klō-ye	
Feathers	t'sosh	me-t'sosa	The proper spelling of these words is probably 'qosh; me-t'qosa. The clicking sound is essential. These words mean 'down,' not feathers; me-t'sosa means "its down."
Mosquito	t'sih	t'si-a	
Three	thā-tē	tha-di-a	
Thirty	that-tsosnan		

Further inaccuracies.

skel-e'-na (or rather ske-lena) means :	my husband, not	man
ya-za	cloudless sky	sky (in general)
kös (or rather kös)	cloud	sky
tih	grouse	bird
tsoo (or rather t'soo)	spruce (<i>abies nigra</i>)	tree
ges	(probably) white salmon	salmon
nin'-e	thou	I
sin'-e	I	thou
a-neh, a-ni are interjections which mean	come here! not verbs meaning	to come
ta is an interjection which means	give it to me! not	to give
sintuh', sinta' mean	be seated (and quiet) not	to sit

Of the verbs some are at the first person, others at the second, a few at the third, and others at the impersonal. Dawson's Vocabularies hint at no difference in Indian between fly and bird, he and that, tongue and mouth, house and village, man and husband.

The above remark concerning the verbs holds good relatively to those recorded by Dr. Boas, a majority of which are at the second person. Others, which, in the latter's Vocabulary, are monosyllabic, cannot be correct for the reason presented in the course of my paper.

As to G. Gibbs' Vocabulary, the admission by its compiler that it "is not always altogether correct" (Tenth Rep., B.A.A.S., p. 68) renders any criticism on the same unnecessary.

NOTE. — When the above was written, I was not yet acquainted with Dr. Boas's short "Vocabulary of the Chilcotin Language" (Twelfth Report on the North-West tribes of Canada, B.A.A.S.), which teems with errors. But that gentleman, being a conscientious scholar, takes care to preface it with the remark that since he is "not familiar with the grammatical structure of the language, the vocabulary must be held subject to revision," a precaution some writers are not loyal enough to take. In this connection, I would take the liberty to observe that the double consonant *tl*, pronounced exactly as in English, is of very common occurrence in all the Déné dialects. Now, since Dr. Boas, and quite a few others, render by *tl* the sibilant *l* which I usually represent by an inverted *l*, I would ask: How do those authors transcribe the common *tl* sound (= *t+l*) which we find, for instance, in the Chilcotin negative particle *lla* (pronounced *tlah*), and in such words as *tlun* (pronounced *tloon*), "mouse," *antlé* (prohibitive particle, *kwæstlen*, "he was born," *laasa*, "very good," *laaja*, "very many," (not "many," as Dr. Boas has it), etc. Dr. Boas spells this last word *laa'la*, that is, with two identical *l*'s, though the sound represented by the first is very different indeed from that of the last, wherein there is absolutely no *t* sound.

