This arbitrary change of value, joined to the fact that these modifying signs sometimes precede, sometimes follow the main character, must unavoidably confuse the mind of the beginner, and render the acquisition of reading unnecessarily difficult.

IV.—In the Déné Syllabary, all the small signs are separate consonants without vowel, and in no instance is any of them used in another capacity. They have always the same value, and the method and logic which we have noticed in the formation of the main or syllabic signs have also presided to the composition of those which are merely consonantal. Thus the non-syllabic gutturals are expressed by vertical lines $(v \vee v)$; the nasals by semicircles $(v \vee v)$, etc. Note also the transformation of $v \vee v$ into $v \vee v$ into

The old Alphabet not only lacks this method and resulting simplicity, but it would seem as if its originator had purposedly contrived to render its acquisition unduly difficult to the white student by giving to s the value of l_s , to h that of f_s etc.

V.—Not only this; but in the would-be adaptation of Evans' system to the needs of the Eastern Dénés, such essentially distinct letters as m and the Greek chi (my kh) are rendered by except the same sign c, in the same way as both s and z are expressed by s. Now, in Carrier tiz means here and tis younger sister; uyiz is the equivalent of "his voice", while uyis corresponds to "his wart", two things somewhat different, if I mistake not. Similar examples illustrating the immense difference in the philological value of those two letters in all the Déné dialects could be quoted almost ad infinitum.

We may also remark that, in the same graphic system, both the letter h and the hiatus, two very distinct phonetic elements