

in Indian as in other languages have no intrinsic signification apart from that imposed on them by the common usage of the community.

The apparent abbreviation of nouns in derivative words and word-sentences which has given rise to some of these misleading designations may be explained by the fact that those who attempted to define the methods of derivation and combination of vocal elements took noun-stems from prepositional and other phrases or from word-sentences wherein those students have perchance found the stem for which they sought, overlooking the fact that language does not make decomposition an antecedent condition to other composition. Again, in some languages the gender-sign is usually discarded from the noun-stem when the stem is united with another to form a new compound.

From Dr. Brinton's definition of incorporation—the process of intercalation or interweaving together of Duponceau—it follows that where no conscious or artificial mutilation of notional stems takes place in the compound there is no subordination, and so to that extent no incorporation; that where no modal or tensal flexions are affixed to the word-sentence in such manner as to give the pronominal and nominal elements—the person-endings and the noun-stems—the appearance of being infixes or enclosed between those elements and the verb stem, there is likewise no incorporation. These changes are not made in the simple tenses of the Iroquoian indicative mode, showing that the combination of the notional stems is a condition antecedent to the affixion of modal and tensal flexions to the word-sentence. The fatal error of this doctrine of incorporation lies in the fact that it places flexions and formatives on an equality with notional stems in the expression of thought, making flexions and formatives an integral part of the semasiologic difference between two expressions or word-sentences composed of unlike notional stems, for it is not the flexions but the notional stems which, from the standpoint of morphology, give to every word-sentence its semasiologic individuality. So that testing the question by Dr. Brinton's definition of what constitutes incorporation as he conceives it was dimly perceived by Duponceau, there is in the ground-forms of Iroquoian words and word-sentences no trace of incorporation; for it is not a question of the affixion or suffixion of elements to a root or stem, but merely the use of a system for that purpose.