

public by Dr Sapir, meagre as it may be, suffices to prove that the Chasta Costa dialect is much less primitive, because more analytic, than the Déné idioms of the Canadian North.

To mention but one point of the grammar of the latter, they form their futures by means of particular inflections, or even excrescences, of the pronominal elements. Thus the proximate future of the Carriers changes the present *æs'æs*, "I sneeze," into *æth's'æs*.

Quite often also, the desinential radical of said verbs undergoes itself a characteristic transformation indicative of the new meaning assumed. For instance, *dæsnî*, "I say," becomes *dæthasnîl* in that same future.

On the other hand, the Chasta Costa decomposes and scatters, as it were, the elements of its verbs, much after the way the modern Romance languages have treated the parent Latin. Thus to form the above mentioned future it simply adds the suffix, or rather separate particle, *thé* to the present.¹ No more any of the two or three original inflections of the Déné negative, no more any internal growth, but instead an independent monosyllable, for the future: such are, indeed, unmistakable tokens of analytic disintegration which bespeaks unfavorable ground or unpropitious environment for the life of the language.

SAINT BONIFACE,
MANITOBA, CANADA

¹ The words Sapir gives as synonymous of "I shall sneeze, I shall look at him," etc., should be translated: "If I sneeze, if I look at him," etc., in Carrier, *thé* and *ts* being in that language the conjunction *if*.