

I likewise took down vocabularies of the Chilcotin, Babine, Sékanais and Nah'ane dialects. Now I never once found a native instructor who could syllabify correctly, or in the same way as the preceding one! This task must be done by the scholar who has mastered the language sufficiently to be in a position to judge for himself, after a careful deductive process.

Perhaps the conjugation of one tense, the eventual, of the very verb of which Sapir gives one C. C. person (*t'd-yi-tnd*) will help opening his eyes to the truth of my contention.

Chilcotin	Carrier
<i>tha-ros-tnan</i> , I shall drink	<i>tha-us-nai'</i>
<i>tha-roñ-tnan</i>	<i>tha-ûñ-tnai'</i>
<i>tha-ro-tnan</i>	<i>tha-u-tnai'</i>
<i>tha-rð-tnan</i>	<i>tha-tsu-tnai'</i>
<i>tha-roh-tnan</i>	<i>tha-uh-tnai'</i>
<i>tha-qu-tnan</i>	<i>tha-Ru-tnai'</i>

Dual: *tha-ð-tnai'*

Here we have at a glance the full root *-tnan*, *-tnai'*, the equivalent of C. C. *-tnd*, Sékanais and Hare *-toñ*, Montagnais *-dañ*, fully distinct from the pronominal crements *-ros-*, *-us-*; *-roñ-*, *-ûñ-* etc., which latter are, in turn, clearly differentiated from the qualifying prefix *tha-*, which stands for *thû*, *thô*, "water," and indicates that the verb is intransitive, because it already contains in its make-up some sort of a complement. Who, with ever so slight a tincture of Déné morphology, would dream of having, for instance, *tha-st-nan*, "I drink"; *tha-ñnt-nan*, "thou drinkest," etc., any more than Montagnais *esd-añ*, Hare *et-oñ*?

As to Dr. Sapir's No. 10, while he admits that his verbal stem *-t'ac* (or *-thac*) is genetically related to my *-thas*, which in all the dialects that I know of refers to the plural, he assures me that it is in Chasta Costa really used in connection with singular subjects. This is very surprising and well deserves deep investigation. Pending this, I accept his word for it, merely suggesting that this root is possibly not the equivalent of northern *-thas*, which is strictly plural in intent, but of singular *-thih*, the desinential *-h* corresponding here to C. C. *-c*. Until I get incontrovertible evidence of it I cannot conceive of a plural form coming to express a singular concept.

With regard to Dr. Sapir's criticism under No. 11, he writes (p. 722): "Father Morice is, in my opinion, quite right." What, then, is *corrigendum* in this, his own statement or mine?

N. B.—I take this opportunity to remark that, in addition to those pointed out by Dr. Sapir, the following misprints occurred in my appreciation of his paper on the Chasta Costa language: