

THE DÉNÉ LANGUAGES.

Considered in Themselves and Incidentally in their Relations to Non-American Idioms.

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

(Read 19th April, 1890.)

INTRODUCTION.

Among the allied sciences which concur in lending ancillary aid to Ethnology none can be compared to Philology. Anthropology's services are valuable, it is true ; yet its investigations tend to the solution more of racial than of ethnic problems. Archæology can hardly be regarded as an infallible criterion of ethnological certitude, since we find among peoples confessedly heterogeneous implements and sometimes monuments of striking similarity. Mythology or Dæmonology can still less aspire to the first place in the ethnologist's esteem ; for, not to speak of the universality of certain myths or beliefs, a people's legends and its very theogony itself are liable to yield to the latent pressure exercised by foreign nations through migrations, captivity or commiscegenation. Sociology can lay claim to great importance indeed ; still it cannot be assigned the first rank among Ethnology's satellites, since we find among such ethnically different peoples as the Jews and the Caffirs, observances the identity of which would lead to false conclusions were Sociology allowed supreme importance in the decision of ethnological questions.*

Such is not the case with philology. "Nothing is more characteristic of the intellectual existence of man than language," says Gallatin.† "It is found to be a more enduring monument of ancient affinities than the physical type, and there is no tribe, however situated, from which this proof of affiliation should not be obtained." This opinion is corroborated by a contemporaneous author, Horatio Hale, in a paper read some years

*The most striking instance adducible in confirmation of these and the following remarks is that of the Nabajoes of New Mexico and Arizona. Those aborigines who are geographically surrounded by heterogeneous tribes, and inhabit a country some 1,500 miles south of the most southern Dénés' hunting grounds differ in physical type, natural dispositions, manners and customs from our Indians. Their legends, myths and religious observances have no equivalents here, and yet their speech stamps them at once as an offshoot of the great Déné family.

†Am. Ant. Coll., Vol. II.

ago before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the fundamental proposition of which is that "the only satisfactory evidence of affiliation or direct relationship of two communities, apart from authentic historical records, is their speech."*

Well might that multifariously-gifted philosopher Leibnitz deplore the carelessness of the explorers of his time, who did not think it worth their while to collect vocabularies of the languages spoken by the nations they pretended to make known to the civilized world. "C'est un grand défaut," he says, "que ceux qui font des descriptions de pays et des relations de voyages oublient d'ajouter des essais des langues des peuples, of car cela servirait pour en faire connaitre les origines."† This reproach the German philosopher, though addressed to travellers in foreign lands, might be construed as applying with even a greater degree of force to those who, like the missionaries, are by the nature itself of their avocation bound to reside among the natives of the countries they evangelize. Not to deserve it, I, for one, shall attempt to unfold to the appreciation of the indulgent philologist the beauties of the languages spoken by a family of American aborigines who, if low in the social scale, still possess in their native dialects vehicles for thought more expressive, and, in their own way, richer than that of many civilized nations. I mean the languages of the Déné Indians, of whom I have given a sociological outline in a late fasciculus of the "Proceedings" of the Canadian Institute.‡

For the benefit of those who may not have read it, let me state that by Dénés I mean that large family of Indians more commonly known under the inappropriate§ names of Tinné, Tinneh, or Athabaskan. It extends west of the Rockies from the 51° latitude north and east of that range of mountains from the Southern Branch of the Saskatchewan to the territory of the Esquimaux. Apart from the Nabajoes of New Mexico, who are ethnologically connected therewith, it is divided into a dozen or more tribes speaking as many dialects.

For the sake of briefness, all the aboriginal terms unavoidably used in the course of this monograph shall be, unless otherwise noted, in the dialect of the Carriers, the most important of the Western tribes. I shall also, to facilitate the intelligence of some of my remarks, occasionally point out the relations of these idioms to the principal other linguistic groups, especially the classical tongues.

*Am. Antiquarian, IV., Nos. 1 and 2.

†Leibnitz, *Monumenta varia inedita, ex Musæo J. Feller*, tom. IX., p. 595, Jena 1717.

‡Proceedings of the Canadian Institute, Octob. 1889, p. 109 and seq.

§See "The Western Dénés"; Proc. Can. Inst. Oct. 1889, p. 109, note 2.

CHAPTER I.

PHONETICS AND GRAPHIC SIGNS.

And first a word concerning the Déné Alphabet. To be complete, it should count—apart from reduplicated but phonetically unchanged letters—no less than 60 graphic signs, 13 of which to represent vowels, 39 for simple and 8 for double consonants.

The vowels are a, â, æ, e, é, è, i, î, o, ô, u, û, ii. They are all pronounced as in French except æ which corresponds to the French *e* in *je, te, le*; é which is sounded as the *e* in the French word "*mets*"; è as that of the English "ten"; *e* and *u* which have the Italian and *ii* the German sound. The use of the latter is confined to a few insignificant bands of Aborigines who have made the Rocky Mountains their home.

The 29 simple consonants are *b, d, f, g, j, k, χ, k̇, l, l̇, m, n, ñ, N, p, q, q̇, r, ʀ, R, s, ṡ, t, ṫ, v, w, y, z*. They are all sounded as in English with the exception of the following: *h* is strongly aspirated; *j* is pronounced as in French; *ñ* as in Spanish*; *N* is nasal; *l̇* is a linguo-sibilant which is obtained by the emission of a hissing sound on both sides of the tongue curved upwards previous to its striking the lingual letter; *r* is the result of uvular vibrations; *χ* and *ʀ* are respectively *k* and *r* pronounced with a very guttural inflection; *R* is the common *r* of the Romance languages, and is proper to a handful of Rocky Mountain Dénés; *q̇* corresponds to the hard *c* in the words "*cœur, curé*" such as pronounced by North-western Frenchmen: it can be described as approaching the sound of *ty* both letters being consonants and sounded simultaneously. The dot in *k̇, ṫ, q̇*, adds to the regular pronunciation of those letters the exploding sound peculiar to most Indian languages. *ṡ* is phonetically intermediate between *s* and *s/h*. The *f* and its co-relative *v* are found only in the speech of a few Eastern tribes.

By double consonants I do not mean the mere succession or grouping of two or more of the above letters retaining their original value as *tl, kw, kfw*. I have in mind those consonants which, either are differently pronounced when agglomerated, as *ch*, or represent sounds which, though phonetically one, cannot be expressed by any of our consonants taken separately. There are eight such double consonants: *sh, ch, th, kh, kr, k̇r, tṡ* and *tl̇*. The first two are pronounced as in English; *th* and *kh* are equivalent to *t+h* and *k+h* but are produced by a single emission of voice.

* It is proper to a few Northern Dénés.

Such is the case with *kr* and *kʀ*, save that the sound of the *r* in this phonetic compound is perceptible only for the natives and those who may have made a specialty of the study of their language. *Ts* and *tʃ* have the exploding sound and their value can hardly be taught otherwise than *viva voce*.

To the foregoing should be added the hiatus (·) which has the effect of abruptly interrupting the pronunciation and slightly elevating the tone of the syllable it follows.

There is no accent in Déné.

Besides, the Déné dialects possess two genuine diphthongs: *au* and *ai* pronounced respectively as the German *au* and the English long *i* in such words as "fire, mire," etc. A peculiarity of the language is that it avoids the succession of two vocalic sounds with as much care as the Polynesian idioms do the accumulation of consonants. Thus "Leo" is pronounced "Leyo" and "Noah, Nowah" by our Indians.

Among the consonants *b* and *p*, *d* and *t*, *k* and *g* are respectively undifferentiated through the whole Déné linguistic group. They can be interchanged without in the least affecting the sense of the word, whilst *t* and *q*, *p* and *v*, *ts* and *kʀw* or *kʃw*, *ts* and *kʀw* are co-affin and transmutable from dialect to dialect and particularize the tribe to which the orator belongs. The same remark applies, but in a broader sense, to the vowels, all of which admit of the possibility of being transmuted with another, no matter how great its phonetical dissimilarity. This last peculiarity will no doubt strike the comparative philologist as an important point of resemblance between the Déné and the Semitic languages. Non-transmutable consonants characterize the idiom and lexically differentiate it from other mother tongues or linguistic families, while the vowels specify the dialect and change from tribe to tribe. A few examples will illustrate my meaning:—

MAN is *kiat* in Kitikson or Abna (Skeena River idiom) and *tæne* in Carrier, the language of the Kitiksons' eastern neighbours. BEAVER is rendered by *tsæmillih*; CANOE by *mæl*; RAIN by *wish* in Kitikson, while the Carriers use the words *tsa*, *tsi*, and *chan* respectively to express the same ideas. These terms being roots in both languages, the dissimilitude of their main constituent part, the consonants, suffices to immediately arouse in the mind of the philologist a suspicion of diversity of language, which a prolonged investigation does not fail to confirm.

Let us now examine the same root words in the various Déné dialects.

MAN is *tæne* in Carrier, *tæni* in Chisxohtin. *tènè* in Sékanais; *tana* in Nabajo, and *déné*, *danè*, *dennu*, *dine*, *dune* in other eastern dialects.

BEAVER is called *tša*, *tse*, *tsi* and *tso*, according to the dialect.

CANOE is rendered by *tsi*, *tse* and *tsu*, relatively to the different tribes.

RAIN is translated *chan*, *chon* and *chièn* in Carrier, Hare and Loucheux respectively.

Here the similarity of the consonants through the various dialects at once strikes us as suggestive of philological affinity. Furthermore, a searching analysis of the elements which concur in the formation of the root will reveal the fact that the real radical for "man" in Déné, considered as a distinct linguistic stock, is *t-n-* or its equivalent *d-n-*, while that for "beaver" is *ts-*, that for "canoe," *ts-*, and that for "rain" *ch-n*, the hyphen replacing the vowels, which as we see, have but secondary importance.

As another instance of the preponderating role played by the consonant, let us take for examination the Loucheux word *Tan*. A linguist unmindful of the foregoing might, rather than compare it with the Carrier word *TæNnge*, assign to it the same signification as the quasi-homonymous Chisxohtin *Than*. Now it happens that *Tan* means "four," while *Than* means "three," the *T* simple running through all the dialects as the chief formative element of the Déné terms for "four," (*tæNnge*, *tîngi*, *tényi*, *tankre*, *tan*, *tê*), whilst the *Th* performs the same function, with the help of variable vowels and non-initial consonants, with regard to the different words used to express our English "three," (*tha*, *than*, *thake*, *thage*, *thaye*, *thièg*).

From which remarks I think I am warranted in deducing the, to me, self-evident conclusion that, in so far as the root words are concerned, the phonetical graphic signs of the Déné languages might be reduced, as in the ancient Semitic tongues, to the mere consonants.

No kind of writing ever obtained among the Dénés previous to the discovery of their country. The missionaries tried to adapt to the language of the Eastern tribes the syllabic characters invented by the late Mr. Evans. But as one of them, a pioneer in the Déné linguistic field well deserving of American scholars, the Rev. E Petitot, judiciously remarks: "cet alphabet qui est parfaitement suffisant pour exprimer les 20 lettres de la langue algonquine, est loin de répondre aux exigences de l'idiome déné-dindjié qui compte comme nous l'avons vu 71 sons phonétiques."*

**Précis de Grammaire comparée pp. XLIX. and L., Paris, Leroux éditeur, 1876.* Rev. Petitot counts as different sounds those produced by doubled or consecutive letters as *ss* and *tt* which circumstance accounts for the difference in our computation of the Déné phonetics.

Moreover, the signs of that alphabet are disposed without logic or method, which is a very serious defect when it is a question of syllabics. No effort had been made to remedy this palpable deficiency until five years ago when the writer of this paper devised the following alphabet which, thanks to the methodical disposition of its signs and the consequent facility in ascertaining their value, has since yielded the most encouraging results.

THE NEW METHODICAL EASY AND COMPLETE DÉNÉ SYLLABARY.

<i>With</i> A Œ E I O U							<i>With</i> A Œ E I O U								
A Œ &c.	△	▽	▷	◁	△	▽	<i>Alone</i>	Y	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	<i>Alone</i>
H	∧	∨	∇	∆	∧	∨	h	Q	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	
Ŕ	∧	∇	∇	∇	∧	∇	//	Q	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	
R	∧	∇	∇	∇	∧	∇	//								
W	∧	∇	∇	∇	∧	∇		L	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	i
Hw	∧	∇	∇	∇	∧	∇		Tl	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	
T D (1)	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	τ	f	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	u
Th	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		Tf	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	
T	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙		Tf	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	(3)
P B (1)	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	±	Z	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	z z
(1)								Tz Dz	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	(4)
K G, Kr	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	'	S	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	s s
χ, Kh	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	\	Sh	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	š
K, Kr	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	∨	Ch	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	
							(2)	Ts	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	
N	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	˘	Ts	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	
M	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙	˘								

Hiatus . — *Accessories* : ° *

EXPLANATORY NOTES. — (1) These letters are not differentiated in Déné. (2) ˘ is the nasal n. (3) z is the French j. (4) s is phonetically intermediate between š and s. * is prefixed to proper names, and ° is suffixed to syllables the vowel of which it is necessary to render long.

CHAPTER II.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DÉNÉ LANGUAGES.

It would be difficult to assign in one word the place which the Déné languages occupy among the chief classifications into which modern philologists have divided the human speech on the basis of its grammatical structure. Certain writers, and even eminent scholars, too fond of generalizations, have given as characteristics of the American languages traits which really pertain only to some of them. W. von Humboldt pointed to the agglutinative tendency of their verbs as to their chief characteristic* and Wiseman quotes in support of this view Malte Brun's remark to the effect that "this wonderful uniformity in the particular manner of forming the conjugation of verbs from one extremity of America to the other favours in a singular manner the supposition of a primitive people which formed the common stock of the American indigenous natives."† Now, it so happens that the Déné verbs are not formed by agglutination,‡ and are just as inflected as the Latin or Greek verbs.

More recently Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull, in a paper, otherwise full of valuable hints concerning the peculiarities of the American languages considered as an independent linguistic group, makes the following remarks, the first of which he emphasizes by the use of italics: "*The Indian noun is not separable as a part of speech from the verb.* Every name is not merely descriptive but *predicative.* . . . In short, every Indian name is in fact a verb."§ Yet, with all the respect due to such an authority on American philology as Dr. Trumbull, I must state that there are in Déné many nouns which have no relation whatever to the verb; nay, the great majority of them is altogether independent therefrom, and they are just as purely nominative as the English "house," "lake," "bear," etc.

In a former paper I have referred to the remarkable propensity of the Déné nation for the self-appropriation of foreign practices and customs. Its language likewise presents to the investigator features so varied as to suggest a mixed origin for the whole stock, but more especially for the Western tribes. It is at the same time compounding, agglutinative, inflective, and polysynthetic.|| Not, of course that it possesses each and

* *Apud* Wiseman, xii Lectures on the Connection betw. Science and Revel. Lect. II. p. 82.

† *Ibid.*

‡ At least as this word is now understood and applied by philologists.

§ Transact. Am. Philol. Assoc. 1869-70.

|| I apply to these epithets the sense given them in the 2d Edit. of Powell's *Introduc. to the Study of Ind. Lang.* p. 56.

every one of these attributes in each and every one of its component parts. But I do affirm that we find them all in the language considered as a whole. In other words the Déné has patent affinities with the Aryan, Turanian and Semitic tongues. This I hope to prove to the satisfaction of the reader in the following chapters.

Another assertion still more common in philological writings and, in the light of the Déné vocabulary, quite as groundless as the preceding ones, is that abstract terms and words expressive of generality and collectivity are wanting in the American languages which are represented by some superficial observers as awkward in their syntax and very limited in their vocabulary. I admit that we must not look to the Déné idioms as to models of phraseological conciseness. That most important property of a language, the power of expressing without periphrases the subtlest efforts of the human mind, is somewhat wanting in the speech of our Aborigines, whilst terms expressive of those abstract ideas the accurate rendering of which constitutes linguistic perfection are not, I must confess, over numerous. Yet the philologist who wishes to propose for the guidance of students a rule of general import should, it seems, previously examine whether it is not too sweeping in its comprehensiveness. That words expressive of abstractness are not altogether wanting in Déné will be proved by the following nouns taken from the Carrier Vocabulary :—

Tli, cold (as affecting human body)	Ƴœf, diurnal revolution of time
Hokwœz, cold (referring to the temperature)	Nûntsé, bleeding of the nose
Sœl, warmth	Hokôš, haze
Tsazœl, heat (of the sun)	Na-kôš, snow-haze (lit. eye-haze)
Hwozœl, heat (of the temperature)	Ƴwœs, cough
Tlo, smile	Unih, jealousy
Tso, weeping	Nœtqœt, fear
Ni, cares	Tsafkœs, obscurity
Shœn, witchcraft	YœƳaih, daybreak
Pœf, sleep	Unté, love
Shih, French " <i>essoufflement</i> "	Nœtai, dance
Qan, old age	Nôyé, play
Tai, famine	Yathœk, talking
Nœtî, effort (physical)	Yuyuz, whistling
Nîni, pleasure	Huzœf, time
Tsus, kiss (childish)	Neni, human mind
	Nezœl, human soul (animating the body)
	Netsîn, second self

Noeta, Indian game (Chinook : <i>lahal</i>)	Nezuf, human shade*
Atlih, Indian game (played with small sticks)	Hwolna, difficulty
Chahwozun, hunger	Hwol'é, easiness
Khu, vomiting	Ætata, olden time
Æltoh, cramp	Horwoenceta, ceremonial ban- queting
Tata, disease	Thoef, kick
Æltsœf, bodily pain	Yaf, locomotion on two feet (hu- man)
Itzi, shivering	Kwœf, locomotion on four feet (and of birds)
Ætenkoh, work (to be done)	Kral, locomotion by running
Lla, manual labor	Pih, " " swimming
Thib, frost	Khe, " in canoe
Moæssai, Latin, " <i>nihilum</i> ," French, " <i>néant</i> "	Kwœz, " in sleigh, etc.

Besides, the third person singular of several verbs is also used to render our abstract nouns.

On the other hand, collectivity may be said to be expressed by such words as *tætai*, ducks (of any species); *tætai-yaz*, birds; *wænnai*, animals, etc. To these might be added, *æra*, French, "*poils*," and derivatives; *ne-na*, eyes; *ne-tzo*, ears; *ne-lla*, hands; *ne-khé*, feet; *ne-kran*, arms, which, though singular in form, are plural or collective in meaning.

Lastly, *nelætsîn*, *nelthœs* mean respectively "brother" and "sister" in the indefinite or general sense; *nethœs* stands for ancestor without reference to his or her sex or degree of anteriority; *neîlken* qualifies any kinsman or kinswoman; *neke-khé* has almost the same signification, etc.

However, I must admit that the Déné languages are rather poor in such vocables. This lexical scarcity is a source of embarrassing perplexity to the student who has not yet acquired the mode of thinking proper to the Indian mind. To express, for instance, abstract ideas, one must frequently have recourse to periphrases which, as a rule, are far from rendering the exact meaning of the Aryan speaker. Not only are those languages deficient in the abstract *form* of many words, but even those sharp distinctions between the multiform operations of the human mind, those subtle and varied feelings which agitate our heart, seem to be perfect mysteries to the Déné idioms. A single sentence or periphrastic locution is all that the Carrier has at his disposal to give utterance to such varied movements as sorrow, melancholy, repen-

*See *The Western Dénés*, Proc. Can. Inst., Oct. 1889, pp. 158, 159.

tance, morosity, displeasure, etc. When moved by any of these or cognate sentiments, he will never say but : *stsi ndæta*, "my heart is sick." In like manner, such widely different moral qualities as goodness, beauty, handsomeness, holiness, liberality, magnanimity, benignity, sweetness, etc., not only cannot be expressed under their abstract form, but even when presented in a concrete shape, as a personal attribute, they have no other synonyms in Déné than *nzu*, "he is good."

Genuine synonyms in those languages are exceedingly rare. In fact I hardly know of any two words employed in one village to express exactly the same object or action. Homonyms there are, but even these are wonderfully scarce. Quite a number of words would indeed present to the unobservant linguist appearances of phonetical identity ; but no native ear will ever mistake, for instance, *sa*, "sun" for *sæ*, "a long time ;" *ntsi*, "your head," for *ntsi*, "he is bad," etc.

On the other hand, owing to that synthetical disposition of most of the Déné verbs, which is but imperfectly developed in our idioms, perfect equivalents between that language and ours are—barring those terms which are roots in Déné—rarer than a hasty observer would at first imagine. As a proof of this assertion, let me open at random my Dictionary of Carrier Verbs. One of the first words that falls under my eyes is the French verb "Briller," to shine. As an equivalent, therefore, I have written down *pæ-sa-udænat*. Now, while that term is certainly the nearest synonymous word that could be found to render the idea represented by the French vocable, it must be confessed that it is more restricted in its meaning. *Pæ-sa-udænat* (literally : "the sun strikes it") denotes a kind of brilliancy caused by the reflection of the solar rays upon a polished surface, and could but improperly be used in connection with an object shining at night through the agency of fire or some other cause.

A little lower down, in the same column of my dictionary, I find the word "Brisé (être)," to be broken. In spite of its 150,000 or so verbal terms, the Carrier vocabulary does not contain a single genuine equivalent therefor. But, to compensate for the lack of that term, what a prodigious exuberance of differentiating forms ! Here I must respectfully demand of the detractors of Indian languages a moment of attention. In lieu of the single Aryan term, the American dialect under review possesses no less than 110 particularizing substitutes, not one of which could be indifferently used for the other. They are expressive of—1st, the object employed to operate the breakage, viz., the fists or the feet, a stick or a whip, or of the cause of such action as the wind, the explosion of fire-arms, etc.; 2nd, the manner in which the object has been affected, that

is whether it has been broken in one place or in many, by the middle or otherwise, purposely or by accident, violently or by gentle pressure; 3rd, the form of the object, qualified, that is whether it is elongated or spheroid, occupying a vast place or not, etc.

Moreover these 110 distinct verbs can be multiplied by four or five according as we give them the iterative, initiative, terminative, etc. forms whereby their signification is also changed. For, as we shall see further on, these forms are not mere modes in the usual sense of the word. Now, where is the Aryan or even the Semitic language which can boast of such lexical richness?

Nor should we overlook the fact that this wonderful discriminative faculty is displayed in connection with each and every instrumentative verb, and that almost any other class of conjugatable terms is even superior in the variety of its forms and the precision and nicety of its distinctions. Let us choose, for instance, the verbs of locomotion. The single paradigm of the verb "to go" includes in my dictionary verbs that are totally different according as to whether the locomotion thereby expressed takes place on two or on four feet, by running or hopping, tottering as a drunk man or with the help of a staff, creeping like a snake or jumping as a frog, swimming or floating, packing or skating, playing or in a state of madness, whistling or speaking, singing or grumbling, laughing or weeping, in sleigh or in canoe, paddling or sailing, diving down or in parallel line with the surface of the water, etc.—also according as to whether the movement is that of an empty canoe or that of the sun, the stars, the clouds, the wind, the snow, the rain, the water, the earth, (*i.e.* relatively to a person drifting down stream), the fire, smoke, fog, ghosts, human mind, feather down, disease, news, etc.—or again, whether it is that of an object elongated or spheroid, heavy or light, liquid or liquefiable granulated, massive, soft, etc., etc.

Furthermore, let us suppose that such varied locomotion takes place in the water and *all* of these individually different verbs will be materially altered; in the fire, and a similar—not identical—variation will result. Nor is this all. By giving them the negative, usitative, causative, causativo-potential, defective, reciprocal, initiative, terminative and iterative forms, each and every one of them will thus be multiplied by the number of forms assumed. And all the other verbs of locomotion can be affected by similar mutations!

Now perhaps I shall meet with incredulous readers when I affirm that this fecundity of the locomotive verbal stems is still surpassed by the prodigious particularizing power evidenced by the objective verbs. Yet this is a mere fact. I will not attempt even a reduced enumeration of

their forms. What I have already said will, I trust, give a fair enough idea of the differentiating superiority of the Déné over the Aryan languages. I shall content myself with stating that the single paradigm of the verb "to put" contains in my dictionary (which could be more complete) over 3,000 verbs all of which differ in meaning as well as in material structure. And this number is repeated in connection with almost all the other objective verbs, which are quite numerous! And to say that a child four or five years old possesses these innumerable vocables well nigh as perfectly as does his father and knows his extricate language infinitely better than any French academician does his own plain and easy mother tongue! Who will now vaunt the so much extolled mental superiority of the white race and despise the intellectual capacity of those poor "savages"?

But we must descend from the heights of admiration to the more prosaic task of rapidly analyzing the different parts which constitute this wonderful speech.

CHAPTER III.

THE NOUNS; THEIR VARIETIES AND INFLECTIONS.

There are in Déné but eight different parts of speech: the noun, the adjective, the pronoun, the adverb, the verb, the postposition, the conjunction and the interjection. Besides the verbs, the immense majority of the adjectives as well as many nouns and a few adverbs are susceptible of conjugation.

Considered in their material structure and etymology, the Déné nouns may be divided into four classes. There are the primary roots which are all monosyllabic as in Chinese. Such are *ya*, sky; *thù*, water; *tsé*, stone; *sæs*, black bear, etc. They are essentially nominative: they neither define nor describe the object they designate; they merely differentiate it from another. I consider them as the remnants of the primitive Déné language, inasmuch as they are to be found with little or no alteration in all the dialects of the family, whatever may be the distance intervening between the Aborigines who speak them.

The second category comprises roots of simple import which are genuine unsynthetical substantives though polysyllabic, generally dissyllabic, in form. To this category belong words as *tæne*, man; *tsèk/hè*, woman; *pængræn*, lake, etc. They possess, to a limited extent, the properties of the monosyllabic roots, being likewise merely determinative and oftentimes varying but little with the change of dialect.

The third class contains composite nouns formed, as a rule, by compounding, though sometimes by agglutinating, monosyllabic or disyllabic roots. Such are *ne-na-pa-ra* (literally: man-eyes-edge-hair), eye lashes; *tæpe-té*, wild sheep horns; *mai-re*, vegetable oil, instead of *mai-se*, literally fruit-oil. These nouns being mere compounds of roots belonging to the two former categories have the same degree of relative immutability with regard to the various dialects as the radicals which enter into their composition.

The fourth and last class is made up of verbal nouns which, as their name indicates, are nothing else than verbs in the impersonal or personal moods employed to qualify objects of secondary import with the help, sometimes of a radical noun, sometimes of a pronoun, and always of a prepositive particle prefixed to, or incorporated in, the verbal substantive. Of this description are the words *pe-yæn-æŋqæŋ* (lit. with-earth-one-cleaves), plough; *u-kwæt-tsæzta* (lit. it-on-one-sits), seat; *æten-pa-yæŋ* (lit. he-works-for-house), work-shop. These and similarly formed words are the only terms which fall under the too comprehensive remark of Dr. Trumbull quoted in the previous chapter.

Of these four classes the first may be said to comprise about two-fifths of the whole aggregate of nouns, the remainder being distributed in almost equal proportions among the three other categories.

In the foregoing we must not fail to notice two grammatical combining processes common to some Aryan idioms, compounding and agglutination. A third process of a different nature, change of meaning by intonation or vocal inflection obtains also among some—not all—of the Déné tribes. Some of these intonations are even proper to fractions of tribes only. Thus *ya* which means "sky" in almost all the dialects becomes "louse" to a Southern Carrier when pronounced in a higher tone. Northern Carriers have another vocal inflection which is combined with the final hiatus and is also peculiar to them. Among them *ælla* means "hands" (of an animal): with the final hiatus it becomes *ælla*; "bark" (of the spruce). *Stsé* corresponds to the English "my stone," by adding to which the hiatus inflection we obtain *Stsé*; "my daughter" (as named by the father).

Judging by the restrictive notes contained within the parenthesis we perceive that the Déné nouns are no exception to the rule common to most Indian languages which ascribes to the substantives the property of connotiveness in addition to that of denotiveness. But I must hasten to remark that, apart from the polysynthetic compounds which are connotive by reason of their synthetism, this rule applies only to a limited

number of nouns. Among the essentially connotive nouns we find the names of the parts composing the animal body. Thus, although the real root for the word "heart" in its indefinite sense is *tsé*, this monosyllable is never employed alone. Though you may not specify it in English, the word used in Déné particularizes the nature of the heart referred to, viz., whether it is human, or simply animal. In the first case, the root (*tsé*) must be preceded by the particle *ne*, the radical element in *tæne*, man. Were we to replace this by the prefix *æ* which contains an idea of vagueness or indefiniteness, we would thereby refer to the heart of a dead animal such as that which might lie before a surgical student for the purpose of dissection.

This last prefix (*æ, é, i, a, u, ko, kwo*, etc., according to the dialects,) constitutes the only semblance of an article of which there is any trace in the Déné languages. It precedes certain monosyllabic roots or compounds of monosyllables such as, in Carrier, *ætan*, leaf; *æto*, nest; *æra-pa-tsæf* (lit. hair-for-awl) needle. It has some affinity with the Hebrew prefix article \aleph \aleph \aleph . That would-be article, like the \aleph of the original \aleph \aleph is assimilated by the vowel of the possessive pronoun or the desinential letter of the words with which it is agglutinated. Thus, "his nest" is said *u-to* instead of *u-æto*, and the prefix *æ* likewise disappears in such compounds as *soh-to*, "robin-nest," *tæras-tan*, "aspen leaf," etc.

The Déné dialects lack declensions of any description. As in the modern analytic tongues of Aryan descent, the office of the cases is, with one single exception, filled by prepositions or rather *postpositions*; for in Déné, as in the Turanian idioms, it is a general rule that the governed word precedes the governing. The exception is the genitive or possessive, which is expressed as in English by first designating the progenitor or possessor and then prefixing the possessive pronoun in the third person to the word denoting the offspring or the object possessed. Thus *William u-yæn* has exactly the same signification as the semi-Saxon "Willelm hys lond," a disintegration of the original "Willelmes lond," which has come down to us under the modern contracted form "William's land."

The possessive pronoun affects some nouns to such an extent as to impart to them a genuine inflection, in fact an inflection which, viewed in the light of the Déné phonology is even more radical than that of the Greek or Latin cases, since the element thereby inflected is not, as in those languages, the vowel which in Déné is unimportant, but the consonant which constitutes the quintessence of the word. For instance *li* is the Carrier monosyllable for "dog," which, when affected by the possessive pronoun becomes *s-læk*. Its Chifxohtin equivalent *tsin* is equally

changed into *sæ-llik* when in contact with the possessive pronoun of the first person singular. *ye* means "grease" the possessive of which is *u-rwe* at third person singular.* Were there no other cases of consonantal inflection in the languages under study, I think these might suffice to confirm the truth of Horatio Hale's assertion that "the opinion which prevails widely among scholars . . . that the languages of the Aryan and Semitic families are the only tongues in which genuine inflections are to be found . . . is utterly erroneous."†

In common with the Mongolian idioms, the Déné has no genuine plural. When absolutely necessary, that number is expressed, not by the adjunction of a pluralizing consonant as the *s* of many modern Aryan languages, or by a vocalic inflection as in Latin and Italian, but by the adjunction of such adjectives as *lai*, "many," or *tsiyauh*, "all." This rule applies to all the nouns (except *li*, dog) expressive of non-human beings. Personal names form their plural by suffixing the particles *khé*, feet (which is also applied to *li*), or more frequently *ne*, root of *tæne*, man. Only two nouns of the Carrier dialect *tsèkhè*, woman, and *tekhé*, relation, undergo a vocalic mutation when in the plural number, becoming respectively *tsèkhô* and *tekhô*.

As in Hebrew—but *minus* any suffix corresponding to the Semitic dualic increment—the names of those objects which are twofold by nature, as the eyes, the hands, etc., are intrinsically dual in meaning though singular in form. To obtain the grammatical singular, one must add to the Déné vocable the participle *kæz*, contraction of *ækæz*, "half." Therefore *ne-lla* refers to both (human) hands, and to get the singular we must say *ne-lla-kæz*, "(human)-hands-half."

Grammatical gender is likewise unknown in Déné, and this is again a link of affinity with the Turanian languages. When necessity requires a generic distinction, it is obtained as in Japanese, by the use of the words "man" and "woman" which, for the purpose become adjectives and mean "male" and "female." Here I cannot resist the temptation to point out the remarkable terminological analogy existing between the Japanese word for "male" and that used by the Chippewayans, one of the most important of the Déné tribes. This term is *yu* in both languages. The Chis̄hohtins replace it by *yoss* which also reminds the linguist of the Japanese *osz* which has the same signification.

* To fully appreciate the inflectiveness of these and similar words one should bear in mind that there is in Déné as much difference between *l* and *l̄* and *ɹ* and *ɹ̄* as between any two non-transmutable consonants of the English alphabet.

† *The Development of Language*, Proc. Can. Inst. Oct. 1888, p. 114.

The names of some mammals, however, change with the sex, and a few have even a neuter gender, as is the case with the name of the caribou which in Carrier is *hwotsih* for the neuter, *ætæten* for the masculine, and *æmma* for the feminine genders.

The peculiar differentiating tendency which we have already noticed in the verbs, extends also to the names of a few fur-bearing animals. Among these we find the beaver whose name is *tsa*. His offspring, when under two years of age is called *tsa-tsel* in Chit̄hohtin. But when the animal has seen two winters, it receives the name of *khoq*, which after its third winter is exchanged with *ætqal'il*, which alludes to its being of age to be mated.

The Déné dialects possess diminutive and amplificative forms which are obtained conformably to the Japanese method with this difference that, while the Japanese *prefixes* to the nouns the words *ko*, "child," and *o*, "big," the Déné *suffixes* thereto the words *yaz* and *cho* which have exactly the same signification.

CHAPTER IV.

THE ADJECTIVES AND THE PRONOUNS.

As heretofore stated, the quasi totality of the Déné adjectives are genuine verbs. Indeed the only real adjectives that do not admit of the possibility of conjugation, are, in the Carrier dialect, *æyu*, another, and *tsiya*, all. *Æstel*, naked, *yuya*, ashamed, *tannrwæz*, cylindrical, *tsachéskhwæn*, red hot, might pretend to the title, but their native form and use are more that of adverbs than of real adjectives.

This being the case, it follows that intrinsic forms of the comparative and of the superlative are no more possible in that dialect than in Hebrew. Their function is filled, as in the Semitic tongue, by some circumlocution. To obtain the comparative the Carriers use the adverb *onnæs*, more, before the adjective, and say, for instance: *onnæs nzu*, "more (he is) good" for better. The superlative, when suggestive of no comparison, is rendered as in English by adverbs corresponding to our "very, much." When it implies some comparison, its expression offers in Déné greater difficulty. In Carrier, we generally make use of some comparative adverb as the above mentioned *onnæs*, or more appropriately the particle *kæs*, both of which are coupled with the relative pronoun (*e*, *èn*, *ène* or *ne*) in this wise: *kæs nzu e*, "the best" (thing). Sometimes a

periphrastic circumlocution takes the place of our superlative, and this is particularly the case among the Eastern Dénés. Thus, according to Petitot, to translate: "my mother is the best of mothers," a Chippewyan would be inclined to say: "mothers all anyhow my mother alone is good." The only intrinsically formed superlative is that of the locative and ordinative adverbs or adverbial-adjectives. Its distinctive element is the prefix *æte*, applied to the adverb in its natural state as *æte-no'*, the most northern; *æte-yo*, the lowest; *æte-tiz*, the nearest (in distance); *æte-tså* the first (in rank or age); *æte-chu*, the first (in the succession of time), etc. This genuine superlative is proper to the Carrier dialect.

A peculiar comparative of similitude obtains through the whole linguistic group. But as it is essentially incorporated in the verb, I simply mention the fact in this connection.

I deem it more relevant to associate with the regular adjectives the demonstrative pronouns which, together with the numerals, have in Déné the same material features and follow the same rules as the two genuine adjectives *æyu* and *tsiya*. These rules have reference to their place in the sentence, viz: immediately before the noun, and their grammatical accord therewith, to understand which a word of explanation is necessary.

The broadest division of the substantives grammatically considered and the only one which affects in any way the unconjugatable adjectives and the demonstrative or relative pronouns connected therewith, is that which differentiates the names of human from those of non-human beings. It has for effect to demand the addition to the adjective of an *n*—from *tæne*—for the singular, and of the suffix *ne* for the plural of adjectives relating to human beings. Thus *æyu* means "another (thing)," *æyun*, "another (person)," *æyune*, "other (persons)."

The same remark applies—barring what has reference to the plural—to the numeral adjectives. These are quite rich in variety of forms. In Carrier *tha* means three (things); *thane*, three (persons); *that*, three times; *thatæn*, in three places; *thauh*, in three ways; *thaitloh*, all of the three (things); *thahæltoh*, all of the three (persons); *thahultoh*, all of the three times, (places or things—massive or spacious). Most of the Eastern dialects lack all but the three first forms. Neither do they, as a rule, possess the ordinal numbers which are expressed in Carrier by the cardinal adjectives preceded by the postpositions (which for the purpose become prepositions) *pæł* or *hwol*, "with it," in this way: *pæł thanæn*, "with him three" (persons) or the third; *hwol that*, "with it three times," or the third time, etc.

In common with the ancient Egyptians and most American aborigines the Dénés use their fingers to count upon, and their system is decimal. Holding his left hand with the palm turned toward his face, the Carrier will bend with the index of his right his little finger and all the others in succession. Then he repeats the same operation on the fingers of his right hand whose palm is this time turned outside, the number six being named on the thumb. That number is *lkae-tha*, "on both it is three" (things), and eight is in like manner *lkae-tœnnge*, "on both it is four" (things). The expression used for nine recalls to mind the *ἐνὸς δέοντος* of the Greeks. The Dénés likewise say: one is wanting (*i.e.* to ten). Ten is *hwontzyai*, "it is won," in Northern Carrier. For eleven all the tribes say ten *plus* one, etc.; for twenty, twice ten, etc., and before the advent of the whites the Carriers said for 100, *pe nahultto*, "with it one counts again."

Another analogy with the Greek language perhaps worth mentioning is that existing between the Déné interrogative pronoun *tî?* "what?" and its Greek synonym *τί*; all other Carrier interrogatives are similarly characterized by the initial consonant T which corresponds to the initial *τ* noticeable in all the Greek pronouns of that class. But enough of this. My intention in commencing this paper was to ignore mere lexical analogies with alien languages.

Of personal pronouns all the Déné dialects possess two kinds. The first is subjective and independent from the verb. It is identical with the Latin *ego, tu, ille*, etc. The other is so incorporated into the body of the verb as to lose its own individuality. It is the equivalent of the pronominal element we notice in the Latin and Greek verbs: *am-o, am-as, am-at*, etc., *λύ-ω, λύ-εις, λύ-ει*, etc. Of this last more shall be said when I come to treat of the verb.

Possessive pronouns assume in Carrier five different forms, according to the signification or the internal structure of the noun to which they are prefixed. The most noticeable peculiarity in connection therewith is the richness of the pronoun of the third person. While four words (his, her, its, their), seem sufficient to the English mind to express it, the Carrier idiom can boast of no less than 17 such terms which, however, when divested of their five accidental forms can be reduced to six: singular *u, hwwo, yœ, tœ*; plural, *pœ* and *he*. The first of these pronouns corresponds to our "his, her, its,"—the pronouns admit of no gender in Déné. The second (*hwwo*) is prefixed to nouns in regiminal connection with such words as "house, lake," and those which denote

extensiveness or indefiniteness. *Yæ* refers to a third completive person as in this sentence *Pol yæ-pa i-kela-hwołtsi*, Paul paid for him. By changing *yæ-pa* into *u-pa*, we would give to understand that *he* paid for Paul. The plural of this pronoun is *he*. *Tæ* has relation to the person whose action is expressed in the sentence. It is the exact equivalent of the Latin *suus, sua, suum*.

It will easily be understood that with such a convenient array of pronominal terms, amphibology is a mere impossibility.

In a late fasciculus of the "Proceedings" of the Canadian Institute, I was struck by a quotation from Peschel to the effect that "in the American languages the connected syllables (of composite words) are always curtailed of some sound."* This is another of the many erroneous statements of philologists, who, because they have obtained some knowledge of a few native tongues, are too prone to apply to those they are unacquainted with the Latin axiom: *ab uno disce omnes*. Or shall we exculpate them from the charge of temerity and lay the blame at the door of those who being in position to acquaint the philological world with new languages, did not take the trouble to do so? Be it as it may, Peschel could hardly find in the Carrier dialect one really composite word to which to apply his own rule. Nay, I think his remark would be more to the point in reference to such a highly inflected language as Latin than with regard to the confessedly polysynthetical Déné idioms, at least if we are to take such a word as *cadaver* as an abbreviated compound formed from *caro data vermibus*.

Still, the case might have been different in pristine times as the name (*Na-ka-stli*) of the village where these lines are written would seem to warrant us to infer. According to a local tradition, a powerful tribe of dwarfs (*atna*) once attacked and well nigh swept it out of existence. As it is situated close by the outlet of this (Stuart's) Lake, the enemy's arrows, which were diminutive in proportions as the hands that used them, floated down the river in immense numbers. Hence, to give a graphic idea of the importance of the conflict, the ancients used to say to their children: the river was covered with the floating arrows of the enemy, *Atna ka pœł tiztli*, which by contraction has become *Nakastli*.

On the other hand, we find in connection with the pronouns remarkable instances of contractions whereby two words, a pronoun and a postposition, primitively independent have combined to form, not a regular composite word as those alluded to by Peschel, but a single monosyllable

* Proc. Can. Inst. April, 1889, p. 291.

possessing the meaning of the original two words. Here are examples in two different dialects.

Carrier Dialect.		Chifxohtin Dialect.	
Scœf, with me, for	s-p-œf	Sa, for me, instead of	s-œp-a
Nyœf, " thee,	m-p-œf	Na, " thee, etc.,	n-œmp-a
Pœf, yœf, him, etc.,	p-œp-œf, y-œp-œf	Pa, ya,	p-œp-a, y-œp-a
tœf, hwof,	t-œp-œf, hwo-pœ-f	nɪwa,	nɪo-p-a
Nef	ne-p-œf	ɪwa,	ɪo-p-a
Nohwœf	nuh-p-œf	Kupa,	ku-pœ-pa
Opœf, heyœf,	opœ-pœ-f, hey-œp-œf		

Of the adverbs I shall say nothing besides mentioning the fact that many of our adverbs have for equivalents in Déné non-adverbial particles incorporated in, or prefixed to, the verb as formative elements. The sequence will explain this peculiarity.

As for the conjunctions and the interjections they offer to the philologist nothing worthy of remark beyond this resemblance with the Mongolian or Tartaric tongues, that conjunctive terms are but seldom used, their number being reduced to a few indispensable words.

CHAPTER V.

THE SIMPLE OR PRIMARY VERBS.

The verb is indeed the word (*verbum*) *par excellence* in Déné. In fact, out of every twenty words of the language, I doubt whether there are two that are not susceptible of conjugation. Were it not for the verb the Déné grammar might be said to be devoid of serious difficulties. As it is, the multiplicity of the verbs, the varieties of their forms, the frequency of their irregularities, the intricacies of their negative elements and the almost unlimited possibilities of their combinations assign to the Déné idioms one of the first places among the most difficult languages known to Philology. The student should not anticipate in these pages a complete treatise on that most complex of the parts of speech. I am not writing a grammar and must confine myself to general outlines. Yet I hope he will miss in this and the following chapters very little of what is of real value to form a sound estimate of the chief characteristics of the Déné verbs. For the sake of perspicuity I shall treat here exclusively of the simple or primary verbs by opposition to the composite or synthetically constructed verbs which shall form the subject of another chapter.

A word concerning the modes, tenses, persons and numbers shall serve us as an introduction to the subject. As in the Hebrew grammar, there is, properly speaking, but one mode, the indicative, in the Déné dialects. The imperative can hardly be called a mode, since it is formed entirely of persons taken from the present tense and eventual future. This future furnishes also the equivalents of our subjunctive and optative. The infinitive does not exist. It is but imperfectly replaced by the impersonal.

As for the tenses, they are of two kinds : primary and secondary. The former are four in number, viz.: the present, preterite, proximate future and eventual future. The proximate future refers to the action as being on the point of taking place and corresponds to the English "I am going to." The eventual future is vague and aleatory in meaning and has no strictly exact equivalent in our languages. Each of these four tenses is expressed by a single word as in Latin and Italian. The secondary tenses are simply the primary tenses accompanied by auxiliary verbs or particles, as *inle, ta, sih*, etc.*

The Déné verbs have three numbers as their Greek co-relatives. But while the dialects of the Eastern Dénés possess, as a rule, three persons for each number, the verbs of the Western Dénés have generally but one—the first—person for the dual. *Par contre*, their verbs of locomotion and their verbs of station have no less than sixteen persons for each tense, viz.: three for the definite singular, three for the indefinite singular, three for the plural and seven for the dual. Besides, all those verbs whose radical varies with the number, as is the case with the verbs of cubation, have always—unless they belong to one of the two categories above mentioned—ten persons.

Before submitting to the appreciation of the philologist paradigms illustrative of the foregoing, it will not be amiss to give a brief outline of the internal structure of the verb in general.

Every Déné verb, no matter of what form or tense it is affected, is composed of at least two distinct integral parts :—1st. a monosyllabic root which is always the desinential syllable of the verb and is generally—not necessarily—invariable ; and, 2nd, a pronominal crement which varies according to the person and the tense. This combination is identical

* In the dialects of the Eastern Dénés the tenses are, according to Rev. E. Petitot, the present, imperfect, preterite and future. In justice to the student of those dialects, I think it necessary for me to state that I am acquainted with missionaries ministering to the Eastern Dénés who speak in rather disparaging terms of that author's Dictionary and Grammar, and insinuate that, except as regards the Loucheux dialect, which he is recognized to have thoroughly mastered, both works are very faulty. Yet I hardly think that he could have erred in reference to such important points of Grammar as are the conjugations and tenses.

with that of the Latin and Greek verbs, with the unimportant difference that the formative elements in the Déné and Aryan verbs are disposed in inverse order.

Those persons who feel inclined to question the capacity of Indian languages for genuine inflections are respectfully referred to the following paradigms. I have disposed the Latin synonym side by side with the Carrier words, to show that the inflectiveness of the Déné verbs is not merely accidental, but pervades the whole conjugation.

PRIMARY TENSES OF THE VERB CÆSTEN, I WORK, I ACT.

CARRIER.	LATIN.	CARRIER.	LATIN.						
<i>Present.</i>		<i>Proximate Future.</i>							
Sing {	œs-ten îh-ten œ-ten	ag-o ag-is ag-it	Sing { <table border="0"> <tr> <td>œthîs-tif</td> <td rowspan="3">I am going to act, (almost acturus sum " es, etc.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>œthan-tif</td> </tr> <tr> <td>œthî-tif</td> </tr> </table>	œthîs-tif	I am going to act, (almost acturus sum " es, etc.)	œthan-tif	œthî-tif		
œthîs-tif	I am going to act, (almost acturus sum " es, etc.)								
œthan-tif									
œthî-tif									
Plur {	œtsœ-ten œh-ten œhœ-ten	ag-imus ag-itis ag-unt	Plur { <table border="0"> <tr> <td>œzthî-tif</td> <td rowspan="3">" es, etc.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>œthîh-tif</td> </tr> <tr> <td>œhœthî-tif</td> </tr> </table>	œzthî-tif	" es, etc.)	œthîh-tif	œhœthî-tif		
œzthî-tif	" es, etc.)								
œthîh-tif									
œhœthî-tif									
Dual :	î-ten	ambo ag-imus	Dual : œtha-tif						
<i>Preterite.</i>		<i>Eventual Future.</i>							
Sing {	îs-ten an-ten î-ten	eg-i eg-isti eg-it	Sing { <table border="0"> <tr> <td>us-ten</td> <td>ag-am *</td> </tr> <tr> <td>oNn-ten</td> <td>ag-es</td> </tr> <tr> <td>u-ten</td> <td>ag-et</td> </tr> </table>	us-ten	ag-am *	oNn-ten	ag-es	u-ten	ag-et
us-ten	ag-am *								
oNn-ten	ag-es								
u-ten	ag-et								
Plur {	œtsî-ten îh-ten œhî-ten	eg-imus eg-istis eg-erunt	Plur { <table border="0"> <tr> <td>œtsu-ten</td> <td>ag-emus</td> </tr> <tr> <td>uh-ten</td> <td>ag-etis</td> </tr> <tr> <td>œhû-ten</td> <td>ag-ent</td> </tr> </table>	œtsu-ten	ag-emus	uh-ten	ag-etis	œhû-ten	ag-ent
œtsu-ten	ag-emus								
uh-ten	ag-etis								
œhû-ten	ag-ent								
Dual :	a-ten	ambo eg-imus	Dual : ô-ten						
			ambo ag-emus						

* In a vague and indefinite sense.

Imperative.

Sing. {		Plur. {
îñ-ten		œh-ten
u-ten		œhü-ten
Plural : œtsu-ten		Dual : ô-ten

As illustrative of the formation of the secondary tenses, I shall give the following, with their Latin equivalents :

œsten ïñle	<i>Latin</i> : agebam
ïsten ïñle	egeram
usten ïñle	egissem
usten sih	agam (definite), etc.

Of the primary tenses it may be said that the two futures are the most immutable in their pronominal elements, whilst the desinential root of the proximate future is of a rather changeable character. As for the preterite, instead of being invariably affected by a vocalic mutation of its personal element, as is the case with the above example, it undergoes quite frequently consonantal variations, either in its radical or in its pronominal part, the *îs*, *ann*, etc., of which are often changed into *sœs*, *sîn*, etc.

Now for the sixteen persons of the verbs of locomotion and of the verbs of station :

Present Tense.

Definite Sing.	{ nœshya, I walk nînya, thou walkest niya, he walks	{ sœsta, I am sitting sînta, thou art, etc. sta
Indef. Sing.	{ nœtsiya, one walks nihya } See below nœheya }	{ tsœzta sœhta } See below hœzta }
Plural	{ nœtsœtif, we walk nœhtif, you walk nœhœtif, they walk	{ œztîftsi tœftsi hœtîftsi
Dual	{ nœs'as, I walk (with one person) nîn'as, thou walkest (do) nœ'as, he walks (do) nœtsœ'as } See below nîtas }	{ sœskré sinkré œskré tsœzkré } See below îkré }
	{ nœh'as, you walk (two together) nœhœ'as, they walk " "	{ sœhkré hazkré

Some of these personal forms have no equivalents in any language that I know of, and consequently require a word of explanation. *Nætsæ·as* and *nîtas* are distinguished practically by a slight difference of meaning only. *Nîtas* is the regular dual of concomitancy which implies that the locomotion is executed by both of *us*, while *nætsæ as* substitutes to the idea of the first person that of the impersonal: one is walking *à deux*. *Nihya* and *næheya*, with their co-relatives of the other tenses, also convey the idea of indefiniteness, but coupled with that of the second and the third person of the plural. For instance, a native orator, while giving orders to a group of fellow countrymen and unwilling to designate any one of them in particular, will say (in the eventual future): *nôhya*, "you shall walk," meaning: *one* of *you* shall walk. Again, referring to an undesignated person in a crowd which he is not directly addressing, he might say in an indefinite manner: *næhōya*, "they shall walk," that is, *some* unknown or purposely unnamed person among *them* shall walk.

The same remarks apply to the verb *sæsta* and derivatives. Should I say to a group of Indians: *tæłtsi*, "sit down," all my audience will at once understand me. But if, instead, I were to say: *sæhta*—the pronominal element of which has the *h* characteristic of the second person plural, though the radical retains its singular form—the natives would immediately understand that I mean only *one* of *them* to sit down, and they would be at a loss to know who is to comply with my request.

Abstracting the many irregularities of the Déné verbs, all their inflections may be reduced to three conjugations, which are characterized by the consonant of the pronominal element of the second person singular.* *n* denotes the first, *ł* the second, and *ł* the third. The verbs above conjugated—with the exception of the last (*sæsta*), which, in common with some irregular verbs, takes for the singular and dual the characteristics of the first, and for the plural that of the second conjugation—all belong to the first. Here is the present of verbs of the second and of the third.

*Petitot in his *Grammaire comparée* of the Eastern dialects counts four conjugations, three of which he bases on the pronominal *vocalic* inflection, the second being in *es*, the third in *as* and the fourth in *us*, while the first he states to consist in the mere juxtaposition of a personal pronoun to an adjective, a preposition or an adverb. On this side of the Rockies, we have no other equivalents of this uninflected conjugation—if conjugation it can be called—than five or six irregular verbs as *s-ra-hwólna* (lit. me-on-account-of-difficulty), "I am difficult." I think it preferable to treat them as so many unimportant anomalies to making them constitute a separate conjugation.

Second Conj.

œs-thœs, I am strong, etc.
 îf-thœs
 f-thœs
 tsîf-thœs
 œf-thœs
 hef-thœs

Third Conj.

œz-chan*, I am pregnant, etc.
 îl-chan
 l-chan
 tsœl-chan
 œf-chan
 hœl-chan

Dual : îl-thœs, we are both strong îl-chan, we are both pregnant.

These and similarly constructed verbs are what I may call primary verbs. Their characteristic is the pronominal consonant of their third person singular (*n, l, l*), which stands alone, unsupported by any vowel, and which differentiates them from the simple, but non-primary, verbs. These, although they are uncomposite in material structure, yet possess two distinct radicals: one preceding, the other following, the personal element which invariably occupies the penult place in all kinds of verbs. The following shall serve as an illustration thereof :

I. Conjugation.

nd-œs-ta, I am sick
 nd-în-ta
 nd-œ-ta

tsœ-nd-œ-ta
 nd-œh-ta
 hœ-nd-œ-ta

II. Conjugation.

t-œs-kœs, I am black
 t-îf-kœs
 t-œf-kœs

œz-t-œf-kœs
 t-œf-kœs
 hœ-t-œf-kœs

III. Conjugation.

t-œz-χwœs, I cough
 t-îl-χwœs
 t-œl-χwœs

œz-t-œl-χwœs
 t-œf-χwœs
 hœ-t-œl-χwœs

Dual : nd-î-ta, we are both sick t-îl-kœs, we are both black t-îl-χwœs, we both cough

A noteworthy feature of the Déné dialects is that, alone among many American idioms, they possess the substantive verb "to be" in its independent form; and, what is even more remarkable, that verb is, in Carrier and Chifxotin, just as regular in its conjugation as any other verb of its class. However, it is used only in connection with a noun or the few adjectives or adverb-adjectives mentioned in a previous chapter. Moreover, elegance demands that its use be corroborated by a kind of secondary substantive verb as in this phrase: I am a man, *tœne œstli hwe œstoh*, literally "a man I-am whereby it-is-I." Nevertheless this verb of redundancy (*œstoh*) may be omitted without any change of meaning re-

**Chan* means "womb," and the literal translation of that verb should read: "I womb, thou wombest," etc.

sulting therefrom, as its main object is simply to give emphasis and elegance to the sentence.

Naturally, the use of the substantive verb is incompatible with that of the Déné adjectives, which are of themselves genuine verbs, combining in their elements our personal pronoun, auxiliary verb, and adjective. I divide them into two classes : primary and secondary adjectives, the first of which, materially considered, correspond to the primary single-radical verbs, and as such fall under the scope of this chapter.

They usually express qualities of simple import, as "good, bad, great, small, wide," etc., and while in their primitive form they are merely denotive. All of them, in addition to the various forms which they are liable to assume as verbs, are also affectible by internal mutations connoting the nature of the object they qualify without, however, becoming objective verbs. Thus *n-cha* (third person singular of *æscha*) means "big," without pointing to any peculiarity in the subject ; *nî^hn-cha* is applicable to a sphere or a spheroid exclusively ; *dî^hn-cha*, to an elongated object and to vocal sounds ; *hun-cha*, to vastness or indefiniteness of proportions.* *Dæ-nî^hn-cha*, without being a composite verb in the estimation of the Déné grammar, yet combines two forms, *dî^hn* and *nî^hn*, and refers to such an article as a ring which is intended for an elongated object, viz., the finger (hence *dæ*, euphonical inflection of *dî^hn*), whilst it is of itself circular in form (hence *nî^hn*). A similar analysis applies to *hwo-dî^hn-cha*. In accordance with the law of euphonic sequence of the vowels, *hun*, qualificative of indefinite spaces, is changed into *hwo* ; *dî^hn* has reference to vocal sounds, and the whole compound denotes the peculiar resonance noticeable in the voice of certain persons whose speech seems to emanate from cavernous depths.†

CHAPTER VI.

THE COMPOSITE VERBS.

Polysynthetism has generally been regarded, and not without reason, as the chief characteristic of the American aboriginal verbs. It pervades the languages of the remotest tribes to such an extent as to permit of their being classed under one single denomination, despite their many terminological and grammatical dissimilarities. Yet that particular feature cannot be said to be their exclusive property. Many a verb of purely Indo-

* *Hun* and its co-relative *hwo* characterize also the Impersonal.

† Identical transmutations take place in many a non-adjective verb.

European parentage, for instance, can trace to a synthetical process its original formation. For what are such terms as *de-ponere*, *re-ponere*, *pre-ponere*, *ex-com-municare*, not to speak of their synonyms and derivatives in the modern analytic tongues, if not synthetical compounds? Scholars are also well aware of the role played in the formation of Greek words by such prepositions as *κατά*, *μετά*, *ὑπερ*, *διὰ*, etc. Nor should we forget the original synthetic verbs *at-standan*, *be-standan*, *for-standan*, *under-standan*, etc., of the early Anglo-Saxon, the main root of our own English. But as no other linguistic group displays this propensity for word agglomeration in such a degree and with such varied results, its claims to be regarded as the special characteristic of the American languages remain unimpaired.

The Déné dialects which, as we have seen, are distinctly inflective in the pronominal elements of their verbs, are also thoroughly polysynthetic in the formation of composite verbal terms. Indeed, it is to that peculiarity, coupled with the multiplicity of their sense-modifying forms, that we must look for the cause of the prodigious number of their verbs. It were tedious, as well as unprofitable for the purpose in view, to enter into the details of the several processes whereby two or more dependent or independent terms are united to compose a new word. A few representative examples will, I trust, suffice to give us an idea of the whole system. I have in a previous chapter hinted at the existence in the Carrier dialect of a comparative internally connected with the primary verbal adjectives and a few other verbs of simple import. This shall serve as our first illustration of synthetism as applied to the formation of the Déné composite verbs.

The primary verbal adjective *æssul* means "I am small," and its third person singular is *n-tsul*. With the help of the proper prefixes we obtain: *ndæ-l-tsul*, he is as small; *dæ-l-tsul*, he is as small as (with a complement); *nga-dæ-l-tsul*, he is as small as that; *pæ-ndi-yæ-l-tsul*, he is as small as he; *læ-ndæ-l-tsul*, they are both as small, one as the other; *su-îl-tsul*, he is small enough; *ta-l-tsul*? how small is he? *læ-l-tsul*! how small he is! We must not fail to observe that the comparative prefixes have for effect to change the pronominal part of these verbs from that of the first to that of the third conjugation. Moreover, these and all other cognate verbs are susceptible of assuming, conjointly with the above prefixes, all the internal inflections assumable by a verb as verb, not counting those they can be affected by as primary verbal adjectives.

For simpler, and perhaps more intelligible, examples we will look to the verbs formed with the help of the particle *ta*, root of *tathi*, "door." By prefixing it to such verbs as *næshya*, "I (human being) walk," we

will get, at the third person singular, *ta-nînya*, "he (hum. b.) walks in (the house)." Should we change the verbal stem, while retaining the modificative prefix, we might say: *ta-nînyît*, he drives in (the house), which, by further verbal modifications, may become *ta-næyæk*, he usually drives in (the h.); *ta-nætġât*, he is susceptible of being driven in (do.); *ta-nætġæk*, it can generally be driven in (do.), etc. If we now try of the objective verbs, we may say, while still keeping the modificative particle: *ta-s'aih* I put in (the house a single object); *ta-dîstaih*, I put in (the house a single object) for my own use; *ta-tark*, it (one single obj.) can be put in (the house); *ta-dîttaih*, it (do.) can be put in (do.) for one's own use; *ta-stle*, I put in (the house many objects), etc., etc. Let us not, however, allow ourselves to be allured by the multiplicity of forms assumable by this and similar verbs. It would lead us to the enumeration of many hundreds of verbs before the supply is exhausted. For the same reason, we shall avoid *ta-s'is*, I throw in (the house a single obj.), which is the first of a new series of objective verbs.

Selecting less prolific forms for our word-building experiences, we come on *ta-ssâ* (lit. "I cry on the threshold"), I beg; *ta-næs'a*, I order in; *ta-hwæjyi*, I enter while playing; *ta-næstsas*, I enter while throwing sticks on the snow;* *ta-dæzni*, I introduce my hand in (the house); *ta-næskera*, I introduce my finger in, etc., etc.

Some verbs of as simple formation connote an even greater number of ideas. For instance, *ntsi*, "he is bad, avaricious," while preceded by the aforesaid prefix *ta*, becomes *ta-ntsi*, which we cannot well translate in English by less than nine words, viz.: "he proves avaricious to those who enter his house." So that if it is true to say that a single idea expressed in one Aryan word frequently requires a periphrase in the American languages, it can be retorted that sometimes short native verbs cannot be translated by less than a whole sentence in our idioms. Nay, the Carrier dialect might even, with some respect, be adduced as a model of phraseological conciseness. As a proof of this, it may suffice to quote the conjugatable adverb *'a*, which means "promptly." To any person requiring of a native courier, for instance, to cover, in one day, a distance of 70 or 80 miles the latter might simply answer: *wa gænnih* (lit. it-shall-be-promptly let-it-not), the real signification of which is: "one cannot reasonably expect that I should do it in so short a time." Same remark applies to *sa'*, a long time; *lat*, often; *su*, well; *niltza*, far; *niltuk*, near, etc., which are similarly conjugatable.

To return to the composite verbs. A slight analysis of the examples

* Indian game much in favor during the winter months.

given above will result in the detection of two radicals: a primary root, which is always the final syllable of the verbal stem, and contains the key to the main signification of the compound,—and a secondary radical, which precedes the personal element, and alters the sense of the primary root. Thus the *ya* of *ta-næsh-ya* indicates that a human being is walking on two feet, and the prefixed particle *ta* furthermore denotes that such locomotion takes place from the outside to the inside of a habitation.

Now if, in lieu of experiencing with a permanent initial particle, we should retain instead an immutable desinential radical, we might successively prefix thereto various initial radicals, whereby new words with new meanings would be formed. *Tzaih*, for instance, is the desinential root of such objective verbs as have for complement anything of a granulous nature. We shall prefix thereto the particle *thé*, whereby—with the incorporation of the pronominal *s*—we obtain *thé-stzaih*, (I take out (of the house gran. obj.), which may be further modified into *ha-stzaih*, I extract (gran. obj.) from; *kæ-stzaih*, I put (do.) on; *pe-stzaih*, I put (do.) in (a recipient); *hwe-stzaih*, I take (do.) away; *hwosa-stzaih*, I bring (do.) to myself; *nænæ-stzaih*, I lay (do.) on the ground; *na-stzaih*, I drop (do., do.); *nîntha-stzaih*, I put (do.) in the wrong place, that is, I lose, etc.

From which we conclude the existence in Déné of two chief synthetic processes, viz., one whereby the verbal stem is changed while the initial prefix remains invariable, and the other which retains the verbal stem unaltered, while it prefixes to it divers modificative particles.

On the other hand, a primary radical may be modified by many a secondary radical, or formative particles performing the office of radicals. Instead of *ta-næshya*, for instance, we might say *ta-na-næsqa*,* I walk in again; *ta-na-hwe-næsqa*, I only begin to walk in again, etc.

Nor should a student, desirous of seeing in all its expansion the wonderful power of composition peculiar to the languages under review, stop at the examination of compounds resulting from the prefixing to a verbal stem of merely one or two sense-modifying particles. To give him an idea of what it can lead to, I shall introduce him to the verb *le-kæ-na-hwe-shæn-dæ-thæ-næz-krok*, which is a simple word, meaning: "I usually re-commence to walk to and fro on all fours while singing." Shall we analyse it? Let us try. *le* is a prefix expressive of reciprocity, which, when in connection with a verb of locomotion, indicates that the movement is executed between two certain points without giving prominence to either; *kæ* denotes direction towards those points; *na* is the

* *Qa* is the equivalent of *ya*, such as inflected by the iterative particle *na*.

iterative particle suggesting that the action is repeated ; *hwe'* refers to the action as being in its incipient stage ; *shæn* means "song," and when incorporated in a verb it indicates that singing accompanies the action expressed by the verbal root ; *dæ* is called for by *shæn*, said particle always entering into the composition of verbs denoting reference to vocal sounds ; *thæ* is the secondary radical of the uncomposite verb *thæskret*, inflected from *thî* for the sake of euphony with *næz*, the pronominal element of the whole compound, the *n* of which is demanded by the previous *hwe'*: *æ* characterizes the present tense, and *s* the first person singular of the third conjugation ; while *kroĕ* is the main radical altered here by the usitative from the normal form *kret*, and is expressive of locomotion habitually executed on four feet or on all fours.

To enable the student to penetrate still further into the synthetism of the Déné verbs, I give below lists of the principal word-formative particles, together with examples illustrative of their use.

The following are postpositions with regard to their complement—noun or pronoun—and prepositions relatively to the verbal stems to which they are prefixed :—

AFFIXES.	EXPRESSIVE OF	EXAMPLES.
<i>xa, xwa*</i>	desire	<i>n-xa-næszæn</i> (lit. thee by desire of I think), I want thee
<i>ké, kwé</i>	love	<i>u-kwé-ssâ</i> (him-through love of-I cry), I pine after him
<i>kœn, kwœn</i>	reference	<i>ho-kwœn-nahwœlnœk</i> (it-about-he narrates) he relates it
<i>kœnne, kwœnne</i> }	deference	<i>s-kœnne-inten</i> (me-in deference to-work), obey me
<i>tfa</i>	transmission	<i>pœ-tfa-s'ai</i> (them-in-hands-I-put), I passed to them
<i>lla</i>	co-operation	<i>ne-lla-îten</i> (us-hand in hand-he worked), he helped us
<i>qa</i>	opposition	<i>hwot-qa-sœ-nîyût</i> (it-opposite to me-he drives), he prohibits it to me

*When in connection with the indefinite completive pronoun *ho*, and sometimes the personal pronoun *u*, the *x*, *k*, of this and the following postpositions are inflected into *xw* and *kw*.

The following affixes preclude the possibility of union with a complement, and are so intimately connected with the verb as to possess of themselves no separate existence :—

AFFIXES	EXPRESSIVE OF	EXAMPLES.
hwosa	approach	hwosa-shya, I arrive (where the speaker stands)
hwe	recess	hwe-shya, I depart (from where the speaker stands)
nîntha	wrong	nîntha-nœs'en, I spoil (lit. I treat wrongly)
thœ, thœenne	ill doing	(huntsi') thœenne-zœsten, I have done (evil)
ha	derivation	ha-shya, I come from
'œn	rejection	'œn-tîsno, I have rejected (person. compl.)
thé	exit	thé-nœshya, I go out
ta	ingress	ta-nœshya, I go in
kœ	partial break	kœ-nœshyœz, I broke (in one place)
ya	total breakage	ya-shyœz, do. (in pieces)
tha	relation to water	tha-stil, I threw (plur. com.) into the water
tsœ	" fire	tsœ-dîstil do (do) in the fire
ne	" the soil	ne-nœstla, I put (do) on the ground
na	" " *	na-stil, I threw (do) to the ground

Besides the above and other similar affixes, I may refer to those which are instrumental in modifying the form of the verb, and which we shall presently study.

CHAPTER VII.

VARIETIES OF VERBS.

While the whole fabric of the Déné conjugations seems to be the almost exact reproduction of the Latin and Greek verbal inflections, the many forms which modify them, and the nature of these modifications, equally remind the student of the *kal*, *niphah*, *piel*, etc., of the Hebrew grammar. I am well aware that some scholars, among them J. W. Powell in his "Introduction to the study of Indian languages,"† are inclined to assimilate these forms to mere grammatical modes. But I am loath to

*This particle, moreover, refers to a prompt action, having the soil for its terminus.

† Second Edit. p. 53.

follow them, because in Déné these alterations of the verbal structure affect the whole of both the affirmative and the negative conjugations, while some of them, as the potential, alter quite as much, if not more, the body of the verb as their English equivalent, which in all the dictionaries is regarded, not as a modal variation of the verb, but as a quite different word. Thus from the verb *kœncœshyés*, "I break," we obtain, with the help of the potential, *kœsqœs*, "I am breakable." On the other hand, some of these forms consist simply in the change of conjugation, which can hardly be likened to a mode.

The principal forms affecting the verbs, in the Carrier dialect, are the affirmative, negative, usitative, potential, causative, reciprocal, reflective, iterative, initiative, terminative, plural and impersonal. I shall explain, in as few words as possible, the nature of each of them.

Of the affirmative nothing needs be said, since it is the normal state of the verb. Yet it may be well to note that a few verbs, the meaning of which is essentially negative, as *hulœs*, "there is not;" *hullil*, "it disappeared," lack the affirmative form, and still are destitute of the elements characteristic of the negative.

The negative can, in Carrier, affect the material structure of the verb in three different ways, viz.: by the incorporation of a negative particle (*l, le, læ, lî, lo*, according to the tense and the letter following these particles); by an inflection of the personal syllable, and oftentimes, though not in every case, by a modification of the mutable part of the desinential radical, *i.e.*, the vowel or final consonant—the initial consonant of a syllable being, as a rule, immutable in Déné. An example will facilitate the intelligence of these remarks. Here are two tenses of the verb *nœs-α*, "I keep in my custody," conjugated under the affirmative and the negative forms.

PRESENT TENSE.		PROXIMATE FUTURE.	
<i>Affirmative.</i>	<i>Negative.</i>	<i>Affirmative.</i>	<i>Negative.</i>
nœ-s-·a	n-œlœzes-œs	n-œthîs-·af	n-œsthœzîs-·al
n-în-·a	n-œlœzîn-œs	n-œthan-·af	n-œsthœzan-·al
n-œ-·a	n-œlœs-œs	n-œthî-·af	n-œsthîs-·al
n-œtsœ-·a	n-œltsœs-œs	n-œz-thî-·af	n-œltsœthîs-·al
n-œh-·a	n-œlœzœh-œs	n-œthîh-·af	n-œsthœzîh-·al
n-œhœ-·a	n-œlœhœs-œs	n-œhœthî-·af	n-œlothîs-·al
D. n-î-ta	n-œlœzî-tœs	n-œtha-taf	n-œsthœza-tal

This form is proper to the Western Dénés, and, when under its three

inflections, to the Carriers exclusively. The other Western Dénés eliminate the negative infixes *l*, *læ*, etc., and if they were to keep the word unchanged by the lexical exigencies of their own dialects they would simply say : *n-æzæs-æA*, *n-æthæzæts-æA*.

The usitative form consists in a modification of the desinential radical bearing sometimes on the vowel and sometimes on the final consonant, or both. Thus *æs'al*, "I eat," becomes in the usitative *æs'æA*, while *æs-chût*, "I take," is transformed into *æs-chæk*. This is the simplest of all the forms, in that sense that it is the only one that never affects any other part of the verb than the desinence. I should also remark, in this connection, that "usitative" is rather inappropriate when applied to the Déné verbs, and is here retained for the sake of conforming to the common wording of American philologists. I think "generalizing" would better answer the purpose.

The potential varies according to the conjugation of the verb it affects. It merely modifies the radical of the verbs of the first conjugation. So, *æ'al*, "he eats," changes for the potential its radical *'al* into *tal*, and becomes *ætal*, "it is edible." But if the verb belongs to the second conjugation, the potential transforms it into a verb of the third.

The difference between the affirmative and the causative is equally one of conjugation rather than of form. As a rule, the causative merely changes verbs of the first into verbs of the second conjugation. *Intso*, for instance, means "thou criest," and by giving its pronominal syllable the *l* distinctive of the second conjugation, the result is *îltso*, "thou causest to cry." This form, if form we must call it, corresponds to the *hyphil* of the Hebrew verbs. It is not simply a transformation of an intransitive into a transitive verb, as is shown in the following : *nainkas*, "thou sharpenest" (a transitive verb); *naitkas*, "thou causest to sharpen." In a few cases it has for secondary effect to materially alter the final radical of the verb. Thus *te-nânzæn*, "thou knowest" (a person), when modified by the causative is *te-nîltzæn*, "thou acquaintest with."

The distinctive elements of the reciprocal form are identical with the particles which, in Northern Carrier, characterize the negative. The difference is only one of place and of results. The reciprocal, unlike the negative, leaves both the pronominal syllable and the desinence unaltered, except when the desinence is immediately preceded by the hiatus, and in a few other cases.

Two prefixes may be assigned as the main distinctive element of the reflective form. They are either *ædæd*, preceding immediately the pro-

nominal crement, or the particle *æ*, prefixed to the modificative syllable *na*. Moreover, *ædæd* has frequently for effect to transform verbs of the second into verbs of the third conjugation. *Tɪnthê* signifies "thou art valuable," and *ɪlthê*, "thou makest him valuable," i.e., thou treatest him with consideration. Hence, *ædæd-ɪlthê*, "thou makest thyself important," in other words, "thou art proud." In like manner, by prefixing *æ* to *nahwæznœk*, "I narrate," we get *æ-nahwæznœk*, "I narrate about myself," that is to say, "I make my confession." This form is susceptible of a few irregularities.

The particle *na* characterizes the iterative form. It is prefixed to, or inserted in, the body of the verb, according to the composition of the latter. When the verb is formed of several radicals, modificative particles or completive pronouns, its place is generally immediately after the initial root and before any complement or formative syllables. Either the radical or the conjugation of the verb is liable to be thereby modified, verbs of the second conjugation being ordinarily given the pronominal elements of the third, and such desinential roots as *ya*, *yal*, *'aih*, *'al*, *'as*, *zœn*, etc., being converted respectively into *ta*, *tal*, *taih*, *tal*, *tas*, *tzœn*, etc. I must remark, in this connection, that such verbs as express an action which, to the Indian mind, is essentially reiterated, take the iterative form, even when in their normal state, as *na-skas*, "I sharpen"; *thé-na-dœs-tli*, "I pray." Divested of the characteristic of iteration, *na-skas* is reduced to *æs-kas*, which should be translated, "I sharpen for the first time a new instrument," while *thé-dœs-tli* refers either to a passing supplication, as in a moment of distress, or to the first prayer of the child.

As for the initiative and the terminative forms, they are obtained by the prefixing or infixing of the particle *hwe'* for the former and *ne'* for the latter. These affixes are generally incompatible with the present tense. They have for effect to prefix an *n* to the personal elements of the verbs which lack it while under their regular form, and *hwe'* furthermore changes the pronominal inflection *thîs*, characteristic of the proximate future, into *nthas*, the other persons of that tense being also proportionately altered. So, from *æsten*, "I work," we get for the initiative *hwe'-næsten*, "I begin to work," and for the terminative *ne'-næsten*, "I have stopped working," while to translate "I will presently commence to work," we will have to say: *hwe'-nthastil*, instead of *hwe'-thêstil*. Both forms are, as far as I know, proper to the Carrier dialect.

By plural I mean a certain form whereby a verb is made to refer to an act exercised repeatedly or in connection with several objects, without, however, having the exact signification or the material

structure of the iterative or the objective verbs. Its distinctive element is *nœ*, sometimes inflected into *ne*, which occasionally slightly modifies the desinential radical. So *hwe-dœs-kés* means "I attach" (viz. to a rope hanging down), and demands a singular complement, while *hwe-nœ-dœskœz* has the same signification, but must follow a plural complement. In like manner *œ-ké-skés*, "I write" (lit. indefinite-on-I draw), points to a single sign or cluster of signs as the result of my action. By altering it into *œ-ké-ne-skœz* we obtain a verb likewise signifying "I write," but implying many words or pages as its complement. This form is applicable only to a limited number of verbs.

The last form on our list is the impersonal. It renders the verb impersonal both in structure and in meaning, and yet it cannot be assimilated to the regular impersonal verbs, because it is a mere transient modification of verbs which are of themselves personal. Its use is limited to a few verbs, as *œt-ni*, "he says," which can be transformed into *hwot-ni*; *ne-œten*, "he does," into *ne-hwoten*; *œtqa*, "he is affected," into *hutqa*, etc., the exact translation of which latter terms is impossible either in English or in French. *Hwotni* is almost the equivalent of "on dit," but is still more indefinite in meaning, and I confess my inability to find in either Latin, French or English synonyms of *ne-hwoten* and *hutqa*.

Besides the above modificative forms, there are in Déné what I may call double or composite forms; that is, a verb is liable to be affected by two or more forms simultaneously. Thus in *te-na-nœs-tzih* (from *te-nœs-zœn*), we have both the iterative and the usitative combined; while *na-îl-chœk* is simply the verb *œschît* modified by three forms: the iterative (*na*), the potential (*îl*) and the usitative (*chœk*).

All these forms, whether simple or complex, affect the structure of the verb in a transient or accidental manner, none of them—except, of course, the affirmative—being necessary to its existence. Should we now wish to classify the Déné verbs on the basis of the peculiarities of their terminal roots considered as normal desinences, we will find five principal groups of verbal terms, including objective, locomotive and instrumentative verbs, together with verbs of rest, which are in turn divided into verbs of station and verbs of cubation. I beg to be excused from enumerating the well-nigh numberless desinential forms assumable by each of these groups.* I shall confine myself to the following brief remarks:—

*To give an idea of their number, it may suffice to state that each locomotive verb is modifiable by no less than 78 desinential variations, which are in turn multipliable by the number of prefixes successively assumed by the verb.

The signification of the objective verbs is determined by the particles prefixed to their personal or pronominal elements, and the nature of their complement, expressed or implied, by their desinential root. This applies also to the verbs of station.

The radical of the instrumentative verbs denotes the instrument or medium employed to perform the action expressed by the verb, while the prefix points to the manner in which said action has been accomplished.

As for the verbs of locomotion, their final determines the nature of the subject, while the particle preceding the pronominal element indicates the direction or extent of the locomotion. Materially speaking, verbs belonging to the same group and having the same signification are apt to become, through their desinential modifications, almost unrecognizable. *Niya*, for instance, means "he (human being) walks," and when referring, let us say, to the human mind, it will be altered into *nædoel-tsæt*, with exactly the same signification.

A verb modified by any of these last terminological inflections may furthermore be affected by any of the several forms which I have described above.

Lastly, considered grammatically and without any reference to their etymology, the Déné verbs may be divided into transitive, intransitive, passive, unipersonal and defective. With the exception of the defective and a few passive verbs, none of these voices have, as such, any fixed characteristic embodied in the conjugation. The passive exists in Déné, but for a limited number of verbs only. It changes a verb of the second into one of the third conjugation. Ex. : *æs'a*, "I order"; *æs'a*, "I am ordered."* Quite as commonly, however, verbs that are passive in English are of the first conjugation in Déné, as *tankœn*, "it is burnt"; *kcenthœk*, "it is broken," etc.

CHAPTER VIII.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

There is hardly any difficulty worth recording in connection with the syntax of the Déné dialects, which is as simple as the machinery of their verbs is complicated. And no wonder : cases and substantival genders, which are ordinarily the occasion of syntactic irregularities, being unknown, it is but natural that the difficulties that spring therefrom be equally wanting.

*Compare the pronominal mutation of this verb with that of its Latin synonym : *jub-eo*, *æs-'a* ; *jub-eor*, *æs-'a*.

Phraseological construction might at first appear somewhat puzzling to the student, yet it is as simple as that of our own English. To understand it, we have only to bear in mind that in Déné the governed word, be it direct or indirect complement, always precedes the governing. As a consequence, to translate almost any English sentence, or part of sentence, it is often sufficient to remark the order of priority observed between its component parts, and then dispose the Déné words in exactly the inverse order. The possessive and completive pronouns, being essentially connected with the nouns, are—together with the subjective substantive—alone excepted from this rule. Supposing, therefore, that we have to translate this sentence: I departed only after I had well covered with warm blankets my dear little children. We first read the words backwards, observing to join the possessive pronouns to the nouns they determine: My-children little dear blankets warm well I-had-covered-with after only I-departed. Now it simply remains with us to translate word after word, thus: *S-æzkhéhkhe yas pækéssine tsæt sæzæl sucho pærauzastæz hukwifaz za hweshya.*

The nature and place in the sentence of the completive pronouns is the only syntactic particular that might be said to offer any real difficulty. Direct completive pronouns are incorporated in the verb, just immediately before the personal element, while the indirect complement is generally prefixed to the initial radical. Ex.: *s-ra-e-nên-ai*, "he gave it to me;" *yæ-ra-le-yê-al*, "he did not give it to him." It will be remarked that these verbs combine in their formative elements—1st, the personal pronoun (*nên, yê*); 2nd, the direct completive pronoun (*e, yê*); 3rd, the indirect completive pronoun (*s, yæ*), in addition to which we find also incorporated therein: 4th, the negative particle (*le* of the last example)

Another feature of the Déné syntax is that these completive pronouns are never expressed in connection with any but the third person singular or plural, while some verbs never admit of their incorporation into their elements unless they be of the plural number. Thus *æschât, dæsnî*, etc., may mean either "I took, I told," or "I took it, him or her, I told him or her," according to the context. As a compensation, the direct completive pronouns find place in many a Déné verb, the English equivalent of which is unrelated to any pronominal complement. Thus, for "God made man," we must say, "God man made-him;" "he took his pipe," must be turned, his (own) pipe he-took-it."

These few remarks will, I hope, suffice to give an idea of the Déné syntax. Shall I now say a word about the idiotisms of the language? The task is rather inviting on account of the abundance of the material

to select from. In fact, I might almost say that the Déné dialects are mainly composed of idiotisms, since, in the words of Dr. Trumbull, "it is nearly impossible to find an Indian name or verb which admits of exact translation by an English name or verb."* Among many phraseological peculiarities, we find, in Carrier, such expressions as *shoon yalthæk*, "he speaks a song," that is: he sings an old air with improvised words; *tsiya sælli*, "it becomes all," for: the supply is exhausted; *upa tææ cædîsga*, "I said badly for him," meaning: my words shocked him; *au spa hwe dîni hwenyaa*, literally: not for-me thereby thou-sayest there-is (not), which is equivalent to: I do not know what you mean.

Without cultivating rhetoric, some Dénés are genuine orators. To add to the forcibleness of their speech, they generally have recourse to comparisons drawn from their daily surroundings, and from the vegetable and animal worlds. Moreover, their language itself is not deficient in figurative expressions, as the following phrases, which are in common use among the Carriers, will show:—*Pæł sæstlve*, "sleep kills me," for: I am very sleepy; *netai angran*, "famine murders us," for: we have nothing to eat; *chahwosai hoh-næshya*, "I walk with bare stomach," *i.e.*, I am fasting; *nakôs æstnla*, "the haze of the eyes has made me," that is: I am snow blind; *utzî-sæłtsi*, "his heart is acrid," for: he is acrimoniously disposed; *sæ-niya*, "he walks alone," meaning: he is a bachelor; *as sta*, "she stays out," *i.e.*, she has her menses, etc. This last expression is a reminiscence of the custom which among the Carriers forbade the use of the paternal or marital lodge to a female having her monthly flow.†

Some words of their language likewise owe their origin to fiction. Thus they call *na-pe-tæn-kre*, "packed-back-with," a species of large-flaked snow which falls in the spring, when the migratory birds make their first reappearance, insinuating thereby that it is dropped by them upon their arrival to their summer home.

All of these words and idiotisms are proper to the Carriers. Other dialects of the same linguistic group are equally well stocked with imaged or figurative expressions which are sometimes the equivalents of the above, though more generally they differ therefrom. For, although the various dialects are so closely co-related as to present to the investigator innumerable signs of unmistakable affinity, yet it would be erroneous to imagine that they have individually no distinctive characteristics. The comparative philologist would even find therein grammatical differences which might be of the greatest importance as conducive to

* *Apud* Introd. Study of Lang. 2d. Ed. p. 62.

†See "The Western Dénés," etc., Proc. Can. Inst., October, 1889, p. 162.

the detection of the earliest and purest idiom, and thereby the ethnologist might find his way clear of many difficulties while attempting to trace the origin and describe the migrations of the tribes that speak them. It is not my intention to enter at present upon such a study; still I can hardly close a philological paper, embracing in its scope all the dialects of the group without at least some reference to such grammatical and etymological dissimilarities.

If we must admit as a principle of comparative philology deduced from the formation of the Romance idioms of Southern Europe, that the mutations effected in a language through migrations or conquest are always in the direction of greater simplicity, or, in other words, from inflectiveness to analysis, then I think the dialects of the Western Dénés must be regarded as more primitive, because more synthetic, than those spoken by the tribes whose actual territory extends east of the Rockies. To prove this assertion, it might suffice to point to the rules governing the formation of the negative verbs in the different dialects. In Carrier we have a triple—and often quadruple—negation, consisting of an independent monosyllable and two or three inflections in the body of the verb. These internal variations are reduced to one—sometimes two—in Chisxohtin, the verb being, as in Carrier, preceded by a negative particle, the co-relative of which is in the Eastern dialects the only particular differentiating the negative from the affirmative. Let us take as an example the verb “I pray.” We have in :

	CARRIER.	CHISXOHTIN.	CHIPPEWAYAN.
<i>Affirm.</i>	the-na-dœs-tli	rèn-tsa-kus-ti	yas-thi
<i>Neg.</i>	<i>au</i> -the-na <i>l</i> -dœs <i>æ</i> s-tli	<i>tla</i> -rèn-tsa-kus <i>æ</i> s-ti	yas-thi <i>illé</i>
	1 2 3	1 2 3	1

So the Chippewayans and all Eastern Dénés simply say : I pray not. This is far, indeed, from the doubly—or trebly—inflected negation of the Carriers.

The Eastern Dénés have also lost quite a number of other inflections still existing in the Carrier verbs. Such are, for instance, the dualistic pronominal inflections of the verbs of locomotion, and of the verbs of station corresponding to the three persons of our singular, as well as the two last persons of the indefinite singular of the same verbs. Furthermore, the remarkable synthetism which we have already noticed in the comparative forms of the primary verbal adjectives (*su-ilcho*, *nd ælcho*, etc.), no less than in their six especial differentiating prefixes (*nân*, *dân*,

hwo, etc.) is totally wanting in most Eastern dialects, which likewise lack such synthetically formed comparative as *æte-no*, *æte-tiz*, *æte-chu*, etc. Time, or some other cause, has also greatly reduced in the Chippewayan, Hare and Loucheux idioms the number of the modificative forms of the objective, locomotive and instrumentative verbs. The ordinal adjectives, which still exist in Carrier, have equally disappeared with the tribes' migrations eastwards. It is also worthy of remark that the Chifzohtin—a Western dialect—which has many terminological affinities with the Hare (eastern) dialect, has similarly lost those terms. Nor can I find in the Chippewayan, Slave, Hare or Loucheux vocabularies any trace of the Carrier inflected numeral adjectives, *ilowh*, *nauh*, *thauh*, *uaittoh*, *thaittoh*, *nahæltoh*, *thahæltoh*, etc., etc.

Now, in the same manner as the admixture of foreign elements in the Latin-speaking populations of the Roman Empire had for effect to gradually disintegrate, and finally replace, by independent particles, the case-endings of the nouns, and the personal inflections of the verbs, even so it must have been with regard to the inflections and synthetical forms which are now wanting in the speech of the Eastern Dénés. On the other hand, since philological researches have taught us that the more synthetical is a language, the stronger are its claims to antiquity, we must conclude from the foregoing that the Carrier is the most ancient, and thereby the purest, of the dialects spoken by the various Déné tribes.

This comparative purity, however, should be understood of its grammatical, or organic, not lexical, features; for there are not among the Carriers two villages the inhabitants of which speak exactly the same language. Strange to say, these differences bear more especially on the most important part of speech, the verb, its conjugations, and its negative elements. Thus, while a Carrier of Stuart's Lake says: *au stææz-χwæs*, I do not cough; a native of Fraser's Lake will say, *au chatææ-læχwæs*, and a Babine Indian so: *hwatæækiχwæs*.

From so important dissimilarities in the actual speech of homogeneous Indians, whose country is contiguous, one might be tempted to infer that their language is not of a very stable character, inasmuch as that of some Eastern Aborigines is represented as wonderfully changeable.* Yet I hardly think it to be the case. I even believe that it can be safely affirmed that the Déné idioms have not varied more during the last hundred years than either English or French ever did during an equal space of time previous to the sixteenth century.

* *Introduct. Study Ind. Lang.*, 2d Ed., p. 63, text and note.

To enable the reader to judge for himself, and, at the same time, to give him an opportunity of appreciating the latent forces which are acting upon the language of our Indians, I shall lay before him lists of the Carrier words that have undergone any variation during the present century.* They are of two kinds: there are those the vocalic or transmutable elements of which have been corrupted into their present form, and those that have been replaced by entirely new words. To the first class belong the following:—

<i>Old words (100 years ago).</i>	<i>New words.</i>
tif, crane	tef
thif, berry-basket (bark)	thef
fœNn, dog	fi
œfthœNn, bow	œfthi
tœne-thœNn, old man	tœne-thî
chœntsœNn, pine (<i>Pinus resinosa</i>)	chœntsi
nînloœNn, it flows	nînli
tœtaNn, duck	tœtai
taltaNn, torch	taltai
nzoNn (he is) good	nzu

and their derivatives, together with a few other terms of similar desinence.

That changes in an American language are not restricted to the inflexible syllables of a word will be shown by the following terms, most of which are still understood, even by children, but have grown obsolete:—

<i>Old words.</i>	<i>New words.</i>
ul'en, lynx	washi
tsonntzif, ice breaker	œté (horn)
ni-yutsé (he barks inland), coyote	chœn-thœ-fi (wood-dog)
zaih-pa-tsâ, red fox	nankœz tœlkœn
sœs-e.œf, brown or cross bear	sœs tœlkœn
ken-tsi, species of red willow	ken tœlkœn

Of these words, the first (*washi*) is evidently a loan word borrowed from the language of the Carriers' neighbors, the Skeena Kitiksons, who

* I base my computation of time upon the age of my informants. One of them, who died two years ago, was close to 100 years old, since he had clear recollection of the advent in this country of the first white men in 1793.

say *welh*; for "lynx." *Tsonntzil* is no more understood, except by elderly people, while *ni-yutsé* is still in use among some Carriers. As for the three last words on our list, they are striking instances of the tendency of a language to resolve its original synthesis into analysis whenever the people that speak it are brought into contact with an alien race. *zaih-pa-tsâ* is a synthetic compound, meaning "he cries for daybreak," and alludes to the nocturnal barking of the red fox. By dint of hearing the French or English name of that animal pronounced by the H. B. Co. traders, the Carriers have imperceptibly dropped their own synthetic vocable to adopt the foreign analytic expression, and they now invariably say *nankæz twlkæn*, "fox (he is) red." Same remark applies to the two other words.

PHILOLOGICAL CONCLUSIONS.

Let us now recapitulate.

The philologist who has had the patience to peruse attentively the foregoing pages will find, I hope, little difficulty in deducing therefrom the following conclusions:—

1ST.—The Déné languages agree with most American idioms through the polysynthetism which pervades all their composite words, and more especially their verbs.

2ND.—They also resemble the Turanian tongues on account of the monosyllabism of most of their roots, their compounding and agglutinative processes of word-building, the formation of their plural and of their amplificative and diminutive, their law of euphonic sequence of the vowels, their innumerable differentiating distinctions, the fundamental rule of their syntax, which requires that the governed word precede the governing, the postpositive character of their equivalents for our prepositions, the scarcity of their terms expressive of relation or conjunction, etc.

3RD.—We must likewise note the following features which they possess in common with the Semitic languages: the immutableness of their initial consonants as contrasted with their vowels, which are essentially transmutable through the various dialects, the nature of their affix article, the number of the modificative forms of their verbs, and the grammatical duality of such objects as are naturally twofold.

4TH.—Lastly, the pronominal inflections of their verbs, their mode of forming the number "nine," as well as the character of all the interrogative and of some possessive pronouns, are as many traits of affinity with the Aryan languages. Furthermore, we should remember that

5TH.—They have but a limited number of words expressive of abstractness, collectivity or generality.

6TH.—Most of their root nouns are monosyllabic, though some are dissyllabic.

7TH.—The almost totality of their adjectives are regular verbs, and as such they invariably follow the noun they qualify.

8TH.—The possessive pronouns are prefixed to the nouns they determine, and constitute an integral part thereof.

9TH.—The adverbs always precede the verbs.

10TH.—The primary, or main verbal, roots are in every case the last syllable of the verb, the penult being invariably the pronominal or inflectible element, which may be preceded by a secondary radical, the negative particle, the completive—direct, or indirect, or both—pronouns, and the various accessory sense-modifying affixes.

11TH.—The substantive verb "to be" exists in its independent form.

12TH.—The divisions of the verbs into transitive, intransitive, passive, etc., are purely theoretical, and have no effect upon the conjugations.

13TH.—There are three conjugations with only one mode and four primary tenses.

14TH.—The negation is, at least, triple in Carrier, double in Chitsohtin and single in the Eastern dialects.

15TH.—The Carrier is the most synthetical and inflective of all the Western or Eastern dialects.
