

AMSTERDAM STUDIES IN THE THEORY AND  
HISTORY OF LINGUISTIC SCIENCE

*General Editor*  
E. F. KONRAD KOERNER  
(University of Ottawa)

Series III - STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE SCIENCES

*Advisory Editorial Board*

Ranko Bugarski (Belgrade); Jean-Claude Chevalier (Paris)  
H. H. Christmann (Tübingen); Boyd H. Davis (Charlotte, N. C.)  
Rudolf Engler (Bern); Hans-Josef Niederehe (Trier)  
R. H. Robins (London); Rosane Rocher (Philadelphia)  
Vivian Salmon (Oxford); Aldo Scaglione (Chapel Hill)

Volume 41

William Cowan, Michael K. Foster & Konrad Koerner (eds.)

*New Perspectives in Language, Culture, and Personality*

NEW PERSPECTIVES IN LANGUAGE,  
CULTURE, AND PERSONALITY

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EDWARD SAPIR CENTENARY CONFERENCE  
" " (OTTAWA, 1-3 OCTOBER 1984)

Edited by

WILLIAM COWAN, MICHAEL K. FOSTER  
*Carleton University National Museum of Man*  
AND KONRAD KOERNER  
*University of Ottawa*

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY  
AMSTERDAM/PHILADELPHIA

1986

no fault of his own, had to rely on, and they will be perpetuated forever, if that isn't already too late. That's just a suggestion I have and I think here's a case in point where it would be useful. We can argue forever about whether those things are really related, but we need that additional information in order to be able to do that on an informed basis, it seems to me.

*Margaret Langdon:* Yes, the point is well taken. The only thing is that the intent of this paper was in fact not to go to the modern data or to argue about the validity of whether what Sapir said was in fact right or not, but to try to do some internal analysis. If I were to include very many forms of specific languages I would certainly do that. I think this is the only place where I actually give specific forms from an individual language and it's in a quote. I'd be glad to find the phonemicized information, but it was irrelevant to the point I was trying to make in the paper.

*Ives Goddard:* Yes, that's what they all say, unfortunately. I see your point, but nevertheless the residue of this problem is that some of these comparisons, which occur in otherwise attractive quotes, will be perpetuated, and many unsuspecting people will not have the full information about them.

*Margaret Langdon:* I'll promise you a footnote, OK?

## *Edward Sapir and Athabaskan Linguistics*

MICHAEL KRAUSS  
*University of Alaska*

---

Edward Sapir devoted much of his life and energy to Athabaskan, a language family which provided a challenge for him to the end of his life, and which fascinated and absorbed him more than any other. Sapir's Athabaskan work began in a casual encounter with Chasta Costa (Oregon) in 1906, when he was 22 years old. Athabaskan and Na-Dene then became a prominent centerpiece of his brilliant comparative work of 1912-1915. From 1920 to the end of his life Sapir remained actively involved and preoccupied with these languages: first from the Olympian heights of his intercontinental Na-Dene/Sino-Tibetan perspective and from the Na-Dene perspective itself; then increasingly from the less lofty perspective of Athabaskan fieldwork and comparison (1922-1929) in Sarcee, Ingalik, Kutchin, Hupa, and finally Navajo, to which he devoted himself far more than to any other language. By the 1930s, he had flung himself into the labyrinth of the Navajo verb; in final humility, with the only congenial colleague he ever had in Athabaskan, the Franciscan Father Berard Halle, Sapir worked on a (rejected) practical orthography for Navajo and on pedagogical lessons in Navajo grammar. The higher Sapir rose in academic circles, the more humbly he immersed himself in Athabaskan. In the following paper I shall provide some account of Sapir's career in Athabaskan, of Sapir's significance for Athabaskan studies, and of the significance of Athabaskan in Sapir's life, for in his Athabaskan work we may see some of the light — and shadow — of Sapir's personality as well.

This paper is an outgrowth of a chapter of another larger

paper, "On the History and Use of Comparative Athabaskan,"<sup>1</sup> written largely from the point of view of Athabaskan linguistics. Here however, I emphasize not only what Sapir meant to Athabaskan linguistics, but also, even more, what Athabaskan meant to Sapir. It is therefore highly biographical and personal, especially about Sapir the man, and his relations with his colleagues. Much is from his correspondence. I do not include in the body of this article any systematic account of Sapir's writings, published or unpublished, on Athabaskan. That is treated separately in an appendix entitled "A Preliminary Annotated Bibliography of Sapir's Work on Athabaskan and Na-Dene."

This article thus also is not intended to provide anything like a full or systematic account of Sapir's work on Athabaskan for specialists in Athabaskan linguistics, nor does it deal with the significance of Sapir's Athabaskan work or his method in it to the development of linguistics more generally. Finally, I shall note that Sapir's Athabaskan fieldnotes are, to put it briefly, the most accurate and insightful that I have ever seen; I expect that this will surprise no one at this Conference who has ever studied Sapir's work.

Though Sapir was the foremost student of Athabaskan, he was not the first. The earliest known European contact with Athabaskan languages was the encounter of Henry Kelsey, of

<sup>1</sup> I am deeply indebted to Victor Golla and Regna Darnell, both for copies of key Sapir correspondence and also for very helpful and stimulating discussions about Sapir's Athabaskan career. I thank Richard Demers for providing copies of the Sapir-Haile correspondence. The quoted letters are mostly in the three main repositories of Sapir's correspondence: the National Museum of Man in Ottawa, the American Philosophical Society in Philadelphia, and the Bancroft Library of the University of California. Other letters are quoted from diverse sources. The Sapir-Kroeber correspondence has been published in Golla (1984); the correspondence at the National Museum of Man has been inventoried by Dallaire (1984). I am grateful to the late Stanley Newman for sending me copies of his student notes from Sapir's Athabaskan classes of 1931-1936, and to Fred Eggan for copies of his student notes from Sapir's Athabaskan classes of 1929-1930. I also thank Mary Haas for sending me copies of her student notes from Sapir's Athabaskan class of 1936, and for her personal recollections of those latter days of Sapir.

the Hudson's Bay Company, with Chipewyan in the 1680s. The earliest known surviving documentation is from 1715. By the mid 19th century the entire Athabaskan family had been well identified and defined, and the relations with Tlingit and Haida (and even Eyak) had been considered. (The Na-Dene hypothesis itself was thus by no means original with Sapir.) Here I shall include only a brief account of the principal figures in Athabaskan linguistics during the late 19th century, Sapir's major colleagues in Athabaskan, and his relationships with them, as essential to an understanding of Sapir's career in this field.

After 1860 there was a great increase in the documentation of Athabaskan, especially with the arrival of the missionaries, such as the Oblates in Canada, the Jesuits in Alaska, the Franciscans in the Southwest, and Goddard in California and elsewhere. These observers provided the first extensive documentation in a number of Athabaskan languages. The Oblates Petitot and Morice, and Pliny Earl Goddard merit special mention here. Later, toward the end of Sapir's life, the Franciscan Berard Haile becomes especially significant.

The most important early figure for comparative Athabaskan was Emile Petitot (1838-1916), who worked in Carada from 1862 to 1882. Petitot published a very important dictionary (1876) extensively documenting Loucheux (Kutchin), Hare, and Chipewyan, with considerable lexical data on several other northern Canadian Athabaskan languages, and a comparative grammatical introduction dealing with Loucheux, Hare, and Chipewyan. The work was a landmark in Athabaskan studies, useful to this day, as a collocation of lexical data, much of which is still not available in any more modern published source. Though he was still alive during Sapir's early Athabaskan days, Petitot's active work in Athabaskan had long since ceased. Sapir, perhaps partly for that reason, set great store in Petitot's *Dictionnaire*: "I am almost daily thanking the Lord that there is Petitot to fall back on" (Sapir to Boas, 25 September 1921).

The Oblate missionary Adrien Gabriel Morice (1859-1938) deserves credit for being the first to understand Athabaskan phonology as an orderly system. He was also the first to at-

tempt to go beyond the simple collation or juxtaposition of forms of similar meaning in different Athabaskan languages, and to assemble cognate stems, seeking to understand the phonological differences among them in terms of development from a common ancestral form. Morice started in British Columbia in 1882-1885 with Chilcotin, then continued in 1885-1906 with Carrier. By 1885 he had achieved the first essentially correct transcription of an Athabaskan consonant system. He was thus the first, and for 20 years, until Sapir, the only person (so far as I know) to distinguish the Athabaskan glottalized consonants in writing. Then, in a paper read 19 April 1890, Morice notes (1891:73) that "p and v, ts and kw or kfw, ts and kw are co-affin and transmutable from dialect to dialect. . . . In that paper Morice explicitly compares the Athabaskan languages with the Indo-European for stability and regularity of development, pleading for application to Athabaskan of the principles developed in Indo-European comparative philology. Morice further paved the way for Sapir in a paper read the following year, 1891, entitled "Déné Roots." Here Morice further attempts to apply these principles to data from eight Athabaskan languages. He includes some rudimentary discussion of phonological correspondences (here referring to Carrier, Hare, and Loucheux):

Radical consonants of this class are *t* [t'] which is convertible into *ʔ* [ʔ']; *tʰ*s into *kʷ* and *ʔ*; *ts* into *kw*, *kfw* and *tc* . . . Therefore the phonetic difference between such words as *tsi*ʰ, *ekfwʰi*ʰ and *ici*ʰ [headʰ] is more apparent than real. They are all the monosyllable *tsi*ʰ modified by the phonology of the Hare and a few other tribes into *kfwʰi*ʰ, while the Loucheux change the *ts* into its co-relative *tc* and say *ici*. (Morice 1892)

The main part of the paper consists of a vocabulary of 370 items, arranged by semantic category, essentially of cognate stems, including an attempt to reconstruct the Proto-Athabaskan root ("Real Root") for each item (or at least the initial consonant thereof). Incidentally, this interesting early work (Morice 1892:153-164) remains to this very day the only attempt at a comparative Athabaskan dictionary in print.

Pliny Earle Goddard (1869-1928) also began his Athabas-

kan work as a missionary, at Hoopa in California, from 1897 to 1900, switching then to anthropology and Athabaskan linguistics, especially of Hupa and the other California Athabaskan languages. He also extended his fieldwork to various Northern and Apachean languages. Sapir would later complain that Goddard jealously regarded the Athabaskan languages as his "private mistress" (Sapir to Kroeber, 1 October 1928), and was always exasperated by the mediocrity of Goddard's linguistic work.

In 1904 Morice published a review of Athabaskan linguistic literature, including a discussion of Petitot (1876), and a rather severe critique of Goddard's Hupa texts, which were the first important published Hupa data. Morice took Goddard to task especially for his phonological faults, e.g., failure to distinguish glottalized consonants. Relations between Goddard and Morice never became friendly.

Three years later Morice published his most advanced article on comparative Athabaskan phonology, "The Unity of Speech among the Northern and Southern Déné" (Morice 1907), in the *American Anthropologist*, where Goddard and Sapir could not possibly have missed it. He included lists of comparisons of cognate stems with observations of consonant correspondences between the northern Athabaskan languages, Navajo, and now also Hupa. Because of his basic grasp of Athabaskan consonant phonology and his perspective of comparative philology, and his expectations — in fact his *insistence* — that Athabaskan consonant systems develop with the same regularity demonstrated to apply to languages of "civilization" such as Indo-European, Morice was able to interpret the inadequate transcriptions of Matthews' Navajo and Goddard's Hupa rather well, e.g., to posit correctly *ts*ʰ where they wrote *ts*, thus assuming orderly correspondences in spite of Goddard's challenge of Morice's authority to do so for languages Morice had never heard (Goddard 1908). As part of the "system of consonantal commutability" he was examining, Morice further noted that "we have the *ts* of the northerners, *tc* of the Navaho, transformed by the Hupa into the unwieldy *tcw*," as in *tcwite* 'flewwood'; on the other hand, the *tc* of the north and *ts* of the south often become *k* among the Hupa, as in *-ke* 'tail'. Morice

was getting rather close, at least in assembling the data and noting the correspondences, though he did not find an explanation for them, and seemed to say, incorrectly, that Hupa here was the language in which the innovations occurred.

In any case, Morice deserves, I believe, far more credit than he has received as a predecessor of Sapir's in comparative Athabaskan. The personal relationship between Morice and Sapir is of interest and significance, as the "pompous windbag" and the "learned doctor" in turn goaded and even supported each other in their Athabaskan linguistics.

Sapir began his work in Athabaskan quite incidentally, in the late summer of 1906, while working on the Siletz Reservation on Takelma, already nearly extinct, which was to become the subject of his doctoral dissertation. Sapir reputedly had the habit of observing the Sabbath on Sunday by not doing his normal work, but as he happened to be living in the home of Wolverton Orton, a good speaker of Chasta Costa, he diverted himself by "whiling away" his "odd moments" taking notes on Orton's language, apparently the dominant Indian language in the area at the time. This was his first experience with Athabaskan. In 1907 and 1908 he also took a few notes at Berkeley along with Goddard on Kato. I have seen no evidence that Sapir did anything more on Athabaskan for five years. Thus 1908 to 1913 was the first of the two five-year gaps in Sapir's Athabaskan work.

Then on 13 May 1913, Sapir wrote Goddard a letter stating the basic correspondences for his PA \**ts*, \**tc*, and \**k*' series. Sapir's impetus for his resumption of Athabaskan, or at least for the letter, was apparently Goddard's publication in 1912 of Chipewyan material, which included a section on "Comparison of Sounds" (Goddard 1912:84-87). Goddard compares forms from Navajo and his own Jicarilla, Hupa, Kato, and Chipewyan data, without reconstructions, and fails to distinguish the correspondences for the stem-initials of, among others, the words for 'grandmother' and 'younger brother' (\**tš* and \**k*), already clearly distinguished by Morice in 1907. However, neither Sapir nor Goddard mentioned Morice's 1907 article at all, though they both surely must have read it. Morice showed precisely what Sapir was trying in his letter of May 1913 to make

Goddard understand. Sapir, however, differed from Morice in finding Hupa closest to the original Proto-Athabaskan.

I have already noted that the French Canadian priest Morice and the Quaker Yankee Goddard apparently never were on good terms. The German-born Jew Sapir also had less than ideal relations with them both. Morice's review of Sapir's Chasta Costa monograph (1914) expressed genuine amazement and almost ungrudging admiration of Sapir's "*tour de force*":

Enlarging on linguistic material incidentally derived from an Indian, mere bits of aboriginal language which would not fill one common-sized page, he managed to write an explanation of the same in no fewer than sixty-seven pages of *first-class philological literature*. His notes on the Chasta Costa Phonology and Morphology are *perfectly illuminating, and betray not only a very keen ear but a quite creditable acumen*. After thirty-two years' study of the Déné group of languages, to which his "Chasta Costa" belongs, *I am tempted to pronounce Dr. Sapir's essay one of the most satisfying monographs ever issued on any of the southern Déné languages*. . . . I note with special satisfaction in his paper those particular sounds such as . . . the lingual and glottal explosions, which I had always thought, and sometimes asserted, must exist in the southern Déné languages, in spite of the inability of former students [e.g., Goddard] to perceive them or of their carelessness in noting down their texts — a presumption for which I was even taken to task [Goddard 1908]. . . . *Dr. Sapir's analysis of the short text which closes his essay is simply admirable, and betrays an insight into the morphology of his material which one is at a loss to know where, or how, it was acquired* [emphasis mine—MK] (Morice 1915a:347-350)

Unfortunately, Morice followed up that favourable review with a rambling paper (1915b) attacking Sapir on a number of specific points in the comparison of Chasta Costa with the northern languages, a paper which Sapir then criticized in turn (Sapir 1915b), in a manner that by his own admission "may seem a bit churlish." This was answered in kind by Morice (1917). All this gratuitous bickering was published in the *American Anthropologist* while the chief editor (1915-1920) of that august journal happened to be none other than Pliny Earl Goddard.

In the long run, however, the interaction between Morice and Sapir turned out to be productive. It may have been

Morice more than Goddard who stimulated Sapir to begin his comparative Athabaskan work (though Sapir never acknowledged this), as Morice came much closer in 1907 than Goddard did in 1912 to the understanding Sapir had achieved in 1913. Sapir, in turn, though he may have silenced Morice in the field of comparative Athabaskan, goaded him in later years to write his massive Carrier grammar, as Morice does indeed acknowledge in the Preface (Morice:

Commenting on a little essay [Morice 1915b] by the author of these volumes, that bright American philologist, Dr. Edward Sapir, had the following in a number of the *American Anthropologist*:

"The chief value of Father Morice's paper seems to me to lie in the further light he throws on the Carrier language, of which previous papers have already shown that he has an admirable mastery. I earnestly hope that Father Morice will not be content with the rather sketchy papers he has hitherto given us on the Carrier language, but will eventually publish a complete presentation of the intricacies of its phonetics and grammatical structure." [Sapir 1915b]

The present work has been prepared with a view to meeting that wish. We fondly hope that the learned doctor will now be satisfied, and that he will deem "complete" enough the "presentation of the intricacies" of the language it contains. Nay, his appetite for linguistic lore, at least of this particular kind, should now soon be replaced by something like surfeit, and some there may be who will feel more repelled than attracted by the very sight of our ponderous tomes. . . . Although only now [1932] presented to the appreciation of the philological world . . . this exposé of the Carrier linguistic machinery is not exclusively due to the urging of Dr. Sapir — albeit it cannot be denied that that scholar was the prime motive power in its publication. (Morice 1932:v)

Sapir was by then more than that: the Sapir-Boas correspondence shows that Sapir made repeated efforts and entreaties to Boas to help Morice get the Carrier work published. Sapir had a much more open-minded attitude towards missionaries than did Boas, and proved here an impartial and tolerant evaluator.

While Sapir and Morice ended up with a grudging respect for each other, the relationship between Sapir and Goddard only deteriorated, as we shall see below.

Goddard for a long time was preparing (or at least assembling data for) a comparative grammar and/or dictionary of

Athabaskan; unfortunately his papers have not yet been located. He wrote a brief historical survey of the field (Goddard 1914:583–585) just before Sapir's Chasta Costa work appeared in print; published an attack (Goddard 1920) on Sapir's Na-Dene (Tlingit-Athabaskan) hypothesis; edited and published Boas's important 1894 Tsetsant material with comparative notes (Boas and Goddard 1924); and finally a brief summary (Goddard 1926) of Athabaskan relationships, including an account which finally shows some understanding of Sapir's reconstructed *\*ts*, *\*tc* and *\*k'* series, but without acknowledging Sapir.

Sapir's first publication in Athabaskan, the 1914 *Notes on Chasta Costa*,<sup>2</sup> already shows his comparative approach, with his reconstruction for "Athabaskan" *ts*, *tc* (sometimes *tcw'*), and *k'* series on the basis of comparisons between Hupa, Kato, Chasta Costa, Chipewyan, Hare, Carrier, Navajo, Jicarilla, mostly from wretched data. I shall not devote space here to Sapir's morphological reconstructions; suffice it to say that the basic outlines of the Athabaskan verbal prefix complex are clearly emerging. The absence of any attention, however, to syntax, even the most elementary sentence structure, is an important and lasting characteristic of Sapir's Athabaskan linguistics; it presumably also reflects the focus of Saussurean linguistics of the era.

It is interesting that Sapir calls his reconstructed language simply "Athabaskan," and calls all the Athabaskan languages "dialects," a clear indication of the close unity he sees in the group still.

Sapir was at the same time deeply interested especially in the problem of Na-Dene.<sup>3</sup> On 6 July 1914, he wrote Goddard, "I am somewhat in a quandary as to what term to employ for

<sup>2</sup>This was, incidentally, also to be by far the most extensive study Sapir himself ever published on an Athabaskan language, his only Athabaskan publication reaching even monograph proportions (85 pages).

<sup>3</sup>As mentioned above, that idea was by no means original with Sapir, but began with the early contact with these languages in Russian America. Rezanov (1805) already had it well defined, better than Sapir, at least in including Eyak.

the large linguistic stock of which Haida, Tlingit, and Athabaskan are specialized members. Does 'Alaskan' appeal to you, or do you find it too vague and misleading? How would it do to extend the meaning of the old term 'Diné' so as to include all these groups, leaving Athabaskan to refer specifically to Morice's Déné?" Sapir was in fact already at work on a major monograph on Na-Dene. The monograph was never published and the manuscript seems unfortunately to have disappeared, a 200-page typescript by 1915, when it was "laid aside" (Sapir to Boas, 8 September 1916). All we have of this work, and the main paper we have left on Na-Dene from Sapir is the "rapid abstract of some of the leading points involved" which Goddard persuaded him to publish as a preliminary report in the *American Anthropologist* (Sapir 1915a). In footnote 1 Sapir mentions that "The general methodology of linguistic reconstruction and the sounds reconstructed for Athabaskan specifically are dealt with in the longer [lost] paper above referred to." We have important further information about that missing work in a letter by Sapir to Radin (17 July 1918), kindly provided by Regna Darnell:

Unfortunately most of my [Na-Dene] material has never been made public. I did start to write a systematic presentation, but when Goddard asked for a preliminary paper for the *Anthropologist*, I rather lost steam on the main work and shelved it. It is perhaps as well, for since beginning to write, Boas' Tlingit Grammar has appeared. This will doubtless require considerable modification of my data. However, about 200 pages of typewriting were completed, including all the lexical material I had gathered up to that time and the greater part of the phonology of consonants. The rest of the phonology and morphology were to follow. Unfortunately I have not had the chance to revise this typewritten copy and put in all the diacritical marks needed. If you think you can make use of the original manuscript I should be pleased to send it to you, provided of course you are extremely careful with it.

A letter from Sapir to Radin, 5 December 1919, confirmed that Radin had by then returned the ms. to Sapir. (Cf. item 5 for further references to this work. The published summary contained about 100 of the 300 lexical comparisons of the original. About 300 Na-Dene lexical comparisons are included in the later comparative Athabaskan ledger, so the main loss here

is probably the phonology.)

From 1915 to 1920 there is the second 5-year gap in Sapir's active Athabaskan Na-Dene work. His special fascination remained, though, and even grew: "Dene is probably the son-of-a-bitchiest language in America to actually *know*"; "most fascinating of all languages ever invented!" (4 October 1920); "I am at present of the opinion that the Na-Dene wave is the most recent of all, for a variety of reasons, among which not the least interesting is the fact that it contrasts most sharply with Eskimo and the languages to the south. I should say that the Na-Dene languages are by all means the most 'un-American' of all the languages spoken on the northern continent" (Sapir to Lowie, 15 February 1921). His frustration with Boas's skepticism or agnosticism was inevitable (to Kroeber, 4 October 1920): "I believe he still doubts (or pretends to doubt) the validity of the Na-Dene construction. And all the time his own Tlingit book is the finest corroboration of my article one could have wished. In effect he out-Na-Dene's me in this book to a frazzle, but he won't see he's done it! Now, you psychoanalyst, where's the complex?" (Boas's book is actually just a remarkably good descriptive sketch and stem list of Tlingit, with no comparative content or intent at all.) Sapir's frustration with Boas here was destined to grow.

In March 1920 Sapir had worked briefly in Ottawa with Haida. Toward the end of 1920, he had begun working actively again not only on Na-Dene, but also on a Na-Dene/Sino-Tibetan comparison, a scholarly activity that he continued with special interest between 1920 and 1929. As far as know, this is the only Asian-American comparison that Sapir ever actively pursued. The main narrative source for this is his letters to Berthold Laufer. He had also begun his big comparative Athabaskan/Na-Dene and Na-Dene/Sino-Tibetan comparative dictionary ledgers. He was full of enthusiasm and ambition (Sapir to Lowie, 8 November 1921): "I have a big Na-Dene program ahead," but also personal apprehension: (Sapir to Kroeber, 4 October 1920) "I tremble to speak of it, though I've carried the germinal idea with me for years. I do *not* feel that Na-Dene belongs to other American languages. I feel it is a great intrusive band. . . . Then there is tone, which feels old. . . . Do

not think me an ass if I am seriously entertaining the notion of an old Indo-Chinese offshoot . . ."; and (Sapir to Kroeber and Laufer, 1 October 1921): "Don't blab too much about my Indo-Chinese just yet. It's not wise. 'Einem Narren zeigt man nicht die halbe Arbeit,' and 98% of one's fellowmen are damned fools."

Sapir's re-entry into this field indeed met with a cold reception. Goddard wrote Sapir, 4 November 1920, "As to your plan of a comparative grammar of Na-Dene — as long as it remains that, I express no objections and feel none. If, however, you confine your comparative grammar to Athapascan I should probably die with the feeling that you had not treated me fairly, but I doubt if I should ever tell you so. You know how the case stands. I have spent twenty years in getting material ready to do that very thing; that is, to make a comparative statement of Athapascan. I have almost as much stuff unpublished as has been published. I don't think either of us can do much good until the Yukon [River] district [presumably including Alaska] has been better studied. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than having someone to share my Athapascan interests with. There are a lot of awfully pretty things in Athapascan." Sapir's response (to Kroeber, 30 November 1920) freely expresses his bitter scorn for Goddard with his usual eloquence, but is reserved regarding Boas, whom Sapir always respected:

I wrote Goddard recently [letter not found] I was working on Nadene again and felt I had to get a first-hand inkling of Athabaskan in the field, that I would be likely to run in on Sarcee. Tried to make it clear my objective was Na-Dene (and beyond!), only incidentally Athabaskan (as necessary stepping-stone). He did not answer as graciously as I thought he might — said if I did what he had been planning to do 20 years (comparative study of Athabaskan), he would consider I had treated him unfairly, though he would not tell me so (isn't this noble?). He might have added that he would die unhappy, with Hupa graven on his heart. Of course I wrote him then a most conciliatory letter — a long one [not found] — in which I tried to make him see that if I suspected, for instance, that there was tone in Athabaskan analogous to Tlingit and my objective was Na-Dene, of course I simply had to find out and follow my problems where they led me. Made it clear I was not after text material as such, offered to turn over *all* my Athabaskan comparative data (etymological dictionary rapidly growing) to him for

his use or our collaboration or anything he chose, and even offered to let him see any Athabaskan MS I might ever prepare before publishing it — in short, playing completely into his hands for the sake of peace and good will. Result — no answer. Why I should feel particularly generous to Goddard I don't know. I owe him nothing but nasty cold water he has stolen from Boas' reservoir.

This was written before Goddard's attack appeared in Boas's *JMAL*. Though he never said as much, Sapir probably also felt this to be a personal betrayal by Boas.

Boas published Goddard's severe attack on Sapir's Na-Dene (Goddard 1920). Sapir's frustration, exasperation, and by now deep personal hurt over that are evident in his letters to Boas, Lowie, Kroeber, and ms. comments [1921] on his copy of the article. As he writes Benedict on 25 June 1922 (Mead 1959:53): "For me the Nadene . . . problem does not stop with Nadene itself. It fills me with something like horror and melancholy both to see how long and technical a road I must travel in linguistic work, how fascinating the aspect, and how damnably alone I must be. There is practically no-one to turn to either for assistance or sympathetic interest." Given the negative response to his Na-Dene, it is no wonder that Sapir never published substantially on Na-Dene/Sino-Tibetan; the work itself in that area seems to have fallen off before 1925. The massive comparative Athabaskan ledger has only minor Na-Dene content, about 300 comparisons, presumably not very different from the original 300, 100 of which he had published in 1915. Perhaps Sapir's interest in Na-Dene had by then also begun to flag. One cannot tell whether the subject was no longer linguistically so rewarding as it first promised to be and/or whether Sapir was in the end reacting to the expected lack of approval, or even scorn and betrayal by his colleagues. In any case, Na-Dene and Na-Dene/Sino-Tibetan were becoming increasingly eclipsed by his interest in comparative Athabaskan and Athabaskan as such.

Another reason for Sapir's increasing preoccupation during the 1920s with rigorous comparative Athabaskan was the friendly rivalry or cooperation that was soon to develop between Sapir and Leonard Bloomfield, another linguist Sapir respected, in proving that the principles of comparative lin-

guistics they had each learned as students in Indo-European worked just as well in the study of the unwritten "primitive" languages of a large Amerindian family; Bloomfield's family was Algonquian, as Sapir's was Athabaskan. I have seen only fragments of the correspondence (from 1924 on) between Sapir and Bloomfield ("It must be a blessing to work only at one's job and not teach Freshman German for a living," Bloomfield wrote to Sapir, 3 June 1925). It is of course significant that Sapir published his most detailed explanation and discussion of his reconstruction of the Proto-Athabaskan *\*ts*, *\*tc*, and *\*kʷ* series in an article entitled "The Concept of Phonetic Law as Tested in Primitive Languages by Leonard Bloomfield" (Sapir 1931, written in 1928-29). Comparative Athabaskan must have been and remained especially attractive to Sapir the comparatist, both because of its cohesiveness permitting rigorous detailed short-range comparison, and because at the same time it offered great scope for much broader comparison with Na-Dene, and even Sino-Tibetan.

Feeling sharply the need for more good Athabaskan data, and looking especially for tone (considering his Na-Dene/Sino-Tibetan interest), Sapir made his important field trip to study Sarcee in 1922, and found with exultation precisely what he was looking for. (As my own still unpublished paper [Krauss 1978] on Athabaskan tone goes at length into the saga of Sapir and Athabaskan tone, I shall go over only certain points of it here.) Suffice it to say that the Sarcee work yielded for Sapir the major refinements he made in the reconstruction of the Proto-Athabaskan phoneme inventory, which apparently no new evidence could convince him to change after 1922.

Here we see some of the less rational aspects of Sapir's character. He could become very enthusiastic, even passionately excited, about a given point; here for example about tone in Athabaskan. When subsequent evidence proved disappointing or contradictory, however, Sapir could be slow indeed to modify his position accordingly. In fact, it would be interesting to see how often, if ever, Sapir is known to have retraced any of his significant claims. We should, however, view this in the context of Sapir's relations with mediocre and often hostile colleagues. Goddard for example, could not hear tone, nor would

he admit of its importance. Sapir's isolation, exasperation, and often basically defensive position, had their cost.

Sapir immediately (1922) published a note on Sarcee tone, with the concluding statement "So fundamental is tone to Sarcee morphology that it is well nigh inconceivable that it should be entirely absent in any other Athabaskan dialect," and in his paper on Sarcee tone (published 1925) he writes "so fundamental is tone to the phonetic and morphological understanding of Sarcee that it is inconceivable that it should not be shared by other Athabaskan dialects as well." Had Sapir forgotten or did he simply dismiss as inadequate in this respect his own initial Athabaskan fieldwork with Chasta Costa?

Sapir continued his quest for Athabaskan tone the very next year, at a summer camp in Pennsylvania, where he located speakers of Ingalik and Kutchin. He wrote that the Ingalik informant "proved disappointing" (Sapir to Boas, 2 July 1923), and "unreliable" (25 July 1923). (There could in any case have been nothing wrong with Thomas B. Reed's Ingalik phonology; the fact is simply that Ingalik has no tone.) Sapir then spent the rest of his time with the speaker of Kutchin, which has tone that agrees with that of Sarcee. In Kutchin Sapir collected a sizable corpus, including twenty texts, from John Fredson.

In another important matter, however, Ingalik and Kutchin both agree, and that is in having two affricate series, *tr* as opposed to *ts*, both representing what Sapir had reconstructed as a single series, his *\*tc*. Instead of revising his reconstruction, Sapir evidently assumed that the extra series must be a result of the splitting that takes place in Kutchin from palatalization;<sup>4</sup> however, we may well wonder what Sapir thought, if anything, of its occurrence also in Ingalik!

In 1924 Boas's important and hard-won 1894 Tsetsant material was finally published in *IJAL*, edited by Goddard, after 30 years in manuscript (Boas and Goddard 1924). It is questionable whether Sapir ever looked at it at all; if he had even seriously glanced at it, he certainly would have been struck by the startling shift of his Proto-Athabaskan *\*tc* to *pf*, which

<sup>4</sup>This is implied in brief 1928 student notes by Li from Sapir on Kutchin historical phonology (Sapir and Li 1928).

Goddard clearly demonstrates in his introduction to his presentation of Boas's data, and which Goddard again mentions in print two years later (1926:491). Sapir certainly would not ordinarily have missed what Goddard missed; he would rather have gleefully pounced on the point that *not* the entire \**tc*-series had shifted in Tsetsaut to *pf*, but only those very same items that were *tr* in Kutchin (and in Ingalik). It is obvious that any consideration of the Tsetsaut data would have required a revision of Sapir's reconstruction of the Proto-Athabaskan affricates, for which there are now clearly two sets of correspondences — Kutchin (and Ingalik) *tr* : Tsetsaut *pf*; as opposed to Kutchin (and Ingalik) *ts* : Tsetsaut *ts* (the two series merged in all the other Athabaskan languages known to Sapir). Why or in what way Sapir ignored that important material remains a dark mystery. Was it in either case simply because he so disliked Goddard, and felt hurt by Boas in his support of Goddard? Sapir was unquestionably aware of Tsetsaut and its importance, both before 1924 (letter to Boas, 9 April 1920, and a brief note dated April 1920 in the collection of the American Philosophical Society, which he took the trouble to make from Tsimshians in Ottawa, on two speakers of Tsetsaut then still alive), and after 1924 (letter to Hoijer, 11 February 1935, taking, in an entirely different connection, data from the Tsetsaut article). Yet Sapir never revised his reconstruction, and there is no discussion of Tsetsaut in the detailed student notes we have from Sapir's Comparative Athabaskan phonology classes 1931–1936.<sup>5</sup>

Sapir continued his intense comparative Athabaskan work at least until his 1925 move to Chicago. On 14 June 1925, he wrote to Ruth Benedict: "So... I dedicate most of my time to the immortal Comparative Nadene (and Athabaskan) Dictionary, which will probably never be written..." However, by late 1926 he had already begun working with a Navajo speaker at Chicago, Paul Jones, and finally found the student he had been wishing for in Fang-Kuei Li (who, as a native speaker of Chinese, could be expected to have an ear for tones!). Sapir

gave Li his Sarcee verb material to edit, which Li did for his master's thesis in 1927 (Li 1930a).

In the summer of 1927 Sapir and Li went to California, starting together on Hupa; Sapir stayed with Hupa while Li went on to study Wailaki and Mattole. To Sapir's great dismay and surprise they found three toneless languages; cf. his letter to Kroeber, 28 June 1927: "It's disappointing to find that Hupa has *no tone!* Evidently not all Athabaskan dialects possess it. I had noted its absence in Arvik [Ingalik] but thought that might be due to my informant's incomplete knowledge." Sapir gathered an outstanding corpus of Hupa material, especially from Sam Brown, including 76 texts.

In 1928 Sapir sent Li north to study Chipewyan, still especially in search of tone. This time Li did indeed find tone, but it was the reverse of what Sapir expected from Sarcee, Kutchin, and Navajo, raising a problem that Sapir never resolved. In 1929 Li went north again to study Hare (where he would again find the reversed tone), while Sapir went with his new student Harry Hoijer to study Navajo. That was to be Sapir's last Athabaskan fieldtrip; the Hare was also Li's. The tone reversal was a problem, and the difference in the cultural backgrounds, age, academic position, and the personalities of Sapir and Li was clearly such that dialogue for the solution of the problem would not have been easy. Sapir himself published almost nothing of the vast Navajo corpus he had collected, and also very little about comparative Athabaskan. Our main sources for his reconstructions of that period are his ledger and the publications of his Chicago students Li and Hoijer, especially Li's *Mattole* (Li 1930b) and "Chipewyan Consonants" (Li 1933), and Hoijer's "The Southern Athabaskan Languages" (Hoijer 1938). However, all three of these important papers omit reconstruction or discussion of tone.

From his 1929 summer at Crystal City, New Mexico, where he collected an enormous amount of Navajo material, Sapir's Athabaskan work became increasingly dominated by his interest in Navajo. Except for the two courses he taught at Yale in 1931–1932 and 1936, we see no evidence of activity in comparative Athabaskan, much less Na-Dene or Na-Dene/Sino-Tibetan, barely even mentioned in his Yale Comparative Athabaskan

<sup>5</sup>The extra Proto-Athabaskan series thus remained unnoted, until I myself stumbled upon it in Alaska in 1961 (Krauss 1964).

courses.<sup>6</sup> On Navajo, on the other hand, Sapir gave courses at Chicago in 1931 (at least), and at Yale in 1932, 1933-1934 (at least); the 1931-1932 Comparative Athabaskan course also emphasized Navajo. We are lucky enough to have excellent notes from several of his students in those courses: Stanley Newman, Fred Eggan, Morris Swadesh, Mary Haas. From these we can reconstruct rather nicely Sapir's lectures on Navajo and especially Comparative Athabaskan (for 1931-1932 we have both Newman and Swadesh, for 1936 both Newman and Haas).

In Navajo, Sapir finally found a true friend and colleague in Fr. Bernard Haile, a Franciscan missionary to the Navajos since 1900. Sapir's correspondence with Haile (1929-1938) is voluminous (188 letters both ways, about 400 pages), and revealing in certain respects, disappointing in others. It is intimate — "Dear Bernard", "Dear Ed" — and preoccupied with logistics and funding. After 1931-1933 the correspondence is increasingly about phonology and orthography. But it never goes very deeply or broadly into Navajo grammatical structure.

In late 1934, inspired by the excitement over phonemic theory, and the unit-symbol per phoneme orthographic principle so fiercely stated in the *American Anthropologist* ([Sapir et al.] 1934:629), Sapir switched Navajo orthographies. He gave up the digraphs he had been using for so long (for example, he replaced *tc* by *č*), ironically precisely at the time when Albert "Chic" Sandoval, his main Navajo informant, to whom he was hoping to teach literacy, was visiting him in New Haven (Octo-

<sup>6</sup>Mary Haas (personal communication, 1984) retains the impression from 1936 that Sapir gave the Comparative Athabaskan courses at Yale mainly at the urging of his students, basically to satisfy demand. The lack of any revisions that we might expect may thus be further explained by Haas's impression that Sapir was by then no longer so actively interested even in comparative Athabaskan as he was in Navajo, let alone more distant comparison. This also explains the total absence of any mention of Eyak, though Sapir certainly had been shown Eyak data by 1935 (by Frederica de Laguna and Kaj Birket-Smith), and is on record as recognizing its significance as a new branch of Na-Dene (Birket-Smith 1935:102, de Laguna 1937:64, and Sapir's letter to Boas, 26 April 1935). The "old spark" was there, but there were no new sparks in comparative Athabaskan at this period, the classes notwithstanding.

ber to December, 1934); and even more ironically just as they were getting involved in the Bureau of Indian Affairs's Navajo literacy and interpreter training programme, which was then just beginning. Sapir, with Haile's help, was to produce a practical manual of Navajo for Roosevelt's newly liberalized Bureau of Indian Affairs under John Collier (with Willard Beatty as head of Education). Their choice of orthography proved exceedingly unfortunate, as they ran afoul of Gladys Reichard's "territory," and J.P. Harrington was then engaged by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to produce the practical orthography. "Dr. Harrington to reduce our alphabet to an anglicized form" (Haile to Sapir, 27 June 1936, calling Beatty and Collier "conceited ignoramuses"); Sapir bitterly to Haile, 26 August 1936: "many thanks for letting me see Miss Reade's lessons. They are wonderful. Would you kindly suggest to Mr. Collier and Dr. Beatty — unless the rules of your order forbid — that these lessons, provided they are inscribed on suitable paper, can be recommended for 'aḷ'a'-wiping purposes? I return them in haste."

From its remote academic position, what Reichard termed the "impractical," "theoretical," "Sapir school" lost this political battle, and remained more or less aloof and/or excluded from the on-reservation Navajo language developments. This misfortune was greatly mitigated by the work of Young and Morgan from 1937 on, who had a much more open attitude and did fine work, but for Sapir it was too late.

One may wonder at the rift over what seems today such a non-issue as unitary symbols versus digraphs in the orthography, but given the personalities of the always jealous Reichard and that of the notorious J.P. Harrington, who was an anti-Semite, among other things, the problem was surely inevitable. (Cf. Ruth Benedict's letter to Margaret Mead (Mead 1959:95) about Sapir's charm and assurance at the 1928 American Anthropological Association: "Nobody but Gladys could resist him.") If it hadn't been orthography, it would have been

<sup>7</sup>It is by no means clear how Reichard's hostility could have been Sapir's fault. It appears that Sapir was supportive of Reichard's involvement with Navajo from the beginning, and that he was very generous to her with

something else. The loss to Navajo and Athabaskan linguistics, however, was long-lasting and severe.

There is a gap in the Sapir-Halle correspondence for 1937, but 1938 is intense: 26 letters (92 pages) from Sapir to Halle, especially on the Navajo lessons. His strength failing, and realizing (15 July 1938) "after all, you've had the practical experience and know what helps the students most, while I, frankly am primarily interested in Navajo structure as such and in Comparative Athabaskan," Sapir delegates primary responsibility for the lessons to Fr. Halle. (Halle published his own lessons, *Learning Navajo*, in four volumes, between 1941 and 1948. What the Sapir-Halle manual would have been we may better know when we examine the contents of boxes 26-27 of the Halle collection at Tucson.)

As Sapir sums up to Boas (12 April 1938): "I consider my Navajo work by far the most important and extensive linguistic research I have ever undertaken" (though Navajo is still not mentioned in Boas's obituary of Sapir in *JAL* 1939). Sapir's last letter to Kroeber, 25 August 1938, confirms that Sapir intended, if or when he got well again, to return to his earlier and broader Athabaskan work, specifically his Hupa texts and comparative Athabaskan: "I am as much as ever interested in large scale patterning, in such problems as reconstructing Athabaskan and placing Tocharian in a genetic and historical sense (which last, incidentally, I think I shall be able to do if my allotted span is long enough). . . . I wish I had time and energy to get out my Hupa texts. They're probably the best texts I ever collected. . . ." He continued, however, to help with detailed comments on the Navajo lessons through his very last unfinished letter to Fr. Halle (28 September 1938), into his final illness. The return to comparative Athabaskan or Hupa texts was not to be.

Sapir devoted a larger part of himself to Athabaskan than to any other specific language field, and left an immense legacy

his time and knowledge of Navajo. This may be seen, for example, in a letter (copy kindly sent to me by Bonnie Urcinoli and Michael Silverstein) from Sapir to Reichard, of 30 September 1934 (in response to hers of 26 September, not seen), six pages masterfully outlining the inflection of the verb 'one person goes' through the persons and tense-moods.

to it. Most of this has yet to be inherited, in part because of Sapir's isolation, but even more because so little of it has been published. A preliminary account of Sapir's written work on Athabaskan and Na-Dene is therefore the subject of the Appendix that follows this article.

## REFERENCES

- Boas, Franz, and Pliny E. Goddard  
1924 Ts'ets'au't, an Athapascan Language from Portland Canal, British Columbia. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 3:1-35.
- Dallaire, Louise, ed.  
1984 Edward Sapir's Correspondence: An Alphabetical and Chronological Inventory, 1910-1925. *National Museum of Man Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service* 97. Ottawa.
- de Laguna, Frederica  
1937 A Preliminary Sketch of the Eyak Indians, Copper River Delta, Alaska. *Publications of the Philadelphia Anthropological Society*, Vol. I. Twenty-fifth Anniversary Studies. D.S. Davidson, ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goddard, Pliny E.  
1908 A Confession as to Errors in Hupa Linguistics. *American Anthropologist* 10:170-171.
- 1912 Analysis of Cold Lake Dialect, Chipewyan. *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History* 10(1):69-165. New York.
- 1914 The Present Condition of our Knowledge of North American Indian Languages. *American Anthropologist* 16:555-601.
- 1920 Has Thingit a Genetic Relationship to Athabaskan? *International Journal of American Linguistics* 1:266-279.
- 1926 Similarities and Diversities within Athapascan Linguistic Stocks. Pp. 489-494 in *Proceedings of the XXII International Congress of Americanists*. Rome.

- Golla, Victor  
1984 The Sapiir-Kroeber Correspondence: Letters Between Edward Sapir and A.L. Kroeber, 1905-1925. *Survey of California and Other Indian Languages* 6. Berkeley: University of California.
- Haile, Father Berard, O.F.M.  
1941 *Learning Navajo*. 4 vols. St. Michaels, Arizona: St. Michaels Press. [1941-1948].
- Hojter, Harry  
1938 The Southern Athapaskan Languages. *American Anthropologist* 40:75-87.
- Krauss, Michael  
1964 Proto-Athapaskan-Eyak and the Problem of Na-Dene: The Phonology. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 30: 118-131.
- 1978 Athabaskan Tone. Ms. University of Alaska, 63 pp.
- Li, Fang-Kuei  
1930a A Study of Sarcee Verb-Stems. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 6:3-27.
- 1930b Mattole, an Athabaskan Language. *University of Chicago Publications in Anthropology, Linguistic Series*. Chicago.
- 1933 Chipewyan Consonants. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology of the Academia Sinica*. Suppl. Vol. 1:429-467. Taipei.
- Mead, Margaret  
1959 *An Anthropologist at Work: Writings of Ruth Benedict*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Morice, Père Adrien Gabriel, O.M.I.  
1891 The Déné Languages, Considered in Themselves and in Their Relations to non-American Idioms. *Transactions of the Canadian Institute* 1:170-212. Toronto.
- 1892 Déné Roots. *Transactions of the Canadian Institute* 3:145-164. Toronto.
- 1904 Les langues dénéés. *Année linguistique* (Paris) 2:205-247.

- 1907 The Unity of Speech among Northern and Southern Déné. *American Anthropologist* 9:721-737.
- 1915a Review of Sapir, Notes on Chasta Costa Phonology and Morphology. *American Anthropologist* 17:347-350.
- 1915b Chasta Costa and the Déné Languages of the North. *American Anthropologist* 17:559-572.
- 1917 Misconceptions Concerning Déné Morphology: Remarks on Dr. Sapir's Would-Be Corrigenda. *American Anthropologist* 19:132-144.
- 1932 *The Carrier Language (Déné Family): A Grammar and Dictionary Combined*. 2 vols. St. Gabriel-Mödling, Austria: Anthropos.
- Petitot, Emile  
1876 *Dictionnaire de la langue Déné-Dindjé*. Paris: E. Leroux.
- Rezanov, N.P.  
1805 Slovar' Unalashkinskago, Kád'yakskago, Kinayskago, Kolyuzhskago, Ugalyakhnutskago i Chungatskago Yazykov. (Ms. 118, Fond Adelunga, Manuscript Division, Salykov-Shechedrin Library, Leningrad.)
- Sapir, Edward  
1914 Notes on Chasta Costa Phonology and Morphology. *University of Pennsylvania, University Museum Anthropological Publications* 2:265-340. Philadelphia.
- 1915a The Na-Dene Languages: A Preliminary Report. *American Anthropologist* 17:534-558.
- 1915b Corrigenda to Father Morice, "Chasta Costa and the Déné Languages of the North." *American Anthropologist* 17:765-773.
- 1922 Athabaskan Tone. *American Anthropologist* 24:390-391.
- 1923 A Type of Athabaskan Relative. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 2:136-142.
- 1925 Pitch Accent in Sarcee, an Athabaskan Language. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris* 17:185-205.

- 1931 The Concept of Phonemic Law as Tested in Primitive Languages by Leonard Bloomfield. Pp. 297-306 in *Methods in Social Science: A Casebook*, Stuart A. Rice, ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1935 Review of Morice, *The Carrier Language*. *American Anthropologist* 37:500-501.
- Sapir, Edward, and Fang-Kuei Li  
1928 Student Notes from Sapir's data on Comparative Athabaskan. Unpublished ms. in possession of Ronald Scollon, Haines, Alaska.
- [Sapir, Edward, et al.]  
1934 Some Orthographic Recommendations. *American Anthropologist* 36:629-631.

## DISCUSSION

William Bright (University of California/Los Angeles), chair

*Mary Haas (University of California/Berkeley)*: I know that of all the things Sapir did, his far-flung attempts to tie up languages that are far apart will continue to excite imaginations for generations to come. Because of that I want to say just a few words about the whole problem of trying to connect Na-Dene with Sino-Tibetan. Sapir was quite right to know that it wouldn't be very well received. At the time he was thinking of these things, it wasn't generally understood, certainly among Americans, what the problems were. At that time, there were gross misunderstandings on the orientalist side of what comparative linguistics could be, and Tibeto-Burman was a beautiful example. It is now understood how all these details fit. Tibeto-Burman in particular is beautiful material, but it wasn't known then because orientalist didn't consider anything a language if it wasn't written down. In language analysis they worked only with written materials, and then when it came to Chinese, well, nobody could agree about a

particular pronunciation at different times and so on. But it was so even with Tibetan. Tibetan presented a strange situation. Scholars would argue about it because it had more consonants than they could account for, so they said that the priests added extra consonants just to make the language esoteric. It wasn't until the 40s that people were able to do field work on these and other unwritten languages. Now they can explain those unwritten consonants as having really been part of the proto-language. And there are so many things to work out on that angle before we can pretend to do anything else. I want to say this because of the fact that somebody is going to just leap in on this and do something. But there is so much to be done, and so much that can be done, and what it will lead to nobody knows. But work is being done. You see, in those days people didn't want to work with unwritten languages — I fought this for I don't know how many years. Perhaps if we hadn't had the Army Specialized Training Program and trained the army in how to speak these languages we never would have gotten around to some of these things, because we weren't allowed to spend 30 years learning one of these languages before we could teach the army to speak them. And it was unheard of in oriental linguistics, so there's been a bit of a revolution there, and it will be beautiful to see. Of course among orientalists whether Thai belongs to Sino-Tibetan or not is a never-ending fight. I don't know when that will ever be solved. I never can remember who stands where on it and it goes on and on.

At any rate, I never did see this material that Sapir had that was referred to, trying to compare it. There are these notebooks he had, such as the one he had on Athabaskan. But I did get a copy of one page. Swadesh showed me maybe a few months before he died a page of this, and thought we should collaborate on working on this because I knew Thai. I said that from what I see here we can't do anything with this particular material because it was all onomatopoeic. So perhaps it was wise that he didn't try to go ahead with it. Well I didn't mean to talk quite so long, but I know that I suppose the next centenary that they will still be talking about these things, I am sure. Whether we'll be any farther along than we are now

or not I don't know.

*Michael Silverstein*: I got the impression in reading the letters to Kroeber, in particular [see Golla 1984:350 (letter 316, Sapir to Kroeber, 4 October 1924)] where he mentions having read Jäschke's Tibetan [Heinrich A. Jäschke, *Tibetan Grammar*, London: Trübner, 1883] for typological reasons as a preliminary to writing *Language* — the index cites no fewer than eleven passages with Tibetan data — rather than for directly comparative purposes for Athabaskan, that Sapir had a kind of "Aha!" notion: here you have this striking — basically, what he called isolating — structure with, in the case of Athabaskan, very shallow (in terms of his projection of time depth), fusional technique in the morphology. And it looked just like phrasal syntax, which he also projected back for Sino-Tibetan after having looked at this Tibetan grammar, so that it became a kind of "Aha!" phenomenon based upon this typological parallelism. Do you have the impression rather that he looked at Tibetan with Athabaskan specifically in mind?

*Michael Krauss*: I think so, yes. I think he must have had that idea before looking at Jäschke. I understand from Ron Scollon — and I've never been able to follow this through — that Sapir's copy of Jäschke is still battling around somewhere, full of Sapir's marginal notations about Na-Dene and Sino-Tibetan. I wish we could find that copy of that book. I do believe that using Jäschke for that was at least part of his agenda. All of this I look at strictly from a point of view of Athabaskan. I can't imagine how he did anything else in his lifetime. It doesn't surprise me that he wrote a book called *Language* right around then too, but what he was doing in Athabaskan would have kept any ordinary person quite busy, just with the comparative use of Jäschke's book.

## APPENDIX

*Preliminary Annotated Bibliography  
of Sapir's Work on Athabaskan and Na-Dene*

The following list includes and describes all Sapir's writings that I know of in the field of Athabaskan and Na-Dene, both published and unpublished. As will be seen, only a miniscule portion of Sapir's enormous contribution to this field has been published. The list contains, in a single approximate chronological order, five main categories of materials: 1) Sapir's own publications; 2) posthumous works, mostly publications (edited, co-authored, or even authored by others, but based largely or entirely on Sapir's data); 3) Sapir's unpublished notes and papers; 4) Sapir's unpublished notes and papers conjectured to exist, but as of this date not found; and 5) notes by Sapir's students from Sapir's courses or lectures. Published works are listed by year of publication, even where we know that the work was completed in an earlier year, thus distorting in some cases the real chronological order. (Sapir's correspondence constitutes still another category of special and substantive importance to his work in this field. Not all of it has as yet been located. I shall discuss it, but am not yet in a position to enter it bibliographically.)

Of this massive material, the first category 1, Sapir's own publications, constitutes only a tiny portion. This category consists of 27 of the 64 items on the list from 1914 to 1938. However, none are books; only the first, (3) *Notes on Chasta Costa* (1914), is even a monograph (85 pages), and the second, (7) Na-Dene preliminary report (1915), a sizable article (24 pages). The rest are mostly very short notes, reviews, or reports on field trips (9 items: 14, 19, 29, 31, 35, 36, 43, 54, 56), or parts which touch on Athabaskan in larger linguistic articles, or which touch on language in longer ethnological articles by Sapir (9 items: 9, 20, 38, 45, 50, 55, 57, 59, 64) or by others (58); only a few are more extensive, 6 to 20 pages (6 items: 8, 21, 11, 27, 28, 60). The total number of printed pages for the 25 items, beyond the first two (109 pages), in this category is only about 115 pages.

Category 2, Sapir's work or field data published by others after his death (9 items: 44,<sup>8</sup> 51, 65, 66, 67,<sup>9</sup> 68, 69, 70, 71) greatly exceed in quantity that which he himself published, especially the Navajo texts (65, about 500 pages of which are Sapir's work) and the Navajo lexicon (69; 314 pages, authored by Harry Hoijer but admittedly based mainly on Sapir's work). These total about 1,000 printed pages of Sapir's work, including three substantial books on Navajo published by Hoijer.

By far the most extensive category, 3, comprises the known unpublished papers, especially fieldnotes, by Sapir (20 items: 2, 4, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26, 33, 34, 39, 40, 41, 42, 61). These include minor items, and brief fieldnotes (Kato, Tlingit, Tsetsaut, Ingalik), but also include Sapir's large comparative Athabaskan/Na-Dene and Na-Dene/Sino-Tibetan dictionary ledgers (1,800 pages and 525 pages, respectively), Sarcee notes and texts (ca. 1,000 pages), Kutchin notes and texts (ca. 600 pages; plus 7,700 slips, secondary), Hupa notes and texts (2,000 pages; 5,000 slips), and Navajo notes and texts (2,300 pages; 11,000 slips). From his great comparative work and fieldwork of the 1920s, only a small bit has yet been published (mainly the Navajo, posthumously).

Category 4, missing unpublished materials that must have existed, contains lesser fieldnotes on Chasta Costa (1), Haida (10), at least largely published, and earlier Navajo in Chicago (32); a comparative Athabaskan phonology paper (30); but most important, the major monograph on Na-Dene and comparative Athabaskan phonology (15; 200 typewritten pages in 1915), which we sorely miss. Item 56 is a very short abstract of a missing paper, the earliest published statement on Navajo aspects that I know of.

Finally, also of great value to us, is category 5, the notes we have directly from Sapir's teaching, written by his students (1928-1936) at Chicago and Yale: Fang-Kuei Li, Fred Eggan, Stanley Newman, Morris Swadesh, and Mary Haas (9 items: 37, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 62, 63), totalling ca. 900 pages of

<sup>8</sup>Item 44 was published by Fang-Kuei Li during Sapir's lifetime.

<sup>9</sup>Item 67 is a posthumous edition by Mary Haas and Victor Golla, but it remains unpublished.

material which in some ways gives a more vivid picture than any other source we have of Sapir's views on Navajo, and especially comparative Athabaskan. More such notes might yet be found, perhaps including those by Gladys Reichard, Fang-Kuei Li, Harry Hoijer, Clyde Kluckhohn, Cornelius Osgood, Charles Voegelin, Benjamin Lee Whorf, Hubert Alexander, or others. To the preceding one might add an unpublished student paper written by Whorf, at Yale, as Sapir's student in Athabaskan, and much of the work of Li and Hoijer, based directly or in part on Sapir's data and/or done directly under Sapir's supervision. For example, Hoijer states in his "Classificatory Verb Stems in the Apachean Languages" (*JMAL* 11:1-13, 1945): "In the preparation of this paper I have used materials on Navaho collected by the late Edward Sapir. Data on the Apachean languages is my own. Dr. Sapir had also begun to assemble material for a paper on this topic which he had no opportunity to finish. This data, now in my possession, has considerably enlightened my task and improved my presentation." That article, in turn, has served as a stimulus and model for perhaps a dozen papers by now (including dissertations) on Athabaskan classificatory verbs. The line is hard to draw, as in fact Sapir's legacy continues to enrich us.

The other category of Sapir's writing, not in the list that follows, is his correspondence. Letters from Sapir which deal extensively with Athabaskan or Na-Dene linguistics that I know of are to be found in correspondence with Franz Boas, Fr. Adrien Morice, Pliny E. Goddard, Robert Lowie, Ruth Benedict, Bertold Laufer, Harry Hoijer, Alfred Kroeber, and Fr. Bernard Haile. Some letters are very substantive, and constitute informative contributions in themselves to Sapir's thinking on specific topics in Athabaskan and Na-Dene linguistics; many are of more historical and personal interest concerning Sapir's work in this field, chronology, logistics, finances, opinions concerning the work of others, relationships with others in the field, and above all, Sapir's personal feelings concerning his work in these languages and the relationship of this work to his life as a whole. For example, in the last year of his life he writes, "I consider my Navaho work by far the most important and extensive linguistic research I have ever undertaken" (to

Boas, 12 April 1938).

The collection and arrangement of Sapir's correspondence concerning Athabaskan and Na-Dene alone would make an interesting study in itself. Here, however, I shall only briefly characterize what I so far know of it below, and include references to it (by recipient and date) in the annotated bibliography that follows. I include only those letters that document or are of relevant interest for the particular entries as listed. This account must remain highly preliminary, especially as I have had no opportunity to check systematically through the Ottawa correspondence files, 1910-1925, now inventoried (Dalaire 1984).

Sapir's correspondence with Boas is perhaps the most extensive (1905-1938), and of great importance for Athabaskan and Na-Dene, particularly during the periods 1914 to 1916, 1920 to 1923, and 1927. Especially long and substantive are the letters of 25 September 1921, 12 October 1921, 25 July 1923, 9 August 1923, 13 October 1923. Perhaps equally extensive and personally very interesting was Sapir's correspondence (1907-1938) with Kroeber, who was also much more sympathetic to Sapir's ideas of deeper genetic relationships, including Na-Dene, than Boas was. The first part of this correspondence, to 1925, has now been published by Victor Golla (1984). Sapir's lengthy correspondence (1913-1934) with the Sinologist Berthold Laufer, largely preserved at the National Museum in Ottawa, is of special importance during the height of Sapir's interest and enthusiasm for his Sino-Tibetan/Na-Dene hypotheses in the early 20s, including some very meaty letters that give us the best discussions we have from Sapir on that proposed connection (12 January 1921, 27 January 1921, 18 February 1921; above all 1 October 1921, 13 typewritten pages, to both Laufer and Kroeber). As for Sapir's only two Athabaskanist colleagues for most of his life, Goddard and Morice, we have at Ottawa some very interesting correspondence with Goddard, mainly from Sapir's early publication period, 1913-1915, and a few from later, as Sapir's exasperation with Goddard grew. Some of that, however, is missing; it would be important, for several reasons, to locate Goddard's papers. There is correspondence with Boas about Morice, for whom Sapir had

more regard than Boas did, especially enlisting Boas's help to get Morice's Carrier grammar published. There is therefore probably also some correspondence of interest directly with Morice, even after 1925, that could perhaps be located. Sapir occasionally mentions his Athabaskan and Na-Dene work in interesting personal ways to other correspondents, such as Robert H. Lowie (1908-1938, published by Mrs. Lowie at Berkeley, 1965), especially 1920-1921, and Ruth Benedict (1923-1938, partly published by Mead 1959, 1966, 1977; much of the rest of Sapir's correspondence with Benedict is in the Benedict Archive at Vassar College, and might be very interesting to see too). Sapir's letters to Harry Hoijer, judging from the only one presently available (2 November 1935) on comparative Athabaskan aspectual stem-sets, would probably be of great interest if they could be found. Finally, the Bernard Haile papers at the University of Arizona Library, Tucson, contain an extensive and revealing correspondence between Sapir and the Franciscan priest, his main colleague in Athabaskan for the last decade of his life (1929-1938), on Navajo, described in the preceding paper.

The list of the annotated entries now follows.

1. 1906 [Chasta Costa fieldnotes], ms. not located. Fieldwork with Wolverton Orton, Siletz, Oregon, July-August. 1906, (partly?) published in 1914a. Contains perhaps also some Galice and Applegate wordlists.
2. 1907 [Kato fieldnotes], ms. 15pp., R.H. Lowie Museum Archives, University of California at Berkeley, with P.E. Goddard during academic year 1907-1908. 2 pp. in Goddard's hand, 13 in Sapir's.
3. 1914a Notes on Chasta Costa Phonology and Morphology. *University of Pennsylvania, University Museum Anthropological Publications* 2:265-340. Sapir's first publication on Athabaskan, already comparative, based on his incidental 1906 fieldwork with his Chasta Costa host, Wolverton Orton, while working on Takelma. Also very short wordlists from Galice Creek (Mrs. Punzie) and Apple-

- gate Creek (Rogue River Jack), pp. 339-340. Reviewed with admiration by A.G. Morice, *American Anthropologist* 17:347-349, 559-572 (1915). Finished in mid-1913. Ref. Sapir to Kroeber, 27 June 1913, 19 July 1913).
4. 1914b Chilcat Vocabulary, ms. 4 pp. American Philosophical Society, Na 2.2. 62 lexical items from Louis Shottbridge, 24 April 1914, in Philadelphia. Shows awareness of pitch contrasts by end of session. Ref. Sapir to Kroeber, 28 May 1914.
5. 1914c [Monograph on Na-Dene], typescript, ca. 200 pp., and manuscript, not located. Ref. 1915a:534, *Summary Report, Geological Survey of Canada, for 1914* (1915:172), *Summary Report, Geological Survey of Canada, for 1915* (1916:269), and correspondence, Sapir to Goddard, 9 January 1915, 10 January 1915, 1 March 1915, 8 March 1915, 4 May 1915; Sapir to Boas, 8 September 1916 ("laid aside" ca. August 1915); Sapir to Radin, 17 July 1918 (quoted in preceding article), Sapir to Lowie, 26 October 1920; Sapir to Boas, 25 September 1921 ("work which I began on Na-Dene long ago (200 typewritten pages, containing a great deal of Athabaskan phonology) but put aside without finishing"). Written 1913-1915, apparently never finished, and not located. Hoijer told Krauss he had never seen it. Partly published in 1915a.
6. 1914d Selected Vocabulary, typescript 5 pp., folder 85.7, Jacobs collection, University of Washington Library. Preliminary version of "comparative vocabulary" published as Section II of 1915a. Vocabulary same as in 1915, but showing original entry numbers, to 309, of 1914c, from which this is a selection. Introductory text rather different from 1915a. Also a few ms. comments in hand of Boas, mostly not incorporated in 1915a. Ref. Goddard to Sapir, 22 December 1914.
7. 1915a The Na-Dene Languages: A Preliminary Report. *American Anthropologist*, n.s. 17:534-558. To remain Sapir's main published statement on Na-Dene, published at Goddard's urging as a "rapid abstract of a much fuller study" (1914c), mainly on grammatical comparison of Athabaskan, Tlingit, and Haida pp. 534-550; lexicon, 98 items (out of at least 309 in 1914c); phonological correspondences, conclusion pp. 551-558, no section specifically on the Athabaskan phonology mentioned in Sapir to Boas, 15 September 1921, quoted above under 1914c.

8. 1915b Corrigenda to Father Morice's Chasta Costa and the Dene Languages of the North. *American Anthropologist*, n.s. 17: 765-773. "Churlish" critique of Morice's article in *American Anthropologist*, n.s. 17:554-572, followed by rejoinder by Morice, Misconceptions Concerning Dene Morphology — Remarks on Dr. Sapir's Would-Be Corrigenda. *American Anthropologist*, n.s. 19:132-144 (1917).
9. 1916 Time Perspective in Aboriginal American Culture: A Study in Method. *Anthropological Series 18, Memoirs of the Canadian Geological Survey* 90. Ottawa. 87 pp. Reprinted in Sapir 1949:389-460. Includes *passim*, comments on Proto-)A(thabaskan) and Na-Dene prehistory and distribution, especially considering linguistic evidence.
10. 1920a [Haida fieldnotes], ms. March 1920, Ottawa, from Peter R. Kelly. Not located. Material incorporated into 1923c. Ref. Sapir to Kroeber, 18 March 1920.
11. 1920b Comparative Na-Dene Dictionary, ms. ledger, ca. 1,800 pp. American Philosophical Society, Na 20a.3 (so titled in Daythal Kendall (Supplement, *Memoir of the American Philosophical Society* 65, 1982, Philadelphia), entry 4115, sent by Hoijer to APS in 1972). Typed blank forms with ms. data added, probably begun in late 1920 (rather than 1913), work mainly to 1927, with few additions to ca. 1933. Data from various Athabaskan languages from Peitot, Goddard, Jenness; Navajo from Franciscan Fathers; Ingalik from Chapman; Koyukon (published) from Jette; Sapir's own data from Chasta Costa (1906), Sarcee (1922), Ingalik (1923), Kutchin (1923), Navajo (1926-), Hupa (1927); Matole from Li (1927), but very little of Li's Chipewyan (1928) and none of Li's Hare (1929); only small amount added in 1930s from Osgood's Tanaina and Morice's Carrier (1932). Most of the Navajo and Hupa data, for instance, are from earlier work, rather than Sapir's own, of 1927. Includes prefixes, but mainly stems, a sheet for each morpheme, most sheets only very partially filled, headed by PA reconstruction. No Eyak. Tlingit from Boas (1917), Haida from Swanton and Sapir, but at most ca. 300 entries from Tlingit and/or Haida. Sapir's main surviving work on Na-Dene, but predominantly comparative Athabaskan. Only ref. Sapir to Benedict 14 June 1925: "So . . . I dedicate most of my time to the immortal Comparative Nadene (and Athabaskan) Dictionary, which will probably never be written. . . ."

12. 1920c Comparative Sino-Tibetan and Na-Dene Dictionary, ms. ledger 525 pp., American Philological Society Na 20a.3, catalogued together with 1920b, but distinct. Typescript forms with ms. filed in for categories Chinese, Siamese, Tibetan, Athabaskan, Tlingit, Haida, with at least one entry for each consonantal group. Includes some reconstructed PA morphemes. Work begun probably late 1920, first mentioned in letter to Laufer, 12 January 1921, ending by 1925, including forms from Sapir's own Kutchin work (1923) but not his Navajo (beginning 1926). See also Sapir-Laufer correspondence and Sapir 1925b.
13. 1920d Tsimshian and Nass River notes, ms. 1 p., American Philological Society, Pn 5.2. Mentions names of two speakers of Tsetsaut, from Tsimshians at Ottawa, April 1920; also Sapir to Boas, 9 April 1920. Indication of Sapir's awareness of importance of Tsetsaut.
14. 1921a A Haida Kinship Term among the Tsimshian, *American Anthropologist*, n.s. 23:233-234. Confirmation that Tsimshian vocative for 'father' is loan from Haida.
15. 1921b [Annotations on copy of P.E. Goddard, Has Tlingit a Genetic Relation to Athapascan? *International Journal of American Linguistics* 4:266-279], at National Museum of Man. Probably 21 September 1921, in disgust; see especially Sapir to Boas, 21 and 25 September 1921, 12 October 1921.  
[In chronological order of writing, the following also belong to 1921: items 22 (The Phonetics of Haida), published 1923c, and 23 (A Type of Athabaskan Relation), published 1923b.]
16. 1922a [Sarcee fieldnotes], ms. 7 notebooks, ca. 100 pp. each, American Philological Society, presented by Harry Hoijer, 1973. *Kendall Supplement*, item 4707. Data from John Whitney, partly published in 1923a, 1924, especially 1925a, and by Li 1930, Hoijer and Joël 1963.
17. 1922b Tales of the Sarcee Indians: texts and translations, typescript and ms., ca. 250 pp., American Philological Society [1102 (21)]. *Kendall Supplement*, item 4708. No date, perhaps later than 1922. Ref. Sapir to Kroeber, 12 September 1922, 1 October 1922; Sapir to Boas, 13 February 1923. Includes typed texts in Sarcee, English translations (for 7 of 25 texts) in Sapir's hand. Not seen.

18. 1922c Sarcee Myths and Tales, typescript, 178 pp., National Museum of Man, Ottawa. Evidently as 1922b, but in more advanced state of preparation. 25 texts, all with word-for-word translation, all typed. No date, perhaps later than 1922.
19. 1922d Athabaskan Tone. *American Anthropologist*, n.s. 24:390-391. Sapir's first published mention of the tone he discovered in his Sarcee fieldwork and of its importance in Athabaskan.
- [In chronological order of writing, the following also belong to 1922 or 1923: items 27 (Personal Names Among the Sarcee Indians), published 1924, and 28 (Pitch Accent in Sarcee), published 1925a.]
20. 1923a A Note on Sarcee Pottery. *American Anthropologist*, n.s. 25:247-253. Primarily archaeological, p. 253 includes comparative linguistic study of diffused term \*'ááá'-'pot'.
21. 1923b A Type of Athabaskan Relative. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 2:136-142. Comparative study of heavy-light stem-final alternation and relative enclitic. Written late 1921. Ref. Sapir to Kroeber, 24 November 1921, "insidiously prepares for far bigger things than its ostensible theme."
22. 1923c The Phonetics of Haida. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 2:143-158. Analysis of sound system of Skidegate Haida, based on fieldwork with Peter R. Kelly, March 1920. Includes remarks on consonants, syllable structure, vowels, and stress and pitch. Contains ca. 300 lexical items. No Na-Dene comparison. Written September-October 1921. Ref. Sapir to Boas, 25 September 1921, 12 October 1921.
23. 1923d [Ingalik fieldnotes], ms. 22 pp. (one notebook), Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley. Lexicon and paradigms (no texts), ca. 600 forms, from Thomas B. Reed of Anvik, at Camp Red Cloud, Pennsylvania, June or July, 1923. Also partial ms. copy by Hoijer, 283 slips, 1960. No publication. Ref. Sapir to Boas, 2 and 25 July 1923.

24. 1923e [Kutchin fieldnotes], ms. 441 pp. (six notebooks, 100, 104, 101, 104, 32 pp.), Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley. Lexicon, verb conjugation, and texts, from John Fredson of Venetie and Fr. Yukon, at Camp Red Cloud, Pennsylvania, July-August 1923. See also Sapir to Boas, 2 and 25 July 1923, 9 August 1923.
25. 1923f Kutchin texts and translations, typescript 145 pp., National Museum of Man, Ottawa. (No date, perhaps later than 1923, but not later than 1925.) A total of 20 texts, from notebooks 1-5, 1923e, including myths, legends, personal accounts, and a speech, with word-by-word translations. Some of this material was also recorded on phonograph records, not located, see Sapir to Boas 22 December 1923. Published by Alaska Native Language Center: Peter 1974 b, c, d, 1975 a, b, 1976; again in 1982.
26. 1923g [Kutchin slip file], ca. 7,700 slips, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley. No date, part ms., part typescript, perhaps later than 1923, but not later than 1925, ca. 5,000 slips for verbs (ca. 8,000 forms), ca. 900 slips for nouns (ca. 1,800 forms), ca. 800 slips for particles, etc. (ca. 3,000 forms); part also in hand of Mary Haas 1933-1934; small amount in hand of Victor Golla 1962-1964. Our copy xeroxed on 390 pp. by Richard Mueller, with some annotation by Mueller, ca. 1965. See also stem list extracted from these files by Haas and Golla, 1964.
27. 1924 Personal Names among the Sarcee Indians. *American Anthropologist*, n.s. 26:108-119. 94 names, description and analysis; also comparative comments, especially pp. 118-119.
28. 1925a Pitch Accent in Sarcee, an Athabaskan Language. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris*, n.s. 17:185-205. Study of Sarcee phonology and morphology, largely comparative, highlighting tone. Finished before July 1923. Ref. Sapir to Boas, 25 July 1923.
29. 1925b The Similarity of Chinese and Indian Languages. *Science* 62:1607, suppl. p. xii (16 October 1925). Sapir's only publication (brief, in third person) on Sino-Tibetan/Na-Dene hypothesis, highlighting tone. See 1920c, and Sapir-Laufer correspondence.

30. 1925c A Comparative Study of Athabaskan Phonology, paper given at Second Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Chicago, 28 December 1925. Notice in *Language* 2:72. Paper not located.
31. 1926a Review of Fr. Berard Haile, *Manual of Navaho Grammar*. *American Journal of Sociology* 32:51. Not seen.
32. 1926b [Navajo fieldnotes], from Paul Jones, Chicago, starting late 1926 (perhaps in error for late 1927), continuing to 1928 or beyond. Not located. Ref. Sapir and Hoijer 1967:1.
- [In chronological order of writing, the following also belongs to 1926: item 44 (A Study of Sarcee Verb Stems), by Fang-Kuei Li, published 1930a.]
33. 1927a Hupa Texts and Slip file, ms. 11 notebooks of ca.125 pp. each; ca. 5,000 slips. American Philosophical Society, Na 20a.4. Kendall Supplement, item 4369. Presented by Hoijer, 30 March 1972. 76 Hupa texts with interlinear English translations. Slip file is vocabulary with grammatical notes filed alphabetically Hupa-English. Chief informant Sam Brown; Not seen. None yet published. Texts in preparation for publication by Victor Golla.
34. 1927b [Miscellaneous Hupa material], ca. 600 leaves, typed and ms. American Philosophical Society, Na 20a.5. Acquired May 1972. Not listed in Kendall Supplement. Not seen.
35. 1927c An Expedition to Ancient America: A Professor and a Chinese Student Rescue the Vanishing Language and Culture of the Hupas in Northern California. *University of Chicago Magazine* 20:10-12. Informal report on Sapir's own work in Hupa with Sam Brown, and Li's on Mattole and Wailaki.
36. 1928a A Summary Report of Field Work among the Hupa, Summer of 1927. *American Anthropologist*, n.s. 30:359-360. Report on results of Sapir's Hupa fieldwork, phonological points (including loss of tone), morphology. Most of this report in typescript in Boas correspondence, December 1927.

37. 1928b Li, Fang-Kuei. [Notes from Sapir on Athabaskan], ms. 30 pp. Kutchin stems, phonology, comparative-historical, with reconstructions, data from Sarcee, Navajo, 19 pp.; Ingalik anatomical terms, 1 pg.; PA tones (Sarcee, Kutchin), 4 slips; PA consonants, 1 pg.; PA verb-stem variants (Navajo, Kutchin, Sarcee) 3 pp.; Chipewyan vowels, development of Chipewyan verb stems. Student-notes from Sapir at Chicago just before and after Li's Chipewyan field-work.
- [In chronological order of writing, the following also belongs to 1928: item 45 (The Concept of Phonetic Law . . .), published 1931a.]
38. 1929a Central and North American Indian Languages, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th edition, 5:138-141. Reprinted in Sapir 1949:169-178. Includes basic statement on Na-Dene grouping, formulated long before 1929, as part of superstock scheme defined by 1920.
39. 1929b Navajo texts, field notes, and word lists, ms. 17 notebooks, of ca. 125 pp. each, ca. 11,000 slips, American Philosophical Society, Na 31.5. Kendall *Supplement*, item 4574. Notebooks contain Navajo texts with English translations. Slip files include verb paradigms with divisions according to stem class; nouns; prefixes; particles; syllable types; etc. Ca. 5,000 slips of word lists marked field notes, ca. 6,000 slips of word lists. Presented to APS by Hoijer, 30 March 1972. Kendall *Supplement*, entry 4574. Partly published in Sapir and Hoijer 1942, Sapir and Hoijer 1973. Chief informant, Albert G. Sandoval of Lukachukai, at Crystal City, New Mexico, 1929, but also later at Yale. Ref. Sapir to Boas, 12 April 1938 on importance of Navajo work.
40. 1929c Navajo conversations, 9 slips, American Philosophical Society [4012 (21)]. Kendall *Supplement*, items 4569, 4573. Short conversations with two participants. In hand of Sapir with additions by Harry Hoijer. Perhaps later than 1929.
41. 1929f Navajo grammatical notes, ca. 100 slips, American Philosophical Society [4012 (19)]. Kendall *Supplement* lists Sapir and Hoijer as joint authors, item 4575. Includes notes on various aspects of Navajo grammar and phonology; some comparisons with other Athabaskan languages; some reconstructions for P.A. Perhaps later than 1929.

42. 1929g A List of Navaho Stems, 141 pp., American Philosophical Society, Na 31.2, many ms. annotations. Collected at Crystal City, New Mexico, 1929, typed perhaps 1930, ms. additions perhaps 1930-1932. Also copy, Halle correspondence, 110 pp. typescript, with annotations in hand of Halle, some same, some different from that in APS Library. Refs. Sapir to Halle, 23 December 1931, 23 January 1932, 4 February 1932, Halle in *American Anthropologist* 44:408-409 (1942), and Halle, *A Stem Vocabulary of the Navaho Language*. St. Michaels, Arizona: St. Michaels Press, I:vi (1950), II:vi (1951).
43. 1929h A Linguistic Trip among the Navaho Indians. *The Gallup Independent* (Ceremonial Edition, 23 August 1929, Gallup, New Mexico.) pp. 1-2.
44. 1930a Li, Fang-Kuei. A Study of Sarcee Verb Stems. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 6:3-27. Reworking of Sapir's 1922 verb material, with extensive introduction by Li on prefixes and stem-variation, pp. 3-14, done as Li's MA thesis under Sapir's supervision at the University of Chicago, 1927. Ref. Sapir to Boas, 9 May 1927.
45. 1931a The Concept of Phonetic Law as Tested in Primitive Languages by Leonard Bloomfield. Pp. 297-306 in *Methods in Social Science: A Casebook*. Stuart A. Rice, ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; reprinted in Sapir 1949:73-82. Written 1928-1929. Sapir publishes for the first time here his reasoning for establishing his PA \*ts, \*tc, and \*kʷ series.
46. 1931b Eggan, Fred. [Class notes from Sapir's Navajo course.] *University of Chicago, Anthropology* 377, spring semester 1931. Ms. ca. 200 pp., in two sets, one of class notes, 150 pp., the other a final version of the notes, with seven typescript excerpts (10 pp.). Detailed and extensive notes important, for Sapir's view of Navajo. Includes a few comparative notes, but basically descriptive.
47. 1931c Newman, Stanley. [Class notes from Sapir's Navajo course.] *University of Chicago, Anthropology* 377, April-May 1931, daily. Ms. notes on 101 slips.

48. 1931d Newman, Stanley. [Class notes from Sapir's Comparative Athabaskan and Navajo course], Yale Linguistics 132, "Primitive Linguistics", 5 October 1931-6 February 1932, twice weekly. Ms. 80 slips. Comparative Athabaskan phonology and morphology, with some emphasis on Navajo. Notes correspond closely to Swadesh's for same course.
49. 1931e Swadesh, Morris. [Class notes from Sapir's Comparative Athabaskan and Navajo course], Yale Linguistics 132, "Primitive Linguistics", 5 October 1931-24 February 1932, twice weekly. Ms. 83 pp., American Philosophical Society, H 6.1. Comparative Athabaskan phonology and morphology, with some emphasis on Navajo. Notes correspond closely to Newman's for same course.
50. 1932a Two Navaho Puns. *Language* 8:217-219. First publication by Sapir of any of his Navajo data.
51. 1932b Problems in Athabaskan Linguistics, American Philosophical Society, 497.3 B63c Na 1., typescript, 3 pp. Later published in *Völkerkundliche Arbeitsgemeinschaft Abhandl.* 19, *Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft und Völkerkunde der Nordamerikanischen Indianer* III:26-28 (1969). Typescript date approximate, donated to APS by Swadesh, 1946, published without changes. Sapir seeks more and better field data on all recoverable dialects, emphasizing difficulties in comparative Athabaskan, especially because of tones.
52. 1932c Swadesh, Morris. [Class notes from Sapir's Navajo course], Yale, ms. and typescript, 33 pp., American Philosophical Society, 497.3 B63c, Na 31a.3. Dated 10 March 1932, Navajo phonology, morphology, lexicon, and text. This is an excerpt (with post-1934 transcription (≠ for earlier *dj* etc.) of far more extensive original notes, probably in APS files.
53. 1933 Newman, Stanley. [Class notes from Sapir's Navajo and Comparative Athabaskan course], Yale, 4 October 1933-19 May 1934, weekly. 99 file slips. On Navajo, but heavily comparative throughout.
54. 1935a Review of A.G. Morice, *The Carrier Language (Déné Family): A Grammar and Dictionary Combined. American Anthropologist*, n.s. 37:500-501.
55. 1935b A Navajo Sand Painting Blanket. *American Anthropologist*, n.s. 37: 609-616. Includes some Navajo forms.
56. 1935c Event Classifications in Navaho, A Study in Linguistic Psychology. *Science* 81:425 (1935). Abstract of a paper presented at Washington meeting of the National Academy of Sciences, April 1935 on aspect in Navajo. Paper not located. Cf. Sapir to Hober, 2 November 1935, and discussion by Sapir's student, Hubert Alexander, on pp. 264-265 of his article *Linguistic Morphology in Relation to Thinking, Journal of Philosophy* 33:261-269 (1936); Alexander read Sapir's paper in December 1935). Earliest published statement on aspect in Athabaskan.
57. 1936a Kutchin Relationship Terms. Pp. 136-137 in Contributions to the Ethnography of the Kutchin. Cornelius Osgood, ed. *Yale University Publications in Anthropology* 14. New Haven.
58. 1936b Linguistic Classification Within the Northern Athabaskan Area. Pp. 3-23 in *The Distribution of the Northern Athabaskan Indians*. Cornelius Osgood, ed. *Yale University Publications in Anthropology* 7. New Haven. Basic statement, tentatively defining Northern Athabaskan linguistic subgroups as eight subdivisions, plus eight unclassified languages, pp. 21-22. (Similar subgroupings at least as early as 1928b, L1 notes.)
59. 1936c Hupa Tattooing. Pp. 273-277 in *Essays in Anthropology presented to Alfred Louis Kroeber*. Robert H. Lowie, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press. Sapir's only published Hupa data, including a few comparative notes.
60. 1936d Internal Linguistic Evidence Suggestive of the Northern Origin of the Navaho. *American Anthropologist*, n.s. 38:224-235. Last publication by Sapir on Athabaskan during his lifetime; including significant comparisons and reconstructions; called a "master-piece" by Kroeber (Seminar on Sapir, 11 May 1959, transcript by Richard J. Preston, p. 12).
61. 1936e Reflexes of Proto-Athabaskan in Several Languages (Hupa, Navaho Chipewyan, Sarcee), slips, Folder 75.10, Jacobs Collection, University of Washington Library. PA consonants and their reflexes in the above-named languages; 1936 while Mrs. Jacobs was working on Na-Dene.

62. 1936f Haas, Mary R. [Class notes from Sapir's Comparative Athabaskan course], Yale, 28 January-29 May 1936, weekly. Ms. 94 pp. Course more strictly comparative (rather than Navajo descriptive); full notes closely corresponding to Newman's for same class.
63. 1936g Newman, Stanley. [Class notes for Sapir's Comparative Athabaskan course], Yale, 28 January-20 May 1936, weekly. 66 file slips. Full notes closely corresponding to Haas's for same class.
64. 1938 Glottalized Continuants in Navaho, Nootka, and Kwakwiltl [with a Note on Indo-European]. *Language* 14:248-274. Status and origin of Navajo stem-initial *n*, *m*, *y*, pp. 250-253.
65. 1942 *Navaho Texts by Edward Sapir, with Supplementary Texts by Harry Hoijer*. Harry Hoijer, ed. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America, 543 pp. Most texts, translations, notes by Sapir, with Albert G. Sandoval and John Watchman, 1929, small proportion added by Hoijer. Perhaps all of Sapir's 1929 texts. Note also Sandoval Navajo texts 1937-1939, ca. 200 pp., American Philosophical Society, 4012 (21); Kendall Supplement, entry 4572, perhaps intermediate stage of (some of) Sapir texts, or new texts. Note also Richard T. Parr (A Bibliography of the Athapaskan Languages, *National Museum of Man Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service Paper* 14:299, 1974, Ottawa), "Navaho texts, including complete text of the Nighway Chant, Gesture Dance, etc. [n.d.]. Ms. in the possession of Harry Hoijer" (and not among Navajo materials listed as given by Hoijer to APS in 1972).
66. 1963 Hoijer, Harry, and Janet Joël. Sarsi nouns. *University of California Publications in Linguistics* 29:62-75. Berkeley. Presentation of Sarcee nouns from Sapir's 1922 data.
67. 1964 Haas, Mary, and Victor Golla. Kutchin Stem List, ms. 101 pp. In hand of Golla. 50 pp. verbs, 44 pp. nouns, 7 pp. texts, edited by Haas and Golla from 1923g. Arranged alphabetically by Kutchin stems; ca. 500 verb stems, 600 noun stems, tentatively marked for tone.

68. 1967 The Phonology and Morphology of the Navajo Language. *University of California Publications in Linguistics* 50. Berkeley. x + 124 pp. Based mainly on Sapir's data, Hoijer is listed as coauthor, and claims to present grammar as Sapir would have. Reviewed by Krauss, *International Journal of American Linguistics* 36:220-228 (1970), and Richard Stanley, *Language* 45:927-939 (1969).
69. 1974a Hoijer, Harry. A Navaho Lexicon. *University of California Publications in Linguistics* 78, x + 314 pp. Based on Sapir's lexical work, and closer to a presentation of the lexicon as Sapir might have done: "I believe this monograph contains all the data collected by Sapir, arranged, as I believe, as he himself might have done."
70. 1974b Peter, Katherine. *Sapir John Haa Googwandak/ Sapir-Fredson Stories*. Fairbanks, Alaska Native Language Center. I 1974, 14 pp. (3 texts); II 1974, 21 pp. (2 texts); III 1974, 22 pp. (3 texts); IV 1975, 23 pp. (2 texts); V 1975, 17 pp. (2 texts); VI 1976, 18 pp. (2 texts). Retranscription, with occasional changes, without tone, of some of Sapir's texts from Fredson, 1923f, Kutchin only.
71. 1982 John Fredson *Edward Sapir haa Googwandak/Stories Told by John Fredson to Edward Sapir*. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Language Center, 113 pp. 19 texts transcribed by Sapir from Fredson's dictated and recorded narration in 1923; retranscribed in modern practical orthography by Katherine Peter; edited with translations from Sapir's interlinear notes by Jane McGary; proofread by Jeff Leer. Kutchin with English translations on facing pages. Includes tone marking. General introduction by McGary, 5-8; biographical sketch of Fredson by Craig Mishler, 11-20. Includes 4 texts not previously published and restores most departures from 1974-1976 editions from the original, with footnotes. English translation excerpted in Clara Childs Mackenzie, *Wolf Smaller (Zhoik Gwatlan), a Biography of John Fredson, Native Alaskan*, typescript dated December 1983, 135 pp. Reviewed by Jarold Ramsey, *Journal of American Folklore* 97:219-221 (1984).

## Addendum

In addition to Box 3, Files 1 and 2, which contain the Sapir-Haile correspondence, I note in James Kari, *A Navajo Reading Bibliography* (Source 2), University of New Mexico General Library, July 1974, that Box 26 of the Bernard Haile papers includes "Lessons in Navaho - 3 typescript notebooks (holograph notes by Fr. Bernard and E. Sapir); 2 typescript versions of same subject, different from the above; holograph fragments. 'Translation of Lessons in Navajo for Mr. Sandoval', by I. Reade, 1936. . . ." and that Box 27 contains "'An Introduction to Navaho by Fr. Bernard and E. Sapir', holograph ms. by Sapir, and typescript (original). . . ." These materials still need to be examined.



Reception following keynote address, left to right: Ives Goddard, Hansjakob Seiler, Margaret Langdon

## *Sapir's Comparative Method*

IVES GODDARD

*Smithsonian Institution*

The distant genetic relationships among North American Indian languages proposed and codified by Edward Sapir have had a profound impact. The linguistic classification which he presented in his base-line *Encyclopaedia Britannica* article (Sapir 1929), and in the earlier studies on which this is in part based, has dominated general treatments of the subject for over half a century, even in discussions that take issue with it. The general procedures that he used in demonstrating proposed relationships, and even to some extent his format for presentation, are still predominant today in articles claiming to elucidate distant connections between American Indian languages. Yet despite the importance of this work, critical discussion of it has been incomplete. The classification has been discussed almost entirely by attempting to redo the work using better recordings of the languages, almost never in the mode of Levine's (1979) study of Haida by critically examining the specific claims and proposals made by Sapir. The methodology used never seems to be discussed and defended as a totality, even by Sapir himself, though to be sure some aspects of it have received repeated attention.

One of the difficulties faced in critically evaluating Sapir's comparative linguistic methodology is the problem of judging the correctness of the method separately from the correctness of the claimed relationships. For example, Sapir's paper on "The Hokan Affinity of Subtiaba in Nicaragua" (Sapir 1925) has been considered by many to be his supreme achievement of this type, but the strongly supported claims of an Otomanguanean affinity for Subtiaba (Rensch 1977, Campbell and Kaufman 1980) seriously complicate belief in the Hokan