

## BLACKFOOT NOTES.

1. *Potentialis of the principal sentence.* The affirmative potentialis of the principal sentence is formed in Blackfoot by prefixing *axk-stai-* (*axk-stau-*, *axk-st-*) to the suppositional potentialis, which is derived from the indicative by means of the suffix *-opi* (*-topi*). In the negative conjugation the negation *-sai-* (*-sau-*) is inserted between *axk-stai-* and the root. E. g. *náxkstaisikstakixtopi* 'I would bite', *náxkstaisausikstakixtopi* 'I would not bite'. For further details and complete paradigm see my paper "Some General Aspects of Blackfoot Morphology" (VKAWA. XIV, No. 5), p. 47 sq. and p. 54 sq., where I have used the too much restricted term "irrealis" instead of "potentialis". Indeed, English constructions of the type 'would — if' are considered by the Indians themselves as equivalents of their own potentialis with *axk-stai-*. But *-stai-* itself means 'not', e. g. *náxkstaisikstakisi* 'that I may not bite' (see about the strictly limited use of this negative prefix op. cit., p. 41). How is it possible then, that the potentialis with *axk-stai-* is affirmative? It is very easy to answer this question. The proper meaning of, e. g., *náxkstaisikstakixtopi* is '(how is it possible) that I would not bite'. This is a rhetorical way of expressing the idea 'I would bite.' The Blackfoot Indians like to use rhetorical phrases. Cf., e. g., the emphatical use of pronominal verbs as *ánniáie*, *ánnimáie*, and others; or the emphatical use of relative suffixes (see my paper „Het emphatisch gebruik van relatief-pronominale uitgangen in het Blackfoot" in P. W. Schmidt-Festschrift, p. 148 sqq.). Similar emphatical constructions are known from many other American Indian languages.

2. *Additional corrigenda to "A Blackfoot-English Vocabulary"* (VKAWA. XXXIII, No. 2).

P. 40, l. 2. Add: *annyáie náxkstanistotoauopi* *I would treat him in this way.*

P. 55, l. 23. The text has *nitsítapokoxpatsko*. Probably a case of haplogy, for we should expect *-skoko* instead of *-sko*.

P. 61, l. 26 sq. The form *minapátsapit* does not belong here (v. *apat-* and *apatsápi-*).

P. 72, l. 10 from beneath. After *áxkoxtsitokopskai* add: (this is the correct form; the texts have *áxkoxtsitokopstai* with *t* misheard for *k*).

P. 98, l. 5. Read: *áioχtoχkoχsópiks* (instead of: *áioχtoχsópiks*).

P. 156, l. 20. Add: *notsámmokân* *my hat*, *otsámmokâni* *his hat*.

P. 202. After l. 20 insert: *ksískstákisíni omi* *okósi* *that child of hers was a little beaver*.

P. 219, l. 25. Read: *matómotapótsists*.

P. 223, l. 2 from beneath. Read: *aápani* (instead of *áapani*).

P. 286. After l. 5 insert: *ó'msi* (*ómsi*) v. *ní'msa*.

P. 312, l. 2 from beneath. Read: *Pinotúyís-tsámmokâni*.

P. 337, l. 19 from beneath. Read: *sauumáí-saskápis*.

P. 363, l. 19 from beneath. Read: *áxkstámi-spumáuoop*.

P. 364, l. 13 and 12 from beneath are to be deleted. The form *sekunákstatsiauaie* *they continually wanted (the gambling-wheel) (to stop rolling)* belongs sub *ista-* *to think*.

P. 372. After l. 23 insert: *-tsámmokân* v. *istsámmokân*.

Amersfoort.

C. C. Uhlenbeck.