

The "river" today like a mill race ^{at flood tide} you would understand why I balk at the "river" idea and cling to the tic-tuck-teK8 root as its key - a tidal stream. I know of none like it in Maine, but I suppose there are many. I begin at Piscataqua ^(rising in sheepscot), then Saco, Royal River (No. Yarm.) - Kennebec, Penobscot - real rivers of varying sizes, but fresh and most of them blocked by falls. The Presumpscot at or near Portland, has falls - the Fore "River" (Portland) is a short tidal "River" and so is the Nonesuch "River" in Scarborough. I maintain the difference is vital. If it isn't, then the Indian would not know why an arrow was not a bullet. If one of them saw water running up hill to the source and called it a "river" - he was lacking in the use of his mother tongue. Has the saltish water no significance in their nomenclature? It isn't potable water as you can understand.

As to Pemaquid and Machigonne - they have no present urge. I brought them up in an apropos spirit, as related to the whole question of applied Abenaki nomenclature. Of course my present problem is Agnam-n-tick-us. I shall "lay hold" of Pemaquid as you set it out and consider it in connection with Krombeza. When I get through with my York book - I digress to say that I shall see that you have a copy with the "author's compliments" - I want to do something with my old friend Krombeza. There is one suggestive point ~~within~~ in its bibliography which I hope may be run to earth. As I recall it, the traveler Ingraham who visited "it" about 1570(?) figured in some litigation about his trip or his vessel, according to Kendall. If so there might be a chancery or admiralty suit in London. I got my Popham documents out of the High Court of Admiralty and that bloomin' court