




DUKE  
UNIVERSITY



LIBRARY





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2015



I.

---

A

SYNOPSIS

OF THE INDIAN TRIBES

WITHIN THE

UNITED STATES EAST OF THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS,

AND

IN THE BRITISH AND RUSSIAN POSSESSIONS

IN

NORTH AMERICA.

BY THE HON. ALBERT GALLATIN.



## PREFATORY LETTER.

---

*New York, 29th January, 1836.*

SIR,

I have the honor to enclose the residue of the Synopsis of the Indian Tribes of North America, classed in families according to their respective languages.

My first attempt was made in the year 1823, at the request of a distinguished friend, Baron Alexander Humboldt. It was that essay, communicated it seems to Mr. Balbi, and quoted by him with more praise than it deserved, in the Introduction to his "Atlas Ethnographique," which drew the attention of the Antiquarian Society, and induced it to ask me for a copy. I had not kept any, but had in the mean while collected and obtained access to many important materials. In the winter of 1825-6, the attendance at Washington of a numerous delegation of southern Indians enabled me to obtain good vocabularies of the Muskogee, Uchee, Natchez, Chicasa, and Cherokee; and I then published a table of all the existing tribes in the United States, which, in its arrangement, does not differ materially from that now adopted. The War Department circulated at the same time, at my request, printed forms of a vocabulary containing six hundred words, of verbal forms, and of selected sentences; and also a series of grammatical queries. The only communication, received in answer to those queries, is that of the Rev. Mr. Worcester respecting the Cherokee, which is inserted in the Appendix. The verbal forms and select sentences in that language, the verbal forms of the Muskogee, Chocta, and Caddo, and the copious supplementary vocabularies in the same tongues, and in the Mohawk and Seneca, were also received in answer; and that of the Chippeway, by Dr. James, (Appendix to Tanner's account,) is partly on the same model.

I believe that I have, in every instance, stated to whom I was indebted for every communication of which any use was made, and pointed out the authority where recourse was had to works already published. I received most liberal assistance from every quarter where I made application. The libraries of the Philosophical Society of Philadelphia, and

of the Historical Societies of New York and of Massachusetts, were opened to me at all times, and their books and manuscripts communicated without reserve. The War Department, both formerly and lately, communicated the materials in its possession; and I am indebted to many individuals, but especially to Mr. Du Ponceau, who, in the most liberal and friendly manner, put his valuable collection of manuscript vocabularies at my disposal, and gave me every information which he thought might be of any use to me.

The form of a comparative vocabulary was adopted as far as practicable; and, in preparing it, every source of information, whether in manuscript or in works already published, was resorted to. The selection of the words was necessarily controlled by the materials. Those and no others could be admitted, but such as were found in a number of the existing vocabularies, sufficient for the purpose intended. Some words of inferior importance were introduced, only because they were common to almost all the vocabularies; and many have been omitted, because they were to be found only for a few dialects. This will account for the absence of abstract nouns, prepositions, &c., in the Comparative Vocabulary. The deficiency is partly supplied for the Southern and for the Iroquois tribes, by the Supplementary Vocabulary. Although the number of words in the comparative vocabulary (No. I.), which embraces fifty-three tribes, was reduced to one hundred and eighty, less than one-half of that number could be obtained for some of the languages. A lesser vocabulary (No. II.) of fifty-three words includes sixteen tribes. About the same number of words has been supplied by Umfreville, for four tribes, (No. III.) The miscellaneous vocabularies (No. IV.) include seventeen, whose scanty vocabularies could not be arranged in the same form. Of the ninety languages or dialects of which specimens are thus given, I think that nine (marked  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ ) are duplicates, or only varieties.

The Synopsis was originally intended to embrace all the tribes north of the semi-civilized Mexican nations. The want of materials soon confined the inquiry, towards the south, to the territory of the United States. The loss of the vocabularies collected by Lewis and Clarke has not been supplied. With the exception of the Salish, and of a few words of the Shoshonee and of the Chinook, we have as yet no knowledge of the Indian languages west of the Stony Mountains, within the United States.

The only existing tribe in the United States, east of the Mississippi, of which the language has not been ascertained, is that of the Alibamons and Coosadas, consisting of five or six hundred souls, seated on the waters of the river Alabama, and who make part of the Creek con-

federacy. West of the Mississippi, and on or south of the Red river, fragments remain, in Louisiana, of ten or twelve tribes, amounting together to about fifteen hundred souls. The vocabularies of four of these have been obtained. Each speaks a distinct language; and it is probable, that this is the case with some of the others. We are unacquainted with the languages of three tribes, (the Kaskaias, Kiawas, and Bald Heads,) estimated at three thousand souls, who wander between the upper waters of the Red river of the Mississippi, and those of the river Platte of the Missouri; and we have as yet but specimens of the languages of the Black Feet, of the Fall or Rapid Indians, and of the Crows. In other respects, the Synopsis of the Indians within the United States, east of the Stony Mountains, is nearly as complete as could have been expected, and embraces some tribes altogether or nearly extinct.

North of the United States, all or nearly all the families of languages are known; but the subdivision into languages or dialects of the same family is incomplete. The inland districts of Russian America have not been explored; and I must acknowledge some deficiency on my part, in not having investigated all the existing materials, respecting the various languages of the tribes which inhabit the seacoast and adjacent islands, from Nootka to Prince William's Sound.

The eighty-one tribes (excluding the nine duplicates), embraced by the Synopsis, have been divided into twenty-eight families.\* A single glance at the annexed Map will show, that, excluding the country west of the Stony Mountains and south of the fifty-second degree of north latitude, almost the whole of the territory contained in the United States and in British and Russian America is or was occupied by only eight great families, each speaking a distinct language, subdivided, in most instances, into a number of languages or dialects belonging to the same stock. These are the Eskimaux, the Athapascas (or Cheppeyans), the Black Feet, the Sioux, the Algonkin-Lenape, the Iroquois, the Cherokee, and the Mobilian or Chahta-Muskhog. I believe the Muskhogee, which is the prevailing language of the Creek confederacy, and the Chocta or Chicasa, to belong to the same family, although, in conformity with general usage, they have been arranged under two distinct heads. This would reduce the number of families to twenty-seven. Of

---

\* The Woccons, an extinct tribe, distinguished in the vocabulary as the XIXth family, have, since that was prepared for the press, been ascertained to have belonged to the Catawba family, No. VII. The eight great families embrace sixty-one of the distinct languages. Excluding the extinct Woccons, the nineteen other families have each but one ascertained language or dialect.

the nineteen others, ten are west of the Stony Mountains; and seven of these inhabit, south of the sixtieth degree of north latitude, the islands and the narrow tract of land contained between the Pacific Ocean and the continuation of the Californian chain of mountains, as far south as the forty-seventh degree of north latitude. Six of the remaining nine families, the probable remnants of ancient nations, are found amongst the southern tribes, either annexed to the Creek confederacy, or in the swamps of West Louisiana. The three others are the Catawbas, the Pawnees, and the Fall or Rapid Indians. Some new families, or totally distinct languages, will hereafter be found in the quarters already indicated: West Louisiana, the wandering tribes on the upper waters of the Arkansas and of the Missouri, and west of the Stony Mountains, in the territory drained by the Columbia river. Many distinct languages or dialects of the Eskimaux, of the Athapascas, and of some of the other great families, will be added to the present enumeration. But I believe that the classification now submitted will, as far as it goes, be found correct. I feel some confidence, that I have not been deceived by false etymologies; and that the errors, which may be discovered by further researches, will be found to consist in having considered as distinct families some which belong to the same stock, and not in having arranged as belonging to the same family any radically distinct languages forming separate families. The only exceptions, in that respect, refer to the Minctare group and the Shyennes, both stated as being Sioux, and to the Sussees, annexed to the Athapascas, in regard to whom the evidence is not conclusive.

It must, however, be understood, that the expression "family," applied to the Indian languages, has been taken in its most extensive sense, and as embracing all those which contained a number of similar primitive words, sufficient to show that they must, at some remote epoch, have had a common origin. It is not used in that limited sense in which we designate the Italian, Spanish, and French as languages of the Latin stock, or the German, Scandinavian, Netherlandish, and English as branches of the Teutonic; but in the same way as we consider the Slavonic, the Teutonic, the Latin and Greek, the Sanscrit, and, as I am informed, the ancient Persian, as retaining in their vocabularies conclusive proofs of their having originally sprung from the same stock.

Another important observation relates to the great difference in the orthography of those who have collected vocabularies. Those which proceed from the native language of the writer, may be reconciled without much difficulty; and it is almost sufficient, in that respect, to note whether he was an Englishman, a German, a Frenchman, &c. But the guttural sounds which abound in all the Indian languages, and even



some of their nasal vowels, have no equivalent, and cannot be expressed with our characters, as used by the French or English. The perpetual substitution for each other of *permutable* consonants, the numerous modifications of which vocal sounds are susceptible, and the various ways in which we express them, even in our own languages, have been fruitful sources of the diversified manner in which the same word is spelled by the European hearers. It requires some practice before you learn how to decipher those varieties. The habit is, however, acquired by comparing together the several vocabularies of the same language, and of two or more dialects previously ascertained to be only varieties of the same tongue. It is proper here to add, that there are nations known by a generic name, but spread over an extensive territory, without being united under a common government, such as the Knistinaux and the Chippeways; of whom it may be said that they have, properly speaking, no general uniform language, but, as might be naturally expected, a number of *patois*, differing in some respects from each other, but still so nearly allied, that they are mutually understood without interpreters. Whenever this is the case, we consider them as the same dialect.

The number of families, of distinct languages, and of dialects, does not appear to be greater in North America, than is found amongst uncivilized nations in other quarters of the globe, or than might have been expected to grow out of the necessity for nations in the hunter state to separate, and gradually to form independent communities. Insulated remnants of ancient languages are also found, not only in Asia, as in the Caucasian mountains, but even in Europe, such as the Basque. The difficulty of accounting for that diversity, is the same here as in the other continent; and there is nothing that I can perceive, in the number of the American languages and in the great differences between them, inconsistent with the Mosaic chronology.

Amidst that great diversity of American languages, considered only in reference to their vocabularies, the similarity of their structure and grammatical forms has been observed and pointed out by the American philologists. The substance of our knowledge in that respect will be found in a condensed form in the Appendix. The result appears to confirm the opinions already entertained on that subject by Mr. Du Ponceau, Mr. Pickering, and others; and to prove that all the languages, not only of our own Indians, but of the native inhabitants of America from the Arctic Ocean to Cape Horn,\* have, as far as they have been

---

\* The grammar of the language of Chili is the only one, foreign to the immediate object of the Synopsis, with which a comparison has been introduced in this essay. Want of space did not permit to extend the inquiry to the languages of Mexico and other parts of Spanish America.

investigated, a distinct character common to all, and apparently differing from any of those of the other continent, with which we are most familiar. It is not, however, asserted that there may not be some American languages, differing in their structure from those already known; or that a similarity of character may not be discovered between the grammatical forms of the languages of America, and those of some of the languages of the other hemisphere. The conjectures lately advanced concerning the Othomi deserve and require further investigation; for it seems to be admitted, that, however different in other respects, its conjugations have the same character as those of the other languages of Mexico.

Although the materials already collected appear sufficient to justify the general inference of a similar character, they are as yet too scanty to enable us to point out, with precision, those features which are common to all the American languages, and those particulars in which they differ; or even to deduce, in those best known to us, the rules of their grammar from the languages, such as they are spoken. I have tried to show how far those points of similarity and differences were as yet ascertained, and have also, for one particular branch, attempted to deduce the rules of formation; or, in other words, to show, that, notwithstanding the apparent complexness and multiplicity of the inflexions of the Indian languages, they were, as in others, always regulated by analogy and modified by euphony. This branch of the subject is contained in the last section of the Introductory Essay, and in the Tables of Transitions now transmitted. I believe, that, with more ample materials and in abler hands, the inquiry might throw some light on the formation and philosophy of languages. Though far from being a competent judge, those of America seem to me to bear the impress of primitive languages, to have assumed their form from natural causes, and to afford no proof of their being derived from a nation in a more advanced state of civilization than our Indians. Whilst the unity of structure and of grammatical forms proves a common origin, it may be inferred from this, combined with the great diversity and entire difference in the words of the several languages of America, that this continent received its first inhabitants at a very remote epoch, probably not much posterior to that of the dispersion of mankind.

We are, however, left to most uncertain conjectures, not only in that respect, but in regard to every thing concerning our Indians prior to their first and recent intercourse with the Europeans. They had no means of preserving and transmitting the memory of past events. No reliance can be placed on their vague and fabulous traditions. They cannot even give an account of the ancient monuments, found in the valley of the Mississippi and of its tributary streams. The want of

documents elucidating the past history of tribes still in the hunter state, cannot be a matter of much regret. That of the commencement and progress of civilization in Mexico, and in some portions of South America, would, if recoverable, be highly interesting. I rather incline to the opinion, that that civilization grew out of natural causes, and is entirely of American origin.

In the brief notices of our Indian tribes, contained in the first five sections of the Introductory Essay, I have, for the reasons above stated, confined myself to the events subsequent to the first arrival of the European invaders. The authorities are always referred to. The "Relations de la Nouvelle France," often quoted, are the collection of the original annual reports of the Jesuits in Canada, to their superiors in Europe, from the year 1633 to 1672, when they were superseded by the "Lettres Edifiantes." They have afforded to Charlevoix the principal materials for the corresponding portion of his valuable and faithful account of the Indians; but he had not exhausted all the information they contain. The Map annexed to the Essay shows, on a very small scale, the seats of the Indians at the time when first discovered; that is to say, at the beginning of the seventeenth century for the Atlantic states, and to the westward generally, at the end of the eighteenth.

It did not come within the scope of this Essay to delineate the habits and characteristics which distinguish the Indian race. Ample details will be found in the writings of the earliest English and French, and of the latest American and English travellers. I have only adverted to some peculiarities which appeared to deserve attention, and more especially to the means of subsistence of the Indians, to the causes of their gradual extinction, and to the only means by which, as it seems to me, the residue can be preserved. Notwithstanding the reckless cruelty and ravages of the first Spanish conquerors, the descendants of the native Mexicans are at present probably as numerous as their ancestors at the time of the conquest. For this no other cause seems assignable than the fact, that they had then already emerged from the hunter state, and had acquired the habits of agricultural and mechanic labor.

I submit the whole to the judgment of the Antiquarian Society, and have the honor to be respectfully, Sir,

Your very obedient servant,

ALBERT GALLATIN.

To GEORGE FOLSOM, Esq.,

*of the Publishing Committee*

*of the American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Mass.*

P. S. The deficiency in the enumeration of the Indian tribes bordering on the Pacific, between the sixtieth and forty-eighth degrees of lati-

tude, has been alluded to. The vocabularies of Mr. Sturgis and of Mr. Bryant were received after the others had been prepared for the press, and the account of the Rev. Mr. Green had escaped my notice. In order to connect these with my general table, it must be observed that, of the four families enumerated by those gentlemen, Capt. Bryant's Sitka is identic with the Koulishen (xxvii. 62); that the Skiddegat, which was supplied by Messrs. Sturgis and Bryant, is designated in the table as Queen Charlotte's Island (xxix. 64); that the guttural Nass language, mentioned by Mr. Green as spoken between King George III.'s and Queen Charlotte's Islands, was unknown to me, and is omitted in the table; and that the Newittee of Capt. Bryant, appears to me to be a dialect of the Wakash, (xxv. 60,) or language of Nootka Sound.

## INTRODUCTORY ESSAY.

---

THE Indian Nations, partly on account of their geographical position, partly in reference to the materials which have been obtained, will be arranged under the following heads, viz.

1. Those who are altogether north of the United States, but not including those families which are partly in the British Possessions and partly in the United States.

2. The Algonkin-Lenape and Iroquois Nations.

3. The Southern Indians east of the Mississippi, and those on the western side of that river south of the Arkansas.

4. The tribes between the Mississippi and the Pacific Ocean. But of those west of the Rocky Mountains an imperfect general notice only can be given, as I have been disappointed in the expectation of obtaining vocabularies or recent correct information from that quarter.

---

### SECTION I.

#### INDIAN TRIBES NORTH OF THE UNITED STATES.

THESE embrace only the two great families of the Eskimaux and of the Athapascas, and some small tribes, bordering on the Pacific Ocean, and situated north of the 52d degree of north latitude.

#### ESKIMAUX.

The name of Eskimaux, given to the Indians of this family, is derived from the Algonkin word "Eskimantick," "Eaters of raw fish." They are the sole native inhabitants of the shores of all the seas, bays, inlets, and islands of America, north of the sixtieth degree of north latitude, from the eastern coast of Greenland, in longitude 21°, to the Straits of Behring, in longitude 167° west.

On the Atlantic, the eastern Eskimaux extend also along the coast of Labrador, south of the sixtieth degree of latitude, to the Straits of Belleisle and within the Gulf of Saint Lawrence, almost as far south as north latitude  $50^{\circ}$ .

The western division of the nation extends without interruption, along the shores of the Pacific, from the Straits of Behring, as far south as the extremity of the Peninsula of Alaska, in north latitude  $57^{\circ}$ ; and may be thence traced eastwardly, under the names of Konagen and Tshugazzi (*Tchougatches*), till they disappear entirely in the vicinity of Behring's Bay and Mount St. Elias, in lat.  $60^{\circ}$ , and long. about  $140^{\circ}$ . A tribe belonging to this division, inhabits the western shores of the Straits of Behring, or that north eastern extremity of Asia, which lies north of the river Anadir. It is known under the name of "sedentary Tchuktchi," and is as yet the only well ascertained instance of an Asiatic tribe, belonging to the same race as any of the nations of North America.

The identity of language, along such an extent of coast, contrasted with the great diversity found amongst small and adjacent tribes as we proceed farther south, is a remarkable phenomenon. The distance in a straight line, either from the Eskimaux seen by Captain Clavering on the eastern coast of Greenland, or from the Straits of Belleisle, to the Straits of Behring, or to the southwestern extremity of the Peninsula of Alaska, exceeds three thousand six hundred miles. But as the Eskimaux communicate with each other only by water and along the seashore, it will be found that the distance, between those of the Straits of Belleisle, and the Konagen who inhabit the island of Kadjak, or Kodiak, (north latitude  $58^{\circ}$ , west longitude  $152^{\circ}$ ;) proceeding along the seashore, is not less than five thousand four hundred miles, without making any allowance for the sinuosities, bays, and inlets of the coast.

But the Eskimaux, who, though they hunt during their short summer, draw their principal means of subsistence from the sea, are rarely found farther from its shores than about one hundred miles. On Mackenzie's River, the mouth of which is in latitude  $69^{\circ} 40'$ , the boundary between them and the Loucheux, their next inland neighbours, is in latitude  $67^{\circ} 27''$ , but no Eskimaux huts are found south of  $68^{\circ} 15''$ ; and their distance from the sea is still less on the Copper Mine River. They thus form a narrow belt surrounding the whole northern coast of America, from the 50th degree of north latitude on the Atlantic to the 60th on the Pacific.



The dividing line between the eastern and western Eskimaux has been ascertained with considerable precision by Captain Franklin. It is found, on the Arctic Ocean, at the northern termination of the Rocky or Stony Mountains, in about  $140^{\circ}$  of west longitude, where the western resort annually, for the purpose of bartering with the eastern Eskimaux iron tools and other articles of Russian manufacture, for seal skins, oil, and furs. That intercourse is of recent date, and the western speak a dialect so different from that of the eastern, that at first they had great difficulty in understanding each other. The dialects of the several tribes of the western division, though obviously belonging to the same stock, differ also more from each other than those of the eastern Eskimaux. The *actual* identity of *dialect* amongst these, and between very distant tribes which have no communication together, is astonishing. Augustus, a Hudson-Bay Eskimaux, of the vicinity of Churchill, (latitude  $59^{\circ}$ , longitude  $95^{\circ}$ ), who was the interpreter of Captain Franklin, could converse with all the Eskimaux met with during his two expeditions. Of those found west of Mackenzie's River in  $137\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$  west longitude, Captain Franklin observes, that "their habits were similar in every respect to those of the tribes described by Captain Parry," (north parts of Hudson's Bay,) "and their dialects differed so little from that used by Augustus, that he had no difficulty in understanding them." The distance, in that case was in a straight line twelve hundred miles, and more than twenty-five hundred around the seashore.

As now informed, we may distinguish at least three dialects or languages amongst those eastern Eskimaux, viz. 1. that of the inhabitants of the northern and western shores of Hudson's Bay, which dialect extends westwardly beyond Mackenzie's River, as has been just now stated; 2. that of Greenland, respecting which it must be observed, that the inhabitants of the western have no intercourse with those lately discovered on the eastern coast, and that these may have a different dialect; 3. that of the coast of Labrador, to which it is not improbable that the language of the Eskimaux of Hudson's Straits may be nearly allied.

Captain Parry's vocabulary, taken at Winter Island in latitude  $67$ , is the most recent, complete, and authentic we have of the language of the Eskimaux of Hudson's Bay, and has accordingly been selected in preference to those of Dobbs and of John Long.

Not having had access to Egede's Grammar and Dictionary of the Greenlandish Language, a specimen only could be given, taken from his and from Crantz's accounts of Greenland. There is not, it is believed, any extant vocabulary of the dialect of the western coast of Labrador. It differs so far from that of Greenland, that the Moravian missionaries were obliged to make a new translation of the Gospels for the use of the Labrador Eskimaux, that previously made for those of Greenland not being sufficiently intelligible to the other tribe. An examination of both has however enabled the learned authors of the "Mithridates" to ascertain the great affinity of the two dialects, in reference both to words and to grammatical forms.

Iceland was discovered and settled by the Norwegians in the latter end of the ninth century. I was informed by Mr. Thorkelson, a learned native of Iceland, and Librarian of the Royal Library of Copenhagen, that it appeared by ancient manuscript Icelandic chronicles, that the island was found already inhabited by a barbarous race, which was exterminated by the invaders. Whether they were Eskimaux cannot be ascertained, Had they been of Norman origin, they would have probably been preserved.

Greenland was discovered by the Norwegians or Icelanders, about one hundred years later than Iceland. Fur colonies were planted shortly after on the eastern and western coast, with which an intercourse was continued, both from Iceland and Norway, till the beginning of the fifteenth century, when it ceased, from causes which have been but imperfectly explained. Unsuccessful attempts were several times made to renew it, and the eastern coast was found inaccessible from the permanent and enormous accumulation of ice on its shores. It was only in 1721, that the Danish government sent a new colony to West Greenland. The ruins of the ancient settlement, but no traces of the descendants of the first colonists, were found. The country was then altogether occupied by Eskimaux, of whom, or any other native inhabitants, no very distinct account is given in the ancient relations.\* The southern part of the eastern coast continues to be blocked up by ice. But Captain Scoresby was able in 1822 to approach its northern part from about 69° to 73° of north latitude; and

---

\* If the account, that the Europeans were for the first time assailed by the nations in the year 1386, is correct, it seems to indicate, that the progress of the Eskimaux, in that quarter, was from west to east,

Captain Clavering, the ensuing year, met with a tribe of Eskimaux in about  $74^{\circ}$  of north latitude. It appears almost incredible that they should have reached that spot, either by a land journey of eight hundred miles across Greenland, or the same distance along the frozen and inaccessible shores between Cape Farewell and the open sea in  $69^{\circ}$  of latitude. It is much more probable that, at a former period, the southern part of the eastern coast was free of ice, in which case we need not resort to the hypothesis, which places the old colony of East Greenland west of Cape Farewell.

In the year 1001, an Icelander, driven by a storm, discovered land far southwest of Cape Farewell, where a colony was soon after sent from Greenland. The country was called Vinland; and, if we can rely on the assertion, that the sun remained eight hours visible during the shortest day of the year, must have been Newfoundland. There, positive mention is made of Indians, who from the description and the name of Skroellings, or dwarfs, given to them by the Normans, must have been Eskimaux.

No mention is made of this European colony after the year 1121, when a bishop is said to have sailed from Greenland to Vinland. But it seems that, to a very late date, there existed in Newfoundland another race of Indians, extremely intractable, seen occasionally on the eastern seashore at the Bay Des Exploits, but residing, as was supposed, in the interior part of the island. These are said to be now extinct; and it is not known, whether any vocabulary of their language, which might indicate their origin, has ever been obtained.

Whatever may have been the origin of the Eskimaux, it would seem probable that the small tribe of the present Sedentary Tchuktchi on the eastern extremity of Asia, is a colony of the Western American Eskimaux. The language does not extend in Asia beyond that tribe. That of their immediate neighbours, the "Reindeer" or "Wandering Tchuktchi," is totally different, and belongs to the Kouriak family.

The vocabulary of the western American Eskimaux which has been selected, is that of Kotzebue's Sound immediately north of Behring's Straits, taken by Captain Beechy. That of the Tchuktchi, extracted from Krusenstern, was taken by Koscheloff; and a specimen has been added of the language of the island of Kadjak opposite to the Peninsula of Alaska, extracted from Klapproth's "Asia Polyglotta."

There does not seem to be any solid foundation for the opinion of those who would ascribe to the Eskimaux an origin different from that of the other Indians of North America. The color and features are essentially the same; and the differences which may exist, particularly that in stature, may be easily accounted for by the rigor of the climate, and partly perhaps by the nature of their food. The entire similarity of the structure and grammatical forms of their language with those of various Indian tribes, however different in their vocabularies, which will hereafter be adverted to, affords an almost conclusive proof of their belonging to the same family of mankind.

#### KINAI, KOLUSCHEN, AND OTHER TRIBES ON THE PACIFIC.

Two tribes are found, on the Pacific Ocean, whose kindred languages, though exhibiting some affinities both with that of the Western Eskimaux and with that of the Athapascas, we shall, for the present, consider as forming a distinct family. They are the Kinai, in and near Cook's Inlet or River, and the Ugaljachmutzi (*Ougalachmioutsy*) of Prince William's Sound. The Tshugazzi, who inhabit the country between those two tribes, are Eskimaux and speak a dialect nearly the same with that of the Konagen of Kadjak Island. The vocabulary of the Kinai was taken by Resanoff, and is extracted from Krusenstern.

From Mount St. Elias in about 60°, to Fuca's Straits in about 48° north latitude, several tribes are found, both on the main and on the numerous adjacent islands, apparently in some respects superior to the more southern tribes along the shores of the Pacific Ocean; and whose languages offer some remote analogies with that of the Mexican. Although similar affinities have been observed even in the dialect of the Ugaljachmutzi already mentioned, these observations apply more specially to the Koluschen, (the same with the Tshinkitani of Captain Marchand,) who inhabit the islands and the adjacent coast from the sixtieth to the fifty-fifth degree of north latitude. Those best known to the Europeans, are the natives of King George the Third's Islands, called "Sitka" by the Russians. The influence of their language has been said to extend as far south as the southern extremity of Queen Charlotte's Island in 52° north latitude. But it is the opinion of several intelligent Americans, who have carried on a trade with the natives along

that coast, that a greater diversity of languages is found amongst them than had been presumed by earlier travellers.\*

The language of the Wakash Indians, who inhabit the island on which Nootka Sound is situated ( $49^{\circ}$  north latitude), is the one in that quarter, which, by various vocabularies, is best known to us. The appended specimen is extracted from the Narrative of J. R. Jewitt, who was among these Indians from 1803 to 1806. That of the Koluschen was taken by the Russian Davidoff. We have added the few words given by Mackenzie, of the language of the Friendly Village near the sources of Salmon River in  $53^{\circ}$  of north latitude, some of that of the inhabitants of the Straits of Fuca, taken from the Spanish Voyage of the "Sutil y Mexicana," and a short vocabulary of those on Queen Charlotte's Islands, lately supplied by the Hon. William Sturgis, of Boston.

These languages appear to belong to distinct families. But those several tribes have been introduced here, principally in reference to their geographical situation.† Bounded on the east by a range of mountains, which may be traced southwardly to California, and which, running parallel to the coast, no where recedes far from it, those seashore tribes do not extend, so far as has been ascertained, farther inland than the sources of the short rivers which empty in that quarter into the sea. They, like the Eskimaux, form a belt of about one hundred miles in breadth, which separates the Inland Indians from the seashore. We at least know with certainty, by Harmon's and Mackenzie's accounts, that the inland Athapascas extend westwardly within that distance of the Pacific Ocean.

Sir Alexander Mackenzie, in his voyage to the Pacific, after having descended the Tacoutche Tesse, or Fraser's River, which he mistook for the Columbia, as low down as  $52^{\circ} 30'$  of north latitude, ascending it again about one hundred miles, and then steering his course by land westwardly, across the chain of mountains last mentioned, arrived at the sources of Salmon River. Descending that short stream to its mouth in Fitzhugh's Sound, he reached the ocean in latitude  $52^{\circ} 20'$ . He could not collect a vocabulary of the language of the inhabitants of the seacoast, but represents it as differing from

---

\* See Appendix, — Note by the Publishing Committee.

† It is also proper to observe, that though placed on that account under this head, it is without any reference to the unsettled question respecting the boundary between the United States and Great Britain west of the Rocky Mountains.



that of the Friendly Village, situated near the source of the river and about ninety miles from its mouth. All the other tribes along the route of Mackenzie, from the Lake Athapasca, or "of the Hills," to the sources of Salmon River, belong to the Athapasca family. The southern point which he reached on the Tacoutche Tesse, is on the boundary line between the Athapascas and the *Atnahs*, another inland tribe which extends thence southwardly.

The chain of mountains nearest to the Pacific is a natural limit, which separates the inland tribes from those on the shores of that ocean. But nature had erected no such barrier between the Eskimaux, who inhabit the seacoasts of the Arctic seas, and their southern neighbours, the Athapascas. They are in a perpetual state of warfare; but neither covets the territory occupied by the other. The deeply rooted and irreconcilable habits of the two nations, derived indeed from their respective geographical positions, have rendered the boundary between them as permanent, as if it had been marked out by nature.

#### ATHAPASCAS.

If from the mouth of the Churchill or Missinipi\* River, which empties into Hudson's Bay, in latitude  $59^{\circ}$ – $60^{\circ}$ , a line be drawn, ascending that river to its source, where it is known by the name of Beaver River (latitude about  $54^{\circ}$ ), thence along the ridge, which separates the north branch of the River Saskatchewan from those of the Athapasca, or Elk River, to the Rocky Mountains, and thence westwardly till within about one hundred miles of the Pacific Ocean in latitude  $52^{\circ} 30'$ ; all the inland tribes, north of that line, and surrounded, on all the other sides, from Hudson's Bay to the Pacific, by the narrow belt inhabited by the Eskimaux and the other maritime tribes last

---

\* *Missinipi*, not to be confounded with the *Mississippi*. Both are Algonkin denominations, the first derived from *nipi*, water; the last from *sipi*, river. *Missi* never means "father," but, in several dialects, "all, whole." In Algonkin and Knistinaux, *missi ackki* and *messe aski*, "the whole earth, the world," from *achki*, *aski*, earth, (Mackenzie.) In Abenaki, *messisi*, "all, whole;" French *tout*, (Rasle.) In Delaware, *mesitscheyen*, "wholly," (Zeisberger). I think therefore the proper meaning of *Missinipi* and *Mississippi*, to be respectively, "the whole water," and "the whole river." Both designations are equally appropriate. Rivers united form the *Mississippi*. The *Missinipi* receives and collects the waters of a multitude of ponds and lakes.



described, do, so far as they are known, belong, with a single exception, to one family and speak kindred languages. I have designated them by the arbitrary denomination of Athapascas, which, derived from the original name of the lake since called "Lake of the Hills," is also that which was first given to the central part of the country they inhabit. Their southern boundary as above described is not in all its details precisely correct, and is rather that which existed eighty years ago, before encroachments had been made on their territory by the Knistinaux.

The exception alluded to is that of the "Quarrellers," or "Loucheux," a small tribe near the mouth of Mackenzie's River, immediately above the Eskimaux, whose language they generally understand, whilst their own appeared to Mackenzie and to Captain Franklin to be different from that of the adjacent Athapasca tribes. As we have no vocabulary of it, no definitive opinion can be formed of its character.

But a portion of the territory included within the boundaries we have assigned to the Athapascas remains still unexplored.

The Rocky Mountains are a continuation of the Mexican Andes. The Columbia is the only large western river, emptying into the Pacific, which, as well as its numerous tributaries, has its source in that chain. Between the 35th and 40th degrees of north latitude, the distance from the mountains to the sea may not be less than nine hundred miles. Their course being west of north, they gradually approach the shores, from which they are not farther than four hundred miles in the latitude of  $57^{\circ}$ – $58^{\circ}$ . The coast thence recedes westwardly, whilst the chain continuing its course northwardly, terminates west of Mackenzie's River, within a very short distance of the Arctic Ocean. No part of the inland country west of the Rocky Mountains and north of the 59th or 60th degree of latitude, has as yet been explored; or at least no account of it has ever been published; and it is only from analogy, and because the whole of the extensive territory above described, which has been explored, is inhabited by Indians of the Athapasca family, that it is presumed, that this will also be found to be the case with the Indians of the portion not yet explored.

The most easterly Athapasca tribe, which extends to Hudson's Bay, has received from the agents of the Company of that name the appellation of Northern Indians, as contradistinguished from the eastern Knistinaux, who inhabit the country south

of the Missinipi or Churchill River. It was under the guidance of those Indians, and without a single white attendant, that Hearne reached in July, 1771, the Arctic Ocean, at the mouth of the Coppermine River. Having no other instrument but an old quadrant, and having made but few observations, he placed the mouth of that river in  $120^{\circ}$  west longitude and almost  $72^{\circ}$  of north latitude. It has since been found, by the correct observations of Captain Franklin, to lie in  $115^{\circ} 37'$  west longitude and in latitude  $67^{\circ} 48'$ . Notwithstanding this enormous difference, full justice has been rendered to the correctness, in other respects, of his relation. All his distances are indeed apparently estimated from the fatigues of the journey and must be reduced. He wintered on his return on the Lake Athapasca, and he describes the country of the Northern Indians, as bounded on the south by Churchill River, on the north by the Coppermine and Dog-rib Indians, on the west by the Athapasca country, and extending five hundred miles from east to west. It is evident that a part of Mackenzie's Cheppeyans is included within that description. Hearne regrets (Preface) the loss of a voluminous vocabulary collected by him of the language of the Northern Indians. But, from the words scattered through his relation, it appears clearly to be the same with that of the Cheppeyans; and he states (June, 1771,) that the Coppermine and the Northern Indians are but one people, and that their language differs less than that of provinces of England adjacent to each other. The Cheppeyans generally trade at and are seen in the vicinity of the Lake Athapasca. According to Mackenzie, they consider the country between the parallels of latitude  $60^{\circ}$  and  $65^{\circ}$  and longitude  $100^{\circ}$  to  $110^{\circ}$  west, as their lands or home. It consists almost entirely of barrens, destitute of trees; and they are obliged to winter in the adjacent woods and in the vicinity of lakes. Though the most numerous tribe of that family, the highest estimate of their population is eight hundred men. They call themselves, according to Captain Franklin, *Saw-essaw-dinnch*, "Rising-sun Men"; and their hunting-grounds extend towards the south to the Lake Athapasca and to the River Churchill. The vocabulary of their language by Mackenzie is the only one we have of any of the Indian tribes of that family east of the Rocky Mountains. The geographical situation and the names of the other tribes are given either by Mackenzie or by Captain Franklin, or by both. But they are all expressly

said to speak dialects of the same language with that of the Cheppeyans.

The tribes thus enumerated east of the Rocky Mountains are; north of the Cheppeyans and east of Mackenzie's River, the Coppermine Indians, who call themselves *Tantsawhot dinneh*, "Birch-rind Men," living formerly on the south side of the great Slave Lake, but now north of it on Knife River, one hundred and ninety souls; and west of them the *Thlingeha dinneh*, or "Dog-rib" Indians, sometimes also called "Slaves," a name properly meaning "strangers," and which has been given by the Knistinaux to several tribes which they drove farther north, or west. Population two hundred hunters.

On Mackenzie's River, below the great Slave Lake are found the Strongbow, *Edchawtawoot*, or "Thick Wood," hunters, seventy; the Mountain Indians, hunters, forty; the *Ambawtawoot*, or "Sheep" Indians; and the *Kancho* or "Hare" Indians, extending towards the great Bear Lake, and adjacent, on the west, to the Dog-rib Indians. Below the Hare Indians are found the *Deegothee*, Loucheux, or Quarrellers, already mentioned as speaking a different language, and being adjacent to the Eskimaux. On the River Aux Liards, (Poplar River,) or south branch of Mackenzie's River, into which it empties in latitude  $62^{\circ} 30'$  —  $63^{\circ}$ , the *Nohannies*, and the *Tsillaw-awdoot* or "Brushwood" Indians, are mentioned.

On the Unjigah, Unijah, or Peace River, the Beaver and Rocky Mountain Indians; together one hundred and fifty hunters.

Near the sources of one of the branches of the Saskachawan, the Sussees or Sursees, stated by Sir A. Mackenzie to speak a dialect of the Cheppeyan language. This is corroborated by information lately received from an intelligent gentleman of the same name, who is at the head of the establishment of the Missouri American Fur Company at the mouth of the Yellow Stone River. The short vocabulary of Umfreville exhibits however but few affinities.

The Athapasca or Elk River, flowing from the south, and the Unijah or Peace River, from the west, unite their waters at the western extremity of the Lake Athapasca, and thence assume the name first of Slave, and, from the outlet of the Slave Lake, of Mackenzie's River. The River Athapasca has its source in the Rocky Mountains; and the territory lying on its waters, though formerly inhabited by Athapasca tribes, is now in the

possession of the Knistinaux, who have driven away the original inhabitants.

The Unijah, which is the principal branch, has its source west of the Rocky Mountains, through which it forces its passage. It was up that river and its southwestern branch, that Sir A. Mackenzie proceeded on his expedition to the Pacific. He found there, as has already been stated, several tribes speaking dialects belonging to the same family as that of the Cheppeyans. He designates them under several probably local names, Nauscud Dennies, Slouacus Dennies, and Nagailers, and has left a short vocabulary of the last. From Mr. Harmon, an American, who resided several years amongst those tribes, we have a recent and much more comprehensive account, as well as a vocabulary of the principal tribe, the Carriers, who call themselves "Tacullies," or "people who go upon water." He describes the country, called New Caledonia by the Northwest Fur Company, as extending, west of the Stony Mountains, three hundred and fifty miles from east to west, and from the 51st to the 58th degree of north latitude. He says that it is very mountainous, containing several lakes; that about one sixth part is covered with water; and that the whole population does not exceed five thousand souls. This must include not only all the Athapasca tribes, as far north as latitude 58°, but also part of the Atnahs.

The Tacullies appear to be seated principally on the headwaters of Fraser's River, and Mr. Harmon mentions two other nations as speaking similar dialects, the Sicaunies on the upper waters of the Unijah River, and the Nateotetains,\* who live west of the Tacullies, on a considerable river of the same name, which, according to his map, empties into the Pacific Ocean, in about latitude 53° 30'.

The similarity of language amongst all the tribes that have been enumerated under this head (the Loucheux excepted) is fully established. It does not appear to have any distinct affinities with any other than that of the Kinai. Yet we may observe that the word "men," or "people," in the Eskimaux language is - - - - - *innuit*,  
 in the Cheppeyan - - - - - *dinnic*,  
 in some of the Algonkin-Lenape dialects *inini*;  
 and that the Cheppeyan word for "woman," *chequois*, seems allied to the Lenape *squaw*.

---

\* Page 379. But this is doubtful.

## SECTION II.

## ALGONKIN-LENAPE AND IROQUOIS NATIONS.

THE Cheppeyan and other eastern Athapasca tribes are bounded on the south by Indians of the great family, called Algonkin by the French, and recently Lenape in America.

The Iroquois tribes are, on all sides but the south, bounded by the Algonkin-Lenape; and it is most convenient to describe, in the first place, the limits of the territory which was in possession of both together, at the time when the Europeans made their first settlements in that part of North America.

Those limits may be generally stated to have been :

On the north; the Missinipi River from its source to its mouth in Hudson's Bay, and thence, crossing that bay, a line extending westwardly, through Labrador, until it reaches the Eskimaux.

On the east; the Labrador Eskimaux, and, from the extreme boundary of these on the northern shores of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the Atlantic Ocean to Cape Hatteras or its vicinity; the line across the Gulf of St. Lawrence passing between Cape Breton Island and Newfoundland; although it is possible that the Micmacs, an Algonkin tribe, may have occupied the southwestern parts of the last mentioned island.

On the south; an irregular line, drawn westerly from Cape Hatteras to the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi or its vicinity; which divided the Tuscaroras, Iroquois, and various Lenape, from some extinct tribes, and from the respective territories of the Catawbas, of the Cherokees, and of the Chickasaws.

On the west; the Mississippi to its source, thence the Red River of Lake Winnipek, formerly called Lake of the Assiniboins (a Sioux tribe), down to that lake; whence the original line northwardly to the Missinipi cannot be correctly traced. The Algonkin tribes are, along the whole of this line, bounded on the west by the Sioux. But there are several exceptions to the general designation of the Mississippi as forming the boundary. This was probably formerly true, as high up as Prairie du Chien in latitude 43°. But the united Sacs and Foxes, an Algonkin nation, are now established on both sides of the Mississippi, from the River Desmoines to Prairie du Chien; whilst, above that point, the Dahcotas, the principal Sioux nation, have long



been in full possession of a portion of the country on the east side of the river, at least as high up as the 45th degree of latitude. And the Winnebagoes, another distinct Sioux tribe, were, when the French made their settlements in Canada, already established in the vicinity of Lake Michigan.

The Iroquois nations consisted of two distinct groups, both embraced within those boundaries, but which, when they were first known to the Europeans, were separated from each other by several intervening, but now extinct Lenape tribes.

The northern group or division was on all sides surrounded by Algonkin-Lenape tribes. When Jaques Cartier entered and ascended the river St. Lawrence in 1535, he found the site of Montreal, then called *Iiochegala*, occupied by an Iroquois tribe, as evidently appears by his vocabulary, an extract from which, taken from De Laet, is annexed. We have no further account till the year 1608, when Champlain founded Quebec; and the island of Montreal was then inhabited by the Algonkins. The boundaries of the Northern Iroquois appear, at that time, to have been as follows:

On the north, the height of land which separates the waters of the Ottawa River, from those which fall into Lakes Huron and Ontario and the River St. Lawrence. But the country north of the lakes was a debatable ground, on which the Iroquois had no permanent establishment, and at least one Algonquin tribe, called "Mississagues," was settled.

On the west, Lake Huron and, south of Lake Erie, a line not far from the Scioto, extending to the Ohio, which was the boundary between the Wyandots, or other now extinct Iroquois tribes, and the Miamis and Illinois.

On the east, Lake Champlain and, farther south, the Hudson River as low down as the Katskill Mountains, which separated the Mohawks from the Lenape Wappingers of Esopus.

The southern boundary cannot be accurately defined. The Five Nations were then carrying on their war of subjugation and extermination against all the Lenape tribes west of the River Delaware. Their war parties were already seen in 1608 at the mouth of the Susquehannah; and it is impossible to distinguish between what they held in consequence of recent conquests and their original limits. These did not probably extend beyond the range of mountains, which form southwestwardly the continuation of the Katskill chain. West of the Alleghany Mountains they are not known to have had any settlement south of the Ohio; though the Wyandots have left



their name to a southern tributary of that river, (the Guyandot.)

The southern division of the Iroquois, the principal nation of which was called, in Virginia, Monæans, in North Carolina, Tuscaroras, extended above the falls of the great rivers, at least as far north as James River, and southwardly at least to the river Neus. They were bounded on the east by Lenape tribes bordering on the Chesapeake and Atlantic, on the south by the Cheraws and the Catawbias, on the north and west by extinct tribes, some of the Lenape stock, others of doubtful or unknown origin.

---

#### ALGONKIN-LENAPE NATIONS.

The numerous nations and tribes, into which that large family was subdivided, may geographically, but not without some regard to the difference of languages, be arranged under four heads; Northern, Northeastern, Eastern or Atlantic, and Western.

#### NORTHERN.

Under this head are included the Knistinaux, the Algonkins and Chippeways or Ojibways, the Ottawas and the Potowotamies and the Mississaugues.

The Knistinaux, Klistinaux, Kristinaux, and, by abbreviation, Crees, are the most northern tribe of the family. Bounded on the north by the Athapascas, they now extend, in consequence of recent conquests already alluded to, from Hudson's Bay to the Rocky Mountains, though they occupy the most westerly part of that territory, on the north branch of the Saskatchewan in common with the Sioux Assiniboins. And they have also spread themselves as far north as the Lake Athapasca. On the south they are bounded by the Algonkins and Chippeways; the dividing line being generally that which separates the rivers that fall into James's Bay and the southwestern parts of Hudson's Bay, from the waters of the St. Lawrence, of the Ottawa River, of Lake Superior, and of the River Winnipeg. Near Hudson's Bay they are generally called Northern Men. According to Dr. Robertson, they call themselves, as many other Indian tribes do, "Men," "*Eithinyook*," or, "*Iniriwuk*," prefixing occasionally the name of their

special tribes. Thus the true name of the Monsonies or Swamp Indians, who inhabit Moose River, is *Mongsoa Eithyn-yook*, or, "Moosedéer men." The same author says, that the name Knistinaux was originally applied to the tribe of Lake Winnipek, called Muskegons. The name has now become generic, and the variations in the first syllable are only an instance of the frequent transmutations, amongst adjacent tribes speaking the same language, of the letters *l*, *r*, and *n*. There are, however, several varieties amongst the dialects of the Knistinaux; the natural result of an unwritten language, spoken, through a territory so extensive, by tribes independent of each other and not united by any regular alliance. Amongst these varieties are mentioned the Muskegons and the Monsonies, of whose dialects we have no vocabularies. That of Harmon is most to be relied on. His wife, as he informs us, was a native of the Snare nation, living near the Rocky Mountains. Yet, allowing for differences in orthography, it does not differ materially from that of Mackenzie's, which must have been taken from the Knistinaux who traded between Lakes Winnipek and Athapasca.

It is difficult to ascertain whether the name of Algoumekins, or Algonkins, did belong to any particular tribe, or was used as a generic appellation. At the first settlement of Canada, all the St. Lawrence Indians living below and some distance above Quebec were designated by the name of Montagnars or Montagnes. This appellation was derived from a range of hills or mountains, which, extending northwesterly from Cape Tourmente (five miles below Quebec), divides the rivers that fall above that Cape into the St. Lawrence, the Ottawa, and Lake Superior, from those, first of the Saguenay, and afterwards of Hudson's Bay. The chain, or rather height of land, intersected by many small lakes, may be traced according to Mackenzie, as far as lake Winnipek, of which it forms the eastern shore. It turns thence westwardly, and is crossed at Portage Methye, (latitude  $56^{\circ} 40'$ , longitude  $109^{\circ}$ ,) between the sources of the Missinipi and a branch of the River Athapasca, where the elevation above the sea has been roughly estimated at two thousand four hundred feet.

The great trading-place of the Montagnars was Tadoussac, at the mouth of the River Saguenay, where several inland tribes and others living lower down the St. Lawrence and speaking the same language, met annually. In the most ancient specimen we have of the Algonkin tongue, which is found at

the end of Champlain's Voyages, it is called Montagnar. The name, from the identity of language, was soon after extended to all the St. Lawrence Indians, as high up as Montreal. Those living on the Ottawa River were more specially distinguished by the name of the Algonkins; and the distinction between those two dialects, the Algonkin and the Montagnar, was kept up for some time, until the name of Algonkin prevailed.

According to Charlevoix, the Nipissings were the true Algonkins. They are called in the First Relations, Nipissiriniens, and lived on Lake Nipissing, at the head of the Portage between the Ottawa River and the waters of Lake Huron. This is confirmed by Mackenzie, who states, that the inhabitants of that lake, about the year 1790, consisted of the remainder of a numerous tribe called Nipissings of the Algonkin nation.

The difference, however, between the two dialects must have been very trifling. Father Le Jeune acknowledges, that it was with great difficulty that he learnt the Montagnar, and that he never became perfect in it. But in one of his letters, he says, "I was consoled in finding that the Nipissiriniens, the neighbours of the Hurons, understood my broken Montagnes (*mon baragoin Montagnes*). Whoever should know perfectly the language of the Quebec Indians would, I think, be understood by all the nations from Newfoundland to the Hurons."\* And in another place he says that there is no greater difference between those two dialects than between those spoken in different provinces of France. Notwithstanding the Father's modesty, it appears that he had discovered some of the principal characteristics of the language. He observes, †

First, that different verbs are used according to the subject of the action; for instance, that, instead of the verb *nimitisson* which signifies "I eat," another verb must be used if you specify the thing which you eat.

Secondly, that there is a difference in the verbs, according as the object is animated or inanimate; though they consider several things as animated which have no soul, such as tobacco, apples, &c. Thus, says he, "I see a man," *Niouapaman iriniou*; but if I say, "I see a stone," the verb is *Niouabaten*. Moreover, if the object is in the plural number, the verb must also be put in the plural; "I see men," *Niouapamonet iriniouet*. ‡

\* Relations of New France, 1636.

† Ibid. 1634.

‡ "I see them men."

Thirdly, that the verbs are also altered according to the person to whom they refer. Thus "I use a cap," *Nitaouin agouniscouchon*. But if I mean to say "I use his cap," I must instead of *nitaouin*, say *nitaouiouan*. And all these verbs have their moods, times, and persons; and they have different conjugations, according to the difference of their terminations.

Fourthly, that the verbs again differ if the action is done by land or by water. Thus "I am going to fetch something;" if it is by land, and the thing is inanimate, you must say *ninaten*; if by water *ninahen*; if animated, and by land, *ninatan*; if animated, and by water, *ninahouan*; &c.

Fifthly, that the adjectives vary according to the substantives with which they are joined; of which he gives several instances. And he further adds that all those adjectives may be conjugated. Thus "The stone is cold," *Tabiscou assini*; "it was cold," *tabiscaban*; "it will be cold," *catatabischan*.

Sixthly, that they have an infinite number of words signifying many things together, which have no apparent affinity with the words which signify those several things. Thus "The wind drives the snow;" wind is *routin*, snow is *couné*; and snow being, according to the Indians, a noble or animated thing, the verb "drives," should be *rakhineou*. Now, in order to say "The wind drives the snow," the Indians, instead of saying *routin rakhineou couné*, say, in a single word, *piouan*. Thus, again, *nisticatchi* means "I am cold," and *nissitai* means "my feet"; but, in order to say that my feet are cold, I must use the word *nitatagouasisin*.

Besides the abovementioned specimens of the Montagnar, and some others interspersed in the Annual Relations of New France by the Jesuits, we have no other ancient vocabulary of the Algonkin but that of La Hontan. The fictitious account of his pretended travels beyond the Mississippi has very deservedly destroyed his reputation for veracity. Yet it would seem that he ventured to impose on the public, only with respect to countries at that time entirely unknown, and that his account of the Canada Indians may generally be relied upon. There cannot be any doubt, notwithstanding the observations of Charlevoix, of the correctness of his vocabulary, which has been transcribed verbatim by Carver and by John Long, and appears to have been the only one used for a long time among the Indian traders.

Among the Algonkin inhabitants of the River Ottawa were the Ottawas themselves (called by the French *Outaouais*),

who were principally settled on and in the vicinity of an island in the river, where they exacted a tribute from all the Indians and canoes going to, or coming from, the country of the Hurons. It is observed by the same Father Le Jeune, that, although the Hurons were ten times as numerous, they submitted to that imposition; which seems to prove that the right of sovereignty over the river, to which the Ottawas have left their name, was generally recognised. After the almost total destruction, in the year 1649, of the Hurons by the Five Nations, the Algonkin nations of the Ottawa River generally abandoned their abodes and sought refuge in different quarters. A part of the Ottawas of that river, accompanied by a portion of those who lived on the western shores of Lake Huron, amounting to about one thousand souls, and by five hundred Hurons, after some wanderings, joined their kindred tribes, towards the southwestern extremity of Lake Superior.\*

They were followed there in the year 1665, by the Missionaries. Their principal missions in that quarter were at Chagouamigong on that lake, and at or near Green Bay on Lake Michigan. They enumerate all the Indian nations in that quarter, excepting only the Chippeways and the Piankeshaws; and an uncertain tribe, the Mascoutens, is added. In every other respect the enumeration corresponds with the Indians now known to us there. The Sauks and Outagamies on the one hand, and the Miamis and Illinois on the other, are specially mentioned as speaking Algonkin dialects, but both very different from the pure Algonkin. This last designation is dropped, with respect to all the Indians south of Lake Superior, except in reference to language. The nation south of that lake, mentioned as speaking pure Algonkin, is uniformly called Outaouais; and the Chippeways, by whom they were surrounded at Chagouamigong, are never once mentioned by that name.† It is perfectly clear that the Missionaries considered the Ottawas and the Chippeways, as one and the same people.

Of the Potowotamies they say, that they spoke Algonkin, but more difficult to understand than the Ottawas. As late as the year 1671, the Potowotamies were settled on the islands called Noquet, near the entrance of Green Bay. But, forty years later, they had removed to the southern extremity of Lake Michigan, where we found them, and on the very grounds (Chicago and River St. Joseph), which in 1670 were occupied

---

\* Relations, F. Allouez, A. D. 1666. † Ibid. A. D. 1666-1671.



by the Miamis.\* They are however intimately connected by alliance and language, not with these, but with the Chippeways and Ottawas.

About the year 1671, the Ottawas of Lake Superior removed to the vicinity of Michillimackinac, and finally returned to their original seats on the west side of Lake Huron.† It is well known, that this nation occupied till very lately a great portion of the Michigan Peninsula, north and west of the Potowotamies, whilst the Chippeways, who are much more numerous, are situated around Lake Superior, extending northwardly to Lake Winnipeg, and westwardly to Red River, that empties into that lake. They are bounded on the north by the Knistinaux, on the west and southwest by the Sioux, on the south and southeast by the Menomenies and the Ottawas. We have not sufficient data to ascertain the dividing line which, north of Lake Superior, separates them on the east from the residue of the old Algonkin tribes. Both names, Algonkin and Chippeway, have become generic, and are often indiscriminately used.

When the Algonkin tribes of the River Ottawa were dispersed in the middle of the seventeenth century, a portion sought refuge amongst the French, and appears to have been incorporated with those of their nation, who still reside in several villages of Lower Canada. The Nipissings, and some other tribes, fled towards Michillimackinac, the Falls of St. Mary, and the northern shores of Lake Superior. It has already been stated that the Nipissings had returned to their old seats. What became of the others is uncertain.

John Long, an Indian trader, says that he first learnt the language amongst the Algonkins of the two mountains above Montreal, and that it was mixed and corrupt. Of this he might not be a proper judge; but his statement shows, that there was a difference between that dialect, and that spoken by the Indians with whom he afterwards traded. These, whom he calls Chippeways, reside north and northeast of Lake Superior from Lake Musquaway, north of the Grand Portage, eastwardly to the sources of Saguenay and to the waters of James's Bay. His Chippeway vocabulary must be that of the dialect of those Indians, and differs but little from those, either of the Chippeways

---

\* They sent word to the Miamis, that they were tired of living on fish, and must have meat.

† Relations, A. D. 1671, and Charlevoix, A. D. 1687.



proper, or of the old Algonkins. That which he calls the Algonkin vocabulary is, with few exceptions, transcribed from La Hontan's or Carver's.

Those who understand the language may judge, from the specimens Long gives of his speeches to the Indians, whether he was well acquainted with it. A good vocabulary of the modern Algonkin, as spoken in the villages of that nation in Lower Canada, is wanted.

We have but scanty specimens of the Ottawa and Potowotamie dialects, the last chiefly from Smith Barton, the first written, in M. Duponceau's presence, by M. Hamelin, an educated half-breed Ottawa. In the appended vocabulary of the Chippeway or Ojibway language, the words, so far as he has given them, are borrowed from Mr. Schoolcraft, who has lately thrown much light on its structure and character. It is hoped that, enjoying so much better assistance than any other American ever did, he will pursue his labors and favor the public with the result. The other words are principally taken from the copious and valuable vocabulary of Dr. E. James. The residue has been supplied by the vocabularies of Dr. Keating and of Sir A. Mackenzie. That of Mackenzie is designated by him as being of the Algonkin language. Coming from Canada, he gives that name to those Indians, from the Grand Portage to Lake Winnipek, whom we call Chippeways.

Although it must be admitted that the Algonkins, the Chippeways, the Ottawas, and the Potowotamies, speak different dialects, these are so nearly allied, that they may be considered rather as dialects of the same, than as distinct languages. The same observation applies, though with less force, to the dialect of the Knistinaux, between which and that of the Algonkins and Chippeways, the several vocabularies, particularly those of Mackenzie, exhibit a close affinity. The Northern Algonkin tribes enumerated under this head, may be said to form, in reference to language, but one subdivision; the most numerous and probably the original stock of all the other kindred branches of the same family.\*

---

\* According to an estimate of the War Department, the Chippeways, Ottawas, and Potowotamies would amount to near twenty-two thousand. It is probable that those living in Canada are partly included. The Chippeways and Ottawas within the United States amount, by Mr. Schoolcraft's official report, to fourteen thousand. Adding some Ottawas not included and the Potowotamies, they may together be estimated at about nineteen thousand. Including the Knistinaux, and the

Although it may be presumed, that the Mississagues did not, in that respect, differ materially from the other northern Algonkins (a question which Smith Barton's short vocabulary does not enable us absolutely to decide), they appear to have, probably on account of their geographical position, pursued a different policy, and separated their cause from that of their kindred tribes. They were settled south of the River Ottawa, on the banks of Lakes Ontario and Erie, and must have been either in alliance with the Five Nations, or permitted to remain neutral. We are informed by Charlevoix, that, in the year 1721, they had still villages near the outlet of Lake Ontario, near Niagara, and near Detroit, and another situated between the two first on Lake Ontario. Twenty-five years later, their deputies attended a treaty held at Albany, between the Governor of New York and the Six Nations. These, whether from a wish to enhance their own importance, or because they began to feel the want of allies, announced to the British that they had "taken in the Mississagues for the Seventh Nation," of their confederacy.\* That intended or pretended adoption was not however carried into effect. The tribe still subsists in Canada; and some amongst them are said to have lately wandered into the Eastern States.

#### NORTHEASTERN.

This division embraces the Algonkins of Labrador, the Micmacs, the Etchemins, and the Abenakis.

It is probable, though not fully ascertained, that the Algonkin or Montagnar language, with some varieties in the dialects, extended nearly to the mouth of the River St. Lawrence. No account has been published of the tribes of that family which inhabit the interior parts of Labrador. But vocabularies have been published, in the sixth volume of the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, of two kindred

---

Chippeways and Algonkins within the British possessions, I should think that the whole of this northern branch of the Algonkin-Lenape family cannot be less than thirty-five to forty thousand souls. All the other branches of the family do not together exceed twenty-five thousand.

\* Colden, Five Nations, Treaty of 1746. The Tuscaroras had been previously adopted as the Sixth Nation. The Mississagues appear notwithstanding to have taken part against the British during the seven years' war. (1 Mass. Hist. Coll. Vol. x. page 121.)

dialects, belonging indeed to the same stock, but quite distinct from the Algonkin. They are called respectively Skoffies and Sheshatapoosh or Mountainees. The origin of the last name is not known; but the language is not that of the Tadoussac-Montagnars. The vocabularies of both were taken from a native named Gabriel; and extracts will be found in the annexed comparative vocabularies.

The tribe of the Nova Scotia Indians, near Annapolis in the Bay of Fundy, with which the French first became acquainted, was called *Souriquois*; and a vocabulary of their language has been preserved by Lescarbot. They are now well known by the name of Micmacs, and inhabited the peninsula of Nova Scotia, Cape Breton, several other islands within the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and all the rivers emptying from the west into that Gulf, south of Gaspé. The words in the comparative vocabulary are taken principally from the manuscript of Father Maynard, Missionary at Miramichi during and at the end of the seven years' war. It was obtained in Canada, by the late Enoch Lincoln, Governor of Maine, who permitted me to take copious extracts; and the original has been placed in my hands by his brother. The words wanted have been chiefly supplied from another manuscript vocabulary in M. Duponceau's collection, taken by Mr. Walter Bromley, a resident of Nova Scotia.

When Father Maynard made his submission to the British in 1760, he stated the number of the Micmacs to be three thousand souls.\*

The French adopted the names given by the Souriquois to the neighbouring Indian tribes. The Etchemins, or "Canoemen," embraced the tribes of the St. John's River, called *Ouygoudy* by Champlain, and of Passamaquoddy Bay; and the name extended thence westwardly along the seashore as far at least as Mount Desert Island. The Island of St. Croix, where De Monts made a temporary settlement, has been recognised to be that now called Boon Island, which lies near the entrance of the Schoodick River above St. Andrew's. The river itself is always called River of the Etchemins by Champlain, who accompanied De Monts, and explored, in the year 1605, the sea-coast from the Bay of Fundy to Martha's Vineyard.

The Indians west of Kennebec River, beginning at Chouacoet, and thence westwardly as far as Cape Cod, were called

---

\* 1 Mass. Hist. Coll. Vol. x, p. 115. He is there called *Manach*.

Almouchiquois by the Souriquois. Chouacoet (probably Saco) is noticed by Champlain as being the first place along the seashore where there was any cultivation. The Indians of the mouth of the Kennebec planted nothing, and informed him, that those who cultivated maize lived far inland or up the river. These inland cultivating Indians were the well-known Abenakis, consisting of several tribes, the principal of which were the Penobscot, the Norridgewock, and the Ameriscoggins. And it is not improbable that the Indians at the mouth of both rivers, though confounded by Champlain with the Etchemins, belonged to the same nation.

The two Etchemin tribes, viz. the Passamaquoddies in the United States, and the St. John Indians in New Brunswick, speaking, both the same language, are not yet extinct. The vocabulary of the Passamaquoddies by Mr. Kellogg was obtained from the War Department.

The vocabulary of the Abenakis is extracted from the valuable manuscript of Father Rasle, (the Norridgewock Missionary,) lately published, at Boston, under the care of Mr. Pickering, by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. The Penobscot tribe, consisting of about three hundred souls, still exists on the river of that name. The vocabulary of their language is extracted from two manuscripts, one taken by General Treat and obtained from Governor E. Lincoln, the other in M. Duponceau's collection, taken by Mr. R. Gardiner of Maine. The dialects of those three eastern nations, the Micmacs, the Etchemins, and the Abenakis, have great affinities with each other, but, though evidently belonging to the same stock, differ widely from the Algonkin language.

They were all early converted by the Jesuits, remained firmly attached to the French, and, till the conquest of Canada, were in an almost perpetual state of hostility with the British colonists. In the year 1754, all the Abenakis, with the exception of the Penobscots, withdrew to Canada; and that tribe was considered by the others as deserters from the common cause. They, as well as the Passamaquody and St. John Indians, remained neuter during the war of Independence.

The dividing line between the Abenakis and the New England Indians, which is also that of language, was at some place between the Kennebec and the River Piscataqua. Governor Sullivan placed it at the River Saco; and this is corroborated by the mention made by the French writers of a tribe called Sokokies, represented as being adjacent to New England and to the Abenakis, originally in alliance with the Iroquois, but

which appears to have been converted by the Jesuits, and to have ultimately withdrawn to Canada.\*

#### EASTERN OR ATLANTIC.

Under this head will be included the New England Indians, meaning thereby those between the Abenakis and Hudson River; the Long Island Indians; the Delaware and Minsi of Pennsylvania and New Jersey; the Nanticokes of the eastern shore of Maryland; the Susquehannocks; the Powhatans of Virginia; and the Pamlicos of North Carolina.

Gookin, who wrote in 1674, enumerates as the five principal nations of New England, 1. The Pequods, who may be considered as making but one people with the Mohegans, and who occupied the eastern part of the State of Connecticut; 2. The Narragansets in the State of Rhode Island; 3. The Pawkunnawkuts or Wampanoags, chiefly within the jurisdiction of the Plymouth Colony; 3. The Massachusetts, in the Bay of that name and the adjacent parts. 5. The Pawtuckets, north and northeast of the Massachusetts. Under the designation of Pawtuckets he includes the Penacooks of New Hampshire, and probably all the more eastern tribes as far as the Abenakis, or Tarrateens, as they seem to have been called by the New England Indians. The Nipmucks are mentioned as living north of the Mohegans, and west of the Massachusetts, occupying the central parts of that State as far west as the Connecticut River, and acknowledging, to a certain extent, the supremacy of the Massachusetts, of the Narragansets, or of the Mohegans. Those several nations appear, however, to have been divided into a number of tribes, each having its own Sachem, and in a great degree independent of each other.

The great similarity if not the identity of the languages from the Connecticut River eastwardly to the Piscataqua, seems to be admitted by all the early writers. Gookin states that the New England Indians, especially upon the seacoasts, use the same sort of speech and language, only with some difference in the expressions, as they differ in several counties in England, yet so as they can well understand each other. Roger Williams, speaking of his Key, as he calls his vocabulary, says that "he has entered into the secrets of those countries wherever

---

\* Relations, and Charlevoix, A. D. 1646, &c.



English dwelt about two hundred miles between the French and Dutch plantations; and that though their dialects do exceedingly differ within the said two hundred miles, yet not so, but within that compass a man by this help may converse with thousands of natives all over the country." Governor Hutchinson also states, that from Piscataqua to Connecticut River the different tribes could converse tolerably together.\*

The Pequods and Mohegans claimed some authority over the Indians of the Connecticut River. But those, extending thence westwardly to the Hudson River, appear to have been divided into small and independent tribes, united, since they were known to the Europeans by no common government. Those within Connecticut were sometimes called "the Seven Tribes." With respect to those along the Hudson and within the jurisdiction of New York, De Laet, who in Dutch affairs is an original authority, places the Manhattans and the Pachamins on the eastern bank of the river and below the Highlands; the Waroanekins on the eastern, and the Waranancongyns on the western bank, both in the vicinity of Esopus, which he mentions by that name; and above these, extending to Albany, the Manhikans on the eastern bank, and opposite to them the Mackwaes, their mortal enemies. "Maquas," was the name given by the Atlantic-Lenape nations to the Mohawks. In the Manhikans we recognise the Mohicans, Mohikanders, or River Indians. The Waroanekins and Waranancongyns are clearly the people since known to us by the name of Wappings or Wappingers, who have left their name to a river in Dutchess County, and who extended across the Hudson, not only to Esopus, but also some distance below the Highlands, where they were bounded on the south by the Minsi † But they are at a later date embraced under the generic appellation of Mohikanders, ‡ which seems to indicate a community of language. And the identity of name, between the Mohikans of the Hudson and the Mohegans of East Connecticut, induces the belief that all those tribes belonged to the same stock. We have however no ancient vocabularies of their respective languages, and must recur to those of the Stockbridge dialect.

---

\* Hist. of Mass. Vol. I. p. 479.

† See treaty of Easton, of 1758, in which the Wappings of Esopus are mentioned, and those south of the Highlands jointly with the Minsi, execute a deed of release for lands in New Jersey.

‡ See treaty of Albany of 1746, abovementioned.



The Stockbridge Indians, were originally a part of the Housatannuck Tribe, to whom the Legislature of Massachusetts granted or secured a township in the year 1736.\* Their number was increased by Wappingers and Mohikanders, and perhaps also by Indians belonging to several other tribes, both of New England and New York. Since their removal to New Stockbridge and Brotherton, in the western parts of New York, they have been joined by Mohegans and other Indians from East Connecticut and even from Rhode Island and Long Island; and the residue of the Seven Tribes of Connecticut is also mentioned, as being settled in the year 1791 at Brotherton.† They are called Mohicans, or Mohekanoks and appear to speak but one dialect. All our information respecting that language is derived from Old or New Stockbridge, or from Canada, where some Indians of that family have also migrated.

Jonathan Edwards, a divine and a scholar, was brought up at Old Stockbridge, and, whilst a child, acquired the knowledge of the language of the Indians of that place. "It had become more familiar to him than his mother tongue, and he had in a great measure retained his skill," in that respect, when he published, in 1788, his valuable observations on the language of the "Muhhekanew Indians."

He states that "the language which is the subject of his observations is that of the Muhhekanew or Stockbridge Indians. They, as well as the tribe in New London (the ancient Pequods or Mohegans), are by the Anglo-Americans called Mohegans, which is a corruption of Muhhekanew.

"This language is spoken by all the Indians throughout New England. Every tribe, as that of Stockbridge, that of Farmington, that of New London, has a different dialect; but the language is radically the same. Mr. Eliot's translation of the Bible is in a particular dialect of this language. The dialect followed in these observations is that of Stockbridge."

Mr. Edwards's vocabulary is unfortunately very short. The defect is partly supplied by two others; one obtained in 1804, by the Rev. William Jenks, from John Konkaput, a New Stockbridge Indian; the other in M. Duponceau's collection taken by Mr. Heckewelder in Canada from a Mohican chief. The appended vocabulary of that language has been extracted

---

\* Holmes's Annals.

† 1 Mass. Hist. Coll. Vol. IX. p. 90, and Vol. V. pp. 12-32.

from those three sources, with the addition of some words supplied by the mutilated remnant of a comparative vocabulary compiled by Mr. Jefferson, in the library of the Philosophical Society of Philadelphia. The vocabulary of the Massachusetts Indians is taken from Eliot's Grammar, (including the words extracted by M. Duponceau from Elliot's translation of the Bible,) and from Josiah Cotton's valuable vocabulary. A specimen from Wood's "Prospect of New England" has been added. The words not found in Roger Williams's Key of the Narraganset Language, have been supplied from a recent vocabulary, taken by General Treat, and communicated by the late Enoch Lincoln. There is no doubt respecting the great similarity of those three dialects; and that the Indians from Saco River to the Hudson, spoke, though with many varieties, what may be considered as the same language, and one of the most extensively spoken amongst those of the Algonkin-Lenape Family.

There may have been some exaggeration in the accounts of the Indian population of New England. In proportion as they are separated from us by time or distance, the Indians are uniformly represented as more numerous than they appear when better known. Gookin, who wrote in 1674, states that the Pequods were said to have been able in former times to raise four thousand warriors, reduced in his time to three hundred men. These had indeed been conquered and partly destroyed or dispersed in the war of 1637. But, according to the accounts of that war, the number of their warriors could not at that time have amounted to one thousand.\* The Narragansets, who were reckoned in former times, *as ancient Indians said*, to amount to five thousand warriors, did not in his time amount to one thousand. As the only wars in which they had been engaged before the year 1674, from the first European settlement in New England, were the usual ones with other Indians, such a great diminution within that period appears highly improbable. With respect to the other three great nations, to wit, the Wampanoags, the Massachusetts, and the Pawtuckets, Gookin estimates their former number to have been in the aggregate nine thousand warriors. He states the population of the two last in his own time, at five hundred and fifty men, besides women

---

\* Seven hundred, on the arrival of the British. Holmes's Memoir, 1 Mass. Hist. Coll. Vol. IX. pp. 75-99.

and children. This great diminution, he and all the other ancient writers ascribed to a most fatal epidemical sickness, which, a few years before the first arrival of the English, had made dreadful ravages amongst those two nations and the Wampanoags.

But, after making every reasonable allowance for exaggerations derived from Indian reports, there can be no doubt, from the concurrent accounts of contemporary writers, that the Indian population, principally along the seacoast between the Old Plymouth Colony and the Hudson River, was much greater in proportion to the extent of territory than was found anywhere else on the shores of the Atlantic, or, with the exception perhaps of the Hurons, in the interior parts of the United States. This opinion is corroborated by the enumerations subsequent to Philip's War, after the greater part of the hostile Indians had removed to Canada or its vicinity. In an account laid before the Assembly of Connecticut in 1680, the warriors of the several tribes in the State are reckoned at five hundred.\* In 1698, the converted Indians in Massachusetts were computed to amount to nearly three thousand souls.† In 1774, by an actual census there were still thirteen hundred and sixty-three Indians in Connecticut, and fourteen hundred and eighty-two in Rhode Island.‡ Those several numbers greatly exceed those found elsewhere, under similar circumstances, so long after the date of the first European settlements. I think that the Indian population, within the present boundaries of the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, must have been from thirty to forty thousand souls, before the epidemic disease which preceded the landing of the Pilgrims.

For this greater accumulated population, two causes may be assigned. A greater and more uniform supply of food is afforded by fisheries than by hunting; and we find accordingly, that the Narragansets of Rhode Island were, in proportion to their territory, the most populous tribe of New England. It appears also probable, that the Indians along the seacoast had been driven away from the interior and compelled to concentrate themselves, in order to be able to resist the attacks of the more warlike Indians of the Five Nations. Even near the seashore, from the Piscataqua to the vicinity of the Hudson,

\* Holmes's Report.

† 1 Mass. Hist. Coll. Vol. X. p. 129.

‡ Ibid. Vol. X. pp. 117 - 119.

the New England Indians were perpetually harassed by the attacks of the Maquas. They were, Gookin says, in time of war, so great a terror to all the Indians before named, that the appearance of four or five Maquas in the woods would frighten them from their habitations and induce many of them to get together in forts. Wood and other contemporary writers confirm this account; and the Mohawks were wont, in Connecticut, to pursue the native Indians and kill them even in the houses of the English settlers.\*

We find accordingly the population to have been chiefly concentrated along the seashore and the banks of the Connecticut River below its falls. That of the Nipmuck and generally of the inland country, north of the State of Connecticut, was much less in proportion to the territory; and there do not appear to have been any tribes of any consequence in the northern parts of New Hampshire, or in the State of Vermont.

The Indians east of the Connecticut River never were, however, actually subjugated by the Five Nations. In the year 1669, the Indians of Massachusetts carried on even offensive operations against the Maquas, marched with about six hundred men into the Mohawk country, and attacked one of their forts. They were repulsed with considerable loss; but, in 1671, peace was made between them, through the interference of the English and Dutch at Albany; and the subsequent alliance between the Five Nations and the British, after they had become permanently possessed of New York, appears to have preserved the New England Indians from further attacks.

The first emigrants to New England were kindly received by the Indians; and their progress was facilitated by the calamitous disease which had recently swept off great numbers of the natives, in the quarter where the first settlements were made. The peace was disturbed by the colonization of Connecticut River. The native chiefs had been driven away by Sassacus, Sachem of the Pequods. From them the Massachusetts emigrants purchased the lands, and commenced the settlement in the year 1635. Sassacus immediately committed hostilities. The Pequod war, as it is called, terminated (1637) in the total subjugation of the Pequods, and was followed by forty years of comparative peace. The principal event during that period was a war between Uncas, Sachem of the Mohe-

---

\* Trumbull, *passim*.

gans and of the conquered Pequods, who appears to have been a constant though subordinate ally of the British, and Miantonimo, Sachem of the Narragansets, who had indeed assisted them against the Pequods, but seems to have afterwards entertained hostile designs against them. He brought nine hundred warriors into the field against Uncas, who could oppose him with only five hundred. Miantonimo was nevertheless defeated, made prisoner and delivered by Uncas to the English. After due deliberation, the Commissioners of the United Colonies of New England determined, that he might be justly, and ought to be, put to death, but that this should be done out of the English jurisdiction, and without any act of cruelty. He was accordingly delivered again to Uncas and killed. The act at this day appears unjustifiable. The English had not taken an active part in the contest. They might have refused to receive him from Uncas. But, this having been done, he was under their protection, and, however dangerous to them, ought to have been either released altogether, or kept a prisoner.

The Narragansets from that time kept the colonies in a state of perpetual uneasiness. Yet the war which broke out in 1675, commonly called King Philip's war, can hardly be ascribed to this or to any other particular circumstance, and appears to have been the unavoidable result of the relative situation in which the Indians and the whites were placed. Collisions had during the preceding period often occurred; but no actual hostilities of any importance had taken place; and Massachusetts particularly, though exposed to obloquy on that account, always interposed to prevent a war. If the Indians were not always kindly, at least it cannot be said that they were in general unjustly, treated. With the exception of the conquered Pequods, no lands were ever forcibly taken from them. They were all gradually purchased from those Sachems respectively in whose possession they were. But there, as everywhere else, the Indians, after a certain length of time, found that, in selling their lands they had lost their usual means of subsistence, that they were daily diminishing, that the gradual progress of the whites was irresistible; and, as a last effort, though too late, they attempted to get rid of the intruders. The history of the Indians in the other British colonies is everywhere substantially the same. The massacre of the whites in Virginia, in the years 1622 and 1644, the Tuscarora war of North Carolina in 1712, that with the Yemassee of South Carolina in 1715, were



natural results flowing from the same cause. And in the year 1755, after a peace of seventy years, notwithstanding all the efforts made to avert it, the storm burst even in Pennsylvania.

Metacomb, or King Philip, as he is generally called, was Sachem of the Wampanoags, and son of Massassoit, the first and faithful friend of the first settlers of the New Plymouth Colony. His most powerful and active ally was Conanchet, son of Miantonimo, and principal Sachem of the Narragansets. A portion of the Indians of that nation, under another chief, named Ninigret, the Mohegans and the Pequods, fought on the English side. The other tribes of Connecticut, with the exception of some in the northern parts of the colony, appear to have remained neutral. The converted Indians of Massachusetts were friendly. All the other New England Indians, assisted by the Abenaki tribes, joined in the war. Its events are well known, and that, after a most bloody contest of two years, during which the two colonies of Massachusetts and Plymouth experienced great losses, it terminated in the complete destruction or dispersion of the hostile Indians. Philip, after the most desperate efforts, was killed in the field of battle. Conanchet shared the fate of his father, having been, like him, taken prisoner in an engagement, and afterwards shot. A small number only of the Indians who had taken arms, accepted terms of submission. The greater part of the survivors joined the eastern tribes or those of Canada. Some took refuge amongst the Mohegans of Hudson River. Amongst those, who did not at that time join the Indians in the French interest, were those afterwards known by the name of Shotacooks, from the place of their new residence on the Hudson, some distance above Albany. They, however, at a subsequent epoch, became hostile, and removed to Canada at the commencement of the seven years' war.

From the termination of Philip's war, till the conquest of Canada, the eastern and northern frontiers of New England continued exposed to the predatory and desolating attacks of the Eastern and Canada Indians. But they had no longer any internal enemies to combat. It appears, from the statements already made, that from eight to ten thousand must, about the year 1680, have remained within the settled parts of those colonies. They have ever since been perfectly peaceable, have had lands reserved for them, and have been treated kindly and protected by the Colonial and State Governments. They are said to amount now to only a few hundred in all the four States. The language,



with the exception of the Narraganset, is nearly extinct. Many had, it is true, removed from time to time to the westward. But the great diminution and approaching extinction are due to the same causes, which have operated everywhere else, and to which we may hereafter advert.

It is probable that the Manhattans and the other tribes, which may have been seated below the Highlands, on the eastern bank of the Hudson, within the jurisdiction of New York, were of the same stock with their eastern neighbours on the main along the Long Island Sound, and may also be included under the general appellation of Mohicans. Of this, however, we have no direct proof, as no vestige of their language remains. The Dutch purchased from them the Manhattan Island, where they erected a fort about the year 1620, and laid the foundation of New Amsterdam, now New York.\* But they appear to have been in a state of perpetual hostility with those Indians.

De Laet, who wrote in 1624, and mentions the purchase, says that the eastern bank of the river was, from its mouth, inhabited by "the Manathanes, a cruel nation at war with us." He also mentions the Delawares or Minsi, living on the opposite shore, under the names of Sanhikans and Mahkentiwomi, as a more humane and friendly nation. It was there accordingly that they made their first settlement in that quarter, about the year 1610.†

About the year 1643, the Dutch appear to have been reduced to great distress by the Manhattans and the Long Island Indians. They applied in vain for assistance to the Colony of New Haven; but they engaged in their service Captain Underhill, a celebrated partisan officer, with whose assistance and, it is said, that of the Mohawks, they carried on the war for several years. Underhill had a mixed corps of English and Dutch, with whom he is said to have killed four hundred Indians on Long Island. And in the year 1646, a severe battle took place at Horseneck on the main, where the Indians were finally defeated. ‡

---

\* Smith's History of New York, p. 38, where is given Governor Stuyvesant's statement of the Dutch claim in 1644.

† The Delaware tradition (Heckewelder's Account, chap. ii.) that they first received the Dutch, is correct.

‡ Trumbull's History of Connecticut, passim.

It appears, from the researches of the Hon. Silas Wood, that there were not less than thirteen distinct tribes on Long Island, over which the Montauks, who inhabited the easternmost part of the island, exercised some kind of authority, though they had been themselves tributaries of the Pequods before the subjugation of these by the English. The two extremities of the island were settled about the same time, the eastern by the English, and the western by the Dutch.

The original records of the towns examined by Mr. Wood show, that the lands were in both districts always purchased from the Indians in possession. It was only in 1665, after the British had taken possession of New York and the whole of the island had been annexed to that government, that it was ordained, that no purchase from the Indians without the Governor's license, executed in his presence, should be valid.\* The Indians appear to have been at times, or at least with a single exception, on friendly terms with the English; and although there is some discrepancy in the accounts, it is probable that the hostilities, which had previously existed between those Indians and the Dutch, had ceased prior to the year 1655.†

The several tribes of Long Island spoke kindred dialects, of which we have two specimens; Mr. Wood's short vocabulary of the Montauks, from a manuscript in the possession of the late John Lyon Gardner; and that of a tribe called Unchagogs (by Mr. Wood), taken in 1792, by Mr. Jefferson, and in the possession of the American Philosophical Society. Mr. Jefferson states that the dialect differs a little from those of the Shinicooks of South Hampton, or of the Montauks; and that these three tribes barely understood each other. The language appears to me to differ farther in its vocabulary from those of New England, than any of these from each other. Although a reservation of land was made for those Indians, there remain only some Montauks; and the language is said to be extinct.

In the absence of the Dutch records, during the fifty years of their dominion, (1610–1664,) we have been obliged to resort to the transient notices of the English or American writers. A certain fact asserted by all of them, confirmed by eye-witnesses, and acknowledged by the Indians, is that the Mohicans or River Indians including the Wappings, had been subjugated

---

\* Smith's History of New York, p. 54.

† Wood's Account of the Settlement of Long Island.

by the Five Nations, and paid to them some kind of tribute. According to Governor Trumbull, the Indians as far east as the Connecticut River had shared the same fate.\* It may be doubted whether this could properly be asserted of all of them. But it is certain that the Long Island Indians did also generally pay tribute; and we have the irrefragable evidence of an eye-witness, the late Samuel Jones, that, as late as the middle of the seventeenth century, it was collected by Mohawk deputies in Queen's County.

Judge Smith, in his "History of New York," published in 1756, says, that, "when the Dutch began the settlement of this country, all the Indians on Long Island and the northern shore of the Sound, on the banks of Connecticut, Hudson's, Delaware, and Susquehanna Rivers, were in subjection to the Five Nations, and, within the memory of persons now living, acknowledged it by the payment of an annual tribute."† He gives no authority for the early date he assigns to that event. The subsequent protracted wars of the Dutch with the Manhattans and the Long Island Indians, and the continued warfare of the Mohawks against the Connecticut Indians, are inconsistent with that account, which is clearly incorrect with respect to the Mohikander River Indians, or Manhicans. These are mentioned by De Laet as the mortal enemies of the Maquas. It was undoubtedly the interest of the Dutch to promote any arrangement, which, by compelling the Mohicans to remain at peace, would secure their own and increase their trade. If they succeeded at any time, the peace was but temporary. We learn from the Relations of the French Missionaries, that war existed in 1656, between the Mahingans and the Mohawks, and that these experienced a severe check in 1663, in an attack upon a Mahingan fortified village. And Colden states that the contest was not at an end till 1673. "The trade of New York," he says, "was hindered by the war which the Five Nations had at that time with the River Indians;" and he adds that the Governor of New York "obtained a peace between the Five Nations and the Mahikanders or River Indians."‡

It is also certain that those Mohikander or River Indians, were not reduced to the same state in which the Delawares

---

\* Vol. I. p. 56.

† Page 216. He quotes the instance of a small tribe in Orange County which still made a yearly payment of about £20 to the Mohawks,

‡ Colden, chap. ii. p. 35.

were placed. It is proved by the concurring accounts of the French and English writers, that, subsequently to the peace of 1674, they were repeatedly, indeed uniformly, employed as auxiliaries in the wars of the Five Nations and the British against the French. At the treaty of Albany of 1746, which has already been quoted, they were positively invited and requested to join heartily with both for that purpose; and they acted accordingly. It may be that the Dutch or English had obtained from the Five Nations a general release of any claim they might have on the lands of the subdued tribes. But if the right was reserved, it is proved by the records of Long Island, that it was not rigidly enforced; and there is reason to believe that the same observation applies equally to the ancient settlements in other parts of the State. The whole western district has of course been purchased from the Five, or as since called, the Six Nations.

---

The Delawares call themselves Lenno-Lenape, which means "Original, or Unmixed Men"; perhaps originally "manly men," if Lenape is derived from *Lenno*, "man, homo," and *nape*, "male." They say that they at first consisted of three tribes, the *Unami*, or "Turtle" tribe, which claimed precedence over the others, the *Minsi*, or "Wolf" tribe, who, though still intimately connected, separated themselves from the Delawares proper, and speak a different dialect, and the *Unalachtgo*, or "Turkey" tribe, who remain mixed with the Unami. They were called Loups (wolves) by the French. But it was because they confounded them with the Mohicans and New England Indians, whom they designated by the general appellation of *Mahingan*, which means "Wolf" in the Algonkin and Chipeway dialects.

#### DELAWARE AND MINSI.

The Delaware and Minsi occupied the country bounded eastwardly and southwardly by Hudson River and the Atlantic. On the west they appear to have been divided from the Nanticokes and the Susquehannocks, by the height of land which separates the waters falling into the Delaware from those that empty into the Susquehanna and Chesapeake. They probably extended southwardly along the Delaware as far as Sandy

Hook, which seems to have belonged to another tribe.\* On the north they were in possession of the country watered by the Schuylkill, to its sources. The line thence to the Hudson is more uncertain. They may originally have extended to the sources of the Delaware; and it was perhaps owing to the conquests of a comparatively recent date, that, at the treaty of Easton, of 1758, the Delaware chief, Tedyuscung, who had at first asserted the claim of his nation to that extent, restricted it to one of the intervening ranges of hills, and acknowledged that the lands higher up the river belonged to his uncles of the Five Nations. East of the Delaware, the Lenape tribes were separated by the Catskill Mountains from the Mohawks. But it has already been stated that the Wappings intervened and extended even below the Highlands. The division line between those Wappings and the Minsi, is not known with certainty.

That between the Delawares proper, and the Minsi in New Jersey, is ascertained by an authentic document. Almost all the lands in that colony had been gradually purchased from those Indians respectively who had actual possession. Some tracts remained, which both tribes stated not to have been included within those sales. And at the same treaty of Easton they both made distinct releases of all their claims to that residue; the Delawares, for the lands lying south, and the Minsi for those lying north of a line drawn from Sandy Hook up the Raritan to its forks, then up its north fork to the falls of Alamating, and thence in a straight line to the Pasequalin Mountain on the River Delaware. The line in Pennsylvania between the tribes is not so clearly ascertained. It is however known that the tract, on which Nazareth stands, was purchased by the Moravians from the Minsi.

Various tribes are mentioned by the Swedes and by De Laet, on both shores of the Delaware, from its mouth to Trenton Falls; and the same observation applies to the western shore of the Hudson below the Highlands. But these are clearly local designations; and they are all included under the name of Renapi by the Swedish writers. The Delawares proper call themselves Lenno-Lenape; and the permutations of the letters *r*, *l*, and *n*, are common everywhere amongst Indian tribes speaking the same language.

---

\* *Quare*, whether the Conois? See Alrick's Commission.



We have two ancient vocabularies of the Delaware, one in the description of New Sweden by Thomas Campanius, lately translated by M. Duponceau, and the other of the Sankhicans, so called, by De Laet. They are almost identical and both are clearly Delaware. The settlements of the Swedes, on the river of that name, do not appear to have extended far above the present site of Philadelphia. The Sankhicans are placed by Campanius at the Falls of the Delaware. They are mentioned by De Laet as occupying the western side of the Hudson, as living along the bays and in the interior of the country, and, finally, as the upper nation on the Delaware known to the Dutch, and living eighteen leagues from the mouth of that river. The Delawares were subdivided into numerous small tribes, distinguished by local names; and it is clear that one of those tribes named Sankhican by the Swedes and Dutch writers, lived up the Delaware where both place it; and that when De Laet speaks of them in the first passage, as inhabiting the western side of the Hudson, he extends the appellation of Sankhican to the Delawares generally.\*

At the same time when William Penn landed in Pennsylvania, the Delawares had been subjugated and made women by the Five Nations. It is well known, that, according to that Indian mode of expression, the Delawares were henceforth prohibited from making war, and placed under the sovereignty of the conquerors, who did not even allow sales of land, in the actual possession of the Delawares, to be valid without their approbation. William Penn, his descendants, and the State of Pennsylvania accordingly always purchased the right of possession from the Delawares, and that of sovereignty from the Five Nations. The tale suggested by the vanity of the Delawares, and in which the venerable Heckewelder placed implicit faith, that this treaty was a voluntary act on the part of the Delawares, is too incredible to require a serious discussion. It cannot be admitted that they were guilty of such an egregious act of

---

\* We learn however, from Mr. Heckewelder, that the Delawares called the Mohawks by that very name "Sankhicani." It is therefore probable that the Maquas, in the course of the war, had a fort or a settlement near the Falls of Trenton, as they afterwards had one twelve miles from Fort Christina, and that, the place being accordingly called by the Delawares *Sankhican*, the Dutch and Swedes mistook it for the name of a Delaware tribe. De Laet's Sankhican vocabulary is at all events Delaware.



folly as to assent voluntarily to an agreement, which left their deadly enemies at liberty to destroy their own kindred, friends, and allies, with no other remedy but the empty title of Mediators, a character in which they never once appeared. And it is really absurd to suppose, that any Indian tribe, victorious too as the Delawares are stated to have been at that time, should have voluntarily submitted to that which, according to their universal and most deeply rooted habits and opinions, is the utmost degradation and ignominy. But it is difficult to ascertain when that event took place; and it seems probable, as asserted by the Indians, that it was subsequent to the arrival of the Europeans.

De Laet, in 1624, writes that the Sankhicans were mortal enemies of the Mannattans; which proves that the Sankhicans, or Delawares, were not yet prohibited from going to war. We find also in Campanius, that the Minquas had a fort on a high hill about twelve miles from Christina; and he says that as late as 1646, the Indians (viz. the Delawares) had taken and burnt alive one of those Minquas. He adds, indeed, "that the Minquas forced the other Indians, who were not so warlike as themselves, to be afraid of them, and made them subject and tributary to them, so that they dare not stir, much less go to war against them." Still, taking all these remarks together, it would appear that the war between the two nations had not yet terminated in complete subjugation. This is corroborated by what Evans says in the analysis of his Map; to wit, that the Iroquois had conquered the Lenno-Lenape; but that these had *previously* sold the lands, from the Falls of Trenton down to the sea, to Peter Menevit, commander under Christina, Queen of Sweden.

The first settlement of the Swedes was commenced in the year 1631.\* Peter Menevit, or Minit, was commander or governor, in 1638.† Their principal establishment was in the vicinity of Fort Christina, near the mouth of the river of that name. In the year 1651, the Dutch built Fort Casimir, now called Newcastle, a few miles below.‡ The Swedes soon after took possession of it. But they were expelled in 1655, by the Dutch, from all their possessions on the Delaware. The country was then governed by a director appointed by the

---

\* Holmes's Annals.

† Smith's History of New York, p. 21.

‡ Ibid. p. 24.

Dutch commander of New York, till the year 1664, when, together with New York, it was taken by the British. Smith has preserved, in his "History of New York," an extract from the Commission of Alrick, one of the first Dutch Directors, dated April, 1657. He was appointed "Director General of the Colony of the South River of the Netherlands, and the fortress of Casimir, now called Niewer Amstel, with all the lands depending thereon, according to the first purchase and deed of release of the natives, dated July 19th, 1651, beginning at the west side of the Minquaa or Christina Kill, in the Indian language named Suspeungh, to the mouth of the bay or river called Bompt Hook, in the Indian language Cannaresse, *and so far inland as the bounds and limits of the Minquaas' land*, with all the streams, and appurtenances, and dependencies."\*

This appears to be the first purchase made from the Minquas; and it may be inferred from all that precedes, that the final subjugation of the Delawares took place about the year 1750. The Europeans were then too weak to have had much, if any, agency in that event.

At a preparatory conference held at Burlington, in August, 1758, prior to the ensuing treaty of Easton, John Hudson, the Cayuga chief, who attended in behalf of the Six Nations, in his speech to the Governor of New Jersey, said, "the Munsays are women and cannot hold treaties for themselves; but the invitation you gave them is agreeable to us, and we will attend, but not here; the council-fire must be held, as heretofore, in Pennsylvania."† The treaty was accordingly held at Easton in October following, and was most numerously attended by deputies from the Six Nations, the Chihokies or Delawares, the Minsis, Wappings, Mohicans, Nanticokes, &c. The result has already been stated. The deeds of release to New Jersey by the Delawares and the Minsis were approved by the Six Nations, through three of their chiefs, who signed them. But, in the course of the conferences, they declared, through their speaker, Thomas King, that they had no claim to the lands of the Minsis or of their other nephews (the Delawares) on the east side of Delaware River. Nor is there any

---

\* Smith's History of New York, p. 25. Chalmers (p. 632) mentions the purchase, and that it was effected by Hudde, a Dutch officer.

† Smith's History of New Jersey.

evidence in Smith's "History of New Jersey," that the proprietaries of that province had ever before obtained deeds of confirmation from the Six Nations, for the lands purchased from the Delaware and Minsi tribes, which were in the actual possession of the same. It would seem, then, that the right to the Lenape lands was not more rigidly enforced by the Five Nations in New Jersey than in New York. The same course might perhaps have taken place in Pennsylvania, had not Mr. Penn applied to them for cessions which they never hesitated to make. It may be also that, as he introduced the laudable custom of public purchases made by solemn treaties, the Five Nations would not permit such national councils to be held by the Delawares without their approbation.

The use of arms, though from very different causes, was equally prohibited to the Delawares and to the Quakers. Thus the colonization of Pennsylvania and of West New Jersey by the British, commenced under the most favorable auspices. Peace and the utmost harmony prevailed for more than sixty years between the whites and the Indians; for these were for the first time treated, not only justly, but kindly by the colonists. But, however gradually and peaceably their lands might have been purchased, the Delawares found themselves at last in the same situation as all the other Indians, without lands of their own, and therefore without means of subsistence. They were compelled to seek refuge on the waters of the Susquehanna, as tenants at will, on lands belonging to their hated conquerors, the Five Nations. Even there and on the Juniata, they were encroached upon by white settlers less scrupulous than the Quakers had been. Nor can it be denied that the agents of the Proprietaries were occasionally too urgent in asking for further concessions of land, and in obtaining extensive and alarming grants from the Five Nations. Under those circumstances, many of the Delawares determined to remove west of the Alleghany Mountains, and, about the year 1740-50, obtained, from their ancient allies and uncles the Wyandots, the grant of a derelict tract of land lying principally on the Muskingum. The great body of the nation was still attached to Pennsylvania. But the grounds of complaint increased. The Delawares were encouraged by the western tribes, and by the French, to shake off the yoke of the Six Nations, and to join in the war against their allies the British. The frontier settlements of Pennsylvania were accordingly attacked both by the

Delawares and the Shawnoes. And, although peace was made with them at Easton in 1758, and the conquest of Canada put an end to the general war, both the Shawnoes and Delawares removed altogether in 1768, beyond the Alleghany Mountains. This resolution had not been taken without much reluctance. At a preparatory conference held at Easton, in 1757, the Delaware Chief Tedyuscung said, "We intend to settle at Wyoming; we want to have certain boundaries fixed between you and us, and a certain tract of land fixed, which it shall not be lawful for us or our children to sell, nor for you or any of your children ever to buy; that we may be not pushed on every side, but have a certain country fixed for our own use and that of our children for ever." And, at the treaty of Easton in 1758, he accordingly applied to the Six Nations for a permanent grant of land at Shamokin and Wyoming on the Susquehanna. The Maqua chiefs answered that they were not authorized to sell any lands; that they would refer the demand to their great council at Onondago, which alone had a right to make sales. "In the mean while," they added, "you may make use of those lands in conjunction with our own people and all the rest of our relations, the Indians of the different nations in our alliance." It is proper to add that the Delawares did not lay any claim to the lands on the Susquehanna, which they acknowledged to belong altogether to the Six Nations.

The removal of the Delawares, Minsi, and Shawnoes to the Ohio, at once extricated them from the yoke of the Six Nations, and cut off the intercourse between these and the Miamis and other western Indians who had been inclined to enter into their alliance. The years 1765-1795 are the true period of the power and importance of the Delawares. United with the Shawnoes, who were settled on the Scioto, they sustained during the seven years' war the declining power of France, and arrested for some years the progress of the British and American arms. Although a portion of the nation adhered to the Americans during the war of Independence, the main body together with all the western nations made common cause with the British. And, after the short truce which followed the treaty of 1783, they were again at the head of the western confederacy in their last struggle for independence. Placed by their geographical situation in the front of battle, they were during those three wars, the aggressors, and, to the last moment,

the most active and formidable enemies of America.\* The decisive victory of General Wayne (1794) dissolved the confederacy; and the Delawares were the greatest sufferers by the treaty of Greenville of 1795.

The greater part of the lands allotted them by the Wyandots was ceded by that treaty, and they then obtained from the Miamis a tract of land on the White River of Wabash, which, by the treaty of Vincennes of 1804, was guaranteed to them by the United States. But the Miamis having contended the ensuing year, at the treaty of Grouseland, that they had only permitted them to occupy the territory, but had not conveyed the soil to them, the Delawares released the United States from that guarantee. They did not take part with the British in the last war, and, together with some Mohicans and Nanticokes, remained on White River till the year 1819, when they finally ceded their claim to the United States. Those residing there were then reduced to about eight hundred souls. A number, including the Moravian converted Indians, had previously removed to Canada; and it is difficult to ascertain the situation or numbers of the residue at this time. Those who have lately removed west of the Mississippi are, in an estimate of the War Department, computed at four hundred souls. Former emigrations to that quarter had however taken place, and several small dispersed bands are, it is believed, united with the Senecas and some other tribes.

The appended vocabularies of the Delaware and Minsi are extracted from those in manuscript received from Mr. Heckewelder, and which make part of Mr. Duponceau's valuable collection.

---

Captain Smith, the founder of the first permanent British Colony in Virginia, has given us the names of six tribes on the eastern shore of Virginia and Maryland. The two most southern, the Acomack and Acolanock, spoke the Powhatan language. Thence to the mouth of the Susquehanna,

---

\* We have, in the tenth Volume of the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society (1st series), two accounts of the Indians engaged in the battle on the Miami, where they were defeated by General Wayne. According to one, there were five hundred Delawares out of fifteen hundred Indians who were in the action; according to the other, three out of seven hundred.



he designates the Wighcomocos, the Kuskarawaock, the Ozimies, and the Tockwoghs, amounting together to four hundred and sixty warriors. He makes no mention of the Nanticokes, but, on his map, a village of that name is placed on the Choctanck River; and we are informed by Mr. Heckewelder that the Nanticokes were called by the Delawares *Tawachguáno*, in which name that of Tockwoghs is easily recognised. In more recent times, all the Indians of the eastern shore of Maryland have been embraced under the general designation of Nanticokes. We learn from Charles Thompson,\* that they were forced by the Five Nations to enter into an alliance with them; a fact easily accounted for, by the erection of the Maqua fort twelve miles from Newcastle, by their geographical situation, and by their weakness. During the first part of the eighteenth century they began to migrate up the Susquehanna, where they had lands allotted to them by the Six Nations, and were after a while admitted as a seventh nation into that confederacy. At the treaty of 1758, Tokaaio, a Cayuga chief, spoke in behalf of the five younger nations, to wit, the Cayugas, the Oneidas, the Tuscaroras, the Nanticokes and Conoys, and the Tuteloes. The Conoys were either a tribe of the Nanticokes or intimately connected with them. Charles Thompson calls the nation Nanticokes or Conoys, but confounds them with the Tuteloes. Mr. Heckewelder thinks the Conoys to be the same people with the Kanhawas. This last name is identical with that of the western river Kanhawa, and it might have been supposed that the Kanhawas were a tribe living on that river, and that called by the Five Nations Cochnowas, which at the conferences of Lancaster (1744) they said they had destroyed. But it seems certain that the Indians on the heads of the Potomac were called Ganawese and Canhawaas.†

The Nanticokes and Conoys, being the allies of the Six Nations, remained on the Susquehanna till the commencement of the war of the revolution, when they removed to the west and joined the British standard. They do not appear to exist any longer as a nation, but are still found, mixed with other tribes, both in the United States and in Canada.

The vocabulary of their language is extracted from two manuscripts in Mr. Duponceau's collection, one taken by Mr.

---

\* Appendix to Jefferson's Notes on Virginia.

† See hereafter under the head of Susquehannocks.



Heckewelder in 1785, from a Nanticoke chief living in Canada; the other taken in 1792, by the late William Vans Murray, and sent by him to Mr. Jefferson. It was taken from an old woman called Mrs. Muberry, the widow of their last chief, who lived at Locust Necktown, Goose Creek, Choctank River, Dorset County, Maryland. The village consisted of five wigwams and two board houses. The few surviving Indians spoke exclusively their own language among themselves. That particular tribe called itself *Wiwash*. *Winikako*, the last great Sachem, died about 1720. The tribe consisted then of more than five hundred souls.\*

Captain Smith, in the year 1608, sailed from James River to the head of Chesapeake Bay. He found the western shore deserted from the Patapsco upwards. The Tockwoghs or Nanticokes were fortified east of the Susquehanna to defend themselves against the Massawomeks, the name given by the Chesapeake Indians to the Five Nations. And he met, at the head of the bay, eight canoes full of those Massawomeks, on their return from an expedition against the Tockwoghs. Two days higher up the river lived the Susquehannocks, amounting to near six hundred warriors, and who were also "pallisadoed in their towns to defend themselves from the Massawomeks, their mortal enemies."

In the years 1730-1740, the Five Nations complained, that the inhabitants of Maryland encroached on their lands. The treaty of Lancaster, in the year 1744, was held principally for the purpose of settling those differences, and also the claim set up by the same Indians to the western parts of Virginia. The Maryland commissioners there stated, that the Susquehanna Indians, by a treaty above ninety years since (1654), had yielded to the English the greatest part of the lands possessed by Maryland from Patuxent River on the western, as well as from Chocktank River on the eastern side of the great Bay of Chesapeake. It would seem from that declaration, that the Nanticokes were, in those early times, included by the government of Maryland in the general designation of Susquehanna Indians.

To this Canassatego, the Onondago chief, replied, that they acknowledged the validity of the deed, "and that the Conestogoe or Susquehanna Indians had a right to sell those lands to Maryland, for they were then theirs; but since that time,

---

\* Mr. Vans Murray's Letter to Mr. Jefferson.

we have conquered them and their country now belongs to us ; and the lands we demanded satisfaction for, are no part of the lands comprised in those deeds ; they are the *Cohongorontas* (Potomac) lands ; those you have not possessed one hundred years, no, nor above ten years, and we made our demands so soon as we knew your people were settled in these parts. These have never been sold, but still remain to be disposed of."

The Five Nations agreed in the sequel to sell their claim to the lands in dispute on the Potomac as high up as two miles above the junction of the North and South Branch. It appears therefore that the Susquehannocks, whose territory extended east of the Susquehanna north of the Nanticokes, possessed the country west and southwest of the said river as far as the Potomac. In the course of the conferences at the same treaty, Gachradodow, another Indian chief, in answer to some observations from the Virginia commissioners, said, "Though great things are well remembered among us, yet we don't remember that we were ever conquered by the Great King, or that we have been employed by that Great King to conquer others ; if it was so, it is beyond our memory. We do remember, we were employed by Maryland to conquer the Conestogoes, and that the second time we were at war with them, we carried them all off."\*

Evans corroborates these facts in the Analysis of his Map. He says that the Iroquois gave the finishing stroke to the Susquehannocks ; but that — Bell, in the service of Maryland, had previously given them a blow, from which they never recovered, by the defeat of many hundred at the fort on the east side of the Susquehanna, three miles below Wright's Ferry (now Columbia). Wherefore, he says, the Iroquois claimed only northwest of a line drawn from Conewago Falls to the North Mountain where it crosses the Potomac, and thence along the said mountains to James River. Evans adds, that the Susquehannocks had abandoned the western shore of Maryland before being conquered, and that the English found it mostly a derelict.

---

\* Chalmers, in his Annals, p. 249, says that, in 1660, the Susquehanna Indians assisted Maryland against the Sanadoa (Oneidas), and he quotes Bacon's Laws, 1661. The British had no intercourse with the Five Nations till after 1664, when they took possession of New York.

The author of the Preface to the Treaty of Lancaster of 1744 further informs us, that the residue of the Conestogoes (or Susquehannocks), who were carried away by the Five Nations, were adopted by the Oneidas, and, when they had forgotten their language, were sent back to Conestogo, where they were then living and speaking Oneida. We find accordingly, in the list of Indians who attended the treaty of Lancaster in 1742, four of them designated as Conestogo Indians that speak the Oneida language, and with genuine Iroquois names. Four others are designated as Canoyias or Nanticokes of Conestogo, where a part had in fact at first removed, and remained some time before they proceeded to the western branch of the Susquehanna.

This destruction of the Susquehannocks must have taken place subsequent to the year 1664, since it was effected jointly by Maryland and the Five Nations, and probably before the arrival of William Penn in Pennsylvania (1680). But the records of Maryland are wanted to elucidate their history.

It appears, however, that a remnant was left besides those carried away by the Oneidas. A portion probably fled toward the River Delaware, where they are mentioned by some of the early writers, and may subsequently have returned to their abodes. William Penn at an early period, anxious to strengthen his claim against the pretensions of Lord Baltimore, obtained a cession of land on the Susquehanna from the Indians, whoever they may have been, who resided there. And this was confirmed in the year 1701, by a treaty made with the Susquehanna and Potomac Indians, but in presence and under the sanction of an Onondago Chief. At that treaty Connoodaghtoh is styled King of the Susquehanna, *Minquaes*, or Conestogo Indians; and those inhabiting the head of the Potomac are called Ganawese.

Mr. Heckewelder, speaking of the Conoys, says, that they are the people we call Canais, Conoys, Canaways, Kanhawas, Canwese; \* and, in another place, † that the Canai settled at a distance, on the shores of the Susquehanna and of the Potomac. Colden mentions, under the year 1677, Canagesse Indians, ‡ and in 1684, the Cahnawaas, § meaning certainly the same people, as Indians friends of Virginia, against whom the Five

\* Historical Account, p. 26.

† Ibid. p. 74.

‡ Colden, Hist. Five Nations, Part I. Chap. iii. p. 38.

§ Ibid. p. 57.

Nations had committed hostilities. Indians living on the Potomac, rather than on the Kanhawa, must at that time have been under the protection of Virginia. And it is probable that the Nanticokes, the Susquehannocks, and the Conoys, Canawese, or Calnawaas, were but one nation, extending from the eastern shore of Maryland, across the bay, and North of the Patuxent to the upper waters of the Potomac.

The final cession by the Five Nations of the lands on both sides of the Susquehanna lying in Pennsylvania southwest of the North Mountain, was effected by the treaties of 1736 and 1742. We have no remnant whatever of the language of the Susquehannocks.

Captain Smith has given a detailed account of the various tribes found in Virginia, at the time of its first permanent settlement in the years 1707 and 1709. Exclusively of the Massawomacs (Five Nations), who are invaders, of the Susquehannocks who lay to the north of the colony, and of the Nanticokes and Tockwoghs on the eastern shore and already alluded to, he mentions four nations or confederacies speaking distinct languages.

Those which formed the Powhatan confederacy embraced, on the southern extremity of the eastern shore, the Acomack and the Acohanock. On the western shore of the Chesapeake, they extended from the most southern rivers that empty into James River to the Patuxent, consisting of thirty-four tribes, each having a distinct name, but speaking the same language, and amounting together (including the Acomacks and Acohanocks) to two thousand nine hundred warriors, or more than ten thousand souls. Their settlements extended westwardly to the great falls of the rivers; but it would seem, though the accounts are indistinct, that their hunting-grounds extended farther west towards the first ridge of hills.

South of the Powhatans, on the waters of the Nottoway and Meherrin Rivers which empty into Albemarle Sound, he places the Chawonock and Mangoags; two Iroquois tribes, known to us under the name of Nottoways and Tuteloes.

West of the more southerly Powhatans, and extending from James River towards the Roanoke, were the Monacans, having several tribes (Massinacack, Monasickapanoughs, &c.) for tributaries. These Monacans are considered as the same Iroquois nation which called themselves Tuscaroras.

And west of the more northern Powhatans, and principally on the upper waters of the Rappahannock, were the Mannahoks, who consisted of various tribes, differing in language, and in alliance with the Monacans.

This account taken literally, so far as it relates to the Monacans and the Mannahoks, is attended with several difficulties. The Mannahoks were almost interspersed with the Powhatans, since they were met by Smith on the tide-waters of the Rappahannock. And the lower town of the Monacans on James River appears to have been immediately above the falls. Lawson says that the well-known coal mine above Richmond was near the Monacan town. It may be that the Tuscaroras had extended their dominion as far north as James River. But it is not improbable that the tribes, seated above the falls of James River, embraced under the general designation of Monacans, were tributaries of the Tuscaroras; and that they, as well as the Mannahoks were, in fact, Lenape tribes, speaking a different language from the Powhatans, and, as usual, generally at war with them. We find indeed that the Susquehannocks themselves, hard pressed as they were by the Five Nations, were, about the year 1637, carrying on a constant predatory war against the Powhatan tribe settled near the mouth of the Potomac.\*

The Tuscaroras and other Iroquois tribes, inhabiting the country south of the Powhatans, will be hereafter noticed. No specimen has been preserved of the languages of any of the tribes, either Monacans or Mannahoks, living west of the Powhatans. Of the language of these, we have only the scanty vocabulary left by Smith, with a few scattered additional words found in Beverly's "History of Virginia"; but these are sufficient to establish beyond a doubt, that they were a Lenape tribe.

The first Virginia settlers maintained an intercourse, often interrupted by hostilities, with the Powhatans during the life of the great chief, father of Pocahontas. Soon after his death, the Indians made an attempt to destroy the infant colony. Near three hundred and fifty English settlers were massacred, and more than three fourths of the plantations abandoned. The English soon recovered, and the contest terminated in a total defeat and partial subjugation of the

---

\* Bozman's History of Maryland.



Indians. In the year 1644, they made another effort, attended with a similar massacre and terminating in the same manner. According to Mr. Jefferson, the number of warriors of the different Powhatan tribes was then reduced to five hundred. In 1676, Bacon, during the insurrection which bears his name, appears to have completed their total subjugation. From that time they had lands reserved to them, for which they paid a nominal tribute; and they were henceforth considered as under the protection of the British Government. They gradually dwindled away, intermarried with the blacks, and have now entirely disappeared. At least it is not believed that a single individual remains that speaks the language.

As soon as the British had taken possession of New York, the governors of Virginia found it convenient, if not necessary, to secure peace with those Massawomeks, or Five Nations, whose incursions have been so long formidable to the Indians living in the vicinity of the heads of the great rivers, particularly of the Potomac. These Indians were now under the protection of Virginia, as appears by the conferences of 1677, 1684, and 1685, already mentioned, and at which Colonel Kendall, Lord Howard, Colonel Bird, &c., successively attended on the part of Virginia. Mr. Jefferson states that the whole of the upper country was obtained by fair purchases, which must have been from the native Indians taken under the protection of the colonial government. These, from their geographical position, could be no other than those mentioned by Captain Smith, under the name of Mannahoks. The loss of the colonial records of Virginia compels us to resort to conjectures, and to the notices preserved in the several conferences or treaties of Albany and Lancaster.

About the year 1722 a treaty was concluded between the Six Nations and Governor Spotswood, of Virginia, by which it was agreed, that the high ridge of mountains, extending along the frontiers of Virginia, to the westward of the present settlements of that colony, should be for ever the established boundaries between the Indians subject to the dominion of Virginia, and the Indians belonging to and depending on the Five Nations. Whether the mountain intended was the Blue Ridge or the North Mountain does not clearly appear. But, by the treaty of Lancaster of 1774, the Five Nations recognised for a trifling consideration the British right to all the colony of Virginia. In the course of the conferences,



and while that matter was in debate, a speech was delivered by the Indian Chief Tachanoontia; a portion of which we will quote, as it proves by his own declaration, that the more western Indians of Virginia were Lenape tribes. It must be premised that the termination *roonaw*, borrowed from the Algonkin *Ireni* (men), was used by the Iroquois, to designate Indians of the Algonkin language.

“All the world knows we conquered the several nations living on Sasquahannah, Cohongoronta (Potomac), and on the back of the great mountains in Virginia; the *Conoyuch-such-roonaw*, the *Cohnowas-ronow*,\* the *Tohoairough-roonaw*, and the *Konnutskinough-roonaw* feel the effects of our conquests, being now a part of our nations, and their lands at our disposal. We know very well, it hath often been said by the Virginians, that the Great King of England, and the people of that Colony, conquered the Indians who lived there; but it is not true. We will allow they have conquered the *Sachdagugh-roonaw* † (Powhatans), and drove back the Tuscaroraws, and that they have on that account a right to some part of Virginia; but as to what lies beyond the mountains, we conquered the nations residing there, and that land, if the Virginians ever get a good right to it, it must be by us.”

---

The first attempt by the British to colonize North America was made in the year 1585, on the coast of North Carolina, at the small island of Roanoke. From the few words collected by Ralph Lane and Heriot, in Albemarle and Pamlico Sounds, and from Lawson's vocabulary of the Pamlicos, it is evident that the shores of those Sounds, from the Virginia line to the vicinity of Neuse River and Cape Hatteras, were inhabited by Lenape tribes. The Pamlicos were reduced by a great mortality in 1695; ‡ and, according to Lawson, that particular tribe was reduced to fifteen warriors in the year 1708.

---

\* Here are two names nearly similar, given to two distinct tribes, perhaps the Conoys of Potomac, and the Kanhawas of the River Kanhawa.

† Sachdagughs are the same as the Powhatans. (Evans's Analysis.)

‡ Archdale.

It is probable however that the Hatteras, the Paspatauks, and some other small tribes, mentioned by him, spoke dialects of the same language. They were bounded on the west by the Chowan and Tuscarora Iroquois tribes; on the south by extinct tribes of uncertain origin.

#### WESTERN LENAPE.

Under this head we include the Menomonies, the Miami and Illinois tribes, the Sauks, Foxes, and Kickapoos, and, finally, the Shawnoes.

The Menomonies or Malominies,\* called by the French, "Folles Avoines," "Wild Oats," are seated on the northerly part of Green Bay, which is their boundary on the east. They are bounded on the north by those Chippeways, who inhabit the southern shores of Lake Superior; on the south by the Winnebagoes. Towards the west they join the Sauks and perhaps the Sioux Dabeota. Their name is derived from the wild rice (*Zizania [clavulosa ?]*), which grows abundantly in their country. The French have occasionally given to the neighbouring Chippeways the same name (Folles Avoines); and they have also extended to both the designation of "Sauteurs," from the Saut or Falls of St. Mary, on account of their visiting it in fishing-time. They are first mentioned by the Jesuits, in the year 1669, when they inhabited the same country as at this time. Their language, though of the Algonkin stock, is less similar to that of the Chippeways, their immediate neighbours, than almost any other dialect of the same stock. As no other tribe speaks it, and they generally speak Chippeway, it is almost impossible to find good interpreters. It is probably owing to that circumstance, that they were for a long while supposed to have a distinct language, belonging to another stock than the Algonkin. The appended vocabulary was addressed by Mr. James D. Doty to Governor Cass; and some words have been supplied from Tanner's Narrative, edited by Dr. James. By the estimate of the War Department, they amount to four thousand two hundred souls.

The Sauks or *Saukies* (White Clay), and the Foxes or

---

\* From *Monomonic*, "Wild rice"; *Monomoniking*, "In the place of wild rice." (Schoolcraft.)

Outagamies, so called by the Europeans and Algonkins respectively, but whose true name is Musquakkiuk (Red Clay), are in fact but one nation. The French Missionaries on coming first in contact with them, in the year 1665, at once found that they spoke the same language, and that it differed from the Algonkin, though belonging to the same stock; and also that this language was common to the Kickapoos and to those Indians they called Maskontens.\* This last nation, if it ever had an existence as a distinct tribe, has entirely disappeared. But we are informed by Charlevoix, and Mr. Schoolcraft corroborates the fact, that the word *Mascontenck* means "a country without woods, a prairie." The name "Mascontens" was therefore used to designate "prairie Indians." And it appears that they consisted principally of Sauks and Kickapoos, with an occasional mixture of Potowotamies and Miamis, who probably came there to hunt the buffalo. The country, assigned to those Mascontens, lay south of the Fox River of Lake Michigan, and west of Illinois River.

The identity of the language has been more recently ascertained by the answers of *Masco*, a Saukie, and of *Wahballo*, a Fox chief, recorded in the report of the Rev. Jedidiah Morse.† The last-mentioned chief says, "the Sauk, Fox, and Kickapoo nations are related by language;" and again, "There are only three nations with whom we can converse, the Sauk, Fox, and Kickapoo nations."

We have no other vocabulary of the language of those nations, but that of the Sauks taken by Dr. Keating from the Sauk chief *Wennebea*, inserted in his narrative of Major Long's Second Expedition.

When first discovered, the Sauks and Foxes had their seats toward the southern extremity of Green Bay, on Fox River, and generally farther east than the country which they lately occupied. The Foxes became particularly hostile to the French and their Indian allies. In the year 1712, they, together with the Kickapoos and Mascontens or Sakies, attacked Fort Detroit defended then by only twenty Frenchmen. But it was relieved by the Ottawas, Hurons, Potowotamies, and other friendly Indians, who, after a long resistance, destroyed

---

\* Father Allouez, Relations of New France, 1666.

† Appendix, p. 122.

or captured the greater part of the besieging force. The Foxes and Sauks, sustained by some of the Sioux tribes, and by the Chickasaws, turned their arms against the Illinois, and for a while intercepted the communication between Canada and Louisiana. They, together with the Kickapoos, compelled the Illinois to abandon their settlements on the river of that name; and the residue of this nation sought refuge, in the year 1722, in the vicinity of the French settlement at Kaskaskia on the Mississippi.\*

The largest portion of the territory of the Sauks and Foxes, even before their late cession, lay on the west side of the Mississippi. At what time they settled beyond that river is not known. They partly subjugated, and finally admitted into their alliance, the Iowas, a Sioux tribe, which is stated by Charlevoix to have been formerly seated on the eastern bank of the Mississippi. By the treaty of 1804, the Sauks and Foxes ceded to the United States all their lands east of that river, bounded, according to their claim, westwardly by the Mississippi from the mouth of the River Illinois to that of the Wisconsin; eastwardly by Illinois River and the Fox River of the Illinois, up to the small lake called *Sakaegan*; and northwardly by a line drawn thence to the Wisconsin, and down that river to its mouth.

The Kickapoos by various treaties, 1809 to 1819, have also ceded all their lands to the United States. They claimed all the country between Illinois River and the Wabash, north of the parallel of latitude passing by the mouth of the Illinois, and south of the Kankakee River, the most eastern branch of the Illinois; the southern part of it by right of conquest from the Illinois and fifty years' possession. But, with the exception of a tract on Vermilion River, the whole country watered by the Wabash appears indubitably to have belonged to the Miami tribes.

The events of the last war with the Sauks are generally known. According to the estimate, they amount to five thousand three hundred souls, the Foxes to thirteen hundred, and the Kickapoos to five hundred. They all now reside west of the Mississippi.

There is no doubt, says Charlevoix, that the Miamis and the Illinois were not long ago (1721) the same people, from the

---

\* Charlevoix, *passim*.

great affinity between their languages. The same affinity was observed by Father Allouez, who says that their language, though of the Algonkin stock, differed much from that of all the other tribes of that family, and that it was the most difficult for the Missionaries to understand. The appended vocabulary of the Miamis is extracted from those of Volney and Dr. Thornton, both taken from the Interpreter, the late Mr. Wells, and with the assistance of the celebrated chief "Little Turtle." That of the Illinois, from a manuscript in Mr. Duponceau's collection, is less authentic; the name of the author, who appears to have been a French priest, being omitted. He calls it a "*Pi-Illinois-Mi*" (Piankishaw, Illinois, Miami,) vocabulary, and considers the three languages as being but one.

The territory claimed by the Miamis and Piankishaws may be generally stated as having been bounded eastwardly by the Maumee River of Lake Erie, and to have included all the country drained by the Wabash. The Piankishaws occupied the portion bordering on the Ohio. They granted, in 1768, their lands east of the Wabash to the Delawares. On the west they bordered on the Illinois; the boundary line being the dividing ridge, which separates the waters emptying into the Saline Creek and the Kaskaskias River, from those which fall into the Wabash.

The Piankishaws are the only tribe in that quarter not mentioned by the French Missionaries, who probably considered them as part of the Miamis. That they were closely connected is certain. For at a conference, held at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, in 1753, with the Ohio Indians and the Six Nations, the Miamis or Twightees recommended to the other Indian nations, and to the English, the infant son of the late chief of the Piankishaws, whom they call "one of their tribes."

The name of Twightees is that given by the Six Nations to the Miamis, who, independent of the Piankishaws, are subdivided into three kindred and allied tribes, viz. Miamis Proper, Eel River, and Outanons or Weas. Though already diminished by wars, they were still a numerous nation, when first visited by the French missionaries in 1669; and they continued a long while in alliance with the French and at war with the Six Nations. But they appear to have, at least for a while, formed a connexion with the last-mentioned nation. They sent deputies to the treaty of Lancaster of 1748, who were presented by the Six Nations, in order that they might be admitted into

the British alliance as they had been into theirs. This connexion appears to have been dissolved in consequence of the removal of the Delawares and Shawnoes to the Ohio. The Miamis have taken an active part in all the wars against the United States. They have now ceded the greater part of their lands, and are said including the Piankishaws to amount to less than two thousand souls.

The Illinois consisted of five tribes, to wit, the Kaskaskias, Cahokias, Tamaronas, Peorias, and Mitchigamias. This last was a foreign tribe admitted into their confederacy, and which originally came from the west side of the Mississippi, where they lived on a small river that bore their name.\* They were formerly the most numerous of the western tribes, amounting, in 1670, to ten or twelve thousand souls.† But, attacked on all sides by the Five Nations, by the Chickasaws, and principally by the Sauks, Foxes, and Kickapoos, they were ultimately almost entirely exterminated.

Originally they occupied the whole country between the Mississippi and the Ohio, including both sides of Illinois River, and bounded eastwardly by the Piankishaws and Miamis. By the treaties of 1803 and 1818, reduced to about three hundred souls, they ceded all their lands or claims to the United States. They had then abandoned every pretension to the territory west of Illinois River which had been conquered by the Sauks and Foxes. But they included in their cession all that lay east of that river, as high up as the junction of the Kankakee and Maple Rivers. The northern part of that country was, as has been seen, claimed by the Kickapoos by right of conquest. Their claim to the territory lying south of the parallel of latitude, passing by the mouth of Illinois River, was not disputed by any other Indian tribe.

The French had at an early date established themselves at Vincennes, and at Kaskaskias, and some neighbouring villages on the Mississippi. But the grants of land obtained by them from the Indians were of very moderate extent; and the western tribes, heretofore mentioned under this head, had not before the present century been disturbed in their possessions. The diminution in their numbers was owing to their intestine wars, and to those of the Iroquois, the Sioux, and the Chickasaws against them.

---

\* Charlevoix.

† Relations of New France, 1671.



Although the *Shawnoes* have been well known to us since the year 1680, their previous history is very uncertain, and the various notices we have of them difficult to be reconciled. The first mention we have of them is by De Laet in 1632. After having enumerated the various tribes on both sides of Delaware River, he says, "some persons add to them the Shawanoes, Capitanasses &c." They are mentioned by the French under the name of Chaouanons, in the year 1672, as being neighbours and allies of the Andastes, an extinct Iroquois tribe, lying southwest of the Senecas, by whom they were destroyed or incorporated in that year.\* Their original seats are uniformly placed, in all the ancient French maps, on the south side of the Ohio and extending southerly to the Cumberland River, which, in all the French and English maps, as late as that of Hutchins, bears also their name. That name which means "Southern," accords with that position. The Sauks and Foxes say, that they were originally of the same stock with themselves, and had migrated to the south.† The account given by the Five Nations corroborates the fact of their having been in alliance with the enemies of the Senecas, and that they were but late comers north of the Ohio. In the year 1684, in answer to the complaint of the French, that they had attacked the Twightees or Miamis, the Five Nations assigned as one of the causes of war, that the Twightees had invited into their country the Satanas, in order to make war against them.‡ It is also well known that, when the Shawnoes of Pennsylvania began, in the year 1740, to migrate to the Ohio, they were obliged to obtain a grant or permission to that effect from the Wyandots. And, in a memorandum annexed to the treaty of Fort Harmar with the Wyandots, of January, 1789, they declare that the country north of the Ohio, then occupied by the Shawnoes, is theirs (the Wyandots') of right, and that the Shawnoes are only living upon it by their permission.

Lawson, in his account of Carolina, (1708,) speaking of the erratic habits of the Indian nations, says, that the Savanoes formerly lived on the banks of the Mississippi, that they removed to the head of one of the rivers of South Carolina, since which most of them had gone to the Iroquois country

\* Charlevoix.

† Morse's Report.

‡ Satanas is the name given by the Five Nations to the Shawnoes.—Colden, chap. V. pp. 69, 70.

on the heads of rivers emptying into the Chesapeake. Mr. Miller, President of the Ebenezer Academy in South Carolina, has given me the following information. "My father was one of the first settlers in the Wanhaw settlement. I have heard him frequently speak of cruel and bloody scenes between the Catawbias and Shawnees. From what I have heard him say, the Cherokees, probably at an early period of the settlement of the Carolinas, occupied a section of country now partly in York County, South Carolina, and partly in Mecklenberg, North Carolina, known in the colonial histories as Craven County. The Cherokees were driven by the Shawnees, and the Shawnees were driven in their turn by the Catawbias." It is clear that this Shawnoe settlement is the same which was mentioned by Lawson, and that it was situated on the head waters of the Catawba or Santee, and probably of the Yadkin or Pedee.

Lawson expressly distinguishes those Savanoes or Shawnoes settled on the *head* of one of the rivers of South Carolina, from the Savannahs, "a famous warlike friendly nation, living to the *south* end of Ashley River." These Savannahs are mentioned by the earliest Carolina writers and by Hewatt under the name of Serannas. That tribe was probably called at first Savannahs by the European settlers on account of their vicinity to the river of that name; and they appear to me to be the same which was afterwards designated by its true Indian name of Yamassees.

M'Call, in his "History of Georgia," mentions that, in the year 1750, a Quaker settlement had been formed west of Augusta, on a body of land, which had formerly been owned by a tribe, called the Savannahs, who had been compelled to abandon it, in consequence of a war with the Uchees, who claimed the land adjoining them to the southward. Whether they were a residue of the Savannahs formerly living south of Ashley River, or of our Shawnoes, cannot be ascertained. It has been stated to me, on verbal but respectable authority, that some Shawnoes were for a while settled on the Savannah above Augusta; and it is certain, that they were at war with the Cherokees and received on friendly terms by the Creeks.

Adair, who alludes to those wars between the Shawnoes and the Cherokees, met, about the year 1740, in the wilderness a large encampment of Shawnoes, who, after having wandered

several years in the woods, were then *returning* to the Creek country.

We know from Mr. Johnston, the Indian Agent, that a body of them, who had originally lived north of the Ohio, had, at some anterior time and from causes not explained, migrated as far south as the Suwanee river, which empties into the Gulf of Mexico and is supposed to derive its name from them; and that they returned thence, about the year 1755, to the vicinity of Sandusky, under the conduct of a chief called Black Hoof. It has been reported, that Tecumseh and his brother, the Prophet, were sons of a Creek woman married during that migration to a Shawnoe.

At the time when William Penn landed in Pennsylvania, they were found in the vicinity of Philadelphia, and have left the name of one of their tribes (Piqua) to a small river in Lancaster county. And their name is found in the year 1701, to an agreement with William Penn, ratifying a sale to him of lands on the Susquehanna by the Conestogo Indians. It is, however, evident that, at that time, they were tenants at will under the Six Nations; and they soon after are found living on a similar tenure on the western branches of the Susquehanna. Evans, in the Analysis of his Map, says that their original seats extended from Kentucky river southwest to the Mississippi, that they were afterwards scattered into all parts, and that, in the year 1755, they again collected on the Ohio.

From these scattered notices, it may be conjectured that, as stated by the Sauks and Foxes, the Shawnoes separated at an early date from the other Lenape tribes, and established themselves south of the Ohio in what is now the State of Kentucky\*; that, having been driven away from that territory, probably by the Chickasaws and Cherokees, some portion of them found their way, during the first half of the seventeenth century, as far east as the country of the Susquehannocks, a kindred Lenape tribe; that the main body of the nation, invited by the Miamis and the Andastes, crossed the Ohio, occupied the country on and adjacent to the Scioto, and joined in the war against the Five Nations; and that, after their final defeat and that of their allies in the year 1672, the dispersion

---

\*The name of the river *Kentucky* is Shawnoese, and means, "At the head of a river." See Johnston's Account, I Trans. Am. Antiq. Society, p. 299.

alluded to by Evans, took place. A considerable portion made about that time a forcible settlement on the head waters of the rivers of Carolina; and these, after having been driven away by the Catawbias, found, as others had already done, an asylum in different parts of the Creek country. Another portion joined their brethren in Pennsylvania; and some may have remained in the vicinity of the Scioto and Sandusky.

Those in Pennsylvania, who seem to have been the most considerable part of the nation, were not entirely subjugated and reduced to the humiliating state of women by the Six Nations. But they held their lands on the Susquehanna only as tenants at will, and were always obliged to acknowledge a kind of sovereignty or superiority in their landlords. They appear to have been more early and more unanimous than the Delawares, in their determination to return to the country north of the Ohio. This they effected under the auspices of the Wyandots, and on the invitation of the French, during the years 1740 — 1755. They occupied there the Scioto country, extending to Sandusky, and westwardly towards the Great Miami, and they have also left there the names of two of their tribes, to wit, Chillicothe and Piqua. Those who were settled amongst the Creeks joined them; and the nation was once more reunited.

During the forty following years, they were in an almost perpetual state of war with America, either as British Colonies, or as independent States. They were among the most active allies of the French during the seven years' war, and, after the conquest of Canada, continued, in concert with the Delawares, hostilities which were only terminated after the successful campaign of General Bouquet. The first permanent settlements of the Americans beyond the Alleghany mountains, in the vicinity of the Ohio, were commenced in the year 1769, and were almost immediately attended with a new war with the Shawnoes, which ended in 1774, after they had been repulsed in a severe engagement at the mouth of the Kanhawa, and the Virginians had penetrated into their country. They took a most active part against America, both during the war of Independence, and in the Indian war which followed, and which was terminated in 1795, by the treaty of Greenville. They lost, by that treaty, nearly the whole territory which they held from the Wyandots; and a part of them, under the guidance of Tecumseh, again joined the British standard

during the last war. They are now much dispersed; the greater part have removed west of the Mississippi, and the number of these is estimated at about one thousand five hundred souls.

We have not so copious a vocabulary of their language as might have been expected. That which is appended has been chiefly extracted from that taken by Mr. Johnston, the Indian Agent. The other words have been supplied from Mr. Jefferson's mutilated manuscript vocabulary, from the Mithridates, General Parsons, Smith Barton, &c.

---

#### IROQUOIS TRIBES.

The northern Iroquois tribes consisted of two distinct divisions; the eastern, forming the confederation, known by the name of Five Nations, whose original territory did not extend westwardly farther than the western boundary of Pennsylvania; and the western, consisting, as far as can be ascertained, of four nations: the Wyandots, or Hurons, and the Attiouandarons, or Neutral Nation, north; the Erigas and the Andastes or Guandastogues (Guyandots), south of Lake Erie.

When Champlain arrived in Canada, the Five Nations were engaged in a deadly war with all the Algonkin tribes within their reach. It is remarkable, that the Wyandots, another Iroquois nation, were the head and principal support of the Algonkin confederacy. The extent of their influence and of the consideration in which they were held, may be found in the fact, that even the Delawares, who claimed to be the elder branch of the Lenape Nation and called themselves the grandfathers of their kindred tribes, recognised the superiority of the Wyandots, whom to this day they call their uncles. And though reduced to a very small number, the right of the Wyandots, derived either from ancient sovereignty, or from the incorporation of the remnants of the three extinct tribes, to the country between Lake Erie and the Ohio, from the Alleghany river to the great Miami, has never been disputed by any other than the Five Nations.

Their real name, *Yendots*, was well known to the French, who gave them the nickname of Hurons. They were called



*Quatoghee* by the Five Nations; and one of their tribes, *Dionondadies* or *Tuinontatek*. They were visited in 1615 by Champlain, and, in 1624, by Father Sagard. And the Jesuits, who subsequently established missions among them, have given, in the "Relations of New France," some account of their language, and ample information of their means of subsistence, manners, and religious creed or superstitions. They had, probably on account of their wars with the Five Nations, concentrated their settlements in thirty-one villages, not extending more altogether than twenty leagues either way, and situated along or in the vicinity of Lake Huron, about one hundred miles southwardly of the mouth of French River. They consisted of five confederated tribes, viz. the *Ataronch-ronons*, four villages; the *Attiquenongnahai*, three villages; the *Attignaouentan*, or "Nation de l'Ours," twelve villages; the *Ahrendah-ronons*, the most northeastern tribe and that with which Champlain resided, three villages; and the *Tionontate*, or "Nation of the Petun," the most southwesterly, which formerly had been at war with the other tribes, and had entered the confederation recently, nine villages.\*

The smallpox carried off about twelve hundred souls in the year 1639. The Missionaries, principally with a view of baptizing dying children, visited at that time every village, and, with few exceptions, every cabin; and embraced the opportunity of making a complete enumeration of the whole nation. They give the general result in round numbers, seven hundred cabins and two thousand families, which they estimate at twelve, but which could not have exceeded ten thousand souls.† They were not only more warlike, but, in every respect, more advanced in civilization than the Northern Algonkins, particularly in agriculture, to which they appear, probably from their concentrated situation, to have been obliged to attend more extensively than any other northern Indian nation. The Missionaries had at first great hardships to encounter, and found them less tractable than the Algonkins. But, whether owing to the superior talents of Father Brebeuf, and his associates, or to the national character, they made ultimately more progress in converting the Hurons, and have left a more permanent impression of their labors in the remnant of that tribe, than appears to have been done by them, in any other nation without the boundaries of the French settlements.

---

\* Father Lallemand, 1640. Relations, &c.

† Ibid.

The only communication of the Hurons, with the infant colony of Canada, was by the river Ottawa, of a difficult navigation interrupted by numerous portages. The Five Nations directed their attacks to that quarter, cut off the several trading parties, which were in the habit of descending and ascending the river once a year, and intercepted the communication so effectually, that, about the year 1646, the Missionaries on Lake Huron were three years without receiving any supplies from Quebec. The Hurons who had lost several hundred warriors in those engagements became dispirited and careless. They indeed abandoned the smaller villages and fortified the larger. This only accelerated their ruin. In the year 1649, the Five Nations invaded the country with all their forces, attacked and carried one after the other the most considerable of those places of refuge, and massacred all the inhabitants.\* The destruction was completed in the course of the ensuing year. A part of the Hurons fled down the Ottawa River and sought an asylum in Canada, where they were pursued by their implacable enemies even under the walls of Quebec. The greater part of the Abrendas,† and several detached bands, surrendered and were incorporated into the Five Nations. The remnant of the Tionontates took refuge amongst the Chippeways of Lake Superior. Others were dispersed towards Michilimackinac, or in some more remote quarters. This event was immediately followed, as has already been stated, by the dispersion of the Algonkin Nations of the Ottawa River.

In 1671 the Tionontates, after an unsuccessful war with the Sioux, left Lake Superior for Michilimackinac, where they rallied around them the dispersed remnants of the other tribes of their nation, and probably of the Andastes and other kindred tribes, which had been likewise nearly exterminated by the Five Nations. Some years later they removed to Detroit, in the vicinity of their ancient seats. And, though reduced to two villages, they resumed their ascendancy over the Algonkin tribes and acted a conspicuous part with great sagacity in the ensuing conflicts between the French and the Five Nations.

---

\* The two Missionaries, Brebeuf and Lallemand, Jr., were made prisoners and burnt alive by the Iroquois. Eight or ten Jesuits were killed in Canada, at different times, whilst on their missionary duties.

† Charlevoix says the villages of St. John and St. Michel. These were names imposed by the Missionaries, and, as appears by the Relations, both places were inhabited by that tribe.

Charlevoix, in 1721, writes, that they were still the soul of the councils of all the Western Indians. Still assuming the right of sovereignty over the country between the Lakes and the Ohio, as far west as the Miami, they encouraged the Shawnoes and the Delawares to remove to the Ohio, by granting to them the possession, though not the right to the soil, of the territory west of Alleghany River, bordering principally on Lake Erie, the Muskingum, and the Scioto. This last river is particularly mentioned by Mr. Johnston, the Indian Agent, as having received its name from them and belonging to them.

It has been seen, that Pennsylvania thought it necessary to obtain a deed of cession from the Wyandots for the north-western part of the State. The treaty of Greenville was signed by all the nations which had taken part in the war. But it was from the Wyandots, that the United States obtained the cession of the territory, west of the Connecticut Reserve, lying between the northern boundary line of that ceded by that treaty and Lake Erie.\* Those remaining in the United States, and till lately at Sandusky, on the Scioto, and near Detroit, are said not to amount to one thousand souls. A still less considerable part of the nation, which took part with the British during the last war, resides in Canada.

The vocabulary is principally extracted from that supplied by Mr. Johnston, with some additions from Smith Barton, and from a collection of sentences in the War Department. A specimen is also given of the ancient Huron from the vocabulary of Sagard, which would have been farther extended if full confidence could have been placed in his knowledge of the language.†

Father Brebeuf was sent in the year 1641, on a mission to the Attiouandas, who were seated south of the Wyandots on the northern shores of Lake Erie. But we know nothing of their language, except that it was a dialect of the Huron. That tribe was, on account of the strict neutrality it preserved during the wars between the Five Nations and the Hurons,

---

\* Treaty of 29th of September, 1817, Article V. The Miami of Lake Erie, and its branch, the St. Mary's, are there specified as their western boundary. The St. Mary's was to its mouth the line between them and the Miamis.

† Since this paper was completed, I have been informed that there is a vocabulary and grammar of the Wyandot language in the library of Yale College. Mr. Johnston's Vocabulary is contained in 1 Trans. Am. Antiq. Society, p. 292.

generally known by the name of "the Neutral Nation." Their policy did not preserve them from destruction, which soon followed that of their kindred tribe. The only further notice we have of them is, that, in the year 1669, Father Fremin, whilst on an unsuccessful mission amongst the Five Nations, came to a village named Gandougarac, inhabited by a remnant of that nation and by some Hurons, who were living there under the control of the Senecas.

The Eries, Erigas, or Cat Nation, were seated on the southern shores of the lake which still bears their name. The French never had any mission amongst them. We only know that they were an Iroquois tribe, and that they were destroyed, in 1655, by the Five Nations. Charlevoix gives the date, and Evans mentions the fact.

The Andastes or Guandastogues were a more formidable nation; and the war of the Five Nations against them appears to have lasted more than twenty years. Although the French Missionaries never penetrated amongst them, those who resided amongst the Five Nations repeatedly allude to the alternate successes of the war. They saw and conversed with many of the prisoners, who were always put to death, and ascertained that their language was an Iroquois dialect. As far as can be collected from their notices, the Andastes were seated on the Alleghany River, extending thence westwardly along the Ohio.

Father Lallemand, in the Relation of the year 1663, states that, in the month of April, eight hundred warriors of the Five Nations had proceeded from the western extremity of Lake Ontario to a fine river, nearly equal (*semblable*) to the St. Lawrence, the navigation of which is free of falls, and which they descended one hundred leagues to the Andastogue village. He must have meant the principal village, and it could not have been far from the site of Pittsburgh. The village was well fortified and the aggressors were repulsed. But, though assisted by the Shawnoes and the Miamis, the Andastes were finally destroyed in the year 1672.\* It seems probable that they were a kindred tribe of the Wyandots, and that which left the name of Guyandot to one of the southern tributaries of the Ohio.

---

\* Charlevoix.

The confederacy known generally by the name of "Five Nations," called by the French "Iroquois," by the Lenape tribes *Maquas* or *Menque* (Mingos), in Virginia *Massawomeks*, in various places by the names more or less corrupted of their respective tribes, consisted, as the name imports, of five nations, seated south of the River St. Lawrence and of Lake Ontario, and extending from the Hudson to the upper branches of the river Alleghany and to Lake Erie. It has been doubted whether Hochelaga now Montreal, which Cartier found, in 1535, inhabited by Indians speaking a dialect of the Iroquois language, was occupied by the Hurons, or by the Five Nations. Independent of the much greater proximity of these, the question seems to be definitively settled by the declarations of the St. Lawrence Algonkins, who cultivated nothing, to Father Le Jeune. In the course of his excursions between Quebec and the site of Montreal, they pointed out to him several old fields, and informed him that they had formerly been planted in maize by the Iroquois.\* It is therefore certain, that, within less than seventy years before the arrival of Champlain in Canada, the Five Nations either were driven from settlements they previously had on the St. Lawrence, or voluntarily abandoned them in order to concentrate their forces and to be less exposed to the attacks of their enemies.

Their five tribes were, from east to west, the Mohawks, the Oneidas, the Onondagas, the Cayugas, and the Senecas. The time when the confederacy was formed is not known, but was presumed to be of a recent date, and the Oneidas and Cayugas are said to have been compelled to join it. Although the fact has been questioned, it is proved by the speeches of the several orators at the treaty of Easton of 1758, that those two tribes were the younger, and the three others the elder members of the confederacy. The residue of the Tuscaroras of North Carolina were, after their decisive defeat in 1712-13, admitted as a sixth nation. And at the treaty of Easton it was announced to the British, that the confederation now consisted of eight nations, the three elder as already stated, and the five younger viz. the Cayugas, the Oneidas, the

---

\* Relations of New France, 1636. The word "Iroquois" is used in this essay as a generic term, embracing all the nations speaking dialects of the same language, and applicable to all those dialects. It is confined by the French to the Five Nations.



Tuscaroras, the Nanticokes and Conoys, making but one nation, and the Tuteloes.\* But the Nanticokes and Conoys removed to the west not long after, and the Tuteloes do not afterwards appear as a distinct nation.

The Five Nations had already acquired a decided superiority over the other Indians, before the arrival of the Europeans. They were at that epoch at war with all the surrounding tribes, with perhaps the single exception of the Andastes on the west. That in which they were engaged towards the north, with the Hurons and Algonkins, was still attended with alternate success on each side. But southwardly they had already carried their arms as far as the mouth of the Susquehanna and the vicinity of Newcastle on the Delaware, and had become an object of terror to all the Indians, from the sources of the Potomac and even farther south, to the Merrimac and the Piscataway.

For this ascendancy several causes may be assigned. Their geographical position was fortunate, and they had the wisdom, instead of extending and spreading themselves, to remain concentrated even at the time of their greatest successes in their primitive seats. They were there protected against any sudden or dangerous attack, on the south by wide ranges of mountains, on the north by Lake Ontario. What was of still greater importance, particularly in savage warfare, they were without doubt more brave and more ferocious than any of the other nations. They were also further advanced in agriculture, in the fabrication of their weapons, and in the few arts of the Indians, than those of the Algonkin-Lenape stock. On all occasions they discovered a greater degree of cultivated intelligence, in no instances more than in the formation and long continuance of their confederacy, and in attacking by turns the unconnected and disunited petty tribes by which they were surrounded.

The superiority of the Iroquois tribes generally over the Algonkins appears indeed incontestable, and to have been partly due to the great subdivision of these into small independent communities. They were far more numerous, and yet, everywhere, we find a prevailing Iroquois tribe, more powerful and populous than any of its neighbours of another stock; in North Carolina, the Tuscaroras; in Canada, the Hurons; above all, the Five Nations. The disproportion between the population

---

\* Takaio's speech, at that treaty.

of these, and that of their enemies taken in the aggregate, is often adverted to by the contemporary writers. And we are astonished to find that, at no time, the numbers of their warriors could have amounted to five, and that about the year 1670, they were less than four thousand.\*

The intercourse with the Europeans, in its beginning, increased the relative superiority of the Five Nations and gave them a decided advantage over their enemies. The western Indians were, for a long while after, altogether destitute of firearms. The lower Algonkins were indeed partially supplied by the French; but in New England every precaution was taken to prevent the Indians in their vicinity from being armed; and the Delawares could not have been supplied before the arrival of the Swedes.† In the mean while, the Dutch, principally intent on trade, and who had a post at Albany as early as the year 1614, furnished the Mohawks and gradually the other Five Nations with ample supplies of firearms and ammunition.

The Five Nations, without discontinuing their warfare with the Mohicans and Delawares, soon turned their principal efforts against those nations of their own stock which were their most formidable enemies.

The destruction of the greater part of the Hurons (Wyandots) took place in 1649; the dispersion of the residue and of the Algonkins of the Ottawa River, in the ensuing year. It is probable, that the general terror inspired by those events was the immediate cause of the final submission of the Delawares, already hard pressed; and that, being no longer in need of the fort near Christina, for the purpose of keeping them in check, the Five Nations evacuated it in 1651, and sold the adjacent land to the Dutch. The capture of the principal village of the neutral nation, the incorporation of a portion of that tribe, and the dispersion of the rest, are stated as having also hap-

---

\* Relations, *passim*. That of the year 1660 estimates them at only two thousand two hundred; but the letters of the Missionaries for that year are not given. The Relation was written in France, and there was a motive for underrating them. The Mohawks are uniformly stated as having seven hundred warriors. And in 1654-5, the three western nations had eighteen hundred engaged against the Eries alone.

† Mr. Heckewelder informs us, that the name of Sankhicans was given by the Delawares to the Mohawks, because they were armed with muskets.

pened in 1651. The war against the Eries appears to have begun in 1653, and to have ended in their destruction in 1655. That with the Andastes is first mentioned under the date of 1656, and was not terminated by their final ruin before 1672. During the same period the Five Nations were, with but short intervals of doubtful peace, at war not only with the northern Algonkins and the French, but also with the Mahingans. And they had carried their arms against the Miamis and the Ottawas of Michigan as early as the year 1657.\*

The acquisition of New York by the British in a short time gave peace to the Lenape tribes of that province, and generally to those who were under the immediate protection of any of the British Colonies. But the destruction of the Susquehannocks, and probably that of the more remote western tribes of Virginia, alluded to at the conferences of Lancaster in 1744, took place before the end of the seventeenth century. It appears from Lawson, that, in 1701, the excursions of the Senecas extended southwardly to the upper waters of Cape Fear River. And from that time they had continual wars with the Cherokees and the Catawbias. Their hatred against this last nation was most inveterate and mutual. The only condition in the arrangement of Lancaster with Virginia, in the year 1744, on which the Five Nations absolutely insisted, was the continued privilege of a war path through the ceded territory to the Catawba country. The most insulting messages of defiance passed between those two nations, at the conferences of Carlisle of 1753; and to that war the ultimate annihilation of the Catawbias may be principally ascribed.

The Five Nations continued their warfare, during the same period, against the Illinois, the Miamis, and the other western nations in alliance with the French. But they followed there the same policy which they had pursued in other quarters; and, in the same manner as they had formed alliances with the Sokokies, the Mississagues, and the Nanticokes, they seized the opportunities, offered by collisions between the French and the Twightees or Miamis, occasionally to detach these from their connexion. The occupation of the intervening territory by the Shawnoes and the Delawares, which defeated those plans, was

---

\* With the exception of the subjugation of the Andastes, in 1672, which is given by Charlevoix, all the other dates in this paragraph are taken from the Relations of New France.

equally dangerous to the British interest and to that of the Six Nations. They showed in that instance more foresight than the colonial governments. As early as the year 1742, at the same treaty in which they harshly reprov'd the Delawares for claiming lands in the eastern part of Pennsylvania, formerly sold by them, they remonstrated against the encroachments made north of the boundary line on the Juniatta and on the Susquehanna, which were injurious to their cousins the Delawares. Those remonstrances were several times repeated, and particularly at the conferences of Philadelphia of the year 1749; and they may be summed up in the speech delivered by the Mohawk orator at the Conferences of Harris's Ferry and Lancaster of 1757.

“In former times our forefathers conquered the Delawares, and put petticoats on them. A long time after that, they lived among you, and, upon some differences between them and you, we thought proper to remove them, giving them lands to plant and hunt on at Wyoming and Juniatta. But you, covetous of land, made plantations there and spoiled their hunting. They complained to us, and we found their complaints true. You drove them into the arms of the French. It is our advice that you send for the Senecas and them, treat them kindly, and give them back some part of their lands, rather than differ with them. It is in your power to settle the difference with them if you please.” The Mohawk chief then informed the government of Pennsylvania of a growing intimacy of the Senecas with the Shawnoes and Delawares.\*

The conspicuous part which the Six Nations had acted during the eighty preceding years, in the contest between the two great European powers of North America, is well known; and that they almost alone were a counterpoise to the general influence of France over the other Indian nations. They gave in the course of it repeated proofs of their sagacity. But it may be doubted, whether the Senecas, on that occasion, had really anticipated the consequences that must follow the complete success of the British arms. That there was some division among the Six Nations is certain; and, notwithstanding the practice of incorporating the residue of conquered tribes, their perpetual wars had by this time considerably reduced

---

\* Probably that portion known in the west by the name of Mingos.

their numbers. It is still astonishing, that they could, in 1756, have been reduced to twelve hundred warriors, as they are estimated in Smith's "History of New York." Whatever may have been the fact in that respect, with the expulsion of the French from Canada their importance ceased; it became the interest of Great Britain to preserve peace with the other Indian nations, and the thirst for war of the Six Nations had no longer any aliment.

With the exception of the Oneidas, they took arms against America during the war of Independence. But the Mohawks were obliged (1780) to abandon their seats and to take refuge in Canada. Those who remained in the United States have been perfectly peaceable since the treaty of peace of 1783. They were estimated in 1796 at three thousand three hundred souls; \* and those in Canada, at about seven hundred. But according to the late estimate of the War Department, those in the State of New York amount to four thousand seven hundred and sixteen, at Green Bay to seven hundred and twenty-five, beyond the Mississippi to four hundred and sixty-five, in all about five thousand nine hundred; which, deducting the Nanticokes, Mohicans, and Shawnoes mixed with them, would leave five thousand. If to these we add the Wyandots and those in Canada, the remnant of all the Iroquois tribes cannot much exceed seven thousand souls. They amounted in the beginning of the seventeenth century to forty thousand. Their destruction has been almost exclusively the result of wars among themselves, or against other Indian nations. With the single exception of the Mohawks, no encroachment had been made on the native possessions of the Five Nations before the year 1783; and their number has not been diminished since that time.

The history of the Five Nations is calculated to give a favorable opinion of the intelligence of the Red Man. But they may be ranked amongst the worst of conquerors. They conquered only in order to destroy, and, it would seem, solely for the purpose of gratifying their thirst for blood. Towards the south and the west, they made a perfect desert of the whole country within five hundred miles of their seats. A much greater number of those Indians, who, since the commencement

---

\* Report of Commissioners of the Missionary Society, 1 Mass. Hist. Coll. Vol. V.



of the seventeenth century have perished by the sword in Canada and the United States, have been destroyed by that single nation, than in all their wars with the Europeans.

But, instead of exerting their influence in assuaging the passions of the Indians and in promoting peace amongst them, the European governments, intent only on the acquisition of territory and power, encouraged their natural propensities. Both France and England courted a disgraceful alliance with savages; and both, under the usual pleas of self-defence and retaliation, armed them against the defenceless inhabitants of the other party. The sack of Schenectady, the desolation of the island of Montreal, the murdering expeditions on the frontiers of New England, are related by the respective historians with indifference, if not with exultation. No scruple was felt in inducing all the Indian tribes to carry on against America their usual warfare, and to desolate, without discrimination of age or sex, the whole extent of a frontier of twelve hundred miles during the seven years of the war of Independence.

The United States are at least free from that reproach. If their population has pressed too fast on the natives, if occasionally they have too forcibly urged purchases of land, their government, ever since they were an independent nation, has not only used every endeavour to be at peace with the Indians, but has succeeded in preventing war amongst them to a degree heretofore unknown in America. And, at Ghent, they proposed an article in the treaty of peace, by which both nations should engage, if unfortunately they were again at war, never to employ the savages as auxiliaries. We trust that under any contingency, the two nations will act as if the article had been made a condition of the treaty.

The vocabulary of the Onondagas was extracted by Mr. Duponceau from Zeisberger's Manuscript Dictionary. That of the Mohawks was taken by Mr. S. E. Dwight, of New Haven, assisted by Mr. J. Parish. That of the Senecas was received through the War Department. Mr. Jefferson's mutilated vocabulary has supplied part of the words in the vocabulary of the Oneidas. The others, and all those in the Cayuga dialect, were taken from Smith Barton.

---

The southern Iroquois tribes occupied Chowan River and its tributary streams. They were bounded, on the east, by the

most southerly Lenape tribes, who were in possession of the low country along the seashores, and those of Albemarle and Pamlico Sounds. Towards the south and the west they extended beyond the river Neuse. They appear to have been known in Virginia, in early times, under the name of Monacans, as far north as James River.

A powerful chief of the Chowans is mentioned in the accounts of the first attempts to establish a colony on Roanoke Island and its vicinity. Lawson, in his account of the North Carolina Indians, enumerates the Chowans, the Meherrins, and the Nottoways, as having together ninety-five warriors in the year 1708. But the Meherrins or Tuteloes and the Nottoways inhabited respectively the two rivers of that name, and were principally seated in Virginia. We have but indistinct notices of the Tuteloes. It has been seen that they had migrated to the north and joined the Six Nations, who brought them forward, in 1758, as one of the younger members of the confederacy. Evans, in the Analysis of his Map, says that the Six Nations had allotted lands on the Susquehanna to several tribes, amongst which he enumerates the Tuteloes from Meherrin River in Virginia; and he further states, that they (the Six Nations) laid no claim to the country of the Tuscaroras who had been driven away, but were not so well satisfied as to the lands of the Tuteloes and Meherrins, whom they had received under their protection. We have no vocabulary of that tribe, and no knowledge that they still exist under that name.

It appears by Beverly, that the Nottoways had preserved their independence and their numbers later than the Powhatans, and that, at the end of the seventeenth century, they had still one hundred and thirty warriors. They do not appear to have migrated from their original seats in a body. In the year 1820, they are said to have been reduced to twenty-seven souls, and were still in possession of seven thousand acres in Southampton county, Virginia, which had been, at an early date, reserved to them. J. Wood obtained in that year a vocabulary of their language from Edie Turner, who was called their Queen. It was transmitted by Mr. Jefferson to Mr. Duponceau, who immediately recognised it as an Iroquois dialect. They had till then been supposed to be one of the Powhatan tribes of the Lenape stock. Another vocabulary has been obtained by the Hon. James Tresevant, which corresponds with that of

Wood, and from which we learn that the true name of that tribe is *Cherohakah*.

The Tuscaroras were by far the most powerful nation in North Carolina, and occupied all the residue of the territory in that colony, which has been described as inhabited by Iroquois tribes. Their principal seats in 1708, were on the Neuse and the Taw or Tar rivers, and, according to Lawson, they had twelve hundred warriors in fifteen towns. The Albemarle district in North Carolina had at that time been settled more than fifty years; and, although some collisions had occurred, no serious conflict had till then taken place between the white emigrants and the weaker Indian tribes, bordering on the sounds and seated near the mouths of the rivers. The settlements did not extend far inland towards the Tuscaroras; and an accession of German emigrants seems to have been the immediate cause of what that nation considered as an encroachment. Lawson, who was Surveyor General of the Colony, was the first victim of their resentment. Having taken and murdered him, they thought they had proceeded too far to retreat, and, falling unexpectedly on the inhabitants, massacred one hundred and thirty in one day. (September, 1711.) They were joined by several small adjacent tribes, which appear to have inhabited the low country between the Neuse and Cape Fear rivers, the principal of which is called Corees or Coramines. The colony was still very weak and was thrown into great alarm. The government of South Carolina sent to their assistance Colonel Barnwell with six hundred militia and about six hundred friendly Indians.\* He killed or took near three hundred hostile Indians, principally of the smaller tribes, surrounded six hundred Tuscaroras, and made with them a peace which they soon broke. In the autumn of 1712, all the inhabitants south and southwest of Chowan River were obliged to live in forts; and the Tuscaroras expected assistance from the Five Nations.† This could not have been given, without involving the confederacy in a war with Great Britain; and the Tuscaroras were left to their own resources. A force,

---

\* Two hundred and eighteen Cherokees, seventy-nine Creeks, forty-one Catawbias, twenty-eight Yamassees. Hewatt's Account of South Carolina. The Indians sent the following year, under Colonel Moore, are called Ashley Indians by Dr. Williamson.

† Letter of Governor Pollock to the Proprietors, of September, 1712. Williamson's History of North Carolina.

consisting chiefly of southern Indians under the command of Colonel Moore, was again sent by the government of South Carolina to assist the northern colony. He besieged and took a fort of the Tuscaroras, called Narahuke, near the Cotechney, between the Taw and Neuse rivers, (March, 1713.) Of eight hundred prisoners, six hundred were given up to the Southern Indians, who carried them to South Carolina to sell them as slaves. The eastern Tuscaroras, whose principal town was on the Taw, twenty miles above Washington, immediately made peace, and a portion was settled a few years after north of the Roanoke, near Windsor, where they continued till the year 1803. But the great body of the nation removed in 1714-15, to the Five Nations, was received as the sixth, and has since shared their fate.\*

The Tuscarora vocabulary prepared by Nich. and Jas. Cassick, native Indians, was received through the War Department.

---

### SECTION III.

#### SOUTHERN INDIANS EAST OF THE MISSISSIPPI.

THE nations still found east of the Mississippi, and south of the territory formerly occupied by the Lenape and Iroquois tribes, are the remnant of the Catawbas, the Cherokees, the Creek confederacy and the Seminoles, the Choctaws and the Chickasas. Of the other numerous tribes, which appear to have formerly inhabited the lower country of Carolina, the eastern part of Georgia, and West Florida, we have but partial and very imperfect accounts.

In the year 1670, when English emigrants first settled in South Carolina, four tribes are mentioned near the seashore between the rivers Ashley and Savannah: — the Stonoes, Edisto, Westoes, and Savannahs. As the Westoes are said to have occupied the country between the Ashley and the Edisto rivers, † it seems probable that the first three tribes were but one nation. They are represented as cruel and hostile, and a war between them and the white settlers began in or before the

---

\* The account of this war is derived from Hewatt and Williamson compared.

† Ramsay and Hewatt,

year 1680.\* They were at the same time at war with the Savannahs, by whom they were shortly after totally defeated and driven away.† The Savannahs remained in the province, and, according to Archdale's testimony, were, in 1695, "good friends and useful neighbours of the English." They are also mentioned by Lawson, who was in Charleston in 1700, as "a famous, warlike, friendly nation, living to the south of Ashley River." The name of Savannahs, most probably derived from that of the river on which they lived, and which is of Spanish origin, is there dropped. Instead of them we find only the Yamassees, occupying the same seats, mentioned uniformly as having been, from the first settlement, friendly to the English and hostile to the Spaniards of Florida; and, as no mention whatever is made of a war with the Savannahs, or that they had been expelled from the province, it may be inferred that they and the Yamassees were the same people, and the last their true Indian name. That of their principal town was Poketalieo, which belongs also to a tributary stream of the Great Kanhawa. We have no specimen of their language; but the name of Coosa Hatchie,‡ or Coosa River, is certainly Musklogee, and renders it probable that they were a tribe of that nation.

The Yamassees had assisted the English in two expeditions, carried on by Governor Moore against the Spaniards of St. Augustine and the Indians living between the rivers Altamaha and Savannah, and again, as late as 1712-1713, against the Tuscaroras.§ In 1715, they suddenly attacked the colony, massacred a number of inhabitants unaware of any danger, and involved South Carolina in a calamitous and dangerous war. They are said to have been excited by the Spaniards, to whom they had previously been remarkably hostile. Subsequent circumstances render the suggestion probable. But other causes, of which the principal was beyond doubt the progress and extension of the settlements, must have coöperated in forming the general combination, not only of the Yamassees and of the Creeks and Appalachians from beyond the Savannah, but also of the Cherokees, the Catawbas, the Congarees, and of all the tribes as far as Cape Fear River. These

\* Chalmers.

† Archdale.

‡ *Hatchie* means *River*, in the Musklogee language, and *Coosa* is the name of a well-known river in their country.

§ Hewatt,



advanced within fifty miles of Charleston, but were finally repulsed; and Governor Craven, with almost all the militia, marched against the Yamassees and their southern confederates, defeated them in a bloody engagement, and drove them across the Savannah out of the province. They were well received by the Spaniards, and still committed hostilities on the frontiers. The warfare continued several years in that quarter. Peace was restored by Governor Nicholson; and that which he made with the adjacent small tribes northeast of Charleston, of which no subsequent notice is taken, does not appear to have been ever after disturbed.\* It may be that the small tribe called *Yamacraw*, which the first settlers of Georgia found near the site of Savannah, was a remnant of the Yamassees.

Of the small tribes northeast of Charleston, both in South and North Carolina, we know hardly any thing but their names. Lawson, who, in 1700-1, travelled from Charleston to the settlement at the mouth of Taw River on Pamlico sound, left the seashore at the mouth of the Santee, and proceeded northwardly to the hilly country, and thence eastwardly to Pamlico or Pamlicough. He mentions the Sewees, Santees, Wyniaws, Congarees, Waterees, and Waxsaws, as very small tribes, residing principally on the waters of the Santee. He left on his right the Cheraws and Cape Fear Indians, whom he does not mention. In his progress northwardly he came to an Esaw town, which appears to have been situated on the Pedee. The Esaws were the only powerful nation till he came to the Tuscaroras. They amounted to several thousands, and within twenty miles of their town Lawson found that of the *Kadapaws*, in which we recognise the name of Catawbas. As no further mention is made of the Esaws, and no other populous nation is ever after alluded to in that quarter but the Catawbas, there cannot, it seems, be any doubt of their identity with the Esaws of Lawson, who probably mistook a local for the generic name of the nation. Between them and the Tuscaroras of the river Neuse, he places the Saponas on a branch of Cape Fear River,† and in their vicinity the Toteros and

---

\* Nicholson became Governor in 1721. He is said by Hewatt to have treated with the Creeks and Cherokees. The permanent peace with the small tribes is inferred from the silence of Hewatt and Ramsay.

† Or rather of the Great Pedee, which he does not mention, and some branches of which he evidently mistook for tributary streams of Cape Fear River.

the Keyauwees, three small tribes amounting together to seven hundred and fifty souls, which had but lately been driven away from the west into that quarter. He was shown, near the Sapona town, the graves of seven Indians "lately killed by the Sinnegars or Jennitos," (*Senecas or Oneidas*,) and the three tribes had determined to unite in one town for their better security.\* East of them and west of the Tuscaroras, he mentions the Sissipahaus on the waters of Cape Fear River, and the Enoes on a branch of the Neuse. With the exception of the Catawbas, we have not the least knowledge of the language of any of those tribes.

Lawson has also given an enumeration of the tribes inhabiting the eastern part of North Carolina, extending westwardly but a short distance beyond Neuse River. He estimates the warriors of the Iroquois tribes at one thousand three hundred, of the Lenape at less than one hundred, of the Woccons at one hundred and twenty, of all the other tribes, including the Machapunga (or Maramiskeet†), the Bear River, Connamox, and Neuse, at only one hundred and twenty. This last number appears to be underrated; and neither the Enoes nor the Coramines are included. But it shows the insignificance of the small tribes which have disappeared.

The records of North Carolina would probably throw some light on that subject. We learn from Williamson that the Saponas and the Chowans, about the year 1720, obtained leave to join the Tuscaroras. The Wyanokes, whom he mentions as having lived on the river Nottoway and formerly emigrated from the Susquehanna, were probably a tribe connected with the Nottoways and Chowans. To the names already mentioned may be added the upper and lower *Sawara* towns, laid down, south of the Dan River, in all the early maps of North Carolina. In Jeffrey's map, a tribe called *Saluda*, is also laid down, south of that river, near the present site of Columbia in South Carolina, with a note, that it had removed to Conestogo in Pennsylvania.

Some detached observations of Lawson may deserve notice. Buffaloes (bisons) were found in his time on the hilly country on the head waters of Cape Fear River; and it is not known that they were ever seen north of that place, east of the Alle-

---

\* Lawson's New Voyage to Carolina, pp. 44 - 47.

† Williamson.

ghany Mountains. He asserts positively, that the wolf of the woods is the Indian dog, that the Indians have no other dogs than domesticated wolves.\* But his most remarkable assertion is, that the "Indian women never plant corn amongst us, as they do amongst the Iroquois, who are always at war and hunting." The reason he alleges for the Iroquois usage was equally applicable to all the other Indians, without excepting those of North Carolina.

The difference between the languages of those several tribes struck Lawson forcibly. He observes that he could find but one word common to the Tuscaroras and the Woccons, who lived but two leagues apart. In the absence of vocabularies, it is now impossible to ascertain, whether most of those several communities spoke languages radically different from each other, or dialects of the same. But we are indebted to Lawson for those of the Tuscaroras, of the Pamlicos, and of the Woccons; and they certainly belong to three distinct languages. He did not suspect that of the Tuscaroras to be an Iroquois dialect, and that his short specimen of that of the Pamlicos would enable us to ascertain how far the Lenape tribes extended towards the south. On comparing the vocabularies of the Woccons and the Catawbias, out of fifty-one words found in both, sixteen appear to have more or less remote affinities; and the Woccons have accordingly been designated as belonging to the same family of languages.†

The Catawbias, according to Adair and Ramsay, could muster one thousand five hundred warriors at the first settlement of South Carolina. Lawson estimates them, under the name of Esaws, at several thousand souls. Mr. Miller says, that they were originally called Flatheads, and were a terror to the surrounding tribes. They were able, at no very remote time, to drive away the Shawnoes from their temporary settlement,

\* It is mentioned in Captain Franklin's first Expedition, that some Coppermine River Indians, having caught a litter of young wolves, kept several in order to improve the breed of their dogs.

† The following are the most remarkable.

	WOCCON.	CATAWBA.		WOCCON	CATAWBA.
<i>one,</i>	tonne,	dupunna,	<i>brother,</i>	yenrauhe,	murrundeh,
<i>two,</i>	numperre,	naperra,	<i>maize,</i>	cose,	koos,
<i>three,</i>	nammee,	namunda,	<i>bread,</i>	ikettau,	koostau,
<i>four,</i>	punnum-punne,	purre purra,	<i>house,</i>	ouke,	sook,
<i>water,</i>	ejau,	eeyau,	<i>snake,</i>	yau-hauk,	y-ah,
<i>Indians,</i>	yauh-he,	yayeh,	<i>goose,</i>	auhaun,	ah-hah,
<i>wife,</i>	yecauau,	yakezuh,	<i>fish,</i>	yacunne,	y-ee.

on the head waters probably of the Santee and Pedee, and, according to Adair, could still muster four hundred warriors in 1743. Yet they are mentioned by the historians of South Carolina, only in 1712, as auxiliaries against the Tuscaroras; in 1715, as having joined the other northern tribes in the confederacy against the colony; in 1756, as requesting that a fort might be built upon their lands; for the last time in 1760, as auxiliaries against the Cherokees. It must thence be inferred that, excepting the short war of 1715, they were always at peace with Carolina. Their perpetual wars with the Shawnoes, with the Cherokees, and, finally, with the Six Nations, may have kept them sufficiently occupied, and compelled them to remain on friendly terms with the only people, by whom they could be supplied with arms and ammunition. Another cause for their peaceable disposition towards the English, may be found in the slow progress of the settlements in that quarter. "In 1736, settlements had extended partially about eighty or ninety miles from the seacoast. Between 1750 and 1760, settlements were commenced two hundred miles from Charleston by emigrants from Pennsylvania and Virginia. Between the seacoast settlements and those to the westward, a considerable tract of country was for several years left in the undisturbed possession of the aborigines."\*

The boundaries and extent of the territory occupied by the Catawbias, cannot be ascertained, and may not always have been the same. It is probable that the Cherokees were originally in possession of the country on the upper waters of the Savannah, the Santee and the Pedee. If, as has been suggested, the Woccons, who bordered on the Tuscaroras, spoke a dialect of the Catawba language, it must have had a considerable extent, and may have been that of the Congarees, of the Cheraws, and of some other of the small tribes.† It is altogether distinct from the Cherokee, but has some affinities

\* Ramsay's History of South Carolina, Vol. I. Chap. vi.

† The Cheraws are said to have joined the Catawbias, and to have been living amongst them in 1768. (Rev. E. Potter's letter to Dr. Stiles in the tenth volume of *1 Mass Hist. Coll.*) Adair mentions the Cheraws, Waterees, Congarees, Enoes, &c., as having joined the Catawbias; but I believe him mistaken when he says that they spoke different dialects. The words collected forty years ago by B. Smith Barton are, all but one, identical with those of Mr. Miller's vocabulary taken this year. (1835.) Barton's *New Views*, &c. (Philad. 1797.)

with the Muskogee and even the Choctaw. These did not however appear sufficient to make it considered as belonging to the same family.

The Catawbas, enfeebled by their disastrous wars and principally by that with the Six Nations, greatly diminished by the smallpox and the use of ardent spirits, and surrounded by the progressive settlements of the white inhabitants, have ultimately ceded all their lands, reserving only a tract of fifteen miles square, on each side of the Santee or Catawba River, on the borders of North Carolina, which, now reduced to ninety-eight souls, they still occupy. Their vocabulary has been obtained, within this year, through the care of Mr. John L. Miller, President of the Ebenezer Academy.

De Soto appears to have passed, in 1540, through part of the Cherokee country. But the Europeans since that time had not come in contact with the Cherokees, before the settlement of South Carolina; and they are for the first time mentioned in 1693, when they complained that the Savannahs, Esaws, and Congarees took prisoners from them, and sold them as slaves in Charleston.\* It appears that the Yamassees used to make incursions into Florida for the same purpose. Governor Archdale, who acted towards the Indians with equal good sense and humanity, put an end to that practice in 1695.† The Cherokees sent more than two hundred warriors, in 1712, to assist the English in the war against the Tuscaroras. Although their name is mentioned, in 1715, amongst the Northern Indians of the confederacy against Carolina, as the whole number of those who took arms in that quarter were estimated at only six hundred, it is not probable that they took a very active part in that conflict. Governor Nicholson established friendly relations with them, which were confirmed by the solemn treaty of 1730, negotiated by Alexander Cummings, and which secured peace for thirty years.‡

In the beginning of the seven years' war, they acted as auxiliaries to the British, and assisted at the capture of Fort Duquesne. On their return home, they committed some depredations in Virginia, which were not tamely submitted to; and

\* Hewatt.

† Ibid.

‡ Hewatt and Ramsay.



several of their warriors were killed. The proper steps to pacify them were not taken; and a war ensued equally calamitous to both parties. It became necessary to bring British troops from the north; two expeditions were made into their country, and peace was restored in 1761. They took arms on the British side during the war of Independence, and, although some prior treaties intervened, partial hostilities continued several years after 1783; and peace was not secured till the treaty of Holston in 1791. By this treaty a territory on which white settlers had encroached, was restored to them. From that time they have ever been at peace with the United States; and, during the last war with Great Britain, they assisted America, as auxiliaries, against the Creeks.

The territory of the Cherokees, Chelakees, or more properly Tsalakies, extended north and south of the southwesterly continuation of the Appalachian mountains, embracing on the north the country on Tennessee or Cherokee River and its tributary streams, from their sources down to the vicinity of the Muscle Shoals, where they were bounded on the west by the Chicasas. The Cumberland mountain may be considered as having been their boundary on the north; but since the country has been known to us, no other Indian nation but some small bands of Shawnoes, had any settlement between that mountain and the Ohio. On the west side of the Savannah they were bounded on the south by the Creeks, the division line being Broad River and generally along the thirty-fourth parallel of north latitude. On the east of the Savannah, their original seats embraced the upper waters of that river, of the Santee and probably of the Yadkin, but could not have extended as far south as the thirty-fourth degree of north latitude. They were bounded on the south, in that quarter, probably by Muskhogee tribes in the vicinity of the Savannah, and farther east by the Catawbias.

The Cherokees, like other Indian nations, were almost always at war with some of the adjacent tribes. They had probably contributed to the expulsion of the Shawnoes from the country south of the Ohio, and appear to have been perpetually at war with some branch or other of that erratic nation.\* They

---

\* The last settlement of the Shawnoes south of the Ohio was at Bull's Town on the Little Kenhawa. They were obliged to abandon it about the year 1770, on account of the repeated attacks of small Cherokee parties.

had also long-continued hostilities with the Six Nations, which do not seem to have been conducted with much vigor on either side, and were terminated about the years 1744–1750, through the interference of the British government. It appears by an answer sent by them at the conferences of Carlisle of 1753, to a previous message of the Delawares, that they had at a former period entertained amicable relations with that tribe. They express in it friendly dispositions, say that they had not heard from the Delawares for a long time, and call them nephews.\*

The country of the Cherokees was strong; they formed but one nation, and they do not appear to have been materially injured by their Indian wars. It would seem, that since they came in contact with the Europeans, and notwithstanding successive cessions of part of their territory, their number, at least during the last forty years, has been increased. Their warriors were estimated at two thousand three hundred in the year 1762, by Adair, who adds, that he was informed that forty years before they had six thousand. According to a late estimate of the Indian Department, they now amount to fifteen thousand souls, including those who have already removed beyond the Mississippi, and exclusively of about twelve hundred negroes in their possession. The progress of civilization amongst them will be hereafter adverted to. We abstain from any observation on recent transactions connected with the intended removal of the whole tribe beyond the Mississippi, this being the subject of pending negotiations, which, it is hoped, may be attended with a result satisfactory to all parties.

The vocabularies of their language are amongst the most authentic we have of any Indian nation. The appended comparative vocabulary was entirely written by Mr. Boudinot, or Mr. Ridge, Jun., both native Cherokees, who speak English as if it were their mother tongue. The Rev. Mr. Worcester has also aided our enquiries in that quarter.

Dr. Barton thought that the Cherokee language belonged to the Iroquois family; and, on this point, I am inclined to the same opinion. The affinities are few and remote; but there

---

\* MS. papers of the late John Montgomery of Carlisle, given to me, with sundry other interesting Indian documents, by his son, the late John Montgomery, of Baltimore.

is a similarity in the general termination of syllables, in the pronunciation and accent, which has struck some of the native Cherokees. We have not a sufficient knowledge of the grammar, and generally of the language of the Five Nations, or of the Wyandots, to decide that question. But a particular character of the Cherokee has been disclosed by Guess's syllabic alphabet.

Sequoyah, or Guess, as he is commonly called, is a native Cherokee, unacquainted with the English language. He saw books in the missionary schools, and was informed that the characters represented the words of the spoken language. Not understanding how this was done, he undertook to make characters of his own for the Cherokee, and at first attempted to have a distinct one for each word. He soon saw that the number would be such as to render that plan impracticable; and discovering that, although the Cherokee is eminently polysyllabic, the same syllables variously combined perpetually recurred in different words, he concluded to have a character for each syllable. This he did by listening, with a view to his object, to every discourse held in his hearing, and noting in his own way every new syllable. In a short time he produced his syllabic alphabet consisting of only eighty-five characters, through which he was enabled to teach within three weeks every Cherokee, old or young, who desired it, how to write his own language. That alphabet has superseded ours. Several books and a newspaper called the "Phoenix," edited by Mr. Boudinot, have been published with those characters; and the Cherokees universally use them when writing in their own tongue. When the first imperfect copy of that alphabet was received at the War Department, it appeared incredible that a language, known to be copious, should have but eighty-five syllables. The examination of a Cherokee spelling-book, published in our characters by the Missionaries, explained what seemed to be a mystery.

It was found that every Cherokee syllable ended in a vocal or nasal sound, and that there were no other double consonants but *tl* or *dl*, and *ts*, and combinations of *s* with four or five different consonants. The language has twelve consonants including *h*, viz. *g* or *k*, *h*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *qu*, *d* or *t*, *dl* or *tl*, *ts*, *w*, *y*, *s*; five vowels, viz. *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*; and a nasal *ung*. It is obvious, that, multiplying the number of consonants (including the *tl*), by the six vowels (including the nasal), and adding to the product the said six vowels, each of

which is occasionally a syllable, you have the whole number of possible syllables in the language, those excepted which result from the combinations of *s* united to another following consonant, with the six vowels. It would have required about thirty additional characters, if Guess, adhering to his principle, had made a new one for each such combination, (*sta, ste, &c., spa, spe, &c.*) He gave a strong proof of talent, in discovering that he might dispense with those thirty, by making for the *s* a distinct character.\* It wanted but one step more, and to have also given a distinct character to each consonant, to reduce the whole number to sixteen, and to have had an alphabet similar to ours. In practice, however, and as applied to his own language, the superiority of Guess's alphabet is manifest, and has been fully proved by experience. You must indeed learn and remember eighty-five characters instead of twenty-five. But this once accomplished, the education of the pupil is completed, he can read, and he is perfect in his orthography without making it the subject of a distinct study. The boy learns in a few weeks that which occupies two years of the time of ours. It is that peculiarity in the vocal or nasal termination of syllables and that absence of double consonants, more discernible to the ear than to the eye, which were alluded to, when speaking of some affinity in that respect between the Cherokee and the Iroquois languages.

It is true that the original idea of expressing sounds by characters was suggested to Guess by our books; it must be admitted that his plan would have failed if applied to perhaps any other language than the Cherokee; and it is doubtful whether, in such case, he would have ascended to the discovery of one character for each analyzed sound. But it cannot be denied that this untaught Indian, in what he has performed, has exhibited a striking instance of the native intelligence of his race.†

\* When Guess subsequently explained the process of his invention, he said that what had cost him most labor was the hissing sound. Guess's characters amount to eighty-five, viz. seventy-seven as above stated, less one, the syllable *mung* not appearing in the language. Finding that occasionally *k* was pronounced *g*; *d* like *t*; and two distinct aspirations connected with *na*, he has added eight characters representing the sounds *s, ka, hna, nah, ta, te, ti, tla*.

† Although this syllabic alphabet has been published several times, it has been thought consistent with the object of this essay to annex a correct copy of it. — See Appendix.

In the year 1732, when Georgia was first settled, the territory of the Creek confederacy, including at that time the Seminoles, was bounded on the west by Mobile River, and by the ridge that separates the waters of the Tombigbee from those of the Alabama, the ordinary though contested boundary between them and the Choetaws\*; on the north by the Cherokees; on the northeast by the Savannah; on every other quarter by the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico. It is believed that at the end of the seventeenth century, the Creeks occupied, south of the thirty-fourth degree of north latitude, the eastern as well as the western banks of the Savannah.

It is not possible to ascertain when the confederacy was consolidated to that extent. During the forty preceding years, we find the Indians between Savannah River and St. Augustine, on various occasions, divided amongst themselves and taking adverse parts in the conflicts between the Spaniards of Florida and the English settlers of South Carolina. It may be, that, as has been seen recently, the contending European powers drew to their respective sides different portions of the confederacy. But we cannot ascertain whether, by the names of Appalaehians and Creeks, both of which occur in Hewatt and other early writers, distinct tribes are designated. It is probable that the appellation of Appalaehians was geographical and applied to the Indians living on the Appalaehicola, or Chatahoochee River, as the name of Creeks seems to have been given from an early time to those inhabiting generally the country adjacent to the river Savannah.

The Creek confederacy now consists of several tribes speaking different languages. The Muskogees are the prevailing nation, amounting to more than seven eighths of the whole. The Hitchitees who reside on the Chatahoochee and Flint rivers, though a distinct tribe, speak a dialect of the Muskogee. The Seminoles or Isty-semole, ("wild men,") who inhabit the peninsula of Florida, are pure Muskogees, who have gradually detached themselves from the confederacy, but who were still considered as members of it, till the United States treated with them as with an independent nation. The name of Seminoles was given to them, on account of their being principally hunters and attending but little to agriculture. A

---

\* According to Adair, the river Coosa was the boundary in his time.



vocabulary is wanted in order to prove conclusively the entire identity of their language with the Muskogee.

There is some diversity in the accounts given by the Muskogees of their origin. The chiefs of the delegation, who attended at Washington in the year 1826, agreed that the prevailing tradition amongst them was, that the nation had issued out of a cave near Alabama River. The Hitchitees said that their ancestors had fallen from the sky. These modes of speaking, common to several of the tribes, only show that they have lost the recollection of any ancient migration, and that they consider themselves as aborigines. Independent of the ancient division into families or clans, which will be hereafter adverted to, Mr. Mitchell, a former Indian agent, said that there was, at no distant time, a political division of the nation into four principal towns or tribes, viz. the Cussetah, the Cowetah, the Tukawbatchie, and the Oscoochee, to which the Creeks, though now dispersed throughout the whole of their country, still respectively belong. This division, however, whether geographical or political, has no connexion with the distinction of languages.

The Uchees and the Natches, who are both incorporated in the confederacy, speak two distinct languages altogether different from the Muskogee. The Natches, a residue of the well-known nation of that name, came from the banks of the Mississippi, and joined the Creeks less than one hundred years ago. The original seats of the Uchees were east of the Coosa and probably of the Chatahoochee; and they consider themselves as the most ancient inhabitants of the country. They may have been the same nation which is called Apalaches in the accounts of De Soto's expedition, and their towns were till lately principally on Flint River. It appears, however, certain that, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, they were, at least in part, seated on the western banks of the Savannah. It has already been seen that, in 1736, they claimed the country below and above Augusta. In Jeffrey's Map they are laid down in the same manner, but with a note that those settlements had been deserted in 1715. This was the year of the signal defeat of the Yamassees, who were assisted by the Creeks. The Yamassees were driven across the river; and it is probable that the Uchees were amongst their auxiliaries, and that, weakened by this defeat, they found it safer to remove to a greater distance from the English settlements, towards Flint River.

It has been ascertained that two other small tribes intimately connected together, to wit, the Alibamons and the Coosadas or Quesadas, who reside near the river Talapoosa, also speak a language or a dialect distinct from that of the Muskogees; but its vocabulary has not been obtained. The Talapoosa and the Coosa form by their junction Alabama River; and the Alibamons must certainly be the residue of the nation of that name, mentioned by the French writers as living in the vicinity of the old French fort on the Alabama. These five languages, the Muskogee and the Hitchitsee, the Uchee, the Natches, and the Alibamon or Coosada are, it is believed, the only ones spoken by the different tribes of the Creek confederacy. The Appalichicolas, with whom a separate treaty has recently been made by the United States, are a portion of the Seminoles, residing west of St. Mark's near the mouth of the Appalichicola or Chatahoochee River. It may be here observed, that, although we have no vocabulary of the Piankishaws and of the Kickapoo, it is fully ascertained that they respectively speak dialects of the Miami and of the Saukee. The Alibamons are the only existing tribe, east of the Mississippi, of whose language we have no positive knowledge, and cannot say whether it is peculiar to them, or belongs to the same stock as some of the other tribes. I incline to the opinion that it is a dialect of the Choctaw, or Muskogee.

Although partial and transient collisions with the Creeks occurred subsequent to the settlement of Georgia, no actual war with them took place for near fifty years. They took an active part in that of the Revolution against the Americans, and continued their hostilities till the treaty concluded at Philadelphia, in 1795. They then remained at peace eighteen years; but, at the beginning of the last war with Great Britain, a considerable portion of the nation, excited, it is said, by Tecumseh, and probably receiving encouragement from other quarters, took arms without the slightest provocation, and at first committed great ravages in the vicinity of their western frontier. They received a severe chastisement; and the decisive victories of General Jackson at that time, and some years later over the Seminoles, who had renewed the war, have not only secured a permanent peace with the Southern Indians, but, together with the progress of the settlements, have placed them all under the absolute control of the United States. The Creeks and Seminoles after some struggles

amongst themselves have ceded the whole of their territory, and accepted in exchange other lands beyond the Mississippi. Their number is estimated at twenty-eight thousand; of whom about twenty-three thousand are Muskogees proper, two thousand four hundred Seminoles, twelve hundred Uchees, six hundred Hitchitees, five hundred Alibamons and Quesadas, and three hundred Natches.

We have copious vocabularies of the Muskogee; one obtained by the late Mr. Hawkins, and transmitted by Mr. Jefferson to the American Philosophical Society; two others taken at my request in 1825-6, by Mr. Ridge, Colonel Hambly, and Mr. Denny, from two distinct Muskogee delegations then at Washington; a fourth since transmitted by the Rev. L. Compere, a Methodist missionary to that nation. The comparative vocabulary is extracted from those several sources. Its form did not permit me to give the several variations, which are more numerous than in the different vocabularies of any other tribe; and it is not improbable that they arise from actual varieties of dialects, rather than from errors of the persons who collected the vocabularies. Those words have been selected which had the greatest number of authorities in their favor. As Hawkins's vocabulary differed most from the other, a separate specimen taken exclusively from that has been appended. The small specimen of the Hitchitsee was obtained at the same time from a chief of that tribe by Mr. Ridge.

The Uchee language is the most guttural, uncouth, and difficult to express with our alphabet and orthography of any of the Indian languages within our knowledge. The vocabulary here given is extracted from one taken by Dr. Ware, in Mr. Duponceau's collection, and from another obtained by Mr. Ridge from an Uchee chief at Washington. Mr. Ridge had probably the best Indian ear, but was not so correct in his English orthography. The Natches vocabulary I took myself from Is-ah-lakuh, an intelligent chief of the remnant of that nation.\*

---

\* The vowels *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, and the diphthong *ie*, are, in that vocabulary and in the Muskogee words marked *G.*, to be pronounced as in French; the *u* is the short one of *but*, *nut*; the *zh* is the French *j*; the *oo*, *y*, and all the consonants as in English; the *g*, always hard. The Uchee and Hitchitsee words taken by Mr. Ridge are, as well as Mr. Hawkins's and Mr. Compere's Muskogee words, written in conformity with the English orthography.

De Soto was the first European who discovered the Mississippi. He crossed it in the year 1541, near the thirty-fifth degree of north latitude, and after his death the remnant of his companions, reduced to about three hundred, descended it to its mouth, and with their frail barks were fortunate enough to reach Panuco on the Mexican coast. Although the Spaniards became thus early acquainted with that large river, and their ships must have passed annually in sight of its mouth, it remained unknown for one hundred and fifty years after De Soto's expedition; and the river was on that account designated by the name of "Rio Escondido." Father Marquette and M. Joliette, in the year 1673, reached it by the way of the Fox River of Michigan and of the Wisconsin. Ten years later La Salle descended it to its entrance into the sea.\* But, having sailed from France with the intention of forming a settlement on its banks, he passed by its mouth in 1685, without recognising it, and landed in the Bay of St. Bernard at the bottom of the Gulf of Mexico. In his attempt to reach thence the Mississippi by land, he was murdered by his own people; it was only in March, 1699, that D'Iberville entered the river from the sea †; and the French, who had first established themselves at the mouth of the Mobile and at Biloxi, did not lay the foundation of New Orleans till the year 1717.

The seashore from the Mobile to the Mississippi, and the banks of that river, were then inhabited by several small tribes, of which the Natches were the principal. All the rest of the country from the Gulf of Mexico to Cumberland River, if not to the Ohio, bounded on the west by the Mississippi and on the east by the Creeks and the Cherokees, was inhabited by the Choc-taws and the Chicugas, two distinct nations, but of the same

---

\* He reached the sea on the 7th of April, 1683. See Tonti's relation in the fifth volume of "Voyages au Nord." Tonti was the friend and companion of La Salle, and his relation of the inland expeditions of that enterprising traveller is the most authentic we have, though disfigured by embellishments in very bad taste, introduced by the Paris publisher. The only good relation of La Salle's last voyage is that of Joutel.

† A British ship, probably that mentioned by Dr. Cox in his "Carolina," entered the river in September of the same year, and ascended it to the place thence called English Town. (Charlevoix). There is no evidence that supports the assertion, that the river had formerly been visited by English vessels.

stock, and speaking, with but few varieties, the same language.

The Chicasas occupied the northern, and the Choctaws the southern part of that territory. The Chicasas were warlike and in a state of hostility with the Cherokees, the Illinois, the Arkansas, and occasionally even with the Choctaws. The Arkansas and especially the Illinois were the steadfast allies of the French. Enterprising British traders from South Carolina reached at an early date the Chicasa country. And owing to those two causes, they became the firm allies of the English, and the inveterate enemies of the French. It was in vain that these invaded their territory, in 1736, by the Tombigbee, and in 1740, from the Mississippi. The Chicasas repelled the invaders and granted at last only a precarious peace. They adhered to the British during the war of Independence; but they have never committed any hostilities against the Americans since the year 1783.

Their continued wars had considerably lessened their numbers. Tonti, the first European who met with them, but who had no opportunity of ascertaining their number, estimated their warriors, in 1682, at two thousand. Adair, who resided many years amongst them, says, that in 1763, they were reduced to four hundred and fifty; which would give at most a population of eighteen hundred souls. According to the late War Department estimate they now amount to five thousand four hundred and twenty-nine. There is no doubt of the increase of the southern Indians during the last forty years; but it is probable that Adair had underrated their number. An arrangement is in train for a cession of their territory in exchange for lands west of the Mississippi.

The vocabulary of their language was written in my presence by an intelligent boy of their nation, who was living with Colonel McKinney, then at the head of the Indian bureau of the War Department, and who spoke and wrote English with great facility. His orthography may in some respects be defective; but it is, on the whole, one of the most authentic vocabularies we possess. Although the separation of the Chicasas from the Choctaws must have taken place long ago, the language is still almost the same, and differs more in the pronunciation than in the words. They understand each other without interpreters. The tradition of the Chicasas is that they came from the west. The Choctaws have lost the



recollection of a former migration, and, like the Muskhogeas, say that they came from under the ground.\*

The Choctaws, properly Chahtas, called also "Flat Heads," on account of the practice, common to several other tribes, of flattening the head in infancy by artificial means, are a much more numerous but less warlike people. Adair, whose estimate of the character of the Indians depends on their political connexions with the English or French, represents the Choctaws as the most worthless of any of the southern tribes. The early French writers complain of their fickleness, and that they could not place confidence in their fidelity. According to Bernard Romans, they were farther advanced in civilization than any of their neighbours, less cruel towards their prisoners, and applying more to agriculture than to the chase. "The Choctaws may more properly be called a nation of farmers than any savages I have met with." "They help their wives in the labor of the fields and many other works." "Their way of life in general may be called industrious; they will do what no other uncompelled savage will do, that is, work in the field to raise grain." † It is certain that the Europeans have no right to complain of them. They have had successively for neighbours the French, the Spanish, the English, and the Americans; and they have never been at war with any of them. Their principal wars have been with the Creeks, always defensive and not very sanguinary. In a conflict of six years (1765–1771), they lost about three hundred people.‡ B. Romans estimated their warriors, in 1772, at less than three thousand, which does not differ materially from Adair's account. According to the enumeration by the War Department, they now amount to eighteen thousand five hundred souls. They have agreed to take lands west of the Mississippi in exchange for their ancient territory; and about fifteen thousand have already removed to that new country.

The Choctaw or Chickasa language is by Du Pratz called the Molilian, a common language (*langue vulgaire*); and the intercourse of the French with other tribes was generally carried on by the means of Choctaw interpreters. A grammar of the language has been prepared by our missionaries and will

---

\* Bernard Romans and Du Pratz. The latter writer (*Hist. de Louisiane*) explains the tradition by supposing that they invaded the country in great numbers.

† B. Romans, *Nat. Hist. Florida*. (New York, 1776.) pp. 71, 83. ‡ *Ibid*,

shortly be published. In the mean while, some of its principal features have been disclosed in their spelling-book, or may be deduced from the appended verbal forms and annotations, supplied by Mr. Alfred Wright, but in which he was (I believe) assisted by the Missionaries. Similar in its general structure to the other Indian languages which have been examined, its system of inflexions is more simple and uniform than any other; and the mode of compounding words in many respects more similar to that used in our own languages. It appears therefore to be the least difficult to be acquired by an European; which accounts for its having been adopted by the French as a general medium of intercourse with all the other adjacent Indian tribes. The annexed vocabularies were extracted partly from the Missionaries' spelling-book,\* chiefly from the copious one transmitted by Mr. Wright.

The affinities between the Choctaw and the Muskogee were such as to make it a matter of doubt, whether they should not be considered as belonging to the same family. The appended vocabularies of both are copious, yet not perhaps sufficient to decide the question. The short comparative one of the two languages shows in one view the most striking of those affinities. I think them sufficient to prove a common origin; but, in compliance with received opinions, they have been arranged in the vocabulary as forming two families.

---

The four great southern nations, according to the estimates of the War Department which have been quoted and are in that quarter very correct, consist now of sixty-seven thousand souls viz.

the Cherokees	.	.	.	.	.	15,000
the Choctaws	.	18,500	}	.	.	24,000
the Chicasas	.	5,500	}	.	.	
the Muskogees, Seminoles, and Hitchittees						26,000
the Uchees, Alibamons, Coosadas, and Natches						2,000

The territory west of the Mississippi, given or offered to them by the United States, in exchange for their lands east of that river, contains forty millions of acres, exclusively of what

---

\* First edition. A copy of the second improved edition could not be obtained.

may be allotted to the Chicasas. Government defrays the expenses of the removal, pays the value of their improvements, and allows them considerable annuities.

Our knowledge of those nations, derived from English and French writers, does not ascend higher than the end of the seventeenth century; and doubts have been entertained respecting their population in former times, and the date both of their first settlement west of the Mississippi, and of the subsequent progress of the Muskogees towards the Atlantic. We have attempted to discover, amongst the Indian names of places or persons mentioned in the relations of De Soto's Expedition, some traces of the tribes, which at that time inhabited the country along his line of march.

The first of those relations was published in 1557,\* by a Portuguese volunteer (of Elvas), an eyewitness, who has not given his name; the other in 1603, by Garcilaso de la Vega, on the oral testimony of a Spanish cavalier, and on written documents from two other soldiers, who were also engaged in the expedition. It is extremely difficult to reconcile in all their details either of the two relations, with respect to distances and courses, with the now well-known geography of the country. There is however a portion of the journey which is sufficiently clear to throw light on the object of our inquiry.

Ferdinand de Soto landed in the year 1539, on the western coast of East Florida, in the Bay of Espiritu Santo, now called Tampa Bay, having with him six hundred men according to the Portuguese narrator, and twelve hundred according to Garcilaso. He thence proceeded in the direction of the seacoast to a village called Anhayca, in the Province of Appalachee. This was situated in the vicinity of a port into which he ordered his vessels, and which, from the position designated, must necessarily have been somewhere in Apalachee Bay. We cannot therefore err much in placing Anhayca, in the vicinity of the Ockockona River. East, and not far from it, the names of *Uzachil* and *Anille* are mentioned, and there is a river precisely in the same position, which to this day is

---

\* Catalogue of Mr. Rich, who has a copy of the original edition. The title is "Relacam verdadeira dos trabalhos que ho Governador don Fernando de Souto y certos fidalgos Portugueses passaram no descobrimento da Provincia la Frodida. Agora novamente feita per hum fidalgo d'Elvas." Printed at Evora, 1557. Hakluyt translated and published this work; *Voyages, &c.* Vol. V. (1609.)

called *Oscilla*. But I have not been able to ascertain whether this is, either an Uchee or Muskhogee name, or whether it may not have been subsequently given to the river by the Spaniards in commemoration of De Soto's expedition. I have been equally unfortunate in my inquiries respecting the etymology of the name *Apalachee*; whether it belongs to the language of any of the existing nations, or whether it has been perpetuated from De Soto's time. It is certain that the river *Appalachicola* is known to the Muskhogees by no other name than that of *Chatta Hatchee*, or *Rock River*. The only name mentioned in that vicinity, having any known affinity with an Indian language, is that of a village near the sea-port, which in the Spanish relation is called *Aute*. In the Muskhogee language *autti* or *oty*, means an island.

De Soto's officers discovered in the course of the winter another and better port, sixty computed leagues west of *Aute*. This was called *Ochuse*, and must have been either *Pensacola*, or the entrance of the *Mobile*. Instead, however, of proceeding in that direction, De Soto, on the information of an Indian boy, determined to march northwardly in search of a gold region. He left *Anhayca* in March, 1540, and, in about forty days of actual march, reached a district called *Cofachiqui* or *Cutifachiqui*. Twelve days' march more in the same direction brought him to *Xuala* in the mountains; and this was the termination of his travels northwardly. The distance from the vicinity of *St. Mark's* to the sources of the *French Broad* or of the *Hiwassee*, both tributary streams of the *Tennessee*, is about three hundred and fifty miles in a direct line. This determines the position of *Cofachiqui*, which was certainly on a river emptying into the *Atlantic*, not far south of the 34th degree of north latitude, on the *Oconee*, or on the *Savannah River*. The statement, therefore, that, according to Indian information, it was but two days' journey to the sea, is erroneous. Between *Anhayca* and *Cofachiqui*, we find the two names of *Achese*, on a river which the Spaniards ascended some days, and of *Ocute*, a fruitful country. *Ochis* is the Muskhogee name of the *Okmulgee river*.\* *Oketa* in the same language means *woman*; and *Cohwita* in Uchee means *man*, and is the well-known name of a *Creek town*. These detached names afford but a slight indication of that part of the country having been

---

\* *Ochis hatchee*, Hickory-leaf river. Rev. L. Compere's information.

at that time occupied by the Creeks. But from Cofaehiqui to the Mississippi, we have a continued series of names, which seems to leave no doubt respecting the several nations along De Soto's line of march, from the time he left Cofaehiqui.

In seven days' march due north from that place, he came to *Chalague*, which cannot be mistaken, since it is the proper name of the Cherokees or Chelokees. From *Xuala*, his course was westwardly, bending to the south. In five days, crossing some bad mountains he arrived at *Quaxule*; in two days more at *Canasaqua* or *Canasauga*, and in five days more at *Chiaha* or *Ichiaha*, situated on the bank of a river, and opposite the upper end of an island. This was an abundant country, where the Spaniards rested thirty days in order to recruit their horses. *Connesauga* is, at this moment, the Cherokee name of a creek that empties into the Coosa at New Echota; and *Echoy* is that of a well-known Cherokee town, situated, not indeed on the same spot as *Ichiaha*, but in the fork of Tugaloo and Savannah rivers; whilst *Ichiaha* must have been on the Coosa, probably some distance below the site of New Echota. But we have repeated instances, such as Echota, Coweta, Tallisee, Piqua, &c., of the Indians having favorite names for towns, which they transfer successively to their several villages. There cannot, therefore, I think, be any doubt that the Cherokees occupied at that time the same territory south of the mountains, in which they were found one hundred and forty years later. And it is remarkable that the line, which then separated them from the Coosa country, is almost in the same place as that which till lately divided the Cherokees from the Creeks.

After leaving *Acoste* a short distance west of *Ichiaha*, the Spaniards entered the territory of *Coosa*, through which they travelled from fifteen to twenty days,\* passing through the populous village of *Coosa*, and arriving at *Tallisee*, another large, fortified, and apparently frontier town, subject to the Caeique of Coosa, and situated on a rapid river. The two names of *Coosa* and *Tallisee* afford a decisive proof that the country was then, as now, in the possession of the Muskhogeas. It is equally clear, that, from the vicinity of the last-mentioned place, until he reached the Mississippi, De Soto was in the

---

\* There is a disagreement here between the Portuguese and the Spanish relations. I have taken the medium.



Choctaw or Chickasa country. We find the names of *Tascaluca* or *Tuscalusa*, "Black Warrior," a pure Choctaw name derived from *Tushka*, "warrior," and *Lusa*, "black," and which is that of the eastern branch of the Tombigbee; that of the province of *Pafalaya*, the precise meaning of which I do not know, but which is clearly derived from the Choctaw word *Falaya*, "long"; that of the town of *Maville* or *Mauvila*, identical with that of Mobile, and given by Du Pratz to the Mobilians, a Choctaw tribe; that of the chief *Nicalusa*, probably "Black bear," from *Nitah*, bear, and *Lusa*, black; and finally that of *Chicasa* itself, given to a village situated within the territory now occupied by the Chicasas.\*

We may thence fairly, and as I think conclusively, infer that the Cherokees, Chicasas, and Choctaws occupied then nearly the same territories as at the present time; and that the Muskhogees were then, as now, seated on the Coosa, to the east of the Choctaws. But we have no proof of the extent of their progress toward the Atlantic. It is, indeed, probable that the seashores of Georgia, as well as of West Florida, were then occupied by different tribes now extinct. We know that the Indians of that peninsula were a distinct nation or nations from the Muskhogees; and that they were subsequently

---

\* I incline to the opinion, that De Soto left the Coosa river at Tallisee, and marched thence westward to the Tuscaloosa or Black-warrior river, which he descended a short distance to Maville. It would appear from the Portuguese relation, that the Spaniards, in about four days' march from Tallisee, arrived at the town of Piache, called by Garcilaso, Tuscaluza, situated upon a great river, which from that account must have been distinct from the Coosa, and across which Soto carried his army. The division line between the Creeks and the Choctaws now is, and probably was at that time, a river or a ridge, and therefore a north and south and not an east and west line. I think also that De Soto must have necessarily crossed the Mississippi at the northern extremity of that immense swamp, which extends northwardly one hundred and fifty miles from the mouth of the Yazoo River, and covers almost the whole ground between that river and the Mississippi. It is impossible that he should have penetrated, or attempted to penetrate through the heart of that swamp, so as to cross the Mississippi near the mouth of the Arkansas. It is equally clear from the details given, that, just before crossing the great river, he was on the northern edge of the swamp. This determines the position of the place where he crossed, between the 35th degree of north latitude and the mouth of St. Francis River. But whether mistaken or not on those points, it does not affect in the least the proofs of the actual place of residence at that time of the several Indian Nations.

subjugated or destroyed by the Seminoles. The Coloosas, the last remnant of those Florida Indians, had been driven to some of the Keys lying near the southern extremity of the peninsula. "Even here the water did not protect them against the inroads from the Creeks; and, in 1763, the remnant of this people, consisting of about eighty families, left this last possession of their native land and went to the Havanna."\*

The accounts of the attempt by the French, in the years 1562 – 1567,† to make a settlement on the coast of Florida and Georgia, prove also clearly that the Indians in that quarter, instead of being united under a confederate government, were divided into a number of small, independent tribes, always at war with each other. None of those now remains, unless some may have been incorporated in the Creek confederacy. The few words which have been preserved of their language appear, with two exceptions, foreign to the Muskhogee and to the Choctaw. Those two are *Antipola*, *Bonnason*, by which the Indians greeted the French, on their arriving amongst them the second time, and which meant "Friends." *Itapela* in Choctaw means "allies," literally, "They help each other."‡ In the Muskhogee *inhisse* is "his friends," and *ponhisse*, "our friends."§

If we were to place implicit faith in the accounts given by Garcilaso de la Vega of the number of Indians in various places, we should infer a greater population than was found to exist one hundred and fifty years later. Considering the sources from which he derived his information, the proneness of common soldiers to swell the number of enemies, and the habitual and notorious exaggerations of the Spaniards of his time, we will in that respect give the preference to the more sober statements of the Portuguese narrator, who kills only two thousand five hundred Indians by the fire and sword at the storming of Mauvila, whilst Garcilaso swells the number to eleven thou-

\* B. Romans' Florida, page 291. He calls the Keys, Vacos and Huysso, and represents the tribe as a set of most inhuman wreckers.

† For an able discussion of the places where the French attempted to make settlements, see Holmes's Annals, a work of great merit, research, and correctness.

‡ Choctaw Vocabulary.

§ These two words, *Antipola*, *Bonnason*, are from Lescarbot. I have not seen the original relation of Laudonnière.

sand.\* In another place, at Cofaqui or Patofa, the last inhabited district before the arrival of the Spaniards at Cofachiqui, the Cacique, who was very friendly, gave them, according to Garcilaso, four thousand warriors, to escort them and four thousand retainers to carry their supplies and clothing. It must be observed that the total amount of their baggage was such, that, on their departure from Anhayca, each soldier carried his supply on his back. On the seventh day of their march through an uninhabited country, the army was arrested by the termination of the path which they had followed thus far. They were then within twelve leagues of the first village in the province of Cofachiqui, and not one of the eight thousand Indian allies could point out the proper direction, which at last was discovered by the Spaniards themselves. And the Indian chief assured De Soto that none of his followers had ever been in that place, and that in their wars with the Indians of Cofachiqui, those of Cofaqui had never passed over their own frontiers. Whether any one Indian warrior has ever been found ignorant of the way to an enemy's village, hardly one hundred and fifty miles distant, and through a country offering no particular obstacle, we are able to judge. According to the Portuguese narrator, De Soto had demanded only six hundred Indians; and when he found himself at a loss which way to pursue, he had no other guide but a young Indian they had brought from Appalache, and who confessed that he did not know where he was. "The Indians of Patofa (or Cofaqui) had been sent back as soon as provisions began to be scarce," though the poor men showed a great deal of trouble to leave the Christians before they saw them in a good country. The numbers, as stated in the Portuguese relation, are not on the whole inconsistent with a population nearly the same as at this time. The greatest apparent exaggeration is perhaps that of the Cacique of Ocute sending two thousand Indians to De Soto with a present of some provisions.

Whatever opinion may be entertained of the respective population of the four great southern nations three hundred, and one hundred and fifty years ago, it appears certain that

---

\* Yet Garcilaso did not intend to impose on his readers, or exceed, according to his knowledge, the bounds of credibility. Born in Peru, he was deceived by an erroneous analogy, and saw nothing extraordinary in the accounts given to him of eight to twelve thousand Indians collected together.

their habits and social state had not, during that interval, undergone any material alteration. They were probably as ferocious, but less addicted to war than the northern Indians. Those of New England, the Iroquois tribes, the Sauks and Foxes, had perhaps made equal progress in agriculture ; but, generally speaking, the southern depended more on the cultivation of the soil, and less on hunting than the Algonkin Lenape tribes. We find the Spaniards under De Soto feeding almost exclusively on maize, and complaining of the want of meat. Two hundred years later, Bernard Romans says, that near one half of the Choctaws have never killed a deer during their lives, and that, whilst in their country, he had but two or three opportunities of eating venison in as many months. Those southern tribes have also remained respectively united together as one nation. The Choctaws and Chicasas are the only exception of any importance ; and the Muskhogeas, as has been seen, incorporated, instead of exterminating subordinate tribes.

Several causes may be assigned for those differences. Surrounded on three sides by the Mississippi and the sea, they had less room to wander or to subdivide themselves. Their country, particularly that of the Choctaws, supplied them with less game ; whilst, in a more southern climate, a greater quantity of agricultural products may be procured with less labor. Yet, although the men may to some extent have assisted the women in the cultivation of the ground, the greater part of the labors of the field still fell upon the latter ; and so long as this is the case, the means of subsistence will continue to be insufficient to promote any but a very limited increase of population.

The Indians, as individuals, have preserved a much greater degree of independence than is compatible with a more advanced state of civilization. They will hardly submit to any restraints ; and it is well known that the nominal title of chief confers but little power, either in war or peace, on their leaders, whose precarious authority depends almost entirely on their personal talents and energy. Yet we find that nominal dignity of Chief, Sachem, Mingo, or King, to have been, but with few exceptions, amongst all the Indians, not only for life but hereditary.\* But another institution, belonging to all the

---

\* Generally, but not universally, by the female line. The hereditary

southern, and of which traces may be found amongst the northern nations, deserves particular consideration.

Independent of political or geographical divisions, that into families, or clans has been established from time immemorial. At what time, and in what manner, the division was first made, is not known. At present, or till very lately, every nation was divided into a number of clans, varying in the several nations from three to eight or ten, the members of which respectively were dispersed indiscriminately throughout the whole nation. It has been fully ascertained, that the inviolable regulations, by which those clans were perpetuated amongst the southern nations, were, first, that no man could marry in his own clan; secondly, that every child belongs to his or her mother's clan. Among the Choctaws, there are two great divisions, each of which is subdivided into four clans; and no man can marry in any of the four clans belonging to his division. The restriction amongst the Cherokees, the Creeks, and the Natches, does not extend beyond the clan to which the man belongs.

There are sufficient proofs that the same division into clans, commonly called tribes, exists amongst almost all the other Indian nations. But it is not so clear that they are subject to the same regulations which prevail amongst the southern Indians. According to Charlevoix, "most nations are divided into three families or tribes. One of them is considered as the first and has a kind of preëminence. Those tribes are mixed without being confounded. Each tribe has the name of an animal. Among the Hurons, the first tribe is that of the Bear; the two others, of the Wolf and the Turtle. The Iroquois nation has the same divisions, only the Turtle family is divided into two, the Great and the Little."\*

The accounts are not so explicit with respect to the Lenape tribes. Mr. Heckewelder indeed says, that the Delawares were divided into three tribes; but one of them, the Wolf or Minsi,

---

principle may have had its origin in the primitive Patriarchal government. A chief is wanted in a state of society which is one of perpetual warfare with the adjacent tribes. Whatever cause may be assigned for the fact, the most ancient accounts and traditions agree in representing barbarous people, when first appearing as independent communities, under a kingly government. The heroic times of Greece, and the petty kings, cotemporary with Abraham, are familiar to all.

\* Vol. III. p. 266.



had altogether separated from the other, and was a distinct nation or tribe, and not a clan in the sense now under consideration. According to Mr. Johnston, the Shawnoes have four tribes, the Chillicothe, the Piqua, the Kiskapocoke, and the Mequachake. The first two, from having given names to distinct towns, would seem to be living in separate places; but the fact, that the Mequachake can alone perform the religious ceremonies of the nation, gives it the character of a clan. Whether the *Totem*, or family name of the Chippeways, descends in a regular manner, or is arbitrarily imposed by the father, has not been clearly explained. But Dr. James informs us, that no man is allowed to change his Totem, that it descends to all the children a man may have, and that the restraint upon inter-marriage which it imposes, is scrupulously regarded. "They profess to consider it highly criminal for a man to marry a woman whose Totem is the same as his own; and they relate instances where young men, for a violation of this rule, have been put to death by their own nearest relatives."\* But the Chippeways and kindred tribes are in this manner much more subdivided than the other Indians are into clans. Dr. James gives a catalogue of eighteen Totems, and says, that many more might be enumerated.

The most direct testimony we have of the similarity, of the institution amongst the northern and southern Indians, is that of Loskiel, in his History of the Moravian Mission.† "The Delawares and Iroquois never marry near relations. According to their own account, the Indian nations were divided into tribes for no other purpose, than that no one might ever either through temptation or mistake, marry a near relation, which at present is scarcely possible, for whoever intends to marry, must take a person of a different tribe."

That a similar division existed amongst the Sioux tribes, had escaped former observers. But Dr. Say, who resided several weeks among the Omahaws, informs us, that they are divided into two great tribes, the Hongashano, and the Ishtasunda.‡ The first is divided into eight, and the other into five bands. Each of these derives its name from some animal, part of an animal, or other substance, which is considered as the peculiar sacred object, or *medicine*, as the Canadians call it, of each band respectively. The most ancient is that of the red maize;

\* Tanner's Narrative, p. 313.

† Part I. Chap. v.

‡ Major Long's Expedition, Vol. I. Chap. xv.

the most powerful that of the *Wase-ishta* ("male deer"). The Puncas are likewise divided into similar bands. Dr. Say does not mention how those several bands or clans are perpetuated; but in another place he says, that "even a very remote degree of consanguinity is an insuperable barrier to the marriage union."\*

I am indebted for the first information respecting the object of that institution among the southern tribes, to the manuscript notes of Mr. Mitchell, formerly agent amongst the Creeks, communicated to me by Mr. Forsyth; and it has been since fully confirmed by intelligent natives of the several nations. Since, however, the Cherokees and the Creeks have attempted to substitute, for their ancient customs, written laws on the model of ours, the institution is falling into disuse, though very recent instances have occurred of its being enforced.

According to the ancient custom, if an offence was committed by one on another member of the same clan, the compensation to be made on account of the injury was regulated in an amicable way by the other members of the clan. Murder was rarely expiated in any other way than by the death of the murderer; the nearest male relative of the deceased was the executioner; but, this being done as under the authority of the clan, there was no further retaliation. If the injury was committed by some one of another clan, it was not the injured party, but the clan to which he belonged that asked for reparation. This was rarely refused by the clan of the offender; but, in case of refusal, the injured clan had a right to do itself justice, either by killing the offender in case of murder, or inflicting some other punishment for lesser offences. This species of private war was by the Creeks called "to take up the sticks," because the punishment generally consisted in beating the offender. At the time of the annual corn-feast, the sticks were laid down, and could not again be taken up for the same offence. But it seems that originally there had been a superiority amongst some of the clans. That of the Wind had the right to take up the sticks four times, that of the Bear twice, for the same offence; whilst those of the Tiger, of the Wolf, of the Bird, of the Root, and of two more, whose names I do not know, could raise them but once.†

---

\* Vol. I. Chap. xiv.

† The Cherokees, according to Mr. Boudinot's information, were divided into seven clans, the Deer, the Wolf, &c.

It is obvious, that the object of the unknown legislator was, to prevent or soften the effects of private revenge, by transferring the power and duty from the blood relatives to a more impartial body. The father, and his brothers by the same mother, never could belong to the same clan as their son or nephew; whilst the perpetual changes, arising from intermarriages with women of a different clan, prevented their degenerating into distinct tribes, and checked the natural tendency towards a subdivision of the nation into independent communities. The institution may be considered as the foundation of the internal policy, and the basis of the social state, of the Indians. It must have contributed towards preserving the southern nations entire and compact as we found them. It certainly was not preserved in its purity amongst the Lenapes; and this circumstance may have had its share in the great subdivision into small, independent tribes, and consequent impotency, of that numerous nation.

There were also amongst the southern nations other institutions intended still more effectually to check the spirit of revenge and retaliation, so universally indulged by every barbarous people; and calculated to preserve either internal or external peace. Such was, among the Cherokees, the City of Refuge and Peace, Echoteh, where even murderers found at least a temporary asylum. This place, where a perpetual fire was kept, was the residence of a peculiar class of men, known by the name of the "Beloved Men," in whose presence blood could not be shed, and who, even out of the city and wherever they went, secured against any act of violence those under their protection.\* Such was also the division of towns or villages amongst the Creeks, into White towns and Red towns, distinguished from each other by poles of those respective colors. Whenever the question of war or peace was deliberately discussed at Thlocotcho, the general seat of government, it was the duty of the representatives of the White towns to bring forth all the arguments that could be suggested in favor of peace.†

---

\* Information given by M. Boudinot. These "Beloved Men" were entirely distinct from the hereditary Mingoos and other chiefs. Mr. Hawkins, under the modest name of Beloved Man of the Four Nations, did, during his life, govern or at least exercise a very considerable influence over the Creeks, Choctaws, and even Chicasas and Cherokees.

† Information from Mr. Mitchell and Colonel Hambly. But it refers to customs falling into disuse, and of which traces only remain.

The aristocratical feature of the institution of clans appears to have been general. Some superiority is everywhere ascribed to one of them:—to the Unamis among the Delawares; to the Wase-ishta among the Omahaws; to the Bear tribe among the Hurons and Five Nations. Charlevoix says, that when the Mohawks put to death Father Iogues, it was the work of the Bear clan alone, and notwithstanding all the efforts of those of the Wolf and of the Turtle to save him.\* But it is among the Natches alone that we find, connected together, a highly privileged class, a despotic government, and something like a regular form of religious worship.

The Natches occupied a territory of moderate extent on the Mississippi, and lived in three villages near the site of the town which has preserved their name. The number of their warriors, which was estimated at twelve hundred, appears from the details of their war with the French to have been rather overrated.

They were divided into four classes or clans, on the same principle and under the same regulations as those of the other southern Indian tribes. They worshipped the sun, from whom the sovereign and the privileged class pretended to be descended; and they preserved a perpetual sacred fire in an edifice appropriated to that purpose. The hereditary dignity of Chief or Great Sun descended as usual by the female line;† and he as well as all the other members of his clan, whether male or female, could marry only persons of an inferior clan. Hence the barbarous custom of sacrificing at their funerals the consorts of the Great Sun and of his mother. Her influence was powerful, and his authority apparently despotic, though checked by her and by some select counsellors of his own clan.

Charlevoix says, that most of the nations of Louisiana had a perpetual fire in their temples. He and Du Pratz describe as eyewitnesses the temple and sacred fire of the Natches. Tonti saw the temple of the Taensas, then living on the west side of the Mississippi, and which is described in his relation with its usual exaggeration. The worship of the sun and fire by

---

\* Vol. I. Year 1646. Father Iogues was the victim of his zeal. He had with difficulty been saved three years before by the good offices of the Dutch commanding officer at Fort Orange.

† Amongst the Hurons the dignity of chief is hereditary through the female line. They believe him to have issued from the sun. Charlevoix, Vol. III.

the Bayagoulas, a Mississippi tribe now extinct, is also particularly mentioned; and traces of it are found amongst the Cherokees, the Choctaws, and the Caddoes of Red River.

Du Pratz asserts that the Taensas and the Chitimachas, both originally living on the west side of the Mississippi, were kindred tribes of the Natches. But we have a vocabulary of the Chitimachas, in which no affinity is perceived with that of the Natches. They seem to have been alone of their stock in that region, and according to their tradition had come from the west.

In the year 1729, on account of a threatened encroachment on one of their villages, in the expectation of being joined by the other Indian nations, they unexpectedly attacked and massacred more than two hundred French inhabitants. They were a few months after besieged in their principal fort by the French and the Choctaws, and driven from their country. They retired to the west of the Mississippi, where the French pursued them; and they experienced such losses, that they have ever since ceased to exist as a distinct nation. What contributed most to its extinction, was the capture of the greater part of the women, who were carried to St. Domingo and sold as slaves. The survivors took refuge at first among the Chicasas, and subsequently among the Creeks, with whom they are now incorporated. They are reduced to about three hundred souls, and have preserved their language amongst themselves, but speak Muskogee; and it is only through that medium that a communication can be held with them, as there is not a single interpreter of their language.

When, in the year 1826, Isahlakteh, the Natches chief, was asked whether he was a Sun, he immediately answered that he was not, for his father was one. But he was less disposed or less ready to answer the inquiries concerning the creed of his tribe at this time. After some conversation between him and Colonel Hambly, this gentleman told me that he said, that the sacred fire was no longer preserved, and that the sun was to them an object of respect but not of worship.

---

We know but little more than the names of the other small tribes, which formerly inhabited the seashore between the Mobile and the Mississippi, and the two banks of this last river, or which are still found west of the Mississippi, and within



the boundaries of the United States, on and south of Red River.

Du Pratz mentions in the vicinity of the seashore, and east of the Mississippi, the *Mobilians*, living near the mouth of that river, and speaking the Choctaw language; the *Pascagoulas* or *Pasca Ogoulas* ("Bread nation") on the river of that name, now living on Red River; and the *Colapissas* or *Aqueloupissas* ("who hear and see"), living then not far from the site of New Orleans, but either extinct or no longer known by that name. He says, that they consisted only of twenty families, whilst Charlevoix at the same time (1721) estimates them at two hundred warriors. To these must be added the *Boluxas* of Biloxi, now living below Natchitoches.

Those whom he mentions on the eastern bank of the Mississippi, above New Orleans, are the *Oumas* or *Humas* ("Red nation"), of whom a few are said to remain below Manchac and others to be found in the vicinity of the Attacapas; the *Tunicas*, originally living opposite the mouth of Red River, in alliance with the French, nearly destroyed by the Chicasas in the course of the Natches war, and the remnant of whom are settled at Avoyelle on Red River; and the *Yazoos*, who, together with some small kindred tribes also living on Yazoo River, amounted to two hundred families. They spoke Chicasa, and were in alliance with that nation and the Natches. During the Natches war, they were nearly destroyed by the Arkansas; the residue of them are now incorporated with the Chicasas.

The tribes mentioned by the same author on the west side of the Mississippi, and whose names at least have disappeared, are the *Bayagoulas*, the *Oque Loussas*, ("Black Water,") the *Avoyelles* and the *Washittas*, driven away by the Chicasas, and according to him incorporated with the Natchitoches.

The most complete account of the numerous small tribes still existing west of the Mississippi, on Red River and south of it, is that of Dr. John Sibley, of Natchitoches.\* They consist partly of such as had within the memory of man migrated from the east side of the river; partly of those who were considered as natives.

The first class embraces the *Appalaches*, the *Alibamas*, and

---

\* President's Message of February 19th, 1806, with the accompanying documents from Dr. Sibley and others.

the *Conchattas*, who came from the Creek country ; the *Taensas*, who, though originally living on the west bank of the Mississippi, had in Du Pratz's time removed to the vicinity of the Mobile, whence they have again migrated to Red River ; the *Humas*, the *Tunicas*, the *Boluxas*, and the *Pascagoulas* already mentioned, and the *Pacanas* said to have come from West Florida. Dr. Sibley asserts that each of these four last-mentioned tribes has a distinct language of its own.

The second class consists of the following tribes, to wit :

1. The Caddoes or Caddokies, who formerly lived three hundred miles up Red River on a prairie near an eminence, on which they say, that, after all the world had been drowned by a flood, the Great Spirit placed one family of Caddoes from which all the Indians have originated. They have now removed to a branch of Red River about one hundred and twenty miles above Natchitoches. Though much diminished in number by the small-pox and by their wars with the Osages, and reduced to about one hundred warriors, they are held in great consideration by all the neighbouring tribes. Amongst these, the *Nandakoes*, the *Inies* or *Tachies*, who have given their name to the province of Texas, and the *Nabedaches*, amounting together to about two hundred warriors, speak dialects of the Caddo language.

2. The *Natchitoches* and the *Yatassees*, living fifty miles above Natchitoches, amounting together to one hundred souls, and speaking the same language, said by Dr. Sibley to be different from any other.

3. The *Adaize*, living between the Natchitoches and the Yatassees, reduced to fifty souls, speak a language totally distinct from any other known to us.

4. The *Appelousas*, in the district of that name, reduced to forty men, said by Dr. Sibley to speak a distinct language.

5. The *Attacapas* (" Men-eaters "), reduced to fifty men, said to have been formerly cannibals, speak a distinct language, which according to Dr. Sibley is also spoken by another tribe near the seashore, called *Caramkouas*, but who probably are without the boundaries of the United States.

6. The *Chactos*, living on Bayou Bœuf, estimated at thirty men, and having also, according to Dr. Sibley, a distinct language.

7. The *Panis* or *Towiaches*, on Red River, near the western boundary of the United States, and having two

villages called Nitehata and Towahach, where they cultivate corn. The *Tawakenoes*, who live two hundred miles west of Nacogdoches, south of Red River, are said by Dr. Sibley to speak the same language. This, from the similarity of name, has been presumed to be a dialect of the *Pawnees*, of the Arkansa. At the time of Major Long's first expedition, they had been driven from their villages by the Osages; but they have probably returned, and are the same nation with those Indians who have now villages on the north of Red River and are designated by the name of *Towecas* and *Wachos*, in a treaty lately concluded with several western tribes. Beyond the Panis, there are none but erratic tribes who do not cultivate any thing.

To this enumeration we must add, though not mentioned by Dr. Sibley,

8. The *Chitimachas*, formerly living in the vicinity of Lake Barataria, and still existing in Lower Louisiana.

Among the various small tribes, the following have Choctaw names, to wit, the *Pascagoulas*, "Bread nation," from *Paska*, "bread," and *ogoulas*, corrupted from *okla*, "nation, people"; the *Aqueloupissas*, "who hear and see," from *hoklo*, "to hear," and *pissa*, "to see"; *Oumas*, "Red people," from *humma*, "red"; *Oqueloussas*, from *oka*, "water," and *lusa*, "black"; to which we might add one of the small Yazoo tribes, mentioned by Du Pratz by the name of *Oufe Ogoulas*, or "Dog nation," from *oufe*, "dog."

This however alone is not sufficient to prove that those small tribes were Choctaws or spoke dialects of that language, unless the names by which they are known to us were those by which they called themselves. The first settlement of the French was on Mobile River, and the first tribe near the mouth of that river with which they came in contact, was called Mobilian and spoke Choctaw. Hence they designated that language by the name of Mobilian, and on account of its great extent it was called the common or vulgar tongue.\* In the same manner as, in the north, we call to this day two Sioux tribes, who speak languages altogether different from the Algonkin, by the Algonkin names of *Winnebagoes* and *Assiniboins*, which they do not recognise as their own. The French were in the habit of designating nations and objects not belonging to

---

\* Du Pratz.

the Choctaws, by the names which that people had imposed on them. Of this we have at least two instances in point. The name of *Achafalaya*, the principal western outlet of the Mississippi, is pure Choctaw, meaning "the long river," from *hucha*, "river," and *falaya*, "long."\* And the name of the *Attacapas*, "Men-eaters," whose language, as appears by their vocabulary, is totally different from the Choctaw, is that which had been given to them by this nation, derived from *hottok*, "a person," and *uppa*, "to eat." As, with the exception of the Natches, we have no vocabularies of any of the smaller tribes originally living on the east side of the Mississippi which were contiguous to the Choctaws, the presumed identity of language remains uncertain. It will be perceived by Dr. Sibley's account, that six of these are still existing, to wit, the Taensas, the Humas, the Boluxas, the Pacanas, the Tunicas, and the Pascagoulas; the four last of which he asserts to have distinct languages from the Mobilian or Choctaw.

With respect to the tribes, natives of the western side of the Mississippi, exclusively of the Panis, who live beyond the boundaries of the State of Louisiana, Dr. Sibley states that they speak six distinct languages, to which must be added that of the Chitimachas not mentioned by him. We have vocabularies of four of these, viz., of the Attacapas and of the Chitimachas, taken by Mr. Duralde and by him transmitted to Mr. Jefferson; and of the Adaize, and of the Caddoes, transmitted by Dr. Sibley to Mr. Duponceau. We have made but partial use of the last, having received one much more copious from Mr. George Gray, the Indian Agent. The three still wanted are those of the Natchitoches, of the Opelousas, and of the Chactos. The four which have been obtained, fully justify Dr. Sibley's assertion; each of those tribes speaks a distinct language and different from any other known to us. It appears also by a letter from Dr. Sibley to Mr. Duponceau, at the time when he transmitted the Adaize and Caddo vocabularies, that he had actually obtained those of some of the other tribes, to the peculiarities of which he alludes. These have not been received.

From the Arctic Sea to the fifty-second degree of north

---

\* There are two Choctaw words for river viz. *hucha*, of the same origin with the Muskogee *hatchee*, and *okhina*, probably "water-course."

latitude, across the continent of America from the Atlantic almost to the Pacific, we have not found more than two great families of languages, the Eskimaux and the Athapascas.

South of these, as far as the thirty-fifth or thirty-sixth degree of latitude, two other families, the Algonkin-Lenape and Iroquois, filled the whole space between the Atlantic and the Mississippi or the meridian which passes by its sources. Another great family, that of the Sioux, extends equally far from north to south, on the west side of the Mississippi. With the exception of a doubtful tribe (the Loucheux), there is not to be found, in the extensive territory occupied by those five families, a single tribe or remnant of a tribe, that speaks a dialect, which does not belong to one or another of those five families.

On the contrary, in the comparatively small territory south of the Lenape and Iroquois tribes, and including that portion of the State of Louisiana which lies west of the Mississippi, we find, allowing even the Muskogee and Choctaw to be but one, three extensive languages, the Catawba, the Cherokee, and the Choctaw Muskogee, and six well ascertained of small tribes or remnants of tribes, to wit, the Uchee, the Natches, and the four abovementioned west of the Mississippi. And there is a strong probability that, independently of the several small extinct tribes of Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, which still existed when those countries were first settled, several of those still existing west of the Mississippi will be found to have distinct languages. It also appears by the statements of their respective population, communicated by Dr. Sibley, and which is indeed notorious, that those small tribes preserve their language to the last moment of their existence.\*

The most powerful southern nations appear to have been, upon the whole, less exterminating than the northern Indians. It is also probable that the impenetrable swamps and the multiplied channels or bayoux by which the delta of the Mississippi and the Red River country are intersected, have afforded places of refuge to the remnants of conquered tribes.

---

\* The same observation applies generally to all the Indian tribes. Instances have been mentioned in speaking of the Nanticokes, the Nottoways, and the Long Island Indians.



## SECTION IV.

## INDIANS BETWEEN THE MISSISSIPPI AND THE PACIFIC OCEAN.

THE Indians under this head are divided into two great sections by the Rocky Mountains.

Those east of the mountains are the Sioux; the Pawnees; the Fall, Rapid, or Paunch Indians; the Black Feet, and some other erratic tribes, not so well known, and which may be embraced under the general though obsolete denomination of Padoucas. Some bands of Snake Indians or Shoshonees, living on the waters of the river Columbia, and of Hietans or Camanches, whose principal residence is south of Red River and of the southern boundary of the United States, are also occasionally found, either towards the sources of the tributary streams of the Missouri, or north of Red River. As the Winnebagoes, whose seats are near Lake Michigan, speak a dialect of the Sioux language, we have also included them under this head.

The nations which speak the Sioux language may be considered, in reference both to their respective dialects and to their geographical position, as consisting of four subdivisions, viz. the Winnebagoes; the Sioux proper and the Assiniboins; the Minetare group; and the Osages and other southern kindred tribes.

The Winnebagoes, so called by the Algonkins, but called *Puans* and also *Otchagras* by the French, and *Horoje* ("Fish-eaters") by the Omahaws and other southern tribes, call themselves *Hochungohrah*, or the "Trout" nation. The Green Bay of Lake Michigan derives its French name from theirs. (Baye des Puans). It is not known at what time they separated from the Sioux people; but it must have been prior to the settlements of the French in Canada. Champlain, in the map annexed to his Travels, has given an erroneous position to Lake Michigan, which he knew only from Indian information; but he calls it "Lac des Puans." They are first mentioned by Father Allouez in the Relation of the year 1669, at which time they occupied nearly the same territory as at present. He says, that they had been nearly destroyed thirty years before by the

Illinois, and that they spoke a language altogether distinct from the Algonkin and the Iroquois. They are said by Charlevoix to have been, in the year 1701, in alliance with the Sauks, the Foxes, and the Potowotamies, against both the Sioux and the Iroquois; and he adds in his journal, (1721,) that they formerly lived on the shores of Green Bay, but had retired farther inland. Carver was the first American who, in the year 1766, travelled through their country, at which time they appear to have been on friendly terms with the Sioux and all their neighbours. Pike, in 1807, estimated their number at two thousand; but, according to the War Department, they amount to four thousand six hundred souls, and appear to cultivate the soil to a considerable degree. Their principal seats are on the Fox River of Lake Michigan, and towards the heads of the Rock River of the Mississippi. Their territory extends northwardly towards the Wisconsin; and they are bounded on the north by the Menomonies, on the west by the Sauks, and on the south by the Potowotamies. As their limits are nearly the same as one hundred and fifty years ago, it may be presumed that they have, during that time, lived generally on friendly terms with the Algonkin tribes by which they are surrounded; but of their former history we know but little. They took part with the British during the last war against the Americans. Their vocabulary, which was received from the War Department, had been transmitted by Mr. N. Boilvin, an Indian agent. Some words were supplied by General Cass; and some have been taken from Major Long's account of his first expedition.

The Sioux proper, or Naudowessies, names given to them by the Algonkins and the French, call themselves *Dahcotas*, and sometimes *Ochente Shakoans*, or, "The Seven Fires," and are divided into seven bands or tribes, closely connected together, but apparently independent of each other. They do not appear to have been known to the French before the year 1660; and they are distinctly mentioned for the first time, in the year 1666, by Father Allouez, then a missionary at Chagouamigong, towards the southwestern extremity of Lake Superior. He says that they lived forty leagues more westwardly in a prairie country; that they did not cultivate the ground; that they were ferocious, warlike, and feared by all their neighbours; and that they spoke a language entirely distinct from any other known to the French. It has already been stated,

that they had a war with the Hurons and the Ottowas of Lake Michigan, who had taken refuge in that quarter, and compelled them to abandon the country. The French carried on a trade with them from their post at Prairie du Chien on the Mississippi; but it is only very lately that they have come into contact with the Americans. Carver was the first who visited them, and gave a short vocabulary of their language, which is generally correct.\*

It may be observed that, considering the short time which Carver resided among the Indians, and that he derived his information of the country north of St. Anthony's Falls almost entirely from Indian reports, his geographical notices of the upper Mississippi were remarkably correct. He is the first who placed the sources of that river within about forty miles of their actual position, in the vicinity of the Red Lake of the Red River of Lake Winnipek, and *south* of the Lake of the Woods. The map annexed to the original edition of his Travels was published during his life, in the year 1778, but does not appear to have been deemed authentic by the commissioners who negotiated the treaty of peace of 1783. The pretended grant of lands from the Indians to him is neither alluded to, nor annexed to that original edition. It made its first appearance after his death, and in subsequent editions.

The four most eastern tribes of the Dahcotas are known by the name of *Mendewahkantoan*, or "Gens du Lac," *Wahkpatoan* and *Wahkpakotoan*, or "People of the Leaves," and *Sisitoans*. The first of these is the only one that cultivates the ground, and occupies, on the east side of the Mississippi, a tract of country extending from the Prairie du Chien, in the forty-third, to the Spirit Lake, north of the forty-sixth degree of north latitude. The three other, inhabit the country between the Mississippi and the St. Peter's, and that on the southern tributaries of this river, as well as that which lies on the head waters of the Red River of Lake Winnipek. These four are better known to us than the more westerly tribes; and their aggregate number may be fairly estimated at about five thousand souls.

The three westerly tribes, the Yanktons, the Yanktoanans, and the Tetons, wander between the Mississippi and the Missouri, extending southerly to the forty-third degree of north

---

\* That which he has given of the Chippeways is only a transcript of that of La Hontan, spelt according to the English orthography.

latitude and some distance west of the Missouri, between the forty-third and forty-seventh degrees of latitude. According to Lewis and Clarke, who in their ascent up the Missouri had frequent interviews with them, their number does not exceed six thousand souls. Renville, a half-breed Dahcota, who served as an interpreter in Major Long's second expedition, has raised the number to twenty-one thousand six hundred, of whom he allows fourteen thousand four hundred to the Tetons alone. From the still more exaggerated account he gave of the population of the Assiniboins, whom he supposed to be still less known to us, very little reliance can be placed on his statements in that respect; and it is believed, though our data are imperfect, that the seven tribes together amount at most to twenty thousand souls.

The western Dahcota tribes have carried on a constant predatory war against all the tribes living on the Missouri, or its tributary streams, from the Mandans to the Osages; and the eastern tribes appear to have been, from time immemorial, inveterate enemies of the Chippeways. The government of the United States has, during the last thirty years, used unremitting efforts to establish a permanent peace between them, and lately, it is believed, with better hope of success.

The Assiniboins (Stone Indians), as they are called by the Algonkins, are a Dahcota tribe, separated from the rest of the nation, and on that account called *Hoha* or "Rebels," by the other Sioux. They are said to have made part originally of the Yanktons; but we are not acquainted with their real name. Their separation must have taken place at an earlier date than has been presumed by late writers. Father Marquette, writing in the year 1669, from the Chagouamigong Mission, after having mentioned the Nadouessies, as a formidable nation speaking a language altogether different from the Algonkin and the Huron, adds, that the Assiniponiels have almost the same language as the Nadouessies, and live about fifteen days' journey from the mission on a lake, which, from a map annexed to that volume of the Relations, must have been Lake Winnipek. The only detailed account we have of them was given by Sir Alexander Mackenzie, and is confirmed by subsequent English writers. They formed an intimate connexion with the Knistinaux and, jointly with them, drove away the ancient inhabitants of the main Saskachawin and of the north branch of the same river. They also continued to occupy the

country bordering on the river, which bears their name, and is the western branch of the Red River of Lake Winnipek.\* It is probable from its situation north of the Yanktons, that this was their original seat. Mackenzie estimates their aggregate number in both places at about five thousand souls, which may be underrated. According to Renville's account, they would amount to twenty-eight thousand. Lewis and Clarke estimate them at sixteen hundred warriors, or rather more than six thousand souls.

Another tribe, called Shyennes or Cheyennes, were at no very remote period seated on the left bank of the Red River of Lake Winnipek, and have left their name to one of its tributary streams. Carver reckoned them as one of the Sioux tribes; and Mackenzie informs us that they were driven away by the Sioux. They now live on the head waters of the river Shyenne, a southwestern tributary of the Missouri. The names of the chiefs who signed the treaty, concluded with them in 1825 by the United States, are pure Dahcota of the Yankton dialect, as will be seen amongst the appended vocabularies. It had been thence concluded that they certainly were a Sioux tribe. I have been however assured, by a well-informed person who trades with them, that they speak a distinct language, for which there is no European interpreter; that the treaty was carried on, through the medium of some of the Sioux; and that the Indian names subscribed to the treaty are translations into the Sioux language of the Shyenne names of the chiefs. They are estimated by Lewis and Clarke at sixteen hundred, and by the War Department at two thousand souls.

We have only two vocabularies of the Dahcota dialects. That of the Yanktons was obtained by Dr. Say. That of the eastern Dahcotas of the Mississippi has been principally extracted from one transmitted by General Cass to the War Department, and partly from those of Mr. Keating and Major Long. It is probable that the dialects of the Tetons and of the Assiniboins, though similar, differ from both. A few words of that of the Assiniboins, supplied by Umfreville, will be found amongst the supplementary vocabularies.

---

\* The source of Mouse River, a southern tributary of the Assiniboin, is within one mile of the main Missouri River, about one hundred miles above the Mandan village. The slightest variation in the nature and elevation of the intervening ground would have thrown all the waters of the upper Missouri into Lake Winnipek and Hudson's Bay.



The Minetares (Minetaree and Minetaries) consist of three tribes, speaking three different languages which belong to a common stock. Its affinities with the Dahcota are but remote, but have appeared sufficient to entitle them to be considered as of the same family.

Two of those tribes, the Mandanes, whose number does not exceed fifteen hundred, and the stationary Minetares, amounting to three thousand souls, including those called Annahawas, cultivate the soil, and live in villages situated on, or near the Missouri, between the forty-seventh and forty-eighth degrees of north latitude. They are kept in a state of perpetual alarm by the Assiniboins, the Tetons, the Rapid Indians, and other erratic tribes, and have on that account been often obliged to change the seat of their villages. Yet they have been often quarrelling with the Ricaras, who like them are an agricultural people; and they make often predatory expeditions against the Shoshonees, in the eastern valleys of the Rocky Mountains. Both the Mandanes and the Minetares consider themselves as natives of that part of the country. The tradition of the Mandanes is, that they came from under ground by means of a great vine, which, breaking under the weight of some of them, has left behind a part of their nation whom they expect to join after death. The color of the chief, who visited Washington, appeared less dark than that of our Indians; and he was the only full-breed Indian, ever seen by me, whose eyes were of a bluish cast. It is believed that this is the tribe, often spoken of as white Indians, and which gave rise to the fabulous account of a tribe descended from the Welsh and speaking their language; a tale, which the knowledge we have now acquired of the various Indian nations and of their dialects has set at rest.

The third Minetare tribe is that known by the name of the Crow or *Upsaroka* nation, probably the *Keecheetsas* of Lewis and Clarke. They are an erratic tribe, who hunt south of the Missouri, between the Little Missouri and the southeastern branches of the Yellowstone River. According to Mr. Donald Mackenzie, who resides at the mouth of the Yellowstone, they have about three hundred lodges, and may be computed at three thousand souls.

The vocabulary of the stationary Minetares, and the specimen of the Crow or *Upsaroka* dialect, were obtained by Dr. Say. We knew from Lewis and Clarke, that the Mandanes spoke a kindred dialect, and this has been confirmed by the

significant names of their chiefs, subscribed to a treaty with the United States. Lewis and Clarke appear to have considered the Rapid, Fall, or Paunch Indians, sometimes also called "Minetares of the Prairies," as belonging to the same family. But all the subsequent accounts agree in assigning to them an entirely distinct language.

The southern Sioux consist of eight tribes, speaking four or at most five kindred dialects. Their territory originally extended along the Mississippi, from below the mouth of the Arkansas to the forty-first degree of north latitude. They were, and still are, bounded on the north by the Dahcotas, on the west by the Pawnees, on the south by the Washitta and Red River tribes, on the southwest by erratic nations. Their hunting-grounds extend as far west as the Stony Mountains; but they all cultivate the soil, and their most westerly village on the Missouri is in about the one hundredth degree of west longitude.

The three most southerly tribes are the Quappas or Arkansas, at the mouth of the river of that name, and the Osages and Kansas, who inhabited the country south of the Missouri and of the river Kansas. Both the Osages and the Arkansas were first seen by the French, in the year 1673, and they always remained in alliance with them. It is not known whether *Quappa* was the true name of the whole nation, or of only one of its tribes; and it may be that they are those called *Pacahas* in the relation of De Soto's expedition. The residue of the Arkansas is now known only by that name (*Quappas*). They consist of only five hundred souls, and still live on the lower parts of the Arkansa.

The Osages, properly *Wausashe*, were more numerous and powerful than any of the neighbouring tribes, and perpetually at war with all the other Indians, without excepting the Kansas, who speak the same dialect with themselves. They were originally divided into Great and Little Osages; but about forty years ago almost one half of the nation, known by the name of *Chaneers* or Clermont's Band, separated from the rest, and removed to the river Arkansas. The villages of those several subdivisions are now on the head waters of the river Osage, and of the Verdegris, a northern tributary stream of the Arkansa. They amount to about five thousand souls, and have ceded a portion of their lands to the United States, reserving to themselves a territory on the Arkansa, south of the thirty-eighth degree of north latitude, extending from the ninety-fifth

to the hundredth degree of west longitude, on a breadth of forty-five to fifty miles. The territory allotted to the Cherokees, the Creeks, and the Choctaws, lies south of that of the Osage, extending in longitude from  $94^{\circ} 20'$  to  $100^{\circ}$ , and in latitude from the thirty-seventh degree to the Red River, the course of which in that quarter is east and west, between the thirty-third and thirty-fourth degrees of north latitude.

The Kansas, who have always lived on the river of that name, have been at peace with the Osage for the last thirty years, and intermarry with them. They amount to fifteen hundred souls, and occupy a tract of about three millions of acres, in about the thirty-ninth degree of north latitude, and ninety-sixth to ninety-eighth degree of west longitude.

The five other tribes of this subdivision are the *Ioways* or *Pahoja*, (Grey Snow), the *Missouris* or *Neojehe*, the *Ottoes* or *Wahtootah*, the *Omahaws* or *Mahas*, and the *Puncas*. The Osages consider themselves the aborigines; but the tradition of these five tribes is, that at a distant epoch they, together with the Winnebagoes, came from the north; that the Winnebagoes stopped on the banks of Lake Michigan, while they, continuing their course southerly, crossed the Mississippi, and occupied the seats in which they were found by the Europeans.

The *Ioways* are mentioned, perhaps erroneously, by the first French missionaries, as living east of the Mississippi. It is certain that they were driven away from the banks of that river by the Sauks and Foxes, with whom they have contracted an alliance which borders on submission. Their principal seats are north of the river Des Moines; but a portion have joined the Ottoes, and are said, though the fact is not fully ascertained, to speak the same dialect.

The *Missouris* were originally settled at the junction of the river of that name with the Mississippi. They were driven away by the Illinois, were found in the year 1724 by M. Bourgmont settled on the Missouri, about two hundred miles above its mouth, near the place where the French fort Orleans stood, and have since joined the Ottoes, with whom they are intermixed, and speak the same dialect.

The Ottoes and the Omahaws, after several changes in their villages, now occupy the territory on the southwest side of the Missouri, above and below the mouth of the river Platte; the Omahaws on the north, and the Ottoes on the south side of that river. They speak kindred though different dialects. The

Puncas, who are settled on the Missouri one hundred and fifty miles above the Omahaws, speak the same dialect.

The population of the Ioways is estimated at twelve hundred; that of the Ottoes and Missouris at sixteen hundred, and that of the Omahaws and Puncas at two thousand; making, with the Quappas, Osages, and Kansas, an aggregate of eleven or twelve thousand souls. All the nations speaking languages belonging to the Great Sioux Family may therefore be computed at more than fifty thousand souls.

The vocabularies of the Quappas and of the Osages are in Mr. Duponceau's collection; the first was transmitted to him by General Izard, and is spelt according to the French orthography; he received that of the Osages from Dr. Murray of Kentucky, and we have another of the same language published by Mr. Bradbury.\* Those of the Ottoes and of the Omahaws were taken by Dr. Say. We have not that of the Ioways; but nineteen words, supplied by Governor Cass, seem to leave no doubt of its identity with the Ottoes.

---

The *Pawnees* speak a language altogether different from that of the Sioux tribes, or of any other Indians known to us; unless that of the *Panis* or *Towiaches* of Red River should be found to be the same. They consist of two nations, the *Pawnees* proper, and the *Ricaras* or *Aricaras*, sometimes also called Black Pawnees.

The Pawnees proper inhabit the country on the river Platte, west of the Ottoes and Omahaws: their three villages, two of which are distinguished by the names of Loup Pawnees and Republican Pawnees, are now in the same vicinity on the river Loup, a northern tributary of the river Platte, about sixty miles above the confluence of those two rivers. They raise corn and other vegetables, but apply still less to agriculture than the Ottoes and Omahaws. They hunt southerly as far as the Arkansa, and westerly to the sources of the river Platte. They were seen by Bourgmont, in 1724, in the same country which they now occupy, but were not known to us before the acquisition of Louisiana. Their number, by the concurrent accounts of General Pike and Major Long, amounts to six

---

\* The words in the appended vocabulary of the Osage, taken from those two sources, have accidentally been confounded.

thousand five hundred souls; their vocabulary was taken by Dr. Say.

The Ricara villages are situated on the Missouri, about one hundred and fifty miles below the Mandanes, in latitude  $46\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ . They cultivate the soil, and are, like the Mandanes, always exposed to the attacks of the erratic tribes. They accordingly had formerly united with them, and were settled together twenty miles below the present site of the Mandane villages. They quarrelled and separated, since which time they have had also a short war with the United States. They appear now to be at peace with their neighbours, and are computed at three thousand souls. All the accounts of the Indians and of the interpreters agree in the fact of their speaking Pawnee, but we have no vocabulary of their language.

We have now enumerated all the Indian tribes west of the Mississippi which cultivate the soil; and it has been seen, that north of the Red River they consist only of the Sauks and Foxes, who are Algonkins; of the Pawnees; and, amongst the Sioux tribes, of those only which belong to the southern group, and of the Mandanes and stationary Minetares. The six western tribes of the Dahcotas, the Assiniboins, the Crows, and all the other tribes not yet enumerated, whether east or west of the Rocky Mountains, cultivate nothing whatever; and those east of the Rocky Mountains subsist principally on the meat of the buffalo. But whether erratic, or agricultural, there is a marked difference between the habits and character of all the Indians, who dwelt amidst the dense forest which extends from the Atlantic to the Mississippi, and those of the inhabitants of the western prairie. These are everywhere less ferocious than those on the eastern side of the Mississippi. Like all savages, they put to death the prisoners taken in battle; but the horrid practice of inflicting on them the most excruciating torture for days together, does not appear to have prevailed anywhere beyond the Mississippi. These observations seem, however, to apply more forcibly to the southern cultivating tribes of the Sioux family and to the Pawnees. Dr. Say, during his residence amongst the Omahaws, collected some important facts, which are equally applicable to their neighbours on the south of the Missouri, of either of those two families.

They reside in their villages at most five months of the year, principally for the purpose of planting, cultivating, and gathering



maize and a few other vegetables. Two winter months are employed by the men in hunting beaver and other fur animals. During the rest of the year, the whole population remove to the buffalo grounds, subsist on its meat, and preserve a portion of it.

They address prayers to *Wahconda*, the Creator and Preserver of the world, to whom they ascribe infinite power and omnipresence. But, although they believe in a future life, it cannot be said that this vague belief has any important influence over their conduct. Like all the other Indians, they put more faith in their dreams, omens, and jugglers, in the power of imaginary deities of their own creation, and of those consecrated relics to which the Canadians have given the singular appellation of *medicine*.

The Missouri Indians of the male sex exceed in height the ordinary average of the Europeans; but the women are in proportion shorter and thicker. The average facial angle is  $78^{\circ}$ , (that of the Cherokees  $75^{\circ}$ ); the transverse line of direction of the eyes is rectilinear; the nose aquiline; the lips thicker than those of the Europeans; the cheek-bones prominent, but not angular.\* The recently born infants are of a reddish brown color, which after a while becomes whiter, and then gradually assumes that tint, which is not perfectly uniform amongst all the Indians, and which, for want of a better approximation, we call copper color. They designate that of the European by words which mean *white* or *pale*. Theirs is not the effect of exposure, as all parts of the body present the same appearance.† The women marry very young, bear children from the age of thirteen to forty, and have generally from four to six.

The Indians who cultivate the soil, are perpetually exposed to the attacks of the wandering tribes. Those of the Missouri had also for enemies the Sauks and Foxes, who have acted too much in that quarter the same part as the Five Nations in

---

\* The superiority of this family of Indians struck the French, who called the Arkansas *Beaux Hommes*. The Osages, who visited Washington and New York twenty-five years ago, were the finest race of Indians ever seen in our Atlantic cities, and answered the description of the Omahaws given by Dr. Say. That gentleman omits another uniform physical character, straight black hair and black eyes.

† Captain Clavering says, that an Eskimau boy of East Greenland, after being thoroughly washed, was of a copper color.

theirs; but they had also continual quarrels, often degenerating into actual hostilities, between themselves. These originated in encroachments on hunting-grounds, elopement or carrying off of women, and stealing of horses. During their temporary absence from their villages, cornfields and provisions in store appear to have been generally respected by straggling parties, even of enemies; with the understanding, however, that Indians when hungry have a right to feed on any provisions which they discover, and may actually want for that purpose. But it is in their mode of warfare, either amongst themselves, or against other tribes, that we find a decisive proof of much less ferocious habits, than those which characterize the Indian who dwells in the forests between the Mississippi and the Atlantic.

The enemies wounded in battle are killed on the spot, but without any particular act of cruelty, and rarely if ever scalped. The prisoners carried home are neither tortured nor put to death. The women are made slaves; the men are considered as servants, and generally employed in taking care of the horses, and in other menial offices, but not in raising corn, that being woman's work. The children are almost always adopted into the nation.

Amongst the exploits which are the boast of their warriors, that which confers the highest distinction is to take a prisoner alive; the next, to strike with a lance or some other weapon an enemy alive; the third, that of striking in the same manner the dead body of an enemy in presence of his friends; the fourth, taking a horse; last of all, shooting an enemy at a distance with a bullet or arrow, this being that which any one can do.

It is but just to observe, that traces of chivalry were also found amongst our eastern Indians. It was a settled rule amongst them, that those who killed stragglers, should leave marks designating to what tribe those who had committed the act belonged. But if done in the vicinity, or even in the heart, of the village of an enemy, the warrior was bound, at the moment he took off the scalp, to raise the warwhoop, thus giving notice of the deed, and trusting to his own superior swiftness and skill for escaping the immediate pursuit of an enraged and unforgiving foe.\*

---

\* The fact, so far as relates to the Delawares, was fully confirmed by General Douglass of Fayette County, Pennsylvania, a gentleman of

It may be added, in reference to the Missouri Indians, that the annual sacrifice of a prisoner, a practice which prevailed amongst the Pawnees, and was lately abolished by the courageous exertions of a celebrated chief, affords an additional proof of the comparatively humane manner in which prisoners were generally treated by them.

---

Two wandering and purely hunting nations, the Fall, Rapid, or Paunch Indians, improperly called Minetares of the Prairie, and the Black Feet, have their principal seats on the south fork of the Saskachawin. Their hunting-grounds extend as far south, as the sources of the Yellowstone River and of its various tributary streams. The Rapid Indians are the most easterly tribe, and are more generally found between the Saskachawin and the Missouri in the vicinity of and above the Mandane village. They have about three hundred lodges, and are estimated at three thousand souls. The Arrapahoes (or Arrapahays) are a detached tribe of that nation, which has lately wandered as far south as the river Platte and the Arkansa, where they formed a temporary union with the Kaskaias (or Kaskayas) and some other erratic tribes. Although intimately connected with the Black Feet, they speak a distinct language.

The Black Feet are one of the most powerful Indian nations known to us. Their lodges are estimated at two thousand five hundred, and their population at thirty thousand. They occupy, as hunting-grounds, the whole territory west of the Minetares and of the one hundred and third degree of west longitude to the Rocky Mountains, and extending from the fifty-second to the forty-second degree of north latitude. They carry on a perpetual war against the Flat Heads, the Shoshonees, and other tribes of the Rocky Mountains, whom they confine within the mountains, and prevent from hunting in the buffalo country. They are always at war with the Crows and other Minetares; but they appear to act on the

---

the most strict veracity and integrity, who during his youth had resided amongst them, and is said to have spoken the language as a native. I regret that, during an intimacy of seventeen years, not having at that time turned my attention to the subject, I neglected so favorable an opportunity of obtaining the most correct information respecting the language of that tribe.

defensive against the Knistinaux and the Assiniboins, who have in fact driven them away from the easterly portion of the Saskachawin country, and call them the Slave Nation.\* We have as yet no other vocabulary of those two nations and of the Assiniboins, but the scanty one of Umfreville. It is however sufficient to show, that the Assiniboins are, as they have been uniformly stated, a branch of the Sioux family; and that the languages of the Rapid Indians and of the Black Feet are distinct from each other, and different from any other known to us.

It will be perceived by an inspection of the map, that, with the exception of some detached bands of the Shoshonees or Snake Indians, who occasionally cross over to the head waters of the Yellowstone and of the river Platte, the only Indians within the United States, east of the Rocky Mountains, not included in the preceding enumeration, are those who may wander between the upper waters of the river Platte and the Red River, west of the Pawnees, Kansas, and Osages. They were designated by Bourgmont, in 1724, by the name of Padoucas; an appellation which seems to have disappeared. The Panis, or Towiaches of Red River, have fixed villages, and have already been mentioned. The Hietans, or Camanches, are within the Mexican dominions; and some stragglers only are occasionally seen within the territory of the United States. Three tribes appear to wander and hunt within their limits in that quarter, or along the Mexican boundary, between the thirty-fourth and forty-first degrees of north latitude. These are the Kaskaias or Bad Hearts, the Kinawas (or Kioways), and the Bald Heads, who, united with detached bands of the Arrapahoes, of the Shyennes, and even of the Shoshonees, were met on the Arkansa by Major Long's detachment during his first expedition. The vocabularies, which Dr. Say had taken of the languages of the Kaskaias and the Kiawas, have been unfortunately lost. We only know, that both were harsh, guttural, and extremely difficult. It is a remarkable circumstance,

---

\* The information respecting the Crows, the Rapid Indians, and the Black Feet, has been principally derived from Mr. Kenneth Mackenzie, who is at the head of the establishment of the American Missouri Fur Company at the mouth of the Yellowstone; and from whom I hope to receive in the course of next year correct vocabularies of those and other adjacent tribes. The Paegan and Blood Indians are subdivisions of the Black Feet.

that none of those tribes understood the language of any of the others; and that they communicated together partly by what is called the "language of signs," partly through the medium of the Crow, which was not the native language of either of them. Their number has been estimated at only fourteen hundred souls by the Indian Department, and, including other small bands mentioned by Lewis and Clarke on uncertain information, cannot well exceed three thousand.

---

The Wakash or Nootka Sound Indians are the most southern tribe on the shores of the Pacific, of which we have been able to give a vocabulary. With the exception of a few words collected in the Straits of Fuca, and of some of the Chinook language at the mouth of the river Columbia, we have not a single one along the coast, till we come to the Ellencs and the Ruslenes of the Spanish missions of New California. Mackenzie has given a short one of an inland tribe, the Atnahs, who, in  $52^{\circ} 30'$  north latitude, are bounded on the north by the Tacullies, and extend thence southwardly down Frazer's River towards the Straits of Fuca. It is also a language distinct, so far as we are now informed, from any other. But of all the tribes inhabiting the territory west of the Rocky Mountains between the forty-second and the forty-ninth degree of north latitude, we have, besides a few Shoshonec words collected by Dr. Say, no other vocabulary but that of the Salish or Flat Heads, which belongs to Mr. Duponceau's collection. This is a small tribe, computed at two hundred warriors, waging an unequal war with the Black Feet, and residing towards the sources of one of the branches of the Columbia River, which must be either the most southern branch of Clarke's River, or the most northern branch of Lewis's River. It will be perceived that, with that single exception, our deficiency embraces all the Indian tribes living on the Columbia River and all its numerous tributary streams. Messrs. Lewis and Clarke had brought with them copious vocabularies of all the Indian tribes along the line of their route. These had been placed by Mr. Jefferson in the hands of the late Dr. Benjamin Smith Barton for arrangement and publication, but could not be found after his death. The country has now been for many years occupied by the British traders; and for the present we must look to



that quarter for information. A long list of the tribes, together with an estimate of their numbers, is annexed to the account of Lewis and Clarke's expedition, to which we must refer the reader. Captain Lewis was of opinion, that along his route there were three distinct families of languages on the waters of the Columbia River; that of the mountains, that of the Columbia plains, and that of the seashore. According to his estimate of the population, which was almost entirely derived from Indian accounts, those on the waters of Columbia River amounted to eighty thousand souls. A more recent statement reduces the number to five thousand six hundred warriors. It is probable that they have been overrated in the one, and underrated in the other estimate. Considering the nature of the country and the means of subsistence which it affords, it is probable that they can hardly amount to fifty thousand souls. This however, as well as any estimate of the population of the Eskimaux, of the Athapascas, and generally of the tribes north of the United States, can only be founded on conjecture. That of the Indians within the territory of the United States east of the Rocky Mountains, is, with few exceptions, as correct as the nature of the case will admit. With this observation we submit the following recapitulation.

Eskimaux, Athapascas, Atnahs, and tribes on the Pacific as far south as Fuca's Straits . . . . .	60,000
Indians of Columbia River, and the seashore of Pacific from 42° to 49° north latitude . . . . .	50,000
Algonkin-Lenape; in British dominions 20,000 } . . . . .	60,000
“ “ in United States 40,000 } . . . . .	
Iroquois tribes; in British dominions . 1,000 } . . . . .	7,000
“ “ in United States . . 6,000 } . . . . .	
Choctaws and Chicasas . . . . .	24,000
Muskhogeas and Seminoles . . . . .	26,000
Cherokees . . . . .	15,000
Uchees, Natches, small Louisiana tribes . . . . .	4,000
Sioux, including Assiniboins (7,000) in British Dominions	50,000
Pawnees 9,500; Panis or Towa-ash 1500 . . . . .	11,000
Black Feet and Rapid Indians . . . . .	33,000
Chiennes . . . . .	2,000
Kaskaias, Kiawas, Bald Heads, and other small erratic bands	3,000
	345,000

## SECTION V.

## GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

THE Rocky Mountains are the great line of demarcation, in reference both to climate and to the means of subsistence which the country in its natural state affords to its inhabitants. The difference between the climate of the Atlantic shores of North America and the opposite European coast, is well known. It consists less in that of the summer heat, which, though greater on the American than on the European side of that ocean, does not vary essentially under the same latitudes, than in the intensity of the cold in the American winters. This is such as to make a difference equivalent to one of more than ten degrees of latitude. Neither the Alleghany Mountains, nor the less elevated transversal chain which seems to extend from the river Saguenay to the sources of the Saskachawin, produce any sensible change in that respect. The comparative observations, made at several military posts, show on the contrary, that the excess both of heat and cold respectively is greater, in the valley of the Mississippi and the adjacent prairies, than on the shores of the Atlantic.\* It may be said generally, that, with variations arising from local causes, the same climate prevails from the seacoast to the Rocky Mountains. But the country lying west of that chain, and more particularly that portion which lies along the Pacific, enjoys a climate similar to that of Western Europe.

Since it is also ascertained, that the climate of Pekin is the same with that of Philadelphia, and that the temperature both in summer and winter of the eastern coast of Asia, north of the Torrid Zone, corresponds generally with that of the eastern coast of North America, under the same latitudes, it appears certain that this difference of climate arises from the respective exposure of the seacoasts. Those which face the west enjoy a much more temperate climate than those which have an eastern exposure. In order to account for such a general result, we must seek for an equally general cause. Apart from the

---

\* This may perhaps be accounted for, by the winds, which, whether from the south or from the north, sweep that immense valley, without being intercepted by any sufficient transversal chain of mountains.

variations produced by a different configuration of the surface of the earth, and by the difference in the general course of the great chains of mountains in the two hemispheres, the most probable general cause will be found in the great prevalence of the western winds throughout the Northern Temperate Zone. The fact is fully ascertained, and is the cause of a difference amounting to about one third in the length of the passages between Europe and America. Those winds reach the western coasts of both, after having crossed the Atlantic or the Pacific Ocean, and with a temperature corresponding with that of the sea. The same winds, on the eastern coasts of Asia and of America, are land winds, and bring with them, especially in winter, when they come from the northwest, the temperature of the country where they originated.

If the trade-winds of the Torrid produce a counter-current in the atmosphere of the Temperate Zone, the rotatory motion of the earth and the effect of the solar heat may be assigned as the primary cause of the difference of climate to which we allude. Whatever that cause may be, there cannot be any expectation of a permanent change in that respect. It is not indeed perceived, how cultivation could make any sensible alteration; and it is ascertained that the absence of trees produces none.\* But the difference between the forest and the prairie country had a greater influence on the means of subsistence and the habits of the Indians, than even that of climate.

The whole country, east of the Alleghany Mountains, was covered with a dense and uninterrupted forest, when the European settlers landed in America. South of the fortieth degree of latitude, it extends in the same manner, as far west as the Mississippi, without any other considerable exception, than a tract called "the Barrens," situated in the vicinity of the river of that name in the State of Kentucky. But, between that latitude and Lake Erie, some intervals of land destitute of wood, and called "Prairies," begin to appear, as you approach the Scioto, and even more eastwardly in the vicinity of the Lake. These prairies gradually increase in size and in number as you proceed westwardly, and are nearly equal in extent to the forest land, in the northern part of the State of Illinois

---

\* It would seem that the climate of Rome was formerly colder in winter than now. The account given of that of Paris by the Emperor Julian would nearly answer for the present time.

and of the adjacent country on the north. North of the Lakes, the forest continues uninterrupted, at least in their vicinity, as far west as Lake Winnipeg. Beyond the Mississippi, the prairies continue to encroach rapidly on the woodland, until at last an immense plain, bounded on the west by the Rocky Mountains, extends from the vicinity of the Arctic Sea to the Gulf of Mexico, leaving only narrow strips of wooded land along the banks of the rivers and water-courses. The forest makes again its appearance in the Rocky Mountains, in the secondary ridges, and in the intervening valleys. Beyond the mountains vast prairies are again found, extending as far west as the northern continuation of the Californian chain of mountains, and known by the name of Columbia Plains. Their extent to the north is not known, but southwardly, and assuming a different character, they reach the Gulf of California. A great portion of the Mexican dominions is equally destitute of trees. The tract of land, contained between the Pacific and the Californian chain, does not exceed one hundred and fifty miles in breadth, and is well timbered.

But there is a vast difference, in the means of subsistence they afford to the Indians, between the Columbia Plains and the Prairies of the Missouri. These are the native country of the bisons, or buffaloes, as they are universally called in America, and through which they range, from the fifty-fifth degree of latitude to the sources of the rivers that empty into the Gulf of Mexico between the Mississippi and the Rio Norte. The buffaloes constitute the principal article of food of the erratic tribes, as well as of the cultivating Indians whom we have designated by the name of Missouris; and their undiminished numbers prove, that the Indian population has not quite reached the extent, of which, in that state of nature, it was susceptible. The Columbia Plains, on the contrary, are as destitute of game as of trees. The buffalo has never penetrated there; the principal and cheapest article of food of the European and American traders was, at least till very lately, horse flesh;\* and dogs were a luxury. The Indians who did

---

\* The horse is not a native of America. The wild herds of Texas are entirely of Spanish origin. They have been obtained by the Indians either directly or by internal exchanges among themselves, and are now abundant in a domesticated state on both sides of the Rocky Mountains, as far north as they can subsist without the aid of food supplied by man.

not live immediately on the shores of the Pacific, or in the Rocky Mountains, derived their means of subsistence almost exclusively from the salmon, which ascends the rivers to their sources, and from various species of native roots, some of which are very unwholesome. They cultivate absolutely nothing; and it is therefore evident that their population must be less, in proportion to territory, than that of the Indians east of the mountains.

The bisons are found, in the Missouri plains, in flocks of several thousands. They generally migrate in winter to the country south of the Arkansa. Many however find during that season, even in high latitudes, an asylum in the valleys of the mountains, or wherever a detached tract of forest land is to be found. Their bulk, shape, and habits render mountains a formidable obstacle to their progress. Wherever a buffalo path is found in a mountainous or hilly country, it is a sure guide for the most practicable way of crossing the mountain. It was such a path, which, for a number of years, became the main route across the Cumberland Mountains, between the southwest parts of Virginia and Kentucky. In the same manner the buffalo has pointed out the most practicable route, across the ridge which divides the sources of the Yellow Stone and the river Platte, from that of Lewis's River, a southern branch of the Columbia, and from those of the Rio Colorado of California. They have penetrated down the last river as far south as the fortieth degree of latitude, and down Lewis's River as far west as the one hundred and fifteenth degree of longitude. Beyond those points they have been arrested in both directions by impassable mountains. Toward the east they had crossed the Mississippi, and, before they were driven away by the American settlements, they had ascended the valley of the Ohio within one hundred miles of Pittsburgh, and that of the Tennessee to its sources. They were but rarely seen south of the ridge which separates that river from the sources of those which empty into the Gulf of Mexico, and nowhere, in the forest country, in herds of more than from fifty to two hundred. The bison is but a variety of the European ox; and the mixed breed will again propagate.\* He

---

\* As doubts have lately been raised upon that point, I must say that the mixed breed was quite common fifty years ago, in some of the north-western counties of Virginia; and that the cows, the issue of that mixture, propagated like all others. No attempt that I know of was ever made by the inhabitants to tame a buffalo of full growth. But calves were occasionally caught by the dogs and brought alive into the settlements. A



is very intractable, and is not known to have ever been domesticated by the Indians.

Some unforeseen circumstances have prevented General Ashley of Missouri, from communicating to me in time, as he intended, some further information respecting the country, which he explored in the Rocky Mountains, and thence in a southwesterly direction beyond Lake Timpanogo. But he has transmitted to me a manuscript map, accompanied with numerous explanatory notes, the materials for which consist of various journeys and explorations by some of our enterprising traders and hunters. It is on that authority, and subject to such corrections, as more complete explorations and scientific observations will hereafter render necessary, that several geographical innovations have been introduced in the small map annexed to this Essay.

It will be seen by this, that the sources of the Multnomah do not reach farther south than the forty-third degree of latitude; that some rivers, which had been believed to belong to it, are southern branches of Lewis's River; that the sources of the Rio Colorado of California are as far north as almost the forty-third degree of north latitude, whilst those of the Rio Norte do not reach the thirty-ninth degree; and that the river commonly called Rio Rojo, that heads nearly opposite to Taos and Santa Fé on the Rio Norte, is a branch, not of the Red River of the Mississippi, but of the Canadian fork of the Arkansa. The most important discoveries, however, relate to the country between the Rio Colorado of California and the Pacific Ocean south of the forty-second degree of north latitude.

The Lake Timpanogo has been found, and is laid down, in the same latitude and longitude nearly, as had been assigned to it by Baron Humboldt. It receives two rivers from the east,

---

bull thus raised was for a number of years owned in my immediate vicinity by a farmer living on the Monongahela, adjoining Mason and Dixon's line. He was permitted to roam at large, and was no more dangerous to man than any bull of the common species. But to them he was formidable, and would not suffer any to approach within two or three miles of his own range. Most of the cows I knew, were descended from him. For want of a fresh supply of the wild animal they have now merged into the common kind. They were no favorites, as they yielded less milk. The superior size and strength of the buffalo might have improved the breed of oxen for draught; but this was not attended to, horses being almost exclusively employed in that quarter for agricultural purposes.

which issue from the mountains west of the Colorado, is known to the Americans by the name of Great Salt Lake, and has no outlet whatever towards the sea. General Ashley's own explorations extend as far south as another smaller lake, to which his name has been given, and which is situated about eighty miles south of the southeastern extremity of Lake Timpanogo. It is also fed by a river coming from the mountains in the southeast, and has no outlet. The discoveries south and west of that place appear to belong to others, and principally to J. S. Smith. Another river known by the name of Last River, coming also from the coast, falls into another lake, also without outlet, situated in  $38^{\circ}$  north latitude, and in the same longitude as Lake Timpanogo.

J. S. Smith descended the Rio Colorado of California, in the year 1826, as far south as the thirty-fifth degree of north latitude. Proceeding thence westwardly, he reached the Spanish Missions of San Pedro and San Diego near the Pacific. The ensuing year, he visited Monterey and St. Francisco; ascended the river Buenaventura some distance, and recrossed the Californian chain of mountains, called there Mount Joseph, in about the thirty-ninth degree of latitude. He thence proceeded north of west, and reached the southwestern extremity of Lake Timpanogo. The eastern foot of the Californian chain, where he recrossed it, is about one hundred and eighty miles from the Pacific. There he crossed some streams, coming from the south, which may either be lost in the sands, or, breaking through the mountains, north of Mount Joseph, unite with the river Buenaventura. The course of this last river, so far as it is known, is from north to south, between and parallel to the Californian chain and the Pacific.

The most southern branch of the Owyhee, a southern tributary stream of Lewis's River, takes its source not far west from the northern extremity of Lake Timpanogo, and in its most southerly bend passes, in the forty-first degree of latitude, through an extremely mountainous and rocky country. The result of Mr. Smith's journey is, that the whole country south of that river, from the vicinity of the Rio Colorado to the Californian mountains, is an immense sandy plain, in which a few detached mountains are seen, "from which flow small streams that are soon lost in the sand. A solitary antelope or black-tailed deer may sometimes be seen. A few wild Indians are scattered over the plain, the most miserable objects in creation."

The chain of mountains, east of Lake Tinipanogo, and west of the Rio Colorado, continues southwardly, close to that river, to the thirty-sixth degree of latitude, where it terminates. The chain which divides the waters of the Rio Norte, from those of the Arkansa, is well known, and is an easterly branch of the Rocky Mountains. But the main chain, which may be considered as a continuation of the Mexican Andes, lies between the Colorado and the Rio Norte. This section of the country is known to us only through the reports of our beaver-hunters (trappers), who have not penetrated farther south than the thirty-seventh degree of latitude. They represent the country extending thence northwardly to the sources of the river Platte, as being only a body of mountains, intersected at right angles by rivers that empty into the Colorado. The only section, which has not at all been explored by the Americans, is that lying east of the Colorado between the Rio Gila and the thirty-seventh degree of north latitude.

---

The uniformity of character in the grammatical forms and structure of all the Indian Languages of North America, which have been sufficiently investigated, indicates a common origin. The numerous distinct languages, if we attend only to the vocabularies between which every trace of affinity has disappeared, attest the antiquity of the American population. This may be easily accounted for, consistently with the opinion that the first inhabitants came from Asia, and with the Mosaic chronology. The much greater facility of communication, either across Behring's Straits, or from Kamschatka or Japan by the Aleutian Islands, would alone, if sustained by a similarity of the physical type of man, render the opinion of an Asiatic origin, not only probable, but almost certain. The rapidity with which the human species may be propagated under favorable circumstances removes any apparent inconsistency between that opinion and the early epoch, which must be assigned to the first appearance of man in America.

Reasoning *à priori*, it would appear that the population of a country may be doubled in the short period of fifteen years, provided it finds adequate means of subsistence. We know with certainty, that the white inhabitants of the United States continue even now to increase, independent of migration, at the rate of near thirty-three and a third per cent. in ten years, and

that their number is therefore doubled within less than twenty-three years. So long as man, compelled to seek, or voluntarily seeking new places of residence, found in his progress no obstacle from more ancient inhabitants, there was no impediment, that could either arrest his march, or retard the natural increase of the population. We know this to be the fact with respect to an agricultural nation. Hunting tribes would meet with no greater difficulty in finding means of subsistence adequate to a similar increase in their numbers; the only difference being that, wanting more space for that purpose, they must have moved faster, and have peopled the earth in their own way, in a shorter time than agricultural nations would have done.

Assuming the central parts of Asia to have been the cradle of mankind, and since three couples would, in thirty periods of duplication, increase to more than six thousand millions of souls, we may fairly infer, not only the possibility, but even the probability, that America began to be inhabited only five or six hundred years later than the other hemisphere.\*

Another problem perhaps more interesting, and the solution of which is not less difficult, is that of the origin of the semi-civilization which was found to exist in certain parts of America. With respect to our own Indians, the only difficulty consists in assigning sufficient reasons for their having remained during so many centuries in the state of comparative inferiority in which we found them. It is perhaps partly on that account, that the Europeans were astonished to find, in Mexico and Peru, a great comparative progress, and in every respect a much farther advanced state of civilization. Yet it is but lately, that any plausible reasons have been suggested, in support of the opinion that assigns a foreign origin to that civilization. The proofs attempted to be deduced from the affinities of languages, appear insufficient. In comparing the vocabularies of twenty distinct American, with those of as many Asiatic languages, accidental coincidences will necessarily occur. The similarity of the structure and grammatical forms of those of America indicates a common origin, and renders it probable that the great diversity of their vocabularies took place in America. Should that have been

---

\* These observations must be understood, as they were intended, as only showing that there is nothing in the American languages and the early epoch which may thence be deduced of the American population, inconsistent with the opinion of an Asiatic origin and with the received chronology.

the case, it can hardly be hoped that any one American will be found to have preserved in its words indisputable affinities with any one Asiatic language. An investigation of the grammatical character of the Asiatic languages, with which we are as yet but imperfectly acquainted, may perhaps lead to a more satisfactory result.\* Even then, the questions would arise, whether a similarity in that respect does not ascend to the most remote antiquity; whether the first emigrants to America were much superior to the present inhabitants of the northeastern parts of Asia; how, if they brought with them a superior degree of civilization, no trace of it is to be found in those northern parts of America, which they must have inhabited in their passage towards a more southern region; and why the civilization which they brought with them was ultimately confined to certain favored spots.

We may indeed suppose, for we have no proof of the fact, that the American arts and institutions, of which we seek the origin, were introduced by subsequent migrations from the other hemisphere, which took place long after America had been first peopled, and when European and Asiatic nations were already far advanced in civilization. Without denying the possibility of such an origin; admitting, as is proved by the population found in the islands of the Pacific, that such a migration was practicable; it is equally obvious that it could, at any one time, have consisted of but few individuals. Any number, however small, might without difficulty have occupied uninhabited islands. But they might not have found a very friendly reception among the American savages; and the influence founded only on the persuasion of a few foreigners, to such an extent, as to induce a barbarous people to change their habits and social state, appears to me less probable, than a gradual progress towards civilization of domestic origin.

On the other hand, it cannot be denied, that a correspondence has already been pointed out, between the style of arts, the hieroglyphics, the calendar, the worship, and other American institutions, and those found in some parts of the other continent. Alexander Humboldt has thrown great additional light on that, as

---

\* The ingenious dissertation of an enlightened Mexican, pointing out affinities between the Ottoman or Othomite, and the Chinese languages, is not quite satisfactory. The principal distinguishing characters of the Indian languages are found in the verb; and the author resorts to the supposition that the Ottomies borrowed their conjugations from the Mexicans.



on every other subject which he has discussed. Much remains to be done, and all the attainable materials have not yet been collected. All that remains of ancient paintings, hieroglyphic or descriptive, should be collected and published; fair and correct drawings of many ancient monuments are still wanted.\* The works, in the Indian languages, of the earliest writers after the conquest should be translated; and every other proof collected of the authenticity of the Mexican and Peruvian annals, and of that of the paintings, or other means of transmitting the knowledge of events, on which they are founded. Should subsequent investigations fail of adducing satisfactory proofs of a connexion between the civilization of America and that of the other hemisphere, the progress that had been made in America has, after all, nothing so wonderful as to render it absolutely necessary to resort to the supposition of a foreign importation. On the probable supposition, that the whole continent of America was inhabited one thousand years after the flood, or near four thousand years ago, the faculties of man, gradually unfolded and improved, may, in the course of so long a period, have produced, without any extraneous aid, that more advanced state of society and of knowledge, which existed in some parts of America, when first discovered by the Europeans. Those centres of American civilization were all found precisely in those places, where we might have expected to find them, if that civilization was of domestic origin.

Those countries where, on account of the climate, greater exertions are required in order to obtain the necessaries and comforts of life, may be those which ultimately will make the greatest progress in the arts and in the acquirement of wealth and knowledge; but they are not those where civilization has been found generally to originate. We uniformly trace its commencement and first progress in the other hemisphere, in countries equally exempt from the rigor of severe winters, and from the excessive heat of the Torrid Zone. In America, the corresponding latitudes are subject in winter to cold as severe as that of the north of Germany; whilst, in the Torrid Zone, extensive and fruitful districts of elevated table land and valleys enjoy a climate as mild and favorable, as the banks of the Euphrates

---

\* Some of the plates of Delrio's account of the City of Stones appear suspicious, as relates to the style of architecture, and still more as to the correctness with which the human figures are drawn.

and of the Tigris. And it is accordingly in those favored spots, in the vicinity of Mexico, of Santa Fé de Bogota, of Quito, and of Cusco, that were found those agricultural and manufacturing nations, those extensive empires and populous cities, with regular forms of worship and of government, which excited the wonder and inflamed the cupidity of the European invaders.

Although we may not place full reliance on the details and the dates of the Mexican annals, it is indubitable that several nations, some of them speaking different languages, have, subsequent to the first civilization of the country, successively occupied the various provinces of the Mexican empire. The ruins of Palenque and of other cities are monuments of those revolutions. The annals and traditions ascend no higher than the Tolteques, as the authors of the first civilization. Whether the merit is due to them, or to some more ancient and unknown people, it may be asked, whence came the subsequent successive conquerors? The abodes of the Azteques, or Mexicans proper, may probably be traced as far north as the Casas Grandas of the Rio Gila; but from what quarter had they come to that place?

In order to account for their success, it must necessarily be admitted, that they were previously an agricultural people; for the pastoral state cannot exist where there are no domesticated animals; and we know with the utmost certainty, that no purely hunting nations could be numerous enough, or keep together and support for any length of time a force sufficient successfully to invade, or make any serious impression on a country, such as Mexico is represented to have been, and in fact was at the time of the invasion. But we now know that, north of the latitude of the Rio Gila, there is nothing west of the Rio Colorado but a sandy desert, nothing between that river and the Rio Norte but accumulated ridges of mountains, nothing east of the last river but the buffalo plains. In fact we find in no part of the country, whether east or north, adjacent to the northern civilized provinces of Mexico, any trace, or any probability of the former existence, of an agricultural people. But we may easily understand, that the civilization of Mexico gradually extended its influence, as from a common centre, northwardly as well as southwardly; that the northerly tribes, as far north as the thirtieth degree of latitude, and perhaps the Rio Gila, without having made the same progress in arts, or attained the same degree of wealth as the ancient inhabitants of Mexico, may have been gradually

converted into an agricultural people; and that, like the German nations in Europe, they may ultimately have conquered their less warlike southern neighbours.

The next and more immediate subject of inquiry is, how we shall account for those ancient tumuli, fortifications, and other remnants, both east and west of the Mississippi, the origin of which is entirely unknown to the Indians, who in the seventeenth century were the sole inhabitants, and still continue to occupy a part of that country.

On this, as on many other subjects relative to our Indians, we are still in want of facts. We are not yet sufficiently acquainted with the extent of the country over which those monuments are spread, or how far they differ in character, extent, or number, in the different sections of the country. They only appear to have been more numerous and of greater importance in the vicinity of the Mississippi and in the valley of the Ohio. There is nothing in their construction, or in the remnants which they contain, indicative of a much more advanced state of civilization than that of the present inhabitants. But it may be inferred from their number and size, that they were the work of a more populous nation than any now existing; and if the inference is correct, it would necessarily imply a state of society, in which greater progress had been made in agriculture. For wherever satisfactory evidence of a greater population is found, this could not have existed without adequate means of subsistence, greater than can be supplied by the chase alone.

Those monuments seem in two respects to differ from any erections that can be ascribed to the Indians, such as they were found by the first French or English settlers. Some are of a character apparently different from those purely intended for defence. It may be doubted whether those extensive mounts, so regularly shaped and with a rectangular basis, such as that near the Mississippi, on which the refugee monks of La Trappe had built their convent, one hundred feet in height, facing the four cardinal points, and with those platforms designated by the name of *Apron*, are entirely the work of man, or whether they may not have been natural hills, artificially shaped by his hands. But if they have been correctly described, they have a strong family likeness to the Mexican pyramids, as they are called, and were probably connected with the worship of the nation. Of these, for there appear to be at least two more, and of

other enclosures or works which cannot be accounted for by a reference to military purposes only, we want full and precise descriptions.

But, if considered only as fortifications, ramparts of earth, in a forest country, strike us as a singular mode of defence, against savage enemies and Indian weapons. All the defensive works, without exception, that were used by the Indians, east of the Mississippi, from the time they were first known to us, were of a uniform character. The descriptions of Mauville at the time of De Soto's expedition, and of Hochelaga by Cartier, agree entirely with the Indian forts within our own knowledge, with that of the Five Nations in the siege of which Champlain was engaged in 1615, and of which he has left a correct drawing, and with every other description given by the early writers. They all consisted of wooden palisades strongly secured, with an internal gallery, from which the besieged party might under cover repel the assailants with missile weapons. And they were also of a moderate size, and such as could be defended by the population of an Indian village. Wood affords the natural means of fortification against a savage enemy, where the material is abundant. It cannot indeed be understood how these works could have been properly defended, unless they were surrounded, not only by the rampart, but also by a palisade. And it is on any supposition extremely difficult to account for works containing five hundred acres, such as that on the banks of the Missouri, which was correctly measured by Lewis and Clarke.

The only conjecture I can form, and it is but a conjecture, is, that the people who erected those works came from the west, and that it was during their residence in the prairie country, that they were compelled to resort to that species of defensive works. They may, as is often the case, have persisted in the habit when there was no longer occasion for it. From the Colorado or the Rio Norte, the way to the Mississippi was easy by the river Platte or the Arkansa. The conjecture is entitled to consideration, only in case further investigation should show a probable connexion between the monuments of the valley of the Mississippi with those of Mexico. The extensive tract of alluvial land along the Mississippi opposite St. Louis, now called the American Bottom, is the place in which are found the strongest indication of a concentrated population.

It is not necessary to refute the opinion of those who would ascribe these works to European emigrants. There is

nothing in them, which may not have been performed by a savage people. The Scandinavian colony of Vinland (Newfoundland) is out of the question. The Norwegians might indeed have penetrated through the Straits of Bellisle to the St. Lawrence. But, if not destroyed by the savages, a considerable time must have elapsed, before they could in their subsequent progress, have reached the Mississippi, and ascended its western tributaries. The well ascertained age of trees, growing on those ramparts in the lower part of the valley of the Ohio, proves, that some of those works were erected before the thirteenth century; and we know, that the insignificant colony of Vinland had not left its original seats in the year 1120. Ignorant as we are and shall ever remain of the internal revolutions, which may have formerly taken place amongst the uncivilized tribes of North America, it is not probable that we can ever know by whom the works in question were erected. Should it appear, from a review of all the facts, that they must be ascribed to a populous and agricultural nation, we must, I think, conclude that this was destroyed by a more barbarous people. It appears at least extremely improbable, that, independently of external causes, or of some great catastrophe, a people once become agricultural should take such a retrograde step, as to degenerate again into the hunting or savage state.

All the Indians of North America, north of the civilized districts of the Mexican empire,\* may be arranged in two classes; those who cultivated the soil, and those who derived their subsistence exclusively from the natural products of the earth and the sea. The territory, over which cultivation had extended, is that which is bounded on the east by the Atlantic, on the south by the Gulf of Mexico, on the west generally by the Mississippi or perhaps more properly by the prairies, on the north, it may be said, by the nature of the climate. The northern boundary of cultivation was, near the Atlantic, that which divided the Abenakis from the Etchemins, including certainly the river Kennebec, and probably the Penobscot. With the exception of the Hurons and other kindred tribes on the northern shores of Lake Erie, there was no cultivation

---

\* These do not now extend so far north as the thirtieth degree of north latitude, unless an exception be found in the long and narrow valley of the Rio Norte called New Mexico. I do not know whether the Indians there cultivated the soil before the Spanish conquest, or whether they have been compelled to do it. The subject deserves investigation.



north of the great Lakes; nor does there appear to have been any amongst the Chippeways, who occupied the country along the southern banks of Lake Superior. They and the Menomonies depended for vegetable food, principally if not altogether on the wild rice, or wild oats, as the plant is called. The few tribes west of the Mississippi, which attend at all to agriculture have already been designated, as well as those, which, extending thence to the Pacific, derive their principal means of subsistence, either from the buffalo, or from roots and fish. Nor were the inhospitable regions of the north destitute of those means. Innumerable lakes cover perhaps one third of the inland country, and would afford an abundant supply of food to an industrious and provident population. The musk ox and the American rein-deer are found under those latitudes, where the buffalo and the common deer cannot exist. Even along the shores of the Arctic Ocean and of its numerous bays, the Eskimaux appear to be as well provided as the more southern Indians. Immense quantities of salmon are caught in the summer, and are easily preserved till the ensuing year. The seal, which is taken even during the winter, supplies the Eskimaux with food, fuel, light, and clothing. And even, where there are neither trees nor drift wood, and where subterraneous abodes are not resorted to, or cannot be excavated, the ice itself affords materials for winter dwellings, as comfortable and as quickly constructed, as the leather lodges or the bark huts of the erratic tribes.

It is obvious, that the population of nations which, for their subsistence, depend exclusively on natural products, is necessarily limited by the quantity naturally produced. A nation of hunters, living exclusively on game, cannot increase the quantity which a given extent of territory can sustain. All they can, at most, effect for that purpose is the destruction of carnivorous animals. If, at any time, their population should be so increased, as to require a greater consumption of food, than is afforded by the natural production of game, this would be checked, and the population would soon be diminished till the equilibrium was again restored. In order to keep up their numbers, the Indians must resist any encroachment on their hunting-grounds. They must fight in their defence, against invaders, as for existence. On the other hand, the great extent of ground necessary to sustain game, sufficient for the subsistence of a very moderate population, compels them to separate

and to form a number of small independent communities. It may easily be perceived that the perpetual state of warfare, in which neighbouring tribes are engaged, had its origin in the same cause which has produced the great diversity of American languages or dialects. We may also understand, how the affections of the Indian became so exclusively concentrated in his own tribe, the intensity of that natural feeling, how it degenerated into deadly hatred of hostile nations, and the excesses of more than savage ferocity in which he indulged under the influence of his unrestrained vindictive passions.

It is worthy of remark that the population of those hunting nations does not appear to have ever reached the maximum of which it was susceptible. We have the proof of this, in the undiminished numbers of the buffalo in the prairies, and even of the deer in the north, and in the facility, with which the numerous servants of the European and American trading companies derive their means of subsistence in those districts from the natural resources of the country, from the chase or from the product of the lakes. The only species of animals, which have decreased, are those which supply furs and skins, for which commerce has created an extraordinary demand. The intestine wars of the Indians may have checked the increase of population; but this is not the only cause, and we may find another in their inveterate indolence, united, as it is, with that habitual improvidence, occasionally attended with the greatest privations and even with famine.

War and the chase are the only pursuits which the men do not think beneath their dignity. This is the uniform characteristic of all our Indian nations. When not thus engaged, they sink into a state of mental apathy and physical indolence, from which strong stimulants alone can rouse them; and to this cause may be traced their excessive passion for gambling and for ardent spirits. Women are everywhere slaves and beasts of burden. Independent of that portion which naturally falls to their share, the cares of maternity and of the household, every other species of labor falls upon them. And this alone has prevented the beneficial effects which would otherwise have flowed from the introduction of agriculture.

It has already been seen, that cultivation is exclusively confined to that portion of the country, clothed with forests, which, between the Lakes and the Gulf of Mexico, extends from the Atlantic to the Mississippi, and hardly beyond it. This terri-

tory, and Chili, in South America, might, in some respects, be considered as centres of an incipient civilization. But the Araucanians appear to have ceased to be hunters, and to have derived their subsistence exclusively from agriculture. Their long and successful resistance against the Spanish invaders proves them to have been a numerous and united people; they were not, like the Peruvians and Mexicans, under the yoke of a civil or religious despotism; and, although they had not made the same progress in arts or knowledge, they may perhaps be considered as the most favorable specimen of the American race. The social state of the semi-agricultural nations of North America presents a very different picture.

Cultivation amongst them appears to have been confined to the maize, some species of beans (*phascolus*), and pumpkins (*cucurbita*), and in some quarters the sweet potato (*convolvulus*), the watermelon, and tobacco; all which plants were also cultivated in Peru.\* Maize, which constituted the most important article, is decidedly of southern origin; but whether the cultivation first took place on the continent, or in the West India islands, cannot be ascertained. It would seem more probable that it originated in the favored elevated plains of the Torrid Zone, and that, in its gradual progress, it was introduced from the neighbouring islands of the Gulf of Mexico, into the country which lies along its northern shores. Its extension northwardly would be a natural process, and may have been favored by the greater difficulty of obtaining food where there is no fish, and the game, consisting principally of deer, is comparatively less abundant, and obtained with greater labor, than in the prairies. But the introduction of agriculture produced little alteration in the habits or manners of the men. They continued to be still hunters, and being too indolent to attend to the daily and tame labors of agriculture, these were again thrown upon the women.

Apart from the pernicious influence of that state of society on the moral feeling and conduct of both sexes, we will here observe, that, although agriculture did to a certain extent increase the population, yet, left to women alone, its effect was very limited. In order that the cultivation of the soil may pro-

---

\* Some species of corn, chestnuts and other nuts, as also some roots, were natural products, which made some addition to their nutritious vegetable food.

mote that increase of mankind, which is limited only by the quantity of land fit for cultivation, it is necessary that the annual agricultural labor should produce a quantity of food, at least equal to the annual consumption of the whole existing population. The labor of women alone is not sufficient to produce that result. A portion of their time is necessarily employed in the other domestic occupations which must always fall to their share; and the residue is unequal to the task of raising food adequate to the whole consumption of the nation. The proportion may vary, according to soil, climate, and the greater or less degree of assistance, which, amongst some tribes, they occasionally receive from the men. But it fell short everywhere of that which was required; and the result was, that, after producing an increase of population proportionate to the additional supply, that increase was again ultimately limited by the quantity of game which the territory afforded.

Supposing, for instance, that a territory containing ten thousand square miles supplied game enough to sustain a population of five thousand souls, and that the labor of women afforded a supply equal to three fourths of the subsistence of the whole population, a most favorable supposition, its total amount could never have exceeded twenty thousand, or four times the number which could be supported by the game alone. For, if we suppose the number to have been for a time raised to twenty-four thousand, since the agricultural labor of the women could only support eighteen thousand or three fourths of the whole, and the game still five thousand, one thousand must have been left without food.

The first European settlers were not, like Cortez, Pizarro, and his worthy comrade De Soto, reckless invaders, who, actuated by the thirst of gold, laid waste the country with fire and sword, and claimed as of right the sovereignty of the land and the servitude of the natives. The Puritans of New England, William Penn, Oglethorpe, and Lady Huntingdon were all conscientious people; and, though Locke's plan of government was a failure, those who on that occasion consulted that great benefactor of mankind, the most powerful advocate of civil and religious liberty, must have been men of liberal minds. Yet it does not appear, that, in forming their plans, any of them was at all arrested by considerations arising from the rights of the natives to the soil. The emigrants all arrived, without any previous steps having been taken in reference to the Indians.

It seems to have been a general opinion, that they had certainly much more land than they wanted; that there would be no difficulty in obtaining a sufficient quantity from them, since there was enough for both parties; that their situation would be greatly improved by the blessings of Christianity and a participation in the arts and superior knowledge of the Europeans; and that both races would subsist and flourish together. Those expectations were fulfilled in every respect but that in which the Indians were most immediately concerned. The fact was, that the Indians, so long as they preserved their habits, had but little if any more land than they actually wanted. And, to this day, they have almost universally proved refractory to every attempt made to induce them to change these habits. The Indian disappears before the white man, simply because he will not work. The struggle was between inveterate indolence and the most active and energetic industry; and the result could not be doubtful. The Indian at first thoughtlessly sold his land for a trifle; he then vainly fought in order to recover or to preserve it; he finally was compelled to seek a retreat farther to the west: and the few who remained behind, though protected by government, and with reserved lands sufficient, as we might think, for their sustenance, still persevering in their indolent habits, sank into a most degenerate race, and have almost altogether disappeared.

The four millions of industrious inhabitants, who, within less than forty years, have peopled our western States, and derive more than ample means of subsistence from the soil, offer the most striking contrast, when compared with perhaps one hundred thousand Indians whose place they occupy. Not only was the hunter unable to procure food for an increased population, but he had generally to provide daily for the wants of the day, and never could accumulate the product of his labor in the shape of capital. An agricultural people, even though as little advanced in that respect as our western settlers are at first, have always, from the moment they have prepared a field sufficient for the food of the family, a capital either in their barns or growing, equal to the product of one year's labor. Within two years, more corn is produced than is wanted for their own support. The surplus affords means of subsistence to new emigrants; it is either sold to those who have some property; or advanced in the shape of wages to those who bring nothing with them but their labor. This simple process,



renewed every year in a fast increasing ratio, and carried on with unexampled activity and energy, has produced those results unparalleled in the known history of nations. There was nothing to prevent the Indian from reaching the same state of agriculture and population, but his own indolence.

It may be admitted that the intercourse with the whites has enlarged the sphere of ideas of the Indians and of late softened their manners.\* Without examining whether, even with those who have preserved their lands, those advantages have not been more than counterbalanced by the introduction of new vices and new evils, it may be asserted, that the general tendency of that intercourse has rather been to perpetuate than to change their habits. The furs and skins of wild animals were the only articles they could offer in exchange of European commodities; and commerce, which by increasing their wants might be considered as beneficial to them, has thus stimulated them to apply still more exclusively their time and faculties to the chase. Even the benevolent intentions of the government of the United States have not always taken the most proper direction. The larger compensation allowed for their lands, and the annuities bestowed upon them, have promoted the habit of being supported otherwise than by labor. It is not by treating them as paupers, that a favorable change can be expected.

So long as the Indians were formidable, their mode of warfare and their excessive cruelty and ferocity made them objects of execration. The feeling has been universal, and is exhibited in as strong colors in the contemporaneous accounts of New England, as it may have since appeared on our western frontiers. That state of things is at an end; the natives have ceased to be an object of terror, and they are entirely at our mercy. We may indeed say, that, if a scrupulous regard had always been paid to the rights of the Indians, this nation would not have sprung into existence. The fact is not less true, that it has been created at their expense; and the duty is imposed upon us to exhaust every practicable means to prevent the annihilation of those who remain, and to promote their happiness. Though their intellectual faculties were palsied and

---

\* The cessation of internal wars amongst the Indians has been successfully promoted by the government of the United States. There may have been, but I have not heard of any instance of a prisoner being tortured, burnt by a slow fire, &c., during the last forty years.

their moral feelings debased, this was the result of the circumstances under which they were placed. I cannot persuade myself, that they were doomed to a transitory existence, corresponding with that of the flocks of deer and buffalo on which they fed. Their natural affections, though exclusive and improperly directed, were not extinguished, and were still displayed within their own tribes, and often towards strangers. They have exhibited repeated proofs of intellectual powers apparently very superior to those of the African, and not very inferior to those of the European race.\* If a correct view has been taken of the great obstacle to be surmounted, that of converting a purely hunting into an agricultural nation, it must be acknowledged to be one of the most difficult undertakings within the power of man.

We read in the legends of those nations which had preserved a recollection of a previous barbarous state, that they were *taught* agriculture by a Triptolemus, or a Manco Capac. It is much to be apprehended, that necessity and compulsion were the deities that made men submit to the fatigue of agricultural labor. The annals of every nation, of which we have any ancient and authentic records, exhibit to us a state of society, of which slavery constituted a component and important part. Such was the case with the Romans, with the Greeks, and with the eastern nations, without excepting the Jews. It seems as if, after man had departed from the first ordinances given to him, conquest and slavery had become necessary ingredients in order to bring him within the pale of civilization. It may be, that it was on that account that slavery, or, upon the most favorable construction, a servitude of fifty years, was expressly allowed by the laws of Moses, and that it is not expressly forbidden by the Gospel. The great and fundamental moral principles of Christianity were left to produce their effect on man, according to his conscience and knowledge, by a religion, intended for all times and for all men without regard to

---

\* Father Le Jeune, answering in one of his letters the objections made to the prospect of converting and civilizing the Indians, says, that it was admitted on all hands, that they were superior in intellect to the French peasantry of that time. It is curious enough to see him at the same time advising that laborers should be sent from France in order to work *for* the Indians. The same sentiment is expressed in a letter written in the Indian language by an Algonkin, who had visited France.

their political or social state, and which disclaims any interference or alliance with the powers that may regulate the machinery of human affairs.

Had the Five Nations, or any other conquering Indian tribe, instead of murdering or adopting prisoners of war, reduced them to a state of slavery and made them their helots, they might have attained a Spartan civilization. That of Peru and Mexico was avowedly the result of conquests, and, in both cases, had for its foundation the abject servitude or submission of the many, the military power of the conquerors, and the yoke imposed by a false religion.

The only well ascertained instance, amongst our own Indians, of their having, at least in part, become an agricultural nation, meaning thereby that state of society, in which the men themselves do actually perform agricultural labor, is that of the Cherokees. And it is in proof, that, in this case also, cultivation was at first introduced through the means of slavery. In their predatory incursions they carried away slaves from Carolina. These were used to work, and continued to be thus employed by their new masters. The advantages derived by the owners were immediately perceived. Either in war, or in commercial intercourse, slaves of the African race became objects of desire; and gradually, assisted by the efforts of the government and the beneficial influence of the missionaries, some amongst those Indians, who could not obtain slaves, were induced to work for themselves. Accounts vary as to the extent of that true civilization. It is believed that it embraces nearly one third of the male population; and the following statement of an actual census of that part of the nation which remained on this side of the Mississippi, taken in the year 1825, corroborates this opinion.

Free males	. 6883;	do. females	. 6900;	total	13,783
Slaves, male	. 610;	do. female	. 667;	total	1,277

---

15,060

White men married to Cherokee women	. 147
Cherokee men married to white women	. 68

33 grist mills; 13 saw mills; 1 powder mill.

69 blacksmith shops; 2 tan yards.

762 looms; 2486 spinning wheels.

172 wagons; 2923 *ploughs*.

7683 horses; 22,531 black cattle; 46,732 swine; 2566 sheep.

The number of ploughs, compared with that of male slaves, shows clearly that no inconsiderable number of male Indians must have been employed in agriculture.

The purchase of slaves to be given to the Indians in order to enable them to live without labor, or the use of compulsory means to oblige them to work themselves, are inadmissible. Example and persuasion can alone be resorted to. And, although these have so often failed, the instance of the Cherokees shows that the case is not hopeless. It is hoped that government, in carrying into effect its laudable intention of providing a permanent place of refuge for the Indians, will give to its operations the direction best calculated to produce that favorable result. But I think that it is principally on the efforts of the missionaries, that we must rely for effecting the object.

The Indians do not and cannot love us; and, seeing the little regard paid to engagements, which they at least had considered as binding on both parties, they look on all the acts of government with a jealous eye. Those ministers of the Gospel who with equal zeal, disinterestedness, and singleness of purpose, have devoted themselves to the service of the Indians, have deserved and alone have acquired their confidence. They may succeed in converting to Christianity the present generation; but this alone will not prevent the speedy annihilation of the Indian race, which is inevitable, unless, forsaking their habits, the Indians shall become an industrious people. There can be no hesitation in asserting, that the labor necessary to support a man's family is, on the part of the man, a moral duty; and that to impose on woman that portion, which can be properly performed only by man, is a deviation from the laws of nature. I leave it to those, who have undertaken the task of instructing mankind in their religious duties, to decide, how far the obligation to labor may be enforced by the religious sanction. For all temporal purposes, a day of rest in the week is unnecessary for those who are idle the greater part of their time. And it is believed, that no nation, or individual, can transgress with impunity that first decree which, allotting to each sex its proper share, declared labor to be the condition, on which man was permitted to exist.

Let not the Indians entertain the illusory hope, that they can persist in their habits, and remain in perpetuity quiet possessors of the extensive territory west of the Mississippi, lately given to them in exchange for their ancient seats. The same

causes will ultimately produce the same effects. A nation of hunters cannot exist, as such, when brought in contact with an agricultural and industrious people. They must be deeply impressed with the conviction that their ultimate fate depends exclusively on themselves.

The obstacles to be surmounted, before deep-rooted habits can be eradicated and a total change be effected, are undoubtedly great, and should be fully understood. If the missions to the Eskimaux have been so much more successful, than those amongst the more southern Indians, it has been principally, because a profitable cultivation of the soil was impracticable in that frozen region, and that, as the inhabitants must continue to draw their subsistence from the sea or the chase, it was only requisite to regulate and not necessary to change their habits.

The attempt may be hopeless with respect to men beyond a certain age; and the effort should be directed towards the children. For that purpose, it is sufficient, that the parent should be thoroughly convinced of the absolute necessity for a change, without requiring him to do himself what perhaps has become impracticable. If that point could be accomplished, and the Indians would permit their children to be brought up by us, the success of the experiment would depend on those appointed to superintend its execution. Moral and religious education will not be neglected. In the present state of those people, no greater demand need be made on their intellectual faculties, than to teach them the English language; but this so thoroughly, that they may forget their own. That, without which all the rest would be useless, is the early habit of manual labor. They must be brought up to work, to till the ground, in short, in the same manner as our own people, as the sons of our industrious farmers. They have land of their own, and will not, when reaching manhood, be obliged to work for others. They have an abundant quantity of land, and may, if they please, be perpetuated and multiply as ourselves. There is no reason why, if they become an agricultural people, the sixty thousand southern Indians should not, within less than a century, increase to one million.



## SECTION VI.

## INDIAN LANGUAGES.

THE vocabularies appended to this essay will enable the reader to judge, whether the preceding classification of the Indian languages is correct. Those of the Mohawk, Seneca, Cherokee, Muskogee, Choctaw, and Caddo, were prepared according to a model circulated by the War Department at the request of the author of this essay. But, in framing a general comparative vocabulary, the selection of the words was controlled by the existing materials; and many have been omitted, because they were found only in a few of the vocabularies, either manuscript, or already published, which could be obtained. It happens, however, that the greater number of words of which we have the equivalents in most Indian languages, belong to that class, which has generally been considered as so absolutely necessary in any state of society, that the words of which it consists must have been in use everywhere in its earliest stages, and could not have been borrowed by any nation from any other. Whenever therefore a sufficient number of words of that description have been found to be the same or similar in two or more languages, such languages have generally been considered as of the same stock, and the nations which spoke them, as having belonged to the same family, subsequent to the time when mankind was divided into distinct nations. The same principle has been adopted in the classification of the Indians; and its correctness has been proved in every instance, where it had been previously ascertained, by the unanimous testimony of the missionaries, traders, and interpreters, that two or more languages were certainly dialects of the same, or kindred tongues. But such is the tendency of languages, amongst nations in the hunter state, rapidly to diverge from each other, that, apart from those primitive words, a much greater diversity is found in Indian languages, well known to have sprung from a common source, than in kindred European tongues. Thus, although the Minsi were only a tribe of the Delawares and adjacent to them, even some of their numerals differed. It is proper however to observe, that commerce may have communicated to barbarous tribes in the other hemisphere, the numerals used by more

civilized nations; and that, as between hunters and hunters there are rarely any objects of exchange, numerals cannot in America have been borrowed by one tribe from another. The pronouns of the first and second person belong also in the Indian languages to the class of primitive words. No definitive opinion can, for want of sufficient materials, be formed with respect to prepositions.

An apprehension of being deceived by false etymologies, or accidental coincidences, has perhaps led into a contrary error. The only case where any language has been placed as belonging to a certain family, without conclusive proof, is that of the Minetares. But there are several, and particularly the Choctaw and Muskogee, which have been set down as forming distinct families, that will probably be found, on further investigation, to belong to the same. Some of the vocabularies are not sufficiently copious; in many instances, affinities will be discovered through the medium of kindred dialects; and, in order to have a full view of the subject, we should have not only a small collection of primitive words, but dictionaries including derivatives. Thus, for instance, the numeral, *one*, in Choctaw is, *achufa*, and, in Muskogee, *humma*, between which there is not the slightest affinity. Yet it is revealed by the Choctaw word for *once*, which is *himmuma*. It is therefore highly probable, that the number of distinct families of Indian languages will be found to be less than has been here stated; though, at the same time, that of subordinate dialects is undoubtedly greater.

The diversity which does actually exist proves only, that the separation of some of the Indian nations took place in very early times; and the difficulty of accounting for it is not greater here than on the other continent. We find there, in one quarter, the Sanscrit and the Chinese in juxtaposition, and, in another, the Basque surrounded by languages of Latin origin. The same cause, which produced that effect, may, under different circumstances, have given rise to ten, instead of two totally distinct languages. In point of fact, the number does not appear to be greater in North America than in Africa, in the northeastern parts of Asia, or in the Oceanic region. The varieties of languages and of dialects must be more numerous amongst uncivilized tribes, principally those in the hunter state, necessarily subdivided into small communities, than in populous nations united under one government. Public speaking

in their councils is the only standard of language of our Indians. None can become fixed and stable, until that character has been imparted to it by the art of writing and the influence of powerful writers. We have proofs of the multitude, at least, of dialects, which will spring out of an oral language, in those of Germany and of Italy, and in the Patois of France. These are indeed but varieties of the French, with a greater or less residue of Latin or of the other more ancient language of Gaul;\* but they still differ (much more in words than in grammatical forms), and are perpetuated, notwithstanding the long-continued influence of a common government and of a common written language. To those obvious causes of a tendency to produce changes, we may add, that inflected languages seem to be more liable to alterations, than those which, like that *spoken* in China, consist principally of monosyllables.

Although, for a proper study of the character of a language, a dictionary could afford but little aid, if it did not include derivatives and compound words, even our meagre vocabularies, if thoroughly investigated, might offer interesting results. Thus for instance, a single glance at the table of numerals shows, that all the Indian nations have resorted to a decimal numeration. But an examination of several of the languages will afford proof, that they must at first have counted by *fives*, instead of *tens*. Thus, in the Choctaw, the numerals *seven* and *eight*, *untuklo* and *untuchina*, are evidently derived from *tuklo* two and *tuchina* three, meaning respectively, five and two, five and three. The same will be found in various other languages, and particularly in those belonging to the Algonkin-Lenape. A further investigation will also show, that, although the Knistinaux, Chippeways, Algonkins, and Abenakis use for the unity the word *peyac*, or *paizhik*, instead of *nequit* or *ngut*, as the other nations of the same stock, they must originally have had also the last word; since their numeral *six* is, in all of them, derived from it. It is probable, that those two

---

\* In seventy-five French Patois, of which specimens have been lately published, no greater grammatical variations are to be found than the union of the pronoun with the verb, such as *Soui* for *Je suis*. In one, in the Ardennes, the pronoun coalesces with the noun, as in our Indian languages; *M'per*, and *S'per*, for *Mon père* and *Son père*. Mr. Heckewelder's apostrophe has, probably for the same purpose, been used by the French writer.

words were used, as *a* and *one* are, in the English language ; and Mr. Schoolcraft corroborates that which with me could only be a conjecture.

It will also be found, that, in the Knistinaux and the Chippe-way, the initial *m* is often prefixed to the noun, instead of the pronominal characteristics *n*, *k*, *w*, when such nouns are taken in an absolute or abstract sense, as, *miskcewon*, nose, *miskotick*, forehead, *meeton*, mouth, *meepit*, teeth, &c. ; which seems to corroborate the existence of a definite article *mo*, discovered by Mr. Du Ponceau in Eliot's translation of the Bible.

Another feature, which may be discovered by the vocabularies, consists in the different names, by which all the Indian nations distinguish the various degrees and modifications of relationship, such as the elder brother, and the elder sister, as distinguished from the younger ones ; paternal, or maternal uncle, &c. But what is remarkable, as a feature common to all, is, that women use different words from men for those purposes ; and that the difference of language, between men and women, seems, in all the Indian languages, to be confined to that species of words, or others of an analogous nature, and to the use of interjections.

It is perhaps less, however, in dictionaries, than by an investigation of grammatical forms and structure, that we must study the philosophy of language and the various ways, in which man has applied his faculties to that object. We may discover in their Relations, that the Jesuits had analyzed the two principal languages spoken in Canada. The venerable Eliot had in his Grammar, published in 1666, exhibited the most prominent features of the Massachusetts dialect. And we have long been in possession of good grammars of several of the languages of Mexico and South America by the Catholic missionaries. But it was not, till after the publication of the more popular works of Egede \* and of Crantz, that public attention was attracted by the peculiar character of the Karalit or Eskimau language. And the first inference was, that the Eskimaux must have been a colony from Europe, or from some other civilized country, and a distinct race from the other American Indians. In the year 1819, Mr. Du Ponceau, after having elicited with much labor, from Mr. Heckewelder, the principal features of the Delaware, and compared it with the

---

\* Alluding to his account of Groenland, rather than to his Grammar.

Eskimau, with the languages of South America, and with the scanty specimens within his reach of those of our own Indians, submitted to the further investigation of the learned the three following propositions, to wit :

1. That the American languages in general are rich in words and in grammatical forms, and that, in their complicated construction, the greatest order, method, and regularity prevail.

2. That these complicated forms, which he calls polysynthetic, appear to exist in all those languages from Greenland to Cape Horn.

3. That these forms appear to differ essentially from those of the ancient and modern languages of the old hemisphere.

The last proposition does not fall within the scope of this essay, and is far beyond my very limited knowledge of languages. All the information, connected with the first proposition, which could be obtained, has been collected, and will be found in a condensed form in the annexed grammatical notices and specimens of conjugations. But the inquiry has, with a single exception, been confined to the languages of our own Indians ; and the result, so far as it goes, fully confirms the first two propositions of Mr. Du Ponceau ; although I think, that there is less of method and regularity in the Delaware and other dialects of the Algonkin-Lenape, than in some of the other Indian languages.

Yet the materials are very incomplete ; although we may perceive the general features, we cannot yet deduce with sufficient precision the rules of grammar or of the composition of words ; and there is some difficulty in discriminating between the specific characters which distinguish certain languages, and the general features which belong to all. But we are at least justified in asserting, that such a general character does exist, that it applies to all those American languages which have been sufficiently investigated, and that it seems to prove, beyond a doubt, that common origin, which could not be discovered in vocabularies so entirely different from each other. It is not however intended to assert, that all the American languages, without exception, possess that general character. It would indeed appear more astonishing, to find them all belonging to one and the same family, than to discover some, like the Chinese in Asia, and the Basque in Europe, of a structure altogether differing from the general mass.

The fundamental characteristic of the Indian languages of



America appears to be a universal tendency to express in the same word, not only all that modifies or relates to the same object, or action, but both the action and the object; thus concentrating in a single expression a complex idea, or several ideas among which there is a natural connexion. All the other features of the language seem to be subordinate to that general principle. The object in view has been attained by various means of the same tendency and often blended together: a multitude of inflections properly so called; a still greater number of compound words, sometimes formed by the coalescence of primitive words not materially altered, more generally by the union of many such words in a remarkably abbreviated form; and numerous particles, either significative, or the original meaning of which has been lost, prefixed, added as terminations, or inserted in the body of the word.

The modern languages of Europe generally, and none more than the English, have substituted, for the inflections of the ancient languages, auxiliary verbs and separable prepositions; and the inflections or compounded words, in the classical languages, bear no proportion in point of number to the multiplied forms and combinations exhibited by those of the Indians.

Notwithstanding this great apparent complexness, all these various forms, either of inflected or compounded words, must necessarily have their foundation in analogy, modified by euphony: but they render a competent acquirement of the language extremely difficult to a foreigner; and even after this object has been attained, more by routine than in any other way, it must be no easy task for the student, to analyze the words, to reduce them to their proper elements, to class them in conformity with the genius of the language, and to convey to others his knowledge with method and sufficient perspicuity.

This remains to be done for almost every Indian language; and we can, in the mean while, only try to give some imperfect notions of the most general features which appear to have been ascertained.

---

#### *Number and Gender.*

There is a great variety in the Indian languages with respect to *Genders* and *Number*.

Like all others, they have various distinct words, expressive of the differences of sex in the human species, in reference

principally to age and consanguinity ; such as, father and mother, son and daughter, man and woman, boy and girl, &c. ; and also distinct names for the male and female of various animals. But, if the grammatical distinction of gender be understood, as applying exclusively to the varied inflections by which it is designated, the Eskimaux, the Choctaws, the Muskogees, and, it is believed, the Sioux, having no inflection of that description, may, in that sense, be said to make no distinction between genders. And the languages of the Iroquois family afford the only instance, as yet discovered, of such a distinction between the masculine and the feminine.

Father Brebeuf pointed it out,\* in the third person of both the singular and the plural of the Huron, or Wyandot : *ihaton*, ' he says ' ; *iouaton*, ' she says ' ; *ihonton*, ' they say ( the men ) ' ; *ionton*, ' they say ( the women ) ' . The same distinction and applied to the same person is found in Zeisberger's Grammar of the Onondago, a language of the same family : *waharrie*, ' he beats ' ; *iagorrie*, ' she beats ' ; *hottirrie*, ' they ( the men ) beat ' ; *guetirrie*, ' they ( women ) beat . ' And we find it again in the specimen of the conjugation of the verb " to eat , " in the Mohawk, another Iroquois language.† In all these cases the inflection is that of the pronoun of the third person. Zeisberger also discovered it in some Onondago nouns, where, as well as in the pronoun of that dialect, it is generally expressed by prefixing or inserting the sound *g* : *sajadat*, ' a male ' ; *sgajadat*, ' a female . '

A much more prevailing distinction is that between animate beings and inanimate things. It is not, however, universal, since it does not exist in the Eskimau, the Choctaw, the Muskogee, and the Caddo, and has not, as yet, been discovered in any other of our Indian languages than the Iroquois, the Cherokee, and the Algonkin-Lenape.

Our information respecting the Iroquois is very limited ; and we can say little more than that the distinction is made. The only notice taken of it in Zeisberger's Onondago Grammar is ( when speaking of the prefixed letters by which, in some cases, the feminine are distinguished from masculine nouns ), in these words, " Nouns of inanimate objects have no prefixes and

\* See his letter of July, 1636, in the Appendix.

† See Appendix, verbal forms ; and do. and grammatical notices of Zeisberger.

accept none." In our Seneca vocabulary, as well as in another printed in London, a word is given for the pronoun *it*, distinct from those for *he* or *she*. And Father Brebeuf, in the letter already alluded to, amongst the most remarkable features of the Huron verbs, says, "that they have some for animated beings, and others for things without life." \*

In the Cherokee language, Mr. Pickering has pointed out the prefixed particles, used to designate the plural, which are commonly assigned to inanimate nouns, and those belonging to the animate class: *kutusi*, 'a mountain'; *tikutusi*, 'mountains'; *atsutsu*, 'a boy'; *anitsutsu*, 'boys'; a distinction which, in various cases, extends to adjectives. And it will be seen amongst Mr. Worcester's answers to grammatical queries, that the same distinction prevails, both in the third person of intransitive verbs, and in the inflections of transitive verbs, according as they govern the noun of an animate, or of an inanimate object.

But it is in the languages of the Algonkin-Lenape family, that the distinction is most remarkable, and may be considered as one of its specific characteristics. It was first pointed out by Father Le Jeune in the Algonkin, † and distinctly stated by John Eliot in the Massachusetts, is repeatedly alluded to in Father Rasle's Dictionary of the Abenaki, specially mentioned in Father Maynard's notes on the Micmac, and explained in Mr. Heckewelder's correspondence with Mr. Du Ponceau respecting the Delaware dialect. "The principle," Mr. Schoolcraft observes in his lectures on the Ojibway (Chippeway) language, "has been grafted upon most words and carries its distinction throughout the syntax. It is the gender of the language, and of so unbounded a scope, as to give a twofold character to the parts of speech." We find accordingly that the inflection, which designates the plural of nouns, varies according to the class to which the noun belongs. According to the dialect or different language, it is *og*, *aig*, or *ak* for the animate; *ain*, *ash*, or *all* for the inanimate gender: but the vocal sound which precedes the characteristic consonant varies, according to euphony, or

---

\* Charlevoix, a faithful compiler, who derived his information respecting Indian languages from the writings of Brebeuf and other early historians, has inserted the observation in his journal. But he assigns erroneously to the Huron the exclusion of the distinction between masculine and feminine. It is the Algonkin, instead of the Iroquois languages, which do not make that distinction.

† See above, Section II., under the head of Algonkins.

usage. Zeisberger seems to confine the use of the Delaware animate termination *ak* to substantives without the prefixed pronoun.

Adjectives, when susceptible of a plural form, are subject to a similar variation of inflection, according as the noun, with which they are connected, is of the animate or inanimate class. Numerals and demonstrative pronouns appear to follow the same rule as adjectives. The distinction seems to be wanted in the personal and possessive pronoun of the third person; or, at least, it has not, if it does exist, been distinctly pointed out. But the inflection of the verb varies in reference to the nature of the noun it governs. Thus, in the Massachusetts; 'I keep him,' *Noowadehan*; 'I keep it,' *Noowadchanumun*: in the Delaware; '*I see a man*,' Lenno *newau*; '*I see a house*,' *Wiquam nemen*: in the Chippeway; '*I see a man*,' *n'wabima*; '*I see a house*,' *n'wabindan*. We are not however informed, whether the terminations or inflections of the verb, which distinguish, whether its regimen belongs to the animate or inanimate class, are always the same, or, if they vary, whether the variations are due to euphony, or usage, or may be traced to some other principle? It appears also that there are some cases, where the termination of the noun governed by the verb is altered on account of the class to which it belongs.

According to Eliot, "there seemeth to be one cadency of the form animate, which endeth in *oh, uh, ah*, when an animate noun followeth a verb transitive. Thus *anogqs*, 'a star,' (which by the Indians is considered as animate) in the plural is *anogqsog*, 'stars.' But in the sentence, 'He made stars,' this last word must be *anogqsoh*, because it followeth (is governed by) the verb *agim*, 'he made.'" This it would seem, if I have not mistaken Mr. Schoolcraft's meaning, is confined to the case when the verb is in the third person. There is in that person no distinction between the singular and the plural; and its termination, *oh, ah* in the Massachusetts, *un, in, &c.* in the Chippeway, is given not only to the verb, but to the regimen when this belongs to the animate class. It appears, that, in the Chippeway, that termination (*un, in, &c.*) is also that of the plural of inanimate things; but why these are not, in all the languages of that family, subject to the same rule as animate beings, does not appear; and all that relates to regimen, with respect both to nouns and pronouns of the third person, requires further investigation and explanation.

The class of animate beings is not in the Algonkin languages confined to animals. In the Massachusetts, it embraces certainly the stars and probably several other personified objects; but, according to Eliot, all vegetables belong to the inanimate, whilst forest trees, both in the Delaware and the Chippeway, are included in the animate class. Various other objects, not probably always the same in every dialect, are also considered as belonging to it, on account of peculiar properties belonging or ascribed to them. Such are, at least in the Chippeway, a stone, a bow, a kettle, a pipe, &c.\* It was probably in reference to this, that the French Missionaries have designated the two classes by the names *noble* and *ignoble*.

It will be easily perceived, that, if this distinction constitutes an essential character of the Algonkin-Lenape languages, it is not on account of the principle itself, but of its extensive application, which pervades the whole language, and affects the termination of every part of speech without excepting the adverbs. The existence of the neuter gender, in the classical languages, renders it almost certain, that it had its origin in the same distinction. But, by a deviation, much more extensive than any found in the Indian tongues, the greater number of inanimate objects came to be designated by the masculine and feminine genders. In the French, the neuter has been altogether excluded; and the arbitrary distinction of masculine and feminine is one of the great difficulties of the language, one also, of which the application is very extensive, on account of the change of termination to which not only the pronouns but the adjectives are subject. In the English, the natural distinction between inanimate and animate, and the subdivision of the last class, according to sex, have been preserved or adopted: but adjectives are indeclinable; and the distinction appears only in the third person singular of the personal and possessive pronouns and in the relative; so that, if the words *her*, *it*, *hers*, *its*, *who*, *whom*, and *whose* were expunged from the language, it might be said of it, as of the Eskimau, that it had no genders. But the distinction has been preserved, in the English, in the case where it was most needed, for the purpose of correcting the ambiguity inherent in the third person of the pronoun; whilst, in the Algonkin, this is the very case which appears not to be provided for, the characteristic sign of the third person being

---

\* Mr. Schoolcraft.



either omitted altogether, or the same for the animate and inanimate genders.

Nice distinctions may, in a purely oral language, escape the notice of the inquirer, if their application should happen to be limited to a few particular cases; and of this at least one instance in point may be given.

We have, in order to institute a useful comparison, inserted, amongst the grammatical notices, an extract of Father Febre's Grammar of the language of Chili.\* The distinction between animate and inanimate, which was not adverted to by Molina, is there pointed out, but incidentally and only in a single case. The particle *pu*, prefixed to nouns, is the common sign of the plural, and is properly applicable to animate, though sometimes used for inanimate objects. But the proper designation of the plural for the inanimate class, is the termination *ica*, substituted for the *pu* prefixed.

The plural number of the nouns is in most Indian languages designated by the addition of a particle prefixed, inserted, or affixed. It is affixed, or an inflection of the termination in the following:

Eskiman, *et, it, ut*; *innuk*, 'man'; *innuit*, 'men'; *iglo*, 'a house'; *iglut*, 'houses.'

Sioux, *pee*; *wectshashtah*, 'man'; *wectshashtahpee*, 'men'; *wah tah*, 'a canoe'; *wah tapee*, 'canoes.'

Algonkin, as already stated, *g, k* for the animate; *sh, n, ll* for the inanimate:

Massachusetts; *nunksqau*, 'a girl'; *nunsqauog*, 'girls'; *hussun*, 'a stone'; *hussunash*, 'stones':

Delaware; *okhqua*, 'a woman'; *okhquewak*, 'women'; *akhsin*, 'a stone'; *akhsinall*, 'stones':

Chippeway; *pinai*, 'a partridge'; *pinaiwug*, 'partridges'; *ossin*, 'a stone'; *ossineeu*, 'stones.'

Cheppeyan (Athapasca), *thlang*; *dinné*, 'a man'; *dinnéthlang*, 'men'; *tsakhulley*, 'a hat'; *tsakhulleythlang*, 'hats.'

In the Cherokee the plural is designated by the prefixed particles *t, ts*, generally though not universally used for inanimate, and *ni* for animate nouns.

In the language of Chili, by *pu* prefixed, or *ica* affixed, as above stated.

In the Iroquois languages by particles generally affixed,

---

\* I am indebted to Judge Davis of Massachusetts for having pointed out that excellent grammar, and loaned to me the only copy, I believe, in the United States.

sometimes inserted, varying in the several dialects, and even in the same, according to the termination of the noun. The particles *shoh*, *nie*, *ogu* are used in the Onondago; *dah*, *suh*, *shoeh* in the Seneca.

Seneca; \* *hahjenah*, 'a man'; *hahdahjenah*, 'men'; *hudagoohonch*, 'a chief'; *hudagoohonchsuh*, 'chiefs.'

The Choctaw, the Muskogee, and the Caddo nouns have, with few special exceptions, no inflection designating the plural. That deficiency is respectively supplied by the words *okla*, *ulgy*, or *homulgy*, and *wia*, all of which mean, 'several,' 'many,' 'a multitude.'

When adjectives are connected (not incorporated) with nouns substantive, the sign of the plural may, in most languages, be transferred to the adjective; and, in the Sioux, the plural sign *pee*, added to the last word of the sentence, be it noun, verb, or even adverb, makes the whole sentence plural.

The plural of pronouns, personal and possessive, is almost universally designated by particular terminations or inflections, distinct from those assigned to the plural of nouns, and which will be adverted to, when treating of conjugations.

In all the languages which have been investigated, with the exception of those of the Sioux family, concerning which the information is not sufficient, there is, besides the singular and general or indefinite plural, a third number, which is sometimes a dual, more generally a definite or special plural, occasionally assuming both forms.

It is represented as a pure dual by the grammarians of the Eskimau, and of the language of Chili; and it appears to be such in the Athapasca. In the various dialects of the Algonkin-Lenape, and in the Choctaw, it is a definite plural; but, although including always, in every such dialect, a definite number of persons, it is not applied precisely in the same manner in all.

In the Delaware, according to Mr. Heckewelder, it embraces our family, nation, select body, us who are here assembled, in this room; and including therefore, at least when he, or they belong to the nation or select body, the person or persons spoken to. But in the Chippeway, as we are informed by Mr. Schoolcraft, it always excludes the person or persons thus spoken to; and it is used in the same manner in the Micmac.

---

\* Seneca Spelling-Book. London, 1818. This was not seen till after the appended vocabularies had been prepared for the press.

The following examples given by Father Maynard appear conclusive in that respect; "Rik tan *kinoo* aunka mook," 'There is somebody who sees *us*,' is the indefinite plural; "*Ninenoo-en* oolanook najamooloktau," '*One of us* will go this evening to see you,' is the special or definite form; and it is obvious that, '*one of us*' contrasted with '*you*,' excludes the person spoken to. The *k*', characteristic of the second person, is always prefixed in the general, and the *n*', characteristic of the first person, in the special or definite plural, in both the Chippeway and the Delaware languages. It will be seen hereafter, that it is a constant rule in both, that whenever the second person, whether in the nominative or objective case, is one of the pronouns connected with the verb, *k*' is prefixed. Therefore, the *n*' prefixed to the special plural shows that the second person was intended to be excluded, that the Chippeways have preserved the original meaning of that plural, and that the Delawares have departed from it. And this seems to corroborate the opinion, that the Chippeway, or Algonkin, is the primary language, and the Delaware one of those derived from it.

In the Choctaw, where *pishno* is the pronoun of the first person for the definite, and *hupishno* that for the indefinite; according to Mr. Wright, "*hupishno* is used, when speaking of an action in which all the hearers are concerned. But if all the hearers are not concerned in it, but only the speaker and some other persons (understood or designated), *pishno* is used."

It is not practicable, from the specimens we have of the Caddo, to decide whether the third number is a dual, or a definite plural. It appears to be a dual in the Muskogee.

In the Cherokee, the distinctions connected with number are more minute than in the Algonkin and Choctaw. There are in that language distinct words or inflections for each of the following combinations of pronouns either personal or possessive, viz. he and I; they and I; thou and I; you and I; you two; you all; they. Of these combinations, the two last are the indefinite plural for the second and third persons; the first, third, and fifth are three distinct forms of the dual; the second and fourth, two distinct forms of a special plural; but none is given for a general plural *we* which might include *you* and *they* with the speaker.

Zeisberger's Grammar of the Onondago throws no light on the subject. But the examples given by Father Brebeuf of the Huron (in the letter already quoted) show, that, though probably differing in the details, the distinctions that relate to the

number, are, in the Iroquois languages, founded on the same principle as in the Cherokee. 'We set off, thou and I,' *kiarascsa*; 'he and I,' *aiarascsa*; 'we, several of us' (*nous autres*) *asarascsa*; 'we along with you,' *esarascsa*.

In the Eskimau, the dual applies not only to pronouns, but also to nouns which, in that number have a distinct inflection from the plural, viz. *k*: *iglo*, 'a house'; dual, *igluk*; plural, *iglut*. In all the other languages, the inflection of nouns is the same for dual, definite, or indefinite plural. The pronouns are alone affected by the distinction, and generally only in the first person; in all the three persons in the language of Chili; in the Cherokee and Iroquois, in the manner already stated. In some languages, the distinction applies only to the nominative, and, in others, embraces also the objective case; but the information is in that respect as yet incomplete.

There is a vocative case in some at least of the Algonkin-Lenape languages, terminating, in the singular of the Delaware, in *an*, and of the Massachusetts in *in*; in the plural Delaware in *enk*, "when coupled with the pronoun *our*." (Zeisberger, page 99). The same termination *eunk* is used generally for the second person plural in the Massachusetts. *Woi kenaau Jerusalem wuttanzunk*, 'O ye daughters of Jerusalem.' (Du Ponceau on Eliot). The only instance of an inflection of the noun, in what may be called the direct regimen, corresponding in some degree with the Latin accusative, has been pointed out.\* The genitive is designated in the Eskimau by an inflection of the noun; in other languages occasionally by an abbreviated form of the possessive pronoun, generally by the relative position of the two nouns. With respect to the other oblique cases, the offices performed by inflections in the classical languages, and by separable prepositions in most of those of Europe, are, in those of America, generally performed by affixed or prefixed inseparable prepositions. Delaware; *uteny*, 'a town'; *utenink*, 'in, from, the town'; *menuppeque*, 'the lake'; *awossenuppeque*, 'over the lake.' In the Eskimau, there are but five such prepositions; *mik*, 'with, through'; *mit*, 'from'; *mut*, 'to'; *me*, 'in, upon'; *kut*, 'around.' They are more numerous in other languages; † and it might be inferred, from the general

\* The objective cases of the pronouns, or the manner in which they are supplied, will be adverted to in the conjugations.

† In the Onondago, Zeisberger gives fourteen inseparable affixed prepositions, meaning, *in, on, at, to, under, along, through, &c.*; but some may be added in the separable form.

tendency to incorporate the accessaries in the same word with the noun or verb, that separable prepositions were not to be found, or but rarely used, in any Indian language. Eliot, in the Massachusetts Grammar, and the authors of the English Seneca Spelling-Book, have enumerated respectively the parts of speech of those two languages; and prepositions are omitted in both. But reasoning *à priori* is unsafe; and facts are still wanted, in order to ascertain, in almost all the Indian languages, the number, the derivation, and the manner of using or compounding the inseparable and separable propositions.

*Substantive Verb. Conversion of Nouns into Verbs.*

The preceding observations relate rather to peculiarities than to the general character of the Indian languages. The substitution of intransitive verbs for the substantive verb, in cases, where this is generally used in modern languages, may be reckoned as one of the general characters of those at least of our Indians.

It appears certain that the Indians have one or more verbs, expressive of locality, and corresponding with the verb *to be*, when used in that sense, as, 'Peter *is* at, or in, such a place.' And it may be, that some of the nations have a verb denoting absolute existence. Mr. Schoolcraft has, in his vocabulary, 'To be,' v. s. *Ja*, and 'I am,' 'thou art,' *nin dya, ki dya*; Mr. Worcester mentions the Cherokee verb *geha*, meaning 'I exist,' and sometimes, 'I dwell,' and another defective impersonal verb *gesunggi*, but which seems rather to denote time, than to apply to existence. Mr. Compere alludes to a Muskogee verb, *domist*, as implying existence; and other instances may perhaps be adduced. But, whether such a verb be found or not in some of the languages, and whatever may be its proper meaning, it is at least certain, that no such verb is used, either as an auxiliary in the passive voice, or in connexion with attributes, or with substantives susceptible of a verbal form. Although the English language has a great number of intransitive verbs; yet, in the passive voice, or when it is intended to express a certain particular state of passive existence, implying no voluntary, organic, or instantaneous action, the substantive verb is uniformly used. We say indeed, 'to run,' 'to sleep,' and even, 'to die'; in which last case,



the act of dying is alone implied. But if we intend to express the state, in which that act places the person, we must recur to the substantive verb and say, 'He is dead.' I may not have expressed the difference with sufficient perspicuity; and the line of distinction between the cases, where we use an intransitive, and those in which we must resort to the substantive verb, is not perhaps always accurately drawn in the language. It is sufficient for our purpose to say, that in all the cases, where we use the verb *to be*, in connexion with an attribute, or with a noun, the Indians use an intransitive verb; and that where we use it in connexion with the participle past, they substitute an inflexion. Thus the passive voice in the Indian languages is, as in the simple tenses of the Latin, formed by an inflexion, consisting generally of the insertion of a particle, such as *xi, ssi*, in the Delaware, *ull* in the Choctaw, &c.\* And, instead of saying, 'I am cold,' 'I am sick,' 'I am a man,' &c., they say, *I cold, I sick, I man*, &c. These various expressions are, each of them, an intransitive verb conjugated through all its persons, tenses, and moods. The only difference is, that, in all those cases, it is the substantive verb which we conjugate; whilst the Indian conjugates what we call the adjective and even the noun itself, in the same manner as he does other intransitive verbs. We find, in the Latin language, several instances of similar neuter or deponent verbs such as *sitio, esurio, ægroto*, &c, which we cannot render into English, without resorting to the substantive verb. The Indian does, in every instance, that which in Latin occurs only in some cases; and he extends the principle to nouns and even to proper names.

When the process is applied to a noun, the noun undergoes the inflexion proper to the verb. Thus in the Micmac, from *lenno*, 'a man,' is derived the verb, *n'looi*, 'I am a man,' the conjugation of which will be found in the Appendix. But the adjective, which, according to our habits, we should consider as converted into a verb, appears in the Indian languages, as if it were the simplest form of the verb. In most cases, the word *he is cold*, or *it is cold*, is found to be identical with what we

---

\* The passive voice in the Onondago and probably other Iroquois languages is formed by an inflexion, not of the verb, but of the pronoun; and, in the Choctaw, the objective case of the pronoun is used, beside the inserted particle.

call the adjective *cold*. Mr. Zeisberger accordingly hesitated, whether, in his Grammar of the Delaware language, he should consider the adjectives as a distinct part of speech; and he ultimately arranged the greater number of them under the head of verbs adjective. There are however, in every Indian language, some adjectives, or words generally considered as such, which from their nature are not susceptible of a verbal form, or which by usage appear only in that of an adjective. Instances of that kind will be found in Mr. Zeisberger's Onondago Grammar.

I believe that it must appear sufficiently obvious, that this general if not universal character of the Indian languages, the conversion into verbs and the conjugation, through all the persons, tenses, and moods, of almost all the adjectives and of every noun which, without a palpable absurdity, is susceptible of it, is entirely due to the absence of the substantive verb;\* the idea of which is nevertheless as clear in the mind of the Indian, when he says, *I cold*, and conjugates the word, as in that of the European, when he says, 'I am cold,' and conjugates the verb *I am*.

The adjective, whether considered as the root, or as one of the forms of the verb, appears nevertheless to have preserved some of the properties of the noun adjective. A few, in the Choctaw, have a distinct plural form. The feminine gender in the Onondago, the inanimate or animate in other languages, are distinguished by a varied inflection. The degrees of comparison are in almost every language expressed by words, corresponding to the English *more* and *most*, preceding or following the adjective.

It appears, that in the Onondago language, a distinction is made between the adjectives which may, and those which do not coalesce with the substantive, and that, when thus coales-

---

\* Father Febre says, that the passive voice, in the language of Chili, is formed by substituting for the termination of the active (in the first person of the present indicative) *gen*, which he asserts to be the substantive verb *sum, es*; and, in another place, that the same termination *gen*, meaning *existence*, added to an adjective, makes the noun substantive of abstract qualities, (corresponding to the English termination *ness*.) This makes an exception, as to the passive voice, for that language. But the adjectives, substantives, and even proper names are, in the Chilian, as in our Indian languages, converted into intransitive verbs and conjugated without the aid of *gen*, or of any other analogous auxiliary verb.

cing, the adjective invariably becomes a verb: *eniage*, 'hand'; *ostwi*, 'little'; *eniastwi*, 'a little hand'; *wageniastwi*, 'my hand is little'; *saniastwi*, 'thy hand is little'; *honiastwi*, 'his hand is little.'

It will be perceived that, in this instance, the conjugation can be carried through all the tenses and moods, but only in the third person; the variations of *hand* and *hands*, and of *my*, *thy*, *his*, *our*, belonging properly, the first to the noun and the other to the pronoun.

The notions of time belong properly to the action and not to the object, to the verb and not to the nouns. Yet we find, contrary to the universal usage amongst our own languages, inflections, in those of the Indians, of nouns and adjectives denoting time, both in the past and future tenses. Mr. Schoolcraft has given instances of it in the Chippeway, where the termination, *bun*, added to a noun proper, indicates that the person has ceased to exist. But the most numerous examples, applying both to adjectives and to substantives, are found in Father Maynard's Notes on the Micmac. It may be, that this peculiarity is due to the verbal form, so easily assumed by nouns of every description.

This process of conversion is reciprocal. Verbs, in almost all the Indian languages, may by a small varied inflexion be converted into nouns. Both verbs and adjectives become substantives in the Chippeway, by adding to them the termination *win*. The same result is obtained in the Delaware by the termination *gan*, and in the language of Chili by that of *gen*. This termination appears, in the three languages, to be principally used for the purpose of forming abstract nouns expressive of qualities. Thus are derived, in the Chilian, *cumegen*, 'goodness,' from *cume*, 'good'; in the Delaware, *wulissowagan*, 'prettiness,' from *wulisso*, 'pretty'; in the Chippeway, *minwaidumowin*, 'happiness,' from *minwaindum*, 'he (is) happy.'

### *Of Pronouns.*

Nouns substantive are often and the verbs are always embodied, the first with the possessive, the other with the personal pronouns, so as to form in each case respectively but a single word. And this union of the verb includes the pronoun not only in its nominative case, or as agent or subject of the

action, but also in its objective case, or as object of the action. Thus the various sentences "He loves me," "I love thee," &c., are always expressed by a single word. This feature is found universally in every American language, from Greenland to Cape Horn, which has been investigated.

John Eliot accordingly commences his Grammar with an examination of the pronoun; "because of the common and general use of the pronoun to be affixed with both nouns and verbs and other parts of speech, and that in the formation of them; therefore, that is the first part of speech to be handled." But although the principle is the same in all the Indian languages, it has been applied in a different manner in almost every one of them. Referring for further details to the Appendix, we will give here only some general notions on that part of speech.

In almost all the Indian languages, there is an intimate connexion between the separate personal pronouns, and the personal or possessive connected with the verb or the noun. An exception is found in the Cherokee, where the pronouns of the first and second person, when used in an absolute sense, in answer for instance to a question, (Who has done it? *I*.) differ from those united with the verb; but these are the same with the possessive united with the noun.

In conformity with what has already been said of the dual and plurals, the inflections which designate the number affect particularly, and in some languages exclusively, the pronouns; varying, for the dual and plural and for their subdivisions, according to the nature of each dialect. The only exceptions are found in the third person, for which there is no personal pronoun in the Choctaw, and no distinction between the singular and plural in some other languages. In the Sioux also, the general termination *pee*, designates alone the plural in many instances; and the plural sign *te*, prefixed, performs the same office in the Cherokee with respect to the objective case of the pronoun.

In the Eskimau and in the language of Chili, the personal pronouns are affixed to the verb, and the same rule applies, in the Eskimau, to the possessive pronoun connected with the noun. The possessive and also the personal pronoun, both in its nominative and objective case, are prefixed to the noun and to the verb respectively, in the Choctaw, the Sioux, the Cherokee, and apparently the Iroquois. In the Muskhojee, the per-

sonal pronoun in the nominative case is affixed, and in the objective case is prefixed to the verb. In the Choctaw the objective case is always clearly, and in the Muskogee and Sioux generally, distinguished by its inflection from the nominative. Its position is also always determined in the Choctaw and in the Eskimau.

In the Algonkin-Lenape languages, the two plurals of the pronouns are, as in others, distinguished from the singular and from each other by inflections; the nominative of the personal pronoun connected with the verb is not distinguished from the objective case by its position; and the particles or inflections by which that object is effected, as well as the terminating inflections which denote the two plurals, both in the possessive and the personal pronouns, are separated from the characteristics which distinguish the several persons. These characteristics are prefixed, and the other inflections are affixed, to the verb or to the noun. Both are very similar in the several languages of that family.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

	<i>Separate.</i>	<i>Verbal.</i>	<i>Posses.</i>		<i>Separate.</i>	<i>Verbal.</i>	<i>Possessive.</i>
<i>I,</i>	nenn,	noo,	n ;	<i>we,</i>	neenawun, kena-	noo—umun,	nu—anon,
<i>thou,</i>	ken,	koo,	k ;	<i>ye,</i>	kenaau, [wun,*	koo—umumwoo,	k—anoo,
<i>he,</i>	noh, nagum,	oo,	w ;	<i>they,</i>	nahoh, nagau,	umwog,	w—anoo.

## DELAWARE.

<i>I,</i>	ni,	n'	<i>we,</i>	niluna, kiluna,*	n'—neen,	n'—ena, una,
<i>thou,</i>	ki,	k'	<i>you,</i>	kiluwa,	k'—himo,	k'—owa, uwa,
<i>he,</i>	neka, nekema,	w'	<i>they,</i>	nekamawa,	w'—ewo, wak,	w—wawall.

Although Mr. Schoolcraft was, in his lectures on the Chipeway, treating specially of the noun and not of the pronoun, the examples he has given of their combination are the most satisfactory that can be selected in reference to the various languages of that family. The exclusive or special plural is that which excludes the person spoken to. The inclusive or indefinite includes that person; and although it has, for that reason, the same characteristic (*k*) as the second person, they are distinguished from each other by a different termination. It appears that the syllable *oom*, which is susceptible of the variations *âm*, *aim*, *im*, *eem*, *ôm*, and which Mr. Schoolcraft considers as the distinctive sign of the possessive pronoun; is

\* *Kenawun*, *kiluna*, indefinite, or inclusive pronoun of first person.



occasionally dispensed with; but, whether at the option of the speaker, or according to some fixed rule, is not explained.

	Moz, a moose.	Os, a father.	Os-ug, fathers.
<i>my,</i>	ni moz-oom,	nos,	nos-ug,
<i>thy,</i>	ki moz-oom,	kos,	kos-ug,
<i>our,</i> (excl.)	ni moz-oominan,	nos-inan,	nos-inan-ig,
<i>our,</i> (incl.)	ki moz-oominan,	kos-inan,	kos-inan-ig,
<i>your,</i>	ki moz-oomiwu,	kos-iwa,	kos-iwa-g,
<i>his,</i>	o moz-oomun,	os-un,	os-un,
<i>their,</i>	o moz-oomiwan,	os-iwan,	os-iwan.

It is obvious, that the termination *ug*, or *ig*, which designates the plural of the *noun*, is the only inflection of that part of speech, and that all the other variations are the inflections of the pronoun and not of the noun. It could hardly at first have been otherwise in the formation of languages.

When we say, 'my house,' 'thy house,' 'his house,' 'our house,' &c., the object which we designate by the name, *house*, remains unchanged; and the variations refer only to the person, or to the number of persons, who own the house. The same observation applies to the combinations of the verb with the pronoun. The variations of number or of person (first, second, or third), either as agent, or as object of the action, belong also in reality to the pronoun and not to the verb. This is at once seen in those languages where the amalgamation has not taken place, or has been but partially adopted. When, in English, we say, 'my house,' 'our house,' or, 'I love,' 'we love,' it is evident that *our* and *we*, are the plural of *my* and *I*; no one will presume to say that they are inflections respectively of the noun *house*, and of the verb *love*.

In those languages where, from reasons or accidental causes unknown to us, the principle of combination has been adopted, it would seem, that an amalgamation of the entire pronoun with the noun or verb, so as to concentrate both in one single word, must have been the first process, at least so far as relates to the first and second persons of the pronoun. An abbreviation of the pronoun would afterwards be substituted. The last process must have been the substitution of an arbitrary letter, or syllable, in which there was no longer any trace of affinity with the original pronoun.

It might indeed be supposed, that, inasmuch as such nouns as *father* are relative and have no real existence without their correlative, and as the verbs, such as *love*, are also independent

of the subject and of the object of love, a pure abstraction; the expressions *my father*, *thy father*, *I love thee*, &c., must have preceded the invention of the verbs, nouns, and pronouns, in their respective insulated forms. This might be true of pure relative nouns, such as, *father*; and we find some reasons for thinking that it was so, in Father Brebeuf's letter and in the manner in which Mr. Heckewelder answered Mr. Du Ponceau's inquiry on that point. The question might be doubtful with respect to some verbs. But it seems that distinct words, designating the first and second persons of the pronoun must have been amongst the first which were wanted and therefore invented by man. At first, proper names alone would be used. Adam and Eve did not stand in need of pronouns. Children, who begin to speak, generally designate themselves at first by the names given to them, and only after a while substitute the pronoun *I*. But, as it became impossible to designate every individual by a distinct proper name, the great convenience, if not the absolute necessity, of words designating the person speaking and that spoken to, must have soon become apparent, and have produced the invention of such words, which, when used in the singular number, have also the great advantage of precision. And we may here take notice of one of the distinguishing general features of the Indian languages, and such a one as we might have expected to find in them.

It must have been the primary object of every language to designate with precision every object and every action, and every modification of which every object or action was susceptible. Specific names would naturally precede generic terms; and, if the Indian languages are often deficient in these, they abound in distinct names for every particular species of tree, for every variety of age, sex, or peculiarity, in certain species of animals, and in degrees of consanguinity, and generally for those subdivisions of the same genus, which in our languages are distinguished by attributes which qualify the generic term. Thus, instead of designating the several species of oak by the names of white oak, black oak, swamp oak, &c., the Indians have a distinct name for every species, and, in many languages, no generic term, embracing all the species of oak.\* And

---

\* There are some exceptions; and even these show the gradual progress of language. *Uppĕ*, in Choctaw, means *trunk* or *stalk*, and is often used, in compound words, for *tree*. An acorn is *nussĕ*; all oaks bear acorns; *Nussuppĕ* (the acorn tree) is the Choctaw word for *the oak*.

instead of discriminating brothers and sisters, uncles and aunts, &c., by the attributes 'elder,' 'younger,' 'paternal,' 'maternal,' &c., they have also distinct names, which have no affinity with those expressive of those qualifications, for 'elder brother,' 'younger brother,' 'paternal uncle,' 'maternal uncle,' &c. In the same manner, when passing, in the pronouns of the two first persons, from the singular to the plural, instead of designating this by a general, indefinite expression, the Indians have all resorted to a dual, or to a specific definite plural; and, in some languages, they have carefully distinguished the several species of dual, and given distinct names to each species, in the Cherokee and Iroquois, for instance, to *thou and I*, *you two*, &c. The apparent confusion in the third person, the want of a word for it in some languages, and its occasional omission in others, may be traced to the same cause; not to a want of precision, but to the tendency to avoid whatever was not definite and precise. The pronoun of that person is in its nature vague and indefinite, a relative, the proper use of which depends on the structure of the sentence and the skill of the speaker or writer. If, in the Choctaw language, *tokchē* equally means, 'to tie,' 'he ties,' 'he ties him,' and 'tie him'; and if *okla tokchē* means both 'he ties them' and 'they tie him,' it is because, in fact, the pronouns *he*, *him*, *they*, *them*, are not to be found in the language. The proper names of the persons, whether subject or object of the action, are used instead of a vague pronoun, 'John ties Peter,' instead of 'he ties him.' And when at last the necessity of a general plural expression was on certain occasions felt, the word *okla*, which means 'a multitude of men,' 'a people,' 'a nation,' was adopted as a substitute for the pronoun which was wanted. The third person singular of the verb is accordingly, in several Indian languages, its root, or simplest form.

In many languages of the other continent, the process by which the pronoun was incorporated with the verb has reached its last stage. Thus, in the Latin, where it has not been adopted with respect either to the possessive or to the objective case of the personal pronoun, but only in the combination of the nominative case of that pronoun with the verb, there does not remain the slightest trace of affinity between the terminations *s* and *t*, which, in the active voice of all the verbs, are the signs of the second and third person singular respectively, and the separable pronouns of those two persons. Those

and other similar terminations, in their present shape, appear and are considered as inflections of the verb. It is quite otherwise in the Indian languages. In all of them, whether in the combination of the possessive pronoun with the noun, or in both the simple and compound conjugations, the separable pronoun and its inflections, though generally in an abbreviated form, are still visible ; and the possessive pronoun in one case, and the personal pronoun in the other, are almost always nearly identical. There are undoubtedly some exceptions, such as the first personal singular in the Choctaw, and the plural termination of the second person in the Delaware ; and the division of the pronoun into two parts, in the Algonkin-Lenape languages, has rendered the affinity less immediately obvious. But there is no language, or dialect, in which there are not still evident traces of the original-pronouns, and of which it may not be asserted, that in all the combinations alluded to, the inflections of number and person are those of the pronoun, and neither of the noun or verb. There is accordingly but little difficulty in the declensions, if they may be so called, of the noun and possessive pronoun combined, or in the simple conjugations which involve with the verb only the subject of the action, or nominative case of the pronoun, provided the variations of which the pronoun is susceptible be previously understood.

It has been already mentioned that, in the Sioux language, the plural sign *pee* is applicable to every part of speech ; and that, in the Cherokee, the corresponding sign *te* is used for the purpose of designating the plural of the objective case of the personal pronouns. In several of the languages, such as the Algonkin-Lenape, the plural is formed by adding a termination to the singular of the pronoun. There are some in which that plural, especially in the first and second person, is not an inflection, but a distinct word having no affinity with the singular. We find the same feature in many European languages : *ego, nos ; tu, vos ; I, we ; thou, you ; &c.*

#### *Transitions.*

The complex compound conjugations consist in the amalgamation of the verb with the pronoun, both in its nominative case, or as agent, and in its objective case, or as the object of

the action. As the passing of the action, from the agent to the object in which it terminates, is thus expressed by a single word, the Spanish authors of Indian grammars have designated that species of conjugation by the name of *transition*. It is common to all the Indian languages, which have been investigated. But, although the character is common to all, the principle does not belong exclusively to them. That, which in that respect characterizes them, is the manner in which the principle has been applied, and which, varying greatly in the different languages, has in some of them been the cause of those countless inflections, which at first excited the wonder of European philologists. Every Hebrew student knows that these transitions exist in that language, and in a form so simple, as not to cause him any great embarrassment. They are founded on the same principle as in the Indian languages. Abbreviations of the inseparable pronouns become respectively, pronouns possessive by being added as terminations to the noun, and the objective case of the personal pronoun by being in the same manner added to the verb. Other distinct abbreviations represent the nominative case of the same pronoun; and as, in the compound conjugation, the abbreviated form of the pronoun in the objective case always follows that in the nominative case, and there are also distinctive variations between the singular and the plural of each, the whole process unites precision with simplicity. It differs no otherwise from the conjugation in the English language, so far as pronouns are concerned, than in the collocation of the pronoun, and in the pronunciation in one word instead of three. They say, *lovIthee*, in one word, instead of *I love thee* in three words; and the number of inflections, or combinations of inflections, required for the purpose, is the same with that of the words, which we use in order to attain the same object, (*I, thou, me, thee, we, us, &c.*)

The system is nearly the same in the Choctaw. The following table exhibits the pronouns, personal separable in the first column; united with verbs in the nominative case in the second; possessive united with the nouns designating the parts of the body, and used also (as in Hebrew) as the objective case, when united with verbs.



	Separable.		Inseparable.		
			Personal nominative.	Personal objective.	
<i>I,</i>	unno,		ille,	sa, su,	<i>me,</i>
<i>thou,</i>	chishno,		ish, is,	che, chi,	<i>thee,</i>
<i>he,</i>	"		"		<i>him,</i>
<i>we, (exc. pl.)</i>	ipishno,		e,	pe, pi,	<i>us,</i>
<i>we, (indef. pl.)</i>	huppishno,		eho,	huppi,	<i>us,</i>
<i>you,</i>	huchishno,		hush, hus,	huchi,	<i>you,</i>
<i>they,</i>	"		okla,	okla,	<i>them.</i>

All the pronouns, in the nominative case, precede the verb, excepting *illē*, which is a termination. The rule applies equally to the simple conjugation and to the transitions. All the pronouns, in the objective case, are placed, in the transitions, immediately before the verb and therefore immediately after the pronoun in the nominative, with the exception always of the first person in the nominative, which is still a termination: *tokch*, 'he ties'; *tokchill*, 'I tie'; *ishtokch*, 'thou tiest,' &c. *Suttokch*, 'he ties me'; *chittokchill*, 'I tie thee'; *ishpittokch*, 'thou tiest us'; (exc. pl.), &c.

Those two rules constitute the whole system of the Choctaw transitions in the paradigm of the verb *tokchē*, 'to tie,' and equally apply to all the tenses and moods, passive voice, and negative form; all these being each distinguished by the insertion of its characteristic particle, but without interfering, otherwise than by their respective collocation, with the pronominal inflections. It is not stated, whether there is more than one conjugation; and, where this depends solely on the inflections of the pronoun, it may well happen that, with some anomalies, there is but one. Such is found to be the case in the language of Chili, where the system of transitions, though somewhat more complex, is governed by uniform rules and attains a precision nearly equal to that of the Choctaw. The pronouns, in the nominative and objective cases, are placed in the Choctaw in the same order as in the French. The English say, *thou tiest me*; the French and the Choctaw, *tu me lies*, *thou me tiest*.

A peculiarity in that language deserves notice. An inserted particle, *ull*, denotes the passive voice; but the personal pronoun, instead of being as in our languages in the nominative, is in the Choctaw in the objective case. Instead of saying, 'I (am) tied,' '*tullokchille*,' they say, 'me (am) tied,' '*suttullokche*.' The same rule applies to all those intransitive verbs which we

express by 'I am,' and to all those, such as, 'I sleep,' '*sunnusse*'; 'I die,' '*sulle*'; in which the person appears to be the object of the action, rather than an active agent.\* But when action is implied in the intransitive verb, the pronoun is put in the nominative case: 'I sing,' '*taloalle*'; 'I came,' '*mintilletokok*.'

If we now turn to the numerous paradigms of the simple conjugations in Zeisberger's Grammar of the Delaware, amongst those anomalies, which compelled him to class the verb into eight conjugations, and many other even in verbs of the same conjugation, we find upon the whole a great uniformity and regularity, and also sufficient evidence that the inflections belong to the pronoun. The initial characteristics of the three persons, which precede the root of the verb, are generally preserved in the indicative mood; the principal exception being found in the frequent omission of the characteristic of the third person, sometimes accompanied by a change of the termination into *u*, or *eu*. The plural termination of the first person *eneen*, or *hena*, is derived from that of the possessive pronoun *ena*, or of the separable *una*, both allied to the Chippeway termination *inan*. The plural termination of the third person, *wak*, or *ewo*, is likewise derived from that of the separable pronoun *wa*. But the connexion between the separable pronoun and its termination when united with the verb is lost in the second person plural, which in the last case ends always in *himo*, or *humo*. Referring to the tables in the Appendix for details, the following examples of the present tense of the indicative will be sufficient to explain what precedes.

	<i>To eat.</i>	<i>To be happy.</i>	<i>To hear.</i>
Infinitive.	mitzin,	wulamulsin,	pendamen,
<i>I,</i>	n'mitzi,	n'ulamalsi,	n'pendamen,
<i>thou,</i>	k'mitzi,	k'ulamalsi,	k'pendamen,
<i>he,</i>	mitzu,	w'ulamalsi,	pendamen,
<i>we,</i>	n'mitzi neen,	n'ulamalsi hena,	n'pendamen een,
<i>ye,</i>	k'mitzi himo,	k'ulamalsi himo,	k'pendam ohumo,
<i>they,</i>	mitzo wak,	w'ulamalso wak,	pendamen ewo.

But, if we pass to the transitions, we find a multitude of varied terminations, for which it appears extremely difficult to find any general rules. There is however one respecting the initial characteristic, which at once strikes the eye. It has

\* The same principle is found in the passive form of Latin deponent (neuter) verbs.

been seen, that, in the Hebrew, in our modern languages, and in the Choctaw, the pronoun, in the nominative, is always distinguished from that in the objective case by their relative position. That fundamental and essential principle has been entirely neglected in the Delaware, and probably in all the other languages of the same family. Instead of this, it will be found, that a preference has been given, in the first place, to the second, and in the next to the first person. When the second person occurs in the transition, whether in the nominative, or in the objective case, we find its characteristic *k* placed before the verb. Whenever the transition is from the first to the third, or from the third to the first person, the *n*, characteristic of the first is, in like manner, placed before the verb, whether that person be the agent, or the object of the action. When the action passes from one third to another third person, its initial characteristic *w* is placed before the verb, or is omitted altogether.\* It thence follows, that the termination, placed after the root of the verb, must perform the various offices of distinguishing, which of the two pronouns is in the nominative or objective case; whether both, or, if only one, which of the two is in the plural; and, whenever the second is one of the persons concerned, that is to say in sixteen cases out of twenty-eight, whether the other pronoun is of the first or third person. To distinguish with precision all the various combinations, resulting from those several offices, requires twenty-eight distinct, different terminations for each tense. The Choctaw requires but twelve, in the same manner as, in English, twelve words are sufficient in order to effect the same purpose; and these run regularly through all the tenses and moods of the verb, whilst numerous discrepancies are found in that respect in the Delaware.

The comparative simplicity of the Hebrew, of the English, and of the Choctaw rests on three principles, neither of which has been observed in the Delaware; the regular relative position assigned to the pronouns in the nominative and objective case; the distinct designation by which the objective is always distinguished from the nominative case of the pronoun; and a

---

\* There are a few anomalies, some only in appearance, such as *k'milgneen*, 'they give to us,' in which the *k* designates the indefinite plural. But the rule may be considered as general. No exception to it is found in the paradigms of the Massachusetts conjugations in Eliot's Grammar.

similar distinction for the plural. And the Delaware conjugations are rendered still more complex, by the transfer of the plural termination of the pronoun, which has separated it from its initial characteristic.

This example shows how men, though setting off upon the same principle, may, by pursuing different routes in its application, impress a different character on their respective languages. Yet the preference given by the Algonkin nations to the second and, next to it, to the first person, though unfortunate in its consequences was very natural. In an oral language, there are always two parties, the person who speaks, and the person or persons whom he addresses. When speaking of the person spoken to in connexion either with himself or with a third person, the person thus addressed is generally the most prominent in the mind of the speaker; and on that account, or from courtesy, he will be named first, without regarding the distinction, whether he be the agent or the object of the action. The Delaware may very naturally have said, 'thee I love,' 'thee he has insulted.' When speaking of himself in connexion with a third person, he becomes the most important party.

May we not also trace to an exclusively oral language, combined with the habit of public speaking, the special plural of the Indians, as well as the different manner in which it appears to be applied? According to Mr. Heckewelder, the Delawares deliberating in council, on a question of war or peace, say 'we,' meaning all of us here present, our nation, as contradistinguished from any other body of men, or nation. According to Mr. Schoolcraft, the Chippeway, addressing another person in behalf of himself and some others, will, in saying, 'we,' exclude the person to whom he speaks. And thus gradually the special plural may have been modified, and have received a different signification in the two languages.

Notwithstanding the great number of varied inflections in the transitions of the Algonkin conjugations, and the numerous apparent anomalies in the several tenses and moods, they still exhibit a degree of uniformity which had its origin in analogy; and there can be no doubt that the rules of their formation, though not very obvious, may be deduced from the paradigms collected by Zeisberger and others. It is not intended to intimate, that the language was formed according to any such preconceived rules; but only that analogy has necessarily produced that uniformity, which renders it practicable to deduce the rules from the language.

The characteristic letter or syllable which precedes the root of the verb designates only, when it is *k'*, that one of the two pronouns is that of the second person; when it is *n'*, that the two pronouns are those of the first and third person; when it is *w'*, that both pronouns are in the third person. The termination must show, in the first case, to what person the other pronoun belongs; in every case, which of the two pronouns is in the objective case; and that termination must also designate, when required, whether one, or both, and, if only one, which of the two pronouns is in the plural number. If therefore, we select those transitions only, in which the action passes from a person in the singular number to another person also in the singular, the termination, not being encumbered with the varied signs of the plural or plurals, must only show in what manner the pronoun, when unknown, is discovered, and which of the two is in the objective case.

There are in each tense seven such transitions from the singular to the singular; and the table, in the Appendix, of the transitions of the present of the indicative of the five Delaware paradigms given by Zeisberger, shows, that when the action passes from the first or second person singular to the third person singular, a particle, viz. *a*, *an*, *awa*, or *awan* is inserted immediately after the root, or unchangeable part of the verb; when the action passes from the third singular to the first or second person singular, the particle inserted is *uk*, *ag*, or *agun*; when the action passes from the first to the second person singular, the particle is *ell* or *olen*; and when the action passes from the second to the first person singular, the particle is *i*, or *awi*. The four characteristic letters used in the four cases respectively are *a*, or *wa*; *g*, or *k*; *l*; and *i*; the other sounds or letters *aw*, *un*, &c., varying according to euphony or usage. Those letters or sounds stand respectively; *a* or *wa* for *him*; *g*, *k* for *he*; *l* for *I*; *i* for *me*. And combined with the initial characteristics *n'*, *k'*, *w'*, (the last often omitted,) they are sufficient to designate with precision the two pronouns involved in each transition, and which of them is in the objective case. When the action passes from one third to another third person singular, although this might be deemed the simplest case, it presents in our five paradigms more varieties than any other case. They are as follows.



<i>Second pers. sing. Imperative.</i>		<i>Third pers. sing. transition to third pers. sing.</i>	
<i>Give thou,</i>	mil,	<i>he gives him,</i>	milan, milgol, milawal,
<i>bring " "</i>	petol,	<i>he brings him,</i>	petagol,
<i>hear " "</i>	penda,	<i>he hears him,</i>	pendagol,
<i>love " "</i>	ahoa!,	<i>he loves him,</i>	w'dahoalawal!,
<i>say " "</i>	ill,	<i>he says to him,</i>	w'dell gun, w'dell ak.

A single example will be sufficient to illustrate the rules for the six other transitions :

{ <i>I give him,</i>	n'mil an, ( <i>him,</i> )
{ <i>thou givest him,</i>	k'mil an, ( <i>him,</i> )
{ <i>he gives me,</i>	n'mil uk, ( <i>he,</i> )
{ <i>he gives thee,</i>	k'mil uk, ( <i>he,</i> )
<i>I give thee,</i>	k'mil ell, ( <i>I,</i> )
<i>thou givest me,</i>	k'mil i, ( <i>me.</i> )

With each of these seven transitions from the singular to the singular, three others are connected, in which either one or the other, or both the pronouns are in the plural number. Thus we have, *I give him, I give them, They give me, They give us*; and so on for each of the seven primitive transitions. The terminations added to these primitive transitions designate therefore, whether one or both the pronouns are in the plural, and, if only one, which of the two. This is effected with great precision for every case, so as to prevent any confusion or ambiguity; but it is difficult to reduce those final terminations to uniform rules. The following table, subject to several exceptions and anomalies, shows the most usual or general of those plural terminations.

	<i>me.</i>	<i>thee.</i>	<i>him.</i>	<i>us.</i>	<i>you.</i>	<i>them.</i>
<i>I, thou,</i>	{ e, ewo, himo,	e, ewo, neen,	ewo, ewo, neen,	na, neen, hena,	wa, himo, himo, hena,	wak, wak, wawak, wawak, wawuna.
<i>they,</i>						
<i>ye,</i>						
<i>we,</i>						

These plural terminations, which are nearly the same with those of the simple conjugation, combined with the four inserted particles *a, g, l, i*, and with the three initial characteristics *n, k, w*, constitute the twenty-eight personal forms or transitions of the present of the indicative; and united, though not with perfect uniformity, with the particles *ep, up, and tsh*, which are the respective signs of the preterite and future tenses, they also form the twenty-eight transitions of each of those tenses

in the indicative mood. But an entirely different plan has prevailed in the subjunctive, or, as Eliot calls it, the suppositive mood, which is rendered into English by *if* or *when*. The initial characteristics of the pronouns are, in that mood, almost always omitted; and the following examples of the simple conjugation and of the seven primitive transitions (from a singular to another singular person) will show how their place is supplied:

<i>If I love,</i> <i>if thou lovest,</i> <i>if he loves,</i> <i>if we love,</i> <i>if ye love,</i> <i>if they love,</i>	<i>Ahoalan, to love.</i> ahoal ak, ahoal anne, ahoal at, ahoal enk, ahoal eque, ahoal akhtit,	<i>Iuen, to say.</i> luey a, luey anne, lue te, luey enk, luey ek, lue khtit.
<i>If, when,</i> <i>he loves him,</i> <i>I love him,</i> <i>thou lovest him,</i> <i>he loves me,</i> <i>he loves thee,</i> <i>I love thee,</i> <i>thou lovest me,</i>	ahoal ate, ahoal akhte, k'd ahoal anne, ahoal ite, ahoal quonne, ahoal anne, ahoal iyanne,	l ate, l ake, l at panne, l ite, l uk quonne, lel lanne, l iyanne.

We find, in the two last transitions, the characteristics, *l*, and *i*, indicative of the action passing from the first to the second and from the second to the first person, but little affinity with the original pronouns. The plural terminations are diversified, *enk, enkwē, yenk, yenkwē, ank, awank, kwek, kwenk, akhtite*, &c., apparently with the general plural sign, but with difficulty reducible to general rules. The simple conjugation and the transitions in the singular number are very uniform, but dissimilar, in reference to the pronouns, from those of the indicative mood. Eliot's paradigm shows, that his suppositive mood was, in the Massachusetts language, of the same character with the Delaware subjunctive.

It appears extraordinary, that there should be, for the moods of the same verb, two systems of conjugation so entirely differing from each other; that for the indicative founded on the inflections of the common pronouns, and that of the subjunctive without any apparent affinity with these, or with the indicative.

In the subjunctive of our languages, the verb is governed by a separate conjunction, which requires a varied inflection in the

verb. But the corresponding Indian mood embraces the conjunction, and concentrates in a single word the verb, the pronoun or pronouns, and the conjunction expressed or implied. Zeisberger says, that conditional conjunctions, such as *ane* and *appane* are thus compounded with the verb in that mood. And in his list of particles, we find *ank*, 'when'; *eet*, 'perhaps.' The coincidence of those with the terminations *ak*, *ank*, *anne*, *it*, *at*, of the singular subjunctive, might therefore sustain the conjecture, that that mood was derived from the incorporation of those conjunctions with the verb. But Mr. Schoolcraft has pointed out certain possessive pronouns, differing from those in general use, to which I think it more probable that we can trace the formation of the subjunctive mood.

He designates these possessive pronouns as "pronominal suffixes," which supply the ordinary distinctions of persons, and are used in connexion with a certain class of substantives descriptive of country and place; and he has given the following example of the union of the possessive pronoun of that species with the word *home*, which may be compared with the subjunctive of the simple Delaware conjugation.

	<i>Chippeway.</i>		<i>Delaware.</i>	
<i>My home,</i>	ainda-yan,		lue-ya,	<i>If I say,</i>
<i>thy " "</i>	ainda-yun,		lue-yanne,	" <i>thou</i> "
<i>his " "</i>	ainda-d,		lue-te,	" <i>he</i> "
<i>our " "</i>	ainda-yang, } ainda-yung, }		lue-yenk,	" <i>we</i> "
<i>our " "</i>	ainda-yaig,		lue-yek,	" <i>ye</i> "
<i>your " "</i>	ainda-wad,		lue-ktit,	" <i>they</i> "
<i>their " "</i>				

Allowing for the usual permutations of *g* and *k*, and of *d* and *t*, and considering that the comparison is instituted between two distinct languages though of the same family, the similarity of the pronominal Chippeway suffixes, with the Delaware subjunctive terminations, is so striking, that it is hardly possible that they should not have had a common origin. But why there were two distinct sets of pronouns, and why this was adopted for the subjunctive mood, remains unexplained.

Amongst the various forms of which the verbs are susceptible, some are mentioned by Zeisberger, which are conjugated, in the indicative, in a manner analogous to the conjugation of the subjunctive; such as,

<i>To be or stay there,</i>	achpin,	achpiya;		<i>where I stay,</i>	epia,	epianne, &c.
<i>to go,</i>	aan,	aane;		<i>where I go,</i>	eyaya,	eyayanne, &c.
<i>to be, or do, so,</i>	lissin,	lissiye:		<i>as I am, or do,</i>	elsiya,	elsiyanne, &c.
<i>to say,</i>	luen,	lueya;		<i>what, (or as) I say,</i>	eloweya,	eloweyanne, &c.

But those forms are generally conjugated in all their moods as the primitive verb. This appears to be the case with the causative form, generally designated by the conversion of the infinitive termination into *owen*, or *sheen*; and also in verbs compounded with prepositions. Thus the verb *witeen*, from *aan* 'to go,' and *witschi*, 'with,' (Zeisberger, page 246) is conjugated as its primitive.

N'da,		K'da,		eu,		N'daneen, &c.
N'witt,		K'witt,		witt eu,		N'witteneen, &c.

The Muskogee pronouns in the singular and in the first person plural of the objective case have a great affinity with those of the Choctaw. In the specimens of its transitions, it will be seen that a common termination *ist* occurs throughout, the meaning of which is not understood. The objective case of the pronoun precedes, and the nominative case follows, the root of the verb. In other respects they would not materially differ from the Choctaw system, were it not that the Muskogee appears to want distinctive signs for the dual and plural of the second person. They substitute for those, with some varied terminations, the words *hokolyn*, from *hokko*, which means 'two,' and *homulgyon* from *omulga*, 'a multitude.' When those two substitutes occur together, and are united with the verb and its two pronouns, they appear rather as three distinct words, than as a concentrated transition.

The Cherokee transitions are less complex than those of the Delaware, though not so simple as in the Choctaw. The two pronouns in the nominative and objective case always precede the root of the verb, leaving no doubt that the inflections of person, number, and case are those of the pronoun, and not at all of the verb. The usual sign of the plural, *te*, prefixed, uniformly indicates that the objective pronoun is in the plural. The pronouns themselves are principally the same as those used as possessive, either entire or in an abbreviated form. *St* is the sign of the dual, and *ts* of the plural for both, particularly in the second person. *Awgin* designates 'him' and 'me,' and *gin*, 'thee' and 'me,' both in the transitions, and as possessive when united to the noun. The signs *ski*, *skiya*, *skina*, distinguish the second person in the nominative case, according to certain fixed rules. But that, by which the pronouns, in the nominative and in the objective case, are distinguished from each other, is not apparent in every instance.

In the conjugations of the language of Chili, the pronouns in an abbreviated form are always placed after the verb. They vary according to the mood, and, both in the indicative and subjunctive, amount to nine, distinguishing the singular, dual, and plural in each person, as follows :

		First Person.	Second Person.	Third Person.
Indicative.	Singular,	n,	ymi,	y,
	Dual,	yu,	ymu,	ygu,
	Plural,	in	ymn,	ygn.

All these pronouns are preserved in the transitions, and occupy the same place as in the simple conjugation; and the other pronoun is expressed by the insertion of a particle, which is not derived from any pronoun. Those transitions are, in conformity to the genius of the language, classed according to the person in whom the action terminates. The first transition is that in which the action passes from any one person to the same *individual* person, and consists therefore of the reflected verbs. The second transition is that, in which the action passes from any of the three persons to the third person. The last four transitions are those, in which the action terminates in the first, or in the second person.

In the first two transitions, the nine pronouns contained in the table represent the nominative case; and the pronoun in the objective case is represented by the insertion of *u* for the first transition, and of *vi* for the second, immediately before the termination expressive of the acting pronoun. In the second transition, the terminations *egu*, and *egn* are respectively added at the end of the word, when the pronoun in the third person, in whom the action terminates, is either in the dual or plural number.

In the last four transitions, the nine pronouns contained in the table represent the objective case, or that in which the action terminates. The particles *e* and *mo*, the first always placed before one of the said nine pronouns, the second sometimes substituted for it, in other cases added as a termination of one of the nine pronouns, represent the pronoun in the nominative case. But the various positions of these two particles, *e* and *mo*, are not sufficient to distinguish in every case, whether that pronoun is in the singular or plural, or indeed to which person it belongs; and when the action passes from the first person, in the dual or plural number, to the second person, it



is necessary, in order to prevent confusion, to resort to a form derived from the first transition.

Some cases remain, in which the same form expresses two or more distinct combinations of the pronouns in the nominative and objective case; such as *I-thee* and *he-thee*; *thou-me* and *he-me*. The confusion falls generally as usual on the third person; and, upon the whole, the plan is inferior to that of the Choctaw, both in simplicity and precision.

The simple conjugations and the transitions of the Sioux consist altogether of combinations of the pronouns with the root of the verb. They always precede it; but the general sign of the plural, *pee*, is affixed as a final termination whenever either of the pronouns or both are in the plural number. It seems, that in the two first persons singular the objective case of the pronoun is distinguished from the nominative, and the plural from the singular in the nominative of the first and in the objective case of the third person: 'I,' *wah*; 'me,' *mah*; 'we,' 'us,' *oan*; 'them,' *weetsha*; \* 'thou,' 'ye,' *eeah*; 'thee,' 'you,' *nee*. The plan is extremely simple; but the apparent want of distinction between the nominative and objective case, in the plural of the first, and in the plural and singular of the second person, produces ambiguity in some instances. Thus *nee tsheeng pee* means equally, 'he loves you,' 'they love thee,' 'they love you'; and *oan tsheeng pee*, 'we love thee,' 'we love you,' 'he loves us.' We have however too few paradigms of the verbs of the Sioux languages to form a definitive opinion.

The information respecting the Iroquois languages is still more incomplete. We have no paradigms of their transitions. It appears from those of the simple conjugation of the Onondago, given by Zeisberger, that it is founded, both in the active and passive voice, on pronominal inflections, that the pronouns are always prefixed to the root of the verb, and that there are several varieties of pronouns for each person. This last feature is peculiar to the languages of that family; and it seems probable, that the selection depends on the termination of the verb.

Egede's Grammar of the Eskimau, which is said to give full information respecting that language, could not be obtained; and the paradigm inserted in his account of Greenland is only the present indicative of the verb "I wash." It is, however,

---

\* Apparently abbreviated from *weetshashtah*, 'man.'

certain, that the separate pronouns are distinguished from each other in the three numbers; that they are used in an abbreviated form in the simple conjugations and in the transitions; and that they are always affixed to the verb, as well as to the noun. The objective case of the personal is said to be identic with the possessive pronoun.

	Separate.	Abbreviations.			wash self, selves, wash him.	
		Nomin.	Object., Possess.			
<i>I,</i>	unga,	nga,	ga, ra,	<i>I,</i>	ermikp unga,	ermikp ara,
<i>we two,</i>	uaguk,	guk,	puk, guk, vuk,	<i>we two,</i>	“ oguk,	“ arpuk,
<i>we,</i>	uagut,	gut,	put, gut, vut,	<i>we,</i>	“ ogut,	“ arput,
<i>thou,</i>	iblit,	tit,	et, it, t,	<i>thou,</i>	“ otit,	“ et,
<i>ye two</i>	iliptik,	tik,	tik, sik,	<i>ye two,</i>	“ otik,	“ artik,
<i>ye,</i>	ilipse,	se,	tik, se,	<i>ye,</i>	“ ose,	“ arse,
<i>he,</i>	una,	k, au,	ne, me, a, at,	<i>he,</i>	“ ok,	“ a,
<i>they,</i>	okko,	uk, ut,	aet,	<i>they,</i>	“ ut,	“ aek.

It appears from all the information we possess on the subject, that all the inflections of person and number, which are found in the Indian languages, connected with the verb, are in reality, as from their nature they might be expected to be in primitive oral inflected languages, the inflections of the pronoun and not of the verb. If, considering the limits of this essay, more space has been allowed to this branch of the subject than may appear necessary, it is because it was the only one, respecting which the materials within our reach were sufficiently ample, for the double purpose of reducing it to rules, and of instituting a comparison between the several modes which nations, that had adopted the same principle, have pursued in the application of that principle. It must also be recollected, that nine tenths, at least, of the several hundred inflections found in the conjugations of some verbs are due to those pronominal combinations; and that, as a preliminary process, they must be fully understood, and the noun and verb be disentangled from those accessaries, before any progress can be made in the acquirement of the language. It is undoubtedly for that reason, that both Eliot and Zeisberger have allotted so great a portion of their Grammars to that object.

There can be no doubt that, even in those languages which appear most complex, the power of analogy in the human mind is such as necessarily to produce a sufficient degree of uniformity for common purposes; and that accordingly all those

multiplied inflections are in every instance reducible to rules, subject to more or less exceptions, according as the plan has in its progress become more or less complex. Many of these exceptions may be traced to euphony, and become also subject to the rules which it imposes. One instance will be given, which will explain the apparent anomalies of some of the Delaware inflections.

It seems that the surd or vocal sound belonging to the abbreviated pronouns, and which Mr. Heckewelder expresses by an apostrophe, (*n'*, *k'*, *w'*, or *ně*, *kě*, *wě*; in Chippeway *ni*, *ki*, *o*,) is essential to them, or cannot coalesce with a vowel. Whenever therefore a vowel is the first letter of a verb, the expletive consonant *d* is inserted between the characteristic of the pronoun and the verb. The rule does not apply to the sound *u* or *o*, but extends to the cases where the verb begins with *l*.

*Achpin*, 'to stay'; *n'dappi*, *k'dappi*, 'I stay,' 'thou stayest.'

*Aan*, 'to go'; *n'da*, *k'da*, &c. *Ahoalan*, 'to love'; *n'dahoala*, *k'dahoala*, &c.

*Lissin*, 'to be so'; *n'delsi*, &c. *Lauchsin* 'to live'; *n'delauchsin*, &c.

*Luen*, 'to say'; *n'dellowe*, &c.

But *wulamalsi* makes *n'ulamalsi*, and *walhaton* makes *n'ohalton*. The rule appears to extend to the Chippeway. *Ishkodai*, 'fire'; *ni dishkdaim*, 'my fire'; *ossin*, 'a stone'; *nin dossineen*, 'my stone'; *ais*, 'a shell'; *nin daisim*, 'my shell.' (Schoolcraft.) But there are exceptions; *os*, 'father'; *nos*, 'my father,' and not *ni dos*.

---

The various means adopted by the several Indian nations in order to effect the same object, that of concentrating in a single word the two pronouns and the verb, and the different character which the first steps once taken have impressed on the several languages respectively, seem to deserve attention, inasmuch as the investigation may throw some light on the history of the formation of languages. It must be admitted that the cumbersome apparatus, with which, in order to attain such a simple object, some of those languages have been overwhelmed, is calculated to excite wonder rather than admiration. Their system of transitions, with its multiplied inflections, appears to me to be the most defective part of the Algonkin-Lenape lan-

guages. Their merit seems to consist in their innumerable analogical and most convenient derivatives;\* in the happy manner by which, through the insertion of a single particle, not only tenses and our common moods, but almost every possible modification of the action, is specially expressed; in the flexibility of the several parts of speech, which has enabled the Indian to enrich his language with so many graphic compound words, and, almost at will, to create new words, perfectly intelligible to the hearer, for every new object or idea. Thus, for instance, the horse is called by the Chippeaws, *paibaizhikogazhi*, and by the Delawares, *nanayanges*. Both are compound significative words; the literal meaning of the first being "the animal with united (solid) hoofs," of the second, "the animal that carries on its back."

The several Indian languages seem to differ considerably in their respective powers and methods of compounding words. Our information on that subject is as yet very imperfect for most of them. But the designation of the several modifications of which the action is susceptible, by particles prefixed, affixed, or inserted, either significative, arbitrary, or the meaning of which is lost, appears to be a feature common to all. An illustration of this principle is found in the formation of the tenses, of the passive voice, and of the negative form in various languages. It will be seen by the tables in the Appendix, that the number of tenses is not the same in all. All indeed have a present, a preterite, and a future; but we find in some a pluperfect, in others a double future, sometimes referring to the nearer or greater length of time which may elapse before the action takes place, sometimes implying respectively, as in the English *will* and *shall*, a voluntary act or an obligation. In some of the languages, that of Chili for instance, there are tenses, the nice shades of distinction between which may not be precisely understood by foreigners. A peculiarity common to many is the use of the present for the preterite. In the Cherokee, a form derived from the participle has been resorted to, in order to designate with precision the present ("I tying" meaning "I do now tie"). In the language of Chili, an insulated tense, unconnected with the regular general system, has been added for the same purpose.

---

\* See, for instance, the derivatives of *wilik*, 'good,' in Du Ponceau's and Heckewelder's Correspondence, pp. 394, 395.

Referring to the Grammatical Notices and to the Tables for further details, we insert here only the most general modes of formation.

The preterite is formed in the Delaware by affixing the termination *eep*, *neep*, *ep*, or *hump*; in the Eskimau by affixing *sok*; in the Choctaw by affixing *kamo* or *chamo*, *tuk* or *tok*, each of which terminations designates a different modification; in the Onondago, by affixing *ochre*, *ochqua*, *nha*, &c., varying according to the termination of the verb; in the Sioux by affixing *kong*; in the language of Chili, by inserting *vu*.

The future is formed in the Delaware by affixing *tsh*, or *ktsh*; in the Eskimau, by affixing *savok*; in the Choctaw, by affixing *chi*, or *he*, according as the action is to take place immediately or at some remote time; in the Onondago, by prefixing *n*, or *na*, the first if the act is voluntary, the last if ordered; in the Sioux, by affixing *ktay*; in Chilian by inserting *a*.

The negative form is made in the Delaware, by affixing *wi* and prefixing generally the negative *atta*, or *matta*; in the Choctaw, by prefixing *ik*, or *ok*; in the Eskimau, by inserting *ngil*; in the Muskhogee, by affixing *kost* (?); in the Cherokee, by prefixing *tlah*; in the Chilian, by inserting *la*.

The passive voice is formed in the Delaware, by affixing *xi*, or *gussi*; in the Cherokee, by affixing *gung*; in the language of Chili, by inserting *ge*; in the Choctaw by inserting *ull* in the body of the verb and using the objective case of the pronoun ('thou tiest,' *ish tokch*; 'thou art tied,' *chit tull okch*); in the Muskhogee, by affixing *agy*, and also using the objective case of the pronoun. In the Onondago, a distinct set of pronouns is substituted in the passive voice. Active *wagerio*, *wascherio*, *waharrie*, 'I, thou, he, beat,' passive; *junkerio*, *jetserio*, *thuvarrie*, 'I am, thou art, he is beaten.'

The collocation of those particles is in each language respectively very uniform, and may be understood by the following examples.

*neg. pr. verb. pas. neg. plur. pret.*

Delaware, *Matta n'penda xi-wi-wun-ap*; 'we were not heard.'

*verb. neg. pas. pret. pl. pron.*

Chili, *Elu-la-ge-vu-ygn*; 'we were not given.'

The indicative and subjunctive moods alone have as yet been mentioned. Of the imperative, it may be sufficient here



to observe that its second person singular is, in many of the Indian languages, if not the root, at least one of the most simple forms of the verb. In others the present of the indicative, and sometimes the infinitive, are amongst the simplest forms. In the Choctaw, *tokchē*, which is the root of the verb "to tie," is equally the third person singular of the present of the indicative, the second person singular of the imperative, and the infinitive. But if the third person of the present indicative appears in that and several other languages in a more simple form than the two first persons of the same tense, it is only owing to the common omission of the pronoun of that third person. The infinitive seems to be less used in the Indian languages than in those of Europe; but they are, in general, rich in participles, present, past, and future, active and passive, and susceptible of modifications which render their use extensively applicable and of great utility.

If we take the word "mood," in its most extensive sense, it will be found that their number far exceeds, in the Indian that in the European languages. By affixing, prefixing, or inserting an arbitrary particle, or rather an abbreviated noun, verb, adverb, preposition, or conjunction, the verb is made to designate the specific modification of the action. Whether that new form should be considered as a mood of the same verb, or as a derivative, is not very important. But it is a matter of regret, that our information on that most interesting view of the Indian languages, and generally respecting all that relates to derivative and compounded words, though sufficient to show the extent to which those several processes are carried, is too limited to enable us to exhibit the subject in a condensed and perspicuous form. The appended grammatical notices embrace the substance of what could be collected in that respect; and reference must be had for further details, particularly concerning the Algonkin-Lenape languages, to the works of the American philologist, from whose writings extracts have been made. A very incomplete and desultory enumeration may convey some idea of those multiplied forms.

Nouns have varied terminations indicative of resemblance, locality, analogy, fellowship; diminutive and derogative forms, and others implying beauty or increase; annexed inseparable prepositions, meaning, *in, under, on, at, about, near, towards, through, &c.* And substantives coalesce with adjectives so as to express in a single word almost every qualification of which any object is susceptible.

Independent of causative, reflected, and reciprocal verbal forms, the following are found :

‘ He is used, continues, intends, is about, is finishing, is at liberty to do a certain act.’ ‘ I see far off, near, one I know,’ &c. ‘ It rains hard, by showers, steadily.’ ‘ The action is, has been, or may be done, ill, better, in a different manner, quickly, attentively, rarely, probably, jointly, repeatedly,’ &c., with various other modifications expressive of doubt, likeness, denial, various degrees of assertion, &c.\*

Words compounded by the union of two verbs, or of a verb and a noun, are in general use. The manner of compounding words, by uniting in a single one the abbreviations, sometimes a single syllable, or even letter, of five, six or more words, belongs equally to the Eskimau and to the Algonkin, and extends, if not universally, probably to many other languages. Some examples will be found in the Grammatical Notices, and amongst these, one of seventeen syllables in the Cherokee: *wi-ni-taw-ti-ge-gi-na-li-skaw-lung-ta-naw-ne-li-ti-se-sti*; which means, “ They will by that time have nearly finished granting (favors) from a distance to thee and me.” But this and similar words are not in common use, and only show to what extent words may be compounded in conformity with the analogies of the language, so as to be perfectly intelligible to an Indian.

That flexibility which has brought into common use the conversion of every part of speech into another, and which has produced that multiplicity of forms, of derivatives, and of compounded words, and that perpetual concentration of complex ideas in a single word, is not only the most striking common characteristic of the Indian languages, but must, it is believed, have in some respects imparted to them greater powers than seem to belong to those of Europe. Some most respectable philologists have indeed seen in those features the proof of an ancient civilization. Even the learned authors of

---

\* Even in the Cheppeyan language (Athapasca), of which we have only the specimen of two pages in Mr. Du Ponceau’s collection, we find the following forms: *bainaysnie*, ‘ I have some recollection ’; *bainasnie*, ‘ I recollect ’; *subainasnie*, ‘ I do remember.’ When I asked Mr. Boudinot to give me, amongst other verbal forms, the Cherokee word for *we two are tied*, he immediately answered; there are two forms. ‘ We two are tied together,’ *agehnahtung*; ‘ we are both tied, but each separately,’ *dagenahtung*. (Note, that Mr. Boudinot uses *d*, where Mr. Worcester writes *t*.)

the Mithridates wonder "how such people can have performed such philological work, which can only have been the result of profound and abstract meditations." And it is remarkable that this assertion is in part founded on the multiplied inflections of the transitions of the verb. "What is most extraordinary is the prodigious number of forms expressing the accusative case of pronouns governed by the verb."\*

May not our early impressions have associated in our minds a general, though vague notion of inflected languages, with an advanced state of civilization? The admiration felt for the great writers of Rome and Greece, the real superiority in many respects of their languages over those of Modern Europe, the origin of these in the invasions of barbarous nations and in the ages of darkness which followed, have given us the habit of associating inflected languages with knowledge and civilization, and those destitute of those forms with barbarism and ignorance. Yet the undeniable merits of the classical languages will be found, on reflection, to consist in their perfection, in the manner in which the principle has been applied, rather than the principle itself.

It is not certainly in the multiplied inflections used in the transitions of some of the Indian languages that we find proofs of profound meditations. All those inflections, however varied, never contain, independent of the root of the verb, any other ideas, but those of two pronouns, respectively agent and object of the action. In whatever manner the ideas contained in '*I love thee,*' '*you love me,*' may be expressed, the accessaries embraced by the word or words are never any thing more or less than '*I thee,*' '*you me,*' &c. The fact that, although the object in view was, in every known Indian language without exception, to concentrate in a single word those pronouns with the verb, yet the means used for that purpose are not the same in any two of them, shows that none of them was the result of philosophical researches and preconcerted design. And, in those which abound most in inflections of that description, nothing more has been done, in that respect, than to effect, by a most complex process and with a cumbersome and unnecessary machinery, that which, in almost every other language, has been as well if not better performed through the most simple means. Those transitions, in their complexness and in the still

---

\* Mithridates. — Esquimaux.

visible amalgamation of the abbreviated pronouns with the verb, bear in fact the impress of primitive and unpolished languages.

But even taking into consideration the most happy features of the Indian languages, the fact, that they were universally spoken by the American nations, whether uncivilized or semi-civilized, does not, so long as we remain unacquainted with their origin, justify either of the assertions, that men in the early stages of society necessarily must, or, on the contrary, that they could not have adopted such forms. The only natural and legitimate inference, since the fact is indubitable, is, that compounded and inflected words were one of the modes which naturally might be, and which in this instance was actually, resorted to by man, in order to communicate his ideas in an intelligible manner.

There are strong reasons for believing, not only that this, though perhaps nowhere carried to the same extent as in America, was a process early adopted by other nations; but that all that belongs to the grammar, to the character, and to the general structure of every ancient language must have had its origin in the earliest stages of the social state, and before man could have attained a high degree of knowledge, and made any great progress in all that constitutes civilization. It must indeed be admitted, that those reasons cannot, from the nature of the question, amount to absolute proof; and the following remarks are intended only as suggesting subjects of inquiry.

There are in Africa, in Asia, in Polynesia, numerous nations, of whose languages we know little more than what may be inferred from meagre vocabularies. An investigation of their grammatical forms would throw great light on the subject. In the mean while, it deserves notice, that the great philologist Vater could point out but two languages that, on account of the multiplicity of their forms, had a character, if not similar, at least analogous to those of America. These were the Congo and the Basque. The first is spoken by a barbarous nation of Africa. The other is now universally admitted to be a remarkable relic of a most ancient and primitive language, formed in the most early ages of the world.\*

---

\* Without admitting the antediluvian pretensions of Cantabrian writers, it is at least obvious that the Basque was the ancient Iberian, the Aquitanian of Cæsar, and that, before the progress of the Teutonic, Phœnician, and Latin nations, Western Europe was occupied in the north by the Celts, in the south by the Iberians. Their respective languages

The modern languages of Western Europe were formed at a time when writing had long been in general use; and it is difficult, if not impossible, to discriminate between what might be considered as the natural progress of language, and the effect produced by the mixture of distinct idioms, and by the respective influence of each. It is obviously impossible to have any evidence of the oral languages of antiquity, before they had been reduced to writing. We cannot ascend higher than the most ancient works which have been preserved.

We cannot assert positively; that the Pentateuch and the Iliad were the first books ever written in Hebrew and in Greek. But there is the highest degree of probability that both of them were composed and written at an epoch so near the time when writing had been first introduced amongst the Jews and the Greeks respectively, that that invention could, as yet, have produced but little effect on the language of either. We may therefore justly consider those two works, as the nearest possible approximation to the oral language of those two people prior to the discovery of the alphabet. If we find in them the same grammatical forms, and substantially the same structure of language, as in the following ages of Hebraic and Greek literature, it affords a strong presumption, that those forms and all that essentially constitutes the character of a language had their origin prior to the invention of writing, and in a very early stage of society.

Those two languages belong to two distinct and dissimilar families. In one of them we find a system of compounded words and of inflections, much less extensive than that of the American nations, but, I suspect, much more perfect, and as superior, as the Greeks even of the Homeric times, were to our Indians. In the Hebrew, we discover, besides several other correspondences,\* transitions, or the combination in a single word of the two pronouns with the verb. Thus, although the application of the principles differs widely in the several languages, still the modes adopted were originally of a similar character. This may be adduced as an additional proof of the common origin of mankind. It proves, at all events, that the

---

prove the more ancient origin of the Iberians, or, to speak more correctly, that they had separated from the common stock and migrated westwardly at an earlier date.

\* The use, for instance, of the present tense for the preterite, and the resort to the participle for designating the present time with precision.



same modes of communicating ideas were in use among very different nations, at the most early times of which we have any knowledge.

A further proof of the very early use of inflected forms is afforded by the fact, that we find them amongst all those nations, from the Ganges to the Atlantic ocean, which indubitably belong to the same stock. They must therefore have had their origin at an epoch prior to the separation of those nations, and which ascends much higher than the invention of writing, or historical times.

Though not belonging to our Indians, it may be observed, that the invention of the substantive verb, and its use as an auxiliary verb, are also of great antiquity, since they are common to all those nations. The infinitive *to be*, in the Latin and Slavonian, and, as I am informed, in the Sanscrit, means also *to eat*. In the Delaware language, the verb *pommauchsin* means 'to walk' and 'to live.'

Amongst those nations, there are two, which do not appear to have ever been subdued, since they occupied their present seats, and whose languages, apparently unmixed with any other, must have been the result of their own natural progress. The transient dominion of Charlemagne and of his successors was that of a Teutonic, over another kindred tribe; and the Latin did not penetrate beyond the Rhine. The variations along the eastern boundary of Germany, which divides it from the Slavonic nations, have only affected particular districts in its immediate vicinity. The heart of Germany and the adjacent kindred northern nations have been and remained Teutonic, without any foreign mixture, from the most remote antiquity to the present time. Although the Tartars had imposed a tribute on Russia, they made no permanent settlement in the country; and their language cannot have had any marked influence on the Slavonian.

The Gothic translation of the Gospels by Ulphilas was made in the fourth century, and is the oldest specimen we have of the Teutonic languages. I have seen no other specimen of it than "Our Lord's Prayer," in the "Mithridates"; but, if I am correctly informed, the language of that translation exhibits the same, and even a greater variety of inflections and of grammatical forms, than are found in the modern German, or in any of the other languages of the same family. The grammars of the ancient Anglo-Saxon corroborate the fact. All that relates to

the German must be left to the great philologists of that nation. But, generally speaking, it would seem, as if the progress of language, in a more advanced state of civilization, had a tendency towards lessening inflections and rendering it more analytical.\*

The introduction of the alphabet in Russia and her conversion to Christianity belong to the tenth century; and we have translations of the Bible and of various church books, written in the ancient Slavonic, almost immediately after those events took place. They are therefore the true representation of that which till then had been only an oral language. There again we find inflections, less numerous perhaps in the verbs, but more so in the cases of nouns, of which there are seven.

These various facts, combined, sustain the opinion, that the grammatical forms, found in polished languages, had their origin at a very remote epoch, and that, having impressed a distinct character upon each, they have not been materially changed by the introduction of writing and by the progress of knowledge. Although the early formation of languages must ever remain a subject of conjecture, we may yet say, that there is nothing inconsistent in that opinion with the manner in which we may rationally suppose that they were formed. After names had been given to visible objects and to most common actions, the foundation being laid in nouns and verbs, the necessity, for an intelligible communication of ideas, of expressing the relations existing between things and actions and the modifications to which they were subject, must have given rise to some expedient for that purpose. Since there were several means for effecting the object, the modes resorted to by different people have varied. But whatever mode might be adopted, the necessity for such expedient was the same in the earliest stages of society as at this day. Grammatical forms were as necessary, for the most common purposes, and when the knowledge of man and his sphere of ideas were most limited, as in the most

---

\* In the English, in the French and other languages of Latin origin, the substitution of the principle of position, for that of inflection, is sufficiently visible. The most general and conspicuous effect has been the annihilation, save only in the pronouns, of the inflections denoting the case of the noun governed by the verb. As these have been preserved in the Slavonian languages, it may be inferred, that the mixture of idioms has had a great share in producing that effect. May not the changes in the modern Greek be partly ascribed to the influence of the Italian?

advanced state of civilization. Notwithstanding the great progress of knowledge during the last four centuries, though new words have been introduced and others become obsolete, though languages have been polished and adorned, the grammatical forms remain the same as they were four hundred years ago, and have been found sufficient for the communication of new ideas and of all that may have been added to our knowledge. The most uneducated men, those who in Europe speak only *patois* of the written language, deviate from the established rules of grammar, but use grammatical forms to the same extent as the best masters of the language. It seems indeed obvious, that the tendency of a written language is to give it stability, rather than to change its nature; and I believe that experience shows, that the changes have everywhere applied much more to words than to grammar.

Although we cannot say, why or how it happened, that the relations existing between things and actions, the qualifications of the things, and the modifications of the action were expressed, in some languages by new words invented for that special purpose, and in others by changes of termination, insertion of abbreviated particles or words compounded in different ways, we easily understand how the principle, which was once introduced, must gradually have extended its influence over the whole language. Analogy is sufficient to explain all the phenomena, after an innovation suggested by necessity had been generally adopted; and there is no difficulty in conceiving, how a peculiar character was thus impressed on each language from its earliest formation.

Every innovation in language must, in the first instance, have been the work of some one individual, to whom it was suggested by the necessity of finding some new means in order to render himself intelligible. After names, till then inflexible, had been given to visible objects, and to the generality of actions, the man, who first thought of expressing the qualification or modification of either, or their relation, by a mere variation in the word, was an inventor. It is very natural to suppose, that that variation consisted at first in blending together two words, either entire or abbreviated. But, whatever the process may have been, the inventors were not philosophers. The invention was suggested by necessity, adopted on account of its convenience and utility, and extended to similar cases by analogy. The inventors, and those who adopted the innovation, were equally

unaware of its ultimate and extensive consequences, and of the character it would impress on the whole language. It may be doubted, whether the utmost sagacity of men could have anticipated those effects, and whether a more perfect language could, even at this day, be formed by the most learned philologists, than any that has been produced by what may be called natural causes.

If, from all the facts which we can collect, it appears that inflections and compounded words have been, amongst the natural and common means, resorted to in the most ancient times by other nations, for an intelligible and full communication of their ideas ; if it is also natural to suppose, that, where not regulated by writing and eminent writers, the application of the principle may have become superabundant and excessive ; there is not, it seems, sufficient reason for inferring from the peculiar character of the languages of the Indians, that they had their origin in a state of society, differing from that which was found to exist in North America, when discovered by the Europeans.











905 A512T v.2 1836 441072

Duke University Libraries



D01129201G