PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE LINGUISTIC CLASSIFICATION OF ALGONQUIAN TRIBES

BY

TRUMAN MICHELSON

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	225
Notes on pronunciation	226
Algonquian linguistic groups	229
Blackfoot (Siksika)	229
Cheyenne	232
Arapaho	234
Eastern-Central	237
Central subtype	237
Cree-Montagnais	238
Cree	238
Montagnais	247
Menominee	249
Sauk, and close linguistic cognates	252
Shawnee	256
Sauk, Fox, and Kickapoo	258
Ojibwa, and close linguistic cognates	261
Ojibwa, Potawatomi, Ottawa, and Algonkin	262
Peoria	270
Natick	272
Delaware	275
Eastern subtype	280
Summary	289
Appendices	290
1. Comparative table of the Cree (Moose and Fort Totten), Menominee, Fox, Shawnee, Passamaquoddy, Abnaki, Ojibwa, Algonkin, Peoria, Natick, and Delaware independent mode, present tense	290
2. Comparative table of the Cree (Moose and East Main), Fox, Shawnee, Ojibwa, Algonkin, Peoria, Natick, and Delaware subjunctive mode, present tense	290
3. Comparative table of the Fox, Shawnee, Micmac, and Peoria conjunctive mode	290

ILLUSTRATION

PLATE 103. Map showing the distribution and interrelation of the Algonquian dialects ..... at end

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE LINGUISTIC CLASSIFICATION OF ALGONQUIAN TRIBES

By Truman Michelson

INTRODUCTION

In order to determine the linguistic classification of the Algonquian tribes, the writer visited in the season of 1910 the Piegan of Montana, the Northern Cheyenne of Montana, the Northern Arapaho of Wyoming, the Menominee of Wisconsin, and the Micmac of Restigouche, P. Q., Canada. Later in the year the Ojibwa of White Earth (Minnesota) sent a delegation to Washington, and the occasion was utilized to procure a few grammatical notes from them. During the season of 1911 he visited the Fox of Iowa, and the Sauk, Kickapoo, and Shawnee of Oklahoma. In the winter of 1911–12 he spent a few weeks at the nonreservation school at Carlisle, Pa., and there had an opportunity to obtain some notes on Northern Arapaho, the Cree of Fort Totten (listed officially as Turtle Mountain Chippewa), Menominee, Sauk, Ojibwa, Ottawa, Potawatomi, and Abnaki. The results of the field work of 1911 and 1912 could be incorporated only in the proof-sheets of the present paper. For some Algonquian languages dependence has also been placed on the unpublished material of the Bureau, some manuscripts of the late Dr. William Jones (for Kickapoo) and of Mr. W. Mechling (for Malecite), and the published material. Prof. A. L. Kroeber very kindly furnished some of his Arapaho texts to supplement those of the writer. Prof. J. Dyneley Prince generously offered the use of his collection of consonantic clusters in Passamaquoddy and Abnaki. Owing to unforeseen circumstances these can not be published here, but they have been of assistance in determining the general character of Eastern Algonquian, and his helpfulness is appreciated. Thanks are due also to Dr. Robert H. Lowie, of the American Museum of Natural History, for the privilege of using some Northern Blackfoot texts. Dr. Edward Sapir, of the Geological Survey of Canada, with characteristic liberality, placed his field-notes on Cree, Montagnais, Abnaki, Malecite, and Delaware (collected in the season of 1911) at the

20903°—28 ETH—12——15

writer's disposal; but they were received too late to make possible the insertion of extracts, except in the proof-sheets.

While it is too early to publish in detail the results of the writer's investigations (this applies especially to Blackfoot, Cheyenne, and Arapaho), still in view of the purely geographic classification by Mooney and Thomas in the Handbook of American Indians,[1] C. C. Uhlenbeck in *Anthropos* (III, 773–799, 1908), and F. N. Finck in his Die Sprachstämme des Erdekreises (Leipzig, 1909), a preliminary linguistic report may be acceptable.

The linguistic classification of Algonquian tribes in the present paper is based essentially on the occurrence of consonantic clusters and a few other phonetic phenomena, and on the pronominal forms of the verb.

It will be seen that the various tables introduced throughout this paper to illustrate grammatic forms are rather uneven, because in many cases the writer has not ventured to abstract the personal terminations proper from the examples given in the authorities. It will be remembered that none of the older and only a few of the recent writers take into account instrumental particles; the result (combined with inaccurate phonetics) has been that often it is too hazardous to venture an opinion as to what the form actually was. Likewise the exclusive and inclusive first persons plural are frequently not distinguished, and here the writer has had to follow his own judgment.

In conclusion, his thanks are due his colleague, Dr. John R. Swanton, for assistance in preparing the accompanying map (pl. 103).

Notes on Pronunciation

It is believed that the reader will have little trouble in understanding the symbols employed in this paper, as much the same system is employed as in the Handbook of American Indian Languages (Bulletin 40, B. A. E.). However, the following notes may prove useful.

Piegan:

$\dot{x}$ is post-palatal, approximately between German *ch* in *ich* and *ch* in *bach*.

x is post-velar.

There are no sonant stops.

Cheyenne:

$\underline{w}$ is a voiceless semivowel.

v is bilabial.

x is the surd velar spirant.

c is the surd alveolar spirant.

$\check{e}$ and $\check{o}$ (employed by R. Petter) represent whispered vowels.

Arapaho:

x is the surd velar spirant.

x^{ι} is the same, weakly articulated.

[1] *Bull. 30, Bur. Amer. Ethnol.*

tc is an intermediate with predominating surd quality, approximately between English *ch* in *church* and *j* in *judge*.

b is a pure sonant.

g is post-palatal; its sonancy is not so marked as that of *b*.

The surd stops are ordinarily unaspirated; when aspirated, the aspiration is indicated by (').

$\hat{e}$ is very open.

θ is a surd spirant articulated between the tongue and upper teeth, nearly on the flesh.

(') indicates aspiration.

$^{\varepsilon}$ indicates the glottal stop.

^{n} indicates the nasality of the vowel.

CREE (FORT TOTTEN):

$\imath$ has the sound of obscure *i*.

$\bar{c}$ is long and close.

(') indicates an aspiration; it is approximately a weak *x*; $'t$ is apt to be heard as θt.

Pure surd stops are easily distinguished, but the corresponding sonants are stronger than those of English; final *g* gives almost the impression of aspirated *k* (*k*').

CREE (RUPERT'S HOUSE: see p. 247):

ts· is alveolar, between *ts* and *tc*.

ϱ is close and short.

CREE (MOOSE):

$\bar{a}$ has the sound of long close $\bar{e}$.

MONTAGNAIS (from Doctor Sapir's notes):

ts· is palatized, between *ts* and *tc*.

$\hat{e}$ is long and very open.

MENOMINEE:

$\breve{e}$ $\breve{\imath}$ and $\breve{o}$ $\breve{u}$ are nearly indistinguishable.

g is very strong; finally it gives nearly the same impression as aspirated *k* (*k*').

FOX, SAUK, AND KICKAPOO:

For Fox, see Handbook of American Indian Languages (*Bull. 40, B. A. E.*), pt. 1, pp. 741–745.

Here it may be remarked that in all three dialects there are no true sonants; they are much stronger than in English.

$'k$, $'t$, and $'p$ among the younger people are but feebly to be distinguished from *k*, *t*, and *p*, respectively.

tc in Fox and Sauk is intermediate, nearly between *ch* in *chill* and *j* in *judge;* in Kickapoo it is a pure tenuis, approaching *ts*.

The final vowels are spoken much more faintly by the younger generation than by those advanced in years.

The writer believes Doctor Jones's *hw* is simply voiceless *w* (*w̥*).

SHAWNEE:

Surd and sonant are difficult to distinguish.

θ is the surd interdental spirant.

$\breve{e}$ $\breve{\imath}$ and $\breve{o}$ $\breve{u}$ are extremely difficult to distinguish.

The final vowels are somewhat more easily heard than in Fox, Sauk, and Kickapoo.

tc among the older generation is pronounced as such; among the younger people it resembles more nearly *ts* in sound.

^{n} and ^{m} are consonants that are hardly sounded—merely indicated—in words by themselves; a vowel preceding renders them full sounding.

(') indicates an arrest.

OJIBWA (of Baraga):

$\acute{a}$ has the sound of $\bar{a}$.

ALGONKIN (of Lemoine):

$\hat{a}$ has the sound of $\bar{a}$.

OTTAWA:

$\bar{i}$ is long and close.

Surd and sonant (especially when final) are difficult to distinguish; final g has nearly the same sound as k'.

η is post-palatal.

DELAWARE:

n', etc. of Zeisberger indicates n followed by an obscure vowel.

ABNAKI (of Sapir):

$ɪ$ has the sound of i.

$o̧$ has the sound of close o.

$ą$ has the sound of nasalized obscure $ʌ$.

MALECITE (of Sapir):

$\hat{e}$ is long and very open.

p has the sound of p weakly articulated.

PASSAMAQUODDY:

$\hat{u}$ has the sound of *oo* in *good*.

$m̥$ is syllabic.

MICMAC:

g has the sound of velar g; apt to be heard as r.

$l̥$ and $n̥$ are syllabic.

ALGONQUIAN LINGUISTIC GROUPS

The Algonquian tribes linguistically fall into four major divisions, namely: Blackfoot, Cheyenne, Arapaho, and Eastern-Central. Each division is discussed in the following pages under the appropriate head.

Blackfoot (Siksika)

This division includes the Piegan, Bloods, and Blackfeet proper. According to Wissler,[1] the linguistic differences among the tribes are mainly in the choice of words and idioms. The same authority states that the Northern Blackfeet seem to differ more from the Piegan than the latter do from the Bloods. The present writer can describe only the language of the Piegan of Montana from personal observation. It is characterized by an abundance of harsh consonantic clusters and long consonants. The latter occur usually between vowels but may occur in clusters. The first of the following tables shows all the clusters[2] of two consonants found in one of the writer's longer texts; the second, all the clusters of three consonants in the same text:

Initial consonant	Second member of cluster						
	q	*k*	*t*	*p*	*s*	*ts*	*tc*
k					*ks*		
t							*ttc*
m					*ms*		
s		*sk*	*st*			*sts*	*stc*
ts		*tsk*		*tsp*	*tss*		
x̣		*x̣k*	*x̣t*	*x̣p*	*x̣s*		*x̣tc*
x	*xq*		*xt*	*xp*			*xtc*

[1] Social Life of the Blackfoot Indians, p. 8, New York, 1911.

[2] In this and similar tables some combinations are given which are not clusters in the strictest sense of the word, but they are introduced here for convenience and on account of their importance.

Initial consonant	2d consonant	3d consonant
k	*k*, *s*	*s*, *k*
t	*ts*, *x*	*p*, *t*, *s*
p	*s*	*k*, *s*
n	*s*	*k*
s	*k*, *t*, *s*, *ts*	*k*, *s*, *ts*, *t*, *ts*, *k*, *p*
ts	*x*	*k*
x̣	*k*	*s*
x	*q*	*t*

SUMMARY

Consonants permitted initially: *k*, *t*, *p*, *n*, *s*, *ts*, *x̣*, *x*.
Consonants permitted medially: *q*, *k*, *t*, *s*, *ts*, *x*.
Consonants permitted finally: *k*, *t*, *p*, *s*, *ts*.

It is likely that *ts* and *tc* represent a sound intermediate between these two. The following clusters also were noted in the same text: *xqtt, skks, stspss.*

The following are all the clusters of two consonants found in three texts of Northern Blackfoot taken down by Dr. Robert Lowie:

Initial consonant	Second member of cluster						
	k	*g*	*t*	*p*	*s*	*s*	*m*
q					*qs*		
k					*ks*		
p					*ps*		
s	*sk*		*st*	*sp*		*sts*	
x	*xk*	*xg*	*xt*	*xp*	*xs*	*xts*	*xm*
ts	*tsk*				*tss*		

It is clear that *xg* is due to mishearing.

The following table shows all the clusters of three consonants in the same texts:

Initial consonant	2d consonant	3d consonant
k	*s*	*k*
p	*s*	*k*, *t*, *p*
s	*k*, *ts*	*k*, *s*, *k*
ts	*ts*	*k*
x	*k*, *q*, *p*, *t*	*s*, *t*

The following cluster of four consonants occurs in the same texts: *xkst*.

It will be seen by comparing the tables of such other Algonquian languages as have numerous clusters that such a condition as obtains in Blackfoot (Piegan) is unique. So far as the writer can judge, the clusters are genuine, not pseudo. The origin of most of them is obscure.[1] Some are due to the assibilation of *t* before *i*.[2] It is likely that the cluster *sk* is original, as can be demonstrated for *st* in certain cases. For the latter, note *nestoa*[3] I (chances not to occur in the writer's texts); Cree *nista* I ALSO; and the instrumental *st* in *nitcitᴀnistāwᵃ* I SAID TO HIM (*ni—āwᵃ* I—HIM; stem *ᴀni*) is to be associated with a similar instrumental in Cree.[4]

However, the formation of the verbal compounds is typically Algonquian and most of the personal terminations of the present independent mode are patently Algonquian. The terminations in *-pinnānᵃ* (e. g., *ni—pinnānᵃ* WE [excl.]) are to be associated with Fox *-penᵃ*, Passamaquoddy *-bᴀn*. Similarly, *ki—puwāwa* YE, is to be connected with Fox and Shawnee *-pwᵃ*, Passamaquoddy *-ba*. The form *ki—āwāwᵃ* YE —HIM has an exact equivalent in Cree and Menominee. The forms *ni—āwᵃ*, *ki—āwᵃ* I—HIM, THOU—HIM, respectively, agree with Cree, Fox, Menominee, and Delaware (one form) as opposed to Ojibwa, Algonkin, Shawnee, and Eastern Algonquian.

Forms like *ki—oxpinnānᵃ* WE—THEE, YOU (not in writer's texts; based on Tims; cf. Uhlenbeck, op. cit., p. 8, bottom) certainly sug-

[1] For one or two probable sources besides those given here, see p. 232.

[2] This change has been already noted by C. C. Uhlenbeck, Original Blackfoot Texts, p. 95, Amsterdam, 1911.

[3] J. W. Tims, Grammar and Dictionary of the Blackfoot Language, London, 1889.

[4] J. Horden, Cree Grammar, p. 99, London, 1881.

gest Passamaquoddy *k—lpen*, which might be taken for *k—ulpen*, but as a matter of fact the *u* has nothing to do with the termination; owing to the phonetics of the language if a vowel following *l* is eliminated, thereby causing the *l* to become final or immediately to precede a consonant, the preceding vowel takes an *o* or a *u* tinge (see the discussion of Eastern Algonquian, p. 283). Now is it not possible that there is a similar phenomenon in Piegan and that the termination should really be given as *ki—xpinnān*^{a}, in which the *x* represents a secondary change of original *n*, as does the *l* of the Passamaquoddy form?[1] The same query would apply to certain other forms not dealt with here.

To judge from Tims, the termination for *we*(excl.)—*him* agrees in formation with Cree and Ojibwa. The agreement with the latter is no doubt purely fortuitous.

Forms like *nestoa* (Tims) I show agreement with Cree.

According to the writer's information some demonstrative pronouns have reference to the state of the object designated, that is, whether at rest or in motion; but some informants contradict this. It is a matter that deserves special attention.

Summing up, we may say that though Blackfoot must be classed apart from Eastern-Central Algonquian, it has the closest affinities to Fox, Eastern Algonquian, and Cree.

CHEYENNE

Cheyenne possesses consonantic clusters, though not in so great profusion as Piegan. By consulting the various tables it will be seen that some of the clusters are peculiar to the language. As is mentioned more than once in this paper, the fact that such Algonquian languages as have numerous clusters differ with respect to the types of clusters tends to show that most of these are unoriginal.

The following clusters of two consonants were noted in three of the writer's Cheyenne texts:

Initial consonant	Second member of cluster						
	k	*t*	*n*	*s*	*c*	*ts*	*v*
t	*tk*					*tts*	
n				*ns*	*nc*		
s	*sk*	*st*				*sts*	
c	*ck*	*ct*					*cv*
ts	*tsk*		*tsn*				
x	*xk*	*xt*		*xs*		*xts*	
v				*vs*	*vc*		

[1] Or it may be that the original sound is lost and that the *x* is an accretion, as *x* in *ki—ixpuwāwa* YE—ME (cf. Fox *ke—ipwa*).

The cluster *tsn* so far as noted is a pseudo-cluster, but the others, so far as the writer has been able to analyze them, are genuine. The following clusters of three consonants were noted in the same texts: *nst, xst, mst, nsts, stn,* the last being certainly a false one. The following clusters were noted as occurring finally: *sts, ns, nsts, xs, vs.* A single cluster (*st*) was observed initially, and that but once; hence it is likely an initial vowel was not heard.

The origin of the clusters that apparently are genuine is practically unknown. One case of *xp* seems merely to have developed from *p*, e. g., *woxpi* WHITE (Fox *wâpi*). The clusters *sk* and *st* are probably original (see discussion of Cree, p. 238. Unfortunately the writer has not been able to find corresponding expressions in Cree for such Cheyenne words as possess these clusters).

There are a number of words of patent Algonquian origin. Examples are: *woxpi* WHITE, *mahō'wiw*^{a} WOLF, *nic* TWO, *nive* FOUR, *mataxtu*^{a} TEN, *matama*^{a} OLD WOMAN, *nā* AND, *misi* EAT, *mi* GIVE, *āmī* MOVE.

It should be noted that under unknown conditions Central Algonquian *n* appears as *t* (compare the treatment in Cree, p. 239; but the two languages do not agree wholly in the usage); furthermore, this secondary *t*, as well as original *t*, becomes *ts* before a palatal vowel. Examples are *hitan*^{a} MAN (Fox *ineniw*^{a}), *nitanōwitatsi'm*^{a} LET US GAMBLE TOGETHER (*tsi* = Fox, etc., *tī*). Original *k* under unknown conditions appears as *n*. This, together with the other phonetic changes stated above, renders most of the forms of the independent mode intelligible. Thus, *ni—ts* I—THEE; *ni—tsemĕ* I—YOU; *ni—tsemenŏ* WE(excl.)—THEE; *ni—ĕmenŏ* THOU—US(excl.).[1] It will be noted that the structure for I—YOU, WE (excl.)—THEE agrees with Natick, Algonkin, and Peoria. The terminations for WE (excl. and incl.), intransitive, approximate the Ojibwa type. The termination for YOU (intrans.) is *ni—m*^{a} (Petter *ni—mĕ*), which phonetically approximates Algonkin, Ottawa, and Ojibwa rather than Peoria. (It may here be mentioned that Peoria, Ottawa, and Ojibwa all belong to the same division of the Central Algonquian languages.) The termination for WE(excl.)—HIM (*na—on*, Petter) has a correspondent in Natick and Eastern Algonquian. The terminations with the third person singular animate as subject are obscure. Those with the inanimate plural as objects patently are to be connected with the nominal suffix for the inanimate plural. With the assumption that original intervocalic *g* is lost, some additional forms take on a more Algonquian appearance. So violent a change is paralleled by the apparent change of *-p(ᴀ)m-* to *-m-* and *-p(ᴀ)t-* to *-xt-*.

[1] The last three forms are taken from Rodolphe Petter's Sketch of the Cheyenne Grammar, in *Mem. Amer. Anthr. Ass.*, I, pt. 6, 1907.

Cheyenne possesses a mode that is frequently used in narration as an indicative; it happens that but few of the forms occur in the writer's texts. The third person singular animate, intransitive, ends in *-s;* the third person plural animate, intransitive, in *-wus* (the initial sound is represented by *w* merely for convenience. The writer has been unable to determine its exact value; it is heard now as *v*, now as *w;* the only thing absolutely certain is that it is bilabial); HE—HIM is *-us;* THEY (an.)—HIM *-owus;* to distinguish third persons, the intransitive third person has an obviative *-niwus*. Assuming the phonetic change of *tc* to *s*, it will be seen that the forms resemble the Fox, Shawnee, and Peoria conjunctive. The *ni* of *-niwus* corresponds to the *ni* of Fox *-nitci*, etc.

The termination of the plural inanimate can be derived from the normal Central Algonquian termination by the phonetic laws stated above. At the same time it greatly resembles the Natick and Piegan forms, which apparently can not be derived from this source.

Summing up, we may say that although Cheyenne must be classed as a distinct major branch of Algonquian languages, yet it has close affinities with the Ojibwa division of the Eastern-Central major division; but as consonantic clusters beginning with a nasal and followed by a stop are not permitted, and the clusters *sk* and *st* occur, we must assume rather a more northern origin. If the Moiseyu really are the Monsoni, as James Mooney thinks (*Mem. Anthr. Ass.*, I, 369, 1907), there is historical support for this assumption. The fact that Natick in the ending of the termination of the present independent mode resembles the Ojibwa type probably led Petter (ibid., 447) to consider Cheyenne[1] closer to Natick. The latter does permit consonantic clusters with a nasal as the prior member and a stop as the second member, but it does not agree entirely with Ojibwa in this usage; note especially the present suppositive (subjunctive) mode. But it should be noted that the cluster *st* is not permitted, though *sk* is; and the cluster *st* is a distinct trait of Algonquian languages of northern origin (cf. Eastern Algonquian, Montagnais, Cree, Blackfoot).

ARAPAHO

This division includes Arapaho proper, Gros Ventre (Atsina), two dialects that are on the verge of extinction, and one dialect that at present is either absolutely extinct or is spoken by only very few indi-

[1] According to the writer's present information there are two Sutaio (a tribe that became incorporated with the Cheyenne) who can still speak their own language, namely, White Bull (Ice) of the Northern Cheyenne and Left Hand Bull of the Southern Cheyenne. Unfortunately the former ceased work before any texts could be secured from him, and the writer has heard only recently of the latter's ability to speak his own language. For this reason no accurate idea of the language can be given here. Cheyenne traditions are unanimous, however, in stating that the language was intelligible to the Cheyenne.

viduals. The writer can describe from personal investigation only Arapaho proper; he has been informed by members of this tribe that Gros Ventre is readily understood by them. According to Dr. A. L. Kroeber, the dialect mentioned as possibly absolutely extinct closely resembled Blackfoot; according to information received, the Piegan of Montana say a body of them joined the Arapaho and still speak their own language. This matter requires careful investigation. It is to be hoped that Doctor Kroeber will publish at an early date his comparative vocabularies of the dialects and also those phonetic laws of Arapaho proper that he has discovered and courteously communicated to the writer.

That Arapaho is an Algonquian language is shown by such words as *hīne'n* MAN, *ni^{n}se^{ɛ}e* MY ELDER BROTHER, *no^{nɛ}tâne^{ɛ}* MY DAUGHTER, *nē'sī^{i}* MY GRANDCHILD, *nīs^{i}* TWO, *nāsâ* THREE, *yē^{i}n^{i}* FOUR, *bätätAx* TEN, *bätebi* OLD WOMAN, *netä* MY HEART, *hä·sitä^{ɛa}* IT IS HOT; as well as by the system of the possessive pronouns. Some of the more radical phonetic changes that the author has observed (some of these had been anticipated by Doctor Kroeber) are *tc* becomes *θ*: *-niθ*, Fox *-nitc^{i}*; *p* becomes *θ*: *netc'* WATER, Fox *nep^{i}*, *nētc'* MY ARROW, Fox *nīp^{i}*; *k* becomes *h*: *hi-* THY, Fox *ke-*, *hâw^{a}* NOT, Ojibwa *kāwin;* *p* becomes *g(k)*: *sīsīgâ^{ɛ}* DUCK, Fox *cīcīp^{a};* *w* becomes *n*: *no^{n}ku* RABBIT, Ojibwa *wā'pōs;* *m* becomes *b* (and *w*?): *bätebi* OLD WOMAN, Fox *metemō'^{a}*, *bätätAx* TEN; *skw* becomes *x'*: *wAx'^{a}* bear, Cree *mAskwA*, Fox *ma'kw^{a}*. With the assumption that *y* becomes *n*, and *g+*, a final whispered vowel, becomes ^{ɛ}, a number of verbal pronominal forms grow clearer in formation. (How these changes may distort words almost beyond recognition may be shown by *ni^{x}tcebgâhut'* HE RUNS BY: *ni(x)* is a common verbal prefix (?); *tceb* = Fox *pemi;* *gâhu* = Fox *-pahō-*; *-t'* the pronominal ending.) Doctor Kroeber has already remarked that in nominal forms the inanimate and animate plurals are not distinguished, though they are in verbal forms.[1] The exclusive and inclusive first person plurals are not distinguished in verbal forms, according to information received by the writer, but they certainly are in the possessive pronouns. It is thus seen that Arapaho has become very specialized. In the writer's judgment, no Algonquian language has deviated farther from the normal.

Arapaho is characterized by very weak nasal vowels, which when pronounced rapidly, however, betray scarcely any nasality. The glottal stop is extremely common. There are a number of consonantic clusters, but none of more than two consonants.

[1] See *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, vol. XVIII, p. 5, 1902.

The following table shows all the consonantic clusters found in the writer's Arapaho notes of 1912:

Initial consonant	Arapaho						
	Second member of cluster						
	k	*g*	*t*	*n*		*tc*	*s*
t				*tn*	*t*		
b		*bg*		*bn*			*bs*
s	*sk*		*st*	*sn*	*s*		
x		*xg*	*xt*	*xn*		*xtc*	

It has not been feasible to separate genuine and pseudo clusters. The *x* before *t* and *tc* is exceedingly weak. The clusters in the writer's Arapaho notes of 1910 were of the same general character but contained *θg*, *θd*, *θn*, and *vn* also. No clusters begin or end a word.

It will be seen that the clusters differ fundamentally in character from those of Piegan, Cheyenne, and Eastern Algonquian. This fact points decidedly to the clusters, with certain exceptions, in all of these languages as secondary in nature and not original.

The grammatical analysis is extremely difficult. It is clear that many secondary phonetic changes have taken place in the welded verbal compound, and so have obscured the stems. However, a sufficient number are clear enough to warrant the assertion that the general structure of Arapaho agrees essentially with the general analysis of Algonquian given by Dr. William Jones. The instrumental particles occur in the correct position. Of these the writer has been able to recognize *b* (Fox, etc., *m;* no *m* exists in Arapaho), *n*, *h*, *t*, *w*.

The personal pronouns of the independent mode (with certain apparent exceptions in the negative verb) are suffixed. Here is a very striking difference between Arapaho and normal Algonquian. The fact that the terminations are suffixed (not partially prefixed and partially suffixed) suggests that in origin they are conjunctive endings (compare Micmac), and so far as the writer has been able to find cognates at all for them (in only a decided minority of instances), it has been with the terminations of this mode. Doctor Kroeber, above cited, has noted that Cheyenne *n-* as the prefix of the second person singular, independent mode, apparently corresponds with Arapaho *-n*. This the writer considers improbable, as it would be incredible that in Arapaho a verbal pronoun that in all other Algonquian languages is prefixed, should be suffixed.

There are some formations that seem thoroughly un-Algonquian; e. g. *hêθo^{u}hok* HE, SHE TOLD HIM, HER, THEM (an.), the obviative of which is *hêθē^{i}hok*. This formation is rare; the writer has met it but a few times, always in words of the same, or approximately the same, meaning. The stem of the examples given is *hok; hê* is allied with *hêī;* so far as known at present there are no phonetic equivalents for the incorporated pronominal elements in any other Algonquian language. The prefixing of the termination for HE—HIM, HER, THEM (an.) before the initial stem is thoroughly un-Algonquian, and can not be paralleled elsewhere in these languages. The occurrence of the objective pronominal elements immediately after an initial prefix (?) is another anomaly.

To sum up, Arapaho seems to have become specialized at an early period, but it is likely that when the phonetics of the language are better understood more points in common with Eastern-Central Algonquian will become apparent; and it is possible that borrowing from a non-Algonquian stock may be shown.

Eastern-Central

Although the Eastern branch presents considerable differences from the Central branch—chiefly in the abundance of consonantic clusters—it is perfectly obvious that, compared with Blackfoot, Cheyenne, or Arapaho, it belongs intimately with the Central group. See the discussion of Eastern Algonquian (p. 280).

CENTRAL SUBTYPE

All these dialects are very intimately connected. To say that one dialect is not closely connected with another means merely that the relations between the two are not so close as between one of the dialects and a third. The lexical correspondence is very marked and the correspondence in the grammatical terminations is close. In the independent mode (or indicative mode) the correspondence is not so close as in the subjunctive. The reason for this is probably that in the latter case there is nothing to connect the personal endings with, and that in transitive forms the single pronouns (which are always suffixed) expressing both subject and object are so specialized that it is not possible readily to analyze them into their component elements, whereas the pronominal endings of the independent mode are unquestionably to be associated with the possessive pronouns and therefore vary more. (The Sauk, Fox, and Kickapoo forms in *-pena*, the Shawnee forms in *-pe*, and the Sauk, Fox, Kickapoo, and Shawnee forms in *-pwa* are wholly anomalous.) However, in the case of the independent mode, the analysis is far clearer than in

other modes. The transitive forms are based mainly on the combination of intransitive ones, sometimes part being prefixed and part suffixed, or both parts are suffixed. In certain forms it is necessary to assume certain pronominal elements which are totally unconnected with the possessive or independent pronouns, but which nevertheless reoccur in other modes than the independent.

The writer's classification of the dialects of the Central subtype is based on a study of the present independent and subjunctive modes, together with phonetic and a few other considerations.

It is possible to formulate certain subdivisions of the group. These are—

Cree-Montagnais.

Menominee.

Sauk, Fox, Kickapoo, together with Shawnee, the last-named being somewhat removed from them.

Ojibwa, Potawatomi, Ottawa, Algonkin, with Peoria somewhat removed from them.

Natick.

Delaware.

It may be further noted that Cree-Montagnais, Menominee, Sauk, Fox, Kickapoo, and Shawnee collectively form a unit as compared with any other of the subdivisions.

CREE-MONTAGNAIS

CREE

Cree is characterized by the maintenance of the clusters *sk; sp, st* (*ck, cp, ct*), which in other members of the Central group (with certain limitations noted below) are converted to *'k, 'p, 't*, respectively.[1] It is a special point of contact with Eastern Algonquian that these are likewise retained in them. Examples are Cree *amisk* (Lacombe) BEAVER, Stockbridge (Edwards) *amisque*, Ojibwa *ami'k*, Delaware *amochk*, Fox *ame'kw^a* (Shawnee *hamäkwa*, Gatschet), Peoria *amäkwa*, Abnaki *pep8n-emesk8* (Rasles) WINTER BEAVER, Micmac *pŭl-ŭmskw* BEAVER OF THIRD YEAR;[2] Cree *miskawew* HE FINDS HIM, HER, Malecite *muskuwan* HE FOUND HER, Natick *miskom* HE FINDS IT, Fox *me'kawäw^a* HE FINDS HIM, HER; Cree *iskwē·u* WOMAN, Micmac *kēsigō-ēsku^a* OLD WOMAN, Natick *squaw*, Fox *i'kwäw^a*, Ojibwa *i'kwä*, Delaware *úxkwäu* (Sapir); Cree *maskwa* BEAR, Fox *ma'kw^a*, Shawnee *^{m}kwa*, Peoria *maxkwa*, Ojibwa *ma'kwa*, Natick *mosq;* Cree *ishpimik* ABOVE, Ojibwa *ishpiming*, Menominee *icpämiya* ABOVE, Penobscot *spumki*

[1] Moreover, under unknown conditions a sibilant is retained before *k* in Fox, Ojibwa, etc., and these agree in the retention or loss of the sibilant.

[2] Rand, Dictionary of the Language of the Micmac Indians, Halifax, 1888.

HEAVEN, Abnaki *spemk*, Passamaquoddy *spemek* HIGH, Shawnee *spemegi* ABOVE (in the sky), Fox *a'pemegi*, Peoria *pämingi;* Cree *miepun* IT SNOWS, Fox *me'pu-* TO SNOW, Natick *muhpoo* IT SNOWS; Cree *mietig* WOOD, Fox *me'tegwi*, Shawnee ^{m}*tegwi*, Menominee *me^{c}tig* (probable mishearing for *me'tig*), Ojibwa *mi'tig* (Jones), *me^{z}tig* (Turtle Mountain, Michelson), Natick *mehtug*, Delaware *mehittuck*, Minsi *michtuk*.[1]

It should be noted likewise that Cree *t*(*tt*) corresponds under unknown conditions to *n* (or its phonetic correspondent) in the other Central Algonquian languages as well as in Eastern Algonquian. Thus Cree *atak* STAR, Fox *Anāgw^{a}*, Shawnee *alagwa*, Peoria *alangwa*, Ojibwa *anang*, Delaware *allanque*, Natick *anogks;* Cree *atim* DOG, Fox *Anemō'^{a}*, Natick *anum*, Delaware *allum*, Ojibwa *animosh*, Malecite *ulamus* (the last two really are diminutives).[2]

Below will be found tables for the Cree present indicative and subjunctive-participial modes.[3] The phonetic laws stated above should be kept in mind to see the correspondence with other Algonquian languages.

[1] It is gathered from Doctor Gatschet's notes on the pronunciation and his graphic fluctuation of *k*, *'k*, *rk* in the same words when corresponding to Cree *sk*, that the true value in Peoria is *'k*. By this is inferred the same regarding *p*. Examples are lacking to show the correspondent to Cree *st*, but the inference made at any rate is plausible. The writer's conclusions regarding Fox, Sauk, Kickapoo are based on Doctor Jones's and his own texts; those on Shawnee are from Doctor Gatschet's graphic variants as well as the author's own notes (but apparently there are also some secondary changes in Shawnee); those on Menominee rest on the writer's own notes; those on Ojibwa are formed mainly from a study of Doctor Jones's texts, though partly from the writer's notes; in other cases the assumption rests on analogy. The quotations from the manuscripts of the late Doctor Jones are available through the liberality of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. Most of the Ojibwa words cited in this paper are from Baraga; they are easily distinguished by lack of most diacritical marks and by the use of *sh* for *c*. Similarly, the Cree of the writer can be easily distinguished from that of Horden or Lacombe. Such words and grammatical terminations as are taken from or based on Doctor Sapir's field notes on Cree, Montagnais, Abnaki, Malecite, and Delaware, are expressly noted as such.

[2] Abnaki *wdamis* HIS DOG, Passamaquoddy *ndemis* MY DOG, both cited by Prince, are forms puzzling to the writer. See *American Anthropologist*, N. S., IV, 316, 317, 324, 684. Even so, the statement that Cree *t* can correspond to *n*, etc., of the other dialects, will stand.

[3] These are extracted from Horden (Cree Grammar, London, 1881) with the exception of the inanimate forms both as subjects and objects, which are extracted from Lacombe. The latter forms are not readily found in Horden and the table in Lacombe is highly confusing in other forms. That the forms exist in Moose Cree is shown by the texts in Horden's Grammar.

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.	it	they inan.
Intrans. . . .	*ne-*	*ne—nan*	*ke—nanow*	*ke-*	*ke—nowow*	*-w*	*-wuk*		*—wa*
me	—	—	—	*ke—in*	*ke—inowow*	*ne—k*	*ne—kwuk*		
us excl. . . .	—	—	—	*ke—inan*	*ke—inan*	*ne—konan*	*ne—konanuk*		
us incl. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	*ke—konow*	*ke—konowuk*		
thee	*ke—ttin*	*ke—ttinan*	—	—	—	*ke—k*	*ke—kwuk*		
you	*ke—ttinowow*	*ke—ttinan*	—	—	—	*ke—kowow*	*ke—kowowuk*		
him	*ne—ow*	*ne—anan*	*ke—ananow*	*ke—ow*	*ke—owow*	*-āō*	*-awuk*		
them an. . .	*ne—owuk*	*ne—ananuk*	*ke—anonowuk*	*ke—owuk*	*ke—owowuk*	*-āo*	*-āwuk*		
it, them inan.	*ni—en*	*ni—enân*	*ki—*{*enow* / *enanow*	*ki—en*	*ki—enâwaw*	*-am*	*-amwuk*		

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.	it	they inan.
Intrans. . . .	*-yan*	*-yak*	*-yuk*	*-yun*	*-yāk*	*-t*	*-tcik*	*—ki*	{*—ki* / *—kwaw*
me	—	—	—	*-eyun*	*-eyāk*	*-it*	{*-itcik* / *-itwow*		
us excl . . .	—	—	—	*-eyak*	*-eyak*	*-eyumi't*	{*-eyumi'tcik* / *-eyumi'twow*		
us incl. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	*-ttu'k*	{*-ttu'kwuk* / *-ttu'kwow*		
thee	*-ttan*	*-ttak*	—	—	—	*-sk*	{*-skik* / *-skwow*		
you	*-ttakwuk*	*-ttak*	—	—	—	*-ttak*	{*-ttakwuk* / *-ttakwow*		
him	*-uk*	*-ukit*	*-uk*	*-ut*	*-āk*	*-at*	{*-atcik* / *-atwow*		
them an. .	{*-ukik* / *-ukwow*	*-ukitcik* / *-ukitwow*	*-ukik* / *-ukwow*	*-utcik* / *-utwow*	*-ākwuk* / *-ākwow*	{*-at*	{*-atcik* / *-atwow*		
it, them, inan.	*-amân*	*-amâk*	*-amak*	*-aman*	*-amek*	*-ak*	{*-akwaw* / *-akik*		

While at Carlisle in the winter of 1911–12 the writer had an opportunity of studying for a brief period the Cree spoken at Fort Totten, North Dakota. Below are tables for the present independent mode and for what was intended (by the writer) to be the subjunctive of the same tense. Apparently there was some misunderstanding, for the forms of the latter correspond with Lacombe's "suppositif" of the "subjonctif" and Horden's future tense of the subjunctive.

20903°—28 ETH—12——16

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.	it	they inan.
Intrans.	*ni-*	*ni—nān*	*ki—nān*	*ki—nān*	*ki—nāwāwa*	*-wa*	*-wAg*		*-wA*
me	—	—	—	*ki—in*	*ki—ināwāwa*	*ni—g*	*ni—gwAg*		
us excl.	—	—	—	*ki—inān*	*ki—inān*	*mi—gunān*	*ni—gunānig*		
us incl.	—	—	—	—	—	*ki—gunān*	*ki—gunānig*		
thee	*ki—tin*	*ki—tinān*	—	—	—	*ki—g*	*ki—gwAg*		
you	*ki—tināwāwa*	*ki—tinān*	—	—	—	*ki—guwāwa*	*ki—guwāwAg*		
him	*ni—āwa*	*ni—ānān*	*ki—ānān*	*ki—āwa*	*ki—āwāwa*	*-ēu*	*-ēwAg*		
them an.	*ni—āwAg*	*ni—ānānig*	*ki—ānānig*	*ki—āwAg*	*ki—āwāwAg*	*-ēu*	*-ēwAg*		
it, them, inan.	*ni—ān*	*ni—ānān*	*ki—ānān*	*ki—ān*	*ki—ānāwāwa*	*-Am*	*-AmwAg*		

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.	it	they inan.
Intrans.	*-yāni*	*-yā'ku*	*-yA'ku*	*-yAni*	*-yēgu*	*-tci*	*-twāwi*	*-'ki*	*-'kwāwi*
me	—	—	—	*-iyAni*	*-iyēgu*	*-itci*	*-itwāwi*		
us excl.	—	—	—	*-iyā'ku*	*-iyā'ku*	*-kuyā'ku*	*-kuyā'kwāwi*		
us incl.	—	—	—	—	—	*-kuyA'ku*	*-kuyA'kwāwi*		
thee	*-tāni*	*-tā'ku*	—	—	—	*-cki*	*-ckwāwi*		
you	*-tēgu*	*-tā'ku*	—	—	—	*-kuyēgu*	*-kuyēgwāwi*		
him	*-Aki*	*-aiyā'ku*	*-aiyA'ku*	*-Atci*	*-aiyēgu*	*-ātci*	*-ātwāwi*		
them an.	*-Agwāwi*	*-aiyā'kwāwi*	*-aiyA'kwāwi*	*-Atwāwi*	*-aiyēgwāwi*	*-ātci*	*-ātwāwi*		
it, them, inan.	*-Amāni*	*-Amā'ku*	*-AmA'ku*	*-AmAni*	*-Amēgu*	*-A'ki*	*-A'kwāwi*		

We will first discuss the indicative forms. In the following Montagnais is left out, as the relations of Cree and Montagnais are treated specially below. Here it is sufficient to say that the two with phonetic differences are essentially a linguistic unit. Statistics follow:

I—YOU (pl.) no correspondent; composed of the intrans. forms for I and YOU with phonetic changes.

I—HIM agreement with F., Men., D. (one form).[1]

I—THEM an. agreement with F., Men., D. (one form).

I—IT agreement with Men., A., Oj.

I—THEM inan. agreement with Men., S.

WE (excl.) intrans. agreement with D. (one form).

WE (excl.)—THEE agreement with D. (one form).

WE (excl.)—YOU agreement with D. (one form).

WE (excl.)—HIM agreement with Oj., A., D. (one form).

WE (excl.)—THEM an. agreement with Oj., A., N.

WE (excl.)—IT agreement with A.

WE (excl.)—THEM inan. formation same as WE (excl.)—IT.

WE (incl.) intrans. (Horden) no correspondent.

WE (incl.) intrans. (Fort Totten) agreement with Oj., A.

WE (incl.) HIM (Horden); cf. Men.[2]

WE (incl.)—HIM (Fort Totten) agreement Oj., A.

WE (incl.)—THEM an. (Horden) no correspondent, cf. Men.[2]

WE (incl.)—THEM an. (Fort Totten) agreement with Oj., A.

WE (incl.)—IT (one form, Lacombe) no correspondent.

WE (incl.)—IT (one form, Lacombe; Fort Totten) agreement with A.

WE (incl.)—THEM inan. formation same as WE (incl.)—IT.

THOU—US (excl.) no correspondent; composed of THOU intrans. $+i+n\bar{a}n$: cf. Fox *ke—ipena* for the formation.

THOU—HIM agreement with Men., F., D. (one form).

THOU—THEM an. agreement with Men., F. D.

THOU—IT agreement with Men., Oj., A.

THOU—THEM inan. formation the same as THOU—IT.

YE intrans. no correspondent; same formative elements found in YE—ME.

YE—ME no correspondent; composed of the intrans. form for YE $+i$.

YE—US (excl.) no correspondent; formation precisely the same as THOU—US (excl.).

YE—HIM agreement with Men., D. (one form); cf. also Oj., A., S., N., Pass.

---

[1] The following are the principal abbreviations used in this paper: A., Algonkin; an., animate; C., Cree; D., Delaware; excl., exclusive; F., Fox; inan., inanimate; incl., inclusive; M., Micmac; Men., Menominee; Mont., Montagnais; N., Natick; Oj., Ojibwa; Ot., Ottawa; P., Peoria; Pass., Passamaquoddy; Pot., Potawatomi; S., Shawnee.

[2] Lacombe gives a variant that agrees absolutely with Menominee.

YE—THEM an. agreement with Men., D. (one form); cf. also Oj. A., S., N.

YE—IT no correspondent; cf. Oj., A., S.

YE—THEM inan. formation the same as YE—IT.

HE—US (excl.) agreement with F., Oj., A., D. (one form).

HE—US (incl.; Horden) agreement with Men.

HE—US (incl.; Fort Totten) agreement with F., Oj., A. (D.?).

HE—YOU agreement with F., Men.

HE—HIM agreement with F., Men. (N.?).

HE—THEM an. agreement with F., Men.

HE—IT agreement with F., Men., P., Oj. (one form).

HE—THEM inan. agreement with F., Men., P.

THEY an.—US (excl.) agreement with F., Oj., A., N., D. (one form).

THEY an.—US (incl.; Horden) agreement with Men.

THEY an.—US (incl.; Fort Totten) agreement with F., Oj., D.

THEY an.—YOU agreement with F., Men., D.

THEY an.—HIM agreement with F., Men.

THEY an.—THEM an. agreement with F., Men.

THEY an.—IT agreement with F., Men., P.

THEY an.—THEM inan. agreement with F., Men., P.

THEY inan. no correspondent.

Common Central Algonquian agreements are naturally not included in the above statistics. Phonetic changes have caused certain terminations to resemble Ojibwa rather than Fox, e. g., HE—ME, THEE, but these are not included, as the formation is identical. The customary final *n* is not here added to the forms for I and THOU when intransitive, as it seems to be purely a phonetic product. The forms for THEY an.—ME, THEE look strange in comparison with other Algonquian languages, but in the writer's opinion a phonetic archaism is the disturbing factor.

It may be mentioned here that in the statistics given in the discussion of other Central Algonquian languages THEY inan. intrans. is not noted, as all agree (so far as material is available), as opposed to Cree. It will be seen that the greatest number of agreements is with Menominee, with Fox (Sauk and Kickapoo) second, and Delaware, Ojibwa, and Algonkin about equal, in the third place. The statistics likewise show that the unity of Cree-Montagnais, Menominee, Sauk, Fox, Kickapoo, and Shawnee mentioned on page 238 applies especially to Cree-Montagnais, Menominee, Sauk, Fox, and Kickapoo. It is due almost entirely to the very intimate relationship between Sauk, Fox, Kickapoo on the one hand and Shawnee on the other (see pp. 252, 258) that the last-mentioned language must be attached to the group. (Sauk, Fox, Kickapoo are practically one language, with slight variations (see pp. 252, 258). In the entire discussion of the

statistics throughout this paper it is understood that all are in agreement, unless the contrary is expressly stated.)

The discussion of the subjunctive-participial does not require such elaborate statistics.

The variant forms of the third person plural animate both as subject and object, ending in *-w*, are stated by Horden to be distinctive of East Main Cree, with the exception of the variants for THEY an.—HIM, THEM an. which occur elsewhere as well. The forms under discussion closely resemble the correspondents in Menominee, Algonkin, Ojibwa, and (to a lesser extent) Ottawa. (In Ojibwa THEY an.—US excl. has different formation, but has the characteristic ending.) Moreover, the respective forms of the second table of Fort Totten Cree (which is discussed below) show the same general structure. The other forms of the third person an. plural as both subject and object (except HE—THEM an., which is a true subjunctive) correspond to the Fox, Shawnee, and Ojibwa participial—not subjunctive. Even so, THEY an.—US (excl.) agrees with Fox (and approximates the Shawnee form), not Ojibwa. I—YOU agrees with Menominee, Ojibwa, and Algonkin. WE (excl.)—THEE, YOU is a true active common Central Algonquian form as opposed to the Ojibwa (and probably Potawatomi) correspondents, which are passives in structure.

Outside the above, excluding phonetic differences, as the presence of the nasal in Ojibwa (also in Delaware), the agreement between Cree, Ojibwa, and Fox in this mode is remarkable. It is a matter of great regret that hardly a single transitive form of the Peoria subjunctive or participial is found among Doctor Gatschet's papers. The terminations of the participial, subjunctive, and conjunctive modes are closely allied in Algonquian (compare the tables in the Handbook of American Indian Languages). Fortunately Doctor Gatschet has left examples of transitive forms of the Peoria conjunctive, so we can make some conjectures concerning the subjunctive. It possessed the nasal as in Ojibwa, and the forms for the third person plural animate, both as subject and object, corresponded exactly with the exception of WE incl.—THEM an., THEY an.—HIM, THEM an., to Cree. The personal terminations for WE—THEE, YOU (pl.) were the true active ones; HE—US (excl.) agreed with Fox and Cree, as also that for THEY an.—US (excl.). (For the last two cf. Shawnee, Algonkin, and Menominee.) The form for I—YOU (pl.) agreed with Ojibwa, Algonkin, and Cree. Herein we find an important point of contact with Peoria. (See, however, p. 271.) It should be noted that the Micmac conjunctive agrees partially with Peoria in having forms for the third person plural animate both as subject and object that correspond to the Fox participial, not conjunctive. We may accordingly conjecture that the Micmac subjunctive agrees partially with Cree in the same way. This together with the reten-

tion of the consonantic clusters *sk*, *sp*, *st* constitute important points of contact between Cree and Eastern Algonquian. The Natick present subjunctive approximates closely to the Fox present subjunctive and so agrees to a certain extent with Cree, but it should be noticed that practically all the forms with the third person animate, singular and plural, as subject are entirely different in structure from either the Cree or the Fox correspondents. The Delaware subjunctive shows marked peculiarities of its own and therefore presents few points of agreement with Cree, none in fact which are not shared by other Central Algonquian languages.

The discussion of the second table of Fort Totten Cree must necessarily be brief, as the sole object of its introduction is to illustrate the variant forms of East Main Cree with the third person plural as subject and object in the present subjunctive, and the correspondents in Menominee and Ojibwa. As is stated above, the table really corresponds with Horden's future tense of the subjunctive and Lacombe's "suppositif" of the "subjonctif." The forms for HE, THEY an.—US (excl. and incl.), YOU are certainly passives in formation (cf. the Ottawa correspondents of the subjunctive); but in every case Lacombe gives variants which are actives, and Horden gives these alone. Again the variants given by Lacombe for WE (excl. and incl.) —HIM, THEM an.; YE—HIM, THEM an. (which alone are given by Horden) in structure have the same formation as the correspondents of the present subjunctive. The Fort Totten Cree forms are composed of the respective intransitive subjects combined with the common objective form of the third person animate, namely *ā*, which undergoes phonetic change before the initial *y* of the suffixes (the forms given by Lacombe do not show this change). The forms of the Fort Totten Cree in which the animate objects are plural exhibit the identical formation but have the characteristic *w* suffix. (The form given in the table for YE—THEM an. is reconstructed by the writer; the form *-atwāwi*, obtained by direct questioning, is surely due to some misunderstanding, as it patently is the form for THOU—THEM an. It should be noticed that in the forms for WE (excl. and incl.)—HIM; WE (excl.)—THEE, YOU; THOU, YE—US (excl.) Lacombe's Cree terminates in *-i*, not *-u* as Fort Totten Cree does. In the forms for WE (excl. and incl.) intransitive, WE (excl. and incl.)—IT, THEM (inan.), Lacombe gives forms with both *-i* and *-u*. Horden gives only the forms with *-ā* (his transcription for long close *ę̄*) corresponding to Lacombe's *-i*. Fort Totten Cree in these personal terminations has *-u*, and this only. It should be mentioned that corresponding to Horden's *t* before *-ā* (his symbol for long close *ę̄*), the Cree of Lacombe and of Fort Totten have *tc* (*tj* in Lacombe) before *-i* throughout. Again, Horden's Cree in the form for YE

intrans. ends in *-wā*, whereas Lacombe's and Fort Totten Cree end in *-u*. It should be added that Lacombe in the forms for HE—THEM an. and THEY an.—IT, THEM inan. gives variants which resemble the corresponding subjunctive (participial) ones in structure, as well as forms which agree with the Fort Totten correspondents. It need scarce be said that neither Lacombe nor Horden distinguishes surd and sonant, nor *'k* from *k*, in his paradigms.

The formation of a preterite with a suffix *pun* in both the indicative and the subjunctive is an important point of contact with Ojibwa (see the discussion of that language, p. 269).

Another special point of contact with Peoria that should be noted is that the inanimate plural, nominative, ends in *-a;* yet notwithstanding these points of contact with Cree, Peoria (as will be shown later) belongs rather with Ojibwa.

The dialectic variations as *nīna* I, *nīra, nīya, nīθa* are well known and need no discussion. However, it should be mentioned that the so-called Cree of Rupert's House [1] is not Cree at all, but Montagnais. This the writer infers from a comparison of Doctor Sapir's notes on the Cree of Rupert's House with his notes on Montagnais, as well as with Lemoine's Dictionnaire Français-Montagnais (Boston, 1901). The following (taken from Sapir's manuscripts) will illustrate the point under consideration: *mA'skwAts·* BEARS, *nikA'mǫwats* THEY SING, ts· *inikA'mǫn'* THOU SINGEST. (See the discussion of Montagnais below.) According to Skinner (loc. cit.), the Fort George Indians speak the same dialect as those at Rupert's House.

MONTAGNAIS

As was stated above, excluding phonetic changes Montagnais is practically the same language as Cree. Some of the phonetic changes which Montagnais has suffered are: *k* (Cree *k*, Fox *k*) becomes *tsh* before *i* (Fox *e* and *ī*, Cree *e*), *tshi-* THOU (verbal), Fox *ke-*, Cree *ke-*, *tshi-* initial stem meaning completion, Fox *kī*[*ci*]-, Cree *ke-; k* (Cree *k*, Fox *g*) becomes *ts* before final *i* and *e*, even if these are lost, *-uts* (ending of animate pl. of nouns), Cree *-uk*, Fox *-Ag^{i}*, *-uts* (third person pl. animate, independent mode, intransitive), Cree *-wuk*, Fox *-wAg^{i}*, *-ts* (sign of locative singular animate), Cree *-k*, Fox *-g^{i}*, *-iats* (first person pl. excl. intransitive, subjunctive mode), Cree *-yāk*, Fox *-yāg^{e}; sk* before *i* becomes *ss;* Cree *askiy* LAND, Montagnais *assi* (Fox *a'k^{i}*); *tsh*[*i*]*t* (Fox *k*[*e*]*t*) becomes *st, stuki* THY EAR, as compared with *utuki* HIS EAR, *tshiiu* THY BODY, *kutaui* THY FATHER, *staiamiau* THOU PRAYEST, as compared with *ntaiamiau* I PRAY; *t*[*u*]*k* becomes *ts* before *e*, *-tse* (sign of the dubitative), Cree *-tokā*, Fox *-tuge; k*[*e*]*sh* becomes *tsh, tshiuelin* THOU ART HUNGRY for *ke+sh-; tc*[*i*]*k*[*i*] becomes *ts, -ats* (subj. mode; third per-

[1] Skinner, Notes on the Eastern Cree and Northern Saulteaux, p. 11, New York, 1911.

son pl. an. subj., third person sing. an. object) as compared with Cree *-atcik*, Fox (participial) *-ātcig^{i}; sk[i]k[i]* becomes *ss*, *-ss* (subj. mode, third pl. an. subj., second person sing. object), Cree *-skik*, Fox *-'kig^{i}* (part.). Further, it may be noted that final *-w^{a}*, *w^{e}* after consonants, has a history in Montagnais different from that in Cree. Observe Montagnais *ni—ku* HE—ME (independent mode), Cree *ne—k*, Fox *ne—gw^{a}*, *tshi—ku* HE—THEE (independent mode), Cree *ke—k*, Fox *ke—gwa*, *-iku* (first person pl. incl. of subjunctive), Cree *-yuk*, Fox *-yAgw^{e}*. These phonetic changes are of extremely wide application. It is unnecessary to give tables showing the verbal terminations as they agree with those of Cree. It may be noted that *-u* corresponds to Cree *-w* and *-au* to Cree *-ow*, except in the first person pl. incl., where we find *-u*. The reason for the latter is not clear.

After emphasizing the essential unity of Cree and Montagnais it may be well to point out some individual traits of the latter. In the first place though there is a *pan* (Cree *pun*) preterite, it is confined to the indicative and does not occur in the subjunctive. Another point is that the "suppositif" of the mode "subjonctif" is clearly allied to the Fox potential subjunctive for which there is no correspondent in Cree (compare Mont. *-iakukue* WE (excl.), *-ikuakue* WE (incl.), *-iekuekue* YE with Fox *-yAgāge'^{e}*, *-yAgAgu'^{a}*, *-yägägu'^{a}*, respectively). The other intransitive persons in Montagnais have the characteristic *ku* but have no correspondents in Fox. The transitive forms do not correspond closely, though there are resemblances between the two languages; hence tables are not given. In closing, it may be added that the Montagnais *on—me*, etc., has the appearance of a passive in structure, but there are several points which are not clear. (The above examples of Montagnais and Cree are taken, respectively, from Lemoine and Horden, with the exception of Cree *askiy*, which is from Lacombe. It will be seen by consulting the tables of Fort Totten Cree that the terminal *k* of Horden is doubtless the strong (impure) sonant *g* of the former, Fox, Sauk, Kickapoo, Ottawa, etc. A couple of examples of Sapir's Montagnais, *ts'inipahā'wAts* THOU KILLEST THEM an. (Fox *kenepahāwAg^{i}*), *ts'īnipahê'wAts* HE KILLED THEM an. (Fox *kīcinepahāwAg^{i}*), *ickwe'wAts* WOMEN (Fox *i'kwäwAg^{i}*), illustrate the principles mentioned above. The writer suspects that Skinner's *tcī a* (Rupert's House Cree) THOU is really *ts'īya*. The initial *ts'* at once classes the word as Montagnais. It is true that according to Lemoine the ordinary Montagnais correspondent has *l*, not *y*; but it should be noticed that in Cree dialectically *kīya* occurs (see Horden, Cree Grammar, p. 3, London, 1881; Lacombe, Dictionnaire de la Langue des Cris, p. xv, Montreal, 1874). The Rupert's House Cree then would correspond to this.)

In discussing the relations of other Eastern-Central Algonquian languages, it is understood that Montagnais agrees with Cree unless

the contrary is expressly mentioned. Hence the fact that Montagnais sometimes is not mentioned merely means that it agrees with Cree.

MENOMINEE

Menominee is characterized by peculiar consonantic clusters due to the elimination of the final *i* of initial stems; thus, *wäpmā'wAG* THEY BEGAN TO CRY (FOX *wäpi-*), *wäpkɛtcpīpA'xtaw*^{a} HE BEGAN TO RUN SWIFTLY (FOX *wäpi-*, *kɛ'tci-*), *nikēsnäwā'wAG* I HAVE SEEN THEM (FOX *nɛkīcinäwāwAG*^{i}), *kätemā'wAG* THEY ARE CRYING HARD (FOX *kɛ'tcimaiyōwAG*^{i}), *kēspīw*^{a} HE HAS COME (FOX *kīcipyäw*^{a}), *kikēsmēkānēgunāwAG* THEY FOUGHT US (FOX *kɛkīcimīgātīhɛ gunānAG*^{i}). This elimination may cause a double consonant, as *pīpīmmēkātōwAG* THEY FOUGHT AS THEY WENT ALONG (FOX *pɛmi* + *pyämīgātīwAG*^{i}), *pīpīmmēsēw*^{a} HE WENT PAST EASING HIMSELF (FOX *pɛmi* + *pyämīsiw*^{a}), *wäppīpA'xtaw*^{a} HE BEGAN TO RUN (FOX *wäpi* + *pyä-*). The combination of the subordinating particle *AS* with initial stems also gives rise to clusters—for example, *aspēmātisēyA* WE SHALL LIVE. The only true consonantic clusters that occur within the same morphologic division of a word are *sk* and *sp;* the latter alone is important in determining the general relations of Menominee. Examples are: *kēspin* PERHAPS, Cree *kīspin*, Ojibwa *kishpin: icpämiyA* ABOVE, Cree *ishpimik*, Ojibwa *ishpiming*, Fox *a'pemigi* (see discussion of Ojibwa, p. 261). The combination *xt* agrees with Micmac, e. g. *pīpAxtaw*^{a} HE IS COMING ON THE RUN, Micmac *pôxtAmkāsid* HE WENT ON. Surd and sonant are exceedingly difficult to distinguish; likewise *ē* and *ɛ̄*. The writer was unable to determine these with absolute accuracy; the sounds are given as taken down. Whispered vowels are easy to hear after *w;* in other cases it is questionable whether they actually exist. A peculiarity of Menominee is that Central Algonquian *s* under unknown conditions becomes *n:* thus *nō·nɛ·ɛ*^{e} MY FATHER (FOX *nōse*), *na*^{e}*ne'* MY ELDER BROTHER (FOX *nesese*), *pōninäw*^{a} HE STOPPED IN HIS FLIGHT (FOX *pōnisäw*^{a}, *-ōnä-* WALK (FOX *-usä-*).

A table of the independent mode follows.

	I	we (excl.)	we (incl.)	thou	ye	he	they an.	it	they inan.
Intrans. . . .	*ni-*	*ni—minâwa*	*ki—minâwa*	*ki-*	*ki—mwâwa*	*-wa*	*-wAg*	*-w*[i]	*-wAn*[i]
me	—	—	—	*ki—i*	*ki—imwâwa*	*ni—g*	*ni—gug*		
us (excl.) . . .	—	—	—	*ki—inwâwa*?	*ki—inwâwa*	*ni—gunâwa*	*ni—gunâwAg*		
us (incl.) . . .	—	—	—	—	—	*ki—gunâwa*	*ki—gunâwAg*		
thee	*ki—n*	*ki—ninemināwa*	—	—	—	*ki—g*	*ki—gug*		
you	*ki—ninimwâwa*	*ki—ninemināwa*	—	—	—	*ki—guwâwa*	*ki—guwâwAg*		
him, her . . .	*ni—âwa*	*ni—Anâwa*	*ki—Anâwa*	*ki—âwa*	*ki—âmâwa*	*-âwa*	*-âwAg*		
them (an.) . .	*ni—âwAg*	*ni—AnâwAg*	*ki—AnâwAg*	*ki—âwAg*	*ki—âwâwAg*	*-âwa*	*-âwAg*		
it, them (inan.) .	*ni—An*	*ni—âminâwa*	*ki—A*[c]	*ki—An*	*ki—Amwâwa*	*-Am*	*-Amug*		

It will be seen that Menominee has many forms quite peculiar to itself, and that the agreements with Cree-Montagnais are far more numerous than with any other languages of the Central subdivision; those with Fox are next in order of number. For the agreements with Delaware, see the section on that language. Details follow:

I—YOU no correspondent; nearest N.

I—HIM agreement with C., F., D.

I—THEM an. agreement with C., F., D. (N.?).

I—IT agreement with C., A., Oj., Ot.

I—THEM inan. agreement with C.

WE (excl.) intrans. no correspondent; nearest P., Oj., A., Ot., N.

WE (excl.)—THEE no correspondent; nearest P., N.

WE (excl.)—YOU no correspondent; nearest N., A., Ot. (P.?).

WE (excl.)—HIM no correspondent; structure as WE (incl.)—HIM.

WE (excl.)—THEM an. no correspondent; cf. WE (incl.)—THEM an.

WE (excl.)—IT no correspondent.

WE (excl.)—THEM inan. no correspondent.

WE (incl.) intrans. no correspondent; nearest P., Oj.; cf. also C.

WE (incl.)—HIM; cf. C.[1]

WE (incl.)—THEM an.; cf. C.[1]

WE (incl.)—IT no correspondent.

WE (incl.)—THEM inan. no correspondent.

THOU—US (excl.) no correspondent.

THOU—HIM agreement with C., F., D.

THOU—THEM an. agreement with C., F., D.

THOU—IT agreement with C., A., Ot., Oj.

THOU—THEM inan. agreement with C.

[1] Lacombe gives a Cree variant which is the exact correspondent.

YE, intrans. no correspondent; nearest P., N.; cf. also Oj., Ot., A.; for last syllable cf. C.

YE—ME no correspondent; nearest N.; cf. also A., Oj., Ot.

YE—US (excl.) no correspondent.

YE—HIM agreement with C., D.

YE—THEM an. agreement with C., D.

YE—IT no correspondent.

YE—THEM inan. no correspondent.

HE—US (excl.) no correspondent; for the structure cf. HE—US (incl.)

HE—US (incl.) agreement with C.

HE—YOU agreement with C., F.

HE—HIM agreement with C., F. (N.?).

HE—THEM an. agreement with C., F. (N.?).

HE—IT agreement with C., F., P., N., Oj. (one form).

THEY an.—US (excl.) no correspondent; cf. THEY an.—US (incl.).

THEY an.—US (incl.) agreement with C.

THEY an.—YOU agreement with C., F., D.

THEY an.—HIM agreement with C., F.

THEY an.—THEM an. agreement with C., F.

THEY an.—IT agreement with C., F., P.

THEY an.—THEM inan. agreement with C., F., P.

Where all agree with or without phonetic changes, no record has been made. In certain cases it is impossible to be sure whether phonetic changes have not disguised agreements.

THEY inan., intrans., looks strange as contrasted with the common Central Algonquian form (on the Cree correspondent, see p. 244); however, it is merely because the word from which it is taken chances to have a vowel before the termination, and not a consonant. The same is to be observed in Kickapoo, and doubtless other dialects; thus Kickapoo *tetepyāan^i*, i. e., *tetepyāwan^i* (see p. 258) THEY inan. ARE ROUND (analysis: *tetepi* CIRCLE, initial stem; *-ā-* secondary connective stem, inan. copula; *-wan^i* termination of the third person inan. pl. intrans. independent mode after a vowel as contrasted with *-ōni* after a consonant). [Note *-niwan^i* in Fox as compared with *-ōn^i*, the ordinary termination of the third person pl. inan. intrans. independent mode; see Handbook of American Indian Languages (*Bull. 40, B. A. E.*), pt. 1, p. 833.]

It should be specially noted that Menominee, Cree, and Fox agree in having the objective forms of IT and THEM inan. expressed by a single form as opposed to Ottawa, Algonkin, Ojibwa, and Shawnee. It is a common Algonquian feature that in subordinate modes the forms are expressed by single pronouns.

A table for the subjunctive mode is not available; however, the writer can give some information concerning the relations indicated

by it. Many of the forms seem peculiar to Menominee and are difficult to analyze. I—YOU agrees with C., Oj., A., Ot., in structure and presumably also with Peoria. HE—US (excl.) has no correspondent (the form is *-iyame*), but distinctly approaches the correspondents of C., F., S., A., and presumably P. The forms of the third person plural animate both as subject and object closely resemble the correspondents in Oj., A., the East Main Cree of Horden, certain variants given by Lacombe in his Grammaire de la Langue des Cris (Montreal, 1874), and to a lesser extent the correspondents in Ottawa. The corresponding forms of Horden's future of the subjunctive, and Lacombe's "suppositif" of the "subjonctif," as well as the supposed present subjunctive of Fort Totten Cree also closely resemble them. It goes without saying that the Menominee forms lack the nasal of the Ojibwa, Algonkin, and Ottawa. On the other hand the various forms of Cree possess an extra syllable with *w*.

To sum up, we may say that although Menominee must be classed by itself, yet it is perfectly clear that it belongs intimately with Cree-Montagnais, etc., on the one hand, and with Sauk, Fox, and Kickapoo on the other.

Sauk, and Close Linguistic Cognates

The differences between Sauk, Fox, and Kickapoo consist of a trifling modification of pronunciation, vocabulary, and idiom. Shawnee is slightly removed from them. To facilitate the discussion of the relations of the last-named language to them as well as the relations of the entire group, tables for the independent, conjunctive, and subjunctive modes in Fox, and for the same modes in Shawnee, are given.

FOX INDEPENDENT MODE

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.	it	they inan.
Intrans. . . .	*ne-*	*ne—pena*	*ke—pena*	*ke-*	*ke—pwa*	*-wa*	*-wAgi*	*-wi*	*-ōni*
me	—	—	—	*ke—i*	*ke—ipwa*	*ne—gwa*	*ne—gōgi*		
us excl. . . .	—	—	—	*ke—ipena*	*ke—ipena*	*ne—gunāna*	*ne—gunānAgi*		
us incl.	—	—	—	—	—	*ke—gunāna*	*ke—gunānAgi*		
thee	*ke—ne*	*ke—nepena*	—	—	—	*ke—gwa*	*ke—gōgi*		
you	*ke—nepwa*	*ke—nepena*	—	—	—	*ke—guwāwa*	*ke—guwāwAgi*		
him	*ne—āwa*	*ne—āpena*	*ke—āpena*	*ke—āwa*	*ke—āpwa*	*-äwa*	*-äwAgi*		
them an. . . .	*ne—āwAgi*	*ne—āpena*	*ke—āpena*	*ke—āwAgi*	*ke—āpwa*	*-äwa*	*-äwAgi*		
it, them, inan. .	*ne—a*	*ne—āpena*	*ke—āpena*	*ke—a*	*ke—āpwa*	*-Amwa*	*-Amōgi*		

FOX CONJUNCTIVE MODE

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.	it	they inan.
Intrans. . . .	*-yāni*	*-yāge*	*-yAgwe*	*-yAni*	*-yägwe*	*-tci*	*-wātci*	*-ki*	*-'ki*
me	—	—	—	*-iyAni*	*-iyägwe*	*-itci*	*-iwātci*		
us excl. . . .	—	—	—	*-iyāge*	*-iyāge*	*-iyAmetci*	*-iyAmetci*		
us incl.	—	—	—	—	—	*-nAgwe*	*-nAgwe*		
thee	*-nāni*	*-nāge*	—	—	—	*-'ki*	*-'ki*		
you	*-nAgowe*	*-nāge*	—	—	—	*-nägwe*	*-nägwe*		
him, them, an. .	*-Agi*	*-Agetci*	*-Agwe*	*-Atci*	*-ägwe*	*-ātci*	*-äwātci*		
it, them, inan. .	*-Amāni*	*-Amāge*	*-AmAgwe*	*-AmAni*	*-Amägwe*	*-Agi*	*-Amowātci*		

FOX PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE MODE

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.	it	They inan.
Intrans. . . .	*-yāne*	*-yāge*	*-yʌgwe*	*-yʌne*	*-yāgwe*	*-te*	*-wāte*	*-'ke*	*-'ke*
me	—	—	—	*-iyʌne*	*-iyāgwe*	*-ite*	*-iwāte*		
us excl. . . .	—	—	—	*-iyāge*	*-iyāge*	*-iyʌmete*	*-iyʌmete*		
us incl. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	*-nʌgwe*	*-nʌgwe*		
thee	*-nāne*	*-nāge*	—	—	—	*-'ke*	*-'ke*		
you	*-nʌgōwe*	*-nāge*		—	—	*-nāgwe*	*-nāgwe*		
him, them, an. .	*-ʌge*	*-ʌgete*	*-ʌgwe*	*-ʌte*	*-āgwe*	*-āte*	*-āwāte*		
it, them, inan. .	*-ʌmāne*	*-ʌmāge*	*-ʌmʌgwe*	*-ʌmʌne*	*-ʌmāgwe*	*-ʌge*	*-ʌmowāte*		

SHAWNEE INDEPENDENT MODE[1]

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.	it	they inan.
Intrans. . . .	*ni-*	*ni—pe*	*ki—pe*	*ki-*	*ki—pwa*	*-wa*	*-(wʌ)gi*	*-wi*	
me	—	—	—	*ki—i*	*ki—ipwa*	*ni—gwa*	*ni—gōgi*		
us excl. . . .	—	—	—	*ki—ipe*	*ki—pe*	*ni—guna*	*ni—gunāgi*		
us incl. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	*ki—guna*	*ki—gunāgi*		
thee	*ki le*	*ki lepe*	—	—	—	*ki—gwa*	*ki—gōgi*		
you	*ki—lepwa*	*ki lepe*	—	—	—	*ki—gōwa*	*ki—gowāgi*		
him	*ni—a*	*ni āpe*	*ki ape*	*ki a*	*ki—āwa*	*ō—āli*	*ō—āwāli*		
them an. . . .	*ni—āgi*	*ni—āpe*	*ki—āpe*	*ki—āgi*	*ki āwāgi*	*ō—ahi*	*ō—āwahi*		
it	*ni—a*	*ni āpe*	*ki—āpe*	*ki a*	*ki anāwa*	*ō a*	*ō—ānāwa*		
them inan. . .	*ni—ana*	*ni—āpe*	*ki—āpe*	*ki ana*	*ki—anāwa*	*ō—ana*	*ō anāwa*		

[1] It may be noted that the late Doctor Gatschet recorded in the independent mode *ku-* for *ō-* in the transitive forms of the third person animate, singular and plural; the writer thinks the former are probably more nearly correct; Doctor Gatschet likewise recorded *u* for o in the forms HE, THEY an.—YOU.

SHAWNEE CONJUNCTIVE MODE

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.	it	they inan.
Intrans. . . .	-yā	-yāgc	-yʌgwc	-yʌni	-yāgwc	-ici	-wātci	-gc	-gc
me	—	—	—	-iyʌni	-iyāgwc	-itci	-iwātci		
us excl. . . .	—	—	—	-iyāgc	-iyāgc	-iyʌmegitci	-iyʌmegitci		
us incl. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	-lagwc	-lagwc		
thee	-la	-lāgc	—	—	—	-'ki	-'ki		
you	-lagō	-lāgc	—	—	—	-lwāgwc	-lwāgwc		
him, them, an. .	-ʌgi	-ʌgitci	-ʌgwc	-ʌtci	-āgwc	-ātci	-āwātci		
it, them, inan. .	-ʌmā	-ʌmāgc	-ʌmʌgwc	-ʌmʌni	-ʌmāgwc	-ʌgi	-ʌmowātci		

SHAWNEE SUBJUNCTIVE MODE

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.	it	they inan.
Intrans. . . .	-yā	-yāgc	-yʌgwc	-yʌnc	-yāgwc	-itc	-wātc	-gc	-gc
me	—	—	—	-iyʌnc	-iyāgwc	-itc	-iwātc		
us excl. . . .	—	—	—	-iyāgc	-iyāgc	-iyʌmegitc	-iyʌmegitc		
us incl. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	-lʌgwc	-lʌgwc		
thee	-la	-lāgc	—	—	—	-gc	-gc		
you	-lagō	-lāgc	—	—	—	-lwāgwc	-lwāgwc		
him, them, an. .	-ʌgc	-ʌgitc	-ʌgwc	-ʌtc	-āgwc	-ātc	-āwātc		
it, them, inan. .	-ʌmā	-ʌmāgc	-ʌmʌgwc	-ʌmʌnc	-ʌmāgwc	-ʌgc	-ʌmowātc		

SHAWNEE

The forms[1] I—HIM, THEM an., THEM inan.; THOU—HIM, THEM an., THEM inan.; YE—HIM, THEM an., IT, THEM inan.; HE—YOU (pl.), HIM, THEM inan.; THEY an.—YOU (pl.), HIM, IT, THEM inan. agree with Ojibwa, etc., in structure. For the probable noteworthy agreements with Peoria, see the discussion of that language. It is quite clear that one of the Delaware dialects agrees in the formation of HE—US (excl. and incl.), THEY an.—US (excl. and incl.), even if there is but the form HE—US (excl.) in the table to support the assertion. Passamaquoddy agrees in the forms for I—YOU (pl.) HIM, THEM an.; THOU—HIM, THEM an.; YE intrans.; YE—ME, HIM; HE—US (excl. and incl.); HE—YOU (pl.), HIM; THEY an.—HIM. It is probable that the forms for HE—THEM an. and THEY an.—THEM an. are shared by Passamaquoddy (and Algonkin) but the phonetics are not certain. The forms correspond nearly to the Fox possessive pronouns for HIS (an. pl.) and THEIR (an. pl.). It is unfortunate that the inanimate forms of Passamaquoddy are not available, as they might show further agreements with Shawnee. However, it may be noted that I, THOU, YE—THEM (inan.), YE—IT agree also with Cree. Natick curiously shows apparent agreement in HE—US (incl.), and so presumably would HE—US (excl.). However, THEY an.—US (excl.) shows a different formation, and hence presumably THEY an.—US (incl.) would also. The agreement with Delaware in the form for HE—HIM may be noted in addition to the one already mentioned. (For another one, see the discussion of Delaware, p. 277.)

The forms with the termination *-pe*, though unique, are certainly to be associated with the Fox *-pena* even if the two do not entirely coincide. Those with the termination *-pwa* make it certain that Shawnee is related very intimately to Fox, etc., for no other Central Algonquian languages have the termination, though it is found (modified phonetically) in Eastern Algonquian, and an allied form occurs in Piegan. The forms for I, THOU—IT point also in this direction.

The terminations of the two subordinate modes given agree with Fox, Cree, and Micmac in lacking the nasal of Ojibwa and Peoria, and Delaware, and the terminations are to be associated with those of Fox. The *w* of the forms for HE, THEY (an.)—YOU is unique at present, otherwise the forms are normal. The forms HE, THEY an.—US (excl.) are to be associated distinctly with the Fox correspondents, though the syllable *-ge-* suggests the Ojibwa correspondents. The first person singular intransitive agrees with Delaware and Micmac. I—THEE at present is unique, but if complete schedules were available for the various Delaware dialects and for the eastern subdivision of the Eastern-Central branch, correspondents would doubtlessly be found. I—IT, THEM inan. agrees with Delaware.

[1] In giving these statistics no account is taken of such forms as are common Central Algonquian.

Phonetically Shawnee differs somewhat from Fox. The sibilant is retained in the cluster *sp*, which appears as *'p* in Fox though retained in Ojibwa (but not in Peoria): *spemegi* ON HIGH, Fox *a'pemegi* (see the discussion of Cree and Ojibwa, pp. 238, 261). The combination *-w^a* is lost after *i* and *ā*, as in Ojibwa: Shawnee *hileni* MAN, Fox *ineniw^a;* Shawnee *hugimā* CHIEF, Fox *ugimāw^a*.[1] It may be noted that *-w^a* is lost after *e* under unknown conditions when corresponding to Fox: *pemθe* (Fox *pemusäw^a*) HE WALKED ON, *piew^a* (Fox (*pyäw^a*) HE CAME. The combination *-wA-* is lost medially under unknown conditions: *pyēgi* THEY WENT (Fox *pyäwAgi*) as contrasted with *hiwaki* (Gatschet, confusion of surd and sonant; Fox *hiwAgi*) THEY SAID. The sound *s* of Fox is replaced by the interdental surd spirant and the preceding vowel is ordinarily syncopated: *nōθa* MY FATHER (Fox *nōsa*), *kōkōmθena* OUR (incl.) GRANDMOTHER (Fox *kō'komesenāna*), *^{n}θeθa* MY ELDER BROTHER (Fox *nesesa*). Corresponding to Fox, Ojibwa, Menominee, etc., *n*, Shawnee has *l* and *n* under unknown conditions, agreeing, however, with Peoria, Delaware, and (partially) Eastern Algonquian in this use.

To sum up, we may say that while Shawnee has certain features of its own, it stands nearest to Fox, and next to Eastern Algonquian; in fact it stands nearly halfway between the two. It will be seen that Ojibwa shares but these persons of the independent mode, namely, YE—THEM an., THEY an.—YOU (pl.), which are not shared by Passamaquoddy. (No account is taken of the agreements in the inanimate objective forms, as we have no correspondents available in Passamaquoddy by which to test them.) On the other hand, Passamaquoddy shares the following forms with Shawnee which are not shared by Ojibwa: I—YOU (pl.), YE intrans., YE—ME; THEY an.—HIM. The forms for HE—US (excl. and incl.) presumably are phonetic correspondents; those for HE—THEM an. and THEY an.—THEM an. probably are equivalents. The Passamaquoddy forms for WE (excl. and incl., intrans.), WE (excl.)—THEE, YOU; THOU—US (excl.); YE—US (excl.), coinciding phonetically with the respective Fox forms, are closely similar to the corresponding Shawnee forms. Accordingly, it may be that many of the apparent points of contact with Ojibwa are due merely to the latter having certain points in common with Eastern Algonquian and Cree (this last has reference particularly to the inanimate objective forms above noted). The fact that Ojibwa in the independent mode shares only the terminations for HE—US (excl. and incl.), and THEY an.—US (excl. and incl.), with Fox as opposed to Passamaquoddy, while the latter shares numerous terminations with Fox as opposed to Ojibwa, and at

[1] It is possible that the last change may account for the differences in certain persons of the independent mode in Fox on the one hand and in Ojibwa and Shawnee on the other; but it is also possible to consider the terminations as differing in morphologic structure. The same point occurs in certain other cases.

the same time a goodly number of terminations with Ojibwa as opposed to Fox—certainly points in the same direction. For Cree (Fort Totten) likewise shares the terminations for HE—US (excl. and incl.) and THEY an.— US (excl. and incl.) with Ojibwa and Fox. Now Ojibwa shares in the independent mode no terminations with Fox as opposed to Cree, while the latter shares a number with Fox as opposed to Ojibwa (see below), at the same time having some points in common with Ojibwa as opposed to Fox (see the discussions of Cree and Ojibwa, pp. 247, 267, 268). Therefore the fact that Ojibwa shares with both Cree and Fox the terminations mentioned may be pure chance. Now if Ojibwa and Fox are only remotely connected, it is improbable on the face of it that Shawnee, which is most intimately related to Fox, should be closely connected with Ojibwa also. Consequently, there remain but few points of contact between Ojibwa and Shawnee that are certain.

SAUK, FOX, AND KICKAPOO

We have seen above that Sauk, Fox, and Kickapoo[1] differ from one another by very trifling modifications of pronunciation, vocabularies, and idioms, and that Shawnee is intimately related to them. The close connection of the Eastern Algonquian dialects is to be noted. It may be well to show that the Shawnee forms for THEY an. —US (excl. and incl.), YOU (pl.) are much closer to the Fox forms than the corresponding forms of Passamaquoddy are to the latter, even if the Shawnee forms are not absolutely identical with the Fox correspondents. On the other hand, Passamaquoddy shares absolutely with Fox the terminations in *-pena* which Shawnee only approximates. Yet Passamaquoddy shares the *ban* preterite of Ojibwa (see

[1] The first two are somewhat more closely related than either is to the third. In the discussions of the interrelations of Algonquian languages it is to be understood that Sauk and Kickapoo agree with Fox, though this is rarely mentioned.

Characteristic of Sauk is the use of the singular for the plural also in the obviative (objective) case, and in possessive pronouns of the third person (singular and plural). Thus Sauk *utʌnemāhʌni pyäniwʌni* means either HIS DOG IS COMING or HIS DOGS ARE COMING. The Fox expressions for these are, respectively, *utʌnemōhemʌni pyäniwʌni*, *utʌnemōhema'i pyäniwa'i* (by chance in the phrase Sauk *utʌnemōhʌni* lacks the *m* suffix which Fox has; but even in Sauk the writer has heard the word with the *m* suffix, though (purely by accident) not in this particular phrase). Note, too, Sauk *i'kwäwa neskinawāwa neniwʌni cemamegu änc'tʌmāgutci usīmehʌni*, which means either THE WOMAN HATED THE MAN BECAUSE HER YOUNGER BROTHER HAD BEEN SLAIN BY HIM, or THE WOMAN HATED THE MAN BECAUSE HER YOUNGER BROTHERS HAD BEEN SLAIN BY HIM, or THE WOMAN HATED THE MEN BECAUSE HER YOUNGER BROTHER HAD BEEN SLAIN BY THEM, or THE WOMAN HATED THE MEN BECAUSE HER YOUNGER BROTHERS HAD BEEN SLAIN BY THEM. In Fox such ambiguity is impossible. See sections 34, 45 of the Algonquian sketch in the Handbook of American Indian Languages (*Bulletin 40, part 1, of the Bureau of American Ethnology*). HER YOUNGER BROTHER and HER YOUNGER BROTHERS are distinguished by the respective terminations *-ʌni* and *-a'i*; the obviatives MAN and MEN would be kept apart by the identical respective suffixes; but the subordinate verb would nevertheless have the ending *-tci*.

Kickapoo agrees with Fox against Sauk in these respects, and so must be counted as nearer the former than the latter. Nevertheless in phonetics Kickapoo is further apart from them than either is from the other. In Kickapoo a special feature is a weak *w* which is either heard as full sounding, as *h*, or not at all. Doctor Jones's and the writer's texts exhibit these variations, and strangely enough agree in such variations for the greater part. An example is *ugimāwa*, *ugimāha*, *ugimāa* CHIEF (selected from Doctor Jones's texts; Sauk and Fox *ugimāwa*). In their native syllabary Kickapoo exhibit the variation of recording and not recording the *w*.

the discussion of that language, p. 269), and this feature forces us to rank it as more distant from Fox than is Shawnee. The consonantic clusters of Passamaquoddy, even if for the greater part these are secondary and due to the phonetic elimination of vowels (see the discussion of Eastern subtype, p. 283), also point in this direction.

The fact that Piegan in certain persons of the independent mode shows distinct affinities to Fox has been briefly mentioned above and is treated more fully in the discussion of Piegan (p. 231).

We have seen that Ojibwa is connected only remotely with Fox, but it may be noted that the Ojibwa subjunctive mode of the dubitative conjugation corresponds to the Fox interrogative subjunctive; but to what an extent the transitive forms agree is questionable, as these are not given by Doctor Jones.

Peoria undoubtedly belongs with the Ojibwa group of Central Algonquian languages; still there are some points of contact with Fox. It should be noted that the sibilant is not retained before *p* as in Ojibwa, e. g. Ojibwa *ishpiming*, Shawnee *spemegi*, Fox *a'pemegi*, Peoria *pämingi* ABOVE, IN THE SKY. The fact that Peoria is in certain respects phonetically more archaic than Ojibwa makes certain terminations of the indicative seem to resemble Fox rather than Ojibwa (see the section on Ojibwa, etc., pp. 267, 271); but there is one termination, namely, that for THEY an.—IT, THEM inan., in which the question of phonetics does not arise and which agrees entirely with Fox as opposed to Ojibwa.

The relation of Natick to Fox is not particularly close. In the discussion of the former language it is pointed out that most of the present suppositive mode corresponds to the Fox present subjunctive and that certain persons of the "præter" suppositive mode correspond to the Fox potential subjunctive.

From the statistics given in the discussion of Menominee it will be seen that there are no certain agreements with Fox (Sauk, Kickapoo) that are not shared also by Cree and Montagnais, while Menominee shares quite a few terminations with Cree and Montagnais which are not shared by Fox. The forms that are peculiar to these four languages, with the possible exception of Natick in the first two—the orthography is not clear—are HE—HIM, THEM an., THEY an.—HIM, THEM. The agreement of Delaware (one form) with these four dialects in the forms for I—HIM, THEM an., THOU—HIM, THEM an. is noteworthy. The fact that the inanimate plural in the objective forms of the independent mode in Cree-Montagnais, Menominee, Sauk, Fox, Kickapoo is expressed by the same forms as the inanimate singular as opposed to Ojibwa, Algonkin, Ottawa, Potawatomi, and Shawnee, is remarkable. Peoria presumably agrees with the first group.

The agreement of Ojibwa, Fox, Cree, and Montagnais in the form for THEY an.—US (incl.) of the independent mode may be noted, as also

the agreement of Fox, Ojibwa, Cree, Montagnais, and Delaware (one form) in the termination for HE—US (excl.). (Note that Fort Totten Cree agrees with Fox and Ojibwa in the forms for HE, THEY an.—US (excl. and incl.).)

Fox, Shawnee, Cree, Montagnais, and Natick lack the nasal in the present subjunctive which Ojibwa, Peoria, and Delaware have. It will be seen that Cree agrees with Fox, as opposed to Ojibwa, in the forms WE (excl.)—THEE, YOU; HE—US (excl.). Note that Algonkin agrees with Fox and Cree in the first two instances and approaches them in the last. Presumably Ottawa agrees with Algonkin in the last form as it does in the first two. Few transitive forms of the Peoria present subjunctive are available, but it is certain that Peoria is in substantial concord with Algonkin and Ottawa. The Cree forms with the third person plural as subject or object correspond to the similar Fox participial forms. In some of these forms therefore Ojibwa seems close to Fox, but most of them are entirely different in structure from both Cree and Fox. Cree and Ojibwa agree in the form for I—YOU (pl.) as opposed to Fox. The remarks made concerning Cree apply with certain limitations to Montagnais. (For these, see the discussion of that language, p. 248.) It is a matter of great regret that so few Peoria subjunctive forms are to be found among Doctor Gatschet's papers; for the Peoria conjunctive agrees in the forms for the third person plural animate as both subject and object (with the apparent exception of the forms WE (incl.)—THEM an. and THEY an.—IT, THEM inan.) with the Fox participial rather than with the Fox conjunctive, resembling Cree in the case of the present subjunctive. Now, as may be seen by reference to the Algonquian sketch in the Handbook of American Indian Languages, the terminations for the conjunctive, subjunctive, and participial are closely allied; hence it is very probable that the Peoria subjunctive is in similar agreement. (See, however, p. 271.) It is remarkable that Micmac in the conjunctive, though lacking the nasal, agrees with Peoria in that many forms in which the third person animate plural is either subject or object coincide with the Fox participial rather than with the subjunctive; but the forms for YE—THEM, HE—THEM, THEY—YOU correspond to the Fox conjunctive, not participial. The forms for HE—HIM; THEY an.—HIM, THEM an. differ in structure. (See the discussion of the Eastern subtype of Eastern-Central major division of Algonquian languages, p. 287.)

In the discussion of Montagnais it has been pointed out that the "suppositif" of the "mode subjonctif" is allied with the Fox potential subjunctive. It is repeated here to emphasize the northern affinities of Fox.

The relations of Fox to Delaware may be briefly dismissed. That Delaware shares in the independent mode the forms for I—HIM,

THEM, and THOU—HIM, THEM an. with Fox, Menominee, Montagnais, and Cree has been already pointed out as well as the agreement (one form) with Fox, Ojibwa, Cree, and Montagnais in the termination for HE—US (excl.). The concord of Delaware, Fox, Cree, and Montagnais in the ending for THEY an.—US is of importance in that it shows the northern relationships of Delaware, but a striking similarity is to be found in the fact that Delaware has a correspondent, though altered considerably phonetically, to Fox *-pena*. As noted above, this termination is found alone in Fox but has correspondents in Eastern Algonquian and Piegan, and Shawnee approximates it. The forms which have the equivalent of *-pena* in Delaware are: WE (excl., and incl.?), intransitive; WE (excl.)—THEE, YOU (pl.), HIM; THOU—US (excl.); YE—US (excl.). In all these, however, Delaware has another form as well. The forms for WE (incl.) are not given by Zeisberger, but it is reasonable to believe that they would be the same as the inclusive forms, that is where they would occur, with the substitution of *k'* for *n'*. It may be added that Delaware has a correspondent to the Fox conjunctive mode. (For other points, see the discussion of Delaware, p. 277.)

OJIBWA AND CLOSE LINGUISTIC COGNATES

The following compose this group: Ojibwa, Ottawa, Potawatomi, Algonkin, and (somewhat removed from them) Peoria, etc. A feature of the group is the accretion of a nasal. Delaware agrees with the group in this respect and this is to be considered a special point of contact with the Ojibwa group. Examples are: Fox *utci* WHENCE, Ojibwa, Peoria *ondji*, Ottawa *undji* (Gatschet), Delaware *untschi;* Fox *āneta* SOME, Cree *atit* (for the phonetics, see the discussion of Cree, p. 239), Ojibwa *anind*, Peoria *alenda*, Delaware *alinde;* Fox *anāgw*^{a} STAR, Cree *atak*, Shawnee *alagwa*, Peoria *alangwa*, Ojibwa and Algonkin *anang*, Delaware *allanque*. Other examples can be readily found by consulting the tables of verbal terminations. The formation of the negative verb by means of a suffix *ssi* (or slightly varying forms) apparently is found in no other Algonquian languages. Examples are: Ojibwa *kâwin kiwâbamigossi* HE DOES NOT SEE THEE, *kiwâbamigossig* THEY DO NOT SEE THEE; Peoria *wapamissokō* DO NOT LOOK AT ME, *kikälindansiwa* SHE DID NOT KNOW (Fox *ke'k+äne+itä-*), Ottawa *kawimshe kikikänedissiwak* (Gatschet) THEY ARE NOT YET ACQUAINTED WITH EACH OTHER (Fox *kī+ke'k+äne+tī+wag*^{i} THEY HAD KNOWN EACH OTHER). A sibilant is retained before *p* (as in Menominee and Shawnee) in Ojibwa, Ottawa, and Algonkin, though not in Peoria (the writer can give no information about Potawatomi on this point): Cree *kīcpin* (*kīspin*) IF, Ojibwa *kishpin*, Ottawa *kīcpin;* Algonkin *kicpin;* Cree *ishpimik* ABOVE, Ojibwa *ishpiming*, Peoria *pämingi*, Shawnee

spemegi, Fox *a'pemegi* (cf. Menominee *icpämiyA* OVER and ABOVE). It is pointed out in the section on Sauk, etc., that Shawnee shares the loss of *-wa* with Ojibwa after *i* and *ā*, e. g., Fox *ineniwa*, Menominee *inäniwa*, Cree (Moose) *ileliw*, Shawnee *hileni*, Ojibwa *ineni*, Ottawa *nine*, Potawatomi *nene* (Peoria *läni-a;* see below); Fox *ugimāw*^{a}, Menominee *okēmāw*^{a}, Cree *okimaw*, Shawnee *hugimā*, Ojibwa *ogima*, Algonkin *okima*, Ottawa *ûgima* (Gatschet), Peoria *kimā*. Final *wa* is lost after *e*(*ä*) in Ojibwa, Algonkin, Ottawa, and Potawatomi: Fox *i'kwäw*^{a} WOMAN (Shawnee *i''kwäw*^{a}), Cree *iskwē·u*, Ojibwa *i'kwä*, Algonkin *ikwe*, Ottawa *'kue* (Gatschet), Potawatomi *kwä* (Gatschet).

OJIBWA, POTAWATOMI, OTTAWA, AND ALGONKIN

According to Dr. William Jones, Ojibwa, Ottawa, and Potawatomi are very closely related. This opinion is confirmed by Doctor Gatschet's notes and by personal information. Doctor Jones makes the observation that Potawatomi has a tendency to slur over syllables; this also can be confirmed from Doctor Gatschet's notes and the writer's personal information (e. g., *nenwAg* MEN, Ojibwa *neniwAg*).

Following is the table for the Ojibwa independent and subjunctive modes, taken from Bishop Baraga's Grammar of the Otchipwe Language (second edition, Montreal, 1878). The second *n* of *nin* in the independent mode is the accretion spoken of above. Under certain conditions it is omitted. Presumably Algonkin agrees in the usage. (It may be noted that apparently the dialect of the Mississippi band of Ojibwa at White Earth, Minn., does not completely agree with the usage given by Baraga in his paradigms.)

The very close relationship of Algonkin may be seen from the tables showing the Algonkin present, independent, and subjunctive modes, extracted from Lemoine's Dictionnaire Français-Algonkin (Quebec, 1911).

OJIBWA PRESENT INDEPENDENT MODE

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.	it	they inan.
Intrans. . . .	*nin-*	*nin—min*	*ki—min*	*ki-*	*ki—m*	(1)	*-wag*	(2)	*-on*
me	—	—	—	*ki—(i)*	*ki—im*	*nin—g*	*nin—gag*		
us excl. . . .	—	—	—	*ki—imin*	*ki—imin*	*nin—gonan*	*nin—gonanig*		
us incl. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	*ki—gonan*	*ki—gonanig*		
thee	*ki—n*	*ki—gon*	—	—	—	*ki—g*	*ki—gog*		
you	*ki—ninim*	*ki—gom*	—	—	—	*ki—gowa*	*ki—gowag*		
him	*nin—a*	*nin—anan*	*ki—anan*	*ki—a*	*ki—âwa*	*o—an*	*o—âwan*		
them an. . . .	*nin—ag*	*nin—ananig*	*ki—ananig*	*ki—ag*	*ki—âwag*	*o—an*	*o—âwan*		
it	*nin—ân*	*nin—âmin*	*ki—âmin*	*ki—an*	*ki—ânawa*	*-âm* / *o—an*	*o—ânawa*		
them inan. . .	*nin—ânan*	*nin—âmin*	*ki—âmin*	*ki—ânan*	*ki—ânawan*	*o—ânan*	*o—ânawan*		

[1] The ending proper in some cases is lost phonetically; in others it has not been recorded. Among the forms collected from the Mississippi band of Ojibwa at White Earth is *kīnibō'wa* SHE HAS DIED; the *-wa* was inaudible but was indicated by the lips. The ending *-wa*= Fox *-wa*, Cree *-w* (i. e. *wa*), etc.

[2] The termination is lost phonetically, e. g. *sanagad* IT IS DIFFICULT= Fox *sANAGAtwi* (*sANA* initial stem; *gAt* secondary connective stem; *-wi* third person singular inanimate independent mode intransitive).

OJIBWA PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE MODE

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.
Intrans.	*-iân*	*-iâng*	*-iang*	*-ian*	*-ieg*	*-d*	*-wad*
me	—	—	—	*-iian*	*-iieg*	*-id*	*-iwad*
us excl.	—	—	—	*-iiâng*	*-iiâng*	*-iiangid*	*-iiangidwa*
us incl.	—	—	—	—	—	*-nang*	*-nangwa*
thee	*-nân*	*-goian*	—	—	—	*-k*	*-kwa*
you	*-nagog*	*-goieg*	—	—	—	*-neg*	*-negwa*
him	*-ag*	*-angid*	*-ang*	*-ad*	*-eg*	*-âd*	*-awad*
them an. . . .	*-agwa*	*-angidwa*	*-angwa*	*-adwa*	*-egwa*	*-âd*	*-awad*
it, them, inan. . .	*-âmân*	*-âmâng*	*-âmang*	*-âman*	*-âmeg*	*-âng*	*-âmowad*

ALGONKIN PRESENT INDEPENDENT MODE

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.	it	they inan.
Intrans. . . .	*ni-*	*ni—min*	*ki—min*	*ki-*	*ki—m*	(lost phonetically)	*-wak*	(lost phonetically)	*-on*
me	—	—	—	*ki—*[*i;* lost phonetically]	*ki—im*	*ni—k*	*ni—gok*		
us excl. . . .	—	—	—	*ki—imin*	*ki—imin*	*ni—gonan*	*ni—gonanik*		
us incl. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	*ki—gonan*	*ki—gonanik*		
thee	*ki—n*	*ki—nimin*	—	—	—	*ki—k*	*ki—gok*		
you	*ki—nim*	*ki—nimin*	—	—	—	*ki—gowa*	*ki—gawok*		
him	*ni—a*	*ni—aaan*	*ki—anan*	*ki—a*	*ki—awa*	*o—an*	*o—awan*		
them an. . . .	*ni—ak*	*ni—anonik*	*ki—ananik*	*ki—ak*	*ki—awok*	*o—à*	*o—awà*		
it	*ni—an*	*ni—ananan*	*ki—anan*	*ki—an*	*ki—anawa*	*o—an*	*o—anawn*		
them inan. . .	*ni—anan*	*ni—anananin*	*ki—anananin*	*ki—anan*	*ki—anawan*	*o—anan*	*o—anawan*		

ALGONKIN PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE MODE

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.	it	they inan.
Intrans. . . .	*-iân*	*-iâng*	*-iang*	*-ian*	*-ieg*	*-tc*	*-watc*	*-k*	*-k*
me	—	—	—	*-iian*	*-iieg*	*-itc*	*-iwatc*		
us excl. . . .	—	—	—	*-iiang*	*-iiang*	*-iiamintc*	*-iamindwa*		
us incl. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	*-nang*	*-inangwa*		
thee	*-nan*	*-nang*	—	—	—	*-k*	*-kwo*		
you	*-nagok*	*-naag*	—	—	—	*-nag*	*-nagwa*		
him	*-ak*	*-ângitc*	*-ang*	*-atc*	*-eg*	*-ātc*	*-awotc*		
them an. . . .	*-akwa*	*-angitwa*	*-angwa*	*-atwa*	*-egwa*	*-ātc*	*-owatc*		
it, them, inan, .	*amân*	*amâng*	*-amang*	*-aman*	*-ameg*	*-ang*	*-omawatc*		

The independent mode will be discussed first. WE (excl.)—THEE, YOU agrees in structure with the correspondents in Ottawa, Potawatomi, Natick, and Peoria (the writer lacks a form to prove this for Peoria in the form WE (excl.)—YOU, but the inference is justifiable). They approximate the Menominee correspondents. WE (excl. and incl.)—IT agrees in structure with Ottawa and the Cree of Fort Totten; WE (excl. and incl.)—THEM inan. agrees with Ottawa (it will be remembered that in Cree the third person plural inanimate coincides with the singular). HE—THEM an., and THEY an.—THEM an. agree with Passamaquoddy in formation.

The subjunctive mode now will be taken up. WE (excl.)—THEE, YOU agree in formation with Cree, Fox, Shawnee, Natick, Delaware, and presumably also with Peoria. (The correspondent in Ottawa for WE (excl.)—YOU is not absolutely certain: see below.) The Ojibwa correspondents are passives in structure; the same may be said of the same forms of the Ojibwa independent mode. WE (excl.)—HIM, THOU—HIM, HE intrans., HE—ME, HE—US (excl.), HE—HIM, HE—THEM an., THEY an. intrans., THEY an.—ME, THEY an.—HIM, THEY an.—THEM an., THEY an.—IT, THEM inan. are conjunctives in structure and agree (with the regular phonetic differences) absolutely with the corresponding forms in Fox, and with the exception of HE—US (excl.) and THEY an.—US (excl.) (which differ slightly in structure, though exhibiting the same type of formation) also with those of Shawnee. Peoria agrees with the Algonkin forms under discussion in the terminations for WE (excl.)—HIM, THOU—HIM, HE intrans., HE—ME, HE—HIM, THEY an. intrans., THEY an.—HIM, THEY an.—IT, THEM inan. The Algonkin form for THEY an.—US (excl.), though agreeing with Ojibwa in the final syllable, nevertheless agrees with Fox (and partially with Shawnee and Cree) in morphological formation. It should be noted that the structure of HE—US (excl.) and THEY an.—US (excl.) is fundamentally the same in the corresponding forms of the Fox, Shawnee, Cree (and Peoria?) subjunctive; the Fox, Shawnee, and Peoria conjunctive; the Fox and Shawnee participial.

With the exceptions noted above, Algonkin agrees completely with Ojibwa in the present tense of the independent and subjunctive modes.

The writer's personal experience with Ottawa was confined to a few hours at Carlisle; hence but a brief description can be given. Syllables are slurred over as in Potawatomi, though probably not to so great an extent. Examples are *kwāb*ʌ*mim* YE SEE ME, *kmīnin* I GIVE THEE. Final *n* is almost inaudible; compare the suppression of final *m*, *n*, *l* in Nass (Handbook of American Indian Languages, part 1, p. 288). In some cases the writer has consistently recorded the sound as a mere aspiration, e. g. in the independent forms for WE (excl. and incl.)—HIM, HE—US (excl. and incl.). In the objective forms of

THEM inan. the writer has consistently recorded the terminal *n* as full-sounding, as also in the forms for I—IT, THOU—IT, HE—HIM, HE—THEM an., HE—IT, THEY an.—HIM, THEM an., THEY an.—IT. In the remaining cases where final *n* is to be expected in the independent mode, excepting the form for I—THEE, the writer has been inconsistent in the recording and non-recording of the sound in question. The problem is further complicated by the fact that the informant likewise spoke Ojibwa, and gave certain forms with the terminal *n* as Ojibwa and the correspondents without them (at least to the writer's ear) as Ottawa. Hence it is possible that confusion of dialect may account for the apparent inconsistency noted above. It may be mentioned that the late Doctor Gatschet's notes on Ottawa show forms without terminal *n* when etymologically expected; but the writer can not say whether the former was consistent in his usage. Another point in phonetics worth noting is that the terminal vowel in the forms I—HIM, THOU—HIM, YE—HIM is distinctly aspirated. Surd and sonant when terminal are extremely hard to distinguish. This applies especially to *d* and *t*. The writer is convinced that with the possible exception in the forms HE—THEE, IT, THEY inan., intransitive, of the subjunctive, *k* does not occur terminally, and that forms which sound as if containing this really end in strong (impure) sonant *g*. Medially surds and sonants are far easier to keep apart. Corresponding to Ojibwa and Algonkin terminal *ng* in the subjunctive the writer consistently heard a post-palatal *y* without a following stop.

Turning now to the verbal forms of the present independent and subjunctive which show the general relationship of Ottawa to other members of the group: In the independent mode the forms for WE (excl. and incl.)—IT, THEM inan.; WE (excl.)—THEE, YOU agree in formation with Algonkin as opposed to Ojibwa. (The form for WE (excl.) —THEE, YOU *k—ninim* is noteworthy for the difference in phonetics as compared with the Algonkin correspondent.) In the same mode Ottawa agrees with Ojibwa as opposed to Algonkin in the forms for HE—THEM an., THEY an.—THEM an. Distinctive of Ottawa (apparently) is the fact that the form for THEY an.—IT is the same as THEY an.—THEM inan. In the subjunctive it may be noted that the forms for WE (excl.)—HIM, THOU—HIM, HE intrans., HE—ME, HE—HIM, HE—THEM an., THEY an. intrans., THEY an.—ME, THEY an.—HIM, THEY an.—THEM an. are subjunctives (cf. Ojibwa) and not conjunctives (cf. Algonkin). The forms that the writer received for HE—US (excl.), THEY an.—US (excl. and incl.), THEY an.—THEE, THEY an.—YOU are passives in formation, probably due to some misunderstanding. The structure of WE (excl.)—THEE (and presumably WE (excl.)—YOU) agrees with Algonkin as opposed to Ojibwa. It should be noted that the form for THEY an.—IT, THEM inan., *anāwād*, apparently is absolutely unique, but the form evidently is to be associated with IT, THEM inan. in objective forms of the independent mode.

The writer's personal information on Potawatomi is too slight for him to make very definite statements concerning its precise relationship with Ojibwa, Ottawa, and Algonkin. As stated above, all are very intimately related. Potawatomi agrees with Algonkin and Ottawa in the structure of the form for WE (excl.)—THEE, YOU of the independent mode as opposed to Ojibwa. On the other hand it agrees with the latter language in the formation of WE (excl., and presumably incl.)—IT, THEM inan., of the same mode as opposed to Ottawa and Algonkin. Potawatomi possesses some marked characteristics of its own in the formation of the independent mode; WE (excl.)—HIM (*n—āmin*) and WE (incl.)—HIM (*k—āmin*) have no correspondents in any Central Algonquian language noted thus far. The forms resemble strongly the inanimate correspondents, but the instrumental *m* (not *t*) distinctly proves that they must be animate. The component elements are the respective intransitive correspondents combined with the common objective pronoun, third person animate, *ā*. The plurals of the forms under discussion must have had a similar structure. THEY an.—YOU (*k—gom*) is unquestionably a passive in formation. Apparently THEY an.—IT has the same termination as THEY an.—THEM inan.

Owing to phonetic differences, Cree, Menominee, Ojibwa, Algonkin, Ottawa, Delaware, and Passamaquoddy seem to agree in the forms for HE—ME, THEE as opposed to Sauk, Fox, Kickapoo, Shawnee, and Peoria, but Penobscot and Montagnais demonstrate that the phonetic change, though the same in the dialects mentioned, is merely a parallel development and has no significance in determining the ethnic relations of the tribes. The umlaut of Passamaquoddy in the forms demonstrates that the change in that dialect at least was a very recent one. In the same way Ojibwa *-âm* is merely the phonetic equivalent of Fox *Amw*^{a} and Peoria *-amwa*.

The Ojibwa present, of both independent and subjunctive modes will now be discussed. Bearing in mind the comments made above on Algonkin, Ottawa, and Potawatomi, this will make clear the general linguistic relations of the entire group. The special points of Peoria are considered below. It may be mentioned here that ordinarily in the statistics of linguistic agreements given throughout this paper the agreement of Algonkin, Ottawa, and Potawatomi with Ojibwa is not noted. Where the agreement of Peoria is important, the fact of the agreement is noted. We will begin with the independent mode.

As noted in the discussion of Fox, Ojibwa shares no terminations with that language which are not shared by Cree except the terminations for HE, THEY an.—US (incl.) which are allied to the forms for HE, THEY an.—US (excl.) and THEY inan. intrans. (Fort Totten Cree agrees with Ojibwa and Fox in THEY an.—US (incl.).) For

this reason we can definitely state that Ojibwa has few, if any, special points of contact with Fox. As is pointed out in the discussion of Shawnee, Ojibwa shares the following forms with that language: I—HIM, THEM an.; THOU—HIM, THEM an.; YE—HIM, THEM an.; HE—YOU (pl.), HIM; THEY an.—YOU (pl.), HIM. It will be observed that Passamaquoddy likewise shares these forms except that for YE—THEM an. It should be noted that the Shawnee forms for I, THOU, YE, HE, THEY an.—THEM inan.; YE, THEY an.—IT certainly are closely connected with the Ojibwa correspondents. It is unfortunate that the Passamaquoddy equivalents are not available. However, it should be noted that Cree agrees in general structure with Shawnee in these forms with the exception of HE, THEY an.—THEM inan., THEY an.—IT. On account of the unsatisfactory material at our disposal, it is best to abstain from a discussion of the relations of Ojibwa to Delaware regarding the independent mode here and refer the reader to the section dealing with Delaware. It will be noted that Ojibwa and Natick show some very marked agreements in the independent mode, namely, in the terminations for the first (excl., and incl.?) and second persons plural as both subject and objects. Owing to the deficient orthography, it is difficult to establish other close relations with Natick, but it is clear that in a considerable number of cases Natick differs from Ojibwa. With Cree, Ojibwa shares no forms that are not shared also by other Algonquian languages outside the Ojibwa group. (Forms are lacking to prove this for WE (incl.)—HIM, THEM an.; but the inference can be made with certainty.) The same applies to Menominee. The Menominee forms for WE (excl. and incl.), YE intrans., YE—ME approximate the Ojibwa correspondents, but it should be noted that in these cases Natick likewise resembles them. The same applies to I, WE excl.—YOU. (The form WE (incl.) intrans. is lacking, but the analogy of WE (excl.) intrans. permits us to infer the form.) The agreement of Cree and Menominee with Ojibwa in the forms of I, THOU—IT, and their approximation in the forms for YE—HIM, THEM an. should be noted; as also the approximation of the Cree form for YE—IT.

We will now proceed to discuss the subjunctive. The presence of the nasal as in Algonkin, Ottawa, Potawatomi (?), Peoria, and Delaware will be noted. But Ojibwa has little in common with the last language in this mode outside the presence of the nasal. The terminations of the third person animate, plural, as both subject and object, for the greater part are in *-wa*. It should be noted that Peoria differs most from Ojibwa in the same persons of the conjunctive and hence presumably (see below) in the subjunctive. Algonkin and Ottawa agree with Ojibwa in this formation. It is a matter of regret that a table for the Potawatomi present subjunctive is not available, as it would be of great assistance in determining the pre-

cise relations of that language to the other members of the division. A similar formation is found in Menominee and also in Cree (East Main). See the section on Menominee. Owing to phonetic changes, Ojibwa and Cree seem to agree often as opposed to Fox, Peoria, and Shawnee, but this is quite accidental. The terminations for WE (excl.)—THEE, YOU are really passives in formation; Algonkin and Ottawa represent the original type. The formation of the terminations of HE—US (excl.), THEY an.—US (excl.) is characteristic of Ojibwa, quite irrespective of the fact that the last ends in *-wa*. The forms are certainly allied to the forms for WE (excl.)—HIM, THEM an. The termination for I—YOU agrees with Cree and Peoria as opposed to Fox. Exclusive of the formations mentioned, the agreement between Ojibwa, Cree, and Fox in this mode is remarkable.

There are a few other points to be considered. Ojibwa can form a preterite in *ban*. Cree and Delaware have a correspondent and the formation of past tenses of subordinate modes by means of this suffix is an important point of contact between these languages. It is remarkable that Montagnais, though sharing the formation in the indicative, apparently lacks it in subordinate modes. Penobscot and Malecite likewise share the formation in the indicative, but the writer can not say whether they use it in the formation of past tenses of the subordinate modes. However, here we find a point of contact with Eastern Algonquian. Peoria has a similar formation but with a suffix *pa*. So far as known to the writer, its use is confined to the independent mode. Delaware possesses the same formation and it is also used to build up past tenses of subordinate modes. It is found also in Natick but seems to be confined to the independent mode. In Micmac it is attached to the conjunctive mode (which is used as an indicative) to form a past tense of the indicative; it is used in the subjunctive also, to judge from l'Abbé Maillard's Grammaire de la Langue Mikmaque (New York, 1869). On the same authority it may be added that Micmac apparently has the equivalent of the Ojibwa *ban* preterite, but only in the subjunctive, not elsewhere. These features make the Micmac forms seem so strange.

To sum up, Ojibwa chief linguistic relations are with Ottawa, Potawatomi, Algonkin, and (somewhat removed) with Peoria (see below). It has relations also with Eastern Algonquian and Cree; it is apparently but distantly related to Fox (also to Sauk and Kickapoo); it apparently has important points of contact with Shawnee, but, as stated in the discussion of that language, these, for the greater part, may be due to the fact that Shawnee has much in common with Eastern Algonquian. Ojibwa and Delaware, exclusive of the nasality and the *ban* preterite (both of which are striking), have not very much in common, but the trouble may be with our material. Ojibwa is not closely related to Menominee.

PEORIA

It was noted above that Peoria [1] certainly belongs to the Ojibwa group, as is shown by the accretion of a nasal and the formation of the negative verb. However, it possesses some strongly marked traits of its own. First of all, it has both *n* and *l* corresponding to Ojibwa, Menominee, Fox, etc., *n* under unknown conditions, and it agrees with Shawnee and Delaware in this use and to a certain extent with Eastern Algonquian. Further, a sibilant is not retained before *p* as it is in Ojibwa, e. g., *pämingi*, Ojibwa *ishpiming*, Fox *a'pemeg*[i]. Below appear the tables of the Peoria independent, conjunctive, and subjunctive modes so far as the writer has been able to construct them from Doctor Gatschet's notes and texts. The transitive forms of the independent mode are all taken from texts. Apparently Doctor Gatschet mistook the conjunctive for the independent. The confusion of surd and sonant has been left unchanged.

PEORIA INDEPENDENT MODE

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.
Intrans. . .	*ni*{*n-* / *m-*	*nin* / *nim*}*-mina*	*ki—mina*	*ki-*	*ki—mwa*	*-wa*	*-waki*
me . . .	—	—	—			*ni—kwa*	*n—koki*
us excl. . .	—	—	—			*ki—gona*	
us incl. . .	—	—	—	—	—		
thee . . .		*ki—lämina*		—	—	*ki—kwa*	
you . . .	*ki—limwa*			—	—		
him . . .	*nd—a*					*-a*	
them an. .	*ni—aki* [2]						
it, them inan.						*-amwa*	*-amōki*

PEORIA CONJUNCTIVE MODE

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.
Intrans. . .	*-yani*	*-yangi*	*-yangwi*	*-yani*	*-yikwi*	*-dji*	*-wadji*
me . . .	—	—	—	*-iyani*	*-iyikwi*	*-ita*	*-itciki*
us excl. . .	—	—	—	*-iyangi*	*-iangi*	*-iaminda*	*-iaminciki*
us incl. . .	—	—	—	—	—	*-langwa*	*-langwiki*
thee . . .	*-lani*	*-langi*	—	—	—	*-atciki*	*-'kiki*
you . . .	*-lakaki*	*-langi*	—	—	—	*-läkwa*	*-lakwiki*
him . . .	*-aki*	*-akinci*	*-angwi*	*-adji*	*-ckwi*	*-ata*	*-atciki*
them an. .	*-akiki*	*-akinciki*	*-angwi*	*-adjiki*	*-ckwi(ki?)*	*-atciki*	*-atciki*
it	*-amani*					*angi*	*amawatci*

PEORIA SUBJUNCTIVE MODE

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.
Intrans. . .	*-yanä*	*-yangiä*	*-yangwä*	*-yanä*	*-yikwä*	*-tä*	*-watä*
him . . .	*-akä*		*-angwä*	*-atä*	*-äkwä*	*-atä*	*-awata*

[1] The writer has not sufficient material to warrant dealing with the question of the exact relation of Peoria to Miami, etc., beyond stating that they all seem intimately related.

[2] Miami.

Owing to the fact that Peoria phonetically is more archaic than Ojibwa in some respects, some of the forms of the independent mode seem to resemble more closely Fox than Ojibwa (the same applies to the conjunctive mode). But passing these over, Peoria has at least these formations which have no correspondents in Ojibwa: I—YOU (pl.); WE (excl.)—THEE; THEY an.—IT, THEM inan. The first two agree with Algonkin, Ottawa, Potawatomi, and Natick, the last with Fox, Cree, and Menominee. It is a matter of regret that Doctor Gatschet made no systematic collection of indicative forms, as some of them might prove to be important in establishing the relations of Peoria. However, from the meager terminations that the writer has been able to collect, it is possible to infer with certainty the forms for I—THEE, THOU—HIM, THOU—THEM an., YE—ME, YE—HIM, YE—THEM an., HE—YOU, THEY an.—THEE, THEY an.—YOU; and these confirm us in maintaining that Peoria belongs with Ojibwa, Ottawa, Algonkin, and Potawatomi. The form for HE—US (excl.) is extremely interesting: unless there is a phenomenon similar to that in Ottawa, and unfortunately we have not sufficient material to determine this, we have a point of contact with Shawnee (which geographically would not be surprising). If the form in question is really identical with the Shawnee form, then we can infer with absolute surety that the forms for HE—US (incl.), THEY an.—US (excl. and incl.) agree with their Shawnee correspondents.

The Peoria conjunctive and subjunctive are discussed in the sections dealing with Cree and Sauk. The terminations of the conjunctive, in which the third person plural animate is subject or object, correspond to the Fox, Shawnee, and Ojibwa participial mode. Now, as in Algonquian the terminations of the conjunctive, participial, and subjunctive are very closely allied, we may infer that the Peoria subjunctive in these persons agreed with the conjunctive. It will be observed that, with the apparent exception of the terminations for HE—THEM an. and WE (incl.)—THEM an., these forms would agree (as do those of the conjunctive) with the Cree subjunctive. (In reading Doctor Gatschet's texts the writer has met with *-atci* and *-awatci*, the terminations for HE—HIM, THEM an., THEY an.—HIM, THEM an., respectively. These are true conjunctive forms. The question hence arises to what an extent his notes giving the forms in the table should be accepted. The true conjunctive forms agree with the Fox and Shawnee correspondents of the same mode, and with the Algonkin correspondents of the subjunctive mode.) Even substituting the Ojibwa participial for the subjunctive in these persons, THEY an.—US (excl.) represent a different structure from that of the Ojibwa correspondent; note also the same difference exists in the form for HE—US (excl.) (see the discussion of Algonkin and Menominee, pp. 252, 265). THEY an.—IT, THEM inan. is a true conjunctive and agrees exactly with the Fox and Shawnee form of the same mode, and the corresponding Algon-

kin form in the subjunctive mode. It should be noticed that Micmac partially shares the feature of the Peoria conjunctive. In the other forms of the conjunctive Peoria agrees with Fox (Shawnee nearly), Algonkin, Cree, and Micmac (treating conjunctive and subjunctive as interchangeable) in the terminations for WE (excl.)—THEE, YOU; HE—US (excl.); (with Natick also in WE (excl.)—THEE, YOU); with Ojibwa, Algonkin, and Cree in the form for I—YOU (pl.). The other forms call for no comment.

From its phonetics Peoria, as said above, seems to resemble Fox closely in some particulars. But its more northern relationships are shown by the fact that the nominative plural of the inanimate noun ends in *a*, agreeing absolutely with Cree, and also by the fact that it shares with Cree and Montagnais a set of terminations that correspond to the Fox interrogative conjunctive and subjunctive, but lack the final syllable *ni*, whereas Ojibwa and Algonkin have the *n* even if the final vowel may be lost.

In closing the discussion of Peoria it should be mentioned that this language, together with Fox, Sauk, Kickapoo, and Shawnee, are the only Algonquian languages in which every animate noun and inanimate noun are known positively to end in the nominative singular in *a* and *i*, respectively (excluding cases in which *wa* is lost phonetically in Shawnee). It is possible that others also may share this feature. Menominee and Ojibwa should be especially investigated with a view to securing additional information on this point.[1]

NATICK

That Natick belongs to the Central subdivision and not to the Eastern subdivision of the Eastern-Central major division of Algonquian languages is patent from the personal terminations of the verb in the present tense (affirmative form) of the indicative and suppositive (subjunctive) modes. Compare the following tables, extracted from Eliot:[2]

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.
Intrans. . .	*n-*	*n—mun*		*k-*	*k—mwœ*	*-u*[3]	*-wog*
me	—	—	—	*k—ch*	*k—imwœ*	*n—k*	*n—kquog*
us excl. . .	—	—	—	*k—imun*	*k—imun*		*n—kqunnonog*
us incl. . .	—	—	—	—	—	*k—kqun*	
thee . . .	*k—sh*	*k—numun*	—	—	—	*k—k*	*k—kquog*
you . . .	*k—numwœ*	*k—numun*	—	—	—	*k—kœ*	*k—kœoog*
him . . .	*n—*[?]	*n—oun*		*k—*[?]	*k—au*	*-uh*	*-ouh*
them an. .	*n—óog*	*n—ónonog*		*k—œg*	*k—œg*	*-uh*	*-ouh*
it, them inan.(?)	*n—umun*	*n—umumun*		*k—umun*	*k—umumwœ*	*-umun*, *-um*[1]	*-umwog*

[1] Though the writer worked with the Mississippi band of Ojibwa (living at White Earth, Minn.) only a short time, he was able to determine the fact that in the independent mode the termination for THOU—ME in the same mode has a final whispered *-i*.

[2] In *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, 2d ser., IX, Boston, 1832.

[3] Taken from forms in J. H. Trumbull's Natick Dictionary (*Bull. 25, Bur. Amer. Ethnol.*).

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.
Intrans. . .	*-on*	*-og*		*-an*	*-ôg*	*-og?*	*-ohettit?*
me	—	—	—	*-ɛan*	*-ɛôg*	*-it*	*-hettit*
us excl. . . .	—	—	—	*-ɛog*	*-ɛog*	*-kqueoġ*	*-kqueog*
us incl. . . .	—	—	—	—	—		
thee	*-non*	*-nog*	—	—	—	*-kqucan*	*-kqueon*
you	*-nôg*	*-nog*	—	—	—	*-kqueòg*	*-kqueòg*
him	*-og*	*-ogkut*		*avdt*	*-ôg*	*-ont*	
them (an.) . .	*-og*	*-ogkut*		*-odt*	*-ôg*	*-ont* *-ohettit*	*-a'hettit*
it, them inan.(?)	*-umon*	*-umog*		*-uman*	*-umôg*	*-uk*	*-umohettit*

We will first take up the terminations of the indicative. I—YOU, YE intrans., YE—ME resemble the correspondents in Peoria and Menominee. Owing to the deficient orthography, a positive conclusion as to which of these Natick most closely resembles in the forms under discussion is not possible. It is probably the latter. WE (excl., intrans.); WE—THEE, YOU; THOU, YE—US (excl.); YE—HIM patently are to be associated with the Algonkin equivalents (and hence partly the Ojibwa ones). I, WE (excl.), THOU, YE—THEM an. presumably have the same affinities. HE—US (incl.) resembles the Shawnee (as certain others do as implied by the agreement with Algonkin) and Passamaquoddy (possibly also Peoria). HE—HIM apparently is to be connected with the Cree, Menominee, and Fox equivalent, but the phonetics are uncertain; THEY an.—THEM an. probably is to be associated with the Algonkin and Shawnee correspondent. WE (excl.)—HIM has a counterpart in Passamaquoddy. The forms with the inanimate object(s) are plainly composed of the intransitive forms and the pronominal element to be seen in Fox *-amw^a*, *-amowāte*, etc.: see section 34 of the Algonquian sketch in the Handbook of American Indian Languages (*Bulletin 40, B. A. E.*), pt. 1. The final *n* in I—IT, THOU—IT, HE—IT presumably is a purely phonetic accretion. It should be mentioned expressly that *-umwog* THEY an.—IT is not to be directly connected with Cree *-amwag*, as is shown by the forms of THEY an.—ME, THEE (Cree *ni—gwag*, *ki—gwag*, respectively). The corresponding inanimate forms of Delaware should be compared.

It should be noticed that the personal terminations of the suppositive mode do not have the *n* as do the Ojibwa group and Delaware, thus agreeing with Fox, etc., Cree-Montagnais, Menominee, and Micmac. A detailed discussion is uncalled for. Most of the forms have the closest correspondence to Fox. The following find their closest correspondents in Delaware: HE—THEE, HE—YOU, HE—THEM (one form) an., THEY an.; intransitive, THEY an.—ME, THEY an.—THEE, THEY an.—YOU, THEY an.—HIM, THEY an.—THEM; HE, THEY an.—US (excl.) resemble the Delaware correspondents.

The terminations of the "præter" tense of the suppositive mode are patently allied to those of the present tense of the same mode. The distinctive mark is a final *s*. It will be observed from the following table that the endings for HE—ME, HE—HIM, HE—THEM an. correspond to the Fox potential subjunctive:

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.
Intrans. . .	*-os*	*-ogkis*		*-as*	*-ógkis*	*-ogkis*	*-ohettis*
me	—	—	—	*-cas*	*-cógkus*	*-is*	*-(c)hettis*
us excl. . .	—	—	—	*-cogkus*			
us incl. . .	—	—	—	—	—	*-kqucogkus*	*-kqucogkus*
thee . . .	*-nos*	*-nogkus*	—	—	—	*-kqueas*	*-kqueas*
you . . .	*-nógkus*	*-nogkus*	—	—	—	*-kquecógkus*	*-kqueógkus*
him . . .	*-nogkus*	*-nogkutus*		*-os*	*-ógkus*	*-os*	*-ahettis*
them . . .	*-nogkus*	*-nogkutus*		*-os*	*-ógkus*	*-os*	*-ahettis*
it, them in-an.(?)	*-umos*	*-umogkus*		*-umósa*	*-umógkus*	*-ukis*	*-umahettis*

The negative verb is formed by the insertion of *-œ-* (*o*), which apparently corresponds to Delaware *-wi-*. Examples are: Natick *kuppaumunœop* I DID NOT PAY THEE, Delaware *atta k'pendolowip* I DID NOT HEAR THEE.

The inanimate plural of nouns resembles the Piegan and Cheyenne forms.

The cluster *sk* is kept as in Cree and the Eastern subtype of the Eastern-Central major division of Algonquian languages; the combination of a sibilant + *p* and *t* presumably become *'p* and *'t*, respectively, though this is not certain, owing to the deficient alphabet: Cree *micpun* IT IS SNOWING, SNOW, Fox *me'pu-* TO SNOW, Natick *muhpoo* IT SNOWS; Cree *mictig* WOOD, Fox *me'tegwi* TREE, Shawnee *mtegwi*, Ojibwa *mezhtig* (Turtle Mountain), Natick *mehtug*, Delaware *mehittuck*, Minsi *michtuk;* Cree *miskawew* (Lacombe) HE FINDS HIM, Fox *me'k-* TO FIND, Malecite *muskuwan* HE FOUND HER, Natick *miskom* HE FINDS IT; Cree *maskwa* BEAR, Fox *ma'kwa*, Shawnee *m·kwa*, Ojibwa *ma'kwa*, Peoria *maxkwa*, Natick *mosq*. (There are also cases where a sibilant apparently is retained before *p* in Natick.) The characteristic consonantic clusters of the Eastern subtype are wanting, and it should be noticed that *l* also is lacking, confirming the opinion that Natick belongs to the Central type.

Owing to the deficient alphabet it is difficult to determine the true consonantic clusters of the language. The groups *-dt-* and *-gk-* and *-bp-* are merely graphic for strong sonants so characteristic of many American Indian languages. The accretion *-n-*, *-m-* occurs but does not agree with Ojibwa in usage, now having it where lacking in Ojibwa, now lacking it where Ojibwa has it. Thus, *wompi* WHITE,

Ojibwa *wâbi*, Fox *wâpi; wonkqussis* FOX (really a diminutive), Ojibwa *wā'guc; anoggs* STAR, Ojibwa *anang*, Delaware *allanque*, Peoria *alangwa*, Fox *Anāgwa*, Cree *atak* (for the phonetics, see the discussion of Cree, p. 239).

The lexical correspondence with the dialects of the Central subtype is far greater than is indicated in Trumbull's Natick Dictionary. (The same may be remarked of the Pequot-Mohegan material published by Speck and Prince.) However, at the present time it is impossible to say in which language the greatest number of correspondents are to be found.

Delaware

Zeisberger's material as contained in his grammar[1] is not good:[2] The forms of the various dialects are given without assigning each form to its proper dialect (see Zeisberger, p. 113, footnote); in the same paradigm some transitive forms have instrumentals, while others lack them; the spelling of one and the same personal termination is frequently absolutely inconsistent (e. g., *-que*, *-ke*); some passives are given as active transitive forms, and in at least one instance (possibly in more; see below) an inanimate objective form is given as animate. Under these unfortunate conditions the tables here given for the present indicative and subjunctive are bound to contain errors, for in the absence of Delaware informants representing the three dialects the writer has had to use discrimination as to the rejection or retention of certain forms. For this reason it is impossible to make very definite statements concerning the general relationships of Delaware among Algonquian languages. Yet the tables will have one result at least, albeit a negative one, namely, that the common supposition that Delaware is intimately connected with Eastern Algonquian (Micmac, Malecite, Passamaquoddy, Penobscot, and Abnaki) is certainly a mistaken one. On the possibility that the three Delaware divisions, Munsee, Unami, and Unalachtigo, were really separate tribes, each having special points of contact with different Central-Algonquian languages, though mutually intelligible, and that the apparent unity was only political, see page 279.

[1] A Grammar of the Language of the Lenno Lenape or Delaware Indians, Philadelphia, 1830.

[2] Others also have criticized Zeisberger adversely (see Brinton, The Lenâpé, p. 105, Philadelphia, 1885, who holds that the criticisms were unnecessarily severe. Correct his last reference to 1869–70, p. 105 ff).

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.
Intrans.	*n'-*	*n'—{neen / hhena*		*k'-*	*k'—{hhima / newo*	*w'- / -u*	*{-wak / -newa / w—newa*
me	—	—	—	*k'—i*	*k'—ihhima*	*n'—{k / gun*	*{n'—{gaak / ge / genewa*
us excl.	—	—	—	*k'—{ineen / ihhena*	*{k'—{ineen / ihhena / ihhenoak / ihhummena*	*n'—{guneen / guna*	*{n'—{geneen / gehhena / [n'?]—gunanak*
us incl.	—	—	—	—	—		*{k'—geneen / [k'?]—gunanak*
thee	*k'—{-ll / len*	*k'—{loneen / lohhena*	—	—	—	*k'—{k / gun*	*{k'—{gaak / ge / genewo*
you	*k'—lohhunao*	*k'—{lohhunao / lohhena*	—	—	—	*k'—guwa*	*{k'—gehhima / [k'?]—guwawak*
him	*n'—{an / a / awa*	*n'—{aneen / ohhena*		*k'—{an / a / awa*	*{k'—{awawa / anewo*	*{-an / -awal / -gol*	*{-awall / -anewa / w'—anewa / -gal*
them an.	*n'—{awak / anewa*	*n'—{awuna / awunanak / awawuno / awawak*		*k'—{awak / anewo*	*{k'—{awawak / awawall*	*-awak / w'—awak*	*{-awawak / w'—awawak / -awawall / -gok / w'—anawak*
It (them inan.?)	*n'—amen*	*n'—amahhena*		*[k—?]—amen*	*[k'?]—amohhuma*	*-amen*	*-amenewa*

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.
Intrans.	-ya -yane	-yenke		-yane	-yeque	-te	-chtite
me	—	—	—	-iyane	-iyeqûe	-ite	-ichtite
us excl.	—	—	—	-iyenke	-iyenke	-quenke	-quenke
us incl.	—	—	—	—	—		
thee	-llane	-lenque	—	—	—	-quonne	-quonne
you	-leque	-leque	—	—	—	-queque	-queque
him	-achte -ake		-anque	-anne	-aque	-ate	-achtite
them an.	-achtite -awake		-awonque	-awonne -achte -awawonne	-awake -achtique [-eki?]	-achtite -akhittite	-achtite -awachtite
it (them inan.?)	-ama	-amenke -amenque		-amane	-ameque	-anke	-amichtite

We will first discuss the independent mode. The first thing that will be noticed is the diversity of forms for one and the same person as subject and object. Such diversity is not found among other Algonquian languages and at once arouses suspicion that the multiplicity of forms is due to the fact that the different forms really belong to separate dialects. When we note further that the different forms point to contact with different Algonquian languages, the probability of this inference is heightened. Thus, *n'—neen* WE (excl. intrans.), *k'—loneen* WE (excl.)—THEE, *k'—ineen* THOU, YE—US (excl.), agree with Cree-Montagnais; *n'—hhena* WE (excl., intrans.), *k'—lohhena* WE (excl.)—THEE, *k'—ihhena* THOU, YE—US (excl.) agree with Fox and Passamaquoddy; *n'—a* I—HIM, *k'—a* THOU—HIM agree with Passamaquoddy, Shawnee, and Ojibwa; *n'—awa* I—HIM, *k'—awa* THOU—HIM with Fox, Menominee, and Cree-Montagnais; *n'—guna* HE—US (excl.) agrees with Passamaquoddy, Shawnee, and Peoria(?); *n'—guneen* HE—US (excl.) with Fox, Cree-Montagnais, and Ojibwa; *n'—aneen* WE (excl.)—HIM agrees with Ojibwa and Cree-Montagnais; *n'—ohhena* WE (excl.)—HIM agrees with Fox.

The cognates of the remaining forms so far as available

will now be given: *n'—awak, k'—awak* I—THEM an., THOU—THEM an., respectively, have correspondents in Fox, Menominee, and Cree-Montagnais; *k'—awawa* YE—HIM agrees with Menominee and Cree-Montagnais; (*n'* ?)—*gunanak*, (*k'* ?)—*gunanak* THEY an.—US (excl. and incl., respectively) agree with Fox, Fort Totten Cree, and Ojibwa (the former also with the Cree of Horden and Montagnais); *k'—guwa* HE—YOU (pl.) has a correspondent in Shawnee, Passamaquoddy, and Ojibwa; *k'—guwawak* THEY an.—YOU (pl.), one in Fox, Menominee, and Cree-Montagnais; *n'—gun, k'—gun* have counterparts in the Montagnais forms for ON—ME, TE, respectively; *w'*—HE (intrans.) has a correspondent in Eastern Algonquian, *-u* HE intrans. corresponds to Fox, Shawnee, and Peoria *-wa*, Cree *-w*, Montagnais *-u; -gok* THEY an.—THEM an. is a passive and corresponds to Fox *-gōgi;* the forms *n'-, k'—ll, len; k'-; k'—i; -wak; n'—k, k'—k, n'—gook; k'—gook* are common Central Algonquian; *k'—ihenook* YE—US (excl.) is a pluralized form of *k'—ihhena; k'—awawak* YE—THEM an. agrees with Menominee and Cree-Montagnais and illustrates the same formation; *-awall* THEY an.—HIM (with phonetic differences) is close to the Ojibwa correspondent: if *w'-* is to be restored, it coincides exactly; as it stands it agrees with the Passamaquoddy correspondent; the forms *n'—gehhena, k'—gehhimo* are palpably passives and really should not have been included; *-gol* HE—HIM, to judge from Shawnee and Passamaquoddy, is really a passive; as a plural THEY an.—HIM, it seems an extension of this; cf. *n'—geneen* (graphic variant for *n'—guneen*); the same applies to *k'—geneen* (Fox *ke—gunāna;* there are correspondents in Ojibwa and Cree); *w'—anawak* (presumably a variant of *w'—anewak*) in its last part decidedly resembles Cree *mowanewun* THEY (indefinite third person plural animate) ARE EATING THEM (third person plural animate);[1] so it is clear that the terminations with *newo* are built up on some such system, though it is possible that some of the forms contain inanimate objects, not animate objects as given in the table (see the tables of the Ojibwa and Algonkin independent mode, pp. 263, 264). The forms *n'—an, k'—an, w'—an* are clearly of the same formation as Malecite *ktian* THOU TELLEST HIM; *tian, otian* HE TELLS HIM (stem *ti*); unfortunately there is no example available in Malecite for I—HIM. The forms with inanimate object(s) show the same type of formation as the Natick correspondents. The conjectural initial *k'* restored by the writer is confirmed by Sapir's notes. In closing the discussion of the independent mode it may be pointed out that it is impossible for one and the same dialect to contain both *k'—guwa* and (*k'* ?)—*guwawak* (see the tables for Fox, Cree, Shawnee, and Ojibwa).

The present subjunctive does not require so detailed a report. It has the nasal as have Ojibwa and Peoria, but otherwise the forms are

[1] Horden, p. 115.

far closer to Fox and Natick. The forms with the third person animate, singular and plural, as subject are the same in structure as those of the latter in nearly all cases and represent a formation otherwise unknown in Central and Eastern Algonquian. Some of the terminations seem peculiar to Delaware.

The forms *-inke* THEY an.—ME, *-inde* WE (excl. or incl. ?)—THEM, which, following Zeisberger, one would be forced to consider transitive forms of the subjunctive, in reality are indefinite passive conjunctives (Fox *-igi*, *-etci*, Peoria *-ingi*, *-ända*, respectively). Again following Zeisberger, *-geyenke*, *-geyane*, *-geyeque* THEY an.—US (excl.), THEE, YOU, respectively, would have to be considered transitive forms, but they are simple passives. The termination *-amanque* WE (excl.)—THEM an. really contains an inanimate object (see the tables for Fox and Ojibwa). Observe that I—IT has an exact correspondent in Shawnee. Certain persons have *n'* and *k'* prefixed indiscriminately in the same forms and have been omitted from the above scheme as unreal (*n'* and *k'* are suggestive of the indicative).

Delaware has a *p*, and *panne* preterite. The former is shared by Peoria, Natick, and Micmac; the latter is found in Ojibwa, Cree, Montagnais, Malecite, and Penobscot (for the combination of both in the subjunctive mode, see the discussion of Ojibwa, p. 269).

The suffix of the future *-tsch* is presumably the same as Fox *-tcā*^{i} VERILY.

It should be mentioned that Delaware has a relative mode that corresponds to the Fox, Shawnee, Micmac, and Peoria conjunctive. The forms given are too few to constitute a complete series but the important point that the first person singular intransitive ends in *-ya*, as in Shawnee (cf. Micmac), is certain.

Delaware has consonantic clusters but to what an extent is not clear from the inadequate phonetic system employed by Zeisberger. Some of these clusters are due to changes of a sibilant with a voiceless stop, e. g., *u'xkwäu* (Sapir) WOMAN, Cree *iskwē·u*. Others are patently due to the elimination of vowels, e. g., *n'milguneen* HE GIVES US (excl.), Fox *nemīnegunān*^{a}, *tulpe* TURTLE, Abnaki *tolba*, Seaticook *tûlipâs* (really a diminutive), Natick *tœnuppasog* (pl.). Others are due to the combination of the signs for the preterite with the final consonant of the present. A nasal before stops agrees with Peoria and Ojibwa in this use as opposed to Fox, Shawnee, Cree, Montagnais, and Menominee. The origin of other clusters is quite obscure. It is doubtful whether there are true long consonants in Delaware; there is reason to suspect that their apparent existence is due merely to a faulty or deficient phonetic system.

It was shown above how Delaware exhibits great diversity in points of contact with other Algonquian languages; attention may here be drawn to the fact that since Fox and Shawnee are closely

related to each other and both to the Eastern Algonquian languages (see the discussion of Sauk, Fox, etc., p. 258), agreement on the part of Delaware with any of these would imply a certain amount of agreement with the others, and as Fox has some decided points of contact with Cree, a similar state of affairs exists as to the latter language. However, these generalities do not answer specific questions. Though it is hazardous, as noted above, to give an opinion on the subject, the writer ventures to believe that Delaware as Zeisberger has presented it is not a single dialect but a composite. The facts of the case probably will be best satisfied by assuming one dialect the closest relationship of which was with Shawnee, but which shared with Fox (the phonetic representative of) *-pena* (Shawnee *-pe*), and another the closest relationship of which is with Cree-Montagnais, both of which assumed dialects had points of contact with Ojibwa and Natick. In the opinion of the writer there is not sufficient evidence at present to warrant the belief that another dialect had especially close relations with Eastern Algonquian, though it is possible there was a dialect that shared a few forms with Eastern Algonquian that were not shared by the other Delaware dialects. But all these theories must remain conjectures more or less plausible till all the Delaware dialects shall have been entirely restudied with the aid of living informants.

EASTERN SUBTYPE

The existing dialects composing this group are Micmac, Malecite, Passamaquoddy, Penobscot, and Abnaki. As mentioned above, these are all characterized by peculiar consonantic clusters and by certain grammatic terminations. However, as compared with Blackfoot, Cheyenne, or Arapaho they belong in the Central group, for there are numerous patent correspondents to the latter in vocabularies and in the discussion of Sauk, Fox, etc., it has been shown how intimately they are related to Fox and Shawnee in the verbal terminations. The correspondence in vocabulary with the Central type is far more general than has been supposed. The peculiar terminations are not very startling and show no more specialization than those of other Algonquian languages of the Central subtype. The peculiar terminations of the Micmac verb are due to the fact that the supposed indicatives are really correspondents to the Fox conjunctive. So in its last analysis the consonantal clusters are the distinguishing feature of the group. Below is a list of consonantic clusters in each of the following: Micmac (from one of the writer's longer texts), Malecite (from one of Mr. Mechling's longer texts), Passamaquoddy (from one of Doctor Gatschet's texts, of moderate length), and Penobscot (from Prof. J. Dyneley Prince's glossary in his article on Penobscot in *Amer. Anthr.*, N. S., XII, No. 2, 183–208, 1910):

MICMAC

Initial consonant	Second consonant of cluster												
	p	*b*	*t*	*d*	*k*	*g*	*m*	*n*	*l*	*s*	*tc*	*dj*	*L?*
p			*pt*		*pk*				*pl*				
b								*bn*	*bl*				
t	*tp*				*tk*								
d							*dm*	*dn*	*dl*				
k	*kp*		*kt*						*kl*	*ks*	*ktc*		*kL?*
g							*gm*	*gn*	*gl*				
m	*mp*		*mt*	*md*	*mk*				*ml*	*ms*	*mtc*		
n	*np*		*nt*		*nk*[1]		*nm*			*ns*	*ntc*	*ndj*	
l	*lp*	*'lb*	*lt*	*ld*	*lk*	*lg*	*lm*	*ln*		*ls*	*ltc*		
s	*sp*		*st*		*sk*		*sm*	*sn*	*sl*				
tc					*tck*								
dj					*djk*		*djm*	*djn*	*djl*				
x			*xt*							*xs*	*xtc*		

[1] Probable mishearing for *ηk*; *nk* in the Malecite and Passamaquoddy tables likewise is *ηk*.

The semivowel *w* occurs after *b, d, k, g, n, l, s, kk, pk, tk, nk, sk, tck*. The only long consonants observed are *tt* and *kk*. These are of rare occurrence.

It has not been possible as yet to determine whether all these clusters occur in the same morphologic parts of words or are due to combinations of different morphologic components. The same statement applies to the clusters of the other languages discussed.

In the text the following clusters occur finally: *tk, pk, mk, nk, lk, tck, djk, sk, kt*. Initially only *kl* occurs; *w* in initial combinations occurs only after *k*.

MALECITE

Initial consonant	Second member of cluster										
	p	*b*	*t*	*d*	*k*	*g*	*m*	*n*	*l*	*s*	*tc*
p			*pt*		*pk*					*ps*	
b											
t	*tp*	*tb*			*tk*	*tg*	*tm*		*tl*		
d									*dl*		
k	*kp*		*kt*				*km*	*kn*	*kl*	*ks*	*ktc*
g							*gm*	*gn*			
m	*mp*			*md*	*mk*			*mn*		*ms*	
n	*np*		*nt*	*nd*	*nk*						
l	*lp*			*ld*	*lk*		*lm*	*ln*		*ls*	
s	*sp*		*st*		*sk*				*sl*		
z									*zl*		
tc					*tck*						

The semivowel *w* occurs after *b*, *k*, *g*, *s*, *tk*, *tg*, *pk*, *sk*.

The following clusters of three consonants occur: *msk*, *stck*, *std*.

The initial clusters that occur in the text are: *sk*, *sp*, *km*, *kn*, *tb*, *ps*, *sl*, *tl*. The semivowel *w* in initial combinations occurs only after *k* and *g*. The clusters which occur terminally are: *kt*, *ktc*, *ptc*.

PASSAMAQUODDY

Initial consonant	Second member of cluster											
	p	*b*	*t*	*d*	*k*	*g*	*m*	*n*	*l*	*s*	*tc*	*ts*
p			*pt*				*pm*	*pn*				
b												
t					*tk*							
d									*dl*			
k	*kp*		*kt*							*ks*	*ktc*	
g												
m			*mt*	*md*	*mk*			*mn*		*ms*		
n	*np*								*nl*	*ns*		*tsn*
l			*lt*			*lg*		*ln*				
s	*sp*		*st*		*sk*							
tc					*tck*							
x			*xt*		*xk*			*xn*	*xl*	*xs*		

The following clusters of three consonants occur: *ntk*, *nsk*, *ksk*, *psk*, *stck*, *xsm*.

The semivowel *w* occurs after *k*, *g*, *l*, *sk*, *xk*, *tk*, *lg*.

The following two long consonants occur: *ss*, *ll*.

These clusters have been observed initially: *kt*, *kp*, *km*, *ks*, *ktc*. Finally, the cluster *sk* was observed. The semivowel *w* was noted as occurring after *k* and *g* of initial consonants.

PENOBSCOT

Initial consonant	Second member of cluster										
	p	*b*	*t*	*d*	*k*	*g*	*m*	*n*	*l*	*s*	*z*
p									*pl*	*ps*	
b			*bt*								
t					*tk*						
d											
k										*ks*	
g									*gl*		
m				*md*	*mk*	*mg*					
n		*nb*	*nt*	*nd*	*nk*	*ng*					*nz*
l			*lt*	*ld*	*lk*	*lg*		*ln*			
s	*sp*		*st*	*sd*	*sk*						
zn			*zt*					*zn*			
tc					*tck*						

The semivowel *w* occurs after *k, g, d, l, m, sk, mk, tc.*

The only true consonantal clusters observed initially were *sk, sp.* After initial *g* and *k, w* occurs. The only final consonantic cluster noted was *ps.*

The following long consonants were noted: *kk, pp, ll, ss.*

Two clusters of three consonants were observed: *bsk, nsk.*

An examination of the tables will show that the old view that Micmac alone of Eastern Algonquian differed especially from Central Algonquian by reason of clusters, is incorrect.

The consonantal clusters of such words that have known equivalents in Central Algonquian are due for the greater part to the elimination of vowels. Thus Micmac *kēsaptug* AFTER HE LOOKED AT IT (for *kēsi+āpi+t+ug;* Fox *kīcāpitAg*^{i}), *wAp*k IN THE MORNING (Fox *wâbAg*^{i}), *mAndu* DEVIL (Fox *mAnitōw*^{a}), *elmied* HE WENT ON (Malecite *elimialit* WHEN HE (obs.) WENT AWAY, Fox initial stem *Anemi* YON WAY); *helno,* Penobscot *alnobe* INDIAN (Shawnee *hileni,* Ojibwa *ineni,* Fox *ineniw*^{a}, Cree *iyiniw* MAN); Penobscot *spumki* HEAVEN, Abnaki *spemk* HEAVEN (Passamaquoddy *spemek* HIGH, Cree *ishpimik,* Ojibwa *ishpiming,* Shawnee *spemegi,* Fox *a'pemeg*^{i}, Peoria *pämingi* (cf. Menominee *Acpämiya*); Micmac *kospemk* AT THE LAKE (Passamaquoddy *kůspemuk* ON A LAKE; Cree *kuspamuw* ROAD WHICH GOES BESIDE TIMBER WHERE THERE IS WATER); Penobscot *pebōnkik* IN THE NORTH (Fox *pepōn*^{i}*+a'kig*^{i}); Penobscot *wōbtegua* WILD GOOSE (for *wōb-* cf. Fox *wâpi-,* Natick *wompi-* WHITE); Penobscot *n'weweldamen* I KNOW IT (*-el-* = Fox *-äne-*); Micmac *elmōdjig* DOGS; Malecite *ulamus* (really a diminutive), Delaware *alum;* Ojibwa *animosh,* Fox *Anemō'*^{a}, Natick *anum,* Cree *atim* (for the phonetics see the discussion of Cree, p. 239); Abnaki *kIdasni̥'m'* (Sapir) THY STONE (Fox *ketA'seni'm*^{i}, cf. Abnaki *s̄In'* STONE); Malecite *k'*^{p}*mo̥'sêba'* (Sapir) YE RUN (Fox *kepemusäpwa*). When a vowel is lost after *l* (corresponding to Fox *n,* Shawnee and Delaware *l*) and a consonantal cluster arises this way, or if the *l* thereby becomes final, the preceding vowel takes an *o* (*u*) tinge; if the preceding vowel be *i,* then *o* attaches itself thereto. To make clear the examples of this it is necessary to state that the cluster *pw* becomes *p* or *b* (note that *pw* does not occur in the tables given above). Thus Malecite *kAnimiol* I SEE THEE (stem *nimi;* intervocalic instrumental *h* lost), Passamaquoddy *ktekAmAl* I STRIKE THEE (*-m-* is an instrumental particle); compare Fox *ke—ne,* Shawnee *ke—le;* for Malecite *kAnimiolpa* I SEE YOU (pl.), Passamaquoddy *ktekmulpa* I STRIKE YOU (pl.); cf. Fox *ke—nepwa,* Shawnee *ke—lepwa.* (It may be as well to mention that Fox *ke—nepwa* is made up of *ke—pwa* and *ne,* and is not a morphologic unit.) Micmac *dagAmulkw*^{a} HE STRIKES US, inclusive, corresponds to Fox *-menAgwe,* in which *m* is the instrumental particle, *e* the phonetic insert, *nAgwe* (Shawnee *-lagwe*) the termination for

HE—US (incl.) of the conjunctive mode. The participial *-ultitcig* in Micmac (and the corresponding forms of the other dialects) corresponds to Fox *-netīteigi*, in which *n* is the instrumental particle, *e* the phonetic insert, *tī* the sign of reciprocity, *tcigi* the third person animate intransitive of the participial.

It should be noted that the elimination of vowels sometimes causes nasals and liquids to become syllabic, a phenomenon which Sanskritists call *samprasāraṇa*, e. g. Passamaquoddy *ɳkwaxsan* RED STONE (PIPE) (cf. Fox *meckw-* + *asen*^{i}).

Especially should it be observed that the clusters, consisting of a sibilant + *k* or *p*, are kept exactly as in Cree (see the discussion of Cree, p. 238). Thus Cree *amisk* BEAVER, Stockbridge (Edwards) *amisque*, Ojibwa *ami'k*, Delaware *amochk*, Fox *ame'kw*^{a}, Shawnee *hamäkwa*, Peoria *amäkwa*, Abnaki *pepSnemesk8* WINTER BEAVER, Micmac *pŭlŭmskw* BEAVER OF THIRD YEAR (Rand); Cree *miskawew* HE FINDS HIM, HER, Fox *me'kawäw*^{a} HE FINDS HIM, HER, Natick *miskom* HE FINDS IT, Malecite *muskuwan* HE FOUND HER; Cree *ishpimik* ABOVE, Ojibwa *ishpiming*, Fox *a'pemegi*, Peoria *pämingi*, Shawnee *spemegi*, Menominee *icpämiyA* ABOVE, Penobscot *spumki* HEAVEN, Abnaki *spemk* HEAVEN, Passamaquoddy *spemek* HIGH; Cree *kuspamuw* ROAD WHICH GOES BESIDE TIMBER WHERE THERE IS WATER, Micmac *kōspemk* AT THE LAKE, Passamaquoddy *kûspemuk* ON A LAKE; Cree *iskwew* WOMAN, Fox *i'kwäw*^{a}, Natick *squaw*, Delaware *ochqueu*, Micmac *kēsigō-ēskw*^{a} OLD WOMAN. Since *sp* and *sk* are original, it is probable that *st* is likewise. The cluster is not common, and the writer has not found in Central Algonquian analogues as yet to such words as contain it. Yet it is perhaps possible to establish the claim indirectly. Micmac *kēsēwistōdidj* means after THEY HAD FINISHED SPEAKING; it is to be presumed that the *stō* corresponds to Fox *'tō* (see section 21.7 of the Algonquian sketch in the Handbook of American Indian Languages, part 1). The *'t* points phonetically to an original **st*. These clusters strongly point to a more northern origin than Fox had.

It is true that the origin of many clusters can not be explained at present, but it is not unreasonable to believe that the application of the foregoing principles will explain many more when our knowledge of the languages shall have increased, and perhaps phonetic laws yet to be discovered will account for the remainder. For the consonantic clusters in Piegan, Cheyenne, Arapaho, and Eastern Algonquian are so fundamentally different that it is improbable that any of their types are original. It may be assumed, then, provisionally that the Central type, from which true consonantic clusters are lacking, with certain limitations, shows the most primitive condition of Algonquian languages.

An original *o* or *u* under unknown conditions seems to umlaut the vowel of the preceding syllable to *o*, *u*, as does postconsonantal *w*. Thus, Malecite *tiogul* HE WAS TOLD; this stands for **tegōl^{i}* (cf. Shawnee *otegōl^{i}* HE WAS TOLD), in which *o—gōl^{i}* is the passive termination and *te* the initial stem. Penobscot *k'namiogona* HE SEES US (incl.), Abnaki *k'namiogonna* are additional illustrations. The terminations are for **ke—guna* (cf. Shawnee); *-he-*, the instrumental + the *e* insert, has suffered the changes shown above and the *h* is lost; the stem is *nami*. Passamaquoddy *ndekamugun* HE STRIKES US (excl.) and *kdekamugun* HE STRIKES US (incl.) are for **ne—meguna* and **ke—meguna*, respectively; *m* is the instrumental particle; *e* the phonetic insert which has been umlauted to *u*. Other examples of this umlauting will be mentioned in the discussion of the verbal endings. Examples in which a *w* (either maintained or lost) has caused umlaut are: Penobscot *namiukw* HE SEES ME (for *n'n-*), Abnaki *n'namiok*, Passamaquoddy *ndekamuk* HE STRIKES ME (Fox *ne—gwa*; rest explained above); *ktekamuk* HE STRIKES THEE (Fox *ke—gwa*).

Below are tables of such forms of the Passamaquoddy independent mode (present tense) and of the Micmac conjunctive (which is used like the indicative) mode as the writer has been able to extract from Doctor Gatschet's papers.

PASSAMAQUODDY PRESENT INDEPENDENT MODE

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they (an.)
Intrans. . .	*n-*	*n—bʌn*	*k—bʌn*	*k-*	*k—ba*		*-wuk*
me . .	—	—	—	*k—i*	*k—iba*	*n—k*	
us excl. . .	—	—	—	*k—ibʌn*	*k—ibʌn*	*n—gun*	*n—gunwuk*
us incl. . .	—	—	—	—	—	*k—gun*	*k—gunwuk*
thee . . .	*k—l*	*k—lpen*	—	—	—	*k—k*	*k—guk*
you . . .	*k—lpa*	*k—lpen*	—	—	—	*k—guwa*	*k—gua*
him . . .	*n—a*	*n—an*		*k—a*	*k—awa*	*u—al*	*-awal*
them (an.)	*n—ak*		*k—anwuk*	*k—ak*	*k—awa*	*u—a*	*u—awa*

MICMAC CONJUNCTIVE MODE

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they (an.)
me . . .	—	—	—	*-in*		*-it*	*-idjik*
us excl. . .	—	—	—	*-ick*	*-ick*		
us incl. . .	—	—	—	—	—	*-lk8*	*-lkwik*
thee . . .	*-l*	*-lck*	—	—	—	*-sk*	*-skik*
you . . .	*-lox*	*-lck*	—	—	—	*-lox*	*-lox*
him . . .	*-uk*	*-ugct*			*-ox*	*-adl*	*-adidl*
them (an.)	*-gik*	*-ugidjik*			*-ox*	*-adji*	*-adidjik*

In comparing the forms with other Algonquian languages it is necessary to keep in mind the phonetic changes hinted at above. In the Passamaquoddy independent mode the *u* and *w* umlaut occurs in the forms for HE—ME, US (incl. and excl.), THEE; THEY an.—ME, US (excl. and incl.), THEE, YOU. The agreement in the use of *l* with Shawnee, etc., in contrast with Fox, Ojibwa, Cree, etc., *n* should be noted; also the elimination of vowels and the phonetic changes involved.

While treating of the linguistic relations of Fox and Shawnee, it was necessary to treat Passamaquoddy at some length. It was shown that Passamaquoddy is very closely related to Fox on the one hand and to Shawnee on the other. The form for WE (incl.)—THEM an. approximates most closely the corresponding Cree and Montagnais form, though not identical with them. The relationship is the same in the case of WE (excl.)—HIM. This last approximates the form in Cree, Montagnais, Delaware (one form), and Ojibwa; it coincides with the analogue in Natick and by chance with that in Cheyenne. We say by chance, as Cheyenne has no other special agreements with Eastern Algonquian, whereas, as was pointed out in the discussion of Fox, Natick happens to share another termination. The form for THEY an.—US (incl.) approximates the Cree, Montagnais, and Menominee analogues. The agreement of the last named with Passamaquoddy is undoubtedly fortuitous, due simply to the fact that Menominee as well as Eastern Algonquian shows certain affinities with Cree-Montagnais. The form for YE—THEM an. apparently is the same as that for YE—HIM. The form for THEY an.—US (excl.) is based on the same formation as THEY an.—US (incl.). The fact that Passamaquoddy shares certain persons of the independent mode with Ojibwa was shown in the discussion of Fox. But it should be noted that all such persons are likewise shared by Shawnee.

There is given below a table of the Abnaki present independent mode so far as the writer has been able to extract the terminations from Doctor Sapir's notes:

	I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an.
Intrans. . .	*nI-* (*n-*)	(*n*)—*bIna'*		*ki-* (*k-*)	*k—ba'*		*-wak'*
me. . . .	—	—	—	*k—i*			(*n*)—*gǫk'*
us excl. . .	—	—	—	*k—ibIna'*	*k—ibIna'*	[(*n*)—*gabIna'*]	
us incl. . .	—	—	—	—	—		
thee . . .	*k—i*	*k—lbIna'*	—	—	—		*k—gǫk'*
you . . .	*k—l.ba'*	*k—lbIna'*	—	—	—		
him . . .	(*n*)—*ą'*	(*n*)—*ąbIna'*		*k—ą*	*k—Amba'*	*o—ą'*	
them an. .	(*n*)—*Aŋk'*			*k—Aŋk'*	*k—Amba'*	*o—ąl*	

A detailed discussion is uncalled for. It should, however, be noted that Abnaki agrees with Fox as opposed to Shawnee (and Passamaquoddy) in the forms for YE—HIM, THEM an. Initial *n* apparently is lost before certain consonants. This accounts for the strange appearance of certain forms. The form for WE (excl.)—HIM agrees with Fox as opposed to Passamaquoddy. HE—US (excl.) is the equivalent of Fox *ne—gōpena*, of the indefinite passive, independent mode. It may be noted that Malecite agrees with Passamaquoddy in this respect. From Doctor Sapir's notes it would seem that in Malecite a faint final *w* is retained after *k'* where etymologically required, which is lost (or at least not recorded by Doctor Gatschet) in Passamaquoddy. The writer's available material is too scanty in the case of Malecite and Penobscot to give tables for them; but it is certain that they agreed essentially with Passamaquoddy and Abnaki.

As Eastern Algonquian shows certain points in common with Cree-Montagnais as opposed to Ojibwa, etc. (see pp. 238, 284) it may be that the *pan* preterite is really a point of contact between Eastern Algonquian and the former; but this is forcing matters, as certain personal endings of Eastern Algonquian agree with Ojibwa, etc. (those shared also by Shawnee), as opposed to Cree-Montagnais. (For additional points of contact between Eastern Algonquian and Cree-Montagnais, see p. 245, in the discussion of the Micmac conjunctive.) Despite the usual view of the subject, the relations of Eastern Algonquian with Delaware are not close. On consulting the tables given in the discussion of Delaware it will be seen how few terminations of the independent mode phonetically coincide with those of Passamaquoddy. There are no agreements between the two that are not shared either by Fox or Shawnee; as a matter of fact, Delaware agrees in some cases with Fox as opposed to Shawnee and Eastern Algonquian. But, as was shown in the discussion of Delaware, the existing material is poor, and it is clear that the several Delaware dialects had different linguistic relations. At present, however, there is not sufficient evidence to show that any one of the dialects had especially close relations with the Eastern branch of the Eastern-Central group of Algonquian languages.

A table of the Micmac conjunctive from Doctor Gatschet's notes is here given because the one from the writer's notes and texts contains too many unfilled schedules. The table is supplemented by the form for HE—US (excl.), *amet*, and these intransitive forms are given:

1 WE (excl.)	WE (incl.)	THOU	YE	HE	THEY (an.)	IT, THEY (inan.)
-i	*-ieg*	*-igwa*	*-in*	*-ɣo*	*-d*	*-djig*

The forms which Doctor Gatschet gives as *-adl* and *-adidl* are considered broken Micmac at St. Anne de Restigouche. The current forms are *-adjl̥*, *-adidjl̥*, yet one of the informants, a woman upward of eighty, constantly used the forms given by Doctor Gatschet. The question of dialectic variation must be taken into account, as Doctor Gatschet's material came from New Brunswick. Final surds and sonants are exceedingly hard to distinguish at St. Anne de Restigouche, but this difficulty is not encountered with those occupying a medial position. In the opinion of the writer there are, finally, neither true surds nor sonants, only intermediates.

A detailed discussion of the forms is uncalled for. There is *l* corresponding to Fox *n*, of course, but the forms themselves morphologically approximate very closely the Fox analogues; as was pointed out in the discussion of Sauk, etc., however, certain terminations resemble the Fox participial rather than the subjunctive, thus partially agreeing with the Peoria conjunctive and the Cree subjunctive. The termination for the first person singular intransitive apparently coincides phonetically with the Shawnee and Delaware analogue. The form for HE—US (excl.) is important as showing the fact that the relations with Ojibwa, Delaware, and Natick are not close. It should be noted that the forms with the third person singular animate as subject suggest relationship with the Fox subjunctive rather than conjunctive. The terminations *-adl* and *-adidl* certainly contain the obvialitive *l*, but though the former is clear enough in formation (*-ad*+*l*), the latter is not.

It may be noted that there is another conjunctive form for the third singular, namely, *-tc*, e. g., *pemietc* WHEN HE WALKS ALONG; this resembles closely the Fox analogue. The other terminations seem to be based on the ordinary conjunctive mode with the addition of a suffix (?) *g* with certain phonetic modifications.

There is a dual, e. g., *kispanadidjig* THEY ARE TIRED, as compared with *kispanedjig* THEY TWO ARE TIRED. The actual terminations seem to be the same; the *-di-* on the face of it apparently corresponds to Fox *-tī-*, the sign of reciprocity. This is brought out by such expressions as *mAdn̥didjig* THEY (more than two) FOUGHT. The analysis of the example is *mAd* TO FIGHT, *n̥* instrumental particle, *-di-* reciprocal sign, *-djig* terminations. The expression then means THEY FOUGHT TOGETHER, the idea of plurality or duality originally not being expressed. Then the later restriction of such forms to plurality would be merely a specialization.

To sum up the general relations of Eastern Algonquian, we may say that the group is very intimately related to Fox and Shawnee; next, to Cree-Montagnais; not closely to Ojibwa; and remotely to Delaware and Natick. The relations with Piegan are not sufficiently clear to justify a positive statement, but it should be observed that

certain personal terminations of the independent mode have close analogues (which are shared by Sauk, Fox, Kickapoo, and partially by Shawnee).

The material at the writer's disposal does not permit a strong characterization of the individual traits of the various dialects composing the Eastern subtype of the major Eastern-Central division of Algonquian languages. According to J. Dyneley Prince and W. Mechling (personal communications), Penobscot, Abnaki, Passamaquoddy, and Malecite are more closely related to one another than any one is to Micmac. According to information received, Micmac can understand Malecite without much difficulty. A characteristic of Micmac is the apparent lack of forms corresponding to the independent mode of the other dialects; but the latter have forms corresponding to the Micmac conjunctive. The preterite "indicative" of Micmac is based on the conjunctive, whereas in the other dialects it is based on the forms of the independent mode; but the principle of formation is alike. According to Prince, the differentiation of Penobscot and Abnaki is comparatively recent. The writer, however, does not consider Abnaki nasalized vowels archaic; on the contrary, he believes the Penobscot pure vowels more original. Passamaquoddy and Malecite are very similar to each other and may prove to be practically identical. In closing the discussion of the Eastern subtype, the writer thinks it well to add that in his judgment the *r* which appears in the works of the older writers was an intermediate between *r* and *l;* hence they recorded it with the sound with which they associated it.

Summary

Algonquian tribes linguistically fall into four major divisions: Blackfoot, Cheyenne, Arapaho, and Eastern-Central. The Blackfoot major group shows some unmistakable signs of contact with Sauk, Fox, and Kickapoo of the Central subtype and with Eastern Algonquian. Cheyenne exhibits affinities with the Ojibwa subdivision of Central Algonquian, though it has also some rather northern affinities. It is premature to venture an opinion with which language or languages Arapaho is to be most intimately associated. The Eastern-Central major division is divisible into two subtypes, Central and Eastern. The Central subtype has further groupings within itself: Cree-Montagnais, Menominee, Sauk, Fox, Kickapoo, and Shawnee; Ojibwa, Ottawa, Potawatomi, Algonkin, and Peoria; Delaware (see the discussion of this language, p. 279), and Natick. Eastern Algonquian may perhaps be divided into two groups, Micmac, on the one hand, and the remaining extant dialects (which, collectively, may be designated Abnaki), on the other. The very intimate connection of Eastern Algonquian with Sauk, Fox, and Kickapoo, as well with

Shawnee, should be emphasized. Owing to the peculiarity in Micmac, noted on page 289, it is not possible to be so confident as to whether this relationship extends as intimately in this language; but the conjunctive mode points in this direction.[1]

[1] It will be noticed that on the accompanying map showing the distribution and interrelation of the Algonquian dialects (pl. 103), there are many names of dialects not dealt with systematically in the texts. This is because the existing material did not make such treatment feasible. The author does not doubt that Nanticoke, etc., are Algonquian dialects. (Dr. Frank G. Speck, of the University of Pennsylvania, has kindly made for the use of the writer extracts from manuscripts in the library of the American Philosophical Society, demonstrating that Nanticoke belongs to the Eastern-Central major division of Algonquian languages. Unfortunately verbal forms were practically absent; so until our knowledge of Unami, Unalachtigo, and Munsee shall be more extensive, it will not be possible to settle definitely the exact position of Nanticoke. Hence it is probable that the other southern Algonquian dialects along the Atlantic coast belong to the Eastern-Central division.) In this connection it may be stated that Pennacook is assigned to the Abnaki-Micmac group, partly for geographical reasons, partly on account of the history of the tribe. The early French and English writers can not be relied on regarding the intimate or remote relationships among the various Algonquian dialects, except where they can be corroborated by existing dialects. The reason for this is not far to seek. As before stated (p. 237), the Central Algonquian dialects are very intimately related, and philology at the time had not reached a point where fine distinctions could be made. It will be remembered how recently it has been possible for philology to determine the interrelations of the dialects within the major divisions of Indo-European languages, and how deficient even to-day is our knowledge of the interrelations of the major divisions of those languages. Moreover, inaccurate phonetics would blur out many distinctive points. It is simply a waste of time to attempt to unravel the vagaries of the orthography of the older writers in the case of dialects existing to-day. The accompanying map does not attempt to represent the distribution of Algonquian dialects at any one period. It will be remembered that our knowledge of the various tribes was not synchronous. It would have been feasible to make a map showing their localities, with dates, provided the interrelations were not shown; but the prime object was to show the interrelations. (A case in point is the localization of the habitat of the Sauk. They were first known in the eastern peninsula of Michigan, only later in the locality shown on the map.) The authority for the localizations can usually be found in the Handbook of American Indians (*Bulletin 30, B. A. E.*). With respect to the map the following departures from the color scheme should be noted: Prince Edward Island and Cape Breton formed part of the Micmac territory. Manitoulin Island and the peninsula between Georgian Bay and Lake Huron were occupied by Ottawa and the peninsula between Lakes Superior and Michigan east of the Menominee by Chippewa.

It may be noted that under the name Abnaki, the Abnaki (properly speaking), Malecite, Passamaquoddy, and Penobscot are included.

The form Chippewa on the map follows that of the Handbook of American Indians; the form Ojibwa in the text conforms to the orthography of the Handbook of American Indian Languages (*Bulletin 40, B. A. E.*).

From Edwards' Observations on the Language of the Muhhekaneew Indians, reprinted in Mass. Hist. Coll., 2d ser., X (Boston, 1823), p. 81 ff., some notes may be made on the language of the Indians of Stockbridge, Mass., though unsystematically. The words *amisquc* BEAVER, *spummuck* HEAVEN at once show the dialect does not belong with Delaware. So does *paumscauk* WE (excl. or incl.?) WALKING (Fox *pämusäyäge* or *-yᴬgwe*) by lacking a nasal in the pronominal ending. The words *npehtuhquisschnuh* WE ARE TALL, *nmeetschnuh* WE EAT (both exclusive in formation) demonstrate that the dialect is not to be associated with Natick, Delaware, or the Abnaki group. The termination *n—nuh* suggests that the termination for WE incl. intrans. was *k—nuh:* this last coincides with a variant Cree correspondent given by Lacombe. On the other hand *n—nuh* and *k—nuh* resemble very much the Menominee correspondents save the lack of the *m* syllable. On a later occasion the writer will return to this particular point. Here it may be said that the *m* + vowel is not so vitally important as the other portions of the termination. The phonetics of *metooque* WOOD are also against intimate relationship with Cree. The word *ktuhwhunoohmuh* I LOVE YOU resembles closest the Natick form; but *nduhwhunuw* I LOVE HIM has a different look. The phonetics of *nogh* MY FATHER suggest affinity with Delaware; cf. *nužwa* MY FATHER (Sapir). These notes were made subsequent to the printing of the map (pl. 103).

It is needless to say that all Algonquian tribes and subtribes could not be shown on the map for want of space.

ADDENDUM

It was impossible to insert in the text the results of the writer's field work in the summer, autumn, and winter of 1912, but the most important results may be summarized briefly here.

Piegan (of Montana) has whispered vowels terminally after *w* and nasals; *x* is distinctly post-velar; final *k* is distinctly aspirated. Gros Ventre (Atsina) sheds little light on Arapaho, sharing with the latter practically all deviations from normal Algonquian. Potawatomi differs more from Ojibwa, Ottawa, and Algonkin than these do from one another. According to communications from Doctor Sapir of the Geological Survey of Canada and Doctor Radin of the International School of Ethnology and Archeology, the Ojibwa dialect at Sarnia, Ontario, seems to be highly specialized. The intimation given in the section on Delaware that Zeisberger's material represents no single dialect was borne out by the writer's experience with the Munsee of Kansas and the Delaware of Oklahoma. Apparently no distinction can be drawn to-day between Unami and Unalachtigo. The phonetic system of Zeisberger is very deficient. Every stop occurs as surd, sonant (after nasals), surd aspirate (terminally), and glottalized. Voiceless *l* occurs medially before consonants in both Delaware and Munsee, and terminally in the latter (where it seemingly is lost in the former). Long consonants are common, also consonantic clusters, owing largely to elimination of vowels. Umlaut is caused by *w*. On the whole, both Delaware and Munsee have suffered very considerable phonetic changes from normal Central Algonquian; Munsee is by far the more archaic of the two. In Munsee whispered vowels occur initially, medially, and terminally (after *w*). In Delaware seemingly they are found medially and terminally after *w*. In both, *s*, *y*, *w*, and *l* occur glottalized as well. The variety of forms given in the table is due in part to dialect mixture, in part to phonetic changes. Some of the forms are due possibly to mishearing; some contain double objects; others seemingly are to distinguish third persons; still others owe their origin to causes which are unknown although the forms exist to-day. The statement that one dialect had the closest relations with Cree-Montagnais and another with Shawnee, is wrong. Zeisberger's inadequate phonetics were wrongly interpreted. It is clear that both Delaware and Munsee are closely related and, though they can not be easily classed with any other large group, it is clear that they approximate the Ojibwa group in important points, and

Ottawa in particular. Phonetically, however, in some points they approximate more closely Peoria and other languages belonging to the same group. (Zeisberger does not distinguish *-k'* [Fox *-g'*] and *-kw*^{a} [Fox *-gw*^{a}]: both are written *-k*; the case of *-mw*^{a}, which remains in Munsee but undergoes certain changes in Delaware, is somewhat similar.) From Doctor Sapir's notes it would seem that the Delaware of Oklahoma and that of Canada (Smoothtown) differ in certain points.

1. Comparative Table of the Cree (Moose and Fort Totten), Menominee, Fox, Shawnee, Passamaquoddy, Abnaki, Ojibwa, Algonkin, Peoria, Natick, and Delaware Independent Mode, Present Tense

		I	we excl	we incl	thou	ye	he	they an.	it	they inan.
intransitive	C (M.)	ne-	ne—nan	ke—nanow	ke-	ke—nowaw	-w	-wuk	-a	-wa
	C (F T.)	ne-	ne—nân	ki—nân	ki-	ki—nawâwa	-wa	-w ag	-wi	-w ani
	Men.	ni-	ni—mnâne	ki—mnâne	ki-	ki—mnâne	-wa	-w ag	-wi	-âni
	F.	ne-	ne—pena	ke pena	ke-	ke—pwa	-wa	-w agi	-wi	
	S	ni-	ni—pe	ki pe	ki-	ki—pwa	-wa	-w agi	-wi	
	Pass.	n-	n—ban	k ban	k-	k—ba		-wak		
	Ab.	ni-	(n)—bina'		ki- (k-)	k—ba'	-'	-wak'		
	Oj.	nin-	nin—min	ki—min	ki-	ki—m	(!)	-wag	(!)	-on
	A	ni- (n-)	ni—min	ki—min	ki-	ki—m	(lost phonetically)	-wak	(lost phonetically)	-on
	P	ni[n- / m-]	nan / nam]—mina	ki—mina	ki-	ki—mwa	-wa	-waki		
	N	n-	n—min		k-	k—mwo	-u	-wog		
	D	n-	n' [nnera / khena]		k'-	k'—[khina / newa]	u'- / -u	-wak / -neuo / u'—newa		
me	C (M.)	–	–	–	ke—in	ke—inowaw	ne—k	ne—kwuk		
	C (F T.)	–	–	–	ki—in	ki—inâwâwa	ni—g	ni—gwag		
	Men.	–	–	–	ke—i	ke—imâne	ni—g	ni gug		
	F	–	–	–	ke—i	ke—ipwa	ne—gwa	ne—gôgi		
	S	–	–	–	ki—i	ki—ipwa	ni—gwa	ni gôgi		
	Pass.	–	–	–	k—i	k—iba	n—k			
	Ab	–	–	–	k—i			(n)—gak'		
	Oj	–	–	–	ki (i)	ki—im	nan—g	nan—gog		
	A	–	–	–	ki—(li kni phonetically)	ki—im	ni—k	ni—gok		
	P	–	–	–	k eh	k—imwa	ni—kwa	n—kuk		
	N	–	–	–	k eh	k—imwa	n k	n—kquog		
	D	–	–	–	k' i	k'—khima	n—[k / gun]	n' [gook / ge / geneva]		
us excl	C (M.)	–	–	–	ke—inan	ke—inau	ne—kanan	ne—kânanuk		
	C (F T.)	–	–	–	ki—indn	ki—indn	ni—gundn	ni—gundnig		
	Men.	–	–	–	ki—inenâne?	ki—inwâwa	ni—gundne	ni—gundnâg		
	F	–	–	–	ke—ipena	ke—ipena	ne—gundna	ne—gundnagi		
	S	–	–	–	ki—ipe	ki—ipe	ni—guna	ni—gundn		
	Pass.	–	–	–	k—iban	k—iban	n—gun	n—gunuk		
	Ab	–	–	–	k—ibina'	k—ibina'	[(n)—gabina']			
	Oj	–	–	–	ki—imin	ki—imin	nin—ganan	nin—gonanig		
	A	–	–	–	ki—imin	ki—imin	ni—gonan	ni—gonank		
	P	–	–	–			ki—gona			
	N	–	–	–	k—inun	k—inun		n—kgunnanog		
	D	–	–	–	k'—[ineen / khena]	k'—[ineen / khhena / khhenauk / khhummena]	n'—[eneen / gwna]	n'—[eneen / gehhena / [n'?]—gunanak]		
us incl.	C (M.)	–	–	–	–	–	ke—konow	ke—konowuk		
	C (F T.)	–	–	–	–	–	ki—gundn	ki—gundnig		
	Men.	–	–	–	–	–	ki—gundne	ki—gundnâg		
	F	–	–	–	–	–	ke—gundna	ke—gundnagi		
	S	–	–	–	–	–	ki—guna	ki—gundn		
	Pass.	–	–	–	–	–	k—gun	k—gunuk		
	Ab	–	–	–	–	–				
	Oj	–	–	–	–	–	ki—gonan	ki—gonanig		
	A	–	–	–	–	–	ki—gonan	ki—gonank		
	P	–	–	–	–	–				
	N	–	–	–	–	–	k—kgun			
	D	–	–	–	–	–		k'—geneen / [k'?]—gunenak		
thee	C (M.)	ke—tin	ke—tinan	–	–	–	ke—k	ke—kuwk		
	C (F T.)	ki—tin	ki—tinân	–	–	–	ki—g	ki—gwag		
	Men.	ke—n	ke—ninemindne	–	–	–	ke—g	ke—gug		
	F.	ke—ne	ke—nepena	–	–	–	ke—gwa	ke—gôgi		
	S.	ki—le	ki—lepe	–	–	–	ki—gwa	ki—gôgi		
	Pass.	k—l	k—lpen	–	–	–	k—k	k—guk		
	Ab.	k—l	k—lbina'	–	–	–		k—gak'		
	Oj.	ki—n	ki—go	–	–	–	ki—g	ki—gog		
	A.	ki—n	ki—ninnin	–	–	–	ki—k	ki—gok		
	P.		ki—lômena	–	–	–	ki—kwa			
	N.	k—eh	k—numun	–	–	–	k—k	k—kquog		
	D.	k'—[—ll / len]	k'—[lomern / lohhena]	–	–	–	k'—[k / gun]	k'—[gook / ge / geneva]		
you	C (M.)	ke—linacow	ke—linan	–	–	–	ke—kowaw	ke—kowawuk		
	C (F T.)	ki—lindâwa	ki—lindn	–	–	–	ki—gwdâwa	ki—gwdâwag		
	Men.	ki—ninimindâwa	ki—ninemindne	–	–	–	ki—gwdâwa	ki—gwdâwag		
	F	ke—nepwa	ke—nepena	–	–	–	ke—gwdâwa	ke—gwdâwag		
	S	ki—lepwa	ki—lepe	–	–	–	ki—gawa	ki—gawôgi		
	Pass	k—lpa	k—lpen	–	–	–	k—gwa	k—gwa		
	Ab	k—lba	k—lbina'	–	–	–				
	Oj.	ki—nanim	ki—gom	–	–	–	ki—gowa	ki—gowog		
	A.	ki—nim	ki—nimin	–	–	–	ki—gowa	ki—gawuk		
	P.	ki—lômwa		–	–	–				
	N.	k—numwo	k—numun	–	–	–	k—kw	k—kwoog		
	D.	k'—lohhumo	k'—[ohhumo / lohhena]	–	–	–	k'—gwa	k'—[gehhena / k'—[t]guwawuk		
him	C (M.)	ne—ow	ne—anan	ke—anawow	ke—ow	ke—owow	-âû	-âuuk		
	C (F T.)	ni—dwe	ni—dndn	ki—dndn	ki—dwa	ki—dwâwa	-tu	-tuwag		
	Men.	ni—dwe	ni—dndne	ki—dndne	ki—dwa	ki—dwâwa	-dwa	-dwag		
	F	ne—dwa	ne—dpena	ke—dpena	ke—dwa	ke—dpwa	-dwa	-dwagi		
	S	ni—a	ni—dpe	ki—dpe	ki—a	ki—dwa	ô—dli	ô—dwâli		
	Pass.	n—a	n—an		k—a	k—awa	u—al	-awak		
	Ab.	(n)—a'	(n)—abina'		k—a	k—awa	u—al	-awak		
	Oj	nin—a	nin—anan	ki—anan	ki—a	ki—dwa	o—j	o—dwan		
	A	ni—a	ni—anan	ki—anan	ki—a	ki—dwa	o—an	o—dwan		
	P	ni—a	ni—anan	ki—anan	ki—a	ki—awa	o—an	o—dwan		
	N	n—a	n—anan	k—anan	k—a	k—awa	u—al	-awak		
	D	n'—a	n'—anan	k'—anan	k'—a	k'—awa	u'—al	-awak		

2. Comparative Table of the Cree (Moose and East Main), Fox, Shawnee, Ojibwa, Algonkin, Peoria, Natick, and Delaware Subjunctive Mode, Present Tense

		I	we excl	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an	it	they inan.
intransitive	C	-yan	-yak	-ynk	-yun	-ydk	-	-lenk	-k	[-ki / -kwaw
	F.	-yâne	-yâge	-yagwe	-yame	-ydgwe	--	-wdie	-'ke	-'ki
	S.	-ya	-yâge	-yagwe	-yame	-ydgwe	-e	-weile	-ge	-ge
	Oj.	-idn	-idng	-iang	-idn	-ieg	-d	-iead	-k	-k
	A.	-idn	-idng	-iang	-idn	-ieg	-d	-iwate	-k	-k
	P.	-yand	-yangd	-yangwd	-yand	-yikwd	-in	-wald		
	N.	-on	-og		-an	-ag	-ogt	-ahelttt?		
	D.	[-ya / -yane]	[yenke]		-yane	-yeque	-le	-chlite		
me	C	–	–	–	-epun	-epdk	-it	-ltetk, -itwaw		
	F	–	–	–	-iyane	-iyagwe	-ite	-iwdie		
	S	–	–	–	-iyane	-iydgwe	-ite	-iwdie		
	Oj	–	–	–	-iian	-ieg	-id	-iwad		
	A	–	–	–	-iian	-ieg	-ite	-iwate		
	P	–	–	–						
	N.	–	–	–	-ean	-eag	-it	-hellit		
	D	–	–	–	-iyane	-iyeque	-ite	-ichlite		
us excl	C	–	–	–	eyak	-eyak	-eyumi't	[-eyumi'tenk / -eyumi'twaw		
	F.	–	–	–	-iydge	-iydge	-iyamete	-iyamete		
	S	–	–	–	-iydge	-iydge	-iyamegite	-iyamegite		
	Oj.	–	–	–	-iiâng	-iiâng	-iiangid	-iiangidwa		
	A	–	–	–	-iiang	-iiang	-iiaiiinte	-iiamindwa		
	P.	–	–	–						
	N.	–	–	–	-eog	-eog	-kqueog	-kqueog		
	D.	–	–	–	-iyenke	-iyenke	-quenke	-quenke		
us incl.	C	–	–	–	–	–	-dtu't	[-dtu'tenk / -dtu'twaw		
	F.	–	–	–	–	–	-nagwe	-nagwe		
	S	–	–	–	–	–	-lagwe	-lagwe		
	Oj.	–	–	–	–	–	-nang	-nangwa		
	A	–	–	–	–	–	-nang	-nangwa		
	P	–	–	–	–	–				
	N	–	–	–	–	–				
	D	–	–	–	–	–				
thee	C.	-itan	-itak	–	–	–	-ik	[-ikik / -ikaw		
	F	-nane	-nâge	–	–	–	-ke	-'ke		
	S.	-la	-lâge	–	–	–	-ge	-ge		
	Oj.	-nân	-gdian	–	–	–	-k	-kwa		
	A.	-nan	-nang	–	–	–	-k	-kwa		
	P.			–	–	–				
	N	-nau	-nog	–	–	–	-kquran	-kqueen		
	D	-ltane	-tenque	–	–	–	-quonne	-quonne		
you	C	-ltukenuk	-itak	–	–	–	-itak	-itakwuk / -itakwow		
	F	-nagwe	-nâge	–	–	–	-nagwe	-nagwe		
	S.	-lagô	-lâge	–	–	–	-lagwe	-lagwe		
	Oj.	-nagog	-gowg	–	–	–	-neg	-negwa		
	A.	-nagwk	-nang	–	–	–	-nag	-nagwa		
	P.			–	–	–				
	N	-no g	-nog	–	–	–	-kqueôg	-kqueôg		
	D.	-lequc	-tequc	–	–	–	-quequc	-quequc		
him	C.	-uk	-ukit	-uk	-ut	-ak	-at	-alcik / -akwaw		
	F	-age	-agele	-agwe	-ate	-dgwe	-dte	-dwale		
	S.	-aye	-ayo	-agwe	-ate	-dgwe	-dte	-dwdte		
	Oj.	-ag	-angid	-ang	-ud	-eg	-dd	-awod		
	A.	-ak	-dugite	-ang	-ate	-eg	-dte	-awate		
	P	-akâ		-angwâ	-otâ	-akwd	-atâ	-awald		
	N.	-og	-ogkut		-odt	-o'g	-ont			
	D	-ayane			-ayane	-ayeque	-ate	-achlite		

3. Comparative Table of the Fox, Shawnee, Micmac, and Peoria Conjunctive Mode

		I	we excl.	we incl.	thou	ye	he	they an	it, they inan
intransitive	F.	-ydni	-ydge	-ydgwe	-ydni	-ydgwe	-dci	-wdcis	-ds
	S.	-ya	-ydge	-ydgwe	-ydni	-ydgwe	-dci	-wdcis	-ge
	M.	-d	-leg	-igwa	-in	-go	-d	-djig	-q
	P.	-yani	-yangi	-yangwi	-yani	-yikwi	-dji	-wadji	-k
me	F.	–	–	–	-iyani	-iydgwe	-dci	-iwdcis	
	S.	–	–	–	-iyani	-iydgwe	-dci	-iwdcis	
	M.	–	–	–	-in	–	-it	-idjik	
	P.	–	–	–	-iyani	-iyikwi	-ita	-iwats	
us excl.	F.	–	–	–	-iydge	-iydge	-iyametcs	-iyamelct	
	S.	–	–	–	-iydge	-iydge	-iyamegici	-eyamegics	
	M.	–	–	–	-ick	-ick	-amet		
	P.	–	–	–	-iyangi	-iangi	-iamindo	-iamincits	
us incl.	F.	–	–	–	–	–	-nagwe	-nagwe	
	S.	–	–	–	–	–	-lagwe	-lagwe	
	M.	–	–	–	–	–	-ilcg	-ilcwik	
	P.	–	–	–	–	–	-langwa	-langwits	
thee	F.	-nâni	-nâge	–	–	–	-'ki	-'ks	
	S.	-la	-lâge	–	–	–	-ki	-'ki	
	M.	-l	-lek	–	–	–	-ak	-akik	
	P.	-lani	-langi	–	–	–	-alcikl	-'kiki	
you	F.	-nagwe	-nâge	–	–	–	-nagwe	-nâgwe	
	S.	-lagô	-lâge	–	–	–	-lwdgwe	-lwdgwe	
	M.	-lox	-lek	–	–	–	-lox	-lox	
	P.	-lakoki	-lungi	–	–	–	-lâkwa	-lâkwiki	
him	F	-ayi	-ayeici	-agwe	-ai	-dgwe	-dici	-iwdcis	
	S.	-ayi	-ayiici	-agwe	-aici	-dgwe	-dici	-iwdcis	
	M.	-ak	-ugei			-ix	-adi	-idedi	
	P.	-aki	-akinei	-angwi	-adji	-ikwi	-ata	-aiciki	

| | | |

LEGEND

EASTERN-CENTRAL ALGONQUIAN GROUP

LANGUAGES OF THE CREE TYPE

- Cree and Montagnais
- Nascapee
- Menominee
- Sauk Fox, and Kickapoo
- Shawnee
- Abnaki - Micmac Group { Abnaki, Pennacook, Micmac

LANGUAGES OF THE CHIPPEWA TYPE

- Chippewa, Ottawa, Potawatomi and Algonkin
- Illinois and Miami

LANGUAGES OF THE MASSACHUSET TYPE

- Massachuset, Narraganset, Wampanoag
- Nauset, Montauk ect
- (Nipmuk and Connecticut River Indians)

LANGUAGES THE EXACT POSITION OF WHICH IS UNCERTAIN

- Unami, Unalachtigo, Munsee, Wappinger
- Mahican and Pequot.

SIKSIKA

CHEYENNE AND SUTAIO

ARAPAHO AND ATSINA

UNCERTAIN

NANTICOKE, CONOY, POWHATAN WEAPEMEOC SECOTAN ETC.

NOTE—Names in parenthesis belong to tribes, each of which probably forms one group with that beneath which it is placed, but they are kept apart for the present for lack of sufficient data.

MAP SHOWING THE DISTRIBUTION AND INTERRELATION OF THE ALGONQUIAN DIALECTS

BY

J. R. SWANTON AND TRUMAN MICHELSON

1911

INDEX

Page

ABALONE SHELL, ornaments of 143
ABNAKI LANGUAGE—
description 280, 283, 284, 285, 286–287, 289, 290
examples in comparison with—
Cree 238, 239
Delaware 238, 290
Fox 238, 239
Micmac 238
Natick 290
Ojibwa 238
Passamaquoddy 239
Peoria 238, 239
Shawnee 238, 239
Stockbridge 238, 290
pronunciation 228
relationships 289
ABNAKI TRIBE—
linguistic investigations among 225
reference to 290
ACCOMPANYING PAPERS, note on 21
ACKERMAN, THOMAS, reference to 37
ACOMA PUEBLO, references to 158, 159–160
ADAMSVILLE, ARIZ., references to 34–35, 112
ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT 9–22
ADOBE CONSTRUCTION, description of 80
AGAVE FIBER, use of 118
AGE OF CASA GRANDE, references to 33, 105
AGUA FRIA VALLEY, ruins in 215–216, 218
AINSWORTH'S RANCH—
reference to 210
ruins on 211
AKUTCHIN, ancient Pima settlement 36
ALARCON, route of 186, 208
ALASKA-YUKON-PACIFIC EXPOSITION, reference to 101
ALGONKIN LANGUAGE—
conjunctive mode 272
description 261–262, 264–269
examples in comparison with—
Cheyenne 233
Cree 243, 244, 245, 250, 251, 252, 259, 260, 261, 262, 272
Cree-Montagnais 259
Delaware 243, 244, 261
Fox 244, 245, 252, 259, 260, 261, 262, 271, 272
Kickapoo 259
Menominee 243, 244, 245, 250, 251, 252, 259, 261, 262, 271
Micmac 272
Montagnais 272
Natick 233, 243, 244, 250, 251, 271, 273
Ojibwa 243, 244, 245, 250, 251, 252, 261, 262, 271, 272, 273
Ottawa 233, 245, 250, 251, 252, 259, 260, 261, 262, 271

Page

ALGONKIN LANGUAGE—Continued.
examples in comparison with—continued.
Passamaquoddy 243, 273
Peoria 233, 245, 250, 251, 252, 260, 261, 262, 271, 272, 273
Potawatomi 259, 262, 271
Sauk 259
Shawnee 243, 244, 245, 251, 252, 256, 259, 261, 262, 271, 272, 273
indicative mode 273
pronunciation 226–228
relationships 238, 244, 289, 290a
subjunctive mode 260
ALGONQUIAN LANGUAGES—
pronunciation 226–228
summary of linguistic investigations 225–226
ALGONQUIAN TRIBES, linguistic classification—
memoir on 22, 221
linguistic major divisions 229
ALIBAMU, researches among 12
AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, archeologic explorations by 18
ANCIENTS, THE, reference to 42
See also Hohokam, Inhabitants.
ANIMAL EFFIGIES, clay (Casa Grande) 134–135
ANTICOSTI ISLAND, reference to 290
ANTIQUITIES OF UNITED STATES, preservation of 10, 17–18
ANTONIO AZUL, Pima chief 34
ANTS, in Pima legend 49, 50
ANZA, LIEUT. COL. JUAN BAUTISTA DE, visit to Casa Grande 57
APACHE—
baskets used by 147
in Pima flood legend 51
pictographs 197, 201
references to 34, 44, 56, 58, 61, 70, 195, 217
ARAPAHO LANGUAGE—
consonantic clusters 284
description 234–237
pronunciation 226–227
reference to 225
relationships 22, 229, 237, 280, 289, 290a
See also Atsina, Gros Ventre, Northern Arapaho.
ARCHEOLOGY in relation to ethnology 42
ARCHITECTURE—
of Casa Grande 72–74, 154–155
of Gila-Salt Compounds 150–152, 156
ARIZONA—
age of ruins 150
antiquities 17
archeologic work in 13, 18
as cultural center 157

Page

ARIZONA—Continued.
(Central) dual composition of ruins..... 151
cliff-dwellings..... 151
collections from..... 20
fetish from..... 122
national monuments..... 18
(Northern) dual composition of ruins.... 151
fabrics from ruins..... 148
pottery..... 137, 139
shell work..... 144
researches in..... 9
shells among aborigines..... 143
(Southern) cliff-houses..... 151
lacking in modern pueblos..... 152
pictographs..... 214
pottery..... 139
(Western) early explorations in..... 186
pictographs..... 214
ARROW-HEADS (Casa Grande)..... 130
ARROW-SHAFT POLISHERS (Casa Grande)..... 126
ATTACAPA, researches among..... 12
ATSINA, linguistic classification of..... 234
See also Gros Ventre.
AWATOBI—
disposal of dead..... 117, 118
pottery..... 139, 141, 156
AXES, STONE (Casa Grande)..... 123–124
AZTEC—
references to..... 54, 186
traditional association with Casa Grande. 33
See also Mexico (ancient inhabitants).
AZTEC PASS—
fort below..... 210–211
origin of name..... 208
references to..... 206, 207, 211
road through..... 204

BAAT, legendary Pima maiden..... 52
BACA GRANT, reference to..... 208
BAKER'S RANCH HOUSE, ruins near..... 201–202
BALLS, STONE, from Casa Grande..... 93–94, 131
BANCROFT—
cited as an authority..... 45
on Sedelmair's account of Casa Grande... 56
BANDELIER—
cited as to Coronado expedition..... 54
description of Casa Grande..... 69–71
on Pima..... 69–72, 152
Pima legend from..... 45
BANGHART RANCH, reference to..... 201
BARAGA, BISHOP—
Ojibwa modes from..... 262–263
references to..... 227, 239
BARTLETT, JOHN RUSSELL, account of Casa Grande..... 66–68, 88
BASKETRY—
Casa Grande..... 147
Gila-Salt region..... 156
Pima..... 147
Quahatika..... 140
BATRE MINERAL CLAIM, fort near..... 215–216
BATRE, MR., acknowledgment to..... 216
BEADS, STONE (Casa Grande)..... 131
BENHAM COLLECTION of Gila Valley antiquities..... 119
BERNAL, CAPT. CRISTÓBAL M., reference to.. 54
BÉXAR ARCHIVES, reference to..... 16

Page

BIG BURRO CANYON, reference to..... 209
BILL WILLIAMS RIVER, references to. . 186, 208, 209
BILOXI, researches among..... 12
BIRD, idol in form of (Casa Grande)..... 121
BITTER MAN, THE, in Pima legend.... 43–44, 60–61
BLACK FALLS RUIN, reference to.....157
BLACKFOOT LANGUAGE—
cluster *st* in..... 234
reference to..... 186, 225
relationships..... 22, 229–232, 235, 237, 289
BLACK'S CANYON, cliff-house at mouth of...197–198
BLACK'S RANCH, references to..... 195, 196, 197
BLACKWATER, ARIZ.—
pictographs near..... 148
references to..... 37, 62, 115
BLOODS, linguistic affinities of..... 229
BOAS, DR. FRANZ, work of..... 15
BOLTON, PROF. HERBERT E., work of..... 16–17
BONE IMPLEMENTS. *See* Implements.
BRASSEUR DE BOURBOURG, cited as to Casa Grande..... 53
BRINTON, DR. D. G., on work of Zeisberger.. 275
BROWNE, J. ROSS, work of, cited..... 53, 62
BURIALS. *See* Mortuary customs.
BURRO CREEK, ARIZ., reference to..... 209
BUZZARD, in Pima legend..... 49, 50, 52

CABORCA, reference to..... 218
CACTUS, GIANT, in Pima legend..... 44, 52, 61
CADDOAN TRIBES, history of..... 17
CAJUENCHE, reference to..... 209
CAKCHIKEL LANGUAGE, manuscripts in..... 12
CALICHE, description of..... 82
CALIFORNIA TRIBES, reference to..... 102
CAMP HUALAPAI, references to..... 186, 206, 211
CANE CIGARETTES. *See* Cigarettes.
CANE GAME, in Pima legend..... 52
CANYON DE CHELLY—
cliff-houses..... 219
pottery..... 139
CANYON DIABLO, ruins in..... 13
CAPE BRETON, reference to..... 290
CARLISLE (PA.) INDIAN SCHOOL, linguistic investigations at..... 225
CARNEGIE INSTITUTION OF WASHINGTON, acknowledgment to..... 239
CARSON, KIT, reference to..... 62
CARTIER, reference to..... 290
CASA BLANCA, reference to..... 71
CASA GRANDE, ARIZ.—
application of name..... 79–80, 87
memoir on..... 25
origin of name..... 33
CASA GRANDE MOUNTAINS, ARIZ.—
pictographs found in..... 148
reference to..... 36
CASA GRANDE STATION, ARIZ., reference to... 72
CASA MONTEZUMA, designation of Casa Grande..... 33, 34
See also Montezuma.
CASAS GRANDES (Chihuahua)—
pottery..... 137, 142, 156
reference to..... 54
type..... 151
CASAS GRANDES of the Gila..... 153
CASTAÑEDA DE NAGERA, PEDRO DE, references to..... 53, 117

Page
CATALINA MOUNTAINS, ARIZ., reference to.... 36
CAVATE—
dwellings, types of.... 188, 219
use of term.... 193, 194
CEDAR, used at Casa Grande.... 146
CENTRAL ALGONQUIAN LANGUAGES—
divisions.... 233
examples in comparison with—
Cheyenne.... 233
Cree.... 233, 239, 245
Menominee.... 249, 251
Ojibwa.... 245
Potawatomi.... 245
reference to.... 290
relationship with Micmac.... 283
CEREMONIAL ROOMS—
reference to.... 142
types of.... 150
See also Kihus, Kiva.
CHACO CANYON, N. MEX., declared national monument.... 18
CHARCOAL, magic power of.... 47, 52
CHAVES PASS, turquoise frog from.... 131, 144
CHEROKEE NATION, researches in.... 12–13
CHEVLON FORK, reference to.... 220
CHEVLON RUIN, reference to.... 139
CHEYENNE DIVISION of Algonquian languages, relationships of.... 229, 289
CHEYENNE LANGUAGE—
consonantic clusters.... 284
description.... 232–234
inanimate plural of nouns.... 274
pronunciation.... 226
reference to.... 225
relationships.... 22, 237, 274, 280, 286
See also Northern Cheyenne.
CHICHILTICALLI, references to.... 53, 54
CHIHUAHUA, MEXICO, shells among aborigines. 143
See also Casas Grandes (Chihuahua).
CHINO VALLEY, ARIZ.—
early migration into.... 218
references to.... 196, 204, 215
ruins.... 201, 216
CHITIMACHA, researches among.... 12
CHOCTAW, reference to.... 12
CIBOLA, references to.... 117, 220
See also Zuñi.
CIGARETTES, CANE (Casa Grande).... 135, 142–143
CI-HO, legendary Pima hero.... 45, 71
CIPIAS, home of.... 220
CIVAN, application of term.... 46
CÍVANAVÂAKI, Pima name for Casa Grande... 33, 43
CI-VĂ-NŎ, Pima legendary chief.... 71
See also Si-va-no.
CI-VA-NŎ-QI, name applied to Casa Grande... 71
CLAN-HOUSE 1, CASA GRANDE—
burial found in.... 117, 127, 139
description.... 106–110
excavation and repair.... 41–42
"seat" excavated in.... 46
CLAYTON, J. B., work of.... 14, 18
CLEAR CREEK, caves on.... 188
CLIFF-DWELLINGS—
decorated fabrics from.... 148
in Colorado.... 151
in Sierra Madre, Mexico.... 151
in upper Verde region.... 188, 194

Page
CLIFF-DWELLINGS—Continued.
in Verde Valley.... 198
pictographs in.... 197
pottery.... 137, 138, 139, 141
resemblances among.... 151
use of term.... 117, 193
COCOMARICOPA, reference to.... 58
COLLECTIONS—
Casa Grande.... 20, 118–121
Fewkes.... 121, 161–179
summary as to.... 20–21
COLORADO—
ancient cultural center.... 157
antiquities.... 17
ruins—
age of.... 150
cliff-dwellings.... 151
pottery.... 137, 139, 140
See also Little Colorado.
COLORADO RIVER TRIBES—
reference to.... 217
relationships.... 220
COMPOUNDS, CASA GRANDE—
age.... 105
ancient inhabitants.... 152
Compound A—
description.... 88–95
excavation.... 37–39
Compound B—
description.... 95–102
excavation and repair.... 40–4
Compound C—
description.... 102–103
excavation and repair.... 42
Compound D—
description.... 104–105
excavation and repair.... 42
Compounds E and F—description.... 106
relation to pueblos.... 150–160
CONCH SHELLS, trumpets of (Casa Grande). 144–145
CONJUNCTIVE MODE—
Algonkin.... 272
Arapaho.... 236
Cree.... 272
Fox.... 234, 253, 260, 261, 265, 271, 272, 279, 288
Micmac.... 245, 269, 272, 279, 285, 287–288
Natick.... 272
Ojibwa.... 268, 272
Peoria. 234, 245, 260, 265, 268, 270, 271, 272, 279, 288
Shawnee.... 234, 245, 255, 265, 271, 272, 279
CONJUNCTIVES, indefinite passive (Algonquian).... 279
CONSONANTIC CLUSTERS—
Abnaki.... 280
Arapaho.... 235, 236
Cheyenne.... 232–233, 234, 236
Cree.... 231, 238, 246
Delaware.... 279, 290a
due to elimination of vowels.... 283
Eastern Algonquian.... 236, 246, 284
Fox.... 249, 283
linguistic classification based on.... 226
Malecite.... 240, 281–282, 283
Menominee.... 249, 280–281
Micmac.... 280–281, 283
Munsee.... 290a
Natick.... 234

Page

CONSONANTIC CLUSTERS—Continued.
Northern Blackfoot 230–231
Passamaquoddy 259, 280, 282
Penobscot 280, 282–283
Piegan 229–230, 231, 236
various Algonquian languages 274
CONSTRUCTION OF CASA GRANDE, method of .. 82, 95
See also Walls.
CONUS SHELL, ornaments of 145
COOKE, LIEUT. COL., reference to 65
COPPER, specimens found in Southwestern ruins 98, 148
CORONADO EXPEDITION, reference to 53, 54
CORTEZ, DON JOSÉ—
cited as to Tontos 217
on Colorado River tribes 209
COTTON (Casa Grande), references to 148, 156
COTTONWOOD, ARIZ., reference to 195
COUES, ELLIOTT, work by, cited 57
COYOTE, THE, in Pima legend 44
COZZENS, work by, cited 62, 66
CREATION LEGEND, Pima 44, 49, 61
CREE LANGUAGE—
cluster *st* in 234
conjunctive mode 272
consonantic clusters 231, 283
description 238–247
examples from Horden 248
examples in comparison with—
Abnaki 279, 283, 284
Algonkin 250, 251, 252, 260, 261, 262, 265, 267, 272
Cheyenne 233, 286
Delaware 250, 251, 256, 259, 260–261, 265, 267, 269, 273, 274, 275, 278, 279, 284, 286
Eastern Algonquian 257, 269
Fox 235, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 256, 258, 259, 260–261, 262, 263, 265, 267, 269, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 278, 279, 280, 283, 284, 286, 288
Kickapoo 248, 259, 267
Malecite 274, 279, 284
Menominee 249, 250, 251, 252, 259, 261, 262, 267, 271, 273, 279, 283, 284, 286
Micmac 256, 272, 284, 288
Minsi 274
Montagnais 247, 248, 259, 261, 267, 272, 278, 279, 286
Natick 250, 251, 265, 273, 274, 275, 279, 283, 284, 286
Ojibwa 249, 250, 251, 252, 256, 257, 258, 261, 262, 263, 265, 267, 268 269, 271, 272, 274, 275, 278, 279, 283, 284, 286
Ottawa 248, 250, 251, 261, 262, 267
Passamaquoddy 267, 283, 284, 286
Penobscot 267, 279, 283, 284
Peoria 250, 251, 252, 256, 261, 262, 265, 267, 269, 271, 272, 274, 275, 278, 279, 283, 284, 288
Potawatomi 262
Sauk 248, 259, 267, 271, 288
Scaticook 279
Shawnee 251, 252, 256, 257, 258, 261, 262, 265, 267, 268, 269, 271, 272, 274, 278, 279, 283, 284, 286
Stockbridge 284, 290

Page

CREE LANGUAGE—Continued.
independent mode 247, 248, 258, 268
indicative mode 273
relationships 232
subjunctive mode 247, 248, 260, 265, 269, 271
See also Cree-Montagnais, East Main Cree, Fort Totten Cree, Moose Cree, Rupert's House Cree.
CREE-MONTAGNAIS LANGUAGE—
examples in comparison with—
Algonkin 259
Delaware 273, 277, 280
Eastern Algonquian 286, 287, 288
Fox 259, 273, 277, 278
Kickapoo 259
Menominee 259, 273, 277, 278
Micmac 273
Natick 259, 280
Ojibwa 259, 260, 273, 277, 280, 287
Ottawa 259
Passamaquoddy 277
Peoria 259
Potawatomi 259
Sauk 259
Shawnee 259, 287
independent mode 259
relationships 244, 250, 252, 288, 289, 290a
suppositive mode 273
See also Cree, Montagnais.
CREMATION. *See* Mortuary customs.
CROWS, in Pima flood legend 52
CRUZATE, DON DOMINGO JIRONZA PETRIZ DE, reference to 54
CUABAJAI, reference to 209
CUCHANS, reference to 217
CULTURE CENTERS, ancient, in Southwest .. 157
CUSHING, FRANK HAMILTON—
head of Hemenway Southwestern expedition 119
on irrigation (Salt River Valley) 114–115
references to 46, 70, 71, 112
researches of 72

DELAWARE LANGUAGE—
consonantic clusters 283
description 228, 275–280, 290a, 290b
examples in comparison with—
Abnaki 238, 284
Algonkin 243, 244, 261, 265, 267, 268, 273
Cheyenne 286
Cree 238, 239, 243, 244, 251, 256, 261, 265, 267, 269, 273, 274, 275, 284, 286
Cree-Montagnais 273
Eastern Algonquian ... 257, 269, 270, 287, 288
Fox 238, 239, 243, 244, 250, 251, 256, 257, 259, 260–261, 265, 267, 270, 273, 274, 275, 283, 284, 287, 290
Kickapoo 259, 267
Malecite 239, 269, 283
Menominee 239, 243, 244, 250, 251, 257, 261, 267, 270, 273
Micmac 238, 256, 273, 284, 288
Minsi 239, 274
Montagnais 259, 261, 267, 269, 286
Natick 239, 243, 244, 250, 265, 269, 273, 274, 284, 286, 288
Ojibwa 238, 239, 243, 244, 256, 257, 261, 265, 267, 268, 269, 270, 273, 275, 284, 286, 288

Page
DELAWARE LANGUAGE—Continued.
examples in comparison with—Continued.
Ottawa 261,265,267,268,273
Passamaquoddy 243,267,286,287
Penobscot 267,269
Peoria 238, 239,256,257,261,265,267,268,270,275,284
Potawatomi 261,268,273
Sauk 259,267
Shawnee 238,239,243,244, 256,257,261,265,267,274,283,284,287,288
Stockbridge 238,284,290
Turtle Mountain (Ojibwa dialect) 239
formation of negative verb 274
independent mode 231,260–261,268,287
indicative mode 273
reference to 225
relationships 231,238,244,289
subjunctive mode 246,260,265,268
suppositive mode 273
DEL RIO—
references to 202,203,204
ruins near 201
DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS, ALGONQUIAN 232
DISCOVERY OF CASA GRANDE 54
DISKS FROM CASA GRANDE—
pottery, perforated 136
stone 129–130,131
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, collections from 20,21
DOG, THE, in Pima legend 61
DOLORES MISSION, reference to 54
DONIPHAN'S EXPEDITION, reference to 68
DOORWAYS AND WINDOWS (Casa Grande) 81,85–86
DRAGOON FORK, application of name 199
See also Sycamore Canyon.
DREAMS, Pima notion of 50
DREW'S RANCH—
reference to 210
ruins on 211
DRINKER, THE, in Pima legend 43–44,61

EAGLE BURIAL (Casa Grande), references to 93,110
EAGLE MOUNTAIN, CAL., references to 36,47
EAGLE, THE, in Pima legends 45,52
EAR SHELL, use as ornaments 143
EARTH DOCTOR in Pima legend 49,50
EASTERN ALGONQUIAN LANGUAGES—
close connection among 258
consonantic clusters 234,238,246,284
examples in comparison with—
Cheyenne 233,286
Cree 233,239,257,280
Cree-Montagnais 286,287,288
Delaware 257,270,278,280,287,288
Fox 257,261,270,279–280,287,288
Malecite 269
Menominee 257,270
Natick 233,286,288
Ojibwa 257,270,287,288
Passamaquoddy 257
Penobscot 269
Peoria 257,270
Piegan 261
Shawnee 257,261,270,279–280,287,288
independent mode 231
relationships 231,232,275,288,289

Page
EASTERN-CENTRAL ALGONQUIAN LANGUAGES, relationships of 22,229,232,237–238,289
EAST MAIN CREE DIALECT—
examples in comparison with—
Potawatomi 268
Menominee 269
forms 245,246,252
subjunctive mode 269
EAST MESA (HOPI), reference to 192
EDITORIAL WORK of Bureau, summary of 19
EDWARDS—
on language of Stockbridge 284,290
reference to 238
EIXARCH, TOMÁS, reference to 57
ELIOT, JOHN, Natick forms from 272–273
EL MORRO, N. MEX., National Monument 18
EL SIRA, ancient Pima Chief 55
EMORY, COL. WILLIAM H.—
on Casa Grande 63–64
work by 44
ENVIRONMENT, influence on habitations 187
ESCALANTE RUINS, references to 112,114
ESCALANTE, SERGEANT BAUTISTA DE, reference to 55
ESPEJO, ANTONIO DE, reference to 186
ETHNOLOGY in relation to archeology, reference to 42
EXCAVATION OF CASA GRANDE, account of 13,37–42

FABRICS (CASA GRANDE), description of 147–148
FEATHER-PLAITED DOCTOR (CIVAN), in Pima legend 51,52
FEATHERS (CASA GRANDE), garments of 148
FETISHES (CASA GRANDE) 121,145
FEWKES, DR. J. WALTER—
bulletin by 17
collection made by (Casa Grande) 20, 121,161–179
memoirs by 23,181
work of 13,17,21–22
FINCK, F. N., reference to 226
FIRST PERSONS PLURAL, reference to 226
FISHES, in Pima flood legend 50
FLAGSTAFF, ARIZ., references to 186,194,195
FLOOD LEGEND, PIMA 49–52
FLOORS OF CASA GRANDE, construction of 80, 83,84–85
FLORENCE, ARIZ.—
pictographs in vicinity 148–149
references to 33,34,72,95,114
FLORIDA, researches in 9
FLY, THE, in Pima legend 52
FONT, FATHER PEDRO—
account of Casa Grande 42,43–44,58–61,88,91
references to 45,63
Uturitue described by 37
visit to Casa Grande 57
FONT'S ROOM (Casa Grande) 91,98,116
FORT, comparison with *trinchera* 218
FORT GEORGE INDIANS, dialect of 247
FORT TOTTEN CREE DIALECT—
discussion of 241–247
examples in comparison with—
Algonkin 265
Fox 257,267,278
Ojibwa 257,267,278
Ottawa 265

Page

FORT TOTTEN CREE DIALECT—Continued.
independent mode 260, 265
investigation of 225
pronunciation 227
reference to 248
subjunctive mode 252
FOX LANGUAGE—
certain forms 239
conjunctive mode 234, 265, 271, 272, 279, 288
consonantic clusters 249
description 252–255, 258–261
examples in comparison with—
Abnaki 238, 239, 279, 283, 284, 285, 287
Algonkin 244, 245, 251, 252, 261, 262, 265, 267, 271–272
Arapaho 235
Cheyenne 233, 234
Cree 235, 238, 239, 243, 244, 245, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 256, 257, 258, 261, 262, 263, 265, 267, 269, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 278, 279, 280, 283, 284, 286, 287, 288
Cree-Montagnais 273, 277, 278
Delaware 238, 239, 243, 244, 250, 251, 256, 257, 260–261, 265, 267, 270, 273, 274, 275, 277, 278–279, 283, 284, 287
Eastern Algonquian 257, 258, 261, 270, 287, 288
Eastern-Central Algonquian 237
Fort Totten Cree 258, 267, 278
Kickapoo 248, 258, 267, 272
Malecite 238, 239, 274, 283, 284
Menominee 238, 239, 243, 244, 245, 249, 250, 251, 257, 261, 262, 267, 270, 271, 272, 273, 277, 278, 279, 283, 284
Micmac 238, 245, 249, 256, 272, 273, 279, 283, 284, 288
Minsi 239, 274
Montagnais 247, 248, 261, 267, 272, 279
Moose Cree 262
Natick 238, 239, 244, 250, 251, 265, 273, 274, 275, 278–279, 283, 284
Ojibwa 235, 238, 239, 244, 245, 249, 251, 256, 257, 258, 261, 262, 263, 265, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 274, 275, 277, 278, 279, 283, 284, 286
Ottawa 248, 251, 261, 262, 265, 267
Passamaquoddy 239, 257, 258, 277, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287
Penobscot 238, 267, 283, 284, 285
Peoria 238, 239, 244, 245, 251, 252, 256, 257, 261, 262, 265, 267, 269, 270, 271, 272, 274, 275, 278, 279, 283, 284, 288
Piegan 261
Potawatomi 262
Sauk 248, 258, 267, 272, 288
Scaticook 279
Shawnee 238, 239, 245, 251, 252, 256, 257, 258, 261, 262, 265, 267, 269, 270, 271, 272, 274, 278, 279, 280, 283, 284, 286, 287, 288
Stockbridge 238, 284
Turtle Mountain (Ojibwa dialect) ... 239
independent mode 247, 248, 267–268, 271, 287, 289
indicative mode 273
noun endings, nominative singular 272
participial mode 245, 265, 271

Page

FOX LANGUAGE—Continued.
possessive pronouns 256
pronunciation 227
relationships 231, 232, 238, 244, 250, 252, 280, 288, 289
subjunctive mode 246, 247, 248, 265, 269, 272
subjunctive-participial mode 245
suppositive mode 273
See also Kickapoo, Sauk.
FOX TRIBE (IOWA), linguistic investigations among 225
FRACHTENBERG, DR. LEO J., work of 15
FROG TANKS, ARIZ., forts near 215–216

GARCÉS, FATHER FRANCISCO—
account of Casa Grande 57–58
references to 37, 63, 186
route 207
GASPÉ PENINSULA, reference to 290
GATSCHET, DR. ALBERT SAMUEL—
death 21
linguistic work 12
Micmac forms from 285, 287–288
on Ottawa forms 261, 262, 266
on Peoria forms 239, 245, 260, 270, 271
on relationship of Ojibwa, Ottawa, Potawatomi 262
on Shawnee forms 239, 254
Passamaquoddy forms from 280, 282, 285
Potawatomi form from 262
references to 238, 257, 287
GEORGIAN BAY, reference to 290
GILA CROSSING, reference to 45
GILA RIVER—
growth of reeds along 142, 147
in Pima legend 45
plumed serpent symbolic of 113, 142
GILA-SALT REGION—
cremation practised in 220
early inhabitants .. 44, 61–62, 94, 102, 115, 156, 218
geographic limit of compounds 151
"great houses" described 156
pottery 137, 141
reservoirs 112, 115
shell carvings from 145
summary of conclusions as to 153–160
See also Salt River Valley, and titles relating to Casa Grande.
GILA VALLEY, antiquities of, bulletin on 17
GILL, DE LANCEY, work of 21
GILL, W. H., collection made by 21
GLOTTAL STOP (ARAPAHO) 235
GLOVER, C. C., acknowledgment to 20
GRAHAM, MAJ. L. P., reference to 65
GRAND CANYON OF THE COLORADO, reference to 157
GRANITE CREEK, ARIZ.—
reference to 200
ruins along 202–204, 215, 218
GRAPEVINE CANYON, ruins in 13
GRINDING-STONES (Casa Grande) 126–127
See also Disks, Slabs.
GROSSMAN, CAPT. F. E., on Casa Grande 44–45, 61–62
GROS VENTRE LANGUAGE, classification of 234, 235, 290a

Page

Guazavas Mission, reference to 56
Guitéras, Eusebio, as a translator 56, 57
Gurley, Joseph G., appointment and work of 19

Haliotis, ornaments of 143
Hammers, stone (Casa Grande) 124–125
Handbook of American Indian Languages, cited as to Fox 227
Handbook of American Indians—
part 1 issued 19
preparation 10, 11, 13–14, 15, 16, 19
reference to 226
Hand stones (Casa Grande) 126
Hano—
legends 49
pottery 159
Hartshorne, Hugh, work of 37
Hasínai, description of 17
Hassayampa Creek, Ariz., ruins on 215, 218
Havasupai—
ancestors 185, 216
relations with Hopi 219
Hawaiian bibliography, preparation of 11–12
Hawks, in Pima legend 52
Hazrinwuqti, legendary Hopi being 51
Hell Canyon, ruins in 200
Hemenway, Mrs., efforts in behalf of Casa Grande ..... 7[illegible]
Hemenway Southwestern Expedition, collection of 119
Hendley, H. W., models made by 101
Hewett, Edgar L., bulletin by 17
Hewitt, J. N. B., work of 13–14
Hina, Sala, Pima potter 140
Hinton, Richard J.—
on Casa Grande 53, 68–69
on ruin near mouth of Granite Creek 204
references to 201, 203
History of Casa Grande—
detailed accounts 54–81
general discussion 53–54
reference to 33
Hodge, F. W.—
acknowledgment to 53
on "accompanying papers" 21–22
work of 11, 14, 19
Hodge, H. C., on ancient irrigation ditch 114
Hoes, stone (Casa Grande) 131–132
Hoffman, Walter J., work of, cited 186
Hohokam—
application of term 153
references to 42, 117
See also Gila-Salt region (early inhabitants).
Ho-ho-qŏm, name applied to Pima's ancestors 71
See also Hohokam.
Hok, legendary Pima monster 48–49, 52
Holmes, W. H., work of 10
Homolobi, early inhabitants of 218
Honanki, description of 195–197
Hopi—
ancestors 151, 154, 159, 216
axes used by 124
bird-calls 146
ceremonial rooms 150

Page

Hopi—Continued.
cigarettes 143
contents of shrine 101
country of 56
cult of plumed serpent 142
dwellings 219
East Mesa 192
foot race 131
Horn clan 159
legends 46, 49, 151, 158, 159
medicine stones 130
mortuary customs 117, 118
mythologic monster of 48
objects deposited in shrines 135
Patki clans 218
pits used as ovens 99
pottery 137, 139, 140, 156, 158–159
rattles 145
references to 58, 113, 144, 207
relations with Havasupai 219
Yaya (fire priests) 47
See also Moqui.
Horden, J.—
on Cree forms 231, 243, 244, 245, 246, 248
references to 239, 241, 252, 278
Horn clan (Hopi), reference to 159
Hough, Dr. Walter, bulletin by 17
Houma, researches among 12
House of Montezuma, designation of Casa Grande 33
See also Montezuma.
Hrdlička, Dr. Aleš, work of 15–16
Hughes, Lieut. John T., on Casa Grande 68
Human remains. *See* Mortuary customs (burials).
Humboldt, Friedrich H. Alexander de, cited as to Casa Grande 53
Hummingbird, in Pima legend 47, 48, 50

Idaho, archeologic explorations in 18
Idols—
Casa Grande 101, 121–122
Gila-Salt region 156
Illustration work of Bureau, summary 21
Implements found at Casa Grande—
bone 145–146
problematical 125, 129
stone 122, 131
wooden 146–147
Inoependent mode (Algonquian)—
Abnaki 286–287
Algonkin 231, 233, 262, 264, 265, 266, 267
Arapaho 236
Cheyenne 233
Cree 231, 247–248, 258, 259–260, 268
Cree-Montagnais 259
Delaware 260–261, 268, 287
Eastern Algonquian 231, 233
Eastern-Central Algonquian 237–238
Fort Totten Cree 241–245, 260, 265
Fox 231, 247, 248, 253, 258, 259–260, 267–268, 271, 287, 289
Kickapoo 259, 289
Menominee 231, 250–251, 259, 265, 268
Montagnais 247, 248, 259–260
Natick 233, 234, 265, 268, 269
Northern Blackfoot 231

Page
INDEPENDENT MODE (Algonquian)—Contd.
Ojibwa ... 233, 258, 259–260, 262–263, 265, 266, 267, 268, 271, 286
Ottawa ... 233, 265–266, 267
Passamaquoddy ... 231, 265, 268, 285, 286, 287
Peoria ... 233, 259, 265, 269, 270, 271
personal pronouns ... 236
Piegan ... 231, 259
Potawatomi ... 265, 267
Sauk ... 259, 289
Shawnee ... 231, 254, 268, 286, 289
See also Indicative mode.
INDIAN HILL, forts at ... 215, 218
INDIAN MISSIONS, article on ... 15
INDIAN TANKS, reference to ... 112
INDICATIVE MODE (Algonquian)—
Cheyenne ... 234
Cree ... 239, 240, 247, 273
Delaware ... 273, 275–278
Malecite ... 269
Micmac ... 269, 273
Natick ... 272–273
Ojibwa ... 247, 273
Penobscot ... 269
Peoria ... 259, 273
various languages ... 273
See also Independent mode.
INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES, reference to ... 290
INHABITANTS—
Casa Grande ... 94, 156
Upper Verde-Walnut Creek region ... 185, 186
See also Migrations, Pima.
INSCRIPTION ROCK, N. MEX., declared national monument ... 18
INSTRUMENTAL PARTICLES—
Arapaho ... 236
reference to ... 226
INTERIOR DEPARTMENT, part in archeologic explorations ... 18
IRONWOOD, used at Casa Grande ... 146, 147
IROQUIAN TRIBES—
habitat ... 290
researches among ... 14
IRRIGATION, ANCIENT—
effect on soil ... 160
in Casa Grande region ... 36–37, 51, 55, 57, 68, 103, 113–115
in Walnut Creek Valley ... 214, 218
IVES, LIEUT. J. C., reference to ... 208, 209

JACALES, references to ... 187, 209
JAMESTOWN EXPOSITION, Smithsonian exhibit at ... 10
JASPER, ORNAMENT OF (Casa Grande) ... 131
JEMEZ PLATEAU, antiquities of, bulletin on ... 17
JEROME, ARIZ., references to ... 194, 195
JEROME JUNCTION, ARIZ., references to ... 203, 204
JOHNSON'S RANCH, reference to ... 210
JOHNSTON, CAPT. A. R., account of Casa Grande ... 44, 64–65
JONES, DR. WILLIAM—
acknowledgment to ... 225
Kickapoo texts ... 258
on Fox, Sauk, Kickapoo, Ojibwa, forms ... 239
on relationship of Ojibwa, Ottawa, Potawatomi ... 262

Page
JONES, DR. WILLIAM—Continued.
references to ... 227, 259
reference to analysis of Algonquian ... 236
JORDAN'S RANCH, ruins at and near ... 195, 198–199
JUNIPER MOUNTAINS, ARIZ., reference to ... 204

KAMALTKAK. *See* Thin Leather.
KEAM COLLECTION, pottery in ... 139
KEARNY, GENERAL, expedition of ... 63
KELLER, FATHER IGNACIO, visit to Casa Grande ... 56–57
KERESAN CLANS, reference to ... 158
KERESAN POTTERY, references to ... 141, 159
KICKAPOO INDIANS (of Oklahoma), linguistic investigations among ... 225
KICKAPOO LANGUAGE—
certain forms in ... 239
description ... 252–255, 258–261, 272
independent mode ... 289
pronunciation ... 227
relationships ... 238, 244, 251, 252, 289
See also Fox, Sauk.
KICKING-BALL GAME, in Pima legend ... 52
KIHUS, references to ... 150, 189
KIHUTOAC, reference to ... 51
KINO, FATHER EUSEBIO FRANCISCO—
account of ... 56
name Casa Grande given by ... 33
references to ... 46, 55, 82, 91, 220
visits to Casa Grande ... 54
KINTIEL RUIN, reference to ... 158
KIVA—
application of term ... 150
description ... 151, 158
examples in Verde ruins ... 189
KIWITSE (ZUÑI), application of term ... 156
KROEBER, DR. A. L.—
acknowledgment to ... 225
on Arapaho language ... 235
on Cheyenne prefix ... 236
KUEHNE. *See* Kino.
KWAHADT. *See* Quahatika.

LABRADOR COAST, reference to ... 290
LACOMBE—
on Cree forms ... 243, 246, 247, 248, 250, 252, 290
references to ... 239, 241
LAMAR PAPERS, reference to ... 16
LAND, in Pima creation legend ... 49
LEAGUE OF THE IROQUOIS, researches relative to ... 14
LEARY, MISS ELLA, work of ... 20
LEDGE-RUINS, meaning of term ... 198
LEGENDS, PIMA ... 42–52
LEMOINE—
Algonkin modes from ... 262, 264
on Montagnais forms ... 248
reference to ... 227
work of, cited ... 247
LEÓN, DR. NICOLAS, acknowledgment to ... 55
LEROUX, cited as to tribal relationship ... 216
LETRADO, murder of ... 220
LIBRARY OF BUREAU, summary as to ... 20
LIMESTONE BUTTE RUIN, description of ... 204–206

Page

LITTLE COLORADO REGION—
ancient inhabitants 151, 157, 158, 218
antiquities 13, 17
cremation not practised in 117
pueblos 153, 220
ruins—
bird fetishes from 121
ceremonial rooms 150
cigarettes from 143
copper bells from 148
pottery from 134, 159
shell carvings from 144
LIZARD, THE, in Pima legend 46
LONG CONSONANTS—
Delaware, Munsee 290a
Piegan 229–230
LOS MUERTOS RUINS, reference to 114–115
LOUISIANA, researches in 9, 12
LOUSE, THE, in Pima creation legend 49
LOWIE, DR. ROBERT H.—
acknowledgment to 225
on Northern Blackfoot 230

MAGDALENA, SONORA, reference to 218
MAGIC, in Pima flood legends 45–52
MAILLARD, L'ABBE, work on Micmac 269
MALECITE LANGUAGE—
description 280, 281–282, 283, 284, 285, 287, 289
examples in comparison with—
Cree 238, 239, 269, 274, 279
Delaware 239, 269, 278, 279
Eastern Algonquian 269
Fox 238, 239, 274
Micmac 269
Montagnais 269, 279
Natick 238, 239, 269, 274
Ojibwa 239, 269, 279
Penobscot 269, 279
Peoria 269
indicative mode 269
MALECITE TRIBE, reference to 290
MAN-FOX, in Pima legend 47
MANGE, LIEUT. JUAN MATEO—
account of Casa Grande 55–56, 91
explorations of 54
reference to 46
MANOS (CASA GRANDE), description of 126
MANUSCRIPTS, LINGUISTIC, catalogue of 18–19
MARICOPA—
in Pima flood legend 51
references to 42, 45, 115
relationships 217
MARX'S RANCH—
reference to 210
ruins below 214–215
ruins on 213–214
MAULS, STONE (Casa Grande) 124–125
MAYER, BRANTZ, on Casa Grande 53, 63
MEARNS, EDGAR A., work by, cited 186
MECHLING, W.—
acknowledgment to 225
Malecite consonantic clusters from 281
on relationships among Algonquian languages 289
MEDICINE STONES (Casa Grande) 130

Page

MENOMINEE LANGUAGE—
certain forms 239
consonantic clusters 283
description 249–252
examples in comparison with—
Abnaki 239, 283, 284
Algonkin 243, 244, 245, 259, 261, 262, 265, 267, 271, 273
Cree 238, 239, 243, 244, 245, 259, 261, 267, 268, 269, 271, 279, 284, 286
Cree-Montagnais 259, 261, 262, 273, 277, 278, 279, 286
Delaware 239, 243, 244, 257, 260–261, 267, 270, 273, 279
Eastern Algonquian 257, 270
Fox 239, 243, 244, 257, 259, 261, 262, 267, 270, 271, 272, 273, 277, 278, 279, 283, 284
Kickapoo 259, 267, 272
Micmac 273
Minsi 239
Montagnais 259, 261, 267, 279, 286
Moose Cree 262
Natick 239, 243, 244, 265, 268, 273
Ojibwa 238, 239, 243, 244, 245, 257, 259, 261, 262, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 279, 283, 284
Ottawa 245, 259, 261, 262, 265, 267
Passamaquoddy 239, 243, 267, 283, 284, 286
Penobscot 238–239, 267, 283, 284
Peoria 239, 244, 257, 259, 261, 262, 265, 267, 270, 271, 272, 273, 279, 283, 284
Potawatomi 259, 262, 265
Sauk 259, 267, 272
Shawnee 239, 243, 244, 245, 257, 259, 261, 262, 267, 270, 272, 273, 279, 283, 284
Stockbridge 290
Turtle Mountain (Ojibwa dialect) 239
independent mode 231, 259, 265, 268
indicative mode 273
noun endings 272
pronunciation 227
relationships 231, 238, 244, 289
subjunctive mode 246, 269
suppositive mode 273
MENOMINEE TRIBE—
habitat 290
linguistic investigations among 225
MENTUIG, FATHER JUAN, reference to 56
MESA, ARIZ.—
references to 51, 55
ruins near 114, 116, 218
MESA VERDE, COLO.—
antiquities 17
cremation practised at 117
ledge-houses 194
pottery 139
MESCAL PITS, description of 116
METATES (CASA GRANDE) 126, 128
MEXICAN ARCHIVES, reference to 16
MEXICAN BOUNDARY SURVEY, reference to 66
MEXICO—
ancient inhabitants 33, 57, 59, 152
copper bells 148
(Eastern) antiquities 13
migration from the north 153
(Northern) architecture 155

Page

MEXICO—Continued.
pottery ... 137
serpent images ... 122
(Southern) pottery ... 156
See also Aztec, Chihuahua, Sierra Madre.
MIAMI LANGUAGE, relation to Peoria ... 270
MICHELSON, DR. TRUMAN, memoir by ... 22, 221
MICMAC LANGUAGE—
conjunctive mode ... 245, 260, 269, 272, 279
description ... 280, 281, 283–285, 287–289
examples in comparison with—
Abnaki ... 238
Algonkin ... 272, 273
Central Algonquian ... 249
Cree ... 238, 245, 256, 272
Delaware ... 238, 256, 273, 279
Fox ... 238, 245, 249, 256, 260, 272, 273, 279, 283
Menominee ... 273
Natick ... 238, 269, 273, 279
Ojibwa ... 238, 256, 269, 273
Ottawa ... 273
Peoria ... 238, 245, 256, 260, 272, 279
Potawatomi ... 273
Shawnee ... 238, 256, 272, 279
Stockbridge ... 238
indicative mode ... 269, 289
pronunciation ... 228
relationships ... 289
subjunctive mode ... 245, 269
suppositive mode ... 273
MICMAC TRIBE—
linguistic investigations among ... 225
reference to ... 290
MIGRATIONS, EARLY, in Southwest ... 153, 157–160, 218–219
MILLER COLLECTION, reference to ... 119
MINDELEFF, COSMOS—
collection from Casa Grande ... 119–120, 122
description of Casa Grande ... 72, 79–81, 86
memoir on repair of Casa Grande in 1891 ... 119
monographs by ... 185
on migration in Verde Valley ... 158
on researches of F. H. Cushing ... 72
on ruins on Verde River ... 217–218
papers by ... 21–22
references to ... 88, 188, 211
tcuhuki found by ... 101
MINOR ANTIQUITIES, Casa Grande ... 118
MINSI LANGUAGE, references to ... 239, 274
See also Munsee.
MISSION RECORDS, reference to ... 16
MISSISSIPPI BAND OF OJIBWA—
dialect ... 262, 263
reference to ... 272
MISSISSIPPI, researches in ... 9
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY—
antiquity of man in ... 15–16
material relating to tribes of ... 12
MOCTEZUMA, CASA DE (House of), references to ... 56–57, 58, 59
See also Montezuma.
MOHAWK TEXTS, character of ... 14
MOHOCE, found by Oñate ... 220
MOISEYU, reference to ... 234
MOJAVE—
in Pima legend ... 51
references to ... 217

Page

MOKI. *See* Moqui.
MONSONI, reference to ... 234
MONTAGNAIS LANGUAGE—
cluster *st* ... 234
description ... 247–249
examples in comparison with—
Algonkin ... 267, 272
Cheyenne ... 286
Cree ... 247, 248, 260, 261, 267, 269, 272, 279, 286
Delaware ... 259, 260–261, 267, 269, 279, 286
Fox ... 247, 248, 260, 261, 267, 272, 279
Kickapoo ... 267
Malecite ... 269, 279
Menominee ... 261, 267, 279, 286
Natick ... 286
Ojibwa ... 261, 267, 269, 272, 279, 286
Ottawa ... 267
Passamaquoddy ... 267, 286
Penobscot ... 267, 269, 279
Peoria ... 267, 272
Sauk ... 267
Shawnee ... 267, 279
independent mode ... 259–260
pronunciation ... 227
references to ... 225, 239
relationships ... 238, 243
subjunctive mode ... 260
"suppositif" of the "subjonctif" ... 260
See also Cree-Montagnais, Rupert's House Cree.
MONTEZUMA—
associated with Casa Grande ... 43, 44
known also as Teuhu ... 48
reference to ... 46
MONTEZUMA, CASA DE, references to ... 64, 65
See also Casa Montezuma, Moctezuma.
MONTEZUMA CASTLE, ARIZ.—
declared national monument ... 18
description ... 194, 195
reference to ... 187
MONTEZUMA, DR. CARLOS, reference to ... 35
MONTEZUMA, HALL OF, reference to ... 68
MONTEZUMA WELL, reference to ... 187
MOONEY, JAMES—
on Moiseyu ... 234
reference to ... 226
work of ... 14–15
MOOREHEAD, WARREN K., work by, cited ... 119
MOOSE CREE DIALECT, references to ... 227, 239, 262
MOQUI, references to ... 51, 56, 58
See also Hopi.
MORMON SETTLERS in Arizona, reference to ... 114
MORNING GREEN, Pima Chief ... 33, 42, 45–48
MORRIS, S. H., collection presented by ... 21
MORTARS (CASA GRANDE), description of ... 123, 127–128
MORTUARY CUSTOMS—
burial—
among Pima ... 109, 117, 118, 155
at Casa Grande ... 93, 106, 108–110, 111, 117, 127, 155
in Walnut Creek region ... 210, 211, 220
cremation—
at Casa Grande ... 109–110, 111, 117, 155
distribution of ... 117, 118, 220
MOSAIC WORK, references to ... 131, 144
MOUND-BUILDERS of Mississippi Valley ... 15–16

Page

MOUNDS AT CASA GRANDE, general description ... 86–87
MOUNTAIN SHEEP, idols in form of ... 121–122
MOUNT HOPE, references to ... 207, 208–209
MÜHLENPFORDT, EDUARD, cited as to Casa Grande ... 53
MUNSEE LANGUAGE—
division of Delaware ... 275
references to ... 290, 290a, 290b
See also Minsi.

NACOGDOCHES ARCHIVES, reference to ... 16
NACTCI, legendary Pima maid ... 46
NADAILLAC, work by, cited ... 62
NANTICOKE LANGUAGE, reference to ... 290
NASAL, accretion of (Ojibwa) ... 261
NASAL VOWELS (Arapaho) ... 235
NATCHEZ LANGUAGE, investigation of ... 12–13
NATICK LANGUAGE—
conjunctive mode ... 272
consonantic clusters ... 234, 283
description ... 272–275
examples in comparison with—
Abnaki ... 279, 290
Algonkin ... 233, 243, 244, 250, 265, 271
Cheyenne ... 233, 286
Cree ... 238, 239, 250, 251, 265, 269, 283, 284, 286
Cree-Montagnais ... 280
Delaware ... 238, 239, 243, 244, 250, 265, 269, 278, 279, 280, 284, 286, 288, 290
Eastern Algonquian ... 269, 288
Fox ... 238, 239, 244, 250, 251, 259, 265, 279, 280, 283, 284
Malecite ... 238, 239, 269, 284
Menominee ... 238, 239, 243, 244, 250, 251, 265, 268
Micmac ... 238, 269, 279, 284, 288
Minsi ... 239
Montagnais ... 286
Ojibwa ... 238, 239, 243, 244, 250, 251, 258, 269, 280, 283, 286, 288
Ottawa ... 250, 251, 265, 271
Passamaquoddy ... 243
Penobscot ... 269, 283
Peoria ... 233, 239, 250, 251, 265, 269, 271, 279
Potawatomi ... 265, 271
Scaticook ... 279
Shawnee ... 238, 239, 243, 244, 256, 265, 280
Stockbridge ... 290
Turtle Mountain (Ojibwa dialect) ... 239
independent mode ... 265, 268, 269
relationships ... 238, 288, 289
subjunctive mode ... 246, 260, 265
suppositive mode ... 259
NATIONAL MONUMENTS, establishment of ... 18
NATION OF THE FORK, habitat of ... 290
NAVAHO, swastika among ... 139
NAVAHO NATIONAL MONUMENT, Arizona, cliff-dwellings of ... 194, 195
NERÓMES (SOUTHERN PIMA), references to ... 70–71, 152
NEBRASKA, early man in ... 15–16
NEGATIVE VERB, formation of ... 261, 270, 274
NENTOIG. *See* Mentuig.
NEW FIRE CEREMONY (WALPI) ... 135

Page

NEW MEXICO—
ancient cultural center ... 157
antiquities ... 17
collections from ... 20
national monuments ... 18
researches in ... 9, 11
ruins—
age of ... 150
cliff-dwellings ... 151
pottery ... 139
shells among aborigines ... 143
NEW YORK, researches in ... 10, 14
NIGHTINGALE, ROBERT C., collection presented by ... 20
NIZA, FRAY MARCOS DE, references to ... 53, 54
NOGALES, reference to ... 56
NOMINAL FORMS (Arapaho) ... 235
NORTHERN ARAPAHO, linguistic investigations among ... 225
NORTHERN BLACKFOOT INDIANS, compared with Piegan and Bloods ... 229
NORTHERN BLACKFOOT LANGUAGE—
consonantic clusters ... 230–231
texts ... 225
NORTHERN CHEYENNE, linguistic investigations among ... 235
NOUNS IN ALGONQUIAN LANGUAGES—
inanimate plural (Cheyenne, Piegan) ... 274
nominative singular endings ... 272

OAK CREEK—
cavate dwellings on ... 219
ruins at mouth of ... 188–193
OBSIDIAN, implements of (Casa Grande) ... 132
OFOGOULA, identical with Ouspie ... 12
OJIBWA INDIANS, linguistic investigations among ... 225
OJIBWA LANGUAGE—
certain forms in ... 239
conjunctive mode ... 272
consonantic clusters ... 283
description ... 261–263, 265–269
examples in comparison with—
Abnaki ... 238, 239, 283, 284
Algonkin ... 243, 244, 245, 250, 251, 252, 259, 261, 262, 271, 272, 273
Arapaho ... 235
Central Algonquian ... 245
Cheyenne ... 233, 286
Cree ... 238, 239, 243, 244, 245, 247, 250, 251, 256, 257, 259, 260, 261, 262, 272, 274, 275, 278, 279, 283, 284, 286
Cree-Montagnais ... 259, 273, 277, 280, 287
Delaware ... 238, 239, 243, 244, 256, 257, 261, 270, 273, 274, 275, 278, 279, 280, 284, 286, 288
Eastern Algonquian ... 257, 270, 287, 288
Fort Totten Cree ... 258, 278
Fox ... 235, 238, 239, 244, 245, 251, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 277, 279, 280, 283, 284, 286
Kickapoo ... 259
Malecite ... 239, 279

Page

OJIBWA LANGUAGE—Continued.
examples in comparison with—Continued.
Menominee ... 238, 239, 243, 244, 245, 250, 251, 252, 257, 259, 261, 262, 270, 273, 279, 283, 284
Micmac ... 238, 256, 273, 284, 288
Minsi ... 239, 274
Montagnais ... 259, 260, 261, 272, 279, 286
Natick ... 238, 239, 243, 244, 250, 251, 273, 274–275, 280, 283, 286, 288
Ottawa ... 245, 250, 251, 252, 259, 261, 262, 271
Passamaquoddy ... 239, 243, 257, 258, 277, 278, 283, 284
Penobscot ... 238–239, 279, 283, 284
Peoria ... 238, 239, 244, 245, 247, 250, 251, 252, 256, 257, 259, 261, 262, 270, 271, 272, 274, 275, 278–279, 283, 284
Potawatomi ... 259, 261, 262, 271
Sauk ... 259
Shawnee ... 238, 239, 243, 244, 245, 251, 256, 257, 258, 259, 261, 262, 270, 271, 274, 277, 278, 279, 280, 283, 284, 286, 287
Stockbridge ... 238, 284
Turtle Mountain (Ojibwa dialect) ... 239
independent mode ... 258, 271, 286
indicative mode ... 273
noun endings ... 272
participial mode ... 245, 271
pronunciation ... 227
relationships ... 231, 232, 233, 234, 238, 244, 289, 290a
subjunctive mode ... 245, 246, 260
subjunctive-participial mode ... 245
See also Mississippi Band.

OKLAHOMA, researches in ... 9, 12–13
OÑATE, JUAN DE—
Hopi pueblos found by ... 220
route of ... 186, 207
ONONDAGA TEXTS, character of ... 14
ONTARIO, CANADA, researches in ... 10, 14, 15
OPA, references to ... 44, 61
OPATA, reference to ... 54
ORAIBI VILLAGE, reference to ... 58
OREGON, researches in ... 15
ORIENTATION of Casa Grande ... 73–74, 94, 95
OROZCO Y BERRA, reference to ... 56
ORTEGA, reference to ... 54

OTTAWA LANGUAGE—
description ... 261–262, 265–269
examples in comparison with—
Algonkin ... 233, 245, 250, 251, 252, 259, 260, 261, 262, 271
Cheyenne ... 233
Cree ... 245, 250, 251, 252, 261, 262
Cree-Montagnais ... 259
Delaware ... 261
Fox ... 248, 259, 261, 262
Kickapoo ... 248, 259
Menominee ... 245, 250, 251, 252, 259, 261, 262
Montagnais ... 248
Natick ... 250, 251, 271
Ojibwa ... 233, 245, 250, 251, 252, 259, 261, 262, 271
Peoria ... 250, 251, 252, 260, 261, 262, 271
Potawatomi ... 259, 262, 271
Sauk ... 248, 259
Shawnee ... 251, 259, 261, 262, 271

Page

OTTAWA LANGUAGE—Continued.
pronunciation ... 228
relationships ... 233, 238, 289, 290a
subjunctive mode ... 246, 260
OTTAWA TRIBE—
habitat ... 290
linguistic investigations among ... 225
OUSPIE, identified as Ofogoula ... 12

PADDLES, POTTERY (Casa Grande) ... 146–147
PAINT GRINDERS (Casa Grande) ... 126–127
PALATKI, description of ... 195–197
PALATKWABI, references to ... 35, 142
PAPAGO—
origin ... 152, 153
references to ... 34, 36, 54, 70, 113, 140
PAPAGO DE COJET, GOVERNOR, reference to ... 37
PARROT, THE, in Pima legend ... 46–47
PARTICIPIAL MODE (Algonquian)—
Cree ... 247
Fox ... 245, 260, 265, 271, 288
Ojibwa ... 245, 247, 271
Peoria ... 245
Shawnee ... 245, 265, 271
terminations ... 245
PASSAMAQUODDY LANGUAGE—
agreement with Piegan ... 231, 232
consonantic clusters ... 259, 283
description ... 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 289, 290
examples in comparison with—
Abnaki ... 239, 284
Algonkin ... 243, 265, 267, 273
Cree ... 238, 239, 243, 244, 257, 267, 284
Delaware ... 243, 267, 277, 278
Eastern Algonquian ... 257
Fox ... 239, 257, 258, 259, 267, 277, 284
Kickapoo ... 267
Menominee ... 238, 243, 267, 284
Micmac ... 284
Natick ... 243
Ojibwa ... 238, 243, 257, 258, 267, 268, 277, 278, 284
Ottawa ... 267
Penobscot ... 238, 284
Peoria ... 239, 267, 273, 277, 284
Sauk ... 267
Shawnee ... 239, 243, 256, 257, 258, 259, 267, 268, 273, 277, 278, 284
independent mode ... 268
indicative mode ... 273
pronunciation ... 228
reference to ... 225
PASSAMAQUODDY TRIBE, reference to ... 290
PATKI CLANS (HOPI), references to ... 142, 218
PATKI CLANS (PIMA), reference to ... 35
PATRICK, H. R., on ancient irrigation ditches ... 114
PATTIES, THE, reference to ... 62
PEABODY MUSEUM, Harvard University, reference to ... 119
PECTUNCULUS SHELL, ornaments of ... 143–144
PELOTE, Nahuatl game ... 94
PENDANTS, STONE (Casa Grande) ... 131
PENNACOOK LANGUAGE, classification of ... 290
PENOBSCOT LANGUAGE—
description ... 280–281, 282–283, 284, 285, 287, 289, 290

Page
PENOBSCOT LANGUAGE—Continued.
examples in comparison with—
Abnaki 239
Algonkin 267
Cree 238, 267, 269, 279
Delaware 267, 269, 279
Eastern Algonquian 269
Fox 239
Kickapoo 267
Malecite 269, 279
Menominee 238, 267
Montagnais 267, 279
Ojibwa 238, 267, 269, 279
Ottawa 267
Passamaquoddy 239, 267
Peoria 239, 267, 269
Sauk 267
Shawnee 239, 267
indicative mode 269
PENOBSCOT TRIBE, reference to 290
PEORIA LANGUAGE—
certain forms in 239
conjunctive mode 234, 245, 260, 265, 268, 279, 288
consonantic clusters 283
description 261–262, 265–269, 270–272
examples in comparison with—
Abnaki 238, 239, 283, 284
Algonkin 233, 250, 251, 259, 260, 261, 265, 267, 268, 269, 273
Cheyenne 233, 234
Cree 238, 239, 243, 244, 245, 247, 251, 252, 256, 257, 261, 262, 265, 267, 269, 274, 278, 279, 283, 284, 288
Cree-Montagnais 259
Delaware 238, 239, 256, 257, 261, 265, 267, 268, 275, 277, 279, 284
Eastern Algonquian 257, 269
Fox 238, 239, 244, 245, 251, 256, 257, 259, 260, 261, 262, 265, 267, 269, 274, 275, 278, 279, 283, 284, 288
Kickapoo 259, 267
Menominee 238, 244, 250, 251, 257, 259, 261, 262, 265, 267, 279, 283
Micmac 238, 256, 260, 279, 284, 288
Montagnais 278, 279
Moose Cree 262
Natick 233, 238, 239, 250, 251, 265, 273, 274, 279
Ojibwa 238, 239, 244, 247, 250, 251, 256, 257, 259, 261, 262, 267, 269, 274, 275, 278, 279, 283, 284
Ottawa 250, 251, 252, 259, 260, 261, 262, 265, 267, 268, 269
Passamaquoddy 239, 267, 273, 277, 283
Penobscot 238, 283
Potawatomi 259, 262, 265, 268, 269
Sauk 259, 267, 288
Shawnee 238, 239, 256, 257, 259, 261, 262, 265, 267, 269, 273, 274, 277, 278, 279, 283, 284
Stockbridge 238, 284
independent mode 259, 265, 269
indicative mode 259, 273
participial mode 245
subjunctive mode 245, 260, 265, 268, 269
relationships 233, 238, 289, 290b
PERSONAL PRONOUNS (Arapaho) 236
PESTLES (Casa Grande) 128

Page
PETTER, RODOLPHE—
on certain Cheyenne terminations 233
on relationship between Cheyenne and Natick 234
reference to 226
PHOENIX, ARIZ., references to 33, 34, 51, 55, 114, 116, 218
PINA CLAN of Chevlon, reference to 139
PICHACHO MOUNTAIN, references to 36, 204
PICTOGRAPHS—
Apache 197, 201
at or near Casa Grande 148–149
at Yampai Spring 209
in Walnut Valley 206, 214
near Frog Tanks 216
near mouth of Black's Canyon 197
near Palatki 197
near Prescott 215
PIEGAN LANGUAGE—
consonantic clusters 231, 284
description 229–232, 290a
examples in comparison with—
Cheyenne 274
Eastern Algonquian 261, 288–289
Fox 256, 261
Natick 274
Shawnee 256, 261
inanimate plural of nouns 274
independent mode 259
pronunciation 226
relationships 229, 234, 259, 288–289
PIEGAN TRIBE—
linguistic investigations among 225
union of band with Arapaho 235
PIGMENTS (CASA GRANDE), description of 101, 126–127, 130
PIMA—
ancient culture 62
as workmen at Casa Grande 37
attitude toward pictographs 149
ball game 147
basketry 147
dwellings 39, 97, 113, 154, 155, 156
face painting 145
fear of Casa Grande ruin 34
kicking-ball game 94
lava rings used by 130
legends 35–36, 42–52, 61–62, 63–64, 65
mortuary customs 109, 117, 118
names for Casa Grande 33
on use of wooden implements 146
origin 71, 152, 153, 154
pottery 141, 147
quartz crystals used by 130
references to 54, 57, 58, 70, 115
relationships 71, 217
Russell's monograph on 42
sleeping mats 99
stone implements 123
swastika among 139, 140
See also Southern Pima.
PIMERÍA, reference to 56
PINAL LEÑAS, reference to 217
PINCKLEY COLLECTION from Casa Grande 120
PINCKLEY, FRANK, resident custodian of Casa Grande 34, 37, 86
PINE, used at Casa Grande 146

Page

PIPES (CASA GRANDE), description of..... 135–136
PIT-ROOMS (CASA GRANDE), reference to..... 101
See also Subterranean rooms.
PLAINS TRIBES, material relating to..... 15
PLANTING STICKS (Casa Grande)..... 146
PLAZAS (CASA GRANDE), description of.. 93–94, 100–101
PLUMED SERPENT—
Hopi cult of..... 142
symbolism (Casa Grande)..... 113, 141–142
PLUMMET, specimen found at Casa Grande.. 125
POPES CREEK, MD., collection from..... 21
PORTO RICO ABORIGINES, article on..... 13
POSO VERDE, in Pima legend..... 48
POSSESSIVE PRONOUN—
Arapaho..... 235
Fox..... 256
POSTON BUTTE, reference to..... 114
POSTON, COL. C. D., reference to..... 149
POTAWATOMI LANGUAGE—
description..... 261–262, 265–269
examples in comparison with—
Algonkin..... 259, 262, 271
Central Algonquian..... 245
Cree..... 245, 262
Cree-Montagnais..... 259
Fox..... 259, 262
Kickapoo..... 259
Menominee..... 259, 262
Natick..... 271
Ojibwa..... 245, 259, 262, 271
Ottawa..... 259, 262, 271
Peoria..... 259, 262, 271
Sauk..... 259
Shawnee..... 259, 262
relationships..... 238, 289, 290a
POTAWATOMI TRIBE—
habitat..... 290
linguistic investigations among..... 225
POTENTIAL SUBJUNCTIVE MODE (FOX)..... 259
POTTERY—
ancient Pima..... 62
Casa Grande—
Bandelier's reference to..... 70
decoration..... 133, 134, 137–142
paddles used in manufacture..... 146–147
reference to..... 68
specialized forms..... 133–137
Gila-Salt region..... 156
Little Colorado ruins..... 134, 137–141
Marx's ranch ruin..... 213–214
Sikyatki..... 134, 137, 139–141
Southwestern and Mexican areas, compared..... 137–142, 158–159
Walnut Creek region..... 220
POWELL, MAJ. J. W., on ancient people of Upper Verde-Walnut Creek region..... 186
PRESCOTT, ARIZ.—
references to..... 202, 204, 215
ruins near..... 218
PRESCOTT NATIONAL FOREST, ARIZ..... 211
PRESCOTT, WM. H., cited as to Casa Grande.. 53
PRESERVATION of Casa Grande ruin, Ariz... 17, 18
PRETERITE—
in *ban*..... 269
in *p* and *panne*..... 279
in *pan*..... 287

Page

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, reference to..... 290
PRINCE, PROF. J. DYNELEY—
acknowledgment to..... 225
forms cited by..... 239
on certain Algonquian relationships..... 289
Penobscot consonantic clusters..... 280, 282
reference to..... 275
PROBLEMATICAL IMPLEMENTS (Casa Grande)..... 125, 129
PRONOMINAL ELEMENTS, objective (Arapaho). 237
PRONOMINAL FORMS of verb, reference to.... 226
PRONOUNS, Eastern-Central Algonquian.. 237, 238
PRONUNCIATION of Algonquian languages.. 226–228
PSEUDO-CLUSTERS (Cheyenne)..... 233
PUBLICATIONS OF BUREAU, description of. 17, 19–20
PUEBLO, term defined..... 189
PUEBLO CREEK—
origin of name..... 207, 210
reference to..... 209
PUEBLOS (BUILDINGS)—
architecture of..... 155, 156–157, 187
associated with cavate lodges..... 188–189
not found west of upper Verde..... 220
relation to compounds..... 150–160
PUEBLOS (INDIANS)—
adobe construction used by..... 80
animal fetishes among..... 122
divisions..... 189
pigments used by..... 130
pottery..... 141
quartz crystals used by..... 130
rattles used by..... 145
reference to..... 33
relationship..... 220
PUEBLOS OF RIO GRANDE, reference to..... 219
PUEBLO VIEJO VALLEY, reference to..... 118, 141

QUAHATIKA—
basketry..... 140
mescal pits..... 116
origin..... 153
pottery..... 140
reference to..... 112
QUARTZ CRYSTALS, used by Southwestern tribes..... 130
QUIGYUMA, reference to..... 200
QUIJOTOAC, reference to..... 140

RADIN, DR. PAUL, on Ojibwa dialect..... 290a
RAIN CEREMONIES (Casa Grande)..... 113
RAIN GODS, in Pima legend..... 42, 47
RAIN-MAN, in Pima legend..... 47–48
RAND—
on Micmac form..... 284
work by, cited..... 238
RASLES, reference to..... 238
RATTLESNAKES at Casa Grande..... 34
RAY, THOMAS, work of..... 37
RED ROCKS, cliff-houses of the..... 151, 194–197
REFUSE-HEAPS (Casa Grande)..... 92, 111
RELATIVE MODE (Delaware)..... 279
RELIGION OF ANCIENTS, references to..... 47, 48, 116, 117, 118
See also Idols, Magic, Plumed serpent.
REPTILES, idols in form of (Casa Grande).. 121, 122
RESEARCHES, ethnologic, summarized..... 9–17

Page

RESERVOIRS—
Casa Grande 70, 111–113
Gila-Salt region 115
RIBAS, FATHER, on Southern Pima 70–71, 152
RIO ALTAR, reference to 56
RIO BAVISPE, reference to 56
RIO GRANDE REGION—
caves 188
derivation of pueblos 151
early inhabitants 151, 218
pottery 139, 140
Pueblos 219
RIO SAN PEDRO, reference to 54
RIO SANTA CRUZ, reference to 54
RIO SONORA, reference to 54
ROAD-RUNNER, THE, in Pima legend 47
ROBBER'S ROOST CAVE, reference to 196
ROOFS (CASA GRANDE)—
modern protective covering 72
original 142
ROOMS (CASA GRANDE), description of 74–79, 82, 89–92, 97–99, 106–109
ROOSEVELT DAM, reference to 51
ROUTES TO CASA GRANDE, description of 34–37
RUBBING STONES (Casa Grande) 127
RUDO ENSAYO, description of Casa Grande 56–57
RUPERT'S HOUSE CREE—
character 247
form from 248
pronunciation 227
See also Montagnais.
RUSSELL, DR. FRANK—
monograph on Pima 42
on lava rings (Pima) 130
on metates 126
on Pima legends as to their origin 155
on word *siba* 46
references to 45, 118
RUXTON, GEORGE FREDERIC, cited as to Casa Grande 53

SACATON, references to 45, 149
SAGUARO, in Pima legend 44, 52, 61
SALA HINA, Pima potter 140
SALT RIVER VALLEY—
ancient migration route 157
antiquities 17, 119
figurines of quadrupeds from 135
legendary home of Pima 51
references to 35, 55, 147
See also Gila-Salt region.
SAN BERNARDINO MOUNTAINS, in Pima legend 47
SANDSTORMS, effect of, at Casa Grande 42
SANFORD'S MILL, ARIZ., description of 34–35
SAN JOSÉ, ruin at 118
SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO DE UTURITUC, reference to 37
SAN JUAN REGION—
pottery from 138, 140
ruins 151, 194
SAN PEDRO VALLEY, references to 54, 118, 121, 220
SANTA CATALINA MOUNTAINS, references to 48, 112
SANTA CLARA PUEBLO, researches in 11
SANTA CRUZ, upper, pottery from 137
SAN XAVIER DEL BAC, reference to 54

Page

SAPIR, DR. EDWARD—
Abnaki forms from 286
acknowledgment to 225
examples of Montagnais from 248
on Delaware and Ojibwa dialects 290a, 290b
on Malecite form 287
on Rupert's House Cree and Montagnais 247
references to 228, 238, 239, 278, 290
work of 15
SAUK LANGUAGE—
certain forms in 239
description 252–255, 258–261
examples in comparison with—
Cree, Micmac 288
Eastern-Central Algonquian 237
Fox, Peoria 272, 288
Kickapoo, Menominee, Ojibwa, Shawnee 272
independent mode 289
noun endings 272
pronunciation 227
relationships 238, 244, 289
See also Fox, Kickapoo.
SAUK TRIBE—
habitat 290
linguistic investigations among 225
SAULT STE. MARIE, reference to 290
SAVEDRA, cited as to several tribes 216, 217
SCATICOOK LANGUAGE, reference to 279
SCRAPERS, STONE (Casa Grande) 132
SEARLES, STANLEY, work of 19
SEDELMAIR, FATHER JACOB, visit to Casa Grande 56
SEEDS found at Casa Grande 150
SELIGMAN, ARIZ., reference to 186
SERANOS. *See* Cuabajai.
SHAWNEE INDIANS, linguistic investigations among 225
SHAWNEE LANGUAGE—
certain forms in 239
conjunctive mode 234, 255, 265, 271, 272, 279
consonantic clusters 283
description 255–258
examples in comparison with—
Abnaki 238, 239, 283, 284
Algonkin 243, 244, 252, 259, 261, 262, 265, 267, 271–272, 273
Cheyenne 234
Cree 238, 239, 243, 244, 245, 252, 261, 262, 265, 267, 269, 271, 272, 274, 279, 283, 284, 286
Cree-Montagnais 259, 287
Delaware 238, 239, 243, 244, 261, 265, 267, 270, 274, 277, 278, 279–280, 283, 287, 288
Eastern Algonquian 261, 269, 270, 287, 288
Eastern-Central Algonquian 237
Fox 238, 239, 245, 252, 258, 259, 261, 262, 265, 267, 269, 270, 271, 272, 274, 279–280, 283, 284, 286, 287, 288
Kickapoo 267, 272
Menominee 238, 239, 243, 244, 259, 261, 262, 267, 270, 272, 279, 283, 284
Micmac 238, 272, 279, 284, 288
Minsi 239, 274
Montagnais 267
Natick 238, 239, 243, 244, 265, 273, 274

Page

SHAWNEE LANGUAGE—Continued.
examples in comparison with—Contd.
Ojibwa ... 238, 239, 243, 244, 245, 258, 259, 261, 262, 265, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 274, 277, 278, 279, 283, 284, 286, 287
Ottawa ... 259, 261, 262, 265, 267, 271
Passamaquoddy ... 239, 243, 258, 259, 267, 273, 277, 278, 283, 284, 286, 287
Penobscot ... 238, 267, 283, 284
Peoria ... 238, 239, 252, 259, 261, 262, 265, 267, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 277, 279, 283, 284
Piegan ... 261
Potawatomi ... 259, 262
Sauk ... 267, 271, 272
Stockbridge ... 238, 284
Turtle Mountain (Ojibwa dialect) ... 239
independent mode ... 254, 268, 286, 289
indicative mode ... 273
noun endings ... 272
participial mode ... 245, 265, 271
pronunciation ... 227
relationships ... 231, 238, 244, 258, 280, 288–290, 290a
subjunctive mode ... 255, 260, 265, 269
SHELL OBJECTS (Casa Grande), description of ... 143–145
SHIWINA, SHIWONA, native name of Zuñi country ... 46
SHONGOPOVI, pottery of ... 141
SHOOK'S RANCH—
reference to ... 210
ruins near ... 211–213
SHOVELS (CASA GRANDE)—
stone ... 131–132
wooden ... 115, 146
SHRINES (CASA GRANDE)—
description ... 101
objects found in ... 98, 101, 121, 135, 142–143
reference to ... 98
SIALIM CÍVANAVÁAKI, Pima name for Casa Grande ... 33
SIALIM TCUTUK. *See* Morning Green.
SIBA, significance of term ... 46
SIERRA MADRE, Mexico, cliff-houses in ... 151
SIKSIKA, Algonquian major linguistic division ... 229
See also Blackfoot.
SIKYATKI—
mortuary customs ... 117, 118
pottery from ... 134, 156, 158–159
See also Tusayan.
SITGREAVES, L., references to ... 186, 207
SI-VA-NO, KING, legendary Pima chief ... 45, 62
See also Ci-vā-nō.
SKINNER, cited as to Cree ... 247, 248
SLABS (CASA GRANDE), description of—
clay ... 136
stone ... 125, 126, 129
SMITH, BUCKINGHAM, references to ... 55, 56
SMOKE SIGNALING, reference to ... 207
SMOOTHTOWN, Delaware dialect ... 290b
SNAKE CLAN, Hopi, reference to ... 159
SNAKE PRIESTS of Walpi, reference to ... 145
SNAKE, THE, in Pima flood legend ... 50
SNIPE, THE, in Pima creation legend ... 49
SOBAIPURI, references to ... 54, 58
SÖ'NÖ, legendary Pima chief ... 44–45, 61–62
SONORA, MEXICO, references to ... 54, 70

Page

SOUTHERN PIMA, references to ... 70, 152
SPANISH EXPLORERS, early, reference to ... 186
SPANISH MISSIONARIES, efforts to reach Hopi ... 207
SPEAR-POINTS (Casa Grande), reference to ... 130
SPECK, DR. FRANK G.—
acknowledgment to ... 290
material of ... 275
SPIDER, THE, in Pima legend ... 46
SPINDLE WHORLS (Casa Grande), description of ... 136
SQUIER, E. G.—
cited as to Casa Grande ... 53
work by, cited ... 64
ST. ANNE DE RESTIGOUCHE, Micmac dialect at ... 288
STEVENSON, MRS. M. C.—
collections made by ... 20
work of ... 10–11
STOCKBRIDGE LANGUAGE—
examples from ... 238, 284
notes on ... 290
STONE IMPLEMENTS. *See* Implements.
STORM-CLOUD, THE, in Pima legend ... 43, 60
STURAVRIK CÍVANAVÁAKI, legendary Pima settlement ... 51
SUAMCA MISSION, reference to ... 56
SUBAIPURIS. *See* Sobaipuri.
SUBJUNCTIVE MODE (Algonquian)—
Cree ... 246–247, 248, 265, 269, 271
Delaware ... 246, 260, 265, 268, 275–279
Eastern-Central Algonquian ... 237–238
East Main Cree ... 269
Fort Totten Cree ... 241–242, 245–247, 252
Fox ... 248, 254, 259, 260, 265, 269, 272, 274, 288
Menominee ... 246, 251–252, 269
Micmac ... 245, 269
Montagnais ... 248, 260
Natick ... 234, 260, 265
Ojibwa ... 245, 246, 259, 260, 262–263, 266, 267, 268–269
Ottawa ... 246, 260, 266, 268, 269
Peoria ... 245, 260, 265, 268, 269, 270, 271
Potawatomi ... 268
Shawnee ... 255, 260, 265, 269
See also Suppositive.
SUBJUNCTIVE-PARTICIPIAL MODE (Algonquian)—
Cree ... 239, 240, 245
Fox, Ojibwa ... 245
SUBTERRANEAN ROOMS, Casa Grande ... 40, 97, 101, 102
SUNWORSHIP, references to ... 47, 48, 116
SUPERSTITION MOUNTAINS—
in Pima legend ... 43–44, 50, 52
reference to ... 35–36
"SUPPOSITIF" of the "subjonctif"—
Montagnais ... 248, 260
references to ... 241, 246, 252
SUPPOSITIVE MODE (Algonquian)
Natick ... 234, 259, 272–274
several Algonquian languages ... 273
See also Subjunctive.
SUTAIO LANGUAGE, reference to ... 234
SWANTON, DR. JOHN R.—
reference to ... 226
work of ... 12–13, 22
SWASTIKA, on pottery ... 139–140
SYCAMORE BASIN, reference to ... 200
SYCAMORE CANYON, ruins in ... 195, 199–200
SYCAMORE CREEK, references to ... 194, 201

Page

TABLETS, STONE (Casa Grande) 125
TAKELMA LANGUAGE, data on 15
TALLIGUAMAYS, reference to 209
TANOAN CLANS, reference to 158
TAOS PUEBLO, N. MEX.—
  collection from 20
  researches in 10, 11
TCACCA, Pima name for Pichacho Mountain .. 36
TCAMAHIA CLANS (Hopi), reference to 159–160
TCERNATSING, legendary Pima chief 45–46
TCUHU, in Pima legend 48–49, 50, 51, 52
TCUHUKI, description of 101, 149
TCURIKVÁAKI, ruin near Adamsville, Ariz ... 35
TCUWUT MARKA. *See* Earth Doctor.
TEMPE, ARIZ., references to 51, 55, 116
TERNAUX-COMPANS, work by, cited 58
TEWA, pottery of 141, 159
TEXAN TRIBES, history of 16–17
TEXAS (HASÍNAI), description of 17
THIN LEATHER, Pima informant 34, 44, 45, 46
THOMAS, DR. CYRUS—
  reference to 226
  work of 11–12
THUMB BUTTE, ARIZ., pictographs near 215
THUNDER, in Pima legend 47
TIGUA, reference to 159
TIMS, J. W., on certain Piegan forms 231–232
TIPONI, reference to 49
TOBACCO CLAN of Chevlon, reference to 139
TOBACCO, NATIVE, found at Casa Grande ... 143
TOHOUSE, in Pima legend 49, 50, 51
TOKA, legendary Pima game 46
TOKÓNABI, reference to 159
TOMBSTONE, ARIZ., reference to 54
TONTO, in Pima legend 51–52
TONTO BASIN—
  "magic tablet" recorded from 122
  pottery 140
  reference to 51
TONTO RIVER, ancient migration route. 153, 158, 218
TONTOS—
  description 216
  reference to 51
TOTONTEAC, derivation of term 51
TOWA QUAATAM OCHSE, legendary Pima magician 51
TRADITIONS connected with Casa Grande 42–52
TRINCHERA—
  comparison with "fort" 187, 218
  construction rare in Pueblo region 220
TRUMBULL, J. H.—
  Natick Dictionary of, cited 275
  Natick forms from 272
TSIPIAKWE, home of 220
TUBAC, reference to 57
TUBUTAMA MISSION, reference to 56
TUCSON, ARIZ., references to 34, 54, 65
TUNICA, researches among 12
TURKEY CREEK, explanation as to name 207
TURQUOISE—
  in Pima legend 46–47
  in shell work 144
  mosaic work in 131
TURTLE MOUNTAIN CHIPPEWA, linguistic investigations among 225
TURTLE MOUNTAIN OJIBWA DIALECT, reference to 239

Page

TUSAYAN, pottery from 137, 139
  See also Sikyatki.
TUSAYAN INDIANS, reference to 79
TUSCARORA RESERVATION (ONTARIO), researches on 15
TUTELO LANGUAGE, data on 15

UHLENBECK, C. C.—
  on certain Piegan forms 231–232
  reference to 226
UNALACHTIGO DIALECT, references to .. 275, 290, 290a
UNAMI DIALECT, references to 275, 290, 290a
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, archeologic explorations by 18
UPHAM, E. P., specimens from Casa Grande listed by 161
UTAH, cliff-dwellings of 151
UTURITUC, old Pima settlement 37, 43

VÁAKI, Pima name for Casa Grande 33
VEGETATION about Casa Grande 36
VERBAL COMPOUNDS, Northern Blackfoot 231
VERBAL FORMS—
  Arapaho 235
  Miemac 280
VERDE VALLEY—
  ancient migration route 153, 158, 218
  antiquities of, memoir on 22
  early inhabitants 216–219
  pottery 140
  ruins 151, 187, 219–220
VI-PÍ-SÉT, designation of ancestors of Pima ... 71
VOWELS (Algonquian), elimination of 284

WADSWORTH, CAL., reference to 47
WALAPAI, ancestors of 185, 216, 220
WALKER, J. D.—
  Pima legend from 45
  reference to 71
WALKER'S BUTTE, reference to 36
WALLS OF CASA GRANDE, construction of 80–81, 82, 83–84, 95–96, 97, 102, 106–107, 116
WALNUT CREEK REGION—
  absence of large "compounds" 218
  early inhabitants 206, 216–219
  habitations of aborigines 209
  irrigation works 214
  pictographs 214, 216
  pottery 220
  ruins—
    age of 219–220
    description 187, 209
    history 206–211
    references to 22, 194, 195, 216
WALPI, Hopi settlement, references to 35, 48, 142, 159–160
WALTHER, HENRY, work of 21
WEAVER, PAUL, reference to 62, 149

WESTERN CLAN-HOUSES, Casa Grande 112
WHEELER SURVEY REPORTS, reference to .. 186
WHIPPLE, EWBANK, AND TURNER, on early inhabitants of Arizona 216–217
WHIPPLE, LIEUT. A. W.—
  Aztec Pass fort mentioned by 210
  on Walnut Creek Valley 206–209

Page

White Feather, ancient Pima chief.. 35–36, 50, 51
White Mountains, in Pima legend..... 52
Williamson Valley, Ariz.—
  references to..... 204, 207
  ruins..... 216
Wind, in Pima legend..... 43, 60
Wind gods, reference to..... 42
Wind-man, in Pima legend..... 47–48
Windmill ranch, reference to..... 195
Winship, cited as to Coronado expedition.... 53
Winslow, Ariz., reference to..... 218
Wissler, on linguistic differences among Algonquian tribes..... 229
Woman of Hard Substance, legendary Hopi being..... 51
Women—
  as basket makers..... 147
  as potters..... 141
Wooden implements (Casa Grande), description of..... 146–147
Woodpecker, the, in Pima flood legend.... 50
Wukkakotk, in Pima flood legend..... 51
Wyoming, archeologic explorations in..... 18

Page

Yabipais, Yampais. *See* Yavapai.
Yampai Spring, pictographs at..... 209
Yaqui River, reference to..... 56
Yavapai—
  ancestors of..... 185, 216
  references to..... 58, 207
Yavapai County, Ariz., reference to..... 186
Yaya, Hopi fire priests,..... 47
Yuma—
  in Pima flood legend..... 51
  relationship..... 220
Yuman stock, cremation practised by..... 220

Zeisberger—
  on Delaware language..... 275, 279, 290a, 290b
  reference to..... 228
Zuñi—
  absence of cremation..... 117
  dwellings..... 150, 219
  early inhabitants..... 154, 159, 218
  pottery..... 159
  references to..... 46, 62, 220
  researches in..... 11