



Beothuk and Algonkian: Evidence Old and New

Author(s): John Hewson

Source: *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Vol. 34, No. 2 (Apr., 1968), pp. 85-93

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1263514>

Accessed: 22/03/2011 10:00

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ucpress>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *International Journal of American Linguistics*.

BEOTHUK AND ALGONKIAN: EVIDENCE OLD AND NEW*

JOHN HEWSON

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

1. The Beothuk vocabularies
2. Beothuk and Algonkian
- 3.1. Gatschet's objections: linguistic
- 3.2. Gatschet's objections: ethnographical
4. Conclusion

1.1. Our information on Beothuk, the language of the aboriginal inhabitants of Newfoundland, comes from four vocabularies: (1) the eighteenth century vocabulary of John Clinch of Trinity, from an unknown informant, (2) that of John Leigh of Twillingate, from the Indian woman Mary March (Demasduit) captured in 1819. (3) the King vocabulary, of unknown provenance, (4) the Cormack vocabulary, taken down from Shanawdithit, who, with her mother and sister, came into voluntary captivity in 1823 because of starvation, and dying in June 1829, is presumed to be the last of the Beothuk.

1.2. There are over four hundred glosses in these vocabularies, and it has been possible to trace a large part in manuscript form. There is a copy of the Clinch vocabulary written into the Letter Book of the Waldegrave administration in the Fall of 1800 in the clear hand of the official scribe; this copy has been useful for checking the garbled printed versions of the Clinch vocabulary and corresponds with Gatschet's copy of Clinch, which according to Gatschet himself, was corrected by Howley 'with the aid of a copy made of the original at Trinity by Mrs. Edith Blake, who took the greatest pains to secure accuracy'.¹

* Research on the Beothuk vocabularies with a view to re-editing and comparative Algonkian work has been carried out with the assistance of the Canada Council. Mary Haas saw the paper in draft form and made several helpful suggestions; any anomalies or errors are, however, entirely the responsibility of the writer.

¹ For Gatschet's version of the vocabularies see

1.3. The whereabouts of the Peyton copy of the Leigh vocabulary, examined by Gatschet and other scholars in the 19th century, is not now known. The original Leigh manuscript, however, prepared as a presentation to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, has recently (1957) been discovered in the possession of a Twillingate family and has brought to light certain errors in the Peyton copy.² Whereas, for example, the latter lists *itweena thumb*, the Twillingate manuscript lists *ipweena thigh*, and *pooeth, thumb*, a clarification which corresponds with the other glosses for *thumb*: *boad* (King), *poorth* (Clinch), *buit* (Mrs. Jure, fellow servant of Shanawdithit). Unfortunately, pages have been lost from this document and all glosses beginning with B,C,D,H,M,N and W (English gloss) are missing. This is the manuscript copied by Robinson,³ however, and where the glosses in Robinson correspond with the Gatschet version of the Peyton copy of Leigh there is a fair degree of assurance that Leigh's original has been copied exactly.

1.4. There are two extant copies of King, written in the hand of Latham, who presented one to Gatschet and the other, apparently, to the Bureau of Ethnology. Also among Gatschet's papers is a copy of a manuscript, probably compiled by James P. Howley which, besides repeating the Peyton copy of Leigh, adds some fifty words from Cormack. The whereabouts, if any, of the Cormack manuscripts, including those detailing anthropological and ethnographic information, is, so far, unknown.

James P. Howley, *The Beothucks or Red Indians*, Cambridge University Press pp. 302-22 (1915).

² Peyton Vocabulary *in* Hatton and Harvey, Newfoundland, its History, etc. Boston, pp. 184-6 (1883).

³ Robinson Vocabulary, Royal Geographical Society Journal, 4.218-20, London (1834).

2.1. The possible relationship of Beothuk to Algonkian was much discussed during the 19th century. Latham states:⁴

The particular division to which the aborigines of Newfoundland belonged has been a matter of doubt. Some writers consider them to have been Eskimo, others to have been akin to the Micmacs, who have now a partial footing on the Island.

Reasons against either of those views are supplied by a hitherto unpublished Beothuk vocabulary with which I have been kindly furnished by my friend Dr. King of the Anthropological Society. This makes them a separate section of the Algonkins, and such I believe them to have been.

In 1862 he is less dogmatic: "The Beothuk is the native language of Newfoundland. In 1846, the collation of a Beothuk vocabulary enabled me to state that the language of the extinct, or doubtfully extant, aborigines of that Island was akin to those of the ordinary American Indians rather than to the Eskimo; further investigation showing that, of the ordinary American languages, it was Algonkin rather than aught else."⁵ He then proceeds to list 22 Beothuk words which, in his opinion, show a relationship between Beothuk and Algonkian.

2.2. Gatschet, who spent a great deal of time working on Beothuk, disagrees with Latham's opinion.⁶ He draws up two lists, the first consisting of six words that are to be found in almost identical form in other Algonkian languages, and a second consisting of 16 Beothuk words which RESEMBLE terms in other Algonkian languages. He considers some of these resemblances extremely doubtful, and in an effort to obtain a correct and unprejudiced idea of the comparative Beothuk-Algonkian lists, indicates the possibility of borrowings from Naskapi or Micmac. He then points out that Latham has not tried to prove the affinity of Beothuk to Algonkian, but had only shown that

Beothuk was of an 'Indian' rather than an 'Eskimo' type. He continues:

. . . in fact, no real affinity is traceable except in *dog*, *bad*, and *moccasin*, and even here the unreliable orthography of the words preserved leaves the matter enveloped in uncertainty.

The suffix -eesh and the plurals in -ook are perhaps the strongest arguments that can be brought forward for Algonkin affinity of Beothuk. But compared to the overwhelming bulk of words entirely differing this cannot prove anything. In going over the Beothuk list in 1882 with a clergyman thoroughly conversant with Ojibwé, the Reverend Ignatius Tomazin, then of Red Lake, Minnesota, he was unable to find any term in Ojibwé, except *wobee white*, and if *gigarimanet*, *net*, stood for *fishnet*, *gigo* was the Ojibwé term for *fish*.

The facts which most strongly militate against an assumed kinship of Beothuk with Algonkin dialects are as follows:

(1) The phonetic system of both differs largely: Beothuk lacks *f* and probably *v*, while *l* is scarce; in Micmac and the majority of Algonkin dialects *th*, *r*, *dr* and *l* are wanting, but occur in Beothuk.

(2) The objective case exists in Beothuk, but none of the Algonkin dialects has another oblique case except the locative.

(3) The numerals differ *entirely* in both which would not be the case if there was the least affinity between the two.

(4) The terms for the parts of the human and animal body, for colours (except *white*) for animals and plants, for natural phenomena, or the celestial bodies and other objects of nature, as well as the radicals of adjectives and verbs differ completely.

When we add all this to the great discrepancy in ethnological particulars, as canoes, dress, implements, manners and customs, we come to the conclusion that the Red Indians of Newfoundland must have been a race distinct from the races on the mainland shores surrounding them on the north and west. Their language I do not hesitate, after a long study of its precarious and unreliable remnants, to regard as belonging to a *separate linguistic family*, clearly distinct from Inuit, Tinné, Iroquois and Algonkin.

2.3. It is not at all surprising, in the light of the above statement, and of the evidence of the Beothuk vocabularies themselves, that Beothuk was listed as an independent linguistic family in Powell's classification of

⁴ R. G. Latham, *Varieties of Man* (1850).

⁵ R. G. Latham, *Comparative Philology* p. 453 (1862).

⁶ Albert S. Gatschet, Second Paper before the APS (1886), reprinted in James P. Howley, *Op. cit.*, 307-16 (1915).

1891. In 1892 however, the question was re-opened; the vocabularies were republished in the Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada by George Patterson.⁷ Unfortunately, this version is completely untrustworthy; Patterson relies on printed editions of the vocabularies, themselves only garbled versions of the original manuscripts. What is worse is that even these are miscopied. The recension of the vocabularies by Patterson is immediately followed by remarks contributed by John Campbell, which include long lists of comparisons between Beothuk and the various Algonkian languages, followed by a brief list of Beothuk words compared with a variety of Malayo-Polynesian words. Campbell replies to Gatschet in spirited form as follows, "First, that an extensive survey of Algonquin phonetics exhibits no reason for excluding the Beothuk from them; second, the objective case, or as the Abbé Cuoq calls it *l'obviatif* does exist in Algonquin and its mark is *n*; third, the numerals do not differ absolutely; fourth, the terms for the parts of human and animal bodies, for colours, animals, plants, natural phenonema, celestial bodies and other objects of nature, as well as the radicals of verbs and adjectives do not differ completely."⁸ He then continues, somewhat astonishingly, "in ethnological particulars there is no real distinction, save in this, that the Beothuks were, true to their Malay traditions, decapitators rather than scalpers." What is even more astonishing is that 25% of his quotations from the immediately preceding presentation of Patterson, show miscopyings and misspellings and misprints; as may be imagined, the disparity between the manuscripts and Campbell's citations is striking. Furthermore the proposed Algonkian comparisons are so far-fetched that he does his case far more harm than good. Even,

⁷ George Patterson, *Beothick Vocabularies*, Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, Section II, 19-26 (1892).

⁸ John Campbell, *Remarks on the Preceding Vocabularies*, Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, Section II, 26-30 (1892).

on occasions, his comparisons are self-contradictory, as when he offers us both Cree *iskwasis* and Micmac *abitajeh* for comparison with Beothuk *woaseesh girl*. Since the two words compared have different etymologies, they cannot both be related to the Beothuk word. The bold claim of a relationship between Beothuk and Malayo-Polynesian is likewise shown to be mere conjecture.

2.4. There the question lay until Sapir's reduction of Powell's 58 linguistic families into 6 superstocks, summarized in his article, *Central and North American Indian Languages* (1929), where Beothuk is listed as a separate branch of the Algonkian-Wakasahan superstock.

2.5. At this point the only dissenting voice to this view had been that of Gatschet; all others who had examined the materials were convinced of a distant relationship between Beothuk and the Algonkian family. Since that time the only opinion expressed on this relationship is that of C. F. and E. W. Voegelin,⁹ who, in a seventeen page survey of Indian languages in North Eastern North America, devote just over a page to Beothuk and assume that Beothuk is not an Algonkian language. There is mention of Speck in four of the six brief paragraphs, although Speck's only contact with Beothuk was a very old woman who claimed descent from a Beothuk father and a Micmac mother and who gave Speck a list of seven Beothuk words, none of which corresponds to anything in the genuine Beothuk vocabularies. The word *bénam woman* is claimed as 'dubiously corroborated' by other Beothuk sources, which are given as the "Peyton Beothuk vocabulary *emem-* and the Patterson Beothuk vocabulary *enam*, both translated as 'woman'." In this respect, the following information should be noted:

(1) The Peyton vocabulary is, in fact, the

⁹ C. F. and E. W. Voegelin, *Linguistic Considerations of Northeastern North America*, in *Man in Northeastern North America*, Andover, Mass. (1946).

unsatisfactory Peyton copy of Leigh, which gives emamoose, corrected to imamoose by Peyton, as the gloss for *woman*.

(2) Patterson does not give any new information, merely repeating the Peyton version of Leigh; the gloss enam does not occur anywhere in the forms he lists.

(3) It would seem fairly well substantiated that the informant was indeed born at Red Indian Lake in Newfoundland since Speck found that the Newfoundland Micmac had utilized the site, and one contact even corroborated her birth.¹⁰ That her father was Beothuk by birth is not at all impossible, but Speck mentions her 'growing senility',¹¹ and the linguistic information, in the circumstances, is extremely questionable.

(4) Although, after several days, the informant came up with the seven Beothuk words, she claimed also to know a song, but Speck comments that it was impossible to make out any words.

(5) Speck was displeased with the attitude of J. P. Howley, who did not believe a word of the woman's story. Howley felt that the information given ran counter to known facts.

2.6. However, the Voegelins' objection to the assumption that Beothuk is an Algonkian language is supported as follows... "Beothuk either shows no resemblance to proto-Algonkian, as reconstructed; or shows resemblances which are all too close. The latter suggest borrowing." The example of Speck's *bénam* is then discussed, 'probably a loan from Penobscot'.¹² Later the possibility is discussed that Beothuk is the donor language, 'accounting for the lexical innovations of Eastern Algonquian'.¹³ The word

¹⁰ F. G. Speck, *Beothuk and Micmac*, New York, 67-9 (1922).

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 58.

¹² More likely it is a corruption of the Penobscot word, since it does not resemble Beothuk; in the circumstances, the possibility cannot be ignored that the old woman was inventing, in order to satisfy Speck's insistence.

¹³ One wonders how far contact with the remote Beothuk could have influenced the whole of Eastern Algonkian.

bénam appears again as the possible source of Penobscot *phénam*, which differs from 'proto-Algonquian **exkweewa* 'woman'.' No mention is made that in the Beothuk vocabularies the gloss for *Red Indian woman* is *woasut* and that this is the transcription of King, an Englishman. Since the diphthong /ow/ of Standard Southern British begins from a front position [e], with lip rounding (phonetic [ø]) an Englishman might well write 'o' (as in *go*, *no*) when he hears /ew/ accompanied by strong lip rounding, as would be inevitable between two labials. The spelling *woasut* may therefore represent /*wewasut*/, which bears a much greater resemblance to **exkweewa*¹⁴ than does the all too dubious *bénam* to Beothuk *emamoose* (which King glosses *white woman*). The relevance to *bénam* and *phénam*, in such a case, disappears.

2.7. The only other example cited is that of Beothuk *mandee devil*, which is compared with 'proto-Algonquian *manetoowa*' and considered as a possible borrowing. Unfortunately, the form *mandee* is nowhere listed in any of the Beothuk vocabularies. Cormack has written the word *aich-mud-yim* along side a figure drawn by Shanawdithit, with the comment 'The Black Man, or Red Indian's Devil'.¹⁵ King, on the other hand glosses *haoot devil*. The mistaken form *mandee* is inexplicably given by Gatschet in a discussion of borrowed terms.¹⁶ Since, at the top of the next page he also discusses 'Ashmudyim *devil*', it cannot be from confusion with this term.

2.8. The assumption that Beothuk is not an Algonkian language is, in this instance, therefore, not supported by very healthy evidence, and we are left with the mere assertion that Beothuk shows either no resemblance, or resemblances close enough to suggest borrowing.

2.9. In this first preliminary survey of the

¹⁴ The correspondence of Beothuk *woaseesh girl* with the diminutive form of the Algonkian word supports this proposal.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, opp. p. 248.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 314.

evidence, it is not my intent to make any assumption about the possible relationship between Beothuk and the Algonkian family of languages. I shall, however, re-examine thoroughly the objections of Gatschet, which would seem to be the basis of any doubt about this relationship, and in taking into account material from the whole of the Algonkian spectrum, including Wiyot and Yurok, give evidence which in contradicting Gatschet's claims, would seem to support Sapir's proposition that Beothuk is an independent member of the Algonkian family.

3.1.0. In the first case, Gatschet claims that the phonetic system of Beothuk is widely divergent from that of the other Algonkian languages. It is true, as he says, that Beothuk lacks *f* and *v*, but in what language of the Algonkian group are these to be found? It is true also that *l* is scarce, so scarce, that there are only two clear instances in over 400 citations; given the nature of the phone, and the circumstances of the transcriptions, the conclusion is safe that */l/* was not a phoneme of Beothuk.¹⁷ Furthermore */l/* does occur in Micmac, and the other sounds listed by Gatschet do occur throughout the Algonkian spectrum, with the possible exception of *dr*, which may, in fact, be nothing more than a transcription for a cacuminal variety of */t/*. Add to this that voicing in Beothuk is non-contrastive, and it can be seen that there is nothing phonetically peculiar in Beothuk that would set it apart from languages of the Algonkian family.

3.1.1. But all this is, in fact, largely irrelevant; languages do not have to be phonetically similar to be related, as is shown by the wide divergence among the Indo-European groups. The phonetic divergence of

English, French, Russian and Albanian is irrelevant to the fact of their relationship within the Indo-European family. Gatschet is here thinking of Algonkian within too narrow a scope.

3.1.2. Gatschet's second objection is that the objective case exists in Beothuk but that none of the Algonkian languages has another oblique case except the locative. Such a statement is false in that it discounts the Algonkian obviative forms in *-n*, which is also the ending of the two cited forms of the Beothuk 'objective': *keathut head*, *nomash-nish keawthon scalping the head*; *nechwa tobacco*, *deh-hemin neechon give me tobacco*.

3.1.3.0. Gatschet's third objection is that the numerals differ ENTIRELY, and that this would not be the case if there were the least affinity between Beothuk and Algonkian. The evidence will be examined here by comparing Beothuk reconstitutions with Proto-Central Algonkian reconstructions and glosses from other Algonkian languages. The Beothuk reconstitutions are of the most obvious and elementary type.

3.1.3.1. In the following comparisons of the numerals ONE, FIVE, SIX and NINE, the following points should be observed:

(1) Beothuk seems to have two words for ONE. Bloomfield writes, "348 *nekotwi 'one': F nekoti, M nekot. C and O have this root in other words, but for the independent particle O has peešik (which appears also in some of the New England languages) and C the unique peeyak."¹⁸ In Micmac, by way of contrast, *newkt* is the independent particle while the other root occurs in the form *pasuk only*. Arapaho uses what appear to be modified forms of both roots: Salzmann gives *čééséy one*,¹⁹ but Sapir also lists *ni·set¹ one*.²⁰

(2) FIVE is glossed *nunyetheek* by King,

¹⁷ It is common in many languages for [r] and [l] to be variants of one phoneme. In Micmac, [l] replaces [r] in French borrowings: *Mali (Marie)*, *Piel (Pierre)*, *Malgelit (Marguerite)*. Mary Haas, pointing out the variations upon *l* and *r* to be found in Eastern Algonkian and Cree, considers Gatschet's phonetic arguments ridiculous.

¹⁸ Leonard Bloomfield, *Algonquian*, in Harry Hoijer and others, *Linguistic Structures of Native America*, VFP (1946).

¹⁹ Zdenek Salzmann, *Arapaho I: Phonology*, IJAL 12.49-56 (1956).

²⁰ C. F. Hockett, Sapir on Arapaho, IJAL 12.243-5 (1946).

ninezeek by Cormack, nijeek by Leigh. The latter forms would suggest that King intended SSB [Λ] as the first vowel of the word, which leads to a reconstitution /nanyeθik/. The glosses of Cormack and Leigh may be considered as attempts to transcribe this. Bloomfield's reconstruction *nya·lanwi has been here changed to *nya·θanwi because of the Arapaho form.²¹ The Fox, Menomini and Ojibwa evidence is in line with this change, and the Cree form which fits neither the original reconstruction nor the change, is, as Bloomfield says, 'probably a borrowing'. Sapir cites Arapaho numerals yeneiθi *some form of four* and yana·θaniθi *some form of five*, the latter by dissimilation from earlier *nya·nya·θani, through nyana·θani.²² This form has been included in the reference because it suggests that the Beothuk form is also reduplicated.

(3) The glosses for SIX are so divergent that they have all been listed and compared. The possibility arises that the *g* of Leigh's version is an attempt to transcribe [ž], as in *mirage*.

(Abbreviations: PCA Proto-Central Algonkian; PCEA Proto Central Eastern Algonkian; Ab Abenaki; Ar Arapaho; B Beothuk; C Cree; Del Delaware; Mic Micmac; Nt Natick; P Penobscot; W Wiyot; Y Yurok. Bl = Bloomfield; CFV = Voegelin;²³ CL = the Clinch vocabulary; C = the Cormack vocabulary; Ha = Haas²⁴ and elsewhere; H = Hockett;²⁵ JL = the Leigh vocabulary; K = the King vocabulary; M = Michelson;²⁶ PP = Père Pacifique 1939;²⁷ S = Siebert;²⁸ Sm = Salz-

mann;²⁹ Sr = Sapir;³⁰ SS = Shirley Silver.³¹ (The use of PCA and PCEA should not be construed as inferring any historical conclusions; they are merely labels for certain well known reconstructions.)

ONE (1)		
PCA	*k o t —	(Ha)
B	k a θ e t	(gathet, JL)
Ar	n i š e t i	(Sr)
W	k u ? c	(Ha)
Y	k o h t —	(Ha)

ONE (2)		
PCA	*p e · š i k w i	(Ha)
B	y a s i k	(yazeek, C)
Atsina	č e · θ i y	(Ha)
Ab	b a s u k ^w	(Sr)
Ar	č é · s é y	(Sm)
O	p e · š i k	(Sr)

FIVE		
PCA	*n y a · θ a n w i	(Bl)
B	n a n y e θ i k	(nunyethick, K)
Mic	n a · n	(PP)
Ar	y ó · θ ó n	(Sm)
Ar	y a n a · θ a n i θ i	(<i>some form of five</i> , Sr)
(from)	*n y a n y a · θ a n i	(Sr)

SIX		
PCA	*n e k o t w a š i k a	(Bl)
B	p i k a t o s i k	(bigadosik, JL)
B	p e š e t θ i k	(bashedtheek, C)
B	p e š e t	(beshed, K)

NINE		
B	y e o θ o t u k	(yeothoduck, JL)
Ar	θ í o ? t o k	(Sm)

3.1.4. Gatschet's fourth objection has several sub-headings, each taking into

cales—de la lange micmaque, Ste.-Anne-de-Restigouche (1939).

²⁸ F. T. Siebert, Jr., Certain Proto-Algonquian consonant clusters, Lg. 17.298-303 (1941).

²⁹ Op. cit.

³⁰ Op. cit.

³¹ Shirley Silver, Natick Consonants in Reference to Proto-Central Algonquian, IJAL 26.112-9 and 234-41 (1960).

²¹ Op. cit., p. 117.

²² Op. cit., p. 244.

²³ C. F. Voegelin, Delaware, An Eastern Algonquian Language, in Harry Hoijer and others, Linguistic Structures of Native America, VFP (1946).

²⁴ Mary R. Haas, Algonkian-Ritwan, the End of a Controversy, IJAL 24.159-73 (1958).

²⁵ C. F. Hockett, Central Algonquian Vocabulary: Stems in /k/, IJAL 23.247-68 (1957).

²⁶ Truman Michelson, Phonetic Shifts in Algonquian languages, IJAL 8.131-71 (1935).

²⁷ Père Pacifique, OFM Cap, Leçons grammati-

account a basic area of vocabulary in which the Beothuk words are said to differ completely from any Algonkian words: parts of the body, animals and plants, natural phenomena. In each case evidence will be presented that contradicts this assertion, but no effort has been made to draw up exhaustive lists.³²

NOSE

PCA	* m e h k i w a n — i	(<i>somebody's nose, M</i>)
C	m i s k i w a n	(M)
Del	h (w) i k i y o n	(CFV)
B	k i n	(gheen, K; geen, JL; guen, C)

BACK

PCA	* n e x p e θ k w a n i	(<i>my back, M</i>)
C	n i s p i s k w a n	(M)
P	n p ə s k w a n	(S)
Nt	n ə p i s k	(SS)
Del	u p x k o n	(CFV)
B	p o s o n	(posson, CL; possont, JL)

EYE

PCA	* n e š k i n š e k w i	(<i>my eye, Bl</i>)
Del	n e š k w i n k w	(CFV)
B	k w i n y a	(gwinya, JL; gheegnyan, K)

NAIL

PCA	* — š k a n š — a	(Ha)
PCEA	* — x k a n š — a	(Ha)
Del	n h i k a š	(<i>my nail, CFV</i>)
Mic	o k o s i	(<i>nail, PP</i>)
B	k u š	(cush, CL; quish, JL)

HAND, FINGER

PCA	* — θ e n č y e —	(Bl)
B	h a n y i s	(hanyees, K)

EAGLE

PCA	* k e l i w a	(Ha)
Wiyot	k o ? w a l i t —	(metathesis? Ha)
B	k o p i t i n	(gobidin, C)

FISH (deverbal)

PCA	* — a · m e · k w	(Bl)
B	t o t o m e š	(dottomeish trout, JL)
B	w e š o m e š	(weshomesh herring, JL)

TREE

PCA	* — a · h t e k w —	(Bl)
Wiyot	o · t i ?	(Ha)
Yurok	t e p o ·	(Ha)
B	a t i a p	(adi-ab, CL)

GOOSEBERRY

PCA	* k a w i m i n a	(Bl)
B	č i k a m i n t	(jiggamint, JL)

SUN AND MOON

PCA	* k i · š e ? θ w a	(Ha)
B	k i w i s	(kewis, K; kuis, JL)

3.2.0. Gatschet's final claim is the proposition that there was a great discrepancy in ethnological particulars between the Beothuk and the other Algonkian tribes. This proposition, too, will be examined item by item.

(1) CANOES: Typical of Algonkian culture is the wide use and application of birch bark. The canoes of the Beothuk were made of such, and not of skins, like the Eskimo kayak. Their canoe was certainly a different shape, having a V-shaped keel which was filled with rocks, and on top of the rocks moss was placed for the comfort of those paddling. In noting this difference however, one must take into account the fact that the Beothuk used their canoe consistently for ocean travel, and even made regular visits to

³² There is no trace in the Beothuk words for parts of the body or of the personalizing prefix found in Algonkian. If the Beothuk words are, in fact, Algonkian, Michelson's comments on Cheyenne are remarkably applicable (op. cit., 78): "... the number of complex phonetic shifts, for the most part determined by adjacent sounds, is enormous. These involve loss of consonants at times of whole syllables, the transformations of consonants and vowels, the leveling of old vowel-quantities, etc." The most notable change, in this case, would be the reduction of the consonant clusters immediately following the personalizing prefix.

Funk Island, which is 40 miles out in the Atlantic off the Newfoundland coast. The purpose of a keel would seem to be to make it easier for the paddlers to turn the canoe quickly and surely into an oncoming sea.³³ The fact that the canoe was ocean-going would also explain the high curved stern and pro'.

(2) DRESS: Shanawdithit's caribou skin robe was preserved by the family with whom she lived and finally passed over to the Newfoundland Museum in 1966. In the Museum there is also a Naskapi caribou skin robe, and the two robes show striking similarities of shape, design and colour. The wearing of leggings was also common with the Naskapi, and the wearing of eagles' feathers in the hair or headdress was common with a great many other tribes.

(3) IMPLEMENTS: Their birch-bark dishes, water-buckets and drinking cups do not depart from a common pattern, neither do their dwellings or their bows, arrows, or deer spears.³⁴ They did however have a seal spear with a detachable, harpoon-like head, the idea of which may have been borrowed from the Eskimo. Since this area of the Atlantic is famous for its seal fishery, such a development is to be expected. De Laguna comments: "The Beothuk...copied the

³³ Cartwright may have the conclusive reason for a keel when he writes (1768:33): "In fine weather they sometimes set a sail on a very slight mast, fastened to the middle thwart". Joseph Banks, a naturalist who visited Newfoundland in 1766, (Howley, *op. cit.*, 28) was of the opinion that this form of construction was for the purpose of folding the two sides together for convenience on portage.

³⁴ D. Jenness, Notes on the Beothuk Indians of Newfoundland, in National Museum of Canada, Annual Report, p. 37 (1927): "Considered in the light of other elements of Beothuk culture, such as the birch bark houses and canoes and the methods of drying fish, they strongly support the theory that the "Red Indians" of Newfoundland were merely a divergent branch of the Algonkian stock." Cartwright in his diary for 26 August 1770 comments that the Montagnais wigwam that he examined showed 'no difference of structure' from the Beothuk wigwams he had seen.

Dorset type 3 head... The prehistoric Indians of Nova Scotia took over the same type."³⁵

(4) MANNERS AND CUSTOMS: Their way of life followed a pattern common to many of the Algonkian tribes living near the seacoast; they wintered in the interior, and spent the summer fishing along the coast. In the fall before proceeding up to their winter quarters they utilized the 40 miles of deer fences alongside the Exploits River to trap the migrating caribou and funnel them into selected river crossings where they could be easily speared, and so provide a winter's store of meat, which was then carefully prepared and stored away in communal store-houses. The use of fences for aiding spearing of migrating caribou at river crossings, and similar processes for the winter storing of food are to be observed among the Naskapi. As also with the Naskapi, the caribou provided almost everything needed for survival, supplying skin for clothing, meat for food, bone and antler to make tools, and sinew for thread.

3.2.1. It has been claimed that their use of red ochre to cover the whole of their persons and their possessions sets them apart, but ochre is used by the other Algonkian tribes, even if not in such lavish quantities. To find such lavish usage one must go to the prehistoric Red Paint culture of the Atlantic seaboard, a culture which is considered a variant of Laurentian.³⁶ Of the latter Spaulding says³⁷

The Laurentian appears to be closely connected with an old, and probably basic level of boreal

³⁵ De Laguna, The Eskimos in North Eastern Archeology, in Fred Johnson, ed., Man in North-eastern North America, Andover, Mass. (1946).

³⁶ T. G. B. Loyd, On the Beothucks, a Tribe of Red Indians, Journal of the Anthropological Institute, 244-247 (1875) in speaking of the possibilities of their ethnic relations, concludes "it appears to me a more rational proceeding to attribute their probable origin to some ancient migration of a branch of the Algonkian nation."

³⁷ R. Spaulding, Archaeological Trends in the Northern Forest in Fred Johnson, ed., Man in

Algonkian culture because of its relatively early chronological position and its prominence in the archaic Algonkian area.

It is quite possible that in isolated areas of Maine and the Maritime Provinces a Laurentian culture survived to a late date because of the unattractiveness of the region to aboriginal agriculturists; the same factor would operate with even greater force in Newfoundland, where the culture may have been maintained until the historic period by Beothuk.

This would place Beothuk as a culture transitional between Palaeo-Indian and Neo-Indian in Griffin's scale,³⁸ a proposition borne out by what we know of Beothuk artifacts.

3.2.2. We know little of Beothuk religious customs or practices, but Cormack's statement that they worshipped the sun can be paralleled with similar statements about the Naskapi; Speck insists that this view is an over-simplification, that the Naskapi, in fact, worship a great being in the sun. The following passage from Le Clercq, concerning the Micmac, is also relevant (1910:243): "It is necessary . . . to be content . . . , and to endure with constancy all the misfortunes of nature, because the sun, or he who has made and governs all, orders it thus."

3.2.3. Finally, much has been made, as we see from Campbell's comment above, of the fact that the Beothuk cut off the heads of their slain enemies, put them on poles and danced and sang around them.³⁹ But it is not necessary to go to Malayo-Polynesian

Northeastern North America, Andover, Mass. (1946).

³⁸ Griffin's scale is given in Fred Johnson ed., *op. cit.*, opp. p. 41.

³⁹ Regina Flannery—*An Analysis of Coastal Algonquian Culture*, Catholic University of America Press 1939, pp. 123-4 mentions that head trophies were common among the Coastal Algonkian. We also have the curious comment of Joseph Banks (*Howley op. cit.*, 28): "Their method of scalping too, is very different from the Canadian's, they not being content with the hair, but skinning the whole face, at least, as far as the upper lip." "I have a scalp of this kind which was

to find similar examples of decapitation. Speck (1940:46) has recorded an Abnaki text in which the Abnaki 'scalped the heads' of a group of Mohawk and hung the heads on posts "all around the island. That is why that island is called Head Place."⁴⁰ Decapitation, again, is archaic in style; taking only the scalp is a refinement of decapitation.⁴¹

4.1. Much of the evidence available in Gatschet's day was inadequate, and sometimes based on assumptions which have since become obsolete. The present paper has attempted to show that none of the evidence brought forward by Gatschet to support his objections will validly do so today when viewed in the light of our present knowledge of Algonkian.

4.2. Such an approach is purely negative, and no attempt has been made to establish positively and coherently a linguistic relationship between Beothuk and the Algonkian family, a task which would require much fuller evidence. It is, however, hoped that such a study will be possible in a future paper.

taken from one, Sam Frye, who they shot in the water, as he attempted to swim off to his ship from them."

⁴⁰ F. G. Speck, *Abnaki Texts*, IJAL 11.45-6.

⁴¹ Speck, in fact, produced a chart (*op. cit.* (1922) opp. p. 44) in which he lists twenty-two items that were popularly supposed to have distinguished the Beothuk, and shows how all but one of these (bone dress ornaments) are distributed among the neighboring Newfoundland and Maritime Provinces Micmac, the Montagnais, Naskapi, and Wabanaki. On page 44 he comments on Beothuk artifacts: "Some of the bone and antler implements and the birch bark receptacles are of the same type as those which I have just discussed as being common among the Algonkian of the East in general." These facts caused him to comment in the opening pages of his monograph on Beothuk and Micmac: (p. 13); "The general supposition that the Beothuk may be a divergent early branch of the eastern Algonkian is indeed borne out by some fairly trustworthy historical, linguistic, and ethnological conclusions."