



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ETHNOLOGICAL POSITION OF THE NATCHEZ INDIANS

By JOHN R. SWANTON

The highly developed monarchical government of the Natchez tribe of Indians and their possession of a national religion centering about a temple which reminds one in many ways of the temples of Mexico and Central America has given them an interest altogether out of proportion to their numbers. It is believed, therefore, that anything tending to elucidate the ethnological position of this people will be welcome.

William Bartram, who between 1773 and 1777 traveled through the regions bordering on the north shore of the Gulf of Mexico, states that the Creeks and the traders of his day considered Natchez a dialect of the Muskogi language,¹ and this opinion is expressed by several other early writers, but it would be difficult to say how much it owes to noticed resemblances and how much to the intimate relationship between Natchez and Creeks in later times. Schoolcraft in the following words expresses the same idea again, though he includes the Yuchi as well: "Another question in the classification of our Indian languages arises from the two small tribes of the Natchez and Utchees, the remnants of which have coalesced with the Muscogeas. We may suppose that there was some ancient alliance to lead their minds to the act; if not some remote affinity, but in the present state of our knowledge they must be separately grouped."² In his classification of American languages, published in 1836,³ Gallatin shows, by the way in which his Natchez vocabulary is inserted, that he considers the language distinct. In 1867, in one of his earliest speculations, Brinton attempted to establish a relationship between Natchez and Maya;⁴ but six years afterward, on the basis of fuller material, obtained from the Natchez remnant among the Creeks through Mrs A. E. W. Robertson, he changed his views entirely and announced his belief that it was a Creek dia-

¹ Bartram, *Travels*, London, 1792, p. 463.

² Schoolcraft, *Indian Tribes*, II, p. 345, 1852.

³ Gallatin in *Archæologia Americana*, II, Cambridge, 1836.

⁴ *Historical Magazine*, 2d series, 1867, I, pp. 16-18.

lect. This position he supported by about forty resemblances between the Natchez language and various Muskogean dialects.¹ Nevertheless the conclusion was not endorsed by Gatschet, and since the latter had access to far more material than Brinton, his judgment was accepted by Powell in classifying the languages of northern America, and Natchez, along with Taensa, was given an independent position as the Natchesan stock.²

The material at Brinton's command when he made his comparisons was the old Gallatin vocabulary of 1836, on which his first speculation was based, and that collected by Mrs Robertson, the two totaling 365 words and phrases. Although excellent so far as it goes, this is only a small fraction of the Natchez material preserved, the two longest vocabularies, those of Pike, collected about 1861, and of Gatschet, collected in 1885, being still in manuscript.

An investigation of the latter two begun about a year ago had already convinced the present writer that Natchez would prove to be a widely divergent dialect of Muskogean before Brinton's paper was brought to his attention. So convinced was he of this fact that he at once set to work to institute as thorough a comparison as the absence of an intimate knowledge of Muskogean grammar would permit, and he believes that the results justify his expectations. The Muskogean vocabularies consulted are the manuscript Choctaw dictionary of Byington; the manuscript Muskogi, Hitchiti, Alibamu, and Koasati vocabularies of Gatschet; the manuscript vocabularies of Pike and Mrs Robertson, and the Creek and Hitchiti glossaries in Gatschet's *Creek Migration Legend*, besides incidental material from other sources.

Du Pratz, our best authority on the ethnology of the lower Mississippi in early French times, distinguishes between those tribes which used an *r* in their language and those that did not. None of the Muskogean dialects which have come down to us contain this sound, but the same is not true of the other languages of the Mississippi valley itself southward of the Quapaw, so far as known,

¹ *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society for 1873*, pp. 483-499.

² *Seventh Report Bureau of American Ethnology*, pp. 95-97. In *The American Antiquarian*, II, 76, 1879, Gatschet does indeed refer to the tribe as "of Maskoki affinity," perhaps following Brinton, but the statement is vague and his more mature conclusion appears to have been as given above.

except Natchez. All other Natchez sounds also find their equivalents in Muskogean, unless we except *v*, which Gatschet occasionally uses instead of *f*, a use which is probably due to nothing more vital than slight differences in hearing on his part. Both *f* and *ʋ* occur more sparingly in Natchez than in the Muskogean dialects, and are never initial sounds as is so commonly the case with them. Harmonic changes are almost confined to a replacement of *ʋ* by *l* on the one side and by *s* on the other. This phenomenon, if not found in Muskogean, is at least present in other Southern languages.

From a grammatical point of view we may say that the richness of Muskogean dialects in modes, tenses, and pronominal forms is hardly duplicated by Natchez in the shape in which we now have it, but the collectors of Natchez material seem to have made no attempt to obtain examples of any mode except the indicative, and there is scarcely an example of the future or of any forms to explain the use of pronominal subjects, objects, and indirect objects when such occur together. We must not look, therefore, for so many grammatical processes in our present Natchez material as in Muskogean, but be satisfied if those that we do find are in agreement.

In both Natchez and Muskogean there is no grammatical gender or case, while number in nouns is represented only by a collective applied principally to human beings. Both distinguish the diminutive in nouns and the augmentative in adjectives. In both verbal nouns are common. Possession, however, appears to be indicated very differently, since the pronouns are prefixed in Muskogean and suffixed in Natchez, besides which the latter uses a special possessive suffix. Nevertheless, these differences are equalized by agreements in form to be noted presently. A marked peculiarity in Muskogean, at least in the Choctaw dialect, is the presence of what Byington terms "article-pronouns," having as their roots *a* and *o*. These are not certainly recognizable in Natchez, but a suggestive resemblance to them is presented by two verbal auxiliaries. For reasons already given, the pronouns appear much more complicated in Muskogean than in Natchez, but at least we may recognize independent pronouns, pronominal affixes, and possessive pronouns and adjectives in each. The pronominal affixes are prefixed in Natchez and usually occupy the same position in

Muskhogeian, though not invariably. Three numbers — singular, dual, and plural — are found in both. The dual is sometimes indicated by a difference in stem, but more often by a special syllable placed after the corresponding pronominal prefix of the singular. The exclusive and inclusive are distinguished in Choctaw but not in Muskogi, Hitchiti, or Natchez. Verb stems are either at the very beginning of the word or are preceded by very few prefixes, rarely more than one. The Muskhogeian dialects take a number of prepositional prefixes which appear to be almost wanting in Natchez, but the Natchez counterparts are independent prepositions which occur in the same situation relatively to the verb though not attached to it. In Choctaw two negative particles are used with the verb, one being placed before it and one after it, but in Muskogi, Hitchiti, and Natchez there is but one which is final. Muskhogeian dialects are like Natchez in the considerable use they make of suffixed auxiliaries, and usually in prefixing the pronominal forms to these instead of to the principal stem. Muskhogeian and Natchez also appear to agree in a very feeble development of demonstratives, only the most general ideas of nearness and remoteness being indicated. This leaves practically nothing in Natchez not represented in Muskhogeian; but besides agreeing in the processes they have in common the two languages present an agreement no less striking in those which they mutually lack. Thus we find no sex gender as in the neighboring Tunica, no series of instrumental prefixes like Siouan, no morphological prefixes like many languages of the North Pacific coast, no strong line of demarkation between animate and inanimate as in Algonquian.

Before taking up actual formal resemblances, it is always of importance to analyze the languages to be considered into their constituent elements of stems and affixes. This I have done very thoroughly for Natchez, carding all forms containing the same stem together and leaving apart those single forms which cannot be definitely classified, although I might myself be of the opinion that they could be so classified with fuller information. After this process had been gone through it was found that the 2400 examples could be placed under fewer than 800 heads, of which it is safe to say that 100 may be placed on the doubtful list above referred to. As yet

I have not carried my study of the Muskogean dialects so far. At the same time I feel able to announce that about 200 of the 700 well-established Natchez stems, i. e. between one-third and one-fourth, have been satisfactorily identified. This is exclusive of certain words such as *átasha* war-club, *yanása* bison, *kue'h* opossum, *pakachilu* war leader, which have evidently been borrowed outright and three of which are found in Cherokee as well as in Muskogean.

The following list contains some of the more prominent resemblances, but it must be remembered that only the stem is inserted unless there is some doubt regarding what constitutes the stem, when the supposed affixes are placed in parenthesis. Examples from Choctaw are indicated by the letter C placed afterward in parenthesis, those from Hitchiti by (H), those from Alibamu by (A), and those from Koasati by (K), while Muskogi examples are unmarked. The preponderance of Muskogi does not mean, however, that relationship with that language is closest, but that Muskogi and Natchez have been compared most thoroughly. The phonetics for the greater part resemble those for which the same signs are employed in English. *x* is the velar spirant. 'l is similar to the North Pacific coast *l* and is pronounced with the tip of the tongue just behind the lower teeth. An apostrophe (') before *h* means that the *h* is not silent. *a* is the obscure sound of a; *u* a *u* barely sounded, and *n* a nasal similar to the French nasals.

NATCHEZ

kuash, luminary
kets, to break
kus or *gus*, to give
kolom, a hollow
kut, to scratch, scrape a skin, shave
kūsh, to comb
kono, *kunu*, *kunū*, crooked, bent
hēsh(*k^u*), navel
hā'k(*au*), tobacco
hasēl, basket
hūntá, now
hash, old
iⁿ'ta, *int*, *intu*, tooth

MUSKHOGEAN

hāsi, luminary (all dialects)
kats, to break
kus, to give (K)
kolō'k(*bi*), a hollow (H)
kut, *kot*, to clip, cut, saw off
kāsh, *kas*, to comb, shave
kun(*hi*), crooked, bent
hāsh(*iwa*), navel
hā'k(*soma*), tobacco (A)
Asála, a basket (C)
hī'ntis, now (H)
ahāssi, old
nūti, tooth, *inóti* (H)

<i>itoxo</i> , finished, gone, completed	<i>atáha</i> , completion, completed, end (C)
<i>ishi</i> , tail	<i>hádshi</i> , tail
<i>ēt</i> , house	<i>húti</i> , house, home
<i>isóx(u)</i> , lecherous	<i>hosǝ'k(li)</i> , lecherous
<i>ichā'kst</i> , frog	<i>shúkati</i> , frog (C)
<i>ananá-i</i> , <i>hánanaī</i> , bullfrog	<i>hanǝ'ni</i> (H), <i>hánono</i> (K), bullfrog
<i>oho</i> , to cough or grunt	<i>oho</i> , to cough
<i>we'h</i> , roar of water, bark of dog	<i>wux</i> , roar of water, bark of dog
<i>ên</i> , fish	<i>nÁna</i> , fish (C)
<i>ǝ'wi</i> , quail	<i>kowaī'(kl)</i> , quail; <i>kowá(si)</i> (H)
<i>úwa</i> , <i>úa</i> , cane	<i>kóha</i> , <i>kóa</i> , cane
<i>ush</i> , duck	<i>fudsó</i> , <i>fúcho</i> , duck
<i>(ók)tu'l</i> , <i>(úk)tu'l</i> , eye	<i>tú'l(ua)</i> , eye
<i>wit</i> , day	<i>níta</i> , day (all dialects)
<i>únu</i> , berry	<i>Ani</i> , small berry, fruit (C)
<i>mem</i> , to fan	<i>mai</i> and <i>ma</i> , to fan
<i>mak</i> , to say	<i>mak</i> , to say, speak, command
<i>mǎ'ha(gi)</i> , plentifully, sufficiently	<i>máhi</i> , greatly, intensely, very
<i>pes</i> , <i>pe'l</i> , to sweep	<i>pas</i> , to brush, sweep
<i>pet</i> , to spread out,	<i>pat</i> , to spread out
<i>paka</i> , to float	<i>pakā'(ka)</i> to float (K)
<i>póyi</i> to boil	<i>Apúx(le)</i> , to boil (C), <i>abǝ's(ka)</i> (K)
<i>pAkpAk(ū)</i> , a large woodpecker	<i>búkhbágh(ki)</i> , a large woodpecker (H)
<i>pûf</i> , to blow	<i>pof</i> , <i>puf</i> , to blow
<i>pi</i> , to whip	<i>bi</i> , to whip, beat (H)
<i>sáwī(s)</i> , locust	<i>sowī'sowī</i> , locust
<i>sī'le</i> , slippery elm	<i>shī'lo</i> , slippery elm (K)
<i>sī'cha</i> , dew	<i>sī'cho</i> , dew; <i>sī'chi</i> (H)
<i>sha</i> , deer,	<i>ichu</i> , deer; <i>itchi</i> (H)
<i>chu</i> , to suck	<i>chu</i> , <i>tsu</i> , to suck
<i>chuf</i> , to spit	<i>tuf</i> , to spit
<i>chomǝt</i> , a hill	<i>chopǝ'k(si)</i> , hill (K)
<i>chochǝ'ls(ki)</i> , a martin	<i>chuchú(ke)</i> , a martin (C) (K) (A)
<i>ta</i> , to strike	<i>ta</i> , to cut off
<i>to</i> , <i>tu</i> , to pound, beat	<i>to(náfäs)</i> , I bruise; <i>(isa)tó(ka)</i> , hammer

<i>tisha</i> , to sneeze	(<i>hak</i>) <i>tish</i> (<i>kida</i>), to sneeze
<i>tu'l</i> , <i>tol</i> , to push	<i>túl</i> (<i>äs</i>), I cut down or push down
<i>tok</i> , dot, blotch	<i>tokó</i> (<i>'li</i>), <i>tokó</i> (<i>xli</i>), dot, blotch, spotted
<i>nā'l</i> , stinging	<i>nā'la</i> , stinging (C)
<i>nē'hkwa</i> , <i>nēk'a</i> , oil, fat, grease	<i>nihá</i> , oil, fat, grease ; <i>nia</i> (C)
<i>nAsh</i> , <i>noch</i> , throat	<i>nok</i> , neck (all dialects)
<i>ladsh</i> , soft (like ripe fruit)	<i>luáts</i> (<i>ki</i>), <i>lowáts</i> (<i>ki</i>), soft (ripe fruit)
<i>lāpAp</i> straight	<i>lapōt</i> (<i>ki</i>), straight
<i>lēpē</i> (<i>p</i>), to stick to	<i>lapá</i> (<i>chiē</i>), to stick to (A), <i>lapá</i> (<i>le</i>) (C)
<i>lēp</i> , limber	<i>libá</i> (<i>tī</i>), limber (H)

Concordance between numbers of examples, however, no matter how striking, is of less consequence than the kind of examples which agree and the manner of agreement. Thus the resemblance between Natchez *han*, or *ha"*, 'to do,' or 'to make,' and Muskogi *hai* or *ha* which means the same thing, although not so close as many above cited, is of more importance owing to the general character of the verbs and the unlikelihood of one language borrowing such a form from the other. Similar is the resemblance between Natchez *ma*, 'it is so,' 'truth,' 'that,' and the Choctaw stem *m* or *ma*, each of which appears in a number of different connections as shown in the following list :

ENGLISH	NATCHEZ	MUSKHOGEAN
truth, it is so, thus	<i>má</i> (<i>gup</i>)	(<i>ó</i>) <i>m</i> (<i>äs</i>), I am so ; <i>mún</i> (<i>go</i>), not so
the same, this same one	<i>má</i> (<i>nawa</i>)	<i>má</i> (<i>tarwa</i>)
nor, or	<i>má</i> (<i>gupāt</i>)	<i>mon</i> (<i>kat</i>) ; <i>ma</i> (<i>tī'ka</i>) (H) ; <i>ma</i> (<i>úkotik</i>) (K)
and	<i>má</i> (<i>gup</i>)	<i>mam</i> (<i>i'k</i>) (H) ; <i>mámi</i> (<i>st</i>) (K)
no more	<i>má</i> (<i>gupu</i>)	<i>mam</i> (<i>ō'sin</i>) (H) ; <i>mō'm</i> (<i>sin</i>)
that is it	<i>ma</i> (<i>náa</i>)	<i>má</i> (<i>tīs</i>) ; <i>mó</i> (<i>lē'h</i>) (C)
there	<i>ma</i> (<i>nA'</i>)	<i>ma</i> ; <i>mami'</i> (H) ; <i>mÁn</i> (C)
also	<i>ma</i> (<i>nō'k</i>)	<i>mā'o</i> , also ; <i>mō</i> (<i>k</i>) (H) ; <i>mō</i> (<i>ō'k</i>) (K)

Another of this class is *húcha*, or *hócha*, 'right,' 'straight,' and

Muskhogeian *fácha*, meaning the same thing. Again compare the stems *hap* 'to bite,' *kimpa* 'to eat a variety,' and *kin* 'to eat one thing,' with Muskogi *impa* 'to eat one thing,' *pa* 'to eat many things,' and *kap* 'to bite.' Plainly an original common stem has here been worked over into somewhat different but for the greater part still recognizably related forms. In Muskhogeian the stem of the verb 'to hear' is *po* or *poh*, and in Natchez it is *eple*; but when we turn to the Natchez word for 'ear' we find *ípok*, which at once singles out the consonant *p*, as the original stem consonant in Natchez. Note also the agreement in form between the demonstratives: Natchez, *ya*, *yáka* 'that,' *ka*, *káya* 'this,' *yaā* 'yonder'; Creek *ya* 'this'; Hitchiti *ak* 'that'; *yan* 'there,' and *yā'kta* 'yonder'; and Koasati *yaā'fa* 'yonder,' although they seem to be in some measure transposed. One of the most convincing stem resemblances is that between *ápi* 'stem,' 'trunk,' and *apichi* 'stem of pipe,' in Muskhogeian, and the stems of the following series of Natchez words: *ébesk* 'bark,' *apiship* 'post-oak,' *apishu'l* 'peach tree,' *hipishul* 'arrow-shaft.' The Natchez stem *í'cha* 'blood,' although different from the usual Creek word, reappears in Hitchiti *ichikchi* and in *cháti* or *chádi*, the ordinary Muskogi word meaning 'red.' Natchez *ish* 'hand,' 'finger,' is unlike the Muskogi words for those parts of the body but appears as the stem of the verb 'to take,' *ishi*, and in the Koassati derivative *ishili* 'handle.' In both languages there is a surprisingly long series of vegetal names apparently sprung from the same root. In Natchez we find *ā'sha* 'hickory,' *ā'dsha* 'sweet potato,' *ástsa* or *ā'lch* 'grape'; in Muskhogeian *ádshi* 'hickory,' *ássi* 'leaf,' *ádshi*, 'maize,' *ási* 'Ilex cassine' from which the "black drink" was extracted. The Muskogi word for potato is *áha*, and at first sight not very near *ā'dsha*, but it is quite possible that the two have been evolved from one form since there is an analogous case in the Natchez *íhi* 'mouth' and Hitchiti *ichi*, in which the form in *h* is Natchez and that with the sibilant Muskhogeian. Again, Natchez *átul* leaf, is unlike the Muskogi *ássi* just given, but on the other hand it is quite near *ítu*, the common word for 'tree' or 'wood' in all Muskhogeian dialects. Carrying this study a little farther we find that *chu*, the Natchez equivalent of

itu, while possibly related to that word, shows a closer affinity with Alabama *chúvi*, and Creek *chúli* or *chóli* 'pine tree,' and with *choki'li*, the Muskogi word for 'post.' The Natchez word for 'pine tree' is also *chúli*. Another case of altered significance in words apparently from the same original stems appears in the terms for 'people' and 'town.' Thus the Natchez word for 'people' is *tam*, quite distinct from Muskogi *ísti*, but on the other hand almost identical with Choctaw *tamáha* 'town,' 'village,' and to complete the contrast we find Natchez *wásst*, *wást* 'town,' 'village,' differing from *tamáha* but very similar to *ísti*. Both Natchez and Muskogi have different stems for the singular, dual, and plural of the verb 'to go.' The dual stems disagree, but those for the singular and plural resemble each other closely, being *a'h* and *ay* or *a'h*, and *pi* and *pi* or *upi* respectively. Very interesting also is the derivation of *wash*, or *was*, the Natchez stem for 'dog,' 'horse,' 'bison,' 'cow,' etc. The corresponding Muskogean terms are all formed on a different stem, that used for domestic animals being *wak*, supposed, probably correctly, to be derived from Spanish *vaca*. For a long time the Natchez form seemed irreconcilable with anything in Muskogean until it was discovered that the word for 'wolf' in Gatschet's Alibamu and Koasati vocabularies was *wáshu*, evidently related on the other hand to Choctaw *neshóba*. Another series of resemblances develops in connection with the words for 'tobacco' and 'to smoke tobacco.' The Natchez stem signifying 'to smoke tobacco' is *puk* or *puka'h*. Compare with this the Creek words *pákwa* 'tobacco-pipe,' (*ísti atsúli*) *pákpagi* 'old man's tobacco,' *múki* 'smoke,' 'dust,' (*hidshi im*)-*múki* 'tobacco-dust,' (*hidshin*) *moka'(dshās)* 'I smoke tobacco.' *Hidshi* in these latter cases is the ordinary Muskogi word for tobacco. The same stem is also used by both for the word 'ball,' and though it would seem at first as if this might have been borrowed by one language or the other along with the ball game, a closer investigation shows that it is too deeply imbedded in each to be accounted for in that way unless the borrowing was very ancient. Thus we find in Natchez *pú'xsha*, *pú'shá* 'ball,' *popúpgup* 'globular,' or 'ball-shaped' (a duplicate form), *ú'shush* *púxungup* 'having a gibbosity,' and in Muskogi *póko* 'ball,' *pulóksās* 'I am round,' *láti*

kubúkni 'having a gibbosity', *apókhi* 'a bunch on anything,' *pók'ha* 'brushwood in bunches.' Compare also Natchez *pa* 'to plant,' 'a crop,' whence is derived *pehélu* 'bread,' with Muskogi *páska* and Hitchiti *palásti* 'bread,' and note that the two latter agree together in a little more than the Natchez stem *pa*. Another case for comparison is Natchez *shóxoni* 'good,' 'handsome,' with *ichokóni* 'pretty,' in the same language, Choctaw *achúkma* 'good,' and *chokmáse* 'pretty,' and Koasati *kókanu* 'good.' The Natchez word for 'goose' is given as *sásak* by Pike and *lálak* by Gatschet. It at first seemed probable that the latter was the native Natchez term and the former borrowed from Muskogi *sásakwa*. Note, however, the way in which forms in *l* and *s* appear in different Muskhogean dialects. In Muskogi, as just noted, it is *sásakwa*, in Hitchiti it is *hasáli*, in Alibamu *shalákhla*, and in Choctaw *xaláklaha*. Of similar persistency are Natchez *tuna* 'thunder,' 'to thunder,' Muskogi *tinítki* and Hitchiti *tonóxkáxchi* 'thunder.' Compare these with three other Natchez stems *tulu* or *tulum* 'to roll,' *tuku* 'to roll (like a caster),' and *tu*, *to* 'to pound,' 'beat,' 'hammer,' and with their Muskhogean counterparts *tolúmida* 'to roll,' *tulúyās* 'I am rolling,' *tonáfās* 'I bruise,' and *isatóka* 'hammer.' Natchez *nāsh* 'drizzling rain' seems to be related to both *wáshki* 'drizzling,' and *ú'ski* 'rain,' in Muskogi. As striking as any similarity is the use of the stem of the verb 'to sleep,' which sometimes appears as *nu* or *no* and at others as *nush* or *nosh* in both languages. Thus we find in Natchez *nush* 'sleep,' *noa-éshias* 'a dream,' *tanóla* 'I sleep' (*ta* = 'I'), and in Muskogi *núdshita* 'sleep,' *anódshki* 'a dream,' *núsi* 'to sleep,' *nókis* 'I sleep.' Natchez *le* 'to stand' is connected apparently with *lä* 'to put,' and *lá-ats* 'rest,' in the same language, and on the other hand with Muskogi *läikis* 'it is standing,' *lä'dshäs* 'I put,' *lääkita* 'resting place.'

Natchez and Muskhogean numerals do not appear at first sight to present any points of similarity, but Brinton was probably upon the right track when he called attention to the resemblance between Natchez *wítan* 'one,' and a Muskogi word for 'first,' "*hati-chiska*," because Natchez *wíta' hua*, Muskogi *í'ta*, and Choctaw *mé'ta*, 'another,' all agree with them. Brinton is also probably correct in deducing *áwēti* 'two,' *nē'di* 'three,' and the latter

part of *kináwiti* 'four,' from the same stem; *óku* 'ten' is possibly from Choctaw *pokoli* 'ten,' abbreviated.

More important than resemblances between principal stems are those between affixes, because the likelihood of their having been borrowed is still less. It has been noted that Natchez and Muskogean nouns have special diminutive suffixes. These agree in function but differ in form — Natchez *-inu*; Muskogean *-udshi* or *-ushi*. The latter is equivalent to the Choctaw word for 'child,' but the former does not appear to occur independently. Turning to the Natchez equivalent for 'child,' however, we find it to be *dshichi*, while that for 'small,' 'little,' is *mudshi-u*, in both of which the root consonant of the Muskogean suffix is prominent. The Natchez augmentative suffix after adjectives, *-in*, agrees quite closely with the Muskogi suffix *-sin*, which has the force of 'very.' The collective suffixes are farther apart, but although there appears to be little relation between Natchez *hni* (*chuná'hni* 'chiefs') and Muskogi *-álgi* (*Maskogálgi* 'the Muskogi people'), the resemblance of the former to Hitchiti *-á'li* (*Maskoká'li* 'the Muskogi,' *Kasí'htá'li* 'the Kasí'hta people') is much closer. However, the syllable *hni* is found with a number of Hitchiti pronouns, and although it cannot be said to indicate plurality, and the relationship to Natchez *hni* is uncertain, there is a strong suggestion that such may be the case. These personal pronouns are what Gatschet terms the subjective absolute pronouns and are as follows: *á'ni*, *chí'hni*, *i'hni*, *pi'hni*, *chi'hnitáki*, *i'hnitáki*. Except in the third persons, which Gatschet does not give, the corresponding verbal prefixes lose *hni* and in the first person *-i*. The Natchez possessive suffix *-ish* (*hakuchúish*, 'maize, its stalk,' *ishinish* 'his') is almost the same as the Muskogean stem *-dsh-*, meaning 'to possess' (*ǝ'dshās* 'I possess'). The Natchez pronominal prefix of the second person singular (*pa-*) and the objective pronominal prefix of the first person singular (*ta-*) seem to be unlike anything in Muskogean. The Natchez subjective pronominal prefix of the first person, *ya-* (*heloyáa* 'I am tired') is, however, very near the usual Muskogi prefix of the first person, *ā-*, (*hidshās* 'I see,' *hodshifās* 'I name'). Instead of *ya-* or *ta-* the stem of the Natchez possessive suffix in the first person is *ni* (*nisha* 'my'), which may perhaps be related to the Choctaw and Hitchiti

pronominal suffix *-li* (*únkalis* 'I halloo,' *áklilis* 'I think'), or the stem of the independent personal and possessive pronoun *Ano* 'I,' 'me,' 'mine.' In the third person there are two Natchez roots, *i-* and *na-*. The first is found only in independent pronouns or possessives, but it agrees in form with *i-* or *iⁿ-*, the Muskogi objective possessive pronoun of the same person. *Na-* is plainly an indefinite (*tána'l* 'someone strikes,' *at pastná'l* 'someone has his legs crossed') and is found in Muskogi *náki* 'something,' *nábu* 'nobody,' the prefix *na-* or *nanta-* forming the *nomen actoris*, and in Chickasaw *nana* 'things,' 'persons.' The reflexive prefix in Natchez is *sh-* (*túlteshú* 'I push myself,' *kilipná' shguk* 'having whirled himself around'), which may be compared with the Muskogi prefix as in *ich'häs* 'I shoot,' *isch'häs* 'I shoot back, in return.' The continuative verbal suffix *-ha* (*tehál* 'seizing,' *käihawish* 'to gnaw') seems to reappear in Choctaw *-haⁿ*, although there it is more of a frequentative than a continuative. *Is-*, the Muskogi instrumental prefix, has been found in three Natchez words — *súkesta'l* 'I am felling,' *supakáts'halish* 'to bore with,' 'borer,' *sapé'ta'l* 'I sweep with' — but further investigation will probably reveal more. The chance of such a suffix being borrowed is extremely slight. The commonest Natchez auxiliary, *-li* or *-l*, is nearly the same as the Muskogean *-li* (*talá'lilis* 'I cause to be laid down,' 'I lay down,' *alokchukúlis* 'I cause to rise up'). In a few cases in Natchez we find an auxiliary *-s* (*tsadi'htäs* 'I whet, sharpen,' *kútas* 'I take off'), which is perhaps the same as *-l* owing to the phonetic change already alluded to. Or perhaps it is connected with the Creek suffixed auxiliary *-s*, 'to be' (*hatidshäs* 'I whiten,' and other examples already given). It is more likely, however, that this latter is represented by the Natchez infinitive suffix *-sh* or *-s*, 'to' (*shú'halish* 'to stretch out,' *patahakúsh* 'to cover' (as with wall paper). The Natchez auxiliary *g* or *ga*, 'to do' (*tuluṭtagúk* 'I have rolled,' *shtá'lpagi* 'you stand') resembles the Muskogi causal *-ga* (*ḡ'stga* 'because there are four') in certain cases much closer than the assigned meanings of the two affixes would seem to warrant. The Natchez perfect suffix *-k* (*lúgagik* 'boiled,' *kilipnáshgúk* 'having whirled himself around') is exactly paralleled in function by the Muskogi *-ki*, (*lámäs* 'I uncover,' *lámki* 'open') and is perhaps connected on

the other hand with the Choctaw determinate or demonstrative 'that,' 'the.' The Natchez auxiliary suffix *-f* (*puf* 'to blow,' *púftaf* 'I blow') is very likely identical with the Choctaw auxiliary suffix *-h* for there are numerous cases in which the two sounds are confused or transposed in recording. It is barely possible, also, that the Choctaw suffix is represented in *-ho* or *-aho*, which indicates the immediate occurrence of an act in Natchez (*tasháho* 'I lie,' *ta'htáho* 'I follow'). The Natchez negative suffix *-āt* or *hāt* (*shóxuni* 'good,' *shoxunihāt* 'not good') is practically identical with the Hitchiti suffix *-it* (*adshakúntiti* 'unable to follow,' *chabátis* 'I do not like') and is nearly the same as the Choctaw negative particle *heto*. The Natchez infinitive suffix *-p* (*kwáship* 'sun,' 'what shines,' *kétsgup* 'knuckle,' lit. 'a break') may be compared with what Gatschet calls the "medial suffix" *-pi* in Muskogi, in such a sentence as the following: *tcháti* 'lakípít' *ǝ'dshin* 'the blood being much' (*cháti* 'blood,' *ǝ'dshin* 'being,' *láko* 'large' (much). Natchez ordinals are usually formed by means of a suffix *-ish* (*áwiti* 'two,' *awiti-ish* 'second,' *láhanuf* 'six,' *láhanuf-ish* 'sixth'), Choctaw by means of a prefix or particle *isht*, and Hitchiti by means of a prefix *is-* (*kolpági* 'seven,' *iskolapakika* 'seventh,' *tuchini* 'three,' *istuchináxa* 'the third'). The Choctaw "article pronouns" above referred to are divided into two classes depending on the root forms *a* and *o*, the former of which is definite, referring to something immediate and present, and the latter indefinite, applying to a considerable or indefinite period of time. The one Byington calls definite, the other distinctive. These are not improbably represented by two Natchez auxiliaries of identical form and analogous meaning. *a* is the usual auxiliary 'to be' (*mána táa* 'I am he,' *helo* 'to be tired,' *helóyaa* 'I am tired'), but it occurs so frequently after nouns that it might easily be considered an article or demonstrative. The second sometimes appears after nouns also, but not frequently. It is usually found with verbs when the action covers some time or is repeated or habitual, though it appears to have been employed so long as to have lost much of its original significance: *tup* 'to cut,' *túp'hagn* 'a cutting,' *tulup* 'to roll,' *tulup-tagruk* 'I have rolled,' *wagat* 'tall,' *wagátgup* 'something tall.'

The results of this comparison of affixes may be tabulated as follows :

NATCHEZ

MUSKHOGEAN

Close Resemblances

<i>dshi</i> , stem of words meaning 'small' and 'child'	<i>údshi</i> , <i>úshi</i> , 'son,' and diminutive suffix
<i>-in</i> , augmentative suffix to adjectives	<i>-sin</i> , adjective suffix with force of 'very'
<i>-ish</i> , possessive suffix	<i>dsh</i> , stem meaning 'to possess'
<i>ya-</i> , subjective personal pronominal prefix of 1st person	<i>ä-</i> , personal pronominal prefix of 1st person in Muskogi
<i>i</i> , root of independent personal pronoun of 3d person	<i>i-</i> , <i>i"</i> , objective possessive pronominal prefix of 3d person
<i>na-</i> , indefinite pronominal prefix of 3d person singular	<i>na</i> , indefinite pronominal affix
<i>-li</i> or <i>-l</i> , suffixed causative auxiliary	<i>-li</i> , suffixed causative auxiliary
<i>sa-</i> or <i>su-</i> , instrumental prefix	<i>is-</i> or <i>si-</i> , instrumental prefix
<i>-k</i> , perfect suffix	<i>-ki</i> , Muskogi suffix with perfect signification; possibly Choctaw determinate or demonstrative meaning 'that,' 'the'
<i>-āt</i> or <i>-hāt</i> , negative suffix	<i>-it</i> , Hitchiti negative suffix; <i>heto</i> , negative particle in Choctaw
<i>-ish</i> , suffix to ordinal numerals	<i>is-</i> , Hitchiti prefix to ordinal numerals; <i>isht-</i> , Choctaw prefix or particle before ordinals

More Remote and Doubtful Resemblances

<i>-hni</i> , collective suffix	<i>-a'li</i> , collective suffix in Hitchiti; <i>-hni</i> , suffix forming subjective absolute pronouns in Hitchiti
<i>-ni</i> , root of possessive suffix of 1st person singular	<i>Ano</i> , I, me, mine, independent pronouns in Choctaw; <i>-li</i> , personal pronominal suffix of 1st person singular in Choctaw
<i>ha-</i> , continuative prefix	<i>ha"</i> , frequentative infix or suffix
<i>-a</i> , suffixed auxiliary, 'to be'	<i>a</i> , definite article pronoun in Choctaw
<i>-u</i> or <i>-o</i> , continuative auxiliary	<i>o</i> , distinctive article pronoun in Choctaw

<i>sh-</i> , reflective prefix or infix	<i>as-</i> , in <i>asitch'häs</i> , I shoot back, in return
<i>-g</i> , suffixed auxiliary 'to do'	<i>-ga</i> , causal suffix in Muskogi
<i>-f</i> , suffixed auxiliary; or <i>-ho</i> , <i>-aho</i> , suffix indicating the immediate present	<i>-h</i> , Choctaw auxiliary 'to be'
<i>-s</i> , suffixed auxiliary, possibly identical with auxiliary 'I'; or infinitive suffix <i>-sh</i>	<i>-s</i> , common verbal suffix in Muskogi
<i>-p</i> , <i>-pi</i> , suffix forming <i>nomen actoris</i>	<i>-pi</i> , suffix in Muskogi called by Gatschet "the medial suffix"

UNIDENTIFIED NATCHEZ AFFIXES

<i>ta-</i> , me	<i>pa-</i> , you	<i>tan-</i> , dual prefix	<i>pi-</i> , plural prefix
<i>-ti</i> , suffix of unknown signification.			

Further investigation would very likely destroy some of these apparent resemblances, but would probably reveal still more. The further the comparison is carried the more points in common seem to show themselves. But making all due allowances for mistakes, accidental resemblances, borrowing, and resemblances due to psychological causes, I think sufficient has been adduced to confirm Brinton's position of 1873 and place the relationship of Natchez to the Muskohogean dialects beyond reasonable doubt. The Muskohogean affinity of the Natchez people is confirmed to a slight degree also by their migration tradition recorded by Du Pratz, which brings them from the west, and by their employment of red and white to distinguish large social groupings having to do with war and peace, respectively. These facts would have little force by themselves, but gain in significance in connection with the linguistic affinities just noted.

But if the evidence brought forward gives a fair presumption that the core of the Natchez state was Muskohogean, a question of even greater interest remains. Whence came the great differences between them and the other representatives of that linguistic family? These are not merely linguistic but social and religious as well. Although the Muskohogean family embraces some of the most highly organized Indian tribes, none of them held its chiefs in such esteem as the Natchez or were such slaves to them. Again, all the

Muskhogeans of which we have any full information were divided into totemic clans, but there is no good evidence that the Natchez possessed any. Their divisions resembled castes more than clans, and with the possible exception of the highest class, or Suns, totemism appears to have had nothing to do with these. Another point which differentiated them from most other Muskhogeans was the possession of and veneration for a temple which was made a special occasion for comment by every early traveler. Temples also existed among the Huma, Bayougoula, and Acolapissa, but apparently among no other Muskhogeans. The fact that these were all on or near the lower Mississippi is probably in itself significant, showing that that area was the seat of a culture different from what existed any distance east or west of it, a culture which the Natchez had imbibed in a higher degree than all their Muskhogeans, but which may have been already old when they reached the river.

BUREAU OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY,
WASHINGTON, D. C.