



WILEY-
BLACKWELL



A • M • E • R • I • C • A • N
A N T H R O P O L O G I C A L
A S S O C I A T I O N

Siouan Languages in the East

Author(s): William C. Sturtevant

Source: *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 60, No. 4 (Aug., 1958), pp. 738-743

Published by: [Blackwell Publishing](#) on behalf of the [American Anthropological Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/665680>

Accessed: 23/08/2010 05:50

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=black>.

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.



Blackwell Publishing and American Anthropological Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Anthropologist*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Brief Communications

SIOUAN LANGUAGES IN THE EAST¹

In a recent paper Carl F. Miller (1957) has "revaluated" the "Eastern Siouan problem" and concluded that there is no basis for assigning to the Siouan linguistic family any of the groups treated by Mooney in his *Siouan Tribes of the East* (1894). Miller pays particular attention to the Tutelo, Saponi, and Occaneechi, places less emphasis on other groups of Virginia and the Carolinas (including the Catawba), and mentions the Ofo and Biloxi only in a footnote. However, he implies (p. 188) that he believes there were no Siouan groups "east of the Mississippi" (the Winnebago and the most eastern Dakota bands are not mentioned—probably Miller overlooked their location east of the Mississippi).

Miller's reasoning is not always easy to follow. He began his investigation because he felt that pottery he excavated in southern Virginia was unlike "that usually attributed to Siouan-speaking peoples" (p. 119)—although "we all recognize [that] language does not predict archeological remains but may in fact differ so radically that there may appear, on the surface, to be no similarity or connection" (p. 195). However, the paper does not involve ceramic typology and distributions, but rather an examination of the data from historical sources and the uses made of them by later writers. Miller's treatment of these sources is open to question at numerous points. But it is the linguistic evidence which is crucial to his thesis, and this he does not examine. It is the purpose of this communication to review that evidence.

The groups involved for which we have actual linguistic material are the Tutelo, Catawba, Woccon, Ofo, and Biloxi. All are now extinct languages (the last speaker of any is a Catawba man born in 1873, who has not used the language for many years). Miller does not discuss any of the evidence on the last four languages mentioned above, merely remarking in his conclusions (p. 206) that "studies should be made on the Catawba, Biloxi, and Ofo to determine whether or not they should be assigned to the Siouan linguistic family." However, he concludes (p. 206) that Tutelo is "not of Siouan linguistic stock but rather of a primitive Algonquian stock. This has been demonstrated etymologically and dialectically by Dr. John P. Harrington [1955:189-202]." The latter paper deals entirely with Powhatan, long known to be an Algonquian language (although not, as Harrington would have it [p. 195], "merely a dialect of Delaware"; cf. Geary 1953, 1955, and Siebert 1941); nowhere in this paper does Harrington mention Tutelo or any of the other Virginia languages. Miller elsewhere suggests that Tutelo was an Iroquoian language (pp. 183, 184, 185, 204), since there is evidence that the Tutelo enjoyed friendly relations with the Tuscarora.

Miller cannot ignore the existence of Tutelo linguistic material collected among the Iroquois of the Six Nations Reserve on the Grand River in Ontario.

However, rather than consider the material itself or its use by comparative linguists, Miller attacks the credibility of the informants who provided the word lists published by Hale (1883), Sapir (1913), and Frachtenberg (1913). He appears to believe that only a "pure blood" Tutelo could provide usable linguistic material, and he misunderstands the linguistic and social situation of the Tutelo among the modern Iroquois. Hale interviewed several Tutelo in the 1870's, at least one of whom apparently was a native speaker of the language (who had, however, spoken only Cayuga for many years). Subsequent investigators found no native speakers of Tutelo, but only Iroquois-speakers who were members of the Tutelo tribe by descent or adoption, and who knew a few words and phrases of the language. However, some of this later material is usable, and it is ridiculous to say that because the informants of Frachtenberg in 1907 and Sapir in 1911 gave many equivalent forms, "there appears to have been some collusion attempted on the part of the Indians of the Grand River Reservation" (Miller 1957:195).

The Tutelo materials published by Hale (1883) are quite extensive: his vocabulary has 279 English entries, many with several Tutelo equivalents, and his discussion of the comparative grammar occupies 18 pages. His informants were an old man named Nikonha or Waskiteng (the only one considered by Miller), an unnamed man who occupied the Tutelo chieftainship on the Six Nations Council, and the latter's aunt, Mrs. Christine Buck (Hale 1883:9-11; 1877; 1879). Sapir's word list of 55 items (1913) was obtained in 1911 from Andrew Sprague. In 1907 Frachtenberg (1913) collected a word list of about the same length from Lucy Buck, through Cayuga for which he used Andrew Sprague as interpreter. In 1882 and 1888 J. Owen Dorsey and J. N. B. Hewitt collected more extensive materials than Sapir's or Frachtenberg's but these remain unpublished (Bureau of American Ethnology Mss. 1412, 2511) except for some kinship terms and numerals given by Dorsey in his preface to Riggs' *Dakota grammar* (1893).

Hale's demonstration (1883) of the Siouan affiliation of the Tutelo language, through comparison with Dakota and Hidatsa, is still convincing. There is no point in repeating here the names of authorities who have accepted Hale's results or refined them. It is sufficient to point out that the latest and most thorough investigation of the subgrouping of the Siouan family, that of Wolff, places Tutelo, Biloxi, and Ofo in one group. Wolff summarizes his results as follows: "The Ohio Valley group of Siouan languages consists of three languages, Biloxi, Ofo, and Tutelo, all of them now extinct. The geographic distribution of these languages is worth noting. While Ofo on the lower Mississippi and Biloxi around Mobile Bay are virtually neighbors, Tutelo and its dialects were spoken in Virginia. Yet, from the viewpoint of comparative phonology Tutelo and Biloxi are much more closely related, while Ofo shows a considerable number of phonological innovations. In spite of their geographic distribution, however, these three languages clearly represent a distinct group within the Siouan linguistic family, having mostly archaic features as far as their phonology is concerned" (Wolff 1950:64-65; as Wolff points out, Griffin has

objected to the label "Ohio Valley Siouan" introduced by Voegelin, but this of course does not reflect on the validity of the linguistic grouping). None of Miller's arguments bear on this conclusion or affect the evidence for it which Wolff presents (Miller does not cite Wolff, nor does he cite Voegelin's 1941 paper which established the Biloxi-Ofo-Tutelo group). Certainly no informant or combination of informants, Iroquois or other, could have invented in the 1870's (before Biloxi or Ofo were recognized as Siouan) a language with a Siouan grammar and with a phonology consistently related to Proto-Siouan as reconstructed by Wolff in the 1940's.

The linguistic position of Catawba (of South Carolina) is at present less certain. Siebert (1945:100-101) has summarized the history of work on this question. The first to suggest a Siouan affiliation was Lewis Henry Morgan, in 1869; others followed him or independently arrived at the same conclusion. As Siebert points out (1945:101), the evidence on which Catawba was classified as Siouan in Powell's *Indian Linguistic Families* (1891:111-116) has never been published. However, a manuscript dated 1890 in the B.A.E. archives (Ms. 3989) appears to be this evidence; in this, J. Owen Dorsey has compared 116 Catawba forms with forms of similar meaning from fifteen Siouan languages, marking 56 as cognate, 52 noncognate, and 18 doubtful. Of those marked cognate, Dorsey selected 23 as particularly close in form and meaning. He made no attempt to establish sound correspondences or to place Catawba in a particular subgroup of Siouan. Swanton in 1923 published a short comparative vocabulary which indicates the divergence of Catawba from other branches of the Siouan family. As Wolff (1950:66) correctly states, "the Siouan affinities of Catawba morphology were conclusively demonstrated by F. T. Siebert, Jr." in 1945. Siebert did not attempt to place Catawba in one of the Siouan subgroups, and Wolff had so much difficulty in finding obvious Siouan cognates in the Catawba material he used that he was unable to establish sound correspondences and concluded that "Catawba may form a group of Siouan, strongly divergent from all other groups and from the parent language . . . [or else it] may be the remnant of a larger pre-Siouan linguistic stock" (Wolff 1950:66). There is sufficient Catawba material available—much of the best of it still unpublished—so that eventually it will be possible to be more precise as to the specific relationship of Catawba and the Siouan languages. Siebert has shown that there is a relationship and a rather close one, in comparison with the broader North American linguistic groupings. The sound correspondences remain to be worked out. It makes little difference whether the inclusive group is called "Siouan-Catawba" or merely "Siouan"; the decision will depend on whether Wolff's reconstructed Proto-Siouan will account for Catawba, or whether a preceding stage will have to be reconstructed from the comparison of Catawba and Wolff's Proto-Siouan.

Woccon is an extinct language of North Carolina, known only through a vocabulary of about 140 items first published in 1709 (reprinted in Lawson 1952:240-251). Siebert (1945:100) has noted that Adelung and Vater in 1816

and Gallatin in 1836 compared this vocabulary with Catawba and concluded that the languages were related. The former cited three pairs of probable cognates out of eight pairs compared (Adelung and Vater 1816:308); Gallatin (1836:87) remarked that "out of fifty-one words found in both [languages], sixteen appear to have more or less remote affinities," and listed fourteen pairs as "the most remarkable"—most of them appear to be cognate. Albert S. Gatschet, in an unpublished manuscript in the B.A.E. archives (Ms. 1449) gives a Woccon-Catawba comparative vocabulary which contains 86 Catawba equivalents taken from his own field notebook. He did not draw any conclusions in this manuscript, nor indicate which pairs he accepted as cognate. My own estimate is that about 19 are probable cognates and about 11 possible cognates. This comparison is probably the basis for Gatschet's implication (1884:15) that Woccon and Catawba belonged to the same linguistic group, and for Powell's (1891:112) assertion that "it is only recently that a definite decision has been reached respecting the relationship of the Catawba and the Woccon," although Powell also cites Gallatin's conclusion (Powell 1891:111). Mooney (1894:65) merely states flatly that Lawson's vocabulary "shows that their [the Woccon's] dialect was closely related to that of the Catawba." It is true that it is evident from mere inspection of comparative vocabularies that Woccon and Catawba are related. However, it is also evident that they are far from being dialects of the same language. Swanton (1923) reports that he compared some of the Woccon material with Tutelo, Biloxi, Ofo, Hidatsa, Dakota, and Catawba, and found about twice as many resemblances with Catawba as with each of the other languages. However, he did not publish his data. Lawson's word list is extensive enough to serve as the basis for a more precise classification of Woccon, now that more satisfactory Catawba data are available and we know something of Proto-Siouan.

Nonlinguistic considerations are irrelevant for the determination of linguistic relationships. But where we lack linguistic evidence—as we do for most of the groups Miller considers—we must use whatever data exist. Cultural resemblances, geographical proximity, political association, brief lists of proper names without meanings, and contemporary summary statements on linguistic resemblances, do not prove linguistic relationships between groups; however, such nonlinguistic factors do indicate possibilities or even probabilities of linguistic relationship. In using such materials it is important to know what language families are certainly represented in the region, since the probability is that an unknown language belonged to one of these families, rather than to one not represented in the vicinity. There is no doubt that Siouan languages were present in the Southeast. Siouan is among the possible affiliations of groups such as the Saponi and Occaneechi, and the historical data must be evaluated with this possibility in mind. This has been the approach used with varying success by Hale, Gatschet, Mooney, Dorsey, Swanton, Speck, Griffin, and others, and it must continue to be used. Sober "revaluation" of the historical documents and of the conclusions drawn from them is all to the good,

but contentiousness resulting in distortion of the evidence merely misleads those unacquainted with the sources.

WILLIAM C. STURTEVANT
Bureau of American Ethnology
Smithsonian Institution

REFERENCES CITED

- ADELUNG, JOHANN CHRISTOPH AND JOHANN SEVERIN VATER
 1816 *Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde mit dem Vater Unser als Sprachprobe in bey nahe fünf hundert Sprachen und Mundarten. Dritter Theil, Dritte Abtheilung.* Berlin.
- FRACHTENBERG, LEO J.
 1913 Contributions to a Tutelo vocabulary. *American Anthropologist* 15:477-479.
- GALLATIN, ALBERT
 1836 A synopsis of the Indian tribes within the United States east of the Rocky Mountains, and in the British and Russian possessions in North America. *Archaeologia Americana, Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society* 2:1-422.
- GATSCHE, ALBERT S.
 1884 A migration legend of the Creek Indians, with a linguistic, historic and ethnographic introduction. *Brinton's Library of Aboriginal American Literature* 4.
- GEARY, JAMES A.
 1953 Strachey's vocabulary of Indian words used in Virginia, 1612. *In* The historie of travell into Virginia Britania (1612) by William Strachey, Louis B. Wright and Virginia Freund eds. Works Issued by the Hakluyt Soc., 2d. series, 103. London.
 1955 The language of the Carolina Algonkian tribes. *In* The Roanoke voyages 1584-1590, David Beers Quinn ed. Works Issued by the Hakluyt Soc., 2nd. ser., 104-105. London.
- HALE, HORATIO
 1877 [Letter to Maj. J. W. Powell.] *In* Ms. 941, Bur. of Amer. Ethnology Archives.
 1879 [Letter to Maj. J. W. Powell and accompanying Tutelo vocabulary.] *In* Ms. 941, Bur. of Amer. Ethnology Archives.
 1883 The Tutelo tribe and language. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 21:1-45.
- HARRINGTON, JOHN P.
 1955 The original Strachey vocabulary of the Virginia Indian language. *Anthropological Papers* 46, Bur. of Amer. Ethnol. Bull. 157.
- LAWSON, JOHN
 1952 Lawson's history of North Carolina. (Reprint of 1937 ed.) Richmond, Va.
- MILLER, CARL F.
 1957 Revaluation of the eastern Siouan problem with particular emphasis on the Virginia branches—the Occaneechi, the Saponi, and the Tutelo. *Anthropological Papers* 52, Bur. of Amer. Ethnol. Bull. 164.
- MOONEY, JAMES
 1894 The Siouan tribes of the east. *Bur. of [Amer.] Ethnol. Bull.* 22.
- POWELL, J. W.
 1891 Indian linguistic families of America north of Mexico. *Bur. of [Amer.] Ethnol. 7th Annual Report.*
- RIGGS, STEPHEN RETURN
 1893 Dakota grammar, texts, and ethnography, James Owen Dorsey ed. U. S. Geogr. and Geol. Survey of the Rocky Mt. Region, Contributions to North Amer. Ethnology 9.

SAPIR, EDWARD

1913 A Tutelo vocabulary. *American Anthropologist* 15:295-297.

SIEBERT, FRANK T., JR.

1941 Certain Proto-Algonquian consonant clusters. *Language* 17:298-303.

1945 Linguistic classification of Catawba. *International Journ. of Amer. Linguistics* 11:100-104; 211-218.

SWANTON, JOHN R.

1923 New light on the early history of the Siouan peoples. *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences* 13:33-43.

VOEGELIN, C. F.

1941 Internal relationships of Siouan languages. *American Anthropologist* 43:246-249.

WOLFF, HANS

1950-1951 Comparative Siouan. *International Journ. of Amer. Linguistics* 16:61-66, 113-121, 168-178; 17:197-204.

NOTE

¹ Published with the permission of the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution.

GARO AVUNCULAR AUTHORITY AND MATRILATERAL CROSS-COUSIN MARRIAGE¹

In one of the most elegantly reasoned arguments ever to appear in anthropological literature, George C. Homans and David M. Schneider have suggested that if preferential unilateral cross-cousin marriage exists in a society, then it is to be expected that matrilateral cross-cousin marriage (marriage of a man to his mother's brother's daughter) will occur in those societies where authority is held by the father. Conversely, they expect that in societies where authority is located in the status of the mother's brother, cross-cousin marriage will be of the patrilateral variety (marriage to father's sister's daughter) (Homans and Schneider 1955). One of the societies which they consider is that of the Garo of Assam, India, the data for which were admittedly sketchy. Material which I have recently obtained on the Garo raises some general questions concerning this theory. It will be the purpose of this paper to discuss the Homans-Schneider theory with reference to more complete data from the Garo, and to suggest the implications which these data have for the theory.

Though it is possible to do no more than give a superficial account of their argument in a brief space, it follows roughly these lines: In the typical patrilineal and virilocal (patrilocal) society, where the men of a patrilineage live more or less close to one another, and where authority is clearly concentrated in the status of the father, the cross-cousin favored for marriage is expected to be the mother's brother's daughter. Radcliffe-Brown pointed out that such societies tend to allow Ego to have a peculiarly warm and permissive relationship with his mother's brother (Radcliffe-Brown 1952:15-31). This uncle might be happy to give his daughter to his cherished nephew, and their friendliness might ease the strains of the father-in-law relationship. For complementary reasons, the father's sister's daughter would be an undesirable spouse in these societies, since the father's sister tends to be a sort of "female father"—