DIALECTIC VARIANTS OF THE NISQUALLY LINGUIS-
TIC ROOT STOCK OF PUGET SOUND.

The Indian tribes of the Puget Sound country, so far as dis-
coverable, possessed no written tongue. After eleven years of
intimate life and intimate observation among them, such as their
physician alone could have, I have failed to find the slightest
trace in language or in life of any reference or indication to
the existence, at any time, of a written tongue. Most Indian
tribes possess, to a greater or lesser degree, some sort of sign
language, but even this was most rudimentary among the Pu-
get Sound Indians and was largely limited to arrangements of
rocks, or twigs, or such things to indicate the nature, number,
size, or success of a hunting or fishing party that had passed
that way. Even this, as I say, was more rudimentary and
crude, as were their limited carvings. Indeed so limited was
their range in this respect that to this day, when a more inti-
mate relation with the white man and his methods makes it
necessary to have a word meaning "writing", the same word
is used for writing, for painting, and for a carving—for a letter,
a word, a book, a picture, a statue, or a bust. This is signifi-
cant in that it represents either the absence of any need of
such symbols, or the poverty of the tongue in that respect, or,
what is perhaps truer still, both of these conditions.

One who has never met such conditions in the study of what
is usually termed a barbaric tongue, does not realize the en-
tirely extraneous difficulties that beset one's path. This may
or not be one of the conditions causing a scarcity of students
systematically studying the tongues of the tribes of the Tulalip
Agency. Eells and Wickersham, particularly Eells, have done
much along these lines with regard to the Indians of the Puy-
allup Agency. I know only of Gibbs and Chirouse who have
done anything at all with regard to the Indians of the Tulalip
Agency. The work of Gibbs was rather insignificant and con-
sisted merely of the compilation of 45 words in the Snohomish
tongue, while he accompanied the Gov. Stevens party as one of
its members in its treaty-making tour. These 45 words are on
file in the Library of the U. S. Bureau of Ethnology in Wash-
ington City, and Pilling refers to them in his bibliography of
the Salishan tongues. The work of Chirouse, also referred to
in the Pilling bibliography, was wider, larger, and more com-
prehensive but it is, from a philologic standpoint, full of errors
and discrepancies necessarily incidental to the manner and in-

tent in which and with which it was undertaken. Chirouse was a missionary and his object was to acquire a means of communication as rapidly as possible in the line of his work. The white man's theology was new to the Indian, to this Indian for Chirouse was his first missionary, and the Indian therefore possessed no aboriginal equivalent for the white man's theological terms. Chirouse, to bridge the gap, proceeded to invent them. He was a Frenchman so he had the Indians attempt to pronounce his French words, the inaccurate result he put down in many, many cases as the Indian word, when it was merely an Indian corruption of a French word. Also, he used the object method in attempting to compile a working vocabulary, and in return he secured many generic and descriptive terms which he took to be sustantive forms. For example, he would hold up a peach and ask the Indian to tell him what it was. The Indian had never seen a peach among the Indians but he had, perhaps, seen a white man eating one, so he replied that it was something to eat—that is, food. This error and hundreds of similar ones occur all through the Chirouse manuscript. The Indian at Tulalip has no word for each particular kind of blossom but has a generic term meaning "flower"—they do not distinguish the different kinds of flowers. Father Chirouse has unwittingly entered this one, same generic term all through his vocabulary under and after the different names, white man's names, for flowers—rose, violet, etc., all the same word. From his standpoint and with his object in view, this is not a defect—he was attempting to get into communication as quickly as possible and his vocabulary is full of short cuts from a missionary standpoint, but dangerous and deceptive ones from a philologic one. Nevertheless, in his own way and in his own field, the good father has done a tremendous work and is the pioneer in that work. To utilize that material safely, however, one must have a working knowledge of the tongue equal to or greater than that of the father himself.

I presume that the scarcity of original work in the genuine Indian tongue is due to the prevalent use of the Chinook jargon by the Northwestern tribes. But whatever may be the cause, the effect, the condition is a striking one.

With the exception of the Indians of the Lummi Reservation of this Agency, the Indians of the agency speak dialectic variants of one common root stock, the Nisqually, as it is usually called. The Lummi tongue is radically different from all of these dialectic variants. The Lummi tongue clearly bears a more northerly relation. The dialectic variants, however, spoken by the majority of our Indians of the Tulalip Agency are related, containing some words entirely different, many words, distantly

related, and a large number of words very closely related, so much so that there is only occasional difficulty in making one's self understood when using one dialect in the home of another dialect.

In the Indian tongue under consideration there are phonetic groups for which we have absolutely no equivalent, and for which it is necessary to invent symbols, the commonest of these is the well-known gutteral sound, so-called, but which I have always termed a velar explodent since that term more nearly describes its source, origin, and nature. This sound must be heard to be understood and no possible arrangement of English letters can represent it accurately and faithfully. It is the occurrence of such conditions in an unwritten tongue that make so much difficulty in putting that tongue upon paper in accurate and permanent form, which, of course, must be done before any analysis or serious systematic study of the tongue is possible.

In the Snohomish or Sdoh-hohbsh tongue, which is the predominant tongue of the Tulalip Agency, there are many of our common English sounds, as well as others. Among the consonants there are certain sounds that are, to the Indian ear and mouth, absolutely synonymous. Thus "b", "m", and "p" are synonymous and interchangeable. Thus the word "si-ab" or "se-ab" (compare with Hindustanee "sahib"), meaning "sir" or "chief", and exactly similar in force to the Latin "vir", may be expressed as "si-am", "si-ab", or "si-ap", all three forms are correct and equally so. So also the Indian word mee-mah", meaning "small", may be expressed as "mee-mahd", "bee-bahd", "mee-bahd", or "bee-mahd", with equal correctness. The sound "d" and "n" are synonymous in the same manner and the word "father" may be rendered "bahn" or "bahd"—"ban" or "bad".

Chirouse, who was himself an European, a Frenchman, comments on the similarity of the Snohomish tongue to various European tongues, as follows:

"It is remarkable that in this Indian tongue we find words that are exactly those of some European language. For example: Baba or Papa, father, is found in the Latin, French, English, etc. THIS or TIS is exactly a duplication of the English THIS. TIS SWATIRHTEN, this earth. The Latin CITO and the Snohomish KITO are **unum et idem** in their meaning, that is, "soon" quick, as soon", etc. The Italians say ADESSO, "at present", and the Snohomish say ADESSA. The Italian says COSI, "so" or "thus", and the Yakima says COS and IKOSI, "so" or "thus". The Italian MA, "still", is exactly the Snohomish MA or EMA, "still". The old Irish PI or SI, "she", is the Snohomish SI, "she". In the Irish tongue we find all of the gutturals and the hard consonants that abound in the Snohomish tongue, moreover there are also a great number of words that have the same roots and the same meanings. For example,

"heavy"—the Indians say ROM with the guttural R. Pmeap, "blackberry". Snohomish Gdmearh, "blackberry". Cead, "permission", Snohomish, sead, "permission". Peo, or teo, "this"; Snohomish, TEA, "this". GUALA, shoulder"; Snohomish, Gualap, "shoulder". TIOMNA, "will"; Snohomish or Klikitat, TEMNA, "will". The German DA, "there", "at" is exactly the Snohomish DA or TA, "there", or "at". The English SEND and the German SENDEN are the same as the Snohomish SEND or TSEND, that is, "to send"."

The above remarkable analogies could be continued in many respects—Latin and French "et", "and"; Snohomish ETA, "and". In fact the analogies can be continued all through the language and the legendary lore. Under the operation of Grimms' laws the analogies widen and increase remarkably. It is interesting in this connection to recall that the Indian tongues of the North Central plains are said to be remarkably similar to the Welsh or Cymric tongue. Clearly the Indian brother is not unrelated to the rest of mankind—clearly he is but an edition bound in red.

In some of its constructions the Indian tongues, the particular ones under consideration in the heading of this paper, are remarkably simple—in others remarkably complex.

For instance, tense or time may be indicated in Snohomish by prefixing TO for the past and TLO for the future, to the ordinary form for the present tense or time. Thus:

Us-huttlh-chud	I am sick.
To-us-huttlh-chud	I was sick.
Tlo-us-huttlh-chud	I shall be sick.

That is all there is to indicating time verbally, that is to say by verbal form, meaning the form of the verb.

So, also, the Snohomish tongue possesses what might, for lack of better term, be called personal verbal enclitics, the suffixing of which to any substantive indicating action or conditions will convert it into a corresponding verb. These enclitics never exist independently and are never so used. They may be indicated thus:

I	Chud.
You, thou	Chuh-hoh.
He, she	Tah, tsah.
We	Chaylh.
You, ye	Chuh-lup.
They	Tlay-ill or Ahl-gwah.

Their uses may best be indicated by example, thus:

Us-huttlh	Sickness
Us-huttlh-CHUD	I am sick.
Us-huttlh-CHUH-HOH	You are sick.

This expedient, with that for indicating tense or time, affords a wonderful and simple range and variety.

Substantives are converted from the singular form to the plural form chiefly by duplicating the first syllable and making the quantity of the vowel of the duplicated syllable long, thus: SKOH-BY, dog. SKOHB-KOHB-BY, dogs. Sometimes this is also done by changing merely the quantity of the vowel of the singular form from short to long, thus: CHUH-GWAHSS, wife. CHAH-GWAHSS, wives.

Diminutives are formed in a manner somewhat similar to that for forming plurals, save that in diminutives the quantity of the vowel of the duplicated syllable is always short, thus: STOHBSH, man. STOH-TOHBSH, little man. KAH-KAH, crow. KAH-KAH-KAH, 1 little crow.

The cardinal numbers are as follows:

Dchoh	One
Sah-lih	Two
Tlay-wh	Three
Bohss	Four
Tsuh-lants	Five
Il-lahts	Six
Tsohks	Seven
Tkah-chee	Eight
Hwulh	Nine
Oh-lub	Ten

Eleven becomes "ten and one", OH-LUB ETA DCHOH, and so on up to twenty. Up to one hundred the multiples of ten are formed by adding the syllable AHTCHEE to the cardinal number. Therefore twenty becomes SAH-LIH-AHTCHEE, and twenty-one becomes SAH-LIH-AHTCHEE ETA DCHOH. This will give the method of formation of all cardinal numbers up to one hundred which is SBUH-KWAHTCHEE. The numbers above one hundred, up to two hundred, are formed in a manner similar to the numbers below one hundred. One hundred and two become SBUH-KWAHTCHEE ETA SAY-LIH. Two hundred becomes SAH-LIH SBUH-KWAHT CHEE, the meaning and construction being obvious. These numerals would be used for counting ordinary objects of no particular class. **Round** objects would not be so counted; the latter are indicated by adding AILTSS and so DCHOH-AILTSS becomes, by elision, DCHAILTSS, and four round objects would be BOHSS-AILTSS with the word indicating the particular objects concerned or counted.

The cardinal numerals become ordinary by suffixing AURH, thus DCHOH-AURH, first, SAH-LIH-AURH, second, etc.

By prefixing the syllable US the cardinal numbers become multiplicatives, thus: US-SAH-LIH, double. US-TLAY-WH, treble. So a further change may be made as follows:

DY-AHTLH .... Once.
TSAH-BAB .... Twice
TLAY-WH-AHTLH .... Thrice
BOHSS-AHTLH..Four times

And so on, adding the syllable AHTLH to the cardinal number, for the remaining numbers.

It should have been noted, in connection with verbs, that any verb form becomes interrogative by suffixing the syllable OH, thus:

US-HUTTLH-CHUD .... I am sick.
US-HUTTLH-CHUD-OH .... Am I sick?

As in Latin, for the purpose of avoiding a hiatus or gaping, elision is quite common, so that when a word ends in a vowel sound that sound is elided if the succeeding word begins with a vowel sound.

Many pages, indeed a book might be written and yet not fully cover all the possibilities of this subject. The observations herein set down are more or less haphazard and disconnected results of occasional observations, the writer having very little leisure time in which to do more than jot down memoranda in the way of collecting data for future digestion. A large amount of such material has been gathered and a portion of it digested and assimilated, at least a sufficient amount to demonstrate some of the broader lines of evolution and growth of this tongue. It is striking, in some cases, how the common impulse of language, which is but the voicing of a common need felt by humanity, is to be seen in many constructional and other forms. I can yet remember the pleasure of meeting old acquaintances of this kind in Indian guise, for example, our ACT and ACTOR are represented in Indian by SEE-AH-YOOS, work; **DUH**-SEE-AH-YOOS, worker. TLAY-DUP, a trolling hook for fishing; **DUH**-TLAY-DUP, a troller. It will be noted that the prefix DUH has all the force of the English suffix OR. HUH-PY, cedar wood. DUH-PY-YUK, one who builds canoes of cedar wood.

CHARLES M. BUCHANAN.