

A
GRAMMAR
OF THE
MASSACHUSETTS INDIAN LANGUAGE
BY JOHN ELIOT.
A NEW EDITION :
WITH NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS,
BY
PETER S. DU PONCEAU, LL. D.
AND
AN INTRODUCTION AND SUPPLEMENTARY
OBSERVATIONS,
BY
JOHN PICKERING.

THE
MASSACHUSETTS LANGUAGE.

INTRODUCTORY OBSERVATIONS.

THE languages of the American Indians¹ however little value may be attached to them, as the source of what is frequently (though without much discrimination) called useful knowledge, have for some time deeply engaged the attention of the learned in Europe, as exhibiting numerous phenomena, if the term may be applied, the knowledge of which will be found indispensable to a just theory of speech. It is true, indeed, that we have long had our systems of universal grammar, or in other words our theories of language, as deduced from the small number of European and Oriental tongues, which have been the subject of investigation with scholars; just as in the physical sciences we have had, for example, our theories of chemistry, founded upon the comparatively small number of phenomena, which had been observed in past ages. But the discovery of numerous facts of the most surprising character in that science, even within our own memory, has compelled the chemists of the present age to re-examine the old, and resort to new theories; and from the great advances made in Comparative Philology in the present age, particularly by means of an extensive acquaintance with the unwritten dialects of barbarous nations, there is reason to believe that some important modifications are yet to be made in our theories of language.

Among the unwritten languages, those of the continent of America present us with many new and striking facts. If we may adopt the opinions of a learned Society in another part of our country, there appears to be "a wonderful organization, which distinguishes the languages of the Aborigines of this country from all other idioms of the known world;" and they shew us "how little the world has yet advanced in that science which is proudly called

Universal Grammar."* We find in them (according to a learned member of the same Society) "a new manner of compounding words from various roots, so as to strike the mind at once with a whole mass of ideas; a new manner of expressing the cases of substantives by inflecting the verbs which govern them; a new number (the particular plural) applied to the declension of nouns and conjugations of verbs; a new concordance in tense of the conjunction with the verb; we see not only pronouns, as in the Hebrew and some other languages, but adjectives, conjunctions, adverbs, combined with the principal part of speech, and producing an immense variety of verbal forms;" it is also one of the most remarkable characteristics of the American languages, that they are "entirely deficient of our auxiliary verbs to have and to be:" "There are no words that I know of (sap, the same distinguished philologist) in any American idioms to express abstractedly the ideas signified by those two verbs."t

Some of the facts here stated, however extraordinary they may be thought by speculative persons, who have formed their theories upon the study of the European languages alone, will be found to have been noticed in the following Grammar of the venerable Eliot, composed at the distance of a century and a half from our own age, and long before any favourite theory or philological enthusiasm can be supposed to have warped the judgment of the writer and led him to distort his facts, in order to make them suit an ingenious hypothesis; The editor cannot refrain from selecting two or three instances, in which this indefatigable man, from an examination of a very limited number of kindred dialects in this part of the continent, has given similar views to those, which are more fully presented by the learned writer just cited; who has extended his investigations to numerous dialects from the northern to the southern extremity of America.

Of the general power of compounding words, for example, Eliot (without however describing the particular

* Transactions of the Historical and Literary Committee of the American Philosophical Society at Philadelphia, vol. i. p. xii.

t Ibid. Report of Mr. Du Ponceau on the Indian Languages, p. xxviii. xl.

mode) says-" This language doth greatly delight in compounding of words, for abbreviation, to speak much in few words, though they be sometimes long; which is chiefly caused by the many syllables which the Grammar Rule requires, and suppletive syllables, which are of no signification, and curious care of Euphonie."* On the subject of the declensions he observes-" The variation of Nouns is not by male and female, as in other, learned languages, and in European nations they do There be two forms or declensions of Nouns, animate, inanimate. 1. The animate form or declension is, when the thing signified is a living creature; and such Nouns do always make their plural in og, as wosketomp, man, wosketompaog; a is but for cuphonie. 2. The inanimate form or declension of Nouns is, when the thing signified is not a living creature ; and these make the plural in ash; as hussun, a stone, hussunash."† Again-in respect to that extraordinary characteristick of the Indian languages, the want of the substantive verb, Eliot says-" We have no compleat distinct word for the Verb Substantive, as the learned languages and our English Tongue have, but it is under a regular composition, whereby many words are made Verb Substantive." Of this mode of forming verbs he then gives the following among other examples : "The first sort of Verb Substantives is made by adding any of these terminations to the word; yeuro, arōō, oō, with due euphonie ; and this is so, be the word a noun, as woske

• Indian Gram. p. 6.

† Ibid. p. 81 9, 10. The Rev. Mr. Heckewelder, in his interesting Correspondence with Mr. Du Ponceau, gives the same account of the Delaware language of the present day: " In the Indian languages (says he) those discriminating words or inflections, which we call genders, are not, as with us, in general intended to distinguish between male and female beings, but between animate and inanimate things or substances." He adds that " trees and plants (annual plants and grasses excepted) are included within the generic class of animated beings." On this latter point, however, Eliot says, that all Vegetables are of the inanimate form; and he then gives these two examples; " mehtug, a tree, mehtugquash; moskeht, grass, mokehtuah." Whether this difference of opinion arises from a difference between the two dialects in this particular, or from some other cause, the editor has not yet been able to ascertain.

tomporo, he is a man; or adnoun, as wompiyeuoo, it ts white; or be the word an adverb, or the like."*

It is unnecessary to enumerate further particulars in respect to the languages of our own part of the country. It should not, however, be overlooked, that the same observations which Eliot and others have made respecting the *northern* dialects, appear to be generally applicable to those of the south and other parts of the continent. The editor is the more strongly impelled to extend his remarks on this point, because the plausible opinions, or rather amusing dreams, of certain philosophers (as they are sometimes styled) have still an influence among us, and continue to give currency to speculative errors instead of established facts. Of these erroneous opinions, founded upon very limited inquiries into the languages of the globe, an ample specimen is given by Clavigero, in his valuable History of Mexico; where they are also most thoroughly refuted by an appeal to facts. To this intelligent author, indeed, subsequent writers, both in our own country and in Europe, have been much indebted, not only for the correction of errors which had been successfully propagated respecting these languages, but also for a refutation of the unfounded opinions of eminent naturalists and philosophers respecting the degeneracy of the animal and other productions of this continent. It will not be useless or out of place, so far as respects the languages of America, to advert briefly to those opinions; because they still have, as above observed, an influence in perpetuating error.

In respect to the general character of these languages, (to adopt the remarks of Mr. Du Ponceau) " it has been

• Indian Gram. p. 15. This want of the verb to be is also noticed in Edwards's valuable Observations on the Language of the Muhhekaneew [Mohegan] Indian, published at New Haven in the year 1788. "They have (says Edwards) no verb substantive in all the language. Therefore they cannot say, he is a man, he is a coward, &c. They express the same by one word, which is a verb neuter, viz. neIn.annauwoo, he is a man. Nemannauw is the noun substantive man: that turned into a verb neuter of the third person singular becomes nemannauwoo, as in Latin it is said Graecor, Graecatur, &c. Thus they turn any substantive whatever into a verb neuter., The learned author adds in a note-" The circumstance that they have no verb substantive, accounts for their not using that verb, when they speak English. They say, I man, I sick," &c. p. 14.

said and will be said again, that savages, having but few ideas, can want but few words, and therefore that their languages must necessarily be poor." To which the same learned writer thus answers by a direct appeal to the simple fact: "Whether savages have or have not many ideas, it is not my province to determine; all I can say is, that if it is true that their ideas are few, it is not less certain that they have many words to express them." He then concludes his remarks in these strong terms: "For my own part, I confess that I am lost in astonishment at the copiousness and admirable structure of their languages; for which I can only account by looking up to the GREAT FIRST CAUSE."*

To the same effect are the observations of the venerable Mr. Heckewelder, whose fidelity, and intelligence, and skill (in the Delaware dialect in particular) are beyond all question. In one of his letters he tells Mr. Du Ponceau, that he must not "imagine that their languages are poor" -that he will be still more pleased as he becomes more familiar "with the beautiful idiom of the Lenni Lennape" -" I should never have done, (he adds) were I to endeavour to explain to you in all their details the various modes which the Indians have of expressing their ideas, shades of ideas and combinations of ideas," &c. t

Will any one require a confirmation of the testimony of persons circumstanced as these two writers are; the one distinguished for those habits of accurate investigation which belong to his profession, and the other for that perfect and minute knowledge of his subject, which is the natural result of forty years' study? If such confirmation should be required, it will be found at large, in the work of Clavigero above cited, where the author refutes in detail many erroneous opinions respecting America, which had so long prevailed. He thus quotes a celebrated writer on this subject: "The languages of America are so limited and so scarce of words, that it is impossible to express any metaphysical idea in them. In no one of those language s

* Report of Mr. Du Ponceau, p. xxvii-xxix,
t Correspondence, p, 368, 377, 393.

can they count above the number three. It is impossible to translate a book either into the languages of the Algonquines or Paraguese, or even into those of Mexico or Peru, on account of their not having sufficient plenty of proper terms to express general ideas." To which Clavigero replies: " We have (says he) learned the Mexican, and have heard it spoken by the Mexicans for many years, but never knew that it was deficient in numerical terms, and words signifying universal ideas," &c. " We know that the Mexicans had numeral words to express as many thousands or millions as they pleased;" and the author then subjoins a long list of them, extending to very high numbers. He then shows that the writers whom he is here opposing, are equally wrong in asserting that these languages cannot express metaphysical ideas; and he affirms "that it is not easy to find a language more fit to treat on metaphysical subjects than the Mexican, as it would be difficult to find another which abounds so much in abstract terms," equivalents to many of which, he declares, cannot be found "in the Hebrew, in the Greek, in the Latin, in the French, in the Italian, in the English, in the Spanish or Portuguese;" and he gives his readers a list of abstract terms with the corresponding Mexican words, "which (he observes) are understood by the rudest Indians." He adds, that it is by means of this abundance of words of this kind, that the deepest mysteries of religion have been explained in that language, and that various books of the Scriptures, and the works of Thomas a Kempis and others, have been translated into it; which, as he justly remarks, could not have been done if the language had been deficient in terms of this nature. The same observations, he says, are applicable to all the languages spoken in the dominions of Mexico, as Grammars and Dictionaries and treatises on religion have been published in them, as well as in the Mexican.*

Such, then, is the character of the languages spoken by the inhabitants of the middle region of this continent; and since the publication of Clavigero's work, we have

* Clavigero's Mexico, Dissertat, vi. Sect, 6 ; in vol. 2, edit. 1787.

been enabled to obtain authentick information of various other languages; particularly of one of the most southern, that of *Chili*, (or the Araucanian, as it is often called,) an account of which is given in the Abbe *Molina's* excellent History of Chili. It will, assuredly, surprise most readers to find how exactly the account given of this language by Molina (who furnishes us with facts instead of hypotheses) corresponds with what Clavigero says of the Mexican; and how completely at variance they both are with those of the speculative writers above alluded to. "So *copious* is the *Chilian* language (says the author) that, in the opinion of those well acquainted with it, a complete dictionary thereof would require more than one large volume; for, besides the radical words, which are very numerous, so great is the use of *compounds*, that it may almost be said in this consists the very genius of the language." Again—"Abstract nouns are very frequent;" and, in another place he states, as a remarkable property of this language, that it makes "frequent use of abstract nouns in a peculiar manner, Thus, instead of saying *pu Huinca*, the Spaniards, they commonly say, *Huincagen*, the Spaniolity; *tamen cuiagen*, your trio, that is, you other three; *epu tamen cajugen layai*, two of you other six will *die-literally*, two of your sixths." The author also mentions in this language (as Eliot, Edwards and others do in the case of the northern dialects) the "practice of converting all the parts of speech into verbs, in such a manner that the whole knowledge of the Chilian language may be said to consist in the management of the verbs."* He adds, that "*proper names* are also susceptible of this elegance. Thus from *Pedro*, is formed the verb *Petron*, to be Pedro; *Petrobui*, was Pedro Owing to this property, the translation of European works into the Chilian is very easy, in which, instead of losing any of their spirit and elegance, they acquire a degree of precision even superior to the originals. This, among other instances that

* To the same effect, Eliot says of the *Massachusetts* language- "The manner of *formation* of the nouns and verbs have such a latitude of use, that *there needeth little other S1111taxis in the language*,"-*Indian Gram.* p. 23.

might be mentioned, is strongly evinced in the *Christian Thoughts* of the celebrated Bouhours, which was translated in the year 1713. There can be no better test of a language than its *translations*, as its comparative richness or poverty is rendered more apparent in this mode than in any other."*

But it may possibly still be urged, that whatever is the fact with respect to the languages of Mexico, Chili, and the more civilized parts of the continent, yet the dialects of the more barbarous nations must be extremely poor and deficient in the particulars above considered. As to some of these very dialects, however, we have the unequivocal testimony of Mr. Heckewelder and Mr. Du Ponceau already cited ; and their opinion is supported by that of writers who have preceded them. It may, perhaps, appear somewhat like want of respect to persons so well known as those gentlemen are, to adduce the testimony of others in support of their statements; but such has been the influence of the opposite opinion on this subject, that the editor trusts he shall be pardoned for briefly recurring to two or three preceding writers; whose observations in this instance are the more important, as they are founded upon the dialects of the *northern* nations alone. *Colden* informs us, that "the Six Nations compound their words without end, whereby their language becomes sufficiently copious." *Edwards* observes -" It has been said, that savages have no parts of speech beside the substantive and the verb. This is not true concerning the *Mohegan*, nor concerning any other tribe of Indians of whose languages I have any knowledge. The *Mohegans* have all the eight parts of speech to be found in other languages." Again-" It has been said also, that savages never abstract, and have no abstract terms; which -with regard to the *Mohegans* is another mistake I doubt not, but that there is in this language the full proportion of abstract to concrete terms, which is commonly to be found in other languages."t The late

Molina's Hist. of Chili, vol. jj, p, 5, 297, 303, 301, *American translation*,
t *Observations*, &c. p. 16.

Mr. Zei berger affirmed the Iroquois language (in which he was thoroughly skilled) to be very copious, Roger Williams, who was distinguished for his skill in the Indian languages, in speaking of the dialect of the Naragansets, declares in emphatic terms, that " their language is exceeding copious, and they have five or six words sometimes for one thing."* If any further proof were necessary in this case; we have it conclusively in the single fact, that *Eliot* found a sufficient stock of words in the *Massachusetts* dialect, for a complete translation of the *Old and New Testaments*.

Such, then, are some of the striking facts, which the investigation of these remarkable dialects has already brought into view; and facts of this novel character could not fail to stimulate the curiosity of all, who take an interest in the study of man, particularly of his distinguishing characteristic, the faculty of speech For , if there is any utility in studying language philosophically, (which all admit,) then it is manifestly indispensable for those, who claim the rank of philosophical grammarians, to make themselves in some degree acquainted with the languages of the barbarous, as well as of the civilized nations of the globe. Accordingly, the illustrious scholars of Europe, particularly of Germany, have for some time past, with their well known ardour and perseverance, been pursuing their researches into the curious dialects of this continent; and they have already examined, with no inconsiderable degree of minuteness, such a number of them as will astonish every reader, whose attention has not been particularly directed to this subject.

In that wonderful monument of philological research, the MITHRIDATES, begun by the illustrious Professor *Adelung*, and continued and augmented by the celebrated Professor *Vater*, by the Honourable *Frederick Adelung*, (the distinguished relative of the late professor,) and by the learned Baron *William von Humboldt*, we find "a delineation of the grammatical character of *thirty-four* American languages, and the Lord's Prayer in *fifty-nine*

**Directions* prefixed to his *Key into the Languages of America*. *Williams* also, in speaking of their numerals; says, "'tis admirable how quick they are in casting up great numbers with the help of grains of corne," &c, *Key*, chap. 1v.

different idioms or dialects of the savages of this country."* But what will be the reader's astonishment to learn, that since the publication of the *Uebersicht aller bekannten Sprachen und ihrer Dialekte*, the present learned Adelung has been enabled to make a more extensive survey of the languages of the globe than I was before practicable, and has enumerated in America twelve hundred and fourteen different dialects!† Justly may we (to adopt the sentiment of Mr. Du Ponceau) express our astonishment at the great knowledge which the Literati of Europe appear to possess of America, and of the customs, manners and languages of its original inhabitants; and cheerfully ought we to express our "thanks to the Germans and Russians, our masters," to whom "the general science of languages is peculiarly indebted for the great progress that it has lately made."

The vast field of investigation, which is thus opening to our view, would be sufficient to dishearten the most adventurous and resolute philologist, if the American dialects were subject to the intricate anomalies of the European tongues,‡ and if they were, moreover, as ma-

• Report, in *Histor. Transact.* vol. i. p. xx.xii.

† *Uebersicht aller bekannten Sprachen und ihrer Dialekte*; or, *View of all the known Languages and their Dialects*, 8vo. St. Petersburg, 1820. A copy of this important work has been presented by the learned author to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. The *Historical Transactions*, and particularly the labours of Mr. Du Ponceau, are noticed by the author in terms of just commendation. In connection with the example of the learned Adelung, I cannot forbear mentioning, as an incitement to American scholars, in these researches, that of Baron William von Humboldt; who (as an obliging correspondent in Germany justly observes) "unites to his high rank as a politician and nobleman the distinctions of genius and erudition." This eminent philologist, (says Mr. Du Ponceau) "surrounded with the honours and dignities of his country, made a journey into the mountains of Biscay and resided there some months for the sole purpose of studying the Basque Language." Report, p. xxxi. He has also been engaged for some years in the study of the Languages of AMERICA.

‡ The almost inconceivable degree of regularity in the American languages is not the least curious of their peculiarities. Molina says of that of Chili—"What is truly surprising in this language is, that it contains no irregular verb or noun. Every thing in it may be said to be regulated with a geometrical precision, and displays much art with great simplicity, and a connection so well ordered and unvarying in its grammatical rules, which always make the subsequent depend upon the antecedent, that the theory of the language is easy and may be learned in a few days." Vol. ii, p. 5, 9th edit. Mr. Heckewelder observes of the Delaware, that the verbs are conjugated through all their negative, causative and various other forms, with fewer irregularities, than any other language that I know of." *Correspondence*, Letter x. Mr. Du Ponceau says too, of the same language, that "it would rather appear to have been formed by philosophers in their closets, than by savages in the wilderness." Report, p. xxvi,

ny have erroneously supposed, for the most part radically different languages. This last unfounded opinion, which has been too much countenanced by speculative writers, has doubtless been one reason why our scholars have not directed their attention to this part of American history ; for, in the works of most writers upon this country, we meet with such numbers of Indian names, often ill-defined and as often misapplied, that we become perplexed and distracted with the multifarious group: Just as an uninstructed spectator (to adopt a remark applied on another occasion) who gazes on the endless variety of flowers that adorn the earth, or the innumerable stars that glitter in the heavens, is lost in the irregularity and disorder which seem to pervade those parts of the natural world, and despondingly imagines the knowledge of them to be placed beyond the reach of human attainment. But as we are enabled by the labours of a Newton and a Linnaeus to class and systematize the innumerable subjects of those departments of knowledge, and find order and regularity amidst the apparent confusion, so, by the assistance of the Adelungs and Vaters and Humboldts of the old world, and of their zealous fellow-labourers in our own country. we can class and arrange the various languages spoken by man; and thus dissipate the confusion and perplexity which reign through the chaos, and discover, in this, the like wonderful connexion and harmony, which are conspicuous in all other parts of the creation.

We now accordingly find, that the numerous dialects of North America may probably be reduced to three, or at most four classes or families :

1. The Kara/it, or language of Greenland and the Eskimaux:
2. The Delaware; and

• Mr. Du Ponceau informs me in a late letter, that he is now able to establish the correctness of Professor Vater's important remark-- that this American language is also spoken in Asia, by the tribe of Tartars called the Sedentary Tschuktschi, who inhabit the most eastern peninsula of the other continent. See *Mithridates*, vol. iii, part 3, p. 464.

3. The *Iroquois*; to which should be added, as Mr. Heckewelder is inclined to think,
4. The *Floridian* class, comprehending the body of languages spoken on the whole southern frontier of the United States.

By the study of only three or four original languages, therefore, a scholar will be able to command a knowledge of the numerous dialects which are spread over all that part of America in which our countrymen will feel the greatest interest. In the same manner as, by the knowledge of three or four principal languages of the old continent, we are able to master all the dialects which are to be found from the northern to the southern extremities of Europe.

The Massachusetts Historical Society, with the view of co-operating at this time with their brethren of other states in affording such aid as may be in their power to persons engaged in these interesting researches, will devote a portion of their Collections to this part of American history; in the course of which it is their intention to communicate to the publick all rare and valuable memorials of the Indian languages, whether printed or in manuscript, which may come into their possession. It is several years since they republished the principal part of Roger Williams' small but valuable Vocabulary of the Naraganset dialect.* They now resume this department of their work by the republication of the present Grammar of the Massachusetts Language. This Grammar had become so rare, that the Society had not one perfect printed copy of it in their extensive collection of early American publications; and they have been indebted to their obliging and indefatigable correspondent, Mr. Du PONCEAU, for a *manuscript* copy, which he has liberally presented to them. The present publication, however, is made from a *printed* copy belonging to one of their members. The Society is also indebted to Mr. Du Ponceau for the Remarks subjoined to the present edition,

* See vols. iii. And v.

which are distinguished by his name: The few other additions to it have been made by the editor; to whose care his colleagues on the Publishing Committee have confided this part of the present volume.

It was thought proper to resume the Indian publications of the Society with a Grammar of some one of the dialects, in order that our scholars might at once be provided with a guide to direct them in their first inquiries; and the Committee have been led by their respect for the memory of the author (and perhaps too by an excusable partiality for a New England production) to select that of Eliot; which appears to have been the first ever published in *North America*.* The work itself possesses great merit in many respects; and, with the aid of Mr. Du Ponceau's remarks, it will afford essential aid in the prosecution of these studies.

But it is now proper to submit a few remarks more immediately relative to the particular language which is the subject of the present Grammar; in doing which it will be necessary to take a general view of the other New England dialects.

The principal nations of Indians in New England, at the first settlement of the country by our ancestors, were five:

- 1, The *Pequots*; who inhabited the most *southerly* part, which comprehended what is now the State of Connecticut. They were once "a very warlike and potent people."†
2. The *Naragansets*; who possessed the country about Naraganset Bay, including Rhode Island and other islands in that bay, and also a part of the State of

* In Spanish America, grammars and dictionaries of the native languages had been published a century before Eliot's. Among the valuable books on this subject in the library of Baron W. von Humboldt, of which the editor has a list, there is a Vocabulary of the Spanish and Mexican Languages, printed at Mexico., as early as 1571.

† Gookin's Historical Collections of the Indians in New England; written in 1674, and first published from the MS. in the Massachusetts Histor. Collect. vol. i. p. 147-8.

Connecticut. This tribe is spoken of by our early historians as "a great people."*

- S. The *Pawkunnawkuts*; inhabiting the territory of the old Colony of Plymouth. These were also known by the name of *Wampanoags*, and were once in possession of Rhode Island.^t
4. The *Massachusetts* Indians; occupying principally the territory which was afterwards inhabited by the English, on Massachusetts Bay. They are described as "a numerous and great people."
- .5. The *Pawtuckets*; who dwelt north and east of the Massachusetts Indians.[‡]

Besides these five general divisions, or tribes, of the New England Indians, however, our historians. often speak of smaller divisions by specifick names, within the same territory; which smaller divisions seem to have been so distinguished, sometimes in consequence of their local situation, and sometimes on account of a slight difference of dialect.

In respect to the languages of these Indians, there seems to have been one principal dialect, which extended through a great part of New England, and was the basis of all the others. *Gookin* (in 1674) says--"The Indians of the parts of *New England*, especially upon the *sea-coasts*, used the same sort of speech and language, only with some difference in the expressions, as they differ in several countries [qu. counties?] in England, yet so as they can *well understand one another*. Their speech is a distinct speech from any of those used in Europe, Asia or Africa, that I ever heard of. And some of the *inland* Indians, particularly the Mawhawks or Maquas, use such a language, that our Indians *upon the coast* do not understand. So the Indians to the southward, upon the sea coast about Vir-

• Ibid. See also *Roger William, 'Key*; where the author Says-"In the Nariganset countrey (which is the chief people in the land) a wan shall come to many townes, some bigger, some lesser, it may be a dozen in 20 miles travel." p. 3.

^t *Mass. Histor. Collect.* vol, viii. p. 159, and vol. x. p. 20, note

[‡] *Gookin*, ubi *Supra*.

ginia, use a speech much different from those in New England."* Roger Williams also, who is spoken of as particularly "skilful in the Indian tongue,"^t agrees, substantially, with Gookin; though from his remarks we should infer, that there were more differences of dialect than Gookin's account would lead us to suppose. Williams says-" with this [the Naraganset language] I have entered into the secrets of those countries wherever English dwell, about two hundred miles, between the French and Dutch Plantations;" and he adds, that "there is a mixture of this language North and South from the place of my abode about six hundred miles; yet within the two hundred miles aforesaid their dialects doe exceedingly differ; yet not so, but (within that compass) a man may by this helpe converse with thousands of natives all over the country." In another place Williams makes a remark which (as above observed) might lead us, at first view, to conclude, that there were many radical differences in the various dialects alluded to by him. His words are-" The varietie of their Dialects and proper speech within thirtie or fortie miles each of other is very great." But the example, which he subjoins in proof of this, shows that his expression is to be taken in a qualified sense, and must be considered as founded upon minute distinctions, which would not be thought to constitute "a very great varietie" of language by any person, except one whose ear had been long habituated to the niceties of some particular dialect; every trifling deviation from which would be as striking, as the slightest violation of the idiom of his native tongue. He observes, that this very great variety of dialect will appear in this word Anum, a dog, which he sets down in four of the languages, thus:

"Anum, the Cowweset
 Ahim, the Nariganset
 Arum, the Qunniyuuck dialect
 Alum, the Neepmuck

* Mass. Histor. Collect. vol. i. p. 149.

^t Gookin; in Mass. Histor. Collect. vol. i. p. 210.

Now, it will be at once perceived, that in three of these four examples there is no other difference of dialect, than the slight one occasioned by the very common interchange of the liquids l, n, r; a difference, which, in a general view of the subject, would not be called " a very great one."*

The observation of the old writers, that there was one principal or fundamental language throughout New England (and even beyond it) is in accordance with the remarks of later writers upon this subject; who have taken a more extended view of these dialects than was practicable at the early period when Williams and Eliot wrote. It will suffice to refer to two writers of our own age, (one of them still living,) eminently distinguished for their skill in the Indian languages-the Rev. Dr. Edwards, whose Observations have been already cited, and the Rev. Mr. Heckewelder, whose Account of the Indians and their languages is well known to every reader. These two writers, who agree in every thing material to the present question, differ only in this circumstance, that each of them considers the particular dialect with which he happened to be most familiar, as the principal, or standard language,

* Williams' Key, chap. xvii. p. 106, London edit. of 1643; republished (in part) in Massa. Historical Collect. vols iii. and v. Williams adds a remark, which is deserving of notice as a refutation of an opinion which at that day (as is often the case in our own) had been hastily formed upon a partial knowledge of the Indian languages: " So that (says he) although some pronounce not L nor It, yet it is the most proper dialect of other places; contrary to many reports." Ibid

This difference of dialect (which was probably the most important of any, because it is the most frequently allude to by the old writers) is also noticed by Eliot in much the same manner as by Williams: u. The consonants l, n, r (says he) have such a natural coincidence, that it is an eminent variation of their dialects. We Massachusetts pronounce then. The Nipmuk Indians pronounce l. And the Northern Indians pronounce r. As instance:

We say	Anum (um produced)	
Nipmuk,	Alum	a dog."
Northern,	Arim	

To which he adds a remark that should not be overlooked-"So in most words." Indian Gram. p. 2. The Nipmuk Indians, (or Neepmuck, as Williams writes it) who are here mentioned, had their principal settlement about fifty miles south-west of Boston, on the territory now called Oxford, in the county of Worcester; but their territory extended into the borders of Connecticut. See Massa. Histor. Collect. vol. ix. p. 80, note.

and then compares all the rest with that ; just as an Englishman would make his own language the standard with which he would compare the northern dialects of Europe, or as a native of Italy would take the Italian language as the standard for those of the south of Europe. Thus Dr. Edwards, for example, in speaking of the Mohegan tongue, observes-" This language is spoken by all the Indians throughout New England. Every tribe, as that of Stockbridge, that of Farmington, that of New London, &c. has a different dialect; but the language is radically the same. Mr. Eliot's translation of the Bible is in a particular dialect of this language. This language appears to be much more extensive than any other language in North America. The languages of the Delawares in Pennsylvania, of the Penobscots bordering on Nova Scotia, of the Indians of St. Francis in Canada, of the Shawanese on the Ohio, and of the Chippewaus at the westward of Lake Huron, are all radically the same with the Mohegan That the language of the several tribes in New England, of the Delawares, and of Mr. Eliot's Bible, are radically the same with the Mohegan, I assert from my own knowledge."*

To the same effect are the observations of Mr. Heckewelder respecting the Delaware language, more properly called the Lenni Lenape. "The Lenui Lenape or Delawares (says he) are the head of a great family of Indian nations who are known among themselves by the generick name of Wapanachki or Men of the East. The same language is spread among them all in various dialects, of which I conceive the purest is that of the chief nation, the Lenape, at whose residence the great national councils meet, and whom the others, by way of respect, call Grandfather."† In another place he says, that " this is the most widely extended language of any of those that are spoken on this side of the Mississippi. It prevails in the extensive regions of Canada, from the coast of Labrador to the mouth of Albany River, which falls into the

* Edwards' Observations, p. 5.

† Correspondence with Mr. Du Ponceau, Letter xiv. (Transactions, p. 391.)

southernmost part of Hudson's Bay, and from thence to the Lake of the Woods, which forms the north-western boundary of the United States. It appears to be the language of all the Indians of that extensive country, except those of the Iroquois stock, which are by far the least numerous Out of the limits of Canada few Iroquois are found, except the remnants of those who were once settled in the vicinity of the great lakes in the northern parts of the now State of New York. There are yet some Wyandots in the vicinity of Detroit. All the rest of the Indians who now inhabit this country to the Mississippi, are of the Lenape stock and speak dialects of that language. It is certain, that at the time of the arrival of the Europeans, they were in possession of all the coast from the northernmost point of Nova Scotia to the Roanoke. Hence they were called Wapanachki or the Abenaki, Men of the East," He adds-" In the interior of the country we find every where the Lenape and their kindred tribes."* From these different accounts, then, it appears, that the Lenape may properly enough be considered as the principal, or standard language of the New England Indians, as well as of various tribes that inhabited the adjacent territories. It appears too, from the concurring testimony of our early historians, that among the Indians of New England there was "a great and numerous people," well known and commonly distinguished by the name of the Massachusetts Indians, who resided principally on the sea coast of the present State of Massachusetts, the extent of whose territory, however, was probably not very well defined. The editor, therefore, without regarding any of the subdivisions of this nation, (subdivisions, which have given rise to a variety of appellations both for the different portions of the people and for their slightly differing dialects,) has thought it proper to follow the example of Eliot in applying to the prevailing dialect of that people the general name of the *Massachusetts Language*. In the same manner, as we include under the general

* Heckewelder's Historical Account of the Indians, chap. ix, (in Transaction of the Histor. and Literar. Committee, &c. p, 106, 107.)

name of English, all the provincial dialects spoken in the several counties of England; though, as far as we can judge, those county dialects differ much more from standard English, than the local dialects of Massachusetts did from the standard Indian of the country. This same language is often mentioned by our early writers under different names; sometimes under the very indefinite appellation of the Indian language; sometimes, however, it is called by its proper name, the Massachusetts; it has also been called the Nonantum language; but more frequently the Natick tongue, apparently from the accidental circumstance, that Eliot established his first Indian church in the town called *Natick*, which was near Boston and was once the town of greatest note among the Indians in this quarter.

With these remarks the editor submits the present edition of this Grammar to the publick, as part of a series of scarce tracts respecting the Indian Languages, which it is the intention of the Historical Society to publish, from time to time, as circumstances shall permit. The present publication will probably be followed by a valuable English and Indian Vocabulary (of the Massachusetts language also) composed by Josiah Cotton, Esquire, who was the son of John Cotton and was once an occasional preacher among the Indians; he died at Plymouth, in this State, during the year 1756. The MS. bears the date of the years 1707 and 1708. They also hope to obtain a Vocabulary of the language spoken at the present day by the small tribe of Indians called the *Penobscots*, who reside near the river of that name, in the State of Maine. A vocabulary of this dialect (the Abnaki) will be of use in making a comparison of the present language with the same dialect as we find it in Father Rale's MS. Dictionary, which was formed a century ago. This last work, of which a short bibliographical account was given, by the editor, in the fourth volume of the American Academy's Memoirs, page 358, and which is the greatest treasure of Indian, that is to be found in this part of our country, ought also to be published without delay, lest some accident should deprive us of it forever. But its large size

alone, even if the MS. were the property of the Historical Society; would forbid its publication in these volumes. It is to be hoped, however, that measures will be taken without loss of time, either under the direction of the University, (to whose library it belongs) or of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences to effect its publication.

The editor has thought it might be acceptable to most readers, and not without use, to add to this e reface, an account of the Indian publications made by Eliot; and the following Li t, which has been collected from the preceding volumes of the Historical Collections, is accordingly subjoined. A valuable account of the Life of the venerable author, drawn up by his much respected descendant, the late Dr. John Eliot, Corresponding Secretary of the Society, will be found in the eighth volume. of these Collections, and also in the New England Biographical Dictionary of the same writer.

JOHN PICKERING.

Salem, Massachusetts,
July 31, 1821.

List of Eliot's Indian Publications.

1. The Bible; of which the New Testament was finished Sept. 5, 1661, (See Mass. Hist. Coll. vol. i. p. 176.) and the Old Testament in 1663. The second edition of the New Test. was published in 1680, and of the Old Test. in 1685. Eliot, in a letter of July 7, 1688, to the celebrated Sir Robert Boyle, who was Governour of the Corporation for propagating the gospel among the Indians of New England, and occasionally supplied money for that purpose, speaks of having paid ten pounds to Mr. John Cotton," who (says he) helped me much in the second edition of the Bible." See Mass. Hist. Coll. vol. iii. p. 187.-The translation of the New Testament was dedicated to King Charles the IId; a copy of the " Epistle Dedicatory" may be seen in the Mass. Hist. Coll. vol. i. p. 174.
2. Indian Catechisms; several of them.-See vol.i. 172, and viii.33.
- 3 ____ Grammar; which is printed in some editions of the Bible.- See vol. viii. 12 and 33.
4. --- Psalter.--Ibid.
5. Singing Psalms.-See vol. i. 172.
6. The Practice of Piety, published in 1686.-See a letter from Eliot to Boyle, in vol. iii. p. 187.
7. Baxter's Call to the Unconverted.-See vol. i. 172.

THE
INDIAN GRAMMAR BEGUN:
OR,
AN ESSAY TO BRING THE INDIAN LANGUAGE
INTO
RULES,
FOR THE HELP OF SUCH AS DESIRE TO LEARN THE SAME, FOR-
THE FURTHERANCE OF THE GOSPEL AMONG THEM,

BY JOHN ELIOT.

- Isa. 33. 19. Thou shalt not see a fierce people, a people of a deeper speech than thou canst perceive, of a stammering tongue, that thou canst not understand.
- Isa. 66. 18. It shall come that I will gather all Nations and Tongues, and they shall come and see my Glory.
- Dan. 7. 14. And there was given him Dominion, and Glory, and a Kingdome, that all People, Nations and Languages should serve him, &c.
- Psal. 19. 3. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard.
- Mal. 3. 11. From the rising of the Sun, even to the going down of the same, my Name shall be great among the Gentiles, &c.

CAMBRIDGE:
PRINTED BY MARMADUKE JOHNSON,
1666.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE,

ROBERT BOYLE, ESQ;

GOVERNOUR:

WITH THE REST OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE AND CHRISTIAN

CORPORATION

FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL UNTO

THE INDIANS IN NEW-ENGLAND.

NOBLE SIR,

YOU were pleased, among other Testimonies of your Christian and prudent care for the effectual Progress of this great Work of the Lord Jesus among the Inhabitants of these Ends of the Earth, and goings down of the Sun, to Command me (for such an aspect have your so wise and seasonable Motions, to my heart) to Compile a Grammar of this Language, for the help of others who have an heart to study and learn the same, for the sake of Christ, and of the poor Souls of these Ruines of Mankind, among whom the Lord is now about a Resurrection-work, to call them into his holy Kingdome. I have made an Essay unto this difficult Service, and laid together some Bones and Ribs preparatory at least for such a work. It is not worthy the Name of a Grammar, but such as it is, I humbly present it

to your Honours, and request your Animadversions upon
the Work, and Prayers unto the Lord for blessing upon all
Essayes and Endeavours for the promoting of his Glory,
and the Salvation of the Souls of these poor People. Thus
humbly commending your Honours unto the blessing of
Heaven and to the guidance of the Will of God, which is
able to save your Souls, I remain

Your Honours Servant in the Service
of our Lord Jesus,
JOHN ELIOT.

THE
INDIAN GRAMMAR BEGUN.

GRAMMAR is the Art or Rule of Speaking.

There be two parts of Grammar:

- I. The Art of making words.
 - 2. The Art of ordering words for speech.
- The art of *making* 1. By various articulate sounds.
words, is 2. By regular composing of them,

Syllables

Articulate sounds are composed. Words

The various *articulate sounds* must be distinguished
Names.
By Characters.

These *Names* and *Characters* do make the *Alpha-bet*.

Because the *English Language* is the first, and most attainable Language which the *Indians* learn, he is a learned man among them, who can *Speak, Reade* and *Write* the *English Tongue*.

I therefore use the same *Characters* which are of most common use in our English Books; *viz. the Roman* and *Italick* Letters.

Also our *Alpha-bet* is the same with the *English*, saying in these few things following.

1. The *difficulty of the Rule* about the Letter [c], by reason of the *change of its sound* in the five sounds, *ca ce ci co cu*; being sufficiently helped by the Letters [k and s.]: We therefore lay by the Letter [c], [p. 2.]

Saving in [ch]; of which there is frequent use in the Language. Yet I do not put it out of the Alpha-bet, for the use of it in other Languages, but the Character [ch] next to it, and call it [chee].

2. I put [i] Consonant into our Alpha-bet, and give it this Character [j], and call it ji or [gi], as this Syllable soundeth in the English word [giant]; and I place it next after [i vocal]. And I have done thus, because it is a regular sound in the third person singular in the Imperative Mode of Verbs, which cannot well be distinguished without it: though I have sometimes used [gh] instead of it, but it is harder and more inconvenient. The proper sound of it is, as the English word [age] soundeth. See it used Genes. 1. 3, 6, 9, 11.

3. We give (v) Consonant a *distinct name*, by putting together (ú f) or (uph), and we never use it, save when it soundeth as it doth in the word (*save, have*), and place it next after (u vocal.) Both these Letters (u Vocal, and v Consonant) are together in their proper sounds in the Latine word (uva a Vine.)

4. We call w (wee), because our name giveth no hint of the power of its sound.

These Consonants (l. n. r.) have such a natural coincidence, that it is an eminent variation of their dialects.

We *Massachusetts* pronounce the *n*. The *Nipmuk Indians* pronounce *l*, And the *Northern Indians* pronounce *r*. As instance :

We say	Anúm	(um produced)	
Nipmuk,	Alúm		A Dog.
Northern,	Arúm		So in most words.

Our Vocals are five: a e i o u. Diphthongs, or double sounds, are many, and of much use,

ai au ei ee eu eau oi oo ∞,

Especially we have more frequent use of [o and ∞] than other Languages have: and our [∞] doth always sound as it doth in these English words (moody, book.)

We use onely *two accents*, and but sometime. [p. 3]

The Acute (´) to shew which Syllable is first
produced in pronouncing of the word; which if it be not
attended, no Nation can understand their own Language:
as appeareth by the *witty Conceit* of the *Tytere tu's*.

ó produced with the accent, is a *regular distinction* be-
twixt the *first* and *second persons plural* of the *Suppositive*
Mode; as

Naumog, If we see: (as in Log.)

Naumóg, If ye see: (as in Vogue.)

The other Accent is (^), which I call Nasal; and it is
used onely upon (ô) when it is sounded in the Nose, as
oft it is; or upon (â) for the like cause.

This is a *general Rule*, When two (o o) come togeth-
er, ordinarily the first is produced; and so when two (oo)
are together.

All the *Articulate sounds* and *Syllables* that ever I heard
(with observation) in their Language, are sufficiently
comprehended and ordered by our Alpha- bet, and the
Rules here set down.

Character.	Name.	Character.	Name.
a		n	en
b	bee	o	
c	see	p	pee
ch	chee	q	keuh
d	dee	r	ar
e		f s	es
f	ef	t	tee
g	gee as in geese	u	
h		v	vf
i		w	wee
j	ji as in giant	x	ex
k	ka	y	wy
l	el	z	zad.
m	em		

Here be 27 Characters: The reason of increasing the
number is above.

And I have been thus far bold with the *Alpha-bet*, because it is the first time of *writing this Language*; and it is better to settle our *Foundation* right at first, than to have it to *mend afterwards*.

[p. 4.] *Musical sounds* they also have, and *perfect Harmony*, but they differ from us in sound.

There be four several sorts of *Sounds* or *Tones* uttered by Mankind.

1. *Articulation* in Speech.
2. *Laughter*.
3. *Laetation* and *Joy*: of which kinde of sounds our *Musick* and *Song* is made.
4. *Ululation*, *Howling*, *Yelling*, or *Mourning*: and of that kinde of sound is their *Musick* and *Song* made.

In which kinde of sound they also hallow and call, when they are most vociferous.

And that it is thus, it may be perceived by this, that their Language is so full of (∞) and ô *Nasal*.

They have *Harmony* and *Tunes* which they sing, but the matter is not in *Meeter*.

They are much pleased to have their Language and Words in *Meeter* and *Rithme*, as it now is in *The Singing Psalms* in some poor measure, enough to *begin* and *break the ice* withall: These they sing in our *Musicall Tone*.

So much for the Sounds and Characters.

Now follows the Consideration of Syllables, and the Art of Spelling.

The formation of Syllables in their Language, doth in nothing differ from the formation of Syllables in the English, and other Languages.

When I taught our Indians first to lay out a Word into Syllables, and then according to the sound of every Syllable to make it up with the right Letters, viz. if it were a simple sound, then one Vowel made the Syllable;

if it were such a sound as required some of the Consonants to make it up, then the adding of the right Consonants either before the Vocall, or after it, or both. They quickly apprehended and understood this Epitomie of the Art of Spelling, and could soon learn to Reade.

The Men, Women, and up-grown Youth do thus [p. 5.] rationally learn to Reade: but the Children learn by rote and custome, as other Children do.

Such as desire to learn this Language, must be attentive to pronounce right, especially to produce that Syllable that is first to be produced; then they must Spell by Art, and accustome their tongues to pronounce their Syllables and Words; then learn to reade such Books as are Printed in their Language. Legendo, Scribendo, Loquendo, are the three means to learn a Language.

So much for the Rule of Making Words.

Now follows the Ordering of them for Speech.

THE several sorts of words are called Parts of Speech, which are in number Seven.

I. The Pronoun.

- | | |
|----------------------|------------------------------|
| 2. The Noun | 3. The Adnoun, or Adjective. |
| 4. The Verb. | 5. The Adverb. |
| 6. The Conjunction. | |
| 7. The Interjection. | |

Touching these several kindes of Words, we are to consider,

1. The formation of them asunder by themselves.
2. The construction of them, or the laying them together, to make Sense, or a Sentence.

And thus far Grammar goeth in concatenation with Logick: for there is a Reason of Grammar. The laying of Sentences together to make up a Speech, is performed by Logick: The adorning of that Speech with Elo-

quence, is performed by *Rhetorick*. Such a use and accord there is in these general Arts.

In the formation of words asunder by themselves,

- Consider
- I. The general Qualifications, or Affections of words.
 2. The Kindes of Words.

[P. 6.] 1. In respect of their Rise
whence they spring.

The Qualifications are 2. In respect of their Consorts,
how they are yoked.

In respect of their Rise some are

1. Original words: sure originis.
2. Ort words sprung out of other:
 - Nominals: or Verbs made
 - Chiefly out of Nouns.
 - Verbals: or Nouns made
 - out of Verbs.

In respect of Consorts, some are

- Simple words: one alone.
- Compounded words: when two or more are made into one.

This Language doth greatly delight in Compounding of words, for Abbreviation, to speak much in few words, though they be sometimes long; which is chiefly caused by the many Syllables which the Grammar Rule requires, and suppletive Syllables which are of no signification, and curious care of Euphonie.

So much for the common Affection of words.

Now follow the severall Kindes of words.

THERE be two Kindes :

1. Chief leading words; Nouns. Verbs.
2. Such as attend upon, and belong unto the chief leading words.

Attendants on the Chief, are	1. Such as are proper to each; as	Adnouns. Adverbs.
	2. Such as are of com- mon use to both; as	Pronouns. Conjunctions.

Independent Passions or Interjections come under [p. 7] no Series or Order, but are of use in Speech, to express the passionate minde of man.

Touching the principal parts of Speech, this may be said in general, That Nouns are the names of Things, and Verbs are the names of Actions; and therefore their proper Attendants are answerable. Adnouns are the qualities of Things, and Adverbs are the qualities of Actions.

And hence is that wise Saying, That a Christian must be adorned with as many adverbs as adjectives: He must as well do good, as be good. When a man's virtuous Actions are well adorned with Adverbs, every one will conclude that the man is well adorned with virtuous Adjectives.

1. Of the Pronoun.

BECAUSE of the common and general use of the Pronoun to be affixed unto both Nouns, Verbs and other parts of Speech, and that in the formation of them; therefore that is the first Part of Speech to be handled.

I shall give no other description of them but this, They are such words as do express all the persons, both singular and plural: as.

	Neen I.	Neenawun or kenawun, We.
Sing.	Ken Thou	Plu. Kenaau Ye.
	Noh or nagum He.	Nahoh or Nagoh, They.

There be also other Pronouns of frequent use:

As the Interrogative of persons: sing. Howan. pl. Howanig, Who.

	sing. Uttiyeu, or tanyeu.
The Interrogative of things;	pl. Uttiyeush, Which.

	Of persons:	pl. Yeug, These men.	Nag or neg, They.
Demonstratives		Yeu this.	Ne This.
	of things:	Yeush These.	Nish These.

[p. 8.]

Distriubtives; as	Nawhutchee, some.	Tohsuog?	How man?
	Monaog, many.	Toshsunash	

But because these are not of use in afficing to other Parts of Speech, they may as well be reckoned among Adnouns, as some do; though there is another Schesis upon them, and they attend upon Verbs as well as Nouns.

The first and second persons are of most use in affixing both of Nouns and Verbs, and other Parts of Speech.

The third person singular is affixed with such Syllables as these, Wut. wun. um. ∞ , &c. having respect to Euphonic: And sometime the third person, especially of Verbs, hath no affix.

These Pronouns, (Neen and Ken) when they are affixed, they are contracted into Ne and Ke, and varied in the Vocal or Vowel according to Euphonic, with the word it is affixed unto; as N ∞ . K ∞ , &c.

If the word unto which it is affixed begin with a Vocal, then a Consonant of a fitting sound is interposed, to couple the word and his affix with an Euphonic: as Nut. kut, num, kum, &c.

I give not Examples of these Rules, because they will be so obvious anon, when you see Nouns and Verbs affixed.

2. Of a Noun.

A NOUN is a Part of Speech which signifieth a thing; or it is the name of a thing .

The variation of Nouns is not by Male and Female, as in other Learned Languages, and in European Nations they do.

Nor are they varied by Cases, Cadencies, and Endings: herein they are more like to the Hebrew.

Yet there seemeth to be one Cadency or Case of the first Declination of the form Animate, which endeth in oh, uh, or ah; viz. when an animate Noun followeth a Verb transitive whose object that he acteth upon is without himself. For Example: Gen. 1. 16: the last word is anogq-sog, stars. It is an Erratum: It should be anogqsoh; because it followeth the Verb ayim, He made. Though it be an Erratum in the Press, it is the [p. 9.] fitter in some respects for an Example.

- In Nouns consider 1. Genera, or kindes of Nouns. 2. The qualities or affections thereof.

The kindes of Nouns are two; according to which there be two Declensions of Nouns, for the variation of the number.

Numbers are two: Singular and Plural.

The first kinde of Nouns is, when the thing signified is a living Creature.

The second kinde is, when the thing signified is not a living Creature.

Therefore I order them thus:

There be two forms or declensions of Nouns: Animate Inanimate

The Animate form or declension is, when the thing signified is a living Creature: and such Nouns do alwayes make their Plural in (og); as,

Table with 2 columns: English description and Indian word. Rows include: Man (Wosketomp), Woman (Mittamwossis), young Man (Nunkomp), Girl (Nunqsqau), Englishman, Englishwoman, God (So Manit), Devil (Mattannit), Ox (So Ox), and Horse (Horse).

10 THE INDIAN GRAMMAR BEGUN.

The Stars they put in this form:

Anogqs, A Star.	Anogqsog.
Muhhog, The Body.	Muhhogkooog.
Psukses, A little Bird.	Psuksesog.
Ahtuk, A Deer.	Ahtuhquog.
Mukquoshim, A Wolf.	Mukquoshimwog,
Mosq, A Bear.	Mosquog.
Tummunk, The Beaver.	Tummunkquaog.
Puppinashim, A Beast.	Puppinashimwog.
Askrok, A Snake or Worm.	Askrokquog.
Namohs, A Fish.	Namohsog. &c.

Some few Exceptions I know.

[p. 10.] 2. The Inanimate form or declension of Nouns, is when the thing signified is not a living Creature: and these make the Plural in ash; as

Hussun, A Stone.	Hussunash.
Qussuk, A Rock.	Qussukquanash.

Of this form are all Vegetables:

Mehtug, A Tree.	Mehtugquash.
Moskeht, Grass.	Moskehtuash

And of this form are all the parts of the Body: as

Muskesuk, The Eye or Face.	Muskesukquash.
Mehtauog, An Ear.	Mehtauogwash.
Meepit, A Tooth.	Meepitash.
Meenan, The Tongue.	Meenanash,
Mussissillron, A Lip.	Mussissittronash.
Muttron, A Mouth.	Muttronash.
Menutcheg, A Hand.	Menutchegash.
Muhpit, An Arm.	Muhpittenash.
Muhkont, A Leg.	Muhkontash.
Musseet, The Foot.	Musseetash.

Of this form are all Virtues, and all Vices: as

Waantamoonk, Wisdome. Waantamooongash, or onganash.

All Verbals are of this form, which end in onk, and make their Plural in ongash, or in onganash.

All Virtues and Vices (so far as at present I discern) are Verbals; from their activity and readiness to turn into Verbs.

All Tools and Instruments of Labour, Hunting, Fishing, Fowling, are of this form. . All Apparel, Housing: All Fruits, Rivers, Waters, &c.

So much for the kinds of Nounes.

The common Affections or Qualifications are two:

1. The affixing of the Noun with the Pronoun.
2. The ranging them into several Ranks.

1. The way of affixing of Nouns, is the putting [p. 11] or using of the Noun in all the three persons, both Singular and Plural.

This manner of speech being a new thing to us that know the European or Western Languages, it must be demonstrated to us by Examples.

	Metah, the Heart,		
	Nuttah, my heart.		Nuttahhun, our heart.
Sing.	Kuttah, thy heart.	Pl.	Kuttahhou, your heart.
	Wuttah, his heart.		Wuttahhou, their heart.
	Menutch eg, A Hand.		
	Nunnutcheg, my hand.		Nunnutcheganun, our hand
Sing.	Kenutcheg, thy hand.	P.	Kenutcheganoo, your hand.
	Wunnutcheg, his hand.		Wunnutcheganoo, their hand.
	Nunnutcheganash, my hands.		
Sing.	Kenutchegash, or kenutcheganash, thy hands.		
	Wunnutchegash or wunnutcheganash, his hands.		
	Nunnutcheganunnonut, our hands.		
Plu.	Kenutcheganooowout, your hands.		
	Wunnutcheganooowout, their hands.		
	Wetu, A House.		
	Neek, my house.		Neekun, our house.
Sing.	Keek, thy house.	Pl:	Keekou, your house,
	Week, his house.		Weekou, their house

	ut, in.	
	Neekit, in my house.	Neekunonut, in our house.
Sing.	Keekit, in thy house.	Pl. Keekuwoot, in your house
	Weekit, in his house,	Weekuwoot, or wekuwo-
		[mut, in his house.

Hence we corrupt this word Wigwam.

So much may at present suffice for the affixing of Nouns.

[p. 12.] Now for the ranging them into ranks.
 The Primitive.
 There be three Ranks of Nouns; The Diminutive.
 The Possessive.
 The same Noun may be used in all these Ranks.

The primitive Rank expresses the thing as it is: as Nunkomp, a Youth. Nunksqua, a Girl. Ox. Sheep. Horse. Pig. So Hassuu, a stone. Mehtug, a tree. Moskeht, grass or herb.

2. The diminutive Rank of Nouns doth lessen the thing, and expresses it to be a little one; and it is formed by adding, with a due Euphonie (es) or (emes) unto the primitive Noun. For Example, I shall use the same Nouns named in the first Rank, here in the second Rank: as Nunkompæs or emes. Nunksquæs or emes. Oxemes. Sheepsemes. Horsemes. Pigsemes. Hassunemes. Mehtugques, or Mehtugquememes. Moskehtuememes.

And so far as I perceive, these two endings (es and emes) are degrees of diminution: (emes) is the least,

3. The possessive Rank of Nouns, is when the person doth challenge an interest in the thing. Hence, as the other Ranks may be affixed, this must be affixed with the Pronoun.

And it is made by adding the Syllable (eum or oom, or um) according to Euphonie, unto the affixed Noun. For Example: Num-Manittoom, my God. Nuttineneum, my man. Nunnunkompoom. Nunnunksquæeum. Nutoxineum. Nusheepseum. Nuthorsesum. Nuppigsum. Nu-

thassunneum. Nummehtugkmm. Nummoskehteum. Nummoskehteumash.

Both the primitive Noun, and the diminutive Noun, may be used in the form possessive; as Nutsheepsemeseum, and the like.

Nouns may be turned into Verbs two ways:

1. By turning the Noun into the Verb-substantive form: as Wosketompoo, He became a man. Of this see more in the Verb Substantive.
2. All Nouns that end in onk, as they come [p. 13] from Verbs by adding (onk) so they will turn back again into Verbs, by taking away (onk) and forming the word according to the Rule of Verbs; as

Waantamoonk is Wisdome: take away onk, and then it may be formed Nōowaantam, I am wise. Kōowaantam, Thou wise, &c.

Waantam, He wise, &c.

3. Of Adnouns.

AN Adnoun is a part of Speech that attendeth upon a Noun, and signifieth the Qualification thereof.

The Adnoun is capable of both the Animate and Inanimate forms; and it agreeth with his leading Noun, in form, number, and person.

For example: Rev. 4. 4. there is Neesneechagkodontash nabo yau appuongash, Twenty four Thrones. And Neesneechagkodontog yauog Eldersog, Twenty four Elders. Here be two Nouns of the two several forms, Animate and Inanimate; and the same Adnoun is made to agree with them both.

The Inanimate form of Adnouns end some in i, and some in e.

The Animate form in es, ot esu: and those are turned into Verbs by taking the affix. As

Wompi, White. Wompiyeuash.
 M̄ooi, Black. M̄oesseuash.
 Menuhki, Strong. Menuhkiyeuash.
 N̄ochumwi, Weak. N̄ochumwiyeuash.

The same words in the Animate form:

Wompesu. Wompesuog.
 M̄ooesu. M̄ooesuog.
 Menuhkesu. Menuhkesuog.
 N̄ochumwesu. N̄ochumwesuog.

Put the affix to these, and they are Verbs.

[p. 14] NUMERALS belong unto Adnouns, and in them there is something remarkable.

From the Number 5 and upward, they adde a word suppletive, which signifieth nothing, but receiveth the Grammatical variation of the Declension, according to the things numbered, Animate or Inanimate. The Additional is (tohsú) or (tahshé) which is varied (tohsúog, tohsúash, or tohshinash.)

For Example:

1 Nequt,	6 Nequtta tahshe.
2 Neese.	7 Nesaasuk tahshe.
3 Nish.	8 Shwosuk tahshe.
4 Yau.	9 Paskoogun tahshe.
5 Napanna tahshe tohsua	10 Piuk. Piukqussuog, Piuk-
tohswash.	qusswash.

Then from 10 to 20 they adde afore the Numeral (nab or nabo) and then it is not needful to adde the following additional, though sometimes they do it.

As for Example:

11 Nabo nequt.	16 Nabo nequtta.
12 Nabo neese,	17 Nabo nesaasuk.
13 Nabo nish.	18 Nabo shwosuk.
14 Nabo yau.	19 Nabo paskoogun.
15 Nabo napanna.	20 Neesneechag kodtog. kodash.

Then upwards they adde to Neesneechag, the single Numbers to 30, &c.

30 Nishwinchag kodtog, kodash.	
40 Yauunchag kodtog, kodash.	
50 Napannatahshinchag kodtog, kodash.	
60 Nequtta tahshinchag kodtog, kodash.	
70 Nesaasuk tahshinchag kodtog, kodash.	
80 Shwosuk tahshinchag kodtog, dodtash.	[p. 15.]
90 Paskoogun tahshinchag kodtog, kodash.	
100 Nequt pasuk kooog. kooash.	
1000 Nequt muttannonganog kodtog. or kussuog. kodash. kussuash.	

The Adnoun is frequently compounded with the Noun, and then usually they are contracted: as

Womposketomp, A white man.
Mooosketomp, A black man.
Menuhkoshketomp, A strong man,
Menuhkekont, A strong leg. Qunuhtug, of qunni, long.
Mehtug, Wood or Tree. And this word is used for a Pike.

When the Noun becometh a Verb, then the Adnoun becometh an Adverb.

There is no form of comparison that I can yet finde, but degrees are expressed by a word signifying more: as Anue menuhkesu, More strong: And Nano More and more. Moocheke, Much. Peesik or Peasik, Small.

4. Of the Verb

A VERB is when the thing signified is an Action.

There be two sorts of Verbs. The Verb Substantive.
 Active.

The Verb Substantive, is when any thing hath the signification of the Verb Substantive added to it: as (am, art is, are, was, were) &c. Actual being is above the nature of a Noun, and beneath the nature of a Verb Active.

We have no compleat distinct word for the Verb Substantive, as other Learned Languages, and our English Tongue have, but it is under a regular composition whereby many words are made Verb Substantive.

[p. 16] All may be referred to three sorts, so far as yet I see.

I. The first sort of Verb Substantives is made by adding any of these Terminations to the word, *yeuoom*, *acoo*, *oo*; with due Euphonie: And this is so, be the word a Noun; as *Wosketompoo*, He is a man: Or Adnoun; as *Wompiyeoo*, It is white: Or be the word an Adverb, or the like; as *James 5. 12. Mattayeocutch*, Let it be nay: *Nuxyeocutch*, Let it be yea. The words in the Text are spelled with respect to pronunciation, more than to Grammaticall composition: here I spell them with respect to Grammatical! composition. See more Examples of this, *Exod. 4. 3, 4, 6, 7.*

2. The second sort of Verb Substantives is when the animate Adnoun is made the third person of the Verb, and so formed as a Verb: as *Wompesu*, White; *Menuhkesu*, Strong; may be formed as a Verb: *Noowompes*, *Koowompes*, *Wompesu*. And so the like words.

And of this sort are all Adnouns of Vertue or Vice: as *Waantam*, Wise: *Assootu*, Foolish, &c.

Whatever is affirmed to be, or denied lo be, or if it be asked if it be, or expressed to be made to be; All such words may be Verb Substantives. I say, may be, because

there be other wages in the Language to express such a sense by. But it may be thus.

3. The third sort are Verb Substantive passive, when the Verb Substantive (am, is, was, &c.) is so annexed to a Verb Active, that the person affixed is the object of the act; as Nōwadchanit, I am kept.

So much for the Verb Substantive.

Now followeth the Verb Active.

A Verb Active is when the word signifieth a compleat action, or a causall power exerted.

Verbs inceptives or inchoatives, I find not; such a notion is expressed by another word added to the Verb, which signifieth to begin, or to be about to do it.

Also when the Action is doubled, or frequented, &c. this notion hath not a distinct form, but is [p. 1.7] expressed by doubling the first Syllable of the word: as Mohmoeog, they oft met; Sasabbath-dayeu, every Sabbath.

There be two sorts or forms of Verbs Active:

1. The Simple form
2. The Suffix form.

The Simple form of the Verb Active, is when the act is conversant about a Noun inanimate onely: as

Nōwadchanumunneek, I keep my house.

And this Verb may take the form of an Adnoun: as

Nōwadchanumunash nōwéatchimineash, I keep my corn.

Or every person of this Verb, at least in the Indicative Mode, will admit the plural Number of the Noun inanimate.

The Suffix form of the Verb Active, is when the act is conversant about animate Nouns onely; or about both animate and inanimate also: as

Kōwadchansh, I keep thee.

Kōwadchanumoush, I keep it for thee.

There be five Concordances of the Suffix form Active, wherein the Verb doth receive a various formation. I think there be some more, but I have beat out no more.

The reason why I call them Concordances, is, Because the chief weight and strength of the Syntaxis of this Language, lyeth in this eminent manner of formation of Nouns and Verbs, with the Pronoun persons.

1. The first Concordance is, when the object of the act is an animate Noun. I call it, The Suffix animate object: as
Kōwadchansh, I keep thee.

2. The Suffix animate mutual: when animates are each others object : as
Nōwadchanittimun, We keep each other.
This form ever wanteth the singular Number.

3. The Suffix animate end, and inanimate object: as
Kōwadchanumoush, I keep it for thee; or, for thy use.
[p. 18.] 4. The Suffix animate form social: as
Kōweechewadchanumwomsh, I keep it with thee.

5. The Suffix form advocate or in stead form, when one acteth in the room or stead of another: as
Kōwadchanumwanshun, I keep it for thee; I act in thy stead.

This form is of great use in Theologie, to express what Christ hath done for us: as
Nunnuppōwonuk, He died for me.
Kenuppōwonuk, He died for thee.
Kenuppōwonukqun, He died for us.
Kenupprowonukro, He died for you. &c.

All these forenamed forms of Verbs, both Verb Substantives and Verbs Active, both Simple and Suffix, may be varied under three distinct forms of variation; viz.
Affirmative: when the act is affirmed .
Negative: when the act is denied.
Interrogative: when the act is question'd.

Again, many of these forms may also be varied in a form causative, in all cases where the efficient is capable to be compelled, or caused to act.

All these will be more conspicuous in the Paradigms, or Examples.

To make compleat work, I should set down many examples.

But I shall (at present) set down onely two examples: One of the Simple form Active, which may generally serve for all the Verb Substantives.

The second Example of the Suffix animate form, which may generally serve for all the Concordances of Verbs suffixed. Even as the Meridian of Boston may generally serve for all New-England: And the Meridian of London may generally serve for all England.

And these will be enough to busy the heads of Learners for a while.

Note this, That all Verbs cannot be formed [p. 19] through all these forms, but such Verbs as in reason of Speech are useable all these wayes, which sundry Verbs are not; as, I sleep, eat, piss, &c.

Before I come to the Paradigms, there be other general considerations about Verbs.

In Verbs consider

1. Divers Modes of the action.
2. Divers Times of the action.

First, The Modes of actions in this Language are five.

1. The Indicative, Demonstrative, or Interrogative Mode, which doth fully assert the action or deny it, or enquire if it be asserted:

Noowadchanumun, I do keep it.
 As Noowadchanumroun, I do not keep it.
 Noowadchanumunas, Do I keep it?

2. The Imperative, or Hortative, or Praying and Blessing Mode, is when the action is Commanded, or Exhorted

to be done, or Prayed for. When a Superiour speaks in this Mode, he commands. When an Inferiour speaks in this Mode, he prayes and intreats. When a Minister speaks in this Mode, he exhorts, and blesseth.

Wadchansh, Keep thou.

Wadchaneh, Keep me,

3. The Optative, Wishing, or Desiring Mode, when one desireth the action to be done: as

Nooaadchanumun toh, I wish or desire to keep it.

4. The Subjunctive, or rather the Supposing, or Suppositive Mode, when the action is onely supposed to be; as in these three expressions:

If it be.

When it is.

It being.

And this third sense and meaning of this Mode of the Verb, doth turn this Mode into a Participle, like an Ad-noun, very frequently.

[p. 20.] 5. The Indefinite Mode, which doth onely assert the action without limitation of person or time; and it is made of the Indicative Mode by adding the termination (at) and taking away the suffix: as

Wadchanumunat, To keep.

There is another Mode of the Verb in reason of speech, and in some other Languages, viz. The Potential, which doth render the action in a possibility to be. But this Language hath not such a Mode, but that notion is expressed by a word signifying (may) to the Indicative Mode. The usual word w1th us 1s (woh) may or can.

All these Modes of the Verb are timed by Tenses, saving the Indefinite Mode, and that is unlimited,

The times are two; Present, and Past. The time to come is expressed by a word signifying futurity, added to the Indicative Mode, as (mos, pish, shall, or will.)

In the Roman Language there do belong unto this Indefinite Mode, gerundive, lofty, and vapouring Expressions; also supine, sluggish, dull, and sunk-hearted Expressions. And though the spirit of this People, viz. the vapouring pride of some, and the dull-hearted supinity of others, might dispose them to such words and expressions, yet I cannot find them out.

As Nouns are often turned into Verbs, so Verbs are often turned into Nouns; and a frequent way of it is, by adding (onk) to the Verb: as

Noowompes, I am white.
 Koowompes, Thou art white.
 Noowompesuonk, My whiteness.
 Koowompesuonk, Thy whiteness.

Every person of the Verb that is capable of such a change in the reason of Speech, may so be turned into a Noun singular or plural.

Before I set down the Examples of Formation of Verbs, I will finish a few Observations about the remaining Parts of Speech.

[p. 21.]

5. Of Adverbs.

AN Adverb is a word that attendeth upon the Verb, and signifieth the quality of the action, by Extension, Diminution, Rectitude, Curvation, Duration, Cessation, &c. according to the various qualities of all sorts of actions.

Adverbs do usually end in (é or u), as wame or wamu, All: Menuhke or Menuhku, Strongly.

The several sorts of Adverbs (according as Learned Grammarians have gathered them together) are

1. Of Time. Yeueu, Now. Wunnonkou, Yesterday. Saup, Tomorrow. Ahquompak, When. Paswu, Lately.

Nôadtuk, A long time. Teanuk, Presently. Kuttumma, Very lately.

2. Of Place. Uttiyeu, Where. Naut, There. Anomut, Within. Woskeche, Without. Onkoue, Beyond. Negonnu, First. Wuttat, Behinde.

3. Of Order. Negonnu, First. Nahohtôeu, Second. Nishwu, Third, &c.

4. Of Asking. Sun, Sunnummatta; Is it? or Is it not? Tohwutch, Why.

5. Of Calling. Hoh. Chuh.

6. Affirming. Nux, Yea. Wunnamuhkut, Truly.

7. Denying. Matta, Matchaog, No. Also Mo sometimes signifieth No. They have no Adverbs of Swearing, nor any Oath, that I can yet finde: onely we teach them to Swear before a Magistrate By the great and dreadful name of the Lord. The word we make for swearing, signifieth to speak vehemently.

8. Of Exhorting or Encouraging. Ehhoh, Hah.

9. Of Forbidding. Ahque, Beware, Do not.

10. Of Wishing. Woi, Napehnont, Oh that it were. Toh.

11. Of Gathering together. Moeu, Together. Yeu nogque, This way-ward. Ne nogque, That way-ward. Kesukquieu, Heaven-ward. Ohkeiyeu, Earth-ward.

12. Of Choosing. Anue, More rather. Teaogku, Rather, unfinished. Nahen, Almost. Asquam, Not yet. [p. 22.]

13. Of Continuation. Ash, Still.

14. Of Shewing. Kusseh, Behold.

15. Of Doubting. Pagwodche, It may be. Toh, It may be.

16. Of Likeness. Netatup, Like so. Nemehkuh, So. Neane, As.

17. Of unexpected Hap. Tiadche, Unexpectedly.

18. Of Quality. Wunnegen. Matchet. Waantamwe, &c. Of this kinde are au Virtues and Vices, &c.

Adverbs are oft turned into Adnouns, especially when his Verb is turned into a Noun.

6. Of the Conjunction.

A Conjunction is a Part of Speech to joyn Words and Sentences: As

Causatives. Wutchb, wutche, newutche. For, from, because. Yeu waj, For this cause.

Disjunctives. Asuh, Or.

Discretives. Qut, But.

Suppositives. Tohneit, If.

Exceptives. Jshkont, Least. Chaubohkish, Except, or besides. Kuttmma, Unless.

Diversatives. Tohkônogque, Although.

Of Possibility. Woh, May or Can.

Of Place. In, en, ut, át. In, At or To.

7. Of Interjections.

AN Interjection is a word or sound that uttereth the passion of the minde, without dependance on other words.

Of Sorrow. Woi, œwee.

Of Marvelling. Hó, hœ.

Of Disdaining. Quah.

Of Encouraging. Hah, Ehoh.

There be also suppletive Syllables of no signi- [p. 23]
fication, but for ornament of the word: as tit, tin,
tinne; and these in way of an Elegancy, receive the affix
which belongeth to the Noun or Verb following; as nuttit,
kuttit, wuttit, nuttin, kuttin, wuttin, nuttinne, kuttinne, wut-
tinne.

Other Languages have their significant suppletives for Elegancy: and some of our English Writers begin so to use [Why], but I conceive it to be a mistake. Our suppletive is rather [Weh], and [Why] is a significant word. It oft puts the Reader to this inconvenience, to stay and look whether it be significant or not; and some are slum-

bled at it. It is seldome an Elegancy, to make a significant word a meer suppletive.

So much for the formation of words asunder.

For the Construction of words together, I will give three short Rules.

1. WHEN two Nouns come together, one of them is turned into a kinde of an Adverb, or Adnoun, and that is an Elegancy in the Language: of which see frequent Examples. See 1 Pet. 2. 2. Pahke sogkodontungane wuttinnowaonk, The pure milkie word, for milk of the word. The like may be observed a thousand times.

2. When two Verbs come together, the latter is the Infinitive Mode: as in the same 1 Pet. 2. 5. Koweekikon-itteamwo sephausinat. Ye are built, &c. to sacrifice, &c. And a thou sand times more this Rule occurs.

3. When a Noun or a Verb is attended upon with an Adnoun, or Adverb, the affix which belongeth to the Noun or Verb is prefixed to the Adnoun or Adverb: as in the same Chapter, I Pet. 2. 9. Ummonchanatamwe wequaiyeumut, His marvellous light: The affix of Light is prefixed to marvellous. Koowaantamwe ketoohkam, Tlwu speakest wisely: The affix of speaking is prefixed to wisely. This is a frequent Elegancy in the Language.

But the manner of the formation of the Nouns and Verbs have such a latitude of use, that there needeth little other Syntaxis in the Language.

[p. 24] I shall now set down Examples of Verbs: and first of the Simple form. And here

First, I shall set down a Verb Active, whose object is Inanimate:

as Ncoowadchanumun, I keep it. (Be it tool or garment.)

And secondly, I shall set down a Verb Substantive:

as Ncoowaantam, I am wise.

Both these I shall set down Parallel in two Columes.

The form Affirmative.
Indicative Mode.

	Present tense.		Present tense.
	I keep it.		I am wise.
	Noowadchanumun		Noowaantam
Sing.	Koowadchanumun	Sing.	Koowaantam
	cowadchanumun.		Waantam noh.
	Noowadchanumumun		Noowaantamumun
Plur.	Koowadchanumumwoo	Plur.	Koowaantamumwoo
	Wadchanumwog.		Waantamwog.
	Praeter tense.		Praeter tense.
	Noowadchanumunap		Noowaantamup
Sing.	Koowadchanumunap	Sing.	Koowaantamup
	cowadchanumunap.		Waantamup.
	Noowadchanumumunnónup		Noowaantamumunnónup
Pl.	Koowadchanumumwop		Koowaantamúmwop
	Wadchanumnuppanneg: or pl.		
	cowadchanummuaop.		Waantamuppanneg.

The Imperative Mode, when it Commands or Exhorts it wanteth the first person singular: but when we Pray in this Mode, as always we do, then it hath the first person; as, Let me be wise: but there is no formation of the word to express it; yet it may be expressed by adding this word unto the Indicative Mode [pa], as, [p. 25. Pâncowaantam, Let me be wise. Our usual formation of the Imperative Mode is without the first person singular, casting away the affix.

Imperative Mode.

	Present tense.		Present tense.
	Wadchanish		Waantash
Sing.	Wadchanitch.	Sing.	Waantaj.
	Wadchanumuttuh		Waantamuttuh
plur.	Wadchanumook	plur.	Waantamook
	Wadchanumahettich.		Waantamohettich.

The Imperative Mode cannot admit of any other time than the Present.

The Optative Mode.

	Present tense.		Present tense.
	Noowáadchánunmun-toh		Noowáaantamun-toh
Sing.	Koowáadchanunmun-toh	Sing.	Koowáaaantamun-toh
	oowaadchanumuncau-toh.		oowáaantamun-toh.
	Noowaadchanumunnan-toh		Noowáaantamunan-toh
plur.	Koowaadchanumunnan-toh	Pl.	Koowáaantamunaz-toh
	oowaadchanumunaz-toh		oowáaantamuneau-toh.
	Praeter tense.		Praeter tense.
	Noowaadchanumunaz-toh		Noowáaantamunaz-toh
Sing.	Koowaadchanumunaz-toh	S.	Koowáaantamunaz-toh
	oowaadchanumunaz-toh.		oowáaantamunaôiz-toh
	Plu.		Plu.
	Noowadchanumunannonuz-toh		Noowáaantamúnanôiz-toh
	Koowadchanumunaóuz toh		Koowáaantamunaôiz-toh
	oowadchanumunaóuz-toh.		oowáaantamunaôiz-toh.

It seems their desires are slow, but strong;
Because they be utter'd double-breath't, and long.

[p. 26.]

The Suppositive Mode: which usually flats the first Vo-
cal and layes by the affix.

	Present tense.		Present tense.
	Wadchanumon		Waantamon
Sing.	Wadchanuman	Sing.	Waantaman
	Wadchanuk.		Waantog.
	Wadchanumog		Waantamog
plur.	Wadchanumóg	plur.	Waantamóg
	Wadchanumahettit.		Waantamohettit.
	Praeter tense.		Praeter tense.
	Wadchanumos		Waantamos
Sing.	Wadchanumôsa	Sing.	Waantamas
	Wadchanukis.		Waantogkis.
	Wadchanumogkus		Waantamogkis
plur.	Wadchanumógkus	plur.	Waantamógkis
	Wadchanumahettis.		Waantamohettis.

The Indefinite Mode.

Wadchanumunát Waantamunát.

Indicative Mode. The form Negative, which is varied from the Affirmative by interposing [oo].

	Present tense.		Present tense.
	Noowadchanumcoun		Noowaantamcooh
Sing.	Koowadchanumcoun	Sing.	Koowaantamcooh
	oowadchanumcoun.		Waantamcooh.
	Noowadchanumcounnonup		Noowaantanmcomun
plur.	Koowadchanumcoowop	plur.	Koowaantamromwoo
	Wadchanumcoog.		Waantamcoog
	Praeter tense.		
	Noowadchanumcounap		Noowaantamcoop
Sing.	Koowadchanumcounap	Sing.	Krowaantamrop
	oowadchanumcounap.		oowaantamop
	Plu.		Plu.
	Noowadchanumcounnanónup		Noowaantamcomunaonup
	Koowadchanumrowop		Koowaantamcoomwop
	Wadchanumcoopanneg.		Waantamcoopanneg.

[p. 27.]

The Imperative Mode of the Negative simple form.

	Present tense.		Present tense.
	Wadchanuhkon		Waantukon
Sing.	Wadchanuhkitch.	Sing.	Waantukitch
	Wadchanumcoottuh		Waantamcoottuh
plur.	wadchanumcohteó		waantamcohteók
	wadchanumohettekitch.		waantamóhettekitch.

The Optative Mode is of seldome use, and very difficult, therefore I pass it by.

The Suppositive Mode of the Simple form.

	Present tense.		Present tense.
	Wadchanumcoun		Waantamcoun
Sing.	Wadchanumcoan	Sing.	Waantamcoan
	Wadchanocog.		Waantamcog,
	Wadchanumcoog		Waanlamcoog
Plur.	Wadchanumcoóg	Plur.	Waantamcoóg
	Wadchanumcoahettit, or cohetteg.]		Waantamcoohettit or [cohetteg.]
	Praeter tense,		Praeter tense.
	Wadchanumcoos		Waantamcoos
Sing.	Wadchanumcoosa	Sing.	Waantamcooas
	Wadchanumcoogkis.		Waantamcoogkis.
	Wadchanumcoogkus		Waanlamcoogkus
Plur.	Wadchanumcoókus	Plur.	Waantamcoógkus
	Wadchanumcoahettis.		Waantemcoohettis.

The Indefinite Mode of the Simple form Negative.

Wanchanumcounát Waantamcounát.

The Simple form Interrogative, is formed onely in the Indicative Mode: All Questions are always asked in this Mode of the Verb, and in no other; and it is formed by adding [as] to the Affirmative.

Indicative Mode.

	Present tense.		Present tense.
	Ncowadchanumunás		Ncowadchanumunnonus
Sing.	Koowadchanumunás	Plur.	Koowadchanumunnaóus
	cowadchanumunáous.		cowadchanumunnaóus Nag.

The Suffix form animate Affirmative.

Here I carry in a Parallel our English Verb (Pay) that so any may distinguish betwixt what is Grammar, and what belongs to the word. And remember ever to pronounce (pay), because else you will be ready to reade it (pau). Also remembe that (Paum) is the radicall word, and all the rest is Grammar. In this remarkable way of speech, the Efficient of the Act, and the Object, and sometimes the End also, are in a regular composition comprehended in the Verb: and there is no more difficulty in it, when use hath brought our Notion to it, than there is in other Languages, if so much.

	Indicative Mode.		Present tense.
	I keep thee, Kcoowadchansh.		I pay thee, Kuppaumush.
1	I keep him,	1	I pay him,
Sing.	Ncoowadchan	Plur.	Nuppayum.
	I keep you, Kcoowadchanunumwoo.		I pay you, Kuppaumunumcoo.
	I keep them, Ncoowadchanóog.		I pay them, Nuppaumôog.
	Thou keepest me, Kcoowadchaneh.		Thou payest me, Kuppaumeh.
2	Thou keepest him,	2	Thou payest him,
Sing.	Kcoowadchan.	Plur.	Kuppaum.
	Thou keeptst us, Kcoowadchanimun.		Thou payest us, Kuppaumimun.
	Thou keepest them, Kcoowadchanoog.		Thou payest them Kuppaumoog.
	He keepeth me, Ncoowadchanuk.		He payeth me, Nuppaumuk.
3	He keepeth thee,	3	He payeth thee,
Sing.	Kcoowadchanuk.	Plur.	Kuppaumuk.
	He keepeth him, coowadchanuh.		He payeth him, Uppaumuh.
	He keepeth us, Kcoowadchanukqun.		He payeth us, Kuppaumukqun
	He keepeth you, Kcoowadchanukoo.		He payeth you, Kuppaumukou.
	He keepeth them, coowadchanuh.		He payeth them, Uppaumuh nah

Indicative Mode.

Present tense.		Present tense.	
	We keep thee, Koowadchanunumun.		We pay thee, Kuppanmunmnun.
1	We keep him, noowadchanoun.	1	We pay him, nuppaumoun.
plur.	We keep you, koowadchanunumun(wame)	plur.	We pay you, kuppaumunumun
	We keep them, noowadchanounonog		We pay them, nuppamnounónog.
	Ye keep me, Koowadchanimwoo.		Ye pay me Kuppaumimimwoo.
2	Ye keep him, koowadchanau.	2	Ye pay him, kuppaumau.
plur.	Ye keep us, koowadchanimun.	plur.	Ye pay us, Kuppaumimun.
	Ye keep them, koowadchanoog.		Ye pay them, kuppaumoog.
	They keep me, Noowadchanukquog.		They pay me, Nuppaumukquog.
3	They keep thee, koowadchanukquog.	3	They pay thee, kuppaumukquog.
plur.	They keep him, oowadchanouh.	plur.	They pay him, uppaumouh.
	They keep us, noowadchanukqunnonog.		They pay us, nuppaumukqunnonog
	They keep you, koowadchanukooog.		They pay you, kuppaumukooog.
	They keep them, oowadchanouh nah.		They pay them, uppaumouh nah.

Indicative Mode.

Praeter tense.

I did keep thee,
Koowadchanunup.
1 I did keep him,
sing. noowadchanóp.
I did keep you,
koowadchanunnumwop.
I did keep them,
noowadchanópauneg.

Thou didst keep me,
Koowadchanip.
2 Thou didst keep him,
sing. koowadchanóp
Thou didst keep us,
koowadchanimunonup.
Thou didst keep them,
koowadchanopaneg.

He did keep us,
Noowadchanukup.
3 He did keep thee,
sing. koowadchanukup
He did keep him,
oowadchanópoh.
He did keep us,
nowadchanukqunnonup.
He did keep you,
koowadchanukcoop.
He did keep them,
oowadchanrópoh.

Praeter tense.

I did pay thee,
Kuppaumunup
1 I did pay him,
sing. nuppaumóp.
I did pay you,
kuppaumunumwop.
I did pay them,
nuppaumópanneg.

Thou didst pay me,
Kuppaumip.
2 Thou didst pay him,
sing. kuppaumóp.
Thou didst pay us,
kuppaumimunonup.
Thou didst pay them,
kuppaumopaneg,

He did pay us
Nuppaumukup.
3 He did pay thee
sing. kuppaumukup
He did pay him,
uppaumopoh.
He did pay us,
Nuppaumukqunnonup.
He did pay you,
kuppaumukcoop.
He did pay them,
uppaumopoh nah.

Indicative Mode.

Praeter tense.

Paeter tense.

1 We did keep thee,
Koowadchaninumunonup,
plur We did keep him,
noowadchanounonup.
We did keep you,
kmwadchanmumunonup,
We did keep them, [neg.
noowadchanounonuppan-

We did pay thee,
kuppaumunumunonup.
1 We did pay him,
plur nuppaumounonup.
We did pay you,
kuppaumunumunonup.
We did pay them,
nuppaumounonuppanneg.

2 Ye did keep me,
Koowadchanimwop,
plur Ye did keep him,
koowadchanuop.
Ye did keep us,
koowadchanumunonup.
Ye did keep them,
koowadchanoopaneg.

Ye did pay me,
Kuppaumimwop.
2 Ye did pay him,
plur kuppaumauop.
Ye did pay us,
kuppaumimunonup.
Ye did pay them,
kuppaumauopaneg.

3 They did keep me,
Noowadchanukuppanneg.
plur They did keep thee,
koowadchanukuppanneg.
They did keep him,
owadchananopoh.
They did keep us, [neg.
koowadchanukunouppan-
They did keep you,
koowadchanukooopaneg.
They did keep them,
owadchanooopoh nah.

They did pay me,
Nuppaumukuppanneg.
3 They did pay thee,
plur kuppaumukuppanneg.
They did pay him,
uppaumauopoh.
They did pay us, [neg.
nuppaumukunnouppan-
They did pay you,
kuppaumukooopaneg,
They did pay them,
uppaumooopoh nah.

The Imperative Mode of the Suffix form animate
Affirmative.

Note, That this Mode of the Verb doth cast off the Affix, or prefix-
ed Pronoun, using onely the suffixed Grammaticall variations.

	Present tense.		Present tense.
	Let me keep thee, Wanchanunutti.		Let me pay thee, Pamunutti.
1	Let me keep him,	1	Let me pay him,
sing.	wadchanonti.	sing.	paumonti.
	Let me keep you, wadchanunonkqutch.		Let me pay you, paununonkqutch.
	Let me keep them, wadchanonti nagoh.		Let me pay them, paumonti
	Do thou keep me, Wadchaneh.		Do thou pay me, Paumeh.
2	Do thou keep him,	2	Do thou pay him,
sing.	wadchan.	sing.	paum
	Do thou keep us, wadchaninnean.		Do thou pay us pauminnean.
	Do thou keep them, wadchan nag.		Do thou pay them, paum.
	Let him keep me, Wadchanitch.		Let him pay me, Paumitch.
3	Let him keep thee,	3	Let him pay thee,
sing.	wadchanukqush.	sing.	paumukqush.
	Let him keep him, wadchanonch.		Let him pay him, paumonch.
	Let him keep us, wadchanukqutteuh.		Let him pay us, paumukqutteuh.
	Let him keep you, wadchanukcook.		Let him pay you, paumukrok.
	Let him keep them, wanchanonch.		Let him pay them, paumonch.

Imperative Mode.

Present tense.		Present tense.	
	Let us keep thee, Wadchanunuttuh.		Let us pay thee, Pamunutti.
1	Let us keep him,	1	Let me pay him,
plur.	wadchanontuh.	plur.	paumontuh.
	Let us keep you, wadchanunuttuh.		Let us pay you, pamunuttuh.
	Let us keep them, wadcbanontuh.		Let us pay them, paumontuh.
	Do ye keep me, Wadchanegk.		Do ye pay me, Paumegk.
2	Do ye keep him,	2	Do ye pay him,
plur.	Wadchanók.	plur.	paumók.
	Do ye keep us, wadchaninnean.		Do ye pay us, pauminnean.
	Let us keep them, wadchanók.		Do ye pay them, paumók
	Let them keep me, Wadchanukqutteu or wad- chanhettich.		Let them pay me, Paumukqutteu, or Paumé- hettich.
3	Let them keep thee,	3	Let them pay thee,
plur.	wadchanukqush.	plur.	paumukqush.
	Let them keep him, wadchanáhettich.		Let them pay him, paumáhettich.
	Let them keep us, wadchanukqutteuh.		Let them pay us, paumukqutteuh.
	Let them keep you, wadchanukook.		Let them pay you, paumukook.
	Let them keep them, wadchanáhettich.		Let them pay them, paumáhettich.

The Optative Mode of the Suffix form animate Affirmative.

This Adverb- (toh) or (napehnont) properly signifleth (utinam) I wish it were. ind see how naturally they annex it unto every variation of this Mode of the Verb. Note also, That this Mode keepeth the Affix, or prefixed Pronoun.

	Present tense. I wish I keep thee, Koowaadchanunan-toh, or napehnont.		Present tense. I wish I pay thee, Kuppapaumunun-toh.
1 sing.	I wish I keep him, Noonwaadchanun-toh. I wish I keep you, Koowaadchanununeau-toh. I wish I keep them, Noowaadchanóneau-toh.	1 sing.	I wish I pay him, nuppapaumon-toh I wish I pay you, kuppapaumuneau-toh. I wish I pay them, nuppapaumóneau-toh.
2 sing.	I wish thou keep me, Koowaadchanin-toh. I wish thou keep him, koowaadchanon-toh. I wish thou keep us, koowaadchaninneau-toh. I wish thou keep them, koowaadchanoneauh-toh.	2 sing.	I wish thou pay me, kuppapaumin-toh. I wish thou pay him kuppapaurnon-toh. I wish thou pay us, kuppapaurnuneau-toh. I wish thou pay them, kuppapaumóneau-toh.
3 sing.	I wish he keep me, Noowaadchanukqun-toh, I wish he keep thee, koowaadchanukqun-toh. I wish he keep him, oowaadchanon-toh. I wish he keep us, koowaadchanukqunan-toh. I wish he keep you, koowaadchanukquneau-toh. I wish he keep them, oowaadchanon-toh.	3 sing.	I wish he pay me, Nuppapaumukqun-toh. I wish he pay thee, kuppapaumukqun-toh. I wish he pay him, uppapaumon-toh. I wish he pay us, kuppapaumukqunan-toh. I wish he pay you, kuppapaumukquneau-toh, I wish he pay them, uppapaumon-toh,

Optative Mode.

	Present tense.		Present tense.
	I wish we keep thee, Koowaadchanunan-toh.		I wish we pay thee, Kuppapaumunan-toh
1	I wish we keep him,	1	I wish we pay him,
plur.	noowaadchanonan-toh.	plur.	nuppapaumónan-toh.
	I wish we keep you, koowaadchanunnan-toh.		I wish we pay youó kuppapaumunan-toh
	I wish we keep them; noowaadchanonan-toh.		I wish we pay them, nuppapaumonnan-toh
	I wish ye keep me, Koowaadchanuneau-toh.		I wish ye pay me, Kuppapaumuneau-toh
2	I wish ye keep him,	2	I wish ye pay him,
plur.	koowaadchanóneau-toh.	plur.	kuppapaumóneau-toh.
	I wish ye keep us, koowaadchanuneeau-toh.		I wish ye pay us, kuppapaumuneeau-toh.
	I wish ye keep them, koowaadchanóneau-toh.		I wish ye pay them, kuppapaumóneau-toh.
	I wish they keep me, Noowaadchanukquneau-toh		I wish they pay me, Nuppapaumukquneau-toh.
3	I wish they keep thee,	3	I wish they pay thee,
plur.	koowaadchanukquneau-toh.	plur.	kuppapaumukquneau-toh.
	I wish they keep him, oowaadchanóneau-toh.		I wish they pay him, uppapaumóneau-toh.
	I wish they keep us, noowaadchanukqunan-toh.		I wish they pay us, nuppapaumukqunan-toh.
	I wish they keep you, koowaadchanukquneau-toh.		I wish they pay you, kuppapaumukquneau-toh.
	I wish they keep them, oowaadchanóneau-toh.		I wish they pay them, uppapaumóneau-toh.

Optative Mode.

Praeter tense.

I wish I did keep thee,
Koowaadchanununaz-toh.
1 I wish I did keep him,
sing. noowaadchanónaz-toh.
I wish I did keep you,
koowaadchanununnaouz-
toh.
I wish I did keep them,
noowaadchanónaóoz-toh.

I wish thou didst keep me,
Koowaadchaninneaz-toh.
2 I wish thou didst keep him,
sing. koowaadchanónaz-toh.
I wish thou didst keep us,
koowaadchanuneeanonuz-
toh.
I wish thou didst keep them
koowaadchanónaouz-toh.

I wish he did keep me,
Noowaadchanukqunaz-toh.
3 I wish he did keep thee,
sing. koowaadchanukqunaz-toh.
I wish he did keep him.
oowaadchanónaz-toh.
I wish he did keep us,
noowaadchanukqunanonuz-
toh.
I wish he did keep you,
koowaadchanukqunnaouz-
toh.
I wish he did keep them,
oowaadchanonaouz-toh.

Praeter tense.

I wish I did pay thee,
Kuppapaumununaz-toh
1 I wish I did pay him,
sing. nuppapaumónaz-toh.
I wish I did pay you,
kuppapaumununnaouz-toh.
I wish I did pay them,
nuppapaumonaouz-toh.

I wish thou didst pay me,
Kuppapaumineaz-toh.
2 I wish thou didst pay him,
sing. kuppapaumonaz-toh
I wish thou didst pay us,
kuppapaumuneeanonuz-toh
I wish thou didst pay them,
kuppapaumónaouz-toh.

I wish he did pay me,
Nuppap aumukqunaz-toh.
3 I wish he did pay thee,
sing. kuppapaumukqunaz-toh.
I wish he did pay him,
uppapaumónaz-toh.
I wish he did pay us,
nuppapaumukqunanonuz-
toh.
I wish he did pay you,
kuppapauamkqunaouz-toh.
I wish he did pay them,
uppapaumonaouz-toh.

[p. 37.]

Optative Mode.

	Praeter tense.		Praeter tense.
	I wish we did keep thee,		I wish we did pay thee,
1	Koowaadchananonuz-	1	Kuppapaumunanonuz-toh.
plur	toh.	plur	
	I wish we did keep him,		I wish we did pay him,
	noowaadchanònanonuz-toh.		nuppapaumónanonuz-toh.
	I wish we did keep you,		I wish we did pay you
	koowaadchanunanònaz-toh.		kuppapaumunanonuz-toh.
	I wish we did keep them,		I wish we did pay them,
	noowaadchananonuz-toh.		nuppapaumonanonuz-toh,
	I wish ye did keep me,		I wish ye did pay me,
	Koowaadchanineaouz-toh.		Kuppapaumineaouz-toh.
2	I wish ye did keep him,	2	I wish ye did pay him,
plur	koowaadchaninneanonuz-	plur	kuppapaumineanonuz-toh.
	toh.		
	I wish ye did keep them,		I wish ye did pay them,
	koowaadchanónaouz-toh.		kuppapaumonaouz-toh.
	I wish they did keep me,		I wish they did pay me,
	Noowaadchanukqunaóuz-		Nuppapaumukqunaouz-toh
	toh,		
3	I wish they did keep thee,	3	I wish they did pay thee,
plur.	koowaadchanukqunaóuz-	plur	kuppapaumukqunaóuz-toh.
	toh.		
	I wish they did keep him,		I wish they did pay him,
	oowaadchanónaóuz-toh.		uppapaumónaòuz-toh.
	I wish they did keep us,		I wish they did pay us,
	noowaadchanukqunnanouz-		nuppapaumukqunanonuz-
	toh.		toh.
	I wish they did keep you,		I wish they did pay you,
	koowaadchanukqunaouz-		kuppapaumukqunaouz-toh.
	toh.		
	I wish they did keep them,		I wish they did pay them,
	oomwadchanónaouz-toh.		uppapaumónaouz-toh.

The Suppositive Mode of the Suffix form animate
Affirmative.

Note, That this Mode also doth cast off the Affix, or prefixed Pronoun,

Present tense.		Present tense.	
1	If I keep thee, Wadchanunon.	1	If I pay thee, Pamunon.
sing.	If I keep him, wadchanog.	sing.	If I pay him, paumog.
	If I keep you, wadchanunóg.		If I pay you, pamunóg
	If I keep them, wadchaog.		If I pay them, paumog.
2	If thou keep me, Wadchanean.	2	If thou pay me, Paumean.
sing.	If thou keep him, wadchanadt.	sing.	If thou pay him, paumadt.
	If thou keep us, wadchaneog.		If thou pay us, paumeog.
	If thou keep them, wadchanadt.		If thou pay them, paumadt.
3	If he keep me, Wadchanit.	3	If he pay me, Paumit.
sing.	If he keep thee, wadchanukquean.	sing.	If he pay thee, paumukquean.
	If he keep him, wadchanont.		If he pay him, paumont.
	If he keep us, wadchanukqueog.		If he pay us, paumukqueog.
	If he keep you, wadchanukqueóg.		If he pay you, paumukqueóg
	If he keep them, wadchanáhettit, or ont.		If he pay them, paumáhettit.

Suppositive Mode.

Note, Where the singular and plural are alike, they are distinguished by Noh or Neen in the singular, and Nag or Nenawun in the plural.

	Present tense.		Present tense.
	If we keep thee,		If we pay thee,
1	Wadchanunog.	1	Paumunog.
plur.	If we keep him,	plur.	If we pay him,
	wadchanogkut.		paumogkut.
	If we keep you,		If we pay you,
	wadchanunog.		paumunog.
	If we keep them,		If we pay them
	wadchanogkut.		paumogkut
	If ye keep me,		If ye pay me,
2	Wadchaneóg.	2	Paumeóg.
plur.	If ye keep him,	plur.	If ye pay him,
	wadchanóg.		paumóg.
	If ye keep us,		If ye pay us,
	wadchaneog.		paumeóg.
	If ye keep them,		If ye pay them,
	wadchanóg.		paumóg.
	If they keep me,		If they pay me,
3	Wadchanhettit.	3	Paumhettit,
plur.	If they keep thee,	plur.	If they pay thee,
	wadchanukquean.		paumukquean.
	If they keep him,		If they pay him,
	wadchanukáhettit.		paumáhettit.
	If they keep us,		If they pay us,
	wadchanukqueog.		paumukqueog.
	If they keep you,		If they pay you,
	wadchanukqueòg.		paumukqueòg.
	If they keep them,		If they pay them,
	wadchanáhettit.		paumáhettit.

Suppositive Mode.

Praeter tense.

1
sing. If I did keep thee,
Wadchanunos,
If I did keep him,
waadchanogkus.
If I did keep you,
wadchanunógkus.
If I did keep them,
wadchanogkus.

2
sing. If thou didst keep me,
Wadchaneas.
If thou didst keep him,
wadchanas.
If thou didst keep us,
wadchaneogkus.
If thou didst keep them,
wadchanas.

3
sing. If he did keep me,
Wadchanis
If he did keep thee,
wadchanukqueas.
If he did keep him,
wadchanós,
If he did keep us,
wadchanunkqueogkuys
If he did keep you,
wadchanukqueógkus.
If he did keep them,
Wadchanos.

Praeter tense.

1
sing. If I did pay thee,
Paumunos.
If I did pay him,
paumogkus.
If I did pay you,
paumunógkus.
If I did pay them,
paumogkus.

2
sing. If thou didst pay me,
Paumeas.
If thou didst pay him,
paumas.
If thou didst pay us,
paumeogkus.
If thou didst pay them,
paumas.

3
sing. If he did pay me,
Paumis.
If he did pay thee,
paumukqueas.
If he did pay him,
paumos.
If he did pat us,
paumukqueogkus.
If he did pay you,
paumukqueógkus.
If he did pay them,
paumos.

Suppositive Mode.

Praeter tense.

1 If we did keep thee,
wadchanunogkus.
plur. If we did keep him,
wadchanogkutus
If we did hep you,
wadchanunogkus.
If we did keep them,
wadchanogkutus.

2 If ye did keep me,
Wadchaneógkus.
plur. If ye did keep him,
wadchanógkus.
If ye did keep us,
wadchaneogkus.
If ye did keep them,
wadchanógkus;

3 If they did keep me,
wadchanhettis.
plur. If they did keep thee,
wadchanukqueas.
If they did keep him,
wadchanahettis.
If they did keep us,
wadchanukqueógkus.
If they did keep you,
wadchanukqueógkus.
If they did keep them,
wadchanahettis.

Praeter tense.

1 If we did pay thee,
Paemunogkus.
plur. If we did pay him,
paemunogkutus.
If we did pay you,
paemunogkus.
If we did pay them,
paumogkutus

2 If ye did pay me,
Paumeogkus.
plur. If ye did pay him,
paumogkus.
If ye did pay us,
paumeogkus.
If ye did pay them
paumógkus.

3 If they did pay me,
Paumehettis.
plur. If they did pay thee,
paumukqueas.
If they did pay him,
paumahettis.
If they did pay us,
paumukqueógkus.
If they did pay you,
paumukqueógkus.
If they did' pay them,
paumahettis.

The Indefinite Mode.

Present tense.	Present tense.
To keep,	To pay,
Wadchanónat.	Paummuonat.

The third Person of the Suffix form Animate is capable to be expressed in the Indefinite Mode.

Note also, That this mode followeth the Indicative and keepeth the Affix.

As for Example.

To keep me, Noowadchanukqunat. To keep thee, koowadchanukqunat. kuppaumukqunat.	To pay me Nuppaumunkqunat. To pay thee, To pay him, uppaumonat
---	--

To keep us,

To pay us,

noowadchamukqunnonut	nuppaumukqunnonut.
To keep you, koowadchanukqunnaout.	To pay you, kuppaumukqunnaout.
To keep them, cowadchanonaout,	To pay them, uppaumonaout.

So much for the Suffix form Animate Affirmative.

(A blank page follows, in the original, between this page and 44. En.]

The Suffix: form Animate Negative.

Indicative Mode.

Present tense.		Present tense.	
1	I keep not thee, Koowadchanunroh.	1	I pay not thee, Kuppaumuncooh.
sing.	I keep not him, noowadchanòh.	sing.	I pay not him, nuppaumòh
	I keep not you, koowadchanoog.		I pay not you, kuppaumuncoomwoo.
	I keep not them, Mat noowadchanoog.		I pay not them, Mat nuppaumoog.
2	Thou keep not me, Koowadchaneúh.	2	Thou pay not me, Kuppaumeuh
sing.	Thou keep not him, koowadchanoh.	sing.	Thou pay not him, kuppaumòh.
	Thou keep not us, koowadchaneumun.		Thou pay not us, kuppaumeumun.
	Thou keep not them, Mat koowadchanoog.		Thou pay not them, Mat kuppaumeumoog.
3	He keep not me, Noowadchanukcooh,	3	He pay not me, Nuppaumukcooh.
sing.	He keep not thee, koowadchanukcooh,	sing.	He pay not thee, Kuppaumukcooh.
	He keep not him, Mat oowadchanuh.		He pay not him, Mat uppaumoh
	He keep not us, noowadchanukcoun.		He pay not us, nuppaumukcoun.
	He keep not you, Mat koowadchanukcoo.		He pay not you, Mat kuppaumukcooh.
	He keep not them, Mat oowadchanuh.		He pay not them, Mat uppaumuh.

Indicative Mode.

Present tense.

1 We keep not thee,
Koowadchanuncomun.
plur. We keep not him,
mat noowadchanoun.
We keep not you,
koowadchanuncomun.
We keep not them,
mat noowadchanounonog.

2 Ye keep not me,
Koowadchaneumwoo.
plur. Ye keep not him,
mat koowadchanau.
Ye keep not us,
koowadchaneumun.
Ye keep not them,
mat koowadchanoog.

3 They keep not me,
Noowadchanukooog.
plur. They keep not thee,
koowadchanukooog.
They keep not him,
mat cowadchanouh.
They keep not us,
noowadchanukounonog.
They keep not you,
koowadchanukroooog.
They keep not them,
mat cowadchanouh.

Present tense.

1 We pay not thee,
Kuppaumuncomun.
plur. We pay not him,
mat nuppanumoun.
We pay not you,
kuppaumuncomun,
We pay not them,
mat nuppaumounonog.

2 Ye pay not me,
Kuppaumeumwoo.
plur. Ye pay not him,
mat kuppaumau.
Ye pay not us,
kuppaumeumun.
Ye pay not them,
mat kuppaumoog.

3 They pay not me,
Nuppaumukooog.
plur. They pay not thee,
kuppaumukooog.
They pay not him,
mat uppaumouh.
They pay not us,
nuppaumukounonog.
They pay not you,
kuppaumukroooog.
They pay not them,
mat uppaumouh.

Indicative Mode.

Praeter tense.

Praeter tense.

1 I did not keep thee,
sing. Koowadchanuncoop.
I did not keep him,
mat noowadchanóhp.
I did not keep you,
koowadchanuncomwop.
I did not keep them,
mat noowadchanopanneg,

1 I did not pay thee,
sing. Kuppamuncoop.
I did not pa him,
mat nuppaumóp
I did not pay you,
kuppamuncomwop
I did not pay them,
mat nuppaumopanneg,

2 Thou didst not keep me,
sing. Koowadchaneup.
Thou didst not keep him,
mat koowadchanóp.
Thou didst not keep us,
koowadchaneumunonup.
Thou didst not keep them,
mat krowadchanopanneg.

2 Thou didst not pay me,
sing. Kuppameup.
thou didst not pay him,
mat kuppamop,
Thou didst not pay us,
Kuppameumunonup.
Thou didst not pay them,
Lma,t kuppamopanneg.

3 He did not keep me,
sing. Noowadchanukcoop.
He did not keep thee,
koowadchanukcoop.
He did not keep him,
mat cowadchanòpoh.
He did not keep us,
noowadchanukcounonup,
He did not keep you,
koowadchanukcoop.
He did not keep them,
mat cowadchanopoh.

3 He did not pay me,
sing. Nuppaumukcoop
he did not pay thee,
kuppamukcoop.
He did not pay him,
Mat paumópoh.
He did not pay us,
nuppaumukcounonup
He did not pay you,
kuppamukcoop,
He did not pay them,
mat uppaumopoh,

Indicative Mode.

Praeter tense.

1 We did not keep thee,
 plur. koowadchaninoomunonup,
 We did not keep him,
 mat noowadchanounonup
 We did not keep you,
 koowadchanincomunonup,
 We did not keep them,
 mat noowadchanounonup-
 panneg.

2 Ye did not keep me,
 plur. Koowadchaneumwop.
 Ye did not keep him,
 mat koowadchancoop.
 Ye did not keep us,
 koowadchaneumunonup.
 Ye did not keep them,
 mat koowadchanoopanneg.

3 They did not keep me,
 plur. Noowadchanukoopanneg.
 They did not keep thee,
 koowadchanukoopanneg.
 They did not keep him,
 mat cowadchancoopoh.
 They did not keep us,
 noowadchanukoounonup-
 panneg.
 They did not keep you,
 koowadchanukoopanneg,
 They did not keep them,
 mat cowadchancoopoh.

Praeter tense.

1 We did not pay you,
 plur. kuppaumunoomunonup.
 We did not pay him,
 mat nuppaumounonup.
 We did not pay you
 kuppaumuncmunonup.
 We did not pay them,
 mat nuppaumounonup-
 paneg.

2 Ye did not pay me,
 plur. Kuppaumeumwop
 Ye did not pay him,
 mat kuppaumcoop.
 Ye did not pay us,
 kuppaumeumunonup.
 Ye did not pay them,
 mat kuppaumcoopanneg.

3 They did not pay me,
 plur. Nuppaumukoopanneg.
 They did not pay thee,
 kuppaumukoopanneg.
 They did not pay him,
 mat uppaumcoopuh.
 They did not pay us,
 nuppaumukoounonuppan-
 neg.
 They did not pay you,
 kuppaumukoopanneg.
 They did not pay them,
 mat uppaumcoopoh.

The Suffix form animate Negative.

Imperative Mode.

	Present tense.		Present tense.
	Let me not keep thee,		Let me not pay thee,
1	Wadchanuncoutti	1	Paemunutti.
sing.	Let me not keep him,	sing,	Let me not pay him,
	wadchanoonti.		paumoonti.
	Let me not keep you,		Let me not pay you,
	wadchanunonkutti.		paumunooutti.
	Let me not keep them,		Let me not pay them,
	wadchanoonti.		paumoonti.
	Do thou not keep me,		Do thou not pay me,
2	Wadchanohkon.	2	Paumehkon.
sing.	Do thou not keep him,	sing.	Do thou not pay him,
	wadchanuhkon.		paumuhkon.
	Do thou not keep us,		Do thou not pay us,
	wadchaneittuh.		paumeittuh.
	Do thou not keep them,		Do thou not pay them,
	wadchanuhkon.		paumóhkon.
	Let not him keep me,		Let not him pay me,
3	Wadchanehkitch.	3	Paumehkitch.
sing.	Let not him keep thee,	sing.	Let not him pay thee,
	wadchanukoohkón.		paumukoohkón.
	Let not him keep him,		Let not him pay him,
	wadchanuhkitch.		paumuhkitch.
	Let not him keep us,		Let not him pay us,
	wadchanukóuttuh.		paumukóuttuh.
	Let not him keep you,		Let not him pay you,
	wadchanukoohteók.		pailmukoohteók
	Let not him keep them,		Let not him pity them,
	wadchanuhkitth.		paumuhkitch,

Imperative Mode.

Present tense.

1 Let not us keep thee,
Wadchanunmuttuh.

plur. Let not us keep him,
wadchanóontuh.

Let not us keep you,
wadchanunmuttuh.

Let not us keep them,
wadchanoontuh.

2 Do not ye keep me,
Wadchanehteók.

plur. Do not ye keep him,
wadchanuhteók.

Do not ye keep us,
wadchanéinnean.

Do not ye keep them,
wadchanuhteók.

3 Let not them keep me,
Wadchanehettekitch.

plur. Let not them keep thee,
wadchanukóohkon.

Let not them keep him,
wadchanahettekitch.

Let not them keep us,
wadchanukóuttuh.

Let not them keep you,
wadchanukóhteok.

Let not them keep them,
Wadchanahettekithch.

Present tense.

1 Let not us pay thee,
Paumuncóuttuh.

plur. Let not us pay him,
paumcontuh.

Let not us pay you,
paumuncóuttuh.

Let not us pay them,
paumoontuh.

2 Do not ye pay me,
Paumehteok.

plur. Do not ye pay him,
paumuhteok.

Do not ye pay us,
pauméinnean

Do not ye pay them,
paumuhteok.

3 Let not them pay me,
Paumehettekitch.

plur. Let not them pay thee,
paumukóohkon.

Let not them pay him,
paumahettekitch.

Let not them pay us,
paumukóuttuh.

Let not them pay you
paumukóhteok

Let not them pay them,
paumahettekitch.

The Suffix form Animate Negative.

Optative Mode.

Present tense.

Present tense.

1 sing.	I wish I keep not thee, Kooaadchanuncoun-toh, I wish I keep not him, noowaadchanoun-toh. I wish I keep not you, kooaadchanuncouneau-toh I wish I keep not them, noowaadchanouneau-toh.	1 sing.	I wish I do not pay thee, Kuppapaumuncoun-toh. I wish I do not pay him, nuppapaumoon-toh. I wish I do not pay you, nuppapaumounwuneau-toh. I wish I do not pay them, nuppapaumouneau-toh.
2 sing.	I wish thou donot keep me, Kooaadchanein-toh. I wish thou do not keep him kooaadchanoon-toh. I wish thou do not keep us, kooaadchanein-toh. I wish thou do not keep them kooaadchanouneau-toh.	2 sing.	I wish thou do not pay me, Kuppapauméin-toh. I wish thou do not pay him, Kuppapaumoon-toh. I wish thou do not pay us, Kuppapauméinan-toh. I wish thou do not pay them, kuppapaumouneau-toh.
3 sing.	I wish he do not keep me Noowaadchanukwun-toh. I wish he do not keep thee, kooaadchanukcoun-toh. I wish he do not keep him, cowaadchanoon-toh. I wish he do not keep us, noowaadchanukcounan-toh. I wish he do not keep you, kooaadchanukcouneau-toh I wish he do not keep them, cowaadchanoon-toh.	3 sing.	I wish he do not pay me, Nuppapaumukcoun-toh. I wish he do not pay thee, kuppapaumukcoun-toh. I wish he do not pay him, uppapaumoun-toh. I wish he do not pay us, nuppapaumukcounan-toh. I wish he do not pay you, kuppapaumukcouneau-toh. I wish he do not pay them, uppapaumouneau-toh.

Optative Mode.

Present tense.

- 1 I wish we do not keep thee,
Kooaadchanunmunan-toh.
plur. I wish we do not keep him,
noowaadchanounan-toh.
I wish we do not keep you,
kooaadchanounan-toh.
I wish we do not keep them
noowaadchanounan-toh.
- 2 I wish ye do not keep me,
Kooaadchaneinneau-toh.
plur. I wish ye do not keep him,
kooaadchanouneau-toh.
I wish ye do not keep us,
kooaadchanéinnean-toh.
I wish ye do not keep them,
kooaadchanouueau-toh.
- 3 I wish they do not keep me,
Noowaadchanukouneau-toh.
plur. I wish they do not keep thee,
kooaadchanukouneau-toh
I wish they do not keep him,
ouwaadchanouneau-toh.
I wish they do not keep us,
noowaadchanukounan-toh.
I wish they do not keep you,
kooaadchaoukouoeau-toh
I wish they do not keep them,
ouwaadchanouneau-toh.

Present tense,

- 1 I wish we do not pay thee,
Kuppapaumuncoon-toh.
plur. I wish we do not pay him,
nuppapaumoon-toh.
I wish we do not pay you,
kuppapaumuncounan-toh.
I wish we do not pay them,
nuppapaumounan-toh.
- 2 I wish ye do not pay me,
Kuppapauméineau-toh.
plur. I wish ye do not pay him
kuppapaumooneau-toh.
I wish ye do not pay us,
kuppapauméinan-toh.
I wish ye do not pay them,
kuppapaumooneau-toh.
- 3 I wish they do not pay me,
Nuppapaumukmuneau-toh.
plur. I wish they do not pay thee,
kuppapaumukouneau-toh.
I wish they do not pay him,
uppapaumouoeau-toh,
I wish they do not pay us,
nuppapaumukounan-toh.
I wish they do not pay you,
kuppapaumukouneau-toh.
I wish they do not pay them,
uppapaumouneau-toh,

Optative Mode.

Praeter tense.

1 I wish I did not keep thee,
sing. Koowaadchanuncounaz-toh.
I wish I did not keep him,
noowaadchanounaz-toh.
I wish I did not keep you,
koowaadchanunounaouz-
toh.
I wish I did not keep them,
noowaadchanounaouz-toh.

2 I wish thou didst not keep me,
sing. Koowaadchaneinaz-toh.
I wish thou didst keep him,
koowaadchanounaz-toh.
I wish thou didst not keep us,
koowaadchaneinanonaz-toh
I wish thou didst not keep them,
koowaadchanounnaouz-toh.

3 I wish he did not keep me,
sing. Noowaadchanukcounuz-toh.
I wish he did not keep thee,
koowaadchanukcounaz-toh.
I wish he did not keep him,
cowaadchanounaz-toh.
I wish he did not keep us,
noowaadchanukrounanon-
uz-toh.
I wish he did not keep you,
koowaadchanukcounaouz- toh.
I wish he did not keep them,
cowaadchanounaouz-toh.

Praeter tense.

1 I wish I did not pay thee,
sing. Kuppapaumuncounaz-toh.
I wish I did not pay him,
nuppapaumounaz-toh.
I wish I did not pay you,
kuppapaumuncounaouz-toh
I wish I did not pay them,
nuppapaumounaouz-toh.

2 I wish thou didst not pay me,
sing. Kuppapaurnéinaz-toh.
I wish thou didst not pay him,
kuppapaumounaz-toh.
I wish thou didst not pay us,
kuppapauméinanonuz-toh.
I wish thou didst not pay them,
kuppapaumounaouz-toh.

3 I wish he' did not pay me,
sing. Nuppapaumukcounaz-toh.
I wish he did not pay thee,
kuppapaumukcounaz-toh.
I wish he did not pay him,
uppapaumounaz-toh.
I wish he did not pay us,
nuppapaurnukcounaouz-
toh.
I wish he did not pay you,
kuppapaumukcounaouz-toh
I wish he did not pay them,
uppapaumounaz-toh.

Optative Mode.
Praeter tense.

1 I wish we did not keep thee,
Kooaadchanunrouuanon-
plur. uz-toh.

I wish we did not keep him,
noowaadchanounanouz-toh.

I wish we did not keep you,
koowaadchanrounaouz-
toh.

I wish we did not keep them,
noowaadchanrounaòuz-toh.

2 I wish ye did not keep me,
Kooaadchanéinaòuz-toh.

plur. I wish ye did not keep him,
koowaadchanónuaouz-toh.

I wish ye did not keep us,
koowaadchanounaouz-toh.

I wish ye did not keep them,

3 I wish they did not keep me,
Noowaadchanukrounaz-toh.

plur. I wish they did not keep thee,
koowaadchanukòounaz-toh.

I wish they did not keep him,
oomwaadchanounaooaz-toh.

I wish they did not keep us,
noowaadchanukòounanon-
az-toh.

I wish they did not keep you,
koowaadchanukòounaouz- toh.

I wish they did not keep them,
oorowaadchanounaooaz-toh.

Praeter tense.

1 I wish we did not pay thee,
Kuppapaumuncounanonuz-
plur. toh.

I wish we did not pay him,
nuppapaumounanonuz-toh.

I wish we did not pay you,
kupapaumuncounaooaz-toh

I wish we did not pay them,
nuppapaumòunaòaz-toh.

2 I wish ye did not pay me,
Kupapauméinaooaz-toh.

plur. I wish ye did not pay him,
kuppapaumoonaoaz-toh.

I wish ye did not pay us,
kuppapaumoonaoaz-toh.

I wish ye did not pay them,

3 I wish they did not pay me,
Nuppapaumukòounaooz-toh.

plur. I wish they did not pay
kuppapaumukòounaooz-toh

I wish they did not pay him
uppapaumoon az-toh.

I wish they did not pay us,
nuppapaumukòonnuanonaz-
toh.

I wish they did not pay you,
kuppapaumukòounaooaz-toh

I wish they did not pay them,
uppapaumounaooaz-toh.

The Suffix form Animate Negative.

Suppositive Mode.

Present tense.

1
sing. If 1 keep not thee,
Wadchanuncoon.
If I keep not him,
wadchanoog.
If I keep not you;
wadchanuncoog.
If 1 keep not them,
wadchanoog.

2
sing. If thou keep not me,
wadchaneean.
If thou keep not him,
wadchanoadt.
If thou keep not us,
wadchaneeg.
If thou keep not them,
wadchanoadt.

3
sing. If he keep not me,
Wadchaneegk.
If he keep not thee,
wadchanukooan.
If he keep not him,
wadchanunk.
If he keep not us,
wadchanukooog.
If he keep not you,
wadchanukooog.
If he keep not them,
wadchanunk.

Present tense.

1
sing. If 1 pay not thee,
Paumuncoon
If I pay not him,
Paumoog
If I pay not you,
Paumununcoog.
If I pay not them,
Paumoog.

2
sing. If thou pay not me,
Paumeean.
If thou pay not him,
Paumoadt.
If thou pay not us,
Paumeeog.
If thou pay not them,
Paumoadt.

3
sing. If he pay not me,
Paumeegk.
If he pay not thee,
paumukooan.
If he pay not him,
paumunk.
If he pay not us,
paumukooog,
If he pay not you,
paumukooog.
If he pay not them,
paumunk,

Suppositive Mode.

Present tense.

1 If we keep not thee,
Wadchanuncoog.
plur. If we keep not him,
wadchanoogkut.
If we keep not you,
wadchananuncoog.
If we keep not them,
wadchanoogkut.

2 If ye keep not me,
Wadchaneeg,
sing. If ye keep not him,
wadchanoog.
If ye keep not us,
wadchaneeg.
If ye keep not them,
wadchanoog.

3 If they keep not me,
Wadchanehetteg.
plur. If they keep not thee,
wadchanukooan.
If they keep not him,
wadchanahetteg.
If they keep not us,
wadchanukoomog.
If they keep not you,
wadchanukooog.
If they keep not them,
wadchanahetteg.

Present tense.

1 If we pay not thee,
Paumuncoog.
plur. If we pay not him,
paumoogkut.
If we pay not you,
paumuncoog.
If we pay not them,
paumoogkut.

2. If ye pay not me,
Paumeeog.
plur. If ye pay not him,
paumuncoog,
If ye pay not us,
paumeeog.
If ye pay not them,
paumodog.

3 If they pay not me,
Paumchetteg.
plur. If they pay not thee,
paumukooan,
If they pay not him,
paumahetteg.
If they pay not us,
paumukooog.
If they pay not you,
paumukooog,
If they pay not them,
paumahetteg.

Suppositive Mode.

Praeter tense.

1 If I did not keep thee,
sing. Wadchanuncoos.
If I did not keep him,
wadchanoogkus.
If I did not keep you,
wadchanuncoógkus.
If I did not keep them,
wadchanoogkus.

2 If thou didst not keep me,
sing. Wadchaneelas.
If thou didst not keep him,
wadchanukcoas.
If thou didst not keep us,
wadchaneelogkus.
If thou didst not keep them,
wadchanoógkus.

3 If he did not keep me,
sing. Wadchaneekus.
If he did not keep thee,
wadchanukcoas.
If he did not keep him,
wadchanunkus.
If he did not keep us,
wadchanukcoógkus.
If he did not keep you,
wadchanukogkus.
If he did not keep them,
wadchanunkus.

Praeter tense.

1 If I did not pay thee,
sing. Paumuncoos
If I did not pay him,
paumoogkus.
If I did not pay you,
paumuncoógkus.
If I did not pay them,
paumoogkus.

2 If thou didst not pay me,
sing. Paumeelas.
If thou didst not pay him,
paumoas.
If thou didst not pay us,
paumeelogkus.
If thou didst not pay them,
pauinoógkus.

3 If he did not pay me,
sing. Paumeekus
If he did not pay thee,
paumukcoas.
If he did not pay him,
paumunkus.
If he did not pay us,
paumukcoógkus.
If he did not pay you,
paumukcoógkus.
If he did not pay them,
paumunkus.

Suppositive Mode.

Praeter tense.

Praeter tense,

1 If we did not keep thee,
Wadchanuncoogkus.
plur. If we did not keep him,
wadchanoogkutus.
If we did not keep you,
wadchanuncoógkus.
If we did not keep them,
wadchanoogkutus.

1 If we did not pay thee,
Paumuncoogkus.
plur. If we did not pay him,
paumoogkutus.
If we did not pay you,
paumuncoógkus.
If we did not pay them,
paumoogkutus.

2 If ye did not keep me,
Wadchaneéogkus.
plur. If ye did not keep him,
wadchanoógkus.
If ye did not keep us,
wadchaneéogkus.
If ye did not keep them,
wadchanoógkus.

2 If ye did not pay me,
Paumeeógkus.
plur. If ye did not pay him,
paumoógkus.
If ye did not pay us,
paumeeogkus.
If ye did not pay them,
paumoógkus.

3 If they did not keep me,
Wadchanehettegkis.
plur. If they did not keep thee,
wadchanukmas.
If they did not keep him,
wadchanunkus.
If they did not keep us,
wadchanukmogkus.
If they did not keep you,
wadchanukcoógkus.
If they did not keep them,
wadchanahettegkis.

3 If they did not pay me,
Paumehettegkis.
plur. If they did not pay thee,
paumukcoas.
If they did not pay him,
paumunkus.
If they did not pay us,
paumukcoogkus.
If they did not pay you,
paumukcoògkus.
If they did not pay them,
paumahettegkis.

The Indefinite Mode.

Present tense.

Present tense.

Not to keep,
Wadchanounat.

Not to pay,
Paummuounat.

The third Person of the Suffix form Animate Negative
is found expressible in this Mode Indefinite: As

3	Not to keep me, Noowadchanukcounat.	3	Not to pay me, Nuppaumunkcounat.
3 sing.	Not to keep thee, koowadchanukcounat.	3 sing.	Not to pay thee, kuppaumukcounat.
	Not to keep him, cowadchanounat.		Not to pay him, uppaumounat.
	Not to keep us, noowadchanukcounnanonut.		Not to pay us, nuppaumukcounnanonut.
	Not to keep you, koowadchanukcounnaout.		Not to pay you, kuppaumukcounnaout.
	Not to keep them, oorowadchanounat.		Not to pay them, uppaumounnaout.

So much for the Suffix form Animate Negative.

The Suffix form Animate Causative is not universally applicable to this Verb; neither have I yet fully beat it out: onely in so me chief wayes of the use of it in Speech I shall here set down, leaving the rest for afterwards, if God will, and that I live to adde unto this beginning.

Affirmative.

- 1 I cause thee to keep me,
Koowadchanumwaheshnuh-
hog.
I cause thee to keep him,
koowadchanumwahunun.
I cause thee to keep them,
koowadchanumwahunununk.

- 2 Thou makest me keep him,
Koowadchanumwahren.
Thou makest me keep them,
koowadchanumwáheneunk,

- 3 He maketh me keep him,
Noowadchanumwábikqun-
uh.
He maketh me keep them,
Nah noowadchanumwaheh.

Negative .

- 1 I cause thee not to keep me,
Koowadchanuwahucohnuh.
hog.
I cause thee not to keep him,
koowadchanumwahunoon.
I cause thee not to keep them,
koowadchanumwahunoon-
unuk.

- 2 Thou makest me not keep him,
Koowadchanumwahéin.
Thou makest me not keep them,
koowadchanumwaheinunk.

- 3 He maketh me not keep him,
Noowadchanumwahikooun-
uh.
He maketh me not keep them,
Ibid.

Imperative Mode.

- | | |
|--|---|
| Make me keep him,
Wadchanumwaheh n noh. | Make me not keep him,
wadchanumwahehkon. |
| Make me keep them,
Nah wadchanumwaheh. | Make me not keep them,
Ibid. |

Suppositive Mode.

- | | |
|--|--|
| If thou make me keep him,
Wadchanumwahean yeuoh | If thou make me not keep him,
Wadchanumwaheean. |
|--|--|

I WAS purposed to put in no more Paradigms of Verbs; but considering that all Languages (so farre as I know) and this also, do often make use of the Verb Substantive Passive, and in the reason of Speech it is of frequent use: Considering also that it doth differ in its formation from other Verbs, and that Verbals are often derived out of this form, as Wadchanittuonk. Salvation, &c. &c. I have therefore here put down an Example thereof

The Verb Substantive Passive.

Noowadchanit, I am kept.

Indicative Mode.

Present tense.

I am kept,
Noowadchanit.
sing. Thou art kept,
koowadchanit.
He is kept,
wadchanau.

Praeter tense.

I was kept,
Noowadchanitteap.
sing. Thou wast kept,
koowadchanitteap.
He was kept,
wadchanop.

Present tense.

We are kept,
Noowadchanitteamun,
plur. Ye are kept,
koowadchanitteamwoo.
They are kept,
wadchanoog.

Praeter tense.

We were kept,
Noowadchanitteamunónup.
plur. Ye were kept,
koowadchanitteamwóp.
They were kept,
wadchanopanneg.

Imperative Mode.

	Let me be kept, Wadchanilteadi.		Let us be kept, Wadchanitteatuh.
sing.	Be thou kept, wadchanilleash.	sing.	Be ye kept wadchanitteak.
	Let him be kept, wadchanaj.		Let them be kept, wadchanaj.

Optative Mode.

	Present tense.		Present tense.
	I wish I be kept, Noowaadchaniltean-toh.		I wish we be kept, Noowaadchanitteanan-toh.
sing.	I wish thou be kept, koowaadchanittean-toh.	sing.	I wish ye be kept, koowaadchanitteaneau-toh.
	I wish he be kept, waadchanon-toh,		I wish they be kept, waadchanoneau-toh.
	Praeter tense.		Praeter tense.
	I wish I was kept, Noowaadchanitteanaz-toh.		I wish we were kept, Nrowaadchanilleananonuz-
sing.	I wish thou wast kept, koowaadchanitteanaz-toh.	sing.	toh.
	I wish he was kept, waadchanonaz-toh.		I wish ye were kept, koowaadchanilteanaouz-toh
			I wish they were kept, waadchanonaouz-toh.

Suppositive Mode.

Present tense.

When I am kept,
Wadchanitteanon.
sing. When thou art kept,
wadchanitteanon.
When he is kept,
wadchanit nob,

Present tense.

When we are kept ,
Wadchanitteanon.
plur. When ye are kept,
wadchanitteanon.
When they are kept,
wadchanit nag,

The Praeter tense is formed by adding (us or ás) unto
the Present tense,

Indefinite Mode.

Wadchanittéinát, To be kept

The form Negative of the Verb Substantive Passive.

Indicative Mode.

Present tense.

I am not kept,
Noowadchanitteonh.
sing. Thou art not kept
koowadchanitteonh.
He is not kept,
Mat wadchanau.

Present tense.

We are not kept,
Noowadchanitteoumun.
plur. Ye are not kept,
koowadchanitteoumwo
They are not kept,
Mat wadchanoog.

Praeter tense.

I was not kept,
Noowadchanitteohp.
sing. Thou wast riot kept,
koowadchanitteohp.
He was not kept,
Mat wadchanôuop,

Praeter tense.

We were not kept, [up.
Nrowadchanitteoumunnon-
plur. Ye were not kept,
koowadchanitteoumwop.
They were not kept,
Mat wadchanoop,

[p. 63.]

Imperative Mode of the form Negative Passive.

	Be thou not kept, Wadchanittuhkon.		Be not ye kept, Wadchanittuhkook.
sing.	Let not him be kept, wadchittekitch.	plur.	Let not them be kept, wadchanittekhettich.

Suppositive Mode Passive Negative.

Present tense.	Present tense.
When I am not kept, Wadchaneumuk.	The Plural is formed by adding (Mat) unto the form Affirmative.
When thou art not kept, wadchaninromuk.	
When he is not kept, wadchanómuk.	

The Praeter tense is formed by adding [us or ás] to the Present tense.

The Indefinite Mode Passive Negative.

Wadchanóunat, Not to be kept.

A TABLE of the Grammar of the Suffix Verbs Aff-matical Addition after the word, are set down: As in the Indicative and Optative Modes; The Imperative by the Suffix. Also note that (I him) and (Thou the Affix; and (Do thou him) in the Imperative and what is prefixed or suffixed to the Radix is

	Indicative Mode.		Imperative Mode.
	Present tense.	Praeter tense	
1	1 oush	1 unup	1 unutti
	2 radic.	2 óp	2 onti
	3 unumwoo	3 unumwop	3 un nkqutch
	4 oog	4 opanneg	4 ontl
2	1 eh or ah	1 ip	1 eh
	2 radic.	2 op	2 radic.
	3 1mun	3 imunónup	3 innean
	4 oog	4 p[ammeg	4 radic.
3	1 uk	1 ukup	1 itch
	2 uk	2 ukup	2 ukqush
	3 oh or uh	3 opoh	3 onch
	4 ukqun	4 ukqunónup	4 ukqutteuh
	5 ukkou	5 ukcoowop	5 ukcook
	6 oh or uh	6 opoh	6 onch
1	1 unumun	1 unumunónup	1 unuttuh
	2 óun	2 óunónup	2 ontuh
	3 unumun	3 unumunónup	3 unuttuh
	4 óunónog	4 óunónuppanneg	4 ontuh
2	1 imwoo	1 imwop	1 egk or ig
	2 au	2 auop	2 ók
	3 imun	3 imunónup	3 innean
	4 auoog	4 auoanneg	4 ók
3	1 ukquog	1 ukuppanneg	1 ukqutteu or é-
	2 ukquog	2 ukuppanneg	2 ukqush [Hettich
	3 ouh	3 auopuh [neg	3 ahettich
	4 ukqunonog	4 ukqunónuppan-	4 ukqutteuh
	5 ukcooog	5 ukcoópanneg	5 ukcook
	6 ouh	6 auopoh	6 ahettich

firmative, wherein onely the Suffixes, viz. The Gram-
for the Affix or Prefix, you may observe it is used onely
and Suppositive Modes lay it by, and arc varied onely
him) in the Indicative Mode, is the Radicall word with
Mode is the Radicall word without any Affix or Suffix:
Grammar.

Optative Mode.		Suppositive Mode.	
Present tense.	Praeter tense	Present tense.	Praeter tense.
1 unon	1 unuaz	1 unon	1 unos
1 2 on	2 ónaz	2 og	2 ogkus
3 uneau	3 ununnaóuz	3 unog	3 unogkus
4 óneau	4 ónaóuz	4 og	4 ogkus
1 in	1 ineaz	1 ean	1 eas
2 2 on	2 onsx	2 adt or at	2 as
3 unean	3 uneanónuz	3 eog	3 egkus
4 óneau	4 ónaóuz	4 adt or at	4 as
1 ukqun	1 ukqunaz	1 it	1 is
3 2 ukqun	2 ukqunaz	2 ukquean	2 ukqueas
3 on	3 onaz	3 ont	3 os
4 ukqunán	4 ukqunanonuz	4 ukqueog	4 ukqueogkus
5 ukquneau	5 ukqunaóuz	5 ukqueóg	5 ukqueógkus
6 on	6 onaouz	6 ont	6 os
1 unan	1 unanónuz	1 unog	1 unogkus
2 ónan	2 ónanónuz	2 ogkut	2 ogkutus
3 unan	3 unanónuz	3 unog	3 unogkus
4 ónán	4 ónanonuz	4 ogkut	4 ogkutus
1 uneau	1 ineaóuz	1 eóg	1 eógkus
2 oneau	2 ónaóuz	2 óg	2 ógkus
3 unean	3 ineanonuz	3 eóg	3 eógkus
4 óneau	4 ónaouz	4 ò	4 ogkus
1 ukquneau	1 ukqunaouz	1 hettit	1 ehettis
2 ukquneau	2 ukquanaouz	2 ukquean	2 ukqueas
3 óneau	3 ónaouz	3 áhettit	3 ahettis
4 ukqunán	4 ukqunanonuz	4 ukqueog	4 ukqueogkus
5 ukquneau	5 ukqunaóuz	5 ukqueóg	5 ukqueòg
6 óneau	6 ónaóuz	6 ahettit	6 ahettis

Onely remember that (toh) is to
be anuexed to every person
and variation in this .Mode.

I HAVE now finished what I shall do at present. and in a word or two to satisfie the prudent Enquirer how I found out these new wayes of Grammar, which no other Learned Language (so fur .as I know) useth; I thus inform him: God first put into rny heart a compassion over their poor Souls, and a desire to teach them to know Christ, and to bring them into his kingdome. Then presently I found out (by God's wise providence) a pregnant witted young man, who had been a Servant in an English house, who pretty well understood his own Language, and hath a clear pronounciation: Him I made my Interpreter. By his help I translated the Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and many Texts of Scripture: also I compiled both Exhortations and Prayers by his help. I diligently marked the difference of their Grammar from ours: When I found the way of them, I would pursue a word, a noun, a verb, through all variations I could think of and thus I came at it. We must not sit still and look for miracles; V p, and be doing, and the Lord will be with thee. Prayer and pains, through faith in Christ Jesus will do any thing. Nil tam deficile quod non-I do believe and hope that the Gospel shall be spread to all the ends of the Earth, and dark corners of the world by such a way, and that such Instruments as the Churches shall send forth for that end and purpose. Lord hasten those good days, and pour out that good Spirit upon thy people. Amen.

FINIS.

NOTE AND OBSERVATIONS ON ELIOT'S INDIAN GRAMMAR,
ADDRESSED TO JOHN PICKERING, Esq. By PETER S.
DU PONCEAU,*

THE great and good man, whose work has given rise to the following observations, did not foresee, when he wrote his Indian Grammar, that it would be sought after and studied by the learned of all nations, as a powerful help towards the improvement of a science not then in existence; I mean the Comparative Science of Languages, which of late has made such progress in our own country, as well as in Europe where our aboriginal idioms have become a subject of eager investigation. The Augustine of New England had no object in view, but, that which he expresses in his title page-" the help of such as desired to learn the Indian language for the furtherance of the Gospel among the natives." But that worldly fame, which he did not seek, awaited him at the end of two centuries; and his works, though devoted to religion alone, have become important sources of human learning.

Religion and Science, well understood, are handmaids to each other. In no instance is this truth more evident than in the branch of knowledge of which we are treating. For it is to the unwearied and truly apostolick labours of Christian missionaries, and of societies instituted for the propagation of the Gospel among distant nations, that we are indebted for the immense materials which we already possess on the subject of the various languages of the earth. The Roman Congregation De propaganda fide t gave the first impulse, which the zeal of the other Christian denominations has, in later times, not only followed but improved upon. The numerous translations of the sacred volume, which have been made under the patronage of the British; Russian, and American Bible Societies, into langua-

* These Remarks having been written at the suggestion of my learned friend, Mr. Pickering, I have thought it right to inscribe them to him as a just tribute of friendship and respect.
P. S. D.

t Many Grammars, Dictionaries and Vocabularies of Asiatick, African and American languages, have been published under the direction of that Society, the only complete collection of which, perhaps, is in the Vatican or in their own library. As the science advances, they will no doubt be reprinted, as the present work is, for the benefit of the learned.

ges, many of which were till then unknown, except by their names, have afforded ample means of comparison between those various idioms; the value of which is not yet so fully understood, as there can be no doubt it will be at a future day. The object of this science is the study of man through that noble faculty, which distinguishes him from the rest of the animal creation; the faculty of "holding communication from soul to soul;" an earnest, as I might say, and a foretaste of the enjoyments of celestial life. It is a branch, and an important one, of the "history of the human mind;" a subject, to the study of which the Lockes, the Mallebranches, the Reids, the Stewarts, the Wolfs, the Leibnitzs and other distinguished men, whose names it is needless to mention here, have devoted their lives. The ignorant, it is true, have said that "metaphysicks is vanity;" but the ignorant may jest as much as they will, they can never succeed in eradicating from the breast of immortal man

"This pleasing hope, this fond desire,
This longing after something unpossess'd,"

which so powerfully impels him to search into every thing that may throw light on his physical and moral existence.

"'Tis the Divinity that stirs within us"--

It makes us feel that our soul is immortal; and it is the agitation produced by this feeling, that makes us very naturally seek and love to dwell on the proofs of our glorious immortality. Hence the delight, which we take in the study of ourselves and of every thing that relates to us, and the efforts, which we make to carry our knowledge as far as the Almighty has permitted it to extend. He, who created the desire, well knows how to set bounds to our foolish inquiries; but, limited as it is, the whole circle, by which our knowledge is bounded, is still open to our researches; and we are yet very far from having reached its utmost verge.

God has revealed himself to mankind in two ways; by his sacred writings, and by the works of nature, constantly open before us; and it is the privilege as well as the duty of man to study both to the advancement of his glory. Therefore while the divine labours to discover the truths, which are concealed or rather veiled under the mysterious language of the former, the philosopher, irresistibly impelled by a similar desire, will interrogate the latter; and, with due submission, will view and

compare all that can be grasped by his understanding and by his senses. Who knows but that, as this world advances towards its inevitable end, it may have been decreed that the knowledge of man should go on increasing, until the blaze of eternal light should burst at once upon the whole race? But I find I have been involuntarily drawn into the regions of fancy; it is time to turn to the Jess fascinating topicks which are the subject of these notes.

Yet before I proceed to the Language of the Massachusetts Indians, I may be permitted to shew what fruits have been derived from the pursuit of our science, since it has begun to be considered as an interesting object of study. What great advantage may be derived from it in the end-whether it will enable us to solve the problem of the origin of the population of this continent, facilitate the formation of an universal oral or written language, or lead to some other discovery not yet thought of, though not less important than those that have been ment10ned, is yet in the womb of futurity ; nevertheless it is certain, that the researches of modern philologists have brought to light many curious and interesting facts, of which our ancestors were entirely ignorant, and by means of which the science has acquired certain fixed points, from whence we may proceed with greater ease to further and more particular investigations.

By the lahours of the illustrious Adelung, a census, as It were, has been taken of all the languages and dialects (that are known to us) existing on the surface of the earth. They have been all registered and enumerated, and it is now ascertained, as nearly as possible, that their aggregate numbers amount to 3064; of which Africa has 276, Europe 587, Asia 987, and America (the largest number of all) 1214, being more than _Asia and Africa together, and nearly as many as the whole of the old continent, Africa excepted. It is true that in the interior, and, perhaps, even on the coast of the latter country, there are nations yet undiscovered, and whose languages, of course, are not known to us; and in the enumeration of American idioms it is easy to perceive, that the same tribes are sometimes registered more than once under different names; but when we consider, that there are also unknown Indian nations on our continent, we shall, by setting off these against those that are variously exhibited, have a tolerable approximation of their numbers and different idioms; and, upon the whole, this inquiry leads us to the almost certain conclusion, that all the languages and dialects of our globe, known and unknown, do not exceed the number of four thousand, but, on the contrary, the probability seems to be that they do not reach it.

It is ascertained, at least nothing has yet appeared to the contrary, that the languages of our American Indians are rich in words and grammatical forms; that they are adequate to the expression even of abstract ideas, and that they have a mode (different from our own) by which they can easily combine their radical sounds with each other so as to frame new words, whenever they stand in need of them. What is still more extraordinary, the model of those languages has been found to be the same from north to south, varieties being only observed in some of the details, which do not affect the similarity of the general system; while on the Eastern continent languages are found, which in their grammatical organization have no relation whatever with each other. And yet our American idioms, except where they can be traced to a common stock, differ so much from each other in point of etymology, that no affinity whatever has been yet discovered between them. The philosopher, who considers this wonderful richness of forms in the languages of our Indians, will be apt to think, that it is the first stage of human speech; that all languages have been thus complex in their origin, and have acquired simplicity in the progress of civilization; but if he will only bestow a single look upon the oral language of the Chinese, he will find his system strongly shaken; for it cannot be civilization, that made this most imperfect idiom what it is; and not a single vestige remains in it to shew that it was ever a complex or even a polysyllabick language. On the contrary, it is to be presumed, that if the Chinese were to adopt an alphabetical mode of writing in lieu of their hieroglyphicks, their oral speech would be found insufficient at least for written communications, and the nation would be compelled to adopt new words and new grammatical forms. For their written characters represent no sounds to the ear, but only ideas to the mind; the beauty of their poetry, as well as their prose, consists in the elegance of the associations ideas presented to the mind through the visual sense; and their communications through the ear serve only for the more common and coarser purposes of life. What affinity is there then between such a language and those of the Indians of America; and how can they be said to be derived from each other? This is an interesting problem, the solution of which yet remains to be discovered.

It has been, moreover, ascertained that one nation at least on the eastern continent of Asia, the *Sedentary Tschuktschi*, speak an American language; a dialect of that, which begins in Greenland, crosses the American continent, (on both coasts of which it is found among the people called Eskimaux,) is spoken at Norton Sound, and the mouth of the Anadir, and from thence northward,

along the coast, to the peninsula called Tschutschkoi Noss, or the promontory of the Tschutschki. On the other hand, no nation has yet been discovered on this continent, that speaks an Asiatic language. The grammatical forms of the languages of the Koriaks, Lamouts, Kamtchadales, and other nations of the eastern coast of Asia, are not yet known to us; and while we are taking pains to investigate the languages of our own country, it is much to be wished, that the learned men of the Russian empire would collect and communicate information respecting those of their Kamtchadale, Samoyed and Siberian tribes; so that a full comparison might be established between them and those of our Indians.'

It has been also ascertained, (and the discovery was first partially made by the great navigator Cook,) that from the peninsula of Malacca in Asia to the Cocos Island, a hundred leagues from the coast of Tierra Firme, and through the various clusters of islands in the South Sea, and also in the Island of Madagascar, dialects of the same language (the Malay) are spoken; which, with other indications, has led an ingenious American writer, Dr. McCulloh of Baltimore, to suppose that the South Sea was once a continent, and that America was peopled through that channel.* This question deserves further investigation; and the Malay, as well as its cognate languages, ought to be studied with that view. No traces of this language have been yet discovered on the coast of the American continent; but they may appear on further research.

I should exceed the bounds which I have prescribed to myself, if I were to take notice of all the interesting facts, which the comparative science of languages has brought to light. Nor is this the proper place to do it. My task is that of an annotator of the venerable Eliot's Grammar of the (Massachusetts) Indian language; and my object is to communicate, in aid of this valuable work, some of the most material facts and observations which several careful perusals of its contents, with collateral studies, have disclosed and suggested to me. Among those studies, I have not neglected that of his translation of the sacred writings, from which I have derived a greater insight into the nature, forms and construction of this curious language, than could be obtained from the Grammar alone; for this is by no means so full as it might have been, if the illustrious author, impelled by his zeal for the propagation of the Christian faith, had

• Researches on America, being an attempt to settle some points relative to the Aborigines of America, &c. By James H. McCullah, junr. M. D. Baltimore, Robinson, 1817. Octavo.

not written it for immediate use, as introductory to the further instruction, which he was so well qualified to give to those who stood in need of it. I have had no other view in writing these notes than to facilitate the labours of my fellow students, and shall be happy, if my efforts shall prove successful, though but in an inconsiderable degree.

There can be no doubt, that this language is a dialect of that widely extended idiom which was spoken, with more or less variation, by the Souriquois and Micmacs in Nova Scotia, the Etchemins, who inhabited what is now the State of Maine, the Massachusetts, Narragansets and other various tribes of the Al-mouchiquois* in New England, the Knisteneaux, and Algonkins or Chippeways in Canada, the Mohicans in New York, the Lenni Lenape, or Delawares, Nanticokes and other nations of the same stock in Pennsylvania and Maryland, and lastly, by the Powhatans in Virginia; beyond which, to the southward, their race has not been discovered, but extended itself westward, under various names, such as Kickapoos, Potawatamies, Miamis or Twightwees, &c. to the great river Mississippi; on the other side of which the Sioux or Naudowessie, and the language of the Pawnees, (or Panis,) branching into various dialects, appear to predominate. On this side, this rich idiom of the Wapanachki, or Men of the East, and the Iroquois with its kindred languages, the Huron or Wyandot, and others, enjoyed exclusive sway; while to the southward, towards Louisiana and Florida, a number of idioms are found, which do not at all appear to be derived from each other, such as the Creek or Muskohgee, Chickasaw and Choctaw, Uchee, (yet unknown, but said to have a character peculiar to itself,) Atacapas, Chatimachas and others, among which no analogy is to be found by the comparison of their different vocabularies. The same phenomenon has been observed in the kingdom of Mexico; where several languages entirely different are crowded together on a small spot, while elsewhere, as in Peru, Chili and Paraguay, some one or two master idioms extend their dominion in various dialects, like our Wapanachki and Iroquois, to a very great distance. These remarkable facts will not escape the attention of the philosopher; but being foreign to my present subject, I have thought it sufficient merely to point them out to the observation of those who feel an interest in these disquisitions,

* The French called the New England Indians by the general name of Almouchiquois or Armouchiquois, which name is to be seen in several of the ancient maps.

t The Aztek or Mexican proper, Othomi, Tarascan, Huastecan, &c.

I shall not waste time in proving, by the analogy of words, the strong affinity which exists between the Massachusetts and the Lenape, Algonkin and Mohican languages; of all which the former more or less partakes, not without a mixture of the Souriquois, Etchemin and other Nova Scotia dialects; it is sufficient to quote what my venerable friend, Mr. Heckewelder, wrote to me on the 8th of April, 1819.* "I once had," he says, "Eliot's Bible here for examination, and well understanding the Mohican language, I soon worked myself into the Natick, so that I could not only understand the one half of it at least, but became quite familiar with the language. There are certain letters in the words which are changed, as I have already somewhere mentioned to you." This change of letters is noticed by Eliot himself in his Grammar, page 2, where he instances the word dog, called anum by the Massachusetts proper, alum by the Nipmuk, and arum, by the northern Indians. The Delawares say allum, the Algonkins alim, the Etchemins (Indians of Penobscot and St. John's) allomoos, and the Miamis lamah.t The changes of the consonants l, m, n, and r for each other are very frequent in the various dialects of American languages. Thus the Delawares of New Sweden called themselves Renni Renape, instead of Lenni Lenape, making use of the r where the others have the l. These variations are very necessary to be attended to in the comparative study of our aboriginal idioms; other instances of them will appear in the course of these notes.

Notwithstanding the strong affinity, which exists between the Massachusetts and these various languages of the Algonkin or Lenape class, is too clear and too easy of proof to be seriously controverted, yet it is certain that a superficial observer might with great plausibility deny it altogether. He would only have to compare the translation of the Lord's prayer into the Massachusetts, as given by Eliot in his Bible, Matthew vi; 9, and Luke xi. 2, with that of Heckewelder into the Delaware from Matthew, in the *Histor. Transactions*, vol. i. page 439, where he would not find two words in these two languages bearing the least affinity to each other, But this does not arise so much from the difference of the idioms, as from their richness, which afforded to the translators multitudes of words and modes of expressing the same ideas, from which to make a choice; and they happened

* The numerous letters and other communications, which I have received from Mr. Heckewelder on the subject of the Indian languages, be considered at a future day a, a most valuable and interesting collection. They are carefully preserved.

t See Barton's *New Views, Comparative Vocab. Verbo Dog.*

not to hit upon the same forms of expression. Thus Eliot translates the words "Our father which art in heaven," by Nooshun Kesukqut, which literally means, "Our father who art in the starry place, among the great luminaries of the sky," from the Delaware Gischuch, the sun, which the Narragansets called Keesuckquand, and adored it by that name;* whence Kesuck, or Keesuck, (or rather Keesukh with a guttural x at the end,) by which these nations designated what we call the sky or the heavens, and also the sun and the space of a day. This NroshunKesukqut might easily have been rendered in the Delaware by Nooch Gischuchink, "Our father heaven or sun in," (the preposition in Leing expressed in the Massachusetts by the termination ut or qui, and in the Delaware by ink, as is usual in the Indian languages;) but Zeisberger and Heckewelder preferred substituting for the word Nooch, which is that by which children address their natural father, the more elegant word Wetochemelenk; and turning to Mr. Heckewelder's Correspondence in the Historical Transactions, p. 421, it will be found, that they had still a choice of other terms for the same word father; such is the wonderful richness of these barbarous languages. It may be remarked here, that even Eliot's own translations of the Lord's prayer, as given in Matthew and Luke, differ from each other more than the variations of the text require; as for instance, in the sentence "Give us this day (or day by day) our daily bread;" in Matthew this is translated by Nummeetsuongash asekesukokish t assamaiinean yeuyeu lcesukod, which literally means "Our victuals of every day give us this (for energy's sake) day on, or sun on." And in Luke xi. 2, he translates it thus: Assamaiinean kokokesulwdae nutasesesukokke't petukqunneg, by which the text is literally rendered, in the same order of words: "Give us day by day our daily bread." These observations I have thought it necessary to make, with the expectation that they may be useful to the student, in his comparative views of the Indian languages.

I ought to observe here also, that the language of Eliot's Grammar may, possibly, not be exactly the same with that of his trans-

* See Roger William, Key, Chap. xii. in 3 Mass. Hist. Col. p. 217.

t Daily or every day, every sun; from kesuk, sun, as above mentioned.

+ I am inclined to believe, that there is here an error of the press, and that this word should have been printed nuttasekesukokke, from kesuk, day or sun, and the t should have been duplicated for the sake of the affixed pronoun n, so as to read nut-ta or n'ta, and not nu-ta, &c.

[Mr. Du Ponceau's conjecture is well founded. He uses the edition of 1680, which, although it is the revised one, is evidently incorrect in this instance. The edition of 1661 has the word as Mr. Du Ponceau here supposes it should be--nutasesesukokke.)

lation of the Bible. There are some differences in the words, as well as in the forms of speech, which it is indispensable that the student should be aware of. For instance; in his Grammar, page 14, he gives the word nequt, (from the Delaware n'gutti,) to express the numeral one, whereas in his Bible he more commonly makes use of pasuk, from the Algonkin pegik and Chippeway pashilc. Thus he says pasuk cherub, "one cherub." 2 Chron. iii. 11, Pa.sv.k ox, lamb, ram. Numb. xxviii. 27, 28, 29. "Pasukqunnuro weyausro," om flesh, Gen, ii. 24. And so in other places. As I proceed in my observations upon his Grammar, I shall also shew some differences in the forms, Yet the two languages (if in fact he did employ more than one dialect) appear to be substantially the same.

This translation of the Bible by our venerable Eliot is a rich and valuable mine of Indian philology. A complete grammar and dictionary might, with labour and perseverance, be extracted from it; for there is hardly a mode or figure of speech, which is not to be found somewhere in the sacred writings. It has been of great use to me in the investigation of the character and structure of the American languages, and I hope to derive still further benefit from it. Every copy of it, that is yet extant, ought to be preserved with the greatest care, as it is hardly to be hoped that it will ever be entirely reprinted.

It is not, however, every attempt at translation into the Indian languages, that ought to be trusted to by the student, Indeed, it is but too true, that even simple vocabularies, when not made by persons, who have resided long among the Indians or who are extremely careful and judicious, are in general miserably deficient. Such is that of the language of the Delawares of New Sweden, published by Campanius Holm at Stockholm in 1696, with Luther's Catechism in Swedish and Indian; both of which (the vocabulary and the translation) are exceedingly faulty, and betray the grossest ignorance of the language. Mr. Heckewelder is of opinion, that the writer knew but little of it himself, and that he compiled his work with the aid of Indian traders, by whom he was constantly led into error. Some of his mistakes are truly ludicrous. He translates the words "Gracious God" by Sweet Manitto; but the word vinckan, (it should be wingan,) by which he attempts to express sweet, is one, which, in the Delaware language, is only applied to eatables; so that the sense, which he conveys to an Indian, is that of O sweet tasted. Manitto ! Yet no language is richer in suitable appellations for the Deity. In the same manner, when he means to express the verb "to love" in a divine sense, he uses the word tahottamen, applicable only to the liking, which men have

for perishable things, when he had eholan, from the substantive ahollowagan, (love,) which it is most probable he was unacquainted with. These observations were communicated to me by Mr. Heckewelder, with many others of the same kind; which, while they prove the ignorance of the writer of that book, afford additional evidence of the astonishing richness of our Indian languages, and of the multitude of words, by means of which they can discriminate between the most delicate shades of the same thought. The verb to love is still differently, but not improperly, expressed by our Eliot: "Womonrok kummatwommóg," love one another. Matt. v. 44. This word is derived from wunnege1i, good; Delaware wuliechen, it is good or well done. Kah kusseh mo ahche wunnegen, "And behold it was very good," Gen. i. 31. From the same root is the word wunanum, bless; Wunanum Jehovah, "Bless the Lord." Ps. ciii. 1. There appears to be no end to this rich variety.

I cannot help observing here, that the same richness, not only in terms applicable to physical subjects, but in moral and metaphysical terms, is to be found in the southern as well as in the northern languages, Thus in the Huastecan idiom (New Spain) we have

Canezomtaba, love, in a general sense.

Canezal, to love (in this sense.)

Lehnaxtalah, love with desire (amor deseando,)

Lehnal, to love, in this sense (apetecer.)

Cacnaxtabal, love with courtship (amor cortesario.)

Cacnal, to love, in this sense (cortejarr.)

Cacnax, a lover, in this sense (cortejo.)

ZENTENO'S GRAMMAR, p. 51.

But it is time that I should have done with these general observations. I shall proceed now to remark: more directly on the contents of the Grammar, which is the immediate subject of these notes.

I. Alphabet

(Gram. p. 1.) *

IT is much to be regretted, that the learned have not yet agreed upon some mode of communicating to the ear, through the eye, an uniform impression of the effects of the various sounds produced by the human organs of speech. The only

* The reader will observe, that this and the other references to the Grammar are made to the original paging of that work, which is preserved in the margin of the present edition.

way to obtain this desirable end, is for some person endowed with correct judgment and a nice, discriminating ear, to propose an alphabet, or table of signs, which, after a time, cannot fail (with perhaps some slight variations) to be generally adopted. My learned friend, Mr. Pickering, of Salem, in an excellent Essay, lately published in the fourth volume of the *Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, has broken the ice and proposed an alphabet for our own Indian languages, which has the merit of great simplicity. It is understood, that its principles are to be followed in the publication of several vocabularies, that are to be inserted in the *Journal of the late Expedition to the "Westward under the command of Major Long*, which is shortly to be put to the press by Mr. Nuttall; and there is no doubt that his example will be followed by others, particularly by missionaries, to whom the Essay has been transmitted by the missionary societies. If, as there is great reason to expect, Mr. Pickering's orthography gets into general use among us, America will have had the honour of taking the lead in procuring an important auxiliary to philological science.

It is universally admitted, that the alphabets of the principal European nations, which have been hitherto used to represent the sounds of our Indian languages, are inadequate to the purpose. The English is anomalous, and its powers not sufficiently determined. Its system of vowels is particularly defective. The French partakes of the same defects, though in a less degree; and in other respects is too often apt to mislead, because its consonants are generally unarticulated at the end of words. The German is more perfect than either; but German ears do not sufficiently discriminate between the hard and soft consonants, such as b and p, g hard and le, and d and t, by which considerable confusion is introduced. It will be recollected, that in Zeisberger's *Vocabulary of the Delaware*, the letter g is frequently used as homophonous with le, because, it is said, the printer had not a sufficient number of types to furnish the latter character as often as it was wanted. Notwithstanding this defect, however, it must be acknowledged that a better idea of the sounds of the Indian languages is given by means of the German alphabet than of any other.

Our author has, of course, made use of the English letters to express the sounds of the Massachusetts language; in consequence of which, it is sometimes difficult to recognize even the same words differently spelt by Zeisberger in the Delaware. Thus the latter writes n'dee, (my heart,) which is to be pronounced as if spelt n'day, according to the powers of the

English alphabet. Eliot, on the contrary, writes it nuttah. This makes it appear a different word, in which we scarcely perceive an analogy with the former. By the first syllable, nut, he means to express the sounds, which the German represents by n'd, (perhaps n't, for the reason above suggested,) the short u standing; for the interval, or sheva, between the two consonants ; which Zeisberger more elegantly represents by an apostrophe. The last syllable, tah, is the German dee or tee, (English day or tay,) the a being pronounced acute, as in grace, face. If our author had selected the diphthong ay to express this sound, and reserved the a to represent its broad pronunciation in far, car, the student would have been much better able to perceive the analogy between the Massachusetts and its cognate idioms. But that was not his object; and it was enough for him that the mode of spelling, which he adopted, was sufficient for his purpose. Had he taken the other course, n'dee and n'tay would have been immediately recognized to be the same word; while n'dee and nuttah hardly shew any resemblance. It ought to be observed, that, although our venerable grammarian, in his alphabet, ascribes the acute pronunciation to the letter a, (except when it takes its short sound before a consonant,) and generally expresses the broad sound of that letter by au, yet there are many words, in which it has the open sound, especially when followed by h: But this can only be discovered by comparison with other languages, derived from the same stock.

The whistled W, of which he takes no notice, but which it is evident exists in the Jl'lassac husetts, as well as in the other Wapanachki idioms, he represents sometimes by w and sometimes also by short l.1, as in uppaumauopoh, "they did pay him," for w'paumauopoh. This is placed beyond a doubt by the circumstance of the personal pronouns affixed to the verbs; n' for the first person, k' for the second, and w' for the third; being the same in the Delaware and Massachusetts languages. Before a vowel, he employs the w, as in wantamooh, "he is not wise;" and sometimes prefixes the ro, as in "oowadchanumcoun," he does not keep it. This oo, placed before the w, was probably meant to express the peculiarity of the whistled sound, by which he seems to have been not a little embarrassed. I believe he once meant to have represented this sound by vf, to which he ascribes a peculiar pronunciation, different from that of v in save, have. (See his alphabet, and his observations on the v consonant in his Grammar, page 2.) But he does not seem to have kept to his purpose; for I do not find the vf employed elsewhere, either in his Grammar or in his translation of the

Bible and New Testament, but always either the w, the cow or the short u when followed by a consonant.

It is remarkable, that our author appropriates no character, or combination of characters, to express the guttural sound of the Greek x;, which is very frequent in these languages. This is a defect very common to Englishmen, who attempt to express Indian sounds by the letters of their alphabet. This sound, being entirely wanting in our language, is very often neglected and not at all noticed. In some vocabularies it is expressed by gh; but as these letters are always united in proper English words, it is difficult to know when they are to be pronounced, or are merely used to lengthen the sound of the preceding vowel or diphthong.

The letter q is often employed by our author, without any other apparent power than that of k, as in "toohkequn," heavy, 1 Samuel, iv. 18; but he also uses it more properly as in English before ua and uo, as in wuskesukquash, "his eyes," and in squontamut, "the gate." Ibid. 15, 18.

Upon the whole, this alphabet, though not so perfect as it might be in the eyes of the scholar, appears, nevertheless, to have fully answered the pious purpose of the excellent author; for he tells us in his Grammar, page 4, that the Indians, by means of it, "soon apprehended and understood this Epitome of the Art of Spelling, and (by its means) COULD SOON LEARN TO READ."

II. Noun Substantive.

(Gram. p. 8.)

OUR author gives but little information on this subject; perhaps there is but little to be given. The genders, as in the Delaware, are not masculine and feminine, but animate and inanimate. Trees, plants, and grasses are in the class of inanimates; which is different from the Delaware, for in that they are classed as animates, except annual plants and grasses. 1 Hist. Trans. p. 367,368.

Substantives are not varied by "Cases, Cadencies and Endings," except animates, when governed by a verb transitive, when they end in oh, uh, or ah. The genders are also distinguished by a difference of termination, but merely for the designation of the plural number. This termination is og in the animate, and ash in the inanimate form. In the Delaware, the animate has ak, and the inanimate all or wall, In the Narraganset, the plural

endings are ock, og, auock, for the animate, and ash, anash for the inanimate. Mithrid. vol. iii. part iii. page 381.

We are not a little surprised, however, after the positive statement of our author, that substantives are not distinguished by cases, (except as above mentioned,) to find different terminations of the same word, in various parts of his translation of the Bible, of which he makes no mention and gives no explanation in his Grammar: Wuttaunoh Zion, "Daughter of Zion." Lament. ii. 8. Woi Jerusalemme wullaunin, "O daughter of Jerusalem." Woi penomp Zione wullaunin, "O virgin daughter of Zion." Ibid. 13. Woi kenaau Jerusaleme wullaimeunk, "O ye daughters of Jerusalem." Solom. Song, ii. 7. Kah ompetak wuttaneu, "And she bare a daughter." Gen. xxx. 21.

The first of these terminations is correct; nullanoh, kullanoh, wuttanoh, "my, thy, his daughter," are the proper nominatives of this word; and its being used in the genitive in the passage cited (the wall of the daughter of Zion) does not militate against the rule laid down; but the termination in the vocative singular, and unk in the vocative plural, cannot be accounted for, any more than eu in the accusative governed by an active verb. The proper plural ending of this word is the animate form og, which our author frequently employs. Qushkeh wonk nuttaunog, "Turn again, my daughters," Ruth, i. 12, I am at a loss how to explain these variations, otherwise than by the conjecture offered before, that our author might have had recourse to different Indian dialects in translating the sacred writings. The Delaware has a vocative case, which generally ends in an: Wo Kitanittowian ! O God; Wo Nihillalan, O Lord, &c. Zeisberger's MS. Grammar.

III. The Article.

IT is remarkable, that this language appears to possess a definite article, although no mention is made of it in this Grammar. This article is mo, contracted from monko, and properly signifies it. Kah MONKO nnih; "And IT (was) so," Gen. i, 7, 9, 11, 24, 30. Onk Mo nnih, "And IT (was) so." Ibid. 15. Kah kusseh MO ahche wunnegen, "And behold IT (was) very good." Ibid. 31.

This pronoun, when used as an article, is still -further contracted into m, which, when followed by a consonant, Eliot connects with it by the English short u, according to his method, and sometimes by short e. Thus he writes metah, "the heart," which should be pronounced m'tah. It is evident, that

them stands here for an article, because the personal affixes my, thy, his, are n, k, and w; nuttah or n'tah, "my heart," kuttah or k'tah, "thy heart," wuttah or w'tah, "his or her heart," and not n'mettah, k'mettah, w'mettah. In the translation of the Bible, this article frequently appears. Kesteah pakke METAH, "Create in me a clean heart." Psalm li. 10. Pohqui kah tan-nogki METAH, "A broken and contrite heart." Ibid. 17. Several words are also found in his Grammar, in which this article is prefixed, though not noticed as such. Mukquoshim, (m'quoshim,) a wolf, muhhog, (m'hog,) the body, &c. When the personal form is employed, the m is left out, and the pronominal affix substituted: Yeu nuhhog, "This is my body." Matt. xxvi.36;

This article exists in several of the Indian languages, as in the Othomi, where it is expressed by na: Na hay, the earth, na metze, the ice, na qhi, the blood, &c.--(See Molina.) It appears also in the Algonkin and its cognate idioms: Mittick, meeteek, (Algonk. an Chippew.) a tree; Delaware, hittuck, and I think also m'hittuck; Mahican, metooque; Shawanese, meticqueh; all which appear to be the same word.--Barton's New Views, verbo wood. So also the Mahican, mooquaumeh, ice, (Barton;) Shawanese, m'quama, (Johnston;) Potowatameh, muequam, (Barton;) Delaware, m'hoclcquammi, (Heckewelder,) and moseet, which, in the language of the Indians of Penobscot and St: John's, means the foot, (Barton,) and is clearly the Delaware n'seet, k'seet, w'seet, (my, thy, his foot,) which Mr. Heckewelder writes n' sit, &c., but observes that the i is long.*

* Since writing the above notes, I have received an answer to a letter, which I addressed to Mr. Heckewelder on the subject of the definite article, a part of speech, which had not been noticed by grammarians in the Indian languages; and I have now the satisfaction to find, that the opinions above expressed were well founded. The letter also corroborates some of my etymological statements; and, as it is short, I have thought it best to insert it entire:

"Bethlehem, 23d August, 1821

"MY DEAR FRIEND,

"I HAVE this moment received your favour of the 21st, and having time left sufficient to answer thereto, before the closing of the mail, I comply with your request. The article "mo" for a or the, which you discovered to be prefixed to substantive s in the language of the Naticks, is the same in the language of the Lenape. We frequently leave the letter m out, in writing, as the word is well understood without it, and because a reader, not acquainted with the language, might pronounce it too harsh, as em, or emdee, for the heart. So it is with other words also, as for instance, in those you quote. The Lenape say, m'hittuk, the tree, or a tree. The Minsi say, michtuk, a tree; also

IV. Adjectives

(Gram. p. 13.)

ADJECTIVES are seldom used singly in the Indian languages, because they are easily compounded with the verb and other parts of speech; with the verb as in the Latin *sapio*, *frigeo*, &c. and with the substantive in a variety of ways, which will be best explained by examples. I lately sent to Mr. Heckewelder the Empress Catharine's Vocabulary, in the German language, requesting him to fill it up with the same words in the Delaware. He very kindly complied with my request, but left some blanks in the Indian part, for which he referred me to notes, (also written in German,) which accompanied it. Among the words thus left blank, were the adjectives OLD and YOUNG, which he said he could not express by terms sufficiently general. The notes on these two words have appeared to me so interesting, and so well calculated to shew the peculiar construction of the Indian languages, that I have thought the reader would not be displeased to have a translation of them. I shall, therefore, fill up the present article with the valuable information which they contain.

" Notes on the word OL-D,

"On this I have to observe, that there are many words which it is difficult, and some even impossible to render by terms, which convey precisely the same general idea; the Indians being so very nice in their discriminations, and having words adapted to every shade which they wish to distinguish. They are particularly attentive to distinguishing between what is animate and what is inanimate. Sometimes, also, there are words which have a double meaning. I will give some examples.

m'tachan, wood; the Minsi say, Machtachan; yet both *hittuk* and *tachan* answer the same purpose,

"With regard to the latter part of your letter, I can only repeat what I have in former letters already noticed, viz. that in the Mahicani and other eastern idioms, (the Natick, &c.) the changing of certain letters in words, and the dropping here and there a letter at the end of a word, from that of the mother tongue, (the Lenape,) causes a difference in the writing and speaking, but not in understanding the same, by any person who can speak, or understand the Lenape. Examples: The Lenape say, *n'dellan*, the Mahicani *n'tennan*, changing the letter *l* into the letter *n*. The mail being about to close, I conclude in haste. I shall write to you further very soon.

JOHN HECKEWELDER."

"The word *old* is employed by us in the most general sense. We say in our languages, an old man, an old horse, an old dog, an old house, an old basket, &c. The Indians, on the contrary, vary their expressions, when speaking of a thing that has life and of one that has not; for the latter, instead of the word *old*, they use terms which convey the idea, that the thing has lasted long, that it has been used, worn out, &c. Of all which take the following examples:

1. *Kikey*, old, advanced in years (applied to things animate.)
2. *Chowioy*, or *chowiyey*, old by use, wearing, &c.

"Note. The first syllable in the word *kikey*, compounded with other syllables, conveys the idea of parents, (Lat. *majores*; Germ. *eltern*.) and in *brutes* is expressive of the stock or race, from which they proceed:

"Compounds.

Kikey, or *kikeyin*, (i long,) to be old, advanced in years.

Kiktyitschik, old, elderly people.

Kikeyilenno, an old man, advanced in years.

Kikeyóchqueu, an old, elderly woman.

Kikechum, the old one of the brute kind.

Kikehelleu, the old ones of the feathered tribe.

"There are also suffixes, denoting the age of animated beings¹ which are worthy of remark; as

Mihillusis, an old man, (Germ. *ein alter Greis*; Fr. *un vieillard*, *un barbon*.)

Chauchsisis, an old woman, (Germ. *altes mutterchen*; Fr. *vieille bonne femme*.)

Mihilluschum, an old male quadruped.

Chauchsachum, an old female quadruped.

"The general words for things inanimate are,
Chowiey, or *chowiyey*, (*Minsi*, *m'chowiyey*.) old.
Chowigawan, an old house, (from *wikwam*, or *wigwam*.)
Chohagihacan, an old field, (from *hacki*, earth or land.)
Choutaeney, an old town, (from *utaeney*, or *uteney*, a town.)
Chowaxen, old shoes, (from *maxen*, *mockasons*, or shoes.)
Chowasquall, old grass, (from *maskik*, grass.)
Chowiey schakhócqui, old coat, old garment,

"There are other words, which denote a thing being old from use or wearing; as

Metchihilleu, old; worn out, (as an edged tool.)

Pigihilleu, torn by long use or wearing.

Lógihilleu, fallen to pieces, &c.

"Notes on the word YOUNG,

"It is here again difficult to find an adequate general term, as the Indians are always fond of discriminating, and using words peculiarly applicable to the thing spoken of. As we say 'a new born child or infant,' instead of 'a young child,' so in Delaware, the word wuski, which signifies new, is employed to convey the idea of youth; and they compound it in the following manner:

Wuski, new, young, (Minsi, wuskiey.)

Wasken, wesgink, the new.

Wuskilenno, a young man.

Wuskóchgueu, or wuskiechqueu, a young woman,

Wuskelenapewak, young people.

Wuskchum, a young quadruped.

Wuskigawan, a new house.

Wuskihagihacan, a new field.

Wuskutaeney, a new town.

Wuskhaxen, new shoes.

Wuskiguall, new grass.

Wuskachpoan, new bread, (achpoan, bread.)

Wuskitamen, to renew something, &c.

"Although the syllable wusk, prefixed to words, serves both to denote young and new, yet the Indians have, besides, a variety of other words for distinguishing the young among animals. For instance; their general term for 'the young,' the immediate offspring, is nitschan, (w'nitschanall, his or her young or offspring, who have been brought alive and suckled,) and this applies to man, and beasts of the genus Mammalia; but when they speak of the feathered kind, or when the young is produced from the egg by hatching, they say, aninschihilleu; plural, aninschihilleisak; barely implying that the animals are young feathered creatures. See Zeisberger's Delaware Spelling Book, p, 100."

V. Pronouns.

(Gram. p. 7.)

THE personal pronouns in the Massachusetts, as in the Delaware language, are divided into separable and inseparable; and their etymology may be clearly traced to the same source. They are in the two languages as follows:

	MASSACHUSETTS,	DELAWARE
I,	Neen.	Ni.
Thou,	Ken.	Ki.
He or she,	Noh or nagum.	Nacama, or neka.
We,	Neenawun, or kenawun.	Niluna, or kiluna.
Ye,	Kenaau.	Kiluwa.
They,	Nahoh, or nagoh.	Necamawa.

The inseparable pronouns, personal and possessive, are the same in both languages; n representing the first person, k the second, and w, o, or ∞, (as euphony may require,) the third, both in the singular and plural numbers.

The particular plural of the Delawares, or the American plural, as Mr. Pickering very properly calls it, has excited much attention among philologists. Our author makes no mention of this distinction; yet there is great reason to believe, that it exists in the Massachusetts idiom. In the Delaware, the particular plural, though not mentioned in Mr. Zeisberger's Grammar, is expressed by niluna, which means we, some of us, with relation to a particular number of persons. It is to be observed, that it begins with the letter n, indicative of the first person; which, being repeated in the last syllable na, seems as if it meant to say, we, we; that is, we, particularly speaking, but not all; whereas the general plural, kiluna, (we, all of us,) begins with the pronominal affix of the second person, as if to say, we and you, or we you and all. The same difference is found in the Massachusetts, where we is expressed in two modes, neenawun and kenawun; the one in the same manner beginning with the affix of the first person, afterwards repeated, and the other with that of the second person; from whence, and the great affinity of the two languages, I strongly conjecture, that NEENAWUN means the particular, and KENAWUN the general plural. This might, I dare say, be ascertained by searching for examples in our author's translation of the Bible; but these notes having been called for sooner than I ex-

pected, I have not time at present for the investigation. If the rules of analogy are not deceptive, it will be found, I believe, that I am right in my conjecture.

Our author does not speak of a dual number; nor is it probable there is any, other than the particular plural.

The question whether all the Indian languages have the particular plural, or some of them the dual in lieu of it, is an interesting one. I at first inclined to the former opinion; but recent inquiries make the latter seem the most probable. In one of them, at least, (the Cherokee,) it appears that there is a dual number. Mr. Pickering, in consequence of the general remarks on this subject, in the Transactions of the Historical and Literary Committee, was led to conjecture, that what had been called the dual in the Cherokee, was in fact only the particular or limited plural, which is common to other Indian dialects. But he has since informed me, that upon conversing on this point with an intelligent young man of that nation, (who is perfectly familiar with our own language,) he has ascertained that this opinion was unfounded, and that the Cherokee language has a proper dual number, like the languages of antiquity. There are varieties in the polysynthetick forms of the Indian languages, which do not, however, affect their general character. Absolute uniformity is not to be found in any of the works of nature; and there is no reason why languages should be excepted from this universal rule.

The interrogative pronoun, as our author denominates it, howan, plural howanig (who,) is also found in the Lenni Lenape. Zeisberger and Heckewelder spell it auwen, which, according to the German pronunciation, gives the same sound, except the h at the beginning. This pronoun, in the Delaware, is formed into a verb in the following curious manner, which I extract from Zeisberger's MS. Grammar:

From AUWEN, who

Singular. Ewenikia, who I am.
Ewenikian, who thou art.
Ewenikit, who he is.

Plural. Ewenikiyenk, who we are.
Ewenikiyek, who you are.
Ewenikichtit, who they are.

It is worthy of remark, that this nation, whose language (as I shall hereafter have occasion to observe) wants the substantive verb, I am, has come so near it, as in these examples,

without being able to find it. It is said that they cannot translate into it the sublime sentence in Exodus iii. 14, I AM THAT I AM. This pronominal verb would, it seems, admirably express the last member of it, at least in the sense of the Vulgate translation, Ego sum Qu1. su111. These are anomalies, which further study and inquiry may, perhaps, enable us to reconcile.

The demonstrative pronoun *yeu* is in Delaware *yun*; and, upon the whole, there is a great resemblance, in this part of speech, between the two languages. But neither Eliot nor Zeisberger have expatiated sufficiently upon it. Indeed, these languages are so rich in forms, that a complete grammar of any of them would be too voluminous for common use.

VI. Verbs.

(Gram. p. 15.)

THE Verb is the triumph of human language. Its fundamental idea is that of existence; I am, sum. This abstract sentiment receives shape and body from its combination with the various modifications of being, by action, passion and situation, or manner of existing; I am loving, loved, sleeping, awake, sorry, sick; which the Latin tongue more synthetically expresses by *amo*, *amor*, *dormio*, *vigilo*, *contristor*, *agrotō*. Next come the accessory circumstances of person, number, time, and the relations of its periods to each other; I am, thou art, we are, I was, I shall be, I had been, I shall have been, Here the Latin again combines these various ideas in one word with the former ones; *sum*, *es*, *sumus*, *cram*, *ero*, *fueram*, *fueo*. Sometimes it goes further, and combines the negative idea in the same locution, as in *nolo*; this, however, happens but rarely; and here seem to end the verbal powers of this idiom. Not so with those of the Indian nations. While the Latin combines but few adjectives under its verbal forms, the Indians subject this whole class of words to the same process, and every possible mode of existence becomes the subject of a verb. The gender or genus, (not, as with us, a mere division of the human species by their sex, but of the whole creation by the obvious distinction of animate and inanimate,) enters also into the composition of this part of speech; and the object of the active or transitive verb is combined with it by means of those forms, which the Spanish-Mexican grammarians have called transitions, by which one single word designates the per-

son who acts, and that which is acted upon. The substantive is incorporated with the verb in a similar manner: thus in the Delaware, *n'matschi*, "I am going to the house, I am going home;" *nihillapewi*, "I am my own master, I am free;" *tpisquihilleu*, "the time approaches," (*properal hora*.) The adverb likewise: *nachpiki*, "I am so naturally;" *nipahwi*, "to travel by night," (*noctanter*;) *pachsennummen*, "to divide (something) equally," &c. In short, every part of speech in these languages is capable of being associated with the verb and compounded with it, by means of its various inflexions and forms. What shall we say of the reflected, compulsive, meditative, communicative, reverential, frequentative and other circumstantial verbs, which are found in the idioms of New Spain, and other American Indian languages? The mind is lost in the contemplation of the multitude of ideas thus expressed at once by means of a single word, varied through moods, tenses, persons, affirmation, negation, transitions, &c. by regular forms and cadences, in which the strictest analogy is preserved! Philosophers may, if they please, find here proofs of what they have thought proper to call barbarism; for my part, I am free to say, that I cannot so easily despise what I feel myself irresistibly compelled to admire.

It is to be regretted, that our venerable author has given but few Paradigms of the conjugations of the verbs in the Massachusetts language. There are, in fact, in this Grammar, but three—the active verbs to keep and to pay, and the neuter verb to be wise; the two first of which are conjugated through their negative and transitive forms, and the latter only in the affirmative and negative. He makes us acquainted with the interrogative mood, and prescribes the form of conjugating verbs through it; but, beyond that, the information which he gives, on the subject of this part of speech, is very scanty; while Zeisberger, on the contrary, in his MS. Grammar, has given us a profusion of the Delaware verbs, regularly conjugated, which will be found to afford much assistance to the student, and give him a great insight into the manner of compounding and conjugating verbs in these languages.

Whether there are any, or how many, different forms of conjugation in this language, does not appear. In the Delaware there are eight, distinguished by the terminations of their infinitive, or of the first person of the present tense of the indicative mood. Zeisberger enumerates them as follows:

The 1st ending in in;	n'da ppin, to be there.
The 2d in a;	n'da, I am going.
The 3d in elendam indicates a disposition of the mind;	niwelendam, I am sad
The 4th in men;	gattamen, I request.
The 5th in an;	ahoalan, to love.
The 6th in e or we;	n'dellowe, I say.
The 7th in in, but used only in the transitive forms;	miltin, to give.
The 8th in on;	n'pelon, I bring.

The moods and tenses of these two languages appear to be the same, though differently classed by their grammarians. Eliot divides the subjunctive mood into two, the optative and suppositive, each having but one tense, which Zeisberger calls the present and conditional tenses of the conjunctive. Our author takes no notice of the participles, which the other includes under the infinitive mood. They are numerous, and susceptible of various transitions and forms. Thus the verb *ganwin*; "to sleep," besides having three tenses in the infinitive, to wit, the present, *gauwin*, the past or preterite, *gauwineep*, "I have slept," and the future, *gauwintschi*, which cannot be rendered into English, but in Latin *dormiturus esse*, has the following participles: present, *gewit*, "sleeping;" (plural, *gewitschik*) preterite, *gewitup*, "having slept;" plural, *gewitpannik*. The future is given in other verbs. Examples of the conjugation of the participle of the causative verb, through the transitive forms, are given in the *Historical Transactions*, vol. i. p. 416, which I think unnecessary to repeat here. I have no doubt, that these forms substantially exist in the Massachusetts idioms; but our author's Grammar is by far too much abridged to admit of their being exhibited,

The formation of the future tense of the indicative mood is different in the Massachusetts and Delaware languages. In the former, it is expressed by the auxiliaries *mos* and *pish*; as, *kah pish kuttayim*, "and thou shalt make;" *kah pish neemunumwog gold*, "and they shall take gold;" *kah pish kupponamunash*, "and thou shalt put." *Exod. xxviii. 2, 5, 12*. In the Delaware, the future is designated by the termination *tsch*; as in *n'poms*, "I go;" future, *n'pomsitsch*, "I shall or will go." In the negative form, this termination is sometimes attached to the conjunction *not*; as *mattatsch n'dawi*, "I shall not go," for *mattu n'dawitsch*. This is one of the elegancies of the language; very different, however, from any thing that we have seen or heard of in the idioms of the old world.

We must not expect, in these languages, to find any thing like the Greek aorists, or those nice distinctions of time and its different periods in relation to each other, which are found in the learned tongues. The varieties of the Indian verbs are applied to other objects. I do not mean to speak, however, of the Mexican languages, in which the verbs are conjugated through all the forms, moods and tenses of the Latin. There you find the imperfect, preterite, pluperfect and even the gerunds in *di*, *do*, *durn*, and the supine.* I have observed elsewhere, that those who write Indian grammars strive too much to assimilate the forms of those languages to their own or to the Latin, whereas they have a grammar peculiar to themselves, which ought to be studied and explained. The curious and not very natural coincidence, which the Spanish grammarians have almost generally found between the Latin forms and those of the languages of their Indians, inclines me to suspect the accuracy of those writers. It is, nevertheless, evident, that the southern idioms have more tenses in their verbs, or forms of conjugation in relation to time, than those of the more northern tribes; in which latter I have only, as yet, been able to discover the present, past and future.

I observed, in my Report to the Historical Committee on the subject of the Indian languages, (Hist. Trans. p. xi.) that it appeared to me, that they were generally destitute of the auxiliary verbs to be and to have; which I shewed to be the case not only in our own northern, but in the Mexican and Othomi idioms. I added, on the authority of Father Zenteno, that the Mexicans could not translate into their language the sublime sentence, "I AM THAT I AM," Exod. iii. 14. In this sentiment I am confirmed, at least as far as concerns the Wapanachki languages, by our venerable author, who expressly says, in page 15 of his Grammar, "We (the Massachusetts)" have no complete distinct word for the Verb Substantive, as other, learned Languages, and our English Tongue have; but it is under a regular composition, whereby many words are made Verb Substantive,"

This curious fact early attracted the notice of the Honourable Judge Davis, of Boston, who, in a letter to me of the 26th of

* In Basalenque's Tarascan Grammar, pages 33 and 34, under the verb *pani*, "to carry," (*llevar*.) are the following paradigms:

Gerund in *di*, Paquaro esti--tiempo de llevar.

--- in *do*, Papan--llevando.

--- in *dum*, Pani-nirihaca-roy a llevar.

Supine in *um*, Hichen himno esca pani-a me me combiene llevar"

--- in *u*, Paquanhaxeti-coza digna, de ser llevada.

March, 1819, suggested some doubts upon the subject; and this circumstance led to a correspondence with the Rev. Mr. Heckewelder and the Rev. Mr. Deneke, which I think sufficiently interesting to warrant the insertion of some extracts from their communications in this place.

I shall extract, in the first place; from Judge Davis's letter, who wrote as follows:

"At present I will only suggest a difficulty, which occurs in relation to a remark in page xi. of your Report concerning the substantive verb to be, in the American languages. I have a manuscript Vocabulary of the language of the Southern or Old Colony Indians of Massachusetts, (compiled by Josiah, Cotton, Esq. missionary to those Indians early in the last century,) in which the verbs to be and to have are expressed in a variety of modifications. I have only room for the infinitive moods of these verbs, and the indicative mood, present tense, with numbers and persons:

'AINNEAAT, to be.

Nennont, I am.	Nenauunyeu, we are.*
Kennont, thou art.	Kenauna, you are.
Nohne, he is.	Nagna, they are.

'AHTOUNNAT, to have.

'Nummahche, I have.	Nenauun nummahche, we have.
Kummahche, thou hast,	Kenau kummahche, you have.
Noh mahche, he has.	Nag mahche, they have.'

"In Eliot's Bible, the sublime passage (Exod. iii. 14.) I am that I am, is thus translated: Nen nullinniin nen nuttinniin. Galatians iv. 12, I am as ye are, is thus rendered: Nen neyane kenaau. How is the first of these expressions to be grammatically resolved, if there be no substantive verb in the language? The last quotation is elliptical in the Greek $\kappa\alpha\gamma\omega\ \omega\varsigma\ \upsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ and so it is in the Indian, which, literally, would be, I as you. Nen I take to be a pronoun, and so is kenaau.....I find, in A. Fabre's Grammar of the Chili Language, the following sentence: 'Los nombres abstractos, como bondad, blancura, &c. se hacen posponiendo el verbo sum, es, est, a los adjetivos ò sub-

* The original MS. of Cotton has here Kenauun yeu: which, agreeably to Mr. Du Ponceau's opinion, (in his remarks on the Pronouns,) was the general plural; nenaun yeu being the particular or limited plural.-EDITOR.

stantivos.'-Molina, I believe, has a similar remark; but the doctrine is not so distinctly announced as by Fabres, to whom Molina appears to have been principally indebted for his observations on the language of Chili.--Jean de Lael also gives us the substantive verb in the Brazilian language; aico, je sui, I ereico, tu es, oico, il est oroico, nous sommes, peico, vous estes, aurae oico, ils sont. In the third person plural, only, the pronoun is prefixed; whereas, in the example from Cotton's MS. (whose Vocabulary, I find, has generally a close correspondence with the Natick,) we notice the pronouns throughout. On this subject of the substantive verb, and especially of its application in the admirable language of Chili, I had some floating ideas, which I had digested into a sort of theory. Schemes of thought are not always readily abandoned; but I find mine not a little disturbed by the remark in that part of your discussion. I may hereafter communicate to you the views to which I refer." Judge Davi adds, in a Postscript to his letter, the following remark: "Eliot often expresses J am by the word nen alone; but Is it not because the phrase is often elliptical in the Greek? In John viii. 58, 'Before Abraham was I AM' is, thus rendered: Negonne onk Abrahamwi nutapip. The expression there is not elliptical in the original; the word nutapip I consider as corresponding to εγω ειμι, though I am not able to trace its origin."

This doubt, suggested from so respectable a quarter, and supported, besides, with so much learning and ingenuity, made me distrust my own opinion, and led me to inquire further into the matter. Still I could not help believing, as I am yet inclined to think, that the want of the substantive verb was a general rule in the Indian languages. I knew too well the inclination of grammarians to assimilate those idioms to their own, to be shaken by paradigms, in which the verb sto, for instance, might be translated by sum or Jam, for want of sufficient attention to the shade of difference between them; but the words Nen nuttiniin nen nuttiniin, by which our author had rendered Jain that I am in his translation of the Bible, though they might not have the precise meaning of the original text, must yet mean something; and I was curious to know by what analogous mode of expression the venerable apostle had got out of this immense difficulty, when he himself had told his readers, that there was "no compleat distinct word for the Verb, Substantive" in the language.* I therefore determined to con-

* Grammar, p. 15.

sult my oracle, Mr. Heckewelder, from whom I speedily received an answer, of which I shall here communicate some extracts:

"8th April, 1819,

" I cannot believe, that any of the tribes connected with the Lenni Lenape can translate into their language the words I am that I am, so as to come up to the same meaning. The late David Zeisbergcr and myself sought many years in vain for this substantive verb. We had the best chapel interpreters, I may say orators, some of whom were not at a loss to interpret critically almost all scripture passages and expressions; yet with regard to the one in question, they never came up to the meaning, but made use of the best substitute they could; for instance: I abtschi gutteli n'dellsin, 'I always act the same;' elsia, natsch abtschi n'dellsin, 'so as I do, I shall always do,' or 'I shall always act the same;' or again, elinaxia abtschitsch n'dellinaxin, 'as I appear, (am to appearance,) I shall always be.' I cannot find a single instance in the language, in which the verb I am is used by itself, that is to say, uncombined with the idea of the act about to be done."

"You have, no doubt, observed, in my Historical Account, page 232, that the Indian, striking his breast, says with conscious pride, I AM A MAN. This he expresses by the words Lenno n'hackey; literally, my body is a man (qr, 'I am a man body,' in the sense that we say, She is a clever body, a young, a handsome body.) I might then translate 'I am that I am' by n'hackey iabtschi n'hacky, 'my body (is) always my body.'- This word n'hackey, with the Indians, is a most expressive word. In the Indian song, of which I have given a translation, (Hist. Trans. p. 204,) the sentence at the beginning, O poor me! is expressed in Indian by Wo gettemaki n'hackey! 'O poor my body!' &c.

"All I can say, at present, of Eliot's translation of 'I am that I am' by Nen nuttinniin nen nuttiniin is, that it can never be a literal translation of the text. The passage in Galatians iv. 12, 'I am as ye are,' which Eliot translates by Nen neyane kenaau, I presume means, 'I look like you, we are alike, or we look like one another. I suppose a Delaware translator would say, Elinaxiyek, nepe n'delinaxin; that is, 'as ye are, so I am also;' but this is always said in the sense of personal appearance, shape, face, countenance, size, &c. He might have said, also, n'gutti ktellinaxihhena, 'we look alike,' 'we look one,' or, n' gutteli

k'delsihhena, 'we do, act, alike;' or, lastly, ni n'dellsin elsiyek, 'I do as ye do,' &c."

In the same letter Mr. Heckewelder enclosed to me a copy of one he had received from the Rev. Mr. Dencke of Lititz, to whom he had written on the same subject. I trust I shall be excused for translating here some extracts from this letter also, which is written in German:

"I have never known," says Mr. Deneke, "the verb to be to exist, either in the Delaware or Chippeway language, and I can find nothing in those idioms that expresses it literally. The nearest to it is (in the Delaware) ni n'dellsin elsia, 'as I do.' The pronoun ni is duplicated to strengthen the expression of the idea of the first person of the verb; elsia is contracted from elgiqui, 'as,' and lissia, 'as I do,' (da ich thue.) Out of this pronoun ni, or nen, perhaps, a new verb might be framed, which, I am inclined to think, Mr. Eliot has done in the Natick. This was easy to be done; but such a word is not genuine Indian. I have been, in vain, trying to understand the meaning of Nen nuttinniin nen nuttinniin, which appears to be the same sentence twice repeated, but have not been able to succeed: - - - ."

"Ni n'delinaxin elinaxia, 'as I appear so I am,' (Ich bin dem so gleich, so wie ich bin.) But this is not answering Mr. Du Ponceau's question, I should probably express 'I am as ye are,' by Ni n'dellsin elsiyeek; and I do not think that there is any thing that comes nearer to it.

"I think we must remain where we are; agreeing, however, upon this point, that in the Indian languages that we are acquainted with, 'I am that I am' cannot be literally expressed, but a substitute must be employed," &c. .

In a Postscript, which follows the copy of Mr. Dencke's letter, Mr. Heckewelder concludes, that if Nen nuttinniin nen nuttinniin means any thing, it must be either "I am a man, I am a man," or, "I do so, I do so."

After much consideration and study of the subject, I incline much to the opinion, that Mr. Heckewelder is right in his last conjecture; and, as it appears to be full time to put an end to these Notes, and the remaining parts of speech suggest no interesting observations, I shall conclude with stating the grounds upon which this conjecture is founded.

It appears to me, in the first place, that the Massachusetts verb nuttinniin is the same with the Delaware verb n'dell sin, 'I do or act,' which the German does not unfrequently spell n'tellsin, confounding the t with the d, because their ears do not suffi-

ciently distinguish between the two sounds. Now the first syllable of *nuttinniin*, 'nut,' in which the short *u* is employed to express the interval or *sheva* between the two consonants, is the same with the Delaware *n'd* or *n't*; the middle syllable *tin* is the Delaware *tel* or *del*, changing *e* into *i* and *l* into *n*; *in* is the termination of the verbal form in the Massachusetts, which *in* this word is the same as in the Delaware; and *nen* is the duplication of the personal pronoun, for the sake of greater energy, as Mr. Deneke has very properly observed.

This etymological deduction would not prove much, without shewing that the verb *nuttinniin* means "to do or act" in the Massachusetts, as *n'dellsin* does in the Delaware. This, I think, can be done by recurring to examples in our author's translation of the Bible. For instance: *To kittinheh*, "What is it that thou hast done unto me?" Gen: xii. 8. *To* means "what;" *kittinheh* is probably the interrogative form of the verb *nuttinniin*, or *n'tinniin*, *k't*, *kut*, or *kit*, being the affix form of the second person, which the letter *k* represents in the Massachusetts as well as in the Delaware. *To kustussem?* "What hast thou done?" Gen. iv, 10. Here the verb is employed in another form, not being combined with the idea of to me, which appears expressed in the former word by the *n*, descriptive of the first person. This is, however, but my humble conjecture, which I offer with great diffidence, after the question has been given up by those who are much more skilled than I am in the Indian languages; of which I profess to know nothing except the little I have acquired in the solitude of the closet.

I have only to add a remark respecting the verb *nutapip*, which, as Judge Davis observes, (in the Postscript to his letter,) is used for I am, in Eliot's Bible: "Before Abraham was, I AM--Negonne onk Abrahamwi nutapip. John viii. 58," At the time when Judge Davis wrote to me, J could not explain the meaning of *nutapip*; but I am now able to do it. *N'dappin* is a Delaware verb, which signifies to be (in a particular place) stare; the preterite is *n'dappineep*, *stabam*, *hic stabam*. There can be no doubt but Eliot's *nutiipip*, that is to say, *n'tapip* or *n'dapip*, is a contraction of the Delaware *n'dappineep*, and means, I was there,

SUPPLEMENTARY OBSERVATIONS. BY THE EDITOR.

AFTER the Notes and Observations of Mr. Du Ponceau had been delivered to the printer, I employed the few leisure moments, which I could command, in considering some of the points discussed in them; and in the course of my inquiries some unexpected facts came under my notice. These suggested reflections, which led to a further correspondence between Mr. Du Ponceau and Mr. Heckewelder; and as this correspondence throws much light upon the structure of the Indian Languages, I have thought it would be useful to state in this place some of the facts, to which I have alluded, together with the substance of their additional remarks upon them.

I. On the Verb TO BE.

IT will be recollected, that in conformity with what has been observed in modern times, by Dr. Edwards in the Mohegan language and by Mr. Zeisberger and Mr. Heckewelder in the Delaware, the author of the present Grammar had said a century and a half ago of the .Maua.c/iusetts language-" We have no compleat distinct word for the Verb Substantive, as other, learned languages, and our English tongue have; but it is under a regular composition, whereby many words are made verb substantive;" which kind of "composition," he adds, takes place in nouns, adnouns, adverbs, or the like.

Notwithstanding this emphatick observation, however, the venerable author, in his version of the Scriptures, had repeatedly found occasion to translate the verb to be, and accordingly often attempted to render it by some equivalent Indian word; a striking instance of which is to be found in the passage already brought under discussion in the preceding Notes: I am that I am, "Nen nuttinniin nen [or ne]nuttinniin."* This circumstance led me to examine some of the passages, in which the verb to be occurred in the English version of the

* Eliot's first edition has nen nuttinniin NE nuttinniin; but the second has nen in both places. This difference will not affect the reasoning respecting the substantive verb, but will only make a difference in the grammatical analysis of the sentence.

Bible; and I soon found, that Eliot appeared to have been driven to the necessity of resorting to Indian words, apparently very different from each other. For one example of this we need not go beyond the very text above cited; where, though in the first part of the verse he employs the expression Nen NUTTINIIN for I am, yet, in the latter part, he uses the words Nen UKOH: I AM hath sent me unto you--"Nen ukoh ancoteamwe nuttamoönuk en kuhhogkacont." In other parts of his version he uses various other forms of expression for the different tenses of the English verb; as will be seen in the following examples;

Gen. iii. 9. Where art thou?	Toh kutapin ?
-- v. 24, And he was not.	Kah mallah na wutápein.
-- xviii. 24. For the fifty righteous that are there- in.	Newutche napannatahshinchag- odtog sampwesecheg na apit- cheg.
Exod. viii. 21, And also the ground whereon they are.	Kah wame ohkeit ne apehttit.
-- xx, 21. Where God was.	Ne God apit.
1 Sam, xix. 3. Where thou art.	Uttoh apean.
1 Kings xxii. 4. I am as thou art.	Nen netatuppe ken.
Job xxxviii. 4. Where wast thou?	Uttoh kutapineas?
Psalms xxxvii. 36. And lo he was not.	Kah kuseh matta ohtano.
Isa. xxiii. 13. This people was not, till the Assyrian, &c.	Yeug missinuinnuog matta ap- pupaneg noh pajeh Assyri- ansog, &c,
John viii. 58. Before Abra- ham was I am.	Negonne Abrahamwi, nutapip,
Rev. i. 4,8, & iv.8. From him which is, and which was and which is to come.	Wutch noh noh koh, noh koh mo, noh paont.
-- xvii. 8. The beast that was and is not and yet is	Puppishimwoh, noh mo, kah noh matta, kah noh yeuyeu apit.

In many other places, however, the author uses some form of the word nuttiniin:

Gen. xxxi. 40. Thus I was in the day the drought consumed me and the frost by night.	Yeu mo nuttinaiin, kesukodaeu kusittau nuttonauushkik, kah toohpu nukonaeu.
-- xxxi. 41. Thus I have been twenty years in thy house.	Yeu nuttinaiin neesnechage kod- tumae kekit.

This apparent diversity in the modes of expressing the same idea excited my curiosity. It was manifest that the venerable author had experienced a difficulty in finding; what he calls in his Grammar, a "complete" verb substantive; and that he had been obliged to content himself with words which only approximated to the strict signification of that verb. I therefore endeavoured to ascertain the precise import of the words, which he thus appeared to have used as substitutes for it. With this view, I began to read Cotton's English and Indian Vocabulary, (the IHS. mentioned in the Introductory Observations to the present Grammar,) from which the Hon. Judge Davis had extracted the example of the verb to be, that had given rise to the discussion in Mr. Du Ponceau's Notes.* In the course of my reading, I soon met with the verb nuttiniin, used by Eliot, in Exod. iii. 14. But I was not a little surprised at the same time to find, that Cotton translated it, not by our verb to be, but by the verb to become. He gives it in this form;

" I am become,nuttinni.
We are become,.....----- yumun.
To become, Unniinat."

This discovery now led me to examine Eliot's Bible for texts where the verb to become occurred; in order to see how far Eliot agreed with Cotton, in rendering that English verb; and I found, that he also had rendered it sometimes by nuttiniin, the very word, which he had in other places used for the verb to be.

Upon returning to my examination of Cotton's Vocabulary, I soon met with another of Eliot's substitutes for the verb to be-the word nutapip, which occurs in this text: Before Abraham was I am--" Negonne onk Abrahamwi nutapip." John viii. 58. But here again I found that Cotton had affixed

* See page xxxv. of the Notes,

to the Indian word a different idea from that which Eliot seemed to have done; for Cotton explained nutapip by our verb to be able, in different modes and tenses as follows:

"I am able,	nuttâppinum.
Thou art able,	ken kuttâppinum,
He is able,	nagum tâppinum.
We are able,	nuttâppinumumun.
Ye are able,	kuttâppinumumwo.
They are able,	nâg tappinumwog, &c.
I was able,	nuttâppinumup.
Thou wast able,	kuttâppinumup.
Be thou able,	ken tapinish.
Let him be able,	noh tapinetch.
Let us be able,	tapinumuttuh.
Be ye able,	tapinumook.
Let them be able	tapinumhittitch.
Art thou able?	sun kuttapinum?
To be able,	tapinumunat."

As I had discovered these various explanations of the Indian words in question, in the same manuscript where the Hon. Judge Davis had found the supposed substantive verb (ainneat) which had given occasion to the discussion in the preceding Notes, I communicated to Mr. Du Ponceau the facts, which had thus fallen under my observation, and referred him to several texts of Eliot's Bible, where the words in question occurred; requesting him, at the same time, to favour me with his reflections on the subject; for whether Cotton was right in translating nuttinniin by become, while Eliot had rendered it by our verb to be, was a point which my own acquaintance with the language did not enable me to determine. ,

Mr. Du Ponceau, in his reply to my letter, (after observing, that "perhaps Cotton could find no better word for become") says-" But if the word means strictly and precisely become, how can it mean TO BE in the text, I am that I am? Eliot's translation would then be--I become, I become. This is still farther from the meaning of his text than the Delaware n'dellsin, I AM so.* If I may indulge a conjecture, I should

* See Mr. Du Ponceau's Note, p, xxviii.

say, that the Wapanachki had no proper word for either be or become, and have perhaps used the same approximation in both cases. In general, it appears to me, that the idea of existence is never presented singly in any Indian word, but always coupled with some accessory idea, which connects the word with what is to follow. Thus, if they meant to say I have now become good, they would probably say, I am now so that I am good, or use a word implying or leading to that compound idea. It is true, the relation back to what I formerly was, does not here appear; and there lies the difficulty." Mr. Du Ponceau, however, without expressing a settled opinion of his own, consulted Mr. Heckewelder, and has obligingly furnished me with their correspondence; the substance of which I cannot communicate to the reader in a more useful and interesting form than their own language.

In the first letter which Mr. Du Ponceau wrote to Mr. Heckewelder (Oct. 8, 1821) he made the following inquiries: "I wish to know how you express the word become in Delaware, as thus : I was once bad, I have now become good; and these Scriptural phrases:

The man is become as one of us. Gen. iii. 22.

What will become of his dreams ? Gen: xxxvii. 20.

What is become of him? Exod. xxxii. 1.

To them gave he power to become the sons of God. John i. 12.

"In the Natick, (or Massachusetts,) Eliot expresses this word by nuttinniin, the same which he uses for I am that I am. I think this word is derived from the Delaware n'dellsin, n'tellsin, changing the l into n, which is very frequent among Indians. If the Delawares use n'dellsin for become, it will confirm me in my opinion.

"In the short History of the Bible, at the end of Zeisberger's Spelling Book, it seems to me I have found the word become expressed by n'dellsin. See page 127, line 10-That they would become too powerful. It seems to me that the word wtellitsch, in the translation, is meant to express become. See also page 136, line 9-wtellitsch sokenapalan. Does not this mean, should be, or became baptized? You will find the word become in several other parts of Zeisberger's History of the Bible; as, for instance, pages 119 and 120, third paragraph-become confirmed; page, 123, second line from the bottom-become universal. In these phrases I do not find

n'dellsin, nor indeed any word to express become; which seems in the Delaware to be understood."

To these inquiries, Mr. Heckewelder replied in two different letters. In his first (in consequence of being requested to return an immediate answer) he merely gives a translation in Delaware of the English phrases proposed, without any comment or grammatical explanation, as follows :

- "1. To become
Allumilissin--elsin.
2. I was once bad, I have now become good.
Nemomachtschilissihump, schukmetschi n'nolilissi.*
3. The man is become as one of us.
Na lenno lussu, elsiyenk.
4. What will become of his dreams?
Ta hatsch leke eechdelungwamoagcma untschi? or, koecu hatsch w'delungwamoagana untschi? what benefit will he derive from his dreams? t
5. What is become of him?
Ta eli achpit? (where is he?) or, ta uchtenden? how is he? what is he about? or, ta leke hocheyal, how does it look about him? (Germ. Wie sieht es um ihn aus?)
6. To them gave he power to become the sons of God.
Milap nikik allewussowoagan wentschitsch gask wequise-
muxit na-Gettanittowit; or, milap nekik wdalle-
wussoagan wentschitschgaski getannellowitall qui-
semaouna."

Mr. Heckewelder's second letter (of Oct. 13) contains a minute consideration of the word become, with an explanation of the true import of the different words by which it is expressed in the Delaware language ; and the whole letter

* "Machtschi, bad; schuk, but; metschi, ready, already; olilis, good, (from wulit.) P. S. D;"

t Nane leketsch; amen, so be it, so may it happen ; koecu, what, something. P, S. D."

is so interesting, and throws so much light upon the structure of the Indian languages, that I am unwilling to abridge it. He writes as follows:

"By your two letters of the 8th and 9th of October, I discover that my first answer to your questions had not reached you. In that I attempted to translate the Scripture passages quoted by you, for the purpose of discovering what word the Delawares have for our word BECOME, or TO BECOME; the German word for it being werden.

"I have since also given the quotations from Scripture, contained in your last letters, due consideration, but cannot discover any kind of word in the Delaware language, that would answer generally to the English word become, or the German werden; neither do I believe there is such a word in their language. Yet they are never at a loss to convey the sense or meaning of this word by means of syllables from two or more words joined together; and, indeed, often the termination of a word is sufficient for that purpose. The word *allemi*, which implies something progressing, advancing towards a close, going on, &c., is with them joined (generally prefixed) to a word which is expressive of the object it is progressing to: Thus, *alleminen* (to ripen) contains the meaning of the two words, *allemi gischiken*, which, when separated, are lengthened out as here written; *tepiken* (Zeisb. p, 37) being the general word for any thing that bears fruit or grain, when or being ripe, full-grown, &c. Again: the word *allemilek* implies a prediction, or any thing expected, progressing towards the point, or towards establishing the fact; as for instance, when I say--*metschi ALLEMILEK endchen ndelloweneep*, it is the same as saying, all that I had said (or foretold) is now coming to Pass.

"In this way the word become is, in a manner, interwoven in the words of their language; and by examining the passages you quote from Zeisberger's Translation, it will be found so. As, in his History of the Bible, p, 119, third paragraph, for the English word increase, or, that they increased, he has the word *alleminenewo*, from the word *allemi gischiken* (the termination *ewo* signifying they) that is, they became more numerous.* At pages 126-7, where you take the word *wtellitch* to express become, (which word, however, has

* "The word *gischiken* is also applicable to the birth of an infant-sound born, J. H."

a different signification) Zeisberger says--ahanhocqui gischigapannik; which words imply an additional or extraordinary increase, which had taken place in Egypt, &c.; and for the words--the king became apprehensive, Zeisberger has--wentschi Sakima nechasop* wtellitsch wsami m'chelhittin, woak allowiwunan--which is--therefore the King became fearful, that by means of this increase they might finally be too powerful for them: Here sop answers for jealous.

"The passage wtellitsch Sokenapalan, which you quote from page 136, line 9--nil milapanil Allouchsowoagan wentschitsch undamemensichtit Getannittowittink is translated from the German text, which reads thus: Denen gab er macht kinder Gottes zu werden. John i. 12. The words kinder zu werden (in English, to become children) are expressed in the Indian word undamemensichtit; in which the two last syllables ichtit express the words to become; (Germ. werden;) so that the two last words, undamemensichtit Getannittowitink, taken together, clearly imply to become children of God.

"The next passage you quote, (from page 108, and which you find in Matth. xviii. 3.)

Mattatsch gluppiweque, woak mattatsch amemensuwiweque, (Eng. If not you turn back, and if not as children ye become,) (GERM. Wo nicht ihr umkehret, und wo nicht als die kinder ihr werdet,)

is as clearly set forth in their language as in either of ours; the word become (Germ. werden) being incorporated in the last word, or expressed -by the last syllables wiweque. The word wentschi for therefore, (in German, darum,) Zeisb. p. 17, with the tsch at the end of it, points or directs to something that is to take place in future; it implies as much as to say in German --damit es geschehen moge. The reason for my going there is also expressed by them thus--wentschitsch na ayane.

"Thus there are many Indian words, which, though necessary in explaining a thing, do not effect it without an additional word. For example, the word anenawi would be; in German, endlich, and in English, at last, finally, &c: Now, by adding the syllable itsch to it, so as to make it anenawitsch, it directs you forward, to something that is yet to take place, which is generally set forth in the next following word or words; as anenawitsch

* "For nechasin and nechasil; see Zeisb, p. 30. Nechasop, in the text, stands for jealous, fearful, &c. J. H."

knemeneen Menachking, that is, in German, endlich werden wie doch Pittsburg sehen--finally, or at last, we shall see Pittsburg, or (as is properly meant) arrive at Pittsburg; the last word in this Indian expression being their name for that place. But I may also say--auwiewi knementsch Menachking, finally we shall see (or arrive at) Pittsburg."

These observations of Mr. Heckewelder will be rendered still more useful to the student, by the following additional explanations, which were communicated in a subsequent letter to Mr. Du Ponceau. Mr. H. says-

The structure of the Indian languages is, as you observe, truly wonderful.... I once believed myself competent to understand every word they used; and I can still plainly see the necessity of every syllable in a word, by which to explain themselves properly. Not being able, however, to answer your questions intelligibly, otherwise than by examples, setting forth words and phrases, which will lead to the required solution, I shall adopt that method.

"Thus with regard to the syllable UND. I begin with the word unden, Zeisb. p. 16. This (says Z.) is to take from, which so far is correct; for, if an I ndi an becomes possessed of an article not seen with him before, he will be asked-" TA GUNDEN?*" where did you get it? or how did you come by it?" for the word unden of itself instructs us, that the article was obtained at some place, or came to hand through or from some source. As, Zeisberger, p. 67-UNDENUMM.EN, to take it from, or, more properly, to have obtained it (es bekmmneri)—WUND-ENSIK, where it is to be got from (Zeisb. p. 72) points to a certain place where the article was obtained or may be had.

"When the syllable UND or WEND is prefixed, in a spiritual sense, it applies to favours, gifts, &c., not to things purchased, or on which a price is set. Thus WENDENUXOWOAGAN, reception, admittance. Zeisb. 111,--UNDOOCHWENALL, he came for their sake, Zeisb. 67.-" Christ undoochwenep getemaxitschit" is, Christ came for the purpose of (saving or relieving) the poor, or needy. WENDaptonachga, of, or from the word, Zeisb. 95, -Christ wundaptonalgun, Christ (by or through his word) speaks unto us (that is, we do not ourselves hear him speak, yet what he says is directed to us) from his place of abode;

* In this word gunden, and some others, Mr. Heckewelder seems (according to the practice of German writers) to use the letter g fork; this latter being the usual prefix to denote the second person.

UNDEN Christink, it proceedeth or cometh from him; UND-amemensemichtit, through or by..... to become, &c.

"I can go no further in explaining the syllable und (from unden) than to add, that when used in a temporal sense, it implies to get or have gotten, procured or purchased such a thing or article from the place or person at the time named. In a spiritual sense, it is applied to a thing obtained by free will or through grace—to be admitted, received, BE, or BECOME a partaker, &c. of, in, or to whatever one or the other of the connected words indicates.

"WENTSCHI is simply therefore (Germ. darum, um desswillen.)

"WENTSCHITSCH is thereby (Germ. dadurch) and directs to the future.

"We have no such words as nentschi, lcnlschi, in the language. The letter w, in wentschi, does not point to the third person, but is necessary to distinguish that word from UNTSCHI, from, of, (Zeisb. 16,) which, being a general word, is frequently either wholly or partly incorporated in other words; as, for instance: Ta untschiey--where does it come from? Nik lennowak wemi utenink UNTSCHijeyih--those men are all come from the city.

"NUNTSCHihilla uteney--I came, with speed, from the city: Kuntschihilla uteney--are you come, with speed, from the city? Untschihilleu uteney--he came, speedily, from the city or town. Kuntschihillahummo uteney—are all come from the city or town?"*

To these remarks should be added a brief explanation of the terminations muxit and sichtit, which occur in some of the preceding examples:

"In looking over your letter (says Mr. H.) after I had written this, I find that I had not sufficiently explained the terminations muxit and sichtit. Please to turn to Zeisberger's Spelling Book, page 104, for the word MACHELEMUXOWOAGAN, honour; p. 82, for the word MACHELEMUXIT, the that is honoured; and p. 52, for MACHELENDAM, to honour, &c. Now MACHELEMAU or MACHELEMAE is, honour him, &c.; MACHELEMUXichtit, may be or become honoured. Now it will be understood as ex-

* "The syllables hilla (taken from the word schihilla, quickly, speedily) added to the word untschi, make the compound untschihilla, and denote either quick running or riding. J. H."

t "It is all the same whether I write this word muxit or mucksit: I have seen the word maxen (shoes) written mocksen, &c. J. H."

actly the same thing, whether I say WENTSCHI MACHELEMUX-ichtitetsch, or WENTSCHitsch MACHELEMUXxichtit, to become honoured. The same thing takes place in the word UND-AMEMENSichtit; the future, to be made, become, in the first words, is in the termination ichtitetsch; in the last, it is partly in the termination of the word wentschitsch, and partly in the termination of the second word ichtit."

I cannot omit adding here (from a letter of Mr. Du Ponceau) the following elucidation of the Indian method of expressing our verbs:

"We are now (says he) upon the word become; and Mr. Heckewelder has told us, that there is no proper word for it in the language of the Delawares, but yet that they are never at a loss for a method of conveying that idea. Let us see how they go about it. Mr. H. instances the words to become honoured; in Delaware wentschi machelemuxichtitetsch, or (what is equivalent) wentschitsch machelemuxichtit. This may be parsed as follows:

"Wentschi (as explained in Mr. Heckewelder's letter) is therefore; wentschitch is thereby, and directs to the future.

"Machelemuxichtit. In the Transactions of the Historical and Literary Committee, (p. 445 of Mr. Heckewelder's Correspondence,) we have the substantive machelemuxowoagan, honour, or the being honoured. The verb is machelendam (3d conjug.) to honour; machelemuxit (particip.) he who is honoured; machelemuxichtit (3d pers. plur. conditional, or conjunctive) if, or when they are honoured. Observe, that the phrase to be honoured is here taken in a plural sense-wentschimachelemuxichtitetsch or wentschitsch machelemuxichtit. Tsch is the sign of the future; and it is a matter of indifference, says Mr. Heckewelder, whether it is suffixed to the preposition by it, or to the verb to be honoured; hence, the two modes of rendering the sentence. Thus "to become the children of God" is expressed in Zeisberger's Harmony; by " wentschitsch undamemensichtit Getannittowitink;" WENTSCHITSCH, thereby in future, UNDAMEMENSICHTIT, (from awemens, child,) to become the children. Here the word become is not at all used, but a compound verb, from the substantive child, expresses the idea; as in the Latin word beatificari (a word formed much after the Indian manner) the syllable fi awakening in the mind the idea of fieri; but as there is no such word as fieri in the Indian (in the mere abstract sense) the same idea is differently expressed. Lastly; GETANNITTOWITINK, of God,--ink or onk is a termination of

relation, and here expresses the genitive. See Zeisberger's Grammar: "Nihillalquonk Allogewoaganall, God's the Lord's works."

The preceding discussion respecting the verbs to be and to become, has been confined (as the reader will have observed) to two of the Indian languages only, the Delaware of the present day, and the Massachusetts as spoken a century and a half ago. But since the correspondence of Mr. Heckewelder and Mr. Du Ponceau, I have been enabled to extend my inquiries on the present question to some other Indian dialects; though not with the same minuteness and certainty as in the case of the Delaware language. For the information which I have obtained, I am indebted to the Rev. Herman Daggett, Superintendent of the Foreign Missionary School, established at Cornwall, in the State of Connecticut; who, notwithstanding the pressure of ill health, was so obliging as to make particular inquiries for me on this subject of the different Indian pupils under his care, In his letter to me, of the 22d of October, 1821, he says--

"I have, strictly speaking, but four Indian languages in my school; the Choctaw, the Cherokee, the Muhhekunneau (or Stockbridge) and the Iroquois, including the Oneida, Tuscarora and Caughnewaga. The youth of the se nations, or tribes, agree in saying, as far as I can make them understand the subject, that they have no substantive verb. Where we should say, I am here, they can only say, I here, or I stand or live here. I have now but one Stockbridge lad; he recognizes, in some measure, his own language in the few words you have given from Eliot, but appears to know nothing of the verb conjugated by Cotton.* The word *nuttinniin*, he says, signifies always the same, without change; and *nutapip*, I was born, or I born.

"The attempts of the different youths at translating the given passages [of scripture] are not very satisfactory. Some of them have a word, or part of a word, which, they say, signifies AM or WAS, in connexion; but they say it has not that meaning by itself. Their translation, they say, is good Cherokee or good Choctaw, &c.; but when I try to bring them to

* The words of Eliot here alluded to, were--*Negonne onk Abrahamwi nutapip*--John viii. 58; and the verb conjugated by Cotton was *ainneat*, which is given above, at p. xxv. As to the close affinity between the *Muhheakunneau* (Mohegan) and the Massachusetts, see above, Introductory Observations, p. 19.

explain and analyze, they are at a loss.....I can plainly discover that there is a beautiful contexture in their languages."*

From the whole of this investigation, then, it appears-

1. That the observation made by Eliot, at the very early period when he wrote, that there was "no complete distinct word for the verb substantive" in the Massachusetts language, is very fully confirmed by what we find to be the case in the Delaware language; which is the main stock of the Massachusetts and other northern dialects, and from which we may reason (in respect to general properties) to the derivative dialects, without much hazard of falling into any material errors.

2. That the Massachusetts verb *nuttinniin* (or *n'tinniin*, as it would now be written) which Eliot sometimes uses for our verb to be, and sometimes for become, is nothing more than an approximation to the strict meaning of those English words.

But the precise import of the Massachusetts verb *nuttinniin* does not yet appear so clearly as to leave no uncertainty upon the subject; though it seems to have a close affinity with the Delaware verb *n'dellsin*, and probably is (as Mr. Du Ponceau has above observed) the very corresponding verb in that kindred dialect. If, upon further investigation, this should prove to be the fact, beyond all doubt, then we shall need no other authority for the fundamental idea of this verb, than that of Mr. Heckewelder, who informs us, that in the Delaware it is, I act so, I act for myself (in German, so *bin ich gestellt*.) Yet, until the identity of the two verbs is incontrovertibly established, it may be allowable in an inquiry of this nature to offer even conjectures; with the hope, that if such conjectures should not be entirely well founded in themselves, they may be the means of exciting such further investigations, as may at last conduct us to the true solution of the problem. Under this impression, I shall submit one other view of the subject, which has occurred to me upon a fresh examination of Eliot's Grammar, and some other works relative to the dialects of our northern Indians. I offer it as a mere conjecture; and I should not venture to do even that, if I had not obtained the approbation of Mr. Du Ponceau himself, who thinks this view not unworthy of being submitted to the reader.

Eliot, in p. 23 of his Grammar, has the following curious remark: "There be also suppletive syllables of no significa-

* For specimens of the Cherokee language, the reader is referred to Dr. Jarvis's Discourse on the Religion of the Indian Tribes of North America; the learned Notes of which contain much valuable information on the Languages of the Indians,

lion but for ornament of the word, as tit, tin, tinne; and these, in way of an elegancy, receive the affix, which belongeth to the noun or verb following, as nuttit, lcuttit, wuttit, NUTTIN, kuttin, wuttin, NUTTINNE, kuttinne, wuttinne."

During a very recent perusal of his Grammar, this remark attracted my notice; and it immediately occurred to me that, possibly, the suppletive syllable tinne might be a constituent part of the verb nuttinniin; in which case the verb itself would be simply nuttiin, or (as we should now write it) n'tiin. Pursuing the investigation, upon this hypothesis, I found in Cotton's MS. Vocabulary several instances, in which the suppletive tin (as well as some of the other suppletives) appeared to be thus incorporated into different verbs with the affixes of the different persons, in conformity with Eliot's observation. This led me to continue my inquiries for a verb of the form I have mentioned (n'tiin); and I had the satisfaction at last of meeting with it in Roger Williams's Vocabulary of: the Naraganset dialect; which is now well known to be nearly the same language with the Massachusetts. In that Vocabulary, the verb in question occurs in the three following phrases; in one of which, however, it is somewhat obscured by the author's very irregular orthography;

"Yo nttin I live here.
 Tou wuttiin? where lives he ?
 Tuckuttiin [tou kuttin?] ... where keep you?" *

Now, if Eliot's verb nuttinniin is in fact the same with Williams's verb n'ttin, the signification of it, as the reader perceives, is very different from that of the pure substantive verb; some other idea being united with that of mere existence in the abstract. How far this analysis of the verb nuttinniin may be well founded, is submitted to the candid reader, with all that hesitation, which ought to be felt by one, who has no more knowledge of the Indian languages than I possess,

Thus far the present remarks have been directed to the meaning of Eliot's verb nuttinniin; and it now only remains, to ascertain the signification of his other substitutes for the

* The English word keep seems to be here used by Williams, in the provincial signification, which it has in some parts of New England at the present day; that is, in the sense of to stay, reside, or (as Williams says in the other two phrases) to live. See his Key, chap. i. in Massachusetts Historical Collections, vol. v. pp. 80, 81.

"complete substantive verb," which occur in the texts above cited (p. xxxi.) The explanations of these last will take up the less time, as the remarks upon the former, in connexion with the general question, have been extended to so great a length. I shall give them in a very concise form, as they occur in Mr. Du Ponccau's letters to me. He says-

"I have studied the problems; and think I have gone a great way towards solving them.

"I. Rev. i. 4. From him which is, and which was, and which is to come--Wutch noh, noh koh, noh koh, noh paont.

WUTCH (Delaw. wentschi) from.

NOH, he, him (Gram. p. 7.) used again for who or which.

KOH. This word is embarrassing, because of the letter k, indicating the second person. I am unable at present to explain it in a manner perfectly satisfactory to myself.

NOH PAONT, This is easily explained from the Delaware. In that language, we find PAHUMP, to come; PEU, he comes; PEWAK, they come. PAONT is undoubtedly an inflexion of the same verb. In Eliot's Grammar, p. 22, we find woi NAPEH-NONT, O! that it were; which literally is-O that it came (to pass.)

Mo. That MO is a particle indicative of the past, I have little doubt; as in Gen. xxxi. 40, above quoted: YEU MO NUTTINNAIIN--YEU, this, (used for thus)--Mo, heretofore, NUTTINNAIIN, was so or so (from n'dellsin,) as stated in the notes before communicated.

"If I am right thus far, then every thing is explained but koh, which I cannot yet sufficiently account for.

"II. Rev. xvii. 8.....and yet is--kah noh yeu yeu APIT.

KAH NOH YEUVEU APIT--and he, this this (yen yeu, Gram. p. 8.) is there; apit (pronounced as epit in German) illic stat. Yeu duplicated, perhaps used for which.

"III. Gen. v. 4..... .kah matta na WUTAPEIN.

NA is an expletive which I cannot explain.

WUTAPEIN (Delaw. w'dappin, he is there.) See Zeisb. Delaware Grammar.

"IV. Psalm xxxvii. 36.....matta ohtano, was not.

OHTANO is probably a form of the same verb, and means he was not there. W'dano, w'tano, ohtano; the o, u and oh are often used by Eliot for the Delaware w sibilant. For the same reason, we say, the Ottawas, Utawas, while their proper name is W'tawas, or Wtawas."

II. Numerals.

ELIOT, in his Grammar, gives as the numeral one, the word nequt only, corresponding to the Delaware n'gutti, and the Naraganset nquit. But in his Bible he uses also the word pasuk, corresponding to the Abnaki pezekou of Father Rale's dictionary, and the Naraganset pawsuck of Roger Williams's Key. Now, in reading Cotton's valuable Vocabulary, the following curious distinction, in the use of these two different numerals, attracted my notice:

"Nequt, a thing that is past.

Pasuk, a thing in being."

I lost no time in communicating this distinction of Cotton's to Mr. Du Ponceau, with a wish that he would ascertain from Mr. Heckewelder, whether any thing of the kind was to be found in the Delaware language. This circumstance gave rise to the following interesting observations on the Delaware numerals:

"The Delawares (says Mr. H. in his first letter) have the following words for one, viz: n'gutti, mawat, mauchsu and majouchsu. The tw first are generally made use of for what is inanimate; the latter two, for what is animate. Paschuk is the true Mahicanni word for one."

In a subsequent letter, Mr. H. gives the following more copious explanation in respect. to the Delaware numerals; which serves at the same time to elucidate the curious structure of the Indian languages:

"Not being quite satisfied with the partial answer I gave you in a hurry respecting the numeral one, I will now expatiate more fully thereon ; first, pointing out what words the Delawares have in their language, equally necessary to be known, in addition to the one above quoted; as much depends, in speaking their language, upon having each word in its proper place; for although the numeral n'gutti, for one, may be in a manner considered as the general word in this language for the number one, (be the same animate or inanimate) yet it is not always the case. Indeed the first syllable of that word, n'gut, (/ leave out always the prefixed n, there being no necessity for it, as it is only put there to explain the numeral; as by saying "one single one") I say, that al-

though this first syllable is very useful, and prefixed to a great number of compound words, all which tend to show that this syllable gut cannot be dispensed with, as will by and by be shown by examples; yet, the latter syllable of the numeral, the ti, is not only in numerous cases useless, but would be even improper, if retained. Ex. The Indian name or word for a one-legged person, being gut-gat, is a compound of two words; gut, from GUTTI, one, and gat, from WICHGAT, the leg: GUTGATSU, he is on e-legged, or has but one leg. GUTOKENAK is the word for one day; GUTAWICAN, one fathom (awican being the word for one fathom, or six feet;) GUT-TAPACHKI, one hundred, &c. Generally speaking, the Indians are very nice in the selecting of words. I will give you such as are in conjunction with the one in question, viz. GUTTI, one: Zeisb. 11, MAWAT (only) one.' Zeisb. 13, MAYAAT (is the same in the Minsey.) The two latter of these three words can in no wise be made use of with that which is animate; on the other hand, the words MAUCHSU and MAYAUCHSU are the proper words for what is animate: MAUCHSU LENNO is one man; MAUCHSU TIPAS, one (single) fowl, &c. (Mayauchs is the Minsey word for the same. See Zeisberger, 52, at bottom.) If I meant to say to a Lenape, that of all the men who had returned from hunting, only one (single person) had killed a deer, I could not make use of the numeral n'gutti, for that one, but I must say--bischi apallauwiwak lennowak weemi, allod mauchs. (or mayauchs) schuk, mescheu, See, for mayauchs, Zeisb. p. 52, at bottom; and for MEMayauchsiyENK, every ONE of us, MEMayauchsiyEEK, every ONE of you, Zeisb. p. 105.

"You inquire further, whether it is the same in the Delaware, as Cotton says it is in the Natick [Massachuselts) that there are 'two words for the numeral one--n'gutte or nequt, for a thing past, and pasu k, for a thing present.' In this remark, I consider Cotton to be under a mistake; for I am sure, that the Mahicanni word n'gutte (the same as the Delaware n'gutti or gutti) is a general word, and in constant use for the present. The Mahicanni say-gutte or gutta for one: "Gutta-gun (in Delaware, gutti-gull) ONE six-penny piece--- n'gutt6xena (Delaw. guttaxen) ONE pair of shoes, &c. I presume the Natick word nequt answers to the Delaware gutTEN, since it points to the past, as for instance-gutTEN n'gachtigel, ONCE I was on the point of dying; gutTEN-woapan, ONCE of a morning; schuk gutTEN Cuequenaku m'pahn, ONLY ONCE I hci-ve been at Philadelphia, &c. The Delawares have also the word nekti (See Zeisb. p. 14) much in use

when speaking of any one thing or article, and not being possessed of more than the one of that kind.

"I have already said (in my last letter) that paschuk is a true Mahicanni word for one; and so I suppose nequt to be, in its proper place.

"You inquire how this word paschuk is pronounced, whether as in German), or as in English, with the acute a. I always write words according to the pronunciation of the Germans; but in writing the word according to the English alphabet, I should write it pawshuk.

"I will add one observation on certain differences between the languages of the Mohegans (or Mahicanni) and the Delawares, both in respect to the words themselves, and the manner of pronouncing. The Mohegans, by changing some of their letters in words from that of the Delawares, by dropping others entirely, and by drawing out their words in speaking, give the language a different sound from what it otherwise would have, were they to abide by the proper letters, and speak off hand as the Delawares do. They generally drop the letter L of the Delawares, and supply its place with the letter N; and where the Delawares have a single vowel, they sound their word as if there were two. For example:

For the Delaware	koecu	(what) they say,	GAQUAI;
For	auween	(who)	AWAAN;
For	ni	(I)	NIA ;
For	oyos	(meal)	WIAAS ;
For	niluna	(we)	NIANA;
For	dee	(heart)	OTTAHA, &c.

To these remarks on the Indian numerals, it may be useful to add an important observation made by Mr. Heckewelder, in the Transactions of the Historical and Literary Committee. He there says--"On the subject of the numerals, I have had occasion to observe, that they sometimes differ very much in languages derived from the same stock. Even the Minsi, a tribe of the Lenape or Delaware nation, have not all their numerals like those of the Unami tribe, which is the principal among them." *

* Correspondence with Mr. Du Ponceau, in the Transaction, p. 381,

INDEX OF INDIAN WORDS IN ELIOT'S GRAMMAR; INCLUDING
SELECT WORDS FROM HIS TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE,

Advertisement. THE following Index was originally intended by the editor to include only those Indian words, which are contained in Eliot's Grammar; and Mr. Du Ponceau had prepared (from the Grammar and Bible together) a separate List of words, corresponding to the seventy English words of the Comparative Vocabularies in Dr. Barton's New Views of the Tribes and Nations of America. But, as many of the words in Dr. Du Ponceau's List were also to be found in the Grammar, and would of course be repeated in an index to that work, the editor has (with the concurrence of Mr. Du Ponceau) incorporated the whole into the present Index. In order, however, to enable the reader to select from it all the words, which correspond to those of Dr. Barton's List, and thus supply the want of a separate Vocabulary, such corresponding words are here printed in SMALL CAPITALS. The words selected from the Bible, by Mr. Du Ponceau, will be readily distinguished by their having no references to pages annexed to them.

Page A

- A (a vowel often inserted for the sake of euphony) See Gram. p. 9
- Ahque (adv. of forbidding) beware, do not 21
- ACHQUNNON, rain. See SOKANON
- Ah (an inflexion of animate nouns.) See Gram... 8
- Ahquompak, when 21
- Ahtuk, a deer 9
- Alum (in the Nipmuk dialect) a dog 2
- ANOGQS, a star 9
- Anomut, within 21
- Anue (adv. of choosing) more rather; 21
also a sign of the comparative degree: Anue menuhkesu, more strong 15
- Anum, a dog 2
- Ao, ooo and yeuco; terminations added to nouns, adjectives, adverbs, &c. in order to change them into verbs substantive; as, wosketomp, a man, wosketompoo, he is a man, or he became a man; wompi, white, wompiyeuoo, it is white, 12, 16
- Aruúm (in the "Northern" dialect) a dog 2
- indicative mode of verbs, in order to make it interrogative. See Gram. p. 27
- It is also used, to change the present tense into the pretetite. See Gram, PP. 62,65
- Ash (adv. of continuation) still 21
- Ash (the plural termination of inanimate nouns.) See Gram. 10
- ASKONUH, skin
- Askook, a snake or worm 9
- Asquam (adv. of choosing) not yet 21
- Assootu, foolish ... 16
- Asuh, or ... 22
- At; a termination used in forming the infinitive mode, which is done by adding this termination to the indicative, and taking away the s1rffe 20

At, en, in, ut: (prep.) in, at
 or to 22
 Ayim, he made. 8

C.

Chaubohkish; except, besides 22
 Chuh (adv. of calling; the
 same as hoh) 21

E.

E (used as the termination of
 the inanimate form of some
 adjectives.) See Gram. p. 13
 E or u; the common termina-
 tions of adverbs; as wame
 or wamu, all; menuhke or
 menuhku, strongly 21
 Ehhoh, hah (adv. of exhorting
 or encouraging) 21
 Ehob, (interj. of encouraging) 22
 En. See á
 Emes or es; terminations added
 to primitive nouns
 to make them diminutives;
 emes is the least of them 12
 Es (mark of diminutive. See
 emes)
 Es and esu (terminations of
 the animate form of some
 adjectives.) See Gram. p. 13
 Eum, oom, or um; the sign of
 the "possessive rank" of
 nouns 12

H.

Hah; the same as ehoh 22
 Hó (interj. of wondering) 22
 HOG, body
 Hóh (adv. of calling; the
 same as chuh) 21
 Hoo; the same as hó 22
 Horsemes; diminutive of the
 English word horse 12
 Horsesog; the plural of the
 English word horse 12
 Howan, who 7
 Howanig; plural of howan 7

Hussun, a stone10
 Hussunemes; diminutive of
 Hussun 12

I.

I (used as the termination of
 the inanimate form of some
 adjectives.) See Gram. p. 13
 In (prep.) See át
 Ishkont, lest 22

K.

Keek, thy house 11
 Keekit, in thy house 11
 Keekou, your house (plur.) 11
 Keekuwout, in your house (pl.)11'
 Ken, thou 7
 Kenaan, ye 7
 Kenawun or neenawun, we 7
 Kenuppoowonuk, he died for
 thee* 18
 Kenuppoowonukqun, he died
 for us* 18
 Kenuppoowonukoo, he died for
 you,*18
 Kenutcheq, thy hand 11
 Kenutheganash or kenutche-
 gash, thy hands 11
 Kenutheganoo, your hand (pl.)11
 Kenuthegash. See kenut-
 cheganash
 Kenutheganooowout,
 your hands 11
 KESUK, heaven
 KESUKOD, day
 Kesukquieu, toward heaveu 21
 KooN, snow
 Koowadchansh, I keep thee 17
 Koowadchanumoush, I keep it
 for thee or for thy use 17
 Koowadchanumwanshun, I
 keep it for thee, I act in
 thy stead 18

* "This form [of the verb] is of great use in Theologie,
 to express what Christ hath done for us." Gram. p. 18.

Koowaantam, thou [art] wise 13
Kooweechewadchanumwomsh,
 I keep it with thee 18
Koowompes, thou art white 16
Koowompesuonk, thy white-
 ness 20
Kusseh (adv.) behold 22
Kuttah, thy heart 11
Kuttahhou, your heart (plur.) 11
Kuttumma, (adv.) very lately 21
Kuttumma, (conj.) unless 22

M

MAHTUG(IUE, wood. See Mehtug
MAMAHCHEKESUKQUT, air
MANIT, God 9
Massachusetts* 2
Matchaog, no 21
Matchet, wunnegen, waan-
 tamwe (adverbs of quality.)
 "Of this kinde are all Vir-
 tues and Vices."
 See Grammar, p. 22
Matta, no 21
Mattannit, the Devil 9
Mattayeumutch, let it be nay.
 James v. 12 16
MEENAN, the tongue 10
MEENANNOH. See meenan
MEEPIT, a tooth 10
MEESUNK, hair. See weshagan
MEHTAUOG, an ear 10
Mehtug, a tree. See mah-
 tugque 10
Mehtugques or mehtugque-
 mes; dimin. of mehtug 12
Menuhke or menuhku,
 strongly 21
Menuhkekont (from menuhki,
 strong, and muhkont, a leg)
 a strong leg 15

* "Massa-chusett--an hill in the form of
an Arrow's Head." Cotton's MS. Vocabulary of
the Language of the Plymouth Indians.

- Menuhki, strong 15
Menuhkoshketomp (from menuhki, strong, and wosketomp, a man) a strong-man 15
Menuhku. See menuhke
MENUTCHEG, a hand 10
METAH, the heart. See tah 11
MEYASUNK, hair. See meesunk
MISSIS, sister
MITTAMWOSSIS, a woman 9
Mo, sometimes signifies not 21
Moeu (adv.) together 21
Mohmoeg (frequentative verb)
they oft met *. 17
MOHTOMPOG, morning
Monaog, many 8
Moocheke (an intensive) much 15
Mooi, black 15
Moomosketomp (from mooi and wosketomp) a black man 15
Mos, pish; words added to the indicative mode to express futurity 20
Moskeht, grass 10
Moskehtuemes; diminutive of moskeht 12
Mosq, a bear 9
MUHHOG, the body. See hog 9
Muhkont, a leg 10
Muhpit, an arm 10
Muhquoshim, a wolf 9
MUKKIESOH, MUKKIS, a child
MUKKIS. See mukkiesoh
MUSKESUK, the eye or face 10
MUSSEET, the foot 10
Mussissittcon, a lip10
MUTToon, a mouth

N.

- Nabo; used in the numerals.
See Gram. 14

* "When the action is doubled or frequented, &c. this notion hath not a distinct form, but is expressed by doubling the first syllable of the word." Gram. p. 17.

- Nag or neg, they 7
 Nagoh or uahoh, they 7
 Nagum or noh, he 7
 Nahen, (adv.) almost 21
 Nahoh. See nagoh
 Nahohtoeu (adverb of order)
 second 21
 NAMOHS, a fish 9
 Nano (a sign of the compara-
 tive degree) more and more 15
 Napehnont, woi, toh; oh that
 it were: Lat. utinam 21, 34
 Naumóg (the ó accented be-
 ing pronounced as in the Eng-
 lish word vogue) if YE SEE 3
 Naumog (the o unaccented be-
 ing pronounced as in log)
 if WE SEE 3
 NAUMoN, son
 NAUT, there 21
 Nawhutche, some 8
 Ne, that 7
 Neane (sometimes written in
 Eliot's Bible, neyane) as 22
 Neek, my house 11
 Neekit, in my house 11
 Neekun, our house 11
 Neekunonut, in our house .. 11
 NEEMAT, my brother
 Neen, I (ego) 7
 Neenawun or kenawun, we* 7
 Neetomp, my friend
 Neg. See nag
 Negonnu (adv. of order) first 21
 Nemehkuh, so 22
 Nen, I (ego)
 Ne nogque, towards that way 21
 NEPAUSHADT, moon
 NEPAUZ, sun
 NEPUN, summer
 Nequt (numeral) one t 14
 The other numerals will be

* See Mr. Du Ponceau's remarks on these two forms of the plural, p. xix. of his Notes.

t Cotton, in his MS. Vocabulary of the Language of the Plymouth In-

- found in the same part of
the Grammar.
- Netatup (addverb of likeness)
like so 22
- Newutche, wutch, wutche;
for, from, because ... 22
- Neyane. See neane
- NIPPE, water
- Nipmuk; the name of a tribe
of Indians. See Introduc-
tory Observations, p. 18, note.
- Nish, these 7
- Nishwu (adv. of order) third 21
- Noadtuck (adv.) a long time 21
- NOGKUS, belly
- Nogque. See ne nogque and
yeu nogque
- Noh or nagum, he 7
- NooSH, my father
- Noochumwi, weak 13
- NooTAU, fire
- Noowaadchanumun-toh;
I wish, or desire, to keep it 19
- Noowadchanit, I am kept 16
- Noowadchanittimun, we keep
each other. This form
always wants the singular
number 17
- Noowadchanumcoun, I do not
keep it 19
- Noowadchanumun, I do keep
it. 19
- Noowadchanumun neek,
I keep my house 17
- Noowadchanumuuas? do I
keep it? 19
- Noowadchanumunash noowéat-
chimiueash, I keep my corn 17
- Noowaantam, I am wise 13, 24
- Noowompes, I am white 16, 20
- Noowompesuonk, my white-
ness 20

dians, has this remark--"Nequt, a thing that is past:
Paruk, a thing in being." But see the observations
on this subject, p. xiv. of the preceding Notes.

- N'puhkuk, my head. See
PUHKUK
- Nuhog, my hotly. See hog
- NUKON, night
- Nummissis, my sister
- NUNKOMP, a young man, a
youth 9
- Nunkompaemes (diminutive
of nunkomp) 12
- Nunkompaes (diminutive of
nunkomp) 12
- NUNKSQAU* a girl 9
- Nunksquaemes (diminutive
of nunksquau) 12
- Nunksquaes (diminutive of
nunksquau) 12
- NUNNAUMON, my son
- Nunnogkus, my belly. See
nogkus
- Nunnuppoowonuk, he died for me 18
- Nunnutcheq, my hand 11
- Nunnutcheganash, my hands 11
- Nunnutcheganum, our hand 11
- Nunnutchegannunnonut, our hands 11
- NUPPooONK, death
- Nuskon, my bone. See uskon
- Nusseet, my foot. See seet
- Nutcheq. See menutcheq
- Nuttah, my heart. See metah
and tah 11
- Nuttahhun, our heart. See
metah and tah 11
- Nuttaunoh, my daughter. See
taunoh
- Nuttin. See tin..... 23
- Nuttron, my mouth
- Nux; yea, yes 21

* The last syllable of this word is printed in the original edition of the Grammar as it is in the present one (qau); but the diminutive, at p. 12, has the same syllable printed qua, as it is also in the Bible. See Joel iii. 3; Zech. viii. 5. The form qau, therefore, seems to be an error of the press,

Nuxyeucoutch, let it be yea.

James v. 1216

O.

Og (thr plural termination of animate nouns.) See Gram. p. 9

Oh (an inflexion of animate nouns.) See Grammar, p. 8

OKASOH, mother

OHKE, earth

Ohkeiyeu (adv.) towards the earth 21

Ongash and onganash (the plural termination of verbal nouns in ONK,) See Gram. p. 10

Onk; a termination often added to verbs, in order to turn them into nouns 13, 20

Onkoue, beyond 21

Ooo See aoo

oom. See eum

ooSQHEONK, blood

owee (interj. of sorrow) 22

Oxemes (diminutive of the English word) ox 9

Oxesog (plur. of the English word ox) oxen 9

P.

Pâ; a particle added to the indicative mode, to give it the sense of the first person of the imperative 25

Pagwodche (adv. of doubting) it maybe. 22

Pasuk (numeral) one. See the note on nequt

Paswu, lately 21

Paummuonat, to pay* 42

* Roger Williams says, this is "a word newly made from the English

Paummuounat, not to pay 58
Peasik or peesik, small; used
 in expressing a degree of
 comparison 15
PETUHQUNNEG, bread
Pigsemes (diminutive of the
 English word) pig 12
Pish. See mos
POMANTAMÓONK, life
POPON, winter
PSUKSES, a little bird 12
Puppinashim, a beast 9
PUHKUK, a head

Q.

Quah (interj. of disdain) 22
Qunnuhtug (from qunni, long,
 and mehtug, wood or tree)
 used to denote a pike 15
Qussuk, a rock 10
Qut, but 22

S.

Sasabbath-dayeu, every sab-
 bath (made a frequentative
 by doubling the first sylla-
 ble. See note on the word
 mohmoeg.
SAUP, tomorrow 21
SEPU, river
SEET, foot
Sheepsemes (diminutive of
 the English word) sheep 12
Sohsúmóonk, forest
SOKANON, SOKANUNK; rain
Sun, sunnummatta? (adv. of
 asking) is it, or is it not? 21

word pay." Key into the Languages of America,
ch. xxv.; in Mas Hist. Collect. vol. v. p. 100, Wil-
liams writes the first person singular, indicative mode,
cuppáimish, I will pay you; but Eliot write, it kuppau-
mush, at the same time directing the reader to pronounce
pay and not pau, See Gram. p, 28.

T.

- TAH, the heart. See metah
 Tahshé; a suppletive word
 used with the numerals.
 See Gram. 14
 TASKON, horn
 TAUNOH, daughter
 Teanuk, presently 21
 Teaogku (ndv.) rather, unfinished 21
 Tiadche, unexpectedly 22
 Tin, tinne, tit; suppletive
 syllables used "for ornament of the word." See Gram. 23
 Tinne. See tin Tit. See tin
 Toh; annexed to every person and
 variation in the optative mood.
 See p. 65. See also nahpenont
 Toh (adverb of doubting) it may be 22
 TOHKOI, it was cold
 Tohkônogque, although 22
 Tohneit, if 22
 Tohsu; a suppletive, used
 with the numerals 14
 Tohsunash, how many 8
 Tohsuog, how many8
 Tohwutch, why 20
 TOOHPU; ice, frost
 TooN, mouth. See muttoon
 Tummunk, the beaver 9

U.

- Uh (an inflexion of animate
 nouns.) See Grammar, p. 8
 Um. See eum
 Us; a syllable added to the present tense
 in order to form the preterite 62, 63
 USKON, a bone
 Ut. See át
 Uttiy u, or tanyeu (pron. rel.)
 Which 7
 Uttiyeu (adv.) where 21

W.

- Waantam, he [is] wise 13
Waantamoonk, wisdom.... 10
Waantamunát, to be wise 26
Wantamcounat (the negative
form of the preceding verb) 27
Waantamwe (adv. of quality) 22
Wadchaneh (imperat. mode)
keep me 19
Wadchanittéinat, to be kept 62
Wadchanónat (animate form)
to keep 42
Wadchanounat (anim. form
neg.) not to keep 58
Wadchanóunát (infin. pass.
neg.) not to be kept 63
Wadchansh, keep thou 19
Wadchanumunat (inan.form)
to keep it, e.g. a tool, a gar-
ment, &c 26
WADCHu, mountain
WANNONK^{oo}oK, evening
Wahsuk. See wasuk
Wame or wamu (adv.) all 21
WAWUK, husband
Week, his house 11
Weekit, in his house 11
Weekou, their house, 11
Weekuwout or weekuwomut,
in his house: "Hence we
corrupt this word Wig-
wam." Gram. 11
Wehtauog, his ear. See MEH-
TAUOG
WEQUAI, light
Weshagan, hair of animals.
See meesunk
Wetu, a house 11
WEYAU^S, flesh
WISHIT^{oo}, the beard
Woh (conj. Of possibility
may or can. This word
is added to the indicative
potential 20

Woi. See napehnont
Woi (interj. of sorrow) the
 same with cowee 22
WOMONITTUONK, love
Wompesu, he is white 16
Wompi, white 13
Wompiyeuco, it is white 16
Womposketomp (from wom-
 pi and wosketomp) a white man 15
Woskeche (adv.) without 21
WOSKETOMP, a man 9
Wosketompoco, he is a man,
 or he became a man 12, 16
Wunnamuhkut, truly 21
Wunnegen (adv. of quality) 22
WUNNEPAG, leaf
Wunnonkou, yesterday 21
Wunnutcheg, his hand 11
Wunnutcheganm, their hand 11
Wunnutcheganowout, their hands 11
Wunnutcheganash, wunnut-
 chegash, his hands 11
WUSKODTUK, his forehead
WUTCH (subst.) a nose
Wutch (conj.) See newutche
Wutche. See newutche
Wuttah, his heart. See metah
Wuttahhou, their heart 11
Wuttaskonoh, his horn. See taskon
Wuttát, behind 21

Y.

Yeu (inan.form sing.) this 7
Yeug (anim.form plur.) these 7
Yeu nogque, towards this way 21
Yeuoh (anim.form sing.) this
 or that 7
Yeum. See aco
Yeush (inan. form plur.) these 7
Yeu waj, for this cause 22
Yeu yeu, now 21

POSTSCRIPT.

THE following Extract of a letter from Mr. Du Ponceau was to have been added to the Notes on Eliot's Grammar as published in the Historical Collections; but an accidental delay rendered this impracticable. The importance of it, however, has induced the Editor to add it to those copies of the Grammar, which are printed in a separate pamphlet.

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Du Ponceau to the Editor.

"IN Barton's New Views (Appendix, p. 5) there is a pretended List of the numerals of the Nanticoke language, which Dr. Barton says he obtained from Mr. Pyrlreus, through Mr. Heckewelder, and which was found among the papers of the former. After I had for some time begun the study of the Indian languages, it struck me, that these numerals could not be those of the Nanticoke, of which I had a vocabulary, shewing it to be an idiom nearly allied to the Delaware. I therefore took the first opportunity of asking information of Mr. Heckewelder; and the result of what he told me is contained in the following Note, which I made at the time in my copy of Dr. Barton's work:

'April 30, 1818. Mr. Heckewelder told me this day, that the Nanticoke language is a dialect of the Algonkin or Delaware; and so it appears by the vocabularies communicated by him to Mr. Jefferson. He may have formerly believed otherwise, and may have told Dr. Barton what he states above. The above list of numerals was indeed made by Mr. Pyrlreus and found among his papers; but it does not appear to what language it belongs.'

"I had lost sight of those numerals and my note, when Mr. Nuttall, told me some days ago, that he had discovered a curious fact, which was, that the numerals of the Nanticoke were exactly similar to those of the Bambara Negroes. I asked him, whether he alluded to Dr. Barton's Nanticoke numerals; and upon his answering in the affirmative, I informed him that those were not genuine; and we both came to the conclusion, that either Mr. Pyrlreus himself, before he came to this country, had been a Moravian missionary in Africa, or that he had obtained the numerals from some of his brethren who had been; or, perhaps, that he had taken them from some Negro in this country. But it is not the less true, that if the same observation should occur to an European, he might be incautiously led to the conclusion, that the American languages were nearly connected with those of the Negroes of Africa; then the inference would be drawn, that the American race was evidently derived

from the African, theories would arise without end, find ingenious arguments would be found, a priori, to prove the migration of the Africans to this Continent; and even the physical causes would be discovered, which turned their black colour into red, and the wool of their heads into hair. It is right, that the learned should be put on their guard against errors of this kind. I subjoin the different numerals here referred to:

	"True Nanticoke Numerals.*	Dr. Barton's sup- posed Nanticoke Numerals.	Numerals of the Bambara Afri- cans. t
"One	Nickquit	Kílli	Killi
Two	Na-eez	Fílli	Foolla
Three	Kis-whu	Sabo	Sabba
Four	Yaugh-whu	Náno	Nani
Five	Nup-pai-a	Túro	Looroo
Six	Hoquuttah	Wóro	Wora
Seven	My-yay-wah	Wóllango	Worroola
Eight	Tzah	Sécki	Sagi
Nine	Pasa-conque	Cóllengo	Konunto
Ten	Millah	Tà	Ta."

* "This list was obtained from a vocabulary taken in the year 1792, by Gen. William Vans Murray, at a Nanticoke Indian town in Dorset County, Maryland, and communicated by him to Mr. Jefferson, who gave it to me. Compare this list with the Delaware numerals in *Historical Transactions*, pp. 374,375. P. S. D."

t "From Bowditch's *Mission to Ashantee*, p. 193, Appendix. See the same work for the numerals of the true Mandingo, and also of a corrupt Bambara or Mandingo dialect. *Ibid.* and p. 182. P. S. D."

Corrections in Eliot's Grammar.

1. INTROD. OBSERVAT. p. 233, line 30, after the word America, insert on the East side of the Mississippi.
Ibid. p. 234. The MS. copy of Eliot's Grammar, here mentioned, was presented by the American Philosophical Society, on the motion of Mr. Du Ponceau.
Ibid. p. 235, lines 14, 15, dele the aid of.
2. In the GRAM. p. 66, line 20, for deficile read difficile.
3. In the NOTES,
 - p. vi. line 29, for Chatimachas read Chetimachas.
 - p. vii. line 17, after Etchemins in.,ert or Abenakis.
 - p. x. line 26, for cortesario read cortesano.
 - p. xiii. line 10, for always united read almost always mute.
 - p. xiv. line 11, after Ibid. 13. insert Wuthassuneutunk wuttanoh Zion,
"The wall of the daughter of Zion." Lamentat. ii. 8,
 - p. xxxii. (in the note at bottom) for xxxv. read xxv.

THE END.