

THE PATTERN OF SOCIETY

CLASS AND RANK

Class feeling was strong among the Lower Chinook though lines of demarcation were not rigidly drawn. The strictest dichotomy existed between definitely upper and lower classmen but there was a wide intervening zone in which classification was far from exact. This intermediate group might be termed a middle class for purposes of analysis but such terminology would not accurately reflect native attitudes. This group consisted, to their minds, of the more successful commoners and the unambitious or remote of kin of the upper class. Movement from the middle group to the upper class through acquisition of wealth and strength of personality was not uncommon. Native formulation of the possibility, however, was always in terms of movement from the lower class to the higher. The fact that in most historic examples the advances were made from this indefinite middle group does not alter the attitude. Such persons merely were further along toward the goal than unconditional commoners; their chances of success were greater though eligibility was equal.

The upper class was relatively small. It appears to have included chiefs and their families, prominent shamans, warriors, traders and others of high birth. To what extent leadership in these activities was a class prerogative and thus connected with birth is uncertain; war and trade probably belong here, shamanism definitely does not.

The upper class was loathe to associate with the lower. An upperclassman's slaves, who lived with him or nearby, probably enjoyed a greater freedom of intercourse with their masters than did lower class neighbors. Children of the two classes were not allowed to play together. Intermarriage, though far from unknown, was strongly disapproved except under unusual circumstances. If a man in the middle ground had distinguished himself through accumulation of wealth or outstanding service to a chief he might be permitted to marry into the upper class and thus take the final step in elevating himself. Under other circumstances the disapproved union would lead to the degradation of the upper class member to the level of the lower, together with their children.

Commoners were free to amass wealth and gain prestige in any way which did not infringe upon the prerogatives of the upper class. They were permitted to hold slaves and to engage in trade. Many of them worked assiduously at menial tasks that an upperclassman would have considered a disgrace to his position.

When, as the result of such industry or through an approved marriage, a man was accepted into the upper class it was sometimes made the occasion of a feast or even a potlatch at the instance of the chief. At such an event the man's accomplishments were paraded and the audience was told that he should be treated as befitted a man of his talents and new station.

A narrative recorded by Boas furnishes an example of meteoric rise from commoner to upperclassman by one who became phenomenally successful at gambling

as a result of obtaining a powerful guardian spirit. The account is highly over-formalized and exaggerated since it was told as a folk tale. It is the familiar story of the poor, lousy boy who achieves success in spite of his disabilities. An excerpt follows:

"Come friend, we will play." "Well," said the boy. He bought a mat. Now he won again all the property of that person. He won his canoe. Now he had won over all the common people. Next he won over the chiefs. He won first one slave and then many. Now he became a chief [upperclassman?]. He had won the property of all those people. Every day the people ate in his house. Now his elder cousin said: "Perhaps he saw a supernatural being. We will play with the accompaniment of batons. Then I shall win all his slaves. He is [too] hopeful." Then he was told: "Your elder cousin wants to play with you." "As he likes." Now the cousins played and the people beat time with batons. They played several nights. He won the eldest brother's slaves and all his canoes. Then he played with the next brother and he won all his slaves; then he won his wives. Now the next brother said: "I want to play with you next." "No, I pity you, as you pitied me formerly." Then the Chehalis came and he won all their property. The Quenaiult came to play at disks. He won their property and their slaves. That lousy boy made everybody poor. He bought the daughters of chiefs among the Quenaiult, the Tillamook, the tribes up the river, the Cowlitz. The wives of the man who had been the lousy boy were taken from among all these tribes. If his cousins had not taken the sea-otter from him, he should not have seen the supernatural being. He saw Itc'ix-ia'n. (Boas, *Chinook Texts*, p. 222.)

These new members occupied, of course, the lowermost ranks of the upper class, in company with the less aspiring members born to the class and those most distantly related to the chiefs. One might continue to climb, slowly, as time went on, but it was rare or unknown for a commoner by nativity to reach the higher ranks of the upper class. It should be emphasized that ranking, except at the extremes, was highly informal and variable.

In addition to birth and wealth, there was yet another variable in distinctions of rank. Upriver and inland peoples were considered of lower rank than residents of the coast, the differential roughly depending upon distance, or relative distance. Thus, other things being equal, a Klatskanie chief ranked lower in the eyes of the Chinook than the chief of a Kathlamet settlement, but higher than a Clackamas chief. Not only were chiefs so differentiated, but the principal applied to other upperclassmen as well. To what extent this attitude was shared by the upriver peoples themselves is unknown, but the feeling for class distinctions extended as far inland as the Wishram.¹ In consequence of this geographical factor, when a chief had a son (or sons) by each of two or more wives, a junior son might succeed his father in the chieftainship rather than an elder half-brother if the latter were the son of a woman from further inland.²

Lest these considerations overbalance the picture, it should be strongly emphasized that birth was never lost sight of as the dominant factor in distinctions of class and rank. Perhaps no other aspect of Lower Chinook life approaches so closely the attitude of typical Northwest Coast peoples. The very fact of emphasis upon rank is significant, despite its lack of formality. The variance from Northwest Coast standards was in degree, not in kind.

¹Spier and Sapir, p. 211.

²See political organization.

It is difficult to consider the upper class and its prerogatives apart from the office of chief and his official prerogatives. This is not the result, to my mind, of a confusion between the two or relationship such as obtained further north on the coast. That is, the chief was not merely a high ranking upperclassman enjoying power and prerogatives by virtue of that fact alone. He did not share the peculiar privileges of his position with other high ranking upperclassmen. His office was distinctly a political one. And yet, he was of necessity a high ranking upperclassman and thus enjoyed not only the rights of his office but also the privileges of his rank. It seems to me that these facts have led informants and early writers alike, or in turn, to epitomize the characteristics, prerogatives, and duties of the upper class in the person of the chief. Mrs. Luscier constantly spoke of the domination of the lower class by the chief—an instructive phrasing—but when questioned further she almost invariably extended the non-political attributes of the chief to the upper class generally. Mrs. Bertrand was even more inclined to personify her remarks, particularly for the era of chief Concomly.

Consequently, the material here presented should be used in close association with that relating to chieftainship (pages 55-58). Anecdotal data of specific personal reference will be found there.

Boas provides instructive documentation relating to class and chiefly prerogatives in describing the division of a stranded whale :

Those who found the whale do not cut it; they wait for the chief. All the people reach the whale. Then the chief takes a stick and measures the whale from the head to the tail. Then he tells the people: "You will cut here; you will cut there." It is distributed among those people. The common people cut from the tail end. When it is all cut, it is carried to the town into the houses. When the whale is measured, the chief tells the people to make the [measuring] sticks two spans and one hand width long, if the whale is large [two spans wide if the whale is smaller]. The people are told: "You cut here," and they cut the whale. Everything is done this way.³

Lee and Frost provide a brief remark of analogous nature with regard to game :
". . . one of the hunters went out and succeeded in bringing an elk into camp; and, according to custom, the most of it was taken to the lodge of the chief."⁴ This statement is of special significance since it refers to the products of a single man's initiative. That the hunter was not a slave is indicated by the qualification, "most of it."

A radical privilege of chiefs and the upper class was the seizure of orphaned children to be sold as slaves to other groups. This statement by Mrs. Luscier is substantiated by early writers.⁵

Commoners were allowed in the audience at the potlatch but only when invited by an upperclassman.

³Boas, *Chinook Texts*, p. 262.

⁴Lee and Frost, p. 283.

⁵See slavery.

SLAVERY

Slaves were held by the Chinook in considerable numbers and played a large role in the economic life. To them fell most of the laborious and disagreeable work though they often worked side by side with their masters. Emma Luscier said that there was no distinction in general type of work but that the most difficult tasks in oyster gathering, wood cutting, and fishing were assigned to slaves. Thompson states that "they appeared as well off as their masters, except their paddling the canoes, and hauling in the seine nets, in all which their masters take a share of the labor."⁶ Concomly is pictured by Henry as sitting idly in the middle of his canoe while the slaves around him paddled,⁷ but then he was always fond of ostentation, especially when visiting the whites. Ross speaks of each freewoman as having two, three, or more slaves in constant attendance, thus relieving her of all drudgery. He adds that in trading activities a woman was commonly followed by a "train of slaves."⁸ Mrs. Luscier estimated that the average upperclassman owned two or three slaves, with chiefs possessing perhaps double that number, or even more in exceptional cases. Concomly owned ten or twelve slaves; this may represent a customary maximum. Commoners were permitted to hold slaves as well as their social superiors but of course it was seldom that a lowerclassman possessed more than one or two.

Most slaves were obtained by purchase from surrounding peoples. It is uncertain from what direction came most of the slaves so acquired. Apparently the Puget Sound region and the Willamette river valley in Oregon were particularly well represented. Both Swan and Mrs. Luscier emphasized a general northern source.⁹ Slaves were an important item in trade, representing the maximum of unit value. There is no doubt that the Chinook not only possessed more slaves per capita than any surrounding people, but that their eminence as traders was largely responsible. Ross' statement that slaves were regularly bought and sold in the manner of any other article of trade¹⁰ was substantiated by my informants. That is, slaves were not only purchased when manual assistance was needed but often merely as a "good bargain" or as a stable unit of value. In recent times the price of a slave varied between one and five hundred dollars or sometimes more. "Not infrequently a valuable canoe is added to the bargain."¹¹ A young female slave from Nisqually was purchased by qe'walapc about 1875 for two hundred dollars plus a considerable amount of property. The possession of a slave or slaves thus enabled one to meet any economic emergency. They might serve as payment of bride price, payment of blood-money, or might be exchanged for goods with which to give a great feast.

Second in importance as a source of slaves was raiding. One Lower Chinook village never raided another; all such activities were directed toward "outside" groups. Here the evidence as to locale is a little more specific. The Chinook, Mrs.

⁶Tyrrell, p. 507.

⁷Coues, p. 750.

⁸Ross, p. 92. Cf. Kane, p. 182.

⁹Swan, p. 167. Gibbs makes the questionable statement that slaves were traded largely from California (*Tribes of Western Washington*, p. 188).

¹⁰Ross, p. 92.

¹¹Swan, p. 167.

Bertrand said, took slaves from the Quinault "whenever they felt like it." This exaggerated statement is nevertheless instructive. According to Kane, slaves usually were procured from the Umpqua river (Oregon) region where they were "sometimes seized by war parties, but the children are often bought from their own people."¹² Thompson is less definite: "These people had many slaves, . . . they were prisoners taken in their marauding expeditions along the seashore, most of them youths when taken."¹³ When encounters occurred with foreign groups slaves were invariably taken, if possible. Thus the sources of slaves secured by force would also indicate the directions in which offensive warfare was waged. On the defensive side, the Chinook seemed to fear most the Quilleute.¹⁴ The latter sometimes were led in their raids by Chinook slaves taken many years before, since the dangerous sand bars of the Columbia river and Willapa Bay rendered an experienced guide almost indispensable. In slave raids an attempt was always made to take captives of twelve years of age or less. No effort was ever made to enslave adult men, though women were occasionally carried away.

There existed several minor sources of slavery. Inability to pay debts or blood-money led to temporary, or sometimes permanent, slavery of debtor to creditor. The murderer of a chief [upperclassman?] automatically became a slave, according to Mrs. Bertrand. Blood-money in such a case was never accepted [a sufficient amount rarely being available?]. A desperate gambler sometimes wagered his own body, beginning with hands, then limbs, and finally head, and with its loss came slavery. Sometimes a specified number of years was involved after which the person regained his former status.¹⁵ In other cases a quantity of goods was named which should be considered the equivalent; if, then, by a lucky chance at gambling or through the aid of his friends the enslaved man was able to amass that amount he might immediately gain his freedom. Enslavement because of inability to pay blood-money seems to have been not uncommon. In such a case the chief called the persons involved before a gathering of villagers, where the defaulter was assigned to the complainant, and was publicly called "slave." In common with all slaves, such a person might later buy his freedom. Or sometimes the enslavement was for a stated number of years only.

A final source of slavery was the marriage of an upperclassman to a slave. Such an act degraded the freeman to the status of slave and all of the offspring of the union likewise.

Local orphans were sometimes seized by chiefs and sold as slaves, but always to some outside group. A man facing inability to pay blood-money often did likewise if an orphaned child were available among his relatives. Such action frequently caused deep resentment on the part of other persons and may have led to feuds. This practice extended to the Kalapuya. A Kalapuya slave at Bay Center had reached there in such fashion. A Kalapuya shaman had been accused of witchcraft by the doctor attending a patient supposedly the former's victim. In order to satis-

¹²Kane, p. 182.

¹³Tyrrell, p. 507.

¹⁴See raids.

¹⁵Parker, p. 245; Swan, p. 156.

fy the claim of the relatives of the deceased the accused shaman seized an orphaned niece and turned her over as a slave. The girl was twelve years old at the time. The recipients sold her and after several exchanges she reached qwatsa'mts. Her owner died some time later, leaving her free. She married a white man and moved to Bay Center before she died. She carried a great resentment for her uncle to the time of her death. At that time she was known as ʒo'xo (old) Maggie; formerly she had been known by the slave name, kälapu'ḏə.

This introduces two new points, freedom for slaves upon the death of masters, and distinctive slave names. With regard to the former, a number of specific examples were furnished by informants but it would be dangerous to generalize from these because all relate to a time when Chinook culture was rapidly being eradicated by white encroachment. It is certain that a master had the privilege of freeing a slave at any time that he pleased, but it is almost equally certain that this was rarely done.

Quite to the contrary, slaves often were killed at the time of the master's death. This was especially true if the deceased were a chief; seldom more than one slave was killed, however, regardless of the number owned. A slave purchased as a companion for a child was almost certain to be killed if the child died. In this case both bodies were placed in the same burial canoe. Parker relates that "the wife of Calpo, a very influential chief of the Chinook village near Cape Disappointment, on losing a daughter in the year 1829, killed two female slaves to attend her to the world of spirits, and for the particular purpose of rowing her canoe to the far off happy regions of the south."¹⁶ Gibbs states that slaves were starved to death when their masters died, and more specifically, that Toke attempted in 1853 to kill a slave after his daughter's death, in pursuance of the girl's request.¹⁷

Slaves were characteristically named after the group or locality of their nativity. Thus, in the account above, kälapu'ḏə (Kalapuya); also puyzä'ləp (Puyallup), kwlii'ute (Quilleute), sqa'tciti (Skagit), tlä'aləm (Klallam), and yulo'' (near Port Townsend, Washington). Both men and women were subject to such designation, but sex identifying suffixes were used. Naming according to this pattern was not invariable practice; owners followed their own desires.

On the whole, slaves seem to have been well treated. As stated above, they worked together with their masters. Also they lived in the same quarters and shared very much the same food, though they ate separately. Their opinions were often sought; their ridicule was deeply felt.¹⁸ The fact that they dared ridicule freemen is significant in itself. Ambitious and enterprising slaves were rewarded by being placed in charge of others. There was even one way by which a slave might gain freedom (in addition to the seldom achieved purchase of liberty). This was through the acquisition of shamanistic power. Such an accomplishment removed the formal stigma but the person might even afterward be taunted with the name. All slaves were allowed to seek guardian spirits and some met with marked success. Owners purchased mates for slaves reaching marriageable age.

¹⁶Parker, p. 245.

¹⁷Gibbs, *Tribes of Western Washington*, pp. 189, 204.

¹⁸Cf. Franchere, p. 242.

Franchere states that slaves were treated with humanity while their services were useful, but as soon as they became incapable of labor, they were neglected and allowed to perish of want, whereupon their bodies were thrown without ceremony under the stump of an old decayed tree or dragged into the woods and left.¹⁹ Kane decries the position of the slave, emphasizing the "power of life and death at pleasure" of the master,²⁰ but he was little acquainted with Lower Chinook life. Slaves were sometimes bet in gambling but there was an equal chance in an exchange of masters that it would be to the slave's advantage.²¹ As an example of especially ill treatment Mrs. Luscier told of a female slave from Puget Sound named nu'tc who was owned by mæt'el' at Oysterville. The latter not only worked the slave long and hard, even though she was very old, but beat her and threw ashes in her face when annoyed.

The punishment for a runaway slave was to have his ears cut off. If the fugitive reached his home people, seldom or never was an attempt made to bring him back. But successful escapes were rare and when the return occurred after several years there was a high probability that no welcome would be forthcoming. Most groups from which slaves were taken, themselves kept slaves; thus the stigma remained, even at home. When it was feared that a slave might run away, he was usually sold.

Some specific data follow:

A slave from near Victoria (Vancouver Island) was owned by ya'amans, chief at Naselle. He had been received by way of Puget Sound. Apparently he was Nutka, for no one on Willapa Bay understood anything of his language. He died before his owner.

A woman at qwatsa'mts owned a female slave from Puget Sound named szmsz'mie. After her owner died she married a white man and moved to Nemah.

The slave named puyä'löp, owned by ko'lätc, became free when his master died and married a woman from Grays Harbor. He did not return home but remained with his wife's people.

The female slave named sqa'tcitl, owned by a'kaiak, was purchased by a white man (Ike Stills), a soldier at the post near Ilwaco. They were married and had many children. A son was at one time married to Mrs. Luscier.

A female slave named t'si'kte' from Neah Bay (Makah) was owned by a'itæmci of Bay Center.

The slave yulo'', owned at qwatsa'mts, married a white man after her owner's death, and remained in the same village.

Dr. Kate (xwənxwa'nc), a Nisqually woman, brought an orphaned girl (qwa'ni') of about fifteen years of age to Oysterville under pretext of bringing her to a better place to live. There she prostituted her and later sold her to qe'walapc of Bay Center. This occurred about 1875.

Both the mother and father of four brothers now living at Bay Center were the slaves of the father of tai'man.

The slave named tlä'alæm (Klallam) was sold by her uncle to "Old Sally" of Kathlamet. After the latter's death she married a white man.

¹⁹*Idem*, p. 241.

²⁰Kane, p. 182.

²¹Cf. Boas, *Chinook Texts*, p. 222.

POLITICAL ORGANIZATION

"All of the villages form so many independent sovereignties. . . . Each village has its chief, but that chief does not seem to exercise a great authority over his fellow citizens." These are the words of Franchere written in 1819 with reference to the social organization of the Lower Chinook.²² Thus these peoples are established as in basic political accord with other known groups of the region.²³ My own informants affirmed the existence of village autonomy, but pointed out that able and well-liked or greatly feared chiefs often exerted a much wider influence than might formally be indicated, though this extended power was strictly unofficial. The villages on the north side of Willapa Harbor may be taken for example. These groups were fairly small and relatively isolated. During the chieftainship of to'q at the centrally located village of nu''kaunt (no. 29 on map, page 37), all of the surrounding towns looked to him as leader for he was kind, generous, and a skilled arbiter. Likewise, Concomly, famed chief of qwatsa'mts (village 9 on map), was said by Mrs. Bertrand to have made his influence felt as far away as Willapa Harbor, but in this case through trade control and military strength. Such power of course must not be confused with political control, since it was of no significance in village internal affairs.

Each village had but one chief, the office normally passing from father to eldest son. However, when a chief had adult sons by wives of different social standing, the eldest son of the highest ranking wife succeeded to the office. Thus qä'tqos, whose mother was from Lower Chehalis, became chief after Concomly's death because his elder half-brother was the son of a Scappoose woman. Upriver people were considered of lower class than those of the coast. The fact that the Scappoose woman was Concomly's favorite wife was of no consequence.²⁴ Concomly himself obtained the chieftainship in an unusual fashion. He succeeded not his father, who was a Quinault, but his mother who had become ruler at qwatsa'mts when her father died and she had no living brothers. Such succession does not follow the formulation given by Emma Luscier (son, brother's son, sister's son), but indicates that under some circumstances a woman might become chief.²⁵ Several examples of normal succession may be seen in the genealogies.

The degree of control over fellow villagers that chiefs actually exerted is somewhat uncertain. Emma Luscier and Mrs. Bertrand disagreed somewhat with Franchere's observation that such control was slight. Certainly his official power was much greater than among many coastal groups.²⁶ Certain procedures not only were within the province of the chief, but were his distinct duty. These included the judging and peaceful settlement of quarrels, the supervision of economic movements and the direction of all activities connected with war other than strictly military maneuvers. Even these were indirectly controlled by the chief since it was he

²²Franchere, p. 250.

²³See Ray, *Native Villages*, pp. 110-16.

²⁴See class and rank.

²⁵Gibbs furnishes a specific case: "Sally, the widow of Tsemahmus, a Tsinuk chief, well known on the lower Columbia, enjoys great authority among the Indians. . . ." (*Tribes of Western Washington*, p. 185).

²⁶Cf. Olson, *The Quinault Indians*, p. 95.

who selected the war chief. The latter was usually a relative who served during the pleasure of the chief. The chief might accompany a war party, but more often he remained at home "since it was so important that his life be protected." This feeling existed not only because of his importance as the village head, but particularly because the enemy would center its attack against him if he were present on the field, and would consider his death or serious injury as tantamount to victory.

In discussing the nature of chieftainship my informants repeatedly emphasized his power to appropriate the property of others for personal purposes without regard of the owner. Ross also speaks of this practice: "All property is sacred in the eye of the law, nor can anyone touch it excepting the principal chief, who is above the law, or rather he possesses an arbitrary power without any positive check, so that if he conceives a liking to anything belonging to his subjects, be it a wife or a daughter, he can take it without infringing the law; he must, nevertheless, pay for what he takes—and their laws assign a nominal value to property of every kind."²⁷

It is doubtful that such appropriation was strictly a chiefly prerogative, as Ross states. Much more probably it was a privilege of any upperclassman in theory, but in practice only the chief dared assume it. Mrs. Luscier declared that the upper class could infringe as much as it pleased upon the lower classes and added that famine was unknown to the former since the food of the latter was appropriated in such a circumstance. All of her specific examples, however, were acts of chiefs. She told of seeing a chief and his party paddling down the Columbia near a fishing site. A lone fisherman had caught several sturgeon. The chief sent one of his group to take the fish, leaving the fisherman not a one. Payment was not made, nor was it customary in any similar circumstance, according to Mrs. Luscier. This contradicts Ross' unequivocal statement; it may represent more recent practice.

This practice extended to the Clatsop. One of their chiefs, *kati'di*, was a particular offender and much disliked. He was constantly sending one or another of his ten sons (agents were always used in property appropriations) to seize goods from some commoner, the penalty of resistance being death. The Chinook on the opposite side of the river became incensed at the treatment their relatives were receiving and met together at the instance of their chief to decide upon a plan of action. The Clatsop chief was in constant fear of his life and seldom left his barricaded semi-underground house. The Chinook felt that the only hope of enticing him out would be to call to him from the outside, speaking pleasantly in the manner of friends. Then when he emerged they could set upon him and kill him. Accordingly a party was organized and departed. When they arrived they were told that *kati'di* was not there though he could be heard talking inside. The Chinook besieged the place for "five" days, but to no avail. Here is one example at least of a chief plotting to undermine his own privileges.

Commoners regularly but informally presented gifts to chiefs, usually of food. The chiefs probably re-distributed the goods among the upper class. In this way the commoners kept in the good graces of the chief and it is probable that summary appropriation as discussed above was by most chiefs directed only against those considered miserly.

²⁷Ross, p. 88.

Ross' "appropriation of wife or daughter" belongs of course to an entirely different category. Mrs. Luscier declared that a chief would never think of taking a man's wife while the man was still living or when succession under the levirate was possible. Failing the levirate, however, an upper-class widow was "given" by the chief to whatever upperclassman he desired, or kept as a wife for himself. If a chief desired a particular unmarried woman as a wife for himself or his son, his request was seldom denied. Fear of consequences in the event of denial played some part,²⁸ but the opportunity to marry into the family of a chief was not lightly to be discarded. In any event the taking of a wife must not be confused with appropriation of property.

The political power of a chief lay definitely in the individual, not in the family to which he belonged. No common term of address existed; the title "chief" was applied to the individual only. Brothers were important in the council but not more so than other prominent upperclassmen. Sub-chiefs or dual chieftainship were unknown. Indeed, the chief was loath to delegate power in any way except to the war chief in the specific circumstance of war. The council was highly informal and relatively unimportant.

The chiefs of various villages never met together for formal council. Lives would have been in danger since relations were more often strained than amicable. Inter-village demands for blood-money or war settlements brought chiefs together but warriors from both sides were always present. These remarks must not be taken to apply to neighboring villages under normal conditions; they represent Mrs. Luscier's formulation.

Each chief was served by a spokesman selected for his ability at oratory. Various men served in this capacity, being selected upon the occasion of need. Not only did the spokesman add strength of presentation to the words of the chief, but he served as an intermediary between classes. It was felt that the chief should not speak to the lower class directly.

A man was responsible only to the chief of the village in which he lived. As soon as a man shifted residence his political affiliations changed. When a man was visiting away from home he was liable to the chief of the village in which he was temporarily situated. This even applied, at least nominally, to a chief when in the village of another. In the case of tiny settlements intermediately located between larger villages, each with its chief, strife sometimes arose between the chiefs as to where jurisdiction ended.

It has been stated that the chief functioned as a judge and that it was his duty to keep peace in the village. Further details regarding the handling of crimes and torts are almost wholly absent. A quite formal institution of blood-money as settlement for serious torts existed, as reflected in customs connected with slavery.²⁹ For lesser wrongs a system of fines assessed by the chief and payable to the injured person seems to have held sway. Beyond this little can be said.

²⁸See marriage.

²⁹q.v.

Concomly, mentioned several times above as chief of qwatsa'mts, ruled during the days of Lewis and Clark and the early fur traders. There is no question but that he was an exceedingly able leader and an accomplished trader. He has become a literary figure through the repeated references to him by all early writers and his picturization in Washington Irving's *Astoria*.³⁰

The bulk of the trade of the time was handled through Concomly's hands. He used his many slaves to advantage in the movement of goods and the contacting of prospective customers. He married several wives (only two are shown in the genealogy) and the associations thus created proved highly profitable through his machinations.

One of Concomly's daughters married McDougall,³¹ a leader in the Astor enterprise. Kane reports that upon the occasion of the marriage Concomly carpeted the path of the bride from the canoe landing on the beach to Ft. George, the scene of the ceremony, with sea otter skins, all of which went to McDougall as a dowry.³² This is an undoubted exaggeration and not in keeping with native practice but it serves to indicate the reputed wealth of the man.

The Clatsop became envious and resentful of this village chief who looked upon the whole of the lower Columbia as his realm. They threatened forceful action and mobilized warriors on several occasions but Concomly easily frightened them into inaction each time by threatening to bring to the field twice as many warriors; a threat which he apparently could easily have fulfilled. The chief pointed to a great rock resting on the summit of Scarborough hill overlooking qwatsa'mts village and declared, "As long as that rock remains in place no one shall question the power of me or my people!" And the rock did remain, throughout Concomly's life and that of his son. But shortly thereafter it disappeared. A party of Clatsop, aided by a number of Tillamook, toppled the rock from its position and rolled it down the hill.

Concomly apparently came into power around the beginning of the nineteenth century. He is not mentioned in 1792 by Boit; rather it is stated definitely that "the village *Chinoak*, [was] command'd by a chief named Polack."³³ But with the coming of Lewis and Clark in 1805 Concomly was well established in office. Scouler estimated his age at sixty in 1824.³⁴ If this were correct he probably became chief as he entered his thirties. He died, according to Dunn, in 1831 and was buried near Ft. George (Astoria),³⁵ after holding sway for perhaps thirty-five years.

³⁰Irving, *passim*. Cf. Lee and Frost, p. 65; Coues, p. 750; Kane, pp. 120 ff.; Thwaites, vols. 3-4, *passim*.

³¹See genealogies.

³²Kane, p. 177.

³³Boit, p. 248.

³⁴Scouler, p. 167.

³⁵Dunn, pp. 131 f. See fig. 8.