IDENTIFICATION

The Algonquin manuscript "Racines de la langue ōtaōaise & algonquine" ('Roots of the Ottawa and Algonquin Language') is a fairly lengthy manuscript from the 17th century in readable, but rather imperfect, condition. Although there are few torn pages, many are seriously water-stained, and a number of pages appear to be missing. The author of the manuscript is anonymous but not completely unknown since it is reasonably clear from a study of several manuscripts, as Hanzeli (1969:68) correctly states, that many of the corrections in both the 1661 and the 1662? manuscripts are in the same hand as the 1669? manuscript. Pilling (1891:7) also agrees, in his comments on "Discourse on Purgatory, and a part of Genesis, in the Algonquian language. 1662? [sic]," that the connections among some of the manuscripts are due to the work of this anonymous author:

The two dictionaries dated 1662? and 1669, and the Discourse, have been corrected and augmented by a Jesuit father who wrote in 1669 and who had a good knowledge of the language, as is attested by the fact that he wrote upon the roots of the Algonkin.

Pilling apparently never saw any of the Old Algonquin manuscripts (1661, 1662?, and 1669?), as indicated by the asterisk in parentheses fol-

---

1. I have a poor xerox copy of this manuscript and a microfilm that is also unsatisfactory in many respects. Because of this, I went to Montréal twice recently to take digital photographs of several manuscripts, including several hundred photographs of the manuscript in question, photographs which I relied on for this paper. Throughout this paper, unclear letter readings are underlined, with larger problems of interpretation followed by a question mark. I would like to express my indebtedness to Marc Lacasse, archivist at the Sulpician Archives in Montréal, for his kindness and assistance in making this manuscript, as well as several others, available to me. I would also like to thank Ives Goddard and, especially, David Pentland for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper. As usual, I alone am responsible for any shortcomings that persist.

2. Neither Hanzeli nor Pilling mention Manuscript 14, a recently discovered Old Algonquin manuscript; see Aubin 1995 and Aubin 1996 for some discussion.

---

lowing each entry in his bibliography, so this comment raises several questions.

It is puzzling that Pilling nowhere in his various entries (Algonquian; Chippewa; Nipissing; Ojibwa; Ottawa) lists the title “Racines de la langue otaoaise & algonquine” in French or in English translation, with his comments above apparently referring to Algonquin to the exclusion of Ottawa. As a result, it is not at all clear what Pilling means by the 1669 dictionary, in spite of the fact that, on page 7, he lists a 1669 French-Algonquin dictionary, followed by an undated French-Algonquin dictionary. It is possible, of course, that Pilling is referring to this manuscript in general rather than in specific terms. But there is also the possibility that he is referring to a dictionary different from the one mentioned “upon the roots of the Algonkin” and which has subsequently been lost. In support of this, one might argue that the passage quoted above can be interpreted as implying that a Jesuit, writing in 1669, corrected and augmented someone else’s work rather than his own. It is interesting to note that Hanzeli (1969:68) approvingly repeats much of the above passage but, for some unexplained reason, applies it to the 1661 and 1662? manuscripts:

These two manuscripts [i.e., 1661 and 1662; my clarification] were “corrected and augmented by a Jesuit father who wrote in 1669 and had a good knowledge of the language, as is attested by the fact that he wrote upon the roots of Algonkin.”

Although Pilling does list the 1661 manuscript (1891:6-7), he makes no mention at all of it in this connection.

Among other questions, one may wonder why Pilling calls the author “a Jesuit father.” Although they arrived in Canada in 1657, the Sulpicians were not given permission to establish missions until 1668, and did not work with Algonquian groups until 1671 (Caulier 1992:18). There is a slight chance that the author may have been a Recollect, but their writings seem to have been rather sparse. Thus, anything Algonquian prior to 1671 is almost certainly Jesuit. On the other hand, as is often the case with the early manuscripts, the dates given are less than certain. Of the three Old Algonquin manuscripts referred to above, only the 1661 manuscript is clearly dated, on the very first page. The 1662 date of the second manuscript, while perhaps reasonable, appears to be only an approximation. Equally approximate is the 1669 date attributed to the third manuscript. There is no date given in the manuscript, and, pending detailed analysis,
there is nothing immediately obvious in the manuscript that would allow
us to infer an exact date. Even if the author was in part responsible for
some of the corrections on the 1661 and 1662? manuscripts, it is not clear
why Pilling assumes that this third manuscript should be dated at 1669
(provided, of course, that this is the manuscript he is referring to). In this
regard, Hanzeli is a bit more circumspect, giving the date of the manu­
script as “c. 1669” (Hanzeli 1969:126). On the cover of the manuscript in
the Sulpician archives, a cover that was, in all probability, added at some later
time, the somewhat surprising date of 1699 is given. This appears to be as
unsupported as the date of 1669, yet serves to underscore the problem, which
is why I have placed a question mark after the date of this manuscript,
although I have continued to use the (approximate) date of 1669.

PARTS OF THE MANUSCRIPT
Divided into four major sections, the manuscript is 281 pages long. Han­
zeli (1969:126), however, states that it is 302 pages in length, which could
mean that in the last 35 years, some 21 pages have been lost. A more
likely explanation for this discrepancy is that he miscounted the number
of pages, something which is easy to do since they are unnumbered and
several appear more than once in the microfilm which he probably exam­
ined (as in the case of Pilling, it seems that Hanzeli never saw the origi­
nals of several of the manuscripts he discusses).

The manuscript begins with a vocabulary of 140 pages, with many,
but not all, of the Algonquin and/or Ottawa entries followed by a French
translation. The words are listed in alphabetic order of the initial constituent,
although this ordering is not always strictly adhered to. The pages are quite
densely packed, and the handwriting is often very difficult to read, even under
magnification. In some cases, words or letters have been written over, some­
times several times, making them practically uninterpretable.

The second section is a 24-page grammar which is of particular inter­
est because it contains one of the earliest discussions of noun medials and
finals in Algonquin or Ottawa. The finals, which are discussed first, are
listed in approximate alphabetic order, followed by the medials, again in
approximate alphabetic order. This section of the manuscript is generally
rather clear, with a lengthy discussion of the verbal system accompanied
by several illustrative paradigms.
The next 67 pages contain a French-Algonquin vocabulary. While the earlier vocabulary section appears to deal with both Ottawa and Algonquin, this second vocabulary is almost exclusively devoted to Algonquin, with Ottawa items included only occasionally. Again, there are occasional problems with the handwriting.

The manuscript concludes with a number of sermons of various types (50 pages). They are almost entirely in Algonquin, with French words or phrases appearing mainly as titles for the various subparts. Of these subparts, some of which are numbered, one series, with each part entitled "Article," goes from 5 to 12, while another, on the Ten Commandments, goes from the Ninth to the Third commandment, in reverse order. The missing numbers thus might indicate that several pages are missing from this part of the manuscript. In addition, a curious feature here is that page 256 is written in two different directions, the top one-quarter of the page right side up from the top downward and the lower three-quarters in the opposite direction, upside down from the bottom upward. Finally, following this, the last 23 pages of the manuscript have been bound upside down.

REFLEXES OF PA *θ AND *l (~ *r) IN THE MANUSCRIPT

As its title indicates, the manuscript obviously includes data from both Old Algonquin and Old Ottawa. In fact, some of the major phonetic / phonological differences between the two appear to have been fairly clearly understood by the author, who comments on them at the very beginning of the manuscript (1):

Faut prononcer l. ou n. po r algonquinne L'e est masculin Co[mm]e La prononciation est differente Il faut chercher le mot en divers endroits V.g. nimara nimana & nimala pour bien aprentre les mots Les faut faire prononcer aux sauvages & garder la quantité. (It is necessary to pronounce l or n for Algonquin r. The e is masculine. Since the pronunciation differs it is necessary to look for the word in various places, for example nimara nimana and nimala, in order to learn the words well. It is necessary to have them pronounced by the Indians and to maintain the quantity.)

3. Ives Goddard (personal communication) has suggested that this may mean that the masculine ⟨e⟩ is pronounced [e], with the feminine ⟨e⟩ pronounced as mute ⟨e⟩ or schwa.
In Old Algonquin, the reflex of Proto-Algonquian *θ and *l (≈ *r) is ⟨r⟩:

1. ‘chien’
2. ‘soleil couchant, caché’
3. ‘boyau’
4. ‘au milieu [du canot]’
5. ‘ceruelle’
6. ‘esperer’
7. ‘estoille’
8. ‘gendre’
9. ‘grenouillez’
10. ‘gueux’
11. ‘habit’
12. ‘hair’
13. ‘long canot’
14. ‘manchot’
15. ‘narine’
16. ‘nepueu’
17. ‘je porte le nom d’un trepasse’
18. ‘jay un nom sale’
19. ‘oyseau moche’ [sic]
20. ‘palais de la bouche’

There is general agreement that this ⟨r⟩ first changed to ⟨l⟩, then changed to ⟨n⟩, which is what one finds in the modern dialects. The systematic difference between Old Algonquin and other dialects, presumably Ottawa and perhaps Saulteaux, rates an explicit comment: “l & n. suppleent a L’r [...] R en algonquinne” (130) ⟨l⟩ and ⟨n⟩ replace the ⟨r⟩ in Algonquin.

Old Algonquin ⟨r⟩ corresponds to Old Ottawa ⟨l⟩:

21. ‘estoille’
22. ‘chien’

4. David Pentland (personal communication) has suggested that ⟨nimara⟩ is Algonquin, that ⟨nimana⟩ appears to be Saulteaux, and that ⟨nimala⟩ is Ottawa. If this is accurate, these forms may well indicate the presence in the manuscript of at least some terms from all three of these dialects. He also points out that, surprisingly, the example cited appears to be the precursor to modern Ojibwa nimanaa ‘I am having sexual intercourse with him/her’ – some speaker’s joke at the expense of an unsuspecting language learner, unless it is just a copying error for nimiinaa ‘I give s.t. to him/her’.

5. Unless otherwise specified, all references are to the 1669? manuscript.
Examples which contain both \( \text{r} \) and \( \text{l} \) may be taken to suggest that the change from \( \text{r} \) to \( \text{l} \) in Old Ottawa did not occur everywhere at once since we find examples of \( \text{r} \) and \( \text{l} \) both occurring in the same word and in the same environment:

(28) 'on le hait en effet' alöchinkerima (16)
(29) 'onenapitieeneffet' alöchaöerima (16)
(30) 'son gosier, palais' olagaskör (60)
(31) 'mongendre' nilinguar (60)

In 28 and 29, both \( \text{r} \) and \( \text{l} \) occur intervocalically. Of particular interest is 31, where we have \( \text{r} \) in word-final position, in contrast to 24, which, in spite of the difference in gloss, appears to be the same morpheme, but with \( \text{l} \) in morpheme-final position. It is, however, also possible that the \( \text{r} \) in these four forms is a simple misspelling on the part of the author, an understandable error if he used the Old Algonquin forms as his point of departure, and that they should in fact contain \( \text{l} \) everywhere.

Further complicating the picture is the following example, where we find both \( \text{n} \) and \( \text{r} \) in the same word:

(32) 'mon palais' ninagask pl. kör (76)

The \( \text{n} \) in this word occurs in morpheme-initial position, whereas \( \text{l} \) occurs in the same morpheme in the same position in 30. As discussed elsewhere (for example, Aubin 2003:13), an initial \( \text{n} \) developed rather early in Ottawa, while a medial \( \text{l} \) (not \( \text{r} \)) was maintained. Since 32 is a dependent noun, the unexpected \( \text{n} \) never appears in word-initial position and is therefore not a product of the early Ottawa development. The final \( \text{r} \) in the plural is likely a misspelling, as in 30, here perhaps for \( \text{n} \). Like the untranslated example \( \text{nimana} \) cited at the beginning of this section, this form is possibly from the Old Saulteaux dialect, which is presumed to have had \( \text{n} \) everywhere (David Pentland, personal communication).

In addition to the forms containing both \( \text{l} \) and \( \text{r} \), or \( \text{n} \) and \( \text{r} \), Pentland has pointed out (personal communication) that there are other
indications that the vocabulary was based on an earlier manuscript. The anonymous author of the 1669 manuscript apparently intended to produce a dictionary of Old Ottawa by revising one written in Old Algonquin. He thus replaced \( r \) with \( l \) (or, word-initially, with \( n \)) most of the time, but he sometimes followed his source too closely and retained the \( r \). He also inserted some distinctively Ottawa words in their rightful place, such as forms with \( alin-> \) ‘ordinary’ on pages 15 and 16, and a few words with stem-initial \( l \), mostly dependent nouns, on page 60. His exemplar (or its source) did not write intervocalic \( h \), so \( mahingan \) ‘loup’ is alphabetized after 17 entries in \( maia\) on page 61. Further, derivatives of \( nah-> \) ‘properly’ are separated from one another by words beginning with other roots: \( nahab 3 i \) ‘il voit bien’ follows \( na ? \) ‘interrogative particle’ and precedes \( naba-> \) and \( natch-> \) (originally \( nach-> \) ?); \( nahelim 3 o \) ‘il ne le touche plus’ comes between \( nadoe\) ‘huron’ and \( nag-> \); and \( nahibat\) follows entries in \( naia-> \) (pages 75-76).

In light of these considerations, it is clear that this is a manuscript with a good deal of dialect mixture, showing forms from at least two dialects, and probably three, often resulting in a rather confusing picture.  

**Finals**

All the finals given on pages 141-145 are listed in Appendix 1. Each final together with its definition, where one is given, is printed in boldface; of the 108 finals, only 19 lack a gloss. Although there is no numbering in the manuscript, it is usually obvious which entry is taken as the final, with

---

6. Two other examples which may contain Saulteaux forms are found in the section on medials, below, again with \( r \) ~ \( m \) alternation.

7. Further, we still know neither how pervasive the problem of apparent misspellings is nor its precise effects. In addition, in terms of the question of medials and finals, there is a rather large number of lacunae, with 25 unglossed and, perhaps more important, numerous supporting examples left untranslated. Because of these difficulties, and since this is the earliest discussion of medials and finals in any Algonquin manuscript, I give as accurate a list as possible, without attempting in-depth analysis at this time. Of course, anyone having experience with Proto-Algonquian or with the languages of the Ojibwe group will find some proto-forms or cognates related to various forms in the list of medials and finals, but such an undertaking at this time must of necessity be \textit{ad hoc} and incomplete, with a fully grounded and properly detailed analysis, and accompanying criticism, if it is ever to be accomplished, better done when this manuscript has been more completely analyzed and understood and the medials and finals posited checked against the work in its entirety.
F105 the only problematic case. For the most part, only noun finals are listed, although there are five possible verb finals included:

- F4 ap 'séance 3 i.'
- F16 che 'enfanter'
- F32 ska 'floter'
- F59 Mŏ 'attacher'
- F85 Rŏs 'fumer'

Each final is followed by one or more examples, with glosses common but not provided consistently (F8, F11, F24), e.g.,

- F8 Beg ou Pek 'Eau'
  - pitōbeg 'eau de 2 Costez'
  - ōinipeg 'eau puante'

In other cases, the examples are unglossed (F22, F52, F62), and there are also seven finals without any examples (F13-16, F20, F82, F84); despite the cross-reference in F82, neither <rō> nor <raō> appears anywhere in the discussion of either finals or medials.

Although many of the examples clearly contain the final in question, in a fair number of others, which I have marked by [sic], the final is not readily identified, e.g.,

- F54 Magŏat n. gŏsi 'senteur'
  - Megastekamek [sic] 'poisson'
  - Achkaōamegōr [sic]

Six of the examples given in F81 illustrate the <r> to <l> correspondence discussed above, with the Old Algonquin forms containing <r> and the Old Ottawa forms, <b>:

- F81 Rigŏat 'chemin'
  - mirōarigŏat 'bon'
  - pissikarigŏat 'long'
  - ninkōtōkijj kōaharigŏat 'une journée'
  - nissōikisōaligōat '3 mois'
  - tanin epitchaligōat
  - apitch entagōk endrakian [sic]
  - nissōgōhagaligōat [d̪h̪ or <g> ?]
MEDIALS

All the medials given on pages 145 and 146 are listed in Appendix 2. Only one of the examples, however, is followed by a gloss:

M8  Gœ
    nikassibingoena
    nikakingœbira

‘visage’
‘Je luy oste ses levres’

There are a few cases of both <r> and <n> appearing within a single entry:

M27  Kïntagan
    nikipiskïntagarena

-gira [sic]

or in duplicate entries:

F75  Rag & re
    ninchïragator
    ...raguisiœek
    peijkïrag
    amïrany [sic]

M10  Nago
    kakanagoeska

CONCLUSION

The detailed analysis of this manuscript promises much more information on the evolution of Old Algonquin and Old Ottawa and their relationships in the latter part of the 17th century. Given the problematic penmanship and the overt dialect mixture, this is, in many ways, the most challenging of the four Old Algonquin manuscripts I have worked on. The judgement of Pilling and Hanzeli that its author knew both dialects well is at least partially supported by the data discussed here. On the other hand, in light of the finals and medials, a more guarded evaluation seems to be in order. More detailed analysis may yet prove Pilling and Hanzeli prescient.

---

8. Although there is no numbering in the manuscript, it is usually obvious which word is intended as the medial, with M22 the only problematic case. I have highlighted in boldface each medial and its definition (only six of the 35 medials listed have no gloss: M18, M20, M21, M22, M23 and M35).
APPENDIX 1. FINALES IN NO[M]INIBUS, POTISSIMUM
(FINALS ON NOUNS, PRINCIPALLY)

[page 141]

F1  ab & eab
    achkimaneab
    ömichtigöčheab ő
    miskööab
    kortaskööab
    mitigööab
    nitirab 3 i
    Fl
    Fab
    kachkimaneab
    michtigöčheab ő
    miskööab
    kortaskööab
    mitigööab
    nitirab 3 i

F2  Aï
    achkataï
    misakōai
    abiminikōe [sic]
    F2
    Anak & Naga
    aöessanak
    aōa [sic]
    abitaōanang [sic]
    chibanaga
    kanakōanagōng
    Iskōetanagōng
    ōntiskaōanaga
    F3
    ap
    nimirōap 3 i.
    F4
    aōas
    niganaāōas 3 o
    F5
    Bak baghisi
    nadōēōibak
    F6
    Bas Baste
    nōisakabas 3 o
    akōabas ő
    risakabaste
    F7
    Beg ou Pek
    pitōbeg
    ōnipeg
    F8
    Begat ou ghisi
    Beganeō, irabegamō [sic]
    sintabegamō [sic]
    F9
    Bi
    aramibing
    ninassib
    F10

‘Corde’
‘de peau’
‘veine’
‘V. du gosier’
‘arc’
‘Veieri’ [i.e., ‘veiller’]
‘de peau’
‘peau fresche’
‘veluē’
‘[p(eau). de Castor’
‘Isle’
‘au dela de lisle’
‘Isle perceé’
‘au bout de Lisle den bas’
‘audevant de lisle’
‘seance 3 i.’
—
‘petun’
‘fumée’
‘Je suis en fumée’
‘il fume’
‘Eau’
‘eau de 2 Costez’
‘eau puante’
‘de chose longue’
‘eau’
Bik Bikis
aœessabik
minisabik
b [sic]
aramikông [sic]
Peijkôabik nichôabikatór
makateôabikisiõpôagan
kichabikite n. sô
Takabikat n. kissi
Tantassôbi-ka teôas mokman
iskôatagabikat
Epitatibikak
Bôgô ou högô.
nikintabôgô
Bô
Bôr
Bôk
che
cheg chegat ou guisi
tagôegat n. guissi
nitantacheg 3 i.
chkôr
minchaskôr [sic]
chkôte
magôskôte [sic]
chô naparechô
Ek 3 ôe
Gama
michigama
kinôgama
eitaöegama
agachigamachi
aœessegami [sic]

‘de chose dure’
‘Isle de rochers’
’dans la pierre ou dans le fer’
‘calumet noir’
‘chaud’
‘froid’
‘pierre de cette grosseur’
‘potage’
‘fruits’
‘Cabane ou chaudiere’
‘enfanter’
‘Robe’
‘Je chang[e] d’habit’
‘herbe’
‘foin’
‘affaissé’
‘tondu’
‘chaud’ V. Verba
‘Lac’
‘Eau’
‘Cabane’
’dans la Cabane’
‘a la derniere’
'deux Cab[anes].'

‘de cette espaisseur’

'asleine [i.e., alène] basgue' (?)

‘arbre’

‘licte de riviere’

’enfant’

‘ou il y a des n.’

‘floter’

‘grandes lames’

‘de ceste grandeur’

‘association’

‘a terre’

‘chemin’

‘2 pistes, i. de deux ho[mm]es’ (?)

‘marée’

‘chaudiere’

‘de deux pierres’
F40 kíó
nimanhíkió

F41 kíóan
pimitchikióan

F42 kíóek
achikióegór
kachkióegór
achichkióagac [sic]

F43 koman
irinkoman

F44 kore
òassakore

F45 koreié
nipitchikorei
nikikorei

F46 kó
nitabóskó
nabekó

F47 kóamó
kóeiakómó [sic]

F48 kóam
nichichótjikóam
aramiskóatóng [sic]

F49 kóat
michakóat

F50 kóat & kóssi
achkakóat

F51 kaóan
iskaóan

F52 kóei & kóas
saba [sic]
nimanikóasabakóamin
nimamkóam [sic]
nimanaskóei
Tchimanisikóei
öraóskóemaga [sic]
nikachkakaraskóei [sic]
peijkóskeia ou peijkóskóeiamaga
Ispanakóeia

‘Bray’ [i.e., ‘pitch, tar’]

‘maison’

‘chair’

‘luisant’

‘ours’

‘chemin’

‘glace’

‘le Ciel’

‘bois’

‘muée’

‘escorce’

‘nous cernons des escorces’
F53 kōeō
ninōtikōeō.

F54 Magōat n. gōsi
Megastekamek [sic]
Achkaōamegōr [sic]

F55 Mes
nichōirames

F56 Mik
napemik, nonchemik

F57 Min
nitapōmin
ōapimin

F58 Minakanes
nininchōkanesimin [sic]

F59 Mō
agōmō
sōngamō
iramō
kigamō

F60 Ne & nes
mi epinetch
nikimines 3 i

F61 ōang & ōanga,
Ispataōanga
aramaōang

F62 ōakis
nitichiriniōakis
niraōinōakisi
mateōakiōek [sic]

F63 ōaōi
pineōaōi

F64 ōar & ōatch
nipitchiōar
ninchoāretōr
ninchoarechiōek
ninchoār
ninchoāretabi

F65 ōaran
nikichkairōna [sic]

F66 ōeian
matchiōeian

—

‘senteur’
‘poisson’

—

‘Je suis degosté’ [sic]
‘castor’

‘grain’

‘Parente, nation’

‘attacher’

‘maladie’

‘terre’

‘Coustume’

‘sont de diverses especes’

‘paquet’

‘2 sacs’

‘Il en traine 2’

‘queue’

‘amik’

‘peau escorchee’
achkiöeian
nikiköeian

F67  òe  agachaöechi

F68  aöe  óraöe

F69  öins  nimaöinis [sic]

F70  öint  abitaöint
önitisköaoëiner [sic]

F71  paga n. guisi  dakipa [sic]
sakapakisi [sic]

[page 144]

F72  Peg  öinipeg

F73  Pögöa & pógössi  matchipögat [sic]
miröpógössse [sic]

F74  Pön  assamipön

F75  Rag & re  ninghórágatór
..raguisioek [sic]
peijkörag
aramôranëy [sic]

F76  Re  nipökôrechin
matôreatch

F77  Ri  nitakamisôrik 3 e.

F78  Raghekôk  ninchóraguekôk

F79  Ramô  adâmiramô

F80  Ran  nikirânich
assamiran
Tagamagarâran

‘paroles, Voix’

‘poil’

‘fruits’

‘Cabane’

‘fe[u]illes’ (?)

‘Eau’

‘goust’

‘Canot’

‘je fais un cal.’

‘grosse escorne’

‘chemin’

‘pluie’

‘Je suis arrêté de pluie’
F81 Rigōat
mirōarīgōat
pissikarīgōat
ninkōtōkijī kōaharīgōat
nissōikisōalīgōat
tanīn epitchalīgōat
apītch entagōk enđtakian [sic]
nissōgōnagalīgōat [⟨n⟩ or ⟨h⟩, ⟨h⟩ or ⟨g⟩?] 'chemin'
‘bon’
‘long’
‘une journée’
‘3 mois’

F82 Rō & Raō
— supra
‘vent’

F83 Rōe
chaborōe
‘neige molle’
‘fumer’

F84 Rōea gōn
‘rets’
‘le bout de la rets’

F85 Rōs
nikigarōs
‘Ecorce de Cabane’
V. Kōeia [⟨i⟩ or ⟨r⟩?]

F86 Sab
Iskōesab
‘boi’ [i.e., ‘bois’]

F87 Sabak
aōessabak
‘Vilage’

F88 Saga
kōssigōsaga
aramisagatōng
‘Vilage grand’
‘pointe ou il y a des arbres’

F89 Sate
miṣate
‘chien’

F90 Sega
kichkisega
‘Vent’

F91 Simō
pinesimō
napesimō
‘riviere’

F92 Sin
ōanitaōesin
‘sak’ [i.e., ‘sac’]

F93 ōisin
rinkitaōisin
‘luit’

F94 Skimōt
aramiskimōt
‘traisne’

F95 Sōtch
epitisōtch
‘de 2 pierres’

F96 Taban
anikōtaban
‘maille a rets’

F97 Takhi
agachataghisi
APPENDIX 2. MEDIAE ALIQUOT (SOME MEDIALS)

F98 Tagan
aōessetatagan
‘portage’

F99 Tchiōan
Sonkitchiōan

F100 Te
pintate

F101 Tek
hechassamatek apieōntek
‘chaleur, soleil’
‘le rayon entre’

F102 Teō
matchiteō

F103 Teōsi
kitōteōisi
ninchoiteōisi
‘Cabane’

F104 Tik
Tchipaiatik
pachitik
‘de Cette grandeur’
‘potute de terre &c’ (?)

F105 atik
napēoatik
‘famille’

F106 Timi
epitantimak [sic]
‘bois’

F107 Tin
aōessatin
tchikatin
machaōatin
‘profond’

F108 Tit
matōétitamōk
titinuiōars
‘choses durs’
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M1 Apōi
nikakapōchan [sic]
‘aviron’

M2 Arōir
pintarōan [sic]
‘fleche’

M3 Arōe
nikichkarōehōa
‘queue’
| M4 | Bin | nikasibingoena | ‘Larveré’ (?) |
| M5 | Bik | nikichòabikissan | ‘chose dure’ |
| M6 | Biketchiōan | Ispabik - etchiōan 
nipikōabikahanassin [sic] 
nitachiōabikōahan [sic] | ‘saut, roche’ |
| M7 | Gaskō | {<g> on <k>} nimenigaskōepira [scratched out] | ‘ongle’ |
| M8 | Gōe | nikassibingoena 
nikakingōebira | ‘visage’ ‘Je luy oste ses levres’ |
| M9 | Gōn | nipiskigöneōirigō akimak | ‘neige’ |
| M10 | Nagō | kakanagoeska | ‘Canot’ |
| M11 | Min | erigokokōa minaghisitch | ‘grain’ |
| M12 | Makateōi | nimakatgōiraō | ‘noir’ |
| M13 | Minakan | ninchōminakaneşiöek | ‘especé’ |
| M14 | Rachka | nioarachkahan | ‘Large’ |
| M15 | Raguičh | nikiōeraguichich | ‘boiau’ |
| M16 | Rang | őacheragōka [sic] | ‘estoille’ |
| M17 | Rag | nichegōrakhisitōn [sic] 
amîö/raguise | ‘Canot’ |
| M18 | Re | nipikörêchin 
nitamörena | — |
| M19 | Ram | nikīpō ramōna | ‘haleine’ |
| M20 | Rititch | nitaøakirintichi [sic] | — |
| M21 | kan | nikakaōikaneskaōs | — |
kitantassôgan
nikintayôn nasab [sic]
M22  kôes
nôsannôkôasgaô [sic]
M23  kôeski
niôiakôeskiôghinan
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M24  kôk
akôtakiôaneab [sic]
M25  kôe
sisôkôebissôn
nipachkatigôechi
apikôechnimôn
M26  kô ou kôa
Tchitakôâ^ahigan
nipakitehakôchima
nipintakôsiton
M27  kôntag an
nikipiskôntagarena
-pira [sic]
M28  Sit
nikikatchissitas
M29  Te
(chô [sic]
nikichkitechôa ou kitaôage
M30  Tik
nitatikôehamim
M31  Tip
niôarintipeha
M32  Ton
nikipiskîtonepira
M33  Tontan
chibatatonepison [sic]
M34  kat
nikakikatechin
M35  Sab
nikintagônassab

'chaudiere'

'Col, teste'

'bois'

'gosier'

'pied'

'aurgilles' [i.e., 'oreilles']

'Je les luy couppe'

'cerf, bois'

'Cerveau'

'bouche'

'talon'

'jambe'
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