In December 1999, I asked David Costa if there was anything I could do for him during a planned visit to the Jesuit archive at St-Jérôme, Québec.¹ Half-jokingly, he asked me to find another Illinois dictionary to add to those at the Watkinson Library, written out by an unknown Jesuit scribe (c. 1700-1720, traditionally attributed to Jacques Gravier), and at the John Carter Brown Library, transcribed by the Jesuit missionary Jean-Baptiste Antoine Robert Le Boulenger (c. 1720). Because of Costa’s suggestion, we now know of a third such dictionary.

The new dictionary² has 672 pages, arranged by French keywords. As I first examined it in the archive, I found a few notes left behind in its pages by scholars who had come across the book in the past. They all said that the language was unknown to them. For example, Father Joseph Richard wrote in 1916, in English, “Dictionary of one of the Algic languages, with some similarity to the Odjibwe, which is it, I cannot tell.” Having studied the Miami-Illinois language since 1975, my first impression was that it was Miami-Illinois. However, it seemed that the Jesuits would have been able to identify the language used in one of their major missionary efforts in the New World. Certain morphological clues suggested that the manuscript might be Sauk-Fox-Mascouten. Among the early Jesuits in the West, Claude-Jean Allouez had spent some time with the Fox and the Mascouten and Jean Mermet had spent two years with the Mascouten. To settle the matter, I looked up the French entries for lexical items that are unique, among the Algonquian languages, to Miami-Illinois, such as paapankamwita ‘fox’, and indeed found <papangam8ita>. Another term unique to Miami-Illinois, miinčiipi ‘corn’, confirmed the identification.

¹. The permission of the Archives de la Compagnie de Jésus, Province du Canada français (ASJCF) and the Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (ARSI) to reproduce the handwriting samples that accompany this paper is gratefully acknowledged, as is the invaluable graphical assistance of Duane Esarey (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill).
². The pagination of the manuscript, referred to in the present volume as Pinet c. 1696-1702, has been added in an archivist’s hand.

Figure 1. Vows written by Pierre-François Pinet (ARSI, Gal. 15/I:212-21).
Figure 2. St-Jérôme dictionary, extract from p. 446 showing the handwriting of Pierre-François Pinet (ASJCF).

How the dictionary ended up in the Jesuit archive at St-Jérôme is still a mystery. The archivist, Isabelle Contant (personal communication, 2004), says that the book does not appear in their listing of documents from before 1800. According to existing records, it did not come from the Séminaire de Québec, Laval University or the archbishopric of Quebec. The dictionary at some time was given to the Collège Ste-Marie in Montreal, as indicated by undated stamps of the college that appear in the dictionary. Indeed, it was probably there that Richard saw the book in 1916. In 1968 the archives of the Collège Ste-Marie were moved to the Jesuit house in Lafontaine, near St-Jérôme. Purely from a logical perspective, Contant believes that all the dictionaries in the archive would have come from the St-Régis mission, the Caughnawaga mission, or from rectories where the Jesuits had lived, as was the case with the famous Ojibwe dictionary of Louis André, which came from a rectory in Ontario. She believes that it would have been in this manner that the books did not become the property of the Oblate fathers, who ultimately replaced the Jesuits in all but two of their missions.

By the spring of 2004 an excellent electronic facsimile copy of the newfound dictionary was made available on CD to the Miami Nation, who loaned hard copies to scholars working for them. Part of my work with
the dictionary has involved determining the identity of the person who composed most of it as well as the identities of the three other people who added a relatively small amount of information. The book itself is now on loan to the Canadian Museum of Civilization in Hull, Québec.

As far as the identity of the principal hand is concerned, its distinctive character matches in every respect that of the Jesuit missionary Pierre-François Pinet, as seen on his vows dated 15 August 1700. Pinet, whose family name is pronounced with the final [t] (as in Jolliet), was born at Périgueux in southwestern France in 1660. He entered the Jesuit novitiate in 1682 and appears to have arrived in Canada in 1692 at the age of 32 (Melançon 1929:63). Working first at the Jesuit mission at Michilimackinac in 1694, he was reassigned in 1696 to serve the two Wea summer villages located on the lower Chicago River, a stone’s throw from Lake Michigan. There he established la mission de l’Ange Gardien [the Guardian Angel mission]. French authorities forced this mission to close in 1697, but it was reopened the following year and Pinet was allowed to return (cf. Rochmonteix 1895-96, 3:495-502). Although he traveled in the winter months (JR 65:71), Pinet’s work among the Wea at the site of present-day Chicago continued through the late winter of 1699-1700, at which time he was reassigned to the Tamaroa summer village located on the site of modern Cahokia, Illinois (Garraghan 1928:115-116; cf. Palm 1931:27-40). It was at there that Pinet was described as “speaking the language [i.e., Miami-Illinois] perfectly”.3 Pinet remained at Cahokia until June 1702, when he was sent to a group of Kaskaskia living on the River des Pères within what is now the city of St. Louis. He died there a few weeks later, on 1 August 1702.4

It was probably on the lower Chicago River that Pinet began this “rough-draft field lexicon” (Costa, personal communication, 2004). Not only did Pinet spend over three of his six years in the Illinois country involved with the Wea, but the years with the Wea also represent his first assignment among Miami-Illinois-speaking peoples. In addition, Costa (personal communication, 2004) has noted that Pinet failed to mark pre-aspiration, which suggests a basic lack of familiarity with the language, as

---


4. There is some confusion in the sources about the date of Pinet’s death; see, however, mention of his death in letter from Bergier, 1 March 1703, in Garraghan 1928:128.
one would of course expect for a missionary in his first years among the
Miami-Illinois-speaking peoples. The historical evidence suggests that at
least some of the language material in the dictionary should be from the
Wea dialect of Miami-Illinois.

There is also a curious onomastic entry in Pinet’s dictionary that
seems to support the Wea dialect theory. This is the name given for the
Illinois River. Under the French entry *Riviere des Islinois* (537) is the
gloss *<in8ca asipi8mi>*, which literally means ‘Inoka’s river,’ Inoka being
the singular form of the self-designation of the Illinois, which included
the Kaskaskia and Peoria, but not the Wea.

In giving rivers ethnonymic labels, Algonquian-speaking groups
generally choose the names of tribes that the rivers lead to or come from.
In other words, Algonquian groups are not in the habit of naming rivers
after themselves. For example, in the mid-18th century and beyond, the
Miami referred to the Maumee River as *taawaawa siipiwi* ‘Ottawa
River’, since the Ottawa were living downstream from them, while the
Ottawa referred to the same watercourse as *maamii ziibi* ‘Miami River’
(whence the modern name Maumee) since the Miami were living
upstream from them. Therefore, the appearance of the hydronym *<in8ca
asipi8mi>* in Pinet’s dictionary seems to imply that whoever gave him this
expression was not an Illinois speaker but rather someone talking about
the Illinois, and probably, given Pinet’s personal history, a Wea. Although
this hydronym was copied by Le Boulenger (160), who was
with the Kaskaskia, the name was first recorded by Pinet, whose mission
was among the Wea.

Three other hands appear in the new-found dictionary, but the
amount of information they add is relatively small. Among these, the
handwriting of Jean Mermet appears on 118 pages. Mermet, who was four
years younger than Pinet, came to Canada in 1698 (Melançon 1929:57).
He replaced Pinet among the Wea at the Chicago River mission in 1700,

---

5. In Miami-Illinois hydronyms, animate nouns functioning as the first member of a
compound appear in the proximate singular form; this pattern is well-attested in record­
ings of native speakers, e.g., *kineepikwameekwa siipiwi* ‘eel river’.

6. The historical Wea were a Miami subgroup; Pierre-Charles deLiette, who arrived in
the Illinois country in 1687 and spent four years with the Wea, notes that the Miami at la
mission de l’Ange Gardien were the Wea band, and that they had been there for ten or
twelve years; cf. Delliette [sic] 1934:392. St-Cosme says all the Native people at Chicago
were Miami (cf. Kellogg 1917:346).
Figure 3. Vows written by Gabriel Marest (ARSJ, Gal. 15/1:67-68).

Figure 4. St-Jérôme dictionary, extract from p. 574 showing the handwriting of Gabriel Marest (ASJCF).
and then, when it closed in 1702, went on to work among the Miami at the St. Joseph River mission in southern Michigan. However, that same year he joined the ill-fated Juchereau tannery project on the Ohio River, in what is now southern Illinois, where he ministered to both Mascouten hunters and French tanners (JR 66:41). In 1704, after the death of Juchereau in an epidemic, Mermet went to labor among the Kaskaskia, although there are indications that he made a detour to visit the Wea, who by that time living on the Wabash. It was among the Kaskaskia that Mermet remained until his death in 1716 (Melançon 1929:57).

Pinet’s dictionary was, presumably, waiting for Mermet at the Kaskaskia mission upon his arrival there in 1704. It was only in that year that Mermet could have begun adding his own observations. Mermet probably also made good use of Pinet’s dictionary, since Jean-François Buisson de St-Cosme observed at Chicago in July 1700 that Mermet at that time did not yet know Miami-Illinois, and he would have had only two years of somewhat sporadic experience with the language before arriving among the Kaskaskia (Garraghan 1928:116).

The handwriting of Gabriel Marest can also be found in Pinet’s book, on 25 pages. Marest was born in 1662 in Champagne and arrived in Canada in 1694 (Melançon 1929:55; JR 65:264-265). Like Mermet he knew Pinet personally, having arrived among the Kaskaskia in 1698 to help Julien Binneteau (Palm 1931:25; Chaput 1969:274). In the fall of 1700, after Binneteau’s death, we find Marest working with Pinet on the River des Péres among the Kaskaskia and some Tamaroa (JR 65:103). Marest then went briefly to the Peoria before finally settling among the Kaskaskia, where he worked until his death in 1714 (Garraghan 1928:120; JR 66:253). Marest was recognized by fellow Illinois country Jesuits and others for his linguistic acumen.

8. For Mermet at Kaskaskia, see JR 66:254-255; for his detour to Wea see Burton 1904:234, also Craig 1893:319.
9. JR 65:69, 66:25, 123. There are probably a few more entries by Mermet and Marest in the dictionary, but not many. The challenge in locating them is that Pinet was disposed to clogging his pages densely with data and the secondary hands are often tucked into tiny spaces within Pinet’s writing, which is itself often of varying sizes.
Ego Johannes Mermet, professus Societatis Jesu, promisit Deo omnipotenti, eorumque Virginis Mariae, sancti Iacobi, sancti Ignatii, sancti Francisci, sanctorum apostolorum, quamvis ratione vel consentiuntur in consuetudinem nostram, per ipsum verum exiguum Odemus et paupertatem resistendam magis.

Promissae propterea quinque me actuam vel praenuntiam, recte sunt quia quod in alianam prolationem vel dignitatem in se extra eligi vel promover.

Promissae propterea quinque me curaturem praenuntiandam quattuor propter rem undem prolationem aliam vel dignitatem nec consentiuntur in mediam quantum in medietate iuris nostrum obidens eum qui misit praeposui, propter subボード geometricum.

Tum siquem nobis aliquis predictorum vicum curare vel praenuntiandam proemptum illum remquetatam me manifestatum, vel proposito eis.

Justaque promissi eis quando accederit ut hac ratione in profecto aliqua Ecclesiae promover, pro cuius quae animae meae

Salve ac recta munus mihi imposedi administratione generet

Ego ac loco ad numem habiturum. Proptroorim Generalium

Societatis, quinque consilium redivum rectum quod vel impetum

Vel quiuis alius quemadmodum habuisse vel dignitatem

Consilio vero suummodi ita maintainet esse promissi, ideo

quim modo quae mihi in mentem veniunt permiscat. Omnia

predicta juxta societatis constitutiones et declarans

Anno 1700 in Valeo missionis S. Angelorum die 7. Iulii.

Joannes Mermet — Societatis Jesu

Figure 5. Vows written by Jean Mermet (ARSI, Gal. 14/1:428-29).
Finally, on only 10 pages is handwriting that is of particular interest, for it belongs to the principal scribe of the massive Illinois–French dictionary at the Watkinson Library, commonly attributed to Gravier.

The “Gravier” and Le Boulenger dictionaries are well-polished works, and appear to represent the culmination of collective efforts of successive missionaries. Jacques Marquette was the first European to visit the Illinois and to study their language, starting in 1669 (JR 54:176-177, 188-189). There is no doubt that he and Claude-Jean Allouez, his close colleague and successor in the region, shared their knowledge of the language, as did Rale, Gravier and Binneteau who followed, with each also working on wordlists or field manuals of his own. Given their common efforts, the veteran missionaries would have passed on these works to the new arrivals. Indeed, Gravier, well equipped with his excellent knowledge of Ojibwe-Ottawa, is noted by Marest as having mapped out the fundamentals of the Miami-Illinois language.10

In attempting to identify the principal scribe of the “Gravier” dictionary and the unknown secondary scribe of Pinet’s, we list the 34 Jesuit priests who are known to have worked with one or more of the Illinois groups – the Kaskaskia, Peoria, Michigamea, Tamaroa, Cahokia, etc. – and/or one or more of the Miami groups – the Wea, Piankashaw, etc. Their names appear below in the order of their arrival among the Illinois or the Miami.11

---

10. See Marest to Germon 9 November 1712, in Lettres édifiantes 1830 10:12; also Membre’s account in LeClerq 1881, 2:137; JR 66:244-247.

11. All birth dates are from Melançon 1929. It should be noted that the history of the Illinois country Jesuits is not without lacunae or other problems. Personal histories of some of the missionaries are remarkably clear, others are not. This list therefore represents a critical synthesis of various Jesuit sources and publications, including the Jesuit Relations, the writings of Camille de Rochemonteix, and primary documents including vows. Also represented are the compilations of Pierre Margry, and letters of non-Jesuit priests, etc. It should be added, as a cautionary note, that each of the published works has its own occasional problem.
Figure 7. St-Jérôme dictionary, extract from p. 669 showing the handwriting of the unidentified scribe (ASJCF).

Figure 8. LeBoullenger dictionary, extract from p. 18 showing the handwriting of its principal scribe (John Carter Brown Library, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island; reproduced from Masthay 2002).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (YEAR OF BIRTH)</th>
<th>ARRIVAL</th>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jacques Marquette (1637)</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>dates too early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude-Jean Allouez (1622)</td>
<td>1669</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>dates too early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacques Gravier (1651)</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>wrong hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sébastien Rale (1652)</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>wrong hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julien Binneteau (1653)</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre-François Pinet (1660)</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>wrong hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel Marest (1662)</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>wrong hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Aveneau (1650)</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>wrong dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph de Limoges (1668)</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>stay too brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Mermet (1664)</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>wrong hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-André Baurie (Boré, Boryé) (1665)</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>stay too brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Baptiste Chardon (1672)</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>~7</td>
<td>wrong dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Marc de Ville (1670)</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Charles Guymonnet (1684)</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph-François de Kereben (1683)</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>dates too late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine-Robert Le Boulenger (1685)</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas-Ignace de Beaubois (1689)</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>wrong hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Baptiste de la Morinie (1704)</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td>38?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Dumas (1692)</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>stay too brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Étienne d’Outreleau (1693)</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>wrong hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>René Tartarin (1695)</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>13?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexis-Xavier de Guyenne (1714)</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>~24</td>
<td>stay too brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine Sénat (1703)</td>
<td>1734</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>wrong hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sébastien-Louis Meurin (1707)</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Magendie (1707)</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julien-Joseph Fourné (1703)</td>
<td>1748</td>
<td>~7</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Vivier (1714)</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathurin Le Petit (1693)</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philibert Watrin (1697)</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>~18</td>
<td>wrong hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julien Pernelle (1721)</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Baptiste Aubert (1722)</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean-Baptiste de Salleneuve (1708)</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>wrong hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julien Deverniai (1719)</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>stay too brief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some of the above are disqualified on the basis of chronology (both Marquette and Allouez were dead before Pinet arrived, and therefore could not have added anything to Pinet’s book). Handwriting samples exclude the greatest number of candidates, including Rale, Gravier, Pinet, Marest and Mermet. Some were involved continuously with people who spoke Miami, not Illinois, dialects (e.g., Aveneau, Chardon) – and there is evidence in the “Gravier” dictionary clearly indicating its material did not come from a Miami dialect. Handwriting samples exclude the greatest number of candidates, including Rale, Gravier, Pinet, Marest and Mermet. Some were involved continuously with people who spoke Miami, not Illinois, dialects (e.g., Aveneau, Chardon) – and there is evidence in the “Gravier” dictionary clearly indicating its material did not come from a Miami dialect. Several others (Limoges, Baurie, d’Outreleau) were not among the Miami or Illinois peoples long enough, it seems, to copy out the huge “Gravier” dictionary or, in fact, to have learned the Miami-Illinois language well enough to compose it. As evidenced by his entries in Pinet’s book, its writer was quite familiar with Miami-Illinois. French spelling provides another important factor to consider. Robert Vézina (personal communication, 2004) has pointed out that the “Gravier” dictionary contains conventions common in the 17th century but quite old-fashioned by the 18th. In other words, the writer used antiquated spellings, including but not limited to the verb ‘know’ spelled with <gn>, such as <cognoistre> and <incognu>, a practice already criticized at the beginning of the 17th century, forms of the verb ‘dry’ with <ei>, such as <seicher> and <seichent>, and the word for ‘nose’ spelled <nes>, rather than modern <nez>. Pinet, who would have learned to write in the late 1660s, writes <connoitre> and <nez> but the stem for ‘dry’ is spelled in the old way with <ei>. Therefore, it would appear that the scribe of the “Gravier” dictionary, unless he grew up in an educational backwater, was born at least by 1660-1670. This would leave us with only three possibilities: Binneteau, Aveneau, and de Ville.

Binneteau, whose handwriting is not available, seems an unlikely candidate. Although his four years in the Illinois country would appear to have been enough time for him to copy out the dictionary, Binneteau was an extremely busy, overworked, often destitute and malnourished missionary whose physical condition continued to deteriorate the longer he

12. Masthay is probably for the most part correct in identifying the dialect of the “Gravier” dictionary as Kaskaskia; however, the Peoria dialect is probably also well represented, since the earliest missionaries spent a great deal of time with that group. That said, with so little difference among the Miami and Illinois dialects in general, differences among Illinois dialects, such as Peoria and Kaskaskia, would have been minimal.
stayed in the mission. The “Gravier” dictionary, however, exhibits a level of care and organization that suggests that it was written à tête reposée, in a relatively relaxed atmosphere. Equally significant is the fact that the very handwriting of its principal scribe indicates that he was possessed of a considerable degree of vitality. Could this have been Julien Binneteau? If he is the scribe, Binneteau had to have written out the dictionary before 1699, the year of his death, and had to have added his comments to Pinet’s dictionary when both were living in the Illinois country between 1696 and 1699. During their days among speakers of Miami-Illinois, Binneteau mostly resided among the Peoria and Pinet mostly among the Wea. However, for a few months they lived together at the Wea mission on the lower Chicago River and spent short periods of time together elsewhere during the winter months. Why Binneteau would have felt inclined to add entries to Pinet’s own field manual is, of course, another question.

Aveneau, for different reasons, also appears to be an unlikely candidate. He worked only among Miami but the evidence indicates that the “Gravier” dictionary represents one or more Illinois dialects of the Miami-Illinois language. Indeed, the book is fastidious in highlighting a handful of specifically Miami terms.

Born in 1670, deVille appears to be the only other possibility to fit this scenario but, again, apparently the Jesuit archive in Rome has no handwriting sample for him.

It could be argued that the dictionary was compiled by one of the earliest and oldest Jesuits in the Illinois country in the 1600s, using an old-fashioned way of spelling – perhaps even by Jacques Gravier, to whom it is commonly attributed – and was only transcribed later into its current form. This scenario implies, however, that, contrary to expectations, the scribe did not modernize the spelling. The very format of the “Gravier” dictionary suggests that it was going to be a template for publication, or at the very least serve locally as the definitive guide to the Illinois language. For this reason, it seems odd that a young scribe would not have modernized the spellings. That having being said, in the outside chance that the dictionary was in fact transcribed by a later-arriving Jesuit, a number of them can still be excluded on the basis of handwriting (deBeaubois, Tar-

13. For Binneteau and Pinet together at the Wea mission and elsewhere, see St-Cosme to Laval, 2 January 1699, in Baillargeon 2002:53, 57, 58; also, Kellogg 1917:346.
tarin, Meurin, Watrin, deSalleneuve), or insufficient time (de Limoges, Baurie, d'Outreleau, Sénat, Devernai).

The only candidates who might have arrived later and stayed long enough, yet without modernizing the spelling, would be Guymonneau, de Kereben, Dumas, Magendie, Fourré, Guyenne, Vivier, le Petit, Pernelle, Aubert and de la Morinie.

The fact that the “Gravier” dictionary is carefully printed may present a challenge in handwriting identification. However, in Pinet’s dictionary we are fortunate to have the unknown writer’s cursive hand, which should allow us to compare it with the handwriting of Binneteau, Aveneau, de Ville, or one of the others in question. The cursive script in Pinet’s dictionary shows a strong resemblance to the signature of Joseph-François de Kereben, however, his signature alone does not allow for a positive identification; a larger sampling of his handwriting is needed to confirm that he was the scribe. Moreover, de Kereben appears to have been born much too late to have learned to spell modern <connaitre> (oldish <connoitre>) as antiquated <cognitostr>, etc.

In conclusion, based on the evidence of his handwriting and philological and historical factors, Pierre-François Pinet was the author of what has been referred to since its discovery in 1999 as the St-Jérôme dictionary, which he composed between 1696 and 1702. Some or much of Pinet’s material appears to represent the Wea dialect of Miami, for a variety of reasons: (1) In the Illinois country Pinet spent about half of his time with the Wea, the first Miami-Illinois-speaking group he worked with. (2) There is a seemingly non-Illinois dialect place name entry in his book. (3) Pinet’s book was composed in the field — not a revised and polished work — and apparently created by someone fresh in the process of learning Miami-Illinois. (4) Costa’s research presents evidence for a Miami dialect origin for some of the entries.

Pinet’s contemporaries Gabriel Marest and Jean Mermet added to his book after his death, the former between 1700 and 1714 and the latter between 1704 and 1716. The fourth hand that appears in Pinet’s dictionary belongs to the principal scribe of the dictionary attributed to Gravier. In the latter, curiously, French words are spelled in a fashion that suggests

14. The Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (ARSI) maintains a file of handwriting samples which may ultimately permit an identification.
that he was an older man in the late 1600s. The identity of this person – who could be Julien Binneteau, Charles Aveneau, or Jean-Marie de Ville – is unknown, and will remain so until a handwriting sample bearing his signature is found.
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