ASSM Manuscrit 104 is an Algonquin-French dictionary apparently completed in 1661, the date on the first page of the main body of the manuscript. What gives this manuscript a special importance is the fact that it is purportedly the oldest Ojibwa/Algonquin document in existence, although its careful alphabetic organization and fairly extensive length give it a somewhat finished appearance, indicating that it is most probably the end result of a great deal of previous work, none of which unfortunately seems to have survived. In spite of its historical precedence, like numerous other early documents, it has, curiously enough, seldom attracted scholarly attention and has, for the most part, slumbered peacefully and relatively undisturbed for generations.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ASSM MANUSCRIT 104

The main body of what the author entitled a Dictionnaire contains some 63 leaves, each two pages long except for the last, for a total of 125 pages. In addition, at the very beginning of the manuscript, there is an initial unnumbered page containing just six words, followed by two fairly messy unnumbered pages containing a number of vocabulary items and short sentences on a variety of topics. There are also several unnumbered pages at the end of the manuscript, one page on numbers with some grammatical comments, the remaining pages on the Principes algonquins, which I reported on in an earlier paper at this conference (Aubin 1998).¹

1. During the fall of 1997, while on sabbatical, I was fortunate enough to be able to once again spend some time working in the Sulpician Archives in Montréal on ASSM Manuscrit 104. On my last day in the Archives, I asked the new archivist, Mr. Marc LaCasse, if it might be possible to obtain a xerox copy of at least parts of Manuscrit 104. To my surprise, he offered to provide me with a copy of the entire manuscript. Thanks to his kindness, I have been able to transcribe the entirety of this manuscript, and, although some problem areas remain, I am confident that most of the difficulties will be resolved when I am able to return to the archives to consult the original. At the same time, I would also like to thank Ives Goddard, David Pentland, and Richard Rhodes for their comments on an earlier version of this paper. I alone am responsible, of course, for any shortcomings that persist.
One salient characteristic of Manuscrit 104 is its length. I have been working off and on transcribing this manuscript since 1995, and I still have numerous forms to check against the original. Each of the 125 pages of the main body of the document contains about forty lines, some with more than one form. Thus, a fairly conservative estimate would put the total number of Algonquin forms in the manuscript at approximately 5,000.

Although the bulk of the main body of the manuscript is in one hand, a complicating factor is the fact that there is evidence that at least three others added to or subtracted from the original in various ways, making some pages of the manuscript rather messy and difficult to read. The first of these other writers is the most important, since it is the same individual who wrote the page on numbers as well as the Principes algonquins, both at the end of the manuscript. The second individual seems to have written his comments at a much later time, since he uses the so-called ‘l-dialect’ of Algonquin, thus lending credence to the belief that these documents were passed from missionary to missionary, with additions and emendations to the original accumulating over time. This second writer is the individual responsible for most of two of the unnumbered pages at the beginning of the manuscript as well as for numerous comments at various places in the manuscript, some of which are rather lengthy. As for the third writer, it is difficult to determine with any precision when he added his comments, although some difficult-to-interpret forms suggest it may have been as late as the 19th century. Overall, he has contributed comparatively little, just the very short initial page of the manuscript and some relatively minor and generally brief comments and/or emendations scattered throughout the manuscript, all of them in very light ink or in pencil.

SOME LINGUISTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ASSM MANUSCRIT 104

Given its age, it is not surprising to find that the manuscript is written in the so-called ‘r-dialect’ of Algonquin, a dialect in which Proto-Algonquian *θ and *l appear as <r>, as in the following examples:

(1)   PA *θ
        arang. pl. gōak ‘Estoille’ (7V)
arim. pl. ḍık ‘chien’ (7V)
The main body of the *Dictionnaire* is arranged alphabetically into thirteen units according to the first letter of the Algonquin word or phrase in question: A, C, E, G, I, K, M, N, O, P, R, S, and T. Although many of the entries contain a single word with its definition, a word that is unrelated to what precedes or follows, we are occasionally given a series of Algonquin forms, all sharing something in common (as in the following from page 10V):

(2)   chantōniker. i   ‘J’estends les bras.’  
chantōēghinan. na   ‘J’estends une robbe.’  
chantōēghichka   ‘Cela je deplie’  
chantōsiton. n. ma   ‘J’esleve cela en le pliant’  
chantōāōagōton. ra   ‘J’estends en haut, v.g. sur une corde de la chair’  
chantōrinchir. ri   ‘J’estends La main’  
chantōnan. n. na   ‘J’estends’

In any series of forms, the French translations often depend on a reading of all of the relevant forms, as in the following from page 11R:

(3)   chichōtibik   ‘au long de L’eau’  
Cf.  cicotc ‘le long de’ (Lemoine 09.Long); agidibiig ‘on top of the water’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.280)  
chichōatin   ‘de La montagne’  
chichōtkitigan   ‘du champ’

It is clear here that what is intended for the last two forms is ‘*au long de la montagne*’ and ‘*au long du champ*’.

In some entries, we are given (roughly) synonymous forms:

(4)   chachaie  
chachaiens  
Cf. chaï   ‘desja, a cette heure, maintenant, pre præterito’ (10R)  

More often, however, we are given relevant grammatical information which enables us to distinguish between similar forms:

(5)   chibite  
chibisō n.   ‘cela est dur a cuire’ (11R)
chachibite ig.  }  ‘cela est dur a cuire’ (11R)
chachibisô nob.

NOUN PLURALS

Algonquin noun plurals show up in all their richness in the *Dictionnaire*, with the various vocalic changes well attested:

(6) a. akim. pl. ak  ‘raquette’ (5R)
amik pl. kôek  ‘un castor, chair de castor’ (5V)
ôaôasesi. pl. sîoek  ‘moussche Luisante’ (43R)
Cf. waawaatesi ‘firefly’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.179)
Pôar. pl. ak  ‘soldat, guerrier’ (55V)
Cf. zhimaaganish ‘soldier’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.253); ogichidaa ‘warrior’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.280)

b. assab. pl. bik  ‘toille d’araignée, une rets’ (8V)
c. akik plur. kôk  ‘une chaudiere’ (5R)
amô. pl. ôk  ‘abeille’ (5V)
askik. pl. ôk  ‘Loup marin’ [i.e., seal] (8V)
atik pl. ôk  ‘une bische, cerf’ (9R)
kinebik pl. kôk  ‘serpent’ (20V)
kisis. plu. sôk  ‘un moys’ (22V)
d. aritchiminer  ‘des pois’ (8R)
Cf. anijiiminan ‘peas’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.226)
min. pl. nar  ‘bleuets, certain petit fruit’ (30R)
e. assin. pl. nir  ‘pierre, Une balle de plomb’ (8V)

Of course, not everything is as straightforward as we might like, and there is the occasional unexplained oddity, which may be an acceptable variant or, perhaps more likely, simply a mistake on the part of the author of the *Dictionnaire*. In addition to this last plural form for ‘stone’, which is the expected one, we also find a different and unexplained plural in a later sentence in the manuscript:

(7) a. Pikôsana assiner  ‘ie coltine des pierres’ (51V)
Cf. pikosin ‘casser’ (Lemoine 09.108); biigisin ‘break on impact’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.149)

The following form is also odd, since it is either a singular with an incorrect final consonant or a mangled plural with missing segments:

b. irinichichig  ‘certaine sorte de canards’ (15R)
DIMINUTIVE NOUNS

Perhaps because of its length, the manuscript provides us with a considerable number of diminutive forms. These forms show several different types of diminutive formation, including some ending in <-ons>, others in <-ch> or <-chich>, several in <-ens>, and even an occasional form showing combinations of these, as in the following examples:

(8) a. arimons  
    makons
    ‘Petit chien’ (7V)
    ‘petit ours’ (26V)

b. aöérichenchich
    aöérichens. pl. ak
    ‘Jeune castor’ (6V)
    Cf. awenicenj, -jic ‘jeune castor de l’année (Lemoine 09.108)

c. kikons. pl. sak
    kikonchich
    kikonsens
    ‘Poisson’ (20R)
    ‘un peu de Poisson’ (20R)
    ‘un petit poisson’ (20R)

d. mikichkan. pl. nar
    mikichkanch
    ‘hameçon, haim’ (30V)
    ‘petit hameçon’ (30V)
    Cf. migiskaans ‘fish hook dim.’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.84)

e. nape. pl. pek
    napec. pl. chak
    ‘garçon, masle’ (35V)
    ‘petit garçon’ (35V)

f. sipioichens
    sipioïchenchich
    ‘petit ruisseau’ (59R)
    ‘petit ruisseau’ (59R)

g. aröens
    iköesens. pl. sak
    kichkichens
    ‘fille’ (14V)
    ‘chienne’ (18V)
    Cf. gishkishenh ‘female dog’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.168)

mikiöamens
    ‘petite maison, cabane’ (30V)

Interestingly enough, although I expected at least some of these forms in <-(i)ch> or <-chich> to have some sort of a pejorative sense (as in Golden Lake Algonquin), at this stage of my analysis, I have found only one form with one of these endings which may possibly be a pejorative, and one form with what appears to be a diminutive ending but which is glossed as an augmentative:
LOCATIVE NOUNS AND PARTICLES

We find the same richness and complexity in the locative nouns and particles in the Dictionnaire, including some in <-ông>, several in <-ang>, numerous forms in <-ing>, as well an occasional form that appears more idiosyncratic:

(10)a. aramakamigông 'dans la cave' (7V)

kigikông 'dans l’an’ (19V)

nôpimimg nôpimamigông 'dans les terres, dans le bois’ (40R)

lôbiông 'Pendant La nuit’ (62V)

b. aramipagôngang 'dans le manteau’ (7V)

aramichkating aramichkaring 'dans le ventre’ (7V)

Cf. anâmackat ‘dans le ventre’ (Lemoine 09.Ventre)

kigikông 'dans le jour’ (19V)

kônìkông 'blanc coe neige, ou, dans la neige’ (24V)

machkimôtâng 'dans le sac’ (25V)

c. araming 'dedans, audedans, dessoubs’ (7V)

ispimimg 'en hault’ (16R)

kôtaking 'aue part, une aue fois’ (23R)

maming ‘aval le riviere’ (27R)

Cf. mâming ‘aval’ (Lemoine 09.80)

nôpimíching 'icy proche dans le bois’ (40R)

VERBS

Although a more detailed discussion of the verbs in the manuscript will have to await further analysis, a few brief comments are in order. Entries for Animate Intransitive, Transitive Animate, and Transitive Inanimate verbs in the Dictionnaire are usually given in a somewhat abstract form, typically a first or second person singular Independent Neutral form without the expected personal prefixes; for many of these verbs, the
vowel of the third person singular is also indicated. Interestingly, the French gloss for these forms is almost always given in the first person singular. Plural forms of these same verbs, although much less common in the Dictionnaire and usually in the first person plural, are also often given without the expected personal prefix, but with the correct suffix, and the French glosses are usually given as though both affixes were there:

(11) a. Pap. Pasagōab. i

rikibe

'ie ris' (50R)

'ie ferme les yeux' (50V)

Cf. basangwaabi 'shut one's eyes' (Nichols & Nyholm 95.247)

b. rikibemin

naparegamepimin

'ous le sommes' [i.e., flooded] (56V)

'nous sommes assis de mesme costé' (35V)

Cf. naban 'on one of the two sides' (Baraga 73.261b)

c. nanekatchitamaōa

ōapaōema

ōanerindan. n. ma

Pinsitaōa

'nous sommes' (56V)

'nous sommes assis de mesme costé' (35V)

Cf. nanékâdjiton 'I make myself suffer by it' (Baraga 73.275b)

d. āinat ig.

ёнisi. nob.

'J'endure pour luy' (34V)

'ie l'emplèche de dormir' (43R)

'ie l'oublie en ma memoire' (45R)

'ie l'entends' (53R)

'cela put sent mauvais' (45R)

VOWEL QUALITY

On the phonological level, it appears that some words contain a vowel which can be either non-nasalized or nasalized, as in the following example:

(12) a. maōis

maōins

'ie vas chercher des fruicts' (28R)

Cf. mawins, (nin) 'I gather berries' (Baraga 73.230b)

The word for 'moose' shows this same variation. Although most of the occurrences of this word in the Dictionnaire have a nasalized vowel, there are a small number of forms with a non-nasalized vowel:

(13) a. mōsōtirin

mōsōkōtatimin

'Langue d'orignac' (33R)

'nous couurons a L'Orignac' (33R)

b. mōnsōpimithe kegat

epōgak

epōgōsitch nob.

'Cela sent La graisse d'orignac' (12V)
mônsōias 'chair d’orignac’ (32V)
mônsōkā ‘il y a là des orignaux’ (32V)
mons. pl. sōck. sōk ‘Orignac’ (33R)
monsōkīōan ‘muffle d’Orignac’ (33R)
c. achimō(n)s pl. sōg ‘orignac qui pût, qui est trop viril’ (2V)

This last form was first written <achimos>, then the <n> was added as a raised letter before the letter <s>. In this connection, the following form, which occurs in Golden Lake Algonquin as zoogipoo, with no nasalized vowels, apparently occurs only with two nasalized <o> vowels in the Dictionnaire:

d. sōnkīpōn ‘il neige fort’ (59V)

VOWEL DELETION

One curious feature of the Dictionnaire is the fact that there are a small number of forms which show evidence of vowel deletion. Perhaps the best example of this is the word for ‘knife’:

(14) a. kina mokman ‘un Tranchoir’ (20R)
    Cf. ginwaa ‘be long’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95. 209)
mokman ‘couteau’ (33R)
mokmanens ‘petit couteau’ (33R)
mōkman pagamagan ‘massie de fer’ (33R)
    Cf. bagamaagan ‘war club’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.158)
Pikōasin mokman ‘le couteau ne peut entrer’ (52R)
    Cf. biigwa’ ‘break someone using something’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.35)

The word for ‘knife’ is usually expected to have three vowels at this period, mookomaan, as in Golden Lake Algonquin, with the loss of unstressed short vowels generally considered to take place sometime in the 19th century. Why the word for ‘knife’ occurs without its short unaccented vowel at this early date is not at all clear. Although there may be a linguistic explanation of some sort for this, it may also be that the word was simply misheard by the author of the manuscript. There are several other forms in the Dictionnaire that may have some bearing on this problem:
Nor is ‘knife’ the only word with a deleted vowel in the manuscript. There are three other words, each occurring both in its ‘full’ form and with a deleted vowel, and with both forms listed together in the Dictionnaire:

(15) a. achkikons
    achikikons ‘poisson frais’ (2V)

b. mantōïs
    3e si
    manitōïs ‘ie suis sorcier’ (27V)
    Cf. manidoowi ‘be a manitou’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.77)

c. mikana
    mikna ‘chemin’ (30V)

In these three cases at least, it would appear that any explanation for vowel dropping can not appeal to alleged mishearing on the part of the author. Further, any linguistic explanation must also somehow explain why these three forms (or four, if ‘knife’ is included) are the only ones undergoing vowel loss. An additional consideration is that only ‘knife’ and ‘road’ show the ‘normal’ Algonquin deletion of short unstressed vowels. In 15b, the deleted vowel appears to be a stressed short vowel. However, Richard Rhodes (personal communication) has suggested that, if we restore the correct personal prefix, <ni->, as the gloss implies (see page 7, above), the deleted vowel is now un stressed, and this form also shows ‘normal’ Algonquin short unstressed vowel deletion. The situation in 15a is less clear. The deleted vowel appears to be a stressed short vowel, but the form itself seems to be somewhat mangled and should probably be <achkikikons>. If we eliminate 15a because of these uncertainties, we are left with three forms, which, if they are in fact accurate, may be the precursors of the well-known unstressed short vowel deletion rule which, well over a century later, would affect many Algonquin/Ojibwa dialects.
INTERESTING VOCABULARY ITEMS

There are numerous vocabulary items in the *Dictionnaire* that are potentially of more than passing interest. First, there are two very different words given for ‘Algonquin’, although exactly when each was used and by whom is not indicated:

(16)a. nehiraoisik
nehiraö. 3. öi
nehirois. 3. si

b. otichkōagami.
pl. öek

mō

‘Les algonquins’ (36R)
‘ie parle algonquin’ (36R)
‘ie suis Algonquin’ (36R)

‘Les algonquins’ (36R)
‘ie parle algonquin’ (36R)
‘ie suis Algonquin’ (36R)

Cf. odishkwagami ‘Algonquin Indian’ (Baraga 73.11a)

In addition, there are general terms for countrymen and women which are unrelated to either of these two terms as well as a term for foreign women:

(16)c. nitchirinik
nitchikōe. pl. öek
otchahon. pl. nak
otchahonens

‘ceux de mon pays’ (38V)
‘femme de mon pays’ (38V)
‘femme estrangere’ (47R)
‘petitte estrangere’ (47R)

Second, a number of forms appear with an initial consonant that has quite generally been lost in modern dialects such as Golden Lake Algonquin:

(17)a. koekonen
koekönening

b. tandache
tantasōtatin apich
tantapich
tampich

‘qu’est ce. comment’ (25R)
‘en quelle partie est ce’ (25R)

‘en quel endroit, ou’ (60V)
‘cambien &c.’ (61R)

‘quand est ce’ (61R)
‘quand est ce’ (61R)

Third, there are a number of place names that occur:

(18)a. metabeōtín

b. ōabichtigōeiaŋ aramōk
ōabichtigōeia

‘Les Trois Rivieres’ (29R)
‘il va tout droit a Quebec’ (29R)
‘Quebec’ (42R)
Fourth, there are a number of words and expressions that are quite blunt in their description of various body parts and bodily functions:

(19)a. aripekoeiao. 3 øi
aribegœiaœs. e
'ie regarde tournant le cul de travers' (8R)
'Le Cul' [i.e., ie panche Le Cul d’un costé] (8R)
Cf. anibegabaw, (nind) 'I lean on one side, standing' (Baraga 73.34b)

b. chik. 3 i
chikitan. ra
'ie pisse' (11V)
'sur luy' (11V)
Cf. zhigizh 'urinate on someone', zhigidan 'urinate on something' (Nichols & Nyholm 95.277)

chikaoïn
'Pissat' (11V)

c. minch. 3 i
mins. 3 i
'mein' (30R)
'ie chie' (30R)
Cf. misi, (nin) 'I exonerate the bowels' (Baraga 73.248b); miizii 'defecate' (Nichols & Nyholm 95.89)

minchiton. ra
'ie fiante sur luy' (30R)

d. Pökit. e
'ie pette' (55V)
Cf. bögid, (nin) 'I fart' (Baraga 73.94b)
PöePöekeiteha
Pöekeitira
'ie le fais petter' (55V)
'ie pette Vers luy' (55V)

e. nitchet
ötehit
'mon cul, mon fondement' (39R)
'son cul, fondement' (47R)

In addition, there are words for certain practices that were apparently common enough to warrant comment:

(20)a. nont nipin
'J’avorte' (39R)
Cf. nond ‘before the due time’ (Baraga 73.310b)

b. kakitamikanechk. 3 a
kakitamikanchôa
'i'ay les maschoires rompus' (17R)
'ie les luy romps' (17R)
Cf. tamikan (avec le Poss.) 'mâchoire' (Lemoine 09.Mâchoire); daamikan 'jaw' (Nichols & Nyholm 95.201)
kichkigöechōa  ‘ie luy couppe la teste’ (19V)
Cf. nin kishkigwebina ‘I tear his head off’ (Baraga 73.129a); giishkikaa ‘tear, rip’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.59); nookkweshing ‘lie with head on something soft’ (Rhodes 85.317)

nökōarabik. 3 kōe  ‘ie Lesche la chaudière’ (39V)
Cf. nóskwatakokwe ‘lécher la chaudière’ (Lemoine 09.Lécher); agidaabik ‘on something mineral (e.g., metal, glass, rock)’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.238)

A final group of words contains miscellaneous items which are of some interest:

(21)a. teöiabegahigan  ‘violon’ (20V)
Cf. naazhaabii‘igan ‘violin’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.278)

kitōtagan  ‘Trompette’ (33R)
Cf. kitotagan ‘bell’ (Baraga 73.197b); kitotagan ‘instrument à vent’ (Lemoine 09.Trompette); godotagan ‘bell’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.144)

b. atchitamo
ōmasatikōeie  ‘escourieux’ (9R)
‘crapaux, grenouille’ (46R)
Cf. omakaki ‘frog’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.184)

rörōkas  ‘oyseau mousche’ (57R)
Cf. nenookaasi ‘hummingbird’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.197)

c. chibanakang  ‘entre deux terres’ (11R)
Cf. jiba ‘through something’ (Baraga 73.168b)
napagapis  ‘La platte ou la jangle d’un collier huron’ (35R)
Cf. nabagaa ‘be flat’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.90)

ōktigan  ‘certain baston que les enfants sauvages font glisser sur la neige, la glace’ (46R)

ōreōiragan  ‘escuelle dont se servent les femmes qui ont leur moys’ (46V)

d. kichkantimi  ‘Profond et escorre’ (19R)
Cf. giishkandan ‘bite through something cleanly’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.59)
kiniikikōm  ‘l’entre deux des Jambes’ (20V)
Cf. -kom (avec le Poss.) ‘jambe’ (Lemoine 09.Jambe)
Pikōtiōin  ‘apostume’ (51V)
ōmikōan  ‘graisse a se graisser’ (57R)
RELIGION

I will now turn to considerations of a somewhat more lofty nature. Since the author of the *Dictionnaire* was presumably a missionary, there are a number of terms related to various practices, both indigenous and European, involving in one way or another the supernatural. Of these, at least some of the various ‘gods’ of the Algonquins did not pass unnoticed:

(22) kapipōnketch  
'le dieu de l’hyver’ (17V)  
Cf. biboon ‘be winter’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.285)

kigikōkeg pl. gör  
'genie de l’air, ou Jupiter’ (19V)

michabōs  
'dieu, genie des Bois’ (29V)

michiōabōs  
'Le grand Lievre, ou le dieu des Lievres’ (29V)  
Cf. waabooz ‘snowshoe hare’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.192)

misabik  
'dieu, genie des Rochers’ (32R)  
Cf. agidaabik 'on something mineral (e.g., metal, glass, rock)’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.238)

ōisaketchar  
'dieu, genie des Animaux’ (45V)

In addition to these, there are a fairly large number of terms related to *manidoo* ‘god, spirit, manitou’:

(23) a. manitō  
'esprit’ (27V)

manitōm  
'mon idole’ (27V)

manitōeīian  
'couverture française’ (27V)

b. manitōkas. ō  
'ie fais le dieu, le demon’ (27V)

mantōis  
'ie suis sorcier’ (27V)

3 si

manitōis  
'c’en fait de luy qq chose extraordt’ (27V)

manitōken  
'ie le fais tout puissant’ (27V)

manitōha

The sweat lodge ritual is also mentioned, as is that of the shaking tent:

(24) a. matōt. 3. tō  
'ie fais sūerie’ (29R)

matōtisan  
'le tabernacle’ (29R)  
Cf. madowoo ‘take a sweat bath’, madowodiswan ‘sweat lodge’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.74)

matōtisanik. e  
'ie le fais ce tabernacle’ (29R)

matōtisanak. ō  
'ie couppe le bois pour fe suerie’ (29R)

b. tchisagan  
'tabernacle a parler au diable’ (62R)  
Cf. jiisakaan ‘shaking tent’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.74)
Finally, there are a small number of expressions referring to various other practices of the Algonquins:

(25) miteoachank. 3. ke
     ‘ie donne a dieu ou au demon par Vœu ou superstition, ou en suite d’un songe’ (32V)
     Cf. ashange ‘feed people’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.13); midewi ‘participate in the Midewiwin’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.84)

pakitchiganiōan nipikōin
     ‘On quitte la Sorcellerie’ (49R)
     Cf. nibikiwin ‘sucking, (a kind of Indian doctoring.)’ (Baraga 73.284b)

tchipaiabō
     ‘bouillon de trespassé’ (62R)

 tchipaiōton
     ‘village de trespassés’ (62R)

If we now turn to the terms referring to the religion of the missionaries, we find that these are, in some ways at least, equally interesting in spite of their relatively small number. Although the problem is seldom discussed in detail, it is well known that an adequate conceptual and linguistic apparatus is necessary in order to discuss a subject of any complexity. In the case at hand, we know that the ultimate goal of the missionaries was to proselytize among the Indians, converting them to Roman Catholicism, an activity which was, of course, difficult if not impossible to engage in until the requisite Algonquin vocabulary had been developed. What we find in the Dictionnaire are tantalizing traces, unfortunately few in number and scattered throughout the manuscript, of the first hesitant steps of the missionaries toward developing this vocabulary:

(26) a. aramakamigōng
     ‘dans la Cave, (ce mot sert pour dire L’enfer)’ (7V)
     Cf. anāmakamig ‘hell, abode of the devils’ (Baraga 73.28b)

kassisan. n. sōa
     ‘ie le purge, ie le nettoye, ce mot peut servir pr le purgatoire’ (17V)
     Cf. gaasii ‘wipe someone using something’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.51)

 kat
   katira
   katiragis
     ‘Pleust a dieu’ (17V)
kasskabaəara 'ie le baptise' (17V)
Cf. nin sigaandawa ‘I baptize him’ (Baraga 73.23a);
ziiga’andaw ‘baptize someone’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.142)
sinkinitaganiöitch ‘celui qui baptise’ (59R)
tchipai. pl. iak. ‘ame de trespasse’ (62R)
Cf. /-jichaagw-/ ‘soul’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.254)
tchipaïatik ‘une croix, (bois d’un trespassé)’ (62R)
Cf. tchibaiätig ‘wood of the dead, wood to be placed on
a grave, that is, a cross’ (Baraga 73.381b); ajiteiatik
‘croix (i.e. bois croisé)’ (Lemoine 09.153);
aazhideyaatig ‘cross’ (Nichols & Nyholm 95.162)

CONCLUSION

To conclude this brief and highly selective overview of Manuscript
104, I would like to make some final observations. It seems to me that the
existence of a fair number of manuscripts in Ojibwe/Algonquin, some of
them well over two and even three centuries old, provides us with the
rather unusual opportunity to add to our study of the modern dialects the
perspective of the recent linguistic history of this language group.
Granted, these manuscripts are imperfect in many ways: they were writ­
ten by non-native speakers, the transcriptions are faulty or incomplete in
various respects, and the manuscripts themselves are often difficult to
gain access to, to mention just a few of the many difficulties. Nonetheless,
in spite of these problems, there is much to be gleaned from these records,
as I hope I have demonstrated in this paper. With the numerous studies of
the last several decades on the modern dialects, studies which have given
us several reliable grammars and dictionaries, we are now in the position
of being able to approach these early texts and to analyze them in some
detail. Although we will in all likelihood find few surprises, I think it is
equally probable that we will find the effort worthwhile. We may even
discover, to the surprise of some, that so-called ‘missionary linguistics’ is
occasionally much better than it is sometimes portrayed...
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