The Archives du Séminaire de Saint-Sulpice de Montréal (ASSM) are the repository of a sizeable number of manuscripts on various American Indian languages. Some of these, written by the early missionaries to Canada, deal with Algonquin and other dialects of Ojibwa and may provide important information about the early history of this language group. In this paper, I will discuss one of these manuscripts, an apparently very old fragment of a French–Algonquin dictionary, part of the volume catalogued as Manuscrit indien 14, Anonyme vi. I will first discuss various characteristics of the manuscript itself; I will then turn to a consideration some of the linguistic features of the manuscript.

THE MANUSCRIPT

The French–Algonquin dictionary manuscript is a modest one, with just 23 leaves of the letter D and 27 leaves of the letter E, for a total of exactly 100 pages, alphabetized by the French entry. The letter D is incomplete, beginning part way into what is presumably the entry for Deux (‘two’); I have not yet completed my work on the letter E, but it appears to be complete. The dictionary fragment is bound with three religious manuscripts of various types: an Algonquin manuscript entitled “Prières et cantiques” (‘prayers and hymns’), a Huron catechism attributed to Père Pierre-Joseph-Marie Chaumonot, S.J. (1611–1693), and an Abenaki manuscript called simply “Prières” (‘prayers’). All four

1 I first saw this manuscript in October, 1993, when David Pentland and I arrived a day early for the 25th Algonquian Conference in Montréal in order to examine Algonquian materials in the Archives. Although we saw several items of interest during our visit, I was particularly intrigued by Manuscrit 14. Returning in August of 1994, I spent several days in the Archives working on it, and I would like to take this opportunity to thank M. Bruno Harel, P.S.S., the Sulpician archivist, for his generous and gracious assistance. I would also like to thank David Pentland, Ives Goddard, Richard Rhodes, and John Nichols for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper; I alone am responsible, of course, for any shortcomings that persist.
manuscripts are bound together in a small book. The cover of the book measures 12.3 \times 18.2 \text{ cm}, and the manuscript pages measure 11.7 \times 17.6 \text{ cm}. The dictionary fragment takes up approximately the last quarter of the volume; it is followed by 10 leaves (20 pages) of letters and prayers and 2 blank leaves (4 pages). There is a small cross at the top of each page of the manuscript, but the manuscript pages are unnumbered in the original; I have added page numbers in all of the examples cited.

The volume has been labelled Anonyme VI (‘Anonymous VI’) by a 20th-century archivist; since the title page of the dictionary is missing, there is no indication of its author or date, but it was probably compiled before the end of the 17th century. It was apparently not listed by Pilling (1891), and also escaped the notice of Victor Hanzeli (1969). Except for two or three individual letters pencilled in above an equal number of words, the entire manuscript is in black ink, apparently in a single hand, and the words are generally clear and easily readable. I would like to stress that all my remarks in this paper are based on my preliminary study of the 60 pages of the manuscript that I have copied; I hope to return to Montréal in the near future to continue my work on the manuscript.

The dictionary entries

Although I have been referring thus far to the manuscript in question as a “dictionary”, it is not really a dictionary in the strict sense of that term. The key words, which are in French, are arranged only in an approximate alphabetical order primarily because items which are perceived as semantically related in some way are often placed together regardless of their strict alphabetic relationship to preceding or following items. For example, on page 2, the entry Dextre (‘right hand’) precedes the entry Dextérité (‘dexterity’). Again, the entry Dieu (‘God’) on page 4 precedes the entry Deifier (‘to deify’) on page 5, which in turn precedes the entry Diffamer (‘to slander’) on the same page. A striking example of this predilection for semantic grouping is found on page 8, where the entry Dimanche (‘Sunday’) is followed by Fete (‘feast’), which is itself followed by the entry Dimension (‘size’) on page 9.

Each key word may be followed by a word or words illustrating the key word or some aspect thereof; much more often, however, full
sentences are used, with a short horizontal line separating most of the subentries. Some of the entries are quite short:

(1) eau de vie

iskōteabō

(page 53)

Most entries are somewhat longer, as in 2, in which I also show the subentries separated by a short horizontal line, as in the original manuscript:

(2) Douter

douter

nimanterindan .n. ma, ie le soupçonne

nit'aramima, ie le soupçonne

nichanaōérint, nichanāōerindan n. ma, ie le soupçonne

nitaperindan, ie divine

(page 36)

A small number of entries are quite lengthy, as exemplified in 3:

(3) Dire

nissi, kissi, iōa, ie dis, tu dis, il dit

nitikik, kitikik [sic], ikitō, idem

iōitōk, et iōitik, ils disent

eōatch, qui disent

titchim, tu me dis, kitirir, iete [sic] dis

mi ka itch, et mi etch, voila cequil dit

tandach kitichimane, que me dis tu

niōindamaōä, ie dis a quelqu’un

nikōekōékō, ie dis tantost dune façon, tantost d’une autre
tane echien, que me dis tu

_____

tane eratch que luy dit il

_____

tanin entien, comment te portes tu, que fais tu

_____

ka nigōt, pas rien [sic]

_____

nit’aranakik 3. aranakike, ie dis des nouvelles

_____

nitaranakikaōa, ie luy dis des nouvelles (page 9)

This entry for Dire (‘to say’) continues on through page 10, page 11, and part of page 12 of the manuscript. The longest entry of all, Eau boisson (‘water[,] drink’), extends for six full pages, from page 47 through page 52.

As can be seen from the examples in 3, the sentences used in the various entries are generally rather short. Occasionally, however, one encounters longer sentences, as in 4:

(4) a. tipan ichinagōssik eiāmiatgik echinagōssioatch eka ka eiāmiatgik, les chretiens ont quelque chose qui les distingue du non chretien (5)

b. nitigōnan missikakichitōtch nigōtōassō gōng eaōich kata arōkekigigat, neninziōassō dach gōnagat katá aiāmiekigigat mi tipōtaman iōa missi ka chitōt. Dieu nous a dit durant six iours continuels sera iour du travail, chaque septième iour sera iour de fête voila ceque iordonne dit Dieu (8)

c. nipamerindananan, nikitchitōaōerindananan, nitakōerindanānan niganaōerindananan aiāmiekigik kitchi takōerindamang hech apitchipatch Jesus, nous honorons, nous croions venerables, nous nous souvenons, nous observons le iour de fête afinque nous nous souvenions entant que Jesus est ressuscité (8)

d. ka makatekoretch tiberindan kitchi eka aiāmiekōikōchimōōatch arichiriūōak, lhabillé de noir gouverne afinque les chretiens ne ieunent pas selon la priere (15)

e. ka ribōakassik kemōtitgik kitikitōnaban mi ōins irerimiran ka ribōakassi, n’ont point desprit ceux qui derobent disois tu, tu derobes cest pourquoi ie pense de toy il na point desprit (28)
As a general rule, after the key word, the Algonquin word or sentence within each entry is followed by a French translation, as in 3, above. In a number of cases, however, the French word or sentence comes first, followed by the Algonquin translation:

(5) Dire [continued]

on ma dit; nitigō

voila cequon ma dit mi ka igōian

ne le dis plus, eka iken minaōatch

ne le dis pas encore, eka iken, kesk

iay oublie ce que ie voulois dire ka iian

voila ceque ie diré mi ke ian (page 10)

Some Algonquin words or sentences are not translated into French, but the meaning can usually be inferred either from an immediately preceding example which is translated or from the key word, as illustrated in 6:

(6) a. Dire

mi ōekōatchimōian, iay tout dit,
mi ōek ka atchimōian [no translation given] (11)

b. Dispost v. sain

kigikabatō, il court viste

pimibatō [no translation given] (16)

c. Effacer

nikaskahan [no translation given] (56)

In two cases, both apparently referring to sexual activity, the translation given is in Latin rather than in French:

(7) a. nimaratichimich .3. i. maratichimichi,
sum addictus peccato venereo (6)

b. ninipioina, effundo semen in ea (51)
Finally, a number of entries merely refer the reader to other entries. These include many references to entries beginning with letters other than D or E, as exemplified in 8:

(8) a. Digue v. chausée
    Dilaier v. differer
    Dilatter v. aggrandir
    (page 7)

b. Domicille [sic] v. maison
    Dominer v. gouverner
    Dompter v. vaincre
    (page 28)

It would appear, then, that these 100 pages of the letters D and E are all that remains of what once must have been an extensive early French–Algonquin dictionary perhaps 1000 pages in length, a dictionary which has now been almost completely lost.

LINGUISTIC FEATURES

In the second part of this paper, I will briefly discuss some of the salient linguistic features of the manuscript. I will begin with the phonology, then deal with various aspects of the morphology, and I will finish with a consideration of a few syntactic items.

Phonology

Perhaps one of the more important phonological features of the manuscript is the fact that it is in the so-called r-dialect of Algonquin, with Proto-Algonquian *l and *θ becoming r:

(9) PA *l > Algonquin r:
    a. nisanagherindan .n. ma, ie scay chose difficile, ie pense quil est difficile (6)
    b. arimat kinōra iŋiniōatch ka cheker nissiōeōatch, il est difficile que ceux la vivent longtemps qui ont tué sans sujet (6)
    c. mirtōtagōssi, il parle agréablement (14)
PA *θ > Algonquin r:
   a. kitirig, iete [sic] dis (9)
   b. ḍragō ki kis garōchinában, tu mavais dit, hier (11)
   c. nirintch, mon doigt,
      nirintchir mes doigts (26)

In spite of the overwhelming frequency of ⟨r⟩ in the manuscript, there are nonetheless four examples of ⟨l⟩:

   a. tanin epitchak michilimakina achōnda ōntchi,
      combien y atil dicy a mischilimakina (17)
   b. manitosser et manitônser ōpitchilãr, il fiante des vers (5)
   c. alisip [no translation given; “eau boisson”?] (47)
   d. ie donne bonne edification, […] afinqu’ils m’imitent
      nisōnga aḷamiha kitchi kikinōabamiōatch (55)

Further complicating the picture is the occurrence of one example with ⟨n⟩ as the apparent reflex of *l:

   maskaōatatétör ni makissiner ninōkighiton,
   mes souliers sont durs, ie les adoucis (44)

Since it is generally accepted that Algonquin r became l, and that the resulting l later became n (Goddard 1978:584, Pentland 1978:119–122), it may be the case that, for some reason, these particular items are in the vanguard of the shift from r to l and n in the Algonquin dialect of the manuscript. The examples would seem to suggest the simultaneous presence in what is presumably a single dialect of r, l, and n as reflexes of Proto-Algonquian *l and *θ. However, 11a can be considered to be simply the borrowing of a place name from a dialect which already had l, presumably the Ottawa dialect spoken at Michilimackinac. Given the small number of forms showing ⟨l⟩ and ⟨n⟩, much more evidence needs to be marshalled before this issue can be adequately examined.

2 The final letter is unclear — the word could be either ⟨ōpitchilar⟩ or ⟨ōpitchilan⟩, with both ⟨l⟩ and ⟨r⟩ or ⟨n⟩ in the same word.

3 Note also the distinctive Ottawa word ⟨achōnda⟩ ašonta ‘here’ (Rhodes 1976:132) in the same sentence.
Not surprisingly, since a French-based orthography is used, some non-French sequences are used to represent some of the consonant sounds of Algonquin that do not occur in French. For example, fortis čč is represented by the sequence ⟨tch⟩ and lenis č by the sequence ⟨tg⟩, as in 13:

(13) a. nikitchinik, ma dextre (2)

b. össaąabanketgik, les devineurs de ce qui est loing (21)

As the example in 14 clearly shows, the author of the manuscript is well aware of the difference in voicing indicated by these two spellings:

(14) nakitgiōan et nakitchioan, eau dormante (32)

Unfortunately, he does not always apply the distinction systematically, using ⟨tch⟩ far more often than ⟨tg⟩, even in cases where it would appear that ⟨tg⟩ should be used, as in 15:

(15) a. matchimanitō, mechant esprit (2)

b. öassaąat kizis achōnda öntchi, il y a loin dicly ausoleil (3)

Another non-French sequence that is occasionally used is ⟨gh⟩, which apparently represents lenis k and, perhaps erroneously, fortis kk, before ⟨i⟩ and ⟨e⟩:

(16) a. niseghiha, ie luy fais peur par quelque action (56)

b. tchissake .vel. tchissaghe, il devine dans le tabernacle qui est une petite cabane (21)

c. nitachang .3. ahanghe, ie donne a manger (29)

d. taghigami⁴ eau froide (47)

In two instances, the manuscript suggests an alternation between s and š or between ss and šš:

(17) a. ichi, dis luy (10)

issi, dis luy, (11)

⁴ The expected form is takkikami. The author of the manuscript has added ⟨k⟩ directly above ⟨gh⟩, but without crossing out the ⟨gh⟩.
b. nit'agōśinnis et nitgōśinchin ka araming pindikessi,  
   ie ne suis pas allé a fond (52)

At present, these are the only examples I have of this alternation, but there may be others in the manuscript. Possibly related to this question is the occurrence in the manuscript of ⟨sk⟩ in many words which have šk in modern Algonquin:

(18) a. ninziotaganiōan paskissigan fusil a deux coups (1)  
   b. eau de vie iskōteabō (53)  
   c. maskoōatatētōr ni makissiner... mes souliers sont durs... (44)

One of the more striking features of the manuscript is the use of the graph (6) (usually printed (8) in works on Algonquian languages), which is almost always used instead of an unaccented ⟨o⟩. This character is used to represent three different sounds, long š, short o, and w:

(19) a. manitō [manitō]. Dieu. (4)  
   b. nitigonan missikakichitōch nigōtōássō göng... [nitikonān misī kā-kīšittōč nikotwāssokonk] Dieu nous a dit durant six iours... (8)  
   c. niōeobis [niwēwipis] .3. i, ie me presse (7)  
   d. niōindamaōa [niwēntamawā], ie dis a quelqu’un (9)

Not surprisingly, in some cases we find ⟨ōō⟩:

(20) a. mi ōkitōrik [?] ōsser [ōssar]. voila ceque ditson pere (11)  
   b. eau de vie, iskōteōabō, vel kiōiskōeōabō, manitōōabō [manitōwōpō] (50)

**Morphology**

As expected in a manuscript of this length, there is a good deal of morphological information about the dialect in question. However, since there are few overt comments of the type that are sometimes found in various early documents, most of the information has to be teased out of the data.

Of particular interest is the presence of considerable information on the verbal system. For many of the verbs given in the independent indicative, there is both a first person singular form and either a third
person singular form or some indication as to how to form it. In a few cases, a much more complete picture of certain verbs is given, at times including various conjunct forms, usually in the third person singular or plural. Some examples are shown in 21:

(21) a. nikakim .3. kakimō, ie parle a loreille (3)
   b. mechagōam kachigakir ichikichōe ōábang nigapos .3. i,
      chaque iour il dit demain ie membarqueré (5)
   c. nissi, kissi, iōa, ie dis, tu dis, il dit
      nitikik, kitikik [sic], ikitō, idem
      iōitōk, et iōitik, ils disent
      eōatch, qui disent
      kitichim, tu me dis,
      kitirir, iete [sic] dis
      mi ka itch, et mi etch, voila cequil dit (9)

Although most verb forms in the manuscript are in the first person singular or the third person singular or plural, there are examples of forms for other persons. In particular, it appears that in this dialect the independent indicative first person exclusive plural ending is -min in the transitive inanimate as well as the animate intransitive (cf. Rhodes and Todd 1981:57):

(22) a. nikikerindāmin tanin epitchak ōakōing ōntchi aking,
      nous savons combien il y a de distance du ciel (18)
   b. nimitachimin, nous sommes dix (23)
   c. nimōskaōgōmin apitch kimiōan, quand il pleut leau tombe dans notre
      cabane (51)

However, there is also a long sentence (4c, repeated here as 23) with four examples of (-nanan) as the apparent ending of the first person exclusive plural in the transitive inanimate:
(23) nipamerindananan, nikitchitōaōerindananan, nitakōerindananan
niganaōerindananan aiamiekigikitakōerindamang hech
apitchipatch Jesus, nous honorons, nous croions venerables, nous
nous souvenons, nous observons le jour de fête afinque nous nous
souvenions entant que Jesus est ressuscité (8)

Given the large number of sentences in the manuscript, it is only to
be expected that there are numerous verb forms in tenses other than the
indicative. By way of illustration, 24 shows some examples of the
preterit:

(24) a. Jesus avoit douze disciples, mitassō achō ninzch oítikemaōaban
    Jesōsser ka aiamiepissintaghebanik [?] (12)

    b. ka ribōkassik kemōtigitgitikitōnaban mi ōins irerimiran ka
       ribōkassi, n’ont point desprit ceux qui derobent disois tu, tu
derobes cest pourquoi ie pense de toy il na point desprit (28)

The author of the manuscript is apparently well aware of the role of
the so-called transitional -t-, which he often writes as ⟨t’⟩, thus overtly
indicating its special nature. Most of the examples in the manuscript
showing the transitional -t- after ni- are verbs, but I have also found two
examples with nouns, also after ni-.

(25) a. nit'arimerindan .n. ma, ie pense qu’il est difficile (6)

    b. nit'aranakik .3. aranakike, ie dis des nouvelles (9)

    c. nit'ichimigō, on dit de moy (11)

    d. nit'atissök .3. atissöke, ie dis des fables (25)

    e. nit'ōpiskōanniskaōa, ie luy grate [sic], frotte le dos (33)

    f. n’ōrōatchikan5 nit'assab, ie devine l’etat dema rets par mon
       fremissement (20)

    g. nit'iskōerintch, mon petit doigt. (26)

In terms of noun morphology, there is also a good deal of inform-

5 Note that the prefix may be either nit- or n- with stems beginning in o-.
with examples in 26 showing both the ending -ink after consonants as well as -nk after vowels; to date, I have found no irregular locatives.

(26) a. kichemikiōan espabikarik ōakahiganing abitaōing belle maison de pierre, haute, au milieu du fort, de lenceinte (29)

b. nipikōaning pite, il vient après moy (33)

c. ōāōiantagan ōmichahing nipōkōha, ie romp [sic] le fond du baril (58)

d. nikitchinigōng, a ma droite (2)

ōkitchinikiring, a la droite v.g. de son pere (2)

e. nikikerindāmin tanin epitchak ōakōing ōntchi aking, nous savons combien il y a de distance du ciel (18)

f. manitōng irōe, il parle comme un Dieu (21)

g. tes passions effrénées te ietteront en enfer kigatapakirigōn aramakamigōng kimatchiahintōin (60)

By way of contrast, I have found only three words with diminutive suffixes, with three examples of -nss and two of -ss:

(27) a. manitōns .p. ser, petits Dieux, petits vers, petits moucherons (4)

b. ōnikite ikōéssens .i, götcharösch òipe, cette fille est une debauchée (60)

c. manitōsser et manitōnser ōmitchilar, il fiante des vers (5)

Syntax

Given the relatively small number of long sentences in the manuscript, there is less syntactic information than one might wish. Notwithstanding, I would like to briefly mention a small number of syntactic items of interest.

First is the complementizer (kitchi), which has been shortened to či in modern dialects such as Golden Lake and Maniwaki:

(28) a. ka makatekoretch tiberindan kitchi eka aiamiekōikōchimōoatch arichiriniōak, lhabillé de noir gouverne afinque les chrétiens ne jeunent pas selon la prière (15)
b. Dieu ma doué d’un bon naturel nikischaôerimik missi ka kichîtôch kitchi pirissikat ribôakaian (35)

c. nikaskîma kitchi sönga aiamiatch, ie le faconne par mes paroles afinqu’il prie bien (55)

d. efforce toy de marcher, manitôkassôr kitchi pimôsseten (59)

Second, the “past tense” or perfective marker, $kî(h)$ in most modern dialects, is sometimes written $<kî>$, with unexplained final $s$:

(29) a. òragô ki $kî$ garôchinâban, tu mavais dit, hier (11)

b. niga nissa kitikitônaban, nissa dach mi ôïnsh ererimiran $ôkîs$ nissar, ie le tueray disois tu, on la tué voila pourquoi ie pense de toy il la tué (28)

c. Il est entré le douzieme, mitassô achô pegik $kîs$ pindîkek, mippi ôïr pintiketch (37)

d. Il a prié durant quarante iours, neômitana et nimitana tassô gôn $kîs$ aiamiie Jesus (45)

Finally, the adverbial particle $<tanin>$, meaning ‘how’ or ‘how much, how many’ (usually followed by the changed conjunct) has lost its initial $t$- in modern dialects such as Golden Lake and Maniwaki:

(30) a. $tanin$ entien, comment te portes tu, que fais tu (9)

b. $tanin$ epîitchak michîlimakîna achônda ôntchi, combien y atil di cy a mishîlimakîna (17)

c. $tanin$ epîtanghiban, combien y avoitil loing (17)

In conclusion, although the preceding discussion is based on what is still a preliminary examination of ASSM Manuscrit 14, I believe it is sufficient to indicate how valuable this document is. For those of us interested in the aboriginal languages of North America and in their history, obtaining as much information as we can of the early contact period is crucial to our understanding. In this paper, I have only scratched the surface of a manuscript which promises to provide us with significant data on Ojibwa-Algonquin, data that is for the most part quite simply unavailable elsewhere. Many important points raised therein remain to be discussed, of course, and I intend to do so in future papers.
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