

ASSM Manuscript 103

by Anonyme IV (1669?)

GEORGE F. AUBIN
Assumption College

IDENTIFICATION

The Algonquin manuscript “Racines de la langue ôtaôaise & 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.¹ 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?),² 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 ̄tāoise & 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 manuscript 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. Hanzeli (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 examined (as in the case of Pilling, it seems that Hanzeli never saw the originals 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, sometimes several times, making them practically uninterpretable.

The second section is a 24-page grammar which is of particular interest 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 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 aprendre 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.³ Since the prononciation differs it is necessary to look for the word in various places, for example *nimara nimana* and *nimala*,⁴ 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’	arim (22) ⁵
(2)	‘soleil couchant, caché’	rikōakōe kisis (130)
(3)	‘boyau’	ōrakhich (168)
(4)	‘au milieu [du canot]’	abitaōragong (171)
(5)	‘ceruelle’	ōirintip (172)
(6)	‘esperer’	nisakerint 3 tam n. ma (192)
(7)	‘estaille’	arang, pl. gōk (192)
(8)	‘gendre’	niringōar pl. rak (197)
(9)	‘grenouill[e]’	agōregō. pl. ōk (199)
(10)	‘gueux’	nipiōirini (199)
(11)	‘habit’	nikoras (199)
(12)	‘hair’	nichinkerint 3 tan n. ma (199)
(13)	‘long canot’	kinōragat (203)
(14)	‘manchot’	nineparenik 3. e (205)
(15)	‘narine’	niterigōm (212)
(16)	‘nepueu’	niringōaris pl. sak (212)
(17)	‘je porte le nom dun trepassé’	nirabinikas 3. ō n. ra (213)
(18)	‘jay un nom sale’	nimaratachinikas (213)
(19)	‘oyseau mōche’ [sic]	rōrōkassō (214)
(20)	‘palais de la bouche’	ōaraga[s]k (215)

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)	‘estaille’	alang (14); [cf. ex. 7]
(22)	‘chien’	alim (15); [cf. ex. 1]

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.

- | | | |
|------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| (23) | ‘mon boyau’ | nilaghis (60); [cf. ex. 3] |
| (24) | ‘mon neuveu’ | nilingualis (60); [cf. ex. 16] |
| (25) | ‘ma ceruelle’ | nilintip (60); [cf. ex. 5] |
| (26) | ‘ma fesse, os de ma cuisse’ | nilögan (60) |
| (27) | ‘moustache’ | nimilichis (211) |

Examples which contain both ⟨l⟩ and ⟨r⟩ may be taken to suggest that the change from ⟨r⟩ to ⟨l⟩ in Old Ottawa did not occur everywhere at once since we find examples of ⟨r⟩ and ⟨l⟩ both occurring in the same word and in the same environment:

- | | | |
|------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| (28) | ‘on le hait en effet’ | alöchinkerima (16) |
| (29) | ‘on en a pitie en effet’ | alöchaöerima (16) |
| (30) | ‘son gosier, palais’ | ölagaskör (60) |
| (31) | ‘mon gendre’ | nilinguar (60) |

In 28 and 29, both ⟨r⟩ and ⟨l⟩ occur intervocally. Of particular interest is 31, where we have ⟨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 ⟨l⟩ in morpheme-final position. It is, however, also possible that the ⟨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 ⟨l⟩ everywhere.

Further complicating the picture is the following example, where we find both ⟨n⟩ and ⟨r⟩ in the same word:

- | | | |
|------|--------------|-----------------------|
| (32) | ‘mon palais’ | ninagask pl. köř (76) |
|------|--------------|-----------------------|

The ⟨n⟩ in this word occurs in morpheme-initial position, whereas ⟨l⟩ occurs in the same morpheme in the same position in 30. As discussed elsewhere (for example, Aubin 2003:13), an initial ⟨n⟩ developed rather early in Ottawa, while a medial ⟨l⟩ (not ⟨r⟩) was maintained. Since 32 is a dependent noun, the unexpected ⟨n⟩ never appears in word-initial position and is therefore not a product of the early Ottawa development. The final ⟨r⟩ in the plural is likely a misspelling, as in 30, here perhaps for ⟨n⟩. Like the untranslated example ⟨nimana⟩ cited at the beginning of this section, this form is possibly from the Old Sauteaux dialect, which is presumed to have had ⟨n⟩ everywhere (David Pentland, personal communication).⁶

In addition to the forms containing both ⟨l⟩ and ⟨r⟩, or ⟨n⟩ and ⟨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 ⟨maïa⟩ 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 õ⟩ ‘il ne le touche plus’ comes between ⟨nadõe⟩ ‘huron’ and ⟨nag-⟩; and ⟨nahibat⟩ follows entries in ⟨naïa-⟩ (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.⁷

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⟩ ~ ⟨n⟩ 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 *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	‘seance 3 i.’
F16	che	‘enfant’
F32	ska	‘floter’
F59	Mö	‘attacher’
F85	Rös	‘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’
	pitöbeg	‘eau de 2 Costez’
	öinipeg	‘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 <rö> nor <raö> 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	Magöat n. gösi	‘senteur’
	Megastekamek [sic]	‘poisson’
	Achkaöamegör [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, <l>:

F81	Rigöat	‘chemin’
	miröarigöat	‘bon’
	pissikarigöat	‘long’
	ninkötökijj köaharigöat	‘une journee’
	nissöikisöaligöat	‘3 mois’
	tanin epitchaligöat	
	apitch entagök endrakian [sic]	
	nissögöhagaligöat [<h> or <g> ?]	

MEDIALS

All the medials given on pages 145 and 146 are listed in Appendix 2.⁸ Only one of the examples, however, is followed by a gloss:

M8	Gõe	‘visage’
	nikassibingöena	‘Je luy oste ses levres’
	nikakingöebira	

There are a few cases of both ⟨r⟩ and ⟨n⟩ appearing within a single entry:

M27	Köntagan	‘gosier’
	nikipisköntagarena	
	-pira [sic]	

or in duplicate entries:

F75	Rag & re	‘Canot’
	ninchöragatör	
	..raguisiöek	
	peijkörag	
	aramörany [sic]	
M10	Nagö	‘Canot’
	kakanagöeska	

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 bold-face 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[MIN]IBUS, POTISSIMUM
(FINALS ON NOUNS, PRINCIPALLY)

[page 141]

F1	ab & eab achkimaneab ōmichtigōcheab ō miskōeab kortaskōeab mitigōab nitirab 3 i	‘Corde’ ‘de peau’ ‘veine’ ‘V. du gosier’ ‘arc’ ‘Veier’ [i.e., ‘veiller’]
F2	Ai achkatai misakōai abiminikōe [sic]	‘de peau’ ‘peau fresche’ ‘veluë’ ‘p[eau]. de Castor’
F3	Anak & Naga aōessanak aōa [sic] abitaōanang [sic] chibanaga kanakōanagōng Iskōetanagōng ōntiskaōanaga	‘Isle’ ‘au dela de lisle’ ‘Isle percéé’ ‘au bout de Lisle den bas’ ‘audevant de lisle’
F4	ap nimirōap 3 i.	‘seance 3 i.’
F5	aōas niganaōas 3 ō	—
F6	Bak baghisi nadōeōibak	‘petun’
F7	Bas Baste niōisakabas 3 ō akōabas ō risakabaste	‘fumeé’ ‘Je suis <u>en fumeé</u> ’ ‘il fume’
F8	Beg ou Pek pitōbeg ōinipeg	‘Eau’ ‘eau de 2 Costez’ ‘eau puante’
F9	Begat ou ghisi Beganeō, irabegamō [sic] sintabegamō [sic]	‘de chose longue’
F10	Bi aramibing ninassib	‘eau’

Finales In noības, Potissimum
Corde ab & eab

ackhmaneab & prau
8 nichtigschwab
mitkeab
Kontahndab & dugosier
mitigab
mitxab 3 i.

Bi lau
avani bing
minasi b
Birk dregos dur BIKS
abesabit
minisabit Jedd tohu
avantikong
Peykhabik
makatodabik
Calund novu

Aii & prau

ackhatai
mihakbai
abiminkobe

prau fresch
belue
P. de Catos
Richabitiki n. 18 claud
Tahabitat n. Kili. Fred
Tantaff bi ku hede motinay

Anak Ile Snaga

Abeyanah andeladelisle
abitadanany
hibunaga

Epitabitak
Bogge ou Bogge
nitiinabogge

Iskutanagong
Sutishanagong

B8 pitage
D8r fruitel
D8r Cabam ou chadine

ap Isang 3 i.

nimhibap 3 i.

aba
nigauabab 3 i.

Dah baghisi Potuy

medgesibak

Bas sumee Baste

migisakabas 3 i.

akabab 8

akababate

Beg Lau ou Dek

Pitsoeg tando 2 Cottz

Pinipoy van puato

Begat ou ghisi

Begant, irabigant

ch R8t
minchast R8r
ch R8t
magos R8r
ch R8t
LH gte chad
Gama lae
michigama
Kindigama
eitabegama
aguahigamachi
abessigami

ARCHIVES DE SAINTE-MARTINE

F11	Bik Bikis aõessabik minisabik b [sic] aramikõng [sic] Peijkõabik nichõabikatõr makateõabikisiõpõagan kichabikite n. sõ Takabikat n. kissi Tantassõbi-ka teõas mokman iskõateabikat Epitabikak	‘de chose dure’ ‘Isle de rochers’ ‘dans la pierre ou dans le fer’ ‘calumet noir’ ‘chaud’ ‘froid’ ‘pierre de cette grosseur’
F12	Bõgõ ou hõgõ. nikintabõgõ	—
F13	Bõ	‘potage’
F14	Bõr	‘fruits’
F15	Bõk	‘Cabane ou chaudiere’
F16	che	‘enfanter’
F17	cheg chegat ou guisi tagõegat n. guissi nitantacheg 3 i.	‘Robe’ ‘Je chang[e] d’habit’
F18	chkõr minchaskõr [sic]	‘herbe’ ‘foin’
F19	chkõte magõskõte [sic]	— ‘affaissé’
F20	chõ naparechõ	‘tondu’
F21	Ek 3 õe	‘chaud’ <i>V. Verba</i>
F22	Gama michigama kinõgama eitaõegama agachigamachi aõessegami [sic]	‘Lac’
[page 142]		
F23	gami timigami takigami akõagami	‘Eau’
F24	gamik pintigamik iskõaiagamigõng	‘Cabane’ ‘dans la Cabane’ ‘a la derniere’

	nichōgamigatōr nichōgamikisiōek	‘deux Cab[anes].’
F25	gamō epitigamōtch	— ‘de cette espaisseur’
F26	ganak peijkōganak ninchōganagatōr nichiganagatōr	‘asleine [i.e., alène] basgue ’ (?)
F27	ganch ōabiminaganch	‘arbre’
F28	gōachk nimamichigōachk	—
F29	gōeia michistigōeia agachistigōia [sic]	‘lict de riviere’
F30	īan pikōatchijan Iskōeian	‘enfant’
F31	ka mitigikōka	‘ou il y a des n.’
F32	ska amangaska epitaskak	‘floter’ ‘grandes lames’ ‘de ceste grandeur’
F33	kam nipeijkōkam ninchōkamōk	‘association’
F34	kamik mitakamik maratagamiga	‘a terre’
F35	kana manisekama [sic] ninchōkanaōek	‘chemin’ ‘2 pistes, i. de deux ho[mm]es’ (?)
F36	kate Iskate arimaskate	‘marée’
F37	kik anikōakik	‘chaudiere’ ‘de deux pierres’
F38	kisi <i>Vi. ōiakis</i> nininchōeiakhis	—
F39	kissin ninchōakissiner	—

F53	kõeõ ninõtikõeõ.	—
F54	Magõat n. gõsi Megastekamek [sic] Achkaõamegõr [sic]	‘senteur’ ‘poisson’
F55	Mes nichiõirames	— ‘Je suis degosté’ [sic]
F56	Mik napemik, nonchemik	‘castor’
F57	Min nitapõmin õapimin	‘grain’
F58	Minakanes nininchõkãnesimin [sic]	‘Parente, nation’
F59	Mõ agõmõ sõngamõ iramõ kigamõ	‘attacher’
F60	Ne & nes mi epinetch nikimines 3 i	‘maladie’
F61	õang & õanga, Ispataõanga aramaõang	‘terre’
F62	õakis nitichiriniõakis niraõiniõakisi mateõakiõek [sic]	‘Coustume’ ‘sont de diverses especes’
F63	õaõi pineõaõi	—
F64	õar & õatch nipitchiõar ninchõaretõr ninchõarechiõek ninchõarç ninchõaretabi	‘paquet’ ‘2 sacs’ ‘Il en traîne 2’
F65	õaran nikichkaõõna [sic]	‘queüe’ ‘amik’
F66	õeian matchiõeian	‘peau escorchée’

	achkiðeian nikikðeian	
F67	ðe agachaðechi	‘paroles, Voix’
F68	aðe ðraðe	‘poil’
F69	ðins nimaðinis [sic]	‘fruits’
F70	ðint abitaðint ðntiskðaðiner [sic]	‘Cabane’
F71	paga n. guisi ðakipa [sic] sakapakisi [sic]	‘fe[u]illes’ (?)
	[page 144]	
F72	Peg ðinipeg	‘Eau’
F73	Pðgða & pðgðssi matchipðgat [sic] mirðpðgðsse [sic]	‘goust’
F74	Pðn assamipðn	—
F75	Rag & re ninchðragatðr ..raguisiðek [sic] peijkðrag aramðrany [sic]	‘Canot’
F76	Re nipðkðrechin matðreatch	—
F77	Ri nitakamisðrik 3 e.	— ‘je fais un cal.’
F78	Raghekðk ninchðraguekðk	‘grosse escorne’
F79	Ramð aðamiramð	‘chemin’
F80	Ran nikiranich assamiran Tagamagaran	‘pluie’ ‘Je suis arrêté de pluie’

F81	Rigöat miröarigöat pissikarigöat ninköiökij köaharigöat nissökisöaligöat tanin epitchaligöat apitch entagök endrakian [sic] nissögönagaligöat [⟨n⟩ or ⟨h⟩, ⟨h⟩ or ⟨g⟩?]	‘chemin’ ‘bon’ ‘long’ ‘une journée’ ‘3 mois’
F82	Rö & Raö	— <i>supra</i>
F83	Röe chaböröe	‘vent’
F84	Röeia gön	‘neige molle’
F85	Rös nikigarös	‘fumer’
F86	Sab Isköesab	‘rets’ ‘le bout de la rets’
F87	Sabak aöessabak	‘Ecorce de Cabane’ <i>V. Köeia</i> [⟨i⟩ or ⟨r⟩?]
F88	Saga kössigösaga aramisagatöng	‘boi’ [i.e., ‘bois’]
F89	Sate mişate	‘Vilage’
F90	Sega kichkiseга	‘Vilage grand’ ‘pointe ou il y a des arbres’
F91	Simö pinesimö napesimö	‘chien’
F92	Sin öanitaöesin	‘Vent’
F93	öisin rinkitaöisin	‘riviere’
F94	Skimöt aramiskimöt	‘sak’ [i.e., ‘sac’]
F95	Sötch epitisötch	‘luit’
F96	Taban anikötaban	‘traisne’ ‘de 2 pierres’
F97	Takhi agachataghisi	‘maille a rets’

F98	Tagan aõessetatagan	‘ portage ’
F99	Tchiõan Sonkitchiõan	—
F100	Te pintate	‘ chaleur, soleil ’ ‘le rayon entre’
[page 145]		
F101	Tek hechassamatek api eõntek	‘ Cabane ’ ‘de Cette grandeur’
F102	Teõ matchiteõ	‘ potute de terre &c ’ (?)
F103	Teõis kitõteõisi ninchõteõisi	‘ famille ’
F104	Tik Tchipaiatik pachitik	‘ bois ’ ‘vieil’
F105	atik napeõatik	‘ cerf ’
F106	Timi epitantimak [sic]	‘ profond ’
F107	Tin aõessatin tchikatin machkaõatin	— ‘choses dures’
F108	Tit matõetitamõk titinuiõars	‘ son (ou) bruit ’ ‘Ils en font’ ‘Il fait du bruit dans un trou’

APPENDIX 2. MEDIAE ALIQUOT (SOME MEDIALS)

[page 145]

M1	Apõi nikakapõchan [sic]	‘ aviron ’
M2	Arõir pintarõan [sic]	‘ fleche ’
M3	Arõe nikichkarõehõa	‘ queuë ’

2 JER (goano)
 Regatamatah api
 wntak... graudau
 500 potand... kerd
 matihitid
 Tobis famila
 Riidkivisi
 minchotevivi
 Tik beis alik of
 Tchipiatik naptiatik
 pachitit bice
 Timi profond
 Epitantimak
 Tim
 asofatij
 tchikatij
 machkabatan of duus
 Tit son (subruit
 matititamb k glas font
 titinuisas se. facadu
 bunt dawlo toou

Medie aliquot

Apbi auiboy
 mihakapobay
 Arbir flizz
 pinterban
 Arce qurio
 mihakawochia
 Bin Laruw
 nikasi binyona
 Bik of duus
 mihakab. kisan
 Bihetdiban. laut, roge
 Jpabik. etgidan
 mpirab. kabayastij

mihakab. kaban
 Galt onylo
 minam... koepera
 000 tinge
 nikasi binyona... of duus
 mihakab. kaban
 000 noige
 nipitigob. birigob aktimk
 Nago laut
 Kihakayobka
 Miz grain
 000 k... minagk...
 Makatob. noiu
 nimatattirab
 Minakan...
 minch. minakandibok
 Racha Luge
 mbarakabay
 Raquich boiau
 mihakab. raquichief
 Rang...
 Sachisugoka
 Rag Cenot
 mihakab. rarisilly
 unlaguist
 R
 nipi...
 nitum...
 Ran...
 nif...
 Ritich
 mihakab. ritintichi
 Ran
 mihakab. ran...
 Ritaut...
 nit...
 R...
 R...
 mihakab. r...

M4	Bin nikasibingöena	‘ <u>Laryere</u> ’ (?)
M5	Bik nikichöabikissan	‘chose dure’
M6	Biketchiöan Ispabik - etchiöan nipiköabikahanassin [sic] nitachiöabiköahan [sic]	‘saut, roche’
M7	Gaskö [⟨g⟩ on ⟨k⟩] nimenigasköepira [scratched out]	‘ongle’
M8	Göe nikassibingöena nikakingöebira	‘visage’ ‘Je luy oste ses levres’
M9	Gön nipiskigöneöirigök akimak	‘neige’
M10	Nagö kakanagöeska	‘Canot’
M11	Min erigokoköa minaghisitch	‘grain’
M12	Makateöi nimakateöiraö	‘noir’
M13	Minakan ninchöminakaneşiöek	‘es <u>pece</u> ’
M14	Rachka niöarachkahan	‘Large’
M15	Raguich nikiöeraguichich	‘boiau’
M16	Rang öacheragöka [sic]	‘est <u>oille</u> ’
M17	Rag nichegörakhisitön [sic] am\ö/raguise	‘Canot’
M18	Re nipikörechin nitamörena	—
M19	Ram nikipö ramöna	‘haleine’
M20	Rititch nitaöakirintichi [sic]	—
M21	kan nikakaöikaneskaös	—

	kitantassögan nikintayönnasab [sic]	
M22	köes nösannsköasgaö [sic]	—
M23	köeski niöiaköeskiöghinan	—
	[page 146]	
M24	kök akötakiöaneab [sic]	‘chaudiere’
M25	köe sisököebissön nipachkatigöechi apiköechimön	‘Col, teste’
M26	kö ou köa Tchitakö [^] ahigan nipakitehaköchima nipintakösiton	‘bois’
M27	köntagan nikipisköntagarena -pira [sic]	‘gosier’
M28	Sit nikikatchissita _g	‘pied’
M29	Te (chö [sic]) nikichkitechöa ou kitaöage	‘aureilles’ [i.e., ‘oreilles’] ‘Je les luy coupe’
M30	Tik nitatiköehamim	‘cerf, bois’
M31	Tip niöarintipeha	‘Cerveau’
M32	Ton nikipiskitönepira	‘bouche’
M33	Tontan chibatantönepison [sic]	‘talon’
M34	kat nikakikatechin	‘jambe’
M35	Sab nikintagönassab	—

REFERENCES

- Anonymous. 1669?. Racines de la langue ôtaôaise & algonquine. ASSM Manuscript 103. Les Archives du Séminaire de Saint-Sulpice à Montréal.
- Aubin, George F. 1995. The French-Algonquin dictionary fragment in ASSM manuscript 14 (Anonyme VI): A first look. *Papers of the 26th Algonquian Conference*, ed. by David H. Pentland, pp. 1-14. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
- Aubin, George F. 1996. The French-Algonquin dictionary fragment in ASSM manuscript 14 (Anonyme VI): Some further comments. *Papers of the 27th Algonquian Conference*, ed. by David H. Pentland, pp. 11-24. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
- Aubin, George F. 2003. The Algonquin-French manuscript ASSM 104 (1661): Miscellanea. *Papers of the 34th Algonquian Conference*, ed. by H.C. Wolfart, pp. 1-17. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.
- Caulier, Brigitte. 1992. Introduction [à 'Les «Messieurs» de Saint-Sulpice en Nouvelle-France, 1657-1759]. *Les Prêtres de Saint-Sulpice au Canada: Grandes figures de leur histoire*. [no editor], pp. 3-28. Sainte-Foy: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Hanzeli, Victor E. 1969. *Missionary linguistics in New France: A study of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century descriptions of American Indian Languages*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Pilling, James C. 1891. *Bibliography of the Algonquian languages*. Bureau of [American] Ethnology Bulletin 13. Washington.