
Approaching the Sources on Miami-Illinois

DAVID J. COSTA

University of California/Berkeley

In the many comparative studies of Algonquian written this century, the Miami-Illinois language has been mostly ignored, despite the very large quantity of written records of the language. No systematic attempts have been made to establish the place of Miami-Illinois within Algonquian, and most observations that linguists have made about the language have been anecdotal (and often wrong). This neglect is due to a feeling summed up by Charles Hockett in a 1964 article on Proto-Algonquian kinship terms, where he says:

Miami, Peoria, and Illinois formerly constituted one or more further languages of the Central Algonquian group, but they are no longer spoken and our records are poor and hard to use. (Hockett 1964:240)

In fact, after studying the manuscript materials on Miami-Illinois, I have found that the poorest records are no worse in quality than other pre-modern sources that are widely cited in Algonquian comparative work, such as Eliot's Massachusetts materials. For the most part, they are considerably better. The problem is that the most easily available materials on Miami-Illinois are among the worst, while the most revealing, helpful records have long been unavailable, lying unexamined in such places as the National Anthropological Archives at the Smithsonian Institution. Second, as to whether the materials on Miami-Illinois are hard to use, I can only observe that no one has ever seriously tried to use them. In this paper, I will try to describe the quality and limitations of all the most important modern¹ materials on Miami-Illinois, and, hopefully, to provide advice to anyone wanting to look at these materials on how they can make the best use of them.

¹By "modern" I mean materials from the 1890s onward. Earlier records of Miami-Illinois present different problems and will be discussed in future papers. Some of them are discussed in Costa (1991).

The basic problem in doing comparative work that includes Miami-Illinois is that the only substantial published source of data on the language, and the one that has been cited far more than any other, is Charles Voegelin's transcription of Jacob Dunn's Miami filecards (Dunn n.d.) in his *Shawnee Stems and the Jacob P. Dunn Miami Dictionary* (Voegelin 1938). Despite his assertion that he took almost no editorial liberties with Dunn's work other than to reverse the order of the entries to Miami to English, Voegelin's redaction of Dunn's filecards is in fact extremely poorly done. First, though this is never indicated anywhere, Voegelin took the liberty of standardizing Dunn's transcription. Thus, Dunn's (c) is replaced by (š), and his (tc) by (č); however, all diacritics in Dunn's examples are also left out (except umlauts on (ä)), especially acute accents and breves, which are all extremely common. This is especially unfortunate in that since Dunn did not hear vowel length, accents are the main source of information about vowel quantity available in Dunn's materials. Thus, 'bear', given by Voegelin as (makwa) is actually given by Dunn as (makwá), while 'deer', given as (moswa), is actually (móswa).

Table 1

<i>Dunn</i>	<i>Voegelin</i>	<i>Gloss</i>
natowŷa	natawia	'Seneca'
p'cissia	pšišša	'prairie chicken'
adv. ² nššánwŷ	andonissánwi	'thrice'
niaúwŷ	nianwi	'myself'
kiaúwŷ	kianwi	'yourself'
lana	lawa	'calf of the leg'
papakŷ'mŷnŷ	papkamini	'hackberry'
nālaúfkŷ	nālaniki	'wild' (prenoun)
lātcŷmŷna	lačimina	'pea'
kināpškomākwa, kwáki	kināpikomākwakwaki	'eel(s)'
awŷnzŷ	awingi	'gall'
k. sapa	ksapa	'fish net' ³
k. alkwatwŷ	kalkwatwi	'the sky is cloudy' ⁴
l. wióssi	lwiassi	'meat plate' ⁵
āpilŷ'ta m.	āpilita	'prairie wolf' ⁶

²(adv.) = adverb.

³This is found on the same card as (kikonāssa), 'fish'.

⁴This is found on the same card as (kŷčŷ'kwŷ), 'sky'.

⁵This is found on the same card as (lakana), 'plate'.

⁶This is found on the same card as (m'whāwa), 'wolf'; (āpilita) = 'he is small'.

Voegelin's editorial work also is marred by dozens of mistranscriptions, both of Miami forms and of Dunn's glosses. Table 1 lists a few typical mis-transcribed Miami forms. However, more seriously, hundreds of words from Dunn's filecards are left out, perhaps half of all the words Dunn recorded. Most words labeled as Peoria or Wea are omitted, and often only the first word on a card is included, and all inflected forms and synonyms are left out. Table 2 lists a few notable words that are not included. In addition to simply leaving out vocabulary, Voegelin usually omits Dunn's comments on individual words, which sometimes contain valuable information. For example, Voegelin gives (kapia) 'umpire', but omits Dunn's further, and presumably older, definition, 'man chosen to make division of game for hunting party, of annuities, or other general gifts'.⁷ It is hard to say why such ethnological information should be left out.

Table 2

āl'kwa	'ant'
tāsónĭ	'bed' (Wea)
āilya	'opossum'
alakakwĭ	'palate'
papásšĭa	'Red-headed woodpecker'
piwĭkanĭ	'hip'
wálsĭa	'mud-cat' (Peoria)
m'cikamĭkwĭ	'dancing ground'
íwa	'he says'
āsépana	'raccoon'
āmkwanĭ	'pumpkin'
wapĭkwakwa	'Ivory-billed woodpecker'
wĭkwaía	'fur hat'
imámwa	'prairie chicken'
ĭktamĭ'ngĭ	'watermelon'
āsaséta	'tattoo-marks'
wapĭpillĭa	'turkey' (old name)
m'ciwĭtáha	'Elk-heart' (a name for the Kaskaskia)
kakĭ'pakwa	'leaf' (Peoria)
apásšĭa	'fawn'
ĭĭ'níwĭ'ta	'he is a man'
alĭníwiánĭ ~ n'dāĭ'níwĭ	'I am a man'

Similarly, for many verbs, Dunn gives both an independent verb (a

⁷ Compare the Fox cognate /aška'pe'wa/ 'ceremonial attendant'. See Siebert 1975:320.

conjunct or participle) and its corresponding independent, which he calls, respectively, the "long form" and "short form" of a verb. Often, Voegelin includes the long forms of verbs, but leaves out most of Dunn's short forms. For example, Voegelin includes (kăwelita) 'he laughs', but not the corresponding (kīweléwa), which Dunn characterizes as "old form — obsolescent". Most linguists would certainly like to have such information, especially since in modern Miami-Illinois, conjuncts and participles have largely replaced independents in their original functions (such as main clause verbs), and Dunn's remark helps shed some light on this.

All in all, given the poor quality of the Miami data in *Shawnee Stems and the Jacob P. Dunn Miami Dictionary*, it is always better to cite Dunn's data directly from the original materials whenever possible.

As to the linguistic ability of Dunn himself, it must be admitted that Dunn understood Miami grammar better than one could probably expect. He was familiar with Baraga's work on Ojibwa, and with several of the basic concepts of Algonquian grammar. For example, it is clear that he understood the difference between animate and inanimate intransitive verbs, as well as transitive animates and inanimates. This is shown by the fact that he often made a point of getting both the AI and II of a verb, or both the TA and TI, as in the card for 'gray': "gray, wapīnggwacīngī (inan.), wapīngosīta (an.)." Or, from the following entry for the 'see' card: "see, v. I see him, nāwaka; I see it, nāmānī."

However, it is in the area of phonetics that Dunn's lack of linguistic training is most obvious. Naturally, this is most apparent in the transcription of long vowels and preaspiration. In fact, Dunn does occasionally indicate preaspiration; he heard it most often after stressed or long vowels, especially back vowels, and he usually indicates it with either (q) or (k).⁶ Table 3 shows some typical words in which Dunn heard preaspiration (indicated by either (qC) or (kC)) that has been independently confirmed.

However, most of the time, Dunn does not indicate preaspiration, and such words have to be checked in the records of better transcribers to determine their true phonetic shape. In trying to determine vowel length, however, Dunn's notes are even less useful than this, as Dunn appears to have been completely unaware of the difference between long and short vowels. This is the case throughout all of Dunn's work, contrary to a statement by Voegelin (1938:63) that Dunn appears to indicate vowel length in the Miami transcriptions in his book *True Indian Stories with Glossary of Indiana Place Names* (Dunn 1908). In fact, in this work, as in some of his early notes, Dunn uses an earlier transcription system that appears to be derived from English-to-English dictionaries of the time, rather than Powell's Bureau of Ethnology orthography, which he adopted later for his texts

⁶In Dunn 1919:47 he defines (q) as "a rare sound of gh, similar to German ch."

Table 3

taqkíma	'his field, farm'
Ykkí'pakéłta	'Indigo bunting'
maki'kkíwí	'medicine, herb'
mukkomínjí	'sumac'
míckílná'qkwā	'painted terrapin'
māqkatíwatci	'they meet each other'
páqkapándanga	'it appears good'
poqkahamaní	'I break a hole in it by tool'
sákkíya	'crawfish'
akkáwí	'his tenderloin'
pakkámí	'his back'
apāqkwana	'ribs'
poqtcíwāwaka	'I bleed him'
oksa	'father' ⁹

and filecards. But preaspiration, if anything, is represented even less often in *True Indian Stories* than in his filecards, and real vowel length is still absent, as seen by comparing the examples in Table 4, all taken from *True Indian Stories*, which are typical:

Table 4

Dunn's Form	Gloss	Actual Phonemic Form
mē-zē-kwah	'hail'	/misihkwa/
shē-pah'-kán-nah	'awl'	/šiipaakana/
pi ^a -jē-wah	'cat'	/pinšiwa/
kil-só-kwā	'sun woman'	/kiilhsoohkwe/

The point of these examples is to show the inconsistency with which Dunn transcribes vowels, especially long and short /i/. The two symbols used are (ē) and (i). Looking at all four of these examples, (ē) is used to represent short /i/ three times, and long /ii/ once; conversely, (i) is used for short /i/ once, and for long /ii/ once. Thus, there is not a one-to-one relation between the symbols used and their values, or vice versa. Presumably (ē) is used for tense [i], and (i) for lax [ɪ], but since both of these sounds are in free variation, these transcriptions tell us nothing about real vowel length. Note also that the preaspirated /k/ of 'hail' and 'sun-woman', also confirmed elsewhere, is not marked.

⁹ But also compare Dunn's (nósa), 'my father'.

However, a more practical point in dealing with Dunn's materials has to be mentioned here; as people have noted (for instance, Goddard 1978:681), Dunn was not consistently careful about transcribing vowel quality. This problem takes various forms, though the main problem is that Dunn frequently confused ⟨ä⟩ (his symbol for /ee/ or /e/) and ⟨a⟩ (his symbol for /aa/ or /a/). That is, Dunn sometimes writes ⟨ä⟩ (= /e(e)/) where it is clear from independent evidence that ⟨a⟩ (= /a(a)/) is correct, and vice versa. Table 5 shows some examples of Dunn's writing ⟨ä⟩ for ⟨a⟩:

Table 5

Dunn's Form	Gloss	Actual Phonemic Form
älakīci	'his guts, entrails'	/alakiši/
kótāwāpōŷ	'brandy, whiskey'	/kóteewaapowi/
nibwáma	'my thighs'	/nipwaama/
šācāciwŷ	'it is slimy'	/ašaahšiwi/
ātcka	'fisher'	/ačiika/ ¹⁰
āpákwa	'nighthawk'	/apeehkwa/
n'dāpwasó	'I do not smoke'	/ntahpwaahso/

Table 6 shows the reverse, examples of Dunn's writing ⟨a⟩ for ⟨ä⟩:

Table 6

Dunn's Form	Gloss	Actual Phonemic Form
namang	'we see it'	/neemaanki/
āpákwa	'nighthawk'	/apeehkwa/
kósamína	'our grandchild'	/koohsemina(a)/
alácahŷ	'his testicles'	/alehšiahi/
akwatamanŷ	'I sew it'	/eehkwaatamaani/
atcípangwia	'snapping-turtle'	/eečipankwia/ ¹¹

Many more examples of this could be cited; since this confusion of plain and unlauded ⟨a⟩ is not an important problem in either Truman Michelson's notes or Gatschet's handwritten notes, I assume these can be considered simple scribal errors. This problem can only be compensated for by cross-checking comparable forms found elsewhere in Dunn's notes, or in the notes of other recorders.

¹⁰In an entry for 'Ursa Major', Dunn correctly transcribes this as ⟨atcī'ka⟩; cf. Gravier's ⟨atchica⟩ and Gatschet's ⟨tchíka⟩.

¹¹Compare Michelson's (1916) ⟨'ātcípañgwiya⟩; this supposedly literally means 'wrinkle-faced'.

As abundant as Dunn's records are, even more important in the study of modern Miami-Illinois are the records of Albert Gatschet (Gatschet 1895a, 1895b, 1895c). Gatschet worked in the 1890s with speakers in both Oklahoma and Indiana (though mostly Oklahoma), recording Peoria, Miami, and Wea. His importance is due to the fact that he was the closest thing to a real linguist that ever worked on the language extensively, recording several invaluable texts and thousands of words, transcribed better than anyone else who had worked with the language as extensively. Additionally, he often recorded single words several different times, not limiting himself to a set transcription, but adding new phonetic details as he heard them. This is extremely helpful for confirming preaspiration on consonants and working out stress and vowel length; it is very nearly the case that Gatschet will eventually mark the preaspiration in any given word if he transcribes it often enough. However, this is less true of vowel length; though Gatschet usually doesn't hear vowel length, and had a hard time distinguishing it from stress, if a word is attested in his records enough times, he often will eventually mark it, with any possible combination of acute accents, circumflexes, or macrons.

Table 7

Typed Card	Probable Intended Form	Gloss
tche	tehi	'heart'
ashukund	ashukuna	'ice'
singwakna	šingwakwa	'cedar'
shishopa	shishipa	'duck'
pighiwa	pizhiwa	'cat'
nita	niła	'I'
mishingwe mizo	mishingweminža	'burr oak'
supiwe	sipiwi	'river'
nalukamiki	melukamiki	'spring'
passia	pāssia	'fawn'
nequtte	nigoti (?)	'one'
andakwa	andākwa	'crow'
ashipakwa	ashipākwa	'flat rock, cliff'

However, one of the commonest problems with Gatschet's filecards is actually not his own doing. Among the filecards in his own handwriting are a few hundred typed cards that Gatschet apparently had done for him by a professional typist. It is clear that Gatschet never checked most of these cards, since a great many of them contain quite egregious typographical errors in both the intended Miami-Illinois forms and in the glosses. Some especially glaring examples of this are listed in Table 7. Sometimes, this

mistranscription extends to English glosses as well (Table 8):

Table 8

Typed Card	Gloss Given	Correct Gloss
passia	'farm'	'fawn'
pitilanwe	'trains'	'it rains'
wassapantaniki	'dam of dog'	'dawn of day'

All in all, data from any typed card in Gatschet's material should always be checked against a handwritten card. If it is found that a certain word is only attested on a typed card, it should only be taken as even partially reliable if it agrees completely with what one believes the form should be on independent comparative evidence.

However, the main problem with interpreting legitimate forms from Gatschet's materials is that even though he had a decent ear, Gatschet's grammatical intuitions and abilities were not particularly good. Though a trained linguist, his grammatical sense was not much better than that of Jacob Dunn, and though he worked on several different Algonquian languages, he never really had a feel for Algonquian grammar. Ordinarily, this is not really a problem; the best tactic is to simply take down the data he got and to draw one's own conclusions about it. Thus, one can ignore the bad etymologies Gatschet proposes, such as that (melokami) 'spring' contains (kami) 'water', that (nimändwä) 'I pray' contains (manitu) 'spirit', or that (päna) 'potato' is somehow present in (pánawaka) 'I dig him up.'

However, Gatschet's difficulty in understanding Algonquian is much more serious when it affects what he actually enters in his notes. Mainly, he had problems understanding person marking on verbs and initial change. For instance, it appears that Gatschet believed that since Miami-Illinois had pronouns for all the grammatically encoded persons, person markers weren't always necessary. This caused Gatschet to occasionally enter into his filecards verbs with no person makers, such as (wila äläli) 'he swims, bathes'¹² or (pála káti natopali) 'I will go on the warpath'.¹³

However, the main problem Gatschet had was with the allomorphy of first person singular verbs. The prefix for the independent first person singular in Miami-Illinois, like Ojibwa, is /ni-/ or /nin-/. This is frequently reduced to /n-/. Additionally, when this prefix precedes an obstruent, the obstruent is almost always voiced, as they are in all other nasal + obstruent clusters. Thus, in all sources, there are a large number of first person independents with initial nasal + voiced obstruent. Apparently this residual

¹²Cf. Fox /anenwiiwa/ 'he bathes'.

¹³Cf. Fox /natopaniwa/ 'he goes on the war-path'.

prenasalization could be hard to hear, so sometimes one finds first-person verbs only marked by voicing of their initial obstruents; this progression goes as follows, with the independent of 'I come' as an example: *nipya* > *nimpya* > *nimbya* > *mbya* > *bya*. The problem with this is that even though such voiced obstruents can be the only prefixal sign of the first person, Gatschet also seemed to know that voiced and voiceless obstruents do not contrast in Miami-Illinois, or at least that verbs usually have only voiceless obstruents word-initially. Thus, he apparently thought that this voicing was either random or not important enough to always write. This led him to occasionally write verbs where this voicing has been factored out — and which thus end up having no person marking at all (Table 9):

Table 9

Gatschet	Gloss	Presumed Correct Form
<i>pía</i>	'I come'	* <i>(ni)mbía</i>
<i>nila piásso</i>	'I do not come'	* <i>(ni)mbiásso</i>
<i>nila pāki'ti</i>	'I fart'	* <i>(ni)mbāki'ti</i>
<i>nila pām'hkāvā</i>	'I make footprints'	* <i>(ni)mbā'hkāvā</i>

Another consequence of this confusion was that Gatschet sometimes put this voicing where it did not belong, such as on non-first person forms, or on conjuncts, which have only suffixal person marking; thus, verbs with conflicting double person marking are created, as in Table 10:

Table 10

Gatschet	Gloss	Presumed Correct Form
<i>ngiatuáni</i>	'I hide it'	* <i>kiatuáni</i> or * <i>ngiatu</i>
<i>gilāshíwa</i>	'he follows'	* <i>kilāshíwa</i>
<i>ndaixkwiáni</i>	'I am hungry'	* <i>aixkwiáni</i> or * <i>ndaixkwi</i> ¹⁴

I feel safe in assuming that these forms that Gatschet gives are completely erroneous, since not only are they not systematic even in Gatschet's notes, but also they are not confirmed in any other source.

Also, Gatschet never really understood initial change in Miami-Illinois. Like the obstruent voicing discussed above, this led him to occasionally over- or under-mark it. A vivid example of this is on his card for 'sunset', where he gives both ⟨*pángcinga*⟩ and ⟨*pānkcinga*⟩. In fact, only the second of these two forms is possible, since the vowel before the ⟨*c*⟩ (actually /*h̄s*/) would only be deleted if the vowel before it (the first vowel of the word here) were long, which would only be the case if the vowel in the first syllable had

¹⁴Note Dunn's ⟨*n'dáikwí*⟩. Compare this to Fox /*ayiihkwiwa*/ 'he is weary'.

Table 11

Hockett's Form	Gloss	Actual Phonemic Form
nô'sa	'my father'	/noohsa/
ipətɛxkiki	'hill'	/iihpatehkiki/
swátɛtswi	'seven'	/swaahteetswi/
kwiwsa	'boy'	/kwiiwhsa/
pilosa	'child'	/piloohsa/
niméšoma	'my grandfather'	/nimehšooma/
melokámiki	'it is spring'	/meeloohkamiki/

undergone initial change — to long /ee/ (written (ä)). On further examination, it turns out that Gatschet does give the correct forms elsewhere, as in the next examples: (kilswa pánkcinga) 'the sun sets' (changed participle; phonemic /peenk(i)hšinka/); (máyi pangíshingiä) 'at sunset' (adverbial; phonemic /pankihšinke/). Apparently what Gatschet has done in creating the ghost-form (pángcinga) is to combine the second-vowel deletion, initial stress, and ending of the changed participle above with the vowel quality of the adverbial.

These are genuine problems one has to deal with in using Gatschet's notes, though they are not as prevalent as my presentation of them has probably implied. All in all, Gatschet is an invaluable resource on Miami-Illinois; even if Gatschet's transcriptions were weaker than they are, his notes would still be essential for their great depth.

The most recent data recorded on Miami-Illinois is in the wordlist obtained by Charles Hockett in 1938 (Hockett 1985). This list consists of words recorded from two speakers, one Peoria and the other Miami, one day in Oklahoma. Though this is based on an English list of only 328 words, the data is of a comparatively high quality in terms of recording preaspiration, and thus his wordlist is invaluable for verifying consonant clusters. Additionally, the marking of vowel quality is more detailed in this source than in any other, and it is only from it that we know the actual phonetic range of Miami-Illinois vowels. However, Hockett's list is not totally reliable; it mainly suffers from the fact that it was gathered entirely in one day and never rechecked, and that Hockett, as he notes himself, didn't yet know much about Algonquian. For instance, though Hockett heard preaspiration in Miami-Illinois more often than anyone else with the possible exception of Truman Michelson, he did occasionally miss it, such as in the Miami examples in Table 11, where the preaspiration has been definitely confirmed by other sources.

Table 12

Hockett's Form	Gloss	Comparative Forms
lê·mwa (M)	'dog'	PA */aθemwa/
nizε·kqsa (M)	'my aunt'	Kickapoo /neθekwiθa/
ni·pi (P)	'water'	PA */nepyi/
ŋgô·ti (M)	'one'	PA */nekwetwi/
nixkô·na (M)	'my liver'	PA */neθkweni/
kó·tεʔwi (P)	'fire'	PA */eškwete·wi/
pî·mi (M)	'fat, grease'	PA */pemyi/
læ·naʔaswα(P)	'cow'	Kickapoo /onenoθwa/
pí·na·ya (P)	'beds'	Fox /apinayi/
ki·mα(P)	'chief'	PA */wekima·wa/
lê·nya (M)	'man'	PA */elenyiwa/
ni·ŋgya (M)	'my mother'	PA */nekya/

However, Hockett's data is still more reliable for marking preaspiration than vowel length. Comparing Hockett's material with that of Michelson, it seems clear that Hockett sometimes heard length, sometimes did not, and often confused it with stress. That is, there are vowels that Hockett transcribes as long that are actually probably short, and upon examination, these always turn out to be stressed. It is beyond the scope of this paper to give a full discussion of the stress rules of Miami-Illinois (see Rhodes 1989 for a partial description), but suffice it to say that Miami-Illinois has a rule of even-numbered syllable stress resembling that of Ojibwa, and a rule stressing penultimate syllables as well. Table 12 contains some such examples of short stressed vowels in both Miami (= M) and Peoria (= P) which Hockett marks as long.

Conversely, Table 13 shows several words where Hockett failed to show vowel length, where it is reliably supported both from other sources and from comparative evidence. However, at least as serious as this is the large number of problems with the transcription of vowel quality in Hockett's list. The main such problem that appears is a large number of words, especially in Peoria, where Hockett transcribes /e/ for expected /i/. This is especially troublesome in that there are genuine synchronic and diachronic processes within Miami-Illinois that create alternations between these two vowels. However, in the examples in Table 14, it is reasonably certain that the transcriptions are wrong, since the vowel qualities given by Hockett are not supported by any other source.

Table 13

Hockett's Form	Gloss	Comparative Forms
axkwapáwata (M)	'he dreams'	Michelson ('á'kwapáwata ^a)
kwiwsa (M)	'boy'	Michelson (kwíwí'sa ⁿ)
pašoxkoni (P)	'ice'	Michelson ('á'cō'kōnī ^a)
šiš'ipa (M)	'duck'	PA */ši·pši·pa/, Michelson (cī'cīpa')
počya (M)	'fly'	PA */o·čye·wa/, Gatschet (û'dsha)
kik·ones·a (M)	'fish'	Michelson (kī'kunā'sá)
mos·wa (M)	'deer'	PA */mo·swa/, Gatschet (*mū'xswa)
wis·a (M)	'many'	Michelson (wī'sa')
mos·ya (M), pl. moxscaki (P)	'worm'	PA */mo·hθe·wa/, Gatschet (mū'xsia)

Table 14

Problematic Form	Gloss	Actual Phonemic Form
péncki (P)	'potatoes'	/péniiki/
ngotimnexki (P)	'nine'	/nkótiminehki/
wšlenwi (P)	'fat'	/wiilinwi/
pclæpæwα(P)	'chicken'	/pileewa/
nižépesa (P)	'my uncle'	/nišihsa/
moxscaki (P)	'worms'	/moohsiaki/
šckápakwα(P)	'skunk'	/šikaakwa/
nelængwodæpæsa (P)	'my nephew'	/niŋenkwalchsa/
wéniča (P)	'sp. of turtle'	/wiinič(i)a/
kanémepni (P)	'seed'	/kánimini/
pæs·epαpα(P)	'raccoon'	/eehsipana/
meš'íwa (M)	'elk'	/mihšiiwia/
lečimineki (M)	'peas'	/léciminiiki/
menétwa (M)	'snow'	/minetwa/
nimepesa (P)	'my older sister'	/nimihsa/

The best notes on modern Miami-Illinois are those of Truman Michelson. Michelson's data, all Peoria, was gathered in the summer of 1916 in Oklahoma, from two speakers. Since he was the only Algonquianist to ever work extensively on the language, his notes are especially valuable, and his transcriptions of the language are easily better than anyone else's. The main focus of his work appears to have been on working out details of verb morphology, especially as Peoria compares with Fox, but he also collected a fair deal of vocabulary and a few texts. However, his materials are not without their problems. One set of problems seems to derive from the fact that Michelson was comparing Peoria to Fox. Though this did lead him to

elicit a lot of data on various uncommonly-used verb forms that are often unattested in others' notes, it also led him to overestimate the similarity of Peoria to Fox. That is, some of his Peoria forms show similarities to Fox which actually do not exist. The most conspicuous example of this is the fact that Michelson almost always transcribes intervocalic sibilants in Peoria as preaspirated; I believe this is from what Michelson expected based on his knowledge of Fox, in which preaspirated and plain sibilants no longer contrast. However, the notes of other recorders of the language, such as Hockett and Gatschet, indicate unequivocally that preaspirated sibilants do contrast with plain ones in Miami-Illinois in pretty much the etymologically expected places. Table 15 shows a few examples of plain sibilants marked as preaspirated in Michelson's notes:

Table 15

Michelson's Form	Gloss	Actual Phonemic Form
í'cítā'ātcí'	'he thinks'	/iisiteehēci/
pā'sákwiyañi	'I get up'	/pasekwiiyaani/
a'cí'saiyi	'nest'	/ašihšayi/
'awā'cilo'	'take (imp.)'	/awašilo/
myālā'ku'síta'	'he looks gaunt'	/myaalaahkosita/
ke'ci'íwiya ⁿ	'creator, God'	/keeshiwiya/
kekanwika'cá ⁿ	'grizzly bear'	/keekaanwikaša/

However, in addition to this, there are also several instances where Michelson transcribes isolated Peoria words in such a way that they look more like Fox; this is unsystematic, but a common feature of such words is that Michelson transcribes Peoria /i/ as /e/ when it is a reflex of proto-Algonquian */e/, probably reflecting his knowledge of the Fox forms, which would have /e/. A few examples of this are shown in Table 16. Table 17 shows more random influence from Fox.

Table 16

Michelson's Form	Gloss	Actual Phonemic Form
me'tegú'ca	'Frenchman'	/mihtekoosa/
nepíñgí'cí'	'towards the water'	/nipinki-'ši/
me'tegwā'kyuñgi	'forest (loc.)'	/mihtehkwaahkiyonki/
me'cí'wiya	'elk'	/mihšiiwya/
kikalólekwa ⁿ	'he spoke to you'	/kikaloolikwa/
ne'cí'mā ⁿ	'my older brother (vocative)'	/nihšiiime/

Table 17

Michelson's Form	Gloss	Actual Peoria Form
'ukwi'sapli	'his son'	/akwihsali/
pyáwa	'he comes'	/piiwa/
pyāto'sāwá'	'he comes walking'	/piitohseewa/

In describing Michelson's transcriptions of Peoria, it should be stressed that even though his records of the language are more accurate than anyone else's, they are not totally accurate, which is what one would expect given that he only did field work on the language once, and for less than a month. Though Michelson almost always heard preaspiration correctly on non-sibilants, his records are not completely reliable for vowel length. In addition to the missed long vowels that are so common in everyone else's records of Miami-Illinois, Michelson, like Hockett, also often mistook stress for length, transcribing short stressed vowels as long (Table 18):

Table 18

Michelson's Form	Gloss	Actual Phonemic Form
kō'semína ⁿ	'our grandchild'	/koohsemina/
pi ⁿ ǰíwa	'cat'	/pinšiwa/
pwākānali ^{i'}	'pipe (obv.)'	/pwaakanali/
'a'pwaiyóni	'smoking'	/ahpwaayoni/
'a'kí	'field'	/ahki/
wí'kanáli	'his friend'	/wiihkaanali/
tcí'pwiya ^k i'	'Chippewas'	/ (a)čipwiaki/
kí'koli [?]	'kettle (obv.)'	/ (ah)kihkooli/ ¹⁵
kwe'tānga ⁿ	'he is afraid of it'	/kweehtanka/

However, the main problem with Michelson's vowel transcriptions is his representation of long and short /e/. The usual convention among Algonquianists of Michelson's time, in languages such as Fox, was not to indicate length on /e/ with diacritics, but with different symbols. Thus, short /e/ was written as (e), and long /ee/ as (ä). These two symbols do not in fact indicate vowels of identical quality, and so this transcriptional practice presumably derives from an idea of how quality corresponds to length for (e). However, Michelson is not always consistent about this; though prob-

¹⁵The stress on the first syllables of 'Chippewas' and 'kettle' is actually second syllable stress which is left behind after the original initial syllables have been deleted.

ably most of the time, this transcription system is followed in Michelson's records, in a fair number of cases, he confuses them. Table 19 lists some cases where Michelson's (e) represents long /ee/; note that the last four examples represent verbs which have undergone initial change, which almost everywhere produces long /ee/:

Table 19

Michelson's Form	Gloss	Actual Phonemic Form
witemiló	'go with me'	/wiiteemilo/
kwándemi	'door'	/kwaanteemi/
'a'kwé'kaníngi	'his neck (loc.)'	/ahkweekaninki/
'áláńgwetci'	'he is tired'	/aalaankweeci/
ke'ci'íwiya ⁿ	'creator, God'	/keešihiwia/
kwe'tatcíta	'he is afraid'	/kweehtaačita/
kyelá'kikitciki	'they tell lies'	/keelaahkikičiki/
me'káńgi	'he found it'	/meehkanki/

Conversely, Table 20 lists some cases where Michelson's (ä) represents short /e/; this seems to be considerably less common:

Table 20

Michelson's Form	Gloss	Actual Phonemic Form
lányá ⁿ	'man'	/ (a)lenia/
lámwá	'dog'	/ (a)lemwa/
niláńgwalepsá ⁿ	'my nephew'	/nilenkwalehsa/
nizá'kwí'sa	'my aunt'	/nisekwihsa/
tcātcá'kwa ⁿ	'Sandhill crane'	/čéčaaahkwa/

In work on the historical phonology of Miami-Illinois vowels that is currently underway, I will explain the stress rules of Miami-Illinois such that one can know how to factor stress out of Michelson's transcriptions; however, suffice it to say for now that though Michelson is more phonetically accurate than any other recorder of Miami-Illinois, one cannot take his vowel transcriptions at face value.

I would now like to make some observations about some of the informants used by the people who have done fieldwork on Miami-Illinois. The main issues are determining which dialects the main informants spoke, and how these dialects might be different from each other. The worst confusion arises with Gatschet's notes. First, the great majority of Gatschet's filecards contain no indication of speaker, or dialect, or even what state the form was obtained in (though most of his work was done in Oklahoma). Even for those Gatschet cards that are identified for dialect, I do not believe

much credence can be given to this unless the actual speaker is identified. Most of Gatschet's data was obtained from four speakers, George Finley, Frank Beaver, Elizabeth Vallier, and Sarah Wadsworth. Gatschet considered the first two of these people to be Peorias, and there is no reason to doubt this. However, Gatschet also labelled most of his data from Sarah Wadsworth as Peoria, even though she was actually a Wea who was born and raised in Indiana. Even more confusing is the dialect identity of Elizabeth Vallier; Gatschet also considered Vallier to be a Peoria, and this opinion was reinforced by George Finley, who also identified her as speaking Peoria. However, in Dunn (1937:37-38), Jacob Dunn's daughter Caroline explains that Vallier was born and raised in Indiana and did not leave that state until she was a married woman. In looking over the texts that Gatschet obtained from Vallier, the only clear indicator of dialect affinity one can find is that she uses the Peoria word for 'leaf', /kaakipakwa/, rather than the Miami word /*(mih)šipakwa*/. However, since it is unlikely that a Peoria speaker would come from Indiana, I think it is likelier that Vallier originally was a Miami, and later in life, living in Oklahoma, came to actually identify herself with the Peorias rather than the Miamis, possibly through marriage. All in all, the dialect affiliation of Gatschet's materials is so unclear that this situation probably cannot be resolved.

The identity of Michelson's informants is more straightforward. Michelson also worked with George Finley, who had worked extensively with Gatschet 20 years before. His other speaker, Bill Skye, appears somewhat less fluent. However, Skye's speech is significant in that he was one of the two recorded speakers of Miami-Illinois to show a rule of penultimate vowel glottalization. The other known speaker who has this rule is Hockett's Peoria informant Nancy Stand, who, significantly, appears to have either been related to or lived with Bill Skye, since Michelson lists both their names together on the first page of his notes from Skye. Thus, this penultimate vowel glottalization may have only been restricted to a small circle of Peoria speakers, as it never appears in Michelson's notes from George Finley, or anywhere in anyone else's notes. At least it cannot be said to be a diagnostic difference between Peoria and Miami.

I hope that this paper has been useful as an overview of what materials exist on Miami-Illinois, and what use can be made of them. At the very least, I hope that I have dispelled the notion once and for all that Miami-Illinois can be excluded from comparative and historical Algonquian studies by having records that are 'poor and hard to use'.

REFERENCES

- Costa, David J.
 1991 The Historical Phonology of Miami-Illinois Consonants. *International Journal of American Linguistics*. [To appear.]
- Dunn, Caroline
 1937 Jacob Piatt Dunn: His Miami Language Studies and Indian Manuscript Collection. *Indiana Historical Society Prehistory Research Series* 1:25-59. Indianapolis.
- Dunn, Jacob P.
 1908 *True Indian Stories with Glossary of Indiana Indian Names*. Indianapolis: Sentinel Printing Co.
 1919 *Indiana and Indianans*. Chicago: American Historical Society.
 n.d. Miami filecard dictionary and texts. Manuscript at the Indiana State Library, Indianapolis.
- Gatschet, Albert
 1895a Notes on Peoria. Manuscript 236, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
 1895b Peoria- and Miami-English Dictionary. Manuscript 2481, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
 1895c Peoria- and Miami-English Dictionary. Manuscript 2483, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
- Goddard, Ives
 1978 Central Algonquian Languages. Pp. 583-587 in *Handbook of North American Indians*, Volume 15: *Northeast*. William C. Sturtevant, ed. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Gravier, Jacques S.J.
 n.d. Illinois-French Dictionary. Manuscript 4871, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution. Washington. [Ca. 1700.]
- Hockett, Charles F.
 1964 The Proto-Central Algonquian Kinship System. Pp. 239-257 in *Explorations in Cultural Anthropology: Essays in Honor of George Peter Murdoch*. Ward H. Goodenough, ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
 1985 Notes on Peoria and Miami. *Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics* 10:29-41.
- Michelson, Truman
 1916 Notes on Peoria. Manuscript 2721, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution. Washington.
- Rhodes, Richard
 1989 Miami Vowel Reduction. Paper read at Summer S.S.I.L.A., Phoenix.
- Siebert, Frank T., Jr.
 1975 Resurrecting Virginia Algonquian from the Dead: the Reconstituted and Historical Phonology of Powhatan. Pp. 285-453 in *Studies in Southeastern Indian Languages*. James M. Crawford, ed. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Voegelin, Carl F.

- 1938- Shawnee Stems and the Jacob P. Dunn Miami Dictionary. *Indiana Historical Society Prehistory Research Series* 1:63-108, 135-167, 289-323, 345-406, 409-478. Indianapolis. [1938-1940.]