

NOTES ON SOME WORD-COMPARISONS  
BETWEEN BLACKFOOT AND OTHER ALGONQUIAN LANGUAGES

BY TRUMAN MICHELSON.

In IJAL 3 : 103 et sq. Professor Uhlenbecks makes some word-comparisons between Blackfoot and other Algonquian languages. This paper must be counted as a distinct contribution to Algonquian philology as it brings out in a way never done before that the number of vocables held in common between Blackfoot and other Algonquian languages is really considerable ; hitherto the emphasis has been laid on the Algonquian character of Blackfoot grammar. In making such a pioneer comparison minor errors are bound to creep in ; and so the following notes may seem to be purely fault-finding, as contrasted with Uhlenbeck's excellent achievement. — Bl. ániu says ; Oj. nind-inā I tell him, I call him. The Ojibwa word is wrongly analyzed : the verbal stem is i and n is the instrumental particle which has become purely formal in this case as is frequently the case, as can be seen from nindidimin " we tell each other " (from Baraga ; -di-reciprocal, Fox -tī-). Incidentally Ojibwa nindinā corresponds to Fox netenā<sup>wa</sup>, I said to him which is explained by me in the *American Journal of Philology* 41 : 181 ; see also BBAE 72 : 72 and 76 (under i- say, name). As instrumental particles, even when purely formal, do not occur in intransitive verbs (save in the middle voice) in Algonquian the comparison with Bl. ániu obviously is wrong. — Bl. -apini eyes, nit-ái-api I see... Fox wápa- to look at. A better Fox comparison is Fox -āpi- to look at, which is related to Fox wápi- (same meaning). — Bl. ápistotakiu makes... based on a root -tot- to make ; cf. Oj. dōdam does, acts ; Cree

totam does. These last correspond to Fox tōtam<sup>wa</sup>, treats it ; but the root is not tōt- but tō- : see BBAE 72 : 72 and 79 under tō- ; the second t is an instrumental particle requiring an inanimate object or objects : wherefore the Blackfoot comparison is not plausible. -Bl. inú dies, initsiu kills. The Algonquian comparisons are wrongly analyzed as shown by Fox ne- kill (not ne's- ; the -'s- is formal instrumental particle requiring an animate object), -nā- die ; furthermore as shown by Fox nep- die, it is impossible for Ojibwa dapine dies in certain place, nissān kills him, nibō dies, to be related to one another. Similar reasoning shows the various Cree words can not be related to one another. I wonder if Bl. inú possibly is to be analyzed as i-ni-u in which i- corresponds to Fox i- thus, -ni- Fox -nā-, -u Fox<sup>wa</sup> ? — Bl. k, ka(u) foot... Fox -sk(a)-with the foot or leg : should be given as Fox -skaw- (animate obj.) -sk- (inanimate obj.) in Jones' transcription. — Bl. -kam- straight ...Fox -kam-. I regret to report that Fox -kam- (presumably taken from BBAE 40, Part I, p. 796 top) does not exist : for ke'tcikamīw<sup>i</sup> read ke'tcigamīw<sup>i</sup> (a similar error is in BBAE 72), for ka'kamīw<sup>a</sup> read kā'kamīw<sup>a</sup> (accents disregarded ; both in Jones' transcription). Ojibwa kitchigami great water and kakami- (and variants) short, sudden (both from Baraga) might have warned Uhlenbeck that the two Fox words are unrelated, because in words given by Baraga medial k ordinarily corresponds to Fox 'k not g. Note too Cree kaskam and -gami- (from Lacombe). Menomini akamia across is unrelated to the other

Algonquian words cited as shown by Fox *agāmā'eg<sup>ki</sup>* 'across the water. — Bl. *ksistsikúyi* day, *ksistsikúma* thunder, *kesúmsun*, moon. I do not suppose that Professor Uhlenbeck really means to imply that the last is really cognate with the first two; or that the various Algonquian words cited are all cognate with one another: in any case they certainly are not, cf. Fox *kí'ceg<sup>kwi</sup>*, sky, day; *kí'ce'swá* sun. No suffixes known at present account for the difference in terminations. It would have been better to list the words separately. — Bl. *ksistuyiu* is warm; cf. Oj. *kiž-*; Cree *kis-*, *kiž-*, warm, to be warm; Ar. *há'sitá<sup>a</sup>* it is hot. There are no such Ojibwa and Cree radicals with the meanings assigned. The words in the works of Baraga and Lacombe from which they have been presumably taken, have been wrongly analyzed. In part we have correspondents to Fox *kí'cōwi-* warm, in part to Fox *kí'ci-* in such combinations as *kí'cetāwi* (so) it is done cooking, *kí'ce'sōwa* he is cooked done, in both of which the *e* is secondary for *i*. But in such cases *kí'ci-* is the ordinary stem *kí'ci-* completion; the particular meanings are caused by the copula on the one hand and the instrumental particle on the other (*-sō-* *-so-* are phonetic transformations of *-swō-* and *-swo-*; the matter is wrongly treated in BBAE 40, Part I: 804; the same shifts occur in a number of Central Algonquian languages). Of course the above does not militate against the connection of Bl. *ksistuyiu*; this connection can only be definitely shown by a complete analysis of the Blackfoot word.

Bl. *eini(u)* buffalo; Fox *nénusw<sup>a</sup>* buffalo. I do not think this comparison is plausible on phonetic grounds. — Bl. *moxtókis* ear.... Fox *uta<sup>i</sup>wawga<sup>i</sup>* his ear. The Fox word is a misprint which Uhlenbeck has taken over: read *u<sup>t</sup>awāgaiyi*. — Bl. *nánoyiu*.... sees him... Fox *nā-*, *nāw-*, *nāu-*; Abn. *nem* to see. The true Fox stem is *nā-* and takes the instrumentals *w*

and *t*. I doubt if Abn. *nem* is connected with the Fox stem. — Bl. *nínixkiu*, *inixkiu* (with prefix *ai-* *ánixkiu*) sings..... Fox *nāgā-*, *nāgasing*. The two Fox citations are not merely variants as I formerly thought, but entirely distinct and should be given as *-nāgā-* and *nāgA-*: see BBAE 72: 80; the last is always inflected in the middle voice, and so are the Cree, Montagnais, and Ojibwa correspondents. If any comparison is made it should be with *-nāgā-*, not *nāgA-*. In that case *ni-* of Bl. *nínixkiu* must be a distinct element and not a reduplication, for in Central and Eastern Algonquian secondary stems are not reduplicated, and so presumably this state of affairs is Proto-Algonquian. Furthermore if the *ní-* were due to reduplication we should then have to equate a Blackfoot initial stem with a Central Algonquian secondary stem. — Bl. *omaxk-* big. I wonder if the connection may not be with Fox *magi-* big, rather than the other words cited. — Bl. *nisisa* my younger brother or sister (a woman speaking). I should think it much more plausible to connect Fox *ne 'sīmā<sup>ʼA</sup>* my younger brother, my younger sister, and its congeners in other Algonquian languages; rather than Fox *ne'se'sā<sup>ʼA</sup>* (so; the vocative is *ne'se'se<sup>ʼ</sup>*) my elder brother, and its congeners. — Bl. *pi-* far.... Fox *pyāw<sup>a</sup>* a long time ago. Where Uhlenbeck obtained this translation for Fox *pyāw<sup>a</sup>* I do not know, but there is a mistake somewhere: *pyāw<sup>a</sup>* means "he, she comes" — Bl. *saxk-* short... Fox *tca'gi* small. The comparison should rather be with Fox *tca'kwi-* short. — Bl. *sok-* straight, sudden, suddenly, aloud; Cree *soki* very, very much, loud. Cf. above *s. v. isok-*. I do not know the source for *soki*; doubtless *sokki* of Lacombe is meant; but the meaning *beaucoup*, *très*, is secondary as may be seen from the examples beginning with *sokk-*; *fortement* is the original one. This corresponds to Ojibwa *sōngi-*, Fox *sōgi-* phonetically, and should be written *sō-*

---

'ki as may be seen from Watkin's dictionary. I think the real correspondent to the Blackfoot sok- is Fox cō'cki- straight.

It goes without saying that there are cognates in other Central and Eastern Algonquian lan-

guages not given, but they are not generally available.

I have given Uhlenbeck's alpha and chi the symbols A and x respectively.

---