

Technical and Bibliographic Notes/Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la
distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may
appear within the text. Whenever possible, these
have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont
pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary material/
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Only edition available/
Seule édition disponible
- Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata
slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to
ensure the best possible image/
Les pages totalement ou partiellement
obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure,
etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à
obtenir la meilleure image possible.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
					✓						

A497.32
R 15
A
286M
P R 15 Sp

A SPECIMEN
OF THE
MICMAC DICTIONARY,

BEING PREPARED AT THE EXPENSE OF THE DOMINION
GOVERNMENT OF CANADA.

By SILAS T. RAND,

OF HANTSPORT, NOVA SCOTIA,

MISSIONARY TO THE MICMAC INDIANS OF THE MARITIME PROVINCES.

The following abridgments are used, viz. :—

n., a noun ; *v. n.*, verb neuter ; *v. a. tr.*, verb active transitive ;
v. a. int., verb active intransitive ; *v. m.*, a verb in the middle
voice ; *v. p.*, a verb in the passive voice ; *adj.*, adjective.

The Consonants are pronounced as in English, *g* being
always hard.

There are three sounds of the letter *a*, viz., *a*, as in *father* ;
ā, as in *fate* ; and *ā*, as in *fat*. There are two sounds of the
letter *e*, viz., *e*, as in *mete* ; and *ē*, as in *met*. There is but one
sound of the letter *i*. It is always short, as in *fit*, *sit* ; the long
sound of *i*, as in *fine*, being represented (as in German and
Greek) by *ei*. *U* has two sounds ; one, *u*, as in *bugle* ; the
other, *ū*, as in *tub*. *U* is always *short* at the commencement of
a word. It is aimed to give the exact pronunciation of the
words in the spelling. The letters placed after a noun, usually
k, or *l*, or *ul*, denote that the addition of these letters forms the

plural. The letters *āk* and *āl*, after an adjective, denote that the *plural*, which is declined like the *noun*, and agrees with it in *gender*, *number* and *case*, is formed by adding *k* for the *animate* gender, and *l* for the *inanimate*.

The verbs are given in the 1st per. singular of the indicative mood. The terminations of the *three persons*, being given, and separated from the *root* by a *dash* (-), the last one, ending in *k*, in the positive, and in *ook* in the negative form, is the *inanimate* gender. When *a* and *ā* are doubled, (*aa*, *āā*), the sounds are simply prolonged.

Ulūmoo'ch, k. A dog. (There seems some evidence that the ancient Indians had dogs, in the fact that *nō* European word was adopted to express the name. In *Ojibway* and in *Cree*, the words for dog are evidently connected with the word in Micmac. In the former language it is *animosh*; in the latter it is *ootim*, and *my dog* is *netam*, which are evidently a modification of another word for dog (of which there are several) in Micmac, when they join the possessive pronoun to it. It is then *'nte*, *my dog*. In Maliseet, again, a dialect very like Micmac, the word for *dog* is *ūlūmoos*, still nearer to the *Ojibway*.)

Ulūmooch-wā, *adj.* Of or belonging to a dog.

Ulūmooch-wā', l, *n.* Dog meat, i. e., *the flesh of the dog*.

Ulūmooch-wāyā'. Of or belonging to the flesh of the dog.

Ulūmooch-wei', k', *n.* A dog's skin.

Ulūmooch-weiā', *adj.* Of or belonging to a dog's skin.

Ulūmooch-w-e, in, it, ik, *v. n.* To be a dog.

Moo ūlūmooch-wow', owūn, ikw, inook. Not to be a dog.

Ulūmooch-oowe-ā, 'ēn, 'ēt', ak', *v. n.* To be turned into a dog; to become a dog.

Moo ūlūmooch-ooeow, eowūn, ooeēkw, o oanook. Not to become a dog.

Ulūmooch-ooa'lūs-e, in, it, *v. m.* To turn one's self into a dog.

Moo ūlūmooch-ooa'lūs-u, uūn, ikw'. Not to turn one's self into a dog.

Ulūmooch-ooaal-ūk, ūt, ājūl, *v, a tr.* To turn him (or *her*) into a dog.

Moo ūlūmooch-ooaal-ak, owt, agool. Not to turn him into a dog.

Ulūmooch-ooa'looks-e, in, it, ik, *v. p.* To be turned into a dog.

Ulūmooch-weg-e, in, it, ik, *v. n.* To have the form of a dog.

Moo ūlūmooch-weg-u, uūn, ik'w, inook'. Not to be shaped like a dog.

Ulūmooch-ooāik, ūl, *v. n.* (1) To be dog meat, i. e., *the flesh of the dog*. (2) There is a supply of dog meat.

Moo ūlūmooch-ooāinook', ūl. (1) It is not dog meat. (2) There is no dog meat.

Ulūmooch-ooāg-ā, ēn', ēt', *v. a. int.* To be hunting for dogs.

Moo ūlūmooch-ā-ooāg-ōw, owūn, ēkw'. Not to be hunting for dogs.

Ulūmooch-ooā'kāde, el, *n.* A place abounding in dogs.

Ulūmooch-ooā'kādeā', āk, āl, *adj.* Of or belonging to a place abounding in dogs.

Ulūmooch-ooā'kādik, ūl, *v. n.* It is a place abounding in dogs.

Moo ūlūmooch-ooā'kādinook', ūl. It is not a place abounding in dogs.

Ulūmooch-wōtp', ūl, *n.* A dog's head.

Ulūmooch-wōtpā', āk, āl, *adj.* Of or belonging to a dog's head.

Ulūmooch-wōtpik', ūl, *v. n.* It is a dog's head.

Moo ūlūmooch-wōtpinook', ūl. It is not a dog's head.

Ulūmooch-wōtpek, ūl, *v. n.* It is shaped like a dog's head.

Moo ūlūmooch-wōtpenook', ūl. It is not shaped like a dog's head.

Ulūmooch-wōtp-ei', an', at', ak', *v. n.* To have a head like a dog's. To have a dog's head.

Moo ūlūmooch-wōtp-ow', owūn, ak'w. Not to have a dog's head.

Ulūmooch-wōtpūm-e, in, it, ik, *v. n.* To have (*in my possession*) the head of a dog.

Moo ūlūmooch-wōtpūm-u, uūn, ikw, inook. Not to have the head of a dog.

Ulūmooch-ooigūn, ūl, *n.* A dog's bone, i. e., the bone of a dog's body. *A dog's bone*, when the phrase denotes the bone he is gnawing, is a totally different expression. *A bone*, when separated from the name of the animal to which it is said to belong, is, *wōkūndow*. *A dog's bone*, when it means the bone he is gnawing, is expressed in two words, viz, *ūlūmooch' oo wōkūndēm'*.

Ulūmooch-ooigūnā', āk, āl, *adj.* Of or belonging to a dog's bone.

Ulūmooch-ooigūnik', ūl, *v. n.* It is a dog's bone.

Moo ūlūmooch-ooigūninook. It is not a dog's bone.

Ulūmooch-ooigūnek', ūl, *v. n.* It is shaped like a dog's bone.

Moo ūlūmooch-ooigūnenook. It is not shaped like a dog's bone.

Ulūmooch-oogünüm-e, in, it, ik, *v. n.* To have (in my possession) a dog's bone.

Moo ūlūmooch-oogünüm-u, uñn, ikw. Not to have possession of a dog's bone.

Ulūmooch-wöbe, l, *plur. n.* A dog's hair, (a single hair.)

Ulūmooch-wōmooks-e, in, it, *v. n.* To look like a dog.

Moo ūlūmooch-wōmooks-u, uñn, ikw. Not to look like a dog.

Ulūmooch-oo-ō'mk, ōmt', ōmājūl, *v. a.* To appear like a dog. N. B.—This word expresses a peculiar idiom. It means *literally, I see him as a dog*, i. e., he looks, as I see him, like a dog.

Ulūmooch-weme, *n.* The fat of a dog; dog grease.

Ulūmooch-wemik, ūl, *v. n.* It is the fat of a dog.

Moo ūlūmooch-weminook, ūl. It is not the fat of a dog.

Ulūmooch-wema-e, ain, aak, *v. n.* To smell like a dog. To emit the odour of a dog.

Moo ūlūmooch-wema-oo, ooñn, aikw. Not to smell like a dog.

Ulūmooch-wāemaak, ūl, *v. n.* It smells like dog's flesh.

Moo ūlūmooch-wāema'nook, ūl. It does not smell like the flesh of a dog.

Ulūmooch-wemema-e, aan, aak, *v. n.* To be redolent of dog oil.

Moo ūlūmooch-wemema-oo, ooñn, aikw, anook. Not to be odoriferous of dog oil.

Ulūmooch-wāoo-ōptūm, ōptūmñn, ōptūk, *v. a. tr.* To see it as dog oil. To appear to my eye as dog oil. (Compare *ōptūm*, I see it—used only as agglutinated—with the Greek *οπτομαι*.)

Ulūmooch-wāgaktūmei', *v. n.* To be in quest of dog meat.

Ulūmooch-weiāgaktūmei, *v. n.* To be in quest of dog skins.

Ulūmooch-wemeāgaktūmei, *v. n.* To be in quest of dog oil.

Ulūmooch-wöbeāgaktūmei', *v. n.* To be in quest of dog's hair.

Ulūmooch-oogünāgaktūmei, *v. n.* To be in quest of dog bones.

REMARKS.

THE Micmac language, like that of other Indian tribes, is both *agglutinate* and *polysynthetic*. The former term denotes that there are syllables that have no meaning by themselves, or when separated from other syllables or words, but which are significant when thus united. The latter term denotes that the language abounds in compounds, in which each term is significant, whether combined or not with other words. In the preceding list I have given a specimen of what is expressed by the former term, which, of course, embraces more particularly all the terminations that are merely grammatical variations, denoting gender, number, person, mood, and tense, &c. Every syllable united to the principal word, which means dog, has indeed a distinct meaning, but that meaning depends on its union with the principal word, for it is not a word, nor does it mean anything when used alone. The process might be extended, and it applies to every beast, and also to some extent to every bird, fish and reptile known to the Indians.

Every *noun* in the language becomes an adjective by adding a syllable to it. This syllable is either *ā* or *āwā*, according to the termination of the noun. Then every noun and adjective becomes a verb by the addition of a verbal termination, to denote gender, number, and person, &c. From these verbs, new nouns, adjectives, and verbs may be formed, and from these again new nouns, adjectives, and verbs, and so on, not quite *ad infinitum*.

An important question arises here respecting a dictionary of the language. According to all precedent, a dictionary that omits numbers of words that have a distinct meaning by themselves, and form an integral portion of the language, is deemed defective. Should not all these niceties of the language be fully explained in the grammar, but exhibited to the eye in the dictionary? I find twenty words in Liddell & Scott's Greek Dictionary under the word *λαγως*, *a hare*, and forty or fifty under the word for a *mountain*, *ορος*, and about sixty under *ανθρωπος*, *a man*; and our larger dictionaries give every noun, adjective,

adverb, &c., and repeat the long lists of words when *mis*, *un*, &c., are to be prefixed, even when the prefix does not, as in Greek and Micmac, change the form of either the principal word, or the affix. Because the affix is *glued* or *soldered* to the word (if I may use *English* instead of Greek and Latin), and the two parts form but a single word, it seems more necessary to put them all in.

Now, if this be proper in English, where no change is made, in either the principal word or the prefix or suffix, nor any union vowel required, it would certainly seem to be much more necessary where all the portions of the compound have to be adjusted for the sake of euphony, and a union vowel, not always one and the same, continually inserted between the parts, so that they may fit harmoniously. The advice and suggestions of the learned are earnestly solicited on this point. If the work is done at all, should it not be done *well*, though a trifle be added to the cost thereby?

One more remark. When people are told that the number of words in an Indian language mounts up to forty thousand or so, they sometimes open their eyes with astonishment, and enquire if all these words are really in use? Now that would be a difficult point to determine, but probably they are not used often, many of them, and some of them never by any one Indian. But what then? are there not scores of words in every dictionary of every language that scores of people never use, and cannot understand? A few hundred words answer for all the common purposes of life; a few *thousands* satisfy the poet and the historian. Still, you find them on every page of the Dictionary, and I may say on every page of the Almanack, and they form an integral part of the language. An Indian may never have had occasion to say, "*The bone of a bumble-bee*," nor "*The fat of a pismire*." But you just join the suffix that means *bone* and *fat* when united to the name of a living thing, but does not mean *bone* or *fat* nor anything else in any other situation, and see if he does not understand the word instantly. He might admire your ideas of entomology, but he would not deny that you had used correct Indian, so far as words are concerned.

But I mention this as an extreme case. There is no need of pushing etymology and peculiar idioms to excess. Every word should be thoroughly tested by actual use or diligent enquiry before it takes its place in the dictionary, and that, with the means now afforded, can be easily done, an opportunity which, if now neglected, may never return.

A FEW instances may be given illustrating the *polly-synthetic* character of the language. Oo-küse-mowe-bějěle-negan-ikchije-těg-āwenoo-adakadimk-āwāūmoo-ogūl. This word contains "only" *fifty-seven* letters, and *twenty-seven* syllables, and is made up of nine different words, and these are pared and trimmed so as to fit together in proper order, each one retaining its essential part, so that the meaning of each is exhibited, and the word means, "Their very superlatively excellent prophesyings." It was said of the celebrated Cotton Mather, that on looking at some of the long words in Elliot's Indian Bible, he exclaimed that "they must have been growing ever since the confusion of Babel." But a slight analysis will show that they have grown very *artistically*, as all natural, or rather *supernatural*, objects grow. For neither the plants that grow, the languages of the world, nor the human beings that use those languages, are the invention of chance, or of any wisdom, less than *divine*. Says a celebrated philologist, of the Greek language: "When in other languages irregularities of style occur, we see at once that they result from inaccuracy or want of skill; while among the *Attics*, who are so distinguished for address and skill, we perceive that they did not wish to make the correction. Indeed, they felt that by removing anomalies, they would deprive their language of the stamp of a production of nature, *which every language really is*, and thus give it the appearance of a work of art, which a language never can become."—(*Buttman's Larger Greek Grammar, Introduction.*) Unquestionably the rude Indians never made it their business to polish their language, or perfect it in any way, and the lexicographer, the grammarian, or the translator soon finds out that to do this for them is no part or portion of *his* business. His work is just to take it as it is, and not attempt to criticise it, or mend it. He may leave that to the philologists and philosophers

But to return to our long Indian word. It springs from a very small root, and, like the tree to which we thus compare it, *grows at both ends*. The root is *kěj*, the stem of many words denoting *knowledge*. Thus, *kěj-eděgā*, *I know*. *Kěj-edoo'*, *I know it*. *Kěj-eek*, *I know him*. The adverb *neganu*, *beforehand*, prefixed to *kěj-edoo*, with the changes required to form the union, gives *neganik-chijedoo*, *I know it beforehand*: in other words, *I am a prophet*. A syllable denoting the agent of the action denoted by the verb, added on to the end, the two parts being again pared and fitted so that the union may be effected smoothly, and you have, *neganik-chije-těg-āwenoo*. Lit., "a man who knows things beforehand," that is, *a prophet*. One more

addition, a'dĕgā, and the special action of the prophet is denoted. Neganik-chije-tĕgā-wenoo-a'dĕgā—I *prophesy*. A further addition to this forms a noun which means the peculiar work of the prophet—*prophecy* or *prophesying*. Three words prefixed, denoting *very*, *superlatively*, and *good* or *excellent*, with a part of the possessive adjective pronoun *their*, (oo), placed before them, and the remaining portion of this pronoun, with the plural ending (ūmoōl), put at the end, and your word is formed. You may still bend on, to use a sea phrase, as many more adjectives at the beginning as you like, and add several more syllables at the end; but the word is long enough in all conscience as it is for our present use.

In many instances these "word-phrases," *holophrases*, as they are termed, while appearing to the eye so long and unwieldy, are in reality "labor-saving machines," for the thoughts are often expressed much more briefly than in English, as well as more forcibly. Thus:—

Wĕch-kwōw-oolĕjik, They are bringing loads on their backs.

Wĕch-kwintōk', He comes singing along as he comes.

Elmintōk, He goes away singing.

Yāle-agwĕsūn-aak, He is walking about with his hat on.

Yālipūkikaak, He is walking about with his spectacles (literally *eye-things*) on.

Pĕm-chājegā', I walk along the shore.

The Micmac Indians who, up to a very late date, knew little or nothing of *written* language, never seem to have had any idea of anything formidable in the length of their compound words. The pronunciation presents no difficulty, as every letter is pronounced, and always sounded one way, and there is no sound in the language which is not in English.

To conclude. A field of wonderful extent, variety, and interest is here opened up to the philologist and ethnologist, and to every learned man, aye, and to every *Christian* man.

SILAS T. RAND.

HANTSPORT, NOVA SCOTIA, }
November, 1885. }