

LEONARD BLOOMFIELD'S  
DESCRIPTIVE AND COMPARATIVE STUDIES OF ALGONQUIAN

IVES GODDARD  
*Smithsonian Institution*

Leonard Bloomfield's work on Algonquian forms the largest body of material in which he documented and accounted for the facts of specific languages. He dealt extensively in both descriptive and comparative studies with four languages in particular: Fox, chiefly represented by Fox proper (Mesquakie); Cree (almost exclusively Plains Cree); Menominee; and Ojibwa (various Southern dialects). It was at one time believed that these four languages represented only a putative Central Algonquian branch of the family, but work on the languages of the Plains and the East Coast has shown that Bloomfield's languages are in fact generally representative of the family as a whole and do not, either by themselves or with others, constitute a genetic subgroup (Goddard 1979:95).

Bloomfield's work on Fox was based on publications of William Jones (1907, 1911) and Truman Michelson (1921, 1925; minor papers listed in Bloomfield 1925-1927, pt. 1:219). The principal source of his Cree data was his fieldwork in 1925, which largely superseded an earlier reliance on the Plains Cree grammar and dictionary by Lacombe (1874); he worked among the Plains Cree of Saskatchewan (principally on Sweet Grass Reserve but also on Star Blanket Reserve) and briefly among the Swampy Cree of The Pas, Manitoba. His Menominee materials were from his fieldwork of 1920 and 1921, supplemented by brief later contacts that included a trip to the field in September, 1939, and by information collected by Morris Swadesh in 1937 and 1938. For Ojibwa Bloomfield at first depended on the texts of Jones (1917, 1919) from Lake Superior and the dictionaries of Baraga (1880) from the Upper Peninsula of Michigan and Cuoq (1886) from the Nipissing-speaking population at Lake of Two Mountains; later he had access to materials obtained by himself and C.F. Voegelin from Ottawa

speakers from Sugar Island, Michigan, and Birch Island and Walpole Island, Ontario.

Bloomfield's studies of Algonquian include a fair amount of unpublished material, which has not been fully calendared, and a number of publications, several of them posthumous. For Fox he published an early grammatical sketch based on the published texts (Bloomfield 1925-1927) and prepared a word list (Bloomfield 1984a);<sup>1</sup> his review of Michelson's *Owl Sacred Pack of the Fox Indians* (Michelson 1921) documents the beginning of his Algonquian work (Bloomfield 1922). He published a brief outline of Cree grammar (Bloomfield 1928a) and two volumes of texts (Bloomfield 1930, 1934) and left behind a large body of additional texts (Bloomfield 1931) and a word list (Bloomfield 1984b). Menominee was described in a brief early paper (Bloomfield 1924) and was treated in the theoretically significant articles "Literate and Illiterate Speech" (Bloomfield 1927a, cited from Hockett 1970:147-56) and "Menomini Morphophonemics" (Bloomfield 1939); it was fully documented by texts (Bloomfield 1928b), a grammar (Bloomfield 1962), and a word list (Bloomfield 1975). For Ojibwa Bloomfield prepared a grammatical sketch of a Walpole Island dialect of Ottawa, which includes the corpus of texts and utterances on which it is based and a word list (Bloomfield 1957).<sup>2</sup> His comparative studies (Bloomfield 1925, 1927b, 1928c, 1941) culminated in the so-called "Sketch" (Bloomfield 1946), an outline comparative grammar of the four languages he worked on with a few scattered citations of forms and features from other Algonquian languages.

The formal study of the Algonquian languages was nearly three hundred years old when Bloomfield turned his attention to them. Many of the major features and grammatical categories had been recognized, and a good deal of the terminology needed to discuss them had been established. Bloomfield's achievement, in the strength of the American linguistic tradition, was to bring explicitness and orderliness to the description of Algonquian inflectional and derivational morphology. The framework that he set up has formed the basis for all useful work on Algonquian since. It is most readily accessible, summarized in a comparative framework, in the "Sketch" (Bloomfield 1946) and has its fullest presentation in *The Menomini Language* (Bloomfield 1962), though as a posthumous work this has the disadvantage of being not wholly consistent on some details. The impact of Bloomfield's achievement is not rehearsed here, however. Rather, the opportunity will be taken to examine some of Bloomfield's

ideas about language and five facets of his Algonquian methods that emerges c *guage* (Bloomfield 1933) field's descriptive approach his successors took him t become clear that perhaps are indeed significant in descriptive practice and general interest not as precisely in areas that pr method and because the basic importance. The interpretation of Bloom

The fundamental d quian work was the dete the fundamental problem perhaps any linguistic methodologies and who their way by ignoring i linguist should record : 1922:276-77, 1972:265) however, that even in a tion in all facets of the "Literate and Illiterate that his solution to the the community norm, v differentiated speech of t field speaks as if the ex explicitly rejects as th *langue* ("the socially un mined" aspects of *pa* 1970:177). His Meno statements that imply even as ideally present the linguist as to which ment which the linguist ever extent is possible

ideas about language and how to study it as reflected in specific representative facets of his Algonquian work. The picture of Bloomfield's views and methods that emerges complements explicit statements in his book *Language* (Bloomfield 1933) and elsewhere. It has been observed that Bloomfield's descriptive approach differed on important points from what many of his successors took him to be saying in *Language*, but in what follows it will become clear that perhaps to a greater extent than has been realized there are indeed significant instances of a lack of correspondence between his descriptive practice and his general statements. These inconsistencies are of general interest not as instances of error but because they are found precisely in areas that present fundamental challenges to any descriptive method and because their consideration therefore sheds light on issues of basic importance. They are also obviously of specific interest in the interpretation of Bloomfield's Algonquian materials.

The fundamental difficulty encountered by Bloomfield in his Algonquian work was the determination of the object of study. This is, of course, the fundamental problem confronting descriptive linguistics, and hence perhaps any linguistic subfield, a problem so intractable that entire methodologies and whole schools of linguistics have only been able to make their way by ignoring it completely. Bloomfield's ideal view was that the linguist should record actual speech and set forth its system (Bloomfield 1922:276-77, 1972:265). His fieldwork among the Menominee revealed, however, that even in a small speech community there was extensive variation in all facets of the language. Bloomfield's account of this variation in "Literate and Illiterate Speech" (in Hockett 1970:152-56) makes it clear that his solution to the problem of systematizing variation was to describe the community norm, which he identified with the maximally rich and differentiated speech of the best unselfconscious speakers. At times Bloomfield speaks as if the community norm could be directly observed, and he explicitly rejects as the linguist's object of study de Saussure's abstract *langue* ("the socially uniform language pattern") in favor of "socially determined" aspects of *parole*, "the actual speech utterance" (in Hockett 1970:177). His Menominee grammar (Bloomfield 1962) contains many statements that imply this approach (Teeter 1970a:529-31). Nevertheless, even as ideally presented this approach involves judgment on the part of the linguist as to which features to identify as conforming to the norm, judgment which the linguist is able to exercise only by having "become, to whatever extent is possible, a member of the speech-community" (Bloomfield

1922:277). And even under these conditions a uniform and consistent community norm is not directly observable and must in part be constructed by the linguist in accordance with the pattern emerging from his study. This is clear from Bloomfield's discussion of the problem of differentiating the three short front vowels of Menominee in a letter of December 28, 1940, to Bernard Bloch (in Hockett 1970:367-68). To provide a consistent and systematic account of the observed facts it was necessary to treat some of them as peripheral, to be dealt with outside the system if at all. Though the undescribed speech varieties in a community might in principle be left for later discussion (Bloomfield 1933:45, 311), in practice they were never systematically described. Of course, this assumption of homogeneity (Hockett 1942:5; Gleason 1961:391), codified in its strictest form in Bloch's concept of the idiolect ("the totality of possible utterances of one speaker at one time in using a language to interact with one other speaker"; Bloch 1948:7), has been an enduring characteristic of American descriptive linguistics, a necessary but fundamentally flawed axiom of synchronic analysis that was later restated, in a formulation that emphasized the feature of unobservability, as Chomsky's competence (Chomsky 1965:3-4).

An examination of the evolution of Bloomfield's treatment of the phonemes of Menominee sheds light on how he arrived at the norm that he eventually presented in his grammar. Since Bloomfield never discussed his reasons for changing his account of certain features, an omission he regarded as a virtue (Hockett 1966:67), a certain amount of inference is required. The evidence comes from the Menominee forms and analyses he published over the years, from some remarks in correspondence (Bloomfield 1919-1932, 1938a, 1938b; Hockett 1970:367-68), and from his manuscript notes on Menominee (Bloomfield 1920-1940, 1937, 1938-1947; Swadesh 1937-1938). The value of the manuscript notes in this connection was earlier observed by Hockett (1965:195, fn. 23).

The central difficulty in Menominee phonemics concerns the three short front vowels: *i*, *e*, *ε*. As Bloomfield eventually described the situation in the 1940 letter to Bernard Bloch (in Hockett 1970:367-68) — after he had arrived at the solution and transcription used in his grammar — both *i* and *ε* are sometimes pronounced the same as *e*: a phonetic [e] that varies with [i] in a particular form is phonemic *i*, an [e] that varies with [ε] is *ε*, and an [e] that has neither of these variants is *e*. Bloomfield considered this phonetic blurring to be "surface variation" (Bloomfield 1962:2, 7-9), though it should be pointed out that it is not entirely governed by phonetic context:

the phoneme *ε* in the per  
*ε* in prefixes is always fo  
phonetic variant for *ε* in  
to Bloch that *ε* was repla  
... depending on word an  
that the conditioning of  
phonetic, but there is no  
ally distinct was morpho  
sistently replaces the *m*  
described in the gramma  
word-initially; (2) otherw  
*h* or ?;<sup>3</sup> and (3) in the ne  
or *y*. The letter to Bloch  
be retained in one or bot  
here again the grammar l

A further complicati  
ments is treated in part I  
that treat these morphop  
the grammar recognize t  
morphophonemes |E| at  
these remain short they  
ified, they surface as *ε*  
lengthened, |E| behave  
and gives *e*-. The morph  
distinction between these  
Not only do some morp  
show lengthening to bot  
variant is somewhat diffe  
84).

Bloomfield's handlin  
elusive problem of the s  
chronologically through b  
either stated explicitly  
issues: (1) the number of  
conditioned and uncondi  
tity of the phoneme or p  
in the published gramma  
and after long-vowel syll

the phoneme  $\epsilon$  in the personal prefixes may be replaced by [e] even though  $\epsilon$  in prefixes is always followed by  $h$  or  $ʔ$ , environments that block [e] as a phonetic variant for  $\epsilon$  in other morphemes. Additionally, Bloomfield wrote to Bloch that  $\epsilon$  was replaced by [e] "anywhere from 1/10 to 9/10 of the time ... depending on word and on speaker" (Hockett 1970:368), which suggests that the conditioning of these replacements may not have been wholly phonetic, but there is no equivalent information in the grammar. Conceptually distinct was morphophonemic variation, by which the phoneme  $e$  consistently replaces the morphophoneme  $|\epsilon|$  in certain environments. As described in the grammar (Bloomfield 1962:95-96),  $|\epsilon|$  is raised to  $e$  (1) word-initially; (2) otherwise in the first syllable of a word if not followed by  $h$  or  $ʔ$ ; and (3) in the next syllable after a long vowel if not before  $h$ ,  $ʔ$ ,  $w$ , or  $y$ . The letter to Bloch has qualifications that suggest that  $\epsilon$  might rarely be retained in one or both of these last two cases (Hockett 1970:368), but here again the grammar has no equivalent information.

A further complication is that the first segment in some non-initial elements is treated in part like  $|\epsilon|$  and in part like [e] by a number of rules that treat these morphophonemes differently. The phonological sections of the grammar recognize two discrepant patterns, indicated by the diacritic morphophonemes  $|\epsilon|$  and  $|\epsilon\cdot|$  (Bloomfield 1962:2, 80, 81, 84-89). When these remain short they are both treated like  $|\epsilon|$  except that, if unmodified, they surface as  $e$ ; the difference between them is that, when lengthened,  $|\epsilon|$  behaves like  $|\epsilon|$  and gives  $\epsilon\cdot$ , but  $|\epsilon\cdot|$  behaves like [e] and gives  $e\cdot$ . The morphological sections, however, make it clear that the distinction between these two diacritic morphophonemes is not a sharp one. Not only do some morphemes and morpheme combinations of this type show lengthening to both  $\epsilon\cdot$  and  $e\cdot$ , but the frequency of each lengthened variant is somewhat different in each case (Bloomfield 1962:103, 107, 182-84).

Bloomfield's handling of what is evidently the extremely complex and elusive problem of the short front vowels of Menominee can be followed chronologically through his publications and notes. The changes of analysis, either stated explicitly or implied by the transcription, concern several issues: (1) the number of short front vowel phonemes; (2) the assignment of conditioned and unconditioned allophones to the phonemes; (3) the identity of the phoneme or phonemes appearing in the environments analyzed in the published grammar as having raising of  $|\epsilon|$  to  $e$  (in initial syllables and after long-vowel syllables); (4) the role of  $\epsilon$  and  $\epsilon\cdot$  in blocking the rais-

ing of *e*, *o*, and *o*; and (5) the analysis of the alternations accounted for in the published grammar with the diacritic morphophonemes |E| and |æ|.

Bloomfield's field notes from 1920-1921 have three short front vowels, written <i>, <e>, and <ε>, but these show a good deal of variation and do not correspond directly to the phonemes *i*, *e*, and *ε*. The phoneme *i* is written in the notes <i>, <e>, and <ī> (<ī> also represents *i*); *e* is written <i>, <e>, and <ε>; and *ε* is written <e> and <ε> (accented <ε'> is also a common writing for *ε*). Examples of this transcription are: <kε'ne'mehsi'naw> "our (inc.) cross-niece" for *kε'nemehsenaw*; <ō'ni'mehs^an>, <o'ne'mehs^an>, and <o'ne'mehs^an> "his cross-niece" for *o'nehsan*; <inε'niw> "man" for *ene-niw* (Bloomfield 1920-1940, B3:43, 8:12).

In the published texts Bloomfield indicated only two short front vowels, replacing what he had recorded as <ε> by either (short) <e> or (long) <ā>.<sup>5</sup> Another systematic change was the substitution of <ō> for <o>, which reflected the perception that these were merely the accented and unaccented variants of the same sound.<sup>6</sup> These changes are seen in the printed forms of the examples just cited: <kε'ne'mehsi'naw>; <ō'ni'mehs^an>, <ō'ne'mehs^an>, and, identically, <ō'ne'mehs^an>; <inā'niw> (Bloomfield 1928b:382, 24). As a consequence, for example, manuscript <o'ne'mehsowā'wan>, which exactly represents *o'nehsowa-wan* "their cross-niece", is printed as <ō'ne'mehsōwā'wan> (Bloomfield 1928b:382, line 41). Inevitably, there are inconsistencies; manuscript <ape'?'sik>, appearing twice on one page for *ape'sek* "more", is once printed as <ape'?'sik> and once as <apā'?'sik> (Bloomfield 1920-1940, 1928b:380). There are other substitutions that appear to reflect a rethinking of the assignment of phonetic variants in particular environments. For example, the substitution of <ī> for <e> in printed <pu' ^wi'taw, pu'awi'taw> versus manuscript <pu'owe'taw, puawe'taw> (for *puawe'taw* "he was hungry") (Bloomfield 1920-1940, 1928b:196, 380) must indicate a realization that the vowel here was different from the very open realization of *ε* that occurs before *ʔ* and a reluctance to spell both the same way. The extent of the changes made in publishing the texts goes beyond what would ordinarily be assumed from Bloomfield's statement in the preface (Bloomfield 1928b:xiv):

[1] The texts are here recorded as they struck my ear. Analysis shows that this record (and therefore, if I heard aright, the actual pronunciation) largely obscures the distinction between three short front-vowel

phonemes, which here

Presumably Bloomfield thought <ε> was so unreliable in his analysis, however, shows a picture of the language that is more accurate than the variation that appears to result from Bloomfield's

Bloomfield used a long *i* appearing in the published script compilation called "The Menominee Language" (Bloomfield 1920-1921 notes and texts) as the initial element of the standard orthography, but with no *i* in the sketch "The Menominee Language" (Bloomfield 1924:338), for Menominee forms. In these is the writing of both <i> and <ī>: "he notices it" but <p<eskuahtem> "door" but <ī> generally corresponds to <e> regularly appears for shortened |ε-|: <utāhpen - for *ota-hpenew*, reflecting that is confirmed by forms (Bloomfield 1924:338), for <ī> (Bloomfield 1924:336) for *pema-t* later written with the morpheme "he cuts it through" (Bloomfield 1925-1927, cf. *pe'tesam* "he cuts it by

Bloomfield (1925-1927) <ī> in these forms. In some elements <ī> is written by c [written <ts>] and raises preceding <ē> to <ī> "act on a dwelling" in <ōni-k<ī> "he builds a house" (*oni-k*), is lengthened to <ē> "falls in" (*pe-hcehsen*); <ni<ī> "makes it" (*neto-sehton, ose*

phonemes, which here appear as *i* and *e*.

Presumably Bloomfield thought his original distinction between <e> and <ē> was so unreliable as to not be worth preserving; his own later analysis, however, shows that his manuscript recordings give a better picture of the language than the published versions, even if they do show more variation than appears to really exist.

Bloomfield used a largely normalized version of the orthography appearing in the published texts in his first Menominee word list, a manuscript compilation called "Alphab[etical] List", in which words from his 1920-1921 notes and texts are listed, mostly without glosses, according to the initial element of the stem (Bloomfield 1920-1940). Essentially the same orthography, but with no indication of stress, is found in two early papers, the sketch "The Menomini Language" (Bloomfield 1924) and the "Notes on the Fox Language" (Bloomfield 1925-1927), which cites a number of Menominee forms. In these sources one notable inconsistency that remains is the writing of both <i> and <e> for *e* in initial syllables: <pemä'nihtam> "he notices it" but <pimäskaw> "he goes by" ("Alphab. List"); <eskuahtem> "door" but <iskötäw> "fire" (Bloomfield 1924:341). Otherwise <i> generally corresponds to both *i* and *e*, and <e> to *ε*, except that <e> regularly appears for *e* where this represents the raising of |*ε*|, or of shortened |*ε*·|: <utähpnew> "he takes him up" (Bloomfield 1924:339) — for *ota·hpnew*, reflecting |ota·hpnew| —, which has a final |·en| that is confirmed by forms like <pe'tenāw> "he takes him by mistake" (Bloomfield 1924:338), for *pe'tenew*; <pemātesiw> "he lives" (Bloomfield 1924:336) for *pema·tesew* (|pema·tesew|, with |·ese-|). Segments later written with the morphophoneme |E| appear as <i>: <kēskisam> "he cuts it through" (Bloomfield 1924:339) for *ke·skesam* with final |·Es-|, cf. *pe'tesam* "he cuts it by mistake".

Bloomfield (1925-1927, pt. 1:225) explicitly recognized that the segment written <i> in these early papers represented two entities of some sort. In some elements <i> fails to cause mutation (replacement of preceding *t* by *c* [written <ts>] and of some cases of *n* by *s*), is lengthened to <ī>, and raises preceding <ē> to <ī> and <ō> to <ū>: e.g. in the final meaning "act on a dwelling" in <pihtikew> "he enters" (*pi·htikew*), <unīkāw> "he builds a house" (*oni·kew*). In other elements <i> does cause mutation, is lengthened to <ē>, and does not cause raising: <pēhtsihsin> "he falls in" (*pe·hcehsen*); <nitōsihtun> "I make it" beside <usēhtaw> "he makes it" (*neto·sehton, ose·htaw*). A scrap of an early manuscript treatment

ions accounted for in  
emes |E| and |æ|. The  
e short front vowels,  
deal of variation and  
ε. The phoneme *i* is  
> represents *i*); *e* is  
and <ε> (accented  
is transcription are:  
r *ke'ne'mehsenaw*;  
ehs^N> "his cross-  
w (Bloomfield 1920-

wo short front vow-  
her (short) <e> or  
stitution of <ō> for  
merely the accented  
changes are seen in  
ke'ne'mehsi'naw>;  
<ō'ne'mehs^N>;  
ence, for example,  
actly represents  
'ne'mehsōwā'wan>  
are inconsistencies;  
page for *apē'sek*  
:apā'sik> (Bloom-  
ions that appear to  
riants in particular  
for <e> in printed  
e'taw, puawe'taw>  
40, 1928b:196, 380)  
erent from the very  
nce to spell both the  
hing the texts goes  
field's statement in

Analysis shows that  
ual pronunciation)  
short front-vowel

of Menominee phonology (Bloomfield 1920-1940) has an analysis that corresponds to this transcription using two short front vowels. The <i> that alternates with <ē> is referred to as "i<sup>1</sup>", the <i> that alternates with <ī> is "i<sup>2</sup>", and the <i> that "is a substitute for e [=ε]... and alternates with ā [=ε·]" is "i<sup>3</sup>". The examples of "i<sup>3</sup>" are: <apē'sin> "he is black" (*ape-sen* |ape-sen|) and <pē'htin^m>, <pē'hten^m> "he puts it in" (*pe-htenam* |pe-htenam|). It is evident that this section, with <i> written for the raised realization of <e>, was written before the two early papers in which segments of this type are written consistently with <e>; this serves to date this manuscript treatment to the period between the completion of field work in 1921 and the presentation to the International Congress of Americanists in August, 1924, and for convenience this treatment will be referred to as the early-20s draft. It seems clear that in the two subsequent early papers the generalization of the writing of <e> rather than <i> in these cases is based at least in part on information from morphological alternations and not strictly on phonetic evidence.

In "On the Sound-System of Central Algonquian" (Bloomfield 1925), which was written after these two early papers, Bloomfield writes Menominee with three distinct short front vowels. In this transcription earlier <i> is written <i> if it is "i<sup>1</sup>" but <ι> if it is "i<sup>2</sup>", and <e> is written for <e>, for <i> that was earlier "i<sup>3</sup>", and for most cases of <e> in initial syllables. The differentiation of <i> and <ι> appears to reflect a re-evaluation by Bloomfield of his phonetic record, since he now writes: "M[enominee] ι is in actual pronunciation partly distinct from i and e, for the highest variants (as in French *fini*) are reserved to it" (Bloomfield 1925:134). This transcription and analysis match a manuscript description of Menominee phonology that contains the following section (Bloomfield 1920-1940):

[2] The short vowels are loose.

The three short front vowels are morphologically distinct, but in actual pronunciation appear to be often confused. As a general rule, I seem to hear a vowel of the type of English *pin*.

The highest variants, resembling French *i* in *fini* are reserved for ι: nī'mut *if he dances*. Here I often heard a half-long or long vowel: nīmīt; ne?nūw, ne?nīw *three*.

The *i* varies the least: mēsīt *if he gives it to me*. Only before laryngals a lower variant is common āsīt *the way he does*.

The lowest variants are reserved for e: pemā'tesiw *he lives*. Before laryngals especially low variants occur, with mouth over-open: ne?new *he*

*kills him*. In ge-  
obliterated in a

For convenience this  
20s draft.

Bloomfield used  
in a revised word list,  
"Alphab. List" is org-  
earlier inconsistency i  
lables is eliminated:  
otherwise, normal v  
<pemātesiw> "he liv-  
(the name of one of th  
words that have a lon  
vowel-quantity patter  
you!" beside non-stati  
appear to match exac  
Algonquian" (Bloomfi

At some point z  
changed the symbols  
<e> replaced <i>, <  
for distributional deta  
the one used in *Langu*  
lications.<sup>8</sup> Other detail  
example, is variously i  
colon, raised dot, and i

The late 1930s s  
Menominee that led to  
aration of the manuscr  
lished grammar and w  
Morris Swadesh, then  
doing intermittent fiel  
Bloomfield about the  
Menominee grammar c  
grammar. The section  
and the section on morp  
returned to the field in  
notes, copies of which  
Chicago. Bloomfield se

*kills him.* In general, however, the distinction between *i* and *e* seems to be obliterated in actual pronunciation; thus one hears *pimā'tesiw*, *ne'nīw*.

For convenience this manuscript treatment will be referred to as the late-20s draft.

Bloomfield used the maximally differentiated form of this orthography in a revised word list, a notebook labeled simply "M", which like the earlier "Alphab. List" is organized by initial element (Bloomfield 1920-1940). The earlier inconsistency in the distinction between <i> and <e> in initial syllables is eliminated: in absolute initial <i> rather than <e> is written; otherwise, normal words have <e> and static<sup>7</sup> words have <i>: <pemātesiw> "he lives", but static <mičiw> "still, yet" and <kinipayiat> (the name of one of the Thunderers). This distinction marks as static some words that have a long vowel in the second syllable and hence match the vowel-quantity pattern of non-static words: e.g. static <kiyāp> "away with you!" beside non-static <keyōn> "heart (card)". The transcriptions in "M" appear to match exactly those in the article "The Word-Stems of Central Algonquian" (Bloomfield 1927b).

At some point after the compilation of the "M" list, Bloomfield changed the symbols he used to write Menominee: <i> replaced <ι>, <e> replaced <ι>, <ε> replaced <e>, and <ē> replaced <ā>. Except for distributional details, this orthography of the short front vowels is the one used in *Language* (Bloomfield 1933) and in Bloomfield's later publications.<sup>8</sup> Other details were not yet settled, however. Vowel length, for example, is variously indicated in Bloomfield's later writings by macron, colon, raised dot, and doubling.

The late 1930s saw the beginning of a period of new work on Menominee that led to the final reanalysis of the phonology and the preparation of the manuscripts that directly underlay the posthumously published grammar and word list (Bloomfield 1962, 1975). Sometime in 1937, Morris Swadesh, then at the University of Wisconsin in Madison, began doing intermittent field work on Menominee and corresponding with Bloomfield about the language. Swadesh had access to an unpublished Menominee grammar of Bloomfield's, referred to here as the 1937 draft grammar. The section on phonology he copied, or in places paraphrased, and the section on morphology he had in Bloomfield's own hand.<sup>9</sup> Swadesh returned to the field in the spring of 1938 and collected texts and associated notes, copies of which he forwarded to Bloomfield at the University of Chicago. Bloomfield sent Swadesh two long letters with commentary and

queries derived from Swadesh's texts, and Swadesh sent them back with corrections and comments from his informants (Bloomfield 1938a, 1938b). One of these informants, Amos Striker, had learned to write Menominee in a technical orthography, obviously having been instructed by Swadesh himself,<sup>10</sup> and Striker began a correspondence with Bloomfield that lasted for more than two years. Striker had trouble with preconsonantal *h*, sometimes writing it where it was not and omitting it where it was, and he appears to be the speaker Bloomfield had in mind when he wrote: "I know one younger man who seems never to use [i] but always [e]" (in Hockett 1970:367). Despite these faults, Bloomfield relied on his work and even posed him questions about minimal contrasts. Bloomfield returned to the field himself for "a few days" in September of 1939 (quoted in Teeter 1970b:236, n. 6), checking masses of material and obtaining new texts. Most of this work appears to have been done with Jerome Lawe, "Little Jerome" (in Hockett 1970:154), an excellent speaker who had "served [Bloomfield] as dictionary and grammar" during his 1920-1921 field work (Bloomfield 1928b:xi), but some was done with Striker and others and one text was obtained from Louise Dutchman, "Red-Cloud-Woman" (in Hockett 1970:153; Bloomfield 1928b:xi), also an excellent speaker, who had become "as a mother" to Bloomfield in guiding his speech. Although expected by Striker to return in 1940, Bloomfield never did, and Striker's last letter, written to him in New Haven after his move there in September, 1940, reported in untranslated Menominee the death of Louise Dutchman.

In the 1937 draft grammar the system and distribution of the three short front vowels is as in "M", except that the orthography using <i> <i> <e> has been replaced by the one using, respectively, <i> <e> <e>. Residues of the older orthography, including a number in the draft morphology that are corrected in Bloomfield's hand, indicate that the sections that were copied from in 1937 had been written a number of years earlier.<sup>11</sup> A number of statements quoted or paraphrased by Swadesh provide insight into Bloomfield's thinking about the three short front vowels:

[3] i e e seem to be not always distinct, but [this] may be merely the fault of my ear.

[4] It seems that in most or perhaps all positions, e may be replaced by e. e.g. in pema-tesew he lives, e for e does not seem to occur. e is used in the grammar for e/e.

The problems solved later by setting up the diacritic morphophonemes [E] and [æ] are handled by overtly morphological formulations ordered with

respect to the phonologi

[5] e is replaced by  
tion, etc., but its i  
conjunct mode[:] n  
-e-neht- ... think.  
e.

After a subsequent rule  
alternations subsumed u  
lable replacements:

[6] In some forms:  
nunciation.

The examples of e with  
where it "appears norm  
dental (t, s, or n).<sup>12</sup> (2) I  
"also", <nekt> "one".  
(5) In the inverse and p  
-enaw. Although the re  
cal terms ("Initial e is p  
worded morphological  
nounced -eh").

The vowel system  
(Bloomfield 1939) show  
mar. For one thing ther  
syllables by <e> excep  
(Bloomfield 1939:107, 1  
no longer written differ  
<pemâtesiw> "he li  
<pema-tesew> (1937  
<nekt> and <pemâte  
phonemic forms *nekt* a  
"Menomini Morphophc  
tightened up version of  
ditioned replacements c  
1937 treatment and tha  
later have [æ] are set u  
[n], which is itself a dia  
an equivalent diacritic

respect to the phonological rules. One section covers the cases of  $|\epsilon|$ :

[5]  $\epsilon$  is replaced by  $e$  in certain forms. It nevertheless acts like  $\epsilon$  in contraction, etc., but its lengthened form is  $e$ : -eht- he (passive); suffix of the conjunct mode[:] me-neh if he be given it ... Historically, the  $e$  of - $\epsilon$ -nem-, - $\epsilon$ -neht- ... think, belongs here. It is pronounced  $e$ , and is lengthened to  $e$ .

After a subsequent rule that lengthens vowels under certain conditions, the alternations subsumed under  $|\epsilon|$  are treated, together with some first-syllable replacements:

[6] In some forms a basic short vowel is treated as  $\epsilon$  but is  $e$  in actual pronunciation.

The examples of  $\epsilon$  with this treatment are: (1) In the pronominal prefixes, where it "appears normally as  $e$ " but is  $\epsilon$  before a glottal ( $h$  or  $?$ ) plus a dental ( $t$ ,  $s$ , or  $n$ ).<sup>12</sup> (2) In the first syllable of static particles: e.g. <mesek> "also", <nekt> "one".<sup>13</sup> (3) In word initial. (4) In the locative ending - $eh$ . (5) In the inverse and passive suffix - $\epsilon k$ . (6) And in the first plural suffix - $enaw$ . Although the replacement in (3) is formulated in strictly phonological terms ("Initial  $\epsilon$  is pronounced  $e$ ."), it is included among the similarly worded morphological replacements (e.g. "Suffix - $eh$  locative ... is pronounced - $eh$ ").

The vowel system described in "Menomini Morphophonemics" (Bloomfield 1939) shows several changes from that of the 1937 draft grammar. For one thing there is the addition of a rule that replaces  $|\epsilon|$  in first syllables by < $e$ > except before clusters of < $h$ > or < $?$ > plus a consonant (Bloomfield 1939:107, 115).<sup>14</sup> As a result, static words and other words are no longer written differently; for the earlier static <nikut> "one" beside <pemâtesiw> "he lives" ("M"), and equivalent <nekt> beside <pema-tesew> (1937 phonology), "Menomini Morphophonemics" has <nekt> and <pemâtesew>, with the first vowels the same, as in the later phonemic forms *nekt* and *pema-tesew* (basic  $|\text{pema-tesew}|$ ). Nevertheless "Menomini Morphophonemics" appears to be essentially a reworked and tightened up version of the 1937 draft grammar. The morphologically conditioned replacements of  $\epsilon$  by  $e$  are handled in a way that falls between the 1937 treatment and that of the published grammar. The morphemes that later have  $|\epsilon|$  are set up with  $|\epsilon|$  followed by a cluster with first member  $|\text{n}|$ , which is itself a diacritic morphophoneme.<sup>15</sup> Those later with  $|\epsilon|$  have an equivalent diacritic morphophoneme  $|\text{ɔ}|$ . A rule replaces  $|\epsilon|$  by  $e$

before an  $|nC|$  cluster. Then, after the operation of the vowel-lengthening rules,  $|\text{ə}|$  is replaced by  $e$  in a second set of morphemes.<sup>16</sup>

The innovations in "Menomini Morphophonemics" (Bloomfield 1939) as compared to the 1937 draft grammar relate to topics that were under discussion between Swadesh and Bloomfield in the spring of 1938, when the 1937 draft was still the point of reference. It is possible that Bloomfield's return to the use of abstract diacritic morphophonemes was stimulated by his discussions with Swadesh. Swadesh's role in promoting the use of morphophonemes rather than lists in the description of synchronic alternations is well known from the milestone article "A Problem in Phonological Alternation" (Swadesh and Voegelin 1939), in which Swadesh says he "learned the use of formulae in synchronic phonology from Sapir" in working on Nootka (cf. Sapir and Swadesh 1939:11, 235-334). In 1938 Swadesh sent Bloomfield a table in which he had arranged the patterns involving  $e$  and  $\epsilon$  and assigned numbers to the four entities thus defined, which he referred to as "vowel morphophomes". In a letter, Swadesh urged that the treatment of the two irregular patterns be brought together, suggesting the possibility of "a morphophome which has some of the characteristics of  $\epsilon$  ( $e$ ) and some of  $e$  ( $i$ )" (Swadesh 1938), and Bloomfield did in fact adopt a solution using morphophonemes. In any event, "Menomini Morphophonemics" was the reworking of an earlier analysis using ideas of synchronic phonology that were coming into favor at the time was written. On a smaller point, Bloomfield's decision to write uniformly  $\langle e \rangle$  instead of  $\langle \epsilon \rangle$  in the first syllables of normal words (except before  $hC$  and  ${}^?C$ ) may reflect Swadesh's views on the phonetics of these vowels, based on his field work, as this innovation corresponds to Swadesh's field orthography (which shows  $[e]$  and  $[i]$  here) but is not found in Bloomfield's earlier materials.

Bloomfield's comments on the transcriptions in Swadesh's texts reveal his view of the problem of the Menominee short front vowels as well as his approach to dealing with it (Bloomfield 1938a, 1938b):

[7] You and I agree remarkably well in the way we take things — to some extent even as to our errors (if such they are).

Swadesh's "morphophomes" are discussed by numbers (their morphophonemic equivalents in the published grammar are: 1 =  $|e|$ , 2 =  $|\text{æ}|$ , 3 =  $|E|$ , and 4 =  $|\epsilon|$ ; to these Bloomfield adds 5 =  $|e|$  in prefixes, and 6 =  $|i|$ ):<sup>17</sup>

[8] [W]e are left with problems: to what extent is (4) Medial  $\epsilon$  phonetically

realized as  $e$ ? I still difference, such that that (1, 2) differ always differ from the rest? It differs in timbre from overlap in actual phonology and on the other hand which could be fulfilling each form many times

Several comments on Swadesh's familiarity with the language edge as a member of the transcription of words:

[9] [Swadesh recording] *syrup*: I can hardly be

[10] *kanew soon*, at a hear also *kaniw*. I remembering a road) by k

[11] as *tiki-set when h* I am not sure about realized that I understood saying of me  $\epsilon$ -ses-n because I had not grasped

[12]  $ka-{}^?weket{:}$  I [[r

The last piece of the puzzle fall into place was the detection of a vowel syllable, if not following as Rule 64, after the seditic that treats it (Bloomfield 1938). Bloomfield was writing to recordings attested its "tete-{}^?tepaha-n AN is my after rehearing the word, Bloomfield suggests the transcription and Swadesh notes that the Swadesh makes the same ohta-teset that from which such cases the transcription

realized as *e*? I still suspect that there may be some constant qualitative difference, such that (1, 2, 3) differ always from (4), or else perhaps such that (1, 2) differ always from (3, 4). Similarly, to what extent does (6) *i* differ from the rest? I strongly suspect that it always, in actual production, differs in timbre from the rest. On the other hand, if (4) [or (3, 4)] does overlap in actual phonetic shape on the one hand with (1, 2, 3) [or (1, 2)] and on the other hand with (6), then we have the task of distinguishing, which could be fulfilled only by a close familiarity with the language (hearing each form many times to see whether *e* or *i* ever occurred in it).<sup>18</sup>

Several comments on Swadesh's recordings attest to Bloomfield's "close familiarity with the language" and to his relying on his internalized knowledge as a member of the speech community to determine the correct transcription of words:

[9] [Swadesh recorded <se-wa-kamite-w>:] se-wa-kamete-w *maple syrup*: I can hardly be wrong, as I heard it at meals over and over again.

[10] kanew *soon, at a near point in time*; so also to my ear; but I seem to hear also kaniw. I remember once being stopped from a false act (we were mending a road) by kani kani kani! *wait a moment!*

[11] as tiki-set *when he was embarrassed, ashamed (bashful)*: should be te-. I am not sure about the last vowel, but think *e* is correct. Before they realized that I understood more than I could speak, I overheard my hostess saying of me *ε-ses-mama-če?taw teki-sew he is bashful like an Indian, because I had not grabbed more than my share of a dainty*.<sup>19</sup>

[12] ka-?weket[:] I [[noted]] recall this name as ka-?wekit.<sup>20</sup>

The last piece of the analysis of the Menominee short front vowels to fall into place was the determination that |*ε*| was raised to *e* after a long-vowel syllable, if not followed by *ʔ*, *h*, *w*, or *y*. This rule may be referred to as Rule 64, after the section of Bloomfield's chapter on morphophonemics that treats it (Bloomfield 1962:96). It still had not been formulated when Bloomfield was writing to Swadesh in June of 1938, though Swadesh's recordings attested its operation. For example, Bloomfield wrote, "tete-?tepaħa-n AN is my notion of the word for *barrel*", and Swadesh, after rehearing the word, added the annotation, "tete-?tepaħa-n barrel"; Bloomfield suggests the transcription "ana-mehewa-hteħon *cross (obv)*", and Swadesh notes that the second <*ε*> is pronounced [e] by Striker;<sup>21</sup> Swadesh makes the same annotation to the <*ε*> of Bloomfield's "aw-ohħa-teħet *that from which he will derive benefit*" (Bloomfield 1938b). In all such cases the transcription used by Swadesh is the one eventually adopted

by Bloomfield. This raising rule does not, however, appear in "Menomini Morphophonemics", which has such transcriptions as: <ē?tek> "that which is in place", <matā?nem> "nasty cur", <kawēwēpenew> "he flings him prostrate", <enōhnet> "if he walks thither or thus" (Bloomfield 1939:108, 109). Apparently Bloomfield became convinced of the accuracy of Swadesh's recordings on this point only after his return from the field in 1939.

It seems likely that a significant element in the working out of Rule 64 was the final determination of the details of a second rule, which turned out to interact with it in a significant way. This second rule is the mid-vowel raising rule, which raises |e·| to i·, |o·| to u·, and |o| before ? to u if a high vowel or a postconsonantal semivowel follows in the same word; it may conveniently be referred to as Rule 66 (Bloomfield 1962:96-97).<sup>22</sup> The earliest formulation of Rule 66 is in the early-20s draft. Although Bloomfield's phonetic recordings show a great deal of variation between mid and high long vowels in the same or related words, this first formulation mentions no systematic exceptions but simply notes that "Violations of the rule occur: kēwi' ^nāw for usual kīwi' ^nāw *he leads him home*" (Bloomfield 1920-1940). A version of this formulation, without mention of exceptions, is in "On the Sound-System of Central Algonquian" (Bloomfield 1925:134, 136). The 1937 draft contains the qualification: "Sometimes this fails to occur when an open vowel intervenes, e.g. ke-waskepi-w" (above the <e·> and linked to it by a bracket is <i·>; Swadesh 1937-1938). In "Menomini Morphophonemics" this becomes: "This alternation sometimes fails to take place in long words: kēwaskepiw beside kīwaskepiw *he is drunk*" (Bloomfield 1939:115). This view of Rule 66, as regularly taking place in the stated environment but sometimes exceptionally (for whatever reason) not operating, is what is reflected by the transcriptions in the wordlist "M": all words are given in a normative form with the raising indicated, except that <ō> is always kept in the onomatopoeic roots <ōhōh-> "calling out" and <ōhōp-> "whooping" (cf. Bloomfield 1962:97).

A word which illustrates both raising rules and their interaction is the name of the myth character Bead-Man, which Bloomfield had the opportunity to hear again a number of times in 1939 while recording from Jerome Lawe the myth in which this character appears (Bloomfield 1920-1940, S73-81). Bloomfield transcribed the first occurrence of this name in the myth as <me-kehsi?neniw> (with the <ε> changed from <e>), the second occurrence as <mi-kehsi·?neniwan> (an obviative; the second <ε> is

changed from <e>), and <me·kehsi·?neniw>. In <mi·kehsi·?neniw>, w alternative possibility) earlier <ε>; in his <me·kehsi·?neniw>, v published grammar and |me·kehse?neniw|; it "wampum bead" and |εneniw|, which proved it shows the operation second, and the operation first. The i· in the third lengthening to |e·| and the first syllable is blocked in the penult does not block after the preceding long vowel would have required blocking the raising of the mid vowel in the 1937 draft) long vowels could not be recognized as phonemic.

Rule 64 and the first mid vowels) were only 1939 field trip and obvious words that attested the validity of the rules to his mind. The recordings in violation of Rule 66 as witnessed in "washes his hands", <me·kehse?neniw> "the Bead-Man" (also, however, belied by the corresponding items. For example, at the field trip, has <uko·'hkumiti·'hs ^n> suppressed in the <kuhkümetuh> "sock" in the 1937 draft: <ku

appear in "Menomini  
as: <ēʔtek> "that  
awēwēpenew> "he  
or thus" (Bloomfield  
need of the accuracy  
turn from the field in

working out of Rule 64  
ule, which turned out  
ule is the mid-vowel  
o| before ʔ to u if a  
in the same word; it  
ld 1962:96-97).<sup>22</sup> The  
ft. Although Bloom-  
ion between mid and  
rst formulation men-  
Violations of the rule  
i home" (Bloomfield  
tion of exceptions, is  
Bloomfield 1925:134,  
metimes this fails to  
skēpi-w" (above the  
937-1938). In "Meno-  
ion sometimes fails to  
skēpiw he is drunk"  
ularly taking place in  
(for whatever reason)  
s in the wordlist "M";  
ing indicated, except  
ōhōh-> "calling out"

their interaction is the  
nfield had the oppor-  
ecording from Jerome  
nfield 1920-1940, S73-  
s name in the myth as  
>), the second occur-  
he second <ε> is

changed from <e>), and then all the rest of the occurrences in the myth as  
<me·kεhsi·ʔneniw>. In his first fair copy he normalized this throughout to  
<mi·kεhsi·ʔneniw>, with <e> written above the <ε> (suggesting an  
alternative possibility) and the <e> in the penult changed from an  
earlier <ε>; in his second fair copy he normalized the form to  
<me·kεhsi·ʔneniw>, which is the transcription *me·kεhsi·ʔneniw* of his  
published grammar and word list. The underlying form of this word is  
|me·kεhseʔneniw|; it consists of the stem of *me·kes* (pl. *me·kεhsak*)  
"wampum bead" and a final related to *enē·niw* "man" (underlying  
|enēniw|, which proves the underlying |ε| of the penult). As finally trans-  
cribed it shows the operation of Rule 64 in the fourth syllable but not in the  
second, and the operation of Rule 66 in the third syllable but not in the  
first. The *i* in the third syllable represents an |e| that has undergone  
lengthening to |e·| and been raised by the *i* in the last syllable, but the *e* in  
the first syllable is blocked from being raised by the intervening ε. The |ε|  
in the penult does not block the raising of *i* because it has been raised to *e*  
after the preceding long vowel. To establish the normal form of this word  
would have required both the recognition of the role of ε and ε· in block-  
ing the raising of the mid vowels (a correlation recognized but stated differ-  
ently in the 1937 draft) and the conclusion that the raising of |ε| to *e* after  
long vowels could not be subsumed under surface variation but must be re-  
cognized as phonemic.

Rule 64 and the final form of Rule 66 (with systematic blocking by the  
mid vowels) were only formulated by Bloomfield after his return from his  
1939 field trip and obviously could not be checked against a rehearing of the  
words that attested these processes. Rather, having established the regular-  
ity of the rules to his satisfaction, Bloomfield rewrote his corpus accord-  
ingly. The recordings in "M" had been normalized to fit the earlier formula-  
tion of Rule 66 as without systematic exceptions: <kesiʔnināhēiw> "he  
washes his hands", <mūnihpeniw> "he digs potatoes", <mikehsiʔnentiw>  
"the Bead-Man" (also Bloomfield 1927b:397). This uniformity was, how-  
ever, belied by the consistent absence of raising in some individual lexical  
items. For example, an early word list, probably compiled after the 1920  
field trip, has <kuhku:ʔmiti:h> "sock", with raising, but  
<uko:hkumiti:ʔhs^h> "his socks", without raising. This peculiarity was  
suppressed in the normative transcription of "M", which has  
<kuhkūmetih> "sock", <nikūhkumeti:h> "my sock", but it reappears later  
in the 1937 draft: <kohku-meti:h> "sock", <keko:hkumeti:h-san> "your

socks" (Bloomfield 1920-1940, 1937).<sup>23</sup> Such a pair of words, which given the meaning are likely to have been among those whose shapes were firmly established in Bloomfield's mind, may well have played a rôle in his thinking about rules 64 and 66. After the final formulation of these rules, the forms of the word for "sock" could be understood as *kohku-metih*, *neko-hkomεti-h(san)*, with |ε| blocking the raising in the possessed forms but itself raised, and hence not blocking, after the long vowel in the unpossessed form. The remaining words of those just cited from "M" were rewritten as *kese-?nenε-hciw* "he washes his hands" and *mo-nehpεni-w* "he digs potatoes" (Bloomfield 1975:85, 136).

The existence of exceptions to Rule 66 is mentioned, including exceptions to the blocking by mid vowels (Bloomfield 1962:96-97), but there is no systematic account of these exceptions and no indication in the published record of which lexical items they occur in. From the perspective of the norm, these exceptions are deviations that fall outside the range of phenomena that are to be systematically described. There are indications, however, that at least some of the exceptions are not simply random fluctuation and inconsistency. For example, in eliciting a list of verb stems containing the root *kese-?n-* "wash" followed by various body-part medials, Bloomfield recorded this root with the raised vowel <ɪ'> in the stems that had a following raising environment even when there was an intervening mid vowel (Bloomfield 1920-1940, 8:12): <ninawkisi' ?nine'hcim> "I am going to wash my hands" (as if *nenaw-kesi-?nenε-hcim*). The exceptional raising in this root reappears in the original typed version of the *Menominee Lexicon*, in which the normative generalization of raising found in "M" is otherwise undone to conform to the final formulation of rule 66: <kese-?nenε-hciw> "he washes his hands", <kese-?nenε-hkiw> "he washes his armpits"; cf. in the same source, with raising blocked, <mo-nehpεni-w> "he digs potatoes". Despite Bloomfield's subsequent hesitation,<sup>24</sup> this fact suggests that this exceptional raising is a real feature that was known to Bloomfield but ultimately not accounted for in his description.

There are also recordings that suggest that exceptional raising may be caused by certain morphemes. One of these is the suffix complex *-heii* (making verbs of collective action from animate intransitives): manuscript <as pūsihe'titua?> "when they embark together" (Bloomfield 1920-1940, 1:64), printed as <as pū'sihe'titua?> (Bloomfield 1928b:8) and kept as *pu-sihεtitua?* (Bloomfield 1962:507) instead of normatively correct as

*po:seh?titua'* (cf. Bloomfield 1920-1940, 1937) "dwelt together" (Swadesh <as wi-kehεtitua?> by B <ki> (Bloomfield 1938a) 1975:275).<sup>25</sup> Another is *-heii* derives agent nouns in *-heii* (Bloomfield 1928b:16), *-heii* (Bloomfield 1928b:16), *-heii* (Bloomfield 1962:278); <muwε-hkew> with the <u> corrected to <u> and the whole rewritten and normalized to *mo-wε-hki*.

The formulation of rule 66 is the result of the coming out of the transcription system, which first appeared in 1938-1940. In addition to the rewriting of the published record, there were also changes in the words and morphemes, both in 1938-1940. One set of changes affected the second syllable of some words, the word for "tree, stick" showing the same pattern of raising: <me' ?tik> (Bloomfield 1924:340); <me' ?tik> (Bloomfield 1925:139), <me' ?tek> (Bloomfield 1925:139); <me' ?tek> (Swadesh 1938:139) show the same pattern of raising. In Bloomfield 1920-1940, early-2 "M"), *ne ?nemεh* (Bloomfield 1920-1940, "M"), *ne ?nema-w* (Bloomfield 1920-1940, "M"), *me ?nekεn* (Bloomfield 1920-1940, "M"), *me ?nekεn*. This set of words suggests that the raising is a phonetic feature; in all these words the raising is expected Menominee <ε> treated differently by Bloomfield. A number of trans-



of words, which given those shapes were firmly fixed a rôle in his thinking of these rules, the word as *kohku-meth*, in the possessed forms the vowel in the unpossessed from "M" were rewritten as *no-nehp-eni-w* "he digs

oned, including exceptions (96-97), but there is no variation in the published transcription from the perspective of the outside the range of the vowel. There are indications, however, of simply random fluctuations of verb stems containing body-part medials, such as *<ī'>* in the stems that there was an intervening *si'ni-ne'hcim* "I am *cim*". The exceptional transcription of the *Menominee* *si'ni-ne'hcim* is missing found in "M" is a violation of rule 66: *si'ni-ne'hcim* "he with raising blocked, Bloomfield's subsequent transcription is a real feature accounted for in his

optional raising may be a suffix complex *-hēti* (transitives); manuscript Bloomfield 1920-1940, 28b:8) and kept as *as* (presumably correct as

*po-sēh'itua'* (cf. Bloomfield 1975:225); *<as wi-kiē-tetua?>* "when they dwelt together" (Swadesh text; Bloomfield 1920-1940, Q6), normalized to *<as wi-keh-etitua?>* by Bloomfield and then reheard by Swadesh as having *<ki>* (Bloomfield 1938a), for normative *as we-keh-etitua?* (cf. Bloomfield 1975:275).<sup>25</sup> Another is *-hki* (which makes verbs of habitual action and derives agent nouns in *-hkiw*): *<saki'puwā'hkiw>* "he is a great biter" (Bloomfield 1928b:16), normalized to *<sake-powē-hkiw>* (Bloomfield 1962:278); *<muwē-hkew>* "cannibal monster" (Striker text, consistently), with the *<u>* corrected to *<u->* by Swadesh (Bloomfield 1920-1940, Q41) and the whole rewritten *<mu-we-hkiw>* by Bloomfield (1920-1940, S46), normalized to *mo-we-hkiw* (Bloomfield 1975:286).

The formulation of rules 64 and 66 was the last major step in the working out of the transcription of Menominee used in the published description, which first appeared in print in 1941 (Bloomfield 1941, 1962, 1975).<sup>26</sup> In addition to the rewritings made necessary by the final form of these rules, there were also changes in the transcription of a number of individual words and morphemes, based on new information obtained from speakers in 1938-1940. One set of these changes involved the short front vowel in the second syllable of some words having *ε*<sup>2C</sup> in the first syllable. For example, the word for "tree, stick, wood" was first transcribed with two different vowels: *<me'etik>* (Bloomfield 1920-1940, "Alphab. list"), *<me'tik>* (Bloomfield 1924:340); then with both vowels the same: *<me'tekwak>* pl. (Bloomfield 1925:139), *<me'tek>* (Bloomfield 1920-1940, "M"), *<me'tek>* (Bloomfield 1939:113); and finally again with the vowels different: *me'tek* (Swadesh 1937-1938; Bloomfield 1962:114). Other words show the same pattern of change: *<ne'ni'meh>* "my cross-niece" (Bloomfield 1920-1940, early-20s list), *<ne'nemeh>* (Bloomfield 1920-1940, "M"), *ne'nemeh* (Bloomfield 1962:384);<sup>27</sup> *<ne'nima:w>* "tobacco" (Bloomfield 1920-1940, early-20s list), *<ne'nemāw>* (Bloomfield 1920-1940, "M"), *ne'nema-w* (Bloomfield 1962:248); *<me'nikin>* "he is big" (Bloomfield 1920-1940, "Alphab. List"), *<me'neken>* (Bloomfield 1920-1940, "M"), *me'neken* (Bloomfield 1962:311). The parallel treatment of this set of words suggests that the successive rewritings do not reflect separate decisions about phonetic detail but successive reanalyses of a systematic nature; in all these words *e* in the second syllable replaces an historically expected Menominee *ε*. Other words of similar shape were, however, treated differently by Bloomfield (cf. Hockett 1981:61).

A number of transcriptional changes indicated in Bloomfield's 1939

field notes involve *i* and *i*·, sounds which he had tended to mishear or confuse (ex. 2). For example, his notes record *ona-wanik* "redsquirrel", with double-underlined *i* (matching Bloomfield 1962:270), correcting the earlier recording as (exceptional) *ona-wani·k* (Bloomfield 1939:115; still uncorrected in Bloomfield 1962:252, 442, 1975:177).<sup>28</sup>

The normative transcription of Menominee words that Bloomfield arrived at he described as "the normal form which they have for most speakers" (Bloomfield 1962:2). As late as June, 1938, in discussing Swadesh's recordings, he had entertained the possibility that the apparent phonetic overlap of the Menominee short front vowels was due to imperfect perception (ex. 8), but by the time he wrote his letter to Bloch in December, 1940, he was persuaded that the overlapping was phonetically real.<sup>29</sup> The fact that the uniform and consistent community norm was at least in part a construction arrived at by linguistic analysis and was not directly observable is clear not only from the history of its formulation but also from data in the primary record that are inconsistent with it. This is, of course, inevitably true about many facts regarding variation if the descriptive framework used treats the object of linguistic description as by definition uniform.

\* \* \*

The rôle of the recognition of community norms in the description of language is also evident in Bloomfield's account and documentation of the use of the obviative in Menominee. An early statement is the following (Bloomfield 1920-1940):

[13] If two *animate* objects of the *third person* are referred to in a possessed noun, in a verb, or, often, in a sentence, then one of them enters into a special category, that of the *obviative* or subsidiary third person....

The obv is not strictly carried over from sentence to sentence, or even from clause to clause; yet it often serves in extended expressions....

One says indifferently, *He came and sat down where he (another person) was sitting*:

*pis-unā'piw inis inuh as apē't* (not obv.)

*pis-unā'piw inis ani'nuh as apē'nit* (obv)

though the latter is felt as the more graceful and sensible locution. Not uncommon are such expressions as *a-pī'w inuh k[im]ē'wʌn wē'ʌn* that *wife of Kinewan's is coming*, where verb and particle are not obviative, although *wē'wʌn* *his wife* is necessarily so; less clumsy is *a-pī'wʌn anuh kimē'wʌn wē'wʌn*.

In the first pair of examples [i.e. non-obviative] *cam* (prox.), <as apē't> "v (obv.)", <as apē'nit> "v <a-pī'w> "she (prox.) v "Rain (prox.)", <wē'w/ (obv.) will come", <anu failure to use the obviative is labeled "slightly clumsy like the second are described

[14] A very common when the discourse outset named as a p in obviative form. | logical utterance; | one will leave the v

Elsewhere Bloomfield was as to obviation" (Bloomfield 1920-1940). In one fragment described to the artificiality (cf. in Hockett 1970:155)

[15] Clumsy speakers tend to give up obviative appears more extensive owing to the slow locution for my benefit

This observation helps to explain some proximates to the emendation of this beginning of which Bloomfield (1920-1940: 8:12):

[16] *uhsē'mehsʌn*

Literally: "His younger brother died." (<*uhsē'nipu'ah*> "he (prox.) came (prox.) was".) The subject of the published texts (Bloomfield 1920-1940: 8:12):

In the first pair of examples the words are: <pis-unā'piw> "he (proximate [i.e. non-obviative]) came and sat down", <inis> "there", <inuh> "that (prox.)", <as apē't> "where he (prox.) was sitting"; <ani'nuh> "this (obv.)", <as apē'nit> "where he (obv.) was sitting". The second pair has: <a-pī'w> "she (prox.) will come", <inuh> "that (prox.)", <kimē'w^n> "Rain (prox.)", <wē'w^n> "his (prox.) wife (obv.)"; <a-pī'w^n> "she (obv.) will come", <anuh> "this (obv.)".<sup>30</sup> In the published grammar the failure to use the obviative for the second third person in cases like the first is labeled "slightly clumsy and less urbane, but not unusual", and the cases like the second are described as follows (Bloomfield 1962:40):

[14] A very common replacement of obviative forms by proximate occurs when the discourse centers round an animate third person who is at the outset named as a possession of another person and therefore is necessarily in obviative form. [The variant using the obviatives] represents a neat and logical utterance: less deliberately and less urbanely, but often enough, one will leave the verb and the pronoun in proximate form[.]

Elsewhere Bloomfield writes of such a case: "Occasionally there is discord as to obviation" (Bloomfield 1962:466).

In one fragment dating to the mid-1930s, some lapses of obviation are ascribed to the artificial conditions of field work (Bloomfield 1920-1940; cf. in Hockett 1970:155):

[15] Clumsy speakers get tangled in the use of the obviative; all speakers tend to give up obviation as soon as the context widens out. This, however, appears more extensively in my texts than it does in ordinary speech, owing to the slow pace of dictation and, with some informants, to simplification for my benefit.

This observation helps to explain why Bloomfield felt justified in emending some proximates to the corresponding obviatives in his texts. An example of this emendation is found in a text dictated by Louise Dutchman, the beginning of which Bloomfield recorded as follows (Bloomfield 1920-1940, 8:12):

[16] uhsē'mehs^n kēsni'pu'ah, inē'niw kēsāwew.

Literally: "His younger sibling died; he was a man."; freely: "His younger brother died." (<uhsē'mehs^n> "his younger sibling (obv.)", <kēs-ni'pu'ah> "he (prox.) died", <inē'niw> "man (prox.)", <kēsāwew> "he (prox.) was".) The subsequent sentences are about the younger brother. In the published texts (Bloomfield 1928b:24) this appears as:

[17] uhsé'mchsΛn kē's-nipōn; inā'niw kēs-ā'wew.

Here <kēsni pu'ah> "he (prox.) died" has been emended to <kē's-nipōn> "he (obv.) died", so that the shift from obviative to proximate takes place between clauses rather than within a clause.<sup>31</sup> The obviation discord in the original first clause is precisely a case of the type described by Bloomfield in the second pair of examples in (13) and in (14) as "not uncommon" and even "very common", and it was used by a speaker who was, by his own account, perhaps the very best that he worked with. Nevertheless, the emendation of the text to conform to the perceived norm evidently took precedence over documenting the use of this construction by a good speaker.

Normative emendation of the use of the obviative is extensive in a passage first recorded as follows from a text dictated by John V. Satterlee (Bloomfield 1920-1940, 1:48):

[18] unēkihiku'māwak kēs misāhkatawe'hew unici'jonasowā'wan asawihkihtūkua? awēnim jōh mama'ci'tawī'tuwa? ini? ak'ē'sis sawēnēmikō'wesit inuh mēsahkatē'wet. ini? teh ajāwīk asaw kēs masā'pahtΛh misik teh napā'n as minu'opahtah. ini? wojī'hkihtuk ajūm mēsahkatē'wet kispin aki'koh awetok'ok aspēc nātamo'k'ut.

(*one-kehekomawak* "parents (prox.)", *ke-s-mesa-hkatēwe-he-w* "he (prox.) made them (obv.) fast", *oni-cianehsowa-wan* "their children (obv.)", *as a-wi-hkihtokua?* "so that they (prox.) would gain it", *aw-enem-yo-h-mama-ce'tawetua?* "whereby they (prox.) would be somebody in the future"; *ene?* "that is", *a-ke-s-es-sawē-nemeko-weset* "how he (prox.) would have been blessed (by manitous)", *enoh* "that (prox.)", *mē-sahkatē-we-t* "one who (prox.) fasts"; *ene?* "that is", *teh* "and", *aya-wek* "how it is", *as aw-ke-s-masa-pahtah* "that he (prox.) may have seen an evil vision", *mesek* "also", *teh* "and", *na-pa-n* "on the other hand", *as-menuapahtah* "that he (prox.) see a good vision"; *ene?* "that is", *wayi-hkihtok* "what he (prox.) gains", *ayom* "this (prox.)", *mē-sahkatē-we-t* "one who (prox.) fasts", *ki-spen* "if", *akekoh* "these (prox.)", *awē-tokak* "manitous (prox.)", *as pē-c-na-tamakot* "they (obv.) properly help him (prox.)".) "Parents made their children fast so that they (the children) would gain the means to be somebody in the future. That is the blessing that would have been granted to the one who fasted. And that is how it is, whether he would have seen an evil vision or he sees a good vision. That is what this one who fasts gains, if he is really helped by these manitous".

The published version of this passage follows (Bloomfield 1928:4):

[19] unē'kihē'kuma  
as a-wī'hkihtunik  
nimikō'wesit inuh  
pahtah misik teh na  
sahkΛtāwā't, kī'spit

In the first sentence, the changed from proximate (*mama-ce'tawenet*) to agr this case is comparable to noun phrase "these manitous" (*anenoh awē-tokan*). Here there can be no post construction because of the has exactly the obviative course situation; it is only normative expectation.

Other usages besides Bloomfield observed that had a special quotative ir lapse into non-quotatives story sound as though he (1970:155). Such a speaker dictation of the tale "The field 1920-1940, 1:106-110 the non-quotatives have described norm: e.g. m (1:106) printed as <wāwē (Bloomfield 1928b:574)."

The worst Menominee was a man he referred to. His vocabulary is small; sentences on a few throat inflections were apparent from him. For example, ablaut in stem-initial syllables but these forms were primitive <ini? inā'cimit> (E anā'tsimit) "that is how I

[19] unē'kihē'kumawak kēs-misā'hk<sup>^</sup>tewāhā'w<sup>^</sup>k unītsi'<sup>^</sup>nehsuwā'wan  
 as a-wī'hkihtunik aw-inim-jōh-m<sup>^</sup>mā'tsi'<sup>?</sup>tawinit. ini'<sup>?</sup> a-kēs-is-sawā'-  
 nimikō'wesit inuh mā'sahk<sup>^</sup>tā'wāt; ini'<sup>?</sup> tāh ayā'wik as a-kēs-m<sup>^</sup>sā'-  
 pahtah misik teh napā'n as minu'<sup>^</sup>pahtah; ini'<sup>?</sup> wayī'hkihtuk ayum mā'-  
 sahk<sup>^</sup>tāwā't, kī'spin ani'nuh awā'tuk<sup>^</sup>n as pā'ts-nā'tam<sup>^</sup>'kut.<sup>32</sup>

In the first sentence, the subject inflection of the last two verbs has been changed from proximate to obviative (*as a-wi-hkihtonek; aw-enem-yo-h-mama-ce<sup>?</sup>tawenet*) to agree with the anaphoric referent "their children"; this case is comparable to (16) and (17). In the last sentence the subject noun phrase "these manitous" has been changed from proximate to obviative (*anenoh awē-tokan*) to agree with the inflection of the following verb. Here there can be no possibility that the narrator has lost the thread of the construction because of the conditions of dictation, since the following verb has exactly the obviative-on-proximate inflection appropriate to the discourse situation; it is only the noun inflection that is out of line with the normative expectation.

Other usages besides lapses in obviation were normalized in the texts. Bloomfield observed that, although the statements in a traditional narrative had a special quotative inflection on all predicates, a "bad speaker... may lapse into non-quotatives for whole sentences at a time, which make the story sound as though he had been present when it took place" (in Hockett 1970:155). Such a speaker was evidently Joseph Satterlee, whose original dictation of the tale "The Frog-Prince" generally lacks quotatives (Bloomfield 1920-1940, 1:106-110). In the published edition of this text, however, the non-quotatives have been replaced by quotatives to accord with the described norm: e.g. manuscript <wāwē'kiw> (Bloomfield 1920-1940, 1:106) printed as <wāwē'kiwin> "she was dwelling somewhere (quot.)" (Bloomfield 1928b:574).<sup>33</sup>

The worst Menominee speaker singled out for comment by Bloomfield was a man he referred to as "White-Thunder"; "his Menominee is atrocious. His vocabulary is small; his inflections are often barbarous; he constructs sentences on a few threadbare models" (in Hockett 1970:154). His deviant inflections were apparently not retained in the edition of the text obtained from him. For example, he several times omitted initial change, the vowel ablaut in stem-initial syllables that characterizes certain verbal categories, but these forms were printed with the initial change of the norm: manuscript <ini'<sup>?</sup> inā'cimit> (Bloomfield 1920-1940, B3:38-39), printed as <ini'<sup>?</sup> ānā'tsimit> "that is how he told the story; that is the story he told" (Bloom-

ded to <kē's-nipōn>  
 proximate takes place  
 obviation discord in the  
 cited by Bloomfield in  
 not uncommon" and  
 who was, by his own  
 nevertheless, the emen-  
 evidently took prece-  
 y a good speaker.

is extensive in a pas-  
 by John V. Satterlee

unici'jonasowā'wan  
 va?<sup>?</sup> ini'<sup>?</sup> ak<sup>wē</sup>'sis  
 i ajāwik asaw kēs  
 ? wōjī'hkihtuk ajūm  
 umo'kut.

hkatēwē·he·w "he  
 van "their children  
 gain it", aw-enem-  
 be somebody in the  
 t "how he (prox.)  
 h "that (prox.)";  
 at is", teh "and",  
 e (prox.) may have  
 "on the other hand",  
 i"; ene<sup>?</sup> "that is",  
 i "this (prox.)";  
 'if", akekoh "these  
 makot "they (obv.)  
 ren fast so that they  
 i the future. That is  
 ho fasted. And that  
 r he sees a good vis-  
 ily helped by these

Bloomfield 1928:4)



phonology suggests that he regarded consideration of these questions as a fit object of inquiry. In this he differed from those for whom only the linguist's final explanatory statements have validity. Such views are harmless when held by linguists who study well documented languages but have potentially disastrous consequences for the scientific knowledge of poorly known languages, for which inevitably the documentation and the analysis largely coincide. Surely, then, Bloomfield's decision to publish his Menominee texts before completing his analysis was correct. The fundamental task of the linguist must be to establish texts. Each age will write its own grammars, but the texts are for all time. It is regrettable, then, that texts are the most neglected of the three components of a linguistic documentation: grammar, texts, and lexicon. Even those in the American tradition who have published texts have had little to say about what texts are or should be either in principle or in particular cases, and the methodology of text editing receives almost no explicit discussion. Neither "texts" (as documentation) nor "editing" are topics in standard textbooks (Bloomfield 1933; Hockett 1958; Gleason 1961).<sup>34</sup>

\* \* \*

It is not possible to draw a sharp line of demarcation between Bloomfield's synchronic and diachronic studies of Algonquian. His most lucid and attractive writings are ones in which he takes a frankly comparative approach to descriptive problems, using data from his four principal languages: "The Word-Stems of Central Algonquian" (Bloomfield 1927b), which even after his later treatments remains the most accessible introduction to Algonquian stem derivation, and "Proto-Algonquian *-i-t-* 'Fellow'" (Bloomfield 1941), an unaccountably neglected article that deserves to be considered a classic of expository descriptive technique. In his early descriptive work, such as "The Menomini Language" (Bloomfield 1924, *passim*), "Notes on the Fox Language" (Bloomfield 1925-1927, pt. 1:221-227, 229, pt. 2:184), and some manuscript treatments of Menominee (ex. 5), Bloomfield freely introduced comparative data in explanatory asides. The first presentation of the phonological rules of Menominee was as historical sound laws (Bloomfield 1924), and the famous disclaimer in "Menomini Morphophonemics" asserting the ahistoricity of basic forms and descriptive order should be read with that in mind.<sup>35</sup> There can be no question that knowledge of Algonquian comparative phonology gave Bloom-

field valuable hints for his description of Menominee, though his eventual presentation includes no comparative references.

The "Sketch" presents an historical phonology and comparative morphology of Bloomfield's four languages and is also, in effect, an introductory descriptive sketch of Algonquian grammar (Hockett 1948; Teeter 1973:1146-1147).<sup>36</sup> Unlike Bloomfield's descriptive work, its comparative methodology presented nothing that was new, and in this it resembles the lucid but methodologically unoriginal exposition of historical linguistics in *Language*, with its even then rather old-fashioned narrow view of the comparative method (Bloomfield 1933:297-495). There is a sharp difference between the treatments of phonology and morphology in the "Sketch". For the phonology the proto-system is reconstructed and the historical changes undergone by the descendant languages are stated, but for the morphology there are reconstructions only for individual forms for which there are direct comparisons. The reconstruction of the morphological systems of the proto-language is not carried beyond the description of these individual reconstructed forms, which are not always broken down into their constituent morphemes, and the historical changes undergone by these systems are not traced. Many formations in the languages are left as unexplained loose ends, with often no clear distinction made between those that are innovations of the individual languages and those that are retentions of forms that have no comparandum, or have shifted their function, or are otherwise not reconstructible.

As a consequence, for example, a complete paradigm of the independent indicative inflection of animate intransitive stems, the basic verbal paradigm, is not reconstructed. The third person singular and plural, which correspond exactly in the languages, are reconstructed with *\*-wa* and *\*-waki*, respectively. The obviative singular and plural are reconstructed with *\*-liwali*, and *\*-liwahi*, with the remark that these are "simplified" in Menominee and Ojibwa, where they lack a reflex of *\*-li-*. The ending of the first and second singular is reconstructed as *\*-Ø*, with the remark that "M[enominee] adds an m, C[ree] an n". The languages are said to "disagree as to the plural forms of first and second persons". There is no attempt to account for the discrepant plural endings, or even to correlate them with the discrepant singular endings (Bloomfield 1946:97). The interrogative order is described as "having an ending *-celi*, added to personal endings which resemble those of the conjunct, the chief differences being extensive use of theme sign *-aaw* for the third person, and of *-kw* instead of [normal

conjunct] *-t* (or *-k*) as a these reconstructions tl ings throughout, has no accounted for.

The treatment of n Bloomfield's general st "the comparative meth (Bloomfield 1933:315). parative morphology, t

Bloomfield's recor his slighting of the dive the languages seem m some distortion in this some cases in the "Sket the attested synchronic resentation varies inv acquaintance with the and Cree. Menominee, tion in the direction seems to be the case.

In the case of Fo shown him that they w the Fox Language" ir emendations. In his co ants, omits divergent and emends what is att other languages, but ledged.

For example, Jon as the Fox word for "n Michelson unambiguous "he is a man" and *ne* even though acknowle some independence"; i text in *Language*. Blc only them in his worc merely graphic errors in his comparative pa

conjunction] -t (or -k) as a third person ending" (Bloomfield 1946:102-103). In these reconstructions the \*-w-, which characterizes the interrogative endings throughout, has not been segmented and most of the paradigm is not accounted for.

The treatment of morphology in the "Sketch" is exactly in accord with Bloomfield's general statement that in the case of irreconcilable variants "the comparative method does not show us the form of the parent speech" (Bloomfield 1933:315). In short, there is extensive information on comparative morphology, but except by implication no historical morphology.

Bloomfield's reconstruction of etyma based on exact comparisons and his slighting of the divergent aspects of the histories of the languages make the languages seem more similar to each other than they are. Although some distortion in this direction is inherent in any comparative approach, in some cases in the "Sketch" this convergence is artificial and does not reflect the attested synchronic facts of the languages. The likelihood of misrepresentation varies inversely with the degree of Bloomfield's first-hand acquaintance with the languages: Fox is the most susceptible, then Ojibwa and Cree. Menominee, which Bloomfield knew best, does not suffer distortion in the direction of the proto-language, but the reverse sometimes seems to be the case.

In the case of Fox, Bloomfield's work with the published texts had shown him that they were often inconsistent on details, and his "Notes on the Fox Language" include both explicit suggestions of error and silent emendations. In his comparative studies, he often selects between two variants, omits divergent glosses, constructs forms related to attested stems, and emends what is attested in order to make an easier comparison with the other languages, but these liberties with the record are never acknowledged.

For example, Jones's texts have evidence for both *ineniwa* and *neniwa* as the Fox word for "man", and inflected forms in a single text collected by Michelson unambiguously show the derived verb of being as both *ineniwiwa* "he is a man" and *neniwiwa* (Bloomfield 1925-1927, pt. 1:220-221). But even though acknowledging that "the shorter form seems to have attained some independence" and citing it without comment in a comparative context in *Language*, Bloomfield takes the longer forms as the norm, gives only them in his word list, suggests that some occurrences of *neniwa* are merely graphic errors that should be emended away, and uses only *ineniwa* in his comparative papers, where it matches the vowel-initial forms of the

other languages (Bloomfield 1925-1927, pt. 1:220, 1933:381, 1984a:36, 1925:135, 1927b:395, 1946:87). In keeping the comparison simple, the real historical change, pointed out by Michelson (1935:155), is ignored.

There is a single attestation of the Fox stem in <kawā'kwaciyan"> "When I am so overcome with sleep as to fall". (Jones 1907:124.1), which is entered unchanged in the word list as <kawā'kwaciwa> "he falls from sleepiness" (Bloomfield 1984a:39). This is first cited, as a comparandum for the final of Menominee <sākihkuwa'siw> "he has a nightmare" and Cree <sekikwasiw>, as Fox <kawā'kwaciwa> "he falls from sleepiness" (Bloomfield 1924:33), then as a comparandum for Cree <kawihkwasiw> and Menominee <kakūhkuwa'siw> "he is sleepy" as Fox <kawehkwaciwa> "he is sleepy" (Bloomfield 1925:149), and finally, when Ojibwa *kawinkwašši* is brought into the equation, as Fox *kawekwaššiwa* (Bloomfield 1946:90; Goddard 1982:44, n. 162).<sup>37</sup> Each of the three successively different emendations of the Fox form, as well as the change in the gloss, was made solely on comparative evidence, and the silently emended Fox forms were cited in ostensible support of equations from which, in fact, they were in part derived.

For the Fox word for "louse" the texts attest only *ahkwahi* "lice (obv.)", pointing to \**ahkwa*, and *ketehkomaki* "your (sg.) lice", pointing to \**ihkwa* (Jones 1907:64.13, 314.14). The alternation in shape between the possessed and unpossessed forms would be unique, but although it might accordingly be conjectured that one of the forms is incorrect there is no evidence from Fox to suggest which. Bloomfield, however, relying on comparative evidence (e.g. Cree *ihkwa*), always cites the Fox form as *ihkwa*, or its equivalent,<sup>38</sup> both in comparative contexts and in his Fox materials (Bloomfield 1924:338, 1925:138, 1925-1927, pt. 2:183, 1946:93, 1984a:33). In fact, however, Fox *ahkwa* "louse" is correct (Paul Voorhis, personal communication 1970) and the irregular alternation in form preserves an example of a poorly understood feature of Fox that Bloomfield (1925:131, 1946:86) refers to as the "deviation" of some short vowels in initial syllables.

From Fox *ahkwima-či-wa* "he is exhausted from running" and *kaš-kima-či-wa* "he is able to move" (apparently frozen compound stems) and *mama-či-wa* "he moves, stirs" (Jones 1907:210.5; Michelson 1925:46.32-316.14) Bloomfield (1984a:59) extracted Fox \**ma-či-wa* "he goes, moves" that is cited without specific gloss as a comparandum of Menominee *ma-ci-w* "he starts off, moves away" and related Cree and Ojibwa forms

(Bloomfield 1925:1 "go" (Bloomfield 19 an Ojibwa stem \**m* rect account and is away" is *ma-ča-*, third singular independent for Fox *mama* Fox verb is used in us (incl.) as move", 1925:452.31-32). It starts off" but *ma* derived agent noun a different abstract shape of the initial in the finals can be Algonquian \*-i- (> nated from Menom the productive fi 1962:303-304). Bloc sons, but he seldor them, and he never

Another altere with Cree *kinosiv* \**kenosiwa* (Bloomf recording, have a lo *kino-si* (Baraga 18 adjusting the Ojibv effaced an example Algonquian historic guages on the lengtl

Bloomfield give ter \**čk* as *šk*, citing and (doubtless con: 1946:89) as the cogr oddly glossed locat form of Cuoq (1886 mon palais". Relyin believed that Ojibw

1:220, 1933:381, 1984a:36, comparison simple, the real stem in <kawā'kwaciyan̄>". (Jones 1907:124.1), which <vāhkwaciwa> "he falls from cited, as a comparandum for "has a nightmare" and Cree "he falls from sleepiness" for Cree <kawihkwasiw> "is sleepy" as Fox 1925:149), and finally, when cited, as Fox *kawekwašwa*.<sup>37</sup> Each of the three successions as well as the change in the stem, and the silently emended comparandums from which, in fact,

attest only *ahkwahi* "lice your (sg.) lice", pointing to the difference in shape between the Cree and Fox forms, but although it might be incorrect there is no evidence, however, relying on comparison with the Fox form as *ihkwa*, or the Cree form as *ihkwa*, and in his Fox materials: 2:183, 1946:93, 1984a:33). (Paul Voorhis, personal communication) The difference in form preserves an important feature that Bloomfield (1925:131, 1946:100) noted about short vowels in initial syllable

from running" and *kaš-* (in compound stems) and *š*; Michelson 1925:46.32, *i-či-wa* "he goes, moves" as a comparandum of Menominee Cree and Ojibwa forms

(Bloomfield 1925:144), and later in inflected forms glossed "move" and "go" (Bloomfield 1946:100). The later comparison includes forms made on an Ojibwa stem \**ma-či-* "go away" that is inconsistent with the earlier, correct account and is apparently also a coinage. The Ojibwa stem for "to go away" is *ma-ča-*, with an archaic unlauded form *ma-či-* attested for the third singular independent in the Nipissing dialect; the correct comparandum for Fox *mama-či-wa* "he moves, stirs" is Ojibwa *mama-či-* "id.". The Fox verb is used in expressions like *taswi me-ma-či[-lyakwe]*<sup>39</sup> "as many of us (incl.) as move", a high-register expression for "we mortals" (Michelson 1925:452.31-32). Its Menominee comparandum is thus not *ma-ci-w* "he starts off" but *mama-ce?taw* "he moves, stirs", with its homophonous derived agent noun meaning "human being" (now "Indian"), which shows a different abstract intransitive final but much more significantly the same shape of the initial and exactly the same range of meaning. The difference in the finals can be explained as resulting from the replacement of Proto-Algonquian \*-i- (> Menominee -e-), which has been almost entirely eliminated from Menominee in stems indicating motion, by Menominee -?ta-, the productive final denoting "activity or movement" (Bloomfield 1962:303-304). Bloomfield mentions the reshaping of stems in his comparisons, but he seldom discusses the recurring patterns and the reasons for them, and he never goes into the details of attested usage and meaning.<sup>40</sup>

Another altered Ojibwa form is *kinosi* "he is long", which is compared with Cree *kinosiw* and other forms pointing to Proto-Algonquian \**kenosiwa* (Bloomfield 1946:110). But all sources, including Bloomfield's recording, have a long vowel in the second syllable of this word in Ojibwa: *kino-si* (Baraga 1880:136; Bloomfield 1957:242; Rhodes 1985:170). In adjusting the Ojibwa word to the comparative evidence Bloomfield has effaced an example of a real, if relatively minor, unresolved problem of Algonquian historical phonology, the frequent disagreement between languages on the length of an *o(·)* after a short-vowel initial syllable.

Bloomfield gives the Ojibwa reflex of the rare Proto-Algonquian cluster \**čk* as *šk*, citing <ninagackung> "at my palate" (Bloomfield 1925:148) and (doubtless constructed from this) *ninakašk* "my palate" (Bloomfield 1946:89) as the cognate of Menominee *nena-kackon*, a plurale tantum. The oddly glossed locative appears to be a rewriting of the Nipissing-dialect form of Cuoq (1886:248), who gives in his entry only <ni nagaskong> "à mon palais". Relying on William Jones's transcriptions Bloomfield at first believed that Ojibwa made no distinction between *sk* and *šk*, and this must

be the reason he replaced Cuoq's <sk> by <ck> (= [šk]) in the earlier paper. By the time he wrote the "Sketch", however, Bloomfield knew from his own and others' field work that Ojibwa did have a distinction between *sk* and *šk*, and that Jones had simply confused them (Bloomfield 1946:88, fn. 10). Cuoq's <sk> in "palate" is confirmed by Baraga (1880:293), who has <ninagask> "my palate", <onagaskon> "his palate", and, apparently on the basis of these nineteenth-century dictionaries, which consistently distinguish these clusters, Bloomfield concluded that the correct Ojibwa form was <ninakask> and wrote this in the first draft of the "Sketch" (cf. Rhodes 1985:274). In the end, though, the ghost-form *ninakask* was reintroduced, apparently as a correction based on the earlier emended form.<sup>41</sup> More seriously, Bloomfield (1925:148, 1946:89) gives the only other etymon attesting Proto-Algonquian \*čk as being supported by Fox *kehkye-wa* "he is old" and Menominee *kecki-w* "id.", with no mention of the obviously germane Ojibwa *kikka* "he is very old" (Baraga 1880:133).

\*\*\*

It would not be correct to encourage the impression that Bloomfield's comparative work was replete with error. It has formed a reliable basis for work in the field and will continue to do so. Bloomfield recognized that, viewed diachronically, the variant features of a language *are* its history and cannot be ignored (Bloomfield 1933:311-12, 394), but in his Algonquian work his attention was not on the myriad of particular details that characterize the individual languages and their histories but often obscure the broader picture. It is evident, rather, that he focused his interest on direct comparisons as a basis for erecting a comparative framework for the study of the Algonquian languages. In this his approach to the comparative study of these languages resembles his quest for the norm behind the attested variation in his descriptive work. And just as he gives no indication that he thought accounting for variant features synchronically was fundamental to understanding the workings of the language of a speech community, he shows no interest in pursuing the examination of synchronic variation as ongoing linguistic history. For Bloomfield, after all, what was the same was the basis of what was language (Bloomfield 1926:154-155).

*Author's address:*

Ives Goddard  
NHB Rm. 85, MRC 100  
Smithsonian Institution  
Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.

1) Bloomfield's word lists have appear to have been used by Bloomfield in brief translations and no example designation "lexicon" simply to indicate distinctions made among "a Menominee English vocabulary, and a still in use Ottawa list is also called "Word 1".

The inclusion of tables of inflections compiled "in the very early 1920s" information in the "Notes on the words and inflectional endings from while the "Notes on the Fox Language" date of compilation would appear at the University of Chicago and would have which it is written.

2) For the identification of Ottawa dialect, see Rhodes (1975).

3) Bloomfield's wording has *ne* is permitted to account for *ne* *ne-mat* "my brother, friend (mat "my mother" (Bloomfield 1962: *ne*?*at* can be explained as a case field 1962:94; fn. 7 below). The earlier transcription of this for *ments* that permitted the raising described (Bloomfield 1920-194

4) Pointed brackets enclose *is* always placed after the vowel over or after the vowel, sometimes symbol <^> found in Bloomfield retained even though the distinction in many doublets of no significance publications. Phonemic transcription field 1962, 1975), but with *?* as writing and is universal in the *merely* to make printing easier.

*Author's address:*

Ives Goddard  
 NHB Rm. 85, MRC 100  
 Smithsonian Institution  
 Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.

## NOTES

1) Bloomfield's word lists have been published as "lexicons", but this designation does not appear to have been used by Bloomfield and seems overly grand for lexical lists that include only brief translations and no examples or text references. That Hockett originally intended the designation "lexicon" simply to indicate relatively large size is suggested by the terminological distinctions made among "a Menomini-English lexicon of about 11,000 entries, a small Cree-English vocabulary, and a still smaller Fox-English word list" (in Bloomfield 1962:v); the brief Ottawa list is also called "Word List" (Bloomfield 1957:x).

The inclusion of tables of inflectional endings in the Fox list suggested to Hockett that it was compiled "in the very early 1920s" (in Bloomfield 1984a:i), since they would have repeated information in the "Notes on the Fox Language" (Bloomfield 1925-1927). But the list includes words and inflectional endings from Michelson (1925), which came into Bloomfield's hands only while the "Notes on the Fox Language" was in press (Bloomfield 1925-1927, pt. 2:187, n.). The date of compilation would appear to have been after 1927, when Bloomfield moved to the University of Chicago and would have had easy access to the University of Chicago notebook in which it is written.

2) For the identification of the dialect that Bloomfield called "Eastern Ojibwa" as an Ottawa dialect, see Rhodes (1976, 1985:ix) and Rhodes and Todd (1981:65-66).

3) Bloomfield's wording has *ε* kept before *h* and before *ʔ*; raising to *e* before intervocalic *ʔ* is permitted to account for *neʔat*, analyzed as underlying [*nε-ʔat-*], the irregular vocative of *ne-mat* "my brother, friend (man speaking)". However, *nεʔε-h*, the irregular vocative of *nekiah* "my mother" (Bloomfield 1962:21), shows that *ε* is not raised in this environment, and the *e* of *neʔat* can be explained as a case of the shortening of a basic long vowel in a static word (Bloomfield 1962:94; fn. 7 below). The formulation permitting raising before intervocalic *ʔ* reflects an earlier transcription of this form as *<neʔε-h>* (Bloomfield 1933:177). The specific environments that permitted the raising of *ε* to *e* in prefixes by surface variation are also variously described (Bloomfield 1920-1940, 1962:7, 21, 95; Teeter 1970b:238).

4) Pointed brackets enclose exact transliterations of the source, except that the acute accent is always placed after the vowel, as in the published texts. In the manuscripts the acute is either over or after the vowel, sometimes indeterminately, or stress is marked before the syllable. The symbol *<^>* found in Bloomfield's early manuscripts and in the published texts has been retained even though the distinction between *<^>* and *<a>* is very inconsistently made, resulting in many doublets of no significance, and was always eliminated in favor of *<a>* in all other publications. Phonemic transcriptions in italics use the spelling of the final description (Bloomfield 1962, 1975), but with *ʔ* used for glottal stop; this was Bloomfield's usage until his very last writing and is universal in the manuscripts, though he experimented with the use of *<q>* "merely to make printing easier" already in the draft of "On the Sound-System of Central

ck> (= [ʃk]) in the earlier  
 ever, Bloomfield knew from  
 have a distinction between  
 them (Bloomfield 1946:88,  
 by Baraga (1880:293), who  
 his palate", and, apparently  
 uries, which consistently dis-  
 at the correct Ojibwa form  
 draft of the "Sketch" (cf.  
 irst-form *ninakašk* was rein-  
 he earlier emended form."  
 ) gives the only other ety-  
 pported by Fox *kehkye-wa*  
 no mention of the obviously  
 a 1880:133).

e impression that Bloom-  
 r. It has formed a reliable  
 so, Bloomfield recognized  
 of a language are its history  
 2, 394), but in his Algon-  
 d of particular details that  
 histories but often obscure  
 he focused his interest on  
 parative framework for the  
 approach to the comparative  
 for the norm behind the  
 ist as he gives no indication  
 synchronically was funda-  
 guage of a speech commun-  
 nation of synchronic varia-  
 :ld, after all, what was the  
 nfield 1926:154-155).

Algonquian" (see letter S11 in Hockett 1987). Italics is sometimes used for morphophonemes (otherwise given between vertical bars: |...|) when Bloomfield's exposition is being followed closely, to avoid introducing a graphic distinction between levels that he did not make.

5) The use of <ā> for the long vowel of the low front quadrant was dictated by established Algonquianist practice, particularly in the transcription of Fox used by Jones and Michelson. In a letter written in September or early October of 1920 (M2 in Hockett 1987) Bloomfield told Michelson: "I like to use *e* for *ā*, whether long or short". (In this letter Bloomfield states explicitly that he thought there were two short front vowels, and his examples and discussion show that he was only beginning to grasp the situation as he later came to understand it [Bloomfield 1919-1932].) The symbols <i i e> later used for writing the three short front vowels (Bloomfield 1925) were selected for similar reasons of conformity as much as possible to the transcription used for Fox (letter S10 in Hockett 1987).

6) The manuscript originals of the texts generally have <o> for *o* only before *w* or *ʔ*, and <u> for other cases of *o* (and for *u*, which is only found before *w* and *ʔ*). The use in the published texts of <i> for *i* and of <ō> for *o* is omitted from the table of equivalences that Bloomfield gave to Siebert (1982:8).

7) Static words (Bloomfield 1962:94), earlier called atonic (Bloomfield 1939:113-14), are exempt from the rules that lengthen a short vowel in a monosyllable and in the second syllables of words with short-vowel first syllables, and they sometimes have other peculiarities. For the correct statements of the rules that lengthen and shorten vowels under various conditions see Bloomfield (1939:113-15) and Goddard, Hockett, and Teeter (1972:1-2).

8) Bloomfield used the new orthography in a note to Michelson of January 19, 1931, then slipped back into the old orthography in a note of February 5, 1932 (Bloomfield 1919-1932).

9) The section here called the phonology has two parts, one labeled "Phonetics" and the other, consisting of morphophonemic rules, labeled "Morphology" (Swadesh 1937-1938); the section in Bloomfield's hand here called the morphology is labeled "Inflection" (Bloomfield 1937). Swadesh wrote the date 1937 on the two sections of the draft, but he seems not to have had them in hand at the time of his brief initial field work on Menominee sometime that year; he did, however, have at least the phonology when he began his 1938 work, as he refers to it at that time (Swadesh 1938).

10) Swadesh was involved in teaching literacy to native speakers of American Indian languages. While at the University of Wisconsin (1937-1938 and the fall term of 1938-1939) he proposed to the Works Progress Administration the setting up of the Oneida Language and Folklore Project, to teach some Oneida speakers to write Oneida and send them out to collect texts; subsequently, after deciding to undertake similar literacy work in Mexico, he turned the direction of the Oneida project over to Floyd G. Lounsbury (F.G. Lounsbury, personal communication 1986).

11) There are some orthographic differences between the 1937 draft phonology and morphology. In the 1937 phonology, as in "M", <o> and <u> contrast only before *w* and *ʔ*, and elsewhere only <u> is written (cf. fn. 6). In the 1937 morphology, <o> is written everywhere except where <u> contrasts with it. For the long diphthongs, "M" and the 1937 morphology have <ia> and <ua>, while the 1937 phonology mostly has <ya> and <wa>, with <ua> and <ia> appearing in the final sections (perhaps changes introduced by Swadesh in copying).

12) Bloomfield notes that basic |e| is *e* in pronunciation also in |mēnē-ʔtam-| "in front", "which doubtless contains the prefix |mē-|".

13) Bloomfield's use of the word "phonology" is not intended to exclude static morphology (cf. kinipayiat) (Bloomfield 1939:109).

14) The formulation of this rule does not apply to *e* (e.g. ehka-hiam "he drinks") (cf. Bloomfield 1962:95; fn. 3).

15) This formulation works only by contrast with *h*, keeping |n| in |nC| just as in (Bloomfield 1939:109, 113; rules for the morphophoneme |n| is used for the element of the morphophoneme |N| in former and |n| in the latter).

16) "Menomini Morphophonemic morphology" (see fn. 11). Long vowel written <yā> and <wā>.

17) The copy of Swadesh's table of morphophonemes but the numbers Bloomfield uses collected by Swadesh on the copy he received.

18) Presumably Bloomfield did not mean rather: if *e* (4) overlaps with *i* in the original.

19) Bloomfield occasionally slip <e> changed from <i>; the <e> he has just written <tē>. For the (1962:205), but when Swadesh checked (Bloomfield 1920-1940, Q59, S54).

20) Bloomfield first wrote "note".

21) Swadesh recorded the word <ana-mehawa-htekun> (Bloomfield 1937:109) of the first element by claiming that "the corresponding initial was not recorded". Swadesh subsequently recorded the word and eventually came to spell all these related words (Bloomfield 1962:213, 234, 304, 305, 368). e.g. the later normalized form *a* (Bloomfield 1962:126) accepted Swadesh's <e> in the first element of <ana-mehawa-htekun> in his first draft (Bloomfield 1937:109) <e> could not be basic |e|, which Rule 64, which allowed this <e> to be basic |E|, an analysis still reflected in the final draft (Bloomfield 1962:126).

22) The raising sometimes is not in the original.

23) A draft section on irregularities.

mes used for morphophonemes. It's exposition is being followed, so that he did not make.

rant was dictated by established used by Jones and Michelson. In Hockett 1987) Bloomfield told In this letter Bloomfield states and his examples and discussion or came to understand it [Bloom- ing the three short front vowels mity as much as possible to the

> for *o* only before *w* or *ʔ*, and re *w* and *ʔ*). The use in the pub- able of equivalences that Bloom-

ic (Bloomfield 1939:113-14), are- llable and in the second syllables have other peculiarities. For the vels under various conditions see (1972:1-2).

chelson of January 19, 1931, then, 1932 (Bloomfield 1919-1932).

one labeled "Phonetics" and the ology" (Swadesh 1937-1938), the labeled "Inflection" (Bloomfield ie draft, but he seems not to have a Menominee sometime that year; his 1938 work, as he refers to it at

speakers of American Indian lan- he fall term of 1938-1939) he prop- the Oneida Language and folklore send them out to collect texts; sub- in Mexico, he turned the direction ounsbury, personal communication

1937 draft phonology and morphol- ontrast only before *w* and *ʔ*, and ology, <*o*> is written everywhere gs. "M" and the 1937 morphology <*ya*> and <*wa*>, with <*ua*> and luced by Swadesh in copying).

t also in |*mɛnɛ-ʔtam*-| "in front-

13) Bloomfield's use of the word "particle" here, whatever the explanation for it may be, is evidently not intended to exclude static words that are parts of speech other than particles, e.g. the name <*kinipayiat*> (Bloomfield 1920-1940, "M").

14) The formulation of this rule does not account for the fact that all cases of initial |*ɛ*| are raised to *e* (e.g. *ehka-htam* "he drinks it up"), and incorrectly allows raising before intervocalic *h* and *ʔ* (cf. Bloomfield 1962:95; fn. 3 above).

15) This formulation works only by splitting into two the rule that replaces first members of clusters by *h*, keeping |*n*| in |*nC*| just to provide an environment for this type of irregular raising (Bloomfield 1939:109, 113; rules 12 and 23). In "Menomini Morphophonemics" the morphophoneme |*n*| is used for the element that is subject to undergoing mutation to *s*, the equivalent of the morphophoneme |*N*| in *The Menomini Language*; the non-mutating *n* is |*N*| in the former and |*n*| in the latter.

16) "Menomini Morphophonemics" has the same use of <*o*> and <*u*> as the 1937 draft morphology (see fn. 11). Long vowels are indicated with a macron, and the long diphthongs are written <*yā*> and <*wā*>.

17) The copy of Swadesh's table with the numbers on it is not with the letter that refers to it, but the numbers Bloomfield uses correspond to the order in which the "morphophemes" were listed by Swadesh on the copy he retained (Swadesh 1937-1938).

18) Presumably Bloomfield did not intend to write "and on the other hand with (6)" but means rather: if *ɛ* (4) overlaps with *e* (1, etc.) and if *i* (6) also overlaps with *e*. The brackets are as in the original.

19) Bloomfield occasionally slips into the old orthography. Here <*mama-ceʔtaw*> has the <*e*> changed from <*i*>; the <*e*> in the first syllable of <*teki-sew*> is a similar slip, given that he has just written <*te*>. For the construction used in this expression see perhaps Bloomfield (1962:205), but when Swadesh checked it with Striker he preferred *mama-ceʔtaw eses-teki-sew* (Bloomfield 1920-1940, Q59, S54).

20) Bloomfield first wrote "noted", then crossed this out and wrote "recall" above it.

21) Swadesh recorded the word for "cross" (in the obviative) from Frank S. Gauthier as <*ana-mehawa-htekun*> (Bloomfield 1920-1940, Q12); Bloomfield supports his different spelling of the first element by claiming that, although the verb was <*ana-mehaw*> "he prays, is a Christian", the corresponding initial was <*ana-mehew*> (these vowel lengths match those in "M"). Swadesh subsequently recorded the verb from Striker as *ana-mehe-w*, and Bloomfield ultimately came to spell all these related elements with a long vowel in the fourth syllable (Bloomfield 1962:213, 234, 304, 305, 368, 1975:18), an exception to the rules that adjust vowel length; e.g. the later normalized form *ana-meh-e-wa-htek* (Bloomfield 1962:262, 1975:18). Bloomfield accepted Swadesh's <*e*> in the noun final <*a-htek[w]*> and used the transcription <*ana-mehewa-htekon*> in his fair copies of Swadesh's text (Bloomfield 1920-1940, S14). This <*e*> could not be basic |*ɛ*|, which would mutate the *t* to *c*, and before Bloomfield formulated Rule 64, which allowed this <*e*> to be taken as an *e* raised from basic |*ɛ*|, he analyzed it as basic |*E*|, an analysis still reflected in some of the materials that make up *The Menomini Language* (Bloomfield 1962:126).

22) The raising sometimes is observed to take place across compound-stem or word bound- ary.

23) A draft section on irregular noun possession (matching the early-20s draft in transcrip-

(tion) has <kuhkú'mith> "stocking, sock", <ukú'hkumíí'hs ʌ n> "his socks", with the <ú> in the second form changed from <ō> (Bloomfield 1920-1940).

24) In the published version these verbs conform to Rule 66, but two derived nouns remain as exceptions: *kesi-ʔnehkwan* "washrag", *kesi-ʔnenε-hcikan* "wash-basin" (Bloomfield 1975:87; not in Bloomfield 1962). Hockett, the editor, suggests that these might better be \**kese-ʔnehkwan* and \**kese-ʔnenε-hcikan*. A slip in a set extracting information from the 1938-1940 materials, on the other hand, solves the anomaly of the first of these forms by giving *kesi-ʔnehkwan*, with the second *e* double-underlined for emphasis (Bloomfield 1920-1940); this would agree with the transcription of the underlying verb as *kese-ʔnehkow* "he washes his face" (Bloomfield 1962:407). The transcription *kese-ʔnehkow* (Bloomfield 1975:84) seems to be supported by early recordings with <ε>, e.g. <kise:ʔnehkow>, but the similar recording <kimo:tehkow> "he steals (habitually)" in the same source (Bloomfield 1920-1940, early-20s list), apparently supporting *kemo-tehkow* (Bloomfield 1975:79), is similarly contradicted by the recording *kemo-tehkow* (with the *e* underlined three times) on a loose sheet containing forms apparently jotted down by Bloomfield on his 1939 trip. A few other words written with exceptional raising appear in the final description: e.g. *ci-pe-weneniw* "deceased person" (Bloomfield 1962:268, 1975:45); *wi-wete-hpe-hpeswan* "veil" (beside *wi-wete-hpe-hpeswan*) and *wi-wete-hpe-hpeswani-k* "veil-cloth, netting" (Bloomfield 1975:279, 282), matching early recordings like <wīwī'tehpehpisu'onik> (Bloomfield 1920-1940, early-20s list).

25) The [i] in the second syllables of these forms, apparently a secondary effect of the raising, is not accounted for. Bloomfield here normalized Swadesh's <uaʔ> (third plural conjunct) to <waʔ> to make the ending conform to the regular rules of vowel shortening (*wa* being the short equivalent of *ua*): "I don't believe there is much difference in this ending, between *u-a* and *wa* — perhaps none. But the unphonemic notation of *u-a/wa* in general in my texts is so disturbing that I want to carry out the phonemic values in future. This means *-u-aʔ/-waʔ* distributed by the general rule, unless it should appear that this suffix has always the long form." (Bloomfield 1938b). He later concluded, in agreement with Swadesh's transcription, that this suffix was indeed (exceptionally) always long.

26) The conclusion reached by Teeter (1970b:237) that "Menomini Morphophonemics" was "a revised and completed version of" the chapter on morphophonemics in *The Menomini Language* is disproved by data considered here. Hockett (1970:367) suggests that "presumably Bloomfield's letter of December 28, 1940, to Bernard Bloch was a reply to questions arising from Bloch's reading of "Menomini Morphophonemics"; parts of the correspondence that Hockett did not print might clarify this, but in any event Bloomfield's letter in fact describes the new analysis of 1940, which he may have told Bloch about at some point.

27) *neʔnemeɬ* is found already in two 1933 letters from Bloomfield to Ruth Landes (June 1 and 6, 1933, Bloomfield 1920-1940). A letter to Truman Michelson has <neʔnemeɬ> (January 19, 1931, Bloomfield 1919-1932), and the early "Alphab. List" has <niʔnimeɬ> (Bloomfield 1920-1940), with the <i> of the prefix changed from <e>.

28) Many of the new transcriptions did not get entered into the typescript of the *Menomini Lexicon*; the "Supplement" (Bloomfield 1975:284-89), containing words found by Hockett in Bloomfield's card file but not in the typescript, has many words from the 1938-1940 work and may well turn out to consist entirely of words obtained or reheard during that period. In fact, as Miner (1977:72) has pointed out, not even all words or variants in the published texts appear in the *Lexicon*. For example, *ohse-mehsema-w* "the younger brother or sister" is given (Bloomfield 1975:171) but not the presumably disfavored variant *ohse-memaw*, though this appears in

texts from at least three speakers. Examples that show that the glosses

29) From the point of view of phonemes had to be considered

30) Here and elsewhere B (obv.)" (the equivalent of *anr*

31) Hyphens have been added to the quoted sentence, but it is printed as the si

32) Two misprints have been corrected. Bloomfield's changes from the <ka> to <asaw kēs>; the script originals, by the normalizing process, the last on the edge, but representative singular number discord are occasional interlinear in Bloomfield's (body"). Bloomfield's translation of "power", the mean over the particular talent or

33) The printed text has 3 the text was dictated. Two or three corresponding quotative <iniwi> the text was checked over, non-quotatives were not emended. predicative negative <kon> quotative (inconsistently "it is this (prox.)" was emended. corresponding quotative (*ayow*

34) Hockett's (1958:142-143) differences between spoken and written "texts" in (19). Although these scholars' text in a language that has a minimal procedure to be used in a minimalist approach to (1985).

35) This disclaimer is "Phonological Alternation"

36) Two typed drafts of Bloomfield's, turned up at the archives (Bloomfield 1938-1940) originally transcribed with <E> in initial syllables w

texts from at least three speakers (Bloomfield 1928b:382, 476, 574). Siebert (1980:114) cites examples that show that the glosses in the *Lexicon* do not always cover the specific textual usages.

29) From the point of view of classical American phonemic theory Bloomfield's overlapping phonemes had to be considered morphophonemes (Hockett 1948:124, fn. 26; Joos 1958:92).

30) Here and elsewhere Bloomfield substitutes the demonstrative ("particle") *anoh* "this (obv.)" (the equivalent of *anenoh*) for *enoh* "that (prox.)".

31) Hyphens have been added to mark the preverbs. In the notebook the paragraph beginning with the quoted sentence comes first (presumably dependent on some earlier conversation), but it is printed as the second of the two paragraphs in the text.

32) Two misprints have been silently corrected: one missing word space and one metathesis. Bloomfield's changes from the manuscript text include: the normalization of the sandhi in <as a-kēs->, for <asaw kēs->; the replacement of <kispin> "if", a common spelling in the manuscript originals, by the normative <kī'spin>; and the addition of the expected plural ending to the second word. The last emendation might seem reasonable on the basis of present knowledge, but representative singulars are common in Algonquian languages and certain kinds of number discord are occasionally encountered. My translation of the first sentence follows the interlinears in Bloomfield's manuscript ("to gain something higher, to prosper"; "be somebody"). Bloomfield's translation "so that they might therefrom gain a continuance of mortal life" (Bloomfield 1928b:5) misses the point that the object of the fasting is to induce manitous to grant one "power", the means by which one is able to lead a complete and competent life (whatever the particular talent or accomplishment might be).

33) The printed text has 35 quotative forms, not one of which was first written as such when the text was dictated. Two occurrences of <ini?> "it was then (that)" were changed to the corresponding quotative <iniwin> in the original manuscript; the rest remained unemended when the text was checked over, perhaps with Jerome Lawe (Bloomfield 1920-1940, T41-44). Two non-quotatives were not emended, presumably by oversight: one of the three occurrences of the predicative negative <kon> was kept as <k^an> rather than being replaced by the corresponding quotative (inconsistently <kawin> and <k^awin>); the predicative demonstrative <ajō?> "it is this (prox.)" was emended to the non-predicative obviative <anum> rather than to the corresponding quotative (<ayowen>) or obviative quotative (<anowen>).

34) Hockett's (1958:142-144) section on "editing speech" is an introductory exposition of the differences between spoken and written registers in English; a recent parallel would be the discussion of spoken "texts" in the introduction to discourse analysis by Brown and Yule (1983:4-19). Although these scholars make clear the difficulty of providing a written edition of a spoken text in a language that has an established written norm, they do not examine the methodological procedures to be used in editing texts of even this restricted type. Elsewhere I have outlined a minimalist approach to editing (Goddard 1973); see now the important article by Heath (1985).

35) This disclaimer is strikingly similar to the one made by Swadesh in "A Problem in Phonological Alternation" (Swadesh and Voegelin 1939:2).

36) Two typed drafts of the "Sketch", together with some other Algonquian materials of Bloomfield's, turned up at Yale in the 1970s and are now in the National Anthropological Archives (Bloomfield 1938-1946). The first draft appears to date to 1938-1939; in it Menominee was originally transcribed with <ε> retained in initial syllables and after long-vowel syllables, then <ε> in initial syllables was changed to <e>: e.g. <pemātesenon> "live thou", with the first

<e> changed from <ε>. The final Menominee transcription thus corresponds to that in "Menominee Morphophonemics" (Bloomfield 1939); an acknowledgement of Menominee data from Swadesh puts the date after June, 1938. Proto-Algonquian was written with word-initial <o> and this was later changed to <we>. The second draft, for which there is only a carbon on which almost no diacritics or special symbols have been written, leaves a space for the writing-in of <ε> after long-vowel syllables, but in the few words that have been completed by hand <ε> has been written in: e.g. <pema-tešew> "he lives", with the first and third <ε> typed and the second <ε> written in by hand in the space that had been left for an <ε>. Thus the typing of the second draft preceded and the annotation (at least of the carbon) followed the final working out of the distribution of Menominee *ε* and *ε* described in the December, 1940, letter to Bloch (in Hockett 1970:367-368).

37) The regular correspondences are (1) Fox *hk* : Cree *hk* : Menominee *hk* and (2) Fox *k* : Cree *hk* : Menominee *hk* : Ojibwa *nk*. Bloomfield takes the Menominee meaning "he is sleepy" to apply to all four languages and the proto-form, but the Menominee form is a reduplication of a stem most widely attested as meaning "he falls asleep" (Lacombe 1874:377; Baraga 1880:127).

38) Bloomfield wrote this word <ehkwa> in two publications in which he was apparently experimenting with a transcription of Fox that used initial <e-> in words with *i-* from basic [e] (Fox lacks initial *e-*); <i-> was written in the one word analyzed, on the basis of morphological evidence, to have basic [i-]: <iwa> "he says (so)", beside the irregular prefixed forms like *neš* "I say (so)" (Bloomfield 1924:338, 340, 1933:382).

39) Michelson writes short *i*, but with the regular stress on the pre-antepenult long vowels in the antepenult are very frequently recorded as short, especially high vowels before voiced continuants, and an instance of a short vowel being written in this position has almost no value as an indication of phonemically correct length.

40) Other Fox words incorrectly made or interpreted by Bloomfield are: \**nesiči* "my foot", \**nesitani* "my feet" (Bloomfield 1941:295, 1946:119), cf. Michelson (1935:134) and Goddard (1973:741); *nehka-tani* "my legs" (Bloomfield 1946:119, following the meaning in other languages), correctly "my feet" (cf. Michelson 1935:141); \**nemene* "I drink it", \**menwa* "he drinks it" (Bloomfield 1946:98), correctly *nemeno*, *menowa* (Bloomfield 1984a:64; Michelson 1935:146); \**na-pe-wa* "man, male" (Bloomfield 1946:107), reflected in Fox only as the dependent noun *ne-na-pe-ma* "my husband" (as in Bloomfield 1925:132) and derivatives of this; \**ni-miheti-waki* "they dance together" (Bloomfield 1946:108), correctly *ni-miheti-waki* (as in Bloomfield 1925:136), with the Fox reciprocal suffix *-(e)š-*, which does not match the vowel length of the apparent reflexes of Proto-Algonquian \**-etwi-* in the other languages; *owi-wašiwā* "he has a pack" (Bloomfield 1941:295, 1946:121, 1984a:6), an etymological gloss, correctly "he has a load on his back" (Michelson 1925:142.22).

41) A letter from C.F. Voegelin (datable to November, 1944, by an associated document) with comments on what must have been essentially the final form of the "Sketch", suggests adding the "wedge" to this word and rewrites the Ojibwa word accordingly (in Bloomfield 1938-1946). Bloomfield acknowledges his reliance on Baraga (1880) and Cuoq (1886) for some data in the "Sound-System" (Bloomfield 1925:130) and the drafts of the "Sketch" (Bloomfield 1938-1946).

Baraga, Frederic. 1880. *in English*. 2nd edn., 1

Bloch, Bernard. 1948. " 24.3-46.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 19 Papers, 4365-a, Na Institution, Washingt

---. [1920-1940.] [Note National Anthropol; ton, D.C.

---. 1922. Review of *TI* Michelson. *American*

---. 1924. "The Me *Americanists Proceea*

---. 1925. "On the Sou

---. 1925-1927. "Notes

---. 1926. "A Set of Po

---. 1927a. "Literate : [Cited from Hockett

---. 1927b. "The W *Meinhof*, 393-402. H

---. 1928a. "The Pl; *Americanists Procee*

---. 1928b. *Menomini* 12. New York.

---. 1928c. "A Note o

---. 1930. *Sacred Sto* *Canada Bulletin* 60.

---. [1931.] [Cree Tex 497.3/B63c/A1a.1, Pennsylvania.

---. 1933. *Language*.

---. 1934. *Plains Cre* 16. New York.

---. [1937.] [Menor *American Philosop*

## REFERENCES

- Baraga, Frederic. 1880. *A Dictionary of the Otchipwe Language, Explained in English*. 2nd edn., part 2. Montreal: Beauchemin & Valois.
- Bloch, Bernard. 1948. "A Set of Postulates for Phonemic Analysis". *Lg.* 24.3-46.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1919-1932. [Letters to Truman Michelson.] Michelson Papers, 4365-a, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- [1920-1940.] [Notes on the Menominee Language.] Manuscripts in National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- 1922. Review of *The Owl Sacred Pack of the Fox Indians*, by Truman Michelson. *American Journal of Philology* 43.276-81.
- 1924. "The Menomini Language". *International Congress of Americanists Proceedings* 21, vol. 2.336-343.
- 1925. "On the Sound-System of Central Algonquian". *Lg.* 1.130-156.
- 1925-1927. "Notes on the Fox Language". *IJAL* 3.219-232, 4.181-219.
- 1926. "A Set of Postulates for the Science of Language". *Lg.* 2.153-64.
- 1927a. "Literate and Illiterate Speech". *American Speech* 2.432-39. [Cited from Hockett 1970:147-156.]
- 1927b. "The Word-Stems of Central Algonquian". *Festschrift Meinhof*, 393-402. Hamburg: L. Friedrichsen.
- 1928a. "The Plains Cree Language". *International Congress of Americanists Proceedings* 22, vol. 2.427-31.
- 1928b. *Menomini Texts*. *American Ethnological Society Publications* 12. New York.
- 1928c. "A Note on Sound-Change". *Lg.* 4.99-100.
- 1930. *Sacred Stories of the Sweet Grass Cree*. *National Museum of Canada Bulletin* 60. Ottawa: F.A. Acland.
- [1931.] [Cree Texts, Series Two, Three, Four; Appendix.] Manuscript 497.3/B63c/A1a.1, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- 1933. *Language*. New York: Holt.
- 1934. *Plains Cree Texts*. *American Ethnological Society Publications* 16. New York.
- [1937.] [Menominee Inflections.] Manuscript 497.3/B63c/A1b.1, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

- , 1938a. [Letter to Morris Swadesh, June 6, 1938.] In Bloomfield 1920-1940.
- , 1938b. [Letter to Morris Swadesh, June 9, 1938.] In Bloomfield 1920-1940.
- , [1938-1946.] [Materials on Algonquian.] Manuscripts in National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- , 1939. "Menomini Morphophonemics". *Études phonologiques dédiées à la mémoire de M. le prince N.S. Trubetzkoy*, 105-115. *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 8. Prague.
- , 1941. "Proto-Algonquian *-i-t-* 'Fellow'". *Lg.* 17.292-97.
- , 1946. "Algonquian". *Linguistic Structures of Native America* 85-129. *Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology* 6. New York.
- , 1957. *Eastern Ojibwa*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- , 1962. *The Menomini Language*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- , 1972. "The Original Preface to Linguistic Structures of Native America". *IJAL* 38.265-66.
- , 1975. *Menomini Lexicon*, ed. by Charles F. Hockett. *Milwaukee Public Museum Publications in Anthropology and History* 3. Milwaukee.
- , 1984a. *Fox-English Lexicon*. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files.
- , 1984b. *Cree-English Lexicon*. 2 vols. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files.
- Brown, Gillian, and George Yule. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press.
- Cuoq, J.A. 1886. *Lexique de la langue algonquienne*. Montreal: J. Chapleau & Fils.
- Gleason, H.A., Jr. 1961. *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*. 2nd edn. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Goddard, Ives. 1973. "Philological Approaches to the Study of North American Indian Languages: Documents and Documentation". *Linguistics in North America*, ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok, Part 1:727-45. *Current Trends in Linguistics* 10. The Hague: Mouton.
- , 1979. "Comparative Algonquian". *The Languages of Native America: Historical and Comparative Assessment*, ed. by Lyle Campbell and Marianne Mithun, 70-132. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- , 1982. "The Historical Phonology of Munsee". *IJAL* 48.16-48.

- Goddard, Ives, Charlie Errata in Bloomfield Heath, Jeffrey. 1985. "Grammar inside an". Anthony C. Wood Press.
- Hockett, Charles F. 1921.
- , 1948. "Implication". 131.
- , 1965. "Sound Change".
- , 1966. "What Algonquian".
- , 1970. *A Leonard University Press*.
- , 1981. "The Phonology of Algonquian". *Linguistics* 23.2:51-61.
- , 1987. "Letters from Algonquian". *Linguistics* 25.2:1-10.
- Jones, William. 1907. *Algonquian Languages* 1. Leiden.
- , 1911. "Algonquian". *American Indian Linguistics* 1. Leiden.
- , 1917. *Ojibwa Tales*. Publications of the American Ethnological Society. Leiden.
- , 1919. *Ojibwa Tales*. Publications of the American Ethnological Society. New York.
- Joos, Martin, ed. 1940. *American Council on Education*. 18.
- Lacombe, Albert. 1886. *Algonquian*. Montreal: Beauchemin.
- Michelson, Truman. 1912. *Algonquian*. 1.
- , 1925. "Accomplishments". *Annual Report* 40:1-10.

- [.] In Bloomfield 1920.
- [.] In Bloomfield 1920.
- manuscripts in National  
n, Washington, D.C.  
*phonologiques dédiées*  
i-115. *Travaux du Cer-*  
*292-97.*
- Native America* 85-129.  
York.  
of Michigan Press.  
ale University Press.  
Structures of Native
- ckett. *Milwaukee Pub-*  
*tory* 3. Milwaukee.  
uman Relations Area
- en: Human Relations  
*Analysis*. Cambridge:
- Syntax*. Cambridge,  
Montreal: J. Chapleau
- ptive Linguistics*. 2nd  
the Study of North  
umentation". *Linguis-*  
Part 1:727-45. *Current*
- ges of Native America:*  
Lyle Campbell and  
exas Press.  
*IJAL* 48.16-48.
- Goddard, Ives, Charles F. Hockett, and Karl V. Teeter. 1972. "Some Errata in Bloomfield's Menomini". *IJAL* 38.1-5.
- Heath, Jeffrey. 1985. "Discourse in the Field: Clause Structure in Ngandi". *Grammar inside and outside the Clause*, ed. by Johanna Nichols and Anthony C. Woodbury, 89-110. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hockett, Charles F. 1942. "A System of Descriptive Phonology". *Lg.* 18.3-21.
- . 1948. "Implications of Bloomfield's Algonquian Studies". *Lg.* 24.117-131.
- . 1965. "Sound Change". *Lg.* 41.185-204.
- . 1966. "What Algonquian Is Really Like". *IJAL* 32.59-73.
- . 1970. *A Leonard Bloomfield Anthology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- . 1981. "The Phonological History of Menominee". *Anthropological Linguistics* 23.2:51-87. Errata, 23.7:326.
- . 1987. "Letters from Bloomfield to Michelson and Sapir". *Historiographia Linguistica*, this issue.
- Jones, William. 1907. *Fox Texts*. *American Ethnological Society Publications* 1. Leiden.
- . 1911. "Algonquian (Fox)", ed. by Truman Michelson. *Handbook of American Indian Languages*, ed. by Franz Boas, Part 1:735-873. *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin* 40. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- . 1917. *Ojibwa Texts*, ed. by Truman Michelson. Part 1: Nānabushu Tales. *Publications of the American Ethnological Society* 7, part 1. Leiden.
- . 1919. *Ojibwa Texts*, ed. by Truman Michelson. Part 2: Miscellaneous Tales. *Publications of the American Ethnological Society* 7, part 2. New York.
- Joos, Martin, ed. 1958. *Readings in Linguistics*. 2nd edn. New York: American Council of Learned Societies.
- Lacombe, Albert. 1874. *Dictionnaire et grammaire de la langue des cris*. Montreal: Beauchemin & Valois.
- Michelson, Truman. 1921. *The Owl Sacred Pack of the Fox Indians*. *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin* 72. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- . 1925. "Accompanying Papers". *Bureau of American Ethnology Annual Report* 40:21-658. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.



rials he used were derived from his own fieldwork, for the most part, and especially in the case of Fox from the published work of others. His major achievement was to bring explicitness and orderliness to the description of Algonquian inflectional and derivational morphology. An examination of the development of his solution to certain phonological problems in Menominee and of his practices in editing his Menominee texts shows his struggle to reconcile the conflicting goals, formulated in his general statements (in his 1933 *Language* and elsewhere), of describing a language by determining the norm of the speech community and documenting a language in exhaustive objective detail. In his diachronic studies Bloomfield reconstructed the phonology of Proto-Algonquian and worked out the historical phonology of the languages he was concerned with; his work on morphology was largely confined to the comparison and reconstruction of directly corresponding features. A normative approach to variation is evident in these diachronic studies as well.

## RÉSUMÉ

Les études algonquiennes de Bloomfield comprennent un grand nombre de travaux descriptifs et comparatifs sur le renard, le cri, le menomini et l'ojibwa. Il basa son travail sur des matériaux recueillis en grande partie sur place, et aussi, surtout quand il s'agissait du renard, sur des ouvrages publiés par d'autres. De toutes ses contributions, la plus importante fut celle d'avoir mis de l'ordre et de la netteté dans la description de la morphologie flexionnelle et dérivationnelle des langues algonquiennes. L'auteur examine de près le développement de la solution bloomfieldienne de certains problèmes phonologiques du menomini et de la pratique de Bloomfield en éditant ses textes menomini. Bloomfield dut lutter pour concilier deux buts opposés, qui furent formulés dans ses déclarations de principes (dans son livre *Language* [1933] et ailleurs): celui de décrire une langue en déterminant la norme de la communauté linguistique, et celui de documenter la langue d'une façon détaillée et exhaustive. Dans ses études diachroniques, Bloomfield reconstruisit la structure phonologique du proto-algonquien et établit la phonologie historique des langues dont il s'occupait. En étudiant la morphologie, il se limita en général à la comparaison et à la reconstruction de traits qui se correspondaient directement. Dans ses études diachroniques aussi, on aperçoit un approche normatif de la variation.

*IJAL* 8.131-71.  
*i Lexicon*, by Leonard

on the Dialects of East-  
*Algonquian Conference*  
arleton University.  
*tionary. Trends in Lin-*

"Subarctic Algonquian  
56. *Handbook of North*  
nstitution.  
*'ka Texts*. Philadelphia:

tionary Project: Prefer-  
id Entry". *Papers of the*  
illiam Cowan, 113-27.

wel Phonemes and Cor-  
*istics* 7:1.6-8.

ninee language.] Manu-  
, American Philosophi-

2, 1938.] In Bloomfield

roblem in Phonological

*Language*, by Leonard

by Leonard Bloomfield.

rica, ed. by Thomas A.  
*guistics* 10. The Hague:

rge body of descriptive  
ind Ojibwa. The mate-