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 The principal source of his Cree data was his fieldwork in 1925, which largely superseded an earlier reliance on the Haas Cree grammar and dictionary by Lacombe (1874); he worked among the Plains Cree of Saskatchewan (principally on Sweet Grass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 Cuq (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Bloomfield's studies of Algonquian include a fair amount of unpublished material, which has not been fully calendared, and a number of publications, several of them posthumous.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); his review of Michelson's *Cul 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). 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 the facets of his Algonquian methods that emerge from his descriptive approach; his successors took him beyond clear that perhaps are indeed significant in the descriptive practice and general interest not as precisely in areas that perhaps method and because the basic importance. The interpretation of Bloomfield's fundamental work was the detection of the fundamental problem for perhaps any linguistic methodology and who their way by ignoring the linguistic should record: 1922:276-77, 1972:265) however, that even in a tradition in all facets of the "Literate and Illiterate that his solution to the community norm, a formalized speech of the field speaks as if the explicitly rejects as the "langue" ("the socially unmined" aspects of pa 1970:177). His Minor statements that imply even as ideally present the linguist as to which extent which the linguist ever extent is possible.
Leonard Bloomfield's Studies of Algonquian

Ch Island and Walpole. A fair amount of unpublished and a number of published early grammatical materials were gathered. The beginning of a brief outline of texts (Bloomfield 1925-1927) and theories of phonemics (Bloomfield 1927a, cited in Bloomfield 1928b) are the theoretical basis for this material. For Ojibwa, a palo Island dialect of the four languages, its features from the earliest to the most recent, document the beginning of a brief outline. The theoretical sketch of the four languages and features from the earliest to the most recent, document the beginning of a brief outline.

The fundamental problem encountered by Bloomfield in his Algonquian work was the determination of the object of study. This is, of course, a difficult 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" (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 self-conscious 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" (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..."
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 1960:67), 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, e. 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 e 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 [e] is e, 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.
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the phoneme e in the personal prefixes may be replaced by [ε] even though
e in prefixes is always followed by h or ?, environments that block [ε] as a
phonetic variant for e in other morphemes. Additionally, Bloomfield wrote
to Bloch that e was replaced by [ε] “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 consis-
tently replaces the morphophoneme |ε| in certain environments. As
described in the grammar (Bloomfield 1962:29-66), |ε| is raised to e (1)
word-initially; (2) otherwise in the first syllable of a word if not followed by
h or ? and (3) in the next syllable after a long vowel if not before h, ?, w,
or y. The letter to Bloch has qualifications that suggest that e 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 |ε| and in part like [ε] 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 |E| and |e| (Bloomfield 1962:2, 80, 81, 84-89). When
these remain short they are both treated like |ε| except that, if unmodified,
they surface as e; the difference between them is that, when
lengthened, |E| behaves like |ε| and gives e, but |e| behaves like |ε|
and gives e. 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 e and e, 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
evasive 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 |ε| to e (in initial syllables
and after long-vowel syllables); (4) the role of e and e in blocking the rais-
ing of e-, o-, and a; and (5) the analysis of the alternations accounted for in the published grammar with the diacritic morphophonemes |E| and |e|.

Bloomfield's field notes from 1920-1921 have three short front vowels, written <i>, <e>, and <e>, but these show a good deal of variation and do not correspond directly to the phonemes i, e, and e. The phoneme e is written in the notes <i>, <e>, and <a> (<i> also represents i); e is written <e>, and <e>; and e is written <e> and <e> (accented <e'> is also a common writing for e). Examples of this transcription are: ke'ne'mehs'new > "our (inc.) cross-niece" for kë'neemehsaw; <o'ni'mehsan>, <o'ne'mehsan>, and <o'ne'mehsan> "his cross-niece" for o'neemehsan; ine'niw > "man" for ine'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 <e> by either (short) <e> or (long) <ä>. Another systematic change was the substitution of <ö> for <o>, which reflected the perception that these were merely the accented and unaccented variants of the same sound. These changes are seen in the printed forms of the examples just cited: ke'ne'mehsii'new; <o'ni'mehsan>, <o'ne'mehsan>, and, identically, <o'ne'mehsan>; ine'niw (Bloomfield 1928b:382, 24). As a consequence, for example, manuscript <o'ne'mehso'wan>, which exactly represents o'neemehso'wan "their cross-niece", is printed as <o'ne'mehso'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 <api'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 <o> for <e> in printed pu'awit'aw, pu'awit'aw > manuscript: <pu'ewe'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 e that occurs before ? 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 her
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Preliminary Bloomfield thought his original distinction between <e> and <e> 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 Menomini word list, a manuscript compilation called “Alphabetical List,” in which words from his 1921-1921 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 Menomini forms. In these sources one notable inconsistency remains in the spelling of both i and e for i in initial syllables: <pemänihtam> “he notices it” but <pimäskaw> “he goes by” (“Alphabet List”); <kaahtem> “door” but <iskötaw> “fire” (Bloomfield 1924:341). Otherwise generally corresponds to both i and e, and <e> to e, except that <e> regularly appears for e where this represents the raising of |e|, or of lengthened |e|: <utähpenew> “he takes him up” (Bloomfield 1924:339) for ota-hpenew, reflecting |ata-hpene| which has a final |en| that is confirmed by forms like <peñtenaw> “he takes him by mistake” (Bloomfield 1922:338), for peñte-ne-w; <pemätesi-w> “he lives” (Bloomfield 1924:336) for pem-a-tese-w (|pema-tese|, with |ese-|). Segments written with the morphophoneme |E| appear as <e>: <keskimäj> “it cuts it through” (Bloomfield 1924:339) for ke-skisam with final |-Es-|, or <pe hesam> “it cuts 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 |y| by |c| written <ts>) and of some cases of |n| by |s|, is lengthened to <i> and raises preceding <e> to <i> and <o> to <u>: e.g. in the final meaning “act on a dwelling” in <pältikew> “he enters” (pi-kitikew), <untikäw> “he builds a house” (oni-k-ke-w). In other elements <i> does cause mutation, is lengthened to <e>, and does not cause raising: <pëhtishin> “he falls in” (pe-hehisen); <nitöshiten> “I make it” beside <usëhtaw> “he takes it” (neto-selton, ose-hlaw). A scrap of an early manuscript treatment
of Menominee phonology (Bloomfield 1920-1940) has an analysis that corresponds to this transcription using two short front vowels. The <i> that alternates with <e> is referred to as “i”, the <i> that alternates with <e> is “i”, and the <i> that “is a substitute for e [*e]... and alternates with a [e *e] is “i”. The examples of “i” are: <ape’sin> “he is black” (ape-sen [ape-sen]) and <pe’htiʌnʌm >, <pe’hiʌnʌm> “he puts it in” (pe-hiʌnem [pe-hiʌnem]). 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 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” but <i> if it is “i”, and <e> is written for <e>, for <i> that was earlier “i”, and for most cases of <e> in initial syllables. The differentiation of <i> and <e> appears to reflect a re-evaluation by Bloomfield of his phonetic record, since he now writes: “M[enominee] ʌ 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):


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: n’mix if he dances. Here I often heard a half-length or long vowel: nimit; ne*nw, ne*nw three.

The i varies the least: mix if he gives it to me. Only before laryngals a lower variant is common a+. at the way he does.

The lowest variants are reserved for e: pemâiesw he lives. Before laryngals especially low variants occur, with mouth over-open: ne*nw he
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kils him. In general, however, the distinction between i and e seems to be obliterated in actual pronunciation; thus one hears pimâtesi, ne'niw.

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

Bloomfield used the maximally differentiated form of this orthography in a revised word list, a notebook labeled simply “M”, which like the earlier “Alphabet 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 words have i:

<piotesi> “he lives”, but static <mietsi> “still, yet” and <kinipayat> (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 <kya> “away with you!” beside non-static <keyon> “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 e, e replaced i, and e replaced å. 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. 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 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. The section on phonology he copied, or in places paraphrased, and the section on morphology he had in Bloomfield’s own hand. 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.10 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 [l] 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.

A number of statements quoted or paraphrased by Swadesh provide insight into Bloomfield's thinking about the three short front vowels:

[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.

The problems solved later by setting up the diacritic morphophonemes [̈] and [̆] are handled by overtly morphological formulations ordered with respect to the phonology.

[5] e is replaced by ə, etc., but its 1 conjunct mode[1] if -e-r̈nt- ... think, er.


The examples of e with where it "appears normal" (t, s, or n): 12 (2) I... "do", <nekot> "one", 1 in the inverse and r -enaw. Although the rhythmic terms ("Initial e is r worded morphological rounced -ch").

The vowel system (Bloomfield 1939) show that for one thing the syllables by <e> except Bloomfield 1939:107, 1 no longer written differ <pemates> "he li" <pema-tesew> (1937 <nekot> and <pemate> phonemic forms neket a "Menomini Morphemic lightened up version of dislocated replacements e 1937 treatment and the later have [æ] or are set up [e], which is itself a dis...
respect to the phonological rules. One section covers the cases of \( \varepsilon \):

[5] \( \varepsilon \) is replaced by \( e \) in certain forms. It nevertheless acts like \( e \) in contraction, etc., but its lengthened form is \( e \); -eh- he (passive), suffix of the conjunct mode;] mench if be given it ... Historically, the \( e \) of -enem, -eh-ath ... think, belongs here. It is pronounced \( e \), and is lengthened to \( \varepsilon \).

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

[6] In some forms: a basic short vowel is treated as \( e \) but is \( \varepsilon \) in actual pronunciation.

The examples of \( e \) with this treatment are: (1) In the pronominal prefixes, where it "appears normally as \( e \)" but is \( \varepsilon \) before a glottal (\( i \) or \( ? \)) plus a dental (\( i \), or \( e \)). (2) In the first syllable of static particles: e.g. \(<\text{mesek}> \), "also", \(<\text{nekut}> \) "one". (3) In word initial. (4) In the locative ending -eh. (5) In the inverse and passive suffix -ek. (6) And in the first plural suffix -esnaw. Although the replacement in (3) is formulated in strictly phonological terms ("Initial \( e \) is pronounced \( \varepsilon \)."), 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 \( \varepsilon \) in first syllables by \(<\text{e}> \) except before clusters of \(<\text{ch}> \) or \(<\text{g}> \) plus a consonant (Bloomfield 1939:107, 115). As a result, static words and other words are no longer written differently; for the earlier static \(<\text{nekut}> \) "one" beside \(<\text{pemateesew}> \) "he lives" ("M"), and equivalent \(<\text{nekut}> \) beside \(<\text{pemateesew}> \) (1937 phonology). "Menomini Morphophonemics" has \(<\text{nekot}> \) and \(<\text{pemateesew}> \), with the first vowels the same, as in the later phonemic forms \(<\text{nekot}> \) and \(<\text{pemateesew}> \). Nevertheless "Menomini Morphophonemics" appears to be essentially a reworked and tightened up version of the 1937 draft grammar. The morphologically conditioned replacements of \( e \) by \( \varepsilon \) are handled in a way that falls between the 1937 treatment and that of the published grammar. The morphemes that later have \( \alpha \) are set up with \( \varepsilon \) followed by a cluster with first member \( \iota \), which is itself a diacritic morphophoneme. Those later with \( \alpha \) have an equivalent diacritic morphophoneme \( \alpha \). A rule replaces \( \varepsilon \) by \( e \).
before an |nC| cluster. Then, after the operation of the vowel-lengthening rules, |σ| is replaced by ɛ in a second set of morphemes.16

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 Phenological 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 ɛ and ɨ and assigned numbers to the four entities thus defined, which he referred to as “vowel morphophones”. 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 ɛ (e) and some of ɨ (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 <ɛ> instead of <ɛ> in the first syllables of normal words (except before hC and ɔC) 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 [ɛ] and [ɨ] 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 “morphophones” are discussed by numbers (their morphophonemic equivalents in the published grammar are: 1 = |ɛ|, 2 = |i|, 3 = |E|, and 4 = |e|; to these Bloomfield adds 5 = |ɛ| in prefixes, and 6 = |i|):17

[8] [W]e are left with problems: to what extent is (4) Medial ɛ phonetically realized as ɛ? I still differ, such that that (1, 2) differ and differ from the rest? ɛ differs in timbre from overlap in actual phon and on the other har which could be fulfilling each form many t

Several comments on Sw:

[9] [Swadesh recopryr]: I can hardly br

[10] kenew soon, at a hear also kaniv. I rer mending a read by k

[11] as ūk-is-set when h I am not sure about realized that I underst saying of me e-ses-n because I had not gr

[12] ka-wa-wen[[: I [Ir

The last piece of the stress fall into place was the det vowel syllable, if not follow as Rule 64, after the sectic that treats it (Bloomfield Bloomfield was writing to recordings attested its ɛ̃ hat: ūk-wa-wen AN is m: after the word, Bloomfield suggests the tr and Swadesh notes that plausible: that from which cases the transcription
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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) 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 (hear-
ing each form many times to see whether e or i ever occurred in it).10

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

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

[10] knew 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 kan! 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 e-ses-manne-oe?aw tiki-sew he is bashful like an Indian,
because I had not grabbed more than my share of a dainty.19

[12] ca ?wekit[?I [[noted]] recall this name as ka-?wekit.20

The last piece of the analysis of the Menominee short front vowels to
fall into place was the determination that e was raised to e after a long-
vowel syllable, if not followed by ?, h, w, or y. This rule may be referred to
is 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-?tepha-n AN is my notion of the word for barrel", and Swadesh,
after rehearing the word, added the annotation, "tete-?tepha-n barrel";
Bloomfield suggests the transcription "ana-mehewa-hitken cross (obv)",
and Swadesh notes that the second <e> is pronounced [e] by Striker;21
Swadesh makes the same annotation to the <e> of Bloomfield's "aw-
chha-test 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: <eʔteki> "that which is in place", <matanem> "nasty cur", <kawewepensei> "flings him prostrate", <enohna> "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 84 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). 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: kewi 'a naw for usual kiwi 'a náw 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 open vowel intervenes, e.g. ke-waskepí-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: kewaskepiw beside kwaskepiw 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 <i> is always kept in the onomatopoeic roots <ohón> "calling out" and <ohóp> "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 1920-1940:57-81). Bloomfield transcribed the first occurrence of this name in the myth as <mekehsí:neniwi> (with the <e> changed from <i>), the second occurrence as <mi-kehsí:neniwan> (an obviative; the second <e> is changed from <i>), and <mekehsí:neniwi>. In <mi-kehsí:neniwi>, w (alternative possibility) earlier <e>; in his published grammar ante <mekehsí:neniwi>, it (wampum bead) and <neniwi>, which proves to be kind it shows the open second, and the operat first. The i in the thi lengthening to <e> is the first syllable is block in the penult does not b after the preceding long would have required bc ing the raising of the mi ently in the 1937 draft) long vowels could not beognized as phonemic.
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working out of Rule 64 ule, which turned out to be the mid-vowel o before e if a
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changed from <e>), and then all the rest of the occurrences in the myth as 
<ne-kehsi-penew>. In his first fair copy he normalized this throughout to
<ne-kehsi-penew>, with <e> written above the <e> (suggesting an alternative possibility) and the <e> in the penult changed from an earlier <e>; in his second fair copy he normalized the form to
<ne-kehsi-penew>, which is the transcription me-kehsi-penew of his published grammar and word list. The underlying form of this word is
me-kehsi-penew; it consists of the stem of me-kas (pl. me-kehsak)
“wampum bead” and a final related to ene-niw “man” (underlying
enew), which proves the underlying |e| of the penult). As finally transcribed 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 e. The |e| 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 e and e-in-blocking the raising of the mid vowels (a correlation recognized but stated differently in the 1937 draft) and the conclusion that the raising of |e| to e after long vowels could not be subsumed under surface variation but must be recognized 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 regularity of the rules to his satisfaction, Bloomfield rewrote his corpus accordingly. The recordings in “M” had been normalized to fit the earlier formulation of Rule 66 as without systematic exceptions: <kési-nināhích> “he washes his hands”, <mùnìnhpeniw> “he digs potatoes”, <mákehsipenew> “the Bead-Man” (also Bloomfield 1927b:397). This uniformity was, however, 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 <káhu-ti:mit> “sock”, with raising, but <uku:ákumití:hsan> “his socks”, without raising. This peculiarity was suppressed in the normative transcription of “M”, which has <káhu-mêmet> “sock”, <nikáhkumetí: “my sock”, but it reappears later in the 1937 draft: <káhu-metí: “sock”, <keko-hkometí:hsan> “your
socks” (Bloomfield 1920-1940, 1937). 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 role 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 *kokwa-net,* *nekohikominet-htsan,* 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?nene-keiw* “he washes his hands” and *mo-nehpeni-w* “he digs potatoes” (Bloomfield 1973:35, 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 or any 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?nii-* “wash” followed by various body-part mediads, Bloomfield recorded this root with the raised vowel `<i> in the stems that had a following raising environment even when there was an intervening mid vowel (Bloomfield 1920-1940, 8:12): *<ninawakist>nine-heiw> “I am going to wash my hands” (as if *ninaw-Nes-kisi?nene-heiw*). 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: *<kesi?nene-heiw> “he washes his hands,”* *kese?nene-kiw> “he washes his armpits”; cf. in the same source, with raising blocked, *<mo-nehpeni-w> “he digs potatoes.”* Despite Bloomfield’s subsequent hesitation, 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 *-kei* (making verbs of collective action from animate intransitives): manuscript *<as pušiketiitua?> “when they embark together” (Bloomfield 1920-1940, 1:64), printed as *<as pušiheitiitua?>* (Bloomfield 1928n:8) and kept as *pušiketiitua?* (Bloomfield 1962:507) instead of normatively correct as *pušikeitiitua?” (cf., Bloomfield 1920-1940, 1:64).
of words, which given shape were firmly held a role in his thinking of these rules, the tood as hokh-xetik, in the possessed forms of the unpossessing vowel in the unpossessing from "M" were rewritten: no-nem-eh-w "he digs," on the other hand, including except -96-97), but there is no mention in the published perspective the outside the range of 9. There are indications, simply random fluctuations of verb stems containing body-part medial, <1> in the stem that re was an intervening si'nine-hem > "I am him). The exceptional version of the Menomini using found in "M" is nulation of rule 66; si'nee-hkwei > "he with raising blocked, Bloomfield's subsequent using is a real feature accounted for in his raising raising may be a suffix complex -ke:x-ins would (Bloomfield 1920-1940, 28b:8) and kept as normatively correct as pos-eh-xtitwa (cf. Bloomfield 1975:225); <as wi-khee-tetua?> "when they dwelt together" (Swadesh text: Bloomfield 1920-1940, Q6), normalized to <as wi-ke-xtitwa?> by Bloomfield and then reëorted by Swadesh as having <ti> (Bloomfield 1928a), for normative as we-ke-xtitwa (cf. Bloomfield 1975:275). Another is -hki (which makes verbs of habitual action and derives agent nouns in -hkiw): <ski-pwa'-hkiw> "he is a great biter" (Bloomfield 1928b:16), normalized to <sake-poe-hkiw> (Bloomfield 1920-1940); <mu-we-hkiw> "cannibal monster" (Striker text, consistently, with the <u> corrected to <a> by Swadesh (Bloomfield 1920-1940, Q41) and the whole rewritten <mu-we-hkiw> by Bloomfield (1920-1940, S46), normalized to no-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 Menomini used in the published description, which first appeared in print in 1941 (Bloomfield 1941, 1962, 1975). In addition to the rewrites 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 e?C in the first syllable. For example, the word for "tree, stick, wood" was first transcribed with the two different vowels: <me?tek> (Bloomfield 1920-1940, "Alphab. List"). <me?tek> (Bloomfield 1924:340); then with both vowels the same: <me?tekwek> pl. (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 1962:284); <ne?nema:w> "tobacco" (Bloomfield 1920-1940, early 20s list), <ne?nemaw> (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 rewrites 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 Menomini e. 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* "red squirrel", with double-underlined *i* (matching Bloomfield 1962:270), correcting the earlier recording as (exceptional) *ona-want-k* (Bloomfield 1939:115; still unrectified in Bloomfield 1962:252, 442, 1975:177).

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.

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*:

\[\text{pis-uná pw isí inh as apé't (not obv.)}\]

\[\text{pis-uná pw isí inh as apé'ni (obv.)}\]

though the latter is felt as the more graceful and sensible location. Not uncommon are such expressions as *a-pi'w inh [min]é'wan wé'wan* that *wife of Kinewan's is coming*, where verb and particle are not obviative, although *wé'wan his wife* is necessarily so; less clumsy is *a-pi'wan anuh kimé'wan wé'wan*.
In the first pair of examples the words are: <pis-unâ'piw> “he (proximate [i.e. non-obliative]) came and sat down”, <inis> “there”, <inuh> “that (prox.)”, <as apé’t> “where he (prox.) was sitting”; <ani’nuh> “this (obv.)”, <as apé’nit> “where he (obv.) was sitting”. The second pair has: <a-pl’w> “she (prox.) will come”, <inuh> “that (prox.)”, <kimé’wan> “Rain (prox.)”, <we’wan> “his (prox.) wife (obv.)”; <a-pl’wan> “she (obv.) will come”, <aruh> “this (obv.)”. In the published grammar the failure to use the obliative 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 obliative forms by proximate occurs when the discourse centers around an animate third person who is at the outset named as a possession of another person and therefore is necessarily in obliative form. [The variant using the obliatives] represents a neat and logical utterance: less deliberately and less urbane, but often enough, one will leave the verb and the pronoun in proximate form.[1]

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 obliative; 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 obliatives 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):


Literally: “His younger sibling died; he was a man.”; freely: “His younger brother died.” (<uhse’mehsan> “his younger sibling (obv.)”, <kés-ni’uah> “he (prox.) died”, <iné niw> “man (prox.)”, <késiwe> “he (prox.) was”). The subsequent sentences are about the younger brother. In the published texts (Bloomfield 1928b:24) this appears as:
[17] uhsē'mehsān kē's-nipō; inā'niw kēs-ā'vēw.

Here <kēsniπ'ah> “he (prox.) died” has been emended to <kē's-nipō> “he (obv.) died”, so that the shift from obviative to proximate takes place between clauses rather than within a clause. The obviative 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 (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] unēkihi'umawūk kēs misāhkatawe'hew unci'xosowā'wan aśawihkiihtkū'aw avēnīn jōh mamā'ci iwā'tuwa? inā' akē'sis sawēnēmikō'wesit inūh mēsāhkatew'et, inā' teh ajāwik aśaw kēs mā's-pahtah misīk teh napō'n as minu'opahat, inā' wojīl hkihtuk aji'm mēsāhkatew'et kāpin aki'kēh avetok'ok aśpēc nātame'kut

(one-kehekumawak “parents (prox.)”, kēs-mēsa-hkatawehew “he (prox.) made them (obv.) fast”, onci'hosowāwan “their children (obv.)”, as a·wi·hkihtokwa” “so that they (prox.) would gain it”, av-e-nenyo·h-mama·ce·tawetus “whereby they (prox.) would be somebody in the future”; enō “that is”, a-ke·sa-sawē-nemeko·weset “how he (prox.) would have been blessed (by manitous)”, enōh “that (prox.)”, me-sahkatēwe't “one who (prox.) fasts”; enō “that is”, teh “and”, aya·wek “how it is”, as a·ke·sa-mēsa-pahōh “that he (prox.) may have seen an evil vision”, mesēk “also”, teh “and”, na·pa·n “on the other hand”, as·mēnua·pahōh “that he (prox.) see a good vision”; enō “that is”, wayi·hkihtok “what he (prox.) gains”, ayaom “this (prox.)”, me-sahkatēwe't “one who (prox.) fasts”, kispen “if”, akeko “these (prox.)”, a·we·tokak “manitous (prox.)”, as pe·ca·na·takamok “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):
in the first sentence, the subject inflection of the last two verbs has been changed from proximate to obviative (as a-wé-hkihtonek, aw-enem-yoh-manene-dawenet) 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 (anenok awe-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 obviative 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 <wawé'kiwi> (Bloomfield 1920-1940, 1:106) printed as <wawé'kiwin> "she was dwelling somewhere (quot.)" (Bloomfield 1928b:574).

The worst Menominee speaker singled out for comment by Bloomfield was a man he referred to as "White-Thunder." "his Menomini 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? inad'> (Bloomfield 1920-1940, B3.38-39), printed as <ini? inad'> "that is how he told the story; that is the story he told" (Bloom-
Bloomfield's goal of describing the community norm of Menominee clearly had a great impact on his presentation of the Menominee data. He provided an explicit account only of the pronunciations, forms, and usages that he had determined constituted the norm, an entity that was in the final analysis an abstraction based on evaluation and analysis of the raw materials collected. His editing of the texts shows that he regarded them as providing examples of Menominee that were consistent with the norm and not as attestations of varieties of actual speech. There is no question that in describing the norm he was able to reduce the extraordinary chaos of the raw Menominee data to remarkable order, and no doubt the delimitation of a norm is a very useful device for approaching such materials. But for Bloomfield the description of the norm was not a framework for the description of the totality of speech observed in the community; it was, or became, by itself the final goal. Deviations from the norm are treated anecdotally or dismissively if at all, and the ideal that they might at least in principle be left for later description (Bloomfield 1933:45, 311) was never realized.

It is hard to avoid observing that Bloomfield's achievement of the goal of describing the community norm of Menominee sits uncomfortably with his exhortation that in describing the language of a community a "linguistic observer... must record every form he can find and... must not select or distort the facts according to his views of what the speakers ought to be saying", not to mention his general condemnatory remarks about normative grammars and about the obliterating of "linguistically valuable forms" by the over-editing of ancient texts (Bloomfield 1933:7, 37-38, 295, 497). In bringing order to Menominee, Bloomfield achieved a different goal from the one he envisioned in praising Truman Michelson's first edited Fox text: "There are many books about language, but very little of human speech is known to science" (Bloomfield 1922:276).

The description of a language as refractively defined by a postulated community norm is fundamentally incompatible with the descriptivist ideal of documenting and accounting for the totality of actual speech. Bloomfield's work on Menominee clearly shows his struggle to reconcile these two goals, which he resolved in favor of the approach that would permit an internally consistent descriptive epitome. Although he refrained from discussing his reasoning in his publications, his retention of his various manuscript attempts at describing precisely the most challenging features of the phonology suggests that it object of inquiry. In a linguist's final explanatory when held by linguists potentially disastrous co-known languages, for w largely coincide. Surely Menominee texts before mental task of the language's own grammars, but the texts are the most neg documentation; grammar tradition who have publ are or should be either irrigation of text editing receive documentation) nor "edi 1933; Hockett 1958; Gle

It is not possible to field's synchronic and di-attractive writings are approach to descriptive languages: "The Word-Stem which even after his lati-tion to Algonquian stem (Bloomfield 1941), an unconsidered classic of descriptive work, such as (passim), "Notes on the I 227, 229, pt. 2:184), and 5). Bloomfield freely int. The first presentation of tonal sound laws (Bloomi i. Morphophonemics' descriptive order should I then that knowledge of
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
tests 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). 34

***

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 -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. 35 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). 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 formal systems 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 oblique 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 *-O, with the remark that "Menominee] 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 -eel, 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
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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 com-
morphology, but except by implication no historical morphology.
Bloomfield's reconstruction of etyma based on exact comparisons and
his sleighting 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 misrep-
resentation 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
eudations. In his comparative studies, he often selects between two vari-
ants, 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 acknowledge-

For example, Jones's texts have evidence for both ineniva and neniva
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 inenivwa
"he is a man" and nenivwa (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 con-
text in Language, Bloomfield takes the longer forms as the norm, gives
only them in his word list, suggests that some occurrences of neniva are
merely graphic errors that should be emended away, and uses only ineniva
in his comparative papers, where it matches the vowel-initial forms of the

There is a single attestation of the Fox stem in *kawâhkwa'y[an]*: “When I am so overcome with sleep as to fall”, (Jones 1907:124.1), which is entered unchanged in the word list as *kawâhkwa*wa “he falls from sleepiness” (Bloomfield 1984a:39). This is first cited, as a comparandum for the final of Menominee *sâkîhka*wa “he has a nightmare” and Cree *sëkikwa*swi, as Fox *kawâhkwa*wa “he falls from sleepiness” (Bloomfield 1924:33), then as a comparandum for Cree *kawhkwa*swi and Menominee *kâkîhkwâ*swi “he is sleepy” as Fox *kawêhkwa*swi “he is sleepy” (Bloomfield 1925:149), and finally, when Ojibwa *kawînkwa*sti is brought into the equation, as Fox *kaweqwa*swi (Bloomfield 1946:90; Goddard 1982:44, n. 162). 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 ostensibly support of equations from which, in fact, they were in part derived.

For the Fox word for “louse” the texts attest only *ahkwâwi* “lice (obv.)”, pointing to *ahkwâ, and keesko* *ki* “your (sg.) lice”, pointing to *ihkwâ* (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 *ihkwâ*), always cites the Fox form as *ihkwâ*, or its equivalent, both in comparative contexts and in Fox materials (Bloomfield 1924:338, 1925:138, 1925-1927, pt. 2:183, 1946:93, 1984a:33). In fact, however, Fox *ahkwâ* “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 (1925:133; 1946:86) refers to as the “deviation” of some short vowels in initial syllables.

From Fox *ahkwâmi*wa “he is exhausted from running” and *ka* *kima*wa “he is able to move” (apparently frozen compound stems) and *mama*wa “he moves, stirs” (Jones 1907:210.5; Michelson 1925:46.32, 316.14) Bloomfield (1984a:59) extracted Fox *ma* *ci* “he goes, moves” that is cited without specific gloss as a comparandum of Menominee *ma*ci “he starts off, moves away” and related Cree and Ojibwa forms (Bloomfield 1925:1 “go” (Bloomfield 1925:1 an Ojibwa stem “m” rect account and is away is ma*ci“, a third singular indep dum for Fox ma*ma* 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 Algonquin *i*- (notated from Menom the productive for 1962.303-304). Blos sons, but he seldom them, and he never.
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(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 unlauteform mači- attested for the

third singular independent in the Nipissing dialect; the correct comparandum for Fox mana-cí-wa “he moves, stirs” is Ojibwa manači- “id.”. The

Fox verb is used in expressions like uswi me nači-fyakwés “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 mači-w “he

starts off” but mana-ce?aw “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 meaning. The difference in the

finals can be explained as resulting from the replacement of Proto-

Algonquian *-č- (~ Menominee -č-), which has been almost entirely elimi-

nated from Menominee in stems indicating motion, by Menominee -ča-, the

productive final denoting “activity or movement” (Bloomfield 1962:303-304). Bloomfield mentions the reshaping of stems in his compara-

sons, but he seldom discusses the recurring patterns and the reasons for

them, and he never goes into the details of attested usage and meaning. 

Another altered Ojibwa form is kinosi “he is long”, which is compared

with Cree kinosiwi 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: kinosi (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 lan-

guages on the length of an of (~ after a short-vowel initial syllable.

Bloomfield gives the Ojibwa reflex of the rare Proto-Algonquian cluster *čk as šk, citing <ninagakwung> “at my palate” (Bloomfield 1925:148) and

(doubtless constructed from this) ninakasì “my palate” (Bloomfield 1946:89) as the cognate of Menominee nena-šašk, a plural tautum. The

oddly glossed locative appears to be a rewriting of the Nipissing-dialect form of Cuq (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 šk and šč, and this must
be the reason he replaced Cuqo's <sk> by <ck> ( = [sk]) 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 1946:38, fn. 10). Cuqo's <sk> in "palate" is confirmed by Baraga (1880:293), who has <ninagask> "my palate", <onangaskon> "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.  

More seriously, Bloomfield (1925:148, 1946:89) gives the only other etymon attesting Proto-Algonquian *ck as being supported by Fox kekyyewa "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).
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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 theFox list suggested to Hockett that it was
compiled "in the very early 1920's" (in Bloomfield 1984:v), 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 come into Bloomfield's hands only
while the "Notes on the Fox Language" was in press (Bloomfield 1925-1927, pt. 2:187, n.1). 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

3) Bloomfield's wording has e kept before h and before c, raising to e before intervocalic
unless permitted to account for ne:ma, analyzed as underlying [ne:ma:]-, the irregular vocative of
ne:ma:"my brother, friend (man speaking)". However, ne:ma:h, the irregular vocative of ne:ma:"my
mother" (Bloomfield 1952:21), shows that e is not raised in this environment, and the e of
ne:ma:"can be explained as a case of the shortening of a long vowel in a static word (Bloom-
field 1962:94; fn. 7 below). The formulation permitting raising before intervocalic e reflects an
earlier transcription of this form as <ne:ma:h> (Bloomfield 1933:177). The specific environ-
ments that permitted the raising of e to e in prefixes by surface variation are also variously

4) Pointed brackets enclose exact transliterations of the source, except that the suita
accent is usually placed after the vowel, as in the published texts. In the manuscripts the suita is either
over or after the vowel, sometimes indeterminately, or stress is marked before the syllable. The
symbol <a> found in Bloomfield's early manuscripts and in the published texts has been
retained even though the distinction between <a> and <a> is very inconsistently made, result-
ing in many doubts 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 (Bloom-
field 1962, 1975), but with ? 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
Algonquian" (see letter S11 in Hockett 1987). Italics is sometimes used for morphophonemics (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 <a> for the long vowel of the low front vowel 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 1929) (M2 in Hockett 1987) Bloomfield and Michelson: "I like to use a for a, whether long or short". (In this letter Bloomfield states explicitly that he thought there were two short front vowels, and his examples and discussions show that he was only beginning to grasp the situation as he later came to understand it) (Bloomfield 1919-1932). The symbols <i> and <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 <œ> for o only before w or y, and <œ> for other cases of o. (And for u, which is only found before w and y). The use in the published texts of <i> for i of <œ> for o is omitted from the table of equivalences that Bloomfield gave to Siebert (1982:8).

7) Static words (Bloomfield 1962:94), earlier called stonic (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 these sometimes have other peculiarities. For 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 1937-1958). The section in Bloomfield's hand here called the morphology is labeled "Infection" (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 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", <œ> and <œ> contrast only before w and y, and elsewhere only <œ> is written (cf. fn. 6). In the 1937 morphology, <œ> is written everywhere except where <œ> contrasts with it. For the long diphthongs, "M" and the 1937 morphology have <œ> and <œ> and <œ> appearing in the final sections (perhaps changes introduced by Swadesh in copying).

12) Bloomfield notes that basic [e] is in pronunciation also in [me-] "in front", "which doubtless contains the prefix [me-]."
1) Bloomfield's use of the word "particle" here, whatever the explanation for it may be, is not intended to exclude static words that are parts of speech other than particles, e.g. the native *-kíeptayš*. *(Bloomfield 1920-1940, 'M').

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

3) This formulation works only by splitting into two the rule that replaces first members of classes by /b/, keeping /n/ in /aq/ 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.

4) "Menomini Morphophonemics" has the same use of /o/ and /a/ as the 1937 draft morphology (see fn. 11). Long vowels are indicated with a macron, and the long diphthongs are written /ys/ and /w/.

5) 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 "morphophones" were listed by Swadesh on the copy he retained *(Swadesh 1937:1938).*

6) Presumably Bloomfield did not intend to write "and on the other hand with (6)" but means rather: if /e/ (4) overlaps with /e/ (1, etc.) and if /i/ (9) also overlaps with /e/ the brackets are as in the original.

7) Bloomfield occasionally slips into the old orthography. Here *mama-ceawew* has the /ce/ changed from /c/; the /ce/ in the first syllable of *teki-sew* is a similar slip, given that he says it written *etc.*. For the construction used in this expression see perhaps Bloomfield (1939:207), but when Swadesh checked it with Striker he preferred *manaw-neqawensaw* *(Bloomfield 1920-1940, Q99, S54).*

8) Bloomfield first wrote "notice", then crossed out this cut and wrote "recall" above it.

9) Swadesh recorded the word for "cross" (in the oblique) from Frank S. Gauthier as *tseenaw-htikew* *(Bloomfield 1920-1940, Q12).* Bloomfield supports his different spelling of the least element by claiming that, although the verb was *tseenaw* "he prays, is a Christian," the corresponding initial was *a-tseenaw-* (these vowel lengths match those in "M"). Swadesh subsequently recorded the verbs from Striker as *ansawehew-* and *ansawehew-*; Ultimate case to all these related elements with a long vowel in the fourth syllable *(Bloomfield 1958:233, 234, 304, 305, 306, 308, 309, 315; 1975:18)*, an exception to the rules that adjust vowel quality and length. The later normalized form *ansawehew-* *(Bloomfield 1962, 1975:18).* Bloomfield adopted *Swadesh's *ce* in the noun final *-cehtikew-* and used the transcription *ansawehew-* *(Bloomfield in his fair copies of *The Menomini Language* (Bloomfield 1920-1940, Q12)). This *ce* could not be basic *e*, which would mutate the root *e*, and before Bloomfield formulated Rule 64, which allowed the *ce* to be taken as an *e* raised from basic *e*, be analyzed as basic *e*, an analysis still reflected in some of the materials that made up *The Menomini Language* *(Bloomfield 1962:126).*

10) The raising sometimes is observed to take place across compound-stem or word boundaries.

11) A draft section on irregular noun possession (matching the early-20th draft in transcription...
(ion) has <kuh-kuh-mith> "stocking, sock", <kuh-kuh-miths>n> "his socks", with the second form changed from <bo> (Bloomfield 1920-1940).

24) In the published version these verbs conform to Rule 66, but two derived noun stems in exceptions kesi-<nehkwon> "washing", kesi-hene-heckow <wash-basin> (Bloomfield 1920-1940). Hockett, the editor, suggests that these might better be kesi-<nehkwon> and kesi-<hene-heckow>. A slip in a set extracting information from the 1940 materials, on the other hand, solves the anomaly of the first of these forms by giving kesi-<nehkwon>, with the second e double-underlined for emphasis (Bloomfield 1920-1940); he would agree with the transcription of the underlying verb as kesi-<nehkwon> "he washes clothes" (Bloomfield 1940-1942). The transcription kesi-<nehkwon> (Bloomfield 1920-1940) seems to have been copied by early recordings with <e>, e.g., <kise-<nehkwon>, but the similar recording <kimo-<nehkwon> "the steals (habitually) in the same source (Bloomfield 1920-1940, early-2th list), apparently supporting kemo-<nehkwon> (Bloomfield 1920-1940), is similarly contradicted by the recording kemo-<nehkwon> (with the e underlined three times) on a loose sheet containing form apparently jotted down by Bloomfield on his 1939 trip. A few other words written with exceptional raising appear in the final description. e.g., <pe-<wenew> "deceased person" (Bloomfield 1940-1942, early-2th list).; wi-were-lpew-lpew-<en> "weil" (beside wi-were-lpew-lpew-<en> and wi-were-lpew-lpew-<en> "veil, cloth, netting" (Bloomfield 1920-1940, early-2th 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 <u-i>? (third plural emphatic <wa>) to make the ending conform to the regular rules of vowel shortening (wa being the short equivalent of i); "I don't believe there is much difference in this ending, between i and wa — perhaps none. But the unphonemic notations of u+i/a+i in general in my texts is something that I want to carry out the phonemic values in future. This means a-i-i/a-i; distributes the general rule, unless it should appear that this suffix has always the long form." (Bloomfield 1920-1940). He later concluded, in agreement with Swadesh's transcription, that this suffix was indeed (exceptionally) always long.

26) The conclusion reached by Tectes (1970b:237) that "Menomin Morphonemics" was "a revised and completed version" of the chapter on morphophonemics in The Menomini Language is disputed 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 "Menomin Morphonemics"; parts of the correspondence that Hockett did not print might clarify this, but in any event Bloomfield's letter in fact describes a new analysis of 1940, which he may have told Bloch about at some point.

27) ne?en?esh is found already in two 1933 letters from Bloomfield to Ruth Larder (June 1 and 6, 1933, Bloomfield 1920-1940). A letter to Truman Michelson has <ni-ne?en?esh> (June 19, 1931, Bloomfield 1919-1922), and the early "Alphabet List" has <ni-ne?en?esh> (Bloomfield 1920-1940), with the <e> of the prefix changed from <e>.

28) Many of the new transcriptions did not get entered into the typescript of the Menomin Lexicon; the "Supplement" (Bloomfield 1927:284-289), containing words found by Hockett 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, A. Miner (1977:72) has pointed out, not even all words or variants in the published texts appear in the Lexicon. For example, oke-neksemaw "the younger brother or sister" is given (Bloomfield 1920-1940:171) but not the presumably disfavored variant oke-<nenew>, though this appears in
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text 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.

2) From the point of view of classical American phonemic theory Bloomfield's overlapping phonemes had to be considered morphophonemes (Hockett 1948: 124, fn. 24; Jones 1958: 92).

3) Here and elsewhere Bloomfield substitutes the demonstrative ("particle") anoh "this (obj.)" (the equivalent of annenoh) for enhoh "that (pros.)."

4) 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.

5) 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 <cas ake>, for <<kaw kës>: the replacement of <këspin> "if", a common spelling in the manuscript originals, by the normative <këspin>; 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 inferences 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).

6) The printed text has 35 quotative forms, not one of which was first written as such when the text was dictated. Two occurrences of <kë> "it was then (that)" were changed to the corresponding quotative <këwin> 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 <kën> was kept as <kë>n rather than being replaced by the corresponding quotative (consistently <kaw> and <kaw:n>); the predicative demonstrative <kë> "this (pros.)" was emended to the non-predicative obliative <kënum> rather than to the corresponding quotative (ayowen) or obliative-quotative (ayowen).

7) 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 minimally different approach to editing (Goldmark 1973); see now the important article by Heath (1985).

8) The disclaimer is strikingly similar to the one made by Swadesh in "A Problem in Phonological Alternation" (Swadesh and Voegelin 1939: 21).

9) 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 Manoomin was originally transcribed with <e> retained in initial syllables and after long-vowel syllables, then <p> in initial syllables was changed to <e>, e.g. <penatekeno> "live thou", with the first
changed from <e>. The final Menominee transcription thus corresponds to that in "Menomini Morphophonemics" (Bloomfield 1936); an acknowledgement of Menominee data from Swadesh puts the date after June, 1938. Proto-Algonquian was written with word-initial <co>- and this was later changed to <coe>. 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 of <e> after long-vowel syllables, but in the few words that have been completed by hand, <e> has been written in e.g. <pemeseew> "he lives", with the first and third <e> typed and the second <e> written in by hand in the space that had been left for an <e>. Thus the typing of the second draft preceded and the annotation (at least of the carbon) followed the final writing out of the distribution of Menominee e and e described in the December, 1940, letter to Bick (in Hockett 1970:367-368).

37) The regular correspondences are (1) Fox <kec> : Cree <hee> : Menominee <hee> and (2) Fox: Cree <hee> : Menominee <hee> : Ojibwa <kee>. Bloomfield takes the Menominee meaning "he is sleep" 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" (Lacombc 1874:377; Baraga 1880:127).

38) Bloomfield wrote this word <ehkwa> in a two publication 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-); <e>- was written in the one word analyzed, on the basis of morphological evidence, to have basic [e-]: <ehkwa> "he says (so)", beside the irregular prefixed forms like am "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 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: *neo-"my foot"; *nesiian-"my feet" (Bloomfield 1941:295, 1946:119); cf. Michelson (1935:134) and Goddard (1932:741); neka-tani "my legs" (Bloomfield 1946:19, following the meaning in other languages), correctly "my feet" (cf. Michelson 1935:141); *meno-"I drink it"; *menowa-"he drinks it" (Bloomfield 1946:98), correctly nenewa, menewa (Bloomfield 1948a:66; Michelson 1935:146); *ne-pewa "man, male" (Bloomfield 1946:107), reflected in Fox only as the dependent noun nema-pewa "my husband" (as in Bloomfield 1925:132) and derivatives of this: *ni-mnheat-waki "they dance together" (Bloomfield 1946:108), correctly *nimheat-waki (as in Bloomfield 1925:136), with the Fox reciprocal suffix -neqwi-. This does not match the vowel length of the apparent reflexes of Proto-Algonquian *-ewi- in the other languages; oyiwa means "he has a "pack" (Bloomfield 1941:295, 1946:121, 1948a:36), an etymological gloss, correctly he has a load on his back" (Michelson 1925:142-22).

41) A letter from C.F. Voegelin (dateable 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 1938:198). Bloomfield acknowledges his reliance on Baraga (1880) and Cauw (1886) for some data in his "Sound-system" (Bloomfield 1925:150) and the drafts of the "Sketch" (Bloomfield 1938:194).
REFERENCES


[Quoted from Hockett 1970:147-156.]


—. 1928c. “A Note on Sound-Change”. Lg. 4:99-100.


—. 1965. "Sound Change". Lg. 41.185-204.


**SUMMARY**
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ras 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
single to reconcile the conflicting goals, formulated in his general state-
ments (in his 1933 *Language* and elsewhere), of describing a language by
determining the norm of the speech community and documenting a lan-
guage in exhaustive objective detail. In his diachronic studies Bloomfield
reconstructed the phonology of Proto-Algonquian and worked out the his-
torical 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 evi-
dent in these diachronic studies as well.

RÉSUMÉ

Les études algonquennes de Bloomfield comprennent un grand nom-
bre 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 pub-
lisés par d'autres. De toutes ses contributions, la plus importante fut celle
d'avoix mis de l'ordre et de la netteté dans la description de la morphologie
flexionnelle et dérivationnelle des langues algonquienes. L'auteur exami-
nait de près le développement de la solution bloomfieldienne de certains pro-
blèmes phonologiques du menomini et de la pratique de Bloomfield en édi-
tant ses textes menomini. Bloomfield dut lutter pour concilier deux buts op-
pose, 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
da façon détaillée et exhaustive. Dans ses études diachroniques, Bloom-
field reconstruit la structure phonologique du proto-algonquien et établit
la phonologie historique des langues dont il s'occupait. En étudiant la mor-
phologie, 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.