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2014 October correction to page 159:

On 7 October 1706, François Ardouin, acting for Antoine de Lamothe, Sieur de Cadillac, hired Adrien Senécal, Louis Lefebvre, Nicolas Cusson, and Joseph Cusson to make a voyage to Détroit [Antoine Adhémar, FHL microfilm #1613460, images #01847, #01848; Adhémar, MNR, Vol. 2, 403-406; Adhémar, RAPQ1930, p. 211 (Erroneously states that François Ardouin was hired. He was the engageur, not the engagé); Adhémar and Roy, Vol. 6, p. 184 (does not state the name of Nicolas Cusson)]. Thanks to Gail Moreau-DesHarnais for discovering this by reading the actual record. Several published indexes have errors or omissions that an examination of the document clearly illustrates.
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Introduction

The thirteen articles here presented evolved over many years, going back to 1980. Some of them (or parts of them) have appeared in *Michigan’s Habitant Heritage*, the Journal of the French-Canadian Heritage Society of Michigan, and, in their entirety, in an early version on Norm Léveillé’s e-zine Késsinnimek – Roots – Racines, from February 2003 to February 2004. This internet e-zine is no longer available, except on a CD that has the entire set of contributions written by many individuals from 2003 to 2007.

In order to make my research accessible to more readers, I agreed to publish them on a CD in this format. I have found additional details since I finished writing the February of 2004 article and the 2009 CD. In my corrections and revisions for this publication, I have added some of the new finds. I have also included, my article “Marriage Contract in New France according to *La Coutume de Paris* / The Custom of Paris,” originally published in *Michigan’s Habitant Heritage*, Vol. 26, no. 3 (July 2005): 135-137.

My hope is to one day use the facts in these articles to write a narrative account, one that will not be burdened or distracted by my extensive footnotes and documentation. The narrative will, nevertheless, be based on the hard evidence cited in these articles with an occasional excursion into speculations that will be identified as such. Some aspects of the Couc / Montour saga may never be fully understood, despite the dogmatic assertions of some writers about the family. For an idea of such a narrative, see my Couc Montour Narrative: Prologue on this disk. This will give you an overview of the family.

The Couc / Montour family has haunted me ever since I became aware of my only Indian ancestress, Marie Mitéouamegokoué, Algonquin wife of Pierre Couc dit Lafleur de Cognac. I dedicate this work to all of her descendants, known and unknown. My descent chart from Pierre Couc dit Lafleur de Cognac and Marie Mitéouamegoukoué is also included.

Thanks to Gail Moreau-DesHarnais for her encouragement and her sharing of discoveries, just as I have shared mine with her. My sincere appreciation, especially to Diane Sheppard, and also to Al Trudeau and Sharon Kelley, for the many times they have proofread my work. Any remaining typographical errors are mine alone.

Suzanne Boivin Sommerville
s.sommerville@sbcglobal.net October 2009 / April 2014

Author’s note: these articles are still in progress. For full citations of some of my sources in the footnotes, see the previous part(s). Copyright is mine. These articles may not be copied except for personal use, with full citation of author, title, and source, in this case, Suzanne Boivin Sommerville, *Sources: Couc / Montour*, the French-Canadian Heritage Society of Michigan, October 2009 / April 2014. Any comments or corrections will be graciously accepted. A technical detail: Modern French hyphenates double first names, *e.g.*, Marie-Catherine, and place names, *e.g.*, Trois-Rivières. The records of New France did not employ hyphens. I have recorded names of persons or places as they appear in the old records, except when I am quoting from a modern source that chose to hyphenate names.

After these articles were written, the *Archives nationales du Québec*, which I abbreviated ANQ, became *Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec*, BAnQ, the Province of Québec. The National Archives of Canada (in Ottawa, Ontario), which I abbreviated NAC, became *Library and Archives Canada*, LAC. I am aware that because of the original publication of these articles over thirteen months, some of my identifications of individuals and citation of sources are repetitious. Bear with me, please.
Definitions

THE STE. ANNE DE DETROIT REGISTER

On the original surviving register, the place name for the religious records is Fort Pontchartrain du Détroit until 1718, when, for the first time, with the word Sainte written as an abbreviation using superscript letters, the name Ste Anne du Détroit appears on one marriage, in a separate booklet, Livres des Mariages. This Book of Marriages begins on page 85 with marriages in 1710, as the registers are now assembled. The record for the marriage of François Pelletier to Marie Robert on 2 March of 1718 describes his parents as being de la paroisse de Ste Anne du detroit.
This is the earliest mention of the name Ste / Ste. Anne or parish of S\textsuperscript{e} Anne (as the name is written, often with no period after the superscript /\textsuperscript{e}/) that I have located in the register.

The other records continue to use Fort Pontchartrain du Détroit (of the whole strait) until after Father Antoine De Lino arrived in 1719; he called it fort Royal du detroit, and then in 1720, fort Royal du detroit Du Lac Erie et Du Lac hurons \[sic\], and he calls himself prestre Recolet \[sic\] “faissant Les fonctions Curiales au fort Royal du detroit,” performing parish functions. This name fort royal does not appear in every entry.

On 17 July 1722, Father Bonaventure, recently arrived to replace Father De Lino, baptized Joseph, son of Jean Baptiste Barrois and Magdeleinne Cardinal, in la paroisse [parish] de S\textsuperscript{e} Anne du detroit, with the word Sainte abbreviated and using superscript.

Godfather was Joseph de Tonty (who signed Deliette), fils de Monsieur de Tonty, commandant, and godmother was Susanne Nolan, who also signed. Page 173 of original. The name S\textsuperscript{e} Anne is used consistently after this date.

Today, the parish and church are known as Ste. Anne de Detroit, of the city of Detroit. I have yet to find the name recorded as S\textsuperscript{e} Anne de Detroit on the images available to me in the Drouin Collection at
ancestry.ca or ancestry.com. This use of “de” appears to be a modern adaptation of the original *S*re An*nee du D*etroit (of the whole strait named *le d*etroit) to indicate that the parish is located in the city of (*de*) Detroit. In modern times the name is sometimes *St. Ann*. Note: on the original registers, spelling is not consistent, accent marks are not used consistently, nor do I recall seeing *Sainte* spelled as a full word in any entry.

On 25 July 1722, Father Bonaventure says the rite took place *dans le glise de S*re An*nee du d*etroit, in the church.

The above images are from the original registers of Ste. Anne de Detroit available at Ancestry.com or Ancestry.ca : Early U.S. French Catholic Church Records (Drouin Collection), 1695-1954 > D > Détroit, Ste-Anne; Autres Registres > 1704-1744

**SOME IMPORTANT DEFINITIONS:**

**HABITANT:** In reconstituting the census of 1666, Marcel Trudel learned that *habitant* (one of the terms used to classify the status of individuals in the census of 1666) referred to a person who was no longer bound by the hiring contract that brought him or her to New France, nor was he a soldier still serving his required years of enlistment. A habitant was a male person, or, if female, *habitante*, who could be granted land or purchase it, and who could engage in trade, including but not limited to the fur trade. He or she could also farm, and many did, or they could hire someone else to farm land for him or her, but farmer was not the exclusive meaning of the term, as my examination of hundreds of notarial documents has verified. (Marcel Trudel, *La Population du Canada en 1666*, Sillery, Québec: Les Éditions du Septentrion, 1995.)
Checking the definition of the word *habitant* in the old French dictionaries of the seventeenth-, eighteenth-, nineteenth-, and even twentieth-centuries, available on the Web, further confirms its meaning. See *Dictionnaire de L’Académie française* at >http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/efts/ARTFL/projects/dicos/<

To Clarence Burton’s translators in the nineteenth century, and to others since then, though, a *habitant* was always a farmer. Recently I’ve been reading the word translated as peasant! In reality, a habitant was an inhabitant of New France who had chosen to remain and be a free citizen, to pursue whatever occupation or trade that became available. Some individuals are even called *bourgeois habitants*.

**PAYS D’EN HAUT** refers to the country upriver from the mother colony on the Saint Lawrence River, including what is now Michigan. If you stand at Niagara Falls and watch the force of the water flowing from Lakes Michigan, Superior, Huron, and Erie cascade into the Niagara River, to eventually pour into Lake Ontario at the site of Fort Niagara before continuing, via the Saint Lawrence River, to the Atlantic Ocean below Québec City, you will understand that traveling from the mother colony via the waterways meant going up river, against the current, to the *pays d’en haut*; and returning to the mother colony from *le pays d’en haut* meant traveling down river. Forget the modern tendency to visualize maps with North up (*en haut*), at the top, and South down (*en bas*), at the bottom! A rough pronunciation guide for *pays d’en haut* is /payee dahn (nasal /n/) oh/

Jetté referred to this geographic area upriver as *Ouest* / West in his citations of an *engageur* (a person who hired individuals), *engageur Ouest*, and of an *engagé* (a person who was hired to go to the *pays d’en haut*), *engagé Ouest*. Recently, an *engage* is being identified as an “indentured servant”. This is not accurate!

**COUREURS DE BOIS / COUREURS DES BOIS**: Both expressions are found in the old records, although the second is technically more correct. These were individuals who literally “ran into the woods” to interact with the Natives, to explore, to establish trade relations, or to evade the responsibilities of the culture and mores of the society of New France. Some of these individuals, in the early days of the colony, were legal, because the term was sometimes used for anyone away from the settled areas, but eventually this term referred to those who had left the colony without permission or who had remained away, sometimes because they owed a debt they could not repay. The term *voyageurs* replaced *coureurs des bois* to designate those who were hired to travel under contract to the *pays d’en haut*.

The government periodically issued pardons to the *coureurs des bois* to encourage them to come back to civilization, especially if they would, in return, assist in a military action, such as the campaigns against the Iroquois before 1701, against the Fox Indians after 1712, and against the English at various times in the history of *Nouvelle France*. The *coureurs des bois* and the *voyageurs* accomplished important diplomatic relationships with the Indians. Although the leaders of New France and the metropolitan government in France usually referred to them with disdain, their contributions to understanding the North American continent were really invaluable.

**SEIGNEURIAL SYSTEM**

Contrary to what you will sometimes read, the Seigneurial System, as it developed in New France, was not feudalism. It can be more accurately compared, for a modern mind, to a cooperative apartment or condominium system. It was a plan to assign and manage land grants from the king in an efficient manner under pioneer conditions.
A seigneur received land—without paying any money—from the 100 Associates in the early period and, after 1663, from the Crown. Tenure was that of Foi et Hommage. A seigneur or seigneuresse (there were some, but I will use the masculine form of pronouns) was literally required to formally swear allegiance to the king in a legal ceremony. He accepted the obligation to have the land cleared within a time limit or forfeit his title and the property held in his name. Others could then purchase or be granted the seigneurie.

A seigneur recruited tenants, who were called censitaires. The seigneurs allotted land, without cost at first, to the censitaires. The property was usually two or three arpents in width along a river or common road, at varying depths, and a seigneur received a small payment for the use of the land and for the services he was to provide. These plots of land laid out in narrow ribbons were sometimes called côtes or rangs. The censitaire paid cens and rentes, just as in a cooperative or condominium system an owner of a unit pays fees, usually monthly, to the developer. He was, however, a free habitant, inhabitant, not a serf or peasant. He could not be removed so long as he maintained a hearth or home there, worked the land, and paid the fees. Annually, this was about two sous an arpent, close to an English acre, sometimes paid in small animals or produce. When the land was sold, one twelfth of the sale price went to the seigneur. This was called lods et ventes. Owners of land in a seigneurie could have more than one piece of property, even in different seigneuries, pass them on to inheritors—including wives and daughters—sell them, or hire a fermier, a person under contract, to work the land in return for stipulated payments.

The seigneur had certain rights, called banalités, not all of which were actually demanded. The censitaire was obliged to:

1) grind his grain at the mill of the seigneur
2) bake bread at the seigneural oven (almost never enforced)
3) give the seigneur every eleventh fish caught in the river
4) dance around the May-pole to honor the seigneur each springtime
5) serve in the various corvées, work crews.

When called to a corvée, the tenant would give personal service (about six days a year) for such things as building common roads or bridges. This banalité could be purchased with money, thus exempting wealthier tenants from performing the task.1 Gustave Lanctot adds that the seigneur, as his responsibility, was required to “maintain a dwelling on his property, to preserve oak trees for naval construction, to report mines or minerals discovered, to reserve land for roads . . . .”2 He concludes: “The tenant was certainly not exploited; for a holding of 120 arpents, free of all further charges, he paid about 173 sous a year.”3 Towns and villages were also developed as seigneuries with smaller plots of lands for houses and sometimes gardens, and some seigneurs were religious orders, particularly Jesuits and Sulpicians.

Cover

---

1 Charles W. Colby, Canadian Types of the Old Régime 1608-1698. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1908. Note: Considerable further research has taken place since the 1908 publication of this work, but these details are accurate.
3 Ibid., p. 55. A livre contained 20 sous or sols and a sol contained 12 deniers. While it is impossible to assign a completely accurate modern value to the New France livre, some estimate that it was worth at least ten 1998 dollars.
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Prologue

A girl child entered the world in 1667 in New France. Most indications are that she was born at Cap de La Madeleine, near Trois Rivières, a small French settlement dating back to 1634 where a group of Algonquins under Sachem Pachirini were granted land among the French who lived and traded there. Her father had arrived in New France as a soldier some sixteen or more years earlier, by 1651. He served as an interpreter during the perilous days of Iroquois negotiations before the Carignan Regiment arrived from France in 1665 and achieved a temporary lull in hostilities by 1668. Thus, she began her life in this world in a period of relative tranquility that persisted for a number of years, in part, because many members of the Carignan Regiment, including the man who eventually became her first husband, decided to make New France their home.

Her Algonquin mother knew well the violence and aggression of the Iroquois, who in the 1640s and 1650s attacked Huron Wendats and Algonquins, indeed any Indians who challenged the Iroquois invasions of the vast territory now known as Ontario and the Great Lakes. Some members of the League of the Five Iroquois Nations, who call themselves the Haudenosaunee, also conducted raids on the settlements of the French colony. Her Algonquin people, like the Huron Wendats, were destroyed and dispersed from their homes. Some of them were adopted forcibly by the Iroquois and others found refuge among the French. Her mother was in Montréal as early as November 1650, when she was baptized a Roman Catholic. At that time she was married to an Indian, who disappeared from the records, as did their two young children, also baptized in Montréal.

How the mother met her second husband cannot be said with any certainty. Had she and her family been taken captive by the Iroquois and moved to Iroquois territory in what is now New York State and then escaped or been redeemed by the French? There is evidence that her husband-to-be traveled to Iroquoia on a diplomatic mission at least once. Or had she and her family taken refuge among Sachem Pachirini’s people at Trois Rivières? Charles Pachirini was one of her witnesses at her marriage. The circumstances of the courtship of this Algonquin and a man from France will never be known with certainty, but by April of 1657, she had agreed to marry the Frenchman at Trois Rivières, where her husband was granted property and where they lived for a while. Their first two children, a girl and a boy, were born and baptized there in 1657 and 1659. In the census of 1667, the family resided at Petit Cap de la Madeleine nearby, and an additional three girls had been born, including the subject of this narrative, who was recorded as three months old at the time of the 1667 census. The baptismal records of the younger children in the family have not survived; but considering the fact that paper records are extremely fragile, this is not surprising. What is amazing is that so many records have survived. These younger girls subsequently married in the Catholic Church, so evidence of their baptisms had to be extant at the time of their marriages.

Before 1681, the family had moved across the St. Lawrence River to another small settlement called St. François du Lac. There, the census declares, they lived on 15 arpents (acres) of cleared land, although the total land they owned was much larger, and they continued to hold property elsewhere. Another daughter and son had been born to the family by 1681, but the first-born daughter had died after an attack on her by a French habitant, inhabitant. The records that might have given a reason for the attack on the girl have disappeared. Her father had also been injured in the encounter; and, in 1680, he journeyed to Québec City to pursue justice for his daughter and for himself. Although the attacker was found guilty and sentenced to death, he was able to avoid his fate by agreeing to be the official executioner for the colony. Monetary retribution was awarded to the father for his injuries.
Members of the family served as godparents for Indians and French alike (as did many other French habitants), and the children appear to have learned their mother’s Algonkin as well as the totally different Huron and the Iroquois languages. But there is no evidence that the family left the colony on the St. Lawrence River to travel into the interior to trade or live with the Indians. The father is recorded as trading for furs within the colony, but he seems to have been occupied mainly with tending to his various farm properties and caring for his family. In fact, very few men of the colony were able to leave it to voyage into the interior legally until the 1680s, although there were, of course, exceptions, many of them the illegal coureurs des bois of the 1670s and beyond. The father of the family was said to be 57 in 1681, so it is unlikely he embarked on a career as a voyageur in the 1680s. His elder son, about to be age 22 in 1681, soon entered the fur trade and traveled to the pays d’en haut, the country upriver from the French colony on the St. Lawrence in the region of the Great Lakes.

The family was prosperous enough to offer substantial gifts in the marriage contracts of two of their daughters, in 1682 and 1684, but marriage contracts for the unions of the other children have not survived. They would, however, have been legally covered by the Custom of Paris as citizens of New France. Members of the family attended the signing of the two extant marriage contracts drawn up at the family home in St. François du Lac. The elder children’s earliest years included at least enough education to enable them to sign their names. This was not true for the four youngest, who grew up without formal schooling in writing, it seems, as each of them declared being unable to sign. Some of them nevertheless left their crosses on documents to indicate they understood the events for which they served as witnesses.

The father of the family died in the spring of 1690 and was buried at St. François du Lac during a time when the Iroquois were again attacking the French colony. He was then said to be 63 years of age but may have been older. Ages recorded at burials are notoriously unreliable. He was buried where the church burned by the Iroquois had once been. Present at his burial were a large number of people, including the seigneur of the settlement. The mother of the family survived until January of 1699, when she was buried at Nostre Dame des Trois Rivières with the honorific title of Madame after receiving all the rites of the Church, identified as an Indian and as the widow of Monsieur, her deceased husband. Because the record is signed only by the officiating priest, it is impossible to say who else might have been present or even whether all of her children were then in the mother colony, for their destiny took them to places far away from the St. Lawrence River.

The eldest surviving daughter appears to have lived out her long life mainly in Trois Rivières, raising her children and serving as a midwife for her community about twenty times She did travel to the English colony of New York at least once. She died in 1750, said to be 81 years old, in nearby Pointe du Lac, where her great-nephew, born in New York, would one day be seigneur. Some of her children, her siblings, and some of their children traveled to the pays d’en haut, the country up river that became Michigan and other locations in the United States of America, and also to the “enemy” English colonies, including New York and Pennsylvania. Death records are missing for all but one of her siblings. Her older brother can be documented as having been killed in 1709 in New York.

The girl child born in 1667, though, died at an unknown location, possibly in Pennsylvania or in the Ohio Valley, by 1753, about 86 years old, having lived for a time at Michilimackinac and Fort Pontchartrain (Detroit) when a very controversial Gascon, Antoine Laumet dit de Lamothe Cadillac, commanded those two outposts of New France. She interpreted Indian languages for him and for others while she lived at Fort Pontchartrain on Le Détroit du Lac Érié, between 1704 and 1706. Her second known husband also lived there until his death in 1706. She then defected to the English and spent more than forty years as an interpreter for the colonial governments of New York and Pennsylvania. She remarried once more, to an
Iroquois sachem. In 1719, the governor of New France attempted to recruit her, through her sister, to return to the country of her birth, but she declined the request. Comments by her contemporaries in the United States colonies assert that she continued to practice her Catholic faith even under the repressive regimes of the English colonial government. In fact, she was praised and admired by Indians, the colonial governors, and other individuals in those colonies and founded a family that is still remembered in the place names of the United States.

This is her story, and her family’s story. The accounts you will read on the English language web sites and in history books differ significantly.

What follows fills in the names missing from this overview of the life of Isabelle Couc dit Lafleur de Cognac, who became known as Madame Montour.

A Narrative Account of the Connections between the Couc dit Lafleur de Cognac Family of New France and the Montour Family of the American Colonies

As a companion to my documented series of articles on the Couc / Montour Family, I have written here an abbreviated narrative account without footnotes. It is not yet the narrative I hope to write, but it provides perspective to the highly-documented details in the parts that follow. These details are not presented chronologically in the articles. I focus on the woman known as Madame Montour, who, under this name, interpreted for two North American colonial powers in the eighteenth century. She has haunted me ever since I first read the basics of her story and learned that she was a daughter of my only Indian ancestress.

The Story as It Exists Now (2008) on Some Web Sites

The story of the Couc / Montour family is grossly garbled by most writers in English (and some writers in French). This is true because most writers in English have never consulted French language sources, not even Simone Vincens’s ground-breaking 1979 Madame Montour et son Temps, which I first read in 1981. What is more, very few of the historians who have read Vincens have also chosen to do original research beyond the documented details in her fine book, the one which inspired me to dig deeper. Instead, historians and genealogists continue to rely, for the most part, on old sources. Even modern historians, who should know better, repeat the errors preserved by writers who had no knowledge of New France and who worked from flawed English translations of French records.

I cite and evaluate many secondary sources about the family in my articles, but for this introductory part I will begin by referring to some recent accounts available now (2008) on the Web to give an idea of the problems with these sources. For example, Wikipedia, perhaps the most-often consulted “free encyclopedia” on the Web, gives the following information: {This Wikipedia Article has been updated, but it still lacks any primary French-language records.}

“Elizabeth Catherine [sic] Montour, better known as Madame Montour (1667 or 1684? - circa 1753), was born to a Native American mother and a French Canadian father.”

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elizabeth_Catherine_Montour
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As editing of all Wikipedia entries is ongoing, the version I quote includes the
comment: “This page was last modified on 17 August 2008, at 15:47.” I accessed
it on 4 November 2008. [Note: it has since undergone revision, not all of it accurate.]

The “biography” continues:

Much is uncertain about Madame Montour's life, including her given name. It seems
likely that she was born Elizabeth Catherine Couc in New France (modern Quebec,
Canada) to Marie Miteçamegçke [sic], the Algonquin wife of Pierre Couc, a French fur
trader [sic]. If she was this Elizabeth, she was born in 1667 near Trois-Rivières, in what
now is Quebec, Canada.

Other sources agree that she was born in New France to an Algonquin mother and French
father, but give her birth year as 1684. This date is based on accounts of her being
kidnapped as a ten year old in 1694 by the Iroquois.

There is some dispute about her parentage. In 1744 Madame Montour claimed to have
been the daughter of a French colonial governor, which is not verified by any existing
official records, and that she was kidnapped by the Iroquois after her father was killed in
a battle with them. Other historical accounts state that she was kidnapped by "anti-French
raiders" in 1695 when she was already a married woman.

There is agreement that Elizabeth traveled with her parents [sic] and spent part of her
youth [sic] at Fort Mackinac and Fort Detroit in what is now Michigan.

First marriage
Elizabeth acquired the Montour surname when she married a Seneca brave named,
Roland Montour [sic]. He appears to have been the father of some of her children, but
little is known about him, not even details of his death. By this point in her life, Madame
Montour, was living in New York in the area of the Genessee River.

Interpreter for colonial governments and Indian tribes
It is believed [sic] that she traveled to the Albany area in 1709 with her brother, Louis
[My addition: his full name Louis Couc dit Lafleur and dit Montour], where he served as
an interpreter. Her brother was killed and she was employed by New York Governor
Robert Hunter to take his place.

She was called to Albany in 1719 and worked as an interpreter for the English colonies
from that time on. In 1727 she was an interpreter at a council in Philadelphia. Her work
was so valued by the authorities that she was paid the same as a man.

Second marriage
Although no date is recorded, Madame Montour married her second husband [sic], an
Oneida chief named Carondowanna. Madame Montour and Carondowanna then migrated
to Otstaugy, now Montoursville, Pennsylvania. Her second husband was killed in the
Carolinas in a battle with the Catawba in the spring of 1729. From the time of her second
husband's death, until her death in the late 1740s [sic], Madame Montour was recognized
as a great leader of her people in the West Branch Susquehanna River Valley.
The biography continues by giving some details about Madame Montour, her children cited in the United States colonial records, and her role in the colonial governments of New York and Pennsylvania, details copied almost exclusively from U.S. colonial sources. I have not included the footnotes or bibliography that are cited on Wikipedia for the above “facts” about Madame Montour. Suffice it to say that not a single source is in the French language, the oldest appearing to date to 1892 and the most recent to the 1979 Dictionary of Canadian Biography entry by William A. Hunter, "COUC, ELIZABETH? [sic] (La Chenette, Techenet [I will return to these names]; Montour),” a biography that cites no French language sources except Tanguay’s nineteenth-century Dictionnaire.

Thus, according to Wikipedia, “Much is uncertain about Madame Montour’s life, including her given name.” Well, let’s just see what an examination of primary New France records reveals.

**Madame Montour’s Name**

For the first time, in any extant document, Isabelle Élisabeth Marie Couc ditte (called or also known as) Lafleur de Cognac is recorded as Esizabeth [sic] in 1667, the year of her birth. The census taken that year at Petit Cap de la Madeleine, Nouvelle France, Canada, reports the presence of:

- Pierre "Couque," age 40 (1627-26);
- wife Marie, 35 (1632-31);
- Jeanne, 10 (1657, baptized 14 July 1657);
- Louis, 7 (1660-59, actually baptized 27 Nov 1659, so he would have been 8 later in the year 1667);
- Angélique, 5 (1662 or 1661, if her birthday occurred after the census was taken);
- Marguerite, 3 (1664-63); and
- Élisabeth ("Esizabeth"), 3 mois (months), thus born 1667, probably before April.

The census was sent to France with Talon’s letter of 27 October 1667. It would have been taken well before this date, in May or June for the Petit Cap de La Madeleine area, so Élisabeth could have been born in February or March. Her baptismal record does not survive, but this is not unusual because many records for the area have been lost over time. There can be no doubt that evidence of her baptism was most certainly available when she married at Sorel in 1684 or she would not have been allowed to receive the Sacrament of Matrimony. The Catholic Church is very strict about such matters.

By the 1681 census, the Couc dit Lafleur de Cognac family resided across the St. Lawrence River from Cap de la Madeleine at Saint François du Lac, where the census records:

- Pierre *Couque*, habitant (inhabitant or resident), age 57 (1624-23);
- wife *Marie*, 50 (1631-30);
- Louis, 20 (1661-60, actually baptized November 1659);
- Marie, 18 (1663-62) thus easily *Marie Angélique*, probably born 1662);
- Marguerite, 16 (1663-64, actually baptized 1 June 1664, this census likely taken before June);
- Élisabeth, 14 (1667);
- Madeleine, 12 (1669-70);
- Jean, 8 (1674-73), all children recorded as unmarried.

The first born, Jeanne, had died in 1679 as a result of an attack on her that also injured her father and that led to a judicial inquiry in 1680.
The census of 1681 was sent to France in November. I count 51 people recorded at Saint François du Lac. Pierre Couc owned three fusils (guns) and declared 15 (not 14, as sometimes reported) arpents of land that he had developed. One arpent is close to the size of an English acre. He had other land, some of which he rented out to others to develop, according to notarial records I have seen, and also property in Trois Rivières, where he had lived before and after his marriage. Élizabeth had five surviving siblings in 1681, all of whom would marry and who would play important roles in her life both in New France and in the English Colonies.

As “Elizabeth Couc dit [sic] Lafleur de Coignac [sic],” she received the sacrament of Confirmation in 1678 at Sorel, a French settlement with an established church, close to Saint François du Lac and on the same side of the St. Lawrence River. On the composite list of confirmations for Sorel (a list drawn up after-the-fact), her name is given only as Elizabeth Couc. The family also had property in Batiscan by 1674, but resided at Saint François du Lac. Because there was no church yet there, the family traveled to the parish at nearby Sorel for religious acts in 1678, 1682, and 1684, her marriage year, when she used the first name of Isabelle on her marriage contract written at her parents’ home. Her parents and all of her surviving siblings were present at the signing of the contract. She is also called Isabelle (the names Élizabeth and Isabelle are interchangeable) at her sister Angélique’s marriage contract in 1682, when her brother Louis is documented as using the dit name Montour. And she was present at her brother Louis Couc Montour’s wedding in 1688 at Saint François du Lac. She served as godmother there at least once.

Isabelle’s Parents

The earliest known record in New France for Pierre Couc dit Lafleur de Cognac (his name recorded as Pierre Kouc Lafleur, but signed Pierre Couc on the document) is dated 27 August 1651, on which day he served as godfather for Perrine, a female Indian, whose mother’s name was Marie Kitarangoukoué, father’s name not given. Pierre served as a soldier when he came to New France from Cognac, France. His origin is revealed on his Catholic Church marriage record dated 16 April 1657 at Trois Rivières. He was also an interpreter of Indian languages, both Iroquois and Algonkin. His bride, though, had not emigrated from France. She was an Algonquin Indian whose ancestors had lived on the North American continent for thousands of years.

The original marriage entry in the registers of Trois Rivières is recorded in Latin, so the name of the woman who married Pierre Couc is given as Mariam, the appropriate Latin feminine case form of French Marie. Her second name is given as Mitè8amèg8Kè nationè Algonquinam. The symbol that resembles /8/ actually looks somewhat like this Wingding symbol for Taurus, ☽; it represented the sound /OU/ or /W/ before a vowel, so her name is sometimes transcribed as Marie Mitéouamegoukoué. (Koué means woman, later corrupted into the noun squaw. See Part 2 for an image of the church document.)

The 1657 marriage record of Pierre and Marie is not, however, the first documented reference to Marie. Her baptism record, almost seven years earlier, survives in the registers of Notre Dame de Montréal. This text is also in Latin. Jean Quintal sent me a photocopy of the entry along with his Latin transcription and a French translation, which I here translate into English:

In the year of our Lord 1650, I, the same [Claude Pijart of the Society of Jesus, serving this parish], have baptized Marie Mitè8amèg8Kè now dite [called] KaKésiKè, spouse of Asababich. The godmother was Marie, spouse of Lépine. [written] 6 November
See Part 2 for an image of this baptismal record. Before her baptism, Marie had used another Indian name, KaKéSiKóKó, or KaKéSiKouKoué; but, apparently following the Indian tradition of taking a new name at important moments in life, she adopted the name Mitéouamegoukoué, and accepted her godmother’s first name, Marie, as a Christian first name, thus adopting a tradition of the Roman Catholic Church. Her daughter Isabelle would also adopt a new name, Madame Montour, at a crucial time in her life after the death of her brother, Louis Couc dit Montour. At Marie’s baptism, she was the wife of Asababich, also an Indian. She had at least two children by him, both of whom were baptised at Montréal and appear to have died before her marriage to Pierre Couc.

All of the above are irrefutable facts. Isabelle Couc’s / Madame Montour’s early life is well-documented, as is her first marriage, and a definite family connection exists between her and the name Montour. Yet, on another web site, I read:

'Madam' Catherine [sic] Montour  
By Robin Van Auken  
Williamsport Sun-Gazette

New World history -- and especially that of the Susquehanna Valley -- is filled with tales but few are more interesting is [sic] Madam Montour.

Her life is sketchy, but mythic in proportion. Historians have proposed that Elizabeth "Madam" Catherine [sic] Montour led an adventurous life on the French and Englishfrontiers. [sic]

She was born in 1667 at Three Rivers, Canada [sic], the daughter of Frenchman Pierre Couc and his Algonkin wife (name unknown [sic]).

According to Dr. Paul Wallace, historian and consultant to the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission from 1951-57, Madam Montour spent several years in the early 1700s at Forts Mackinac and Detroit where her relatives were engaged in the Indian trade.

Note the repetition of her “several years” in what became Michigan without any details. The item continues:

John G. Freeze, in an 1879 [sic] article, "Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography," reports that she married Roland Montour, "a brave of the Senecas." No further information is available about him.


Although there is no “further information” available about Roland Montour, writers continue to refer to him as Madame Montour’s first husband. United States historian Daniel Richter says Montour’s first name is Alexander. I have seen no evidence for either allegation; no one cites a precise primary source. These writers all assumed that Montour must have been either the father or the husband of the woman who used the name Madame Montour. (See Part 6.) Many older sources also maintain that her ancestry is Huron, not Algonquin, and that brother Louis is her father, errors I consider in my articles.
The Wikipedia article continues:

It is believed [sic] that she traveled to the Albany area in 1709 with her brother, Louis, where he served as an interpreter [sic]. Her brother was killed and she was employed by New York Governor Robert Hunter to take his place.

At least, this article recognizes that Louis (Couc dit) Montour is her brother, not her father.

No attempt has been made to fill the gap between a birth in 1667 (or 1684? [sic]) and Madame Montour’s arrival in New York, something which Simone Vincens did document. This period and primary sources from the records of New France have been the focus of my original research.

**Madame Montour’s First and Second Husbands**

Because they have not bothered to consult available French language primary records, few writers know that Isabelle Couc’s first husband was Joachim Germaneau, a soldier in the Carignan Regiment that came to New France to subdue the Iroquois in 1665. After mustering out of the military, he established himself on a seigneurie (plot of land conceded by the king of France) at Rivière du Loup not far from Trois Rivières and across Lac St. Pierre from St. François du Lac. He engaged in the legal fur trade for many years, both before and after his marriage to Isabelle in April of 1684. Their marriage contract includes a donation by Germaneau to his future wife of his personal property and rental income that belong to him now and that might be his in the future, both in this country and in Old France: “biens meubles, rentes, . . . que luy appartiendra de present et que luy pourroit appartinir Cy apres . . . tant en ce paises qu’en la Vielle france.” (See my article on the Marriage Contract under the Custom of Paris). Isabelle’s parents gave her a *dot*, dowry, of two properties in Trois Rivières. The seventeen-year-old bride marrying a much-older man saw to it that her trousseau was recorded in a list appended to the end of her marriage contract:

- a feather bed with its coverings, a base for the bed, six pewter [étain] dishes, a pewter chandelier, half a dozen pewter forks, the clothes she is taking with her, all estimated to total 150 livres.

All those who maintain that Madame Montour was “wholly Indianized” will have to consider the ramifications of this trousseau. There is, however, ample evidence in the United States colonial records of this “European” cultural characteristic of Madame Montour, since it is documented that her admirerers sent her suits of European clothing and that she was received socially by the “ladies” of Philadelphia.

It is very possible Isabelle accompanied her husband Germaneau on his trade voyages to Michilimackinac after their marriage because her sisters, Marguerite and Madeleine, and their voyageur husbands, Jean Fafard *dit* Maconce and Maurice Ménard, were also there in the 1690s. A boy, Michel Germaneau, was born in about 1695, son of Joachim. A girl, Marie Anne, whose father remains a mystery, entered the world sometime after 1695. Although, like their mother, their baptismal records have not survived, they received the Sacrament of Matrimony, in 1717 and 1730 respectively, and had to have been baptized somewhere.

Whether or not Isabelle accompanied her husband or her sisters to the *pays d’en haut*, the country upriver from the mother colony, she is definitely documented at Michilimackinac by the controversial Gascon
commandant who served there between 1694 and 1697, Antoine Laumet dit de Lamothe Cadillac. Writing in 1704, Lamothe Cadillac referred to her as la femme de Tichenet, the wife of Tichenet, with a brother-in-law named Maurice Ménard. Maurice married Isabelle’s sister Madeleine Couc, my ancestress, possibly at Michilimackinac, but certainly some time before the baptism there in 1695 of their first-born son, Antoine. The other Couc daughters married other men and can be accounted for elsewhere in 1704, so la femme de Tichenet must be Isabelle.

Joachim Germaneau died by 1700, when his property was transferred to another person. With Germaneau deceased, Isabelle became la femme de Tichenet, the wife of Tichenet, by 1704; and, indeed, Isabelle Couc and Pierre Tichenet served as godparents at Fort Pontchartrain in 1704 and in 1706, when Lamothe Cadillac was commandant there. No trace of the religious marriage between Isabelle and Pierre has survived. So many records have disappeared, including some for Fort Pontchartrain and early ones for Fort St. Joseph (Niles, Michigan). But Isabelle was obviously in the good graces of the Church if she was permitted to be a godmother in 1704 and 1706. As I said above, the Roman Catholic Church can be fussy about these matters.

Pierre Tichenet died during an outbreak of violence among the Indians at Fort Pontchartrain in June of 1706 while Cadillac was returning to the fort with a large convoy of soldiers and settlers from the mother colony. Cadillac had been absent from the fort since the summer of 1704, undergoing judicial investigation for his possible malversations at Detroit. The Dictionnaire de L’Académie française, 1st Edition (1694) defines malversation (Page 635) as:

Malversation. s. f. v. Faute notable, & punissable, commise dans l’exercice d’une charge, d’un employ, comme Corruption, exaction, concussion, larcin. Commettre des malversations. on recherche ses malversations. : A notable and punishable crime committed in the exercise of a commission, of an employment, such as corruption, fraud, extortion, larceny.

Isabelle gave testimony for the inquiry into the not-insignificant allegations against Lamothe Cadillac to a representative who went to the fort in September of 1704, although only Cadillac’s version of her testimony survives in his 1704 memoir.

Isabelle again served as godmother in the fall of 1706 after Cadillac had returned to the fort, but then she disappears from the records until 1707, when she is cited in a most curious document, one that is mentioned nowhere else in any colonial correspondence I have read, a conseil de guerre or court-martial.

Étienne Véron, sieur de Grandmesnil, Cadillac’s commis (official clerk), recorded and preserved in his files this interrogation of a deserter who reported the defection of “Lafemme dunomé Tichenet,” a phrase which the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collection mistranslated more than 100 years ago as “the woman named Tichenet,” instead of as “the wife of the man named Tichenet.” According to the deserter’s testimony, the wife of the man named Tichenet had left Fort Pontchartrain to join Bourgmont, another soldier deserter, and her brother Montour at a place on Lake Erie, and they planned to go to the English. (See my Parts 5 and 6 for more about Germaneau, Tichenet, and Cadillac’s 1704 accusations about la femme de Tichenet, accusations which have been accepted without question, exaggerated, and embellished by mostly-male historians who have turned the subject into a soap opera.)

Then in 1708, a man named François Clairambault, sieur d’Aigremont, sent by the king to investigate further alleged misdeeds at Fort Pontchartrain, recorded the name La Chenette, another variation of la femme de Tichenet, to identify the woman who left the fort to join Bourgmont.
The Connection between the French and English Colonies

The recorded details about Isabelle’s presence at Michilimackinac, at Fort Pontchartrain *du Détroit du Lac Érié*, and as a fugitive intending to travel to the English with her brother Montour provide the *bridge* that connects Isabelle Couc of New France to her next incarnation as Madame Montour in Albany, New York. Her sister Marguerite Couc, widow of Jean Fafard *dit* Maconce, and their Fafard children can be traced to Fort Pontchartrain, as can Marguerite’s second husband, Michel Massé. The children of these two sisters and also their sister Madeleine’s children can also be traced to the colony of New York at the time that Madame Montour served the government at Albany, as documented in both the United States and New France colonial records. (See, especially, Part 8.)

I will not present now the political, and economic conditions in New France and at Fort Pontchartrain in 1706-1707; but I will mention that the political scene among the First Nations—including between those Nations previously allied with the French and the formerly-enemy Iroquois, and all of them with the French—had been changed dramatically, at least in theory, by the Great Peace of 1701 (a treaty largely unknown to earlier historians); and war had broken out between France and England in 1702. The three defectors:

Louis Couc, who married under the name Couc *dit* Montour and, by the time of his defection, was known as Montour almost exclusively;

Isabelle Couc (widow of both Germaneau and Tichenet), who eventually adopted her assassinated brother’s *dit* name, Montour, to honor him, as did her daughter and some of her nephews and nieces); and

Étienne de Vériard, sieur de Bourgmont, commandant at the fort during Cadillac’s absence

all had legitimate reasons to flee Fort Pontchartrain. Any suggestion of a romantic or sexual alliance between Isabelle and Bourgmont is, however, the *least* convincing reason of all, although it has been the sole reason advanced by historians.

Bourgmont, as commandant replacing Cadillac during the outbreak of violence among the Natives at Fort Pontchartrain in 1706, faced responsibility for it, although no blame for the incident was originally assigned to him. The violence aroused out of rivalries among the Indians themselves. Also, the French had not been able to supply the Indians with the trade goods they desired, in part because of the war with England as well as because of a glut of beaver furs in the warehouses since about 1696, such that *castors* / beavers were no longer accepted as readily as before. As a result, the Western Indians had begun to travel to Albany, as well as to Fort Pontchartrain, to trade once the Great Peace of 1701 removed the threat of Iroquois aggression. Any French going to Albany or conducting Indians there to trade were, however, subject to severe punishment, even death, during the 1702-1713 war; so the defections by Isabelle, Bourgmont, and Montour could not have been entered into for frivolous reasons. And D’Aigremont reported in 1708 that most of the *pelletteries* (furs and other skins) from Fort Pontchartrain had indeed ended up in New York; thus, traffic between the French and English colonies was not unknown. It was perilous, but it had a persuasive, although then-illegal, economic and political basis.
By 20 August 1708, Louis Montour had met for a second time with Lord Cornbury at Albany and promised to return and bring the “Far Nations” (Great Lakes Indians) to Albany to trade. On 16 May 1709 O.S. (Old Style, 5 May N.S., New Style), arrived at Albany the “Sachem called Kaqucka of the Messasaga Nation called by the Name of the Farr Nations with 4 Indians of the same Nation who came with Montour to the 5 Nations [Iroquois Confederacy] & were conducted thither by Montours Sister [sic].” By this time Louis Montour had been assassinated by an agent of the French government, but his sister and his wife continued to Albany. The sachems say, "We are come upon the word of Montour. . . . We have had a great Loss having lost the Man who guided us" and "we have had a great Loss by Montours Death. . ." (As written, with underlining mine. See Parts 7 and 9.)

Isabelle most likely witnessed the assassination of her brother, but she continued to lead the Indians recruited by him to trade at Albany in 1709. Under the name Madame Montour, first name “Eysabelle,” wife of an Iroquois named Carondowana, she is documented as an interpreter and advisor to the New York government by 1711, when she appeared at a conference in Albany between Governor Robert Hunter and the leaders of the Iroquois. As reported by Alison Duncan Hirsch, "The account book for the 1711 expedition [of the English colonies against New France]—the only surviving English document to give Madame Montour a first name—shows that ‘Eysabelle Montour interpretress’ was given five-eighths of a yard of stroud cloth, two yards of duffel cloth, and one shirt for interpreting from mid-July to mid-October 1711.” Hunter, himself, writing to Kilian Van Rensselaer the following year, 15 May 1712 (O.S.) said: “I beg you’ll countenance [give or express approval to] Mrs. Montour for I shall never be able to hear the truth but by her means.” (See Parts 6 and 7.)

The Wikipedia article (in 2008) and other articles about Madame Montour do not cite these precise references. Instead, Wikipedia moves on to Madame Montour and her Iroquois husband, Carondowana, establishing themselves on the West Branch of the Susquehanna River in Pennsylvania, they say, by about 1727.

Those articles mention neither the 1719 visit to Albany of La St Serny (Angélique Couc, wife of François Delpé dit St Serny) to her sister, La Germano, in Nouvelle Angleterre to ask her, unsuccessfully, to return to the French colony and serve that government. The visit is documented in both French and English records. Nor do they cite the visit in 1721 of Isabelle’s daughter, Marie Anne Germaneau (aka Montour, on her 1730 marriage contract, where she is identified as daughter of a LaMotte [sic] and Isabelle Montour). Marie Anne traveled to Orange (Albany) with two of her Ménard cousins, Louis and Marie Madeleine Ménard, children of Madeleine Couc and Maurice Ménard, and Marie Anne was still present there in 1722. One year later, in 1723, the Couc sisters sold the Trois Rivières property given to Isabelle at her marriage. Angélique Couc had somehow obtained permission for the sale from Isabelle, Madeleine, and Marguerite, as she stated she was acting with their consent. (See Part 8.) This sale would seem to indicate Isabelle had definitively decided to remain in the American Colonies.

The details I have just cited are unknown to most historians and are very definitely unknown on the various web sites (except in items I have written) that tell the story of Madame Montour.

The first surviving evidence of Madame Montour in Pennsylvania is at a “Council held at Philadelphia, July 3d, 1727,” when Governor Patrick Gordon met several chiefs of the Five Nations but “most of them of the Nation of the Cayoogoes [Cayugas]…. Tannewannahgeah spoke, & by Montour the Interpretess [sic]” his words were conveyed to the Governor. In turn, the “Governour” spoke to them “by M[rs]. Montour, a french Woman, who had lived long among these People, and is now Interpretess.”
The Couc / Montour Family of Nouvelle France and the English Colonies

council met again on 4 July with the same “interpretess” and ordered payment to “the Interpretess 1 Stroud, 1 Shirt, 1 Matchcoat. To her Husband, Carondawana [sic] 1 Strowd, & another to her Niece.”

Who this niece was is unknown, although further research suggests she is the woman known as “French Margaret” in the American colonies, a daughter of Isabelle’s sister Marguerite. And Isabelle’s niece Geneviève Massé, who married John Henry Lydius of Albany, New York, lived in Albany within a few years of their wedding in Montréal in 1727. Two Lydius children would serve as godparents for Madame Montour’s grandson, Nicholas Montour, son of Andrew Montour, her son by Carondowana, and Sally Ainse. These are very definite links to relatives present in the future United States of America.

There are further connections between Madame Montour / Isabelle Couc and her relatives and even individuals who had known her at Fort Pontchartrain, as you will see, especially in Part 8.

Madame Montour continued to serve the English colonial government until shortly before her death that was reported early in 1753. Andrew Montour, her son by Carondowana, continued her legacy, even interpreting for and advising George Washington, future first president of the United States. Other Montour descendants are also cited in the colonial records.

Isabelle’s two children who married and died in New France are also documented in the last three parts of this work.

Isabelle could not write or sign her name or tell her own story. Enough documentation survives, however, to piece together an accurate account of this extraordinary woman and her family. Their descendants can be proud. The guesses and embellishments about her life do not hold up well under a critical examination of the secondary sources that continue to be considered definitive. My articles evaluate the sources from the past for her family’s story, and I challenge some modern interpretations of those sources. The process of arriving at an accurate history is as important as the final product.

Keeping in mind that Governor Robert Hunter of New York, in 1712, considered Madame Montour a source of the truth, I invite you to join me in the quest to tell her story truly, and her family’s story, through a critical examination of sources, because All Sources Are Not Created Equal.
All Sources Are Not Created Equal
The Couc / Montour Family of New France and the English Colonies
Part 1
Suzanne Boivin Sommerville, FCHSM member

All men may be created equal, as the Declaration of Independence affirms, but the same cannot be said about the sources used in compiling a genealogy, a family history, or even a major historical study. If you care about accuracy, it is vitally important to understand this, particularly in the “brave new world” of the internet with its plethora of web sites listing “instant” pedigrees as well as offering apparently authoritative “stories” about ancestors available at the click of a mouse button.

The now more easily accessible out-of-copyright books, such as Tanguay and other pillars of the genealogical and historical past, create another potential problem. I repeat: pillars of the past. So much has been done, since the end of the nineteenth century, with the primary sources that Cyprien Tanguay and many others did not or could not consult. While I am eternally grateful for his seven-volume work (my first major genealogy purchase more than thirty years ago), I have known for almost as many years that his work is flawed, biased, and incomplete, as are other early genealogical indexes, including Denissen’s Genealogy of the French Families of the Detroit River Region, whose basic source for the older records was Tanguay’s index books. The same is true for most of the records about French Canadians at the Church of Jesus Christ Latter-Day Saints. Histories and genealogy trees relying solely on these indexes or others like them are likely to perpetuate errors. Certainly, René Jetté’s 1983 Dictionnaire généalogique des familles du Québec (my second major genealogy purchase) corrected many of these errors, but this dictionary, with records only to 1730, has its own errors, many of which have since been corrected. Jetté was based on the early research at the University of Montréal by the Programme de recherche en démographie historique (Program of research in historical demography or

---

4 Tanguay’s contribution is nevertheless significant. PRDH reports: “It seems that in the last century, Cyprien Tanguay had access to certificates that are no longer in existence, especially for Sorel, Saint-Augustin, and Petite-Rivièr-Saint-François, when he was writing his famous Dictionnaire généalogique des familles canadiennes depuis la fondation de la colonie jusqu’à nos jours [originally published] Montreal: E. Sénécal, 1871-90. A search through his dictionary enabled to add 815 more certificates.” http://www.genealogie.umontreal.ca Volume 1 was originally published in 1871 and Volume 7 in 1890, a time span of nineteen years.

5 Christian Denissen (Rev. Fr.), Genealogy of the French Families of the Detroit River Region, 1701-1936, Detroit Society for Genealogical Research, currently in a 1987 revision, but based on work compiled by the end of the nineteenth century. Even the 1987 revision suffers from not having consulted more modern research, as should be apparent from the numerous corrections published in MHH. Denissen anglicized (gave English spelling) to all first names, thus Pierre becomes Peter, Marie becomes Mary, Étienne becomes Stephen, etc., distorting the actual names on the actual records. He also consistently used Three Rivers for Trois-Rivières, a practice I deplore.


7 René Jetté, Dictionnaire généalogique des familles du Québec, Les Presses de l’Université de Montréal, 1983. Records only to 1730. Many corrections have been published in genealogical journals and noted in PRDH.
And then there is the tendency, especially in the past, for United States historians and compilers of genealogical data to ignore Canadian sources, particularly French-Canadian, as they cannot read French. In fact, one would think the two nations existed in total isolation from each other despite the almost four hundred years of shared history. United States researchers have also tended to consult only the indexes already known to them without taking into consideration the giant steps achieved in the Province of Québec since the early 1960s. That is when PRDH began a new reading of actual extant records, independent of the older indexes, not limited to the vital statistics of birth / baptism, marriage, and death / burial. Nevertheless, this marvelous resource is yet another index and not a primary source. Bertrand Desjardins at PRDH continues to accept corrections and updates to its data when they can be confirmed to be valid, as I will demonstrate subsequently.

Other primary documents only beginning to be mined for their details are the notarial records, thousands of them extant and indexed in various publications or partially on CD-rom but more comprehensively by *Parchemin*, a computerized data base available only at centers in the Province of Québec to date. Here, too, relying only on the excerpted data without examining the original can lead to errors or the omission of significant names and facts found only in the text. By reading the text of someone else’s hiring contract, Gail Moreau-DesHarnais found the fifty-first name for the plaque dedicated to the First Convoy of 1701 now gracing Hart Plaza in Detroit. [See FCHSM web site for a photo of the plaque.] The name of Guillaume Bonnet dit Deliard, an eighteen-year-old apprentice who later died at Detroit, was not listed in the “index to notarial records.”

Then there are the official New France colonial documents themselves, many of them indexed at the Library and Archives Canada web site, where a marvelous search engine called *ArchiviaNet* {now replaced by a newer search engine} can assist in isolating references to individuals mentioned in the documents.

I will explore this topic of the inequality of sources and the proper use of sources by using the Couc / Montour family of New France and the English Colonies. Those of you who have been reading my articles know that this family is of primary interest to me. What you may not know is that myths and

---

8 PRDH, Gaëtan Morin Éditeur. http://www.genealogie.umontreal.ca Also available in book format (Burton [Detroit Public Library, Main Branch] and Mount Clemens libraries), records to 1765; on CD-Rom to 1799 (very expensive), and on the Internet to 1799. There is an English version of the web site. You can browse the Internet site at no cost but must subscribe to see the full “certificates” available. Cost is very reasonable. Background material on the site is wonderful. Take the time to read it. PRDH is continually updated with corrections and additions to its data.

9 Editor’s note: The index used for the beginning of the documentation for the list of voyageurs who came in the first convoy of 24 July 1701 to Détroit was from the lists of names by E.-Z. Massicotte, “Répertoire des engagements pour l’ouest conservés dans les archives judiciaires de Montréal,” *Rapport de L’Archiviste de la Province de Québec pour 1929-1930*, Rédempti Paradis, 1930, p.206. “1701, 27 mai. – Engagement de Pierre Gouvereau [Gauvreau] à Messire Jean Bochart, pour le service du Roi, pour aller au Détroit – Etude Adhémar.” The name of Guillaume Bonnet dit Deliard was found in the middle of the document indicating that he would be accompanying Pierre Gouvereau. Pierre Gauvreau was a master arms maker, and Bonnet would be his apprentice in Detroit.

errors about its members continue to proliferate on the internet and in publications. Before I demonstrate some of the perpetuated errors and correct them, though, a few definitions.

What are INDEXES? Indexes are secondary sources copied from primary sources or original documents. They might be called dictionaries, répertoires, or by another name, but they are really indexes. Indexes usually contain data about births / baptisms, marriages, deaths / burials, other recorded events, such as notarial documents, which someone copied and excerpted from primary records. A published excerpt or transcription from an original record is not automatically guaranteed to be accurate. It just indicates that one reader saw and copied these details from an original. You must, of course, always record your index or other published sources, especially those on the internet, as well as an original source if you are able to see it, perhaps on microfilm.

PROBLEMS with using only indexes:

1. The transcriber may have misread the original, easy to do given the unfamiliar handwriting and the physical condition of early records, or may have made errors in translation. One of my favorites is the recording of a daughter said to be named Mercredy (Wednesday) Boivin, apparently because the reader could not accept there might be two daughters named Anne Boivin, one born on a Mercredy. I am not immune to errors like this, one example being my misreading of the word size, situated, for seize, sixteen, in my early study of notarial documents. The reference was to a residence located on a street and not to a house number. I had to see many examples of the same “house number” before I verified the definition. Assumptions like this simply cannot be made, especially when dealing with older French words or phrases.

2. The transcriber may have “corrected” the original because of other known or assumed information. Even apparently simple spelling “corrections” can mislead. An index with corrections like these may also contain faulty links forced between individuals with the same or similar names, links based solely on the assumption that a same name equals the same person, a particularly dangerous assumption for many of the families of New France. In the best of all possible worlds, a transcriber should record exactly what the record contains—no more, no less—without attempting to “correct” anything. Any additional information should be separated and identified as such. Perceived errors in a text should also be indicated but not corrected in the text itself. Traditionally, the Latin sic (“so,” “thus,” “in this manner”) in brackets [sic] within a quoted text signals a perceived error or a variation to an accepted standard.

3. The original record may contain mistakes reported by the principals involved or recorded by the priest or clerk. Common sense has to be used when evaluating, for example, the entry of one sister’s name when the other sister is most certainly the party involved. This is not just a phenomenon of the past. I was a witness to a priest almost recording the name of a younger sister as the intended bride, instead of the elder sister’s name, my friend’s. Imagine what could have happened when the principals were illiterate or if they were inattentive while the record was read aloud.

4. Transcription of data in a record is usually incomplete. The record may have more details, sometimes crucial details that could modify the impression created by an excerpt. This is a particular problem when

---

11 Although I did not record the web database where I found this misunderstanding years ago, it was most probably taken from transcribed baptismal entries from Rouen: R. P. Archange Godbout, O.F.M., *Origine des Familles Canadiennes-Françaises*, Extrait de l’État civil Français. Montréal: Éditions Élysée, 1979, p. 31.
evaluating quotations cited in histories as well. What does the partial quotation omit? I will demonstrate some striking examples of this mis-use of sources.

5. Publication of a reader’s transcribed notes can either create or perpetuate errors. Just because something is published does not guarantee eternal accuracy. Later research may have corrected an earlier reader’s misreadings, guesses, assumptions, or judgments; or new primary sources may have been located. In this field, research is always ongoing until the last scrap of evidence has been examined, even though it is difficult to have to say: No further evidence has been found to date. Leave it to the novelists to embroider the facts. A good illustration of this problem became the subject of discussion on Rootsweb’s Quebec-Research mail list in July of 2002.\textsuperscript{12} I had already written this section of this article by then, so when I saw one of my own citations, published in Michigan’s Habitant Heritage in April of 2000, being taken too literally, I promptly responded.

PRDH provides what it calls "certificates" of the records available on its web site. Based on information copied from the original documents, these certificates contain data arranged in summary form. The PRDH certificate version of the earliest known record in New France for Pierre Couc \textit{dit} Lafleur de Cognac reports these details in chart format:

\begin{verbatim}
PRDH #87278 [As it currently exists.]
  Trois-Rivières  1651-08-27
  Birth :1651-08-24  
  Rank Name Age M.S. Pr. Sex
  01 PERRINE
  Origin : AMERINDIENNE
  --- c  p  f

  02 MARIE KITARANGOUKOUE
  MOTHER OF 01
  Origin : AMERINDIENNE
  --- --- p f

  03 FATHER OF 01
  Origin : AMERINDIEN
  --- --- p m

  04 PIERRE KOUC LAFLEUR
  Origin : COGNAC
  --- --- p m

  05 JEANNE ONAUS
  SPOUSE OF 06
  --- m  p  f

  06 PIERRE LEFEBVRE
  SPOUSE OF 05
  --- m --- m
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{12} See RootsWeb archives under subject “Jeanne Aunois (Nounau)”, July 8, 9, 10, 2002.
On 27 August 1651 at Trois-Rivières, Pierre "Kouc Lafleur," "origin" Cognac, was present (indicated by the letter "p") when three-day-old Perrine, a female, was baptized. Perrine is called an "Amérindienne" in "origin" by PRDH. Perrine's mother is identified as Marie Kitarangoukoue, whom PRDH gives the "origin" of Amérindienne. Perrine's father's name is not given, although the "father" is said to be present (p), but his "origin" is said to be Amérindien. The certificate lists the presence of Jeanne Onaus, who was also given the "origin" of Amérindienne on the certificate in an earlier version and identified there as spouse of Pierre Lefebvre. When I reproduced this earlier PRDH certificate in my article in 2000, I added: "Although this is the only place I have seen her [Jeanne Onaus, the wife of Pierre Lefebvre] described as an Indian, she is identified as such in this document (Source PRDH online)."

When one Quebec-Research list contributor identified Jeanne as a Native, without any qualifications, another contributor, Fran (Deschamps) LaChance, of Sarnia, Ontario, questioned this as Jeanne’s origin, citing Denis Beauregard’s “Fiche Origine reference: >AUNEAU, Jeanne (F). INSEE:92071. Pl [Place of origin]: Sceaux. Zone: Hauts-de-Seine. [in France] Dest: Québec." Luckily, and to his credit, the original contributor had kept careful records of his sources for the information, and he informed Fran of my citation in MHH, but without also citing my statement, “Although this is the only place I have seen her described as an Indian ....” To her credit, Fran took the question to PRDH, and the Webmaster replied to Fran, who then copied the reply to the list:

> I went back to the original document (written in [L]atin) and there is no mention of her being an "Amerindienne". I have no idea how or why this false information was written there and I hasten to correct it. Sorry for the inconvenience. In the absence of this reference, there is no reason to think she was not from France. Actually, the Historian Marcel Trudel in his "Catalogue des immigrants" writes she was from the Perche region but I have no idea where he would have gotten this information. No one else mentions the Perche in her case.

13 PRDH #87278 Trois-Rivières 1651-08-27 Birth: 1651-08-24. The word amérindienne itself did not exist until relatively recently. Author’s note: I should also add that PRDH automatically assumes the father and mother are present and alive if information in the record does not indicate otherwise. This assumption can be misleading.

14 I have read that someone believes this Marie Kita-ran-gou-koué is really Marie Mité-oua-me-gou-koué because the last particles, "gou" and "koué" (or "kway") are the same, and that this Perrinne could even be “daughter” of Pierre! I did not record the source. According to the linguist J. A. (Jean André) Cuoq, Algonquin “k8é” or “koué” means woman, having the same original meaning as squaw, today considered a pejorative word because of the negative connotations later given to the word. See Cuoq’s dictionaries and other works on Iroquois and Algonquin languages at Early Canadiana http://www.canadiana.org/

15 Also spelled Auneau and other variations. See PRDH on-line.


In the meantime, at 7:00 a.m. (information travels fast on e-mail lists!), I had replied to Fran’s original question, in part:

I have since examined the microfilm of the original, and it seems to be anyone's guess whether any such identification is given on the record, as it is terribly hard to read.

As I have said so many times, just because it is published or on the net does not make it eternally right. Sometimes it's important to notice ‘how’ a find is reported as well, as I did qualify the identification.19

FCHSM member Richard Van Wasshnova wrote to me asking me to “let readers of the FCHSM journal know about the PRDH correction.”20 Here it is, Richard, your request came just in time.

One more comment: qualifying words found in a citation or an index are terribly important, words such as: perhaps, only, although, possibly, it seems, without any further evidence, _etc_. Unfortunately, most computer genealogy programs until quite recently do not allow the use of these qualifiers, instead requiring a definite name, date, and place. It’s hard to leave those items blank, isn’t it? Another Quebec-Research contributor, Father Owen Taggert (pen name for Father John Sullivan), wrote:

The by-word, whether in international politics or in genealogical research is "trust, but verify". Did Jeanne Nounau (Aunois) emigrate to Quebec from Sceaux, in the suburbs of Paris? Or was she one of the people who were here before the French arrived? The record is unclear. And, as we are so often reminded, speculation in genealogical matters is risky at best!21

6. Although not indexes, all history books and articles must be treated as secondary sources, mine included. Already I need to update some of the citations I made to other writers in my 1999 and 2000 articles because, after examining original sources myself, I have discovered some of my secondary sources were not totally accurate.

Of course, a writer must, at times, rely on the work done by others. If you are doing history, though, you need to maintain a _historical perspective_ about your sources. Always check the date of original

---

18 Message text written by INTERNET:QUEBEC-RESEARCH-L@rootsweb.com
> X-MESSAGE: #18 Date: Tue, 09 Jul 2002 13:35:39 -0400<
19 Message sent 7/09/2002 7:00 AM (EDT)
20 Message for 110435.1567@compuserve.com; Tue, 9 Jul 2002 15:51:11 -0400 (EDT)
21 Fr. Owen Taggart (aka for Fr. John Sullivan) also wrote: “I wish to second cousin Suzanne's comment that the dates, names, and places as well as other data found on line or in published works are subject to error. I wish to add that the dates, names and places inscribed on official certificates and in official registers are also subject to error. Not to mention that the handwriting of the registrar is not often clearly legible, and that, even in our own times. For earlier records, it is often true that the participants who furnished the original data were to the point of not knowing how to spell their own names. For the earliest records, the registers are often damaged by water, by fire or simply by the ravages of time, and they are frequently written in handwriting that needs to be deciphered by a trained paleographer.” Fr. Owen Taggart, message for 110435.1567@compuserve.com; Tue, 9 Jul 2002 09:30:25 -0400 (EDT).
publication and / or reprint date. Look at the bibliography or the citations for the author’s or web site’s sources. Some give none. Does the author list primary as well as secondary documents? Remember that translations of original French records must be considered secondary sources. Some translators know only modern French, not the French of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-centuries or even the French of modern Québec, a direct descendant of the French of New France. Note this parallel: United States and Canadian speakers of English do not speak the “Queen’s English” of modern-day Great Britain, nor do all anglophones speak the same dialects.

7. Finally, it is not unknown for someone to lie (or obscure the truth) when giving information for a public record. Other primary records may refute or at least challenge the probably false information. This phenomenon is particularly important when telling the story of the Couc / Montour family.
All Sources Are Not Created Equal

Part 2

Persistent Errors Concerning the Couc Family

Suzanne Boivin Sommerville

Before I continue, a word about spelling. Standardized spelling of names is a recent phenomenon. The extant records are filled with variations of names, often spelled differently even on the same document. I have tried to be consistent with the spellings in the text that follows. When a variation appears in the records, I will record it as it appears. I have also chosen to enter double first names as they appear on the original documents, without a hyphen. Modern French hyphenates these names like this: Jean-Baptiste, thus applying a modern standard to our ancestors, who did not use hyphens in this way.

Any errors in reading the handwriting of the old documents are mine alone, unless otherwise noted. Although thirty-one years of reading high school student essays prepared me for this daunting task, some of the original handwriting is obscure, if not unreadable, especially from a microfilm copy. Information added within brackets [ ] is mine and not part of the original unless otherwise noted. The Latin word *sic* in parentheses, *(sic)*, or brackets, *[sic]*, indicates the item is as it appears in the original source. I have tried to use *sic* only when a particular error or variation seems important to indicate.

The first of the name in the New World, **Pierre Couc dit Lafleur de Cognac**, is also the first in the family to suffer from an error found in an index. Tanguay (Volume 1, 1871) claims Pierre died in 1665 and even repeats the error of his *Dictionnaire* and emphasizes it in his *A travers les registres* (1886) in an entry for the year 1665:

Aôût [August]

Le 6.--- Sépulture de Couc dit Lafleur, agé de 41 ans, soldat de M. de Froment, marié en 1657, aux Trois-Rivières, à Marie Mite8ameg8k8e. Il avait été, par accident, frappé d’une balle par ses compagnons. “Occisus glande catapultae fortuito a socio.” (1) Glans-dis.--- Balle de plomb. Catapultae.--- Machine de guerre a lancer des traits (catapulte). (Reg. des Trois-Rivieres.)

The English translation of *A travers les registres* by Armand H. Demers, Jr. (1998), perpetuates the error:

August 6th
The burial of [Pierre] Couc dit Lafleur, 41, one of M. de Froment’s soldiers, who had married Marie Mite8ameg8k8e in 1657 in Trois-Rivières. He had been shot accidentally by one of his companions. “Occisus glande (31) catapultae (32) fortuito à socio.” (Trois-Rivières Register) … “killed with a lead projectile catapulted by an ally.”

[In footnote 31: Glans-dis was a lead bullet. In footnote 32: Catapultae was a catapult or military device for throwing stones, spears, arrows, bullets of some kind, etc.]

---


23 Armand H. Demers, Jr., *Searching through the Old Records of New France*, Quintin Publications, 1998, p. 60. Brackets around Pierre added by Demers. This translation of Tanguay’s work perpetuates several other errors and adds a few.
Tanguay’s mistake has been known at least since Benjamin Sulte’s history of Saint-François-du-Lac (1886), in which Sulte says: “It is not this Pierre Couc [the one married to the Algonquine] ... who was killed by a cannon at Trois-Rivières in 1665 but a soldier of the same name belonging to the Carignan regiment.” “Ce n’est pas ce Pierre Couc ... qui fut tué par un canon, aux Trois-Rivières, en 1665, mais un soldat du même nom appartenant au régiment de Carignan.”24 Actually, not even the name may be the same.

I still see the August of 1665 death date for Pierre on records on the web, despite the overwhelming evidence that Pierre was not buried until the spring of 1690, after being recorded in the censuses of 1667 and 1681. He died well-after three more of his seven children were born to him and his wife subsequent to 1665. Even Marcel Trudel in his 1983 Catalogue des immigrants 1632-1662 “killed” Pierre Couc in 1665, and he could have known better.25 Jetté published the correct information in 1983, the same year as Trudel’s work: “d (between 05-04 and 18-05) 1690 St-François-du-Lac”; (recorded as) 40 years old in the 1667 Recensement (Census); 57 years old in the 1681 Census; and cité (mentioned as present) 24 Aug 1651 in Trois-Rivières; soldier, interpreter.26

I myself checked the microfilm of the register at Trois-Rivières and printed the page for the 6 August burial.27 The entry is in Latin, in miniscule handwriting, the smallest on the page, barely a line and a half unsigned by any priest, and very difficult to read. There is a blank where the first name of the man should be. I see no evidence of any age given for the man recorded as being buried, although in the other entries on the page ages are in numerals. In addition to the quotation above, all the unidentified priest recorded is that this man was a soldier of what could be transcribed as Froment, definitely one of the Carignan companies, which arrived from France in 1665, whereas Pierre Couc can be documented in New France as early as 1651 and married in 1657. Jack Verney identifies the captain of this company as Pierre Salvaye de Froment, who commanded “what was perhaps the weakest company in the regiment.” Verney, in his attempt to identify the soldiers of this company, lists “Sépulture de Coue [sic] (La Fleur). Killed at Trois-Rivières by the accidental firing of a cannon in August 1665.”28 I truly do not know whether Verney believed the soldier’s name was “Sépulture de Coue dit La Fleur,” as the list he was working from has only the name La Fleur, apparently. “Sépulture” means burial. It seems this is another example of misunderstanding French and combining two separate sources that are otherwise unconnected.

I agree with PRDH that reading the last name as "Lafleur" could be problematical. This is how the excerpt appears on PRDH:

24 Histoire de Saint-François-du-Lac, p. 35. This history and others are available on Early Canadiana but must also be subject to question because of developments since 1886 or whenever the others available were published. < http://www.canadiana.org/ >
26 René Jetté, Dictionnaire généalogique des familles du Québec, Montréal: Les Presses de l’Université de Montréal, 1983, p. 278. Hereafter Jetté. Note: first number is day; second number is month: 05-04 is thus 5 April; 18-05 is 18 May. Misunderstanding the European system of numbers for dates is another source of errors.

Suzanne Boivin Sommerville, © 2014, all rights reserved
I also copied the St-François-du-Lac burial record for Pierre Couc, said to be 63 at his death, thus possibly born about 1627 or 1626 if his birthdate was known and his next birthday would have been celebrated after the day of his death. 30 The burial took place between 5 April and 18 May, dates of the records before and after this one, and Pierre was buried where the church that had been burned by the Iroquois once stood. No precise date is given for death or burial. There is no evidence he died as the result of an Iroquois attack, something else I have seen people assert, although I suppose it is possible because the next two people buried are said to have died from this cause. The priest, Jesuit Father Louis André, 31 recorded that many people attended the funeral, but only two witnesses are cited:

[In the margin] enterrement de Pierre couc dict [sic] la Fleur de coignac [sic]

[In the body of the entry] lan mille six cent quatrevingt et dix est decedé dans la communion denostre mere ste eglise pierre couc dict la fleur de coignac agé de soixante et trois ans et a esté enterré dans lelieu ou estoit leglise bruslee par les iroquois, ont esté presents a Son enterrem quantité demonde entreautres de Sieur crevier Seigneur du lieu et de Jacques Joüiel.

[signed] Louis André de la compagnie de Jesus [signed] Crevier [and] Joüiel 32

Translation, corrected for modern standards:
Burial of Pierre Couc dit Lafleur de Cognac.

In the year sixteen hundred and ninety died in communion with our Mother the Holy Church Pierre Couc dit Lafleur de Cognac, sixty-three years old, and he was buried at the place where the church burned by the Iroquois stood. Present at his burial were a large number of people, among others, sieur Crevier, seigneur of this place, and Jacques Joüiel.

[signed] Louis André of the Company of Jesus, Crevier, Joüiel.

---

29 Programme de Recherche en Démographie Historique, or PRDH (Program of research in historical demography) Gaëtan Morin Éditeur. http://www.genealogie.umontreal.ca You can browse the Internet site at no cost but must subscribe to see the full “certificates” available. Cost is very reasonable. Background material on the site is wonderful. Take the time to read it.

30 I must add that ages on a death record are always subject to caution. I use 1627-26 to suggest that if the precise anniversary of birth occurred after the day of death, the individual would have turned 64 before the end of 1690.

31 This Jesuit granted a concession of seven arpents of land on the Batiscan River to Pierre Couc on 19 September 1674, Adhémar, Archives Nationales du Québec, hereafter ANQ, photocopy. Pierre was thus not unknown to him. Note: Archives Nationales du Québec / National Archives of Québec is now Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec, BAnQ.

32 As best I can read it on FHL microfilm #1018091 Registres Saint-François-du-Lac 1687-1790 (University of Montréal filming, 1972).
By Tanguay’s third volume, published in 1888, two years after Sulte’s correction, Pierre Couc still has no burial record, although in this entry he is said to have been born in 1624. Instead Tanguay transformed the individual buried in 1665 into Pierre's son, although there is no evidence for a son of Pierre Couc who is also named Pierre, especially one who would have been a soldier of Froment in the Carignan Regiment.\(^3\) If this soldier was 41 in 1665, he would have been born in 1624, thus a contemporary of Pierre, not his son. How Tanguay arrived at the age of 41 for the man buried in 1665 I will never know. Not satisfied with this first “son” Pierre, Tanguay cites yet another son Pierre, baptized at some unknown date and buried “5 avril 1690” at “St-Thomas, Pierreville,” a city which did not exist in 1690. In 1690, there was only St François du Lac (without hyphens), a seigneurie where Pierre had land, in New France (Nouvelle France), also called Canada. This is another error commonly found: recording a modern place name instead of the actual historic name.

I recently (2002) found this on the web:

Marie MITE8AMEG8K8E b. 1631, St-Francois-du-Lac, Qc., CAN, bp. 6 Nov 1650, Montreal, Hochelaga, QC, Canada, occupation Algonquin, m. (1) Assababich/Assaback, occupation Algonquin, m. (2) 16 Apr 1657, in Trois-Rivieres, St-Maurice, Qc., CAN, Pierre COUC-LAFLEUR, b. 1624, Cognac, France, occupation Fur Trader, d. 1690, buried: Apr 1690, St-Francois-du-Lac, Qc., CAN. Marie died 1699, Trois-Rivieres, St-Maurice, Qc., CAN, buried: 8 Jan 1699, Trois-Rivieres,\(^3\) St-Maurice, Qc., CAN.

---

\(^3\) He does not appear in the censuses of 1667 and 1681 as a member of the family. However, PRDH reports children born to Marie in an earlier marriage, as:

B 1650-05-06
01 Pierre Amerindien
02 / Assababich Amerindien pere de 01
03 / Miteoumigoukoue Amerindienne mere de 01
04 Pierre / Deschamps

And:

B 1652 - 11 - 01
01 Catherine 5 ans
02 / Assababich pere de 01
03 Marie / Miteouamegoukoue mere de 01
04 Anne / DuHerisson [Anne Leneuf du Hérisson, natural or adopted daughter of Michel Leneuf du Hérisson]
05 Joseph / Duperon

I have not yet found further evidence of these two children, nor do they appear with the Couc family in any census. The above “certificates” were copied from the book version of PRDH.

\(^3\) The record reads: "L’an mil six cent quatre vingt dixneuf Le huitième Janvier aesté inhumée dans le Cimetière dela paroisse nostre dame des Trois Rivières madame Lafleure sauvagess veuve Monsieur Lafleur apres avoir reçu tous les sacrements dou[e] des sentiments dun veritable Chréstien --par moy prestre Recolet faisans les fonctions Curielles. [signed] frere Elisée Crey Recolet.” Notice she is “Madame” widow of “Monsieur” and a true Christian. I don’t see any disrespect in this entry, although I have read comments objecting to the fact she is called sauvagess. I’ll say it again: It makes a difference to go to the original source. FHL microfilm #1298969. Sauvage and sauvagessse are simply the French words for the indigenous peoples the English named Indians, at first, and, more recently, Native Americans. Modern French identifies First Nations peoples as Premières Nations and amérindiens / amérindiennes. When I first wrote this section, I did not know where this researcher found a precise baptism date for Marie, although I am aware there are some guesses out there about the identity of Marie’s parents. I have a few myself, but they are only that, guesses without further evidence. I later learned that Marie’s baptism record has indeed been found. See below.
These identifications of place names may well be driven by the request for information on genealogy computer programs, but the Hochelaga and St-Maurice QC are anachronisms, attributing something from the present to a time in the past. I also do not know why this researcher claims Pierre’s occupation is fur trader, a subject to be considered subsequently.

According to Thomas Charland, Pierreville did exist as a fief conceded to Laurent Philippe in 1683, but it was above (up-river from) the seigneurie of St François du Lac. Modern Pierreville was built on the site of a portion of St François du Lac given to the Abénakis in 1700 by Madeleine Hertel. Charland also reports: “The first parish church of Saint-François-du-Lac was on the Pointe du Moulin, just below the present village of Notre-Dame-de-Pierreville, on l’Île du Fort, named this because of the fort that was built there in 1687.”35 I have read that the area of the original settlement is partially under water now.

Pierre Couc’s Marriage Record

Another misreading of the original records occurred for Pierre Couc’s marriage in 1657 at Trois-Rivières, although Tanguay is not the source for this new error. He reports no parents for Marie Mitéouamigoukoué in Volume 1 (1871), only that she is an “algonquine” [sic], nor does his Volume 3 add any further details. By the time of the entry in Jetté, though, the parents are named “Barthélemi & Carole Pachirini,” leading some to give, erroneously, the “last” name of Miteouamigoukoué to Barthélemi Anaraou. His name is Barthélemi Anaraoui on the PRDH French version of the record and Bartholomàus Anàra8i on the Latin versions in the registers.

Priests assigned Christian first names at baptism to all receiving the sacrament, the infant or convert often receiving the first name of a godparent. Indians, however, did not use the same name as their father’s (or their mother’s) name. An examination of the records on PRDH should demonstrate this.

Sillery 1659-09-14 :
01 MARIE EKOUEOUITCH Origin : INDIENNE;
02 CHARLES PACHIRINI BROTHER OF 01 Origin : INDIEN;
03 ANTOINE OUABOUKAIMA NEPHEW OF 04 Origin : INDIEN;
04 ETIENNE EITAOUIKIGIC Origin : INDIEN

Notice in particular that Marie and Charles, although brother and sister, do not carry the same Indian name; and, in the set below, Marie, although spouse of Vincent, does not use his name. Vincent’s mother has yet another Indian name.

35 Thomas-M. Charland, O.P., Histoire des Abénakis d’Odanak, 2ème édition, Novembre 1989, Réimpression par la Société Historique de la Région de Pierreville, p. 20 and p. 32. Charland also states that on 15 May 1798, the seigneurie of Pierreville, owned then by François-Joseph Lemaître-Duhaime, was “sold by sheriff Antoine-ISidore Badeaux to William and David-Alexander Grant and Nicolas [sic] Montour, with the part of this seigneurie belonging to the Abénakis specifically reserved to them” at that time. (p. 140) He spelled his name Nicholas in his signatures at Pointe-du-Lac, photocopy). Nicholas Montour, the seigneur of Pointe-du-Lac, is the grandson of Isabelle Couc / Madame Montour, and great-grandson of Pierre Couc. Nicholas Montour is son of Andrew Montour and SARAH AINSE HANDS, who was at Detroit after her separation from Andrew. Nicholas was born 1756, baptized on October 31 1756 in the Dutch Reformed church at Albany, New York, godparents Martin and Sara Lydius, his cousins, grandchildren of Marguerite Couc and Michel Massé, as will be seen in a later section. See Dictionary of Canadian Biography for Nicholas Montour and Sarah Ains. Photocopies from the Registers of Pointe-du-Lac, FHL #1302359 & 1302360
The Jesuit Relations report these missionaries’ understanding about Indian names. Since the Jesuits were educated linguists of some skill, as well as first-hand witnesses of Native traditions, it is worth quoting part of one of their relations at length, in this case concerning the Hurons / Wendats:

**OF THE MISSION OF SAINT JOHN THE BAPTIST AMONG THE ARENDAENHRONON.**

In this Country, there are no Names appropriated to Families, as in Europe. The Children do not bear their Father's name, and there is no name that is common to the whole Family,- each one has his own different name. Nevertheless, it is so arranged that, if possible, no Name is ever lost; on the contrary when one of the Family dies all the relatives assemble, and consult together as to which among them shall bear the name of the deceased, giving [page 165] his own to some other relative. He who takes new name also assumes the Duties connected with it, and thus he becomes Captain if the deceased had been one. This done, they dry their tears, and cease to weep for the deceased. In this manner, they place him among the number of the living, saying that he is resuscitated, and has come to life in the person of him who has received his name, and has [121 i.e. 119] rendered him immortal. Thus it happens that Captain never has any other name than that of his predecessor, as formerly in Egypt all the Kings bore the name of Ptolemy.

Therefore, as this election of the Captains, or (as the Hurons say) the resurrection of the dead, is always celebrated with pomp and splendor, when it became necessary to bring back to life the brother of this new Christian,—that is, when new Captain had to be elected,—all the chief men of the Country were called together; and we also were invited, as to [sic] Ceremony in which the French were greatly interested because it was question of reviving the name of Atironta, he who had formerly been the first of the Hurons to go down to Kebec [sic], and to form friendship with the French. When the Nations were assembled, they conferred on us the honor of selecting him whom we wished to assume that name and the office of Captain. We deferred the choice to the discretion and prudence of the Relatives. "We therefore," said they, "cast our eyes on that man," pointing out Jean Baptiste to us; "and we do not wish his name [122 i.e. 120] to be any longer Aëoptahon but Atironta, since he brings him back to life."

I did not know any of this, however, in the mid-1980s when my copy of Jetté arrived. I recall my excitement when I first read the entry, thinking I now had names for the parents of my only documented

---

36 #403783 PRDH. Numbers 9 and 10 do share the common particle “CHIOU.” From reading some of Cuoq’s nineteenth century dictionaries of Algonkin and Iroquois (available at Early Canadiana http://www.canadiana.org/), I understand some elements of a deceased parent’s or husband’s name might appear within a child’s or a widow’s name. Until I know more about these languages, I cannot hazard a guess.

37 From CHAPTER X. (of XLVIII), as copied and pasted from the web site of the Jesuit Relations: http://puffin.creighton.edu/jesuit/relations/ Page numbers within brackets as copied. Algonquins had the same tradition. From Chapter XII (of XLVIII.) “Of the Mission of the Holy Ghost among the Algonquins, the Nearest to the Hurons: This Election was followed by the Resurrection of those Persons of importance who had died since the last Feast; which means that, in accordance with the custom of the Country, their names were transferred to some of their relatives, so as to perpetuate their memory. . . .” Similar reports are given concerning naming systems among the Iroquois Nations. The colonial correspondence I have read more than once reports that henceforth an individual will be known by a totally different name, as he has assumed the name of a deceased chief or relative.
Amérindienne ancestress. Some years later, though, when I began examining the original documents on microfilm, I realized that the two individuals named as mother and father are in reality two men, witnesses for Marie at her marriage.

The record of the marriage exists in two forms, one a beautifully handwritten transcription (copy)\(^{38}\) of the original record, and the other the original register itself.\(^{39}\)

Remember that photocopies did not exist until the twentieth century. In both sources the record is in Latin. On the original, the witnesses’ names are, as best I can reproduce them in a computer font:

\[
\text{Algonquinis, Carolus Pachirini, et Bartholomæus Anàra8i; et gallis autem D[ominus] Péré, mercator, et D[ominus] [blank space] Ameau, dictus S. Severinus}
\]

Now I knew enough Latin to recognize that the “us” ending on Carolus and Bartholomæus (as well as the “um” ending on Petrum, Latin for Pierre, and Paulum, for Paul Ragueneau, the Jesuit performing the ceremony) indicate masculine grammatical case endings, a language phenomenon that does not exist at all in English nor in French for names, although French does have masculine and feminine name word endings. All of these individuals are thus men, and nowhere is it stated any one of them is a parent. Certainly, there is no justification for changing Carolus (Charle or Charles) into Carole or even Charlotte.\(^{40}\) The bride’s first name, usually spelled Marie in French, is given as Mariam, the Latin feminine case form, and her second name, on the original, as “Mitè8amèg8K8è nationè Algonquinam.”

\(^{38}\) FHL #1298969.
\(^{39}\) FHL #1294977 or #1018092, an earlier filming. This reel also contains registers for Saint-Joseph Miamis (or des Illinois), now Niles, Michigan.
\(^{40}\) The other two witnesses are Frenchmen (Gaulis) Sir [Dominus] Jean Peré and Sir Ameau called S[t] Séverin. On the same wedding day as Pierre and Marie’s, in the PRDH version, the same witnesses appear for another marriage, duly recorded as male, summarized below in an abbreviated version, just as they are on the PRDH Couc marriage certificate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M 1657 - 04 - 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 Etienne / Magouch Amerindien M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Marguerite / Tchiouantoukoue F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 Charles / Pachirini M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Barthelemy / Anaraoui M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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On this record the “8” is actually a Greek upsilon [u] on top of a Greek omicron [o], producing a symbol which the Jesuits and other officials used to represent a sound not found in French, close to French /OU/ or English /W/ before a vowel. When this symbol was transcribed and printed for publication, no appropriate equivalent was available to the typesetters, so the numeral /8/ was chosen to take its place. PRDH transcribes the /8/ as /OU/. On the original handwritten documents the symbol looks somewhat like this Microsoft Word® Wingding 61535,   See the record above for its actual form.

“Mitè\(\am\)èg\(\K\)è”

My thanks to Jean Quintal for telling me about this Wingding symbol for the Taurus sign of the zodiac after reading an earlier version of this article, and special thanks to him for reminding me that there are also neuter case endings in Latin. He likewise provided the correct names for the Greek letters and personal e-mails, March 2003. Other Latin case endings appear in the record: Pierre’s mother is named “Elizabeth\(\Templair\)”. Trois-Rivières is “Triq Fluming”, this latter an example of a neuter case ending. In addition to sending me the wingding symbol and identifying the names for the various Greek case endings, Jean Quintal helped me resolve another enigma about this Couc marriage record. When I first viewed it on FHL microfilm #1018092, I noticed that the handwriting for this act, said to have been performed by Paul Ragueneau (“ego Paulus Ragueneau” or “I Paul Ragueneau”) did not match the handwriting for the 13 November 1676 marriage of Elie Bourbaut and Jeanne Sauvaget recorded on the same page, likewise said to have been performed by ego Paulus Ragueneau. Mr. Quintal had also noticed that the Couc marriage did not appear to be in Father Ragueneau’s handwriting, so he sent me a digital image of a 1652 document that is without a doubt that of the Jesuit. In particular, the [P] and [R] of his name are distinctive, but the [P] and [R] of the 16 April 1657 Couc marriage do not match those of either the November 1676 marriage or the 1652 document. Paul Ragueneau’s 30 January 1657 entry of the baptism of Nicholas Onnenhase, Nipissirinien, with “La fleur de Cognac” and Nicolas Du Plessis as
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asked me to take a closer look at the case ending on Bartholomǽus, which I had originally read as Bartholoméus. Like the authors I am correcting, I am not without error, and I appreciate being informed and enlightened.

Although Jetté’s name appears on the Dictionnaire généalogique des familles du Québec, it is the work of many individuals, not one. I do not know who was responsible for naming these two men, Barthélemi Anaraoui and Charles Pachirini, as Marie’s father and mother in the form of Barthélemi & Carole Pachirini. It was surprising, though, to see the same error perpetuated in Michel Langlois’s recent Dictionnaire Biographique des Ancêtres Québécois (1608-1700), where he identifies Marie as daughter of “Barthélémy Mitèouamigoukoué” and of “Carole Pachirini.”

While I am on the subject of Marie Mitèamékiskè, several data bases on the Web assert that Marie’s parents have been identified. In each case, the parents cited are a pure guess. Jean Quintal has, however, correctly located and transcribed her baptism record, a record originally misread by PRDH. As Quintal reported to me:

It is baptism # 11, dated 6 November 1650, in the parish of Nôtre-Dame de Montréal by the Jesuit Claude Pijart. At this time there was no church and the religious ceremonies were conducted in the chapel of Mademoiselle Jeanne Mance’s Hôtel-Dieu.

godparents, does, however, reproduce the [P] and [R] of the 1652 document. I took another look at the baptism and burial register for Trois-Rivières (FHL #1298969), and the first evidence of Paul Ragueneau in Trois-Rivières that I located is what appears to be his name as part of an entry written by Jacobus DeLaplace for 24 August 1656. Then the entry for 21 November 1656 is the supplemental ceremony of a baptism for a child born in August and baptized by Father Bailloquet, with the entry written by Ragueneau, again with the distinctive [P] and [R]. He continues to sign 12 December of 1656; 10, 15, and 30 January 1657, the Nicolas Onnenhase baptism; then 25 March. The next page is very hard to read at the top, but I finally concluded the first entries for April 1657 are in the handwriting of Gabriel Druilletes. I checked PRDH, which identifies the officiating priest as GABRIEL DRUILLETES Occupation: JESUITE for #87410 and # 87411, Trois-Rivières, both on 1657-04-15. Gabriel Druillettes’ handwriting appears to be the closest to that recording the Couc marriage on the next day, 16 April. The [A] of “Anno” and the "1657 Aprilis ego," in particular, seem the same in these records. This is, of course, a guess on my part; I am not an expert analyst of handwriting. Also, I have no idea why Father Druillettes would have needed to physically enter the record for Father Ragueneau. Father Druillettes signs record #87412 for the next day, 1657-04-17, and Father Ragueneau is back for a 1657-05-14 baptism. By June 1657, Jacobus Delaplace is identified as the priest recording the entries. Father Ragueneau left Trois-Rivières on 22 June of 1657 to go to join those already at Sainte-Marie-de-Ganentaa (Gamentaha) or Sainte-Marie among the (Onondaga) Iroquois, “the first attempt at an organized apostolate among the Iroquois.” DCB I, p. 563. There he would certainly have met Charles Boivin again, the uncle of my ancestor Pierre Boivin, and the architect of both Sainte Marie among the Hurons (now Midland, Ontario) and Sainte Marie among the Iroquois (now Town of Salina, Onondaga County, New York). See Wilfrid Jury and Elsie McLeod Jury, Sainte-Marie among the Hurons, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1954, and Elizabeth Metz, Guide and History of Sainte Marie among the Iroquois, Syracuse, New York: Quartier Printing Co. Inc., 1995.

43 Michel Langlois, Dictionnaire Biographique des Ancêtres québécois (1608-1700), Sillery: La Maison des Ancêtres québécois, Tome 1 (Lettres A à C), 1998. Continued in Tome 2 (Lettres D à I), 1999; Tome 3 (Lettres J à M), 2000; Tome 4, Lettres N à Z. Sillery: Les Éditions du Mitan, 2001. Although I wrote to Langlois about this, he did not see fit to issue a correction nor to explain why he did not, although he accepted other corrections I sent.

44 Personal e-mails from Jean Quintal, 3 March 2003 and 22 April 2003.
The text is in Latin. Jean Quintal sent me a photocopy of the entry along with his Latin transcription and a French translation, which I here translate into English:

In the year of our Lord 1650, I, the same [Claude Pijart of the Society of Jesus, serving this parish], have baptized Marie MitèamègKè now dite [called] KaKésiKèKè, spouse of Asababich. The godmother was Marie, spouse of Lépine. [written] 6 November

True to Indian tradition, Marie had another Indian name, KaKésiKèKè, or KaKésiKouKoué. Norm Léveillé, in his tribute to Marie on his web site, says:

The closest word to "Kakesik8k8e" in Abenaki is "Kakasikôkôi" = That which belongs to the great clear sky. Or, "Kakasokwad" = it is a clear sky. It could be referring to the Great Spirit in Father Sky, her soul now belonging to Him. This translation is the work of Joseph "Elie" Joubert, one of the last speakers of Abenaki.45

Her Mitéouamigoukoué name has been translated as “swamp medicine” or as “fish medicine woman.” All I am sure of is that the last syllable, koué, definitely means woman.

Marie’s “Cross” as a Signature

Twice in the extant records, Marie signed documents with her cross, on her daughters’ Angélique’s and Isabelle’s marriage contracts. Her “cross” on the marriage contract of Joachim Germano and Isabelle Couc’s is distinctive, leading some to believe it is a totem mark. Norm Léveillé’s web site (at http://www.leveillee.net/ancestry/totem.htm) reproduces the signatures from the document I sent him.

Mite8ameg8k8e's Totem on her daughter Isabelle's Marriage Contract

45 http://www.leveillee.net/ancestry/mariem.htm Abenaki, like Algonquin, is a member of the Algonkin language family.
Whether this is truly a totem mark may be debatable, but it is proof of her consent and her presence at the writing of the contract. Norm added the typed names of those who signified their presence with a cross or signed. The Pierre Couc, Crevier, and Montour (brother Louis Couc Montour) signatures show clearly, but Angélique Couc’s has been cut off. The notary indicated the marque of the future espoux, Germano; the future espouse, Isabelle; St Sernin, Angélique’s husband; and Marie Magdeleine Couc, and also (but cut off on this excerpt) the marks of Marguerite Couc and Jean Couc.

**The Pierre Couc Estate**

When I originally inquired many years ago whether there were any surviving documents detailing the settlement of the Pierre Couc Estate, either after his death in 1690 or after the death of his wife in January of 1699, the archives at Trois-Rivières informed me none existed. Recently, though, many documents from Trois-Rivières have been indexed and now appear on the web site of BAnQ {formerly ANQ}.

The most poignant one is a 1 March 1694 petition by Marie Mitouamegoukoué, widow of Pierre Couc, “in her extreme age and poverty,” to the judicial system at Trois Rivières to be paid her rightful inheritance from her husband, concerning une concession at St François that had been abandoned because of les enemies, the enemies (my reading of the word), and another at Cap de La Magdelaine that Pierre had given to a man who was to pay thirteen minots of grains in return for occupying and working the land. This man had turned the property over to another man; and the current renter had paid nothing since the death of Marie’s husband four or five years ago. She states that, up to the time of her petition, she had not received anything and that her children being unable to provide for her: ses enfants ne pouvant la faire subsister faute de moyens, her children not being able provide subsistence for her because they did not

---

46 BAnQ, Cote: TL3.S11.P2395, Centre: 3-Rivières, Ordonnance concernant la nommée Marie Mitouamegoukoué, Sauvagesse algonquine, veuve du défunt Pierre Couc Lafleur de Cognac (Cognac), décédé il y a 4 ou 5 ans, qui vit dans une extrême vieillesse et pauvreté avec d'autres Sauvages dans les bois vu que ses enfants ne peuvent la faire subsister, faute de moyens, pour qu'elle puisse jouir des biens de 2 concessions de son feu mari, l'une à Saint-François et l'autre au Cap-de-la-Madeleine, donnée à bail d'héritage et dont elle n'a reçu aucune chose depuis le décès dudit Lafleur. C'est ainsi qu'est nommé François Delpé de Saint-Serny (Saint-Cerny), son gendre demeurant à Trois-Rivières, en tant que curateur de la succession dudit défunt pour voir ce qui pourrait revenir à ladite veuve. - 1 mars 1694. The two pages include other details not included in the summary.
have the means (to do so), she was then obliged to live among the other Indians, sauvages, in the woods, not at any of the properties once in the possession of her husband.

Reading these details in the petition without placing them in the context of the times could lead to possibly unwarranted conclusions about the unfairness of the law in New France or even about Marie’s children’s lack of concern for her, despite the fact that it is an unrelated Frenchman who had failed to pay legally contracted rent. In the eyes of some modern writers, as she is undoubtedly an Algonquin, she could not possibly have been treated as fairly as any other inhabitant of New France! “Political correctness” of the present era sometimes causes these writers to transpose the legitimate grievances of post-New France Native Americans back to a period about which they know little. The document in question, though, certainly shows that Marie’s appeal received reparation, whatever the circumstances were that required her to petition the court, because her son-in-law, François Delpé dit “St Serney,” who lived then (March of 1694) in Trois Rivières, and who signed his mother-in-law’s petition with his cross, was appointed as her guardian to claim the payments due her. Subsequent documents confirm he fulfilled his duties.47 And, once the political and personal family facts of the 1680s and 1690s are known by those who might pass harsh judgments, any suggestion that her children had abandoned their mother entirely should be put to rest.

Germain Lesage titles the second chapter of his Histoire de Louiseville48 (a later name for Rivière du Loup) “Dans l’incertitude (1683-1701).” The years 1683 to 1701 were certainly filled with incertitude, uncertainty, not only at Rivière du Loup, where Joachim Germaneau had property, but also across Lac St Pierre at St François du Lac, where Pierre Couc was buried in 1690, and at nearby settlements. It is in these years that the Iroquois again began to threaten the colony of New France, after about fifteen years of peace that had been accomplished after the arrival the Carignan Regiment in 1665.

Lesage cites contemporary historian La Hontan, who reports that, in the summer of 1687,

he [La Hontan] accompanied Intendant Champigny to enlist forty-six men from ‘la rivière du Loup’ and other locations on lac Saint-Pierre, for the expedition the Marquis de Denonville was undertaking against the invaders.49

Able-bodied men, therefore, were removed from the area and could not defend it. Two years earlier, Joachim Germaneau had sold a birchbark canoe with six places, canot d'écorce à six places, for 120 livres, on 22 August 1685 to Joseph Aubuchon, who gave him 40 livres for the canoe and promised to pay the rest. In this document Germaneau says the canoe had been part of a convoy to “Katerakoui” (Fort Frontenac, modern-day Kingston, Ontario); the governor had made a visit there after his arrival in New France to assess the Iroquois threat after his predecessor’s, La Barre’s, humiliating “treaty” with the

---

47 See BAnQ, Cote: TL3,S11,P2396, Centre: 3-Rivières, Comparation de Claude Jutra (Jutras) Lavallée, demeurant à Trois-Rivières, en tant que créancier de la succession du défunt Pierre Couc Lafleur de Coignac (Cognac), pour déclarer qu’il a fait saisir et arrêter entre les mains de Nicolas Lecacheux (Cacheux), demeurant au Cap-de-la-Madeleine, 13 minots de blé qu’il doit de rente à cause d’une terre située au Cap-de-la-Madeleine que ledit défunt a donné à bail d’héritage au nommé Héber (Hébert), lequel avait cédé ladite terre audit Lecacheux aux mêmes conditions. Il est ordonné que les 13 minots de blé saisis, que ledit Lecacheux reconnaît devoir de rente audit Héber, seront baillés et délivrés à François Delpé de Saint-Serny (Saint-Cerny), en tant que curateur de la succession dudit feu Lafleur et de Marie Miteouamegoukoué, sa veuve, algonquine de nation. - 2 mars 1694


49 Ibid., p. 46, citing Collection Oakes, Nouveaux documents de La Hontan, Archives publiques du Canada, Ottawa, Patenaude, 1940, p. 48.
Iroquois in 1684. Germaneau also states that the “Marquis de Denonville,” the new governor-general of New France, had promised him at La Chine that if the canoe was damaged, since he accepted it, the damages would be paid (“he” being ambiguous, possibly Germaneau?).50 (See Part 5.) Not only men were required to defend the colony but also material possessions, such as canoes and food for the militia and soldiers.

The infamously reported Iroquois “massacre” at Lachine occurred in 1689. In the following years, Lesage says, the Iroquois attacked “Saint-Ours, Sorel, Contrecoeur, Saint-François-du-Lac, the islands of lac Saint-Pierre and Rivière-du-Loup.” At this latter place, the “aggressors burned the [seigneur’s] manor.” And, as Pierre Couc’s burial record reports (see above), they burned down the church at Saint François du Lac. The next two burials after Pierre’s are of men who are specifically said to have been killed by the Iroquois. Madeleine de Verchères’s mythic defense from an Iroquois attack at her home, the fort at Verchères, neighboring Contrecoeur, occurred in October, 1692. Most of the habitants in these areas open to Iroquois attack fled to safer localities in these years. Lesage declares that only four families appear to have resided in Rivière du Loup in 1693.51 In this same year, in August, even though the seigneur of Saint François du Lac, Jean Crevier, did not abandon the place, while he was “tending to the harvest with fifteen or sixteen men, … a signal was received of the approach of a party of Iroquois. The workers fled to the fort, which was only a gunshot away, but one habitant was killed, and a soldier as well as sieur Crevier taken prisoner.”52 He died in captivity.

Yet, if farming the land could not be done because of Iroquois raids, families still had to earn a living somehow.

On 19 August 1692, at the home of Henri de Tonty, rue Notre-Dame, François Delpé dit “St Serney,” Angélique Couc’s husband, and nineteen others, some of whom would later travel to Fort Pontchartrain, were hired to go to Fort St Louis53 in Illinois territory by Henri de Tonty, brother of Alphonse de Tonty, and also with François Daupin de Laforest. There is no evidence that Angélique accompanied her husband, nor that she did not, but baptisms for her children born between 1691 and 1695, when she was again documented in the colony for the birth of a child, are missing. She could have traveled to Fort St Louis. Germaneau, with possibly his wife, Isabelle Couc, and definitely with Louis Montour, as well as Madeleine Couc and her husband, were at Michilimackinac before 1695. Marguerite Couc and her husband Jean Fafard dit Maconce were most likely also there; at least Marguerite can be documented there in 1699. (See Part 5.) The youngest Couc child, Jean Baptiste, would have been about twenty years old in 1693, but no trace of him has been documented in 1694, the year of his mother’s petition.

It thus appears that Marie’s children and their spouses were elsewhere just before her petition, hired out to others for pay, shortly before or at the time of the judicial appeal. Furthermore, the terror and confusion of the years immediately after Pierre Couc’s death made it difficult to conduct any legal business in the area.

50 Jacques-René de Brisay de Denonville, Governor-general of New France, 1685-1689, arrived 1 August 1685, and almost immediately traveled to inspect the colony, including a visit to Fort Frontenac. DCB II. Did Germaneau accompany him? Another contract, 12 September 1687, which I have not yet seen, appears to be an evaluation of the condition of the canoe. “Estimation du canot vendu par Germano à Aubuchon,” 12 September 1687, Notary Adhémar.
51 Ibid., p. 53.
53 Notary Adhémar, ANQ, photocopy.
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The exact place and time have not survived, but the Iroquois massacred, at the young age of about 49, another ancestor of mine, André Jarret de Beauregard, uncle of Madeleine de Verchères, by sometime in 1691 (between May and September). No death document has survived, but Marguerite Anthiaume, his wife, was a widow by 22 September 1691. On 21 February 1692, Intendant Bochart de Champigny issued an ordonnance allowing Xaintonge, a notary at Saint Ours, to draw up the inventory of André’s possessions. He explained that there was no notary at Verchères and the closest “justice,” or judicial court, was at Trois Rivières (downriver and across the St. Laurent), “where it is hard to get to because of the distance and the war.” Perhaps similarly, it was not until March of 1694 that Marie, accompanied by Joseph de Lestre (Delestre) Beaujour, demeurant à Québec, were able to settle her case with Pierre Niquet, demeurant à Saint Cézembre. Pierre Niquet, un seigneurial dont elle peut être chargée envers les seigneurs .

Let us not make the mistake of condemning where no condemnation may be warranted. Who among us would have been able to survive, much less thrive, in the terrible years of 1683 to 1701 in New France, even with good intentions? The title of this series is “All Sources Are Not Created Equal.” It should be sub-titled: “Some sources may not have been read properly, nor, perhaps, have all sources yet been discovered or understood!”

---

54 Two more documents that concern the succession of Pierre Couc, after the death of Marie, are now (2009) available at BAnQ: The first is a claim on the succession of Pierre Couc dating back to April of 1681. In it, Angélique Couc declares she never received anything from the succession. Cote: TL3,S11,P2749, Centre: 3-Rivières, Requête de Joseph de Lestre (Delestre) Beaujour, demeurant à Québec, au nom et comme tuteur des enfants mineurs de feu Charles Roger Descolombiers (des Colombiers), demandeur, comparant par l’huissier Pottier (Pothier), contre François Delpé Saint-Sorny (Saint-Cerny, Sincerny), demeurant à Trois-Rivières, défendeur, comparant par Angélique Couc, sa femme, pour que le défendeur soit condamné à payer au demandeur la somme de 140 livres au nom et comme ayant droit en la succession de feu Pierre Couc, père de sa femme, contenue en la promesse faite par le défunt Couc au profit du défunt sieur Descolombiers le 2 avril 1681 avec l’intérêt de la somme au temps de l’ordonnance; la défenderesse répond que n’ayant jamais rien eu de la succession dudit défunt Couc, son père, et voulant déclarer n’y rien prétendre requiert être renvoyé absous; la défenderesse et son mari sont déchargés de la demande mais le demandeur pourra se pourvoir sur les biens de la succession du feu sieur Couc ainsi qu’il avisera bon être; dépens compensés (signé Lechasseur). - 13 juillet 1705

The second concerns an adjustment on the sale at auction of the Couc property at la rivière de Saint-François. Part of the property had been gifted to Saint-Sernin et Angélique Couc, sa femme in their marriage contract. They requested the portion of property belonging to them be subtracted from the sale. Cote: TL3,S11,P2831, Centre: 3-Rivières, Adjudication d’une terre sise en la seigneurie de Saint-François, appartenant à la succession de feu Pierre Couc dit Lafleur de Cognac, contenant 4 arpents de large sur la profondeur jusqu’au chenal Tardif, à prendre d’un bout sur le devant au bord de la rivière de Saint-François, tenant d’un côté aux terres du domaine de la seigneurie et l’autre côté à celle de François Delpé Saint-Sernin (Saint-Sorny, Saint-Cerny, Sincerny) au plus offrant et dernier enchérisseur en vertu d’une ordonnance de monseigneur l’intendant en date du 16 mars dernier, et à la requête de publication de l’enchère de Joseph Crevier de Saint-François, officier d’une compagnie des troupes de la Marine porteur du pouvoir de Marguerite Hertel, sa mère, veuve de feu Jean Crevier, vivant seigneur de Saint-François; sur lesdits 4 arpents, ledit Saint-Sernin et Angélique Couc, sa femme, et fille dudit feu Couc, ont comparu en conséquence d’une déclaration à eux faite de la vente de ladite terre à la requête de ladite Hertel qui avait dit que, par leur contrat de mariage, ledit feu Couc, leur père, leur a donné un demi arpent de large de la terre sur toute la profondeur à prendre en la joignant à une qui leur appartient, demandant alors la distraison de ladite terre pour être jointe à la totalité de celle qu’ils possèdent; la terre réduite à 3 arpents et demi de large sur la profondeur jusqu’au chenal Tardif a été adjugée par vente et délivrance à Pierre Niquet, demeurant à Saint-François, pour la somme de 220 livres et de payer les cens, rentes et droits seigneuriaux dont elle peut être chargée envers les seigneurs. - 9 juillet 1708
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All Sources Are Not Created Equal
Part 3

The Couc dit Lafleur de Cognac Children

Suzanne Boivin Sommerville

All of Pierre and Marie’s seven children lived interesting lives, even fascinating ones. Misreadings and published errors sometimes confuse exactly who these seven children are; so, for the record, here they are, as currently (2002) shown on PRDH. Please note PRDH did not use accents for names of persons. Additions in brackets are mine.

Children born before 1766 :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Marriage</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>First name of the child</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Name of the spouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>1657-07-14</td>
<td>1679-10-23</td>
<td>JEANNE</td>
<td>Trois-Rivières</td>
<td>Trois-Rivières</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>1659-11-27</td>
<td>1688-01-07</td>
<td>1709-00-00</td>
<td>LOUIS</td>
<td>Trois-Rivières</td>
<td>St-François-du-Lac</td>
<td>Pays-d'en-Haut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>before 1662</td>
<td>1682-08-30</td>
<td>1750-01-07</td>
<td>MARIE ANGELIQUE</td>
<td>Lieu indéterminé (au Québec)</td>
<td>[Place unknown, in Québec, probably Cap de la Madeleine, according to her marriage contract]</td>
<td>Sorel Pointe-du-Lac</td>
<td>François Delpe St Cerny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>before 1664</td>
<td>06-01</td>
<td>before 1686-12-31</td>
<td>MARGUERITE</td>
<td>Trois-Rivières</td>
<td>Jean Fafard</td>
<td>[remarried to Michel Massé before 1705-12-31 Pays d’en haut, also according to PRDH]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>before 1667</td>
<td>[early 1667, by March]</td>
<td>1684-04-30</td>
<td>1752-00-00</td>
<td>ISABELLE ELISABETH MARIE</td>
<td>Lieu indéterminé (au Québec)</td>
<td>[possibly Cap de la Madeleine]</td>
<td>Sorel Colonies anglaises (États-Unis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>before 1669</td>
<td>before 1684-12-31</td>
<td></td>
<td>MARIE MADELEINE</td>
<td>Lieu indéterminé (au Québec)</td>
<td>Maurice Fontaine</td>
<td>[I have seen no evidence Maurice ever used the dit name Fontaine, although his father did.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

55 No indication is given that Marguerite was married when she witnessed Isabelle’s marriage contract on 26 April 1684, Antoine Adhémar, notary at Trois Rivières, ANQ, photocopy. This document names Isabelle’s parents, and Louis Couc Sr de Montour, Angélique (wife of François Delpé sr St. Cernen also present), Marguerite, Marie Magdelayne, and Jean Couc, frères et soeurs de la ditte [sic] Isabelle Couc, all living at St François. Angélique’s marriage contract also identifies the presence of the same members of the family. 27 July 1682, Ameau, photocopy. Jeanne had died in 1679. See Part 2 for most of the signatures and crosses. (No Marie Anne Couc or Pierre Couc fils were present, despite the guesses of some researchers.)

56 This is another name that is spelled in a variety of ways. I will try to standardize it in the above form. He was also known as Robert Hunter in honor of the governor of New York.

57 Nevertheless, 7 Jan 1688, Marie Madeleine is still called daughter of her father and not wife of anyone at the baptism of a son of her brother, Louis Couc Montour, and Jeanne Qui . . . [sic] at St François du Lac in the seigneur's house. Godparents: Jean Péré & Marie Madeleine Couc, daughter of Pierre Couc. No first name for the child survives on the damaged document, nor can Jeanne’s second name be read, but Jetté and PRDH say this child is Joseph Couc Lafleur Montour, son of Jeanne Quigetigoucoue. (A Joseph Montour was present at Fort
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m before 1673  before 1706-11-24  JEAN Lieu indéterminé (au Québec)  Anne

I cite the 2002 PRDH list because even the composition of the family has been misinterpreted in the past. Tanguay lists eight children in the family. Some web sites, as well as some recent books and articles, also contain errors about who they are. Charles A. Hanna, in 1911, knew the work of Benjamin Sulte and cited Sulte’s identification of the link between the Couc family of New France and the Montours of the English colonies. Hanna says all the children were born at Three Rivers [sic], either Sulte’s error or Hanna’s guess. Hanna then lists the eight children found in Tanguay, massacring Marguerite’s first husband’s last name as “Lafart dit Laframboise [sic]” for what should be Fafard dit Maconce, and recording Angélique’s husband’s name as “M. St. Corney [sic]” whom, Hanna says, she married “August 4, 1692” [sic], not 1682, ten years off the mark. From Sulte’s notes identifying the Montours of New York as the Cousins of New France, Hanna then assumes that Louis Couc, “the half-breed [sic] son of Pierre Couc,” was the father of Madame Montour, and that she must have been named Margaret [sic][59] after her mother, a Sokoki.

Both of Hanna’s assumptions are false, as Montour is not the name of Isabelle’s / Madame Montour’s father. United States writers, in Hanna’s time and even more recently, knew little or nothing about the “dit” (called, aka) and “dite” (feminine form) naming systems of New France, not to mention the Native naming customs. Nor did they know it was not a strong tradition in New France to name a child after a parent or grandparent. More likely, a child was named after one of the godparents, as was true for Jeanne named after godmother Jeanne Crevier, wife of Pierre Boucher (she is identified as de la Mesle, her father’s dit name); and Des Groseilliers was godfather, most probably Médard Chouart sieur Des Groseilliers, soon to defect to the English with Radisson in 1665); and for Louis, godparents were Louis Godefroy, sieur de Normanville, and his wife Marguerite Seigneuret. Marguerite Couc was not named for her godmother, once again Jeanne Crevier, which would have repeated the name Jeanne, although this repetition of names did occur in some families.[60] Marguerite’s godfather was Jean Pére, an important

61 Hanna, p. 200. Only Tanguay gives a first name of Marguerite for Louis’s Sokoki woman; his source is not extant. American writers before the modern period use the phrase “half-breed” to indicate children of marriages between an Indian and a European. “Métis” with both capital /M/ and small /m/ is the phrase used in Canada, but not until, essentially, the British period. English writers also changed French first names into English ones.
62 Actually her name is Marguerite, another example of a writer “correcting” the spelling of a name.
63 See the two Pierre Roy sons of Pierre Roy senior and Catherine Ducharme. The Pierre baptized 1677-01-03 at Laprairie (PRDH #17688) had Fiacre Ducharme as godfather. This Pierre married Marguerite OuabakKiKoué (here spelled as consistently written on Detroit records. PRDH has only a very few references to her from the registers of the mother colony and thus standardizes the name (in error) as Marguerite Ouacaikikoue). Pierre Poupart served as godfather for the second Pierre Roy born to Pierre and Catherine, Montréal 1679-06-17 (PRDH #40540). He married Marie-Angelique Faille (FAYE in Jetté, the two spellings pronounced identically).
friend of the family. I have enjoyed myself speculating which of the women named Élisabeth / Isabelle might have been a godmother for Élisabeth / Isabelle in the Cap de la Madeleine of 1667. When "Pierre Kouc Lafleur" himself was godfather for an Amérindienne [sic, as PRDH records it] 27 August 1651 at Trois Rivières, she was named Perrine, a feminine form of Pierre. See the record in Part 1.

Other assumptions have been made about the family, for example, that the children without baptisms must have been born in the pays d’en haut, the country upriver from the mother colony. What those who suggest this do not know is that records are lost for Cap de la Madeleine and Saint François du Lac for the crucial period of the births of the children with missing baptisms. Angélique and Isabelle were obviously known to have been baptized or they would not have been allowed to receive the sacrament of matrimony. A guess that Pierre and perhaps all of his family were off trading out in the wilds with the Indians when the unrecorded births occurred is not easily supported, as all legal trading during the early years of the family’s existence was limited to the colony, with Natives coming down to trade for European merchandise and carrying their furs down with them. I’ve seen no evidence Pierre did any legal or illegal trading; instead the documents I’ve seen associate him with tending to his various properties and his involvement in legal disputes (including the court case in 1680-81 in Québec City in connection with his daughter Jeanne’s death in 1679), although he traded with the Natives when they came to the colony.

Besides, the threat from marauding Iroquois was simply too great for most men to go off to trade in the pays d’en haut from the mid-1640s until after the Carignan Regiment soldiers suppressed the Iroquois by 1668. Pierre Couc’s neighbor at Trois Rivières, Pierre Boucher, declared in his Histoire Véritable et Naturelle, written in 1663, that it was almost impossible for men to go into their fields to tend their crops and animals in those years without being killed, wounded, or abducted by the Iroquois. Even the Western Nations (mainly Odawas and Huron-Petuns) were not able to come down the Ottawa River to the mother colony each summer to trade in any numbers. Only after 1669 did legal trade excursions into the pays d’en haut begin to take place to any extent. The last Couc child, Jean Baptiste, was born about 1673, when Pierre was at least in his forties. A misunderstanding of basic history can easily lead to inaccurate leaps of interpretation. It may be romantic to imagine Pierre with his Indian wife and their children living as quasi-legal fur traders or trappers, but the evidence I have seen to this date just does not support such

---

62 My best “guess” is that the godmother was Élisabeth Radisson, who is recorded as “Isabelle redison” wife of “La vallee” (Claude Jutras dit Lavallée in Jetté) on the 1667 census for Cap de la Madeleine, which also records the Couc family present there in 1667. NAC, MG 1 - Série G1, NAC F-765, photocopy. She is sister of Pierre Esprit Radisson, the famous explorer, and aunt of Étienne Volant Radisson, the clerk, constm, for the Company of the Colony at Fort Pontchartrain in the first years, 1701-1704. Her son Pierre, b 1664, was a voyageur in a convoy of more than 45 men who traveled to the fort, those hired on 10 July 1703, the same day as Étienne Vemiard sieur de Bourgmont, who would figure in Isabelle’s life. Adhémard, photocopied.

63 See Jetté, xiv-xv.

64 A Louis Lafleur, son of Pierre Lafleur, served as honorary godfather in the absence of François Lemaistre on 11 August 1677 at Montréal for the baptism of François Gerbaux, son of Christophe & Marguerite Lemaistre of Rivière du Loup. Mother of the child is said to be present in Montréal because of the fur trade. Also present Judith “Rogaut” (Rigaud), then wife of Jean de Laplanche and grandmother of the child. This family and Joachim Germaineau had property at Rivière du Loup. If this is truly Louis Couc Lafleur, about to be 18, then this record is the only known example of his signing under this name. Photocopy. I have seen no evidence of another Pierre “Lafleur” with a son named Louis. He signed his 7 January 1688 marriage record simply "Pierre Lafleur".

65 I’ve read these details in several sources too numerous to mention, including Boucher. Boucher’s visit to France was instrumental in convincing the monarch to send the Carignan Regiment.
Pierre Couc’s eldest son, Louis Couc Montour, did, however, engage in the legal fur trade in the pays d’en haut, despite the fact he is often presented solely as a renegade and fugitive. At the age of seventeen he received a concession of land from the seigneur, Crevier, at St François du Lac in 1677 and may have worked it. As early as 8 August 1688, the year of his marriage to Jeanne, though, “Louis Couc de Montour” was hired by François de Boisguillett, represented by Jean Boudor, to go to Baye des Puants (Green Bay, Wisconsin). By 19 August 1692, Louis Montour, then thirty-three years old, was doing the hiring himself, engaging Pierre Mouflet, voyageur, to go to the 8ta8ais (Ottawas / Odawas translates it, is said, as traders) and neighboring nations, leaving the ensuing year in the spring, 1693, and planning to return in the spring of 1694. Two days later, 21 August 1692, the notary Maugue wrote a contract for Louis Couc Sieur de Montour in the presence of Joachim Germano [sic], brother and assistant of Montour, frere et assistant du sr de Montour. (Note the use of the term “brother” instead of brother-in-law. In-laws are sometimes identified as brothers or sisters in the extant documents.) This contract concluded an agreement with Claude Fezeret, sieur de Guilbot, son of René Fezeret, bourgeois of Ville Marie, to form a société for common profit from a voyage they planned to make to the 8ta8ais (Ottawa country) to trade; at this time 8ta8ais generally referred to Michilimackinac at modern-day Saint Ignace, Michigan, and points beyond. The contract also speaks of working la forge, a furnace or hearth where metals are heated or wrought (possibly from a mine or ore deposits?), a task that might take up to three years.

---

68 Journal of the Jesuit Fathers, in the year 1652: “On the 21st [of May], two men in a canoe,-one a Frenchman, named La fleur de Cognac, a soldier; the other, a young Algonquin,—having gone to raise their fish-line on the other side of the River, opposite the fort of Three Rivers, were attacked by a volley of 7 or 8 gunshots. The savage died two days later; the Frenchman was wounded, but not seriously. The enemy promptly retreated, being pursued by a number of canoes and shallops.” Also in Desrosiers 2: 3. Léo-Paul Desrosier, Iroquoisie, 1652-1665, Tome 2, Septentrion, 1998: On 19 November 1653, “Lafleur” and Des Mares leave New France with Teharegonen (Tekarihoken, Teharihogen), Mohawk sachem, for the country of the Mohawks / Agniers. “On the same 19th, Teharihogen embarks at 3 Rivers [sic] with sieurs des Mares et la fleur, for Anien. The other Anien having embarked, put back and remained at 3 Rivers.” (Jesuit Relations 1653 and Desrosiers 2: 37) Entry for May 1654: sometime this month, letters received from Des Mares & Lafleur among the Onontaguis / Onondagas (Desrosiers 2: 48). 1 July 1654, Des Mares & Lafleur return with Batard Flamand and an embassy of Agniers / Mohawks, having passed the winter in Iroquoisie (modern-day New York State). (Desrosiers 2:53) On his return Pierre Couc serves as interpreter at Trois-Rivières, and lives there in the fort, according to Simone Vincens, Madame Montour et son temps, Québec / Amérique, 1979. Hereafter Vincens. In 1660, three years after his marriage, Pierre Couc is “habitant et Interprete pour les sauvages aux trois rivières” when he purchased land, two arpents by 25 arpents, in the Jesuit seigneurie of Cap de la Magdelaine, from Pierre Cailleau. Note: he is not identified as a fur trader. The sale included a house in the village near the mill, two pigs, at least eight chickens, and a “Coq”— all for 750 livres. Notary Severin Ameau, 7 January 1660, ANQ photocopy. The family had land at Trois Rivieres as well, and Jean Crevier granted land “quatre arpents de front” in St François du Lac to Pierre Couc 14 October 1673, Adhémar, ANQ, photocopy.

69 26 January 1676, concession of Ile St. Joseph at St. François by seigneur Crevier to Louis Couc, fils de Pierre, Notary Adhémar, #164, photocopy. Louis had, apparently, not yet chosen the dit name of Montour in 1676.

70 21 August 1692, Maugue, ANQ, photocopy. See Parts 4 and 5 for the presence of Claude Fezeret, sieur de Guilbot, son of René Fezeret, Montour, and Germano at Michilimackinac in 1699.

71 In a later document, “Montour” is cited as one of the witnesses attesting to the discovery of a mine in the region.

72 It is interesting to note that by 1701 Michel Massé, perhaps already Louis’s brother-in-law, was a blacksmith, forgeron, who, being absent from Ville Marie, requested his father, Martin Massé, a master tool maker, taillandier,
This contract is yet another example of a document which contains details within it that are not summarized in an index. If I had not ordered a copy, I would never have known that “Germano” and Montour were associated for this venture because the name Germano does not appear in any index that lists the document.\textsuperscript{73} I have other extant records of Montour’s legal involvement in the\textit{ pay d’en haut}, including one listing the names of sixteen men, Montour among them, allowed to go up to Michilimackinac at the beginning of September 1697, after all trade was forbidden in 1696, with Sieur de Tonty \textit{capitaine Reformé}, signed 28 October 1697 by Intendant Champigny.\textsuperscript{74}

As I stated earlier, Tanguay lists eight children, not seven, in the Couc family, including an Elizabeth, b 1667 (with no mention of her use of the variant name Isabelle, causing some commentators to maintain they were two different individuals).\textsuperscript{75} When she married in 1684, she used the first name Isabelle. She herself appears never to have signed her name, although she did mark a cross on at least two documents,\textsuperscript{76} and it is under the name Isabelle that she is said to be unable to sign the registers of Fort Pontchartrain in 1704 and 1706. The eighth child Tanguay adds is a “Marie” baptized 1663. Absence of a precise date and place in Tanguay is a red flag signaling caution. Then he tags Angélique, b 1661, onto the end of the list of children.

This simple entry has led researchers to make other errors, even though this “Marie” is easy to account for. The 1667 census taken at Cap de la Madeleine reports: Pierre "Couque" age 40 (1627-26); wife Marie, 35 (1632-31); Jeanne, 10 (1657, baptized 14 July 1657); Louis, 7 (1660-59, actually baptized 27 Nov 1659, so he would have been 8 later in the year 1667); Angélique, 5 (1662 or 1661, if her birthday to protest for him that a \textit{soufflet} or bellows brought from France by a Mr. Duperé, merchant, does not serve to heat the fire because its tube is too small and too weak, “tuyeau trop menu et trop faible.” 28 September 1701, Adémâr, ANQ, photocopy. The complaint was certified by other blacksmiths, among them a Prudhomme. The bellows was to be repaired for 40 \textit{livres du pais}, money of New France. Was Michel also involved in this enterprise with Montour? He had been in a society with François (Daupin) de Laforest to work as a \textit{taillhandier}, edge toolmaker, in Illinois territory, beginning in 1696 and to continue for three years. Adhémar #3520, ANQ photocopy. Both Captains Alphonse de Tonty and François Laforest served as second-in-command at Fort Pontchartrain, where Michel Massé had property, and both captains were eventually named commandants there.

\textsuperscript{73} It does not appear in the Antoine Roy book index nor on \textit{Parchemin}.
\textsuperscript{74} MG1, Vol. 15, NAC F-15, ff. 143-143v. Tonty was replacing Cadillac at Michilimackinac.
\textsuperscript{75} The name is spelled both Elisabeth and Elizabeth in the French records, as is Isabelle as Izabelle. See William A. Hunter, “Couc, Elizabeth? [sic] (La Chenette, Techenet [sic]; Montour,” DCB III (1974), pp. 147-48, for his list of English language primary sources. He cites no French language sources, except Tanguay, and uses only the incomplete MPHC “Cadillac Papers” English translation of French documents from the colonial archives.
\textsuperscript{76} 26 April 1684, Notary A. Adhémar, ANQ, photocopy of marriage contract. On her sister Angélique’s marriage contract 27 July 1682, Ameau, she is Isabelle. Her cross appears on both of these documents. She was recorded as Elisabeth three days after Angélique’s contract when she served as godmother for her brother Louis’s son François, 30 August at Sorel, the same day as Angélique’s marriage at Sorel. The child, whose Indian mother’s name is not given, had been born more than a year earlier, 6 April 1681, said to be from St François du Lac, and had his future uncle-by-marriage, François Delpé, as godfather, who apparently gave him his first name. PRDH, taken from Tanguay. You really need to hear the French pronunciation of Isabelle and Elisabeth to understand how these two names were commonly interchanged. Isabelle is just another version, just as Susan is another spelling for my name, Suzanne. I have received notes addressed to me as Susan and I have been called Susan even by those who know the spelling and English pronunciation of my baptismal name. (Not many people in the States know the French pronunciation!) I’m also called or addressed as Sue, Suzie, even Suzi.
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was after the census was taken);77 Marguerite, 3 (1664-63); Élisabeth (“Eslizabeth”), 3 mois (months), thus born 1667, probably before April.78

The 1681 census for St François du Lac records: Pierre Couque, habitant (inhabitant or resident), age 57 (1624-23); wife Marie, 50 (1631-30); Louis, 20 (1661-60, actually November 1659); Marie, 18 (1663-62) thus easily Marie Angélique, probably born 1661 or 1662; Marguerite, 16 (1663-64, actually baptized 1 June 1664, this census likely taken before June);79 Élisabeth, 14 (1667); Madeleine, 12 (1669-70); Jean, 8 (1674-73), all children recorded as unmarried.80 First-born Jeanne had died in 1679.81

As can be seen above in the list from PRDH, birth / baptism records are extant only for Jeanne, Louis, and Marguerite. No record I have ever seen exists for a girl child baptized and named only Marie, although each of the girls used Marie as part of her name at one time or another.82 Tanguy evidently had to fit in that name “Marie” of the 1681 census, almost leaving out the continued existence of Marie Angélique, who definitely married in 1682, the year after the census. The census does not record Angélique elsewhere in 1681, although her future husband is also recorded at St François, age 34, with one fusil and 12 arpents of developed land.

This listing of a “Marie” has encouraged at least one researcher, Barbara J. Sivertsen, to fabricate a Marie Anne Couc and fit her into the family.83 Using the book version of PRDH, which does not attempt to link individuals to families, this writer found an isolated confirmation record for a girl she identifies as a daughter of Pierre Couc. While it is true PRDH reports that a MARIE ANNE LAFLEUR Residence: ÉVECHE [diocese] DE QUEBEC 012 [years old, thus born 1669-8, not 1663-62] was confirmed at Batiscan in 1681,84 it must be stressed that “Lafluer” is one of the more common “dit” names, Jetté citing 55 families before 1730 who used it and two more individuals for whom it was a last name. It is, of course, also true that the Couc children sometimes used their father’s “dits” names, both Lafleur and

---

77 The census was sent to France with Talon’s letter of 27 October 1667. MG 1 - Série G1, NAC F-765. It would have had to have been taken well before this date, in May or June for the Cap area, according to a personal message from Bertrand Desjardins of PRDH. Simone Vincens, counting back three months from October, mistakenly gives August as Isabelle’s birth month.

78 PRDH calls the location Comté de Champlain, but the microfilm of the record for the Couc family places them in Petit Cap de la Madeleine, MG 1 - Série G1, NAC F-765. Angélique’s marriage contract states she is native to (originally from) the Cap. Photocopies.

79 This census was sent to France in November of 1681. MG 1 - Série G1, NAC F-765.

80 I count 51 people recorded at St François. Pierre owned three fusils and declared 15 (not 14, as sometimes reported) arpents of land that he had developed. He had other land, according to notarial records, and property in Trois-Rivières, some of which he and his wife gave to Isabelle at her marriage in 1684, described in the marriage contract.

81 Jeanne Couc died as a result of an attack that also injured her father. There is no extant evidence that she was raped in this attack, although some writers say she was, and it is possible. Documents for the original inquiry have not survived. See surviving documents concerning the legal appeal Pierre Couc filed: Jugements et déliberations du Conseil souverain: 30 December 1680, II, p. 459; 24 March 1681, II, pp. 523-24.

82 On 9 July 1673, Angélique, about eleven years old, is recorded as “Marie Angélique” for the baptism at Ville Marie (Montréal) of Pierre, son of Alexis Tegarné, Iroquois, and Anne 8tachi8aba [ink blot] 8K8e, Algonkine, with Pierre Picoté de Belestre as godfather (father of Marie Anne, who married Alphonse de Tonty), photocopy. Perhaps this is a time Angélique’s father visited Ville Marie for the trade fair. She is simply “Marie” at the baptism of daughter Véronique, PRDH #88308 1700-01-01, and of son Maurice, #88395 1703-06-19, both at Trois Rivières.


84 PRDH #403523 Batiscan 1681-06-02.
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Cognac, Louis being baptized with the name Lafleur in 1657, and “Elizabeth Couc dit Lafleur de Coignac [sic]” recorded with all of these names for her 1678 confirmation at Sorel.\(^8^5\) Nevertheless, a case cannot be built on one reference to a Marie Anne Lafleur, however suggestive.

Sorel, the site of Isabelle Couc’s confirmation and marriage, is far closer to the Couc residence at St François du Lac than Batiscan is to St François du Lac, and Batiscan is downriver on the other side of the Saint Laurent. (Map work is another component of research.) Furthermore, only a bishop can confer the sacrament of Confirmation. Bishop Laval also visited Sorel in 1681, on 8 June. At Sorel Bishop Laval confirmed nine individuals, six days after he administered the sacrament to twenty-three at Batiscan on 2 June.\(^8^6\) Surely a daughter of Pierre Couc would have been confirmed at Sorel, as Isabelle was. I do not know with certainty who this Marie Anne is, but as no Marie Anne appears with the Couc family in the census of 1681, she is almost certainly not a Couc.

I decided to go as close to the source as I could. From the microfilm of what may be a handwritten transcription of all confirmation records for 1681, including Batiscan, I read “Marie Annelafleur.”\(^8^7\) This

\(^8^5\) PRDH says the exact date was omitted; photocopy of Sorel record, dated only 1678, FHL #1294705. This film says the following years are missing for Sorel: 1679-1685 (a crucial period for the Couc family), 1690-1707 (also crucial, especially for marriage records for Marguerite and Madeleine), 1721, 1722, 1760. Tanguay, in the nineteenth century, knew a source for some precise records for Sorel, including Angélique’s and Isabelle’s marriages there. Abbé A. Couillard Després, in his *Histoire de Sorel*, Montréal: Imprimerie des Sourds-Muets, 1926, may also have had a now-missing source for Isabelle’s church wedding, as he says the marriage was blessed by Father Pierre Volant de St-Claude, whose own father acted as witness at the marriage. Couillard Després, though, also uses a variation of Tanguay’s error by calling Pierre Couc a soldier of “Frémont [sic]”. (p. 82) The father of the priest, Pierre Volant, is Claude Volant, sieur de Saint Claude, who married, about 1653 at Trois-Rivières, Françoise Radisson, the sister of Pierre Esprit Radisson and Élisabeth Radisson, wife of Claude Jutras, a fact which reinforces my “guess” that Élisabeth / Isabelle Radisson was Élisabeth / Isabelle Couc’s godmother, but does not prove it. Two of his sons were priests, twins Pierre and Claude. Another son was Étienne Volant, sieur de Radisson (Jetté). Radisson went to Detroit with the first convoy in 1701 and served there until the summer of 1704 as commis of the Company of the Colony / Compagnie de la Colonie. This same company, on 10 July 1703, hired yet another Volant son, Jean François Volant, sieur de Fosseneuve, to go to Fort Pontchartrain as a hunter, on the same contract that hired Étienne Véniard, sieur de Bourgmont, in the same capacity. Both men signed: *Jean Francois Volant dit Fosse Neuve et de bourg / mont*, the latter signature written on two lines. Thanks to Gail Moreau-DesHarnais for noticing Bourgmont’s signature, as the index to this act mistranscribes the name. It is definitely Bourgmont, even in the text of the contract. “Radisson” was also present and signed. On the title page, it reads: “Engagement par Messieurs de la Compagnie pour Bourgon [sic] et vollant de fosseneuve,” my reading. Notary Chambalon, ANQ, photocopy. Isabelle Couc is first documented at the fort in April of 1704.

\(^8^6\) PRDH list of confirmations. After leaving Batiscan, the bishop went to Champlain on the 3rd, Cap de la Madeleine on the 4th, Trois Rivières the 5th; then he crossed the Saint Laurent River to Sorel for the ceremonies there on the 8th before continuing his visits to other parishes. Among the nine confirmed at Sorel on the 8th was Geneviève Letendre, age 12, who would go to Fort Pontchartrain by 1703. This widow of François Pelletier was the wife of Étienne Volant, sieur de Radisson.

\(^8^7\) FHL #1311432. Lists also appear within some parish registers, but I have not found the Batiscan one on the microfilm of its registers. The year 1681 appears to be lost. Among those confirmed that day at Batiscan: *Marie Mad. Trotier, 11; Caterine Trotier, 7; Marie Mad. du fresne* (Thunay dite Dufresne, who would go to Fort Pontchartrain in 1706), 8; *Marie Jeanne Colet, 8; Marie lafond, 9*, all of whose parents were residents of Batiscan. Jeanne Couc received confirmation at L’Immaculée Conception des Trois Rivières 12 May 1664; Angélique Couc in 1676, listed in the St François du Lac register (PRDH shows her incorrectly as Angélique COUE; it is truly Couc); and “Elizabeth Couc dit [sic] Lafleur de Coignac” in 1678 at Sorel, but on the composite list, FHL #1311432, her name is given only as *Elizabeth Couc*. Photocopies) The family did have property in Batiscan in 1674 (photocopy of notarial record), but resided at St François du Lac and used the parish at Sorel for religious acts in 1678, 1682 and 1685.
name follows the names of “Marie Mad. Trotier,” age 11, and “Catherine Trotier,” age 7. According to the census of the same year, these girls appear to be daughters of Jean Trotier & Geneviève de Lafon. The census for Batiscan for this same year, 1681, lists only one “Anne,” age 12: “Anne Trottier [sic], daughter of François “Trottier” and his wife, Jeanne Hardy.” Jetté spells the name Trottain. François Trottain was a veteran of the Carignan Regiment who eventually became a notary. On 25 July 1682, he was “among the habitants of Batiscan united to demand a permanent parish priest.” How likely is it that Anne Trottain’s father neglected to see to it that his twelve-year-old daughter was confirmed when the bishop came to Batiscan in 1681, if, one year later, he petitioned for a priest to be stationed in Batiscan? I believe this hand-written Marie Annelaflleur, cleaned up as “Marie Anne Lafleur” for various publications, is an error. Could the copyist have recorded the wrong name, given that this seems to be the third entry of “Trotier” in a row? I have seen more outrageous examples of a priest or clerk changing a name through a lapse of concentration. I have even done it myself.

Not having considered any of these possibilities, though, Sivertsen continues to develop the existence of this “Marie-Anne (Lafleur) Couc” by “marrying” her to an Englishman, Joseph Greenhill, and even extrapolating this “fact” into one of the reasons Louis and Isabelle defected to the English. Then she writes:

Virtually nothing is known of this couple except that they had a son, also named Joseph (Grinhill), born about 1683 in British America [sic]. Joseph was a shoemaker who married twenty-one-year-old Marie-Louise Paille in Montreal in 1711. Since Sivertsen cites a marriage contract, I decided to send for it, and it became obvious she did not do the same, as there is no mention of any Pierre Couc anywhere on the record. In fact, the mother of Joseph Greenhill, the son, on both the marriage record of 15 July 1711 at Montréal and the contract (14 June 1711 Lepailleur), is given as Marie Anne Cook (British spelling), residence Wooster [sic], Angleterre, deceased at the time of the 1711 marriage; and the father, a merchant, residence Wooster, Angleterre, is also declared deceased. That’s Angleterre, England, not Nouvelle Angleterre, New England.

Marcel Fournier’s entry for “Greenhill, Joseph born in 1679 (marriage) or 1686 (abjuration)” says he is originally from Worcester, county of the same name, in England (Angleterre), and that he emigrated to New England (Nouvelle Angleterre) at an unknown date. Evidently his parents remained in England if 1684. I have not found confirmation records for the younger children, but Bishop Laval went to France in 1684, requesting to resign from his position. His successor, Bishop Saint Vallier, did not arrive in New France until 1687. See DCB II for both men.

88 NAC microfilm F-765.
90 25 July 1682, Adhémar, cited in Michel Langlois, Tome 4, p. 418, my translation.
91 Sivertsen, p. 99. Parentheses as in original.
92 Sivertsen cites “Archives nationales de Quebec (Montreal), ACTES: Pierre [sic] Couc 1711-6-14: Contrat de mariage entre Joseph Grinhil . . . et Marie-Louise Paillé”, p. 294. This is the contract written by the notary Lepailleur that does not include any mention of Pierre Couc. ANQ, photocopy.
93 PRDH #48036 1711-06-15, and photocopy. The parents of the bride, Leonard Paillet and Louise Vachon, are also said to reside in Wooster [sic], Angleterre, on the PRDH certificate, but this is a copying or reading error, as they were very definitely recorded as residents of Montréal, where Louise was born in 1690. To be fair, I must admit the word Angleterre is occasionally used to refer to Nouvelle Angleterre on some correspondence I have seen, but this is very rare.
that is given as their residence, or former residence, as they were deceased. For this Marie Anne Cook to have been Marie Anne Lafleur and mother of Joseph Greenhill the younger, she would have had to travel to England by 1679 (before age ten, two years before her confirmation) or prior to 1686 (before the age of 17). Fournier continues: “About 1708, Joseph Greenhill was taken prisoner by the French and the Abénaquis during an attack on the posts in New England. Brought to Montréal, he abjured the Anglican religion 20 October 1709.”

That a daughter of Pierre Couc, decidedly Catholic, could have gone to England (or even New England) to give birth to Joseph Greenhill, Anglican, just does not seem possible. As I said before, similar names do not guarantee same person.

Sivertsen may have been influenced by the fact that Isabelle’s grandson, Nicholas Montour, was baptized in the protestant faith, but there is no evidence Isabelle herself ever abandoned her faith. In fact there is evidence she carried at least one grandchild to Philadelphia to have her baptized in the Catholic church there. I will return to this writer, Sivertsen, for her totally false identification of the husband of a member of the next generation of the Couc / Montour family.

Pierre Couc and his wife, Marie, had seven children, six of whom had descendants that can be documented. Their documented lives are fascinating in and of themselves without having to fabricate anything.

---

All Sources Are Not Created Equal
Part 4
Louis Couc Montour & the Colonial Documents
Suzanne Boivin Sommerville

I have copies of the extant records for births, marriages, and deaths, and of most of the other documents concerning the members of this family. I also have photocopies of primary source references to events in which they were involved. Thus I was able to provide PRDH documentation for the 1709 death of Louis Couc dit Montour. The date for his death recorded on PRDH during one of my first visits to the web site when it began in May of 1999 was 1708-04-00; but I knew that Louis, using the name Montour, was very much alive after April of 1708, meeting at Albany, New York, with Lord Cornbury, and promising him to return the following year with “farr Indians” (Western Nations, in this instance, Mississaugas) to trade.95 So I wrote to Bertrand Desjardins at PRDH.

With this item, I am moving beyond the indexes and into a consideration of surviving non-genealogical historical documents and the riches contained in them. Note how I cite each of my primary and secondary sources in my e-mail to Bertrand Desjardins that resulted in the correction:

Dear Mr. Desjardins,

Zoltvany mentions April, 1709, for the killing and cites Peter Wraxall, An Abridgement of the Colony of New York from the Year 1678 to the Year 1751. Edited by C. H. McIlwain, Harvard University Press: 1915, pp. 64-65. He also cites Vaudreuil à Pontchartrain, 14 novembre 1709, AN Col., C11 A, vol. 30, f. 50, which I have seen. [This letter gives Vaudreuil’s reasons for having Montour killed that year.]

I have seen the references to Montour and his sister in Wraxall, vol. XXI, pp. 64-68, in abbreviated form on the website below. There it begins, without a date for the entry, part way into p. 64, with a description of the assassination, and says it occurred "about 12 days ago." The next entry is for 17 May 1709 [Old Style96] at Albany, reporting: “Yesterday arrived here a

95 New York Colonial Documents (hereafter NYCD), 5: 65. Peter Wraxall in: Harvard Historical Studies, vol. XXI, p. 50, says: “. . . Montour an Indian who came over from the French to this Govt brings several farr Indians to Trade at Albany & receives a Reward for the same, tho I think not equal to his Service, (being but £ 5). However he promises to go among the farr Nations again & bring down more Indians.-- . .” [sic]

96 Old Style dates were approximately eleven days earlier than New Style dates in 1709. Although France converted its calendar upon Pope Gregory's decree in 1582, and New France, of course, observed the calendar of France, Great Britain and the American Colonies did not. The British Colonies of North America did not adopt New Style until 1752. For the French / New France records there is no need to speak of "January 1, 1674/1675" or "February 23, 1714/1715", and I have permanently banned the feature on my genealogy program that automatically gives the date
Sachem called Kaqucka of the Messasaga Nation commonly called by the Name of the farr Nations with 4 Indians of the same Nation who came with Montour to the 5 Nations & were conducted hither by Montours Sister," The sachems say, "We are come upon the word of Montour. . . . We have had a great Loss having lost the Man who guided us" and "we have had a great Loss by Montours Death. . . ." [as written, with underlining mine.]

You can view these pages at the THE OHIO VALLEY-GREAT LAKES ETHNOHISTORY ARCHIVES: THE MIAMI COLLECTION

<http://www.gbl.indiana.edu/home.html>

in the documents that include the year 1709.

I am glad to be able to give you more precise information.

Suzanne Boivin Sommerville

As a result of my contribution, the death date for Louis is now given as 1709-00-00. The New York records include other references to Montour, including the following. On 14 July 1709 (Old Style), the lieutenant governor of New York and "ye Jerseys" attempted to use Montour's death at the hands of the French to gain support from the Iroquois against the French:

Their [the French] treacherously murthering [sic] of Montour one of your Brethren before your Faces, in your own Country this Summer [sic] is an Evident mark of their Insolence and how they Intend to use you. . . . 98

Only the name Montour is used in these records, but Louis Couc dit Lafleur adopted this “dit” name of Montour99 as early as his sister Angélique’s 1682 marriage contract, which Louis signed Montour.100 The contract was written at the home of Pierre Couc in St François du Lac. Louis also signed his sister Isabelle’s marriage contract in 1684, his own marriage record, and many other documents, including legal contracts and a sous seing privé (privately written document) dated at Boucherville 11 October 1701.101

97 E-mail sent 1/28/2000, 6:05 P.M. Additions in brackets not in original e-mail.
99 A personal e-mail from a correspondent in France in 2002, informed me that there are two villages in Saintonge, “big and small Montour, on the commune of Nercillac. They are on the road between Cherves and Nercillac. They are situated in the area called ‘le pays-bas’, the low country, All of these places are next to Pierre Couc’s origin in Cognac, less than 10 km, I believe.” My translation. I have also learned that there is a church called “Nôtre-Dame de Montour” in Nercillac. Thus, the name Montour existed and still exists in France, near the birth place of Pierre Couc, and may be the source for Louis’s dit name.
100 27 July 1682, Notary Ameau, ANQ, photocopy.
101 Written at Boucherville 11 October 1701, and deposited in the étude or records of Antoine Adhémar, 23 April 1703, ANQ, photocopy. This is one of the records that taught me that a date mentioned on an index of a notarial document might not be the actual date of the actual document. Louis’s daughter Marie Madeleine, about age 7, had
All of it appears to be in his handwriting. Seventeen months later, on 23 April 1703, Jean Marchand carried the single sheet of paper to the notary Antoine Adhémar to have it filed in Adhémar’s papers. The document is a donation by Montour to his sister “magdelaine Couc femme de maurice menard” of any of the property he might be entitled to as heritage, inheritance, because he is unable to repay her for expenses she financed. Their mother had died and had been buried at Trois Rivières 8 January 1699. No specific inventory after death documents appear to have survived for either Pierre or Marie, but the children, male and female, would have been entitled to share equally in their parents’ estate under the terms of the Custom of Paris. In 1723, Angélque, with her husband and acting for her sisters Marguerite, Isabelle, and Madeleine, sold property in Trois-Rivières that had belonged to their parents. The purchaser was Louise Lemaitre (daughter of Judith Rigaud & François Lemaitre), femme de Jacques Duguay, fils, absent. As their brother Jean Baptiste Couc is not mentioned but was definitely alive, it is possible he, like Louis, filed a similar disavowal to any inheritance.\(^\text{102}\) Jean himself was in Pennsylvania by at least 1733, as will be seen.

Montour also gave his sister two horses and all the animals that he might have, generally tous les bestiaux, as reimbursement for all the payments (and support?) she gave on his behalf, fraix qu’elle a fait pour moy. The small sheet of paper, frayed on the edges, shows signs of having been folded into three parts and then once more, and perhaps tucked into a wallet of some kind. It is a poignant document, presenting a warm, honest, and loving side of Louis not found in other extant references.

Between this document and his appearance in New York in 1708, another reference I have found tells us of his whereabouts: Cadillac’s report of seeing him in the company of Pimabansô, a Loup (Wolf) or Mahican Indian.\(^\text{103}\) Writing from Fort Pontchartrain in August 1706, having just arrived there from the mother colony with the large convoy of that year, Lamothe Cadillac (he consistently signs his name in this way) reports to Governor-general Vaudreuil:

> The Frenchmen who went down [down river to the mother colony from Fort Pontchartrain]\(^\text{104}\) along with some Hurons killed three Loups [Mahicans, who had allied themselves with the
Iroquois]. I find their deed to be well done. I passed close by the dangerous spirit [trouble-maker, *l’esprit dangereux*] Pimabansô while in Seneca territory [*Sonontouan*]. I saw the opportunity to trim his sails [literally, to cut his commerce, *aluy tailler de la besogne*]; but he is a demon who gets away with everything, as I have just learned that he is nearby, coming from *Orange* [Albany, New York] loaded with brandy to his liking; perhaps the heavens will enlighten us to work effectively in regard to him as you have suggested to me.

The man named Montour is keeping company with Pimabansô. What do you want me to do with this man? Everyone has told me that he has always been left free down there [downriver from Fort Ponchartrain, where Cadillac is writing. In the mother colony? In Iroquoia?] and that nothing is said about his comings and goings.

Vaudreuil annotated this passage in the margin:

This item about Montour does not discomfit Sieur de Lamothe as much as he pretends it does. He is the brother-in-law of La Tichenette [*Latishenette*], who serves him [Cadillac] as interpreter [go-between: *truchement*] in his most secret business. Mr. de Lamothe will know well how to make use of this man when he has need to do so.  

It is interesting that Vaudreuil tells Pontchartrain he knows Cadillac is not as bothered by Montour as he pretends to be and that he (Cadillac) uses La Tichenette as "truchement" or interpreter for his most secret business. *La femme de Tichenet* or wife of Tichenet is the name Cadillac himself had used in 1704 to refer to a woman whose brother-in-law was Maurice Ménard, a woman who was at both Michilimackinac and Fort Pontchartrain when Cadillac was in those two places and who was said to have interpreted for him, one who gave testimony in connection with the legal trial Cadillac underwent in 1704-1705. This last woman is specifically identified as *Elisabeth Couc* [sic], present at Fort Pontchartrain to be questioned in September of the same year that Isabelle “Coup” stated she could not sign the register when she served as godmother in April of 1704. She again served as godmother in 1706, this time with Pierre Tichenet as godfather. I will return to these documents and the identification of *La Femme de Tichenet* as Isabelle Couc subsequently.

---

105 “Coppie [sic] de la Lettre Ecrit a monsieur Le marquis de Vaudreuil par le sieur de Lamothe Cadillac du detroit Pontchartrain le 27 aoust 1706” Copy of a letter written to Monsieur le marquis de Vaudreuil by sieur Lamothe Cadillac from Détroit Pontchartrain 27 August 1706, with annotations by Vaudreuil. AC C11A, Vol. 24 (1706), NAC F-24. Emphasis mine. My translation. I read the original French of the English version found in *Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collection* (hereafter MPHC), Volume 33, 1903. Vaudreuil had become increasingly careful to have Cadillac put everything in writing by this time and to supplement anything Cadillac might send to France with his own understanding of events. He had seen the effect of Cadillac’s earlier exaggerated or absolutely false correspondence. Thus he made a copy of this letter Cadillac wrote to him, annotated it, and sent it with the annotations to Pontchartrain.

106 This woman cannot be Angélique or Marguerite Couc, as they were *la femme de St Serny* and *la femme de Massé*, respectively, in 1704, Marguerite having been *la femme de Fafard dit Maconce* earlier. Maurice’s other sisters-in-law were equally known by other names.

107 *Papiers Beauharnois* (Francois de Beauharnois, Chevalier Seigneur de la Chaussaye, Beaumont et autres Lieus, Conseiller du Roy en ses conseils, Intendant de justice, police et finances en la Nouvelle France), 29th of May seventeen hundred and five. NAC C-2925, ff. 415-16. Photocopied on microfilm in the 1960s but acquired by the French archives earlier from Le Duc de Leuchtenberg [sic], a collector of documents. This document has not been translated and published, to my knowledge.

108 21 April 1706, baptism of Pierre Roy, son of Pierre and his wife Marguerite OuabanKiKoué, with Pierre Tichenet and Isabelle “Coup” (Couc) as godparents. Pierre Tichenet signed. The priest signing is Récollet Constantine
It is also interesting that Vaudreuil alludes to the fact that Cadillac "uses" men like Montour when it is beneficial to him and, by implication (he gives no further identification for her), suggests that Pontchartrain knows who La Tichenette is, as he identifies Montour through his relationship to her, although he does err in calling Montour brother-in-law instead of brother. Cadillac had referred to la femme de Tichenet in the mémoire he sent to Pontchartrain in 1704. Equally interesting, Vaudreuil himself “knew what to do with Montour” when he sanctioned the assassination of Montour in 1709 because he, Montour, was assisting Western Nations in trading at Albany.

Montour, the brother of Tichenet, is next mentioned in a November of 1707 conseil de guerre (court-martial or, literally, war council) held at Fort Pontchartrain, a document preserved in the papers of Étienne Veron de Grandmesnil the son.109 As reported in the MPHC translation, when questioned about who caused a soldier named Jolicoeur to desert, Pichon dit Larose, the soldier on trial, replied that it was:

Sieur de Bourgmont [who] enticed him away, and that he [Pichon] could not get him to return, so he left him with Montour, the brother of the said Tichenet.110

This “said Tichenet” is elsewhere in the document definitely identified as La femme de Tichenet. The English translation version, unfortunately, reads: “and also [to lay hold of] the woman named Tichenet,” the French original is: et deprendre pareillement Lafemme d'un nommé Tichenet, the wife of the man named Tichenet. Thus, the English version does not name this woman as the wife of Tichenet, leading to further confusion as to her identity for those who know only the English translation.

Later in this same 1707 “Conseil” document, Bourgmont, La Tichenet, and her brother, Montour, are said to have beaver or other pelletteries (animal skins or furs) stored at La Grande Rivière on Lake Erie. Their alleged plan is to go to the English.

After my warning that similar names do not necessarily identify the same person, you might be wondering whether this Montour is truly Louis Couc dit Montour and not another man with the same name, considering Vaudreuil’s error in calling him the brother-in-law instead of the brother of Latishenette. The above reference definitely associates La Tichenette with Montour’s family, though, and I have previously cited references to Montour as Isabelle’s brother in my other articles in Michigan’s Delhalle, who was killed in June of 1706, as was Pierre Tichenet. Original register of Ste. Anne de Detroit, hereafter Ste. Anne. Detroit Public Library, Burton Library microfilm #1252, photocopy.

109 “Jugement rendu par le Conseil de guerre Contre Bertellemey pichon soldat de la Compagnie de Cortemanche [sic] de la garnison du fort pontchartrain,” Grandmesnil, photocopy Archives Nationales du Québec, (ANQ) 4 880, photocopy. Signed by Jacques Lucas and by Lamothe Cadillac, derâné, Dargenteuil d’ailleboust, Guignolet, Francoeur, and Grandmesnil, secrétaire, with Lafleurder, sergeant of the company of Laforest, and Brindamou, sergeant of the company of LaChassaigne, also present and indicating they could not sign. The English translation in the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections, in particular, has influenced the characterization of La Tichenet and Bourgmont by English language writers, whose only source is this translation. It was, therefore, with considerable interest (and ultimately astonishment) that I examined a copy of the original French document and questioned the translation of two key words in MHH, July and October 2000. I will cite some of the details from these articles in a later section. See my articles on Grandmesnil the younger in MHH, January, April, and July of 2001. I still do not know whether this account of a court martial in 1707 ever went beyond the papers of Grandmesnil the younger. I have seen no mention of it in any of the contemporary colonial correspondence (and I have exhausted the extant sources), although other conseils de guerre and soldier desertions are cited.

**Habitant Heritage.** For the purposes of this one, the question is easily resolved by quoting a reference I have not yet cited in my published articles.

This next record from the *Commission on Indian Affairs at Albany* (found in the Canadian Archives, photocopy of original) makes his identity quite obvious and refutes all other “guesses”:

Jean Fafar alias Maconts and Joseph Montour the first being nephew & the last Son of Montour who was murdered by means of the French for encouraging the far Indians to come to trade with the Inhabitants of this Province, appeared before this Board . . . [all copied as written]\(^1\)

“Jean Fafar alias Maconts” is Jean Baptiste Fafard *dit* Maconce,\(^2\) son of Jean Fafard *dit* Maconce (Algonkin for *ourson* or bear cub), interpreter and voyageur, and of his wife, Marguerite Couc, sister of Jeanne, Louis, Angélique, Isabelle, Madeleine, and Jean Baptiste Couc, thus nephew to Louis. This Jean Fafart / Fafard / Fafard *dit* Maconce, the son, married 4 November 1715 at Fort Pontchartrain to Marguerite Joseph (Jetté says Queroti), daughter of Joseph and “la Joseph [sic],” *Hurons de Nation*, and resided at Détroit for a time. It is he, not his father (as some claim), who died there and was buried 21 December 1756, said to be 70-80 years old. His sister, Marie Anne Maconce, wife of Louis Javillon *dit* Lafeillade, was buried there 29 September 1752, said to be 55.\(^3\)

Their father, Jean Fafard, the interpreter for the King in the Ottawa language, was cited as *Macons* or *Macons* by 1691 in Michilimackinac, and even earlier.\(^4\) Born in Trois-Rivières 17 September 1657,\(^5\) he

---

\(^1\) Minutes, Jan. 7, 1723 - Sept. 4, 1732, RG 10, vol. 1819: 137a, NAC microfilm C-1220. Photocopy. Original is in English.

\(^2\) Sometimes recorded or transcribed as *Macouce* because of the similarity of “u” and “n” in the written texts. It is definitely an “n”. Ste. Anne de Détroit.

\(^3\) Born in Trois-Rivières 17 September 1657,\(^5\) he


served Daniel Greyselon, sieur Du Lhut (later spelled Duluth) in 1677 at the age of 20, according to Simone Vincens, and spoke Huron, Iroquois, Algonkin and Sioux. In 1678-80 he traveled as far as the source of the Mississippi and helped save the captured companions of René Robert Cavelier de La Salle from the Sioux. When he returned to Québec, he was placed in prison for a time until King Louis XIV granted amnesty to the *coureurs de bois*.\(^\text{116}\) Jean Fafard Maconce the elder died in the *pays d’en haut* at an undetermined place, probably before 1703, certainly before his wife, Marguerite Couc, remarried to Michel Massé.

His wife is not called a widow in a court case in 1700 involving events that occurred in the previous year in Michilimackinac. The case is translated in *Edge of Empire*, published in 2008.\(^\text{117}\) So, when I saw it, I quickly accessed Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec, BAnQ,\(^\text{118}\) and used its search engine, Pistard, to see whether the 1700 document was available there for me to see in its original French. It was, and it contained more than one surprise, as will be demonstrated in Part 5.

The passage in question, on page 134, reads: “the deponent [person giving testimony, Dominique Estienne] left to go off to say his prayers. Upon leaving his prayers he passed by Makonchy’s [sic] hut where he encountered only Makonchy’s wife and the man named Boisjoly his [sic] brother-in-law who asked him where he was going….” Footnote 11, page 137, identifies “Makonchy” as “Possibly Jean Fafard dit Makoues [sic], an interpreter at Michilimackinac. See Fr. Enjalran to ?, 7 mai 1684, AN, C11A, 6: f. 525r. His wife was Marguerite Couc, a métis woman and one of three sisters living at the post. Jetté, DG, 410.”

I certainly knew both the reference to Fr. Enjalran and to Jetté, and much more, as demonstrated above, about *Maconse* / Makons / *MaKonchz* (as I read it here), and other variations. The letter is truly /n/, not /u/, a common misreading of the old handwriting.

Prior to seeing this eye-witness report documenting “Makonchy’s wife,” I was unaware of any precise reference to Marguerite’s presence at Michilimackinac, though her sisters Isabelle and Madeleine could be placed there definitively. Scholars have assumed that Marguerite was also there, because her husband’s presence is well-documented. The publication of the interrogation of Dominique Estienne removes any shadow of a doubt. She, like two of her sisters, was there, and the reference demonstrates that her husband did not die, or was not known to be deceased, before 1699.

My knowledge of the persons involved enabled me to make some precisions to Peyser’s transcriptions and translations, so I wrote to José António Brandão, editor of *Edge of Empire* after Joseph L. Peyser’s death. The translation “the man named Boisjoly his [sic] brother-in-law,” *son beau frere* in the original, should actually read “Boisjoly her brother-in-law.” Boisjoly is Pierre Fafard *dit* Boisjoly, brother of Jean Fafard, thus brother-in-law of Marguerite Couc.\(^\text{119}\) In addition, Pierre Fafard *dit* Boisjoly is the brother of

\(^\text{115}\) PRDH #87424.

\(^\text{116}\) Vincens, p. 95. All according to Vincens, as I have not yet verified these citations.


\(^\text{118}\) http://www.banq.qc.ca/portal/dt/accueil.jsp?bnq_langue=en

\(^\text{119}\) See Jetté, p. 410 and Notary Adhémar 22 September 1697, a society entered into between François Fafard *dit* Delorme (who was an interpreter at Fort Pontchartrain from 1701 on) and Pierre Fafard, his brother. See also 11 September 1697, a donation from Pierre Fafard *dit* Boisjoly to his niece, Marguerite Fafard, surely recorded in case of his death on his projected voyage. See also his obligation, 24 September 1607 to Jean Chorel de St Romain.
François Fafard dit Delorme. Montour is also mentioned in the court case in the testimony of another witness, Pierre Mauriceau, who declared that both “Dominique Estienne and Montour” had been witnesses to the events that led to the court case, so Montour was in Michilimackinac in 1699.\(^\text{120}\)

To return to the individuals mentioned in the 1723 New York document above, they have ties to Fort Pontchartrain. Louis Couc dit Montour’s son, Joseph Montour, and Joseph’s wife, Élisabeth / Isabelle Onontio, a Huron, are documented there, as are Marguerite Couc and her second husband, Michel Massé (along with, possibly, the two young Massé daughters) and definitely Marguerite’s son and daughters by Fafard, some of whom call themselves “dit(e)s Maconce” or simply use the last name Maconce.\(^\text{121}\) I will refer to these Detroit records again.

Jean Fafard, nephew, and Joseph Montour, son, are clearly related to the Montour who was assassinated, and that Montour has to be Louis Couc dit Montour.

In yet another link the Couc family has with the English colonies, this time with the New York area, Geneviève Massé, daughter of the former wife of Jean Fafard, Marguerite Couc, and her second husband, Michel Massé, married John Henry Lydius, son of the Albany minister, and eventually they settled in Albany after 1730. I will cite this and other connections later.

Geneviève Massé, Jean Fafard dit Maconce and Joseph Montour are not the only relatives of Isabelle and Louis known to be in New York or Pennsylvania while Isabelle / Madame Montour was there, as documented in the United States colonial documents. In a letter addressed to Thomas Penn, 22 August 1733, James Logan speaks of her brother, known in the New France records as Jean Baptiste Couc, husband of Anne,\(^\text{122}\) but whom Logan identifies in this way:

\[
\text{John Montour, Brother to Madam Montour (so called), formerly wife to Carundawana \([\text{sic}]\), alias Rob Hunter, is husband, as he says to Anameackhiskaman, who with her son claimes \([\text{sic}]\) some Land at or near Leckey, or forks of Delaware, above Durham . . . .}
\]

This letter was written to introduce John Montour, who was to be the “Bearer” of it, to Thomas Penn, one of the sons of the famous Quaker, William Penn. I have to wonder whether John ever knew the letter’s contents because Logan characterizes him in an unflattering but nevertheless picturesque way, saying he

Indeed, the contracts listed in Volume V of the \textit{Inventaire des Greffes des Notaires du Régime Français}, published in 1944, refer to many of the individuals who appear in the translations in \textit{Edge of Empire}.\(^\text{120}\) Peyser, p. 133.

\(^\text{121}\) Daughter Magdeleine baptised 30 October 1711, with Pierre Roy and Marguerite Fafart, the infant’s cousin, as godparents. Ste. Anne de Detroit, photocopy. Note: neither Jetté nor PRDH list this child. Given the pattern I have demonstrated of godparents naming their godchildren, I have to wonder whether Isabelle / Elisabeth Couc served as godmother for Joseph’s wife, Isabelle / Elisabeth, and gave her her baptismal name. Early records at several missions in the \textit{pays d’en haut} are not extant, and the Detroit registers are obviously incomplete.\(^\text{122}\) PRDH says they married before 1706-11-24, when their son Jean Baptiste was born and baptized four days later at Lachine on 1706-11-28, #13817. Anne is identified as an Abénaquise at the baptism. Godparents were Lambert “Cuillerie” and Catherine Patisser. Interestingly, when their son François Kouk, age seven, died and was buried 1711-07-14 at Montréal, PRDH gives JEAN KOUK the “Origin” Amerindien, and ANNE, Amerindienne, #50689. These terms are relatively modern ones used by PRDH but not on the record itself. The register actually reads: "François Kouk sauvage décédé à l’Hôtel Dieu de cette ville agé de sept ans fils de Jean Kouk et de Anne sa femme" (photocopy). François Kouk, Indian, deceased at the Hôtel Dieu (hospital) of this city, age seven, son of Jean Kouk and of Anne, his wife. Once again an index version is not totally accurate. I am not sure whether this Anne and Anameackhiskaman are the same woman.

Suzanne Boivin Sommerville, © 2014, all rights reserved.
is “very noisy & troublesome . . . a senseless fellow, and is like his brother as an oyster is to an apple.” Logan then provides another image of Isabelle / Madame Montour, as he saw her in 1733, when she would have been sixty-six years old. After first reporting that John “says his sister will be in town [Philadelphia] in a day or two,” Logan adds, in closing the letter:

She is of another make [from her brother], but ancient, & should be well treated. Pray know of her in ye [the] most proper manner whether ever she rece[ed] [received] that suit of clothes w[ch] I sent her about 8 years since, in your names, by Henry Smith.123

Although Isabelle was only six years older than her brother Jean / John, she is considered “ancient” by James Logan and to be treated with respect, in the “most proper manner.” Those who give a birth date later than 1667 for Madame Montour, such as 1684, in reality Isabelle's year of marriage to Germaneau, obviously do not know this reference. Someone born in 1684 or later would have been only 49 or younger in 1733, hardly “ancient,” even for the eighteenth century. Women are documented as giving birth then well into their 40s and even in their early 50s. It should also be pointed out that the word ancient had another connotation in eighteenth-century English; an ancient one had wisdom that should be respected.124

The “Montours [sic] sister” referred to in Wraxall125 and the sister of John Montour mentioned by James Logan are the same woman: Isabelle / Élisabeth / Marie Couc dite Lafleur de Cognac, sometimes identified as the wife of Tichenet, la femme de Tichenet, and also, as will be seen, La Germano, the wife of Germano, (Joachim Germaneau / Germanau), her first husband. Germaneau was deceased by 1700 when his property at Rivière du Loup was sold.126

And it is Isabelle – and the use and misuse of sources about her – who will be the subject of the next part.


124 It also suggested venerable or worthy of esteem. See 1828 dictionary: http://1828.mshaffer.com/d/word/ancient

“Some persons apply ancient to men advanced in years still living; but this use is not common in modern practice, though found in scripture.

“With the ancient is wisdom. Job.”

I might add that, as of this writing (April 2009), I am three years older than Madame Montour was in 1733.

125 Wraxall’s abridgment is a partial transcript of records which no longer exist, so it is technically a secondary source, although his work is contemporary with some events recorded. Even his manuscript notes are gone, having been destroyed in a 1911 New York State Capitol fire.

I have given speeches about Madame Montour in the last few years. After presenting her story, I have frequently been asked: “How many times was she married?” My reply has been: once to a Frenchman; once to a French Canadian; and once to an Oneida sachem, known as Jean Leblanc. The marriage contract for the marriage to the Frenchman survives as documentary evidence, with proof for the next two marriages from testimony found in more than one primary source. The allegations made by Antoine Laumet dit de Lamothe Cadillac in one document and the presumptions made by more recent writers concerning other “husbands” cannot be substantiated. In this section I will consider the Frenchman and the French Canadian.

Joachim Gemaneau

There is no doubt that Isabelle Couc, in April of 1684, married Joachim Gemaneau from the parish of Saint Maxime de Confolans, diocese of Limoges in Limousin, France. He was a veteran of the Carignan Regiment from the company of Lafouille. After several years experience as a voyageur and employer in the legal fur trade in the pays d’en haut, Gemaneau was about forty to Isabelle’s seventeen when they married. Most commentators have made the mistake of jumping to conclusions about the character of this much-older man married to a young woman, assuming he must have been dull, lifeless, and unable to satisfy the “vivacious” young Isabelle, twenty-three years his junior. Cadillac, in 1704, reported that Isabelle Couc, identified by him as la femme de Tichenet, abandoned her first husband after a year of marriage (in 1685?), but he is the sole source for this comment. Other extant documentation presents a more complex image of Gemaneau.

At the end of the regiment’s service in 1668, Joachim Gemaneau decided to remain in the colony and joined his Carignan comrades at the seigneurie of an enseign in the company of Lafouille. After several years experience as a voyageur and employer in the legal fur trade in the pays d’en haut, Gemaneau was about forty to Isabelle’s seventeen when they married. Most commentators have made the mistake of jumping to conclusions about the character of this much-older man married to a young woman, assuming he must have been dull, lifeless, and unable to satisfy the “vivacious” young Isabelle, twenty-three years his junior. Cadillac, in 1704, reported that Isabelle Couc, identified by him as la femme de Tichenet, abandoned her first husband after a year of marriage (in 1685?), but he is the sole source for this comment. Other extant documentation presents a more complex image of Gemaneau.

At the end of the regiment’s service in 1668, Joachim Gemaneau decided to remain in the colony and joined his Carignan comrades at the seigneurie of an enseign in the company of Lafouille. This enseign, Charles Duquey, vicomte de Manereuil, was conceded a seigneurie in 1672, naming it Manereuil. It was also called Rivière du Loup (now Louiseville). Sometime before 1674, Gemaneau associated himself

---

127 Jean-Maurice-Philippe de Vernon, sieur de LaFouille, Jetté.
128 This Rivière du Loup, modern-day Louisville, should not be confused with another of the same name farther down the Saint Lawrence River (flowing toward the ocean). Mahigan-sipy in Algonquin, Rivière du Loup (Wolf River) may have been named after the Iroquois Loup (Wolf) tribe massacred there by the Algonquins, who then claimed the hunting grounds as their own. The first written mention of the area appears in the works of Samuel de Champlain, who, in 1603, named the lake nearby Saint Pierre, and, in 1609, called the river Rivière Sainte Suzanne, having first seen it on this saint's feast day, August 11. Germain Lesage, Histoire de Louiseville 1665-1960, Presbytère de Louiseville, 1961, p. 16. As I see it, and for purely selfish reasons, it is unfortunate that my patron saint’s association with Rivière du Loup / Sainte Suzanne did not survive. In a similar vein, if La Salle and his company aboard the Griffon in 1679 had reached Lac Sainte Claire on 11 August instead of 12 August, the feast of Sainte Claire, this lake might today be Lake Sainte Suzanne, but undoubtedly would have lost the final “e’s”, as has Lake Saint Clair.
with François Banliac dit Lamontagne, another veteran of the company of Lafouille and inhabitant of Rivière du Loup, and with a man named Aymard, who drowned during a trading voyage with a sieur Dupas. Banliac and Germaneau canceled their association and settled their account on 7 February 1674, Banliac owing him 90 livres, a debt that was satisfied the following year. One year later, 5 June 1676, Joachim Germaneau, now himself definitely personally involved in the fur trade, owed 310 livres and 9 sols for merchandise to Jean Petit dit Bruneau. As Bruneau was not present, Germaneau made the agreement with Bruneau’s wife, Marie Cheney, one of the many examples of a wife in Nouvelle France handling business affairs during her husband’s absence. Germaneau promised to pay in castors (beaver skins) after his own voyage to the Outaouais (Ottawa). The year 1676, eight years after many Carignan soldiers left New France, is thus the earliest I can now document him as engaged in the fur trade. In 1676, Isabelle was only nine years old, and her family was established at St François du Lac across Lac Saint Pierre from Rivière du Loup.

Germaneau did not totally neglect his property during his voyages, though, because on 2 September 1680, in a document written at the home of Nicolas Geoffroy at Trois Rivières, Joachim Germaneau settled his business with Jean Gerlaise de St Amand, to whom he was renting his land at Rivière du Loup. Gerlaise, also a veteran of the company of Lafouille, owed him 13 minots de blé (wheat). Germaneau had arranged for Gerlaise to work his land in a contract passed between them by the notary Severin Ameau. Michel Langlois reports that Gerlaise also promised Germaneau deux boeufs, two oxen, in the autumn and also trois journées de boeufs, which I understand as three days of work by oxen, when planting began in the spring. This gives the impression that Germaneau may have worked the land in 1680-81, but his name does not appear in the census of 1681, probably taken there before June. I have located no further document concerning Germaneau after this one until his 1684 marriage, but his land is mentioned in the 3 June 1684 concession of property to Lamontagne. Joachim and Lamontagne were to determine the

---

129 François Banliac (also spelled Banhiac and at least six other ways) married his second wife, Marie Angélique Pelletier, seventeen-year-old daughter of François Pelletier dit Antaya and Marguerite Morrisseau, on 26 September 1661 at Sillery. Her grandfather, Nicolas Pelletier, had worked as a carpenter on Champlain’s Habitation around 1636-37. The first Banliac child, Marguerite, would grow up to marry François Dupuis, a soldier in the Company of La Grois, at Champlain, 10 November 1698, eventually becoming my ancestors. PRDH and photocopies.

130 7 February 1674, with addendum 12 June 1675, Notary Adhemar, #95, photocopy. Germaneau signed both items with his mark.

131 Joseph Petit dit Bruneau married Marie Chenay 1675, and their son Joseph married Marie Anne Delpé, daughter of Angélique Couc, Isabelle’s sister, in 1709. Marie Anne died in 1710 without any children; Joseph remarried Marie Brisset in 1713 Sorel, and then Agathe Sicard de Carufel in 1729. I descend from the second and third marriages. See my Family History.

132 5 June 1676, Notary Becquet, #874, written at Trois Rivières, photocopy.

133 Jack Verney says a minot is “a unit of dry volume equal to approximately 40 litres.” Verney, p. 129.

134 2 September 1680, Adhémar, who resides at Champlain but is notary for Trois Rivières. The Ameau contract is mentioned in this document.

135 Michel Langlois, Tome II, p. 341. The document is very hard to read, but I believe I can agree with Langlois. Although I have referred to Langlois’s entry for Germaneau, I have also obtained and read the documents in question. Michel Langlois published a four-volume Dictionnaire Biographique des Ancêtres Québécois (1608-1700). Tome 1 (Lettres A à C), 1998; Tome 2 (Lettres D à I), 1999; Tome 3 (Lettres J à M), 2000, these three published at Sillery: La Maison des Ancêtres Québécois; Tome 4, Lettres N à Z, Sillery: Les Éditions du Mitan, 2001. These books are wonderful sources for references to original documents!
dividing lines between their properties, *laquelle ils on ci-devant désertée en partie*, which they had previously cleared in part.136

In the year after his marriage to Isabelle, he declared his debts, saying he owed Jean Boudor 531 *livres 9 sols* and 5 *deniers* for merchandise provided to him by 11 May 1685. He was ready to leave for a voyage to the Outaouais and would pay in *castors* on his return. No indication is given that his wife would accompany him nor that she would not. He sold a birch bark canoe with six places, *canot d’écorce à six places*, for 120 *livres*, on 22 August 1685, so he had returned from the Ottawa country by then or, more likely, had not yet left. Joseph Aubuchon gave him 40 *livres* for the canoe and promised to pay the rest. In this document Germaneau says the canoe had been part of a convoy to “Katerakoui” (Fort Frontenac, modern-day Kingston, Ontario). He also states that the “Marquis de Denonville,” the governor-general of New France, had promised him at La Chine that if the canoe was damaged, since he accepted it, the damages would be paid (“he” being ambiguous, probably Germaneau).137 Another contract, 12 September 1687, which I have not yet seen, appears to be an evaluation of the condition of the canoe.138 Also in 1687, on 18 November, Jacques Gaultier *dit L’orange*, affirmed that he was asked by Vincent Dugast, forJacque Patron and Monsieur *Germanot [sic]*, to go the the 8*naïs* in 1685 to get pelletaries made into 150 robes, *Robbes*. Gaultier had returned in 1686, and the robes had been taken to Sr Pachot [sic] by Louis Pascault [sic], his brother [sic].139

On 24 February 1688, Joachim Germaneau’s two properties at Rivière du Loup were confirmed by the new seigneur, Jean Lechasseur. Germaneau was present and accepting for himself and his heirs.140 It thus seems he was present in the colony during the winter of 1687-88. Just months later, though, in May of 1688, Lechasseur sold the seigneurie to Nicolas Perrot, the renowned explorer, emissary to the Western Nations, and author of an account of his exploits. Perrot, was not successful in paying the 4000 *livres* price for the seigneurie and it reverted to Lechasseur a few years later.141

I have located no additional documents concerning Germaneau until 1692, when there is a flurry of activity. Several contracts written in Montréal involving Joachim Germaneau are extant for 1692,

136 Cited in *Les Ursulines des Trois Rivières*, p. 26, read at *Early Canadiana*. http://www.canadiana.org The word *désertée* does not mean to turn into a desert, as some commentators and historians have suggested, but just the opposite: to prepare the land for settlement and cultivation of crops.

137 Jacques-René de Brisay de Denonville, Governor-general of New France, 1685-1689, arrived 1 August 1685, and almost immediately traveled to inspect the colony, including a visit to Fort Frontenac. DCB II. Did Germaneau accompany him?


139 18 November 1687, Notary Basset, photocopy. If I am reading accurately, Gaultier was still due money for this voyage. An endorsement that follows the document is unreadable on my copy, but may indicate the debt was paid. I have not attempted to determine who these individuals are with any precision, but 27 August 1693, Marie *Pascault*, widow of Louis Chappaco, transferred rights of succession to Joachim Germaino. Notary Adhémar, photocopy. “Latourette” and Jean Boudor, as well as Charles de Couagne, were signatories. I have not yet fully transcribed this and another transfer of rights from “Claude de Grozelon de Latourette” to Joachim Germaino on 4 September 1693, Notary Adhémar, photocopy. Claude Greyselon, sieur de LaTourette, is brother of Daniel Greyselon, sieur Du Lhut, explorer and fur merchant, after whom Duluth, Minnesota, is named. See DCB, vol. II for both men, the sons of Claude Greyselon & Marie *Patron*, Jetté.

140 “Bail A TITRES NOUVEL par Jean LeChasseur, Lieutenant General A Joachim Germaneau,” 24 February 1688, Notary Ameau, #411, photocopy, witnessed by Véron Grandmesnil senior, whose son would later travel to Fort Pontchartrain in 1705, and Pierre Le Maistre.

141 For the sale, see 15 May 1688, “Vente de La terre de la Seigneurie de la Riviers du Loup faite par Monsieur LeChasseur au Sr Nicolas perrot,” Notary Adhémar, #1042, photocopy. For Nicolas Perrot, see DCB, Vol. II.
including his hiring of Gabriel Lemieux to go to the Outaouais, specifically to Michilimackinac and Sault Ste Marie, on 19 August.\footnote{Notary Adhémar, #2182, photocopy.} Germaineau was present for all of these transactions. Thus, Germaineau did not simply disappear into the pays d’en haut, abandoning his young bride, as has been suggested by some writers. It is even possible she traveled and worked with him. In the most interesting contract, on 21 August, Joachim Germaineau declared the extent of his debts: 500 livres to sieur Jean Boudor, but he says he has repaid Boudor even more in castors, and 230 \textit{livres} which “he Germano gave or loaned to the said Sr Boudor by the intercession of \textit{his wife}”: \textit{Luy Germano bailla audit Sr Boudor par l’intermédiaire de \textit{sa femme}, Germaineau’s wife, at least according to Michel Langlois.\footnote{Michel Langlois, Tome II, p. 342.}} When I read the document for myself, I saw that this transaction had occurred three years earlier (thus 1689), and “\textit{sa femme}” could be (but does not have to be) Boudor’s wife, Marguerite Seigneuret, who just happens to be Louis Couc Montour’s godmother.\footnote{Marguerite Seigneuret first married Jean Boudor, fils de René Fezeret, bourgeois de Ville Marie.} The document then says Joachim asked the two of them to be willing to keep his money, the 230 \textit{livres}, until he returns “from Chambly, where he had to go”: \textit{et les prìa tous les deux de vouloir luy garder son argent jusqu’à son retour de Chambly ou il devroist aller.} It is unfortunate that the pronoun “sa” / “his” in “his wife” is ambiguous; because if it truly refers to Joachim Germaineau’s wife, Isabelle, it would be evidence that Isabelle and Joachim may have worked together in the fur trade. It would certainly be support for her involvement with him in 1689, five years after their marriage. This is important because of Cadillac’s 1704 \textit{mémoire} that claims Isabelle abandoned her husband one year after their marriage.

The 1692 document also reports Germaineau had given or loaned to Boudor “two hundred and thirty eight \textit{livres} in castors and martins at Sr Boudor’s home in the presence of Sr Pachot: \textit{deux cent trente huit livres que luy Germano luy bailla chez le dit Sr Boudor en presence du Sr Pachot en castors et martins}, which they would share, \textit{partager}. In addition he declares he owes 70 \textit{livres} to Aubuchon; and, according to Michel Langlois, \textit{40 livres à Barbe-Émand}. In examining the contract myself, I must correct Langlois’s transcription, because I read that he owed à \textit{Madame Babie environ 40 livres}: owed to Madame Babie about \textit{40 livres}. Barbe Emard died by 1659, according to Jetté, whereas Madame Babie, born Jeanne Dandonneau, was involved in other transactions of this nature. Her husband, Jacques Babie (Baby), a merchant, had died in 1688. Another \textit{60 livres} were owed to sieur Soumande in 1692; and 24 to sieur Saint Romain.\footnote{Jeanne Dandonneau’s son Louis Babie was part of the first convoy to found Detroit, hired 27 May 1701, Adhémar, photocopy.} The image that emerges from this contract and the preceding ones is that of an upright man involved with his property, active in the fur trade, and willing to declare and satisfy his debts.

On the same day, 21 August 1692, Germaineau served as counsel for his “brother” Louis Couc Montour. Germaineau’s name does not appear in the index to the notary’s documents, so this reference has been missed by earlier researchers. (See Part 4.) Montour signed an agreement with \textit{Claude Fezeret, sieur de Guilbot, fils de René Fezeret, bourgeois de Ville Marie}, to form a \textit{société} for common profit from a voyage they would make to the 8ta8ois to trade. The merchandise was provided by René Fezeret, and Sr

\begin{flushright}
\textit{Ibid.} Jeanne Dandonneau’s son Louis Babie was part of the first convoy to found Detroit, hired 27 May 1701, Adhémar, photocopy. Her niece, Angélique Dandonneau, whose second husband was Ignace Jean \textit{dit} Vien, later lived at Michilimakinac.
\end{flushright}
Guilbot would be concerned with *la forge*. Sr Montour (and other individuals?) were to work it as long as the source was available, which could take three years. The sale of the merchandise to the Indians was to be shared equally between these two, but a quarter of the sales would go to Fezeret for the advances he made to them and to the *boutique* (store, shop) of Guilbot. The agreement was passed at the home of Fezeret, in the presence of Joachim Germano, *frère et assistant du sr de Montour*. Once again, the image of a responsible older man, this time helping his younger brother-in-law, here identified as *brother*, seems to indicate that Joachim and Isabelle were not alienated; or, if they were, he had at least maintained ties with the family.

Germaneau filed yet another contract on 21 August 1692, receiving 1810 *livres 7 sols* of merchandise from Pierre Lamoureux *dit* St Germain, a former Carignan Regiment soldier, as was Germano himself. As guarantee for the loan, Joachim named Lamoureux *dit* St Germain his heir in case of death. Germaneau declared he was doing this because of the friendship St Germain had always shown him. The potential donation, however, should not be construed as Germaneau’s disinheriting Isabelle. The Custom of Paris decreed that only property owned prior to his marriage and the couple’s community property – not including Isabelle’s *douaire* or the property given to her by her parents, her *dot* – would qualify for such a last will and testament. If their son Michel Germaneau’s age in the year of his marriage in 1717 is truly twenty-two, it would appear no known children had yet been born to the marriage. In the case of his death, Isabelle would retain her *douaire préfix* of 300 *livres* and the trousseau and the property given her by her parents. This donation did not eliminate her as an heir to the community property remaining after all debts were satisfied.\(^\text{148}\) Again in 1693, on leaving once more for Ottawa territory, Germaneau named St Germain his beneficiary because of the “affection and good friendship that he has always held for him.”\(^\text{149}\)

More contracts exist for 1692 and 1693, including a loan of 183 *livres* from Germaneau to *Louis Couc de Montour* [sic] on 11 September 1693,\(^\text{150}\) to be repaid at *Michilimackinac* or in Ville Marie (Montréal), and one involving his association with Claude Greyesolon, sieur de LaTourette, the brother of Daniel Greyesolon, sieur Du Lhut.

Another reference to Joachim Germaneau as definitely alive that I have found was recorded on 24 September 1694. On this day he was absent from a hiring contract written in Montréal that stipulated that “Joachim Lucas, de Boucharville [sic]” would go to Michilimackinac on “Germanau’s” business.\(^\text{151}\)

---

\(^\text{147}\) Recall that Vaudreuil called Louis Couc Montour the brother-in-law of La Tichenette, Isabelle Couc, when he is actually her brother. See Part 4. This aka name, La Tichenette, will be examined in Part 6.

\(^\text{148}\) The marriage contract includes a donation by Germaneau to his future wife of his personal property and rental income that belong to him now and that might be his in the future, both in this country and in Old France: “biens meubles, rentes, . . . que luy appartiendra de present et que luy pourroit appartenir Cy apres . . . tant en ce pais qu’en la Vielle france.” Isabelle’s parents gave her a *dot*, dowry, of two properties in Trois Rivières. A. Adhémar, 26 April 1684, written at the home of “Lafleur et sa femme” in St François du Lac, photocopy from ANQ. See my article on the Custom of Paris at the FCHSM web site.

\(^\text{149}\) Donation, 12 September 1693, Notary Adhémar, #2556, photocopy. Pierre Lamoureux *dit* St Germain married Marguerite Pigarouiche, Indienne, about 1671 and had three children by her, including François, who, in 1712, married Marguerite Ménard, Maurice Ménard’s niece, the widow of Lambert Cuillerier. In 1684 on 2 October, Pierre Lamoureux married Barbe Celle, widow of Louis Charbonnier. Jetté

\(^\text{150}\) 11 September 1693, Notary Adhémar, #2525, photocopy.

\(^\text{151}\) 9 September 1694, Adhémar: “Engagement en qualité de voyageur de Joachim Lucas [as spelled in an index of Adhémar’s documents], de Boucharville, à Pierre Lamoureux, marchand, de la ville de Villemarie, faisant pour Joachim Germano.” Pierre Lamoureux was present in Montréal and acting for the absent Germano to hire Lucas. ANQ, photocopy. I have verified that the name should be **Joachim Loiseau** (son of Lucas Loiseau & Françoise
Acting for “Germanau” was his friend, Pierre Lamoureux dit St Germain. Joachim Lucas was to go to the 8ta8ois with a canoe of merchandise and to return in 1695 with pelleteries.

September of 1694 is the same month Lamothe Cadillac began his voyage to Michilimakinac to assume his position as commandant. Some of the canoes in this convoy turned back, although I do not see Lucas’s name listed among those voyageurs who abandoned the trip. Isabelle’s sister Madeleine, Madame Maurice Ménard, gave birth to son Antoine at Michilimakinac; at least he was baptized there in April of 1695, perhaps having Antoine Laumet dit de Lamothe Cadillac as godfather and giving the child his first name, Antoine. Marguerite Couc was most likely also there in these years with her husband Jean Fafard dit Maconce. Isabelle’s and Joachim’s son, Michel, was born about 1695-94, according to his age of twenty-two at his marriage in 1717, although no baptism record survives, so it is possible Michel was born at Michilimackinac or elsewhere in the pays d’en haut. His Catholic marriage required evidence of baptism somewhere!

Then, in 1696, Joseph Moreau referred to having a promissory note, un billet, from “Germanau” for 200 livres in beaver skins; a debt, une obligation, from Maconce (Jean Fafard dit Maconce, Germaneau’s brother-in-law); and yet another from Jean de Beauvais for 1600 livres, also in beaver, financial papers which Cadillac unlawfully seized from Moreau at Michilimackinac. Since Moreau petitioned to have that note returned, he must have had some expectation of collecting the amount due.

The register on which the baptism of Antoine Mainard, son of deceased [sic] Maurice, appears as the first entry is a transcription of an earlier register that no longer exists. This recording is the only item for the 1690s. The next recordings are for 1712 to about 1742, but the only original surviving register begins in 1741, complete with signatures of participants. Several of the records -“extraits”- summarized for the period prior to 1742 include information that could have been known only at a later date, for example, that a certain woman is “NOW” (at the time the copy was made) Madame Langlade, an entry for 27 sept 1712, the baptism of daniel fils de daniel villeneuve et de domitille à present mde. l'langlade. Domitille Oukabé, Ottawa, sister of La Fourche, first married Daniel Amiot dit Villeneuve and then later, after the death of Villeneuve, Augustin Mouet, sieur de Langlade. And, of course, Maurice did not die until 1741 at Chambly, photocopy. Maurice, definitely, and probably his wife, were there in the post-1713 period. He is documented there in several sources and requested permission to have his wife join him in 1713. They assigned a procuration to his brother, Louis Mesnard, to care for two of their minor daughters and their business affairs (21 septembre 1713, notary Tailhandier, signed by Maurice, very much alive). Their daughter Susanne, married to Gabriel Bolon in 1726 at Michilimackinac, according to the transcribed entries, can also be documented there after the new register began. At least one of Maurice’s sons also can be documented there.


Suzanne Boivin Sommerville, © 2014, all rights reserved
And yet one more document has come to my attention to confirm that Germano was still alive in 1699. To my delight, when *Edge of Empire* arrived late in 2008, I found him documented at Michilimackinac in a May of 1700 court case involving events that had occurred the previous year. The deponent, Dominique Estienne, testified that he had been “planning to go off and in leaving he heard Germain [sic, as published in this translation of the document] say quite loudly…. The name Germain also appears at the bottom of page 135 in this translation. My gut feeling was that the name was probably Germano, so I quickly accessed Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec, and used its search engine, Pistard, to see whether the 1700 document was available there for me to see in its original French. It was! When I saw the original, there was no doubt that the spelling is actually Germano in both instances. To finish the reference, Germano said quite loudly, “speaking about the said packs [of castors] which were in the room, those are packs that do not belong to Guilhebaud [sic] but definitely belong to his father [René Fezeret].” Guilhebaud is Claude Fezeret, sieur de Guilbot, fils de René Fezeret, bourgeois de Ville Marie, who had been in a société with Montour. (See the reference above.) Since the castors truly belonged to the Fezeret the father, the testimony again shows Germano as an upright man. This document contained further gems that I address in Part 4.

I concluded Part 4 by saying Joachim Germaneau / Germanau / Germano, Isabelle’s first husband, was deceased by December of 1700 when his property at Rivière du Loup was sold. Germaneau thus probably died between 1699 and 1700, about fifty-four to sixty years old: Soldier, voyageur, trader, friend, husband, and father of at least one son, Michel, born in the last years of his life, about 1695-94. And, as will be seen, his wife, Isabelle Couc, would still be known as la Germano, the wife of Germano, la femme de Germano, in 1720.

**Pierre Tichenet**

As well as being la femme de Germano, Isabelle / Madame Montour is also known as “la femme de Tichenet” and *La Tichenet*, the abbreviated French feminine form for wife of Tichenet, or, in the truncated version used in 1708, *Lachenette* (*La [ t i ] chenette*?); but she is not “commonly” (or ever in

---


158 His son, Michel Germaneau, is said to be twenty-two at his 1717 marriage to Marie Catherine Lescuyer, the widow of Jacques Miville, thus born about 1695-4. Contract 5 April 1717, Notary Le Pailleur, gives no age, but the church ceremony at Montréal the same day says he is *vint deux*. Photocopies. It is tempting to believe that, wherever he was born, Michel had as godfather Michel Massé, who gave him his first name, but there is, of course, no proof. See Part 10 for Michel Germaneau.

159 In the 1704 mémoire: AC C11E, Vol. 14, NAC F-412, photocopy, and in “Jugement rendu par le Conseil de guerre Contre Bertainemy pichon soldat de la Comp[agnie] de Cortemanche [sic] de la garnison du fort pontchartrain,” written by Grandmesnil the younger, ANQ 4 880, photocopy, where the text reads: “*Lafemme dunomé Tichenet,*** MPHC mistranslated this as “the woman named Tichenet” instead of as the wife of the man named Tichenet. These translated documents are in MPHC Vol. 33 (1903) and 34 (1904). No record of the marriage survives, unfortunately, but many registers for the *pays d’en haut* are missing, including the early records before 1720 for the mission at St. Joseph, now Niles, Michigan.

As I see it, “La Chevrette” may be someone’s gross misreading of “La Chenette” from d’Aigremont’s November 1708 report on Fort Pontchartrain, “n’s” and ‘v’s” and ‘u’s’ often being misread one for the other. In 1707 Minister of the Marine Pontchartrain commissioned François Clairambault d’Aigremont to inspect the posts of Michilimakinac, Fort Pontchartrain at Le Détroit du Lac Érié, Fort Niagara, and Fort Frontenac during the summer of 1708. The Michigan Pioneer Historical Collection translation of d’Aigremont’s report, the one most commonly used by English language writers, names her Le Chenette [sic] and La Chenette.

The author of the web site alleging the “common” name of “La Chevrette” also proclaims: “For many years, she was at odds with Cadillac, the founder of Fort Pontchartrain who spread the word to all who would listen that she was kept by more than [sic] a hundred men.” It is true Cadillac claimed that la femme de Tichenet, whose brother-in-law he identifies as Maurice Ménard, had 100 lovers at Michilimakinac, but he made the allegation in his long 1704 mémoire to Pontchartrain when he was defending himself during his trial for mismanagement at Fort Pontchartrain. This mémoire was also read by Intendent Jacques Raudot at the request of Pontchartrain, who wanted Raudot to find out what was really going on. I know of no proof that Cadillac, or anyone else, made these allegations to others or “spread the word to all who would listen.” I have not seen any of these details in any other seventeenth- or eighteenth-century documents. Only modern writers who cite the mémoire and take it out of context “spread the word,” at times with a good deal of prurient interest. Isabelle, in fact, could not have read the mémoire herself to challenge it. For the same time period Cadillac alleges she had a hundred lovers, 1694-1697, Cadillac also claimed there were no significant illicit relationships at Michilimackinac between Native women (or any other women) and Frenchmen during his tenure there. Jesuit Father Carheil had another version, written in 1702, of the licentiousness at the post after Cadillac’s tenure. Cadillac seems to have changed his story after-the-fact, so to speak, when it was convenient for him to raise questions about the “virtue” of la femme de Tichenet, who had testified concerning the events in 1704. More than once his contemporaries declare him to be incapable of telling the truth when his self-interest is involved.

Also in the 1704 mémoire, Cadillac “married” la femme de Tichenet to Jean Leblanc (Outoutagan, called Jean Leblanc (the white one) because of the lightness of his mother’s skin), an Ottawa Chief of the Sable sub-group of the Michilimackinac Ottawas / Odawas, and claimed that she left him to marry someone else.

---

161 As alleged at <http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/MarjChapman/trcouc.htm>. As best I can tell, the source is a secondary one.
162 AN, FC, série C11A, vol. 29, fol. 26-77v, photocopy from NAC, the Canadian Archives.
163 See MPHC, Vol. 33, for its partial English translation.
164 AC C11A, Vol. 29, ff. 26-77v, photocopy. Folios 47, 48, 50. The Natives at Fort Pontchartrain reported the information about her and Bourgmont to the author of the report, d’Aigremont. He may thus be using his understanding of their version of the name. It’s easy to slide over that “ti” (pronounced /tsi/, short for petit!) in Tichenette, a feminine version of Tichenet.
166 BN Clairambault 882, notes taken from original document in Paris, sent to me by Gilles Havard, 2001; also cited in Delanglez. Jesuit Father Carheil wrote a scathing account of the illicit activity at the post. See DCB.
167 See Gilles Havard’s Empire et métissages, Indiens et Français dans le Pays d’en Haut 1660-1715, Québec and Paris: Septentrion and presses de l’Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2003, especially his chapter 10, “Sexualité et internariage: le pays du métissage.” This wonderful book may eventually be translated into English and, for those who cannot read French, will fill a void in the history of the pays d’en haut that eventually became the United States.

Suzanne Boivin Sommerville, © 2014, all rights reserved
Jean Leblanc was a significant actor in the Great Peace of 1701. He was definitely at Fort Pontchartrain at the same time as Isabelle, so some historians turn either him or Étienne Véniard, sieur de Bourgmont, temporary commandant at the fort in 1706, into the jealous lover who “killed” Pierre Tichenet. This allegation is good material for a romance novel but not very good history, even if every word written by Cadillac is taken as absolute fact, because this guess conveniently ignores the complicated political situation at the fort. I will consider Bourgmont in Part 6.

Whatever the truth of Isabelle’s relationships with men, Récollet Father Constantin Delhalle did not object to her serving as a godmother twice at the fort, 1704 and 1706, both after Étienne Veniard de Bourgmont’s arrival, first in 1702 and in 1703, and then again by January of 1706, nor did Récollet Dominique De La Marche (recorded here as he usually signed the records) in the fall of 1706 after he had been there almost two full months, for Isabelle again served as a godmother then.

The La Germano and La Tichenet(te) / La Chenette of the French colonial records is the same woman called, in the United States colonial records, Madame, Madam, Mistress or Mrs. Montour, wife of the Oneida Iroquois, Carondowana, aka Robert Hunter.

You would not know this from some of what is available about her on the web, especially on the county or State pages for New York and Pennsylvania. Do a search sometime on <http://google.com>. Many misinterpretations still remain to trap unsuspecting readers, both on the web and in published secondary sources, even by current U. S. historians. Nevertheless, all the fantasizing done by primarily male writers

---


169 For the relationship between Bourgmont and Isabelle, see my articles “Madame Montour (La Techenet) and the 1707 Judgment of Pichon dit La Roze at Détroit: the perils of translation and interpretation,” Michigan’s Habitant Heritage, Vol. 21, #3, July 2000, pp.121-130; and “Postscript to the Perils of Translation and Interpretation,” MHH, Vol. 21, #4, October 2000, pp. 163-166.

170 Bourgmont was chosen by Cadillac 28 September 1705 (Notary Chambalon) to take charge at the fort in Cadillac’s continued absence. Cadillacs had departed the fort in the summer of 1704, leaving Alphonse de Tonty in charge. AN, FC, Série C11 A, Vol. 22, NAC F-22, f. 274, photocopy. The councils Bourgmont held with the Natives during his tenure also survive: 8 March 1706, with the Huron Le Pesant and the elders of his Nation, Father Constantin (Delhalle) and Grandmesnil also attending; 24 March 1706, same persons; 26 March 1706 at the Mississaugas; and 2 July 1706, again at the fort a month after the initial violence, with the Hurons, Miamis, and Ouiatanos (a branch of the Miamis), and Grandmesnil also attending, Delhalle having been killed a month earlier. AN, FC, Série F3, Vol. 2, ff. 320-325, photocopy. The issues discussed at these councils, which were not translated by MPHC, challenge the old story that the violence in June of 1706 arose because: “while Cadillac is out of town . . . the temporary commander’s dog bites an Ottawa. The Ottawa beats the dog. The commander beats the Ottawa to death. Ottawas attack a group of Miami Indians -- who had good relations with the French -- in retaliation, killing five.” This is the version as reported by The Detroit Almanac, 300 years of life in the Motor City, edited by Peter Gavrilovich and Bill McGraw, Detroit Free Press, 2000, p. 32. It is repeated in a work published in 2008 by John Hopkins University Press, Claiborne A. Skinner’s The Upper Country, French Enterprise in the Colonial Great Lakes. Skinner’s section on Fort Pontchartrain contains errors of fact. The “standard” history of the early years of Detroit, written without knowledge of the Bourgmont councils and many other surviving documents, is in need of major revision.
in the past cannot be supported by any extant evidence I have located to this date. Unfortunately, their “histories” read like romance novels.172

What can be supported – not just invented – about the men associated with Isabelle / Madame Montour, for whom there are no extant marriage records?

Tichenet was killed during the Ottawa / Miami conflict at Fort Pontchartrain in 1706, according to none other than Jean Leblanc (Outoutagan), Ottawa, speaking in June 1707 to Governor-general Vaudreuil at Montréal.173 *The Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collection* translation of his speech spells the name TECHENET, and it is this spelling I used in my 1999 and 2000 articles in *Michigan’s Habitant Heritage*. I had not then read the original French documents on microfilm, which definitely reads TICHENET, nor had I yet seen the microfilm of the original registers of Ste. Anne de Détroit, which Pierre Tichenet signed “pierre tichenet” and “tihenet”; Pierre Tichenet served as a godparent 1704-1706 at the fort, once with Isabelle as godmother.174 Nor had I examined two notarial documents written at Batiscan, which he also

---

172 Here’s Henri Folmer’s version: “De Bourgmond [sic] seems to have been a gallant officer whose soldierly virtues accompanied an easy susceptibility to womanly charms. The latter characteristic proved detrimental to his respect for military and social discipline. He dared to conquer the heart of one of the married ladies at Fort Detroit and eloped with her. Quite naturally he incurred the wrath of Mr. Tichenet, the unfortunate husband, and his friends, who doubtless were somewhat prejudiced against him for having succeeded where others had failed. Quite obviously, also, Madame Tichenet must have been a very charming lady, because De Bourgmond received all the blame.” Henri Folmer, “Étienne Veniard de Bov [sic] enfin, s.” The version Cadillac used, which definitely read TICHENET and included both the microfilm on hand and the transcript, is the one that Governor Vaudreuil annotated: photocopy and my translation. The version Cadillac annotated is on ft. 108v but does not include the words “sang froid” and several others. It was not unusual for a clerk to fail to include all details on hand-written copies sent to different individuals. None of this suggests, though, that Outoutagan / Jean Le Blanc or Bourgmont “killed” Tichenet because they were jealous lovers, despite Vincens’ suggestive allusion to Bourgmont as a New France version of the Biblical David, who, because he lasted after Bathsheba, doomed her husband, Uriah, to his death by ordering him into a battle sure to kill him. See her *Madame Montour et son temps*, pp. 190-91. I unfortunately quoted her analogy in my 1999 articles, not knowing any better then. Vincens has recently been edited and translated by Ruth Bernstein as *Madame Montour and the Fur Trade* (1667-1752). Bernstein adds her own notes and creates some new errors, unfortunately.

173 In June 1707, Outoutagan / Jean Le Blanc reported: “It is I, my father, it is the Outauois who killed the grey robe [Father Delhalle] accidentally [par mègard ], to be truthful, but ultimately [enfin] it is we [the Ottawa] who have killed him, and the soldier [La Rivière], because it is we who are the cause of all the evil that happened at detroit, as for tichenet, it is the S. Bourmond [sic] who killed him in sending him to fight against us, because, after all [enfin], the father, and the soldier were killed in the first fire [when the fighting began], and everything that happened after that, it was in cold blood [sang froid], because bourmond ordered it.” AC C11A, Vol. 26, NAC microfilm F-26, ft. 116. This is the version that Governor Vaudreuil annotated; photocopy and my translation. The version Cadillac annotated is on ft. 108v but does not include the words “sang froid” and several others. It was not unusual for a clerk to fail to include all details on hand-written copies sent to different individuals. None of this suggests, though, that Outoutagan / Jean Le Blanc or Bourgmont “killed” Tichenet because they were jealous lovers, despite Vincens’ suggestive allusion to Bourgmont as a New France version of the Biblical David, who, because he lasted after Bathsheba, doomed her husband, Uriah, to his death by ordering him into a battle sure to kill him. See her *Madame Montour et son temps*, pp. 190-91. I unfortunately quoted her analogy in my 1999 articles, not knowing any better then. Vincens has recently been edited and translated by Ruth Bernstein as *Madame Montour and the Fur Trade* (1667-1752). Bernstein adds her own notes and creates some new errors, unfortunately.

174 On 27 April 1704, baptism of Marguerite Roy, fille legitime de Pierre Roy and Marguerite OuabanKiKoué, with Henry “belille” and Isabelle “coup” as godparents. (This is not the only time or place that the family name is spelled with a final /p/, which was most likely silent, /cool/, as in loup, wolf, and coup de baton, hit with a stick.)
signed “pierre tichenet” when he served as a witness for concessions of property granted there by Father François Vaillant, the very Jesuit who later accompanied the first convoy to Detroit in 1701. Both documents were written on 4 May 1697, one granting property to François Fortage and the other to Jean Lemoine. Until my search for and reading of documents concerning Pierre Tichenet and his family, Tichenet has been misidentified and misrepresented because of the “guesses” writers fabricated because they had no further documentation.

In August of 1691, he, along with Ignace Durand and Charles Couturier, all from Batiscan, where Isabelle’s father, Pierre Couc, at one time had property, were loaned 300 livres, some of which was for merchandise to trade in their voyage to the Outaouas, to be repaid by August of the following year. The loan was granted by Jean Péré, an important and interesting merchant, a witness at Pierre Couc’s marriage, godfather at the baptism 5 June 1664 of Marguerite Couc at Trois Rivières. Godmother was Jeanne Crevier, wife of the Pierre Boucher, who visited France and wrote a history of the colony. Péré also served as godfather for the two-month-old son of Louis Couc dit Montour and Jeanne Quigesigoucoué, a child now believed to be Joseph Montour. Godmother was Marie Magdeleine Couc, daughter of Pierre Couc, habitant of Rivière Saint François. And, identified as formerly a bourgeois from La Rochelle in present-day France, he was witness on the same day for Louis Couc’s marriage to Jeanne, both events on 7 January 1688. Acting for Péré the at the 1691 contract was Joseph Delestre, Péré’s nephew. It is not unlikely the Couc family knew Pierre Tichenet; they at least had mutual acquaintances.

There is one more hiring contract on record for Pierre Tichenet but it is missing, as is one between St Fafard and Sr Tinchenet, whether the father(s) or the son(s) bearing these names cannot be determined in the notation in Antoine Roy’s index of Adhémar’s works. Pierre’s father, Alexandre, was associated

godmother declared she could not sign: La marine [sic] Declare ne pouvoir signer. The entry is the second surviving and complete record in the register. Marguerite Roy, Isabelle’s godchild, will be considered in a later section of this work. On 5 May 1704, baptism of Joseph, fils legitime of Francois Bienvenue and Genevieve Laferriere, godparents Pierre Tichenet and Francoise Dumouchelle, signed by pierre tichenet. On 21 April 1706, baptism of Pierre Roy, son of Pierre and his wife, Marguerite OuabanKiKoué, with Pierre Tichenet and Isabelle Coup (Couc), signed by thenet. The priest signing these three records is Constantine Delhalle, who was killed at the beginning of June 1706. as was Pierre Tichenet. This Pierre Roy died at age 10 and was buried in Pointe aux Trembles 19 June 1716. PRDH #12037. One witness was Soeur de Laconception, Marguerite Roy, Pierre’s sister, and aunt to the boy. See the entry for her in DCB II.

175 Notaire Trotain, photocopies. Vaillant accompanied the 1701 convoy to the fort and returned almost immediately to the mother colony, as he had pre-arranged to do. By 1702, though, Vaillant served the missions in Iroquoia, or modern-day New York, for several years. The identity of the other priest accompanying the convoy is truly unknown.

176 Notary Gilles Rageot. ANQ, photocopy.

177 The name of this boy child of Louis Couc dit Montour cannot be read. It is interesting to note that on the same page as the baptism of Louis’s son, on 3 March 1688, Philippe Rigaud de Vaudreuil, future governor of New France, served as godfather for a sauvage about three or four years old who was named Charles Philippe. The godmother was Charlotte Denys so the child was named for both godparents. Vaudreuil was thus present there and could have met the Couc family. Another damaged record shows Pierre Couc as godfather signing for the baptism of a child whose name and parents’ names also cannot be read. Godmother was Suzanne Hude, daughter of Jacques Hude, and the act took place between 16 November 1687 and 7 January 1688 at Saint François du Lac. Since Pierre Couc served as a godfather for one of his daughter Angélique’s children, I must wonder whether this unidentified child could have been another grandchild, perhaps named Suzanne, but that’s all I can do, wonder. Photocopies. One of Madeleine Couc’s children was named Susanne in 1706, but the godmother was not a Suzanne. Photocopy.

178 PRDH and photocopies.

179 Antoine Roy, Inventaire des Greffes des Notaires du Régime Français, Vols. V & VI, Québec: Archives de la province de Québec, 1944 & 1945, Quinton Publications reprint. Note: this is an index, not the complete documents.
with Nicolas Perrot on voyages made to the ‘MasKoutains and Nadouassous [Sioux]’ prior to 1687, and he transferred to Perrot all of his rights and profits resulting from their society. As previously noted, in 1688 Perrot bought the seigneurie of Rivière du Loup, where Germaneau had property. It is quite probable they worked and traveled together. Several other notarial documents exist for Alexandre, one for another son, Joseph, and then Alexandre, his wife and family drop out of sight.

My point in citing these details is that Simone Vincens in her Madame Montour et son temps had not consulted all the extant documents when she suggested Tichenet was a soldier. At this time, soldiers in the Troupes de la Marine came directly from France, except for the sons of current officers, who

---

180 14 August 1687, Notary Adhémar, ANQ, photocopy.
181 Antoine Rivard, Pierre Lesieur, and Joseph Tichenet, all voyageurs residing in Batiscan, borrowed 624 livres, 11 sols, for good merchandise delivered by Jean Soumande, merchant, for the voyage they were to make aux Arcanes, or to the Arkansas. Obligation, 27 July 1700, Notary Raimbault, ANQ, photocopy. “Aux Arkansas” is said to be the source for the word Ozarks. The French were on the Arkansas as early as 1686. See Morris S. Arnold, Unequal Laws unto a Savage Race, Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1985; and Colonial Arkansas, 1686-1804, same publisher, 1991.
182 Interrogation of Alexandre Tichenet, 6 September 1691, Dupuis and Peuvret, Prevôté de Québec, #219, ANQ, photocopy. On this document, Alexandre states he is an innkeeker, cabarater, 48 years old; that he has been in the country for about 26 years; that he was a member of the Carignan Regiment in 1665 (as was Joachim Germaneau); that he and René Pasquet went among the Sioux and were in commerce together; and that he, Alexandre, and his family were then planning to return to France. In this dispute over an accusation that Alexandre had beat up or fought, battu, Pasquet, Alexandre was placed in prison until the prévôté (legal court) could decide the question. I have not yet seen anything further. Note: Jetté identifies Alexandre as a member of the company of Lanoraie in the Carignan regiment. An e-mail from Diane Sheppard, 10 October 2008, informed me: “Denis Beauregard has identified the son who was in the Mississippi Valley as Vincent (born 6 October 1679 in Champlain). He married in Mobile, Alabama in 1706 to Marie Proux (she was from La Rochelle). Vincent appears in the Fort Maurepas census (present day Ocean Springs, Mississippi) as Vincent Alexandre. He was known by Vincent Alexandre dit Chenay in Mobile. See Higgenbotham’s Old Mobile Fort Louis de la Louisiane 1702 - 1711. Vincent may be the same man as Tineau Alexandre listed in the 1699 census as a Canadian at Fort Maurepas. Vincent Alexandre was listed in the 1700 census of Fort Maurepas as a Canadian.” Thanks to Diane Sheppard for this reference. It would be interesting to know whether Vincent and Cadillac encountered each other at Fort Maurepas!
183 Vincens, p. 190. Pierre is the son of Alexandre Téchenay (Jetté’s spelling, which PRDH standardizes as TINCHENET), who married Marie Bouillon, from Saintonge, widow Mathurin Touillault, on 16 August 1668 at Québec. He was from Poupas, Castelsarrasin in Gascogne, near Cadillac’s origin and place of baptism (Antoine Laumet was born at Laumont near Caumont, baptized 5 March 1658 at St-Nicolas-de-la-Grave, arrendissement of Castelsarrazin). Lamothe Cadillac served as mayor of Castelsarrazin for a short time beginning in 1723. Pierre was born about 1671; 10 years old in the census of 1681 Batiscan; cited 18 February 1697 Batiscan. Jetté. Thus in 1704-1706, he would have been about 33 - 35 years old. Isabelle was 37 - 39. PRDH #8266 Batiscan 1697-02-18 shows the marriage of Jean Baribault and Marguerite Cosset, for which Pierre “TECHENET Residence: POINTE-AUX-ECUREUILS” served as witness. Jean’s brother, Louis Baribault, also a witness, was hired to go to Fort Pontchartrain 10 July 1703, the same day as Bourgmont. Adhémar, photocopy. I do not know of any document accounting for Pierre Tichenet’s or Isabelle’s travel to Fort Pontchartrain. My educated guess is that they and the Pierre Roy family were at Saint Joseph des Miamis or Mission St. Joseph (now Niles, Michigan), where Jesuit Father Claude Aveneau was the missionary until Cadillac illegally removed him in 1707. Some Miamis and Hurons (Wendats Petuns led by Quarante Sols) from the Saint Joseph River mission relocated to Fort Pontchartrain by 1703 at Cadillac’s invitation and then abandoned the post after the violence of 1706. Isabelle and Tichenet could have accompanied the Miami and the Roy family. Isabelle’s brother-in-law, Michel Massé and “sa famille,” his family, left “la Riviere St. Joseph” for “le detroit” in 1703, abandoning goods held in surety by the Jesuit fathers because of an outbreak of violence among the neighboring Nations. See BAnQ Cote: TL4,S1,D1117. Pierre Roy is also mentioned in connection with this legal decision. This is a record I located before 2014. Isabelle allegedly defected by sometime in 1707.
petitioned to have their sons appointed. Although it is possible Pierre was a soldier because his father had been, no evidence has been found for it, and Isabelle could easily have met Tichenet, possibly at Michilimackinac before or after the death of Joachim Gemarneau, or even earlier. Tichenet must have had some integrity since Father Vaillant asked him to witness concessions of land, and he was definitely involved in the legal fur trade or in voyages to the pays d'en haut, as were Isabelle's husband, her brother Louis, and all of her brothers-in-law at one time or another, even Angélique's husband, who is usually characterized as simply a stay-at-home farmer.

As mentioned earlier, on 19 August 1692, at the home of Henri de Tonty, rue Notre-Dame, François Delpé dit “St Serney” and nineteen others, some of whom would later travel to Fort Pontchartrain, were hired to go to Fort St Louis by Henri de Tonty, brother of Alphonse de Tonty, second in command under Cadillac at Detroit, 1701 to early 1706, and commandant there from 1717 until his death in 1727; and also with François Daupin de Laforest, later to be second in command at Detroit in 1706 and named commandant to replace Cadillac in 1710-11, although he did not go immediately to the fort. Angélique's husband would thus have known both the de Tontys and Laforest. Delpé dit St Serney’s sons also served as voyageurs, as did the Ménard sons.

Jean Leblanc / Outoutagan

As for Jean Leblanc / Outoutagan “marrying” Isabelle: If he did marry her, he had another wife at Michilimackinac in 1712, as reported by Peter N. Moogk, one more historian who appears to have swallowed without question Cadillac’s 1704 stories. In his 1969 Dictionary of Canadian Biography article about “Outoutagan,” Moogk says: “In 1712, Father Joseph-Jacques Marest indicated that a perpetual feeling of insecurity [at Détroit] caused most of [the Ottawas of Détroit], including the wife of Outoutagan (probably Mme Techenet) [sic] to return to Michillimakinac. As for Outoutagan, he stayed at Détroit.” A later revision of this article, however, now omits the reference to “(probably Mme Techenet.” This may be because La femme de Tichenet / Madame Montour, perhaps already the wife of an Oneida sachem, was definitely interpreting in New York in 1712 and cannot be this 1712 wife of Outoutagan.

Moogk also writes, in 1969, as I translate it from the French: “Cadillac describes Outoutagan as a hypocritical traitor, and his wife, Mme Techenet [sic], as a bigamous person who sought amorous adventures [‘coureuse bigamé’], who, moreover, exhibited support for the English.” The word “coureur”
literally means “runner”, but it has the sense of “womanizer” when joined by “de jupons”: runner after skirts. *Le Petit Larousse Illustré 1996*, gives a non-gender definition for *coureur / coureuse*: a person who seeks amorous adventures, “recherche les aventures amoureuses,” hence my translation. The revised English version of the 2000 CD-Rom of the DCB calls her “a slut,” as the original English version does. See also the biography on the DCB online.

Moogk is careful to grant Cadillac motivation for maligning Outoutagan: “The testimony the sister of Outoutagan gave about the activities of Cadillac and Radisson at Détroit [concerning the events for which Cadillac was accused of malversation in 1704] could be the origin of this hostile attitude.” Moogk does not, however, question Cadillac’s “hostile attitude” toward “Mme Techenet” nor his definitely exaggerated, if not entirely false, claims about *La femme de Tichenet* and her 100 lovers.

More than anyone else in the family, Isabelle / Madame Montour is maligned and misidentified in books and articles, old and new, particularly in the older English-language works. Many writers even now refuse to admit this woman is Madame Montour, preferring other guesses, suppositions, and romantic fictions developed in the last two centuries without any—or little—knowledge of New France records or customs. Some of these perpetuated errors will be the subject of my next article.

---

189 The revision, though, in the *English* language version I copied from the DCB CD-Rom, still perpetuates this passage from Moogk’s article: “Outoutagan’s importance in French Indian policy is suggested by the differing accounts of his character. Cadillac portrayed the chief as a treacherous hypocrite and described his wife, Mme Techenet [Elizabeth Couc*], as a bigamous slut who was pro-English to boot. Part of this hostility may have been engendered by the testimony of Outoutagan’s sister about the misdeeds of Cadillac and Étienne VOLANT de Radisson at Detroit. On the other hand, Vaudreuil spoke of ‘the submissive and apparently sincere manner in which Outoutagan has always spoken to me, together with the blind obedience he has shown to my orders and in doing my will.’” Brackets are as they appear in the article. Moogk carefully qualifies Cadillac’s evaluation of Outoutagan but does nothing to counter the charges against “his wife [sic], Mme Techenet.” Compare the effect of this English version using the word “slut” to my translation of the French version. The French is most likely a translation from Moogk’s English, as it appeared in 1969.

190 Richard White’s January 2006 article in *William and Mary Quarterly*, “Creative Misunderstandings and New Understandings,” sees *La Chenette* as "a dangerous woman with a voracious sexual appetite that consumed and discarded men.” He adds: “She threatened not only the men she loved and left but also the careful patriarchal model of empire that the French and their allies crafted.” Sounds like a blurb for a Romance novel! Another White passage is filled with more generalizations: "She would, when her liaison [sic] with Bourgmont was over, travel to Albany and become a power broker along the borders where the French and English competed for influence, trading partners, and allies. She [as Madame Montour] became a person more widely known and influential than Bourgmont." White also used the name *Henri de Bourgmont* instead of the correct *Étienne de Véniard, sieur de Bourgmont*, not Henri, and White cites only Frank Norall’s eighteen-year-old 1988 book (one I have read), a study that does not challenge the unsubstantiated calumnies (or at least exaggerations) against the woman White calls only *La Chenette*. White appears not to know her aliases, although he does recognize her as Madame Montour. My protest to the editor of WMQ resulted only in a published correction of Bourgmont’s first name in a later issue, but no revision or even acknowledgement of my challenge to White’s interpretations.
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All Sources Are Not Created Equal  
Part 6  
Interpreting Sources, Primary & Secondary  
La Tichenette / Madame Montour  
and  
Étienne de Véniard, sieur de Bourgmont, and  
Antoine Laumet dit de Lamothe Cadillac  

Suzanne Boivin Sommerville  

I began Part 5 by saying that when I speak about Madame Montour, one of the first questions I am frequently asked is how many times Madame Montour was married. The answer that can be documented is three: to Germaneau, the man from France; to Tichenet, the French Canadian; and to Carondowana, the Oneida, but not necessarily to Outoutagan (Jean Leblanc), the Ottawa. Nor can Isabelle Couc / La Tichenette / Madame Montour be documented as the wife of Bourgmont. No evidence exists for these allegations, despite what you will read on the web and in articles about Étienne de Véniard, sieur de Bourgmont, accounts that fantasize or sensationalize their relationship, as I have already demonstrated, or which show evidence of not having seen all the relevant citations.

Bourgmont  

One web site reads:

1706 Detroit, country marriage Veniard (Venyard) de Bourgmont (1680-1730) who went Coureurs [sic] de Bois to madame La Chenette aka Techenet alias Elisabeth Couc, they moved into Indian Country. Elisabeth later joined her brother Louis Couc dit Montour died 1709 in English colony and she took the name Madame Montour. She had a third marriage to Robert Hunter alias chief Onnieout Carlindawana died 1729...  

January Etienne Venyard, sieur de Bourgmont (1680-1730) arrived Detroit (maybe Michillimakinac?) taking command of the fort from Tonty. This is a conflict as Cadillac was in command from 1704 to 1710. Later Etienne deserted his post to become a Coureurs de Bois with other deserters and according to sieur d'Aigremont lived in the woods like a savage with a woman named La Chenette (Tichenet). Cadillac sent soldiers after the deserters, but they escaped, going farther west...” [as copied and pasted]

---

191 http://www.telusplanet.net/public/dgarneau/metis4.htm  This web site cannot be trusted, as it does not document its entries and plays to the wishful thinking of amateur genealogists.

192 There is no conflict. Cadillac left the fort in the summer of 1704, Alphonse de Tonty serving as the interim commandant until early 1706 after Cadillac sent Bourgmont to replace Tonty. Cadillac did not return to the fort until 8 August 1706. He did not then leave the fort for the mother colony until the spring of 1711, after having been replaced by Renaud Dubuisson, who arrived by December 1710, himself a temporary commandant for Daupin de Laforest.

I am sure this researcher did the best he could with the sources he had, but this excerpt presents several errors and misunderstandings, including a failure to mention that d’Aigremont, one source for Bourgmont living with La Chenette, simply recounted what the Natives (or Cadillac) told him at least a year after the events reported had taken place. Note no citation of sources.

Others either state outright that she married Bourgmont or repeat the allegation that she was his mistress. Another web site says, with my additions in brackets:

Elisabeth/Isabelle COUC b. c. 1667, Three Rivers [sic], Que,
   m. (1) 26 Apr 1684, in contract- Notary Adhemar/, 30 Apr 1684, Sorel, Richelieu, Qc., CAN, separated, Pierre-Joachim [He is called Pierre only on son Michel’s marriage record, but Joachim on the marriage contract. He had been deceased since at least 1700, when Michel would have been about five years old.] GERMANO/GERMANEAU, b. 1636/56 [sic], St Maxim, Limoges, France, (son of Joachim GERMANEAU and Catherine CHOUFY [more probably CHOURY] ) occupation Carignan reg. soldier, d. bef. 5 Apr 1717, Louisville [sic], Qc., CAN, [Deceased by 1700, His place of death is unknown, and LOUISVILLE (actually Louiseville) did not exist in 1717, still being known then as Rivi ère du Loup until into the 19th century.]
   m. (2) unknown, [??? I assume this “unknown” is to account for the child Marie Anne Montour, to be considered in Parts 11-12.]
   m. (3) separated, Jean LeBLANC, occupation Chippewa chief, [If the word separated suggests Germaneau was still alive when this alleged marriage took place, that is not necessarily true. Besides, only Cadillac says she "married" Jean Leblanc, who was an Ottawa du Sable, not a Chippewa. The French called the Chippewas Sautéurs.]
   m. (4) separated, Pierre TECHENET/LaCHENETTE, [Tichenet died in 1706.]
   and unknown, [possibly referring to the father of Andrew Montour’s “brother Lewis” See my Part 10.]
   and Etienne de VENIARD-de-BOURGMOND, occupation Commandant of Detroit [only for eight months, and then as Cadillac’s temporary replacement].
   m. Robert HUNTER-CARONDOWANNA.

Now, as I count them, that’s a total of seven “husbands” or paramours.

This researcher is unaware that Germaneau had definitely died by 1700 when his property was sold (10 December 1700 “Concession LeChasseur - De Lamirande, Normandin, notary, ANQ, photocopy); Isabelle most probably did not “separate” from him when she married Tichenet because a separation did not allow remarriage in New France. He seems equally unaware that the father of Isabelle’s daughter, Marie Anne Montour, is identified as Jean Baptiste [a name often used when the first name is unknown] Montour on her marriage contract and as “le nommé La Motte” – the man named La Motte – on the church record at Québec in 1730, at least 28 to 35 years after Marie Anne’s birth. We’ll never know the reasons for the differences in her parents’ names on her extant marriage records or those on her brother’s records. The reference to “le nommé La Motte,” the phonetic pronunciation of Lamothe, led Jetté to
suggest that *peut-être, possibly*, Antoine Laumet *dit* de Lamothe Cadillac, husband of Thérèse Guyon, fathered Marie Anne Montour, an interesting speculation, but, nonetheless, only a speculation, one that I will explore subsequently. The “Lewis” of the English colonial records is said to be a brother of Andrew Montour, who is definitely the child of Madame Montour and Carondowana, but no identification survives for the “father” of Lewis, whom Andrew did not meet until they were both adults. More on “Lewis” later.

As for Isabelle becoming the “wife” of Bourgmont, no original record or even report claims *la femme de Tichenet “married”* Bourgmont, only that she allegedly defected with him from Fort Pontchartrain, and together they joined her brother Montour and lived like *sauvages*, Indians, the best way to live in the wilds, it seems to me, although it is the English version that translates the word *sauvages*, the French term for what the English called Indians, as “savages,” a word with unfortunate connotations. Only secondary sources speak of a “marriage” or an affair. Bourgmont himself later married in France with no reference to any previous marriage, although he did have a child by a Native woman and that child traveled with him to France and back.194

The MPHC English translation, unfortunately, reports that Bourgmont “kept” La Chenette. This translation, commissioned by Clarence Burton more than one hundred years ago, interprets the French phrase “‘y entretient” as “whom he kept.” The passage, in context, reads:

> But M. de Tonty said to them [the Indians]: “the world must be turned upside down, they send me a private soldier [Bourgmont, just named an *enseigne*] to command me.” These words redoubled their [the Indians’] uneasiness, of which the Sr. De Bourgmont was warned by a woman named Le [sic] Chenette whom he kept.195

In its modern sense, the word “kept” can suggest nothing less than that the woman is his mistress, and this is how writers in English have interpreted the phrase; but this is not the exclusive meaning in either eighteenth-century or modern French. The basic meaning in French, then and now, is to take care of, to see to the needs of someone, or to employ. Could it be Bourgmont was only “keeping” La Chenette as his employee? Could he have hired her? Was she simply his interpreter? She is said to have “warned” Bourgmont about the “uneasiness” of the Indians. She would have been the one who understood the Ottawa and Miami (both Algonkin) and the Huron (Iroquois) languages, having lived among them all her life.

I am sure Intendant Talon and Governor Frontenac would be amazed to learn that they “kept” – in the modern sense – young female Indians. A book published in 1863 but referring to events in the late seventeenth century reports:

> M. Talon take[s] care of the little girl . . . as well as other Indian girls whom he *looks after* to be instructed in the faith [M. Talon . . . prendre soin de la petite fille . . . parmi d’autres filles sauvages qu’il *y entretient* pour être instruites en la foi]

---

194 See Frank Norall.
M. le Comte de Frontenac has for some time taken care of little Indian girls [M. le Comte de Frontenac y entretient depuis quelque temps de petite filles sauvages] 196

A faulty translation can certainly slant the meaning of a passage. What is more, it appears to be the Indians who informed D’Aigremont that Bourgmont “entretenoit” Lachenets [sic]. 197 I have to wonder whether the Indians would have used the term “keeping” a mistress. Even the document about Native American mores attributed to Cadillac 198 explains that unmarried Native women were mistresses of their own bodies and could engage in sexual relations at will. The concept of a “kept” woman seems to have been foreign to them.

The next sentence in the passage reads: “On the basis [of Lachenet’s information] the said sieur Bourgmont called an assembly of these Indians [the Ottawa] and told them “I have learned that you have talked with Mr. de Tonty about going to make war with the Sioux.” 199 Clearly, La Chenette was serving as an interpreter of the Indians’ speeches and their mood, and Bourgmont acted as a result of her knowledge.

It is thus true that both Isabelle and Bourgmont can be documented in the same place at the same time, Fort Pontchartrain between 1704 and 1706. Bourgmont was hired as a voyageur in 1702 and then as a

196 Early Canadiana Online: From Les Ursulines de Québec, depuis leur établissement jusqu’à nos jours, Saint-Thomas, mère, 1833-1885.; Sainte-Marie, mère, 1831-1886. 612 pages. (Québec? : s.n. , 1863) Matching pages: 259, 411. See my articles in MHH, 2000, for other examples of the use of the word in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as well as for a discussion of the verb débaucher, which in both French and English (to debauch) is used to indicate that the allegiance of an individual or group of individuals has been compromised, that they have been won over not exclusively in a sexual manner but to an opposing side in a political sense.

197 Later, D’Aigremont reports that Quarantesou (also called Quarante Sols), the Huron dispatched by Bourgmont, allegedly told the Miamis: “I am sent by the tribes of Detroit to tell you to join them, to go all together against the Sioux; but I warn you that it is in order to kill you. I know it from a good source. Bourgmont and La Chenette, [sic] have told me so.” And “This Quarantesou, according to the Outaouais, was a rascal whom the Sr. Bourgmont employed to deceive them.” (MPHC, 34: 432-33.) The French phrase used for the word translated as “employed” is se servoit: “Ce Quarantesou a ceque disent les outaois estoit unfourbe dont le sr Bourgmont se servoit pour les tromper.” This verb, se servir, means to use or make use of rather than to employ. I am also intrigued by D’Aigremont’s comment: “M. de La Mothe told me that he had been accused of trading with the English, and of employing [se servoit = using] the Sr. Bourgmont for that purpose; but there is no ground for believing that that is so. He [Cadillac] is too clever to put his interests in the hands of a man so dissolute as the Sr. Bourgmont, who deserted from Detroit to go after a woman called La Chenette, referred to above, with whom he is living in the woods like a savage.” (MPHC translation, 34: 441.) Pichon, almost a year earlier, in November of 1707, allegedly reported that Bourgmont had been waiting for La Tichenette to join him. The French word translated as “dissolute” is, in the original French, déréglé, from déregler, meaning mentally unstable or lawless rather than dissolve. As Cadillac may have been the source for the version reported by d’Aigremont, though, I must discount it. Cadillac was more likely throwing dust into d’Aigremont’s eyes (as Jean Delanglez also believes) to evade the charge of trading with the English. D’Aigremont wrote Pontchartrain in 1710: “As regards the complaint which M. de La Mothe [sic] has made to you, that I had not conversed with him long enough [in 1708] to learn thoroughly the reasons which have governed his action, I thought, My Lord, that any longer conversation with a man like him, whose disposition is secretive and full of cunning, could only make me more doubtful about things which it was my business to learn.” MPHC 33: 467. Underlining mine. Cadillac also tried to convince d’Aigremont to marry his daughter. D’Aigremont declined.


199 “Surquoy le dit sr Bourgmont fut assembler ces Sauvages et leur dit j’ay aprit que vous avez parlé a M. de Tonty pour aller faire la guerre aux Sioux.”
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hunter to go to the fort in 1703, so he did not arrive there for the first time in January of 1706. Then he acted as temporary commandant at Détroit from January to August 1706 during Cadillac's absence, leaving the mother colony late in 1705 and having to travel part of the way overland because of the lateness of his departure. Bourgmont and Grandmesnil (the younger), who accompanied him, were commissioned to take an inventory at the fort in the presence of de Tonty and Father Constantin "delhalle" (as he signed his name), missionnaire, including all the “merchandise, fixtures, houses, stores, lands cleared, and generally everything which is at Détroit.” Isabelle appears under the names Isabelle Couc, recorded as “Coup” when she served as godmother, and also as Élisabeth “Couk” when she was questioned in September of 1704 about events that had taken place at the fort earlier in the year. This interrogation, referenced earlier, in connection with a procès, or legal investigation about Cadillac’s behaviour at the fort, had been commissioned by the intendant of New France, François de Beauharnois. It is from Fort Pontchartrain in 1707 that la femme de Tichenet, her brother Montour, and Bourgmont are alleged to have deserted, after which she and her brother are said to be planning to go to live among the English that summer.

---

200 Citations appear above. Hunters were necessary at the fort to feed the inhabitants. Despite Cadillac’s claims, thousands of Indians did not settle there in the first two years, particularly during the winter hunting months. I am indebted to Gail Moreau-DesHarnais for originally noticing Bourgmont’s signature on the 1703 document.

201 Photocopy of Contract between Lamothe Cadillac and the Compagnie de la Colonie, Notary Chambalon, 28 September 1705. AN, FC, série C114, Vol. 23, f. 89v. The attack by the Ottawa on the Miamis occurred during Bourgmont’s tenure, on 1 or 2 June 1706. Bourgmont deserted sometime after Cadillac returned and was allegedly pursued sometime in 1707. Nevertheless, his agent Pascaud, in Montréal, acting for “Sieur de Bourmont Enseigne dans les Troupes dun detachment de la marine,” hired Jacques Estienne, Maximilian Demers, and Gilbert Desaults dit Lapointe (my ancestor), voyageurs, to take a canoe to Fort Pontchartrain with merchandise and to return with the pelleries belonging to the Sieur de Bourmont, and to accomplish this task even if he he is not there. Notary Adhémar, 13 April 1707, #7677, photocopy. Bourgmont had evidently left his power-of-attorney with Pascaud, although it appears not to have survived.

202 Original registers of Ste. Anne de Détroit, 1704 and 1706. Her sisters are also recorded with the last name “Coup” in the mother colony: Jeanne “Coup” burial 1679 Trois-Rivières, Angélique signing this record “Anigelique Couc”; Angélique “Coup” at the baptism of her son Pierre, 8 July 1695, no indication she was present. She consistently signed Angélique Couc. Marie Madeleine “coup,” 1 December 1698, Boucherville. The French pronunciation of “Coup” is /COO/. It is possible the name Couc was similarly pronounced or heard that way, with the final hard “c” silent, although Marguerite is often recorded as Kous. Marguerite and Madeleine could not sign their names, nor could Isabelle. Angélique and Louis, as well as their father, could sign their names and used the COUC spelling, and they are consistently recorded with a “c” or “k” or “que” at the end of the name.

203 Testimony taken in September 1704 at Fort Pontchartrain from both “Elisabeth Couk” and “Piere Tichenet [sic]”. Papiers Beauharnois NAC C-2925, ff. 415-16.

204 She is "La femme de Tichenet" and Montour's sister, in the First Council of War (court martial) held at Fort Pontchartrain, dated 7 November 1707, filed in the papers of Étienne Véron Grandmesnil the younger, secretary to Cadillac, said document now in the Archives Nationale du Québec. "Jugement rendu par le Conseil de guerre Contre Bertellemy pichon soldat de la Compagnie de Cortemanche [sic] de la garnison du fort pontchartrain," Grandmesnil [élis, the son, Cadillac’s hired clerk], photocopy Archives Nationales du Québec, (ANQ) 4 880. The DCB still mis-identifies Grandmesnil the elder, Étienne Véron’s father, as Cadillac’s secretary. I have informed them of this error. She is “Latishenette” (and associated with Montour) in Vaudreuil's annotation of Cadillac's 27 August 1706 letter from Fort Pontchartrain, AC C 114, Vol. 24, NAC microfilm F-24, f. 287. I have yet to see any formal mention of the events reported in the conseil de guerre in any other colonial document, and I have searched. I even wonder whether it ever left the official papers of Grandmesnil the younger to go to be read by anyone else in any official capacity. This set of papers also contains the concessions of property written by Grandmesnil the younger that were granted at Fort Pontchartrain by Cadillac in 1707 and the 1711 inventory of Cadillac’s property.
Note: the version reported by the soldier being interrogated in 1707, Pichon dit Larose, does not say they are going to live like sauvages, Indians. It is d’Aigremont’s 1708 account that makes this allegation, one which has been distorted out of all proportion, particularly since the English word “savages” carries definite connotations not conveyed by the word Indians. The diverse attempts to merge the various accounts, without considering the separate sources, has led only to confusion and, I believe, fiction in recording this incident.

Montour is cited in Albany by 1708, speaking with Lord Cornbury; and his sister, “Montours sister” [sic], is there along with Montour’s wife by 1709 (sources for which will be considered in Part 7). Whether this “wife” was Jeanne, the Algonquinne, said to be thirty-two in 1688, or another woman cannot now be determined, but a 29 August 1723 letter says:

Montour an Ind[ian] being sent by order of the Late Lord Viscount Cornbury when Gov[ernor] of this Province of N York in August 1708 to treat with the Ind[ian] affairs at Albany brought his Son Michell [sic] to ye Reverend Mr. Thomas Barclay Minister of ye [the] Church of England there & during his [Michell’s] abode with the Rev Mr Barclay which was about five years and a half he has been taken care of as to his Dyet [sic] & Clothing but Especially in his Schooling and well Instructed in ye [the] principals of Christianity & good Morality for which Rev Mr. Barclay has disbursed the Sum of fifty five pounds as may appear by the Rec[eipts] & Vouchers ready to be produced and it is but Just that he should be Reimbursed by this Province out of some publick money in the Treasury Wherefore we humbly hope your Exc[ellency] will be pleased to take ye [the] Case of this Gentleman into your wise and personal Consideration . . . . 205

Who “Michell’s” mother is cannot be determined, nor is it stated how old he was in 1708. The other English records call him Michael. As I understand this passage, he stayed with Rev. Barclay for five and a half years, but the petition for payment was not written until 1723. Five and a half years from June of 1709, the year of Louis Montour’s death, would extend to 1715 or thereabouts. Michel Germaneau makes his first appearance in New France records at his marriage in 1717, and his witnesses have ties to the English colonies, as I will demonstrate. I find it interesting that this “son” of Louis and the son of Isabelle and Joachim, Michel Germaneau, share the same first name, which just happens to be the name of their uncle, Michel Massé, but I am, of course, speculating. A “brother-in-law” was said to be present at Louis’s assassination, but who he is will never be known. See Part 9.

Louis Montour’s other sisters are accounted for elsewhere at this time of his desertion, Angélique in Trois Rivières;206 Marguerite in Détroit;207 and Madeleine in Boucherville.208 Bourgmont simply disappears

205 NAC, C-1220, ff. 55-55v, photocopy, my underlining.
206 7 January 1709, Angélique was present at her home there and signing the marriage contract of her daughter Marie Anne Delpé and Joseph Petit Bruno, Notary Veron Grandmesnil the elder, father of Cadillac’s commis, writing the document at a time when his son was at Fort Pontchartrain working for Cadillac, photocopy. See my articles on the Grandmesnils, father and son, and Marie Lepage in MHH, January, April and July of 2001.
207 9 October 1707, Marguerite Couk, wife of Massé, godmother with Charles Fafard, son of Sieur Delorme, her first husband’s nephew, for baptism of Joseph, son of Joseph Soudinan (?), huron, & Sentralon(?), huronne, at Fort Pontchartrain; this is the first written evidence of Marguerite at Fort Pontchartrain. 20 March 1709, baptism of Marguerite, daughter of François Marquet dit Périgord and his wife Louise Galernaude. Godparents: Paul Guillet and Marguerite Maconce (Marguerite Fafard dite Maconce, daughter of Jean Fafard and Marguerite Couk). Guillet signed. And 5 May 1710, marriage, after three consecutive banns, of Jean Baptiste Turpin, son of deceased Alexandre Turpin & Charlotte Beauvais, his wife, of the parish of Montréal; and Marguerite Fafart, daughter of Jean Fafard and Marguerite Couque, his wife, of this parish and nouvelle colonie. All from original registers of Ste. Anne.
from the records for several years. Whatever their relationship, no evidence of any marriage is now known to exist between Bourgmont and Isabelle.

When he appears again, Bourgmont is farther south in Illinois territory by 1713, well-after Madame Montour is cited as wife of the Oneida sachem by 1711, in Missouri country by 1714, although legend has it he was in Détroit in 1712 during the Fox War. Between 1712 and 1714, Bourgmont’s appearances in the Jesuit Missions aroused “an avalanche of denunciations.” There was “never a question of treason,” however. According to the Dictionary of Canadian Biography: “The minister of the Marine appeased the critics by giving Lamothe [then in Louisiane] secret orders to have Bourgmond [sic] arrested, but it does not seem that the governor of Louisiane followed the orders. By 1713, Cadillac was at Fort Louis, Mobile, in Louisiane (actually modern-day Alabama), although he traveled to Kaskaskia on the Mississippi River in the summer of 1715 to check out a mine and left one of his sons

I have not yet seen any satisfactory explanation for the term nouvelle colonie in 1710, although Saint Philippe des Miamis (now Fort-Wayne, Indiana) is called such in later years, at least by 1720.

208 7 February 1709 baptism at Boucherville of François Ménard, born the 6th, son of Maurice Ménard and Madeleine Couq. FHL #1288825, photocopy.

209 But see M. de Vaudreuil au Ministre (5 novembre 1708), RAPQ. Two years ago, in 1706, Vaudreuil had told the Sonnotouns (Senecas), when they asked him to pardon two French deserters, that only the king had the right to pardon. Also mentioned in this letter is the 1708 killing by a young Native in the village of the Onondagas of a soldier “de la garnison du détroit,” from the garrison at Detroit, who deserted with another. The governor agreed to accept a slave in the place of the soldier to “cover” or atone for the death. Was one of these deserters Bourgmont? The timing is right.


212 This mine was possibly associated with Jacques Mainville / Miville. Cadillac, while he was in Louisiane, may have slandered “Mainville,” as well, saying he was keen on Indian women, tres adonné aux sauvagesesses. In citing this passage, Gilles Havard qualifies Cadillac’s accusation, saying he is certainly habituated to projecting on others his own faults: “certes habitué à projeter sur les autres ses propres travers”, Empire (2003), pp. 657-58. Miville himself is on record as petitioning to have his wife and family join him in Louisiane, just as Bisaillon wished to visit his wife. Jacques Miville’s wife, Catherine Lécuyer, later married Michel Germaneau, Isabelle’s son, in 1717, after Jacques had died at some unknown time and place. Since Michel’s whereabouts are not known until his marriage in 1717, I have to wonder whether he met Catherine through her first husband, who traveled to Fort Pontchartrain. Jacques Miville was part of the large group arriving in Détroit in 1706. The Cadillac Papers in MPHCH report he came with Paul and Jean (Baptiste) Lescuyer, brothers. (Jetté says Jean Baptiste also engagé Ouest 19-02-1708) They brought ten head of cattle and three horses to Détroit in 1706. These were the first domestic animals in the west.” (MPHC, Vol. 33, p. 272). A Robert Chevalier, Louis Morisseau and Jacques Maurisseau (See my comments about him later) were also part of this contingent, as was Laurent Leveille, Panis Indian, and Louis Normand dit Labrière, who served as godfather to Isabelle’s godmother at the baptism of a Huron baby in September at Fort Pontchartrain. This 1706 group arrived in August. I have seen all of their hiring contracts. See my articles in MHH on brides of soldiers and other women who voyaged in 1706. Did Isabelle have her children, Michel (about twelve) and Marie Anne (five to ten), with her? Could one of these people, or her sister, Marguerite, have assumed temporary responsibility for the children when Isabelle fled the fort? Did Catherine Lécuyer travel to the fort after the birth of her son Jean Baptiste Mainville in February of 1707? If she did, she was back in the mother colony for the baptism of her daughter Marie Anne, 3 October 1708. These questions, unfortunately, remain unanswered, but the interconnections and Cadillac’s accusations are more than intriguing.
there and some other men to work it. Bourgmont resumed exploration on the Missouri River in 1722. He returned to France in 1725 and was ennobled that same year.

A Relevant Digression

In 1714, though, Bourgmont was associated with Michel Bisaillon in Illinois Indian territory. Bisaillon had married Marguerite Fafard dite Delorme at Fort Pontchartrain in June of 1710. Marguerite is the niece-by-marriage of Marguerite Couc, her first husband, Jean, being the brother of François Fafard dit Delorme, this Marguerite Fafard’s father. (There were two Marguerite Fafards at this time, and they were cousins. So many women are named Marguerite!) Claude Ramezay, then serving as governor of New France during Vaudreuil’s absence in France, writes:

I have learned, through Sieur de Liette, who commands among the Illinois, that Sieur de bourmont, and two men named bisaillon and bourdon, lead a life not only scandalous but even Criminal in many ways. In the first place they have opposed the project of Sieurs de Liette and de Vinsenne, which was to make peace between the illinois and the myamy [Miamis]. These gentlemen state that they would have succeeded in this but for the obstacles raised by these seditious men, who have fomented dissension between these two nations."

Jesuits Pierre Gabriel Marest and Jean Marie de Villes had also reported these men caused disorder among the Illinois and that they had attempted to introduce the English from Carolina into the territory. Michel Bisaillon himself, who had by then served seventeen years in the pays d’en haut, gives another version in “Justification de Michel Bizaillon,” placing some of the blame for the “disorders” among the Natives on de Liette, a cousin of brothers Henri and Alphonse de Tonty, although, regrettably, Bisaillon does not mention Bourgmont.

Much of the standard published history ignores the comments of “little” people like Michel Bisaillon, preferring to accept the word of the “leaders” of the colony. Ramezay was definitely not an eye-witness; he simply recorded the messages he had received. It is crucial to ask these questions: Who were his sources? What were their motivations? And what happened next? According to Michel Bisaillon:

---

213 Delanglez, citing relevant documents.
214 Dechêne, DCB, Vol. II.
215 30 June 1710, marriage, after three consecutive banns, of Michel Bisaillon, son of Benoist Bisaillon and Louise Blaye ses pere et mere of Ville de Clairmont in Auvergne, and Marguerite Fafart, daughter of François Fafart and Marie Magdeleine Jobin, ses pere et mere, of this parish. Registers of Ste. Anne. Jetté gives Louise Bléderne for Michel's brother Benoit; and Françoise Deblay for brother Etienne. He also lists a Pierre Bisaillon (Benoit & Louise Bléderne) of St.-Jean d'Aubergoux, ev. Clermont, Auvergne, as brother to Benoit, Etienne and Michel. This Pierre Bisaillon went to Pennsylvania in 1688-89. See DCB III, 69-70, and also Hanna.
216 Ramezay to the Minister (September 18, 1714) in: Wisconsin Historical Collections, XVI, pp. 300-303, p. 302. Spelling is as it appears in this published translation. Claude Ramezay served as governor during Governor Vaudreuil’s absence in France, 1714-1716. Vinsenne is Jean Baptiste Bissot de Vincennes. Sieur de Liette is a cousin of the de Tonty brothers.
217 Mr de Ramzay à quebec le 28 oct 1715, AC C11a, Vol. 35, NAC microfilm F-35, ff. 99-100v.
218 See C. J. Russ, “Liette, Pierre-Charles de (di Lietto, Deliette, Desliettes), aide de camp d’Henri Tonty”, DCB II. He was cousin to Henri and Alphonse Tonty.
Mr. Desliettes [sic] then arrived at the Illinois to bring them presents from Mr. le General [the governor-general of New France] but Mr. Desliettes, instead of attracting the sauvages to him, alienated them, first because he delayed 10 or 12 days to give them the presents from Mr le general; second, because he had no respect [f.100v] for the principal chiefs; third because he spoke to the Illinois against Bizaillon [sic], being jealous of the affection these sauvages have for him. Bizaillon kept silent and let Mr. Desliettes do as he wished. If Mr. Desliettes had asked him to help him in the Service of the King, he would have done so with pleasure as he has always done and even without "interest" [expecting any gain or compensation in return] considering it a pleasure to serve his prince. The way Mr. Desliettes governed caused a division in the village of the Sauvages, who, not being happy, separated a year after Mr. Desliettes had arrived.

The English sent an envoy with a message and presents by means of Sauvages to the Illinois. Their presents were accepted and the principal chiefs, having left the council, asked Bizaillon what they should do. He replied that they could not accept two “words” [paroles, or statements of policy] from two opposing crowns, that they should uphold the first "parolle" [that received from the French] and that the English would finish by destroying them [the Illinois]. The Illinois chiefs told Bizaillon that they would be true to their first parolle.219

Another letter from Ramezay, 28 October 1715, one year later, explains, first, why Ramezay had originally approved the proposition made by Charles Lemoyne, sieur de Longueuil (an emissary to the Iroquois) and Jesuit Father Vaillant (present at Le Détroit in 1701 and a missionary to the Iroquois) to send Bisaillon to the Illinois and then declares that Bisaillon is to obtain the pardon of de Liette and Father de Villes, two of his accusers (see above). This letter also mentions a reply from Governor Hunter at Albany, and, of course, Madame Montour was interpreting for Governor Hunter at that time.

In 1715, Ramezay's son Monnoir wrote that he stayed with Bisaillon at les Illinois du Rocher long enough to assemble 450 men, arriving at Chicago on 17 August and composing his letter from there 28 August.220 It is this Ramezay son who was killed in 1716 on a mission with d'Adoucourt, also killed, the son of Charles Lemoyne, sieur de Longueuil. These young men had been sent to prevent the Illinois from accepting the propositions of the English after the failed mission against the Fox (Renards / Mesquakie).

I would love to trace a strange message from a "French woman at Orange" (Madame Montour is consistently identified as a French woman) who speaks of these men to Charles Ruette d’Auteuil, sieur de Monceau. This French woman does not wish to be identified as a source.221 Madame Montour used the identical language in speaking to James Letort in 1727-28, which I will cite from the United States colonial records in a later section. She told Letort that she said what she did only in the hope that it would be reported. D’Auteuil, sieur de Monceaux, in 1722, was convicted of illegal trade in Orange more than once, although he had, in fact, been given permission to trade.222 He married Thérèse Catin,223 widow of

220 Wisconsin Historical Collections (WHC), Vol. XVI, Letter from Ramezay to the French Minister, 3 November 1715.
222 For example, 25 September 1720, Ordonnance, MG 8 – A 6, NAC C-13588, 119-121, and other infractions.
223 Joseph L. Peyser wrote an article about Thérèse Catin that treats her unfairly, as I see it, including calling her a “contentious butcher’s daughter.” Much of Peyser’s language is similarly “loaded” and biased. “The Fall and Rise of Thérèse Catin: A Portrait from Indiana’s French and Canadian History,” Indiana Magazine of History, XCI (December, 1995), pp. 361-377. “Thérèse Catin became the first woman to make a business investment in what is
Simon Réaume, interpreter for the governor, all of them very much involved in the fur trade, including the governor, according to some testimony. But I must end this digression.

Bisaillon was pardoned. Bourgmont was granted nobility. To cite only the complaints against them is just part of the story. I must add that Bourgmont returned to France with his son, born of a Native woman in Missouri about 1714, but this illegitimate child did not get in the way of his ennoblement. Bisaillon fathered two legitimate children in Illinois country, well before his marriage at Fort Pontchartrain, and an illegitimate child in 1712, which may have been enough to arouse the ire of the missionaries, although all of the children were baptized at Kaskasia. Bisaillon’s “Justification” nevertheless includes an interesting detail at the end of the document:

Bizaillon having stayed a year at the Illinois with Mr. Desliettes without saying the slightest thing [against him], speaking only good about him to the sauvages, returned to Michilimakina and took with him 50 Illinois because of the danger [of traveling at the time].

Bizaillon having arrived at Michili maKina, Mr. Du[tisné?] wanting to establish himself at 8abache [Wabash, near modern-day Lafayette, Indiana], asked him whether he wished to accompany him since the French told him that he would be needed; but because he [Bisaillon] wished to go to see his wife, he told him he could not, unless Mr. le general [the governor-general, Vaudreuil] wished it for the service of the King. [end]

Once again, the “story” is not as unambiguously clear as some declare it to be. The same is true of the commonly accepted, published biography of Étienne Véniard, sieur de Bourgmont, and that of Madame Montour.

**Madame Montour in French and English Language Sources, both Primary and Secondary**

More than anyone else in the Couc family, Isabelle / Madame Montour is maligned and misidentified in books and articles, old and new, particularly in the older English language works. Many writers even now refuse to admit this woman is Madame Montour, preferring other guesses, suppositions, and romantic fictions developed in the last century without any—or little—knowledge of New France records or customs.

Her first name used to be the stumbling block, as writer after writer insisted that she was named either Madeleine, after the presumed name of her “father’s” (Montour’s) wife; or Catherine, this assumption because a “granddaughter” was said to be named Catherine, so she must have been named after her grandmother! Beliefs about naming systems created more misidentifications because English language

now the state of Indiana. On 11 June 1735, the commandant of Fort Miami [now Fort Wayne, Indiana], Philippe Damours de La Morandière, signed an agreement” with her that transferred to her the Miami post. Widow Catin and d’Autueil had married 27 September 1734 at Montréal, photocopy.

224 Jetté reports “Enfants naturels: 1. (mère: Marie-Thérèse, Amérindienne): Pierre b 13 Nov 1703 Kaskasia. 2. (mère Marie ASEMGMASOUA, Amérindienne): Michel n 1 b 2 April 1712 Kaskasia.” A more accurate reading of the baptisms, and Michel’s own testimony, reveals that the first two children were born of legitimate marriages. To be considered in a later section. Children by Marguerite Fafard dite Delorme: Michel 1716 and Marie Marguerite 1718 at Laprairie; Marguerite Fafard, buried 26 Dec 1728 Ile Dupas; Michel d avant 1728. (Jetté) See my article about Michel Bisaillon and his son Michel on the FCHSM website.
writers of the past also always assumed Madame Montour carried her father’s or husband’s name. (Can you see the traps one can fall into by applying customs used by one group to another?) Yet in New France, although a woman used her birth name throughout her life, it was not unusual for her to adopt a totally new *dite* name, sometimes one not related to her father’s or husband’s name(s).225 Married women were also called *Dame* or *La femme de*, followed by their husband’s surname or *dit* name.

The issue of the first name of Madame Montour “interpretress” should have been resolved recently by Alison Duncan Hirsch, who allowed me to refer to her find in my October 1999 article.226 Hirsch was able to consult documents I requested in the spring of 1999 but which, I was informed by the New York Historical Society, could not be accessed, unfortunately, without my going to see them in person,. These documents give Madame Montour a first name, and the first name recorded is *Eysabelle*. The payments for wampum belts are all made to "Mrs." or "Madame Montour," while the name of the "interpretress" is always listed as "EYSABELLE Montour."

Those who reject Isabelle as Madame Montour are most often the ones who have never heard of her under the name of “la femme de Tichenet”; nor do they know the crucial role played by the events at Fort Pontchartrain when Lamothe Cadillac was commandant there. These political events definitely affected her and her brother’s decision to go to New York. (Speculation: After all, since most of the pelleteries from the Fort were already being carried to the English, they may have gone with Cadillac’s blessings until he learned he was to be investigated by d’Aigremont. It would not have been the first or the last time he turned against those he originally solicited to do his work.)

---

225 As a minor example, Marie Lalande, wife of Pierre Émard, used her mother’s birth name, Filiatrault, at the 21 October 1707, baptism of François, son of Pierre Haimart, *cy devant soldat in the Company of M. DeLorimier, and Marie Filiastreax*. Registers of Ste. Anne de Detroit.

226 “The Celebrated Madame Montour, ‘Interpretress’ Across Early American Frontiers” by Alison Duncan Hirsch, of Pennsylvania State University, Harrisburg, speech presented to the McNeil Center for Early American Studies Seminar Series, University of Pennsylvania Law School, February 6, 1999, e-mail copy sent to me in July 1999. Her revision of this paper was published in *Explorations in Early American Culture*, Volume 4, 2000, Pennsylvania Historical Association for the McNeil Center for Early American Studies, pp. 81-112. She acknowledges my 1999 suggestions to her, but she did not revise her earlier paper to include all of them. For example, she continued to attribute a 1679 notarial document, unfortunately cited by her as “Lawsuit filed June 5 1779 [sic]”, as connected to Louis Montour under the name “Louis Manitouake Koucq”, when the record actually reads differently, as I discovered and she herself acknowledged: “The computerized index to the judicial archives in Montreal refers to a Louise Manituouake Couc [sic], not Louis, …” E-mail 11 September 1999, emphasis mine. Louise Manitouakikoué, Algonquine, and Pierre Artault, sieur de LaTour, married about 1664 in the region of Trois-Rivières (Jetté), “Koué” is Algonkin for woman. Perhaps the indexer of *Parchemin* saw Kouc in error. Hirsch’s account of Isabelle’s years in New York and Pennsylvania, though, is very well-presented, the best I have seen.

227 Hirsch (1999), citing Peter Van Brugh and Hendrick Hansen, Account Book for the Vetch Expedition Against Canada, Aug. 20, 24, 27, 29, 1711, *New York Historical Society*, New York: "The account book for the 1711 expedition—the only surviving English document to give Madame Montour a first name—shows that ‘Eysabelle Montour interpretress’ was given five-eighths of a yard of stroud cloth, two yards of duffel cloth, and one shirt for interpreting from mid-July to mid-October 1711.” [(*54) Footnote *54 Van Brugh and Hansen, Account Book, fols. 5, 6, 14 (Aug. 20, 24, 27, 1711)]; and, for the passage above, Footnote *55 Van Brugh and Hansen, Account Book, fols. 16, 18, 19, 26. My emphasis. I regret that I have not yet seen these documents myself.
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Those who do know that she and Cadillac were in the same places at the same times take his words about her as absolute truth, even though Cadillac is an acknowledged and documented liar. Here is the relevant passage from Cadillac’s 1704 Mémoire, in my translation:

The wife of Tichenet is the daughter of a Frenchman and a female Indian [Sauvagessè]; after she was married with the blessings of the Church, at the end of a year, she left her husband and fled to English territory, where she married to a "sauvage" [male Indian] of the "Loups" [Wolf tribe or Mahicans], with whom she lived twelve years, having several children by him; during the last war, this woman was taken in English territory by our Iroquois of the Sault [Sault St Louis, near Montréal]; she was ransomed by one of her brothers-in-law, a Frenchman named Maurice Ménard, who brought her to the Ottawas, where her first husband was, to whom she no longer wished to return; at Michilimackinac she lived a licentious life; as her brother-in-law wished to change her behavior, she accused him of wanting to seduce her in return for taking her back to the English; she complained to me and, having filed the charges, she was discovered to be lying; she then convinced two Canadians to change their allegiance to desert to the English and when she escaped with them, I had her followed; she was apprehended with these two young men, who confessed their deed. I sent her under escort to the chevalier de Calièrè [then at Montréal, not named governor until 1699, and deceased before 1704], who had her go down to Québec [City] to have her sent to France. Because no precautions were taken, the man named Jean Le Blanc [Outoutagan] . . . rescued her and returned her to Missilimakinak [sic] and married the woman, who left him to take another, and she had more than a hundred "mariages de Jean de Vignes" [illicit relationships].

The MPHC published its English language translation of this passage in 1903. That translation has influenced those who have written about “La Tichenet” in English. Writers choosing to cite this passage seemingly enjoyed calling attention to the “scandalous” allegations made by Cadillac.

228 In Antoine Laumet dit de Lamothe Cadillac's long 14 November 1704 Mémoire written in Québec while he was under house arrest and then sent to France, she is La femme de Tichenet. In this Mémoire, Maurice Ménard, husband of her sister Madeleine Couc, and interpreter at Michilimackinac, is said to be her brother-in-law, and she is cited as having been at Michilimackinac during Cadillac’s tenure there (1694-1697). AC C 11E, vol. 14, f 189v-190. NAC F-412
229 For example, Vaudreuil writes in 1707: “what he [Cadillac] says about the Outtavois [Ottawas], who came down to Montreal with Jean le Blanc and loaded themselves there with ammunition, is a tale he has invented. That is no difficult matter for the Sieur de La Mothe [sic, Cadillac consistently signed his name “Lamothe Cadillac” His name is also sometimes spelled La Motte, giving a good clue as to the phonetic pronunciation of his name.]; he has had the privilege of doing so [inventing tales] for a long time." Observations of the Marquis de Vaudreuil on the Letter from de Lamothe of the 1st of October, 1707”, MPHS, Vol. 33. See Jean Delanglez’s many demonstrations of Cadillac’s mendacity in his series of articles in Mid-America; an historical review, Chicago, Loyola University (Institute of Jesuit History) from 1944 - 1951. Specific articles to be cited.
230 This phrase, en face de l’église, is often wrongly translated as in the front of the church. The sense is that the marriage took place in the presence [en face] of Church witnesses and with its consent. My thanks to Father John L. Sullivan (alias Owen Taggart) for clarifying this matter without any doubt.
231 My translation.
232 For example, an editor’s note to an article by Jean Delanglez: “Cadillac’s interpreter [La Tichenet] happened to be a notorious profligate wench. . . .” Jean Delanglez, “Cadillac: Proprietor at Detroit,” Mid-America, 32 (1950), Editor’s Note, p. 175, a comment in connection with Cadillac’s 1704 Mémoire. The editor also says that Delanglez “was revising his manuscript account of the Memorandum [Cadillac’s 1704 Mémoire, translated in MPHS, Vol. 33] before his death, trying to make clear what Cadillac intended to be confusing.” Possibly, Delanglez was equally
Governor Calièrre was deceased when Cadillac wrote this mémoire and could not dispute it. No surviving records found as of this date support the allegations. Isabelle could not have spent twelve years married to a Loup by whom she had several children after abandoning her first husband at the end of a year, as Cadillac alleges. Twelve years from April 1685, a year after her marriage to Joachim Germaneau, is April 1697, giving Cadillac only a few months to send her down to Callière, then governor of Montréal, with Frontenac as Governor. Cadillac himself left Michilimackinac by the summer of 1697. In that same time span she was allegedly rescued by and “married” Jean Leblanc, deserted him for another, and had 100 lovers. Her son by Germaneau, Michel, is said to be twenty-two years old at his marriage in 1717, thus born about 1695-94. The math just does not compute. Perhaps the “twelve” years and “100” lovers were simply Cadillac’s characteristic Gascon exaggeration (!), but many commentators have taken his word as gospel.

More seriously, though, I believe the point must be made that Cadillac's accusations against Isabelle, la femme de Tichenet, sister-in-law to Maurice Ménard, related to Montour, were made in 1704 when Cadillac himself was undergoing a legal trial, procès, that accused him of mismanagement at Fort Pontchartrain. His characterization of la femme de Tichenet as a “loose woman” (or what Moogk calls “a slut”; see my Part 5) is not an isolated ploy. In his own defense in his mémoire to Pontchartrain, he was slandering or accusing almost everyone involved, calling people bastards and lower class workers, even professing that the governor and intendant were incompetent to judge him. Jean Delanglez comments: “Perhaps the document should be turned over to psychologists or dramatists”; and, he adds, “one wonders about his [Cadillac's] sanity.” Delanglez certainly demonstrates, without a doubt, Cadillac’s other liberties with the truth.

In September of 1704, testimony concerning Cadillac’s behavior at the fort earlier in the year was taken from several people at Fort Pontchartrain, as I have mentioned more than once earlier. (Excuse my repetitions, but this detail is important and unknown by any historian I have read, including Delanglez.) The summary of the trial activities cite several persons, including “Élisabeth Couk [Couc], Chatleraude, Demeuless [and, added above the line] Jacques Croquelois dit Laviolette, sworn witnesses deposed at the said Détroit by the said Sieur de Vincelotte in his said function.” These men and “Élisabeth Couk” were "recused” because their testimony was considered inadmissible. That is to say a challenge was made, claiming these individuals were in some way biased or legally unable to testify. One basis for recusing testimony was that an individual worked for one of the involved parties. Which party recused each one, Cadillac or the Company of the Colony, is not indicated. However, the document continues:

we declare inadmissable and badly founded the challenges and pretensions [to recuse] made against [witnesses] Pierre and Michel Leméé [Lemay]; Louis Juilliet; and Pierre Rivet; witnesses deposed by us [Beauharnois and the Superior Council], as well as those made against Sieur de Tonty; Father Chasle [Delhalle], Récollet missionary at Détroit; [several words crossed out]

baffled by Cadillac’s attacks on La Tichenet. This article is part of a series of articles by Delanglez published between 1944 and 1951.

233 References for these items cited elsewhere in this article. I am aware that Vincens gives Michel’s birth year as 1685, but no record survives; and, no matter how hard I try, I cannot change the vint deux, twenty-two years old, of the church record, into trente-deux, thirty-two years old. He was active as an engagé in the fur trade as late as 26 June 1729, thus about age thirty-four, going to Michilimackinac where his uncle, Maurice Ménard, served as interpreter (J. B. Adhmar, #2838, photocopy), and died at Montréal 14 May, buried 15 May 1734, habitant journalier de la cote St. Pierre, no age given. Photocopy.

234 Delanglez, 1950, pp. 172-173.
Claude Riviere [Rivard235] Lorangé; Jean Baptiste Morisseau; Jean Richard; and Pierre Gauvreau, [who] although they are employed by the said Company, [they are] witnesses necessary to this case [affaire]; and, having consideration for their depositions and that of Pierre [sic] Tichenet, [who is] not recused [neither party, the Company nor Cadillac, attempted to have his testimony rejected], we will proceed to a final judgment of the suit in eight days [huitaine] 236

I have found no further documents connected with this procès, although I would dearly love to read Isabelle’s and Tichenet’s testimony, in particular. According to Cadillac, she denied interpreting for him with Quarante Sols.

I believe I am the first to cite this document in connection with Madame Montour. It is a very interesting summary of the workings of the justice system in New France and refutes claims that Cadillac was treated unfairly or held “against his will” from returning to Fort Pontchartrain.237 His “will” had nothing to do with it. Cadillac was legitimately charged with a complaint by the Company of the Colony, at that time Cadillac’s employer and responsible for all matters at the fort. The legal process was followed; and Cadillac was cleared of the charges after a year, in June of 1705, mainly because it became too much of a problem to try to convict him. He would have demanded to go to France to appeal, as he had planned to do in the Moreau and Durand case in 1698, to have the case judged there. Given the protection he was at that time still receiving from Pontchartrain, the Minister of the Marine, he would have taken his case to France. Instead, he received word in 1705, one year after the fact, that the king had granted him full control of trade at Fort Pontchartrain, the order arriving a year late because the 1704 appointment was lost when the English pirated the ship La Seine carrying the original decree.238

In the fall of 1705, then, Cadillac planned for his return to the fort as “absolute Master.” Violence between the Ottawas (Odawas) and Miamis at Fort Pontchartrain, joined by the Detroit Hurons (Wendat Petuns), broke out at the fort about twenty days before Cadillac departed from Lachine in June with the large convoy of 1706. It seems Isabelle was at the fort through the winter of 1705-06, serving as godmother in April of 1706, and, although not documented in the registers of Ste. Anne, her brother, Louis Montour, may have been there. Cadillac arrived with his convoy of soldiers and potential settlers on 8 August, among whom, most probably, were Marguerite Couc, her Fafard and perhaps her Massé

235 A Claude Rivard dit Loranger was hired to go to the fort 27 May 1701 and 10 July 1703. Photocopies. The others mentioned are also documented.
236 Papiers Beauharnois (Francois de Beauharnois, Chevalier Seigneur de la Chaussaye, Beaumont et autres Lieus, Conseiller du Roy en ses conseils, Intendant de justice, police et finances en la Nouvelle France), 29th of May seventeen hundred and five. NAC C-2925, ff. 415-16. Photocopied in the 1960s but acquired by the French archives earlier from Le Duc de Leuchtenberg [sic], a collector of documents. These documents were not available to Farmer and Burton and other early historians of Detroit, and, to my knowledge, more recent historians.
237 Those who accept without question the “myth” of Cadillac often use this phrase. But see Yves Zoltvany, “Antoine Laumet dit de Lamothe Cadillac,” DCB, Vol. II. Cadillac made no attempt to go to the fort that summer of 1705, after the trial was settled, nor in the fall after receiving word he was to be “absolute master,” instead sending Bourgmont, recently named an enseign, to serve as temporary commandant and Grandmesnil the younger as commis or clerk to take a required inventory of the Company’s possessions at the fort so that Cadillac could repay the Company for its investment.
238 At Versailles, 14 June 1704, Pontchartrain to Cadillac, AC C11E, Vol. 14, NAC F-412, ff. 192-195. This document is Cadillac’s transcription of Pontchartrain’s letter, signed by Cadillac, with his, Cadillac’s, annotation: “I have the original here.” Pontchartrain to Vaudreuil, 17 June 1705: “You will find attached duplicates of the letters I wrote you last year.” Transcription in Les rapports des Archives nationales du Québec, 1920-1975, Les Publications du Québec, CD-Rom version. (RAPQ)
children, and her second husband, Michel Massé. Bourgmont and Isabelle / La Tichenette are reported to have left the fort to join her brother Montour sometime late in 1706 or in 1707; no precise date survives, but Isabelle was still at the fort on 26 September 1706, when she served as godmother for Louis, son of “Pierre Taoun [ink blot] rony” and of “Martine, Hurons de nation”. The priest did not reject her as a godmother because of any “scandalous” sexual or other unacceptable behavior. “Scandalous” behavior can, after all, be something other than sexual. Montour appears in New York by 1707, perhaps having been there earlier, and again in 1708, his sister by 1709 at the latest, and the rest of the story shifts for awhile to the surviving United States colonial records.

The colonial documents and other records I have cited leave little doubt as to the identity of Montour and Madame Montour. Other surviving documents reinforce their identity. As will be seen, some of them have not been cited previously in any works I have read.

My articles in Michigan’s Habitant Heritage of 1999 and 2000 presented an account of Madame Montour’s life based on some of my preliminary research and on Madame Montour et son temps, the work of Simone Vincens, to whom I am indebted for introducing me to Isabelle’s story. My intent then was to reach an audience that cannot read French. I have since consulted almost every primary source cited in the secondary sources I used in writing these articles and my follow-up ones about translations of key documents. I could not have done this research without the excellent indexes, Internet sources, and mail service from the National Archives of Canada and Les Archives Nationales du Québec. I am grateful to all of those who assisted me in my quest. As a result, I have found some of my secondary sources to be less precise than they could have been in interpreting the primary sources. I have also located new primary source documents. Although I am acutely aware that there are dozens, perhaps hundreds of documents still waiting to be mined for the gold (and fool’s gold!) they might contain, I have nevertheless already located sources no one else, to my knowledge, has found, and these documents reinforce the identity of Isabelle Couc of New France as Madame Montour of the colonies of New York and Pennsylvania.

---

240 Original register of Ste. Anne de Detroit, photocopy. Godfather was Louis Normand “Labriere”.
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In writing history and family history, it is imperative to evaluate one’s sources. Not all are equal, for a variety of reasons. I have to believe that web sites and published writers did the best they could with the information they researched or accepted from others and that they were honest in reporting their finds. I have been honest in reporting my primary documents, and I have necessarily sometimes accepted without question some of my secondary sources, on occasion to my chagrin because I’ve later learned that some sources are simply inaccurate, often because they relied on earlier works that were based on guesses or deductions. I have also learned other writers put too much faith in the French documents that have been translated and published, which, as of now, are partial and faulty. Partial evidence can lead to invalid conclusions. It is indisputable that writers in the past, and even more recently, did not have access to primary source documents that are now available, even if they have not been published. Locating and consulting primary documents is much easier now with microfilms and photocopies available by mail, and even digital images on the web, not to mention the improved indexing and computer search capabilities that did not exist until relatively recently; but, for much of Isabelle’s story, the researcher must, of course, be able to read French.

The exclusive use of secondary sources can create other problems because some writers do not say where they obtained their information, often merging various sources without any indication they are doing so; or they may show preconceptions or prejudice, thus slanting their interpretation. Personal, religious, or political biases or misunderstandings are obvious in both the older and the more recent histories.

I am not immune from any of this. Nor am I immune from the occasional typographical error, momentary failure of memory, or even from speculation when documentation is lacking or unclear, although I do try to emphasize that some of my conclusions are speculative. When I point out the errors and misunderstandings of writers in the past and present, I do so only to set the record straight as I see it, and to present a model for judging and using sources. I fully expect someone will find issues to debate in my presentation.

A final problem with evaluating one’s sources stems from having to decide whether to believe all of the information or testimony found in primary documents. Disinformation was not invented in the modern period. And, sometimes there are good reasons to lie.

In my study of the Couc / Montour family, I have not been satisfied to accept the information provided by indexes or secondary source histories, especially those written in the nineteenth century, and I have even questioned information and testimony found in primary documents. In this article I will demonstrate why I challenge previous histories of the Couc / Montour family. I will do this by acting as a detective or trial lawyer might do in sorting through the assertions and the evidence.
Madame Montour and Montour
According to the Older English Language Secondary Sources

On several Internet references, Madame Montour is identified as the wife or daughter of Montour, who is sometimes given the first name Roland.241 United States historian Daniel Richter, in 1992, cites Montour’s first name as Alexander.242 I have seen no primary evidence of either, nor do these sources give any source. A frequently cited secondary source, William M. Darlington, writing in 1880, gave his version of Montour’s background:

About [sic] the year 1667 a French Gentleman named Montour settled in Canada. By a Huron Indian woman he had three children—one son and two daughters. The son, Montour, lived with the Indians, and was wounded in the French Service, in a fight with some Mohawks, near Fort La Motte.243 He deserted from the French, and lived with “the farr Indians” the Twilightees (Miamis) and Diondadies (Pétuns or Wyandots). By his assistance Lord Cornbury prevailed on some of these tribes to visit and trade with the people of Albany in 1708. [Parenthetic information as it appears in the original.]244

Of these comments, only the last, the reference to Lord Cornbury, is accurate. The “Huron Indian woman” designation is definitely a guess made years after the fact. In his letter from New York on 20 August 1708, Cornbury’s words are, as cited by Charles A. Hanna (1911):245

I did in a letter of the 25th day of June last [O.S.], inform your Lordships that three French soldiers, who had deserted from the French at a place called by them Los Destroit, were come to Albany.

"Los Destroit" is obviously Detroit, then called Fort Pontchartrain / Le Détroit du Lac Érie by the French. Another published version of this document uses the form “Le Destroit,” not Hanna’s “Los Destroit.”

In addition to these soldiers, Cornbury mentions another “deserter,” whom he questioned, and also

241 But see also: “Roland MONTOUR b. 1740, m. Betsey SENECA, b. USA, d. 1830, Dunnville, Ont., CAN. Roland died 1828, Dunnville, Ont., CAN.,” which I found surfing the web. Dunnville is the modern name for the area of La Grande Rivièr’re, where Louis Couc Montour allegedly stashed pelletries in 1707. This Roland is said to be the son of Andrew Montour. I have no further information about the reference.

242 Daniel Richter, Ordeal of the Longhouse, University of North Carolina Press, 1992, p. 224. It is hard to say who Richter’s source is, as his footnotes cover whole paragraphs.

243 Darlington’s footnote 1: “New York Colonial History: Fort St. Anne, or La Motte, erected 1666, on the upper part of Lake Champlain.” This “La Motte” is obviously not Antoine de Lamothe, who would have been only eight years old in 1666.


Besides this deserter, there is come to Albany one Montour, who is the son of a French gentleman, who came above [i.e., more than] forty years ago to settle in Canada; he had to do with an Indian woman, by whom he had a son and two daughters. The man I mention is the son. He had lived all along like an Indian. Sometime ago, he left the French, and had lived among the Far Indians; and it is chiefly by his means that I have prevailed with those Far Nations [the Miamis and Wyandots\textsuperscript{246}] to come to Albany.\textsuperscript{247}

In using the Cornbury letter, Darlington evidently chose to interpret the phrase “above forty years ago” as precisely the forty-first year, 1667 (actually Isabelle’s birth year); and he did not hesitate to supply a Nation for the “Indian woman,” although this is not found in the Cornbury letter (or in any other primary source I have seen). Peter Wraxall, writing in the 1750s, much closer in time than Darlington, wrote:

Tho the Records do not say who this Montour was, yet from various circumstances I gather, that he was an Indian who had formerly been in the Service of the French & was by them deemed one of their Indians, (of what particular Nation I can’t find but I believe either a Seneca or Mohawk Indian who had been made a convert by the Jesuits) but had now come over to this Govt \textsuperscript{4} & was employed to Negotiate our Interest with the Western or farr Indians.\textsuperscript{248} (Emphasis mine.)

Darlington’s source for the wound received by a Montour “in the French Service” is an English translation of the original French Rélation of events that happened in 1694 and 1695, published in New York Colonial History, Paris Documents. The incident is noted by the French historian La Potherie as well; but, although La Potherie was alive at the time of the event, he was not then in New France.

Whether the “Montour” La Potherie and the Rélation mention is the same as Louis Couc \textit{dit} Montour cannot be established definitively. (Some writers still believe the Montour who was wounded is the father of the 1708 Montour). There nevertheless appears to be only one individual in the colony using the name Montour at that time.\textsuperscript{249} This is the episode as reported by La Potherie in his history, my translation:

Two Mohawks having met three Frenchmen near Fort La Mothe, which is in Lac Champlain, they asked one to the other, “Who is there?” \textit{[qui vive?]}. We are Mohawks \textit{[Anies]}, said the former; and we are French \textit{[said the latter]}. Good, replied the Mohawks, placing their weapons at their cheeks \textit{[couchant en joue]; taking aim at}, you are the ones we are looking for. At the same time, Monsieur \textit{[the individual to whom La Potherie’s “letter” is addressed]}, Montour was hit by a gunshot \textit{[coup de fusil]}, which did not prevent him from firing his gun \textit{[fusil]} at the one who had wounded him, which threw him to the ground as if dead; the other two Frenchmen did the same to the other \textit{[Mohawk]}; but they were very surprised when they heard them \textit{[the Mohawks] cry

\textsuperscript{246} Brackets added by Hanna. In the letter itself Cornbury identifies the “Far Nations” as “Twigtwicks [Miamis] and Dinnondadoes [Wyandots]; the nearest of their castles is eight hundred miles from Albany.” Quoted in Hanna, Vol. 1, p. 198.


\textsuperscript{248} Peter Wraxall, An Abridgment of the Indian Affairs Contained in Four Folio Volumes, Transacted in the Colony of New York, from the Year 1678 to the Year 1751, edited with an Introduction by Charles Howard McIlwain, Cambridge Harvard University Press, 1915, footnote 1, p. 52-53, underlining mine. Burton Library, Detroit Public Library, R I 974.7 N42.

\textsuperscript{249} Do a search on PRDH. Louis Couc, \textit{dit} Lafleur and \textit{dit} Montour, signed “Montour” on his sister Angélique’s marriage contract in 1682, photocopy, and Isabelle’s 1684 contract, citations above.
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out a moment later. The Frenchmen quickly ran far away [gagnèrent bien vite du pied] in the fear that there were many other Indians [Sauvages] in the neighboring woods. 250

I translated the preceding text from the French version recently published in France of Le Roy Bacqueville de la Potherie’s Histoire de l’Amérique Septentrionale. My photocopy from the microfilm of the original Rélation of events that happened in 1694 and 1695251 gives the date as 13 June 1695 and includes these further details not found in the published version of La Potherie:

(1) that Montour was wounded in the stomach or belly: au ventre;
(2) that this did not prevent him from taking revenge; and
(3) that the Frenchmen, fearing there were other sauvages in the area, did not want to divert themselves by scalping the Mohawks they had wounded.

I translated “s’amuser” as “to divert themselves” (even though it is sometimes translated as “to amuse themselves”) because it certainly has a different connotation here, that of wasting valuable time in which they could escape. At least one of these wounded was captured a few days later. 252 The incident took place during the attempt to re-establish Fort Frontenac in 1695. 253

La Potherie did not arrive in New France until November 1698 and left in 1701; he writes that he used official documents, surely including this 1695 Rélation, as sources for his Histoire de l’Amérique Septentrionale, which he first submitted in 1702 after his return to France; but he or someone else must have chosen not to include some items of description in the original Rélation. 254 It is possible his manuscript itself was censored, as its publication was refused until 1722. This is another example of the need to take into account a writer’s credibility and sources – and, possibly, the editor involved. La Potherie did not footnote any of his sources, although he does identify the times he was an eyewitness, for example, at the Great Peace of 1701 at Montréal.

I am amazed at the various published versions available of this incident, none of which specifically identifies this Montour in any other way in the text itself, although La Potherie seems to assume his reader, the person to whom this “letter” is addressed, will know who Montour is because he gives no further identification. You can read an English translation of the Rélation on Early Canadiana on the Web. 255 La Potherie’s history can also be found there in French.

251 See Peter N. Moogk, “Monseignat (Monseignac), Charles de,” DCB II. He was secretary to Governor Frontenac in these years.
253 I have seen the date confidently cited as 1694, 1698, and other years!
254 See DCB, Vol. 2.
255 “An account of the most remarkable Occurences in Canada from the month of September 1694 to the departure of the Ships in 1695,” History of King William’s War, and the consequent negotiations between the French and Indians, in America, 172 pages. (S.I. “ s.n., 18--?) Selection begins on p. 76, and episode is reported on p. 81. Read at Early Canadiana on-line.
But to return to the identity of this Montour. Can he be Louis Couc? In October of 1695, Callière reports news received from Cadillac at Michilimackinac informing him that since springtime the allied Nations had sent about 900 men against the Iroquois and that the Hurons were intriguing with the Iroquois through wampum offered to Le Baron, a Huron-Petun. Did Louis Montour join these Natives in traveling with the intention to fight against the Iroquois? He can be documented as planning to go to Michilimackinac in 1692 in an endeavor estimated to take three years, thus to 1695, and he returned there by at least 1697. It seems possible he is the Montour of the above incident.

Darlington expresses no such restraint. On the basis of one mention of a Montour wounded in the French Colony and Lord Cornbury’s 1708 reference to a Montour appearing in Albany, Darlington assumes Madame Montour was one of the two daughters of Cornbury’s “Frenchman Montour” senior, placing her birth “in Canada about the year 1684” (the year of Isabelle’s marriage). Why “Montour” mentioned only two sisters to Cornbury will never be known; perhaps he referred only to the two sisters known to have been at Detroit, Isabelle and Marguerite. It is even possible he said no such thing but that both of these sisters were with him in New York in 1708 and Cornbury knew they were.

Darlington then proceeds to base his next suppositions on the version of Madame Montour’s life reported by Witham Marshe years later, in 1744. Marshe understood she was the daughter of a “French gentleman” who had been “governor” in Canada and that she had been “captured by some warriors of the Five Nations when she was but ten years old, taken to their country and brought up by them.” Since Marshe wrote that he understood that she claimed she had been taken about fifty years ago, Darlington calculated her birth year as sixty years before she spoke to Marshe, 1684.

Therefore, three isolated references, in the years 1695, 1708, and 1744, serve as the basis for his conclusions. Darlington obviously did not know that Montour’s sister fled Fort Pontchartrain for the English colonies; nor did he know Cadillac’s story about a sister-in-law of Maurice Ménard, La femme de

---


257 21 August 1692, Maugue, ANQ, photocopy. See earlier reference.

258 Sixteen men, Montour among them, were allowed to go up to Michilimackinac at the beginning of September 1697 with Sieur de Tonty capitaine Reformé, signed 28 October 1697 by Champigny. Photocopy.

259 Louis’s sister Jeanne died in 1679. Madeleine, wife of Maurice Ménard, had to have been at Michilimackinac in the 1690s because her son Antoine is recorded as having been baptized there in 1695. It is possible Antoine Laumet dit de Lamothe Cadillac served as godfather and gave the baby his first name. She was back in the mother colony by at least 13 March 1701, when son Pierre was baptized at Boucherville. Other children older than Pierre may also have been born in the pays d’en haut, but exactly where cannot be said. Madeleine most likely returned to Michilimakinac with her husband in 1713-14 and may have died there. I have no evidence Angélique traveled outside of the mother colony, except in 1719-20 to New York (to be presented subsequently), but several of her children, said to be born in the early 1690s, also have no extant baptismal records. None of Marguerite’s children have extant baptismal records. PRDH. All who married with the blessings of the Church, however, as did these children without extant records, did have to have been baptized somewhere.

260 Isabelle was gone from Fort Pontchartrain after September of 1706, and her sister Marguerite is documented there: 9 October 1707, Marguerite Cok, wife of Massé, godmother with Charles Fafard, son of Sieur Delorme, her first husband’s nephew, for baptism of Joseph, son of Joseph Soudinan(?), huron, & Sentralon(?), huronne, the first documented evidence of her there; and 20 March 1709, baptism of Marguerite, daughter of François Marquet dit Périgord and his wife Louise Galernaudo, but not in 1708.
Tichenet (formerly La femme de Germaneau) “marrying” a Loup (Mahican) Indian, and allegedly living with him for twelve years sometime after 1685. I wonder what he would have concluded had he known this tale.

Later in the same article, Darlington modifies his earlier statement:

Madame Montour evidently was older than she told Marshe, at Lancaster in 1744, as she was at Albany in 1711 as Mrs. Montour—her old age referred to in 1734 as her protection—and blind before 1754 [sic]. “It is probable that she was captured prior to 1696, after which year the raids of the Iroquois into Canada ceased for some time. That she was very young when captured, is clear. She could not have been less than sixty years old at the time of the treaty of Lancaster in 1744, and probably was older, and if but ten years of age when taken, as she said, the year of her captivity was 1694, and of her birth 1684.” [Quotation marks as in original]

Note the use of “probably” and “if,” qualifications usually ignored by those who cite Darlington or, without citing anyone, proclaim these deductions as fact. It does not even enter Darlington’s mind that Madame Montour herself may have “invented” her answers to Marshe, the inquisitive delegate from Maryland.

I’ve already quoted Logan’s description of Madame Montour as “ancient” in 1733. The allusions to “her old age referred to in 1734 as her protection—and blind before 1754 [sic]” also come from the United States colonial records and can probably be trusted. The mention of her being blind and led on horseback dates to 1746 and is reported by her son Andrew. William Hunter in the Dictionary of Canadian Biography writes: “In the following year [1746] her son Andrew moved to the Ohio [River valley], travelling from Logstown (Ambridge, Pa) to Venango (Franklin, Pa.) ‘in the Month of March, when his Mother who was blind rode on Horseback and he led the Horse on Foot all the Way.’ ”

Nevertheless, even though adding and subtracting are necessary skills in making conclusions about who an individual might be, first one must evaluate one’s sources. Not everything that appears in print is automatically accurate. Darlington, and many others, accept without question Madame Montour’s story reported by Marshe, just as many accept without question Lamothe Cadillac’s version of La Tichenette’s past. Misunderstandings, fabricated life stories, lies, slander, and simple typographical errors do exist even to this day. Just pick up a copy of the National Inquirer or even The New York Times.

---

261 I do not understand the use of internal quotation marks in this passage. Footnotes for this page refer to (1) Dussieux, Canada, and (2) Marshe’s Journal, with the (2) coming after this passage presented as a quotation, although it is not a direct quotation from Marshe. Darlington, p. 157.

262 See Part 4.

263 On 15 October 1734, the Iroquois Hetaquantagechty accused “a certain Woman” of making “some base Misrepresentations” and said “old Age only protects her from being punished for such Falsehoods; that in the mean time they must resent it and hope to get rid of her.” The reference is to a council on 15 September 1734, when it was “represented [that] by the Account given of those Indians [including Hetaquantagechty] by Mrs. Montour, now in Town, whose Husband, Carondowana, was the Oneida Chief, it appears that though they [Hetaquantagechty and his companions] are not Persons of any great Note amongst the Six Nations, yet they set out for this place at the Desire of some Chiefs of those Nations.” Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania, Vol. III, p. 578 and p. 572. See William Hunter’s biography of her in DCB III (1974), p. 147, but this too is in need of major revision.
Madame Montour according to Marshe

Witham Marshe went to interview “Mrs. Montour” on 28 June 1744 (O.S.), at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, while both he and she were attending the Treaty of 1744. Marshe, the secretary to the commissioners of Maryland at the 1744 treaty, visited her cabin specifically because he had heard about “the celebrated Mrs. Montour, a French lady (but now, by having lived so long among the Six Nations . . . become almost an Indian.” She was a “celebrity” to him, an exotic. In addition to her tale about her parentage and early life, he reports what he himself had previously heard about her [as recorded in the version cited by Hanna, emphasis mine]:

She has [(sic) another version reads “had”] been a handsome woman, genteel, and of polite address, notwithstanding her residence has been so long amongst the Indians; though formerly she was wont to accompany the several chiefs who used to renew treaties of friendship with the Proprietor and Governor of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia, the metropolis of that Province; and being a white woman was there very much caressed by the gentlewomen of that city, with whom she used to stay for some time. 264

That a French white woman could survive and thrive among the Indians and yet preserve her language (they spoke to each other in French), learn English, and be accepted by gentlewomen in society in Philadelphia is definitely a source of wonderment for Marshe. Had he not been titillated by her fame, would he even have bothered to visit? What if he had known she was the daughter of a Frenchman and an Algonquinne, thus, in the eyes of his contemporaries, a “half-breed”? What if he had known that later historians would call her “a slut”?

Hanna’s version of Marshe’s account mentions her children, whom Marshe identifies as “two of her daughters, by the war-captain, who were both married” and present with her in 1744, and only one son, who was “gone to war against the Catawbas”; but he does not reproduce Marshe’s description of Madame Montour’s grandson:

One of these young women had a son, about five years old, who, I think was one of the finest featured and limbed children mine eyes ever saw, and was not so tawny or greased as the other Indian children were, but on the contrary, his cheeks were ruddy, mixed with a delicate white, had eyes and hair of an hazel colour, and was neatly dressed in a green ban-jan, and his other garments were suitable. 265

264 Marshe’s Journal entry for June 28, 1744 (O.S.), as quoted in Hanna, Vol. 1, p. 201, emphasis mine. I have noted that Hanna changed several words and punctuation marks in his version of Marshe’s account; as examples, he uses the word “has” instead of “had been a handsome woman”; says that Madame Montour reported having two daughters (who the second daughter is, I do not know, perhaps a daughter-in-law?) with plural sons-in-law instead of one “son-in-law”; and omits two pertinent passages entirely, those which describe her grandchild, age five, also present, and he omits: “She is in great esteem with the best sort of white people, and by them always treated with abundance of civility; and whenever she went to Philadelphia (which formerly she did pretty often), the ladies of that city always invited her to their houses, entertained her well and made her several presents.” The other version I have seen was published in William Henry Egle’s Notes and Queries, Historical and Genealogical, chiefly relating to interior Pennsylvania, Vol. 1, Harrisburg, Penna.: Harrisburg Publishing Company, 1895, pp. 293-94. I do not know which is the typographically accurate version nor whether the original manuscript copy still exists. Hanna does not cite the version he is copying, but he does refer to Egle in other citations.

265 Ibid., p. 294.
Why Hanna chose not to include this description will never be known. He does include the detail that Madame Montour had not remarried after the death of her husband “about fifteen years ago,” a detail confirmed by Carondowana’s documented death in 1729. Count Zinzendorf, in 1742, wrote about their son Andrew: “Andrew’s cast of countenance is decidedly European, and had his face not been encircled with a broad band of paint, applied with bear’s fat, I would certainly have taken him for one.”

Hanna does cite Zinzendorf, so he must have read this description.

Cadwaller Colden, in 1759, just six years after Madame Montour was reported to be deceased, wrote that Governor Hunter of New York had

allwise a French woman standing by him, who had married one of our Indians, to inform him whether the interpreters had done their part truly between him and the Indians, notwithstanding that Col. Schuyler was present at the same time. This woman, commonly called Madame Montour, had a good education in Canada before she went among the Indians, and was very useful to Mr. Hunter on many occasions, for which reason she had a Pension, and was sometimes admitted to his table in her Indian dress.

Colden arrived in New York by 1719, when he was named first surveyor general. His use of the word “commonly” suggests she may not be using her husband’s or even her birth name.

In none of these references is Madame Montour herself said to be of mixed parentage, nor is she so-identified in the references to Isabelle Couc at Fort Pontchartrain. In speaking to Marshe, “Mrs. Montour” apparently said only that her father was “a French gentleman” and “governor” in Canada. Was Isabelle shrewd enough to know that being of so-called “mixed blood,” the daughter of an Algonquinne, would be a political disadvantage to her? Cornbury, also, reports Montour was “the son of a French gentleman,” although he clearly says Montour’s mother was an Indian. Louis seems not to have obscured his First Nation ancestry.

The imprecision about their parents has led many English language sources to accept without question even more speculations put forward about Louis Montour and Madame Montour. Thus, some claim Isabelle / Madame Montour is the illegitimate daughter of a governor of New France, an extrapolation on the story Witham Marshe reported he heard from her lips. This “governor” is most often guessed to be Frontenac, based on an allegation that “he is charged with ‘debasing the morals of the Colony by propagating more than sixty half-breeds.’” Actually, Marshe does not mention Frontenac, or any other name, only that he understood Madame Montour to say her father was a “gentleman” and a “governor” in

266 Written by Zinzendorf as an entry for 30 September 1742, as quoted in Hanna, Vol. 1, p. 223. It was common knowledge that Carondowana was his father.
268 28 June 1744 (O.S.), cited by Vincens, Madame Montour, pp. 33-34, in a French translation, and partially quoted by Hanna, pp. 200-202 in English.
269 Louis de Buade de Frontenac and de Palluau was governor of New France from 1672 to 1682 and again from 1689 to his death in November of 1698 at Québec at the age of seventy-seven. See DCB, Vol. I.
270 Hanna states: “Buell, in his Life of Johnson, says: ‘Catharine [Madeleine?] {sic} Montour was a daughter of the Count de Frontenac by a Huron woman. She was born at Fort Frontenac about 1692 [1680-84, or earlier] {sic}, and her name figures in a curious old document called Accusation against Louis de Buade, Comte de Frontenac, in which, among other things, he is charged with ‘debasing the morals of the Colony by propagating more than sixty half-breeds.’ “ Information in brackets as found in the original, except for my use of sic in curly brackets. I have been unable to find the “curious old document.” Charles Hanna, Wilderness Trail, Vol. 1, p. 201, footnote 2.
Canada. How good was Marshe’s French? The governor of France was called Onontio (Great Mountain) by the Indians, and he was also addressed as "mon père," my Father, by the Nations who interacted with the French.

Isabelle could not possibly have been taken by the Indians as a child, also Marshe’s understanding. She was confirmed in 1678, age eleven; served as godmother in 1682, age fifteen; witnessed Angélique’s marriage contract the same year; and married 1684, age seventeen, all events documented earlier in my articles, and, as will be seen, Conrad Weiser stated she had fled from Canada with her family, although he did not know why. As in Cadillac’s tale about her living twelve years with a Loup Indian, the math just does not compute. It is possible she (and her brother) may have lived for a time among the Miami prior to (or after) the Detroit years, considering her apparent friendship with Pierre Roy’s wife, Marguerite OuabanKiKoué, since she served twice as godmother for Roy infants.271

**Madame Montour’s Connection with the Miami**

She had another link with the Miami Indians. In the United States colonial documents, “Mistress Montour” is said to have a sister “married to a Miami,” according to James Letort’s report at a council in Philadelphia 18 April 1728 (O.S.). Letort, an Indian Trader, said he had recently been given information “by Mistress Montour, who had married the Indian called Robert Hunter [Carondowana took this name out of respect for the governor], & was here [Philadelphia] with her said husband last summer.” She told him:

> the people of the five Nations had sent to the Miamis and Twechtweys, called also the naked Indians, settled at the Western end of the Lake Erie, within the french claims, desireing [sic] them to engage & take up the Hatchet of War against the English & Christians.”273

He had planned to journey to trade with the Miamis “last Fall”, 1727, and thus he had

---

271 The friendship of the Roy and Montour families evidently continued because on 30 October 1711, Magdeleine, daughter of Joseph Montour (believed to be the son of Louis Montour & Jeanne, an Algonquinne) & Isabelle Monthio (PRDH version, but I read “Ononthio”), a Huronne, at Détroit, was baptized with godparents Pierre Roy & Marguerite Fafard, cousin to Joseph (Ste. Anne). 1711 is the year Madame Montour begins to appear in the extant documents as an interpretress in New York so this “Isabelle,” wife of Joseph Montour and a Huron, cannot be the wife of Carondowana. Could this “Huronne,” with the name “Ononthio,” the name given to the governor of New France by the Indians since the days of Montmagny (Great Mountain = Onontio), be a source for “Mrs. Montour” being the daughter of a governor? She too would have been called “Mrs. Montour” by the English. Another child, Joseph, was born to Joseph Montour and Elisabeth (an alternate name for her just as it was for her aunt), hurone du detroit, in January of 1714 and baptized at Montréal 23 July 1714 (six months old). Godparents were Pierre Crepeau & Marie Joseph Cusler. Pierre signed P. Creseau, photocopy. Pierre had been a Frère Charon, religious brother, from 1704 to before 1712, when he married Angélique Aubuchon, from a voyageur family, on 17 May 1712. He was a brewer. His wife died and was buried 12 May 1714, just two months before Joseph’s baptism. He remarried to Marie Leduc (Lambert & Jeanne Descaries), cousin of Pierre Leduc dit Souligny, who married Françoise Massé, Joseph Montour’s cousin.

272 His father was Jacques Letort, whom Hanna identifies as a Frenchman Huguenot refugee who came to Pennsylvania from London in 1686, Vol. 1, p. 165.

consulted Mrs. Montour, a French woman, Wife to Carondowana, about his journey thither, who having lived amongst & having a sister married to one of that Nation he believed might be a proper person to advise him.  

The alleged “sister” among the Miamis could well be Marguerite Couc, Isabelle’s true sister, although she was not, as far as is known, married to a Miami. She is documented at the Saint Joseph Mission (now Niles, Michigan) between 1720 and 1723. After John Henry Lydius, originally from Albany, married her daughter Geneviève Massé in Montréal in 1727, the year Letort consulted Madame Montour, she may have returned there, or to the Ouiatanon (Miami) post (West Lafayette, Indiana), or to St. Philip on the Maumee, nearer Lake Erie (modern-day Fort Wayne, Indiana), where Pierre Roy and his family lived from about 1720 to their deaths by about 1732-33. Marguerite may even have voyaged to New York, because the Miamis are documented as trading with the English after the erection of an English trading post at Chouaguen (Oswego). These eighteenth century people traveled far more than I ever imagined before I began my examination of the original documents. Or this “sister married to a Miami” could have been Carondowana’s “sister” or even Louis Couc Montour’s wife, perhaps now remarried. The terms “sister” and “brother” and “son” and “daughter” were used fairly loosely among the Indians, and even among the French, to designate “in-laws.” Or it is possible Letort may simply have misunderstood. He would not be the first or last to do so.

At the very least, Isabelle did have ties with the Miami through her acquaintance with the Pierre Roy family and, as will be seen, the Roy family is documented at the St. Philip Miami post by 1720, at the latest. The couple was still definitely at St. Philippe Miamis eight years later when their daughter Magdeleine married Pierre Chesne (dit Labutte) on 25 May 1728.

---


275 People who know I read and understand French often assume I was born in French Canada instead of in Detroit to French-Canadian parents. It is possible Letort had a similar misunderstanding about Madame Montour’s sister. He may have wondered why a French woman would live among the Miamis if she was not married to one.


277 Ouiatenon on the Ouabache was “but three days’ journey from a nine-mile portage (at present-day Fort Wayne, Indiana) connecting the Maumee and Wabash rivers. … St. Philippe des Miamis (Fort Miami) was established to guard the portage in 1722.” Noble, p. 67. Actually, it may have existed before 1722, perhaps by 1718.

278 Pierre Roy was ordered to take himself, his wife and children, and his possessions to Fort Pontchartrain, to winter there, and to return the following spring to the new colony. See an English language excerpt of the instructions in Frances Krauskopf, translator and editor, *Ouiatanon Documents*, Indianapolis, Indiana Historical Society, 1955, specifically p. 167. As summarized on the Canadian Archives ArchiviaNet: 3611

Extrait du mémoire de Vaudreuil pour servir d'instruction à l'enseigne Dumont qui s'en va commander au pays des Ouiatanons et à la rivière des Miamis - lettres à remettre à Tonty; les voyageurs munis de congés et les marchandises resteront à Détroit jusqu'à ce qu'on sache si les Miamis et les Ouiatanons quitteront leurs villages ou non; ira avec Reaume au village des Miamis et communiquera à Pierre Roy et aux autres Français l'ordre de quitter ce village et de se retirer à Détroit; demandera à Vinsenne "de le venir joindre" au village des Miamis; tâchera de convaincre les Miamis de s'établir à la rivière Saint-Joseph et les Ouiatanons de s'installer sur le Téatiki. Colonial Archives Item part of: Fonds des Colonies. Série C11A. Correspondance générale; Canada MG 1 - Microfilm of original, reel no. F-42, Volume 42 , fol. 158-160v.

The full letter refers specifically to Roy’s wife, children and possessions and to the other details.

279 Photocopy of marriage contract written by Father Dominique Thaumur at St Philippe and deposited 30 July 1728 in the Étude of J. B. Adémar, ANQ. Marriage act inserted in the records of Ste. Anne de Detroit. Magdeleine’s
Continuing his report, Letort says:

she seemed very much to approve of the same [his voyage to the Miamis], upon which he proposed that she & her husband should goe [sic] along with him, which she readily agreed to, & that she appeared very cheerfull & desirous to undertake the Journey.²⁸⁰

Letort was not able to set out that fall of 1727 but did seek the approval of Manawkyhickon, “an Indian Chief of Note.” Manawkyhickon, though, had “discouraged him, telling him he might happen in his way to see some white heads, who come to hunt not for Skins but for flesh and scalps”. Later when he spoke again with

Mistress Montour about their intended Journey, she told him she could not goe with him, for that she had heard some news that he was a stranger to, with which she would acquaint him, but he must by no means lett [sic] it be known that she was his author.²⁸¹

The news involved, in addition to the warning cited above, a Delaware Indian woman, “whose son had been killed some time agoe [sic] by a Shawanese.” She had sent Manawkyhickon

a Long Belt of black Wampum of twelve Rows, Desiring that by means thereof her tears might be wiped away, that Manawkyhickon had sent his black Belt to the five Nations, and that the five Nations sent the same to the Miamies, with a message desiring to know if they would lift up their Axes, and joyn [sic] with them against the Christians, to which they agreed.²⁸²

Letort then “acquainted Mrs. Montour of his Design of communicating what she told him to our Governour, they [sic] answered he might do so, for it was with that intention she had acquainted him with it.”²⁸³

Letort again questioned Manawkyhickon about whether he was aware of any further news, but when “he would tell him nothing,” Letort informed him about what he himself had heard, “at which the Indian appeared surprized, admiring who could inform him of these things, but that at length He (Manawkyhickon) own [sic, admitted] to him that both these were true.”²⁸⁴

It seems, as Letort continued in his report to the board, Manawkyhickon was “a near relation of Wequeala, who was hang’d last year in Jersey, that he much resented his Death, & went immediately after to the five Nations” to seek revenge. This threat of violence was not, however, the only potential conflict. After consulting with Madame Montour, Letort himself had met with the Iroquois,

who told him, on his enquiring of them for news, That the French Governour, at his return to Montreal last year from New York, where he went about the new fort built by the English near the Lakes [at Oswego, New York], sent for the chiefs of all the Nations about Canada in Alliance

sister, Marguerite, and her husband, Guillaume Dupont, returned to Québec City that year after Magdeleine’s marriage. See my article on Marguerite Roy, MHH, October 2003.

²⁸⁰ MPCP.
²⁸² Ibid, p. 296.
²⁸³ Ibid. Emphasis mine.
²⁸⁴ Ibid. Emphasis mine.
with the French, & told them he wanted them to pull down a certain house that had been lately built, but the Chiefs answered, that could not be his business with them to pull down a house, if he wanted them to goe to War he should tell them so. The Governour answered that he could not say that, but would send them to the Chief Governour at Quebeck [sic], who would give them an answer, that the Governour of Quebeck received them very kindly, & sent them back with a Letter to the Governour of Montreal, who told them on receipt of the Letter, that they, viz: the Governours would write to their Master the King of France, & desired the Indians in the mean time to goe home & be in readiness till the King’s orders came.285

In 1728, the “governour” at Montréal was Claude Michel Bégon, who was sent to New York in the summer of 1727 to expel the English from their new Fort Oswego (Chouaguen). He is the brother of Michel Bégon, who, in 1720, had authorized La St Serny (Angélique Couc) to keep her écarlatines (red English strouts or duffel cloth), a gift from her sister, La Germano, in English territory. I will discuss this visit in Part 8. The “house that had been lately built” at Oswego was the English response to the stone fort erected by 1726 at Niagara (across the Niagara River from modern-day Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario) by Joncaire, the French agent responsible for carrying out the killing of Louis Montour. Vincens reports that a year after Fort Oswego opened, 1,200 packets of beaver were received there because “the Western Nations were enchanted that they no longer had to travel as far as Albany to trade; the Miamis bluntly invited the English to go to them; their emissaries were none other than ‘Jean Fafard alias Maconce and Joseph Montour, son of the assassinated Montour.’ ”286 (See my Part 3) The governor at Québec City and of all New France was Beauharnois, who at that time was still supporting John Henry Lydius, husband of Geneviève Massé and nephew-in-law of Isabelle, another fact to be examined in Part 8. The “Nations about Canada in Alliance with the French” waiting “in readiness till the French King’s orders came” would include the Miamis.

Although the council board “were of the opinion, that there is no great Dependance [sic] to be had on this information of Montour’s,” further inquiries were to be made, and the governor of Pennsylvania ordered that “three Matchcoats be given to James Letort & John Scull, to be by them delivered to Allummapees, Mrs. Montour & Manawkyhickon.”287 The further inquiries and subsequent outbreaks of violence on the frontier confirmed the truth of Mistress Montour’s warning.288 It seems she was definitely knowledgeable about the political maneuvers of both the French and English colonies. The fact that Madame Montour’s daughter, Marie Anne Montour, and Isabelle Couc’s goddaughter, Marguerite Roy, can be documented in the mother colony, specifically in Québec City in 1728, is also of interest, appearances to be considered

285 Ibid., 296. See also S. Dale Standen, “Beauharnois de La Boische, Charles de, Marquis de Beauharnois,” DCB, Vol. III.

286 Vincens, p. 243, citing Norton and the same document I cited in Part 3. The Miamis trading with the English in 1731-32 returned with the deadly smallpox, which spread throughout the pays d’en haut, including Detroit (taking the life of Pierre Roy’s wife, Marguerite 8abanKiK8é on 31 October) and, transported by the domiciled Indians who traded in Albany, even in the mother colony of New France, where almost 2000 deaths were said to have occurred because of it. 287 MPCP, p. 297.

288 “At a Council held at Philda., September 1st, 1728 (O.S.), All those appearances of disquiet among the Indians seemed more & more to confirm the information which James Letort gave this Board in April last, & that it was not to be doubted but they were, in a great measure, owing to the practices of Manawkyhickon, who, in Resentment for the Death of his relation Wequeala, hang’d last year in Jersey, has been endeavouring, not only to stir up the Twechtwese or naked Indians, call’d by the French Miamies, against the Christians, but likewise if possible, to sett the five Nations at variance with the English.” Ibid., p. 330.
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later in this work. Marguerite Roy had left Fort Saint Philippe in May of 1728. And it seems significant that, about this time, nephews of Louis and Isabelle Couc begin to use the *dit* name of Montour.

I have quoted at length from the 1728 council at Philadelphia to have it serve as a counterpoint to the “tale” told in 1744 by “the celebrated Madame Montour,” as recorded by Marshe. The eighteenth century was no more immune to rumor, speculation, sensationalism, innuendo, and out-right lies than is the twenty-first. Nor are historians, now and in the past, unmarred by misinterpreting their sources or slanting their versions of history. In my study of the Couc / Montour family, I have not been satisfied to accept the information provided by indexes and other secondary publications because I learned not to trust them when I myself examined the primary sources and the ways in which they were interpreted. Marshe, Darlington, Hanna, and some of the translations of French colonial documents just do not hold up to a careful analysis once other documents are consulted.

In 1744, Isabelle was seventy-seven years old, her Iroquois husband deceased since 1729, just two years after she began to interpret for the government of Pennsylvania in 1727. The move to Pennsylvania took place after the French fort was erected at Niagara in 1726, followed by English Fort Oswego, and, preceded in 1725 by the death of Governor Vaudreuil. Her brother, Louis Couc *dit* Montour, had been assassinated thirty-five years earlier by Louis Thomas Chabert, sieur de Joncaire, with the approval of the governor of New France, Philippe Rigaud de Vaudreuil. In a 1721 letter to Vaudreuil, William Burnet, then governor of New York replacing Hunter, protested this “infamous murder” that had occurred twelve years earlier, saying Joncaire deserved to be hanged. Vaudreuil, in 1706, knew that La Tichenette had served as *truchement* (go-between or interpreter) for Cadillac and that she was related to Montour, as documented above. In 1709, after Montour’s death, Vaudreuil gave as one of the reasons for approving the assassination of Montour that he was the issue of a marriage between a Frenchman and a female Indian, a *sauvagesse*; and, according to him, offspring of such marriages cause the most trouble for the French. He used this as a reason for not allowing marriages between the new colonists of Fort Pontchartrain in 1706 and Native women, a decision Pontchartrain questioned but later upheld. It seems Vaudreuil objected most to the independence and free spirit these children of two cultures demonstrated. Yet, in 1719, he wished Madame Montour to return to New France.

Isabelle most likely witnessed the assassination of her brother but then continued to lead the Indians recruited by him to trade at Albany in 1709. Under the name Madame Montour, first name “Eysabelle,” wife of Carondowana, she is documented as an interpreter and advisor to the New York government by August 1711, when she appeared at a conference in Albany between Governor Robert Hunter and the leaders of the Iroquois. Hunter himself, writing to Kilian Van Rensselaer the following year, 15 May 1712 (O.S.) said: “I beg you’ll countenance [give or express approval to] Mrs. Montour for I shall never be able to hear the truth but by her means,” another ironic counterpoint to the “tales” she told and the tales told about her. These last references are found in the United States colonial records, but she is also documented under her other names in the records of New France, one of which I found in 2002, which I will consider in Part 8, and, after that, I will document the next generation of the Couc / Montour family.

---

289 Written in French, Letter from William Burnet, 11 July 1721, NAC, photocopy.
290 Peter Van Brugh and Hendrick Hansen, already cited.
291 Letter from Robert Hunter, governor of New York, to Kilian Van Rensselaer, Albany, 15 May 1712, photocopy of manuscript from the New York Historical Society.
At the end of Part 7, I stated that the French and English colonial documents and other records I have cited in these articles leave little doubt as to the identity of Montour and Madame Montour. Other surviving documents reinforce their identity. As will be seen, they have not been cited previously in relation to the Couc / Montour family in published works I have read.

Document #1

The first court martial at Fort Pontchartrain, held in 1707, includes testimony that Isabelle Couc (called wife of Tichenet, la femme de Tichenet, La Tichenette) and her brother Montour were planning to go to Orange (Albany, New York) to stay there forever. Now, it’s one thing to be reported as intending to go somewhere and quite another to actually be documented there.

I have learned that by two years later, 1709, the governor of New France, Philippe de Rigaud, sieur de Vaudreuil, knew that "latichenette" was among the Iroquois of New York.

"Parolles des jroquois Sonnontouans et ounontaguez a Mr LeMarquis de Vaudreüil"
8 August 1710

In a 1710 council held at Montréal with representatives of the Five Nations, Vaudreuil specifically refers to "latichenette" as “a bad spirit,” un mauvais ésprit, who, he believed (or at least affirmed), had influenced someone named Bienville to go to Lake Champlain the previous year, 1709, to attack the French or their allies, faire coup Sur nos gens, and to take prisoners to Orange as part of England’s planned invasion of New France, an invasion that never took place. The Senecas and Onondagas at the council in 1710 told him the incident may not have been reported truthfully; they themselves did not believe everything they heard, and he should not believe all the evil rumors, les mauvais bruits, including those about the Iroquois preparing to attack New France (and about la femme de Tichenet?).

293 This was the Vetch “Glorious Enterprise” that was abandoned. See Bruce T. McCully, “Catastrophe in the Wilderness: New Light on the Canada Expedition of 1709,” William and Mary Quarterly, Vol. XI, Oct., 1954, pp. 441-456, especially page 453. McCully comments on examples of censorship on a document describing the “Camp at the Wood Creek reviewed,” dated at Albany, August 16, 1709, which is included in the article.
294 “Parolles des jroquois Sonnontouans et ounontaguez a Mr LeMarquis de Vaudreüil,” 8 August 1710, NAC F-31, f 105 of ff. 98-105v. These Iroquois had come to condole (mourn) the death of Jesuit Father Lamberville, who had served in their country, and for whom they had always had esteem and consideration. In connection with the previous year’s attempted invasion, they affirmed that they would not accept the hatchet of war offered them either by the English or the French but would remain neutral. I have not yet determined who Bienville could be, but see DCB I for François Le Moyné de Bienville, older brother of both Charles, sieur de Longueuil, and Jean-Baptiste,
had authorized the killing of La Tichenette’s brother, Louis Couc dit Montour, that very year of the alleged incident, 1709, because he led Western Indians to trade at Albany. Montour’s sister continued to lead the Indians after her brother’s death, as reported in the New York documents. Thus both Montour’s sister and La Tichenette are documented in New York in 1709.

Document #2


Ten years later, in 1719, the same Governor Vaudreuil sent “la St Serny” to Nouvelle Angleterre to try to convince her sister to come back to Nouvelle France. The woman “la St Serny,” who traveled to the English colony in 1719, is named on the ordonnance document dated 14 November 1720 as both “Magdeleine [sic] Montour” and sister to a woman named La Germano, then in the English colonies.

While it is true, La St Serny is called “Magdeleine Montour” on the document, this is a clear error, as “Magdeleine” Couc is la femme de Ménard. The only femme de St Serny (various spellings) in 1719 is Angélique Couc, sister of Madeleine, Marguerite, and Isabelle. There is only one possible La Germano (la femme de Germano, or wife of Germano), and she is Isabelle Couc, sister of both Madeleine and la femme de St Serny, Angélique. The wife of François Delpé dit St Serny / St Cery / Saint-Serny. Simone Vincens (in 1979), and I (in 1999) have cited the 1720 ordonnance, but I appear to be the first to have read a photocopy of the original, manuscript document, in the spring of 1999, and first to have seen the La Germano, a detail not reported by Vincens.

The visit is also referenced in the New York documents because Madame Montour requested payment there for her services as interprêtrès. As Alison Hirsch reports, Madame Montour used her sister’s objective in visiting (to convince her to work for Vaudreuil instead of continuing to live with and interpret for the English in Albany, New York) as leverage to acquire the pay she had not been receiving for some time. The New York officials approved continuing her on the payroll. Vincens also cites their decision, reporting they “considered she could do much harm to this [the New York] government if she returned to

named sieur de Bienville after François’s death in 1691. François may have served in “Governor Brisay de Denonville’s campaign against the Iroquois in 1687,” and, in February 1690, he accompanied the expedition against Corlaer (Schenectady, N.Y.).” Is it possible he fathered a son there before his death, one who carried his name? Jean Baptiste Lemoyne, sieur de Bienville, later served with Cadillac in Louisiane.


Madeleine is erroneously named Marguerite on a document. And, on Geneviève Massé’s marriage contract in 1727, Geneviève’s mother is first called Marguerite, and later in the same document Isabelle. PRDH and photocopies.

Hirsch (2000) cites NYC Mss., 57: 168; 62: 1; NYCM, 13: 163. “Saratoga—now Schuylerville, above Albany—was the home of French refugees from Canada, so Isabelle may have been interpreting for them as well as for the Iroquois. The petition [to be paid] itself has not survived; it may have been the document that New York contracted David Le Tellier to ‘translate.’ The phrase ‘a man's pay’ has been misread to mean that she was asking to be paid the same as a man, a sort of proto–feminist seeking equal pay for equal work.” Hirsch writes that Isabelle “threatened to leave the British, claiming that the government of New France had sent her sister to persuade her to return to Canada.”, p. 95. Emphasis mine. It was not a claim; it was the truth. I have not yet seen the documents cited by Hirsch.
Canada and would render important services if she remained.”

At that time, écarlatines were treated as contraband in New France if owned by non-Natives. In a judgment of 4 June 1719, “arrêt en conseil du 4 juin 1719,” the very year of La St Serny’s visit to her sister, the agents of the Compagnie des Indes, then in charge of the fur trade, had even been “authorised to make whatever visits they deemed appropriate to all the homes of the habitants of Nouvelle France, without distinguishing between religious or secular, being accompanied by an officer of justice to search and confiscate any merchandise of foreign manufacture, the which should be burned in public.”

Canoes and other bateaux returning to the French colony were also inspected.

Angélique, La St Serny, appealed the confiscation of the gift from her sister; and, in 1720, Intendant Bégon issued the judicial order to restore the écarlatines to her because Governor Vaudreuil had authorized the voyage and allowed her to accept, without fear, any presents her sister might give her: sans crainte ce que sa dite soeur luy pourroit donner. The ordonnance reads:

The Sieur Rocbert garde magasin [storehouse keeper] is ordered to return the four pieces of écarlatines to femme St Serny, Monsieur le Marquis de Vaudreuil having said he allowed her to carry them with her because LA GERMANO [my emphasis], her sister, gave them to her.

Thus Bégon, the intendant and author of the ordonnance knew the sister in the English colonies was at some time wife of Germano. This is the first (but not the only) reference I located definitely linking the name Germano / Germaneau to Isabelle / Madame Montour while she was in exile in New York.

Vincens cites a letter from the commissioners of Albany to Peter Schuyler, 25 September 1719, New York State Archives, and quotes from it. This is my English translation of her French translation from English. I have not seen the source document. Note that this is also Beauharnois’s argument about Lydius ten years later.

The problem of the Natives’ preference for écarlatines is clearly stated as early as 1709, novembre, 14, Lettre des intendants Raudot au ministre: “sale of the écarlatines and blue cloth that the Indians like (prefer) must be permitted in order to prevent all of the beaver skins from being carried to Orange, especially through the intervention of the Indians of Sault Saint Louis: (‘il faut permettre la vente des écarlatines et du drap bleu que les Indiens aiment pour éviter que tout le castor ne soit porté à Orange, notamment par l'entremise des Indiens du Sault-Saint-Louis’), summary of Série C11A, Vol. 30, NAC F-30, ff. 271-320v, from ArchiviaNet search tool at the National Archives of Canada web site. On the original, the word Indians is sauvages. The French unsuccessfully tried to duplicate the English workmanship and eventually authorized purchase of English cloth to sell to the Indians.

Histoire du commerce canadien-français de Montréal 1535-1893: un souvenir, Saint-Pierre, T. (Télésphore), 1869-1912. 138 pages. Montréal? : Sabiston, 1894? P. 31. The following year, 1720, those who denounced contraband holders received the profits of the sale of the contraband. I do not know who “denounced” La St Serny. In 1722, the denouncers did not even have to wait for an evaluation of the value of the contraband, which was determined at a fixed price, prix fixe. On 14 mai 1726, no one without permission was allowed to travel to Nouvelle Angleterre. Read at Early Canadiana online, my translation. Many of the permissions granted survive. See ArchiviaNet search tool, Colonial Documents.

The brother of Etienne Rocbert, Jacques Urbain Rocbert, sieur de Lamorandière, was the principal “cômis de Messieurs de la Compagnie” of the Colony, then in charge of trade at Le Détroit in 1705. On 30 May (Adhémar) he was part of a group, including Jaques Cardinal, Pierre Mauriceau, Louis Lefebvre, and Pierre Lescuyer, hired by the Compagnie to go to fort le pont Chartrain du lac Érie. ANQ, photocopy. Note that Pierre Mauriceau had known Montour in 1699 Michilimackinac. See Part 4.
This name, *La Germano*, is a reference I found on a copy of the original document, which I cited in October of 1999 in *Michigan’s Habitant Heritage*. When I first read the name, I was surprised that Simone Vincens had not included it in her citation in 1979, as she did report the official decision. She may have read a handwritten copy of the original, or an abstract, because the handwritten copy does not correctly transcribe the name. I have seen both copy and original, and the original definitely reads *La Germano*. Multiple misreadings and faulty transcriptions appear on both handwritten and typed copies of original records. It is always safest to go to the original document, when this is possible.

Upon finding the 1720 reference to *La Germano*, I couldn’t help but be struck by the fact that Isabelle’s son, Michel Germaneau, and her daughter, Marie Anne Germaneau, are documented for the first time in New France in Montréal by 1717 and 1718 respectively, two years and one year before Angélique’s visit to her sister. (Had the family lost touch with Isabelle after she left Detroit?) Not quite two years after the visit, 11 July 1721, Governor William Burnet wrote to Governor Vaudreuil to affirm that “Joncaire has for a long time deserved the hangman’s noose for the infamous murder of Montour”. Burnet had arrived to replace Robert Hunter as governor of New York in September 1720 and, by the following year, had obviously informed himself about the incident that had occurred twelve years earlier.

In 1721-22, Marie Anne Germaneau traveled to “Orange” with her cousins (so identified on the document), Louis and Marie Madeleine Ménard, children of Madeleine Couc and Maurice Ménard, shortly after Burnet’s letter was written. Marie Anne Germaneau’s name appears only in the text of the document (to be presented next as Document #3) but not in any index I was able to consult. One year later, in 1723, the Couc sisters sold the Trois Rivières property given to Isabelle at her marriage. Angélique had somehow obtained permission for the sale from Isabelle, Madeleine, and Marguerite, as she stated she was acting in their names and with their consent.

**Document #3**

**The Ordonnance of 15 July 1722**

This document was cited in my October 2003 *Michigan’s Habitant Heritage* article on Marguerite Roy after I had written my early version of this one, and will be added here. It refutes the assertions by some historians that Isabelle’s daughter either had no contact with or was not acknowledged by her French-Canadian cousins. Marie Anne traveled to Orange with two of her Ménard cousins, Louis and Marie Madeleine Ménard, children of her aunt Madeleine (Couc) and Maurice Ménard. I know this now because her name is included among those individuals accused in an “Ordonnance between Sr. Cugnet and Marie Magdeleine Menard, Louis Menard and others,” as titled, of having gone there without permission. If I had not sent for this document in 2002, I would not have discovered that among the “others” so accused is

---

302 Vincens, p. 241.
303 “Nouvelle France, Ordonnances des intendents 29 juin 1720 - 17 decembre 1721,” MG 8, Ag vol. 6, ff. 148-49, 14 November 1720 (a handwritten copy of the original), reads Vaudreuil “avoir permis d’apporter avec elle tout ce que la Germaisse sa soeur luy donneroit,” as best I can read the transcription handwriting, which, unfortunately, is more difficult to read than the original.
304 Written in French, Letter from William Burnet, 11 July 1721, NAC, photocopy. See Part 7.
305 A transcription of this *ordonnance* of 15 July 1722, is found on NAC microfilm of Fonds des Ordonnances des Intendants de la Nouvelle-France, MG 8-A6, film C-13588, Vol 7, pp. 181-91, and I now have the original from Les Archives du Québec, photocopy.
306 11 June 1723, Notary Pierre Petit, ANQ TR, photocopy.

Suzanne Boivin Sommerville, © 2014, all rights reserved
Marie Anne Germaneau, “cousine” of “brother and sister Louis Menard and Marie Magdeleine Menard, femme de Jean-Baptiste Renaudet,” Magdeleine’s second husband. The summary of the proceedings against these people indicates that Marie Anne Germaneau could not be interrogated because she had remained in Nouvelle Angleterre. Thus I am now sure she and her cousins were in Orange, or Albany, at the same time her mother, Madame Montour, was interpreting for the government of New York.

I was not, however, checking an index, a transcription copy, or a full original document when I found the next item. Its discovery resulted from my research on Isabelle’s nephew-by-marriage, John Henry Lydius.

**Document #4**

First some background. Six years after Angélique traveled to New York, Governor Vaudreuil died in 1725 and was replaced, first, by Charles Lemoyné, Baron de Longueuil, as interim governor, to whom I will again refer, and then by Charles de Beauharnois de la Boische, Marquis de Beauharnois, the brother of François de Beauharnois, the intendant of 1704 who authorized the questioning of “Elisabeth Couk” at Fort Pontchartrain in connection with the legal trial against Cadillac. (See Part 6.)

Madame Montour seems to have relocated to Pennsylvania about the time of Vaudreuil’s death, shortly before or after. There she and her husband, also known as Robert Hunter after the former governor of New York, worked for the Pennsylvania authorities by 1727. The first surviving evidence of her there is at a “Council held at Philadelphia, July 3d, 1727,” when Governor Patrick Gordon met several chiefs of the Five Nations but “most of them of the Nation of the Cayoogoes [Cayugas].” “Tannewhannegah spoke, & by Montour the Interpretess [sic] his words were conveyed to the Governor. In turn, the “Governour” spoke to them “by M[rs]. Montour, a french Woman, who had lived long among these People, and is now Interpretess.” The council met again on 4 July with the same “interpretess” and ordered payment to “the Interpretess 1 Stroud, 1 Shirt, 1 Matchcoat. To her Husband, Carondawana [sic] 1 Strowd, & another to her Niece.”

These details have been reported several times by several writers, with speculation about who this “Niece” is. Although I do not know her identity with any certainty, she could be, perhaps, Joseph Montour’s wife, Isabelle / Elisabeth Ononthio, Huronne, Isabelle’s niece-by-marriage, who gave birth to a Magdeleine (Fort Pontchartrain, baptized 30 October 1711) and a Joseph Montour (born in January of 1714 and baptized at Montréal 23 July 1714, six months old). Joseph Montour, son of the Montour who was assassinated, is documented in New York in 1725, along with Jean Fafard dit Maconce, nephew of

---

307 DCB III, p. 41.
308 Madame Montour may have been in Pennsylvania earlier. Francis Jennings identifies a “Cakundawanna” present in Pennsylvania in 1714 representing the Iroquois, as most likely actually Carondowana. Whether he simply traveled back and forth from New York to fulfill this role is unknown. *Ambiguous Iroquois Empire*, New York, 1984, p. 265. Isabelle appears to have continued to interpret in New York in a private capacity for Governor Robert Hunter at least to 1720. She was living in Pennsylvania by, at the latest, the 1730s.
309 *Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania*, Vol. III, pp. 271-276, FHL microfilm #0844502, vols. 2-3. Emphasis mine. The council met again on 5 July; and before leaving, the Natives “further requested a Writing to Shew that the Governor Allowed them to Stave [break or smash a hole in the container] any Rum they mett with in the Woods, which was promised with this Limitation, that they should not meddle with any Rum they found in any houses whatsoever, and that they should not on any account seize any to drink or carry it away. . . ”. All copied as written.
310 See Part 8.
the same Montour, as I cited in Part 3 and also in Part 7. She could be Isabelle’s niece, “French Margaret,” daughter of Marguerite Couc and Jean Fafard dit Maconte. Or, although less likely, I wondered, could the “Niece” of 1727 be Geneviève Massé?

In the same year of 1727, when Madame Montour was in Pennsylvania, an ordonnance or law was passed by French royal decree prohibiting strangers, even naturalized ones—strangers mesme naturalizes—from engaging in any commerce in the Colonies francaises, except that involving agriculture, la Culture des terres. It did not arrive in New France until mid-year. In response to the ordonnance two years later, in October of 1729, Governor Beaucharnois wrote to the then-Minister in France, Maurepas, son of Pontchartrain, because he, the governor, was concerned about John Henry Lydius. In February of 1727, Lydius had married Geneviève Massé, Isabelle’s niece, the daughter of Marguerite Couc and her second husband, Michel Massé. It seemed unlikely but not impossible that the “niece” of July 1727 could have been Geneviève Massé. The couple would have had ample time to travel to Philadelphia, even at a time when such travel was officially forbidden without permission. Any definitive answer, however, seems to be lacking in the extant documents.

The possibility was intriguing to me, though, so I began to search for information about John Henry Lydius in the French colonial documents and, in 2002, discovered a 1729 document that contains a surprising variation of the name La Germano, a reference no one, to my knowledge, has cited in connection with Madame Montour, a reference linking Lydius, his wife Geneviève, and their aunt in the English colonies.

English language sources, however, seem unclear about Geneviève’s parentage and relatives. Peter N. Moogk’s article about Lydius in the Dictionary of Canadian Biography says Lydius “married a Canadian, said by some to have been part Indian.” A web site for Albany, New York, reports Geneviève’s lineage in similarly vague terms: “Tradition holds that she was of French and Native American ancestry,” at least as of my last visit, even after I corrected their imprecision in the summer of 2001. Apparently, these sources did not and do not see fit to check the New France records to investigate the truth of the hear-say or “tradition.”

Lydius, the son of a Dutch Reform minister in Albany, abjured protestantism before marrying Geneviève at Montréal on 13 February 1727. The abjuration appears just before the marriage record in the registers of Nôtre-Dame de Montréal, although some sources say it is lost! How the couple met...
remains a mystery at this time. Did Lydius travel to Montréal? Or did Geneviève travel to New York? Since the Miamis are known to have traded with the English in the 1720s, and Geneviève’s mother, Marguerite Couc, is documented among the Miamis from 1720 to at least 1723, it is feasible that mother and daughter accompanied the Miamis to do business in New York before relocating to Montréal, where the marriage to Lydius was solemnized. After all, Marguerite’s son by Jean Fafard dit Maconce is documented in New York in 1725.316

Geneviève Massé
Wherever and however they met, Geneviève Massé and John Henry Lydius were definitely in Montréal by 1727, when they had their marriage contract written by the notary Le Pailleur, 12 February 1727, at the home of Michel Massé in Ville Marie (Montréal).317 This contract is the earliest extant evidence I had found of Geneviève’s existence until just recently.318 On the contract Geneviève’s mother’s name is first given as “Dame Margueritte Couc de Cognac [sic]” and, later in the document (amazingly, as fate would have it), as “Isabelle Couc de Cognac,” another anomaly that will never be resolved. (As I have noted, this is not the only example of one Couc daughter being mistakenly identified as another, just as Angélique was called Magdeleine in 1720. Is it at all possible Isabelle attended the signing of the contract?)319

Massé et sa femme, his wife, are definitely recorded as present at their daughter Geneviève’s church ceremony the next day, but Marguerite’s name, inexplicably, does not appear on the church record signed by her husband, a blank being left where her name should appear. The reason for this must also remain a mystery, although I have seen the phenomenon on other records.

The couple married with the permission of Charles Lemoine, Baron de Longueuil,320 Chevalier de l’ordre militaire de St. Louis, gouverneur pour le Roy de la ville et gouvernement de montreal (who had served as interim governor at the death of Vaudreuil), and François Seguenot, priest of the Seminary of St. Sulpice de Paris, resident at the seminary, thus with both civil and religious approval. Longueuil had served for

---

316 Jean and his cousin Joseph Montour are said to have arrived with “nine canoes of Twightwigh Indians”… “among whom they live and have married to squas [sic]”. Minutes of the Commission on Indian Affairs at Albany, (RG 10, vol. 1819, NAC film C-1220. f. 137a, photocopy.
317 ANQ photocopy.
318 She and her sister are documented in the mother colony earlier than this, as I will document subsequently. I have speculated that she was baptized at Fort Pontchartrain, along with her sister Françoise, each girl given her first name by one of the few women documented there by 1704: Geneviève Letendre or Geneviève Laferrière, and Françoise Dumouchelle, daughter of Bernard Dumouchel Laroche and Jeanne Jouin Joanne, who accepted a position as a servant for the Lamothe Cadillac family, 6 July 1703 Adhémar, photocopy ANQ. See my “The Other Women and Early Detroit, Part One” in MHH, Vol. 22, October 2001, and the subsequent installments.
319 James Letort’s report at a council in Philadelphia 18 April 1728 (O.S.) referred to a conversation he had with Madame Montour the previous fall of 1727 concerning a possible trading voyage to the Miamis. Later, though, she would not agree to travel to the Miamis with Letort. See Part 7.
320 See Céline Dupré, “Lemoine de Longueuil, Charles,” the “only Canadian in origin created baron in New France”, DCB II, pp. 418-420. See also the entry for him in the year 1725 at <http://vieux.montreal.qc.ca/> His brother “Bienville” served not-at-all-happily under Cadillac in Louisiana when Cadillac was commandant there 1713-1717, but even considered marrying Cadillac’s daughter, whom he found attractive, before deciding against it because of her father’s “character.” For his letter about this topic, see Jodoin, Histoire de Longueuil et de la famille Longueuil, pp.119-28, at Early Canadiana <http://canadiana.org>
many years among the Iroquois, even being adopted by the Five Nations in 1694. He was sent to Iroquoia in 1725, the last year of Vaudreuil’s life, to try to circumvent the establishment of an English trading post at Chouaguen, at Oswego, New York, and to request the permission of the Five Nations to erect a military fort, redoute, at Niagara, near the place where Joncaire had already received permission to establish a house and trading post at the portage (Lewiston, New York). I have already mentioned Longueuil’s son, Étienne Auguste, sieur d’Adoucourt, who, along with the son of Claude Ramezay, Monnoir, died in 1716, killed by the Chérokis in Illinois country. In 1716, a “French” woman in Albany apparently had possible information about them, as reported by Charles Ruette d’Auteuil, sieur de Monceaux. The full details were then still unknown.321 (See my Part 6, where I theorize this “French” woman could have been Isabelle.)

Witnesses at the 1727 marriage contract included, for the groom: Jean Bouillet, seigneur de La Chassaigne, also member of the military order of St.-Louis, governor of Trois-Rivières. He had “commanded 100 soldiers in the unsuccessful expedition led by Claude Ramezay against the Iroquois in 1709,” at the time of the failed English invasion and also in the same year Vaudreuil thought that La Tichenette was influencing the Iroquois. During La Chassaigne’s 1726-1730 governorship of Trois Rivières (where Isabelle’s sister Angélique and her family lived), he “took part in a mission to Burnet, governor of New York, to attempt to have Fort Oswego demolished, because it had been erected in violation of the 1713 Treaty of Utrecht.” Burnet, while maintaining that the French fort at Niagara was itself a violation of 1713, nevertheless, called him a person of “great merit”.322 Lachassaigne was absent for the signing of the contract, but he was represented by Jean Baptiste Legardeur, écuyer, seigneur de Repentigny, officer in the troops of the marine, son of Agathe de St Père. Also present was Julien Trottier Desrivières, identified as bourgeois merchant of Ville Marie, but whom I know to be a member of a fur-trading family with ties to Fort Pontchartrain. He had hired voyageurs to travel to the pays d’en haut in 1716 and 1717,323 specifically sending canoes to Michilimackinac during the Fox War. Michel Germaneau first appears in extant documents in 1717 Montréal. I have speculated that he took advantage

321 See NAC, MG 1 Série C11A, F-37, fol. 44-45v, “Déliberation du Conseil de Marine sur une lettre de Vaudreuil datée du 12 novembre 1716, as summarized at ArchiviaNet: “a lady in Orange made it known to d’Auteuil that this news about the deaths of the two young men was false; will write to Hunter to attempt to clarify this mystery” : “une dame d’Orange a laissé entendre à d’Auteuil que cette nouvelle [the deaths of the two young men] était fausse; écrira à Hunter pour tenter d’éclaircir ce mystère [he would write to Hunter to attempt to clarify the mystery].” The actual Vaudreuil letter says the Kaskaskias ("des Sauvages de la nation des Kaskakias"), an Illinois Nation, killed the two men, but this was an error, as it was determined that they had been killed by the Chérokis, possibly with the influence of the English. Vaudreuil wrote that, according to a letter that Ramezay sent him, the “Sr D’auteuil” reported that finding himself at Orange at an assembly where this news was brought, since he seemed to be distressed by it and left the assembly, “une Dame” of this place came to speak to him the next day, and said she had noticed his distress and that the two officers were certainly not dead but that that she could not tell him anything further and begged him to keep the secret she had just told him, “Conseil de M. le Marquis de Vaudrueül a quebec le 12 Novembre 1716”, C11A, vol. 37, ff. 44-45, photocopy. Madame Montour used similar language to James Letort in 1728, with the intention that Letort pass on her information. See Part 6. The French woman in Orange, whoever she was, seems to have had information of some kind. It is intriguing to note that Isabelle’s daughter Marie Anne may have been among the Illinois; Cadillac visited there in 1715; and Bourgmont was definitely there, a subject to be considered in a later article.

322 Ulric Lévesque, “Bouillet de La Chassaigne (Chassagne), Jean,” DBC II, 91-92, my translation from the French version of DCB. See Part 11, footnote 75. A sergeant of La Chassaigne, Jean Joly dit Jolycoeur, was buried at Fort Pontchartrain in 1707.

323 5 May 1716 and 9 May 1717, Jetté. I have not yet received these contracts or a later one involving Fort Pontchartrain.
of the royal pardon granted to those *coureurs de bois*, or others away from the mother colony, who agreed to take part in the Fox initiative.\(^{324}\)

The bride’s parents are indicated as present at the contract, and then, again inexplicably, a half of a page is left blank on the document, the section that should have listed those present for the future bride. Those who signed on the last page, however, include the bride and groom; the father of the bride, *Michel Masse*; and friends *De Repentigny fils; Desrivieres; John Morris; Robt. Frantor (?); agathe [de] St Pere\(^{325}\)* (mother of Repentigny fils); *R. [René] Decotiaigne; Blondeau; Marieanne pothier* (identified as *dite Laverdure* in the text); *marguerite pothier; janne masse; francoise masse* (Geneviève’s sister); and *Louise pothier*. Basically the same persons signed the church marriage record, except for John Morris, Robt. Frantor (?), *marguerite pothier; janne masse*, although she is indicated as present; and *francoise masse*. Additional persons present were a second “blondeau,” “jean pothier,” “jannet potier,” and two signatures I cannot read. Madame Jean Pothier, née Marie Massé, sister of Michel and aunt of the bride, is also said to be present but, it seems, did not sign. Geneviève gave birth to at least two Lydius children in Montréal by 1730.

Among their activities, John Henry Lydius and his wife were engaged in ransoming English prisoners in 1728 before any question was raised about whether he could remain in the New France colony.\(^{326}\)

**Document #4 and John Henry Lydius**

*1729, octobre, 25, Lettre de Beauharnois et Hocquart au ministre*

By 1729, though, Governor Beauharnois feared that the ruling prohibiting aliens to engage in commerce in the French colony, issued in 1727, the year of the Lydius marriage, but not yet in force in February of that year, would mean Lydius would have no way to make a living for his family, since he had been allowed to trade *within* the colony with the Iroquois during the first two years of his marriage. Beauharnois suggested to Maurepas that perhaps Lydius should be hired as an interpreter of Iroquois and be paid 300 *livres* a year instead of being banned for his commerce.

Beauharnois adds the following reasons for his request to grant Lydius an exemption: Lydius has a perfect knowledge of the state of the country; he is held in high regard by the Iroquois, whose language he understands; and his wife (Geneviève Massé) is

---

\(^{324}\) See the handwritten letter of Jacques Campeau, 6 September 1716, in which he states that after the expedition to war against the Fox, he returned by way of Michilimackinac. BAnQ, TI4,S1,D2019. The letter is translated and printed in Joseph L. Peyser, translator, with José António Brandão, editor, *Edge of Empire*, Documents of Michilimackinac, 1671-1716, Michigan State University Press and Mackinac State Historic Parks, 2008, but I had located and copied the document years before 2008.

\(^{325}\) See the interesting story of this business woman, mother of seven children, who founded a textile manufacturing enterprise, employing English prisoners to instruct local *habitants* and learning dye techniques from the Natives. The enterprise existed from 1705 to 1713. DCB III. Except for this initiative, the *habitants* of New France were required to import their clothing or textiles from France. See also the entry for her in the year 1725 at <http://vieux.montreal.qc.ca/>.

\(^{326}\) All Notary Joseph Charles Raimbault, 24 avril 1728, “Obligation par John Henry Lydius, flamand de nation et Geneviève Massé sa femme; à Joseph Hertel pour la somme de 350 livres pour argent à débourser aux sauvages du Lac St-François pour le rachat d’un prisonnier du nom de James Nap.”; “Obligation par Jean Henry Lidyus, flamand … pour 440 livres …”; 20 mai 1728, Obligation par Jean Henry Lydius . . . pour le rachat de Benjamin Haly, anglais qui a été retenu captif depuis trois ou quatre ans chez les sauvages du Lac St-François. Photocopies. The seigneurie of St François du Lac is the site of Pierre Couc’s former property.
petite niece of a Frenchwoman married to an Iroquois by the name of Le Germano who lives in New England (Nouvelle Angleterre, a general name for the English colonies, including the New York and Pennsylvania areas) where he has been assigned a pension by the Province, and who is so dangerous a spirit [esprit si dangereux] that deceased Mr. de Vaudreuil used every strategy to make him return to Canada, or to get rid of him, which he did not succeed in doing. All of the family of Lydius's wife is of the same spirit.327

The document reads petite niece, which could, perhaps, mean young niece instead of great-niece.328 Geneviève is actually the niece of Isabelle, the only sister of Marguerite known to have established herself in Nouvelle Angleterre. Since Geneviève is the child of Marguerite's second marriage, Beauharnois may have guessed at the “great-niece” relationship, if that is his meaning. Geneviève was born when her mother was about forty, as well as can be determined, although Beauharnois may have been ignorant of this fact. At any rate, there is no known great-aunt in any extant records. She would have had to be a sister of Pierre Couc or of his wife, Marie Mité8ameg8K8é, or of Michel’s parents, Martin Massé or his wife, Jeanne Ducorps dite Leduc.

Le Germano

Beauharnois did not want Lydius to be forced to return to Nouvelle Angleterre because, if he resented his dismissal, it could be of great consequence for this, the New France, colony: "d'une grande conséquence pour cette colonie," evidently because of Lydius’s perhaps dangerously compromising knowledge of New France, New York, and the Iroquois (an echo of the New York officials’ concern in keeping Madame Montour in their service in 1719), but especially since he had family ties to Le Germano and his wife.

The first striking item here is the phrase “so dangerous a spirit (esprit si dangereux), interesting because the deceased former governor had used a similar phrase to describe La Tichenette nineteen years earlier, in 1710: esprit mauvais. Lamothe Cadillac had employed the same phrase to describe Pimabansô, the Loup or Mahican Indian keeping company in 1706 with the Montour identified by Vaudreuil as “brother-in-law” [sic] of La Tichenette. And Beauharnois is quick to add that all of the family related to Lydius by marriage are of a similar spirit.

A Brief Digression

In a joint letter of 1709, Vaudreuil and Intendent Raudot asserted that all Frenchmen who had married sauvagesses had become free thinking idlers of an intolerable independence: libertins feneans, et d’une independence insuportable,329 that all offspring of unions between French and Indians demonstrated an

327 1729, octobre 25, Lettre de Beuharnois et Hocquart au ministre, NAC C llA, Microfilm of original, F-51, ff. 6-8v. “petite niece d'une francoise mariée avec un Iroquois nommé le Germano qui demeure actuellement dans la nouvelle angleterre ou il luy est assigné une pension par La Province, et qui est d'un esprit si dangereux que feu Mr de Vaudreuil avoit mis tous en usage pour le faire revenir en Canada, ou pour S'endeffaire, à quoy il n'apû réussir. Toute la famille de la femme du dit Lidius est du mesme Esprit.” Madame Montour was also assigned a pension. See my citation of Colden in Part 7.

328 Another word, when taken literally, though, the military rank of petite-enseigne when it has sometimes been translated as “little” cannot be accepted. It has nothing to do with the size or the quality of the individual but only military status. In English such an officer is a “petty” officer, one of lower rank.

329 Libertins is often translated as sexually promiscuous ones, but it also has the sense of free thinkers, those who refuse to submit to any established rules and values, instead (as seen by the New France authorities) insolently
indolence as great as the Indians themselves: *dune feneantise* [fainéantise] aussy grande que les sauvages *mesmes*, and thus such marriages should not be allowed to take place at Fort Pontchartrain, as Vaudreuil had ordained in 1706 in reply to Cadillac’s request to permit such marriages. The joint letter of 1709 then says Vaudreuil was obliged to order the Sieur de Joncaire to do away with the man named Montour, who is the product of this kind of marriage. The letter continues: “It seems that all the children thus born seek to create difficulties for the French.” Vaudreuil, in his private letter to Pontchartrain, writes in praise of Joncaire, reporting that he (Joncaire), by means of men who were with him, had broken the head (*casser la tête*) of Montour, French by nation, but a man (working) entirely for the English and being paid by them (*francois de nation, mais homme entierement aux anglois, et a leurs gages*). It is interesting to note that the son of a Frenchman and an Indian is acknowledged to be a citizen of the French nation, regardless of his “mixed” parentage. While Vaudreuil could not avoid naming Montour as a French citizen, he did not hesitate to approve his assassination without a proper trial. Vaudreuil was most certainly looking for a scapegoat to present to Pontchartrain for the many defections by the Western Nations who were going to the English to trade.

To return to Lydius’s situation in 1729 and Beauharnois’s dilemma: Another echo of the former governor’s language occurs in the surprising use of “*le Germano,*” employed here to name the husband of Geneviève Massé’s aunt married to an Iroquois, “*le*” being the masculine and “*la*” the feminine form of the word “*the,*” as in the French phrases “*le nommé Germano,*” the (man) named Germano, or “*la nommée Germano,*” the (woman) named Germano. It is Vaudreuil, the previous governor, who had identified the sister of La St Serny (Angélique) as “*La Germano*” in 1720, at least according to Bégon. Beauharnois evidently did not know the Iroquois name Carondowana (*Grand Arbre* / Big Tree) or his alias of Robert Hunter, but he surely had access to the former governor’s papers and letters.

He could not have known that Madame Montour’s husband died that very year, but his death had only recently been condoled by Patrick Gordon, Governor of Pennsylvania, where Isabelle and her husband, with their son André / Andrew, had been working and living at Otstonwakin, now *Montoursville*, Pennsylvania. Gordon’s letter of 10 August 1729 (O. S.) expressing his personal sorrow and sending ten strouds to cover the deaths of several Oneidas during a war with Indians in South Carolina, was written from Philadelphia to the Oneida Shikellimy, who had lost a son, and to “Peter Alias Kataryonyacha” (most probably Madame Montour’s son-in-law married to Margaret Montour, if Margaret is her daughter). Gordon wrote that he had “loved Carundowana [*sic*] as Our brother” and said that as soon as he heard of the disaster he had sent to the “Canestogoe” Indians for them to send to see whether he was still alive and to offer to Pay his Ransome.” The letter was also delivered to the Oneidas and Tuscaroras, and they reported to Albany that they did not know what to make of the news. On 21 July 1729 (O.S.), their representatives had informed the Albany officials of their many losses, but they apparently did not know all the names of those deceased or held prisoners. The news of Carondowana’s death might not have reached Beauharnois by October. Albany sent Laurence Claessen to the Oneidas on 21 October determining their own destiny. *Fainéantise* = slothful ones, do-nothings, thought to be a greater vice than laziness. I myself find nothing lazy about the life of the *coureurs de bois* or voyageurs or Indians.

330 Vaudreuil et Raudot à Pontchartrain, 14 novembre 1709, RAPQ CD version, and photocopy. It is interesting that neither this letter nor the personal letter of Vaudreuil to the minister reached France this year, the ship carrying it having been highjacked by the English. Vaudreuil’s wife was on the ship when it was taken. The letters and *mémoires* thrown into the sea were sent in duplicate in 1710, so that it was at least 1711 before Pontchartrain could respond to them. I cannot help but wonder what could have happened had the message been received more promptly. Delayed receipt of correspondence from France occurred in 1704, also because the English pirated a ship.

331 Vaudreuil à Pontchartrain, 14 novembre 1709, RAPQ CD version, and photocopy.
with instructions to “Interpret the Said Patrick Gordon’s Letter to them in their Language.” On 11 May 1730 (O.S.), representatives of the Oneidas were still requesting the names of those taken as prisoners, so that they could confirm those who were still alive.

The reference to Le Germano, the Iroquois husband of a Frenchwoman relative of Geneviève Massé, is yet another indication that the woman interpreting in New York is Isabelle. It even suggests that Carondowana may have been in the New France area at one time, perhaps even a convert to Catholicism at Sault Saint Louis (now Kahnawake), if Vaudreuil tried to make him return to Canada, unless this is simply Beauharnois’s misunderstanding of Vaudreuil’s efforts to have Isabelle — Le Germano — return to New France.

More Parallels

At first, Lydius was granted an exemption from the ordonnance; but he was deported to France within a year under the accusation that he was not practicing his new religion. This is rather strange as his children were baptized, as I will document. From my reading about the affair, it seems to me Lydius was incriminated for his alleged ties to the illegal trade between New France and New York as much as for any "religious" lapse, a trade deplored, at least officially, by both governments but pursued nonetheless. Perhaps Beauharnois was following his predecessor’s tactic of making an example of one individual to deter many others. In fact, Governor Beauharnois and Intendant Hocquart said 'the banishment would make a strong impression 'on those who are in the habit of carrying on, or favoring foreign trade'.

Lydius, in 1730, may have been in a similar political position as Louis Montour in 1709, both men challenging the official trade regulations of New France and favoring the desires of the Indians themselves (and their own economic needs) instead of continuing to exploit the Indians for political or military objectives in the on-going conflict between France and England. Most interestingly, the domiciled Natives did not support the accusations against Lydius, and the Western Indians who accompanied Montour in 1709 greatly admired the man who led them.

332 Minutes of the Commission on Indian Affairs at Albany, NAC film C-1220, ff. 296-297. His death occurred during a conflict with the Flat-heads, the Catawba Nation in South Carolina, although the Oneidas claimed it was with the Virginia Indians encouraged by the English, and the Albany commissioners soft-pedaled or altered the report of Virginia Governor Gooch in order to, as they explained it, prevent the outbreak of war and the death of Christians. Gordon of Pennsylvania himself wrote “We are much Troubled that they [the Iroquois] went to Fight wth Indians that were in Friendship with the English, and were Tradeing wth Them. The English would not hurt the Five Nations If they knew them, but they thought them Enemies, because they Came to Fight Against their Friends, all the English are one People, and all their Friends Should be one People, we grieve for this Mistake and unhappy Loss.” It is interesting to note that Gordon refers to the Five Nations even though the Tuscaroras had been accepted by this time as the Sixth Nation, with property allocated to them among the Oneidas.

333 Minutes of the Commission on Indian Affairs at Albany, NAC film C-1220, ff. 315v -316. I have read the letters written by two priests supporting this accusation. They say they have not seen Lydius attend religious services. See also Lettre de Beauharnois et Hocquart au ministre concernant l'affaire de John Hendricks Lydius, originaire d'Orange, établi à Montréal, convaincu [sic] d'avoir entretenu un commerce illicite avec les colonies britanniques - jugement du Conseil supérieur qui l'a banni à perpétuité de cette colonie; l'envoient en France car il serait dangereux de le retourner dans son pays; accusations portées contre lui par les missionnaires du Sault-Saint-Louis et du lac des Deux-Montagnes; projet des Indiens de ces deux villages de demander son élargissement; calomnies de Lydius contre le jésuite Pierre de Lauzon. Summary on ArchiviaNet for entry NAC F-52, ff. 21-26. I have a photocopy of the full document.

335 DCB, Vol. V.
Document #5

Request et plainte pour Mr le procureur du Roy contre Lambert Cullerier, 1 July 1706

Vaudreuil, in his letters to Pontchartrain, also had cited the necessity to use the assassination of Louis Montour in 1709 “to make a strong impression” on others, both Native and French, to deter them from going to trade with the English. Montour was not the only one so-treated. Three years earlier, in 1706, about the time Cadillac reported he saw Louis Couc Montour returning from Orange, Vaudreuil and the legal system sought the arrest of yet another member of the Couc family, Louis’s brother, un sauvage nommé Couc frère de Montour, an Indian named Couc, brother of Montour, for allegedly traveling to Orange against the ordonnances of the king. Jean’s friend, Lambert Cuillerier, who would serve as godfather for Jean Couc Montour’s son, Jean Baptiste, that very year in November, was arrested and interrogated on 1 and 2 September 1706. The record of the interrogation is sixteen pages long, all in Antoine Adhémar’s wretched handwriting, and concludes with recording that Lambert “Cullerier” was returned to the prison in Montréal on 2 September. The interrogation had not been microfilmed as of June 2000, when I obtained a photocopy during my visit to Les Archives du Québec, Montréal branch.

Vaudreuil also approved the arrest of the father of another man suspected of illegal activity, St Germain, undoubtedly Pierre Lamoureaux dit St Germain, Joachim Germaneau’s friend (See Part 5), who had loaned Germaneau money and trade goods in the 1690s for his trading expeditions. St Germain’s son, probably François, allegedly equally involved in the voyage to Orange, could not be located. The prisoners, St Germain and “Cullerier,” were later released because, in Vaudreuil’s words, “however hard we tried, we couldn’t find any proof against the men named Cuillerier and St Germain. They stayed in prison a long time, but then we could not help but let them go.” Jean Couc Montour also could not be found to undergo any interrogation. I must note here that Vaudreuil was suspected at this time of illegal profit from trade with the Indians through his tenant St Germain and may have been trying to deflect Pontchartrain’s demands for explanations by offering him these arrests as a good-faith attempt to curb illegal trading.

336 Request et plainte pour Mr le procureur du Roy contre Lambert Cullerier, 1 July 1706, ANQ-Montréal, photocopy of a document that had not been microfilmed, obtained on a visit to the archives in June of 2000. It was a thrill to hold this original document in my hands. Cuillerier testified that they had gone to hunt bustards on Lac Champlain and nothing else. He also indicated that Jean Couc resided at Sault Saint Louis at that time.

337 Pierre Lamoureaux dit St Germain’s first wife was Marguerite Pigarouiche, Amérindienne. Their son, the one being sought, was most likely François, born about 1675; married, contract 26 July 1712 Le Pailleur (Bellevue), Marguerite Ménard, widow of Lambert Cuillerier and daughter of Jean-Baptiste Ménard & Marguerite Étienne, thus niece of Maurice Ménard. St Germain père had remarried 2 October 1684 at Montréal to Barbe Celle. Jetté. Vaudreuil was accused of illegal trading at the “bout de l’Ile” of Montréal, using St Germain, his tenant there, as his agent. Although Vaudreuil deplored Louis Montour as an example of a mixed marriage, he evidently had no qualms about dealing with a man who had himself fathered such offspring.

338 Mm. De Vaudreuil et Raudot au Ministre, 15 November 1707, RAPQ.

339 On 23 October 1702, Vaudreuil “became a seigneur. Callière and the intendant François de Beauharnois granted him the territory located just across the western tip of Montreal Island, including the little Ile aux Tourtres in the Ottawa River. The seigneurie was nothing more than a wilderness tract, but its ideal location for the Indian trade made it a valuable piece of real estate. However, Vaudreuil only began to draw income from it on July 26, 1703, when he leased it to Pierre Lamoureux, dit Saint-Germain [sic], a Montreal merchant, for three years at 1,000 livres annually.” It is here that he was accused of carrying on illegal trade, such that he had to dismiss St Germain. Yves F. Zoltvany, Philippe de Rigaud de Vaudreuil, The Carleton Library No. 80, McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1974, p. 28, citing relevant documents.
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Alleged travel to *Orange* by Jean Couc Montour in 1706; actual travel and leading the Western Indians to *Orange* by Louis Couc Montour in 1708-09; and alleged illegal trade with Albany, as well as irreligion, by John Henry Lydius led the government to “make an example” of these individuals.

**Document #6**

1756 Oct. 31. Nicolaes, of Andrew Montour and Sara.

Wit.: Martinus and Sara Maria Lydius

**The Lydius Children**

According to the Albany web site: “The Lydiuses left Quebec shortly after the birth of their second child - whom John Henry refused to have baptized in the French church.” Nevertheless, the records of Nôtre-Dame de Montréal document that Elisabeth Gertrude Sara Lydius was baptized 27 February 1728, and Jean Louis Lydius was baptized 1 November 1729, less than a month after Beauharnois’s letter to the French minister. Was Jean Louis baptized even though his father objected? Is this “second” child mentioned on the Albany web site yet another son? Or is there some misunderstanding here. Peter N. Moogk says Lydius “was imprisoned in August 1730. […] [and on] 28 September the Conseil Supérieur fined him 3,000 *livres* and banished him. He was put aboard the *Héros* bound for Rochefort, and although his wife was allowed to accompany him, their newborn [sic] son was kept behind as a ward of the crown.”

The letter written by Beauharnois and Hocquart to Maurepas in October of 1730 indicates “this foreigner was married at Montréal to a *métive* by whom he has two young children.” Lydius was not convicted of trading illegally, but the other allegations about his suspicious influence among the domiciled Indians and his irreligion were apparently enough to have him deported to France.

Both of the children documented as having been baptized had interesting and important godparents: For the daughter in 1728, René de Coüagne (a prominent merchant) and Agathe de Saint-Père, who had attended the Lydius marriage. Agathe de Saint-Père (Madame de Repentigny) is the business woman who sponsored the local initiative to fabricate textiles with the assistance of both English prisoners and the Indians from 1705 to 1713. And, for the Lydius son, Agathe de Saint-Père’s daughter, Agathe de Repentigny, widow Bouat, and Jean Louis de Lacorne, ecuyer, officer in a detachment of troops, who

340 DCB V 488, underlining mine. I doubt whether Moogk consulted the registers of Nôtre-Dame de Montréal for any baptismal records, as he cites only “ANQ-M, État civil [civil records], Catholiques, Nôtre-Dame de Montréal, 13 févr. 1727,” the marriage record, and the marriage contract the day before.

341 “15 octobre 1730: “cet Etranger s’est marié à montréal a une *métive* dont il a deux jeunes enfants,” at least if I am reading the word *métive* accurately, as it is partially obscured by the Archives Coloniales seal on the document.

342 See DCB III. In 1749 he was “host to the famous Swedish naturalist Pehr Kalm during the latter’s stay in Montreal.” His sister Thérèse married François Poulin de Francheville and, known as Madame Francheville, she was an active business woman after the death of her husband in 1733. DCB III.

343 DCB III. Except for this initiative, the *habitants* of New France were required to import their clothing or textiles from France.

344 She was his second wife, his first being Madeleine Lambert Dumont. See Jean Blain’s article on François-Marie Bouat, lieutenant-general and judge, in DCB II. He was heavily involved in fur trade commerce from early in his life. His sister Marguerite married Antoine *Pascaud*, an important merchant in Montréal and La Rochelle. At Pascaud’s death in La Rochelle in 1717, his wife took over the family affairs, becoming a properous business
obviously gave the baby his first names. It is Lacorne who, in 1726, informed “the new governor Charles de Beauharnois, that the English had incited the Five Nations to destroy French Fort Niagara” after his visit to New York.

This is certainly an intriguing cast of characters involved with trade and with the Iroquois in the English Colonies! I could cite equally noteworthy details about the other godparents and witnesses attending religious ceremonies for the Lydius family. In 1730, though, John Lydius was related by marriage to Aunt Isabelle, who was considered to be a politically dangerous spirit, and for that reason, if for no other, he would have to go.

A “Genevieve Agathe,” daughter of “Jean Henry” and “Genevieve Agathe Macé”, was buried 17 December 1730, apparently after John Henry Lydius had been deported to France. I have to assume she had also been baptized if she was buried from the Church, but she is definitely a girl. At first, I did know whether she could be Elisabeth Gertrude Sara (all names associated with Lydius’s relatives), now identified in the death record by her mother’s and her godmother’s name, or whether this Sara survived and eventually lived in New York.

I learned in 2003, though, that two of the Lydius children were entrusted to the care of Françoise Massé, their maternal aunt. On 15 October 1733, Françoise, anticipating her death, commissioned a document to put her affairs in order. She states she had taken care of two Lydius children: a sick little daughter, whom she kept for eight months (possibly the child buried in December of 1730?), and a son (Jean Louis, baptized in November of 1729), whom she had taken care of for three years (thus since 1730), having been charged to the task of arranging for his shelter and education by Mr le gouverneur general. The identity of the “newborn” son Lydius allegedly refused to have baptized remains a mystery to me at this time.

Françoise identified several possessions within the house she had inherited from her father and indicated some belonged to her sister, Lydius’s wife, who would inherit from their father after she, Françoise, died; and she also identified expenses she sustained for Lydius and the debts owed her by Lydius and others and mentioned a trunk sent from Europe belonging to Lydius. Françoise departed this life on the 19th and was buried on the 20th of October 1733, leaving one son, Pierre, who would eventually follow his woman herself. See DCB II article by Yves F. Zoltvany and Donald J. Horton, and my earlier references to Pascaud in connection with Joachim Germaneau and Bourgmont.

Céline Dupré, “La Corne de Chaptes, Jean-Louis de,” DCB II, pp. 341-42. She adds that (about 1705): “According to Gédéon de Catalogne, he had lost the command of Fort Frontenac for having saluted Lamothe Cadillac with a cannon shot,” Cadillac at the time being out of favor with Governor Vaudreuil. This may have taken place during Cadillac’s return to the mother colony in 1704. I have not yet seen the source. Vaudreuil later praised La Corne, as did Beauharnois. See “Extraits pour le roi de lettres de Longueuil, Bégon, Beauharnois, Dupuy, Chaussegros de Léry et Noyan” which also mentions La Corne’s report: “rumeurs rapportées par La Corne (déclarations de Tekarihoken) au sujet des conférences tenues à Albany,” MG 1 - Série C11A, Microfilm of original, reel no. F-49, Volume 49, fol. 550-556v.


15 octobre 1733, Declaration de François Massé épouse de sr Souliigny, pour mettre ordre à ses affaires avant de mourir, Notary François Lepailleur. The declaration mentions an inventory after death for Michel Massé, 23 June 1730. On it, Françoise Massé and John Henry Lydius were present and signing. Michel Massé’s wife, Marg’-e Cognac, is said to be absent de ce pâis” at that time. J. B. Adhémar, No. 3265, ANQ, photocopy.
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father, **Pierre Leduc dit Souligny**, to Michilimackinac. I wonder whether the Albany Web site will accept this notarized document as proof of Geneviève’s family.

Or perhaps it will accept the 23 January 1734 inventory taken after Françoise’s death, at which René de Couangne served as guardian of Jean (Jean Louis), minor son of St Lydias and Geneviève Massé, his wife. René de Couangne had been selected to serve in this capacity by the *lieutenant general* on 19 January 1734. Toussaint Pothier was the assistant guardian. What became of this Lydias child I do not yet know.

---

348 Françoise, 26 year-old daughter of deceased Michel Massé and of Marguerite Lalfeur, married Pierre Leduc, 27, son of deceased Jean & Marguerite Desroches of the Côte St Pierre (also Michel Germaneau’s residence), in the presence of Jean Baptiste and Lambert Leduc, brothers; René Couangue, merchant, who also attended Geneviève Massé’s marriage; François Volant, merchant, married to Michelle Pothier *dite* Laverdure in 1723, and nephew of the Radisson who was *commis* of the Company of the Colony at Detroit in 1704; Agathe de St Père, also present at Geneviève’s marriage; and signed also by a J. B. (?) Forestie and catherine (?). A J. B. Forestier signed many records at Fort Pontchartrain, including the extant first page, and the signatures seem identical. The signature on the first page was not likely entered when the register began or was begun again after a 1703 fire because Forestier would have been only fifteen years old in 1703. Note: the entry on PRDH for the Leduc / Massé marriage says no mother’s name is given, but “Marie Lalfeur” is very easy to read on the microfilm copy of the entry. Françoise signed but her husband did not. 1731 May 28, Notre-Dame de Montréal. Photocopy. Michel Massé had died 21, buried 22 June 1730, about 54 years old, at Montréal. Photocopy. PRDH reads the record as “Malle.” The marriage contract 19 May 1731, #5126 J. B. Adhémar, shows Françoise’s parents as deceased Michel Massé and Marguerite Cognac, another *dit* name for the family. Witnesses for the groom: his mother, Marguerite Deroche; Jean-Baptiste, Joseph, Lambert, and René Leduc, his brothers; and Pierre Sarazin, his brother-in-law; Sieur Joseph LeDuc his paternal uncle; and Paul Le Duc his cousin; and Dame Agathe de St Père, spouse of Pierre LeGardeur Escuyer Sieur de Repentigny. Witnesses for the bride were Jean Pouthier [*sic*] LaVerdure, *marchand*, and Marie Massé, her uncle and aunt; Sieur René de Couangue [signed R. DeCoüagne, *marchand bourgeois*, and Louise Pouthier [signed *pottier*], his wife; Sieur François Volant and Damoiselle Michelle Pouthier [signed *pottier*], his wife; and Damoiselles Jeanne Pothier [signed *anne pottier*], Louise De Couignet [signed *Marie Louise de Coüagne*] and Marguerite Pothier, all *cousins* and *cousines*; and, finally, Pierre Derivon Escuyer Sieur de Budemont, Captain of a company of troops, who had served Cadillac at Detroit. The contract was written at the home of Françoise Massé in Montréal, property inherited from her deceased father. Françoise gave birth 30 March 1732 to Pierre, baptized 31 March at Montréal, with René de Couangue and Catherine Pothier, who had also attended her sister Geneviève’s 1727 marriage, as godparents. Françoise died 19 October, buried 20 1733, Montréal, and Pierre Leduc remarried twice, eventually working out of Michilimackinac. The last reference I have located for Marguerite Couq is a sale of real and personal rights to property by Marguerite Cousq, widow of Michel Massé, merchant bourgeois of Montréal, to “René de Couangne” for 100 *livres*, 8 June 1740, Notary Simonet, photocopy. In 1740 she would have been seventy-six. Her whereabouts after this date and her death record are unknown. Some have speculated that her daughter Marguerite, wife of deceased Turpin, is “French Margaret” of the English colonies, and that French Margaret is not the daughter of Isabelle but her sister’s daughter. I do not see any reference to her in her daughter Françoise’s 1733 *Déclaration*. Françoise does mention René de Coüangue.

349 Photocopies of the relevant documents. Maurice Ménard “interprète pour le roi à Michilimakinae” was domiciled with “Souligni” when he was in Montréal to sell property to François Lamoureux St Germain on 26 July 1731, Notary René Choreal de Saint-Romain, photocopy. Pierre Leduc *fils*, the son, had a daughter Charlotte by an Indian woman. Charlotte was baptized at Michilimackinac at the age of two years old. She had been given emergency baptism three months earlier by Father Le Franc, the priest who supplied the full rites of baptism on 1 October 1758. She married 2 March 1771 at L’Assomption (now Windsor, Ontario) to Joseph Mainville and has descendants to this day. Photocopies of both records. Some sources say Charlotte is daughter of Pierre Leduc senior, but the baptism record clearly calls Pierre *fils*, son of Pierre, and Pierre Leduc senior’s third wife, Agathe Villeneuve, Madame *Souligny*, acted as godmother.

350 Inventaire 23 June 1734, J. B. Adhémar, no. 6294, ANQ, photocopy.
Once in France, Lydius convinced the authorities there to allow him to leave and then went first to Holland and eventually back to New York with his family. English language writers also do not present him in a good light, but I have the feeling all of these accounts need to be re-examined. He may have been an unscrupulous man, but Lydius may also suffer from biased reporting. Other Lydius children were born in New York, two of the Lydius children, Martin Lydius and Sara Lydius, even serving as godparents or sponsors in 1756 for their cousin, Nicholas Montour, grandson of Isabelle.

---

351 “The Lydiuses moved south - taking up winter residence in the family home at the corner of State and Pearl Streets in Albany and establishing a trading post on the upper Hudson at the site of today’s Fort Edward. The couple raised at least eight children, the last six being baptized in the Albany Dutch Reformed Church. … Because her husband was absent often, French-speaking Genevieve Lydius became the mainstay of the family in Albany. John Henry Lydius went to England in 1764 to press his more questionable land claims. He never returned and Genevieve was left to manage his extensive holdings, provide for and monitor her still dependant children, and also to deal with those who came to Albany upset about her husband’s business and real estate transactions. Unlike her devious and duplicitous spouse [sic], Genevieve Lydius was known to travelers and townspeople as a charming and engaging woman.” As copied from <http://www.nysm.nysed.gov/albany/pcalhindex.html>

352 See McIlwain’s “Introduction” to Wraxall’s Abridgement: “Lydius certainly bore no very good reputation in the Colony of New York. … The whole matter is very much tangled with the crooked politics of the time.” And, complaints against him endorsed “by a council hostile to the governor should not be taken too seriously.” McIlwain even suggests some documents were suppressed or destroyed by his political enemies. Footnote 1, pp. cvii-cviii, and cix.

353 Nicholas Montour, son of Andrew Montour and Sarah Ains (Hands), who was at Detroit after her separation from Andrew, b. 1756 and baptized on October 31 in the Dutch church at Albany, New York, godparents Martin and Sara Lydius: 1756 Oct. 31. Nicolaes, of Andrew Montour and Sara Lydius. Wit.: Martinus and Sara Maria Lydius. Records of the Reformed Dutch Church of Albany, New York, 1683–1809. Excerpted from Year Books of the Holland Society of New York <http://aleph0.clarku.edu/~djoyce/gen/albany/part4.html#baptismal>

See DCE V for Sarah Ains.

Children of John Henry Lydius and Genevieve Massé, according to Alabany Web site, with, in brackets, transcriptions from Albany Dutch Reformed Records on the Web <http://aleph0.clarku.edu/~djoyce/gen/albany/>. Curly brackets contain Sivertsen’s citations in Barbara J. Sivertsen, Turtles, Wolves, and Bears, A Mohawk Family History, Heritage Books, 1996. I have made no attempt to resolve the differences.

Martinus (c.1730-1786) [probably born in Europe in 1731]
Nicolas Jacob (1732-after 1748) [1732 Oct. 8 Nicolaes, Jacob, of Tobs. and Genevieve Lydius. Wit.: Nic. Lydius, Jacob and Isabella Staets. (My note: I do not know what “Tobs.” indicates. Misreading for abbreviated “Johannes”?) ] {October 8, 1732, Albany}
Margaret (1734-after 1756) [19 May 1734 Maragriet, of Johannes Henr. Lydius and Geneveva Maste. Wit.: Jacob Rozeboom, Geertruy Isabella Lydius. Note: this Gertrude Isabella, is she aunt of Margaret?] {Mayanne [sic] ba.: May 19, 1734, named for her aunt.}
Sara Maria (1738-after 1759) [1738 July 1. Zara Maria, of Johannes Lydius and Geneveva Mazee. Wit.: Johannes Jan [?] Rozeboom. Geertruy Isabela Lydius. (as written)] {ba.: July 07, 1738}
Balthazar (1740-1815) [1740 March 8. Balthazar, of Johannes H. and Geneve Lydius. Wit.: John J. and Rykje Rozeboom] {ba.: March 08, 1739/40}
Catharina (1743-1818) [1743 Sep. 25. Catharina, of Johannis and Geneveva Lydius. Wit.: Johannes Jac. and Magtel Rozeboom.] {ba.: September 25, 1743. Married Henry Cuylor}

The Albany Web site gives these death dates: John Henry Lydius (1704-1791 [in England]); Genevieve Massé (d. 1780s).
On 23 September 2003, I discovered a most amazing reference in the Indian Records, RG 10, Series 2, New York Commissioners of Indian Affairs, NAC microfilm C-1220. Lawrence Claessen, interpreter to the Iroquois for New York, had been sent to speak with each of the Iroquois Nations. On his return in October of 1727, he reported that after his arrival at the Seneca Nation on 29 September 1727:

The Senneke Sachems Informed me that the french of Canada keep a Continuall Correspondance with Some people who Live on the Susquahene river a little above Casastoque [;] a french Interpreter from montreal named Mouresaux had been there last year [1726] . . . to the Settlement where some french live who are much disaffected to the British Interest [255a – 256]

The major French family living on the Susquehanna River is Madame Montour’s family. In fact, with Carondowana, her Iroquois husband, she appeared as an interpreter in Philadelphia for the first documented time in July of that very year, 1727. “Mouresaux” is undoubtedly Jean Baptiste Morisseau, who would be cited as an interpreter to the Iroquois missions at the 2 May 1728 baptism of his daughter, a record he signed at Montréal (photocopy). The child baptized 2 May 1728 is Madeleine Françoise, which record Jean Baptiste signed “Mari [inkblot] aux”.

His wife is Suzanne Petit, whose sister, Marie Anne Petit, married Michel Lamy in 1725. This Lamy couple hired Marie-Anne Montour, Isabelle’s daughter, to work for them for a year from March 1727 to the following March. What is more, his older Morisseau brothers traveled to Fort Pontchartrain, and brother Jean Morisseau’s wife, Anne Pastorel, newly widowed, was hired to serve as wet nurse, nourrice, for the baby Madame Cadillac was expecting in 1703, a girl, Marie Thérèse Lamothe Cadillac, whose baptism is the first complete surviving record in the registers of Ste. Anne de Détroit in February of 1704. The next complete entry in April is the first record of Isabelle Couc at the fort.

---

John Henry’s father, Rev. Johannes Lydius (d. 1710) married Isabella Rachels (d. 1745). Their children:

**Geertruy** (1695-1757)
**Maria Adrianta** (1697-after 1726)
**Margarita Johanna** (1701-after 1736) [1701 Nov. 19. Margarita Johanna, of Johannes Lydius and Isabella Rachels. Wit.: Col. Pieter Schuyler, Margarita Selyns, Maria Schuyler.]
**John Henry** (1704-1791) [1704 Johannes Henricus, of Johannes Lydius and Isabella Rachel. Wit.: Kiliaan Van Rensselaar, Elisabeth Banker.]
**Sara/Susanna Catharina** (1707-1727) [1707 Susanna Catharina, of Johannes Lydius and Isabella Rachels. Wit.: Henrik Van Rensselaar, Johannes and Elisabeth Schuyler.]

Dominie Lydius died in Albany on March 1, 1710. “Johannes Lydius was mourned by his congregation, memorialized by Mohawk diplomats, and eulogized by several contemporaries including Anglican Reverend Thomas Barclay,” with whom Louis Couc Montour had placed his son Michael in 1708. By January 1711, Isabella Rachels remarried to Jacob Staats, and John Henry was brought up by him and his brother-in-law Albany trader Jacob Roseboom. Kiliaan Van Rensselaar, witness for John Henry Lydius’s baptism, and Col. Pieter Schuyler, witness for Margarita Johanna, were intimately involved with the politics of the day. The cast of characters in New York is as interesting in its inter-connections as is its counterpart in New France.

Photocopies of both entries, as well as for the other Morisseau children.
The Couc / Montour Family of Nouvelle France and the English Colonies

The documents I have cited certainly reinforce the identity of Madame Montour as Isabelle Couc. They also document complex inter-relationships between and among the residents of New France and the English colonies. Other details about Madame Montour lie buried and scattered in the many primary sources and articles written about her. Often these details are presented in a biased and incomplete fashion, and it is instructive to examine the sources themselves, unfiltered by any commentary, as I will do next. I will, of course, add my own comments but will identify them as such.

I will refer to some of these details in the future installments; but, for now, it seems I am not just imagining that Isabelle / Madame Montour may have served as a double-agent. At least, I am not the only one to suspect her allegiance may have been divided, and the Senecas were not 276 years in the future [in 2003], as I am.

11 August 2003, Feast of Saint-Suzanne

Post-script #2:
See <http://www.cccu.org/resourcecenter/resID.843,parentCatID.89/rc_detail.asp> for the story of Saint-Suzanne:

SAINT SUSANNA
Martyr
(†286)

Saint Susanna was nobly born in Rome, the daughter of a certain Gabinius, who after his conversion became a priest; she was also the niece of Pope Saint Caius, her father’s brother. This family was also related to the emperor Diocletian. Susanna’s father had raised her with great care in the fear of God and love of Jesus Christ, and she had made a private vow of virginity. Diocletian, wishing to obtain the consent of this very beautiful maiden to marry his favorite, Maximian, sent a certain Claudius, another member of her family, to propose the espousals. She refused to consent, making known to her father and Saint Caius her vow, and saying that even if she had not resolved to conserve her chastity, she would not wish to marry a man responsible for the massacre of an infinite number of Christians. The Emperor’s messenger was converted by her confession of faith, and became a fervent penitent.

When Diocletian received no answer from his messenger concerning the results of the commission, and then learned of the conversion of Claudius, he was very irritated; then with Claudius he arrested Suzanne, Gabinius her father, and several other Christians. He had Suzanne beaten in her residence, then decapitated secretly. The emperor’s wife, Prisca, who was also a Christian in secret, buried her body clandestinely and prayed to her as a holy martyr. Later the house of Gabinius was transformed by Pope Saint Caius into a church; it eventually became a convent for Cistercian nuns. Saint Susanna suffered towards the beginning of Diocletian’s reign, about the year 295.

The church of Santa Susanna / Saint Susan / Sainte-Suzanne, 14 Via XX Settembre (Piazza San Bernardo), is the “national church for Catholics from the USA, and Mass is therefore celebrated in English.” See © Chris Nyborg 2000 <http://home.online.no/~cnyborg/susanna.html>
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This narrative, Susanna and the Elders, from the Book of Daniel, chapter 12, is particularly applicable to the life of Isabelle Couc Montour. Susanna, wife of “Joakim” (Joachim, the name of Isabelle’s first husband) was a virtuous woman who was falsely accused of having carnal knowledge of a young man by two elders, magistrates who themselves lusted after her and whom Susanna had repulsed. When, on the basis of their testimony, she was condemned to death, the prophet Daniel exposed their lie by cross-examining each accuser separately. He asked them to name the tree under which the alleged act of adultery had occurred. Each man cited a different tree; and, as a result of their false accusations, they themselves were then sentenced to death.

Amazing! Even in Biblical times, a judgment decreed on the basis of mendacious testimony could be overturned through a careful analysis of the evidence.
Madame Montour and her Religion

Although her grandson Nicholas was baptized in the Albany Dutch Reformed Church, Isabelle, according to several reports, appears to have continued to practice her Catholic religion as best she could under the laws in existence in the colony of Pennsylvania and the especially restrictive laws in New York. This is true despite the fact that, in 1742, she asked a Moravian missionary, Count Zinzendorf, to baptize some children, called her children in one secondary source, her grandchildren in another, and, in Reichel’s *Memorials of the Moravian Church* itself, simply “two children.” I have not seen the original German source. Zinzendorf replied, according to Vincens in her French translation of the English translation of Zinzendorf’s German: “that the rite is a serious matter and would not be administered until a missionary resided with them, which left her distressed.” The word “distressed” is my translation of Vincens’s French translation “très affligée.” This is as far as Vincens goes in her citation. As reported by Paul A. Wallace, biographer of Conrad Weiser, however, Zinzendorf further explained that “it was the habit of the Brethren to baptize ‘only such persons as we thought we would have frequent opportunity of reminding of the significance of the rite’.” Wallace quotes the English translation in Reichel’s *Memorials*.

When I examined the full text of the *Memorials*, I read:

> There is a promiscuous Indian population in this village.

Madame Montour brought two children to me and asked me to baptize them, alleging the custom of the Canadian Fathers as an excuse for her request. I refused, telling her that whenever a Brother settled here we would take the matter into consideration, as we were in the habit of baptizing only such persons as we thought we would have frequent opportunity of reminding of

---

Reichel, in a note on page 15, quotes from “James Logan, letter to Governor Clarke, of New York, dated March 30, 1742”: “[The Moravians] are so much for universal charity that without binding themselves to any form, they join with all persuasions that profess their being inwardly guided by the Spirit of Christ, -- Papists or Protestants, as far as I can learn, without distinction; for though they utterly dislike the fopperies of the Romish service, -- the adoration of the saints, images, etc., -- yet, if the heart be right, they dispense with all the rest as the exteriors in worship of a more indifferent nature; and hence, in a conversation I had last week with the Count, he spoke of Cardinal Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, as his most particular friend.”


357 Vincens, p. 285.


the significance of the rite. At the same time, I spoke to her of that spiritual baptism which the heart, even of the unbaptized, may, without any effort or premeditation, on his part, experience. She left me displeased.\textsuperscript{360}

There is a world of difference between “distressed” and “displeased”. The word “distressed” suggests anxiety or suffering; “displeased” denotes annoyance stemming from an injurious offense. Madame Montour was irritated by the Count’s words, not saddened. I would translate the word “displeased” as \emph{mécontante}, angry. I do not, however, know the original German word.

The issue here appears to be whether the two children from the “promiscuous Indian population,” a description usually omitted when the passage is cited, should be baptized \textit{at all} without the subsequent supervision of a Moravian Brother. Isabelle specifically cited the “custom of the Canadian Fathers” (another detail not often mentioned in secondary sources that refer to her request). The Canadian Fathers baptized as soon after birth as possible, especially when the parents were Catholic. She was not ignorant of this custom, having served as godmother for infants at least four documented times. Hirsch nevertheless writes: “Apparently, she considered baptism important but did not necessarily care which church baptized the children in her extended family. The churches were not as easy-going.”\textsuperscript{361} Hirsch thus gives the impression Isabelle was ignorant of the distinction between a baptism by a Catholic priest and that by a representative of a Protestant denomination. Actually, Hirsch may be the one who is misinformed. Baptisms for individuals not nominally belonging to the baptizing church are not entirely unusual, as I will illustrate. In addition, one of Madame Montour’s voyages to Philadelphia may well have been to obtain an official Catholic baptism for a granddaughter, so she certainly knew the difference.

She certainly would have also known about \emph{ondoyement}, the baptism of a child by a lay person if an official representative of the Church was not present or not likely to be available soon, especially if the child was in danger of death; but she may have hesitated to perform such a baptism herself on possibly healthy children, considering that the closest Catholic church was in Philadelphia and \emph{ondoyement} was not to be performed indiscriminately. A “lay baptism” performed with ordinary water poured on the child’s head and the words: “I baptize you in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit” would then be supplied by a priest in the presence of godparents with all the sacramental religious ceremonies: application of holy oils, renouncing Satan, \emph{etc.}, and recorded when the child could be taken to a church or mission. The baptism remained canonically valid whether a Catholic religious official ever formally supplied the sacrament.\textsuperscript{362} Her sister Angélique, a mid-wife, performed lay baptism in Trois-Rivières at least one documented time, but this child was then taken to the priest.\textsuperscript{363}

Because of the Catholic belief that an individual can be baptized only once, Protestants who had been baptized in their own denominations also received “supplied” rites when they embraced Catholicism.

\textsuperscript{360} Reichel, p. 98, underlining mine. Burton Library, Detroit Public Library, I 572 M9 R27.

\textsuperscript{361} Hirsch, 2000, p. 105.

\textsuperscript{362} My father gave one of my sisters lay baptism at her birth. She died almost immediately, but my father’s act allowed her to be buried in a Catholic cemetery. In addition, I have read that “Except for the Episcopal Church, the Moravian Church is the only Protestant church with an apostolic succession,” thus the sacramental acts of its validly ordained ministers would be considered valid. I have no idea whether Isabelle knew this. Zinzendorf probably did. See Frederick Klees, \textit{The Pennsylvania Dutch}, The Macmillan Company, 1950, read at <http://www.horseshoe.cc/pennadutch/religion/moravian/moravian.htm>

\textsuperscript{363} Angélique, good woman St Serny, \textit{la bonne femme St Serny}, served as mid-wife more than twelve times at Trois Rivières. A 1728 entry specifically says she had \emph{ondoyé}, given lay baptism, to the child Marie Claire, daughter of Louis Lemaistre and Claire duGué. Photocopies.
Many examples of this practice exist, including an entry at the parish of Saint François Xavier in La Prairie de La Magdeleine on 26 July 1699. Father Louis de Lafaye of the seminary of Ville Marie first certifying having conferred (interestingly this word “conferé” is crossed out) and then wrote supplied (suppléées) the holy ceremonies of baptism for Antoine Barrois, son of Antoine Barrois and Anne Le Ber, age about 15 (19?), who had been baptized among the Dutch of New York, aux flamans.\(^\text{364}\) His sister Anne, who later became a nun in the Congrégation de Notre-Dame de Montréal, Sister Saint-Charles, had been baptized at Albany Dutch Church 3 May 1685.\(^\text{365}\) It is relevant to note that two of this Antoine’s half-brothers, also born among the Dutch, were given supplied baptism ceremonies in this year that their parents returned to New France, and one of them was definitely a witness for the marriage of Isabelle’s son Michel Germaneau in 1717. Anne Le Ber, member of a prominent French merchant family, had remarried to Hillebrand Lootman at the Albany Dutch Church on 20 December 1689. Her children from her second marriage are recorded at their formal baptisms under the names Barrois and Lootman (with spelling variations), as well as “Albrin,” a French version of Hillebrand.\(^\text{366}\) Another person returning to New France with his family in 1699 was Jean Baptiste de Poitiers, sieur du Buisson, a former Carignan soldier who had been an interpreter of English and Dutch in New York. His son, Louis de Poitiers du Buisson, born 7 December 1696 at Esopus, not far from Albany, en La Nouvelle Angleterre, received baptism on 15 November 1699 at Notre-Dame de Montréal, in whose registers it is written that he had been given lay baptism by the minister of Orange and named Louis at that time, ondoyé par le ministre d’Orange et nommé pour lors Louis.\(^\text{367}\)

The long-standing friction between France and England, Canada and the United States, Catholicism and Protestantism—even that between males and females—must inevitably filter into the use and misuse of sources. Here is another example of how inaccurate quoting of a primary source can distort, especially when the citation of a quotation from the source misreads it or adds further information to develop a thesis close to the writer’s prejudices.

French-Canadian Heritage Society of Michigan member John Jackson wrote to me in all innocence:

> Isabelle told the appalled preacher [Count Zinzendorf] that the Savior had been born in France and put to death by Englishmen.\(^\text{368}\)

Jackson was referring to Zinzendorf’s visit to Otstonwacken, the same visit during which “the old Madame” Montour asked Zinzendorf to baptize some children. The Moravian minister had told Madame

---

\(^\text{364}\) FHL #1288833, photocopy of this record. See also “Jean Baptiste Lotman, cy devant [nommé Herbrand, in the margin] de la nouvelle holande aage de trente sept ans” at Montréal, 8 November 1699. FHL #0375840. Godfather: Jean Baptiste de Poitiers, sieur du Buisson, who obviously gave “Herbrand” his baptismal name; godmother, Agathe de Saint Père, who would attend the Massé daughters’ weddings. (See Part 8.) Jean-Baptiste de Poitiers was a Carignan veteran who had been an interpreter of English and Dutch in New York, 1674-1699. One of his sons, Guillaume, would marry an Indian, Marie Apeke8rata, at Kaskaskia before 1720. Jetté. The priest providing the supplemental rites would usually include the phrase, “...if you are not already baptized.”


\(^\text{367}\) FHL #0375840, photocopy.

\(^\text{368}\) Personal E-mail from John Jackson.
Montour's new settlement was at a place he called Bethlehem (Pennsylvania), and she allegedly answered him with the above comment. William M. Darlington’s version of the story, in 1893, reads:

She had entirely forgotten the truths of the Gospel, and, in common with the French Indians, believed the story originated with the Jesuits, that the Saviour’s birth place was in France, and His crucifiers Englishmen.369

In response to seeing Jackson cite this allegation yet again, I wrote to him:

You know, I have never trusted that story. My built in "Hogwash" alarm sounded right away. I think I know why now, based on finally reading an English language version of the section of Zinzendorf’s Journal reporting the incident. It comes just after the widely quoted (word-for-word) description370 of Andrew or "Andreè" [the name as recorded in this extract]:

"Here we dismounted and entered the cabin of the old Madame [Andre / Andrew / Andreè’s mother].

"Her husband had been a war chief, and had been killed in battle.

"Upon seeing us she wept bitterly, and when I spoke of our affairs, and among other things remarked that we had named our town Bethlehem, she observed that the town in France, where Jesus and the holy family dwelt, was also named Bethlehem. I inferred

370 Zinzendorf described “the son of old Madame De Montour” in these terms:

This man’s face is like that of any other European; but all around it he had a broad ring of bear’s grease and paint, after the Indian fashion. He wore a cinnamon colored coat of fine cloth, a black neck cloth, with silver spangles, a red damask vest, pantaloons, shoes, stockings and a hat; and both his ears were ornamented with brass and other wire twisted together like the handles of a little basket.

His name is Andreè; he received us cordially, and when I addressed him in French, he answered in English.

Eugene Schaeffer, “Extracts from Zinzendorf’s Diary of his second, and in part of his third journey among the Indians, the former to Shekomeko, and the other among the Shawanese, on the Susquehanna,” Moravian Historical Society Transactions, 1:3, 1869, pp. 88-89, passage dated about 1 October 1742, translated from a German MS., in the Bethlehem Archives, underlining mine. Zinzendorf describes “Madame Montour” as “an Indianized French Lady” who lives at “Ostonwacken, forty miles from Shamokin”, p. 84. Another translation of this description is cited by Hanna, I, p. 223. See <http://historymatters.gmu.edu/mse/letters/question1.html> for the problem of “trusting” edited documents: “There are many excellent published diaries and letter collections, of course, which have been edited with faithfulness to the original and — very important — with candor about what has been omitted or changed, and why. But, as historian C. Vann Woodward discovered when he edited the manuscript of Mary Boykin Chesnut’s Civil War diary, some editors of published diaries have greatly altered the texts. Woodward found that the editors of two previous, much-used editions of the Chesnut diary had changed many of her words, moved entire passages from one place to another, and even wholly made up other passages. Reputable editors in print or on the Web do not do this, of course, and they are clear about changes generally considered appropriate: correcting spelling, "modernizing" capitalization and punctuation, and, more invasively, cutting out "repetitive" passages for reasons of space. Such carefully (and openly) edited published texts can be relied upon in a general way, but if a certain diary or collection of letters is a centerpiece of your project, you should look at the original if possible.” Considering the differences between the two English translations I have seen, I have to wonder whether Reichel added details, such as Carondowana’s death at the hands of the Catawbas, not mentioned in the Schaeffer translation.
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from this that what is commonly reported of the French Missionaries is most probably true, namely, that they taught that Christ was a Frenchman and the English were his crucifiers; since this woman, born a Christian, did herself not know otherwise but that Bethlehem lay in France. [Underlining mine]" [Note the qualifying words inferred, reported, and probably.]

Isabelle can be credited only with the belief that Jesus and his family dwelt in Bethlehem and that Bethlehem was in France. It is Zinzendorf, and those who misquoted him, who add the second detail about the English killing Jesus. I am sure they did it with much glee. All versions that I have read citing this incident also corrected the original spelling as recorded by Zinzendorf, it seems. The version I have was published by the Moravian Historical Society Transactions, 1:3, 1869, p. 89. I received it just this last summer [2001].

This abridged version of Zinzendorf’s Journal was translated by Eugene Schaeffer from a German manuscript in the Bethlehem Archives. I myself have not seen the original, so I must, for now, trust this translation or what I assume to be an unabridged version in Reichel’s Memorials itself, again with my underlining:

Here we dismounted and repaired to Madame Montour’s* quarters. Her husband, who had been a chief, had been killed in battle with the Catawbas. When the old woman saw us she wept. In course of conversation, while giving her a general account of the Brethren and their circumstances, I mentioned that one of our towns was named Bethlehem. When the old woman saw us she wept. In course of conversation, while giving her a general account of the Brethren and their circumstances, I mentioned that one of our towns was named Bethlehem. Hereupon she interrupted me and said: “The place in France where Jesus and the holy family lived was also named Bethlehem.” I was surprised at the woman’s ignorance, considering she had been born and brought up a Christian. At the same time I thought I had evidence of the truth of the charge brought against the French missionaries, who are said to make it a point to teach the Indians that Jesus had been a Frenchman, and that the English had been his crucifiers. Without attempting to rectify her misapprehension, I in a few words stated our views, replying to her inquiries with sincerity of purpose, without, however, entering into an explanation, as I had purposed remaining retired for a few days. She was very confidential to Anna, and told her, among other things, that she was weary of Indian life.

Even with the differences in wording in the two translations, I am once again reminded it is important to go to the complete source, whenever possible, and not to simply repeat truncated versions in secondary sources. In this translation she simply “wept,” whether “bitterly” or not may depend on the original German word. After all, one can weep out of sheer pleasure. Hirsch reports: “She had wept with joy when the Moravians arrived....” And not only did she interrupt Zinzendorf instead of merely “observing,” she also had other “inquiries” about his “general account of the Brethren,” which Zinzendorf, on the face of it,

371 Egle in his Notes and Queries considers the tale attributed to Zinzendorf “undoubtedly apocryphal.” XIX, p.119.
372 E-mail message sent to John Jackson, 2001. Insertions in brackets are my additions. I hope to see the original German and ask my college friend, who is native to the tongue and also taught it, to give her opinion. A more modern translation may be available, but I have not seen it.
373 Reichel, pp. 96-97, Burton Library copy. The asterisk ( * ) sends the reader to Reichel’s version of Madame Montour’s identity.
374 Hirsch, “The Celebrated Madame Montour,” Explorations in Early American Culture, Vol. 4, published by the Pennsylvania Historical Association for the McNeil Center for Early American Studies, 2000, p. 105. Hirsch refers to “June Lloyd’s assistance in comparing the original German and the contemporary English translation.” Page 108, footnote 78. This may explain her use of the word joy to describe Madame Montour’s weeping.
politely but sincerely sidestepped, not wanting to cut short his time alone. She does not strike me as “ignorant.” I will not here explore the “confidential” information some commentators say she allegedly shared with Anna, Zinzendorf’s consort, as I have not seen any evidence of Anna’s testimony, and there is certainly none here, except for the comment that Madame Montour “was weary of Indian life.” So was Zinzendorf after far less time among the Indians. He also had problems with geography. Wallace reports that Zinzendorf “placed the Wyoming Valley [Pennsylvania] (which he visited) in Canada (which he wanted to visit), and identified the Delawares with the Hurons.”

It may be instructive to compare Zinzendorf’s comments about Madame Montour’s “ignorance” with those of Conrad Weiser, who, like Madame Montour’s son Andrew Montour, was an interpreter and a frequent traveler with Andrew. Weiser accompanied Zinzendorf in 1742, arriving at “Otstuaga” (also called Otstonwakin, and now Montoursville, Pennsylvania) 21 September, but he had also “quartered” himself there with Madame Montour five years earlier, in 1737, and reported she not only fed him and his companions (as well as she could in a time when food was scarce) but also “showed great compassion” to them then and gave them “some provisions for the journey.” With reference to his 1742 visit, he later reported (1747) that upon his arrival at Otstonwakin:

> we were remarkably well received. The Count had much discourse with an old Frenchwoman who had lived from youth among the Indians, and had fled with her relatives from Canada for I don’t know what reasons. She spoke French with her children and was known to me for many years by the name of Madame Montour. She was a Roman Catholic and a very intelligent person, as were her children too.

Frankly, I accept Weiser’s testimony about Madame Montour’s intelligence far more than Zinzendorf’s or the interpretations of secondary source writers. Weiser spent much more time with Madame Montour and her family than did Zinzendorf, who left for Europe after his visit. It is amazing to me how many secondary sources fail to quote Weiser’s identification of her as a Roman Catholic just as they omit Zinzendorf’s reference to her knowledge of the custom of the Canadian Fathers. These omissions are a good example of my comment in the first article of this series: “Transcription of data in a record is usually incomplete. The record may have more details, sometimes crucial details that could modify the impression created by an excerpt. This is a particular problem when evaluating quotations cited in histories as well. What does the partial quotation omit?” I might also point out that Weiser’s testimony certainly challenges Marshe’s understanding that Madame Montour arrived in the English colonies as a child, a captive of the Iroquois. (See Part 7.) As Weiser understood it, she and her relatives had “fled from Canada,” although he did not know why.

---

375 See Wallace for Zinzendorf’s negative attitude toward the Indians: they “interested him not primarily as fellow men, but as God’s vineyard. He heartily disapproved of their persons.” Page 136.
376 Wallace, p. 139.
377 Wallace, p. 80.
378 Wallace, quoting from Weiser to Brunnholtz, Feb. 16, 1747; Juniata College Library, Huntingdon, Pa.; p. 139, footnote 21, underlining mine. Christopher Gist at Muskungum “a Town of the Wyendotts” on Elk Creek, Christmas Day, 1750, reports that he was shown a “Book (which was a Kind contrived for Them [the Indians] by the French in which the Days of the Week were so marked that by moving a Pin every Morning they kept a pretty exact Account of the Time) to shew [sic] Me that He understood Me, and that He and his Family always observed the Sabbath Day.” Perhaps Isabelle and her family used a similar device. *Christopher Gist’s Journals* with Historical, Geographical and Ethnological Notes and Biographies of his Contemporaries by William M. Darlington, Pittsburgh: J. R. Weldin & Co. 1893.
379 See Wallace for Weiser’s characterization of Zinzendorf, especially pp. 140-144.
At times, as has already been demonstrated, a writer will add details that cannot be traced to a primary source. Here’s another example. Some historians say Madame Montour reputedly traveled to Philadelphia to the Catholic church there to have a grandchild baptized.\(^{380}\) Even though it is reported at several removes from any original source, I am once again indebted to John Jackson for sending me this following image from Isabelle’s life:

The late church historian Dr. Shea telling of the visits of these primitive Americans to the above named shire [while making periodic pilgrimages to St. Joseph's church in Willing's Alley] in order to receive the holy sacraments of their religion, says that in 1743, Count Zinzendorf wrote of the Senacas and other western Indians, who always were well received at Philadelphia and encouraged to visit the Catholic missionaries, that “when any of them come to Philadelphia, they go to the Popish chapel to Mass.” And again (to quote the Doctor [Shea]): “The famous Madame Montour, wife of an Oneida chief, and on many occasions interpreter for the English, came to Philadelphia in her own carriage, and on one of her visits had her granddaughter baptised at St. Joseph's.” Shea, *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, I (New York, 1886) 401, citing Reichel's *Memorials of the Moravian Church* for his statement of the baptism of this Indian princess.\(^{381}\)

---

\(^{380}\) John Gilmary Shea, *The Catholic Church in the United States*, P. J. Kenedy & John G. Shea, 1879, FHL #0908268, says that “in 1729 a Catholic Chapel existed at a short distance from Philadelphia, on the road from Nicetown to Frankfort, and that it was built by Miss Elizabeth McGawley, a young Irish lady, who had settled in that part with a number of her tenants.” (p.199) French Margaret, probably Isabelle’s daughter married to Mohawk Peter Quebec, with him and two children, is reported to have traveled “in a semi-barbaric state, with an Irish groom and six relay and pack-horses” in 1754 when they halted at the Moravians on their way to New York. (Hanna, I, p. 205) “In the year 1730, Father Josiah Greaton, a Jesuit, was sent from Maryland to Philadelphia.” Shea (1879), pp. 199-200. I have to wonder whether the existence of Catholic places of worship was one of the attractions that drew Madame Montour to Pennsylvania. In 1701 New York, by contrast, “a law was passed excluding Catholics from office, and… . The next year Queen Anne granted liberty of conscience to all the inhabitants of New York, Papists excepted. […] Few dared to avow themselves Catholics, and in the absence of priest and church it was impossible to fulfill the duties of religion, as there was no way but the then long and expensive journey to Philadelphia.” Shea (1879), p. 331, underlining mine. The Jesuits ministering to the Iroquois were effectively banished in 1710, except for chaplains serving at Niagara (about 1726) and Crown Point. See John Tracy Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, Benedictine Studies, Baltimore and Dublin: Helicon, 1965. I recently found this passage in Sir William Johnson’s Papers, Vol. IX, p. 117, in “Transactions with the Six Nations,” September 8, 1753. The Indians had been told to stay away from Osswegalty [Oswegatsy], and replied: “you White People pray, and we have no nearer Place to learn to Pray, and have our Children Baptized, then [sic] that, however as you insist upon it, we will not go that way.”

\(^{381}\) E-mail from John Jackson, 16 July 2001, citing Rev. Thomas C. Middleton, "Some Memoirs of Our Lady's Shrine at Chestnut Hill, Pa, Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, XII, 1 (March 1901) 19-20. Brackets as in e-mail. The source has no further citation. “St. Joseph's Catholic Church was organized in 1732 in Philadelphia county, Pennsylvania (now city of Philadelphia.) The first mass in Pennsylvania is said to have been celebrated in 1708. Catholics were present around Philadelphia (English, Irish and German) by 1720-30 in large enough numbers to cause Father Joseph Greaton, a Jesuit, to come from Maryland to found the church in 1732. The church was located at Willing's Alley below Fourth, and Father Greaton first served there. . . . We, however, know that Governor Gorden [sic], in 1734, informed the Council that a house had been erected in Walnut street, [probably at the north-west corner of Walnut and Front streets, or else St. Joseph's on Willing's alley and back from Walnut street] for the open celebration of mass, contrary to the statutes of William the Third. The Council advised him to consult his superiors at home. In the mean time they judged them protected by the charter, which allowed ‘liberty of conscience’.” [Brackets as in source I found surfing the Web.]
I love to pair this image of Isabelle, late in her life, traveling “in her own carriage,” with the image created of her as a seventeen-year-old bride by the list of items in her trousseau, a list appended to the end of her marriage contract:

- a feather bed with its coverings, a base for the bed, six pewter [étain] dishes, a pewter chandelier, half a dozen pewter forks, the clothes she is taking with her, all estimated to total 150 livres.382

I have read that 150 livres was the average yearly salary of a working-class man in New France. The contract runs eleven hand-written pages, the eleventh page containing the description of Isabelle’s trousseau, a gift from her parents. Her parents also gave her two properties in the ville (town) of Trois Rivières, originally obtained by them on 1 September 1658, from Urbain Baudry dit Lamarche, and on 27 July 1660, from Gilles Trotier, in contracts written by the notary Séverin Ameau, who had attended their wedding in 1657. One property, five toises wide and twenty deep was bordered on the northeast by the property of Sebastien Dodier, and on the southwest by Gilles Trotier. It appears to be the same property sold in 1723 by Angélique Couc and her husband, acting for themselves and for their sisters Marguerite, Isabelle, and Madeleine.383

These details present a totally different image of Isabelle from the one imagined by some who see her as wholly Indianized; or the image peddled by Cadillac in 1704 as part of his own defense; and it is definitely different from the exaggerated version presented by more recent historians, who judge her as only a “notorious profligate wench” when she is identified as la femme de Tichenet.384

In trying to locate an original source for this tale of Madame Montour’s voyage to Philadelphia, the closest I can now come is Zinzendorf’s post-script shortly after the passage quoted above:

We will probably resume our journey about the 9th inst. At times we have observed signs of grace in Andrew. Anna [Nitschmann] has experienced the same in the case of Madame Montour’s granddaughter.*

Editor Reichel footnotes this passage with a “*Quære”, which I understand to be a question:

---

*The minutes of the Council, at the same time, calls their proceedings thereon “the Consideration of the Council upon the building of the Roman mass house, and the public worship thereon”, July 1734.” Isabelle interpreted for Governor Gordon. See <www.mcn.org/2/noel/Church.htm> and <http://www.oldstjoseph.org/htmlpages/history.htm>

382 26 April 1684, Antoine Adhémar, notary at Trois Rivières, ANQ, photocopy. Marie Mite8ame8k8é signed Isabelle’s marriage contract with what appears to be a bird symbol (perhaps a crane?) or a combination of a bird and a cross. Crosses were made by the other members of the family, except Pierre, Louis Montour, and Angélique, who signed their names. See Part 2.

383 11 June 1723, Notary Pierre Petit, ANQ TR, photocopy. Jacques Baudry (Beaudry) dit Lamarche, son of Urbain, later acquired Cadillac’s Detroit property in about 1722, the profits from which enabled Cadillac to purchase the mayor’s position at Castelsarrazin. See DCB II. I am continually amazed at the inter-connections among these people.

384 See my Part 6.

385 Reichel, p. 99. “Anna” is Anna Nitschmann, a companion also visiting Otstonwakin, whom Zinzendorf later took as his consort.
Mary Magdalene, alias Peggy, who interpreted at a treaty held at Lancaster, in February of 1760? In youth she had been baptized by a Catholic priest in Philadelphia.\textsuperscript{386}

Reichel gives no sources for these statements nor for his further details about “Peggy,” nor does he mention a “carriage.” Perhaps the “carriage” is lost in John Gilmary Shea’s notes.

In an 1880 personal letter Shea writes:

> There is some curious matter in regard to Queen Catharine Montour [sic], which I wish to study out. When ever she came to Philadelphia she was made much of by government and encouraged to go to St. Joseph’s Church.\textsuperscript{387}

By 1886 with the publication of his \textit{The Catholic Church in Colonial Days}, Shea reported:

> The Senecas and other Western Indians were always well received at Philadelphia and encouraged to visit the Catholic missionaries. “When any of them come to Philadelphia,” wrote Count Zinzendorf in 1743, “they go to the Popish chapel to Mass.” The famous Madame Montour, wife of an Oneida chief, and on many occasions interpreter for the English, came to Philadelphia in her own carriage, and on one of the visits had her granddaughter baptized at Saint Joseph’s.\textsuperscript{388}

“Queen Catharine,” possibly Isabelle’s granddaughter, is no longer named in the 1886 version, although Madame Montour’s Oneida husband is cited. But Shea’s source for this entire paragraph is “Reichel, “Memorials of the Moravian Church,” i., pp. 120, 99,” on which pages I find no mention of any “carriage.” It is a pleasant image to contemplate, but without firm attribution I will have to relegate it to the status of legend, or to my novel.

\textit{Veritas / Truth?}

I imagine we can forgive Madame Montour for her tales to Witham Marshe (see Part 7), considering all the tales that have been spun about her during and after her life. In speaking with Marshe, Isabelle may have sincerely wished to protect members of her family, just as Louis Montour may have wished to do by identifying, in 1708, only two sisters (if he truly did identify only two sisters! See Part 6.) Truth is elusive. We’ll never know all the answers, but it is certain that the French, before 1751, “offered a large Sum of Money to any Person who would bring to them the said Croghan and Andrew Montour the Interpreter alive, or if dead their Scalps.”\textsuperscript{389} By 1753 the French had “set £ 100. on [Andrew’s] head”.

\textsuperscript{386} Reichel, p. 99. He then “marries” this woman to a “white man named Hands, and on marrying him she was called Sally Hands.” Since the DCB identifies Sally Aine (Hands) as Andrew Montour’s wife, I must respond to Reichel’s identification with some caution.

\textsuperscript{387} John Gilmary Shea to Mr. Mallet, Elizabeth [New Jersey], January 21, 1880. photocopy courtesy of Special Collections Division, Georgetown University Library. My thanks to them for their prompt reply to my request. I have never seen Madame Montour called “Queen,” although her probable granddaughter was so-called. Catharine was a frequent guess for Madame Montour’s first name, a guess that has been discredited since at least Darlington’s writings.

\textsuperscript{388} Shea, 1886, p. 401. Copy at Cardinal Edmund Szoka Library, Sacred Heart Major Seminary, Detroit, Michigan. My thanks to the staff for facilitating my visit.

\textsuperscript{389} \textit{Christopher Gist’s Journals}, entry for 30 January 1751: Gist quotes George Croghan, who reported “That two Prisoners who had been taken by the French, and had made their Escape from the French Officer at Lake Erie as he...
and he defended the British side of the Seven Years’ War / French and Indian War.\textsuperscript{390} Andrew even served with the young George Washington in the 1750s\textsuperscript{391} and, in the 1760s, traveled to Detroit and perhaps to Michilimackinac, his mother’s ancient haunts, when he worked with William Johnson, who was in charge of Indian Affairs for New York. His mother was deceased by then,\textsuperscript{392} but she lived long enough to know he would serve an important role as an interpreter and go-between for the Indians and the English colonies, just as she had been for the Indians and the French and the English. How ironic that this woman — one who sought to facilitate understanding, one whom Governor Robert Hunter saw as a source of truth — has been so misunderstood because of a misuse and a misunderstanding of sources and, perhaps because of known or unknown biases.

**Perpetuation of errors**

Errors in identifying or describing Madame Montour are not limited to writers of the past. Alison Duncan Hirsch, in 2000, writes:

> Isabelle was an avowed Christian, but exactly what she understood that to mean is difficult to know. To Catholics she was a good enough Christian to serve as a godmother; to Moravians, she was ignorant of the most basic knowledge of the Bible.\textsuperscript{393}

I beg to differ with Hirsch. All that can be documented, it seems, is that she was ignorant of geography. I truly do not understand how historians can make such sweeping pronouncements.

It is not that “difficult to know” her understanding of the “meaning” of being a Christian. The life she led and the acts of charity she is said to have performed\textsuperscript{394} are far more persuasive in defining her understanding than a simple failure to know that Bethlehem is not in France. Ample testimony survives to

---

\textsuperscript{390} “August 29 [1753] . . . As To Andrew Sattelehu [one of his Indian names, also spelled Sattelihu], he is now interpreter for Virginia and receives a salary of £ 300.; twice he has visited Onondogo this Summer, and now will be sent to Allegheny, and to bring back with him [French] Margaret’s relatives who still live in French Canada. [French Margaret is most probably Andrew’s sister, although some call her his cousin.] The French have set £ 100. on his head. The Governor has also made him a Colonel and presented him with a tract of land on the Potomac. The Six Nations have let it be known, that whatever nation should kill him, with it they would begin war; therefore he is held in high esteem among them.” “A Missionary’s Tour to Shamokin and the West Branch of the Susquehanna, 1753 [identified as “the journal of Rev. Bernard A. Grube, who visited Shamokin and the Indian towns along the west branch in 1753” from a document preserved in the Archives at Bethlehem, Penna.], ” *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 39, No. 4, October, 1915, pp. 440-444, quote on 443-444. Grube identifies “French” Margaret as both Andrew’s sister and Madame Montour’s niece. I have not seen the original document.

\textsuperscript{391} See Washington to Dinwiddie, June 3, 1754, and Dinwiddie to Hamilton, June 18, 1754, for example. Howard Lewin, “A Frontier Diplomat: Andrew Montour”, *Pennsylvania History*, XXXIII (1966), 153-186, quotes from these documents, but letters may also be seen on-line at the American Memory, Library of Congress <http://memory.loc.gov/ammemhome.html> in the Washington papers.

\textsuperscript{392} The only surviving mention of her death is cited by Hanna, I, p. 202, a letter from John Harris, January of 1753, reporting “Madame Montour is dead.” Hanna does not cite a source, and the letter apparently cannot be found.


\textsuperscript{394} Hirsch cited several but evidently did not recognize them as examples of “Christian” behavior.
demonstrate that she knew the essence of Jesus’ words in the Parable of the Talents, Chapter 24 of the Gospel of Matthew:

34 Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:
35 For I was an hungry, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in:
36 Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.
37 And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me […]
38 Then shall he also answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me.

Madame Montour spent her “talents” well. I have read testimony that she fed the hungry, gave drink to the thirsty, sheltered the stranger, clothed the naked, and visited the sick, even providing healing potions;395 and, while I’ve seen no evidence she literally went to visit anyone in a prison, she associated with those who were being sought to be put in prison. Actions speak louder than words.

Other modern writers referring to Madame Montour or to her son Andrew, who is documented in colonial records much better than she is, also make unwarranted judgments. Nancy L. Hagedorn, in her article about Andrew, decides that Madame Montour was “probably” Catherine Couc, born in 1684 to Louis Couc (Montour) and a Sokakis [sic] Indian at St. François du Lac.396 It doesn’t seem to bother her that no records exist for a child named Catherine.397 Hagedorn simply dismisses the William A. Hunter entry in the Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Volume III, which identifies Madame Montour as Elizabeth Couc, born at Three Rivers [sic] in 1667, instead stating she “believes” Elizabeth was Madame Montour’s aunt without giving any reasons or documentation. But then this author also states that Andrew (André in French) Montour’s apparent use of the name Henry in the early 1760s is, in her words: “Another indication of Montour’s indebtedness and inner confusion.”398 As the French pronunciation of André (“ahndray”) can sound very much like French Henri (“anhree”), perhaps this confusion of names for the

395 Wallace quotes Weiser’s “memorandum” for “Mad. Montur’s [sic] fever medicine”, which Weiser obtained from her at the Treaty of 1744 at Lancaster, p. 196, citing Peters MSS., II, 16, H.S.P.
397 Son François born 4 June 1681 at Saint-François-du-Lac, baptized 30 August 1682 Sorel, mother’s name not given, Isabelle his godmother; died and was buried 9 December 1700 at Trois-Rivières; son Jacques born July 1683, baptized Nicolet 1 May 1684, recorded in Trois-Rivières register, mother a Socokie he had taken as wife according to custom. Louis’s only known daughter, Madeleine, was most likely born circa 1687-86, possibly of his Algonquinne wife Jeanne, whom he married 7 January 1688, the same day their two-month-old son, believed to be Joseph, was baptized, both events at Saint-François-du-Lac. Madeleine was buried at the end of February 1697 at nine or ten years of age, Trois-Rivières. The entry is damaged. The death of his wife Jeanne is unknown, as is the identity of the wife who accompanied him to Albany and of the mother of the Michel Montour placed with the Rev. Barclay in 1708.
398 Hagedorn, p. 312, footnote 32. James H. Merrell, Into the American Woods, Negotiators on the Pennsylvania Frontier, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, also devotes most of his references to Andrew to develop his thesis, and he seems genuinely confused as to whom to believe about Madame Montour’s identity, though he does thank Alison Duncan Hirsch for sharing some of her work with him.
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same person is as simple as a clerk in Pennsylvania hearing the sounds for what he recorded as “Henry” in his English language record, instead of André or Andrew,399 as it is consistently spelled in the New York and other English records. My hunch may not be right, but I am certain it is too simple an explanation when one is trying to force one’s facts into a predefined thesis presenting Andrew as a mediator or go-between betwixt two worlds (and never the twain shall meet!) resulting in “inner confusion.” I wrote in the margin of the text of my copy: Hogwash! I had long before lost patience with the tendency of historians to bend their evidence to conform with their theories.

Some of the Canadian nephews and great-nephews and -nieces of Louis Couc Montour and Isabelle Couc / Madame Montour adopted the name Montour, in some cases eventually abandoning their original surname, a fact that is readily proven by an examination of the excellent New France church records.400 Were they, too, suffering from “inner confusion” in using their uncle’s and aunt’s adopted name? Or is it not more likely they were not-so-simply paying tribute and perpetuating the spirit of deceased persons, just as the Amérindiens did, by adopting the name of a deceased member of their family.401

The English language secondary sources about this family—in the past and in the present—need major revision and correction,402 and the primary sources need to be read and re-read with a great deal of care, always keeping in mind that it is quite possible for individuals to provide disinformation, to misinterpret, or to just make mistakes. I hope my exploration of the extant sources has both clarified and added complexity to the story of Madame Montour and her family. I know I will no longer be able to read anyone’s historical study without questioning the author’s use of sources. Considering the gaps in documentation, I deplore the broad-brush interpretations and the attempts to manipulate selected citations into a pre-determined thesis already decided upon by too many modern historians.403 I am equally aware of my use of selected quotations, but my goal is to return as much as I can to the original sources, especially those not previously consulted, and I have indicated the times I am speculating, I will be the

---

399 Primary sources seem to indicate that Henry and Andrew are the same person. See Hanna. See also Egle’s attempt to unravel the question of Henry vs Andrew. Among other details, he points out that on an August of 1761 letter “where the word Henry appears, the name originally written was Andrew, but subsequently erased and the other written. The endorsement on this paper is as follows: ‘Paper given to Andrew Montour for 1,500 acres of land over Sasquahannah, July 11, 1761.’ ” “The Montour Family,” Notes & Queries, XIX, p. 122.

400 The adoption of the dit name Montour by nephews seems to begin by 1729, within ten years of Angélique’s visit to New York in 1719 and six years after the sale of the Trois-Rivières property owned by the four surviving sisters. In his marriage contract (Notary Simonnet), Angélique’s son is named as “Maurice delpé dit Montour” on 29 July 1729, and he is identified by the same name the next day at the religious ceremony uniting him to Therese Petit, daughter of Pierre Petit & Marguerite Veron Grandmesnil, at Trois-Rivières. Marguerite’s brother Étienne was present at Fort Pontchartrain at the time Louis Montour and his sister defected, and, indeed, wrote the conseil de guerre that records their plan to go to the English. So much of what really happened has not survived, but it is not impossible that Étienne Grandmesnil told additional details to his nephew-marriage, Maurice. By 5 August 1739, a son of Maurice was baptized simply as Jérôme Montour. Photocopies. In some cases the original surnames of some of the Delpé dit Saint Serny and Ménard cousins disappear in time, replaced entirely by the name Montour. See PRDH.

401 See citation to Jesuit Relations in my Part 2 for the tradition of resurrecting a deceased by transferring his name to a living person. Perhaps the fact that both she and I walked the same territory, Fort Pontchartrain and the city of Detroit, my birthplace, led me to this work to resurrect Isabelle Couc Montour and retell her story right.


403 For example, Richard White and his “middle ground”; James H. Merrell and his “go-betweens” or mediators at the edge of the woods; and Susan Sleeper-Smith and her “kinship networks”.

---
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first to admit that my work may have flaws and misunderstandings (both mine and those of my secondary sources), which a future researcher may set straight. I am sure there is more out there waiting to be found, and I will continue the quest. More and more, though, I believe in what John Mack Faragher cites as the "Morgan method":

As Joseph Ellis puts it, [Edmund] Morgan taught us that “interpreting the past means laying your own eyes on the primary sources and seeing patterns there that no one else had seen before. Before there was the Nike ad there was the Morgan dictum: Stop telling me what other historians have said and tell me what you see.”

I have been telling what I see.

Speculations

In 1744, the same year as the Treaty at Lancaster and Witham Marshe’s interview with the “celebrated Madame Montour,” Philippe Thomas Chabert de Joncaire, who had been born the year Isabelle defected to the English, was serving as “officer in the colonial regular troops, Indian agent, and interpreter,” called Nitachinon by the Iroquois. He is the son of the Joncaire who saw to the killing of Louis Couc dit Montour in 1709. In 1735 Philippe Thomas Chabert de Joncaire

... succeeded his father as principal agent for New France among the Iroquois. As such, he was hostage, trader, interpreter, and political agent. He had to supply the European trade goods on which the Indians had become dependent. He was obliged to pacify the Iroquois when the French

---

404 See <http://www.common-place.org/vol-01/no-03/school/> for John Mack Faragher’s discussion of the "Morgan method”.

405 From Peter Wraxall’s Abridgement, cited earlier: “Albany 8 May 1709 [Old Style, about eleven days later in New Style, thus 19 May] – Three onondaga Indians arrive ... [and] say that about 12 days ago Montour the Indian in company with 10 Sachems of the Farr Nations met the French Interpreter called Jaen Ceur [Joncaire] & some French Men at a place called by the Indians Ossaroda being upon the Creek that lyes opposite Cayouge. The S[d] [said] French Interpreter Jean Ceur advised Montour to turn back again otherwise he would oblige the 5 Nations [Iroquois League of the Long House] to kill him, upon w[which] he replied he would perform his Journey to this Place. Jean Ceur then desired him to smoak, he replied he had no Tobacco, Jean Ceur then gave him a little, Montour took out his knife to cut it, Jean Ceur then asked what he did with such a little Knife & desired Montour to give it him & he would have him one that was better, as soon as Jean Ceur had the Knife he flung it away at the same time there stood a French Man behind [Jean Ce] [sic] Montour with a Hatchet under his Coat who cut the S[d] Montour into his Head & killed him, whereupon the 10 Sachems come to Cayouge with Montour would have killed the French Interpreter Jean Ceur & all his Company if it had not been for the S[d] Montours Brother in Law who prevented it. Notwithstanding the great Misfortune of the Death of Montour the said 10 Sachems (p. 65) of the farr Nations will come to see their Bro' [brother] Corlaer.” Pages 64-65. Just as the governor of New France was called Onontio by the Indian Nations, the governor of New York was called Corlra. The “[Jean Ce]” is as in original, evidently a copying mistake caught by Wraxall or someone who copied Wraxall’s manuscript, and the (p. 65) refers to the manuscript copy on which the published version is based. It is possible the brother-in-law could be Michel Massé or, less likely, Maurice Ménard, traveling with these Missasaguas from the area of Fort Pontchartrain, but we’ll never really know. On 16 May 1709 (Old Style, 5 May New Style), arrived at Albany the “Sachem called Kaucka of the Messasaga Nation called by the Name of the Farr Nations with 4 Indians of the same Nation who came with Montour to the 5 Nations & were conducted hither by Montours Sister.” Page 66, my emphasis. In 1710, 22 September, “a French Smith was seen going from Canada to the Senecas Country with Two of that Nation & that the Sennecas had promised to protect him against the English.” Wraxall, p. 79. Michel Massé was a forgeron, blacksmith, although it is a huge stretch to assert he is this particular blacksmith of 1710. Natives repeatedly pled with both the French and the English for artisans who could mend their weapons and other metal objects.
or their Indian allies did something disquieting, and to mollify the French when young warriors, contrary to tribal policy, committed an aggression. Hostility towards Indian nations unfriendly to the French had to be maintained. British initiatives, such as the summoning to Chouaguen (Oswego, N. Y.) in December 1743 of one warrior from every village, required reporting to the governor. Some persuasion was needed to keep the Senecas supplying Fort Niagara (near Youngstown, N. Y. [across the Niagara River from modern-day Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario] with fresh game. So successful was Joncaire that by 1744 the British had offered a reward for him dead or alive. Governor George Clinton of New York hopefully half-believed rumours that he might join the British service if good terms were offered.406

I can see in these words echoes of Isabelle’s life during the years she served as Madame Montour and when she was known as La Tichenette (a possible threat to Cadillac or called an evil spirit by Governor Vaudreuil); and I must restrain my imagination from declaring her a special agent, “half-believing” as I do that she worked for the Iroquois and England and New France in these later years, although I cannot prove it.407 Thus, I will have to hold back my imagination for my “novel” version of her life, in which I can unleash my intuitions and give them full rein, unless I find further evidence. What can be documented about my seventh great-grand aunt is nevertheless fascinating in and of itself without inventing anything.

I cannot, however, ignore a phrase in one of Vaudreuil’s dispatches to the Conseil de la Marine dated 14 October 1716 at Québec. He had just returned from two years in France during which he attended to family property matters and also sat in on the deliberations of the Council that governed France after the death of Louis XIV. He explains that during his absence, the temporary governor, Claude de Ramezay, had communicated with Governor Hunter of New York (for whom Madame Montour interpreted) and that the two governments seemed to be in agreement that the commerce conducted by the Indians between Nouvelle France and Nouvelle Angleterre could not be abolished entirely, “l’on ne pourra pas l’abolir entièrement.” He mentions a confiscation of eight écarlatines belonging to the English that had been deposited at Sault Saint Louis, where some of the domiciled Indians lived. A third of their value had been awarded to the Indians who exposed them “pour ne les point aliéner,” in order not to alienate them. He goes on to say that “it is very difficult, if not absolutely impossible, to prevent the Indians to go to get écarlatines chez les Anglais, because those furnished by sieurs Neret and Gayot [the firm in France in charge of the fur trade], in addition to the fact that they are not as lovely, cost the Indians forty livres of beaver a piece more expensive than those made by the English.” I must ask whether it is pure coincidence that Madame Montour gave her sister écarlatines in 1719. (See Part 8.) Then Vaudreuil closes this message by saying:

We live outwardly [on the surface: extérieurement] very well with the governors of the English colonies. The Marquis de Vaudreuil will explain to the Council in the articles concerning the Iroquois and other Indian Nations, some secret matters [quelque affaires secretes] that occurred;


407 Compare this description of Joncaire the younger to that of Isabelle’s nephew-by-marriage, John Henry Lydius: “His career was both aided and compromised by conflicting perceptions of him. Called an English agent by the French, a forked-tongued serpent by the Indians, a traitor by provincial authorities, and a swindler by embarrassed title holders from several colonies, he left that notoriety for posterity when he left New York in 1765. The subject of frequent romanticized and antiquarian profiles during the two centuries that followed, the legend of this frontier maverick lives on!” Read at <http://www.nysm.nysed.gov/albany/jhlydius4615.html>
but one must hope that they will not have any consequences, unless war with the English begins again.408

I am not sure all of the “secret matters” have ever been revealed. Some of the documents were written in code (I have seen examples of these coded messages on microfilm) or they have simply been lost. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that many times in his correspondence with France, Vaudreuil declares his most important task as governor is to maintain the neutrality of the New York Iroquois.409 Is it possible Madame Montour and her family were part of this plan? Part of “quelque affaires secrètes”? I have never stopped wondering why, late in his life in 1719 (he was about 82 when he died in 1725), Vaudreuil invited Isabelle to return to New France, unless he feared he would no longer be able to protect her. I hasten to add this is pure speculation, but she did begin to interpret in Pennsylvania after the time of Vaudreuil’s death in 1725 and about the time the fortified French Fort Niagara was built in 1726 to replace Joncaire the elder’s home and trading house on the Niagara River, near Lewiston in modern-day New York.410 Or perhaps she feared the proximity of the new English fort at Oswego. Governor Robert Hunter, who had trusted Madame Montour, left the picture by 1720, and while the new governor, William Burnet, continued many of Hunter’s policies, the Assembly passed a law two months after Burnet arrived that made it “unlawful for any one, directly or indirectly, to barter or sell to any subject of the French King or on behalf of such person, ‘any of the Cloaths knowne by the Name of Stroud waters, Duffales’ [read écarlatines] etc.”411 The trade between Canada and Albany had been brisk, and not merely between the natives and the Europeans. At issue was both France’s need to preserve trade with the Western Nations and the French, Dutch, and English merchants’ desire to maintain their financial profits. My deduction that Madame Montour may have served both New France and New York has more basis in reality than the stories told by Cadillac and Marshe, the only sources for their allegations. And my guess, emphatically identified as such, is at least as valid as the interpretations that have been perpetuated without any such proviso. The history of the interactions and collaboration between the individuals in the two “enemy” colonies has not yet been written.

One more document: le petit Montour and écarlatines

In April of 2009, searching at Library and Archives Canada by using the key word Orange, I located a letter of Governor Vaudreuil to the minister in France that someone has dated 1713, in which he mentions le petit Montour and écarlatines, although the summary provided by LAC does not include these words. The governor of New France, Vaudreuil, had been accused of illicit commerce with Orange, Albany, in connection with the arrest of several men detained at the fort at Chambly. In defending against this accusation and others, Vaudreuil summarized the letter from the captain and commandant at Chambly, Sieur (François) de Jordy, which reported that un sauvage observed that Sieur de St Paul had twelve or

---

408 Chicago Historical Society, Box 352, photocopy. The item is signed Vaudreuil.
409 See Yves F. Zoltvany, Philippe de Rigaud de Vaudreuil, Governor of New France 1703-1725, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1974, p. 198: “he had always considered that managing the Iroquois was his most important responsibility”. One of his last acts as governor before his death was to send Longueuil on a “crucial mission to Iroquoia.” p. 202. Longueuil was not unacquainted with the Couc family. See Part 8.
410 See Frank Hayward Severance, The story of Joncaire, his life and times on the Niagara. Digital file copyright by Cornell University Library 1993. Citation URL: <http://historical.library.cornell.edu:80/Dienst/UI/1.0/Display/cul.nys/nys271> See this for Severance's account of the story of Joncaire and the building of the "trade house" and the "stone" house at Niagara, but keep in mind the publication date of 1906. I have read that duffel cloth was more refined than stroud.
411 See McIlwain's introduction to Wraxall, p. lxvi.
fifteen pacquets of Castor that he had loaded into the canoe of a sauvage of the Sault [St Louis] named Montour. Later Vaudreuil identifies Montour as petit, the little or young(er) Montour. From the information given there is no way to tell who this is. Isabelle’s brother, Jean Couc Montour, had resided at Sault St. Louis, though he could hardly be called young or little at the age of about 34. Petit Montour may have been Louis Couc Montour’s son, Joseph Montour, who, with his wife, Élisabeth / Isabelle Onontio, a Huronne, are documented at Fort Pontchartrain (See Part 4.) Their daughter Magdeleine was baptized there 30 October 1711; and son Joseph Montour (born in January of 1714) was baptized at Montréal 23 July 1714, about a year after Vaudreuil’s 1713 letter, at six months old). Joseph Montour, son of the Montour who was assassinated, is later documented in New York in 1725, along with Jean Fafard dit Maonce, nephew of the same Montour, as I cited in Part 3. See also Parts 7 and 9.

I cannot give this document justice in this set of articles, but it contains significant details about the governor’s efforts to keep in touch with what was going on in the English colonies. The accusation had been made that, among other things, Vaudreuil had sent (and now I am paraphrasing):

François Leber, a man named Beaulac, and a third Frenchman from Laprairie to Orange. He says he did this as a pretext to discover the designs (plans or intentions) in the delicate situation New France and New York found themselves in. He did not use this pretext to send Castors (to trade); and, he says, “I did even more: I had them arrested and then released since this served the good of the king’s service.” Because of the delicacy of the political situation, he could not risk having them fall under suspicion (of being spies).

This François Leber is most certainly a cousin of Anne Leber, the wife of Antoine Barrois, whose sons by her second marriage aux flamands, among the Dutch, the Lootman / Barrois brothers, were witnesses at Isabelle’s son Michel’s 1717 marriage in Montréal. (See Part 10.) Beaulac is Claude Hertel, sieur de Beaulac, brother of Jean Baptiste Hertel, sieur de Rouville, who with Simon Dupuis accompanied Livingston when he returned to Albany after his stay in New France. These names are also mentioned in the document.

My quest is, evidently, not yet over.

**Beyond the documents**

Coming from a writer as committed to documentary evidence as I am, it may seem strange for me to ask: Is it just coincidence that my favorite name when I was a child was Isabelle? and that I dreamed of one day naming a daughter Isabelle? Both of us are associated with the same parish, Ste. Anne de Detroit, and both of us walked the paths of what is now modern-day Downtown Detroit and voyaged on the waterways of Le Détroit du Lac Érié and the Great Lakes.

---

412 Library and Archives Canada, Collections Canada online, Private Archives and Colonial Records, MG1-C11A, Volume 34, fol. 57-62v, quotation on 58v.
413 See Part 8.
415 See Jetté for these relationships.
I have stood many times in Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario, staring across the Niagara River at what remains of French Fort Niagara, the stone structure that now survives on the American side.\textsuperscript{416}

My photo, 2008, with cropping by Al Trudeau

Each time I appealed to the spirits of the deceased voyageurs, soldiers, Amerindians, and their women companions (far more women than have been assumed) who traveled the river at this juncture. I asked them to aid me in my quest, especially Isabelle. I am sure she passed there either en route to or returning from the portage that allowed the travelers to bypass the magnificent Niagara Falls, the major obstacle between Lakes Ontario and Erie.\textsuperscript{417} Isabelle has been haunting me, in the finest sense of the word, for years now.

At the end of one of the speeches I gave, a member of the audience suggested that I should explain the “significance” of Madame Montour. I can’t pigeonhole her like that. Only in the particular can the universal be found; her life is more than the sum of its parts. By telling the parts of her life that have survived, I invite you to form your own conclusions — not just about her life but about the process of turning “sources” into “histories” — and I ask you: Would any of you like to have your life reduced to a few catchy phrases? Similar restraint has not been shown by those who do not hesitate to see Isabelle as only an infamous woman, allegedly involved in many amorous, shocking (or titillating) relationships with men. Interestingly, no hint of scandal appears in the United States records nor in the French records other than as interpreted by modern historians. Some writers present Madame Montour as the “celebrated” “interpretress,” equally nonconforming to other standards “expected” of her, and thus to be studied as a woman who “lived on several frontiers.”\textsuperscript{418} Her life is far more complex (and more simple, much less pretentious) than is indicated by the slurs and labels applied to her and recorded in the published histories.

A final thought (for now). Browsing the Web, I discovered a site identifying the feast day\textsuperscript{419} of Sainte Isabelle, sister of King Louis IX,\textsuperscript{420} Saint Louis, who was responsible for building the Sorbonne and La

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{416} Brian Leigh Dunnigan, describing the fort during an imaginary tour of it as it would have been in 1781, says “Dominating all, however, is the ‘Castle’. This building was the first to be constructed by the French (1726) and now serves as officers’ quarters.” The original stone buildings still survive. “Fort Niagara in 1781,” \textit{Bicentennial Stories of Niagara-on-the-Lake}, edited by John L. Field, Published by the Bicentennial Committee, Lincoln, Ontario: Rannie Publications, 1981, p. 4.
\bibitem{417} René Bourassa, accused of illegal travel in Orange in 1721 with Marie Anne Germeneau’s cousins, in May of 1721 wrote an account of measuring the falls. See Frank Severance, \textit{An old frontier of France; the Niagara region and adjacent lakes under French control} (Volume 1), New York Dodd, Mceed and Company, 1917. Read on-line at The Cornell Library New York State Historical Literature
\bibitem{418} Hirsch (2000), p. 111.
\bibitem{419} 22 February: Feast of the Chair of Saint Peter at Antioche or Sainte-Isabelle de France.
\end{thebibliography}
Sainte-Chapelle, one of my favorite places in the world. According to this site, Sainte Isabelle is celebrated on 22 February, also the feast of the Chair of Peter at Antioch, as I later confirmed, although I also learned that Sainte Isabelle of France is celebrated on 26 February. The month, at least, is right.

Although many children in New France were baptized with the name of a godparent, it was additionally a tradition to name an individual or a place for the saint(e) whose day was then celebrated. I have to wonder whether I have, by chance, in a “wondrous strange” way, found Isabelle Couc’s birth date. Said to be three months old in the census of 1667, she could have been born in February. The census for her family’s home in 1667, Cap de la Madeleine, was undertaken in the months of May and June of 1667. What a remarkable coincidence this would be if this is true, not the least of which is that Isabelle of France, like Isabelle Couc, had a brother named Louis, who founded a dynasty of sorts, and that, in this account, her feast day is shared with Saint Pierre, her father Pierre Couc’s patron saint! Whether I am correct or not, when I find “ coincidences” like this, I feel the guiding influence of powers beyond strictly documentable facts.

I will continue to follow my intuitions, and I will even conjure up William Shakespeare for Hamlet’s words to friend Horatio after they both had seen the ghost of Hamlet’s father. Horatio speaks first:

Horatio: O day and night, but this is wondrous strange!  
Hamlet: And therefore as a stranger give it welcome.  
There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,  
Than are dreamt of in your philosophy.

The last installments in this series will study the next generation of French Canadian descendants of Isabelle Couc, and some of their cousins, a subject that has not yet been explored to any extent in any published source.

<http://www.aei-saumur.com/meteo/stephane/observations/dmois/2.htm>

420 In 2007, I learned that I descend from Robert 1st, le Vaillant (1216-1250), comte d’Artois, the brother of Louis IX, Saint Louis. The father of Louis, Isabelle, and Robert is Louis VIII, the Lion (1187-1226), king 1223-1226, the son of and successor of Philippe Auguste and Isabelle de Hainault. In 1200, Louis VIII married Blanche de Castille, the granddaughter of Eleanor of Aquitaine and Henri II Plantagenet. See MHH, Vol. 28, #4, October 2007, pages 191-196 for my article “Mystery Woman Marie Penne, Peme, Peine, Pelle, etc., Wife of Jean Guénet at Sainte-Anne-des-Plaines, daughter of Antoine Boichu dit Peyne, and Our Connection to King Louis the VIIIth of France: A Journey through a Maze of Spellings, Transcriptions, and Alternate First Names.” Perhaps these ancestors are also influencing me in my research!

421 April 2001 e-mail from Bertrand Desjardins of PRDH, citing a 1970 article by the demography department at the Université de Montréal.

422 Shakespeare, Hamlet. Act 1, scene 5, verses 166-69, my underlining. Shakespeare is another person whose “identity” exists in his works far better than in the biographies written about him, most of which are sheer invention.
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Part 10

Isabelle’s Children

Section 1

Suzanne Boivin Sommerville

The story of Madame Montour’s and Carondowana’s son Andrew Montour has been chronicled by several writers, and, for the most part, told well (even considering he is consistently called a “half-breed” in the older United States sources). The same cannot be said for Isabelle’s other children. A shadowy “brother” of Andrew, named Lewis in the United States sources, is said to have been “at the Ohio” River Valley and formerly an interpreter at Detroit. I have so far been unable to find any evidence of him in the Detroit records. He was a half-brother Andrew had not yet met until they were both adults. Although I have not yet seen a full version, some writers say Martin Mack’s 1745 Journal reports that Andrew missed seeing this brother when Lewis visited Shamokin, and he is mentioned in other documents. In 1751, according to Thomas Cresap:

Mr Montour informs me that he had a Brother who was Interpreter between the French and the Indians for a considerable time past, at a Fort called Detroit on Lake Eare [sic, Erie], but he has now left them and come to the Ohio, and gives the following Accot [Account]: that the French had built a new Fort at a place call’d Kyhogo on the West Side of Lake Eare [Erie], and that there was a great number of French gathered together last fall in order to cutt off [sic] a Nation of Indians called Pickolines, who came from the French about four years ago & Settled on the Branches of the Ohio.

Note: no name is here given for this “brother.” The term brother was used fairly loosely to indicate brother-in-law or even cousin. I have not yet determined whether this “brother” could be one of several male cousins active in the fur trade and as interpreters. Conrad Weiser, however, specifically uses the name Lewis:

423 Cited by Vincens, p. 310, footnote 53. Moravian Archives, Box 121. I have not yet seen a full version of Mack’s journal. Hirsch cites Mack, Journal, Sept. 16-Nov. 3, 1745, and indicates there is a contemporary English translation. Hirsch (2000) writes: “During the Macks’ month-long visit, several of ‘the Old Mothers Kindred’ came down the rivers and paths. French Margaret and her husband had traveled four hundred miles from the Great Lakes to Philadelphia with ten horses laden with deerskins. One of several canoes ‘full of Indians...going out to War’ against the southern Indians brought Isabelle’s son, who lived in Canada and had never met his half-brother Andrew.” Page 109. See also Hanna, I.


425 Andrew’s cousin François Ménard was interpreter at the St. Joseph River (Niles, Michigan) in the 1737 – 1741 period, and his family was based in Montréal and Sault au Recollet after 1742. At the baptism of a child in 1747, he is said to be absent “en party d’ambassade aux nations d’en-haut.” His son, Louis François married at the age of 24 in 1760, thus seeming to be too young to be any “brother” of Andrew in 1751. François Ménard’s son Pierre used the name Montour at Detroit, where his widow, Geneviève Amable Sicard, would remarry to Joseph Carrier 27 Nov. 1781. PRDH and Ste. Anne. Andrew also had cousins named Louis St Serny and Louis Ménard. The latter Louis traveled to Orange with his sister Magdeleine and his cousin Marie Anne Germaneau in 1721. See Part 8.
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Lewis Montour [wrote Weiser to the Governor], Andrew’s brother, disturbs [the Indians] often by bringing strong Liquor to them, they cannot help buying and drinking it when it is so near, and Lewis sells it very dear to them, and pretends that his Wife which is an ugly Indian Squa [sic], does it.426

The year appears to be 1754.

It seems impossible to trace a tantalizing reference for 25 July 1747 to “un Sauvage dit Germeneau,” of the military party of “Monsieur de St Luc.”427 “This Germeneau” deserted and went to Orange (Albany, New York). The other “Sauvages” feared that “the said Germeneau,” once he reached Orange, would give information about the extent of the French forces, and that they [the Indians] would be overwhelmed by an enemy force greater than ours: “ils ne fussent enveloppés par un party ennemi supérieur au nôtre.”428 Could there have been another son of Isabelle and Joachim Germeneau named Louis (and later Lewis), who lived among the domiciled Indians, a son who, like Isabelle’s daughter, Marie Anne Germeneau, was also known as Montour some of the time? He could have served as an Indian interpreter at Detroit without his name ever being recorded in the official records, and Louis is the name of Isabelle’s brother.

Whoever “Brother” Lewis / Louis is, I have nevertheless paused more than once at the 21 November 1706 baptism in the Ste. Anne de Détroit registers of an unnamed male child with unnamed parents whose godmother was Angélique Proteau, wife of Étienne Bontron, my ancestors, and whose godfather was Louis Normand.429 Although Isabelle was thirteen years older than Louis Normand, their families were not unknown to each other, his mother having provided lodging for witnesses attending the 1680 judicial inquiry held in Québec City concerning the death of Isabelle’s sister Jeanne.430 And, in fact, not two

426 Wallace, p. 368, citing Prov. Rec., M, 402; C.R., VI, 149. First use of brackets as in Wallace. The year appears to be 1754.
427 This is Louis La Corne, also called Louis Luc, Chevalier de La Corne. See DCB III. Jetté assigns him the dit name Saint-Luc, son of Jean-Louis La Corne & Marie Pécaudy. He led an attack near the garrison of “fort de Sarastau,” Saratoga, Fort Clinton, and returned with 41 prisoners and 28 scalps. From a letter by François-Pierre de Rigaud de Vaudreuil, 4 October 1747, summary on ArchiviaNet, C114, Vol. 89, ff. 168-171. See my references to Captain Rigaud, son of Governor Vaudreuil, in later installments. Serving under his command in 1726 was the man who would become the husband of Isabelle’s daughter Marie Anne.
428 “1747 – Extraits en forme de journal,” Collection de manuscrits contenant lettres, mémoires, et autres documents historiques relatifs à la Nouvelle-France: recueillis aux Archives de la province de Québec ou copiés à l’étranger; mis en ordre et édités sous les auspices de la Législature de Québec, avec table, etc., Blanchet, J. (Jean), 1843-1908. (Québec?: s.n.] 1884, p. 349. Read at Early Canadiana Online: <http://www.canadiana.org/>
429 Louis Normand dit Labrière (Pierre Normand Brière & Catherine Normand) married Marie Anne Bruneau (Vincent Bruneau & Marie Cordier Rigaud) 1701-05-29 Québec. Daughter Marie Angélique baptized 1707-06-20 Ste. Anne de Détroit. Cadillac hired him and his family and a servant on 18 February 1706, to leave in May of 1706 to go to Fort Pontchartrain to work for three years as a taillemandier, edge-tool maker. Engagement de Normand Labrière, Notary Chambalon, ANQ, photocopy. Whether they actually left in May cannot be determined, although Cadillac himself originally said he would leave in the early spring but did not depart until late June after being ordered to do so.
430 Interestingly, Louis Normand’s mother, Catherine Normand, had petitioned for payment when she provided lodging at Québec in 1680 for witnesses attending the inquiry into the 1679 murder of Jeanne Couc, Isabelle’s sister. Isabelle was twelve in 1679 when her sister died, and Louis Normand was born that very year of 1680. Benjamin Sulté, Histoire de Saint-François-du-Lac. Montréal?: s.n., 1886 p. 26. Read at Early Canadiana Online: <http://www.canadiana.org/> See also “Procès de Jean Rattier dit Du Buisson accusé du muertre de Jeanne fille de Pierre Couc des Trois Rivières en 1679,” Les Editions Quesnel de Fomblanche, Albert Quesnel, éditeur, transcription.
months before the baptism of the unnamed male child, Louis Normand had also served as godfather on 26 September 1706, this time with Isabelle “Coup” as godmother, for a boy given the name Louis after his godfather, son of Taouen [ink blot] rons (?) and Martine, Hurons. The 26 September 1706 event is the last known act showing Isabelle’s presence at the fort. For this, her fourth documented act as a godmother, she again declared she did not know how to sign.

Louis Normand’s godchild, the unnamed male child —fils— of November, could also have been named Louis after his godfather. I will, of course, never know if this fils could be Isabelle’s child, the elusive Louis / Lewis, brother of Andrew, perhaps fathered by the deceased Pierre Tichenet, who had died in June of that year, but for whom, inexplicably, no death or burial record survives in the registers of Ste. Anne; nor is there any record for the soldier, Larivière, or even for Father Delhalle, as he signed the name, also deceased that June of 1706. His death and burial is not formally entered into the register until 1723, when he was exhumed and reburied seventeen years after his death. The entry in the register of Ste. Anne for 30 May 1723 says that Father Bonaventure and others located the body of “Reverend pere Constantin de Lhalle [sic] Recollet” according to information given them by “Sr. Delisle who had helped to bury him.”

Father Delhalle’s register entries simply stop a little more than a month before his death with the burial on 24 April 1706 of Rafael Bienvenue, age three, son of François Bienvenue dit Delisle and his first wife, Geneviève Charron dite Laferrière. Geneviève’s burial record is also not extant. Father Delamarche’s surviving entries begin on a separate page dated 16 August after his arrival 8 August. There was, of course, no priest available at Fort Pontchartrain to make any death entries immediately in June, but it seems to me these deaths — Larivière, Pierre Tichenet, Father Delhalle, perhaps Geneviève Charron dite Laferrière— should have been recorded, especially the priest’s, when the large convoy including Father DeLamarche arrived, unless these entries were later lost or destroyed. I hasten to add I am speculating here.

Isabelle, La femme de Tichenet, must have left the fort some time after the September baptism or within the following year. Did she place a newly-born son in the care of someone at the fort, perhaps her sister Marguerite Couc, or Pierre Roy’s wife, Marguerite 8abanKiK8é (who had given birth to son Pierre in April, with Pierre Tichenet and Isabelle as godparents), or someone else who had recently given birth who could serve as nourrice, wet nurse, for the child? Isabelle would not be the first or last woman forced into leaving a baby behind. Her niece Geneviève Massé, Madame John Henry Lydius, would leave two children in the care of her sister, Françoise, in 1730. (See Part 8.) French-Canadian women arriving in 1706 gave birth to two infants at Fort Pontchartrain by November, and three more babies entered the world before March of 1707.

Four more Hurons, in addition to the one cited, one Ottawa, and one

431 George Paré, The Catholic Church in Detroit, Detroit: The Gabriel Richard Press, 1951, p. 154, and photocopy of the entry. The burial of Rafael Bienvenue, age three, son of François Bienvenue dit Delisle and his first wife, Geneviève Charron dite Laferrière, was the last item written in the registers by Father Delhalle, on 24 April 1706. No baptism record for Rafael survives. Pierre Tichenet had served as godfather for Joseph Bienvenue in 1704. No death record survives for Madame Delisle either, although an inventory was taken at the fort of the Delisle possessions, including women’s and children’s clothing, prior to her widower husband’s remarriage. See MPHC, Vol. 33. Bienvenue dit Delisle remarried to Marie Anne Lemoine in 1708, and together they had nine children at Detroit beginning in 1709 before returning to Montréal by 1724, where two additional children were born. Jetté. François Bienvenue Delisle was buried at Ste. Anne de Detroit 29 September 1751, said to be eighty-eight. See also Sharon Kelley & Gail F. Moreau, “Deaths and Burials Recorded at Ste-Anne-de-Détroit--1706-1718” in MHH, Vol. 22, Commemorative Issue #2, April 2001, pp. 65-70.

432 These babies were the children of Pierre Mallet and of his wife Magdeleine Thunay; Jacob de Marsac de Lobtrou (Lhommtrou, dit Desrochers), Sergent dans une Compagnie de la Marine au Canada, and of his wife, Thérèse David; Antoine de Lamothe Cadillac, commandant, and of his wife Thérèse Guyon; Jérôme Marillac dit Sanscartier,
Iroquois du Sault were also baptized by April. Like so many details in Isabelle’s life, the documentation is simply not extensive enough to identify the precise time of her departure from the fort, nor all the reasons she and Bourgmont defected, however much some writers assert they have the facts. Nor does anything survive to resolve why Father DeLamarche did not identify the parents of the unnamed son. His identity and that of “Lewis” remain a mystery, as do the early years of Isabelle’s children Marie Anne and Michel.

Lewis was also known as Tau-Weson / Tan Weson. At least, Sivertsen writes:

Andrew’s brother Louis Montour (Tan Weson) had stayed in Canada during the 1744-48 war, but he returned to Pennsylvania by 1752. Louis’s wife [like one of Andrew’s] was also named Sara, and their daughter Esther was baptized by the Reverend Ogilvie in 1758. Louis probably died not long after, but Sara, a half-sister of the Oneida war chief Skenadon, retained the surname Montour for a considerable period until she took the name Sally Anise [sic] in Detroit after the Revolution.433

Since the Dictionary of Canadian Biography identifies Sarah or Sally Ains (Hands) of the Detroit records as wife of Andrew Montour, as well as because Sivertsen makes other errors of identification, I must withhold judgment at this time. The baptism of “Hester” that she cites indicates that the parents’ names are “Louis” and “Sara” only.

Besides, as documented by Fred Coyne Hamil, the Sarah / Sally Ains or Hance (of Detroit by 1778 and Rivière La Tranche, the Thames River near modern-day Chatham, Ontario, by 1785), disclosed her identity in her own words in 1789:

Your petitioner was brought up on the Susquehanna River, and at seventeen years of age married one Andrew Monture [sic], Interpreter [sic] for the Crown, by whom she had several children who are now living. Her husband a few years after left her with her relations the Oneidas living on the Mohawk River, and being a little accustomed to civilized way of living, your petitioner requested of the said nation to give her the portion of land she was entitled to in order to improve upon it in the manner of white people.434

I have not yet seen all the sources Hamil cites, and they are extensive for the Detroit and Thames River area. There seems to be no doubt, though, that Sarah / Sally was mother of Nicholas Montour. Hamil also

433 Sivertsen, p. 110, citing a number of sources, some of which I have not yet seen. She identifies Michael Montour’s wife as Esther, and claims she is the infamous Queen Esther of the battle of Wyoming in 1778. I have not seen enough of the sources to comment, except that Sivertsen’s many other leaps of judgment do not allow me to trust her.

434 Fred Coyne Hamil, “Sally Ains, Fur Trader,” Historical Bulletin No. 3, issued by The Algonquin Club, Detroit, January, 1939, p. 2, copy at Burton Library, Detroit Public Library, citing “Upper Canada Land Petitions, Miscellaneous, 1789-1795, (MSS in Public Archives of Canada). Hamil does not have all of his facts straight about Andrew Montour’s mother, though, citing Hanna’s and Darlington’s versions only. He believes Andrew and Sally married “as early as 1745,” after the death of Andrew’s first wife, the granddaughter of Allumapies, “for in 1758 one of her daughters was approaching womanhood.” Page 3, citing PA, Series 8, Vol. VI, 4859: “Paid William Bromwich for a pair of stays for Polly Montour.” Sally could be a Shawnee and still have Oneida “relations.”
reports: “Sally presented another petition to the Council at Newark on August 12, 1797. This was signed by her son Nicholas Montour, who had the Lydius children as his sponsors at baptism, as her agent and attorney. Curiously, she now stated that she was a Shawnee Indian, instead of an Oneida, as formerly.”

Madame Montour’s and Carondowana’s son Andrew, also known as Satellihu and Oughisera, and his sister Margaret (married to Katarieniecha, a Mohawk, also known as Peter Quebec) remained in the English colonies, although Andrew is recorded in 1753 as escorting “French” Margaret’s “Canadian relatives” from Canada to Pennsylvania. I must ask why they are called Margaret’s relatives and not Andrew’s; perhaps they are her in-laws. Some writers insist Margaret, called French Margaret, is Madame Montour’s niece, but Hanna says:

French Margaret is called both the niece of Madame Montour and the sister of Andrew Montour, by the Rev. John Martin Mack, who visited her in 1753. At Philadelphia, June 18, 1733, Chief Shekallamy told Governor Gordon some news of a plot on the part of the whites to cut off the Indians, which he had received from ‘an Indian who lives in his neighborhood, named Katarieniecha [or Peter Quebec], who is married to one, Margaret, a daughter of Mrs. Montour.’ Shekallamy’s account must be taken as the more correct.

See my Part 8 for citation of Nicholas Montour’s baptism, with his Lydius cousins as sponsors. Hamil, p. 17, citing Petitions, A, IV, no. 45; Upper Canada. Land Book C (Public Archives of Canada), 75, my emphasis. Hamil also addresses the fate of Andrew and Sarah’s other three children. He suggests there may have been a son named Andrew, lending credence to the fact he has sometimes been confused with his father. When Andrew separated from their mother, three of his children by Sally were supported by the Pennsylvania government, and the youngest still required nursing, a bill for it being paid in June of 1758 at a cost of £11.10.6. See PA, Series 8, Vol. V, 4093, 4348.

John Jackson in an unpublished manuscript (2001): “Now Karondowana’s son was deyakonakardon, wearing the horns, and renamed Oughisera. The honor raised him to a higher sense of being, a deeper tradition of kakweniatsera, authority, and kanaisera, pride.” Page 46. This occurred in 1751 when Tanacharison “reclaimed Sattilihu to the League.” Jackson quotes Tanacharison: “you [Andrew] are not Interpreter only; for you are one of our Council, have an equal Right with us, for we look upon you as much as we do upon any of the chief Counsellors”. My sincere thanks to Jackson for sharing his work on the next generations.

Rev. Bernard A. Grube in his journal reported a visit in 1753 to “French” Margaret, Andrew’s sister, during which he says she told him that Andrew “now will be sent to Allegheny, and to bring back with him Margaret’s relatives who still live in French Canada.” “A Missionary’s Tour to Shamokin and the West Branch of the Susquehanna, 1753,” Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, Vol. 39, No. 4, October, 1915, p. 443, a translation from the German of a journal now held in the Moravian Archives at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Grube also calls Margaret Mrs. Montour’s niece. I do not know the original German phrasing, which may be “mother’s sister’s daughter”.

Hanna, Vol. I, P. 203. Brackets as they appear in Hanna. Perhaps there were two Margarets, one a daughter and the other a niece. Spangenberg speaks of visiting “Sáteiliu’s sister” in 1745, after earlier referring to Andrew Montour, but does not name her. He “had a boil on her neck, on which Spangenberg laid a plaster to soften it” when he and Brother Joseph “went over to the island [at Shamokin], to visit Madam Montour from Canada, who lately with her family had become Indianized.” “Spangenberg’s Notes of Travel to Onondaga in 1745,” contributed by John W. Jordan, Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, 2: 4, October, 1878, 424-432, and 3: 1, January, 1879, pp. 56-64, passage on 429, emphasis mine. Shikellimy (variously spelled) or Swatana, “an abbreviation of Onkiswathetami, ‘he causes it to be light for us’,” was “an Oneida chief of the Bear clan, resident near and at Shamokin (now Sunbury, Pa.), an Iroquois supervisor of the Shawnees and a key figure in Indian-English relations; first mentioned in official records in 1728; d. at Shamokin on 6 Dec. 1748.” William A. Hunter cites the naturalist John Bartram, “who met Swatana in 1743 and also obtained information from his son”; Bartram also “recorded that ‘Shickelamy ... was of the six nations, or rather a Frenchman born at Mont-real, and adopted by the Oneidies, after being taken prisoner.’” DCB, Vol. III, p. 606, emphasis mine. He had been baptized by a
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You may also recall that Conrad Weiser spoke of her plural “children.” (See Part 9.) But perhaps there were two distinct “Margarets” related to Isabelle, despite Hanna’s citation of Mack.

Other writers maintain Isabelle Couc, born in 1667, could not have been the mother of Andrew, a man in his prime in the early 1740s. The rough calculations of the year of his birth vary widely, one writer insisting Isabelle would have been too old to be the mother of the “little son” mentioned a year after Carondowana’s death in 1729.439 Yet I am aware of a woman, my friend’s mother, who gave birth at age fifty-two to her seventh child. Isabelle would have been fifty-two in 1715. It is not impossible. Then again, the Natives had a long tradition of adopting individuals, children and adults, and there may not even be any genetic link among the “children,” “sisters,” and “brothers” mentioned. We of the Western Tradition may be hung up on the necessity for such an identity.

I certainly wonder whether there were two “Margarets,” one Andrew’s sister and the other his mother’s sister’s daughter (as it may be expressed in the original German), possibly Marguerite Fafard, daughter of Marguerite Couc and widow of Jean Baptiste Turpin, whom she had married at Fort Pontchartrain in 1710. (See Part 6.) Someone named “La Turpin” is recorded as having been taken from Detroit to the English before 1717. In a letter of 8 April 1717, Sabrevois, then commandant at Fort Pontchartrain, wrote to Governor Vaudreuil that 8yla8iKigiK had come to the fort with rum in the summer of 1716, bringing an invitation from the English to trade with them. “It was this wretch who, as I was told, took away La Turpin to the English.”440 Sabrevois does not indicate when this had occurred, that previous summer or earlier or later. It seems he himself did not witness the event. Jacques Charles de Sabrevois served as commandant at Fort Pontchartrain 1715-1717 after the death in Québec of the then commandant, Laforest, in 1714. The last documented appearance at the fort of Marguerite Fafard, wife of Turpin, appears to be the 30 October 1711 baptism of her cousin Magdeleine, fille de Joseph Montour et de

439 Jon Parmenter, “Isabel [sic] Montour, Cultural Broker on the Frontiers of New York and Pennsylvania,” in The Human Tradition in Colonial America, edited by Ian K. Steele and Nancy L. Rhoden, Wilmington, Delaware: SR Books, 1999. Parmenter quotes Katharine Bennet, “Madame Montour,” Northumberland County Historical Society, Proceedings and Addresses 13 (1943): 37. When I consulted Bennet, I found, in addition to her many misunderstandings, that she quotes James Logan but gives no source for this passage: “Carondawana [sic] was of the Oneida tribe, a great Capt. Of ye 5 nations who fell in an encounter with the Catawbas in the spring of 1729. On the 16th of 6 mo., 1729, presents of strowds were sent to ye chiefs of the 5 nations upon ye death of their Capt. Carondawana (alias Robert Hunter) and also above 50 of their men killed and taken by ye southern Indians, assisted by ye English traders of Carolina; while on the 29th of 5th month, 1730 there was forwarded a whole suit of mourning clothes to Carondawana’s widow, Montour, and a coat to her little son and a handkerchief.” Page 37. The language seems authentic, but the question remains: how little is little? Bennet believes “the French Governor sent his [sic] sister to try to prevail on [Madame Montour] to remove to Canada,” instead of her sister, Madame Montour’s, sister! See my Part 8. The involvement of the “English traders” in the violence is not downplayed in this report. Parmenter also misunderstands the identity of the sister of Madame Montour, La St Serney, who visited New York in 1719, saying she was the sister who lived among the Miamis. (p. 150) He obviously has not read the French document that references the visit.

440 “C’est ce malheureux qui a emmennez la Turpin a cequel’on ma dit aux Anglois.” NAC microfilm F-38, f. 166, photocopy. Translation of the letter can be found in MPHC, Vol. 33, pp. 582-584, but several phrases are mistranslated, for example, “casser la tête,” to break his head, becomes “I would have him shot.” The French and the Allied Indians were actively engaged in the Fox Wars 1715-1717. Louvigny had “borrowed” Sabrevois’s unidentified interpreter to serve in the Fox mission, even though he had Maurice Ménard and St. Pierre, so Sabrevois could not understand 8yla8iKigiK’s message to the Natives of the fort until the winter of 1716-1717.
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Marguerite Couc, La Turpin’s mother, is documented at the fort in January of 1716, when she served as godmother for “francois” and “andre,” identified as Hurons, with no names given for the parents. (It is difficult not to wonder whether this André could possibly be Isabelle’s son, carried to the fort to be (surreptitiously?) baptized because no priests were then in New York, but I am, of course speculating wildly here. One use of a name means little. Nevertheless, if La Turpin had returned from the English by this time, who knows?) Marguerite Couc’s daughter “Marie Maconce” (most likely Marie Anne) was godmother for Marie, “nation des poux” (Potawatomi), also in January. Michel Massé, step-father of these girls, signed the record for a marriage on 4 November 1715, so it appears that he and possibly the family were at Fort Pontchartrain in the winter of 1715-1716. This November ceremony united Marguerite Couc’s son Jean-Baptiste Fafart dit Maconce and Marguerite Joseph, daughter of Joseph and “La Joseph, huronne de nation.” This Marguerite would also have been niece by marriage to Isabelle but she would not likely become known as “French” Margaret, although she might have learned the French language. “French” Margaret, though, is said to be wife of Peter Quebec, so unless this Marguerite Joseph remarried at a time when her first husband was still alive (very unlikely), she is not the one. There are so many women named Margaret / Marguerite!

441 Her other appearances, in addition to her marriage, are: 14 December 1710, baptism Jean Baptiste Turpin, son of Jean Baptiste Turpin, habitant, and Marguerite Fafart, his wife, born today. Godparents: François Fafart dit Delorme (an interpreter) & Magdeleine Maret femme de Joseph Parent. Godmother signed. Deniau. (p. 53) March 1711, baptism of Louis, son of Joseph Nemanso (?) & ChichinonK8é, Stagamis (Fox / Mesquakie Indian, among the earliest references to the Fox being present at the fort even before Cadillac left. They are also documented there in 1710.). Godparents: Joseph Rivard & Marguerite Fafart, femme Turpin. Deniau. (122-23) 4 April 1711, baptism of Paul, son of Onacha & KinebiKoKK8é, Stagamis. Godparents: Alexis Lemoyne & Marguerite Fafart, femme de Turpin. Godfather signed. Deniau. (125) 22 May 1711, baptism of Marie Magdeleine, [names of parents unknown] Huronne. Godparents: Pierre Stebre [Esteve] dit Lajeunesse, habitant, & Marie Marguerite Fafart, femme Baptiste Turpin. Deniau. (127) 23 June 1711, baptism of Marie Magdeline, daughter of 8eninîh8é & 8nta8iatans, Hurons. Godparents: Alexis Germain, voyageur, & Marguerite Fafart, femme de Jean Baptiste Turpin. Deniau. (127) 23 June 1711, baptism of Marie Magdeline, daughter of 8eninîh8é & 8nta8iatans, Hurons. Godparents: Robert Rheaume & Marguerite Fafart, femme Turpin. Deniau. (128) 30 October 1711, baptism of Magdeleine fille de Joseph Montour et de Isabelle Ononthio [I read Ononthio on the original]. Godfather: Pierre Roy, habitant, & Marguerite Fafart, femme de Turpin. Deniau. (133) Transcription of Native names are as good as I can decipher them. Priest conferring the sacrament in each case is Father Deniau. Numbers in parentheses refer to the original register on microfilm at Detroit Public Library, Burton Library. The separate extant registers are not all assembled chronologically, accounting for the jump from page 53 to 122 for records in 1711. Robert Réaume, my ancestor married to Élisabeth Brunet, along with Toussaint Pothier and Joseph Trottier Desruisseaux, conveyed Mesdames Cadillac and de Tony to Fort Ponchartrain in the fall of 1701. “Engagement to the King; ... of Trottier, Reaume and Pothier,” 5 November 1715, so it appears that he and possibly the family were at Fort Pontchartrain in the winter of 1715-1716. This November ceremony united Marguerite Couc’s son Jean-Baptiste Fafart dit Maconce and Marguerite Joseph, daughter of Joseph and “La Joseph, huronne de nation.” This Marguerite would also have been niece by marriage to Isabelle but she would not likely become known as “French” Margaret, although she might have learned the French language. “French” Margaret, though, is said to be wife of Peter Quebec, so unless this Marguerite Joseph remarried at a time when her first husband was still alive (very unlikely), she is not the one. There are so many women named Margaret / Marguerite!

442 Jean Baptiste Fafart dit Maconce and his wife Marguerite, now called Marguerite ougnes or 8agnes, had a daughter, also named Marguerite, baptized in March of 1722, who died and was buried 19 April 1728, six years old. At the baptism of their daughter Marie Anne, about 10 days old on 30 August 1724, the mother is identified as Marguerite quer8ta, and at the baptism of son Nicolas, about six months old, on 27 July 1727, she is called simply huronne, all of these children born en legitime mariage, in a legitimate marriage. Original register of Ste. Anne de Detroit. The “French” Margaret of Pennsylavnia is also said to have a son named “Nicholas.” According to Hanna, “Conrad Weiser, in 1754, speaks of meeting Andrew Montour and Nicholas Quebec at Harris’s Ferry, both of whom
Jean Baptiste Fafard dit Maconce the younger did not die until 1756 at Detroit, buried 21 December 1756, said to be seventy to eighty years old, with a certificate from Jesuit Father Potier, the priest at L’Assomption across the Detroit River in what is now Windsor, Ontario, that Jean Baptiste had received the sacrament of Penance. \(^{443}\)

If she went to the English, La Turpin, aka Marguerite Fafard, did not stay with them, however, as she is recorded as giving birth to two children, one, named Joseph, son of an unnamed father, born in July of 1725, baptized at Pointe Claire 21 September 1725; and the other, Louis, born 27 November 1727 at Ile Carillon and baptized 26 January 1728 at Bellevue, whose father was identified as Paul Primeau. \(^{444}\) All of

accompanied him to Aughwick, to attend the Indian conference there.” Hanna, Vol. 1, p. 205. It is tempting to consider this 1754 “Nicholas” as the “bastard” child of Marie Anne Germaneau, somehow removed from the hospital in Québec and “adopted” by “French” Margaret. Nicolas René would have been twenty-eight in 1754, and could have been one of the “relatives” brought from French Canada in 1753, but there seems no way to prove this. See my later discussion of this child Nicolas René in Part 12. Madame Montour’s grandchild, Andrew’s son, who bought the seigneury of Pointe du Lac, was also named Nicholas (English spelling), as was the Huron Nicolas / Orontony, who led a group of Detroit Hurons to Sandusky in 1739. He “appeared at Albany, New York, on 30 July 1743 with a wampum treaty belt given to the Hurons 40 years earlier [about 1703], at the time when Michipicthu [also called Quarante Sols] was attempting to bring English traders into the Detroit region.” DCB III, 495, emphasis mine. Madame Bégon, Marie Isabelle / Élisabeth Rocbert, daughter of the garde-magasin Rocbert and wife of Claude Michel Bégon, wrote to her son-in-law in November of 1748 about this “Nicholas” and the menace he posed at Detroit. RAPQ CD-Rom, Tome 15, p. 6. See <http://vieux.montreal.qc.ca/> in the year 1725 for a portrait of Élisabeth Rocbert de la Morandière. See my earlier references to Quarante Sols. Among other things, La Tichenette reputedly interpreted Quarante Sols’ Huron language for Cadillac in 1704, said interpretation at issue in Cadillac’s 1704-05 trial. Repetition of names can lead not only to confusion but also to some interesting conjectures. \(^{443}\) Ste. Anne de Detroit. This record is sometimes erroneously cited as his father’s burial.

\(^{444}\) Jetté and PRDH. The son of Paul Primeau later married in the mother colony. Jean Baptiste Turpin, husband of Marguerite Fafard dite Maconce, died sometime after 1718, perhaps in Illinois country. I have yet to pursue this inquiry. The third Fafard dite Maconce daughter, Marie Anne, married Louis Javillon dite Lafeuillade, a soldier, and both of them were buried at Fort Pontchartrain, Marie Anne Maconce femme de Lafeuillade on 29 September 1752, said to be fifty-five, and Louis Javillon on 20 September 1754. Ste. Anne de Detroit. The Denissen index does not read this latter record correctly.

Having recorded in Part 6 the Jetté citation that Michel Bisaillon fathered illegitimate children, I can now report his own words to demonstrate that the published indexes do not necessarily always have the whole story. Thanks to Gail Moreau-DesHarnais, I now have a copy of a judicial inquiry, an “Interrogatoire,” interrogation, Bisaillon underwent on 19 August 1714 in Montréal. In addition to summarizing his activities in Illinois country and the pays d’en haut, he maintains under oath that “he left sixteen or eighteen years ago from this city [Montréal] with the Reverend Fathers Maret [ Gabriel Marest] and [Jacques] Gravier who went to the Illinois, where he was married to an Illinoise ‘en face de notre mere Ste Eglise’ [in the presence of a Church representative].” He was asked “whether he married Illinois and how many” and replied that “he married two Indians, one an Illinoise and the other a Matchigamias ‘En face dEglise [sic]’, be it known, the Illinoise by Father Beneteau and the Matchimias by Father Mermet and that the two of them [his wives] are deceased, the first eight years ago and the other six. Asked whether he did not also marry with the daughter of the man named ‘fafart de Lorme’, [he] said about four years ago he married her at Detroit,” a marriage found in 1710 at Ste. Anne de Detroit. “Interrogatoire de Bizailion,” 19 August 1714, Notary Adhémar, photocopy of document at ANQ, Montréal. Michel Bisaillon appears to have remained in prison after this interrogation until 31 August, when he was released. Marthe Faribault-Beauregard’s index of records for Kaskasika shows “Bisaillon, Marie, n. ce jour. B. 22-02-1699, fille de Bisaillon [no first name] & de Marie-Thérèse” with godparents Antoine Baillargeon and Marie Aco, his wife. Julien Binetateau, s.j., p. 115, with no indication of enfante naturelle. The child Pierre of 1703 she lists as having a father whose first name is said to be Pierre and whose mother is Marie-Thérèse Oasuresa, with no indication of illegitimacy. Godparents: Pierre Champagne and Elisabeth (no other name given). Jacques Gravier, s. j. The 1712 child, Michel Bisaillon, also is said to have a father named

\(^{444}\) Suzanne Boivin Somerville, © 2014, all rights reserved
these places are upriver from Montréal. If the widow of Jean Baptiste Turpin remarried “Peter Quebec,” no trace of the ceremony survives, to my knowledge, but Jean Baptiste Turpin appears to have died not long after 1718.\footnote{My research on this question is ongoing.} So many questions remain. \{See my April 2014 MHH article on the two J. B. Turpins, sons of J. B. Turpin.\}

**Another Digression**

**Marguerite Fafard \textit{dite Maconcé}** is not, however, the mother of the child Benoit baptized 3 August 1723 at Laprairie, as reported by Jetté in 1983 and, originally, by PRDH. I have demonstrated to PRDH that this Marguerite Fafard, identified on the church registry entry as \textit{La Grande bisaillonne}, is not \textit{femme Turpin} but truly \textit{femme de Bisaillon}, the wife of \textit{Michel Bisaillon}, probably named here in this way to distinguish her as the older of two “femmes Bisaillon” then in Laprairie. \textit{This femme de Bisaillon}, mother of Benoit, is **Marguerite Fafard \textit{dite Delorme}**, daughter of François Fafard \textit{dit} Delorme and Marie Madeleine Jobin. The two Marguerites are cousins and both were married at Fort Pontchartrain in 1710. A reader for PRDH originally saw “La Grande Bitaidoure [sic],” but the writing on the same page by the same priest recording the names of “anne Catherine bisaillon” and “Étienne bisaillon” is identical to “bisaillonne” except for the addition of the “ne” suffix, giving the name a feminine form. Catherine Bisaillon is the wife of \textit{Étienne Deniau \textit{dit Destaillies}}. On the same page of the register, \textit{Thérèse de Tonty}, daughter of Alphonse (both of whom are documented at Fort Pontchartrain), was the godmother for their daughter Marie Anne Deniau on 20 July 1723. Madame Étienne Bisaillon, another \textit{femme Bisaillon}, is Anne Françoise Leber, daughter of François Leber (nephew of Jacques Leber, mentioned earlier) and \textit{Marie Anne Magnan}, a sister of \textit{Antoine Magnan \textit{dit} Lespérance}, who was also at Detroit and whose family will be mentioned later. Michel Bisaillon was deceased before 1722. \{See my Part 6 for Michel Bisaillon.\} I now can confirm that Michel Bisaillon died in the English colonies before 18 May 1722, as documented by his wife on the day she sold a \textit{Panisse} Indian slave he had left in her care.\footnote{Photocopies of \textit{La Prairie} registers. \{See Notary Guillaume Barette, 18 May 1722, ANQ, photocopy, for the report of Michel Bisaillon’s death in the English colonies.\} On 25 September 1725, permission was granted “Estienne Deno and Catherine Bisaillon, his wife, Charles Petit, Englishman, and Laforce” to go to \textit{Nouvelle Angleterre} to see their relatives and claim their interest in this tannery; see Jetté, 1983, and \textit{Clergé en Nouvelle Angleterre}, \textit{Étude démographique et répertoire biographique}, written with the collaboration of Pierre Delorme.} On 25 September 1725, permission was granted “Estienne Deno and \textit{Catherine Bisaillon}, his wife, Charles Petit, Englishman, and Laforce” to go to \textit{Nouvelle Angleterre} to see their relatives and claim their interest in this tannery; see Jetté, 1983, and \textit{Clergé en Nouvelle Angleterre}, \textit{Étude démographique et répertoire biographique}, written with the collaboration of Pierre Delorme.\footnote{I have since located documents in which Jean Baptiste Turpin is cited in references preserved in the Kaskaskia Papers and in Louisiana (Province) \textit{Conseil Superieur} Court Records that detail the legal dispute about the estate of Jean Baptiste Turpin. Jean Baptiste Turpin, native of Montreal in Canada, resident of Kaskaskias in Illinois, about 45 years, was buried 16 August 1731, according to \textit{Archdiocese of New Orleans Sacramental Records}, Volume I, 1718-1750 (New Orleans, Archdiocese of New Orleans, 1987) [SLC, B1, 67]. Thank you to Gail Moreau-Desharnais for verifying this record in a personal message to me in 2013. My research on this question is ongoing.} So many questions remain.

Pierre and mother Akensamac8e, G. Marest signing. Did someone guess that this Pierre is the father? Is this a misreading? I believe it a misreading, and that Michel is the father of Michel, as demonstrated in other records I have, including the marriage records for Michel Bissaillon, the younger. On NAC microfilm of the records for Kaskaskia, C-2899, I see \textbf{no first name} for any of these Bisaillon records, only a “P” for the \textit{Latin} word for father, and only the 1712 child is said to be illegitimate. The “illegitimacy” of the first two children, at least, is questionable. See DCB II for Jesuit Fathers Jacques Gravier; Joseph-Jacques Marest and Pierre-Gabriel Marest, brothers, the first of which brothers served primarily at Michilimackinac and the second in Illinois country; and also for Jean Mermet, who was with Father Claude Aveneau in 1702 at St. Joseph Miamis (Niles, Michigan) and accompanied Charles Juchereau de Saint-Denis to establish a tannery near modern-day Cairo, Illinois, in addition to serving in Illinois territory. \textit{Étienne Véniard, sieur de Bourgmont}, later said he saw the tannery in person. The tannery failed in part because of an epidemic that may have resulted in Juchereau’s death in 1703. See DCB II. Louis Pelletier identifies “Beneteau” as Julien Binet, who died in the \textit{pays d’en haut}, 25 December 1699. \textit{Le Clergé en Nouvelle France}, \textit{Étude démographique et répertoire biographique}, written with the collaboration of PRDH, Les Presses de l’Université de Montréal, 1993.
inheritance.” Only four years earlier, Étienne Deniau dit Destaillis had been fined for going there without permission. I am again digressing because the inter-connections are so striking.

Andrew Montour’s Wives

To return to the United States Colony children of Isabelle, Andrew Montour had at least two wives, possibly three, one of whom is identified as the granddaughter of Allumapees, a Delaware, and one, in 1768, named Catharine. The wife from whom Andrew separated shortly before or after the birth of Nicholas Montour in 1756, Sally Ainsé, is well-documented at Detroit and on the Thames River (La Tranche), in the modern Chatham, Ontario, area. Andrew traveled to the Detroit region with William Johnson in the 1760s. For more of his story, see the several published works. Fresh research remains to be done in the New York and Pennsylvania records to resolve some of these identifications of Isabelle’s English colony children, nephews, nieces, and grandchildren, including Andrew’s children. Relying solely on the older sources is just not trustworthy, and I am unaware at this time of any serious studies of descent through the alliances Isabelle’s children and grandchildren had with Indians. Isabelle’s two other children did, however, leave an interesting paper trail.

Isabelle’s child Michel Germaneau, by her first husband, Joachim Germeneau, can be documented in Montréal by the time of his marriage 5 April 1717. This was shortly after the congé system of permits

447 NAC, MG 8 – C 8, microfilm C-13986. They were allowed to carry with them eighty pounds of deerskin (chevreuil) to defray the cost of the voyage, and they had to have their permit visaed by the commandant of Chambly. An older brother, Pierre Bisaillon, also lived in Pennsylvania. See DCB III. I am sure fresh research must be done on the Bisaillon family to incorporate the references in the New France records, such as this one. Along with the Montours, they may be among the French “disaffected with the British” living in the Susquehanna River area in 1726. See Part 8.

448 See Hanna, Vol. I, p. 246 for citations. Andrew’s son John Montour, said to be his eldest son by the granddaughter of Allumapees, also is fairly well-documented. John Jackson has written about him in an unpublished manuscript. I thank him for sharing his work.

449 See DCB V.


451 I have to wonder whether Michel Massé served as his godfather and gave him his first name. He and Laforest were associated in 1696 and Laforest (along with Henri de Tonty, Alphonse’s brother) were deeply involved in Illinois territory. Laforest’s wife, La Comtesse de Saint-Laurent, even petitioned to have the Illinois property restored. I have not yet seen “Société entre François de Laforest et Michel Massé,” 2 septembre 1696, Adhémar. The members of the Couc / Montour family may have far more ties to the Illinois than have been explored before now; it is even possible Michel Germeneau was born there. See DCB II for Dauphin [sic] de La Forest’s concession at Fort Saint Louis, Illinois, and see my citation of Angélique Couc’s husband’s hiring contract to the Illinois with nineteen others for Henri de Tonty, written by Adhémar 19 August 1692, in Part 5. It just might be possible that the four Couc women gave birth to some of their undocumented children in Illinois territory. As I have said elsewhere, these seventeenth- and eighteenth-century people traveled far more than I imagined or others have given them credit for.
to trade went back into effect by a royal decree after a hiatus since 1696 and also after yet another pardon had been issued in 1714 for the coureurs de bois and others absent from the mother colony. It is not generally known that some of these men did not return because they could not pay their debts to the merchants who had legitimately financed their trade voyages in the past. Instead they are documented as coming as close to the mother colony as they could to see whether a pardon had been issued. Several such pardons were granted over the years. This time the king’s grace would be given especially to those who, in return for their pardon, agreed to join in the campaign against the Fox Indians that had begun between the Fox and other Western Nations at Fort Pontchartrain in 1712, a struggle that had the endorsement of the Western Nations. As Michel’s uncles were involved in these expeditions, it is possible Michel Germaneau was also, and that he then decided to establish himself in the mother colony of New France and to marry the widow of a man who surely knew his mother.

Whatever took him to Montréal, Michel’s marriage contract was written by the notary Le Pailleur on the same day as the church ceremony. The text identifies the future groom as Michel Germano son of deceased Joachim Germano and of Marie Couc: “michiel germano fils de deffunt Joachim germano Et de marie Couc ses pere et mere de cette paroisse en son nom (of this parish acting in his own name). If Michel is acting in his own name, he should have been at least twenty-five years old or he had attained his majority through a judicial decree, no longer extant. For example, Charles Amiot Villeneuve, about twenty-one, son of deceased Charles Amiot and deceased Rosalie Duquet, his wife, with evidence of his baptism on 1 June 1697, was granted legal emancipation by Intendent Bégon on Monday the seventh of February 1718. Michel’s bride was “marie Catherine Escuyer [sic],” widow of deceased Jacques Miville and daughter of deceased Pierre Lescuyer and Marie Juillet: “veuve du feu Jacques miville fille de feu pierre Escuyer et marie juillet ces pere et mere aussi de cette paroisse pour elle et en son nom.” Jacques Miville or Mainville, as he is usually recorded, had traveled to Le Détroit with the convoy of 1706, the same year he married Catherine. Her “Lescuyer” brothers, Paul and Jean, along with Jacques Mainville, were hired by Lamothe Cadillac 29 May 1706 to take three horses and ten “betes à corne,” literally horned animals, to Fort Pontchartrain. Whether Catherine accompanied her husband that year cannot be determined, but more than twenty-five wives and other women were part of the convoy. Jacques Mainville was definitely known to Cadillac. See my additional comments about their relationship in my long footnote.

Michel Massé and Maurice Ménard were associates for this venture.
Other judicial decrees for later years are extant and can be found through the ArchiviaNet search engine at the website of the National Archives of Canada. See NAC microfilm C-13574. Michel’s Uncle Maurice knew Charles’s uncle, Daniel-Joseph Amiot dit Villeneuve and his family at Michilimackinac, and Charles Amiot’s wife, Angélique Métivier, served as godmother for Marie Anne Montour’s 1730 child. See references to be cited in this series. A Louis Métivier married Marie Fafard, a cousin of Marie Anne Germaneau / Montour and lived in Kaskaskia and at Fort St. Joseph. Research in progress.
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June 20, 1710: "A man named Mainville, an inhabitant of Montreal, has found, as he (p. 546) pretends, a copper mine on a stream that flows into the Wabash River. The bits that he has brought here are all like the one that I give myself the honor of sending to your Lordship by the return of the Renommée [a ship]. Twenty-eight months [1708?] ago he brought some others of another sort that seems to me to be antimony. This man has had tests made by a convict at Pensacola, a professional smelter, who assured him that there was silver as well as in the lead mine of the Illinois, and that he would get some if they would permit him to go and make tests of it on the spot. This Canadian begs your Lordship very humbly to permit him to bring all his family to this colony," English translation in Mississippi Provincial Archives, FHL Microfilm #1305386, Volumes 1-3, emphasis mine. Hereafter MPA. Michel Bisaillon also expressed his desire to be reunited with his family. (See Part 6.) Cadillac was officially removed from Detroit by the time this dispatch was written, having been named governor of Louisiane on 5 May 1710; but it took months for the king’s message to reach him in Detroit (by December of 1710 via Renaud Dubuisson). And, of course, he did not leave Detroit right away, not until the spring of 1711, when he traveled to the mother colony to dispute his loss of property at the fort. Then he returned to France in November of 1711, and he did not arrive in Louisiane (actually near Mobile in modern-day Alabama) until June 1713.

Cadillac, when he was in Louisiane, said some nasty things about Jacques Mainville in reply to a complaint d’Artaguette received about Cadillac himself. D’Artaguette was sent to Kaskasia in 1711 with twelve soldiers, including Penicaut, who wrote an account. D’Artaguette’s 12 May 1712 letter to Pontchartrain includes the following: "The copper mine that Sieur de Mainville has found is also on this river [Wabash]. Several lead mines in which it is maintained that there is silver are near it. I am convinced that when we shall send into that country men who are experts in minerals, acquainted with the manner in which tests are made, we shall find some." (MPA, Vol. 2, p. 62) Cadillac replied in his 26 October 1713 letter: “This complaint could have been formed only by a man named Mainville who is a prime fool, a backwoodsman and a real debauchee, unprincipled and insubordinate, married in Canada, very much devoted to the Indian women.” MPA, Vol. 2, full letter on pp. 162-204. (See Gilles Havard’s comment about Cadillac’s attack on Mainville in my Part 6.)

Jacques Mainville and his wife had two children by 1708. Twenty-eight months ago would have been about February of 1708. His second child was born in October of 1708, and he was absent for the baptism. He is the only Miville / Mainville who resided in Montréal, that I can now tell. RAPQ notes that he was named 19 Feb 1708, on one of three contracts (also 14 February & 24 April) for men hired to go to "la Rivière de la Mobile." I have not yet seen the contracts. Hired in the same contract as his were "Estienne Estienne, Jean L’Escuier, et Joseph Girard à [by] Gabriel Baudreau Graveline," who is documented also at Detroit for the 24 November 1708, baptism of Marie Louise, daughter of Gabrielle Baudreau (Gabriel Baudreau dit Graveline, son of Urbain and Mathurine Juillet) and his wife Catherine Forestier, presently at the fort but voyageur preparing to descend to La Mobile. It is likely Jacques Mainville was also there at the fort. Godparents for the child were Joseph Parant and Marthe Forestier (sister of Catherine), femme du nommé Chanteloup (François Chalut dit Chanteloup), living at the fort. No signatures. (Ste. Anne) Marthe Forestier had deserted the 1706 convoy to the fort and was delivered there under escort the following year. (Thanks to Gail Moroue-DesHarnais for finding the contract ordering her transport to the fort.) No death date has survived for Jacques Miville / Mainville, but he was obviously deceased when his wife married Michel Germaneau in 1717.

A “Blot” or “Blof” is also mentioned by Michel Bizallion in 1715, along with “Alarie and Bourdon,” as traveling with him and “serving as guides for 200 lieux [about 500 miles] of path by land” from the “8yatanons 8abaches nation des Miamise” [Miamis at the Wabash] before “1711 to warn Detroit of an impending attack by “les Mis” [Miamis]. It had to be before the spring of 1711 because that is when Cadillac left Detroit, and Bizallion reports that “Mr. dela motte being very pleased with Bizallion sent him aux mis to speak to them on behalf of the governor, which he did without any personal interest. Bizallion happily [or luckily: heureusement] succeeded in his embassy and brought 50 mis to Detroit and returned to the Illinois by order of mr. dela Motte to subdue them [put the Illinois in obedience to the king]. Bizallion went with three Frenchmen, Barois, Chevalier, and La Pierre.” “Justification de Michel Bizallion,” 28 October 1715, NAC F-35, f. 99v. Bisaillon had returned to the mother colony by September of 1714. See my earlier reference and Part 6. Cadillac traveled to Kaskasia in 1715 and investigated a mine. He left...
The church record gives Michel’s age as twenty-two, *vint deux*, and identifies Michel’s father as deceased Pierre Germano and his mother as Marie Lafleur, *wife* of Pierre. Note the differences: the first name for Germano: Pierre on the church record, Joachim on the contract; and Marie Lafleur on the church record, Marie Couc on the contract. As will be seen, his sister Marie Anne Germaneau / Montour also has conflicting identification of her parents on her marriage records in 1730. As for Michel, he may never have known his father, who had died by 1700, when Michel would have been about five years old (See Part 5), and I have no evidence he ever lived with his mother nor that he did not.

Nevertheless, among the witnesses for Michel at the marriage and the contract is at least one of the interesting Lootman / Barrois brothers with ties to New York. I do not know how Michel met them; but they are identified as his friends; and two of the brothers, François and Jean Baptiste, themselves eventually lived in Detroit. Their half-sister, Marie Anne Barrois, in 1697, married François Ardouin, who went to Fort Pontchartrain in October of 1706; and by April of 1707, he was serving as Cadillac’s

one of his sons there to tend to it. NAC, F-35, 101 – 104v and other references. Bourgmont was also in the area at the time.

According to Jetté: LOTMAN, François m 31-05-1717 Montréal (Ct 13 Le Pailleur) Sauvage, Marie-Anne (Jacques & Marie-Catherine Jean) 5 children, 4 born in Detroit, 1722, 26, 27,30; LOTMAN, dit Barrois, Jean-Baptiste m 30-04-1717 Montréal (Ct 30 Lepailleur, which the archives say is missing) Cardinal, Marie-Madeleine (Jacques & Louise Arrivée) 7 children; 2 born in Detroit, 1722, 1724.


461 PRDH #48210 records the names as Francois Lootman and Basile Barroy, but I read, just barely, Batiste Barroy on the photocopy. The handwriting is wretched, though, so it may well be Basile, although I have found no evidence for a “Basile” Barroy or Lootman. François and Jean Baptiste married in Montréal in 1717, the same year as Michel, as noted in footnote above. Early in 2009, visiting BAnQ to see what records might have been added concerning the Barrois brothers, I located several that will deserve future attention. Among them is a two-part inquiry, Cote: TL4,S1,D1935, Centre: Montréal, Procès contre Barrois, accusé de négoce avec les Hollandais. - 5 juin 1716 - 2 septembre 1716, - 6 document(s) textuel(s); and TL4,S1,D1991, Procès contre Barrois, accusé de traite illégale avec les sauvages. - 6 août 1716 - 8 août 1716. - 8 document(s) textuel(s). Examining the actual files reveals that the person who summarized them referred to only one Barrois whereas the text identifies les Barrois, more than one name man Barrois, and that the men are identified as *des flamans D’Orange*, Dutch from Alabany, New York, from whom eight pieces of *écarlatines* (see my comments about these woolen fabrics) had been seized and who had recently arrived. Claude de Ramezay, governor of Montréal and interim Governal-general in Vaudreuil’s absence in France, comments that he “has written to Mr Hunter that if *les Anglois* come here to trade, I will have their merchandise seized, to which he [Hunter] agreed.” Michael Germaneau’s mother, Madame Montour, interpreted for Mr. Hunter, and her husband took the name of Robert Hunter. The other individual mentioned in the files is Livingston, probably Robert Livingston of New York. He married 1697 “Aug. 26. Robbert Levingston, Jr., y.m., and Margareta Schuyler, y.d., both l. here.”

This Dupuis marriage is a month before the marriage July 21. Moses De Puis, y.m., from Canada, and Annetje Christiaansz, y.d., both l. here. http://aleph0.clarku.edu/~djoyce/gen/albany/part1.html#marriage Among the possessions seized were letters, one written in Flamande addressed to Marguerite Livingston, most likely Robert’s wife at Albany and another in French from an uncle to *les dit Barrois*. Another document that has become available is Cote: TL4,S1,D1479, - 14 août 1713 - 18 août 1713 - 4 document(s) textuel(s), mentions as a witness *François Lootman, 17 ans, apprenti tonnelier de Paul Hotesse*. This is surely François “Lotman” Barrois. The quest in the New York records is not yet complete. See also http://www.nysm.nysed.gov/albany/bios/lrlivingstonjr.html

Suzanne Boivin Sommerville, © 2014, all rights reserved
Catherine, Widow Miville, was born 3 October 1683 in Montréal, thus she was thirty-three years old at her remarriage to twenty-two-year-old Michel. It was not unusual for an older woman to marry a younger man in New France, especially a widow with a young family to support. Her children by Jacques Miville, Jean Baptiste and Marie Anne, were ten and nine years old in 1717. On the marriage contract, Michel Germaneau acknowledges the inheritance rights of the two Miville children. Jean Baptiste Miville was hired to travel to the *pays d’en haut*; or, as Jetté phrases it, he was *engageur Ouest*, in the same time period as his step-father, and Marie Anne Miville married Nicolas Brazeau in 1730 Montréal. 

Present for Catherine at the contract were “Jaque dielle” and “Catherine Juillet, epose de joseph poupard, ses cousins.” Jacques Diel (Charles & Marie Anne Picard) is cousin by his maternal grandmother, Antoinette de Liercourt, Catherine L’Écuyer’s grandmother, called Anne Antoinette de Liercourt in Jetté. She first married Blaise Juillet in 1651 and remarried to Hugues Picard, Marie Anne Picard’s father, in 1660, shortly after Blaise Juillet’s death by drowning in trying to evade some Iroquois. Catherine Juillet is the daughter of Catherine Celle and Catherine L’Écuyer’s maternal uncle, Louis Juillet, who was associated with Jean Fafard *dit* Maconce, Michel Germaneau’s uncle. Just as Michel’s mother, recorded as Elisabeth Couk, had been, Louis Juillet was interrogated in connection with the legal trial against Cadillac in 1704.

Catherine Juillet herself had first married on 19 June 1702 at Montréal (contract 18 June, Adhémar) Jacques Hussey (Frédéric & Marguerite Kensey) of Esope, Nouvelle Angleterre (near Albany, another link with the English colonies and the Looitman / Barrois family). Hussey died sometime before Catherine remarried to Joseph Poupard (René Poupard of the Carignan Regiment & Marie Gendron) on 1 December 1711, also at Montréal (contract 01 December, LePailleur). On 5 May 1715, Joseph Poupard was an *engageur Ouest*, Jetté’s phrase to identify a person who hired individuals to travel to the *pays d’en haut*.

---

462 Photocopy of the notarial records.
463 Jetté and notarial records written by Adhémar 7 October 1706; 2 April; 18 April 1707.
464 Jetté and photocopies.
465 I have recently located but not yet examined a full copy of a notarial document for Catherine Juillet, widow Joseph Poupard, granting power of attorney to Pierre Biron, as she is about to leave for the *pays d’en haut*. The date is 22 June 1742.
466 Contrary to popular report, Blaise Juillet was not part of Adam Dollard’s expedition against the Iroquois. He died just as Dollard and his men were setting out but was not with them. See the entries in the registers of Montréal for 1660.
468 Marcel Fournier speculates that James Hussey, born in 1670, was taken during the attack at “Corlear” (New York) in 1695. He also says Hussey spent several years in an Indian mission “probablement Kahnawake,” where he was baptized. This may be a pure guess, but the baptismal act is nevertheless missing. According to Fournier, he died a little after 1706, “because his wife gave birth to illegitimate children whose fathers are unknown [sic].” Fournier, pp. 148-49. Jetté identifies the children as Marie, 16 September 1710 Montréal; and anonymous twins of undetermined sex, born and died 9 August 1711 Montréal. It is possible Hussey was never taken as a prisoner but is one of those who came to New France from the American colonies on his own.
haut, the country up river from the mother colony, that became Michigan and other U. S. States. His father and mother had married 6 April 1679 at Boucherville; and, although Joseph had been baptized in 1684 in Contrecœur, the family was in Hill Water, near Orange (Albany), New York, by the 1686 birth of his sister Marie. His mother died there, and his father remarried to Marie Perrin of Amboy, New Jersey, probably the sister of Élisabeth Perrin married to Jean Lalande, another Carignan Regiment veteran and an interpreter of English who served the colony of New France. Five children were born of this second marriage before René Poupard senior and his second wife died in the winter of 1707-1708. Isabelle may have been in the Albany area by then. Cadillac reported seeing her brother Louis Montour returning from Albany in 1706, and Montour definitely traveled there in 1708 and was on his way there with his wife and sister when he was assassinated in 1709. The children of the Poupard family appear again in Montréal by 1708. A daughter, Madeleine, worked as a servante at Hôtel Dieu hospital in Québec, as will be seen in a later section. Son Jean Poupard of this second marriage would take as wife, in 1718, Marguerite Poudret, daughter of Antoine Poudret and Catherine Gendron, Marie Gendron’s sister; and son Charles would marry Agnès Brazeau in 1719. A child of this marriage, Charles Poupard, baptized 23 October 1720 at Montréal, married Isabelle Babette Elisabeth Aubin St Aubin Lacasse, a descendant of one of the early Detroit families, 10 February 1755 Ste. Anne de Détroit. The various alliances are intriguing.

Present at the marriage contract for Michel Germano were: francois baroi lodman, as he signed it; and, as I read the record, his brother battise Barroy, who did not sign. PRDH reads “basile” and it may well be Basile, but I am not aware of any Basile Barrois. Also signing were Catherine Juillet, Jean Baptiste poudret and a vin cent Lo renz, as well as I can read it, although he is not mentioned in the text. These last two may be official witnesses. The contract was written at the home of Joseph Poupard, “Lootman,” “Barroy,” Dielle, and “Jean Baptiste Poudret” are named as witnesses on the church document; but

469 See Marcel Fournier, pp. 156-158. Jean Lalande married Élisabeth Perrin about 1689 at Amboy in New Jersey but was in Hill Water by 1700. See p. 181 for the Perrin sisters. Jean Lalande later served as an interpreter of English. I have not yet sent for the 1715 Poupard contract and several others.

470 Fournier, pp. 189-190. Circumstances of their deaths are unknown.

471 See both Jetté and PRDH. The first time I saw this marriage contract I read Joseph “Maynard” instead of Poupard, until I checked his wife’s, Catherine Juillet’s, records! Another reminder to triple-check readings, especially of the old handwriting. Other children of René Poupard and Marie Gendron: René Poupard m 1712 Catherine Laberge; Marie Poupard m 1708 Henri Rocloff Van de Werkan (another link with the Dutch of Albany); and Élisabeth Poupard m 1713 Charles Charron. Three other Poupard children from the second marriage were born in Hill Water. One, according to PRDH, Madeleine Poupart, baptized “1708-05-29 Montréal, born 1704-10-00 Still Water [sic] proche d’Orange en La Nouvelle-Hollande,” had as godparents, as recorded by PRDH, the interesting “Louis Deramezai [de Ramezay] Monnoir, son of Claude Deramezai, Occupation: chevalier de St-Louis, gouverneur de cette ile, Residence: Montréal,” and Marie Roebert daughter of “Etienne Roebert, Occupation: garde-magasin du roi Residence: Montréal”. This godfather died on the Ouabache River, killed by the “Chéraquis” in 1716. A “French woman” in Orange believed she had information about him at the time he was reported as deceased. Madeleine Poupart’s godmother is daughter of the Roebert who was ordered to release the écarlatines belonging to Isabelle’s sister in 1720. Marie Élisabeth Roebert would become Madame Bégon and write a valuable and enchanting series of journal entries and letters. DCB III. See my Parts 6 and 8. I am sure the “Madelon Poupar, d’orange servante de l’hôpital” in Québec City in January of 1723 is this Madeleine. She served at other times as well, beginning not too many years after her baptism, sometimes called “la petite Madelon”. Marie-Anne Montour is documented as servante in the same hospital from July 1728 to January 1729, as will be seen.
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although only “jaque dielle” and “poudret” signed this document along with priat, vicaire, the priest, “many others” are said to have attended. Who Jean Baptiste Poudret is I cannot yet say.\textsuperscript{473}

The \textit{Poupard} family and the \textit{Lootman / Barrois} brothers more than intrigue me. Jean Baptiste Lootman / Barrois was born at Iope or Esopus (modern-day Kingston, New York), New Netherland, in about 1691, with no surviving baptism record, and his brother François was born about 1696, “among the Dutch,” as well. Esopus, said to be Catherine Juillet’s husband Jacques Hussey’s home, is very close to Orange / Albany, where Isabelle, as Madame Montour, began to interpret after leaving the fort at \textit{Le Détroit} in 1706-1707. She had certainly arrived in the colony of New York by 1709, and may well have been part of the not-well-documented trading expeditions from the \textit{pays d’en haut} before or after that date. Cadillac was accused of trading with the English during this time. François Lootman / Barrois was supplied baptism at Laprairie 26 July 1699 after his parents had returned to New France.\textsuperscript{473} As with Jean Baptiste Lootman / Barrois, no birth / baptism record survives for Michel Germaneau, \textit{circa} 1695 if he was twenty-two in 1717, but he is a contemporary of these Poupard and Lootman / Barrois families with origins in or ties to the American colony. If Michel was married in the Church, he had to have been baptized and he had to have had evidence of his baptism or testimony by others that he had been baptized. Whether Isabelle traveled to New York by 1695 remains unknown, only Cadillac’s 1704 \textit{Mémoire} alleging she did with her alleged Loup husband. Perhaps only the alleged “Loup” husband is a tall tale and she did voyage to the English colonies, but we may never know why.

Michel Germaneau first makes his appearance in the surviving registers of New France with these marriage records, as far as I now know. As I have said, I believe he established himself in the mother colony not long after the 1714 amnesty decreed for all \textit{coureurs des bois} or others away without permission, providing they serve in the Fox Wars. His sister, Marie Anne Germaneau, appears for the first time the following year. I have no direct evidence Michel and Marie Anne ever met – nor that they did not – but there is quite a bit of at least circumstantial evidence that they must have known each other. For example, they were both in Montréal in 1718, where Michel and his wife definitely resided.

**Isabelle Montour’s daughter Marie Anne Germaneau**

Isabelle Montour’s daughter Marie Anne, who appears to have used the last names Germaneau and Montour, was in Montréal by at least 1718, using the name Germaneau. Researchers have questioned whether one of the Marie Annes is daughter of Louis Couc Montour (there is no evidence for such a daughter), but PRDH\textsuperscript{474} declares her one woman, although you will see her in two separate entries in

\textsuperscript{473} 2014 addition: See letter to \textit{Madame Marie jafare} [wife of Louis Metivier, as proven in other documents of this case] \textit{Au fort de Chartres}, written 26 December 1736 by J. P. Mercier, priest, in which Father Mercier reported \textit{Poudret} confirmed to him that he had seen her sister (Marguerite, widow of Turpin) “several times in New England [a term that also applies to other U. S. colonies]” and “he had never had any knowledge that she had in fact changed” her Catholic religion. The document is part of the judicial inquiry concerning the estate of Marguerite’s husband, Jean Baptiste Turpin, and Poudret’s first name is most assuredly Jean Baptiste. Church of Jesus Christ Latter Day Saints, Family History Library microfilm #1302012, Louisiana (Province) Conseil Superieur Court Records, 1740 12 26 01 - 1741 07 31 06 and a search on PRDH. Research in progress.

\textsuperscript{474} See both Jetté and PRDH, and my Part 9. I have known about, for at least two years, Linda Breuer Gray’s 1999 dissertation at McGill University, Montréal, “Narratives and Identities in the Saint Lawrence Valley, 1667-1720, available at Collections Canada, NAC, but I have only recently had the time to give it serious consideration in connection with the Couc / Montour family. Gray has an excellent presentation of the Barrois / Lootman family and others who traversed the border between New England and New France.

\textsuperscript{475} Listed on PRDH as: MARIE ANNE GERMANAU MONTOUR LAMOTHE
Jetté’s 1983 dictionary. Her extant signatures using each last name, Germaneau and Montour, are quite similar, even in the misspelling of Marie as Mairie. I believe they are one woman.

She did not, however, sign her presence on 27 July 1718 at Montréal as godmother for and giving her name to Marie Anne Larcheveque, daughter of Mathieu Larcheveque & Catherine St André (Achín in Jetté), with Jacques de Bordé as godfather.476 Two days later, 29 July 1718, Michel “Germanau” was baptized, son of Michel Germanau & Marie Catherine Lécuyer, with godfather Jean Baptiste Menard, related to Maurice Ménard, the husband of Madeleine Couc, and godmother Jeanne Macé (she signed jeanne masse), apparently the wife of Michel Campau, also early settlers at Detroit. Jeanne is the sister of Michel Massé, Marguerite Couc’s second husband. The godparents are thus cousins to the baby. Jeanne Massé is documented at Fort Pontchartrain in 1708, 1709, 1710, and 1720; her signatures on all of these records match.477 These two Montréal baptismal records appear on the same page of the register, separated only by a burial record. Both Marie Anne and Michel Germaneau were therefore in Montréal in July of 1718.

Marie Anne Germaneau may or may not have spent time with her brother Michel or with Aunt Marguerite Couc Fafard Massé. Simone Vincens assumes she was cared for by Angélique Couc, la femme de St Serny. Family visitations or custodial care are rarely documented. Marie Anne did, however, know two of Aunt Madeleine Couc’s children, her Ménard cousins Louis and Marie Madeleine. In the fall of 1721 she traveled with them and some others to Orange. I know this because of my discovery that her name is included among those individuals accused and found guilty of having gone to Orange without permission, recorded in an “Ordonnance entre Sr. Cugnet et Marie Magdeleine Menard, Louis Menard et autres,” and others, as titled.478 They were fined 500 livres each. If I had not sent for this document in 2003, I would not have learned that among the “others” so accused is Marie Anne Germaneau, cousin of “brother and sister Louis Menard and Marie Magdeleine Menard, femme de Jean-Baptiste Renaudet,” her second husband. The summary of the proceedings against these people indicates that Marie Anne Germaneau could not be interrogated because she had remained in Nouvelle Angleterre. Another of the “others” was Étienne Deniau dit Destaillis, husband of Catherine Bisaillon.479 (See above.) Thus, I know

476 A Jacques Laborde was a witness for 22 juillet 1701 Procès entre Louis Normand et sa femme, (No 297) ANQ-Québec, a legal case in which Louis Normand’s wife petitioned for separation from her husband. I do not know who Jacques de Bordé is.

477 Jeanne Massé’s daughter Marguerite Campeau was baptized 16 March 1708 with Marguerite (Fafard) Maconce giving the child her first name; son Paul Alexandre “Campot” was baptized 14 September 1709 with Paul Alexandre Guilet and Cécile Catin, Jacques Campeau’s wife, as godparents. Jeanne was then godmother 27 April 1710 for Jeanne, a Huron. In 1720, she served as godmother for Native children on 25 February and 29 June, and on 20 September 1720 for Joseph, son of Nicolas le huron, with Joseph Parant as godfather. Ste. Anne.

478 A transcription of this ordonnance of 15 July 1722, is found on NAC microfilm of Fonds des Ordonnances des Intendants de la Nouvelle-France, MG 8-A6, film C-13588, Vol 7, pp. 181-91, and I now have the original from Les Archives du Québec, photocopy. The original interrogations appear not to be extant; at least the archives could not locate them for me.

479 Others listed on the Canadian Archives ArchiviaNet summary of the document, 15 July 1722, are Etienne Deneau DesTaillis (husband of Catherine Bisaillon), François Dumay, Pierre Hubert dit Lacroix (brother of Jacques who resided in Detroit by 1709), Charles Deslites, and René Bourassa. Even more people are named as connected to the case or to travel to Orange, including Jean de Lalande. Charles Deslites is said to be of unknown origin (Jetté), but could be an illegitimate child of the Pierre Charles de Liette, cousin of Henri and Alphonse Tonty, who served much of his career among the Illinois. De Liette / Deslites complained about Michel Bisaillon’s activities among the Illinois and later had to apologize to him. (See Part 6) See DCB II for C. J. Russ’s suggestion that a “son of Pierre-Charles, born perhaps of an Illinois mother, might have replaced [his father] among the Illinois” after about 1722. The “bastard” children of the men of the period are rarely investigated and identified as often as those born of 163
Marie Anne and her cousins were in Orange, or Albany, at the same time her mother, Madame Montour, was interpreting for the government of New York, and just two years after her aunt, La St Serny, visited her sister Isabelle. (See Part 8.) What is more, on the first known record after she returned from New York, she called herself Marie Anne Montour. Those writers who assert that Marie Anne had no contact with her Canadian cousins do not know that this judicial record and others exist or did not look for them. How many other references are just waiting to be brought to light after so many years in obscurity?

Michel Germaneau at Montréal and Elsewhere

Michel’s name appears in the registers of Nôtre Dame de Montréal several times after the birth of his son. On 17 February 1726 he served as godfather for Etienne Laporte, son of Etienne (de) Laporte, a soldier of the company of Beaucourt, and Elisabeth “laporte” his wife.480 The couple had been at Lachine in 1720 when a daughter, Marie Anne, was baptized. Jetté identifies this “Elisabeth” as Suzanne Élisabeth Charbonneau, widow of Mathurin Bourbelon dit Langevin, and daughter of Jean Charbonneau and Isabelle Aboire, whose origins are unknown. Godmother was Geneviève Courrau (Courrault), most likely the former wife of Pierre Hurtubise. Geneviève Courrault remarried to Nicolas Le Cours 14 February 1706. His brother Gilles Le Cours married Catherine Ménard, sister of Maurice, on 17 January 1712.481 I will mention Gilles Le Cours again. Geneviève’s first husband, Pierre Hurtubise the elder, is uncle of Pierre Hurtubise (spelled Hurtibise in Jetté) married to Louise Beauvais. This couple was involved in looking after Marie Anne Germaneau’s child, Nicolas René, the following year, 1727. I will return to this child subsequently. Michel, thus, at least knew the aunt of the couple who accepted responsibility for seeing to the welfare of his sister’s child.

On 22 September 1728, Michel served as godfather with a Marguerite Roy as godmother for Michel Roy, son of Étienne Roy, habitant de la cote du Nord of the parish of Montréal, and Marie Lescuyer, his wife, the sister of Michel’s wife, Catherine.482 It seems impossible to determine which Marguerite Roy this godmother is. She did not sign. Most probably she is Étienne Roy’s sister married to Louis Langevin dit Lacroix; but Pierre Roy’s daughter Marguerite, Isabelle’s godchild, at that time Madame Dupont, gave birth to a child in November of 1728 at Québec and could have paused in Montréal as she traveled from Fort St Philippe (later Fort Miami, now Fort Wayne, Indiana) to her and her husband’s home in Québec City, where Marie Anne Montour began to work as a servante at the Hôtel Dieu hospital in July of 1728, all to be discussed subsequently.483

their women partners. Although it is not generally known, Alphonse de Tonty himself fathered such a child born out-of-wedlock: 1688-04-11, baptized at Lachine as Louis Morin, son of “Loret, lieutenant, resident of Ville-Marie,” and Marie Morin, wife of “Jacques Galop,” resident of the Pays d’en haut, who in 1688 had been a fugitive from the colony living in “Nouvelle Angleterre” for nine years. “Jacques Galop” was in reality Jacques Viger. Dollier, Grand Vicaire de Monseigneur L’eveque De Québec, and curé at Montréal, declared at Marie Morin’s remarriage 1695-06-23 to Jean Bouteiller that there had never been any marriage between Jacques Viger and Marie Morin. The child Louis Morin, now called Louis Tonty, two years old, died 1690-12-24 at Montréal (photocopy). Alphonse de Tonty and Marie Anne Picoté de Belestre married at Montréal 1689-02-17. (PRDH and photocopy) Their first child, Philippe, was baptized 1689-09-30 Montréal and, according to Jetté, was buried 1690-12-24, the same day as Louis Morin / Tonty? This is surely an error. PRDH does not assign this or any death date to Philippe.

480 17 February 1726, FHL #0375842, photocopy.
481 All Jetté.
482 Ibid., and photocopy.
483 See MHH, October 2003 for my article about Marguerite Roy. This article is now on the FCHSM website.
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Michel Germaneau and his wife lived at Côte St Pierre (on the St Pierre River) of the island of Montréal. Michel several times became a hired man, an engagé, to travel to Michilimackinac and elsewhere. I have so far found no documents concerning Michel from 1718 until 1724, when Nicolas Sarrazin, brother-in-law of Catherine Juillet,484 and his associates Amariton485 and François Augé, hired him on 20 May 1724 to go there with certain merchandise and return the following year with pelleteeries.486 He would be paid 175 livres en castors, beaver skins. With Jean Baptiste Mainville, most likely Michel’s step-son, he was hired 28 May 1725 by Claude Caron and Philippe Leduc to go again to Michilimackinac.487 He contracted to return to the pays d’en haut each of the next two years: 28 April 1726, hired by associates Duplessis, René Bourassa (who may be the same man accused of going to Orange the same year Marie Anne Germaneau traveled there in 1721), and Nicolas Sarrazin.488 On 19 May 1727, it was Jean Chevallier, merchant, who hired him.489 One of the Chevallier families was based in Michilimackinac, but I am not yet sure whether this is Jean Baptiste, the father. On a 27 May 1728 contract, Michel Germaneau acknowledged owing Lambert LeDuc St Aumert, spelled Saint-Omer in Jetté,490 40 livres for 20 minots de blé (wheat), promising to repay him in August in coin money or in beavers, en argent ou en castors. Less than a month later, 5 June 1728, he and his wife borrowed 213 livres 7 sols from Pierre Courraud La Coste for merchandise.491 He promised to repay the loan in August of the following year, if he returned then, as he was (again?) going to the war against the Renard/Fox Indians. More than once the officials of New France allowed voyageurs to carry merchandise to the pays d’en haut to trade for their profit in return for fighting against the Fox. This made the king’s expenses for this conflict more economical as he did not have to send additional soldiers and pay to feed and transport them to the pays d’en haut. Michel either did not go or obviously returned because on 11 September 1728 he served as godfather, as mentioned above. The unsuccessful expedition was led by Constant Le Marchand de Lignery.492 Some of those in the original convoy may have returned early. The following year Nicolas Sarrazin married Catherine Juillet’s sister Marie Louise Juillet 25 November 1715 Montréal, contract 24 Le Pailleur. Jetté.

François Amariton, of unknown origin, enseigne in 1696, captain in 1716, married before the census of 1716, in France, Marie Millon, of unknown origin, herself an engagé Ouest 21 April 1724 to 13 May 1727. Jetté.

20 May 1724, J. B. Adhémari, #1247, ANQ photocopy.

25 May 1725, J. B. Adhémari, summary in RAPQ. Michel’s cousin François “Sincerny” was hired by the same men on the same day. Jetté cites hiring contracts for Jean Baptiste Miville / Mainville. Philippe Leduc appears to be uncle of Pierre Leduc, who married 1731-05-28 Montréal Françoise Massé, daughter of Marguerite Couc and Michel Massé. See Part 8.

28 April 1726, J. B. Adhémari, summary in RAPQ. François Mesnard Bellerose and a Joseph Beauvais were hired by the same men on the 26th. There were many hiring contracts written in 1726, 1727, and 1728, close to 200 in 1727 alone.

19 May 1727, Raimbault fils, summary in RAPQ.

This Lambert Leduc dit Saint Omer is son of Lambert & Jeanne Descarie. Another Lambert Leduc, a nephew of this Lambert senior, attended the marriage of his brother Pierre Leduc, son of dec. Jean & Marguerite Desroches. Pierre Lucduc Souchigny senior married twenty-six year old Françoise Massé, daughter of Michel Massé and Marguerite Couc, 1731-05-28, PRDH #149715 Montréal. See Part 8. Pierre Leduc was also engagé Ouest 27-06-1729 and 02-06-1730 (Jetté). They had a son, named Pierre Lucduc Souchigny fils. See FCHSM website.

5 June 1728, J. B. Adhémari, #2437, ANQ photocopy. Jetté says Pierre Courraud is probably cousin of Cybard, thus a cousin of Geneviève. He married Anne Massé, widow Guillaume Maillot, in 1718 Montréal. Anne is sister of Michel Massé. In 1722, Pierre Courraud remarried to Marie Marguerite Aubuchon dite Lespérance.

See “Le Marchand de Lignery, Constant”, DBC II. The expedition failed to confront the Fox, who had fled to the West. Instead Lignery ordered the burning of villages and harvests. R. David Edmunds and Joseph Peyser say the expedition left Montreal on 5 June 1728 (the day of Michel’s contract) and “consisted of Four hundred French soldiers and coureurs de bois [sic], and several hundred mission Indians” and were “joined by additional coureurs de bois and hundreds of western Indians … , who swelled Lignery’s force to almost 1,650 men.” Underlining mine. The
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Sarrazin once more hired Michel 26 June 1729 to go yet again to Michilimackinac. He would be paid 200 livres en castors.

I wonder whether Michel’s sister joined him for this voyage, as she stopped working at the hospital under the name Marie Anne Montour at the end of January and is not documented again until her marriage to soldier Jean Montary a year later. Could this soldier also have been dispatched to Michilimackinac? Jean Montary is documented at the hospital in 1724, 1725, 1726 and in May and June of 1729, as well as in 1730 after his second marriage, as I will demonstrate. All I can do now is suggest this as a possible scenario. There may well be others!

Michel’s uncle, Maurice Ménard, husband of Madeleine Couc, served as sergeant and interpreter at Michilimackinac in these years, but he is also documented as descending to the mother colony at times. Madeleine seems to have joined her husband at Michilimackinac after he requested permission for her to do so in 1713. It was Father Chardon, Jesuit missionary, who specifically asked the governor to let Ménard return to Michilimackinac with his wife. I will mention Father Chardon again.

so-called coureurs de bois accompanying the soldiers from Montréal were actually more accurately voyageurs, engagés, or hired men. The Fox Wars, The Mesquakie Challenge to New France, Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993, p. 111. I am sure there were far fewer soldiers than volunteer men. These authors use primarily published English language translations or transcripts of documents.

Letters sent from Missilimakinac by Jesuit Fathers Marest and Chardon in June, July, and August of 1713 mention Maurice Ménard, Isabelle’s brother-in-law, and Villeneuve (Daniel Amiot dit Villeneuve), who were about to leave to go back to the colony to report on the status of things. Speaking of these two men, Marest says of Sieurs de Mesnard et Villeneuve: I have already given you (Vaudreuil) testimony concerning both of these men that I believed I owed to them. The first does not need any recommendation to return, (to Michilimackinac, literally to come back up river). "Je vous [Vaudreuil] ay desja ren" le premier n’a pas besoins de recommendacon pour remonter.” Emphasis mine. Father Chardon, missionary, asked the governor to let Ménard’s wife come, “de luy laisser venir icy sa femme.” C11°, NAC F-34, ff. 82v-83v for the 29 June 1713 Chardon letter. Maurice had petitioned to have his wife join him. On 21 September 1713, the notary Taillhandier wrote a document naming Louis Ménard procurator with power of attorney “general Special et Irrevocable” for his brother Maurice Ménard and Magdeleine Couque, his wife. The power of attorney given to Louis included seeing to the education of two Ménard daughters “en pension chez les Soeurs de la Congregation” or elsewhere. In 1713, the two unmarried daughters were Madeleine, at least nineteen, and Suzanne, seven years old, who would marry Gabriel Bolon, a soldier, in 1726 at Michilimackinac. Unfortunately, this record is one of the transcribed partial entries. Neither Maurice nor Madeleine appear to have been present 11 November 1714 at Chambly when Marie Madeleine Ménard, daughter of Maurice Ménard and Magdelaine "Couque ses père et mère" of Boucherville married Charles Pavie dit Lafleur, a soldier. “Marie Madeleine Menard” signed. Her sister, Marie Marguerite, "mad[am]e boileaux," who had married Pierre Boileau in 1706 and settled in Chambly, is also said to be present at this, Madeleine’s first, marriage. Madeleine would remarry to Jean Baptiste Renoaudit, also a soldier, 18 April 1717, also at Chambly, with the contract written at Fort Chambly 6 May 1717 by Father Antoine De Lino, Récollet, who would serve at Fort Pontchartrain beginning in 1719. Madeleine’s father was present and signed. The contract was deposited with the notary J. B. Adhémar on 6 May by the newly-married couple, ANQ, photocopy. PRDH & FHL #1018130 photocopy. Maurice is indicated as present in Michilimackinac in “Congés et permis enregistrés à Montréal,” 1722, juin, 05 and 1726, mai, 20, MG 8 C 8, NAC microfilm C-13986, Transcript, Vol. 2, pp. 493 and 1722 and on numerous other surviving documents. I have not yet charted the many references to him in the extant documents. He seems to have been highly respected and influential. His wife’s, Madeleine Couc’s, death record has not survived, but she is said to be deceased by son François's marriage in 1756, when Maurice is still called interprète at Michilimakinac. Maurice was buried 10 May 1741 at Chambly, sergeant at half-pay for the king, having made his Easter Duty, said to be 86 years-old (actually about to be 77 on 7 June). Many habitants were...
According to another Jesuit, Father Marest, there were several Frenchwomen present even then, in 1713, at Michilimackinac. He praises Daniel Amiot dit Villeneuve’s wife, Domitilde Oukabé, Ottawa sister of Chief Lafourche, as “an example of wisdom to the few French women who are here and to the Indians.” He also reports Father Chardon was looking forward to perfecting “his learning of the outaouaise language during the winter” with Domitilde, Madame Villeneuve, as his teacher. An anonymous manuscript plan of Michilimackinac circa 1717 places the fort at its modern-day Mackinaw City, Michigan, reconstructed site and says “This post is called MissilimaKinaK, the French abandoned the older one [at modern-day St. Ignace, Michigan] because this location is more suitable, there is a fort, a commandant and some habitants, even Frenchwomen [;] in 1716 during trading season there were about 600 Frenchmen, coureurs de bois.” Who is to say that Marie Anne Germaneau / Montour and her aunt Madeleine were not some of these women in 1716 or later? The surviving transcription (hand-written partial copy) of early religious acts at Michilimackinac preserves a record of baptisms from 1712 and marriages from 1725 to 1741, at which time the extant original register, complete with signatures, begins. The women whose children were baptized were surely there in those years. Although it has not received much attention in the published histories, Michilimackinac was a very important outpost of New France long before the British arrived to take charge of it and move it to Mackinac Island.

Michel Germaneau’s Last Years

On 1 Décembre 1730, François Bugret (Bougret in Jetté) dit Dufort and his wife, Geneviève Chevalier, of Lachine, sold Michel Germano, habitant, des coteaux St Pierre, a continuation of land situated at la côte St Pierre. François’s brother, Pierre Bougret, went to Fort Pontchartrain 16 July 1702 and 28 July 1704, the convoy sent to interrogate habitants of the fort, including Elisabeth Couk and the Indians, and to return with Madame Cadillac and other women, as well as with the pelletteries the Indians refused to send down earlier that year, allegedly under Cadillac’s orders, when Cadillac himself left. Other

witnesses: "sergent à demi Solde pour le Roy ayant faits ses paques aagé de 86 plusiers habitants ont été temoins.”

Photocopy. Maurice and Madeleine are my seventh-violat grandparents.

495 NAC, Série C11 A, microfilm F-34, photocopy.

497 See FHL microfilm #0865224. The earliest summarized record is for April of 1695, the baptism of Antoine mainard, son of deceased [sic] Maurice. The record was obviously copied after Maurice’s death in 1741. It is said Maurice and Madeleine’s marriage is also noted on this excerpted register, but I have been unable to find it on the microfilm. Perhaps it is recorded on a badly damaged sheet. Or perhaps someone guessed that, if the boy was baptized there, the parents must have been married there. I really do not know, but I continually find evidence of guesses like this presented as fact.


499 When Cadillac himself left the fort in 1704 to return to the mother colony, Madame Cadillac and other women stayed behind as willing "hostages" to the Indians, if Cadillac's version of what transpired can be believed. Cadillac warned the Huron Quarante Sols that the Natives must take good care of their “mother,” Madame Cadillac, and
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Bougrét brothers also were voyageurs. Geneviève Chevalier, widow Jacques Foucher at her marriage to Bougrét in 1719, was daughter of Joseph and Françoise Marthe Barton. Her brother Jean Baptiste was an engageur Ouest 10-07-1718 to 19-08-1730; marchand voyageur, but I do not yet know whether he is the Jean Chevalier who hired Michel in 1727. With his wife, Françoise Alavoine, and his soon-to-become famous family, Jean Baptiste Chevallier relocated to Michilimackinac by 1719.

After 1728, Michel borrowed from Pierre Crevier Duverney, a record I have not yet seen (J. B. Adhémar, 4 June 1731), and he served as godfather one more time, 28 October 1731 for Marie Amable Richer, daughter of Jean Baptiste Richer, habitant de la Coste St Pierre, and Marie Jarry. The godmother was Elisabeth Trottier, femme de Baptiste Dany de la meme coste. Jean Baptiste Danis’s first wife was Marguerite Lécuyer (Paul & Françoise Lecomte). On 27 May 1733, Marie L’Ecuver, femme Michel Germano, was godmother with Charles Poupard for Marie Amable Brazot (Brazeu), Catherine L’Ecuyer’s grandchild, daughter of Nicolas Brazeau and Marie Anne Mainville. Nicolas Brazeau (Nicolas & Anne Pinsonnault) had married 9 October 1730 at Montréal. As previously cited, Charles Poupard married Agnès Brazeau, Nicolas’ sister, in 1729.

Michel Germaneau was buried 15 May 1734 at Montréal, having died “the night before about one hour after midnight, habitant [resident] journalier [dayworker] from la cote St Pierre.” No age is given on his death record, unfortunately, and only two priests from the seminary and the parish priest signed the record. Ironically, “Louise Joseph Longueil,” eight months old, was buried on the same day. According to the record, she was the daughter of le chevalier de longueil and Madame Louise [sic] Soulange. In 1728, Paul Joseph Lemoine, sieur de Longueil, the son of Charles Lemoine, Baron de Longueil, who had traveled so many times to Iroquoia, had married Marie Geneviève de Joybert de Soulanges, the niece-by-marriage of Governor Vaudreuil. he who had authorized or at least officially approved the killing of Michel’s uncle, Louis Couc Montour.

On 23 December 1738, four years later, Michel Germaneau’s widow, Catherine Lescuyer, renounced her right to their common property —“communauté De Biens”— being able to claim what was due to her by her widow’s benefit, (douaire) dowry (dot), and marriage contract agreements: “douaire, dot, et conventions matrimonial a Elle accordée par son dit Contrat de mariage.” This probably means the estate had debts. Her douaire, the sum she was entitled to in the event of her husband pre-deceasing her, was 500 livres, as stated in her marriage contract. I have not yet seen further mention of her son, also arrange for “refreshments” for her, or he, Cadillac, would not give him any little shots of brandy when he returned from his business in Québec. “Conseil tenu au Fort Pontchartrain, 8 and 9 juin 1704,” Collection Moreau de Saint-Méry, AC F3, Vol 2, ff. 301-302, NAC F-378, photocopy, my translation. This document and several others were, apparently, unavailable to the early historians of Detroit. See my article “The Other Women and Early Detroit,” Part 2, in MHH, January 2002. The events that occurred in June and earlier in 1704 resulted in the legal trial against Cadillac.  

501 Jetté, who also cites DCB II. His marriage to Marie Françoise Alavoine 8 April 1709 Montréal resulted in the birth of fifteen children, not all of them listed by Jetté to 1730, the later children baptized at Michilimackinac beginning in 1719; other children are: Anne Thérèse Esther in 1732; Angélique in 1733; and Luc, baptized in 1735, all at Michilimackinac, whom Jetté does not show. He also errs in naming Louis-Thérèse (male) as Louise-Thérèse. Photocopy of Michilimackinac records and PRDH. There does not seem to be any connection between this Chevalier family and the godfather of illegitimate Nicolas René, son of Marie Anne Germanau.

502 Jetté, PRDH, and photocopies.

503 PRDH

504 Jetté. She is the daughter of Vaudreuil’s wife’s brother.

505 23 December 1738, Danre de Blanzy, #2645, ANQ photocopy.
named Michel, born in 1718, but Catherine Lescuyer often served as godmother after the death of her second husband and survived until 9 August 1757, when she was buried at Montréal.\textsuperscript{506} I have not yet completed my search for further documents about her.

\footnotesize{PRDH}

\textsuperscript{506} PRDH
Marie Anne Germaneau / Montour

The surviving records for Marie Anne tell a remarkable story but an even more poignant and disturbing one than her brother Michel’s. In 1728, ten years after first appearing in the records of the mother colony of New France, again using the name Marie Anne Germaneau, she admitted being the mother of an illegitimate child named Nicolas René, whose birth had been recorded in a 13 January 1726 baptism at Montréal, father and mother said to be unknown at the baptism. He does not appear to be her only child born out-of-wedlock. Her other children will be presented shortly.

In 1728, she “hired out” Nicolas René, that is, gave him to the care of the Hospitaliers de La Croix et de Saint Joseph, to be brought up by them and to serve them at Hôpital Général de Montréal. The Hospitaliers were also called les frères Charon, an order of religious brothers founded by François Charon. As will be seen, 1728 is the same year that a woman using the name Marie Anne Montour was to have completed her year as a servante for the family of Michel Lamy in Montréal; and the year a Marie Anne Montour appeared as a servante at the Hôtel Dieu in Québec City; and, finally, as I have already mentioned, the year Michel Germaneau, Marie Anne’s brother, was hired to serve in the Fox war. (See Part 10.) Something must have happened between 1718 and 1727-28 to cause her to begin using the last name Montour.

The surviving documents concerning Nicolas René (no last name given in the documents) present a tantalizing mystery as well as a significant example of New France’s social program for children born outside of marriage. The man who initiated this program, whose purpose was to see to the care and upbringing of these children by volunteer families, was Intendant Michel Bégon, the same who, in 1720, authorized the return of the écarlatines to Marie Anne’s aunt, La St Serny. Jean François Mathieu Martin de Lino,507 was also responsible, in part, for this strategy to rescue illegitimate children or children whose mothers could not care for them; some of these children had been given away to Indians in the past.508 Coincidentally, his brother, Father Antoine Martin de Lino, who signed his name Antoine DeLino, served at Fort Pontchartrain, Le Détroit, during this time, from 12 November 1719 to March 1722.

507 As of October 2003, a searchable version of The Dictionary of Canadian Biography is on the Web. <http://www.biographi.ca/EN/index.html> See DCB II for Antoine and Jean-François-Mathieu Martin de Lino. Their father, Mathieu-François, a member of the Conseil supérieur, was very involved with the Company of the Colony that was initially in charge of trade at Fort Pontchartrain. See DCB I for him.

508 See Serge Goudreau, “Le village huron de Lorette: une crèche pour les enfants canadiens du XVIIIe siècle,” Mémoires de la Société Généalogique Canadienne-Française, 51-1 (223) printemps 2000, 7-12, for a discussion of this initiative begun in 1722 by Intendant Michel Bégon, the same who returned the écarlatines to La St Serny in 1720.
Marie Anne Germaneau / Montour’s great-grandfather, Pierre Couc’s father, was named Nicolas, but it turns out that the first name Nicolas René, may have been given at the infant’s baptism in January of 1726, by his godfather, Nicolas René Chevalier.509 The godmother was Françoise Larcheveque. The man who served as godfather for the baby with “unknown” parents was there when the baby was assigned to the care of Pierre Hurtebise (spelled Hurtibise in Jetté) and Marie Louise Beauvais,510 his wife, according to the dictates of an act passed before Adhémar dit St Martin 17 August of 1727,511 six months before Marie Anne officially acknowledged the child as her son. This Nicolas René Chevalier, a master armorer, maître-armurier, from Paris, does not appear to be related to the Jean Baptiste Chevalier family then and later so prominent at Michilimackinac and at Fort St Joseph (Niles, Michigan).

The 17 August 1727 document concerns “a bastard child named nicolas René,” as reported by the said Nicolas René Chevalier, his godfather,” present and signing.512 No parents’ names are identified, but the child was said to be about eighteen months old. Pierre Raimbault, procurator for the royal jurisdiction of Montréal, procureur au siege de la Jurisdiction Royalle de montréal, reported that Geneviève Gauthier, wife of Jean Vermet, wigmaker (perruquier) of Montréal, declared to him that the child had been abandoned by his mother. It is not stated on this document whether Geneviève Gauthier may then have known that Marie Anne was the mother of the child. Also present at the 1727 contract, Geneviève Gauthier, Madame Vermet, added that she herself had taken the child to Pierre Hurtibise and Marie Louise Beauvais, his wife. No dates for the abandonment or transfer of the baby are given. On 17 August of 1727, though, the Hurtebises officially promised to treat the child as their own for eighteen years: to feed, educate and train Nicolas René, to see to it that he is raised as a Catholic, and to provide for him at the end of this period of time certain items of new clothing: hat, coat, vest, pants, stockings, and French shoes and a belt, four shirts and four ties, and also his old belongings; “chapeau capot veste cullottes bas et souillier françois et une ceinture, quatre chemises et quatre cravattes” and also “ses vielles hardes” and also “ses vielles hardes.”

Six months later, 23 February 1728, a woman who called herself “Marieanne Germaneau” had already removed the child named Nicolas René from the home of the Hurtebises in order to find another placement for him. She had decided to offer him to the Frères Hospitaliers of the Hôpital général de Montréal, who agreed to board the boy and educate him until he reached the age of twenty, thus to about 1746. Perhaps incidentally, Marie Anne Germaneau’s cousin, Madeleine Ménard, and Madeleine’s second husband, Jean Baptiste Renaudet, had sold property in Chambly to the Frères Hospitaliers just weeks earlier, on 6 February 1728,513 with “marie madeline menard femme de renaudet” signing a permission on 25 December 1727, Christmas Day, for her husband to transact the sale for 120 livres in merchandise. The sale document itself was signed by Frère Gervais Hodiesne, the same representative of the hospital who also signed the 1728 “engagement” contract, for Nicolas René. I have no idea whether

509 Nicolas René Chevalier, a master armorer, maître-armurier, from Paris, married twice: Marguerite Brisset 6 November 1720 Québec, and Marie Leblanc, 4 August 1727 Montréal. Jetté.
510 The Hurtebises had no children in 1727, although they had married in 1723. The Beauvais family is another with serious involvement and alliances in the fur trade. Pierre Hurtebise’s wife is the daughter of Raphaël Beauvais & Élisabeth Turpin. Élisabeth Turpin is the half-sister of Jean Baptiste Turpin, who married Marguerite Fafard Maconce in 1710, Jean Baptiste being the son of Marie Charlotte Beauvais, Alexandre Turpin’s second wife. Jetté. Alexandre’s eldest son, Alexandre Romain Turpin, born of his first wife, was a Frère Charon.
512 The French reads; “dun Enfant Bastard nommé nicolas René aceque dit le dit Nicolas René Chevalier son parrain aussi present.”
513 6 February 1728, Vente par J. B. Renaudet aux Freres Hospitaliers, no. 2351, Notary J. B. Adhémar, photocopy.
this sale of property is specifically connected to the Hospitaliers’ later agreement to see to the care of Nicolas René; but, since Marie Anne had traveled to Orange with this same cousine and her brother, Louis Ménard, in 1721, the transaction, at the least, suggests a link.

On the 1728 “Engagement par Marie Germaneau de son enfant aux freres hospitaliers” notarial record, Marie Anne identified and recognized Nicolas René as her son, who was about two years old. She signed the document, at first, mair, and then mariane germaneau – the first and only evidence I have located of her signature with this last name.514 She stated that she had been the one who left the baby with the Vermets in a guardianship or baby-sitting capacity only. After Procurator Raimbaud had awarded the child to the Hurtebises in 1727, where he stayed for an unidentified length of time, she withdrew him for Bonnes Considerations, good reasons, paying for his time with them, with the intent to place him somewhere that would assure he would be well-cared for and educated, as she herself was unable to look after him. By this 1728 contract the Frères Hospitaliers agreed to be responsible for the child.

The 1728 contract repeats the provisions for clothing to be provided to the child at the end of his service, saying he will receive new clothing from “foot to head” [sic] and also his old possessions: “toute en Neufes pied En Cap ainsi avec ses vielles hardes,” as stipulated also by the 17 August contract of the previous year. The document adds that neither Marie anne Germanau nor anyone else will be allowed to withdraw the child for any reason whatsoever: “pour quelque Raison que Ce soit Le Retirer”; but, to the contrary, should Nicolas René “by lack of devotion or willful behavior or any other cause leave the said frères hospitaliers, she would be held responsible to search for him and to bring him back under penalty of the laws. The said Procureur du Roy would also be responsible to pursue in his name those who gave the child asylum.515 I have no idea what became of the boy, although this strikes me as very strong language to use for a child who was then only two years old.516 Did the unnamed father have any say in the matter? The issue remains unknown.

These two documents present a fascinating example of New France’s provisions for and concern about children whose mothers could not support them and whose fathers were declared unknown. There had apparently been an upsurge of such births, and the government responded to protect these infants.

Marie Anne Germaneau / Montour’s Fafard and Massé Cousins

Marie Anne Germaneau / Montour is not an isolated example of unmarried mothers. Her cousin Marguerite Fafard dite Maconce, the daughter of Marguerite Couc Fafard Massé, bore two children

514 23 Feb 1728  Adhémar dit Saint-Martin, No. 2355, ANQ-Montréal, photocopy.
515 The French reads: “si par Inconstance Libertinage ou autres il quitoit les dit freres hospitaliers Elle sera tenue et obligé De Le Chercher et Le Ramenir de son Devoir sur Les peines Des ordonnance ainsy que Le dit Procureur du Roy de poursuivre En son nom Ceux qui Luy Donneroit Retraite.”
516 I have seen one other contract which stipulates that the mother must search for her child should he leave the supervision of the adoptive parents, but the procurator is not similarly charged by law to seek him. Nicolas René would have been 20 in 1746. In 1747, only three Brothers and four very old pensioners remained at the hospital. The establishment would pass into the hands of Madame d’Youville (Dufrost). At the time Nicolas René entered into the care of the freres hospitaliers, the administrator was Louis Turc, frère Chrétien, from 1720 to 1735. Interestingly, Louis Turc was a patient at Hôtel Dieu at the same time Marie Anne Montour served as servante. See reference to him in this article in a later section. See DCB II for François Charon de La Barre, involved in the fur trade and founder of the hospital and the hospitalières. It was Charon’s plan for an establishment at Le Détroit du Lac Érié that was at first chosen to be implemented in 1701. Cadillac was not the only one who found the location desirable for a trading center. La Potherie also asked to be granted the trade there.
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out-of-wedlock, but she named the father of one of them. (See Part 10.) Marguerite’s sister, Marie Madeleine Fafard, referred to as “Marie Madeleine Macons fafar” on her child’s baptism record, gave birth 22 January 1723 to a daughter, Agnès, who died just a month later, 24 February. Like her sister Marguerite, Madeleine identified the father of her baby, naming Antoine d’Ailleboust (son of Antoine d’Ailleboust sieur de Coulonge & Félicité Picard).\footnote{This child did not live long: “Agnès n et b 22-01-1723 Montréal s 24-02-1723 id.” (Jetté). The church record itself calls the child Agnès Dailleboust, daughter of Antoine, son of Mr. de Coulounge according to the mother Marie Madeleine Macons fafar. Godparents were Charles Reinville and Agnès Renault.} Antoine d’Ailleboust the son, also sieur de Coulonges and de Mantet, married five years later, in 1728, Marie Louise, the daughter of Étienne de Villedonné and Marie Damours, de Villedonné’s first wife. The year before the baptism of Agnès, in March of 1722, this same Étienne de Villedonné, then fifty-nine years of age, was sent to command at Fort St. Joseph at present-day Niles, Michigan (sometimes identified as Fort Saint Joseph des Miamis or des Illinoïs), where “Marguerite Kouk femme du Sieur Massé” served as godmother on 2 May 1723\footnote{Photocopy of the register. She served as godmother six times from August of 1720 to May of 1723.} for Marie Joseph de Villedonné, a child born to de Villedonné’s second wife, Françoise Roussel, whom he had married at Québec in 1715. The families were not unknown to each other.

Marie Madeleine Macons fafar does not appear to have been there at St Joseph with her mother, though, for she was in Chambly, the home of her Ménard cousins, on 25 May 1722, when she served as godmother for Madeleine Robert, daughter of Jacques Robert and Jeanne “dumuy” (Demers), with godfather Pierre Pépin. She signed the record.\footnote{Photocopy of the register. She served as godmother six times from August of 1720 to May of 1723.} A child born in January of 1723 would have been conceived by May 1722, or shortly after. I have also learned that “Marie Madeleine fafar” was not the only one of Marguerite Couc’s children present in the Montréal area about this time or earlier. Marguerite Couc’s Massé daughters were also there by 1721.

Early in November of 2003, I discovered that Geneviève Massé can be documented in the mother colony six years before her 1727 marriage, which I and others had previously cited as the first documented act revealing her existence. (See Part 8.) On 26 May 1721, she acted as godmother in Montréal for a baby who was given her first name, Geneviève, daughter of André Roy & Jeanne Péladeau, with a Jean Baptiste Ménard, who could not sign, as godfather. Geneviève Massé did sign, and this signature matches those on her marriage documents. Her sister, Françoise Massé, also appears in the mother colony as a godmother before Geneviève’s marriage. It is actually Françoise’s presence in 1722, not her sister’s in 1721, that I first discovered by chance while scanning a page of the La Prairie church register that records the 1722 baptism of a child of René Bourassa, who (not-so-coincidentally?) had traveled to Orange with Marie Anne Germaneau in the fall of 1721.

On 6 September 1722, using the distinctive signature I had seen before on other documents, “franÇoise massé” served as godmother at La Prairie for Pierre, son of Pierre Beaudin and Suzanne Vallée, with Michel Beaudin as godfather. Finding this record sent me back to PRDH’s wonderful search engine at its web site, and I then consulted the microfilms and made photocopies of the records at my local Family History Center. I learned Françoise signed again on 7 May 1723 at Montréal, with René de Couagne as godfather, for Françoise Barthe, daughter of Theophile Barthe and Charlotte Alavoine, a record on which she is specifically identified as the daughter of Michel Mace [sic]; and she signed yet again as a godmother on 25 October 1725, once more at Montréal, with François Volant, who signed as godfather, for another baby, likewise named Françoise, daughter of Pierre Dubois and Barbe Haguenier (Paul...
Haguenier & Barbe Delestre). Barbe Haguenier’s mother is the daughter of Thierry Delestre & Marie-Suzanne Péré. This last record is particularly striking for several reasons, first, because Barbe Haguenier’s maternal uncle is the influential La Rochelle merchant Jean Péré, who was present at the 1657 marriage of Pierre Couc and Marie Mite8ameg8k8é, and he is also the godfather of Françoise Massé’s mother, Marguerite Couc. There are more connections, as well.

The 25 October 1725 signature of François Volant, f. Volant, matches the signature witnessing Françoise Massé’s 1731 marriage. On 11 July 1723 at Montréal, François Volant had married Michelle Pothier dite Laverdure, the daughter of Jean and Marie Massé, Françoise Massé’s paternal aunt. François Volant’s father is the brother of Étienne Volant, sieur de Radisson, clerk for the Company of the Colony in the first years at Fort Pontchartrain. His wife, Geneviève Letendre, accompanied him there and I speculate she may well have served as godmother for Geneviève Massé and given her her name, although no record survives in any known and extant register. Another brother, Jean François Volant, sieur de Fosseneuve, traveled to the fort with Bourgmont in 1703. The link to Fort Pontchartrain continues into the future.

On 17 May 1734, François Volant’s mother-in-law, Marie Massé, as widow of Jean Pothier Laverdure, assigned a power of attorney to Pierre Hubert Lacroix to sell property held in her name at Fort Pontchartrain, including property she had purchased for 217 livres from deceased (in 1734) Joseph Vaudry and his wife (Marie Lepage) in a transaction before Father Bonaventure, a document evidently written at Fort Pontchartrain but not now extant, dated 15 August 1721. Joseph Vaudry is Marie Lepage’s second husband. I will mention Marie Lepage again. She is the only woman Cadillac granted property in her name, a parcel of land within the fort next door to Cadillac himself. Her first husband received property outside of the fort in the same year, 1707, and Joseph Vaudry, whom she married by 1719, as second husband of Marie Lepage, still held title to this land in 1731.

The other godfathers and the couples for whom the Massé daughters served as godmothers also suggest interesting connections I will investigate.

I have also examined a 1721 “Marché d’apprentissage de Baptiste maconce,” about 25 years old, an apprenticeship agreement for three years, of Baptiste maconce, to François Lafargue, of Ste. Foy, to teach “Baptiste” how to be a tailleur d’habits, tailor of clothing. “Baptiste” did not sign the document, but I
must wonder whether this is Marguerite Couc’s son Jean Baptiste Fafard dit Maconce, who also could not sign and who would later travel to Albany in 1725. The children of Jean Baptiste Fafard the elder appear to be the only ones to use the name “Maconce.” The contract stipulates that he will be fed and given drink, provided heat and a bed, be treated gently and humanely, and even have his clothes washed. The document was written in Villemarie, rue St.-Paul, 5 January 1721, at the home of Jean Pothier, perhaps the Jean Pothier who attended the Massé daughters’ marriages.524

The daughters of Marguerite Couc, both Fafard and Massé, perhaps their brother Jean Baptiste Fafard dit Maconce, and their cousin Marie Anne Germaneau / Montour, can be documented in the mother colony before or by 1721, with their mother, Marguerite Couc, at Fort St Joseph between 1720 and 1723. Her last documented appearance at Fort Pontchartrain was 6 January 1716.

I cannot establish definitively each time members of the family traveled back and forth from — or within — the pay d’en haut; but Michel Massé and his step-daughter Marie (Anne?) Fafard Maconce, said to be sixteen, were in Montréal on 23 September 1713, staying at the home of Michel’s father, Martin Massé. The name Anne is enclosed within a box on the document, indicating it was to be considered null, so I do not know which of the three “Marie” Fafards she is. On this day, 23 September 1713, Marie and her step-father testified they had recently arrived in the mother colony from the 8ta8ais, Ottawa territory. On 16 September 1712 of the previous year, Michel, habitant of le detroit, was in association with his brother-in-law, interpreter Maurice Ménard, and others, to voyage to and trade at Michilimackinac. It seems indisputable that Marie traveled there with her step-father and uncle at some time if she had just returned from the “8ta8ais” in August of 1713. How many more examples must there be of undocumented children and wives traveling with those officially cited as going to the pay d’en haut?

Michel and his step-daughter were interrogated in 1713 in connection with a legal inquiry into whether eau de vie had been given or sold to the Natives by “St Germain,” François Lamoureux dit Saint Germain, son of Isabelle Couc’s first husband’s, Joachim Germaneau’s, friend Pierre. (See Part 5.) François, the year before, had married on 26 July 1712 (contract Le Pailleur at Bellevue, church record missing). Marguerite Ménard, the widow of Lambert Cuillerier, Jean-Baptiste Couc Montour’s friend. (See Part 8.) Their St. Germain son would unite with a descendant of the Couc family and live for a time at Fort St. Joseph. See my article about “My Relatives at Fort St. Joseph” on the FCHSM website.

If this Marie of 1713 is Marie Anne Fafard, her first three children by Louis Javillon dit Lafeuillade, a soldier of Laforest, are said to be illegitimate, the first an unnamed son baptized two years later, 23 June 1715, at Pointe Claire, up river from Montréal, and born just days before at Fort des Sables, on the New York shore of Lake Ontario, but their marriage record cannot be found.526 As I have indicated before,

524 Notary David, ANQ, photocopy.
525 Written by Adhémar, photocopy obtained from the original interrogation held at ANQ-Montréal, #028-1483f. Family members of the voyageurs, including the women, obviously traveled back and forth with the men. For the association of Michel Massé and Maurice Ménard, see Adhémar, 10 and 16 September 1712, ANQ, photocopies.
526 Jetté and PRDH. Note: Fort des Sables is not Detroit, as Jetté and PRDH indicate, although the Javillon couple may well have been married at Detroit with the record now lost. The Javillon couple was definitely married by a representative of the Holy Roman Catholic Church before the baptism of their son Antoine 15 April 1723 at Bellevue, also up river from Montréal. Marie Anne and Louis died at Detroit, as cited earlier. Louis Javillon contracted to carry merchandise to Detroit for his captain, Laforest, then commandant at Fort Pontchartrain, 31 August 1712, Adhémar, photocopy. The Fox Indian “war” had begun 13 May of 1712 at the Fort.
soldiers were not always granted permission to marry, and this should somewhat qualify the “illegitimacy” of these children, who were acknowledged and brought up as Javillons dit(e)s Lafeillades.

Marie Anne Germaneau’s Illegitimate Children

I’ve often wondered why the children are called “illegitimate” when it is generally the genetic parents who failed to have the expected religious or legal ceremonies performed, in particular the fathers who abandoned or refused to acknowledge the children they begot. Marie Anne Germaneau / Montour appears to have had several illegitimate children born of “unknown” fathers, or father’s whose names she did not reveal for the record, as her cousins sometimes did, nor did the fathers come forward to accept responsibility. At any rate, the indexes say that the following are Marie Anne’s “enfant[e[s] naturel[le[s]”:

Marie Josephé at Montréal 14 May 1721, thus conceived about August of 1720 and born just a few months before Marie Anne Germaneau’s voyage to Orange with her cousins in the fall of the year 1721. Godparents: Jacques Lefevre & Marie Gadois. Marie Josephé was buried at Montréal 1721-08-30, with the mother’s name once again identified as Marie Anne Germaneau.

Jean Baptiste, baptized at Chambly 4 February 1723, after Marie Anne’s return from Orange, conceived about May of 1722, son of an unknown / unnamed father. Godparents: René Boileau, her cousin-by-marriage, & Marguerite Chevalier, mother’s name given as Marie Anne Montour.

Nicolas René, at Montréal three years later, 13 January 1726, conceived about April of 1725, with no mother’s or father’s name given on his baptismal record, but whom Marie Anne Germaneau later identified as her child, as discussed above. Godparents: Nicolas René Chevalier & Françoise Larcheveque.

527 See Part 10 for the illegitimate children of the two Marguerite Fafards, dite Maconce and dite Delorme.
528 PRDH #45564 Montréal 1721-05-14 Birth: 1721-05-14, thus conceived about August of 1720. Marie Gadois could be Marie Chrétienne Gadois (Jean Baptiste & Marie Baudreau, widow Pierre Ducharme) b 1695 Montréal m 1729 François Gatien, widower of Agathe Leduc. Is this Jacques Lefevre son of Louis Lefebvre, sieur Douchouquet m. Angélique Perthuis (Pierre & Claude Damisé) 28-09-1700 Montréal? Louis Lefebvre’s brother, Edmond, served as valet de chambre and maître d’hotel de Frontenac, and was an inn-keeper, aubergiste, in Québec; m Marie Agnès Maufay 1700 Québec. (Jetté) Jacques Lefebvre Douchouquet (n et b 17-03-1708 Montréal) was engagé Ouest by Lignery and Marsolet on 25-05-1726. On the RAPQ listing of hiring contracts related to the fur trade, I count 58 in April, 68 in May, and 10 in June of 1726. It was a very busy season. Brother Louis Joseph Lefèbvre m. 1729 Céleste Petit (Jean Petit dit Boismorel & Marie Bailly), sister of Marie Anne Petit, wife of Michel Lamy. Another sister, Suzanne Petit, married Jean Baptiste Morisseau.
529 PRDH #51799 Montréal 1721-08-30.
530 PRDH #5719 Chambly 1723-02-04 Birth: 1723-02-04, conceived about May of 1722.
531 René Boileau appears to be son of Pierre Boileau and his wife, Marguerite Ménard, daughter of Maurice and Madeleine Couc. Chevallier and Larchesque families were active at Fort St Joseph and at Michilimackinac, but I have not linked this Marguerite Chevalier to these families, although Jean Baptiste had a sister, Marguerite, born 1688. His brother Jean had a daughter with this name, born 1710, whose mother is Catherine Lavallée.
532 PRDH #46389 Montréal 1726-01-13 Birth: 1726-01-13, conceived about April of 1725. Mathieu Larcheveque, for whom Marie Anne served as godmother for his daughter in 1718, had a sister named Françoise, born in 1706, who could be this godmother.
Marie Jeanne, at Montréal 29 March 1728,\(^{533}\) conceived about June of 1727, with the mother’s name identified on the baptismal record as Marie Anne Germaneau, this birth occurring at the end of Marie Anne Montour’s contract with Michel Lamy and his wife (see below) and four months before Marie Anne Montour’s appearance at Québec in July of 1728. I have found no further reference to this daughter or to the Jean Baptiste born in 1723. Godparents: Maurice Girard [sic] & Marie Jeanne Jolicat [sic]. It is probable Marie Anne herself was not present at the baptism and that others recorded her with the last name Germaneau.

The Name Montour

René Boileau, godfather in 1723, appears to be the twenty-year-old son of Pierre Boileau and his wife, Marguerite Ménard,\(^{534}\) daughter of Maurice Ménard and Madeleine Couc, thus Marie Anne’s cousin.\(^{535}\) Marie Anne Germaneau had traveled to Orange / Albany in the fall of 1721 with wife of Boileau, Marguerite Ménard’s, sister and brother, Madeleine and Louis Ménard, and she was still there early in 1722. If this is the same Marie Anne, then it is the first evidence of her using her uncle’s and her mother’s adopted name, MONTOUR, in New France; and, significantly, this first use seems to occur after her visit to Orange / Albany and in the presence of her cousin Marguerite Ménard’s son. She would use the name Montour again.

As mentioned above, in 1728, using the name Marie Anne Germaneau, she admitted being the mother of Nicolas René, a child given to the Hospitaliers in Montréal to be raised there by them. One year earlier, 13 March 1727, again if these are the same woman, she had used the name Marie Anne Montour when she was hired to serve Sieur and Demoiselle Lamy as a servante for one year, contract written by notary Tétreault at Montréal.\(^{536}\) Her male cousins began to adopt the name Montour about this time, definitely by two years later, 1729,\(^{537}\) when her Aunt Angélique’s son Maurice Delpé Montour married Thérèse Petit (who is, however, from a totally different Petit family, unrelated to Marie Anne Petit, Madame Michel Lamy). Marie Anne Petit’s brother-in-law, Jean Baptiste Morisseau, her sister Suzanne Petit’s husband, an interpreter from Montréal, was said to have visited the Susquehanna, eventually the home of Madame Montour, in the summer of 1726, not even a year before the Lamys hired Marie Anne and one year before Madame Montour is first documented in Philadelphia. (See Part 8.)

\(^{533}\) PRDH #46809 Montréal 1728-03-29 Birth: 1728-03-28, conceived about June of 1727. The PRDH reading of “Jolicat” may truly be Jolivet. I have not located Maurice Girard / Tivard (?); but at the hospital in Québec, on “Juillet 1727 le 10e Charles jolivet de lorette agé de 25 ans dela menagerie sorti le 16e (6),”p. 135, appears to be Charles François, b 1701; sister Anne Marguerite dite Marie-Jeanne m 20 Nov 1730 Montréal André Desnoyers dit Descamps. This is my best guess at this time for the godmother’s identity.

\(^{534}\) PRDH Marriage #3904 Boucherville 1706-07-05

\(^{535}\) In yet another link, René Boileau married 1732-09-09, also at Chambly, Marie Anne Robert (PRDH), whose parents, Prudent Robert and Marie Madeleine Fafrad dite Delorme, themselves had married at Detroit 7 January 1711 (St. Anne). Marie Madeleine Fafrad is the sister of Marguerite Fafrad, the wife of Michel Bisaillon, both women the daughters of Madeleine Jobin and François Fafrad dit Delorme, interpreter at the fort during Cadillac’s tenure, and later, and brother of Jean Fafrad dit Maconce and his wife, Marguerite Couc.

\(^{536}\) 13 March 1727, Engagement de Marianne Montour aux Sieur et Demoiselle Lamy, J. B. Tétreault, ANQ-Montréal, photocopy.

\(^{537}\) PRDH “89254 Trois-Rivières 1729-07-27 Maurice Delpe Montour Residence:Trois-Rivières” married Therese Petit. Also photocopy.
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All three times that an age is given for Marie Anne on documents I have seen, she is identified as Marie Anne Montour. The ages that have so far been recorded for Marie Anne on two extant documents place her birth in 1695-94 (same as her brother Michel?), from her age of thirty-five estimated on her death record in Québec in April of 1730; or circa 1697-96, based on the about thirty of the 13 March 1727 contract employing her to serve Sieur Michel Lamy and his wife, Marie Anne Petit for a year, until 11 March 1728. As will be seen, another document assigns her a different age.

Marie Anne Montour as Servante at Montréal

The Lamys agreed to pay Marie Anne Montour 100 livres and also to provide room and board and her other needs in return for her services. “Lamy” and “Marie anne petit” signed, but Marie Anne Montour declared she was unable to sign, although Marie Anne Germaneau signed early the next year, 1728, and Marie Anne Montour signed twice in 1730. She apparently learned this basic skill in the course of the year. The date of the contract, 11 March of 1727, when Marie Anne agreed to work for the Lamy couple, who were then resident in Montréal, is just days after her cousin Geneviève Massé’s February marriage to John Henry Lydius, also in Montréal. I have no idea whether Marie Anne was among the “others” mentioned as present at this wedding. It is always frustrating when a priest indicates “others” were present without indicating their names!

Michel Lamy, age thirty-five, from Ste Catherine, town and archdiocese of Liège, Belgium, had married Marie Anne Petit, age twenty-five, on 24 July 1725 at Montréal. Jean Baptiste Morisseau attended his sister-in-law Marie Anne Petit’s marriage, signing the record. Marie Anne had given birth to a child name Charles, father unnamed, on 24 April 1719 at Montréal, a boy who died on 17 July 1719. The Lamys’ first child, named Marie Anne, was born and baptized 8 June 1726. She was thus a not-yet one-year-old infant when Marie Anne Montour began to work for her family as a servant. Madame Lamy gave birth to a second child, François Michel, born 24 April, and baptized 25 April 1728, a little more than a month after the 11 March 1728 expected culmination of Marie Anne Montour’s contract with them, during which time Marie Anne Germaneau / Montour herself became pregnant, giving birth to daughter Marie Jeanne, on 29 March 1728, a child conceived about June of 1727. Both novels and the historical record are filled with harrowing accounts of a master taking advantage of his female servant, but no one can now say who fathered Marie Jeanne or what happened to this child.

ANQ, photocopy. Michel Lamy and Marie Anne Petit married 24 July 1725 at Montréal. Jean Baptiste Morisseau, her brother-in-law, and an interpreter, was present at the wedding.

Lamy is from the same village, Liège in Belgium, as Jean-Jacques Gerlaise dit Saint-Amand, who worked Joachim Germaneau’s land at Rivière du Loup, although there is not likely any connection between the two men. (See Part 5)

Les villages de nos ancêtres by Marcel Fournier <http://planete.qc.ca/histoire/villages/septembre98.htm>

PRDH 48488 Montréal 1725-07-24
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In working for Lamy and his wife, though, Marie Anne Montour was among those who have a definite connection to her mother’s experience at Le Détroit, Fort Pontchartrain.

**The Morrisseau Family and Connections to Le Détroit**

The family of Michel Lamy’s wife, Marie Anne Petit, is *Petit dit Boismorel* (Jean Petit & Marie Baillly). Her sister Suzanne Petit’s husband, Jean Baptiste Morrisseau, an *engageur Ouest* 1716 and interpreter for the king in the Iroquois missions in 1728: “interprète du roi pour les missions iroquoises en 1728.”\(^1\) is the son of Vincent Morrisseau and Marie Anne Bamont. Both Jean Baptiste and his brother Louis Morrisseau were *engage* several times to voyage to the newly-established Fort Pontchartrain, Jean Baptiste himself 1702 to 1706; Louis in 1706; and another brother, Pierre, from 1701, the first convey, to 1705, all going to *Le détroit du Lac Érie*. In addition Pierre had to have known Marie Anne Germaneau’s father, Joachim, at Michilimackinac.\(^2\) One of these brothers must be the Morrisseau who served as interpreter with Isabelle for Cadillac before 1704.\(^3\) Since Jean Baptiste Morrisseau (as well as Isabelle / “Elisabeth Couk”) was interrogated in connection with Cadillac’s 1704 legal trial, he is most likely the one.\(^4\)

His wife Suzanne’s younger brother, Étienne Petit, was *engage* 15 March 1716, with Jacques Godefroy, by “Jean Baptiste Maurisseau” himself to make the voyage to the end of the lake [Lake Ontario], around Katarak8y (Fort Frontenac, modern-day Kingston, Ontario) and to *Fort des Sables* (on

---


Translation: Jean Baptiste grew up learning Iroquois and became a talented interpreter; and, he is identified as a sergeant in the troops of a detachment of the marines. In 1713, he contracted marriage with Suzanne Petit, daughter of the huissier royal of Ville-Marie. In 1716, Intendant Bégon named him to be in charge of the storehouse at Fort Frontenac, where he went with his wife. He was equally charged to trade in all of the region. In 1729, he is seen in company with sieur de la Vérendrye.

This last reference is more likely a nephew with the same name. I have the contract to go to Fort Frontenac, found with Pistard at BAnQ in 2008. It is dated 31 January 1716. His wife was permitted to take *une servante* (Oh, I would love to know her name!) and was to be in charge of trade at the fort. Étienne Petit, Jean Baptiste’s brother-in-law, and Jacques Godefroy are two of the voyageurs mentioned on the contract from *Ordonnances de Justice et police rendues par Monsieur Bégon*.

\(^2\) Jetté


\(^4\) Cited by Simone Vincens.
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the New York side of Lake Ontario): “pour faire le voyage au fond du lac, autour de Katarak8y et au fort des Sables” (Étude Adhémar); and on 6 October 1718, Étienne Petit is also documented in the registers of 

As garde-magazine, storehouse keeper, Jean Baptiste Morisseau and his wife were hired to go to Fort Frontenac in 1716, Suzanne being assigned a salary specifically for her work there. Jetté cites Jean Baptiste as an engageur to 25-5-1720 to 2-06-1727, voyageur.\textsuperscript{546} Both husband and wife are even documented at Fort Pontchartrain, Jean Baptiste on 21 November 1720 for the baptism of Angélique, daughter of “Jacque Godefroy” and his wife, “Mde Marie Chaine [Chesne],” with Catherine Mallet (most likely Madame Pierre Perthus) as godmother; and Suzanne Petit on 31 December 1721, for Susanne, daughter of “Pierre Steve [Estève]” and “Magdaleine frapier” (among the founding families at Detroit who arrived in 1706), with “Sr Jaque Godefroy” as godfather. They signed the entries.\textsuperscript{547} Father Antoine DeLino, brother of the man who assisted in promoting the program to care for infants whose mothers could not care for them (See above), performed these baptisms. Jean Baptiste’s nephew, also Jean Baptiste but from Repentigny, about to be eighteen years old, was hired to go to the pay d’en haut in April of 1726 with Nicolas Roze, to return the following year, but I have not yet seen this document. The younger Jean Baptiste is the son of Pierre Morisseau and Catherine Caillonneau.

When I was originally writing this part, I had not yet located the item I reported in my post-script of 26 September 2003 in Part 9 (now reported in Part 8 and repeated here):

\begin{quote}
On 23 September 2003, I discovered a most amazing reference. Lawrence Claessen, interpreter to the Iroquois for New York, had been sent to speak with each of the Iroquois Nations. On his return in October of 1727, he reported that after his arrival at the Seneca Nation on 29 September 1727:

The Senneke Sachems Informed me that the french of Canada keep a Continuall Correspondance with Some people who Live on the Susquahene river a little above Casastoque [:] a french Interpreter from montreal named Mouresaux had been there last year [1726] . . . to the Settlement where some french live who are much disaffected to the British Interest\textsuperscript{548}

The major French family then living on the Susquehannah [sic] River is Madame Montour’s family. In fact, with Carondowana, her Iroquois husband, she appeared as an interpreter in Philadelphia for the first documented time in July of that very year, 1727. “Mouresaux” is undoubtedly Jean Baptiste Morisseau, who would be cited as an interpreter to the Iroquois missions at the 2 May 1728 baptism of his son Pierre Amable [sic], a record he signed at Montréal (photocopy).

Actually, in my haste to record this reference, I confused two entries. Pierre Amable was baptized on 19 August 1729; his godparents were his older siblings, Jean Baptiste Laurent and Catherine Morisseau, who signed the record. Jean Baptiste Morisseau is again recorded as interpreter for the Indians on this 1729 record. The child baptized 2 May 1728 is Madeleine Françoise, which record Jean Baptiste signed Mari

\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{546} Jetté and colonial documents.

\textsuperscript{547} Original register of Ste. Anne, pp. 166 and 169.

\textsuperscript{548} Indian Records, RG 10, Series 2, New York Commissioners of Indian Affairs, NAC microfilm C-1220, 255a – 256, photocopy.

\small
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Like other writers, I am not immune from inaccurate copying, and once I recognized this I added a correction to Part 9 as it originally appeared. I could have also added that another “French” family then in Pennsylvania is the Bisaillon family, but I am still working on this connection. The mention of interpreter Morisseau visiting the Susquehanna is yet another link between him and Isabelle, especially since his sister-in-law, Marie Anne Petit, wife of Michel Lamy, hired Isabelle’s daughter the following year.

On 18 September 1727, La Corne, writing to the minister in France, praises one of his own sons serving at Niagara and looks forward to the return of another son, then in France, one who knows the Iroquois and Ottawa languages well. He adds that only Joncaire is now useful (as an interpreter) at Niagara, “Morisseaux being so infirm that it is difficult to count on him.” Jean Baptiste Morisseau the elder would have been only forty-three years old in 1727. He had traveled the rivers and lakes of the pay d’en haut for at least twenty-five years. His death record appears not to have survived, but he is recorded as deceased by at least twenty years later when his daughter Marie Joseph married, in 1748, “Gilles Straouds [sic], an Englishman from, interestingly, “La Caroline.” The eldest brother in the Morriseau family, Jean Morisseau, had been engagé Ouest as early as 9 June 1695. His wife, Anne Pastorel, as a 26-year-old widow of recently-deceased Jean Morisseau, was hired 27 August 1703 to serve two years as wet-nurse, nourrice, for the child Madame Cadillac was then expecting. As Cadillac himself explained, “these ladies [his wife and Madame de Tonty] have nourrices for their children.” Marie Thérèse Lamothe Cadillac’s baptism in February of 1704 is the first complete surviving record in the registers of

549 Photocopies of both entries, as well as for the other Morisseau children.
550 NAC, MG1-C113, Vol. 49, F-49, 528-530v. Digital images on found through ArchiviaNet.
551 PRDH #174194, 26 February 1748, Charlesbourg. DCB III says “an affair of honour forced [Gilles William Straouds] to flee the justice of [Carolina] to New France, and that because “one child of the marriage lived only a few months, “in 1751 Strouds purchased from some Acadian Indians a two-year-old boy born of English parents and had him baptized Pierre at Quebec.” Suzanne Petit did not die until 23 June 1764 at Montréal. PRDH #302987.
552 Jean Morisseau, the eldest in the family, was baptized as Jean Baptiste 1675-06-03 Sorel, and it is under this name that I identified him in my article in MHH on “The Other Women and Early Detroit,” October 2001. According to PRDH, his brother, Jean Baptiste Pierre, b. 1684-01-27 Repentigny married 1713-07-10 Montréal Suzanne Petit Boismorel, and brother Pierre, 1677-04-16 Boucherville, married 1704-01-17 Boucherville, Marie Catherine Caillonneau and died 1750-02-02 Repentigny. Marie Madeleine “Mauriceau,” child of this couple, married Pierre “Chovet,” son of André Chovet, second husband of Anne Pastorel. Another child of Andre Chauvet dit Camirand & Marie Anne Pastorel dite Lafranchise, Marie Anne, married “Pierre Delpe St cerny Montour,” Angélique Couc’s son, 1758-02-06 at Pointe du Lac, where Nicholas Montour would later purchase a seigneurie. Intriguingly, Jean Morisseau’s death was not recorded until his burial at Saint Sulpice in 1717, the year Michel Germaneau first appears in the Montréal records, fourteen years after Jean’s death. If I am reading the register notation correctly, he had apparently originally been buried outside of the cemetery or, possibly, he was now being buried there, although I doubt such a burial would make its way into the register. PRDH’s notation: “SON CORPS A ETE TRANSPORTE LE 27 JUIN 1717• ‘A ETE ENTERRE JEAN MORISSEAU MORT IL Y A QUATORZE ANS ET ENTERRE HORS DU CIMIETIERE’ “ Translation: His body was transported / moved on 27 June 1717. “Was buried Jean Morisseau, deceased 14 years ago and buried outside the cemetery.” It seems more likely the body was transported from its burial outside the cemetery and reburied in 1717 with the blessings of the Church. (PRDH and photocopy) I would love to know exactly why the body may have been originally denied Catholic burial. The fact that he was reburied in 1717, the year of Michel Germaneau’s marriage, sends my imagination soaring. The Jean Morisseau couple was said to be from Saint Sulpice in a 12 November 1702 document when they acknowledged owing 140 livres du pays to Adrien Bétourne and his wife Marie Deshayes, present and accepting for her absent husband. Adhémar, ANQ, photocopy.
553 Cadillac to Pontchartrain from Québec, 25 September 1702, Cadillac Papers, Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collection, (MPHC) Volume 33, p. 139, and photocopy of original from NAC.
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Ste. Anne de Détroit. The next complete entry at the fort in April is the first record of the presence there of Isabelle Couc / La femme de Tichenet, soon to become Madame Montour. Pierre Tichenet is documented there in 1704 as well. Thus Anne, a sister-in-law of the Morisseau brothers, was at Fort Pontchartrain at the same time as Isabelle Couc. She surely knew her and witnessed the events at the fort. On her hiring contract, the Lamothe Cadillacs agreed to provide transportation to the fort and food, both on the voyage and at the fort, for Anne and her baby, et son enfant, and they would pay her 450 livres a year, beginning at the time of the birth of the Cadillac child. The Lamothe Cadillacs promised to pay her one-half of her salary if the child was still-born or died within the first six months of life. If the child died after six months but before the end of the first year, Anne Pastoureul would receive her full payment for that year. It is a nice touch to note that she would also be given a “robbe de chambre,” a dressing gown. Anne Pastoureul had given birth at Repentigny on 5 May 1703 to a posthumous Morisseau child, Marie Catherine Morissette, who would grow up to marry Isabelle’s nephew, her sister Angélique Couc’s child, François Delpé dit Saint Serny fils, the son of François. There was an older Morisseau son, Jacques, born in February of 1701, and another child, Vincent, 5 April 1699, who had died 27 September 1701. Anne and her daughter appear to have left the fort with Madame Cadillac in September of 1704, returning to the mother colony with those who had been sent to investigate the events earlier in the year. (See Part 10.)

Anne Pastoureul remarried in Montréal on 17 July 1707 to André Chauvet dit Camirand, a 37-year-old sergeant in the company of Courtemanche, whom she may have met at the fort, and she went with him back to Fort Pontchartrain as part of a contingent of settlers that year. They left the fort to establish themselves at Trois Rivières, the home of the Delpé dit Saint Serny family, before July of 1714. Like Madame Delpé dite Saint Serny / St Serny, Angélique Couc, Anne served as a sage femme—mid-wife—at Trois Rivières after her relocation there, and may well have served as such at Fort Pontchartrain or perhaps learned her skill there. The presence of a sage femme, unidentified by name, is noted in the registers for the twins born in 1708 to François Fafard dit Delorme and his wife, Marie Madeleine Jobin.

Anne Pastorel’s child Marie Anne, by her second husband, André Chauvet dit Camirand, also married into the Delpé dit Saint Serny family, some of the descendants eventually using the name Montour. In fact, the following marriage record from PRDH for 6 February 1758 provides striking relationships even many years later:

| PRDH #305619 Pointe-du-Lac | where Isabelle’s grandson Nicholas Montour would later be seigneur and where her sister Angélique died in January of 1750 at about 87 years old |

1758-02-06
Rank Name Age M.S. Pr. Sex

01 PIERRE ST CERNY MONTOUR --- c p m

02 MARIE ANNE CHOVET --- c p f

03 MAURICE ST CERNY MONTOUR FATHER OF 01 --- d m [son of Angélique Couc]

554 27 August 1703, Adhémar, ANQ, photocopy, Anne Pastorel hired to serve two years as wet-nurse for Madame Lamothe, Alphonse de Tonty present in Montréal acting for Cadillac and his wife.
555 Register of Notre-Dame de Montréal, FHL microfilm, photocopy.
Notice that the children of Maurice St Cerny Montour and Thérèse Petit all carry the name MONTOUR in 1758. 557 All of these alliances were many years in the future, though, when Marie Anne Montour worked for the Lamys.

**Who is Marie-Marguerite Massé, wife of Jean Vidal?**

I have, however, discovered another tantalizing reference and possible alliance, or perhaps a coincidence. Just two years before hiring Marie Anne Montour, Michel Lamy evidently worked for a while for a Jean Vidal, of unknown origin in Jetté, married to a Marie Marguerite Massé, also of unknown origin, at least as of now. In the same year as the Lamy marriage, this couple had a daughter, Marie Marguerite Vidal, baptised on 28 April 1725, at Québec, with, as godparents, Philippe René “Bauvais,” who signed “Legardeur Beauvais,” and Louise André Deleigne, who signed “loüise André,” neither godparent naming the child. Could this 1725 Marie Marguerite Massé of unknown origin be yet another daughter of Michel Massé and Marguerite Couc? Until I found Geneviève and Françoise Massé documented in 1721 and 1722, I did not know these two daughters were cited in the records of the mother colony before 1727, two years after 1725. This remains an open question, perhaps impossible to resolve but nonetheless a valid question, one which leads to another: What happened to Jean Vidal and his wife? They appear several times in the records of New France, and then seem to disappear, and nowhere is a Marguerite Massé mentioned in the inheritance documents I have so far seen for the Massé daughters, Geneviève and Françoise, after the 1730 death of their father.

---

556 This is a different Petit family, Petit dit Gobin, settled in Trois Rivières and Saint François du Lac. There was yet another Petit family, dit Bruneau, whose son married Angélique’s daughter.

557 PRDH #305619 Pointe-du-Lac.

558 This “Beauvais” is not related to the other Beauvais family, but to the large and influential Legardeur family. Both godparents are most interesting, especially Louise, a sort of New France Scarlett O’Hara. See the DCB III for her story, but be aware of the sexist language used by the author.
Nevertheless, the same year of the baptism of Marie Marguerite Vidal, on 26 September 1725, *Michel Lamy, négociant* (merchant’s assistant) in Montréal, acting in the name of Jean Vidal, merchant, furnished and loaned Louis Desmoulins of *Cote de Saint Anne* near Batiscan (probably Louis Sionneau *dit* Desmoulins), and Jacques Grignon, of Cap St. Michel, 559 *261 livres* 16 *sols* of good merchandise and also *200 livres* of *castor sec* (dry beaver) 560 for the voyage they would make to the *Illinois*, all to be repaid in the month of August next, or earlier, in *castors* or pelletteries at the price of the bureau. The full loan was repaid by the following *9 May 1726*. I need to do more with Michel Lamy and Jean Vidal’s connection with trade in Illinois territory and elsewhere to see whether it sheds any light on my other recent discovery, one which associates Marie Anne Montour with Illinois territory. As for Marie Anne Montour herself, after evidently working for the Lamys for a year, she next appeared as a *servante* in Québec City.

**Marie Anne Montour: Illinoise?**

In May of 2002, I located a record showing *Marie Anne Montour* present at *Hôtel Dieu de Québec*, the hospital, as *servante*. Her name first appears *27 July 1728*, her origin surprisingly identified as *Illinoise*, and equally surprisingly, her age as *twenty-six*.

*Juillet 1728*

*le 27e Marie anne Montour illinoise agée de 26 ans servante de l’hôpital 4 [days]*561

After her first appearance at the Québec hospital, she continues to appear each month as *servante through* January of 1729, a full year before her marriage.

If Marie Anne Montour gave her own age in 1728, and she was truly twenty-six, then her birth could have occurred as late as *1702* or even *1701*, if her birthdate was known and it occurred after 27 July. This is only two or three years before her mother is first officially documented at Fort Pontchartrain in 1704. I have already said that I have not yet located any official document accounting for Isabelle Couc’s travel to the fort, although I have speculated that she and Pierre Tichenet were with Pierre Roy and his Miami wife at the Mission at the St Joseph River (modern-day Niles, Michigan, not that far from Detroit). Or does this record again raise the question whether Marie Anne Germaneau and Marie Anne Montour are two separate women? And, if so, what happened to Marie Anne Germaneau?

As I stated above, until I found this record of Marie Anne Montour’s 1728 presence in Québec, origin *Illinoise* (to be considered subsequently), the ages assigned to Marie Anne on two other documents placed her birth in either 1695-94 or 1697-96, both estimated dates, but within the years of Cadillac’s command at Michilimackinac. His first year at *Le Détroit* was 1701-1702. No records for the years 1694-1702 survive for Detroit or Michilimackinac, except for the copied reference to the baptism of Antoine Ménard, Isabelle’s nephew, at Michilimackinac in 1695, a record transcribed after 1741. Nor do any records survive for these years at the Mission of the St Joseph River.

559 Desmoulins appears to be Louis Sionneau (Mathurin & Marie Anne Guibault), and Jacques Grignon the son of Jacques & Marie Thérèse Richer, Jetté. Simon Soupiran, a master surgeon, was another “commercial partner of Jean Vidal, and their collective property was seized in the late 1720s,” according to Peter Moogk in DCB III. This would have been before Michel Massé’s death in 1730. I have not yet seen the documents Moogk cites.

560 *Castor sec* (dry beaver, as opposed to *castor gras*, fat or greasy beaver) was beaver that had not been worn by the Indians to absorb body oils that made the fur more useful for hatters. There were several other types of beaver, each type in demand at different times.

561 FHL #1287130 Hôtel-Dieu de Québec, p. 161
Illinois is a term that was applied to the Mississippi River area and also, possibly at a later time, to Fort St Joseph des Miamis or des Illinois, because the Miami Indians were closely related to the Illinois. Father Charlevoix, in a 1721 account of his voyage to St Joseph (at a time when Marguerite Couc can be documented there), wrote:

Fifty years ago, the Miamis were settled on the southern extremity of Lake Michigan, in a place called Chicagou, from the name of a small river, which runs into the lake, the source of which is not far distant from that of the river of the Illinois; they are at present divided into three villages, one of which stands on the river St Joseph; the second on another river which bears their name, and runs into Lake Erié [now the Maumee River, and Fort Wayne, Indiana], and the third upon the river Ouabache [Wabash, now West Lafayette, Indiana], which empties its waters into the Mississippi; these last are better known by the appellation of Ouyatanons. [The English called them Weas.] There can be no doubt, that this nation and the Illinois were not long ago the same people, considering the great affinity which is observed between their languages; but I shall be able to speak of this with greater certainty when I shall be on the spot.  

Marie Anne’s aunt, Marguerite Couc, served as a godmother several times at what had become Fort St Joseph Miamis in the early 1720s (as I have commented several times; please be patient with me) before she was again present in Montréal for her daughter Geneviève’s marriage to John Henry Lydus in 1727 (See Part 8), the very year Marie Anne Montour began to work for the Lamy family and one year before Marie Anne Montour’s presence at Hôtel Dieu.

Was Marie Anne with one or another of her aunts for some of the time early in her life? Very young children rarely appear in the official registers or in the colonial correspondence. Did she at any time travel from Detroit or St Joseph or St Philippe (which became Fort Miami, and is now Fort Wayne, Indiana) to Albany with her aunt Marguerite’s children, the Fafard cousins or Geneviève and Françoise Massé? Or with cousins Jean Baptiste Fafard Maconce and Joseph Montour in 1725, once the path was once again open for the Western Indians to trade in the English colonies at Oswego? Not everyone is cited by name in the official records. She was definitely in Montréal by 1718, using the name Marie Anne Germaneau, perhaps living with her brother, Michel Germaneau, and his wife. It may not have been safe to use the name Montour in 1718. I have no evidence Michel Germaneau ever used it, but then he had a cousin Michel / Michael Montour, son of his uncle, Louis Couc Montour, who was left in the care of Reverend Thomas Barclay in New York in 1708. (See Part 6.) Even though Marie Anne is documented in Montréal several times and at nearby Chambly, this does not mean she did not travel elsewhere, as I now know. These eighteenth-century people, even the women, traveled far more than I ever imagined before I began examining the extant records. So many of the hiring contracts that have survived, especially those written in the spring months, stipulate that the hired men will return that year or the following year, and

---

563 See Marthe Faribault-Beauregard, La population des forts français d’Amérique (XVIIe siècle), Éditions Bergeron, 1982, for Fort de la Rivière Saint Joseph des Illinois (Miamis), 1720-1773, but be aware that some of her citations are her “educated” guesses, as she herself admits in her introduction, even though she presents them as facts and does not identify the ones she has guessed on the basis of evidence she had.
564 See Part 6. The New York council voted to pay the expenses in October 1726, Minutes of the New York Council, cited by Hanna, 1, 203.
they did not necessarily travel without passengers or family members, as the testimony of “Marie Fafard” and her step-father in 1713, mentioned above, demonstrates.

Perhaps all of these scenarios are possible, Marie Anne living for a time with her mother and / or her aunts, then in the Montréal area by 1718, returning to the Miamis, and again to Montréal, to Orange in 1721, back to Chambly where cousins lived, again to Montréal, perhaps to the Illinois, perhaps even with Jean Baptiste Morisseau to the Susquehanna River in 1726. After all, some time after her son Nicolas René’s January of 1726 birth, she left him in the care of Jean Vermet’s wife. Then she somehow came to the attention of Michel Lamy and Marie Anne Petit, Jean Baptiste Morisseau’s sister-in-law, and worked for the Lamys in 1727-1728. Eventually, her contract with them fulfilled and mother of yet another child, she arrived in Québec City in July of 1728, in the third year after the death of Governor Vaudreuil.

In 1728, the year Marie Anne is documented at the hospital of Québec City, her mother, Madame Montour, warned of unrest in the Miami areas, as reported at a Council at Philadelphia, April 18th, 1728. I have already cited this reference in Part 6 but repeat it here:

James Letort, an Indian Trader, was lately come to town from Chenastry, on the upper parts of the River Susqueannah, to acquaint this Government with a matter he had been informed of by Mistress Montour, who had married the Indian called Robert Hunter, & was here with her said husband last summer [1727] in company with those of the five Nations who had visited us then, the Import of which is, That the people of the five Nations had sent to the Miamis and Tewchtwesys [a branch of the Miamis], called also the naked Indians, settled at the Western end of Lake Erie within the french claims, desiring them to engage & take up the Hatchet of War against the English & Christians.565

Did the Iroquois send their message only because Manawkyhickon had requested them to avenge the death of his “near relation”? The French were also conferring with the Iroquois and with “the Nations in Alliance with the French ... to pull down a certain house that had been lately built” by the English at Oswego, a house erected to counter the trading house on the Niagara River built by Joncaire. This trading house evolved into a fort on Lake Ontario across from modern-day Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario, in the very year Morisseau visited the Susquehanna by way of

a Small River which vents into the Cadarghque Lake [Lake Ontario] above [up river from] the falls of Jagara [Niagara] & [blank] the head of the river by a carrying place till they meet again with water Carryage & So down the Susquehanna River to the Settlement where some french live who are much disaffected to the British Interest

That the said french Interpreter has used his Endeavours with the Schawenos [Shawnee] Indians to have them Removed if they love their lives a [end of line in binding] from the place near Jagara.566

Other witnesses at Michel Lamy and Marie Anne Petit’s marriage in 1725, in addition to interpreter Jean Baptiste Morisseau, include Toussaint Lecavelier, also called Cavelier, and his brother Jean Baptiste. Toussaint voyaged to the pays d’en haut many times. He is the “French Gentleman” Jonah Davenport, in

1731, told the Pennsylvania authorities had repeatedly traveled to “the Ohio [River Valley],” starting in 1727, to visit the Indians at “Kithanning,” one who endeavored to attract the Shawnees there to the French Interest.\(^{567}\) In 1731, James Letort, well known to Madame Montour, identified this “Frenchman” as Cavelier and said he had been to the Ohio each year except 1729 (which happens to be the year he married Marguerite Parent in August), at times accompanied by his blacksmith brother.\(^{568}\)

In 1728, Governor Gordon instructed Henry Smith and John Petty, who were about to carry messages to the “Susquahannah,” to tell “Carundowana,” Madame Montour’s husband, that “Jonah Davenport never complained of him, & therefore there was no Occasion for his [‘Carundowana’ ‘s] Letter on that head.”\(^{569}\) As the letter written from Madame Montour’s husband that year and her letter to Gordon are no longer extant, we’ll never know what it is that Carondowana believed Davenport had “complained of him.” While it is also true Gordon assured Carondowana he had no reason to be concerned, it is easy to speculate that the alleged “complaint” may have had something to do with the frequent visits from the French to the Susquahanna and elsewhere in Nouvelle Angleterre or to the disputed Ohio region. Cavelier’s visits to the Ohio (Ohio River area, not the future State) were definitely reported in 1731 by Davenport and Letort. Madame Montour herself, with her son Andrew, years later traveled to the “Ohio.” William Hunter in the *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* writes: “In the following year [1746] her son Andrew moved to the Ohio, travelling from Logstown (Ambridge, Pa) to Venango (Franklin, Pa.) ‘in the Month of March, when his Mother who was blind rode on Horseback and he led the Horse on Foot all the Way.’ ”\(^{570}\)

Eighteen years earlier, though, on 18 April 1728, the day of Letort’s report conveying information he had received from Madame Montour, Governor Gordon instructed “J. Le Tort & John Scull” to:

> Deliver another of these strouds to M. Montour, give my Service to her & tell her that on the faith of a Christian and the profession of fidelity to this Governm' wch she made to me to be industrious in procuring all the certain Intelligence she can, of all affairs transacted amongst the Indians that relate to ye Peace of this Province & transmitt an acc' of them to me, and that I now desire her to inform me by a Lett' to be wrote by one of you of what she knows at this time relating to this matter. \(^{571}\)

The “matter” concerned the unrest of the Indians on the frontier, including among the Miamis in the “French” territory, where she had a “sister.” The “profession of fidelity to this Governm” appears to have come after the rumors that a family on the Susquahanna had divided interests, and Madame Montour apparently appears to have promised to transmit “Intelligence” concerning, in particular, maintaining the “Peace” of the province.

\(^{567}\) *Pennsylvania Archives*, I. 1, 299, hereafter P. A.

\(^{568}\) P. A. I. 1, 300-301. I have a number of New France hiring contracts for Toussaint Lecavelier that I have not fully analyzed. Also see Frank Severance, cited above, for his references to Cavelier. Toussaint’s wife, Marguerite Parent, is the daughter of Joseph Parent and Marie Madeleine Maret. Joseph Parent, on 9 March 1706, contracted to voyage to Fort Pontchartrain from Montréal to work at his trade as master toolmaker and brewer for three years. Cadillac granted him land at Detroit in March of 1707. He and his family were settlers at Detroit, their ninth and last child born there in 1709. They appear often in the registers of Ste. Anne de Détroit. Photocopies.

\(^{569}\) P. A. I. 1, 229, emphais mine.

\(^{570}\) See Part 7.

\(^{571}\) P. A. I. 1, 211, emphasis mine. See Part 7.
But none of this, fascinating as it is, establishes why Marie Anne is associated with “Illinois” territory as an origin, except for the fact that Saint Joseph des Miamis was sometimes also called des Illinois. Furthermore, on another surviving record, she (or her mother) is said to be of Nouvelle Angleterre / New England, in 1730.

**Marie Anne Montour’s Marriage**

Twelve years after she first appeared in the documents of New France as Marie Anne Germaneau in the 1718 baptism record at Montréal, Marie Anne’s 29 January 1730 marriage contract under the name Marie Anne Montour, says she is “Anglaise de nation fille de deffunt Jean baptiste Montour et Elisabeth Coucqnac [sic] de la ville dorange en la nouvelle angleterre.”572: English in nation, daughter of deceased Jean Baptiste Montour and Elisabeth Coucqnac from the town of Orange in New England. Whether Marie Anne’s designation as “Anglaise” stems from the fact that her mother is said to then reside in “nouvelle angleterre” cannot be determined. I haven’t yet proven Isabelle’s presence in New York for the time of Marie Anne’s birth, whenever and wherever that was, though she was definitely there interpreting in New York before Michel’s marriage and Marie Anne’s appearance in Montréal.

According to the contract, at the time of the marriage, Marie Anne’s surviving parent, Elisabeth “Coucqnac,” a combination of Couc and Cognac it seems, is, I repeat, said to be resident of Orange (Albany) in Nouvelle Angleterre, the colony of New York. Madame Montour may actually have been in Pennsylvania at the time of Marie Anne’s marriage, having possibly relocated there by 1727, at least appearing at a council in Philadelphia with Iroquois representatives as “interpretesse” in July of 1727. She was definitely there at Otstonwakin (modern-day Montoursville, Pennsylvania) on the Susquahanna by 1737, ten years later, when Conrad Weiser visited her. (See Part 9.) It is also possible Marie Anne did not know of this relocation if it had occurred by 1727, or perhaps Madame “Eysabelle” Montour and her Iroquois husband Carondowana traveled between Pennsylvania and Iroquoia in New York. Carondowana was an Iroquois representative among the Pennsylvania Delaware (Lenape) Indians before his death in 1729. Or possibly Marie Anne did not want to reveal her mother’s new residence. After all, the Senecas had told the New York authorities there was a French family on the Susquahanna in 1726, a family at that time “disaffected to the British Interest.”

Marie Anne’s church marriage record the next day, 30 January 1730 at Notre Dame de Québec, is of little help with this question of her origin, but it identifies Marie Anne Montour’s parents as a man named Lamotte and Isabelle Montour, with no indication they were married. This name “Lamotte” allowed Jetté to advance the theory that Antoine Launet dit de Lamothe (pronounced and often written Lamotte) Cadillac fathered Marie Anne.573 Isabelle and Lamothe Cadillac were certainly in the same places at the same times, and Lamothe Cadillac certainly could be construed as a guilty man when he lashed out at Isabelle / La femme de Tichenet in 1704, turning her into what a later historian would call “a slut.”574 Marie Anne’s genetic father is a topic I will consider later.

Both of Isabelle’s children, Michel and Marie Anne, thus have conflicting information recorded in the separate records of their marriages. Why these discrepancies exist, as well as those found on the marriages of Geneviève and Françoise Massé,575 I can only guess.

---

572 Contrat 29 Jan 1730, Dubreuill, photocopy.
573 Jetté, PRDH, and photocopy of church register.
574 Peter Moogk in DCB III, English version.
575 For Geneviève’s and Françoise’s marriages, see Part 8.
Nevertheless, it is fact that Marie Anne Montour / Germeneau married Jean Montary on 30 January 1730 at Québec. Present for the bride at the church ceremony: Jean Vermet (wigmaker) and J. B. Cardinet576 (another wigmaker), who had not witnessed the contract. Present for the groom: Pierre L’Europe and Antoine Fardeau. "Mairiane [sic] Montour" signed the document. Jean Montary is identified as son of deceased Jean and Marianne (blank, no last name given), of the parish of St Sauveur in Castelsarrazin, where Cadillac served as mayor briefly in 1723-24, an office he purchased with the money from the sale of his Detroit property. The marriage contract had been written the previous day in the home of Jean Vermet, rue du Saut au matelet. Present for Marie Anne the day before at the contract: Jean Vermet and his wife Geneviève Gauthier, who had given Marie Anne Germeneau’s son Nicolas René to the Hurtibise couple. For Jean Montary, witnesses were Antoine Fardeau and his wife, Charlotte Chaillé, and Pierre Leurope. Also present and signing, “J. b [C. ?]” Dupont,” and “Charle Duperre”, probably official witnesses. The bride signed the contract, as well as I can transcribe it here: mairianmont [sic].

A Digression about the Proper Use of Sources

Jean Montary is identified on other records as dit Jolicoeur. Seeing this “dit” name caused Barbara Sivertsen to incorrectly identify him as the “Jolicoeur” cited in 1707 as a deserter from Fort Pontchartrain in the same document that mentions Isabelle, “La femme de Tichenet,” deserting, along with Bourgmont, to join her brother Montour.577 Sivertsen compounds her error by identifying Jean Montary’s second wife, named “Marie Lafleur” on the church record, as, in Sivertsen’s words: “daughter of Joseph Lafleur and his wife Elizabeth—Joseph was Louis Couc’s son [probably] baptized in November, 1687. His wife Elizabeth a Huron from Detroit [sic]”. 578 I am not aware of any record on which Joseph Montour, son of

576 Jean Baptiste Cardinet’s son, also Jean Baptiste, was hired to travel to Fort Pontchartrain by Charles Nolan de LaMarque on 18 April 1721. Notary David, ANQ, photocopy.
577 “Jugement rendu par le Conseil de guerre Contre Bertellemy pichon soldat de la Comp[agnie] de Cortemanche [sic] de la garnison du fort pontchartrain,” 7 November 1707, Secrétaire Grandmesnil, Archives Nationales du Québec, ANQ 4 880, photocopy. Signed by Jacques Lucas and by Lamothe Cadillac, Derané, D’Argenteuil d’Ailleboust, Guignolet, Franceur, and Grandmesnil, with Lafleurdor and Brindamour also present and indicating they could not sign. Also translated into English, not always well, in MPHC, Vol. 34.
578 Barbara J. Sivertsen, Turtles, Wolves, and Bears. A Mohawk Family History, Heritage Books, 1996, footnote 22, p. 295. PRDH identifies Jean Montary’s second wife as Marie Elisabeth Dér[y] dit Lafleur and dit Larose (sic), this last name the one under which the widow of Jean Montary was buried (#254682 Québec 1765-08-11 Décès : 1765-08-10). At Fort Pontchartrain, 30 October 1711, occurred the baptism of Magdeleine daughter of Joseph Montour, the son of Louis Couc Montour and of Isabelle Monthio (sic, as on PRDH. I read Onnthio on the original Ste. Anne de Detroit register). Godfather: Pierre Roy, habitant, & Marguerite Fafart, femme de Turpin. Marguerite is the daughter of Jean Fafard and Marguerite Couc, thus cousin to Joseph (and perhaps will become the French Margaret of Pennsylvania). I have to suspect that Joseph’s wife, called both both Elisabeth and Isabelle, had Isabelle as her godmother at some unknown location whose records have disappeared. Joseph and his wife were in Montréal by 1714-07-27 when Joseph Montour, six months old, was baptized, son of Joseph Montour and Elisabeth, Huronne de Détroit. #190417 Montréal PRDH. He and his wife were also documented at Albany in 1725 in the Commission on Indian Affairs, Minutes, Jan. 7, 1723 - Sept.4, 1732, RG 10, vol. 1819: 137a, NAC microfilm C-1220. Photocopy. Sivertsen also claims another daughter for Isabelle, Marguerite “Germeneau,” based on the false initial reading by PRDH, #47032 Montréal 1729-05-06 baptism of Louise Marguerite Renault, daughter of Jean Renault Langlois, and, what someone read as Marguerite GERMNEAUE, as it appears in the book version of PRDH. Jetté identifies this wife of Jean Renaud dit Langlois, from London, England, as Marguerite Charbonneau (Jean & Isabelle Aboire), born about 1686, married 1710. The origins of Jean Charbonneau and his wife Isabelle are unknown, but Michel Langlois says they came to New France with four of their already-born children, including Marguerite, by
Louis Couc dit Montour, used the name Lafleur, although Louis had been baptized with his father’s, Pierre Couc dit Lafleur’s, dit last name in 1659.

Sivertsen did her research from the multi-volume book version of PRDH, which made no attempt to join individuals to specific families, so Sivertsen is the only one to claim these linkages. Just as she did in identifying Marie Anne Lafleur with the English woman Marie Anne Cook (See Part 3), she again confused same or similar names.

Jetté, which she also cites as one of her sources, nevertheless identifies Marie Elisabeth Déry, second wife of Jean Montary dit Jolicoeur, as daughter of Joseph Déry dit Larose and Elisabeth Harbour, not Huron. She seemingly missed this reference. Widower Jean Montary married Elisabeth “La Fleur” 26 August 1730 at Quebec, and the priest, or someone else, confused the name, apparently using a generic “La Fleur” rather than the “Larose” dit name for Déry.

All that is given about the Jolicoeur mentioned in the interrogation of Pichon dit La Rose (sic) is that he is of the company of “Duverrier [sic]” (actually Leverrier) and this testimony:

   Asked who was the reason for the desertion of the man named Jolicoeur, he [La Rose] said that Sieur de Bourgmont caused him [Jolicoeur] to defect, and that he [Bourgmont] did not want to...

1695. *Dictionnaire Biographique des Ancêtres Québécois*, Tome 1, Sillery: La Maison des Ancêtres, 1998. She cannot be the child of Isabelle. See Part 10 for Michel Germaneau’s presence at the baptism of a child of Suzanne Elisabeth Charbonneau, the eldest child of the family, born about 1683, Jetté. There may be a Charbonneau link with the English colonies, but precisely what the link could be is, as of now, unknown. I include these errors by Sivertsen as a cautionary tale for researchers. Same name is not necessarily the same family.

579 Jetté, p. 825

580 PRDH and photocopy. Witnesses were Jacques Cheval dit St. Jacques; Paul de Beaucour; Louis Agathe; Gabriel Cotu. The bride and groom are said to reside in the said city, on “Boul Ch???”.

581 The name “duverrier” has also been mistranscribed as “duvivier”. The registers of Montréal have a clear example of the name of Captain Leverrier recorded in error as du Verrier. On 2 November 1705, Jean Roche dit la Fontaine, soldier of the company of Duplessis, married Marie Anne Failly. Present as a witness was François Jérome Beaune Leblanc dit La Tour, “Sergent de la Compagnie de mr Le Verrier”. On the very next day, 3 November, this François Jérome Beaune Leblanc dit La Tour married Angélique Dardenne, and the same priest, Father Priat, recorded that François was sergeant of the company of du Verrier. Also present: Michel Kerigou Fily, “sergent of du Verrier,” and Louis Villier dit Saint Louis, “Caporal de la dite Compagnie.” Photocopy. (I suspect Leblanc dit La Tour has a connection with Detroit but may also have served Cadillac in Louisiana.) François Leverrier, sieur de Rousson, was named a captain in 1694, but there was no captain du Verrier or du Vivier at the time of the 1707 court martial. Simone Vincens’s identification of Jean Joly dit Jolycoeur, buried at Fort Pontchartrain in 1707, as the Jolicoeur of the court martial can not be supported because this Jean Joly dit Jolycoeur was a sergeant of La Chassaigne, not Leverrier. The transcript of the registers of Ste. Anne de Detroit (hand-written copy certified by Tanguay) gives the captain’s name as “Lachenai,” and this is the name reported by Jetté in his entry for Jean Joly. There was no Captain Lachenai in 1707. The name is definitely La Chassaigne on the original. Cadillac even reported the death of a sergeant in 1707 but not any of the other deaths alleged in the conseil de guerre, leading me to believe that this document was never sent anywhere except the papers of Grandménis the younger, Cadillac’s employee. For Cadillac’s report of the death of a sergeant, see “Le sieur de Lamotte Cadillac les 10, 15 (or 20, 25?) septembre et 1 octobre 1707,” extracts with commentary by Pontchartrain, NAC F-27, f 149v, photocopy. Pontchartrain was not happy with Cadillac’s naming a replacement for the deceased man. Witnesses cited at the 1727 marriage contract of Isabelle’s niece Geneviève Massé and John Henry Lydios included, for the groom: Jean Bouillet, seigneur de La Chassaigne, who was a captain in Canada by 1687, but who did not actually attend. See my Part 8 and Jetté. Captains often gave permission for marriages, especially if they had information relative to the parties contracting the union.

191
take him [Jolicoeur?] here [Fort Pontchartrain], having left him with Montour, the brother of the said Tichenet. [sic. La femme de Tichenet or La Tichenette (feminine form) / Isabelle Couc / Madame Montour]

Asked whether he did not have knowledge that the sieur de Bourgmont returned near La Longue Pointe [Long Point, Ontario, on Lake Erie, a portage place for voyageurs] to go meet the said Tichenet [traveling from the fort?], he said that monsieur de Bourgmont had left the said Jolicoeur on the route to wait for the said Tichenet and to take her to join him [Bourgmont] at La Grande Rivière [at modern-day Dunnville, Ontario, farther east of Long Point], and that the said Jolicoeur, being bored with waiting for her, got back into a canoe to return to Détroit [au détroit], but as he met along the way the said Tichenet, she made him turn back and she took him [Jolicoeur] with her to join the sieur de Bourgmont [at la Grande Rivière].

Montour allegedly had pelletteries stashed on an island in La Grande Rivière / the Grand River. I have no idea what happened to this soldier named only Jolicoeur. Perhaps he too defected to the English and is the deserter killed by the Iroquois by 1708. I do not know whether the enigmas presented in this 1707 conseil de guerre, recorded by Grandmesnil, the younger, will ever be resolved, although other writers have taken all of the details in it as absolute fact.

Further compounding her error in identifying the Jolicoeur of 1707, Sivertsen blithely ignores the age of seventy-eight given for Jean Montary dit Jolicoeur at his death in Québec, also found in the PRDH book version and now on the internet:

PRDH #362145 Québec 1773-04-05 Décès : 1773-04-04
Rang Nom Âge É.m. Pr. Sexe
01 JEAN MONTARI Profession : ANCIEN SACRISTAIN DE L'EGLISE DE QUEBEC [former sacristan of the church] 078 --- d m

And she also failed to check the entry for the census of 1744 in Québec (City), when he is said to be forty-five:

PRDH #186450 Québec 1744-00-00
Rang Nom Âge E.m. Pr. Sexe
01 JEAN MONTARI Profession : GARDE DE PORT 045 m p m


583 Gail Moreau DesHarnais and I visited an island in the Grand River near Dunnville during a heavy rain storm in June of 2000. We were stunned by a flash of lightning and a tremendous clap of thunder, as if the spirits of Isabelle, her brother Montour, and Bourgmont were saying, “Yes, you found the right spot”! The poet in me loves such apparent coincidences.

584 See M. de Vaudreuil au Ministre (5 novembre 1708), RAPQ. Two years ago, in 1706, Vaudreuil had told the Sonontuans (Senecas), when they asked him to pardon two French deserters, that only the king had the right to pardon. Also mentioned in this 1708 letter is the killing by a young Indian in the village of the Onondagas of a soldier “de la garnison du detroit” who deserted with another. The governor agreed to accept a slave in the place of the murdered soldier to “cover” or atone for the death. Was the “other” of these soldier deserters Bourgmont? The timing is right. Montour spoke to Governor Cornbury in 1708, and Cornbury himself interrogated “another” deserter, although I have seen no summary of that interrogation. See my Part 7.
Whether the estimated ages on these records are precise or not, seventy-eight in 1773 gives a birth year of 1695, but death and census records are notoriously unreliable. If he was born in 1695, this husband of Marie Anne would have been a twelve-year-old soldier deserter in 1707. In the census of 1744, he is even younger, said to be forty-five, thus born 1701.

These are not the only documented ages given for him.

Jean Montary dit Jolicoeur, soldier of Rigaud

As I discovered, Montary is also cited in 1726 as twenty-five, the age given in the records of Hôtel Dieu, the hospital at Québec, where Jean Montari dit Jolicoeur, soldier of Rigaud, entered on 5 June of 1726 and left on the 11th.

*Juin 1726*

\[
C \text{ompany de Rigaud 5 Juin Jean Montarie dit jolycoeur de Castel sarrazin en Languedoc âgé de 25 ans soldat parti le 11 idem 6 [days]} \]

Since Jean Montary himself most probably stated his age for this record of 1726 and for the census of 1744, they must be assumed to be more accurate. If he was twenty-five in 1726, that makes his birth year 1701. Thus, based on Sivertsen’s identification, he would have been a six-year-old soldier in 1707. Even if the age of thirty, given for him at the Hôtel Dieu when he was there 26 days in May of 1729, is correct, that would still give a birth year of 1699. Once again, same name does not guarantee same person, particularly the name Jolicoeur (pretty or good heart). Do a search for it some day on PRDH. Jetté, in 1983, listed 30 individual family names that used it up to 1730, including Montary. Sivertsen again made unwarranted guesses on the basis of incomplete evidence and reported them as facts. There is, however, little ambiguity about the name Captain Rigaud de Vaudreuil in 1726.

Captain Rigaud

The company of Rigaud had as its captain (What an unbelievable coincidence!) the son of Governor Philippe Rigaud de Vaudreuil, who had died in 1725, the year before Montary spent time at the hospital, and who had been so crucially involved with Marie Anne Montour’s family. I believe I am the first to find this evidence that Jean Montary dit Jolicoeur was a soldier, and that he served in the company of François Pierre de Rigaud, fifth son of Philippe de Rigaud de Vaudreuil, the Vaudreuil who authorized both the killing of Marie Anne’s uncle, Montour, in 1709 and the visit to New York in 1719 by the sister of Madame Montour, Angélique, La St Serny.

---

585 FHL #1287130 Hôtel-Dieu de Québec, p. 111. The last number indicates the number of days spent at the hospital in the given month.
586 FHL #1287130, p. 182.
587 DCB, Vol. IV, p. 661.
It is even possible that Captain Rigaud recruited Montary from Castelsarrazin on his visit to France in 1723. He “obtained command of a company” in 1724, and “returned to Canada” in 1726. 588 Although the 1726 hospital record appears to be the first evidence of Jean Montary, soldier in the company of Rigaud, in New France, I do not know when he arrived. Gérard Malchelosse says that a report on “the posts of the pay d’en haut for the years of 1723-1725, indicates the garrison of Fort Saint Joseph des Miamsis and des Illinois (now Niles, Michigan) included, as commandant, de Villedonné. Marguerite Couc served as godmother there for one of the Villedonné children; and, although she is not documented at Saint-Joseph after 1723, she could nevertheless have been there. Malchelosse then identifies as one of the officers at the fort, Rigaud de Vaudreuil. 589 The Dictionary of Canadian Biography, in addition, indicates Rigaud was absent in France from 1723 (most likely leaving in the fall, when the ships returned to France) until 1726. 590 He truly could have recruited Montary while he was there before he returned in 1726, the same year Montary appears at the hospital. Rigaud de Vaudreuil’s father’s ancestral land holdings were in Revel, Languedoc, 591 not far from Toulouse and Castelsarrazin. His brother, Pierre de Rigaud de Vaudreuil de Cavagnial (1698-1778), known as Cavagnial, would later serve as the last governor of New France.

Others mentioned by Gérard Malchelosse as present in the garrison of Fort or Post St Joseph, in addition to Father Charles Michel Masaiger, missionnaire aumonier, include several intriguing names. I will comment on only a few: de Sabrevois (Isabelle’s niece, Susanne Ménard’s 1706 godfather; and Susanne is also documented there with her family and soldier husband Gabriel Bolon); de Lignery; Saint-Ours Deschaillons; Du Vivier (not to be confused with Leverrier); de Montigny; Le Gardeur de Beauvais; Robert Groton dit Saint-Ange (who would travel with Bourgmont in his explorations); Jean Colet, sergeant.

Robert Groton de Saint Ange also accompanied Charlevoix in his famous voyage, 1721-22, years when Marguerite Couc was at St Joseph. In 1723 Saint Ange went up the Missouri “with Véniard de Bourgmond [sic] to go to construct Fort Orléans” and was part of Bourgmont’s expedition to the Padoucas, or Comanches, in the west of Kansas in 1724. He was in charge of Fort Orléans during Bourgmont’s return to France in 1725. He remained in Illinois territory and in 1729 bought a house at Fort de Chartres. 592 Marguerite Couc was thus connected to Bourgmont at least through a mutual acquaintance, and it is not unlikely they knew each other, either at Fort Pontchartrain or at the St Joseph post. (See Part 6.)

Montigny, or Jacques Testard de Montigny, was with Frontenac for his attack on Orange and seconded Ramezay in the 1709 foray to Pointe de la Chevelure (Crown Point, New York) at a time when Vaudreuil believed “latishenette” was influencing the Iroquois. (See Part 8.) In 1716 he was godfather for Jean


590 See Jean Hamelin and Jacqueline Roy, “Rigaud de Vaudreuil, François-Pierre de,” DCB, IV, pp. 660-62. “In 1726 he returned to Canada, but went back to France to settle his father’s estate two years later; he revisited it in 1730 and 1731.” Page 661.

591 See Yves F. Zoltvany’s article on Philippe de Rigaud de Vaudreuil in DCB II.

592 DCB II.
Baptiste Morriseau’s son Pierre, an event for which Jean Baptiste was absent. As widower of Marguerite Damours, he married Laporte de Louvigny’s daughter, Marie Anne Laporte dit Louvigny, in 1718. He went to Baie des Puants with Charlevoix in 1721, where Father Chardon served, but was back by 1723. The Dictionary of Canadian Biography article about him then jumps to 1730, when he went to Michilimackinac to relieve Renaud DuBuisson, who, as interim commandant at Fort Pontchartrain, had replaced Cadillac in 1710 and who later served at Fort Miamis (now Fort Wayne, Indiana).

Le Gardeur de Beauvais, Philippe René Legardeur, sieur de Beauvais, seems to be the same man who served as godfather for Jean Vidal’s and Marguerite Massé’s daughter 8 April 1725 with “Louise Deleigne André” as godmother. Michel Lamy, Marie Anne Montour’s employer, was associated with Vidal. This Le Gardeur de Beauvais also served as godfather for Jean-Baptiste Cardinet’s daughter, Renée Thérèse Cardinet, on 14 July 1727; and Cardinet, a wig-maker like Jean Vermet, attended Marie Anne Montour’s 1730 church marriage as a witness for her, as cited above. Jean Baptiste Cardonnet’s son, also Jean-Baptiste, was hired to travel to Fort Pontchartrain by Charles Nolan de LaMarque on 18 April 1721.

The interconnections are more than remarkable.

593 PRDH #44628, 1716-05-04 Montréal. Godmother was Catherine Nolan, spouse of Martin de Lino.
594 DCB III. The article leaves unexamined the years 1723 to 1730.
595 18 April 1721. Notary David, ANQ, photocopy. I am sure this is the son and not the father because this Jean Baptiste did not know how to sign in 1721. He later signed documents, including one with his father’s signature also on the act.
Marie Anne Montour’s Last Child

Not quite three months after her marriage, on 16 April 1730, Marie Anne gave birth at Québec to another child and another of the ubiquitous Jean Baptistes. The mother of Jean Baptiste is named “Marie Anne Montour” on the record, with her husband identified as Jean Montary, but the child is said to be “Né de pere inconnu,” born of an unknown father, and “Baptisé sous condition,” indicating he had been given lay baptism, ondoyement, before being carried to the priest for the formal ceremonies to be supplied. This child, whose father’s name is not revealed, died only months later at Saint Augustin des Maures on 5 August 1730, according to PRDH. Possibly sent there to be served by an unidentified wet nurse. The child’s death is only twenty-one days before the 26 August 1730 re-marriage of widower Jean Montary to Marie Élisabeth Déry. (See Part 11.) I have not yet located any inventory after death documents concerning the Montary/Montour marriage; none may exist.

Jean-Baptiste Montary’s godparents in April were Pierre Grondin garçon (son or unmarried) and Marie-Angélique Métivier.

Pierre Grondin, husband of Marie Fournier, is of unknown origin, according to Jetté. Langlois identifies this Pierre Grondin senior as from Brouage, France, brother of Jean Grondin. He died 28 and was buried 30 August 1729 at Lauzon, age 80, so he cannot be this godfather; but he had a son, garçon, also named Pierre, born 11 baptized 14 April 1711 Rivière Ouelle. At the time of the baptism, Pierre the elder’s wife, also of unknown origin, had recently remarried to Jean Baptiste Franche dit Gens or Ginse, Anglais, said to be 40 at the marriage ceremony on 16 January 1730 Lauzon. Fournier says of Jean Baptiste “Giness”: “the circumstances of his coming to New France as a captive [sic] are unknown. He was probably brought up and baptized in an Indian mission under the name Jean Baptiste Gens (act lost) and later freed.” There is, nevertheless, no certainty he was ever a captive, that I am aware of. The traffic between the English colonies and New France was not insignificant.

A Marie Angélique Métivier, born and baptized 3 September 1700 at Beauport, daughter of Louis Métivier and Louise Savaria, is most likely Jean Baptiste Montary’s godmother. Marie Angélique had married Charles Amiot (Charles Amiot & Rosalie Duquet) on 18 February 1719 at Québec, about a year after he obtained his legal age of majority by judicial decree. Her husband’s uncle, Étienne Amiot, sieur de Lincour, was hired to go to Le Détroit on 10 July 1703. Forty-three other men were hired along...
with “Estienne Amyault Lincour, de Québec,” including Jacques Campeau, who became a resident of Detroit, and Jean Vermet’s brother Jacques Vermet. On two other contracts that same day, an additional seven men were hired, including Bourgmont, Étienne Volant, sieur de Radisson, most likely accompanied by his wife Geneviève Letendre, since she was present at the fort the following February; and his brother François Volant, sieur de Fosseneuve. I do not know whether Étienne Amiot returned to the mother colony that fall or whether he was present at the fort when the suspicious fire that destroyed records was set in October of 1703. He married twice, with fifteen children born at Québec by 1729, again according to Jetté.602

His nephew Charles the younger’s brother, also Étienne Amiot but dit Villeneuve, married Jeanne Campagna in 1708, and the family settled at Saint Augustin, where Marie Anne Montour’s son Jean Baptiste died and was buried. Ten children were born and baptized at Saint Augustin before Étienne Amiot the younger’s death at the end of 1730.603 I have to wonder whether he, his wife, or his brother-in-law’s wife, Marie Angélique Métivier, saw to the care of mother-less Jean Baptiste Montary at Saint Augustin, but I will probably never know. Jacques Vermet also resided at Saint Augustin. It is possible, though, that, if this is the right Marie Angélique,604 she heard stories about the early years at the fort, and not only from her husband’s family.605

Marie Angélique Métivier’s maternal aunt, Marie Charlotte Savaria, was one of the single women, apparently unattached to any family, who arrived at Fort Pontchartrain with the convoy of 1706. Charlotte Savaria had been hired 26 April 1706 by Marie Thérèse Guyon de Lamothé for two years beginning 1 May, to work for Monsieur and Madame de Lamothé Cadillac as a servante. Charlotte’s sister Louise, Marie Angélique Métivier’s mother, was present at the hiring contract to assist Charlotte. The Cadillac had other servants in the earlier and later years, not all of whom are documented. (Ann Pastourel in 1702 is one. See Part 11.) With six surviving children in the Lamothé Cadillac family in 1706 and a seventh

602 The 1983 edition of Jetté wrongly lists Jeanne Campagna as Étienne Amiot the elder’s wife, but corrects the error in the individual listing for him.
603 Jetté.
604 There is another woman with the name Angélique Bonaventure Métivier, who would have been nineteen in 1730, and who is from another Métivier family. Jetté.
605 This family had several ties with Isabelle or her family, which supports my identification of this woman. Mathieu Amiot dit Villeneuve, the elder Charles Amiot’s father, was married to Marie Miville: 22 Oct 1650 Québec. This Marie Miville, daughter of Pierre Miville & Charlotte Maugis, was Jacques Miville’s aunt. In 1706 Jacques Miville married Catherine Lécuyer, who remarried to Michel Germaneau in 1717 after Jacques Miville/Mainville’s death. Mathieu Amiot and Marie Miville also had a son, Daniel Joseph Amiot dit Villeneuve, a voyageur, n 04 b 05 Oct 1665, therefore a contemporary of Isabelle, m. 02 Sept 1709 Montréal to Marie Kapiouapnoké, Outaouaise, also known as Domitilde Oukabé dite Neveu, Amérindienne, with children born at Michillimakinac, 1712-1722. Maurice Ménard was with Villeneuve at Michillimakinac in 1713, as I indicated earlier. Mathieu Amiot, another brother, b 25-08-1667 Québec, is recorded at the 1681 census for Saint François du Lac as a domestique of Laurent Phillippe. He died 02 and was buried 03-12-1684 at Québec, the year of Isabelle Couc’s marriage. Coincidentally, he was confirmed by Bishop Laval at Sorel on the same day in 1678 as “Elisabeth Couc Lafleur dit [sic] Cognac, 11 ans.” (Abbé A. Couillard Després, Histoire de Sorel, Montréal, 1926, p. 66, and photocopy from the Sorel records. On another list of Confirmations, she is called simply “Elizabeth Couc.”) The list of those confirmed that day in the registers of Sorel: Louis Jean dit Lafontaine, Marie Madeleine Richaune, 16 ans, Jeanne Richaune 10 ans, Marie Charlotte Charron 11 ans, Louis de Contrecoeur 10 ans, François Pelletier 20 ans, Jean François Pelletier 15 ans, Marie Madeleine Proutré-Lavigne 8 ans, Mathieu Amiot 11 ans, Louis Crevier 9 ans, Elisabeth Couc Lafleur dit Cognac 11 ans. Gabriel Amiot, age 36, brother of Charles and Étienne, was in the hospital at Québec from 6 January, Marie Anne’s last full month there, to 28 February of 1729, FHL #1287130, pp. 175, 177.
born within six months of Charlotte’s arrival. Charlotte must surely have been kept busy. She was to be paid 65 livres a year, and she would receive one pair of French shoes and one black taffeta headdress each year: une paire de souliers francos et une Coiffe de taffetas noir ausi par Chaque année. She would be provided food, a bed, heat (suggesting she would not herself have to obtain the wood to burn), and her clothing would be washed, blanchisée, all according to the custom practiced in this country. “This” must mean the standards in the mother colony, where the document was written. Before her contract expired, Charlotte Savaria married Jacques Desmoulins dit Philis in 1707, although the church record has not survived. She most likely continued to work for the Cadillacs after her marriage, at least to fulfill the contract.

Cadillac had hired “Jacque demoulin dit philis” on 10 May 1706. Jacques agreed to go to the fort to live there or, as an option, to return to the mother colony after a certain time. He was to be fed on the voyage and received an advance of 22 livres du pays, money of New France, in cash. Cadillac allowed him to carry brandy, eau de vie, in his canoe and advanced him 80 livres in merchandise to carry to the fort and trade for his own profit or to transfer to Lamothe Cadillac upon arrival. Jacques was also to reimburse the cash advance of 22 livres. Charlotte Savaria and Jacques Desmoulins dit Philis were thus present at the fort in the last months Isabelle was there (perhaps with her daughter Marie Anne Germaneau / Montour and her son Michel, and (who knows?) a new baby, Louis? (See Part 10.). Charlotte and Jacques (who is often called Philis or Filis) settled at Le Détroit, where they had nine children from 1708 to 1723.

Charlotte’s sister, Louise Savaria, mother of Marie Angélique Métivier, remarried in 1712 to Joseph Daniel Fisk, originally from Lynn, county of Essex, in Massachusetts. He was taken prisoner about 1708, according to Fournier, and abjured Protestantism 14 December 1712. Two children were born to the Fisk

---

606 See my article in MHH, April 2003, for documentation of the composition of the Lamothe Cadillac family in 1706, documentation not published prior to my article.


607 The 65 livres a year is significantly lower than the 450 livres the Cadillacs promised to pay Anne Pastorel in 1703, but by this time Cadillac was not being subsidized by the king or by the Company of the Colony for his living expenses. Also, Charlotte was not bringing a child or children with her as was Anne.

608 26 April 1706, Engagement de Charlotte Savaria, Notary Lacetièrre, ANQ photocopy. Her sister Louise Savaria was present at the contract to assist her sister. I have no evidence that she accompanied her sister to Detroit.

609 A gap in the records between July and October of 1707 may account for this missing marriage document and several others, including Jacques Langlois’s marriage, although his marriage contract, written at the fort by Grandmesnil the younger, is extant. The political situation at the fort in these months was especially complicated, as it is during this time the Ottawas attacked the Miamis at the fort in June of 1706, the action that caused the deaths of Father Delhalle, the soldier Larivière, and Pierre Tichenet, the husband of La Tichennette / Isabelle Couc. These months also seem to be the time when Cadillac sent “a Recollet” (possibly Father Chérubin Deniau) to serve the Miamis he had asked to relocate from their fort on the St. Joseph River (modern-day Niles, Michigan) to a new one, on what Cadillac calls the Maurepas River, considered to be present-day Maumee River by historians, but which I believe to be the River Raisin at modern-day Monroe, former Frenchtown, Michigan. Evidence exists for the mission, named Saint Antoine de Pades. See my article in MHH, April 2009, now also on the FCHSM website. Cadillac would “wage war” on these Miamis the following year, 1708. Father Deniau must have recently arrived in 1707 to replace the deceased Father Constantine Delhalle, although he does not begin to record events in the registers of the fort until November of 1707. Father DeLamarche remained in residence into 1708.

610 10 May 1710, Notary Lacetièrre, photocopy

611 Jetté, and photocopies of records.
couple at Beauport in 1714 and 1715. Both of Jean Baptiste’s godparents thus have ties to the English colonies, and one of them to Fort Pontchartrain.

Although this child was born three months after Marie Anne’s marriage, his father is said to be unknown. Did Jean Montary realize his wife was pregnant (possibly six months pregnant) at their marriage? I have to wonder whether it is believable for a man to establish, as the contract states, a dowry of 3000 livres, a considerable sum at the time, for a woman who had, apparently, given birth to four illegitimate children (unless he fathered one or more of the earlier children) and who was about to give birth to another child allegedly fathered by another man, and yet that is what the baptismal record reports. The motivations and circumstances, not to mention the names of the genetic fathers of Marie Anne’s children, will most likely never be known. It is possible Jean Montary, soldier, was refused permission to marry earlier. This was not unusual, especially during a time of war, as the following example demonstrates.

Also arriving in the 1706 convoy to Fort Pontchartrain, along with Charlotte Savaria, was Thérèse David, age forty, who, as widow Massé Martin, had just married “en face de l’église” soldier Jacob Marsac dit Lhommetrou, also dit Desrosiers. Thérèse left behind a child born to her and Marsac in November of 1704, a child who died that fall of 1706. This child was not, though, the product of any casual dalliance. Although Thérèse David was not married to Marsac in church until June of 1706, her marriage contract was signed not on 25 June 1706, as Jetté indicates, but two years earlier, on 25 June 1704. The marriage did not occur then because Marsac was about to leave to fight the English, nos Ennemies. Since the marriage could not be solemnized until his return, and since on such a voyage God could withdraw him from this world, dieu le Retirer de Ce monde, Marsac willed Thérèse David all his worldly goods. Their son Jacques was born 26 and baptized 27 November 1704 at Montréal; he was buried 5 October 1706, also at Montréal. Thérèse David’s daughter Marie Thérèse Martin had married Louis Haguenier 17 February 1705 at Montréal and given birth to a daughter on 3 December 1705, who was buried on the 30th. It is possible Jacques Marsac, the baby, was left in the care of his half-sister when the baby’s parents left for Fort Pontchartrain.

Louis Haguenier is the brother of Barbe Haguenier. Françoise Massé signed as a godmother on 25 October 1725 at Montréal, with François Volant, who signed as godfather, for a baby named Françoise, daughter of Pierre Dubois and Barbe Haguenier. Barbe Delestre, the mother of Barbe and Louis Haguenier, is the daughter of Thierry Delestre & Marie-Suzanne Péré. As I pointed out in Part 11:

This last record is particularly striking . . . because Barbe Haguenier’s maternal uncle is the influential La Rochelle merchant Jean Péré, who was present at the 1657 marriage of Pierre Couc and Marie Mité8ameg8k8é, and he is also the godfather of Françoise Massé’s mother, Marguerite Couc.615

612 Fournier, p. 130. Joseph Fisk attended the 1719 marriage of Charles Amiot and served as godfather for their first child in 1721. Photocopies.
613 Massé Martin is sometimes confused with Martin Massé, Michel Massé’s father. They are two different men whose first and last names have been switched by some researchers.
614 Jetté and photocopies. Marriage contract 25 June 1704, Notary Lepailleur, ANQ, photocopy. Thanks to Gail Moreau-DesHarnais for originally noticing, in 2000, this 1704 date on the marriage contract during our visit to the archives. Captains or the governor would not always grant the soldiers permission to marry, especially in times of war. Both Thérèse David and Jacob Marsac died at Detroit. She is a cousin of Marie Lepage (See footnote 22) and served as godmother for Marie’s illegitimate daughter in 1709.
615 Jetté and photocopies. See also Part 3.
Jean Péré also attended Louis Couc Montour’s marriage 7 January 1688, and served as godfather on 20 January of the same year for Louis’s son, about two months old, probably named Jean but known later as Joseph, with Madeleine Couc as godmother.\textsuperscript{616} Thérèse David’s family also had connections with Pierre Couc.\textsuperscript{617}

Marie Anne Montour’s Father

I will never know Jean Montary’s reasons for marrying Isabelle’s daughter, nor the identity of so many of the fathers of the children born outside of marriage, including Marie Anne’s children. But lurking at the back of my mind for my novel version of Isabelle’s story (if Marie Anne is truly the child of Lamotte, as stated at her marriage, and if “Lamotte” is Lamothe Cadillac) is Jean Montary’s home of Castelsarrazin, where Antoine Laumet, sieur de Lamothe Cadillac, resided at the time Montary may have entered military service, 1724. Could Cadillac have had an attack of conscience so late in his life? It seems impossible!

This suggestion is certainly speculation tinged with a bit of wild imagination, and I present it as such. It would serve well in a novel. But Montary himself appears to have been a moral man, in later years serving as godparent for several illegitimate children, as did his daughter. He was buried as a former sacristan of the church. His own two children, born fifteen years apart (in 1731, Marie Angélique, and, in 1746, Julien) served as godparents for a Marie Julienne Couque (named after both godparents), born 11 March and baptized 13 April 1763 at Québec, daughter of Jean Couque and Marguerite (no last name), legitimately married.\textsuperscript{618} I have yet to trace whether this “Couque” is a French version of the English name Couc.\textsuperscript{619} I have yet to trace whether this “Couque” is a French version of the English name Cook then current in what had just become British Canada (as I believe it probably is) or whether this Jean Couque is somehow related to the Pierre Couc descendants of New France and the English colonies. I may never know. Just one more coincidence, it seems!

And no one will ever really know the name of Marie Anne’s own father, even if my other improbable but possible scenario for a novel comes into play. This imagined (I emphasize imagined!) dramatic scene would show Jean Baptiste Cardinet arriving at the church in 1730 (he was not present at the contract) as a witness for Marie Anne at her marriage to declare to Marie Anne that her father was truly Antoine Lamotte (pronounced and recorded as La Motte). He knew this because a woman who had attended his own marriage on 31 October 1702, the controversial Charlotte Françoise Juchereau, had told him so.

\textsuperscript{616} Photocopies of records at Saint-François-du-Lac, FHL #108091. The baptismal record is damaged, but I can just barely read the name Jean given to the child. PRDH identifies him as Joseph.

\textsuperscript{617} Thérèse David’s father, Claude David, is brother of Guillaume David, Marie Lepage’s grandfather, so Thérèse is Marie’s cousin. (Jetté, p. 312) On 29 December 1657, Pierre Couc filed charges against Guillaume and Claude David and Barthélemy Bertaut for assault and the injuries he sustained. Michel Langlois, Tome 2, p. 41, citing Baillage de Trois-Rivières. Marie Anne David, sister of the Madeleine David who married Jacques Lepage, Marie’s father, was confirmed in the same year as Isabelle Couc, in 1678 at Sorel. Their names appear on the list of 15 individuals confirmed in 1678 at Sorel “et autres lieus circonvoisins” (and neighboring regions). Registers of Sorel, LDS Film #1294705.

\textsuperscript{618} All PRDH.

\textsuperscript{619} Jean Battiste Cardinet, dit Chevalier, wigmaker (like Jean Vermet) and surgeon, married on 31 October 1702 at Québec, contract 18 Chambalon, photocopies to Marie Madeleine Stilson (Jacques & Marguerite Marblehead) of New Castle, Nouvelle-Angleterre, yet another link to the English colonies. La Comtesse attended both contract and church ceremony and signed both records, as did many other notables in the colony, including Intendent Champigny, who with his wife sponsored the bride, and Beauharnois, recently arrived to serve as intendent. Marie Madeleine Stilson is sister of Jacques Stilson, who married, 4 October 1705 Montréal, Anne Marguerite Odiorne from Piscatoué in Nouvelle-Angleterre, widow Batson. She had been taken with her Batson children in war in 1703 and was servante for Antoine Pascaud in 1704-05. See my earlier references to Pascaud, including his authorizing
She is the self-proclaimed Comtesse de Saint-Laurent, femme de Viennay Pachot and then femme de Laforest. Although there is no evidence Cadillac attended Cardinet’s marriage, he was in the mother colony in the fall of 1702, at the time of Cardinet’s marriage to Marie Madeleine Stilson, to sign the documents appointing him to serve the Compagnie de la Colonie before returning to the fort. La Comtesse’s second husband, François Daupin, sieur de Laforest, served as godfather for Cardinet’s daughter Marie Françoise in Québec 30 December 1710. Cadillac’s second-in-command in 1706, Laforest had been named commandant of Fort Pontchartrain when Cadillac was appointed to go to Louisiana in 1710, although Laforest did not travel to the fort until late 1712, Dubuisson temporarily substituting for him. Cadillac and Laforest did not part amicably in 1711, embroiled as they were about Cadillac’s property and rights to income from the fort. La Comtesse’s son Daniel Pachot also served at the fort and in the pays d’en haut. Although La Comtesse and Cadillac had possibly good relations for a time (they at least did business together), she and her second husband became his enemies, as was true for almost all of Cadillac’s acquaintances, it seems. But even Minister of the Marine Pontchartrain called La Comtesse de Saint-Laurent “a dangerous woman,” and she is quite capable of having transmitted either the truth about Marie Anne’s father, or a lie. Like Cadillac, Charlotte Françoise Juchereau can be documented telling lies. At any rate, that’s what will happen in my novel. Or maybe not.

Meanwhile, in reality, Marie Anne may have lived a way of life closer to that which her mother, under the name La femme de Tichenet, was accused of living by the person who might well have been Marie Anne’s father. Or Marie Anne may simply have been unlucky in love. Or she may have been raped. Or she may have enjoyed sharing her favors with the soldiers or other men of the colony. The men had to be, at the least, willing participants. Birth-control was not then as efficient as it would be for subsequent generations. She is not the sole example of young and older women of the New France colony who bedded without benefit of marriage; their partners were no less responsible for the children born of these alliances, although definitely more discreet, and, to this day, almost all anonymous. And this despite the old adage: Anonymous is a woman!

Odysseus’ son Telemachus, in Homer’s Odyssey, not having known his father at all since Odysseus set out for the Trojan War when Telemachus was a baby, laments as he comes into his own manhood: “Who has known his own engendering?” DNA analysis was not a possibility until just recently. I have not, however, completed my research. Several entries found at the Hôtel-Dieu, have given some further avenues to pursue, including but not limited by the following.

Further Documentation for Marie Anne Montour at Hôtel Dieu

After the Hôtel Dieu record in July of 1728, Marie Anne Montour was listed as a servante at the hospital for six full months, at which time she was replaced by Marie Sigouin in February of 1729. Marie a convoy to collect Bourgmont’s peltries at Fort Pontchartrain in 1706. Jacques Stilson was a clerk for the king’s storehouse, magasin du roi, in 1705. The legal trial against Cadillac was conducted in 1704-05. So many possible sources of undocumented information exist in these interconnected relationships.

620 PRDH #63149 Québec 1710-12-30, Marie Françoise Cardinet.
621 In addition to other transactions, she even encouraged the hiring of as many as possible to take brandy, eau de vie, to Fort Pontchartrain after Cadillac began to serve as “absolute master” in 1706.
622 See DCB II. Born in 1660, she did not die until 1732, surviving Cadillac by two years. For her lies, see Louvigny’s and Raudet’s comments about her self-alleged involvement in trying to free soldiers held in the prison at Québec in 1706. Could they have been soldiers who deserted from Cadillac’s 1706 convoy?
623 FHL #1287130, p. 176 for her return in February of 1729 and p. 160 for her last full month in July 1728.

Suzanne Boivin Sommerville, © 2014, all rights reserved
Sigouin had worked as *servante* at the hospital in the months before Marie Anne’s arrival but not during Marie Anne’s time there.

Marie Sigouin appears to be Marie Madeleine Sigouin, born 29 April 1681, the daughter of Jean Sigouin & Lucrèce Billot. She never married and did not die until 1754. When she returned to serve the hospital on 6 January 1729, her age was given as 44. Her brother, also Jean Sigouin, had been hired to voyage to Michilimackinac on 10 June 1695 by Jean Baptiste Bisson, sieur de Vincennes (later to serve in Miami territory at St. Joseph and at Post Miamis on the Maumee). About thirty-five men were hired that spring of 1695 to travel there, where Cadillac had just assumed command the previous fall. Among these men was Jean Mauriceau, hired on the 9th of June, 1695. (What stories might her brother have told Marie Sigouin?) She may have left her employment at the hospital to help care for her nieces and nephews. There had been deaths in the family, including that of her sister-in-law, Marguerite Dubeau, wife of brother Jean, who died 28 September 1727 at Hôtel Dieu and was buried on the 30th. The daughter of Marie’s brother Robert Sigouin, had married in 1718 Jean Baptiste Griveau dit Boisjoli. Just a year before his marriage, Griveau was hired by “Joseph Raimbault de Piemont” to go to Michilimackinac on 26 April 1717. This Joseph Raimbault dit Piedmont is the son of the Procureur du roi involved with placing Marie Anne Germaneau’s son Nicolas René in 1727. I have not yet seen this 1717 contract. By March of 1729, Marie Sigouin was *servante* for *Mr le general*, the Governor of New France, Beauharnois, who lobbied the French authorities to allow John Henry Lydius to remain in New France. She was replaced as *servante* at Hôtel Dieu by Marie Thérèse Gagné. Governor Beauharnois was then concerned with what to do with John Henry Lydius, husband of Marie Anne’s *cousine*, Geneviève Massé, the niece of Isabelle, and an Iroquois husband in New York whom Beauharnois identifies as *Le Germano*. (See Part 8.)

Marie Anne and her future husband, Jean “Montarie dit Jolicoeur,” are thus not the only interesting persons documented at Hôtel Dieu around this time, he being there both before and after Marie Anne’s months as a *servante*, each time identified as a soldier in the company of Rigaud.

In Part 11, I cited the first reference to *Jean Montarie dit Jolicoeur* that I had then found in the records of Hôtel-Dieu:

```
juin 1726
C. de Rigaud 5 Juin Jean Montarie dit jolycoeur de Castel sarrazin en Languedoc âgé de 25 ans soldat parti le 11e idem [left on the 11th of the same month] 6 [days] p. 111
```

I have since re-examined the records and note that the first soldier from the Company of *Rigaud* is listed both in October and November of 1724. This following record then appears in December:

```
```

Then in January of 1725:

---

624 PRDH Online.
625 RAPQ CD-ROM list of hiring contracts.
626 FHL #1287130, p. 181
He had thus arrived in New France by the fall of 1724. The writing on these pages is very faint, especially the one for 15 December 1724, so I understand how I missed these entries my first time through. I had highlighted the January 1725 entry; but, since there were other soldiers with the name Jolicoeur, I could not, at first, trust it. Subsequently, after his appearance at the hospital in 1726, he was there again in 1727 and 1729:

- **juin 1727**
  - *C de Rigaud le 1ère* [the first day of June] Jean montari dit joly coeur de castel sarrazin agé de 25 ans soldat sorti le 11e idem [left on the 11th of the same month] 10 days

- **mai 1729**
  - C. de Rigaud le 5ème Jean montari dit joly coeur de castell sarrazin agé de 30 [sic, possibly a mistake that should read 26, like the number of days] ans soldat 26 days

- **juin 1729**
  - *C de Rigaud Jean montari dit joly coeur soldat* [no age] 30 [all thirty days]

Whenever Marie Anne’s husband, Jean Montary, began to serve in New France as a soldier, he is not identified as one at either of his marriages. Nevertheless, according to an entry at the hospital for November of 1730, he was still a soldier even after his second marriage, and had not yet mustered out.

- **C. de Rigaud 1ère Jean Montari dit joly coeur de Castel sarrazin agé de 30 ans** [once again said to be 30] soldat sorti le 5 [left on the 5th] 5 days

Not really surprisingly, since they too were soldiers, two witnesses for Jean Montary who attended the signing of Marie Anne’s and Jean’s marriage contract and their wedding, as mentioned earlier (See Part 11), also appear as short-term visitors to the hospital before and during Marie Anne Montour’s time there, Pierre L’Europe, belonging to the same company, Rigaud, as Jean Montary, and Antoine Fardeau.

- **août 1727**
  - Nouvelles levées [from the new recruits arrived in the colony]
    - Pierre leurope dit St. amant de bourg agé de 19 ans soldat (2 days)

- **septembre 1727**
  - Nouvelles levées Pierre Leurope dit St amant soldat sorti le 9 idem [left on the 9th of the same month] (9) p. 139

- **décembre 1727**
  - C. Rigaud le 6ème Pierre leurope dit St Amant de Bourges agé de 20 ans soldat sorti le 10ème (4) p. 147

---

627 FHL #1287130.
628 FHL #1287130.
629 FHL #1287130, p. 222. Then, on page 225, December 1730: “Canonnier 25e Jean Robin dit Latouche de Chenier en Saintonge agé de 22 ans sorti le 29 4 [days]”. He would marry Marguerite Roy, Isabelle’s 1704 godchild, in 1739. See my articles on Marguerite Roy and her brothers on the website of the FCHSM.
septembre 1728
le 17e Antoine fardeau dit St. Antoine de loudun agé de 33 ans soldat (13)

octobre 1728
Nouvelles levées
Antoine fardeau dit St. Antoine soldat sorti le 12e jdem (12) p. 167

juillet 1729
le 16e Pierre l’Europe dit berry [note change in dit name] de Bourges agé de 22 ans soldat sorti le 19 (3) p. 187

The Jean Vermet Family

In addition to the men who served as witnesses for Jean Montary at his marriage, I found another witness at the hospital who would attend Marie Anne Montour’s marriage. Remember that she was first documented at the hospital in late July of 1728 and that by August she was a servante that full month and each month thereafter through January of 1729. Present in August of 1728, Marie Anne’s first full month:

le 5e Jean vermet de l’Ile Dorleans paroisse de la Ste famille agé de 42 ans sorti le 11e jdem (6) p. 163

The Montary / Montour marriage contract would be written in Jean Vermet’s home at Québec City, rue du Saut au matelot, a year and a half later, 29 January 1730. He was previously a resident of Montréal and Boucherville, although he was born at l’Ile d’Orléans, as indicated by this origin given to him during his hospital stay. This fact and other examples like it lead me to believe the “origin” given on the records at the hospital is a birthplace rather than a current residence. His wife was also born at l’Ile d’Orléans, but at the time of their marriage contract, 13 August 1713, she is said to be from Boucherville, where the contract was written, signed by Jacques Charles de Sabrevois, who served at Detroit from 1715 to 1717. Madeleine Couc Ménard resided in Boucherville at least to 1713, as did some of her children afterwards, Antoine Ménard in particular; and Sabrevois had acted as godfather for the Ménard daughter Susanne in 1706 at the very time Susanne’s father, Maurice, was traveling with Jesuit Father Marest to Michilimackinac to reestablish the mission there.

630 Jean Vermet was born 16 and baptized 17 June 1685 at Ste Famille, Isle d’Orléans, thus his “origin” for this hospital record was the parish of his birth, not his current residence nor the places from which he had recently lived, Montréal or Boucherville, where his children had been baptized. PRDH. His brother Jacques Vermet was hired to go to Fort Pontchartrain 10 July 1703, photocopy, but lived at Saint Augustin, where baby Jean Baptiste died in 1730. Yet another striking example of the meaning of the place name on the hospital entries is the recording at the hospital in May of 1725 of Paris as “origin” for Agnès Olivier, 67, wife of “Civadier” (p. 79). She had married Louis Sivadier fifty-six years earlier in 1669 at Ste Famille, Ile d’Orléans, yet Paris is still the place cited. Jetté.
631 See Nive Voisine’s article in DCB Vol. II. Sabrevois later served as commandant at Fort Chambly from 1720 to 1724, where Jean Renaudet and his wife, Marie Madeleine Ménard, lived. She traveled to Orange with her cousin Marie Anne Germaneau in 1721. Sabrevois had married, in 1695, Jeanne Boucher, the daughter of Pierre Couc’s contemporary, Pierre Boucher, and served in expeditions against the Iroquois and against Nicolson’s 1709 attack by way of Lake Champlain. (See Part 8)
Another example of the “origin” of a person present at the hospital representing a birth place appears in a citation for "**Madelon Poupard [Poupard], d'orange servante de l'hôpital**” in January of 1723. She and her family had returned from Albany, *Orange*, the place of her birth, by the time of her baptism supplied on 29 May 1708, some fourteen years earlier at Montréal.632 She had been born “1704-10-00 Still Water [sic] proche [near] d'Orange en *La Nouvelle Hollande,*” and her parents, René Poupard dit Lafleur and his second wife, Marie Perrin of Amboy, New Jersey, were deceased when, in 1708, Madeleine had as godparents “Louis Deramezai [de Ramezay] Monnoir, son of Claude Deramezai, Occupation: chevalier de St-Louis, gouverneur de cette île, Residence: Montréal”; and “Marie Rocbert daughter of Etienne Rocbert, Occupation: garde-magasin du roi Residence: Montréal.”633 This godfather died on the Ouabache (Wabash) River, killed by the “Chéraquis” in 1716. A “French woman” in *Orange* believed she had information about him at the time he was reported as deceased, and she talked to Charles d'Auteuil about it. (See Part 8, where I speculate this Dame could have been Isabelle Couc, Madame Montour.) Madeleine Poupard’s godmother was daughter of the Rocbert who was ordered to release the écarlatines (red English stroud or duffel cloth) belonging to Isabelle’s sister in 1720. My scanning of the hospital’s records from 1712 on indicates Madeleine Poupard appears to have worked for the hospital many years. It is tempting to believe she would have been a possible informant that a position was opening there for Marie Anne. Madeleine’s brother, **Joseph Poupard**, husband of **Catherine Juillet**, had provided his home for the signing of Marie Anne’s brother’s, Michel Germaneau’s, marriage contract. (See Part 10.) Joseph Poupard had given “Madelon” lay baptism at her birth. The inter-relationships are amazing! But I have again digressed.

Three days after Jean Vermet was dismissed from the hospital, the records report for 16 August 1728:

*le 16° Marie Therese vermet de Montreal agée de 14 ans sortie le 21°* (5)

This is Jean Vermet’s daughter, baptized 1 June 1714 Montréal. Once again the origin given is her birth place, not her current residence at her father’s home on *rue du Sault du Matelot*. She would marry that very year, on 25 October 1728 at Québec City, to Antoine Fruitier from Paris.634

632 Madeleine is the daughter of René Poupard dit Lafleur (my ancestor by his first wife) and his second wife Marie Perrin of Amboy, New Jersey. See reference above. Could she possibly have influenced Marie Anne to apply to the hospital for work? As far as I can tell, she began working in the hospital about 1712, and is sometimes identified as *la petite Madelon*. She was still there in 1724 but not in 1726. She married Gaspard Munier, PRDH 164660 1732-11-23 Québec, but she apparently had forgotten her father’s name as he is called Joseph and not René. Her brother Joseph had given her lay baptism at her birth. Like Michel Germaneau and Marie Anne Germaneau / Montour, she may have had few, if any, memories of her father.

633 PRDH, and photocopy.

634 Marriage Antoine Fruitier & Marie Thérèse Vermet, 25 October 1728, photocopy. Present: “Joseph Dion des pres,” who signed “Joseph guyon despr…”; Charles tessier; jean vermette (signed *Vermet*); Maurice Coutu lau. Marriage contract 23 October, Dubreuil, Jetté. Son Antoine Fruitier baptized 15 Dec 1730 Montréal. Jean Vermet’s brother Jacques was at Detroit in 1703. Joseph Guyon Despres also went to Detroit several times. Son of François Guyon & Marie-Madeleine Marsolet, he had married in 1697 Marie-Madeleine Pettit (Jean & Marie Bailly), sister of Marie Anne Pettit, Madame Michel Lamy, who hired Marie Anne Montour in 1727, and also sister of Suzanne Pettit, Madame Jean Baptiste Morisseau. Joseph Guyon is a cousin of Thérèse Guyon, wife of Lamothe Cadillac. Jean Baptiste Morisseau, interpreter for the Iroquois by 1728, had visited the Susquehanna in 1726 at the time Madame Montour and her family may have been there. See post-script to Part 9. Note: The name of the Morisseau child baptized in 1728 is not Pierre-Amable, as I first recorded it, but his sister, Madeleine-Françoise. Pierre was born in 1729, when his father is still cited as interpreter for the Iroquois missions. Like everyone else, I too sometimes copy the name below the one I intended to copy! I have corrected the reference in this version.

Suzanne Boivin Sommerville, © 2014, all rights reserved
It is Marie-Thérèse’s mother, Jean Vermet’s wife, Geneviève Gauthier, who told Procurateur Raimbault that Marie Anne Germaneau abandoned her child, Nicolas René, for which reason she took Marie Anne’s child to Pierre Hurtubise and Marie Louise Beauvais, who promised to raise the child to age eighteen.635

None other than Joncaire, he who five years earlier had sanctioned the assassination of Montour, served as godfather in June of 1714 for Marie Thérèse, Geneviève Gauthier and Jean Vermet’s daughter.636

PRDH #44275 Montréal 1714-06-01 Birth : 1714-06-01
Rank Name Age M.S. Pr. Sex
01 MARIE THERESE VERMEIL --- c p f
------------------------------------------------------------------------
02 JEAN VERMEIL SPOUSE OF 03 FATHER OF 01 Occupation : PERRUQUIER --- m p m
------------------------------------------------------------------------
03 GENEVIEVE GAUTIER SPOUSE OF 02 MOTHER OF 01 --- m p f
------------------------------------------------------------------------
04 THOMAS DE JONQUAIRE Occupation : ECUYER, LIEUTENANT D'UNE COMPAGNIE DU DETACHEMENT DE LA MARINE --- --- p m
------------------------------------------------------------------------
05 CATHERINE JUCHERAU --- --- p f
------------------------------------------------------------------------
06 PRIAT Occupation : VICAIRE --- c p m
------------------------------------------------------------------------

Note the variant spellings of “Vermeil” for the “perruquier” (wigmaker) Vermet (both endings pronounced /may/, although the name is sometimes recorded as “Vermette” /met/); and “De Jonquaire” for “de Joncaire,” (Jean Coeur in New York records!) Catherine Juchereau seems to be the niece of Charlotte Françoise Juchereau, La Comtesse de Saint-Laurent (see my earlier reference to her), and the future wife (24 July 1718 Montréal) of Jean Baptiste LeGardeur, sieur de Repentigny, whose parents are Pierre LeGardeur and Agathe de Saint Père. She, with this son, attended Geneviève Massé’s 1727 marriage and also Françoise Massé’s 1731 marriage. (See Part 8) Pierre Legardeur was an engageur from 22 May 1715 to 5 June 1723. (What interesting conversations these individuals may have had among themselves. How I wish I could time-travel!)

A year later, in 1715, another Vermet daughter had equally remarkable godparents:

PRDH #44479 Montréal 1715-08-06 Birth :1715-08-06
Rank Name Age M.S. Pr. Sex
01 CATHERINE GENEVIEVE VERMET---cpf
------------------------------------------------------------------------
04 RAOUL MARIE PHILIDOR Occupation :SECRETAIRE DE M. DE RAMEZAY------pm
------------------------------------------------------------------------
05 DE RAMEZAY Occupation :GOUVERNEUR DE L'ILE DE MONTREAL Residence:ILE DE MONTREAL-------m
------------------------------------------------------------------------
06 CATHERINE CATIN DAUGHTER OF 07---cpf
------------------------------------------------------------------------
07 HENRI CATIN FATHER OF 06-------m
------------------------------------------------------------------------

635 17 Aug 1727 Adhémar. At the time of the contract, Pierre Hurtebise and his wife were said to be domiciled at the home of “Jacques Augé, rue Notre Dame”; witnesses: Jean Biron frenière, marchand; J. B. Daguihe; Etienne Desaunies; Nicolas René Chevalier, the godfather of illegitimate Nicolas René, also present and signing. Jean Biron dit Frenière also signed Françoise Massé’s wedding contract as a witness in 1731. See Part 8.
636 PRDH #44275 Montréal 1714-06-01 Birth: 1714-06-01 with Catherine Juchereau as godmother.
The secretary of de Ramezay would have had access to the governor’s papers in this period when Ramezay served as interim governor-general during Vaudreuil’s absence in France, a time when Ramezay communicated with Governor Hunter of New York. Madame Montour interpreted for Robert Hunter; her Iroquois husband, Carondowana, even took his name. Henri Catin’s daughter Thérèse Catin, sister of Catherine, first married Simon Réaume, interpreter active at Detroit and in the pays d’en haut, and then, much later, Charles Ruette d’Auteuil, who reported the message from La Dame, the French Lady in Orange, in 1716, this incident also taking place while Vaudreuil was in France.

Another of Catherine Catin’s sisters, Cécile Catin, la femme de Jacques Campeau, blew the whistle, so to speak, about the suspicious fire at Fort Pontchartrain in 1703, a fire that destroyed the original register of what became the parish of Ste. Anne de Detroit. Suffice it for now to say Campeau was eventually cleared of all charges of having falsely accused the perpetrator of the fire, something that is not usually reported when the story of the fire is presented. Even an annotation on the National Archives of Canada summary of the document is inaccurate. Campeau was convicted only of having maliciously lied about who set the fire but never accused of setting the fire himself. As it turns out, it seems he may not have lied about the man who set the fire, although at first he tried to cover for him. Campeau’s name was cleared on 18 February 1734, conveniently after both Cadillac and Alphonse de Tonty were deceased. A soldier in Tonty’s company, Pierre Roquan dit Laville, had confessed to Campeau that he, Roquan, set the fire at the instigation of Madame de Tonty. Campeau tried to protect Roquan and, especially Madame de Tonty, who, he said, was ill, by reporting that it was an Indian who had done the deed; but Campeau’s wife leaked the original story to government officials, setting off the official inquiry in 1706 that resulted in Campeau being fined and doing public penance for having maliciously accused Roquan. All witnesses at his original trial repeated Campeau’s “false” story. Cadillac himself maintained an Indian (or a Frenchman dressed as an Indian) had set the fire. The historians of Early Detroit sometimes report that “Indians” (plural) did the deed! Cadillac allegedly received burns and lost papers in the fire, items which may have revealed matters he did not want revealed concerning the trade practices at the fort for which he underwent a legal inquiry in 1704-05. And the register of religious acts at the fort up to that time was also destroyed in the fire. It is my firm belief that it was never recreated after it was lost again.

I must ask once again: What events that have not survived had been entered into that early register? Only a fragment now exists at the top of a page for an act in late 1703, October, before a new register begins with the entry on this page for the baptism of Marie Thérèse Lamothe Cadillac in February of 1704. The next surviving entry, for April 1704, is the first documentation of Isabelle Couc at the fort; and her second husband, Pierre Tichenet, also appears in an entry for 1704, even signing it.

To return to 1720, the godparents for a Vermet son include an important government official and the wife of Joncaire:

PRDH #45497 Montréal 1720-12-12 Birth :1720-12-11
Rank Name Age M.S. Pr. Sex
01 LOUIS VERMET---cpm


208
04 LOUIS JEAN LAUBINOIS DE TOURRENNE Occupation :ÉCUYER, FAISANT LES FONCTIONS DE COMMISSAIRE ORDONNATEUR DE LA MARINE

05 MADELEINE LE GUAY [wife of Joncaire]

The Vermet family certainly chose interesting godparents. Next, they lived in Boucherville, at least in 1725, where daughter Marie Anne was baptized in April, but the godmother’s name was not Marie Anne. Boucherville, as I have said, is the home of the Maurice Ménard family. One year later Nicolas René would be born and become a ward of the Hurtebises, given to them by the Vermets, before being taken into the care of the frères hospitalières two years later.

There is more to be told about the Vermets, which I will present in my next installment.

This section completed 14 November 2003, the 299th anniversary of Lamothe Cadillac’s 1704 Mémoire that inspired me to research his allegations about La femme de Tichenet revisions and additions in 2009 and 2014

638 MARIE ANNE Vermet, PRDH #3535 Boucherville 1725-04-09 Birth : 1725-04-09, godparents: Pierre Veroneau & Helene Gautier. Neither godparent gave his or her first name to the girl baby named Marie Anne.

Suzanne Boivin Sommerville, © 2014, all rights reserved
In the last installment, I identified the interesting people Jean Vermet and his wife chose to serve as godparents for their children. But there was more for me to learn about Jean Vermet and his wife.

Jean Vermet, Thief?

A thick set of documents I have in my possession concern, first, a trial held in Québec City to determine the guilt or innocence in a charge of theft made against eighteen-year-old Marie Anne Magnan dite Lespérance, a *dit* name that, ironically, means hope. The trial, beginning in February of 1730, was held shortly after Marie Anne Montour’s marriage and eventually merged into a second inquiry into the death by suicide of Marie Anne Magnan *dit* Lespérance in June of 1730. She had been held in the prison of Québec City from February to her death in June. I cannot here divulge all the particulars concerning these inquiries, which I present in a separate article in *Michigan’s Habitant Heritage*, January 2004; but, when asked whether anyone had ever encouraged her to steal from the other families who employed her, she mentioned Jean Vermet, wigmaker, and his wife, among others.

She had visited the Vermet home and testified that while she worked for Damoiselle Frontigny, Vermet encouraged her to steal from her employer and “to carry what she stole to [Vermet’s] house. She said he...

---

639 See my article in *Michigan’s Habitant Heritage* (hereafter MHH), the Journal of the French-Canadian Heritage Society of Michigan, Volume 25, #1, January 2004. Also at http://habitanthertiage.org on Individual and Families section. Marie Anne Lespérance gave her age as about seventeen, and stated that her occupation was “couturière et Vagabonde,” seamstress and vagabond. She had earlier lived with her uncle Hervieux. (Léonard *dit* Jean Baptiste Hervieux, a merchant, had married her father’s sister, Catherine Magnan.) Marie Anne Magnan knew her father and mother were deceased. I do not know whether she was aware she had been born in 1712 and baptized 23 September 1714, at about two-and-a-half years old, the daughter of Jean Magnan *dit* Lespérance and Marie, a Sioux Indian. Her father died and was buried 31 December 1719 at Montréal. PRDH. Marie Anne was not the only illegitimate child he had and whom he acknowledged. His last will and testament acknowledged her and two boys, Jean and Antoine, and provided for them to inherit 500 livres each from his estate. “Testament de Jean Maignan *dit* Lespérance,” 7 October 1719, Notary David, ANQ, photocopy. Both Jean, age seven, and Antoine, age four, were baptized at Michilimackinac on 12 July 1713. Their baptisms are recorded in the portion of a surviving register that was copied sometime after 1741 from a no-longer surviving original source. No mothers’ names are given. Jean the son apparently married Rose, a “Sauteuse de la Pointe” Indian (Chippewa), 30 August 1749 at Michilimackinac, and had their children legitimized and baptized: Alexis, about eight; Anne Esther, about six; and Marie Joseph, about three. Photocopy. Jean Magnan the father’s brother, Antoine Magnan *dit* Lespérance, traveled to and lived and worked for a time at Fort Pontchartrain, and he himself appears to have fathered an illegitimate daughter there. This daughter has erroneously been assigned to another “Lespérance,” Bonaventure Compain *dit* Lespérance, husband of Catherine Badaillec *dit* Laplante, a couple who were long-gone from Fort Pontchartrain by the time of the baptism of the illegitimate girl, for whom paternity is now attributed to Compain in the indexes. See MHH, January 2004.

640 Marie Madeleine de Lajoue had married Pierre Frontigny *dit* Ménich in 1715. He died in 1728, and she did not remarry until about a month before the trial, on 7 January 1730 at Ste. Foye, to Gilbert Boucault *dit* Godefus. Her first husband had been *maître d’hôtel de Bégon* and merchant in 1720; and then he was writer for the legal body, la Maréchaussée de Québec, in 1725. Jetté. See DCB II for her father François and DCB III for her second husband and his brother, Nicolas-Gaspard Boucault, who was secretary for Bégon 1719-1726.
took away with him three pots of brandy (eau de vie) she had carried out of La Frontigny’s cellar (cave). Without her participation and secretly, he had also taken several pewter plates, two bottles, and two turkeys [d’indes], hidden in a basket.” Once, having gone to the Vermet home, she recognized several dishes belonging to La Frontigny, and “she took them back despite the said Vermet, in the presence of la nommée Belair, and la nommée St. Andrés, and returned the said dishes and bottles into the hands of the said Belaire to take them to M. Bouard [if I am reading this accurately, he is a priest] to have them returned by him to La Frontigny.” I do not yet know who the women “Belair” and “St. Andrés” are with any certainty.

Marie Anne Magnan also testified that

François Lafontaine, who lived at the home of le Sr Walon, was also solicited by the said Vermet to steal from him [Walon] and to carry the stolen property to him [Vermet], that she, the respondent, herself saw this young woman take to the said Vermet several items of merchandise, some turkeys, capons, and wine that the wife of Vermet came herself to get in the Kitchen of Sr Walon, which the girl gave her [the wife of Vermet], and that she [François] left by night by way of the kitchen window to go eat turkey and other fowl with the said Vermet and his wife, and that the respondent went there herself and ate with him, and that this commerce continued during all the time this girl [François Lafontaine] lived with Sr. Walon.

A Marie Francoise Lafontaine served as godmother for Antoine Fruitier, son of Marie Therese Vermet, Jean Vermet’s daughter, and Antoine Fruitier, on 15 December 1730.

If Marie Anne Magnan is to be believed, the Vermet home was a den of thieves! Before she implicated the Vermets in wrong-doing, she had already confessed her own guilt, indicating that in committing her theft she had sought revenge against her uncle, named Hervieux, who had mistreated her, she said, so she was not seeking any excuse for her deed. I am not aware at this time of any legal action taken against the Vermets.

641 ANQ-Q, #832. The daughter of Pierre André, sieur de Leinge, the official interrogating Marie Anne Magnan, herself has a most interesting history. See DBC, Vol III: 14, for Michel Paquin’s account of her life, which reads, in this article, like a New France version of Scarlett O’Hara! “Her father held the important office of Lieutenant general for civil and criminal affairs of the provost court of Quebec, and it seems the young girl had all the charms necessary for attracting penniless young officers, by whom she was continually courted. She much preferred their company to that of richer suitors whom her father favoured.” In 1731, her father decided to ship her off to France, but, disguised “as a man she succeeded in fleeing, aided by two of her suitors. The next day the frivolous creature changed her mind and returned to the ship.” [Note the slanted language!] She stayed in France for a year. At the age of thirty-two in 1741, she married René Ovide Hertel, who is said to “assist the bride” at Marie Thérèse Véron Grandmesnil and Pierre Baby’s marriage contract in 1748. Dame Louise Catherine André also signed the contract. Pierre Baby offered a douaire préfix (dowry) of two thousand livres. See my articles: “Marie Lepage & Etienne Veron Grandmesnil: Rush to Judgement? An Example of Misinterpreted Evidence.” Michigan’s Habitant Heritage 22, no. 1 (January 2001): 25-34. “Marie Lepage & Etienne Véron Grandmesnil: Rush to Judgement? An Example of Misinterpreted Evidence (Part 2).” Michigan’s Habitant Heritage 22, no. 2 (April 2001): 72-81. “Marie Lepage and Etienne Véron Grandmesnil: Rush to Judgement? An Example of Misinterpreted Evidence (Conclusion).” Michigan’s Habitant Heritage 22, no. 3 (July 2001): 114-123. [These articles are, in 2014, on the FCHSM website.] René Ovide Hertel himself is cousin of Etienne Véron Grandmesnil, who declared himself as such when he was present at René Ovide’s most interesting marriage, one his mother opposed, as recorded at length in the registers at Québec 11 October 1741 and in the records of the Conseil Supérieur. PRDH and photocopies.

642 PRDH #145237Montréal 1730-12-15. Thomas Goulet was godfather.
Since the two Marie Annes knew the Vermets, I have to believe Marie Anne Magnan knew Marie Anne Montour. Like Isabelle’s daughter, Marie Anne Magnan had also left Montréal, as she testified, to seek work in Québec, in her case as a seamstress. Perhaps she even knew the father of Marie Anne’s son Jean Baptiste, born in 1730 while Marie Anne Magnan was in prison, and possibly that Marie Anne Montour had left a child in Montréal in the care of the frères hospitalières. Women might tell each other details they would reveal to no one else. Marie Anne Magnan’s own lover, a soldier in the company of Lantinac, married while she was in prison. One of the witnesses at her trial was a soldier in the company of Captain Rigaud, Jean Montary’s captain.

A Frère Hospitalière in the Records of the Hospital in Québec City

You can imagine my state of mind when I found the next person also appearing at the hospital in Québec in September 1728 when Marie Anne Montour was servante:

le 6e Mr Louis Turc dit Chretien de Martigues agé de 40 ans sorti le 21e (15)643

He was in charge of the Charon hospital of the frères hospitalières where Marie Anne’s son, Nicolas René, was placed that very year, 1728. (I do not, of course, know whether they ever met, but I truly must restrain myself from imagining conversations between this director of the Montréal hospital and a young woman who may have seen him while he was at the Québec hospital, a woman whose son had recently been left at his institution.)

A Priest with Ties to the Illinois Documented at the Hospital in Québec City

As I continued to examine the microfilm of these hospital records, I had trouble believing what I was seeing, the coming together of all of these individuals associated with the Montary / Montour marriage and with Marie Anne’s child Nicolas René. Then I was absolutely flabbergasted to find the name of Father Dominique Thaumur dit LaSource present at the hospital, performing baptisms there, and even signing the records, thus authenticating them. I had seen his signature before.

Dominique Thaumur dit LaSource

Dominique Thaumur dit LaSource, members of whose family established themselves at Kaskaskia in Illinois territory, first appears in the hospital entries just after the record for Louis Turc dit Chrétien. On 7 September, a Negro named Leveillé, from the Islands, “leveillé neigre des Illes,” about nine years old, belonging to Mr. Guillemin, entered the hospital and remained twenty-three days that month. He was baptized on the 24th with the first name Joseph Marie and identified as from Martinique. His “owner” is identified as Conseiller au Conseil Superieur of Québec. Godparents were Sr. François Mauberg, soldier of the Company of Mr. de Beaujeu, and Mademoiselle Charlotte Le Gardeur, both of whom signed with the priest of the seminary, D. Thaumur.644

643 See DCB II entry for François Charon de La Barre, founder of the hospital, who died aboard Le Chameau returning from France in 1719, where he had recruited men. He had named Louis Turc as one of the masters, maîtres, of his school. Monseigneur Saint-Vallier appointed Turc, who took the name Frère Chrétien, superior of the community, which he led from 1720 to 1735. See also article about Turc in DCB III.

644 FHL #1287130, p. 165. The next page includes an intriguing entry for the 20th: “Mr. Nicolas Auguste Gillet Chaumont de Paris agé de 32 ans secrétaire de Mr. Daigremont (10 days)”. François Clairambault d’Aigremont had written the 1708 report on conditions at Fort Pontchartrain, the one that conveys the testimony that “La Chenette” had deserted with Bourgmont and that they were living like Indians. “Daigremont” himself died at Québec, 1
I had seen Thaumur’s signature before on the 24 May 1728 marriage contract of Pierre Chesne and Marie Madeleine Roy. Marie Madeleine Roy and her sister Marguerite Roy, Isabelle’s godchild of 1704 and thus Marie Anne Montour’s “spiritual” sister, were both born at Fort Pontchartrain.\footnote{645}

When Father Thaumur signed the 24 September 1728 record in Québec at Hôtel-Dieu, he had recently arrived from having written the marriage contract for Pierre Roy and Marguerite 8abanKiK8é’s daughter Madeleine Roy and Pierre Chesne in the Roy home at Miami Mission St Philippe (modern-day Fort Wayne, Indiana). He performed the marriage ceremony there the next day, 25 May.\footnote{646} Mother and father were present, and two Roy sisters, as well as others, also attended and signed. Father Thaumur most probably stopped at Fort Pontchartrain to insert the marriage record in the registers of Sœur Anne du Détroit. (The fort’s church was officially known by this name first in 1718 and then continuously from 1721 on.) This was not his first visit there. He had been at the fort before. In 1718 Father Thaumur left the mother colony with Abbés Goulven Calvarin and Jean Paul Mercier for the mission of the Tamarois (Cahokia, Illinois). All of these men passed through Fort Pontchartrain and, as I discovered, they signed the register in August of 1718 when they baptized several Indians.\footnote{647} Ten years later, as he traveled toward Québec City in 1728, Thaumur then paused again in Montréal on 30 July, to deposit with the notary J. B. Adhémar the marriage contract he had written on 24 May 1728\footnote{648} before continuing his voyage.

On 13 October 1728 Thaumur appears again at the hospital as “La source,” his dit name, priest of the seminary, pretre du seminaire. He is there again for thirty days in November, thirty-one days in December of 1728, and then for twelve days (nineteen days absent) in January 1729, Marie Anne’s last month as servante. Where was he during the nineteen absent days? And did they correspond with the end of the month? Marie Anne was gone by the end of January.

Thaumur was again at the hospital four months later, in May of 1729, at “different times” for 20 days, the same month Montary was there.\footnote{649} An entry three months after that, for August 17\textsuperscript{th}, reads:

\begin{flushleft}
oût 1729\footnote{650}
17\textsuperscript{th} baptism of Joseph Marie La Piace [sic, La Place?], sauvage de Nation, belonging to a mr de La Ronde Capitaine, about seventeen or eighteen years old, sufficiently instructed, godparents Joseph St Amour & Angelique fortier. D. Thaumur ptre
\end{flushleft}

December 1728, buried on the 4\textsuperscript{th}, while Marie Anne Montour served at the hospital. See DCB II. The interconnections and coincidences are so convoluted! I dare say they would not be believed in a novel.\footnote{645} See my article on Marguerite Roy in MHH, Volume 24, #4, October 2003.\footnote{646} Inserted as a loose sheet of paper, p. 204, within the register proper between entries by Frère Bonaventure for 13 June and 24 September 1728, page 204. Ste. Anne de Detroit, Detroit Public Library, Burton Library, microfilm #1252, vol. 1, Photocopy. The Chesne couple is then documented at the fort.\footnote{647} Pages 63-67 of original register.\footnote{648} Church ceremony for Madeleine Roy, daughter of Pierre Roy and Marguerite 8abanKiK8é, and Pierre Chesne took place on 25 April 1728 at St Philippe, Village des Miamis, present-day Fort Wayne, Indiana. Father Dominique Thaumur wrote the marriage contract in the home of Pierre Roy on the previous day, 24 May, carrying it to the notary J. B. Adhémar in Montréal by 30 July 1728, and, during his return to the mother colony, he apparently left the church record at Ste. Anne du Détroit to be placed in its registers or perhaps the newly-married couple carried it with them, as they are next documented there. (Ste. Anne, p. 204) Jetté and PRDH inaccurately guess the marriage occurred at Detroit, another example of partial information becoming fact. See J. B. Adhémar’s notation of receiving the contract on 30 July 1728. Photocopy.\footnote{649} FHL #1287130, p. 182.
And he once again signed. I certainly have no proof Father Thaumur and Marie Anne ever spoke, but the “coincidence” is again striking.

Thaumer died at Québec 4 April 1731 and was buried the next day in the cathedral. According to a contemporary report by Bertrand de Latour, everyone considered him a saint and wanted “to touch their rosaries to his body, & tear his clothing to have relics.”

A Digression: an Illustration of the Problem of Duplicate Names: the Two Priests Named Chardon

But Thaumur’s was not the only signature surviving on the register of the hospital. In January of 1729, the last month Marie Anne Montour is recorded as servante for all 31 days, the baptisms of two “enfants sauvages” are recorded. They had been given as a present to Mr. le Marquis de Beauharnois, the then-governor and the one who, that very year, feared the influence of “Le Germano” and his wife on the Lydius family, as described above. (See Part 8) These sauvages children were baptized on 17 January, both of them by Chardon prêtre.

When I saw this record, I believed that Father Jean Baptiste Chardon, like Father Thaumur, had returned to Québec recently. I knew he had left his post at Baie des Puants (La Baie or Green Bay, Wisconsin), “which was burned by Constant Le Marchand de Lignery on his return from his expedition against the Renards / Foxes, an expedition Marie Anne’s brother, Michel Germaneau, contracted to join.” Earlier, this same Father Chardon had been missionary to the Ottawas at Michilimackinac “at the time when peace with the Iroquois was being signed in Montreal,” 1701, and went then to Baie des Puants, from which he served the pays d’en haut for thirty-two years, in 1711 visiting the post “on the St Joseph River, temporarily replacing Father Claude Aveneau.” I knew that Cadillac had removed Father Aveneau from the St Joseph Miamis post in 1707, the year of Isabelle Couc’s probable defection. The early registers for this Miamis post—sometimes called des Illinois—have not survived, but it is easy to speculate that Marie Anne Germaneau / Montour could have been born and baptized there before 1704, “origin” Illinoise. Her mother is documented at Fort Pontchartrain with Pierre Tichenet and with Pierre Roy and his Miami wife in 1704. Marie Anne Montour’s sacramental marriage in 1730 would not have occurred without some evidence that she had been baptized.

---

650 FHL #1287130, p. 190. The child died the next day. Angélique Fortier appears earlier on the page as having entered the 12th of the same month, from Montréal, 25 years old, left on the 29th. St Amour appears to be an infirmier or nurse, p. 188.
651 See Noël Baillargeon, “Thaumur de La Source, Dominique-Antoine-René,” DCB II.
652 FHL #1287130, p. 174.
653 FHL #1287130, p. 175. They were named Charles Louis, Sauvage Renard de nation, about six years old, with godparents jean francois Tisserant escuyer sr de mont chevreux & Damoiselle Louise duroy, both of whom signed; and Barbe Charlotte Sauvagesse panis [sic] de nation about ten years old, godparents: Sr jean louis Volant maistre d’hospital de Mr le general & Charlotte du Roy espouse du sr Basile Marchand de cette Ville.” This Volant does not appear to be related to the other Volants of New France who were so involved with Fort Pontchartrain. Jetté identifies him as from St-Germain-en-Laye, archdiocese of Paris, m Barbe Duroy, contract LaCetière 4 April 1727 Québec. Panis and panisse are terms for the Pawnee Indians, often taken as slaves by other Indians, the name sometimes used indiscriminately for all Indian slaves. Not all panis are slaves, though.
654 See 5 June 1728, J. B. Adhémar, #2437, ANQ photocopy, referenced above in Part 10.
655 See Joseph Cossette, “Chardon, Jean-Baptiste, priest, Jesuit, missionary,” DCB III. Chardon had a long and distinguished career among the Natives.
I also knew that, unlike Father Thaumur, who died in Québec at the hospital 4 April 1731, Father Chardon, if he left Baie des Puants before 1729 to go to Québec, was elsewhere in March of 1729. Father Jean Baptiste Chardon somehow voyaged to the St Joseph Miamis Mission, although the Dictionary of Canadian Biography says “little is known about the missionary’s activities [after the burning of his mission] until 1733.” There, on 8 March 1729, he baptized Joseph, son of Jean Baptiste Baron voyageur de la paroisse de boucherville de present etabli en ce poste, voyageur from the parish of Boucherville at present established in this post, and Marie Catherine 8ekioukoué, married to each other en face de l’église, in the presence of a Church representative, with godparents “Mr. Louis Coulon de Villiers fils and Marie Rhéaume, daughter of Sieur Jean Baptiste Rhéaume, interprete, and of Simphorose ouaouagoukoué, married to each other in the presence of the Church.” This is the only

656 Registers of Mission de la Riviére Saint-Joseph des Illinois (This is how the mission is identified on the microfilm.), FHL #1018092. Gabriel Bolon appears in the register of the Hôtel-Dieu in September of 1723 as a member of the Company of St. Pierre. This appears to be Jean Paul Legardeur, sieur de Saint Pierre, brother-in-law of Agathe de Saint Père, and interpreter for Lignery in the war against the Fox in 1716. Sabrevois referred to him in his 1717 letter as interpreting that year with Maurice Ménard. (See Part 10) Saint Pierre himself died circa 1722-23, but not before he had met Charlevoix on his famous voyage. DCB II. Bolon entered Hôtel-Dieu on the 30th of August, “gabriel ballon agé de 17 ans de Xainte Soldat,” and stayed two days. On 2 September, he left the hospital. On the 17th of September, “gabriel ballon [now] agé de 18 ans de Xainte Soldat” entered and left on the 17th (sic) but is recorded as having stayed 10 days, apparently an error on the exit date. FHL #1287130. Marguerite Couc, Marie Anne Montour’s and Suzanne Ménard’s aunt, is documented at Mission de la Riviére St. Joseph des Miamis and des Illinois from 1720 to 1723, and a Marie Fafard with her husband, Louis Metivier, master carpenter, served as godparents there 5 June 1745 for the baptism of a Miami, Mekabik8nya, 50, and a Miamise named madelon, about 50, who were also married that day. Both Louis Metivier and “Mari ffar” signed. This appears to be Marie Madeleine Fafar, another daughter of Marguerite Couc, the one who gave birth to an illegitimate child in 1723 (See Part 11). A Marie Angélique Métievier served as godmother for Marie Anne’s child in 1730.

657 There is some controversy as to whether this “Marie Rhéaume” is the Marie Madeleine Réaume who married, first, Augustin Larcheveque, and then Louis Chevallier, with children baptized at Michilimackinac and at St Joseph Miamis. Marthe Faribault-Beauregard claims the wife of Larcheveque and Chevallier is the daughter of Robert Réaume and not of his brother, Jean-Baptiste, as does PRDH, following Faribault-Beauregard. I do not know who is correct, but if Faribault-Beauregard is right, Susan Sleeper-Smith’s thesis about Marie-Madeleine’s kin-network of Natives must be called into question at least in this example. See her Indian Women and French Men, Rethinking Cultural Encounter in the Western Great Lakes, Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001. She, too, cites Jean Baptiste and Symphorose as the parents of Marie Madeleine, but they had at least three documented daughters, two of whom married, and Sleeper-Smith does not establish any “kin-network” between them and Madeleine Réaume, nor does she mention Jean Baptiste’s documented daughters as Madeleine’s sisters: Judith Réaume, mentioned only once in a summarized baptismal record, 27 June 1725 at Michilimackinac; Suzanne Réaume, m. Charles Joseph Personne 1 July 1747; and Marie Joseph Réaume m. Jean Baptiste Jourdain, 1746, both marriages at Michilimackinac, with the brides from “La Baye,” now Green Bay, Wisconsin. PRDH and photocopies. One would think sisters would be involved in any trade alliances. It is possible the “Marie” of 1729 is Marie-Joseph. A baptism record for a Madeleine, daughter of either Robert or Jean Baptiste has not survived. I nonetheless see a ghostly resemblance between the 1729 signature of “Marie” and the signatures of Marie Madeleine Réaume in later years. Perhaps handwriting analysis could resolve the dilemma. Note: PRDH has subsequently accepted Jean Baptiste as Madeleine’s father, not Robert, as a result of James Paquette’s research.

The father of this “Marie” Réaume, though, is definitely Jean Baptiste Réaume, interpreter at Baie des Puants (Green Bay, Wisconsin), who would have known Father Chardon when he was there and most likely traveled with him from La Baie to St Joseph. Jean Baptiste is also brother of Simon Réaume, husband of Thérèse Catin, who later married Charles d’Auteuil, sieur de Mousseaux, and brother of Robert Réaume, my ancestor, who accompanied Mesdames Cadillac and Tony to Detroit in 1701. Jean Baptiste, Simon and Robert Réaume are sons of René Réaume. Robert, husband of Elisabeth Brunet dite Belhumeur, are my ancestors through their daughter Judith m. 1726 Jacques Lalande.
extant entry signed by Chardon in these no-longer-complete registers, although he is said to have served there much earlier before the surviving original register begins in the 1720s.

Believing I had located Father Chardon in Québec in January of 1729, I had to ask myself why a voyage to Miami country was undertaken so early in the season. Normally, canoes traveling to the pays d’en haut would not be able to leave the mother colony until after the ice had melted, often into April or May, but I have read in the official correspondence of individuals being sent up earlier traveling over the ice. It seemed to me to be surely too much of a stretch to suggest he had gone to locate Marie Anne Montour’s baptismal record! (I do have a strong imagination!)

All of this pure speculation came to a crashing halt when I found another record for March of 1729 at the parish church of Notre Dame with the identical “Chardon” signature of the hospital’s record. Jean Baptiste Chardon could not have been present at both Saint-Joseph and Québec in the same month. After carefully comparing the handwriting on both of the March of 1729 records, I finally learned there was another Father Chardon, Louis, who was ordained in 1726 at Québec. 658

I include this almost-fatal error of mine to remind myself I am not immune from the mistakes I have presented in this series of articles and to demonstrate the need for precision in definitively identifying individuals. I so wanted the Chardon at the hospital to be Father Jean Baptiste Chardon, in part, because another entry in the Saint Joseph register, one which comes just before the March of 1729 one, involves another granddaughter of Pierre Couc. It is the baptism 23 April 1728 of Marie Louise Bolon, daughter of Marie Anne Montour’s cousin, Suzanne Ménard, and her husband Gabriel Bolon, with the same Jean Baptiste Baron & Catherine 8eKiouKoué of 1729 as godparents. This entry was signed by the Jesuit Mésaiger. After the 8 March 1729 baptism, the next fairly legible, complete entry occurred some time in 1730, the baptism of a son, name unreadable, of Gabriel Bolon and Susanne Ménard, followed by an entry for 25 November 1730, the baptism of Susanne, daughter of Jean Baptiste Baron & Marie Catherine 8eKiouKoué, with the commandant of the post, Louis Coulon de Villiers, as godfather and Suzanne Ménard, wife of Bolon, as godmother, both entries by Father Mésaiger. Father Jean Baptiste Chardon’s whereabouts in 1730 remain unknown.

By then, Suzanne Ménard’s cousine Marie Anne Montour, and her son, had departed this earthly life.

Marie Anne Montour’s Death

Leaving so many questions unanswered by extant records located to this date, Marie Anne Montour died a few days after the birth of her son Jean Baptiste Montary and possibly as a result of the birth:

+ Marie Anne Montour

Le Vingt troisieme Avril milSept cent trente a ete enterrée dans le cimetiere de ce lieu Marie Anne Montour femme du nommé Jean Montary dit Jolicoeur décedée le jour precedent après avoi reçu Les derniers sacrament dans sa maladie agée d’environ trente cinq ans Presens Monsieur Couvier, Prestre & autres
[Signed] Boullard Curé de Quebec 659

658 Jetté. See also Pelletier, p. 222.
659 FHL film #1289908
The twenty-third of April seventeen hundred and thirty was buried in the cemetery of this place Marie Anne Montour, wife of the man named Jean Montary dit Jolicoeur, deceased the previous day after having received the last sacraments in her illness, age about thirty-five. Present: Monsieur Couvier, Pastor, and others. (Signed) Boulland Curé de Quebec.

Oh, how I wish Father Boulland (who may be the one to whom Marie Anne Magnan entrusted stolen goods) had entered the names of the OTHERS! Whatever sins or errors haunted her journey in this world, Marie Anne left it with the blessings of the sacrament of Extreme Unction, now called Last Rites, reconciled with her Heavenly Father according to her understanding of her religious obligations. Her mother would survive another twenty-two years and most likely did not receive the Last Rites.

Marie Anne Germeneau / Montour and “La Motte”

Despite the questions that may remain about whether these Marie Annes are two different women, the extant signatures of Marie Anne Germeneau and Marie Anne Montour lead me to believe they were signed by the same woman, even to mis-spelling the first letters of Marie as Mair….

The conflicting citations of her “origin” – Anglaise de nation on the marriage in 1730 and Illinoise at the hospital in 1727 – indicate to me that she was definitely born outside of the mother colony. Whether the recorder in 1730 gave her origin as Anglaise because of her mother’s “residence” in Orange or whether Marie Anne was not forthcoming as to her actual birthplace – if she knew it – will never be known. She is nevertheless associated with both areas. My belief is that she was born at Mission Saint Joseph des Miamis, modern-day Niles, Michigan, before her mother was documented at Fort Pontchartrain in 1704, when Pierre Tichenet was also documented there. I believe she and her brother, Michel, were with their mother at that time. Even Cadillac, in 1704, says she had (plural) children. Records for the earliest years of the St Joseph mission are missing and may well have been destroyed when Lamothe Cadillac prevented Jesuit Father Aveneau from returning there in 1707, as I have already suggested. If Antoine

660 That Cadillac sent a récollet to serve the Miamis at a new position closer to the English and refused to allow Father Aveneau, Jesuit, to return to St Joseph can be found in Mémoire du Roi à Vaudreuil et Raudot, 6 June 1708, signed Pontchartrain (RAPQ transcription, and photocopy of original), and in other correspondence. Word had obviously reached France the previous year, 1707. Neither the king nor Pontchartrain was pleased by Cadillac’s tactics. The historians of Detroit, for the most part, have ignored this episode.

Before inviting the Miamis to go to a place on the Maurepas, 12 lieues from Detroit, Cadillac had sent Sieur Boucher to ask the Miami to settle on the land across the river from the fort at present-day Windsor, Ontario. This Maurepas River, probably named by Cadillac to honor the man who would soon become Minister of the Marine, is now believed to be modern-day Maumee; but it is more likely River Raisin and most probably at a place then called Saint Antoine de Pades, perhaps after Antoine Lamothe Cadillac.) The Miami had left the fort after the Ottawa and Huron attacked them in June of 1706. Boucher, on a document dated 14 November 1706, was to tell the Miamis: “It would be good for you to come and establish yourselves close to me on the other side of the river vis a vis my village. If you come I will make a fort near your fire [word unreadable] and palisades [des palisades]. I will put there Frenchmen and chiefs and [word unreadable] nearby to place your elderly, your women and children in safety when you are away at the hunt or elsewhere. By the means of these two forts and of our village not a single canoe will be able to pass through our river without our allowing them to do so. I will keep boats and cannon at the foot of the two forts so that we can promptly give you help it it is needed. The French will never quit these two forts and our bones will be mixed with yours forever. As a mark of my friendship for you, I [will?] send one of my sons to you so that he can learn your language and to make an alliance with you that will never end. Do not trust the Poutoutamis and Sakis allied with the Outouais. Burn the fort of the Poutoutamis if you have not already done so, the one au bas du riviere St Joseph, at the lower part of the St. Joseph River. Do not unearth the bones of their dead
La Motte dit de Lamothe Cadillac is the “La Motte” cited in 1730 as father of Marie-Anne, he may have been motivated by more than political reasons when he aroused the wrath of Pontchartrain by ordering this Jesuit away from his mission.\footnote{NAC, AC C11^A Vol. 24, NAC microfilm F-24, f.200v, photocopy.} This and the fact that Jean Montary is from Castelsarrasin, where Cadillac served as mayor about the time Montary may have been recruited, is certainly at least circumstantially suspicious. Where did the 3000 livres come from for Montary, apparently still a simple soldier, to offer as a douaire? Another question that will never be answered! It is also circumstantially interesting that Pierre Tichenet, Isabelle’s second husband, is the son of Alexandre Téchenay (Jetté’s spelling, which PRDH standardizes as TINCHENET), who was also from near Castelsarrasin in Gascogne, near Cadillac’s origin and place of baptism.\footnote{Alexandre Tichenet from Castelsarrasin married Marie Bouillon from Saintonge, widow Mathurin Touillault, on 16 August 1668 at Québec. See Part 5. Antoine Laumet was born at Laumont near Caumont, baptized 5 March 1658 at St-Nicholas-de-la-Grave, arrondissement of Castelsarrasin. PRDH.} But the possibilities are only that, possibilities…

If Marie Anne was born or baptized at Fort Pontchartrain, though, I also cannot ignore the fact that Cadillac proclaimed that a son his wife gave birth to in 1702 was the \textit{first child born} at the fort. Historians and genealogists have assumed the 1702 child died, just as Cadillac feared he would. Nevertheless, according to Cadillac, certainly an authoritative source in this instance, the baby that Marie-Thérèse Guyon was expected to deliver shortly after her husband left the fort to go to Québec on business very definitely survived after his birth in the summer of 1702. The baptism record for this son, Joseph Lamothe Cadillac, is also missing. Four years later, though, in 1706 on 30 September, Lamothe Cadillac wrote to Pontchartrain from the fort, saying he had his four-year-old son with him (thus born in 1702). Cadillac refers to this four-year-old as the \textit{first child} born at the fort. He then says His Majesty had promised a pension to the first-born at a new settlement, and he requests the pension; or, if the pension is not granted, he asks the King to enroll this four-year-old in the troops and pay him as the other soldiers are paid.

because they are not \textit{coupables}, responsible.” My translation. AC C11^A, Vol. 24 (1706), NAC microfilm F-24, ff. 365-366. Note: Cadillac is not here following his own much-cited plan to have the Indians learn French. This may be one of the earliest references to a plan to settle the South Shore of the Detroit River. I am not aware the Miamis ever accepted this invitation, but there is extant evidence that Father Chérubin Deniau and Pierre Roy were at a Miami mission called \textit{St Antoine de Pades} (St. Anthony of Padua, possibly named after \textit{Antoine Lamothe Cadillac}) in the fall of 1707. Near the end of the entries for 1711 of a St. Anne de Detroit register of Indian baptisms, Chérubin Deniau, \textit{prêtre missionnaire Récollet}, entered three records for baptisms he had performed four years earlier, in 1707, at what Father Deniau identifies as the mission of \textit{Saint Antoine de Pades aux Miamis}, and he certified these additions on 25 November \textbf{1711} at Fort Pontchartrain. (FHL 126, Original, p.135) Pierre Roy was the godfather in each instance for two Miami infants and one adult Miami. It is even possible that his wife, Marguerite 8abanK8é, served as godmother and named the Miami daughters, both baptized as Marie-Anne, he may have disobeyed Pontchartrain’s order to go immediately overland to \textit{Louisiane}.
Pontchartrain's annotation is very hard to read, but I think he rejects the request, at least I have, as of this writing, seen no further mention of it.\textsuperscript{663}

Cadillac was aware that Pierre Roy, husband of Marguerite 8abanKiK8é, the man left in charge of his Detroit property in 1711, had left Fort Pontchartrain, or, as Cadillac claims, been “driven away” from the fort. Word did travel back and forth between the New and the Old Worlds and within the New World, most of which personal correspondence has been lost. Interestingly, Cadillac visited Illinois territory, traveling from Fort Louis to Kaskaskia in 1715,\textsuperscript{664} to investigate a mine that may have been originally located by Mainville, first husband of Catherine Lescuyer, wife of Michel Germameau in her second marriage in 1717, just as he reportedly found a mine on the Ouabache / Wabash.

Whether Cadillac’s assessment of Pierre Roy’s reasons for leaving Fort Pontchartrain is accurate or not, Cadillac, once back in France in 1717-18, pursued his demands for payment for the real and personal property he had to abandon when he was appointed to serve in Louisiane. His appeal resulted in partial payment from the king by 1722. Grandmesnil the younger was his agent all those years, first hired in 1705 to go to the fort with Bourgmont and named Cadillac’s representative in the mother colony in July of 1709, just days after the baptism of the first illegitimate child recorded at Fort Pontchartrain, a girl, Marie Thérèse, born on the eighth anniversary of the founding of Detroit, 24 July 1709, and apparently named after her cousin and godmother, Thérèse David, but perhaps after Cadillac’s wife.

This Marie Thérèse’s mother, Marie Lepage, is identified on the baptismal record as the widow of deceased Beausseron. Marie Lepage is the only woman granted property at the fort by Cadillac. This occurred in March of 1707 before her husband’s death and at the same time he was conceded property outside of the fort. She had married soldier François Bosseron / Beauceron (Laurent & Anne Dumaine) on 12 June 1706 Montréal, and they voyaged to the fort with the large convoy of that year. His death record is not extant, but several individuals died during a 1708 Miami attack near the fort, none of which deaths appear as burials in the register as it now exists.

At her baptism, the infant’s, Marie Thérèse’s, father is said to be Étienne Véron Grandmesnil (the younger), Cadillac’s clerk, who then left the fort to travel to the mother colony, empowered by a hand-

\textsuperscript{663} See MHH, April 2003, for my account of locating this reference. At the time I wrote this April of 2003 article, I was unaware of another fact concerning Captain Rigaud, born 8 February 1703 at Montréal, son of Governor-general Rigaud, sieur de Vaudreuil, Cadillac’s “enemy;” and Louise Élisabeth de Joybert de Soulanges and de Marson: “his father had him appointed at the age of five [1708] to the company of gentlemen midshipmen, despite the regulation that candidates be 18.” DCB IV, my emphasis. Cadillac was not the only one seeking favors for their sons. See also http://habitantheritage.org for “Who Was the Anonymous 1702 Wet Nurse for One of Lamothé Cadillac's Children? Additional Documentation for the Birth of a Cadillac Child at Fort Ponchartrain in 1702.” Michigan's Habituant Heritage 26, no. 1 (January 2005): 21-27, for a pdf version of my article with further proof there was a Cadillac baby at the fort in 1702.

\textsuperscript{664} See NAC, F-472. Cadillac’s letter written at Kaskaskia is dated 18 May 1715. As Jean Delanglez reports, “Cadillac left for the north without telling anybody or giving Bienville orders. The latter found out he was gone a week after his departure (186), and two months later Bienville got orders and the information that Cadillac ‘was going to the Illinois country.’” Jean Delanglez, “Cadillac’s Last Years,” \textit{Mid-America}, an historical review, Vol 33, 1951, 3-42, p. 26, footnote 61, citing \textit{Mississippi Provincial Archives}, III, 181 ff. Cadillac was gone eight months. See also Jean Delanglez’s earlier articles in \textit{Mid-America}, all cited in Zoltvany’s biography of Cadillac in DCB II. For the searchable on-line version of the Dictionary of Canadian Biography:
<http://www.biographi.ca/EN/index.html> Bienville is Jean Baptiste Lemoine or Lemoyne, sieur de Bienville, brother of Charles Lemoyne, sieur de and baron de Longueuil. See my earlier references to Charles Lemoyne.

Suzanne Boivin Sommerville, © 2014, all rights reserved
written document signed at the fort by Cadillac himself, to handle Cadillac’s business. When Marie Thérèse herself appeared in the mother colony by 1729 at the age of twenty in Beauport and 26 January 1733 in Québec City, she was using the last names Véron and Grandmesnil; but she married a first cousin, Pierre Baby, son of Étienne’s sister, without any dispensation for consanguinity being sought or granted for the marriage, although a dispensation of three banns was granted. I cannot help but question the identity of her genetic father.

Étienne Véron Grandmesnil the younger continued to be involved with Cadillac’s business until 1741, eleven years after Cadillac’s death in 1730. Grandmesnil communicated with Baudry dit Lamarche, the man who purchased the Cadillac property at Detroit. Cadillac used the money from his Detroit property to buy the mayoral position at Castelsarrasin, a position he held in the year of Captain Rigaud’s visit to France.

Fact and Fiction

There is certainly enough documented here for a novelist to expand! I am aware that my citation of facts supported by documentation is sometimes mind-numbing if not overwhelming. Nevertheless, the facts in and of themselves often strain the willing suspension of disbelief required for fiction and would not be believed in a novel. And they definitely challenge the “standard” published histories of the Early Years of Detroit. What cannot be denied, though, are the documented connections and interconnections that I have demonstrated existed among these individuals and families. These were real people. They do not neatly conform to the “theories” and guesses historians have put forward. The events these real individuals saw, the stories they heard and told, and the pain and joy they experienced may not have been written down for posterity to examine and analyze; and yet they most assuredly shared information with each other, just as we do. And some of that information can never be retrieved. They also may have gone years without knowing the truth and they may have fallen prey to distortions foisted on them as a result of propaganda. I must ask why it took until 1723 before Marie Anne Germaneau began to use the name Montour, and that only after her presence in Albany can be documented. Her male cousins adopted the name shortly thereafter.

As with so many details in Marie Anne’s mother’s life (and in Lamothe Cadillac’s life), the documentation is, however, not extensive enough to resolve the enigmas that remain. I can only point them out and allow my imagination and my humanity to fill in the blanks and tell the story as I see it, and my vision is sometimes radically different from the standard versions. Isn’t this what all novelists and historians do? No one writer has all of the facts or the absolute truth. Unlike some other writers, however, I refuse to pronounce either definitive or value judgments about these individuals and the choices they

---

665 See my articles in MHH, concerning the first illegitimate child, Marie Thérèse, recorded as born at Fort Pontchartrain on the Eighth anniversary of the founding of Detroit, 24 July 1709. “Marie Lepage and Étienne Véron Grandmesnil: Rush to judgement? An example of misinterpreted evidence,” in three parts, MHH, January, April, and July 2001. Note the DCB articles about the two Étienne Véron Grandmesnils, father and son, need to be revised. I have informed the archives and DCB of my research.

666 PRDH #277128 Contract by Notary Pillard 1748-04-17, and #181015 marriage at Trois-Rivières 1748-04-22, photocopies of these and other records.

667 Roy, J.-Edmond (Joseph-Edmond), 1858-1913, Histoire du notariat au Canada depuis la fondation de la colonie jusqu’à nos jours, Lévis, Québec? : sn., 1899. Page images from Early Canadiana Online. I have also seen other references to his later involvement.

668 Many, but definitely not all, of the documents concerning Cadillac’s property dispute can be found translated in MPHC, Vols. 33-34. The transcriptions and translations, however, need revision.
made or those imposed on them. Too much remains unknown. They lived in perilous times when Old World nations fought each other at the same time they were encountering the Nations of the “New” World, who had their own battles to fight. Our own times should warn us of the tragedies that arise when different cultures meet head-on. On a more personal level, Marie Anne – and Isabelle – are not the only young women, then and now, abandoned to face the emotional, social, religious, and economic consequences of bearing a child out-of-wedlock; and the children of these unions had their own complex physical and emotional needs. Although I wonder about the unknown “fathers” of the many enfant(e)s naturel(le)s, brought into this world by Marie Anne and all of the others, if I may paraphrase Shakespeare (whoever he was!), I say, in the words of the ghost of Hamlet’s father: “Leave them [all] to Heaven.”

The spirits of my ancestors have been haunting me for some time now to set their stories straight.

As John F. Kennedy is reported to have said “at a Yale commencement, ‘The great enemy of the truth is very often not the lie . . . but the myth.’ ” I sincerely hope my exploration of the extant documents has given my readers a new perspective about myths, lies, the process of using sources to write history (or to create myth), and the actual lives of our ancestors. I myself will never be able to read any “history” in quite the same way as I have in the past.

When Isabelle Couc served as godmother at Fort Pontchartrain, she three times declared she could not sign, among the few words I am sure she spoke; but others did sign and provide testimony, some of which has not yet been examined. And I can and do “sign” and will continue to do so. I have not yet exhausted the extant documents. I am not yet finished with my quest.

Author’s note: these articles are still in progress. For full citations of my sources, see the previous part(s). Copyright is mine.© These articles may not be copied except for personal use, with full citation of author and source. Since I am, at this stage, my only final proof-reader, any comments or corrections will be graciously accepted. I used to tell my students the (probably apocryphal) story of the Arab rug makers who deliberately wove errors into the beautiful carpets they made because: Only Allah is perfect.

---

## Descendants of Pierre COUC & Marie MITÉOUAMEGOUKOUÉ

| I | Pierre COUC  
dit La Fleur de Cognac  
abt. 1627 Cognac, Aunis, France  
(Nicholas/Élisabeth TEMPLAIR) | 16 April 1657  
Trois Rivières, New France, Canada | Marie MITÉOUAMEGOUKOUÉ, Algonquin  
Born abt. 1631  
Algonquin Nation |
|---|---|---|---|
| II | Madeleine COUC  
(Sister of Isabelle Couc/Germano/Madame Montour  
and Marguerite COUC Fafard/Massé, etc.) | about 1692, perhaps Michilimackinac | Maurice MÉNARD  
(Jacques/Catherine FORESTIER) |
| III | Françoise ROBIDOUX  
(Guillaume/Marie Françoise GUÉRIN) | 5 February 1725  
Longueuil | Louis MÉNARD |
| IV | Maurice PLOUF  
(Pierre/Marie Joseph ÉRICHÉ) | 16 January 1747  
Sault Au Récollet | Marie Françoise MÉNARD |
| V | François PLOUFFE | 16 August 1790  
Sainte Rose, Île Jésus | Marie Agathe Angélique CHAURETTE  
(François/Marie Agathe CLEMENT LARIVIERE CHAMBLY) |
| VI | Louis PLOUFFE | 26 January 1813  
Sainte Thérèse de Blainville | Marie SIGOUIN  
(Amable/Marie-Élisabeth PAUQUETTE) |
| VII | Louise PLOUFFE | 10 January 1837  
Saint Martin, Île Jésus | Michel BIGRAS FAUVEL  
(François BIGRAS/Marie Louise LACHAINE ditte Jolicoeur) |
| VIII | Joseph Isaïe BOIVIN | 16 April 1855  
Saint Jérôme, Québec | Lucie BIGRAS |
| IX | Joseph BOIVIN | 9 September 1878  
Sauveur des Monts, Québec | Paulexime BENOIT  
(Philibert/Caroline LEDUC) |
| X | Jean BOIVIN | 25 December 1925  
Ottawa, Ontario | Anna DUPUIS  
(Édouard/Marie Rose JARRET ditte BEAUREGARD) |
| XI | Suzanne BOIVIN | | George SOMMERVILLE  
(Archibald/Janet Clark CURRIE) |
Direct Descendants of Pierre Couc [Note: some birth dates may be baptism dates unless otherwise noted]

1  Pierre Couc dit Lafleur de Cognac  b: Abt. 1627 in Cognac, Saintes, France  
d: Late April or early May 1690, buried St-François-du-Lac  
+Marie Mité8ameg8k8é  
Father: Unknown  
Mother: Unknown  
b: Abt. 1631 in Algonquin Nation, baptized as Mariam Mité8ameg8k8é  
dite (called) Kakésik8k8é, wife of Assababich, 6 November 1650 in Montréal by Father Claude Pijart (photocopy)  
[Thanks to Jean Quintal for finding this record]  
d: buried 8 January 1699 Trois-Rivières  
m: 16 April 1657 in Trois-Rivières  

2  Marie-Madeleine Couc  b: Abt. 1669 in St-François-du-Lac?  
+Maurice Ménard  
Father: Jacques Ménard  
Mother: Catherine Forestier  
b: 07 June 1664 in Trois-Rivières  
d: 9 May 1741 in Chambly  
m: Abt. 1692 in Michilimakinac?  

3  Louis Ménard  b: Abt. 1697 in Michilimakinac  

+Françoise Robidou  
Father: Guillaume Robidou  
Mother: Marie-Françoise Guérin  
b: 25 June 1707 in Longueuil  
m: 11 February 1725 in Longueuil  

4  Marie-Françoise Ménard  b: PRDH 105874 Longueuil Bapt. 28 November 1730  
Birth : 27 November 1730  
Father: Pierre Couc (Blouf)  
Mother: Josette (Marie-Cécile) Ériché (Richer)  
m: PRDH 115279 Sault-au-Récollet 16 January 1747  

5  François Plouffe  b: PRDH 297387 Bapt. Montréal 20 April 1763  
Birth : 19 April 1763 Sainte-Geneviève  
+Marie-Agathe-Angélique Chaurette  
Father: François-Ignace Chaurette  
Mother: Marie-Agathe Chambly [Clement Lariviére Chambly]b: PRDH 660306 Sainte-Geneviève (Pierrefonds)  
m: PRDH 352380 Sainte-Rose, Île-Jésus 16 August 1790  

6  Louis Plouffe  b: after 1790, possibly Jean-Louis PRDH 688503  
b: Abt. 1790, possibly Jean-Louis PRDH 688503  
Sainte-Rose, Île-Jésus 1793-11-12 Birth :1793-11-12  
+Marie Séguin [Sigouin]  
Father: Amable Siguin [Sigouin]  
Mother: Marie-Élisabeth Paquette  
b: PRDH 221852 Saint-Vincent-de-Paul 1781-09-17  
b: Abt. 1781  
m: 26 January 1813 in Saint-Thérèse de Blainville (photocopy)  

7  Marie-Louise Plouffe  b: Abt. 1817  

+Michel Bigras-Fauvel  
Father: François Bigras  
Mother: Marie-Louise Lachaine-Jolicoeur  
[This line goes back to Étienne Bontron dit Major and Angélique Proteau, who were also at Fort Pontchartrain when Isabelle and Marguerite Couc, sisters of Madeleine Couc, were there.]  
m: 10 January 1837 in Saint-Martin, Île-Jésus (photocopy)  

8  Lucie Bigras  b: 14 December 1837  

+Joseph-Isaïe Boivin  
Father: Pierre Boivin  
Mother: Marie Meunier dit Lagacéb: 28 March 1834 in Île-Jésus  
m: 16 April 1855 in Saint-Jérôme, Terrebonne (photocopy)  
in Saint-Jérôme, Terrebonne, Québec, Canada  

9  Joseph Boivin  b: 14 July 1858  

+Pauline (Marie-Alexine) Benoit  
Father: Philibert Benoît  
Mother: Marie Caroline LeDuc  
b: 12 October 1859 in Saint-Janvier, Québec  
m: 09 September 1878 in Saint-Sauveur-des-Monts, Terrebonne, Québec, Canada (photocopy)  

10  Joseph Jean Aldéric Boivin  b: 10 April 1903 in Val David, Terrebonne, Québec, Canada  

+Marie Anna Alphonse Dupuis  
Father: Alfred Édouard Dupuis  
Mother: Marie-Rose Jarret de Beauregard  
b: 22 April 1898 in Saint-Guillaume d’Upton, Québec, Canada  
m: 25 December 1925 in Ottawa, Ontario, Canada (photocopy)  
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Marriage Contract in New France according to
La Coutume de Paris / The Custom of Paris
by
Suzanne Boivin Sommerville


The France from which the original colonists of New France emigrated allowed many different legal “customs” for the use and inheritance of property after a marriage. By 1664, *La Coutume de Paris* / the Custom of Paris was chosen as the one “custom” to be followed in *Nouvelle France* and *Acadie*, Canada. This did not change after the British took over the government of Canada (the Quebec Act of 1774 protected *La Coutume de Paris*); and it also applied to all the French settlements across the Detroit River in what became Ontario, and in what is now the United States: along the Mississippi, in *Louisiiane*, at Michilimackinac, at Fort St. Joseph (Niles, Michigan), *etc.*, and definitely in the Detroit / Monroe areas. Modifications or changes were made under Spanish and American rule in *Louisiane* and elsewhere under United States law, and, after 1837, in Canada; but the basic provisions of the Custom of Paris continued to be chosen by many couples in Canada to the extent that the law provided.

The marriage contract was a legal document, usually - but not exclusively - drawn up before the marriage. It appears also to have been an occasion for celebration by the family and friends who were present to witness and sign the act. Since lawyers were banned from New France, this legal document (as well as many others) was drawn up by an official called a NOTARY. In distant settlements, the marriage contract could be written by a priest or a commandant of a post, to be delivered to a notary at a later date. Thousands of these marriage documents survive and they preserve a fascinating window into the society of New France.

TERMS and DEFINITIONS

**INTITULÉ / Title:** *Contrat de mariage entre X et Y*. Contract of marriage between X and Y.

The first section of the text identifies the parties appearing before the notary to contract marriage, their ages, parents’ names, parishes of origin, current domiciles, professions or occupations. This is usually followed by the names of those in attendance to counsel the couple and witness the document and often an indication of their relationship to the future bride and groom.

The future spouses promise to solemnize their marriage *in facie ecclesiae* (Latin) / *en face de l’église* (French): before witnesses and a representative of Holy Mother Church, Catholic, Roman and Apostolic, as soon as possible, which was French law at the time.

The next section usually identifies the extent to which the couple will observe the Custom of Paris. Since the Custom allowed important variations, this is where any such choices would be indicated. Even if a marriage contract was not written, all marriages were established under the basic provisions of the Custom, but most couples, of all social classes, filed a contract, some spelling out the variations to be in effect. Unless otherwise stated, all couples owned property after marriage under a *communauté de biens*.

**COMMUNAUTÉ DE BIENS / Community of commonly held marital property,** both moveables, *biens meubles* (household goods, tools, animals, clothing, *etc.*), and *conquêtes immeubles*, those immovables (usually real estate) acquired during the marriage. The *communauté de biens* did not include the immovables, called *acquets* (usually real estate), inherited by a wife before or during the marriage.
As for variations, Hans W. Baade describes one: “[T]he most extreme [of the variations allowed within the Custom of Paris] is the stipulation of separation of property [séparation de biens] to the exclusion of community property. That clause was fairly frequent in contracts of second marriages, especially where one of the spouses had children from what was colloquially called the ‘premier lit’ (literally, “first bed”).” (Baade, p. 16)

A séparation de biens could also be legalized after a marriage if conditions warranted (e.g., because of misuse of funds by either spouse or for other reasons, such as the absence of a spouse). Couples could even petition for a séparation de corps, bodily separation, although divorce was, of course, not sanctioned by the Church and remarriage would not have been canonically allowed.

Some marriage contracts expressly state the Custom would be followed even if the couple changed their domicile:

The future spouses shall be in common as to their movable goods and immovable acquisitions according to the Custom of Paris, by which their community shall be regulated and apportioned, even though afterwards they come to establish their domicile or make acquisitions in countries with contrary customs, laws and usages, which they hereby expressly alter and renounce. (Baade, p. 16.)

The next clauses usually include provisions for:

PAYMENT OF PRIOR DEBTS:
“Ne seront tenus des deutes l’un de l’autre faits et créées avant le futur mariage ainsy aucunes y a seront payées et acquittées par celuy qui les a faits et créées et sur son bien.”

The future spouses were not liable for debts incurred prior to the marriage. These would be paid by the one who contracted the debt and from his or her property. This clause would sometimes be followed by a declaration of the assets brought to the marriage by both the future wife and the future husband, and whether some or all of these were to be considered propres, the legal possessions of the owner, therefore not entering into the marital community.

DOT (pronounced /duht/): the equivalent of the English Law bride’s dowry, but not subject to the rules of English law. Under the Custom of Paris, a future bride could stipulate that some or all of her dot would remain her propres, hers legally to hand on to her heirs or to be returned to her family in the case of her death without children. The dot was usually a gift of the bride’s parents, sometimes real property or goods to help the couple become established, or in the case of the Filles du Roi, from the king, Louis XIV. (The Filles du Roi were marriageable women sent from France between 1663 and 1673.) Sometimes the dot was an advancement of inheritance.

DOUAILRE, either douaire coutumier, customary dower (one half of the community property and the right to use the community property during the lifetime of the widow, usufruit), or douaire préfix, une fois payé, a stated amount. The douaire was provided by the future husband, to be granted to his widow at his death before any debts owed to the community were subtracted. The choice of type was the widow’s. Sometimes the contract states that the future husband will hypothéquer, establish a type of mortgage, for his current possessions to satisfy this future indebtedness. Although this term douaire has sometimes been translated as dowry, it is really “dower” rights, or the rights granted to the widow of a marriage, and it
was far more generous under the Custom of Paris than under English law. In case of a separation of property resulting from bankruptcy, the douaire could not be seized by the persons who were owed money. (From “Le contrat de mariage et le statut des femmes en Nouvelle-France”: “En cas de séparation de biens découlant d’une faillite, le douaire ne peut être saisi par les créanciers.”)

**PRÉCIPUT**: a right of either surviving spouse to a specific amount of money or possessions at the death of the other spouse, and before any division of the estate. Often this sum was one-half of the douaire. Prospective spouses also reserved the right to keep their personal *linge, hardes, et bijoux joyeux* (linens and clothing, tools and other possessions, such as firearms, and jewelry) and the wife was allowed to keep her *lit garni*, her furnished bed.

**RENONCIATION** of the marital community by the wife (or later by children of the marriage). “This clause specified that the wife or children renouncing the community could recover (*reprendre*) that which the wife had brought into the community (*apporté*), in addition to the douaire and the préciput where stipulated.” (Baade, p. 17) A renunciation of the marital community sometimes occurred if the debts of the community were substantial.

**DONATION entre vifs, mutuelle, égale, et réciproque**: “The donation clause generally stipulated a reciprocal gift to the survivor of all or part of the predeceasing spouse’s estate, either in full property or in usufruct, and conditioned upon the absence of children of the marriage at its termination by death.” (Baade, p. 18) A widow in New France was thus protected from eviction and destitution. She did not have to petition any court to enjoy the use of the community property. This clause was often followed by the *insinuation* clause: “To have these presents registered where necessary, the parties give all power to the bearer thereof.”

After the formal language concluding the contract and a statement that it was read aloud, the future spouses signed the contract, if they were able to do so, or sometimes affixed their crosses, and witnesses who chose to do so also signed. It is interesting that some contracts include signatures by individuals not mentioned as witnesses in the text of the contract.

**Inheritance Laws under the Custom of Paris**

Each child of a marriage, male and female, inherited equal shares of one half of the marital community property at the death of a parent. Often an inventory was taken first. If a child of a marriage predeceased the parent and had children of his or her own, those children inherited the share their parent would have received. If children were under legal age, twenty-five in *Nouvelle France*, a *tuteur*, guardian, was appointed to safeguard their interests until they came of age. This guardian was often, but not always, the surviving parent. At the death of the surviving parent, the remaining marital community of that union was dissolved and transmitted to surviving heirs.

Second (and third … ) marriages further complicated the situation, and contracts for remarriages often indicate that the children of the prior marriage would be brought up, fed and clothed, and provided education at the expense of the new marital community, without jeopardizing their inheritance rights from the former community. Other variations were possible, such as that the widow of the second marriage would be treated as if she were a child of the first for inheritance purposes, especially if she was young or had no children of her own.
If a wife died without legal children, her *proprès* and any *dot* reverted to heirs in her birth family. Wills and Final Testaments were thus rarely needed in New France, except by *celibate* or unmarried individuals who chose to stipulate who would receive specific gifts from their estate. Illegitimate children were sometimes provided for through a Last Will and Testament.

It would require an examination of the extant contracts to spell out the other variations. I have learned more from reading the contracts themselves than from any published commentary, and I am still learning.

As can be readily seen, adopting the Custom of Paris as the legal code for New France assured the protection, first, for children born to a marriage, then for widows, and also for the families of wives who died without leaving any issue. This “custom” may have been chosen because of pioneer conditions facing the first settlers, the relative scarcity of women, and a belief that those who cannot easily help themselves must be provided assistance. It is not surprising, then, that begging and destitution were relatively unknown in New France.

Married women were required to have the permission of their husbands to engage in business or legal matters, and single, underage women, permission of their fathers or guardians. A husband could alienate property without his wife’s consent, although he could not alienate any income from property she owned, her *inalienable* right. The provisions of the Custom compensated a married woman for the liberties a husband could take with their common property. Once a woman attained her majority as a single woman or became a widow, though, she was free to engage in legal matters in her own name, and far more than you might imagine did become business women, even engaging in the fur trade.
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There are other sources, but these are the ones I found most helpful for this presentation, and I wanted to limit this handout to two sheets of paper, back-to-back. Geneviève Postolec has written about the transition stage in the nineteenth century when some of the rights of women in Canada were curtailed.
See also Bettina Bradbury, “Debating Dower: Patriarchy, Capitalism and Widow’s Rights in Lower Canada” at <http://www.ghm-mhg.mcgill.ca/publications/ppi/bradbury.html> Visit the Web site of Les Archives Nationales du Québec for addresses to obtain photocopies of marriage contracts by mail. Most of the older contracts will be found at the Québec, Montréal, or Trois-Rivières branches. One good source for dates of marriage contracts and the notaries involved up to 1730 is René Jetté, Dictionnaire généalogique des familles du Québec des origines à 1730, Les Presses de l’Université de Montréal, 1983. PRDH (Programme de recherche en démographie historique / Program of research in historical demography) also sometimes cites marriage contracts. <www.genealogy.umontreal.ca>