

CHAPTER IV.

Are the American Indians of Jewish Descent?—History of the Theory—What Mormons Claim—Jewish Analogies—Facts Fatal to the Theory.

The theory that the American Indians are descendants of the children of Israel was profoundly entertained by some of the most learned and most pious men of this country a century ago, and the number of analogies they pointed out between the two peoples is not exceeded by the number pointed out between the Indians and any other race.

Bancroft remarks: "The theory that the Americans are of Jewish descent has been discussed more minutely and at greater length than any other. Its advocates, or at least those of them who have made original researches, are comparatively few; but the extent of their investigations and the multitude of the parallelisms they adduce in support of their hypothesis, exceed by far anything we have yet encountered."—*Native Races*, Vol. V., pp. 77, 78.

The first to advance this theory were a number of the Spanish priests of Mexico, of whom Garcia was the most scholarly. He claimed to find evidence sustaining it in the similarities between the Indians and the Jews in character, dress, religion, physical peculiarities, condition and custom. Both, he declares, were liars, despicable, cruel, boastful, idle, dirty, turbulent, incorrigible and vicious. Both were slow to believe. Both showed a lack of charity to the poor, sick and unfortunate. Both were naturally give to idolatry. Both raised their hands to heaven in making an affirmation. Both buried their dead

on hills without their cities. Both rent their clothing upon hearing bad tidings. Both gave a kiss on the cheek as a token of peace. Both celebrated their victories with songs and dances. Both drowned dogs in wells. And both practiced crucifixion.¹ These analogies are certainly absurd enough, yet they compare favorably with those that the Mormons adduce to prove the same theory.

The first Englishman to advocate the Jewish descent of the American Indians was Rev. T. Thorowgood, whose work, "Jewes in America, or Probabilities that the Americans are of That Race," was published in London in 1650. The following year it was replied to by Sir Hamon L'Estrange, in his "Americans No Jewes."

William Penn was also of this opinion, and wrote the following to the Free Society of Traders of London in 1683: "I am ready to believe them of the Jewish race—I mean of the stock of the ten tribes—and that for the following reasons: First, they were to go to a land not planted or known"—see 2 Esdras 13:40-45—"which, to be sure, Asia and Africa were, if not Europe, and he that intended that extraordinary judgment upon them might make the passage not uneasy to them, as it is not impossible in itself, from the eastermost parts of Asia to the westermost parts of America. In the next place, I find them of a like countenance, and their children of so lively resemblance that a man would think himself in Duke's Place, or Berry Street, London, when he seeth them. But this is not all; they agree in wrights, they reckon by moons, they offer their firstfruits, they have a kind of feast of tabernacles, they are said to lay their altar upon twelve stones, their mourning a year, customs of women, with many other things, that do not now occur."

¹ "Native Races," Vol. V., p. 80.

One of the first Americans to advocate the Jewish descent of the American Indians, was James Adair, in his "American Indians," London, 1775. He had been a trader among the tribes of the southeastern part of the United States for forty years, and wrote much from his own observations. In many respects his work is both commendable and valuable. Jewish rites, customs, beliefs and institutions which he claimed to find among the Indians are: "1. Their division into tribes. 2. Their worship of Jehovah. 3. Their notions of a theocracy. 4. Their belief in the administration of angels. 5. Their language and dialects. 6. Their manner of counting time. 7. Their prophets and high priests. 8. Their festivals, fasts and religious rites. 9. Their daily sacrifice, 10. Their ablutions and anointings. 11. Their laws of uncleanness. 12. Their abstinence from unclean things. 13. Their marriage, divorces and punishments of adultery. 14. Their several punishments. 15. Their cities of refuge. 16. Their purifications and preparatory ceremonies. 17. Their ornaments. 18. Their manner of curing the sick. 19. Their burial of the dead. 20. Their mourning for the dead. 21. Their raising seed to a deceased brother. 22. Their change of names adapted to their circumstances and times. 23. Their own traditions; the account of English writers; and the testimonies given by Spaniards and other writers of the primitive inhabitants of Mexico and Peru."—*Book of Mormon Lectures*, p. 245.

Among other Americans who held this theory were the Indian missionaries, Mayhew and Eliot, Elias Boudinot, Rev. Ethan Smith, Dr. Jarvis and Josiah Priest. Boudinot's work, "Star in the West," appeared in 1816; Smith's "View of the Hebrews" in 1820, and Priest's "American Antiquities" in 1833. This last-named work is still a standard with the Latter-day Saints, if not with

archæologists, although from being a work on antiquities it has become an antiquity itself. George Catlin has also expressed the opinion that the American Indians have Jewish blood in their veins, though he does not claim that they are either Jews or the "lost tribes." He speaks of them as an amalgam race and thinks that they have descended from the Jews crossed with a primitive stock. And George Jones, in his "History of Ancient America," holds that the inhabitants of North America, but of North America alone, and the "lost tribes" are identical.

But by far the most scholarly and illustrious advocate of the Jewish theory was Lord Kingsborough, an Irish nobleman, whose work, "Mexican Antiquities," published in nine volumes, in London, from 1831 to 1848, is, laying aside his theory, deserving of much commendation. Bancroft says of him: "Kingsborough has a theory to prove, and to accomplish his object he drafts every shadow of an analogy into his service. But though his theory is as wild as the wildest, and his proofs are as vague as the vaguest, yet Lord Kingsborough can not be classed with such writers as Jones, Ranking, Cabrera, Adair, and the host of other dogmatists who have fought tooth and nail, each for his particular hobby. Kingsborough was an enthusiast—a fanatic, if you choose—but his enthusiasm is never offensive."—*Native Races*, Vol. V., p. 84.¹

According to these authors, the ten tribes, or a portion

¹ I have succeeded in getting hold of a single work on this subject outside of those written by Mormons. This work is "The Ten Tribes of Israel; or, The True History of the North American Indians, Showing that They are the Descendants of These Ten Tribes," by Mr. Timothy Jenkins, published in Springfield, O., in 1883. Although this book has been put before the public more recently than the works of most of the writers on this theory, it abounds in the same curious analogies, imaginary similarities and unfounded inferences that characterize the rest. It is a cheap compilation of the notions and assertions of Adair and others, with the author's ideas interspersed.

of them, left Assyria, where they had been carried captive, traversed the continent of Asia, crossed the Behring Strait, and, traveling down the Pacific Coast, established a Jewish civilization in Mexico and Central America.

But this theory, so widely entertained a century ago, has no learned defenders to-day. It belongs to the past, has been left behind in the onward march of scientific research, and is looked upon as one of those ludicrous fancies upon which men have expended so much zeal with so much satisfaction to themselves and so little to succeeding generations. The attitude of later writers toward this theory is expressed in the following extracts from their works:

"One of these theories is (or was) that the original civiliziers of Mexico and Central America were the 'lost ten tribes of Israel.' This extremely remarkable explanation of the mystery was devised very early, and it has been persistently defended by some persons, although nothing can be more unwarranted or more absurd. . . . This wild notion, called a theory, scarcely deserves so much attention. It is a lunatic fancy, possible only to men of a certain class, which in our time does not multiply."—*Ancient America*, pp. 166, 167.

"It is hardly necessary at this day to advert to a belief which was profoundly entertained a century ago, except as an evidence of the progress of ethnological knowledge."—*Prehistoric Races*, p. 323.

"The notion that the Indians are descendants of the Israelites is absurd."—*Ridpath's History of the United States*, p. 41.

"But all such theories of the origin of the American races from an Israelitish stock, or from a Cymric or a Gaelic, may be safely dismissed as the fruits of misguided enthusiasm and perverted ingenuity."—*Mr. A. T.*

Rice, in the Introduction to Charnay's *Ancient Cities of the New World*.

"There has been a vast amount of discussion relative to the ten lost tribes of Israel. The literature upon this subject is extensive and somewhat amusing as well as absurd."—*The Mound Builders*, p. 139.

"The wildest as well as the most diverse hypotheses were brought forward and defended with great display of erudition. One of the most curious was that which advanced the notion that the Americans were descendants of the ten 'lost tribes of Israel.' No one at present would acknowledge himself a believer in this theory; but it has not proved useless, as we owe to it the publication of several most valuable works."—*The American Race*, p. 18.

"As for the Lost-Tribes-of-Israel theory, on which Kingsborough was wrecked, no archæologist of to-day would be willing to give it a second thought."—*North Americans of Yesterday*, p. 429.

The Book of Mormon presents this theory, but with two important differences. It claims that only a remnant of Israel, in which Manasseh, Judah and possibly other tribes were represented, came to America; and that, instead of coming by way of Behring Strait, they entered our continent at two different points, the Nephites landing somewhere on the west coast of South America and the Mulokites near the Isthmus of Panama.

For confirmation of the Book of Mormon account, Latter-day Saints appeal to the Old Testament Scriptures in which it is claimed reference is made to the book itself, to the continent of America, to the people who inhabited it, to their emigration from Asia and to the coming out of the book and the religious movement connected with its appearance. They assert that the Book of Mormon is

called "the book that is sealed" (Isa. 29: 11), the "stick of Ephraim" (Ezek. 37: 15-20), and the "great things of my law" (Hos. 8: 12). That the continent of America is called the "midst of the earth" (Gen. 48: 16), the "land shadowing with wings" (Isa. 18: 1), and the "mountain in the height of Israel" (Ezek. 17: 23). That to reach it the people were to "run over the wall" (Gen. 49: 22), go "over the sea" (Isa. 16: 8), and "flee," get "far off," "dwell deep" and go "unto the wealthy nation, that dwelleth without care, saith the Lord, which have neither gates nor bars, which dwell alone" (Jer. 49: 30-32). And that the record of this people was to "speak out of the ground" (Isa. 29: 4), and "spring out of the earth" (Ps. 85: 11); that a few of its words were to be delivered to a "learned" man (Professor Anthon) to read, who was to say, "I cannot, for it is sealed;" that the book was to be delivered to one "not learned" (Joseph Smith), who was to reply, "I am not learned," and that following this the Lord was to do a "marvelous work and a wonder" among a people who were to draw near him with their mouths and with their lips honor him while their hearts were removed far from him (Isa. 29: 11-14). Thus, by associating together in a certain relation passages which have not the slightest reference to the subject, but which may be so applied, a plausible story is constructed by which the unlearned and credulous are deceived. Shakespeare very truly wrote:

"In religion,
What damned error but some sober brow
Will bless it, and approve it with a text,
Hiding the grossness with fair ornament?"

Mormon writers, in their attempt to trace the American Indians back to a Jewish origin, having no positive proof upon which to rely, have fallen back upon the

analogies, similarities and resemblances which have been pointed out between the two peoples, not considering that such are more often due to human instinct and similar environment than to contact or relationship. These analogies, similarities and resemblances are taken from the works of such earlier writers as Adair, Boudinot, Smith and Priest, and are merely stated in Mormon works, not elaborated upon, for a truthful elaboration would make their forcelessness and ludicrousness so apparent that the theory they are intended to prove would not be believed.

Orson Pratt points out the following analogies between the American Indians and the Jews in order to sustain the claim of the Book of Mormon that the former are of Israelitish origin: "But in America we do truly find several hundred nations of people who do not exhibit that diversity of character which we find distinguishing the nations of the eastern world. Their color, their features, their general physiognomy, their traditions, their manners and customs, their dialects, their general characteristics of mind, and modes of living—all proclaim that they are descended from one common origin. While their religious worship, their belief in one God, their computation of time by the ceremonies of the new moon, their having an ark of the covenant, their erection of a temple similar to the Jewish temple, their erection of altars, their divisions of the year into four seasons corresponding to the Jewish festivals, their laws of sacrifices, their ablutions and marriages, their places of refuge, their manner of conducting war, their abstaining from eating certain things forbidden by the laws of Moses, and the numerous affinities of their language to the Hebrew—all testify loudly that they are of Israelitish origin."—*O. Pratt's Works*, p. 211.

There are two important facts that these theorists

persistently ignore. First, that there are as close similarities between the Indians and other peoples in language, religion and custom, as there are between the Indians and the children of Israel. And, second, that more than to counterbalance these analogies, there are peculiarities in the American languages, religions and customs which can not be harmonized with this theory of descent. It has long been conceded by ethnologists that analogies can not be considered positive evidence of a connection between nation and nation, for it is a well-known fact that peoples wholly unrelated and having had no contact with one another very often possess striking similarities in habit, custom and rite. The Zulus of South Africa, for instance, who are in no way related to the tribes of Israel, are known to possess a number of customs strikingly Jewish, such as the observance of their feast of firstfruits, their raising up seed to a deceased brother, etc. These close similarities have caused no little comment among travelers. Analogies, therefore, are not first proof of the relationship of nations and peoples, but, when such a relationship is indicated by well-defined traditions, the structure of language, etc., they may be considered as cumulative evidence to strengthen the theory. As the structure of the American languages is wholly different from that of the Hebrew, and as there is nothing in any of the American traditions to indicate their derivation from the Hebrew stock, we may say that the analogies pointed out by Mormon writers to prove that the American Indians are descendants of the Jews are wholly without value as proof.

On the impossibility of proving the relationship of two nations by analogies in custom, rite, institution and belief Latham remarks: "To tell an inquirer who wishes to deduce one population from another that certain dis-

tant tribes agree with the one under discussion in certain points of resemblance, is as irrelevant as to tell a lawyer in search of the next of kin to a client deceased that, though you know of no relations, you can find a man who is the very picture of him in person—a fact good enough in itself, but not to the purpose.”—*Man and His Migrations*, pp. 74, 75.

On the same point Bancroft says: “But analogies, even when fairly drawn, are by no means conclusive evidence. So much depends upon the environment of a people that a similarity in that particular is of itself sufficient to account for most of the resemblances which have been discovered between the customs, religion and traditions of the Americans, and those of Old World nations.”—*Native Races*, Vol. V., p. 5.

And Foster observes: “To undertake to trace ethnic relations between widely separated peoples, by similarity of manners and customs, is an uncertain guide. Man, apart from his improvable reason, has what we call, in the higher animals, instinct; and as the beaver everywhere constructs his dam according to a definite plan, so will man perform certain acts instinctively, after a certain manner. Hence, among barbarous nations, we may expect to find a similarity of manners and customs, without necessarily supposing that they are the result of inheritance.”—*Prehistoric Races*, p. 310.

As we examine the analogies in rite, institution, custom, habit and belief, which are cited by the Mormons to prove the account in the Book of Mormon, the truthfulness of these statements will become apparent, for most of the rites, institutions, customs, habits and beliefs of the American Indians are wholly unlike the rites, institutions, customs, habits and beliefs of ancient Israel, while the few that are said to possess Jewish features are so

faintly similar as to need a liberal amount of touching up to make these features recognizable. Of the latter some are not exclusively Jewish, but are to be found among other nations and peoples. Others are purely local, found among but few of the tribes. While still others have been made out of whole cloth. When carefully and conscientiously examined they prove to be very unsatisfactory evidence, if they can be called evidence at all.

DIVISION INTO TRIBES.

It is claimed that the American Indians are divided into tribes like the children of Israel; hence that they must be of Israelitish descent. This is about the first argument presented by the Mormons to prove their theory. Timothy Jenkins, who is not a Latter-day Saint, but who holds with them the theory of the Jewish descent of the American race, states this argument as follows: “As the Israelites were divided into tribes, and had a chief over them, and always marched under ensigns of some animal peculiar to each tribe, so the Indian nations are universally divided into tribes, under a sachem or king, chosen by the people from the wisest and bravest among them. He has neither influence nor distinction, but from his wisdom and prudence. He is assisted by a council of old, wise and beloved men, as they call their priests and councilors. Nothing is determined, of a public nature, but in this council, where every one has an equal voice. The chief, or sachem, sits in the middle, and the council on each hand, forming a semi-circle, as the high priest of the Jews did in the Sanhedrim of that nation.”—*The Ten Tribes of Israel*, p. 117.

But the simple fact that the American Indians are divided into tribes, under chiefs and with councils to

make their laws, does not prove their Israelitish extraction any more than it proves their descent from the Mongolians, Africans or Polynesians; for tribes of these races in Asia, Africa and Polynesia are organized in the same general way. Besides, the tribal governments of America were not cast in one mould, but in many moulds, and none of these were made in Palestine. The Iroquois had no supreme chief, but their confederacy, which is declared to have been "one of the most extraordinary primitive governments ever recorded," was governed by a council of fifty chiefs, who, in time of war, appointed two war chiefs to look after their military affairs.¹ Among the Wyandots each gens, of which there were eleven, was governed by a council composed of four *women*, who appointed the gentile chief. The eleven gentile councils, with the chiefs, constituted the tribal council.² The Crow nation is ruled by two head chiefs, of equal authority, and six counselors.³ The Omahas formerly were presided over by two head chiefs of equal power, assisted by subordinate chiefs.⁴ Each town of the Creeks had its own chief, or *miko*, chosen from a particular gens and for life; next to him stood the council of the town, composed of the *mikalgi*, and counselors, which appointed the Great Warrior; following these in authority came the *hini halgi*, old men and advisers, who presided over the annual busk or feast, had charge of the public buildings and directed agricultural pursuits; after these came the *isti tchakalgi*, beloved men; and, lastly, the common people.⁵ The permanent ruler of the Lenapes, who was called the peace-chief, was chosen from a

¹ "North Americans of Yesterday," p. 425.

² *Ibid.*, p. 420.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 416.

⁴ "Third Rept. Bu. Am. Ethno.," p. 357.

⁵ "Migration Legend of the Creeks," Vol. I., pp. 156, 157.

particular gens by the chiefs of the other gentes; his authority was not absolute and in war he had no concern, the military operations being in charge of a war-chief who won his place by his prowess and skill.¹ In Mexico the king was assisted in the government by a council of the nobles. Tlascalala was ruled by four supreme lords, each independent of the others; these, with the rest of the nobility, formed a parliament or senate which made the laws of the State.² In Yucatan the power of the king was absolute, and he appointed all officers, both secular and religious, organized courts, and had the power to condemn to death any of his subjects whom he saw fit.³ With the Quiches the king was a despot who appointed lieutenants over his provinces and who was supported by a council of twenty-four grandees.⁴ And in Peru the government was a mild, though absolute, despotism, the voice of the Inca being considered the voice of the sun.⁵

The reader will observe that, instead of there being only one form of tribal government in America, and that form resembling the government of the children of Israel, there were, in fact, many forms which present no clearly defined resemblances to the latter. In some tribes chieftainship was hereditary; in others, elective; and in still others the head of the tribe or band assumed his place simply through the pressure of public opinion, without the formalities of an election.⁶ Some of the tribes had one chief; others had a number. Some had councils which assisted the chief in the administration of affairs; in others the power of the king was absolute, or nearly

¹ "The American Race," p. 76.

² "Native Races," Vol. II., p. 141.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 643.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 641.

⁵ "Conquest of Peru," Vol. I., p. 13.

⁶ "North Americans of Yesterday," p. 416.

so. Some tribes were governed by a council of men; others by a council of women. To claim, therefore, that there was but one form of tribal government in America, and that this form was cast in a Jewish mould, is absurd and is contradicted by the facts.

WORSHIP OF JEHOVAH.

Mr. Stebbins says on the similarity of the theistic ideas of the Indians and the Jews: "Their worship of Jehovah, calling him Yohewah, is itself a good assurance of their Hebrew origin."—*Lectures*, p. 244. And he quotes from Catlin the following: "The first and most striking fact amongst the North American Indians that refers us to the Jews is that of their worshipping, in all parts, the Great Spirit, or Jehovah, as the Hebrews were ordered to do by divine precept, instead of a plurality of gods."

But there is not one of these assertions true. The original words for Deity in the Indian tongues do not convey the idea of personality, but express simply the supernatural in general, the marvelous, the mysterious, the incomprehensible, the unknown. Even the more advanced nations, the Aztecs, Mayas and Peruvians, were not monotheistic, for they all had many gods, although their pantheons were usually presided over by supreme rulers like those of the Greeks and Romans. As for the "Great Spirit," who in the popular conception was the deity of the red man everywhere, it is now conceded by all the best students of the primitive American religions that he is wholly a creation of the missionary, unknown to the American tribes before the Discovery; and the name "Yohewah" is only the effort of the Cherokees to pronounce the English Jehovah; as are also the Choctaw "Chihowa" and the Creek "Chihufa." The original word

for God in the Cherokee is *Oo-neh-lah-ner-he*; in the Choctaw it is *Chit-o-ka-ka*, and in the Creek, *Hi-sak-i-ta Im-mis-si*.

Powell, on American society, art and religion, writes: "Nations with civilized institutions, art with palaces, monotheism as the worship of the Great Spirit, all vanish from the priscan condition of North America in the light of anthropologic research. Tribes with the social institutions of kinship, art with its highest architectural development exhibited in the structure of communal dwellings, and polytheism in the worship of mythic animals and nature-gods remain."—*First Ann. Rept. Bu. Ethno.*, p. 69.

NOTIONS OF A THEOCRACY.

Jenkins asserts: "The Indians also, agreeable to the theocracy of Israel, think the Great Spirit to be the immediate head of their state, and that God chose them out of all the rest of mankind as his peculiar and beloved people."—*The Ten Tribes of Israel*, p. 141.

But as the American Indians originally did not have a knowledge of the Jewish Jehovah, how could they have had the Jewish conception of a theocracy? It is impossible to understand how they could have believed in the divine government as did the children of Israel when their gods were only mere fetiches, deified animals, apotheosized men and the elements and phenomena of nature. If such a belief as Jenkins describes existed, it certainly dates from this side of the time when they were taught by the Christian missionaries to believe in a Great Spirit.

BELIEF IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF ANGELS.

"These people," says Jenkins, "believe most firmly that their seer or high priest has communion with power-

ful invisible spirits, whom they suppose have some share in the rule and government of human affairs, as well as in that of the elements."—*The Ten Tribes*, p. 147.

But while this is true, it does not suggest any resemblance whatever to the communion of the Hebrew prophets of old with the angels of the Lord, but was a practice most heathenish and barbarous. The red man is very superstitious. He believes in dreams and visions and brings them on by excessive feasting or protracted fasting. His "angels" were the manitous, okies, fairies, spooks and hobgoblins seen in these dreams and visions. But his communication with the unseen world was not all imaginary, and many of his medicine men were expert mediums and could "call up the spirits" in a way that would put some of the experts of the present day to shame. Brinton, in the following, gives the general method pursued by the Indian priests in communicating, supposedly, with the spirits of the dead: "One of the most peculiar and characteristic exhibitions of their power was to summon a spirit to answer inquiries concerning the future and the absent. A great similarity marked this proceeding in all northern tribes, from the Eskimos to the Mexicans. A circular or conical lodge of stout poles, four or eight in number, planted firmly in the ground, was covered with skins or mats, a small aperture only being left for the seer to enter. Once in, he carefully closed the hole and commenced his incantations. Soon the lodge trembles, the strong poles shake and bend as with the united strength of a dozen men, and strange, unearthly sounds, now far aloft in the air, now deep in the ground, anon approaching near and nearer, reach the ears of the spectators. At length the priest announces that the spirit is present, and is prepared to answer questions. An indispensable preliminary to any inquiry is to

insert a handful of tobacco, or a string of beads, or some other douceur, under the skins, ostensibly for the behoof of the celestial visitor, who would seem not to be above earthly wants and vanities. The replies received, though occasionally singularly clear and correct, are usually of that profoundly ambiguous purport which leaves the anxious inquirer little wiser than he was before."—*Myths of the New World*, p. 309.

From this it will be seen that the angels with whom the Indian medicine men communed were of the same class with those who possessed the demoniac of Gadara. The practice of holding intercourse with such spirits would be branded by every true Latter-day Saint of to-day as a practice exceedingly sinful.

THEIR LANGUAGES AND DIALECTS.

It is claimed that the languages and dialects of the American Indians possess affinities to the Hebrew. This is a favorite argument with the defenders of the Book of Mormon. Apostle Kelley quotes the following from Josiah Priest: "Hebrew words are found among the American Indians in considerable variety."—*Presidency and Priesthood*, p. 259. And Apostle Pratt gives the following from Elias Boudinot: "Their language in its roots, idiom and particular construction appears to have the whole genius of the Hebrew; and what is very remarkable, and well worthy of serious attention, has most of the peculiarities of the language, especially those in which it differs from most other languages."—*A Voice of Warning*, p. 82.

But these assertions are so manifestly false that they hardly need serious consideration. In the first place, the Indians did not speak a language, but languages. Brinton informs us that there are 180 stocks in the two Americas,

each having its own distinct tongue, which is divided and subdivided into numerous languages and dialects. Bancroft counted nearly six hundred languages between Alaska and the Isthmus of Panama, and these are so diverse one from another that the tongue of the Iroquois is unintelligible to the Dakota and both to the Algonkin. Besides this diversity, the Indian languages are polysynthetic in structure, while the Hebrew is inflectional, and, since the days of Duponceau, they have been recognized as constituting a linguistic body by themselves.

THEIR MANNER OF COUNTING TIME.

On the Indian manner of reckoning time, and its resemblance to the Jewish, Jenkins says: "They reckon time after the manner of the Hebrews. They divide the year into spring, summer, autumn (or the falling of the leaf), and winter. Korah is their word for winter with the Cherokee Indians, as it is with the Hebrews. They number the years by any of these four periods, for they have no name for year. And they subdivide these, and count the year by lunar months, or moons, like the Israelites, who also counted by moons."—*The Ten Tribes*, pp. 119, 120.

The Jewish divisions of time were a year of twelve lunar months, with an intercalary month, Veadar, a week of seven days, and a day beginning at evening and divided into two parts, daylight and darkness, the former divided into twelve hours and the latter into three watches.¹ Nowhere in America did such a method of reckoning time prevail. The mere fact that the Indians reckoned time by years, seasons, lunations and days signifies nothing as to their origin, for all primitive peoples do the same. It is only natural that man, observing the

¹ Bissell's "Biblical Antiquities," pp. 134-139.

succession of daylight and darkness, the changes of the moon and the revolution of the seasons, should reckon by these natural divisions of time. Rev. J. G. Wood says of the Hottentot: "As is the case with most savage races, his unit of time is the new moon, and he makes all his reckonings to consist of so many moons."—*Uncivilized Races of Men*, Vol. I., p. 239. Is this proof that the Hottentots are descendants of the lost tribes?

In Mexico and Central America, where the people had developed somewhat beyond the northern tribes, the method of reckoning time was both artificial and original. With both the Aztecs and Mayas the year consisted of eighteen months of twenty days each, divided into weeks of five days each, the last day of each week being set apart for marketing and pleasure. And five additional days were intercalated each year to make the 365.¹ Among the Muyscas the day was divided into four parts: three days made a week and ten weeks a lunation, or *suma*. Twelve *sumas* made a rural year, twenty a civil year and thirty-seven a ritual year.² These methods of reckoning time are strikingly un-Jewish.

THEIR PROPHETS AND HIGH PRIESTS.

The Indian priests or prophets were known by different names among different tribes. The Algonkins and Dakotas called them "those knowing divine things;" the Mexicans, "masters or guardians of the divine things;" the Cherokees, those "possessed of the divine fire;" the Iroquois, "keepers of the faith;" the Quichuas, "the learned;" the Mayas, "the listeners;" the Eskimo, "the ancient ones;" and the Apaches, the "wise ones." To the average white man they are known simply as "medicine

¹ "Native Races," Vol. II., Chapters XVI., XVII.

² "American Antiquities," p. 317.

men." Among the Algonkins there were three orders in the priesthood, the *wabeno*, the *mide* and the *jossakeed*, the last being the highest, which no white man could enter. The priesthood exerted a powerful influence over all the tribes and was the great foe that the Christian missionaries had to face in planting in the wilds of America the gospel of the cross. The advocates of the Jewish theory contend that the priesthoods of the American tribes are only another mark of their descent from the children of Israel. On the prophets and priests among the Indian tribes Jenkins remarks: "The Indians have among them orders of men answering to our prophets and priests. In the Muskohge language *hitch lalage* signifies cunning men, or persons prescient of futurity, much the same as the Hebrew seer. But the Indians, in general, call their pretended prophets *loa-che*, men resembling the holy fire, or *clohim*."—*The Ten Tribes*, p. 145.

Here is a surprise for our students of Hebrew! On their high priests he quotes with approval the following from Bartram: "There is in every town or tribe a high priest, usually nicknamed by the white people the juggler or conjurer, besides several of inferior rank."—*Ibid*, p. 147.

He also informs us that the Indians wore on their breast a plate made from a conch-shell, and that it was hung over the neck by an otter-skin strap the ends of which were passed through two holes bored in the shell and fastened to polished buck-horn buttons. This, he says, was in "imitation of the precious stones of *urim* and *thummim*, which miraculously blazed upon the high priest's breast the unerring words of the divine oracle."

None but the eye of a half-crazed theorist can see in these similarities any evidence to support the theory of

the Israelitish descent of the American Indians. If the Jews and Indians were the only peoples who have had prophets and high priests, there might be some force to the analogy, but as they are to be found among many other tribes, it counts for nothing and proves nothing.

FEAST OF FIRSTFRUITS.

The Jewish "feast of weeks," which is also called "Pentecost," "feast of harvest" or "day of firstfruits," is said to have had its analogue in America in the *puskita*, or *busk*, of the Creeks and similar festivals among other tribes.

The law governing an observance of the feast of weeks among the Israelites is given in Num. 28:26-31. "Also in the day of the firstfruits, when ye bring a new meat-offering unto the Lord, after your weeks be out, ye shall have an holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work; but ye shall offer the burnt-offering for a sweet savor unto the Lord: two young bullocks, one ram, seven lambs of the first year; and their meat-offering of flour mingled with oil, three tenth deals unto one bullock, two tenth deals unto one ram, a several tenth deal unto one lamb, throughout the seven lambs; and one kid of the goats, to make an atonement for you. Ye shall offer them beside the continual burnt-offering, and his meat-offering (they shall be unto you without blemish), and their drink-offerings." This feast lasted one day.

On the observance of such a feast among the Indians of the southern part of the United States, Jenkins says: "Mr. Bartram, who visited the Southern Indians in 1778, gives an account of the same feast, but in another nation. He says that the feast of firstfruits is their principal festival. This seems to end the old and begin the new ecclesiastical year. It commences when their new crops

are arrived at maturity. This is their most solemn celebration."—*The Ten Tribes*, p. 165.

I condense the following account of the observance of the busk among the Creeks from the description given of it in Gatschet's "Migration Legend of the Creeks," Vol. I., pp. 177-183. Let the reader be on the lookout for any Jewish features it may present, but let him not be disappointed if he does not find any.

The *busk*, or *puskita*, lasted from four to eight days, the length of its observance depending upon the size and importance of the town celebrating it. The time of its observance, which was fixed by the *miko* and his council, depended upon the maturity of the maize crop and upon other conditions. On the first day the men cleaned the inclosed area of their great house (four shed-like buildings put together so as to form an inclosed square) and sprinkled it with white sand. Those whose duty it was prepared the powerful emetic, black drink, while others placed four logs in the center of the area in the form of a cross, with the arms pointing toward the four cardinal points. At the point where the four logs converged, the new fire was made by friction. Three dances were danced during the day: in the morning the women of the turkey gens danced the turkey dance, in the afternoon four men and four women danced the tadpole dance, and in the evening the men danced the *hiniha*. In the middle of the forenoon of the second day the women took part in the gun dance. At noon the men rubbed ashes from the hearth of the new fire upon their chins, necks and bellies, and, after a plunge in the river, returned to the great house. They then rubbed some of the new maize, which in the meantime had been prepared by the women, upon their faces, breasts and hands, and the feasting began. The third day was passed by the men sitting in the

inclosed square. On the fourth day the women cleaned their hearths, and, after sprinkling them with clean, white sand, obtained a spark of the new fire and kindled their own with it. After this, the four logs being consumed, the men rubbed the ashes, as before, upon their persons and leaped into the river. Following this act they tasted salt and danced the long dance. On the fifth day four new logs were placed on the hearth of the great house and the men drank *assi* (black drink). The sixth and seventh days were spent by the men in the great house. The ceremonies of the eighth day were the most impressive. A decoction made of fourteen medicinal plants was drunken by the men and rubbed on their joints. Following this, another mixture was prepared composed of the ashes of old maize cobs, pine burs and ashes from the home hearths. A pan of this was mixed with another of wet clay and was brought to the cabin of the *miko*, and two others were taken to the cabins of the warriors, who rubbed themselves with the contents. After this, the *miko* and his counselors walked four times round the burning logs, each time throwing tobacco blossoms into the sacred fire, which ceremony was repeated by the warriors. A cane with two white feathers on one end of it was then stuck up at the *miko's* cabin, and remained until sunset, when a man of the fish gens took it down, and, followed by the populace, marched to the river. On the way the death-whoop was sounded four times, at intervals, until they reached the water's edge. Then some of the tobacco was thrown into the river, and the men, plunging in, picked up four stones, and, crossing themselves, uttered the death-whoop four times, each time throwing one of the stones back into the river. After nightfall the mad dance was participated in and the *busk* ended. At this feast a general amnesty was proclaimed

and all crimes, except murder, were forgiven. This is Adair's "day of atonement." At the celebration of the *busk* old furniture was broken to pieces and was replaced by new, and old feuds were forgiven and forgotten. Similar to the *busk* of the Creeks was the green-corn dance of the Cherokees and other tribes, but outside of their being feasts of firstfruits, marking the incoming harvest, they possessed no features similar to those of the feast of firstfruits among the children of Israel.

CIRCUMCISION.

It is claimed that circumcision was practiced by the American Indians. Beatty, an early traveler on the Ohio, asserts that an old Christian Indian informed him that an old uncle told him that long before his day the people practiced the rite, but that it was given up on account of the mockery of the young people. But this story has come through too many hands to be very reliable. It is possible that it was wholly the invention of the old Christian Indian to make the native religion appear to conform more closely to the Jewish.

Nevertheless, it is certain that a rite analogous to circumcision was practiced by a few American tribes, though it was by no means universal. Bancroft remarks: "Although circumcision was certainly not by any means general, yet sufficient proof exists to show that it was in use in some form among certain tribes."—*Native Races*, Vol. II., p. 278.

That the natives of Mexico and Central America practiced the rite is stoutly maintained by some, while it is just as stoutly denied by others. Las Casas and Mendieta declare that it was practiced by the Aztecs and Totonacs, and De Bourbourg claims the same for the Mijes, while Cogolludo denies that it was practiced in

Yucatan, and Herrera and Acosta consider the incision made on the prepuce to have been mistaken for the rite. Clavigero denies that the rite was ever practiced, and declares that the scarification of the breast, stomach and arms is the practice confounded by other authors with circumcision.¹

But even if the rite were performed in America, it could not have been Jewish circumcision, for circumcision among the Jews was for a "token of the covenant" between them and Jehovah, and the Indians had absolutely no knowledge of the Jewish Deity. Therefore, it was either a phallic rite, as Squier thinks,² or simply the sign of the renunciation of all sexual pleasure for a life of celibacy, as Brinton believes.³ But circumcision is by no means an exclusively Jewish practice, for it is observed by the Kaffirs, South Sea Islanders, Ethiopians, Egyptians and Mohammedans. Says Bancroft: "At the present day the rite of circumcision may be traced almost in an unbroken line from China to the Cape of Good Hope."—*Native Races*, Vol. III., p. 439. Therefore, if it was derived from the Old World at all, it might have been brought from many other countries besides Palestine.

ABLUTIONS AND ANOINTINGS.

Both the American Indians and the Jews applied water to their persons ceremonially, and this is triumphantly held up as another proof of their relationship. The following is from Jenkins: "The Indian nations in the coldest weather, and when the ground is covered with snow, practice their religious ablutions. Men and children turn out of their warm houses, singing their usual

¹ "Native Races," Vol. II., pp. 278, 280.

² "Native Races," Vol. III., p. 507.

³ "Myths of the New World," p. 172.

sacred notes, at the dawn of day, 'Y. O. He-wah,' and thus they skip along, singing till they reach the river, when they instantly plunge into it."—*The Ten Tribes*, p. 174.

But what is there in this to suggest an Israelitish origin? Smith ("Bible Dictionary," Art. Baptism) says: "It is well known that ablution and bathing was common in most ancient nations as a preparation for prayers and sacrifice, or as expiatory of sin." I presume that there is not a savage tribe but who applies water to the person in some of its ceremonies. Moral defilement is so intimately connected with physical defilement in the uncultured mind that the means that removes one will remove the other.

On the anointings among the Indians, Jenkins says: "The Hebrews also had various washings and anointings. They generally, after bathing, anointed themselves with oil. Their kings, prophets and priests were anointed with oil, and the Saviour himself is described as 'the Anointed.' The Indian priests and prophets, or beloved men, are always anointed by unction. The Chickasaws, some time ago, set apart some of their old men. They first obliged them to sweat themselves for the space of three days and nights in a small hut made for that purpose, at a distance from the town, for fear of pollution, and from a strong desire they all have of secreting their religious mysteries. They eat nothing but green tobacco leaves and drink nothing but button-snake wood tea to cleanse their bodies and prepare them to serve in the beloved, holy office. After which their priestly garments are put on, with the ornaments before described, and then bear's oil is poured on their heads. Like the Jews, both men and women often anoint themselves with bear's oil."—*The Ten Tribes*, p. 174.

In the absence of proof that the Hebrew prophets and priests sweated themselves, ate green tobacco leaves, drank button-snake wood tea and anointed their heads with bear's oil, preparatory to taking up their sacred duties, we are justified in concluding that this analogy proves nothing but the ignorance and credulity of its propounders.

LAWS OF UNCLEANNES.

The Jewish and Indian women, during their menstrual periods, were separated from society, and the former were never more scrupulous about this than were our own aboriginal tribes. Usually among the Indians lodges, apart from the rest, were set aside as places for their retirement. Schoolcraft considers this the most strikingly Jewish of any of the Indian customs. "The most striking custom of apparently Hebraic origin," he says, "is the periodical separation of females, and the strong and universal idea of uncleanness connected therewith."—*Schoolcraft's Archaeology*, Vol. III., pp. 60, 61.

Of all the analogies cited, this is the only one so far considered which is sufficiently exclusive to deserve any special attention, for while the idea of uncleanness was associated with woman at the time of her menstrual periods by many primitive peoples, yet among none was it associated with her to the degree that it was among the Jews and the American Indians.

CITIES OF REFUGE.

Israel had six cities of refuge, three on each side of the Jordan. To any of these a person suspected of murder might flee and find a safe asylum until his case had been decided by judicial inquiry. If, upon trial, he were found guilty, he was turned over to the avenger of blood

for execution; if guiltless, he was released; or, if guiltless of the crime of murder, but chargeable with some other form of homicide, he was detained until the death of the high priest.

A similar institution existed in America in the "peace towns" of the Cherokees, Creeks and Senecas. The peace town of the Cherokees was Echota, near the mouth of the Little Tennessee. That of the Creeks was Kusa, or Coosa, on the Coosa River, Alabama. And that of the Senecas was Gaustrayea, four miles east of Lewiston, New York. Among the Cherokees—and here their law differed from that of the Israelites—even the willful murderer was safe as long as he remained within the precincts of their sacred Echota, until the annual recurrence of the green-corn dance, when a general amnesty was proclaimed. If he desired to leave before, he either had to run the risk of being slain, or else appease the wrath of the friends of the murdered man with presents. Among the Iroquois, fugitives from justice, no matter what their tribe, found safety, lodging and food at Gaustrayea. Curtains of deerskin separated the pursued from the pursuer until the former had been properly cared for, when they were withdrawn and the hostile parties could either renew hostilities or flight as they saw fit.¹ Similar to these were the places of refuge of the Greeks and Romans, such as groves, altars and temples. So great was their abuse that Tiberius limited their number and greatly curtailed their privileges. This, with the preceding, is the closest analogy that I have observed between the American Indians and the children of Israel, yet when there is so much against it the relationship of the two peoples can not be proved by any such chance similarities.

¹ "Nineteenth Rept. Bu. Am. Ethno.," pp. 207, 208.

ABSTINENCE FROM UNCLEAN THINGS.

Apocstle Orson Pratt gives as one of his reasons for believing that the Indians are of Jewish extraction "their abstaining from eating certain things forbidden by the law of Moses." And Jenkins says: "The Indians would not eat either the Mexican hog, or the sea-cow, or the turtle, as Gumilla and Edwards inform us; but they held them in the greatest abhorrence. Neither would they eat the eel, or any animal or bird they deemed impure."—*The Ten Tribes*, p. 175.

But the disgust in which these various animals were held must have been purely local, for they were, in many parts, considered very wholesome as food. The Mosaic law classes as unclean the camel, hare, coney, hog, those fishes without scales, the weasel, mouse, lizard and chameleon. In America the llama, the American camel, was highly prized as food by the Peruvian tribes. The tapir, the Mexican hog, was a favorite article of food with the Mayas, as was also the turtle; and both, with the sea-cow, were highly esteemed by the Isthmian tribes. And as for squirrels, eels, catfish, hares, and, in a pinch, even mice and snakes, they did not come amiss in the aboriginal larder. Cannibalism prevailed throughout America, and there were but few tribes who were not addicted to the practice of eating human flesh.¹ The semi-civilized Aztecs and Mayas both were cannibals and ate the flesh of their human sacrifices. The practice prevailed in the north among the Algonkins and Iroquois, as noted by the Jesuits, and history records the fate of a Miami chief who, being a friend to the English, was murdered by the Indian allies of the French and devoured. Lafitau, Muret and Bruhier declare that some of the South Amer-

¹ "Prehistoric America," p. 62.

ican tribes even ate their dead, but this is denied by other, and perhaps better, authority.¹ It would seem that the American Indians were very far from the Jews in respect to the animal food they ate.

MARRIAGE, DIVORCE AND PUNISHMENT OF ADULTERY.

Says Catlin: "In their marriages the Indians, as did the ancient Jews, uniformly buy their wives by giving presents, and in many tribes very closely resemble them in other forms and ceremonies of their marriages."

But the custom of wife-buying is not exclusively a Jewish custom. In Africa the Zulu still purchases his wife with oxen, the number given depending upon the value set upon her by her parents. And the practice of wife-buying existed among our barbaric English ancestors up to the time of Cnut, who abolished it. It is only one of those practices of primitive society arising from the belief that women are the property of the men. This is a sufficient explanation of the American custom; we need not look for a better.

As to divorce, if an American Indian and his wife could not agree, the usual custom was for them simply to separate, he going to his gens and she to hers, the children, if they had any, usually following the mother. I fail to see any distinctive Jewish custom here.

As for the crime of adultery, a very few tribes punished the guilty parties by stoning them to death. The American Indian, like most other men, was jealous of his marital rights, and as stones were plentiful and he knew how to hurl them it is not to be wondered at that he sometimes resorted to this method of punishing his wife's seducer. Why we have to go to Palestine for an explanation of this simple and primitive method of punishment is

¹ "First Rept. Bu. Am. Ethno.," p. 182.

inexplicable. But all tribes did not stone the adulterer to death. Among the Modocs the adulterer was punished by putting out an eye, by expulsion from the tribe, or by paying a fine of a string of beads.¹ A Gallinomos slew his wife's seducer.² In another California tribe the husband could either kill his wife or give her up to her mate and appropriate the latter's wife to himself.³ Adultery among the Comanches was punishable by death or exposure or was settled by private agreement by the interposition of the elderly warriors.⁴ The Zapotec could kill or pardon his wife's seducer according to pleasure; a man who forcibly deflowered a virgin was stoned to death.⁵ Adulterers in Mexico were either stoned or strangled.⁶ In Yucatan and Guatemala they were thrown from precipices.⁷ Again, in Guatemala, a married man taken in the act with a maiden was compelled to pay a fine of from sixty to one hundred rare feathers. If the crime was committed with a married woman, for the first offense the parties were simply warned and were compelled to pay a fine of feathers; for the second, they were forced to inhale the smoke of a certain herb, *tobacoyay*, which, while painful, was not fatal.⁸ There is nothing in these methods of punishment to suggest a Jewish derivation.

ORNAMENTS.

The children of Israel and the American Indians wore ornaments, and of course, as no other people have done the same, they must be related. William Penn writes as

¹ "Native Races," Vol. I., p. 350.

² *Ibid.*, p. 390.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 412.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 510.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 660.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 464.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 658.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 673.

follows on Indian ornamentation: "They wore ear-rings and nose-jewels; bracelets on their arms and legs; rings on their fingers; necklaces made of highly polished shells found in their rivers and on their coasts. Their females tied up their hair behind, worked bands around their heads and ornamented them with shells and feathers, and are fond of strings of beads round several parts of their bodies. They use shells and turkey spurs around the tops of their moccasins, to tinkle like little bells as they walk."

And Jenkins sees in these Indians, with their ornaments and finery, a wonderful resemblance to the people described by the prophet Isaiah (ch. 3: 18). "In that day the Lord will take away the bravery of their tinkling ornaments about their feet, and their cauls, and their round tires like the moon, the chains, and the bracelets, and the mufflers, the bonnets, and the ornaments of the legs, and the headbands, and the tablets, and the ear-rings, the rings, and the nose-jewels, etc., etc."

Of course this is very conclusive! It need not surprise us if before long our Mormon friends should suggest the descent of the Fiji Islanders and our "upper ten" from the lost tribes for the same reason. This argument is devoid of both logic and common sense.

PURIFICATION AND PREPARATORY CEREMONIES.

Adair gives this account of the purification and preparatory ceremonies of the American Indians, evidently of the Creeks: "Before the Indians go to war, they have many preparatory ceremonies of purification and fasting, like what is recorded of the Israelites. When the leader begins to beat up for volunteers, he goes three times round his dark winter house, contrary to the course of the sun, sounding the war-whoop, singing the war-song and

beating a drum. He addresses the crowd who come about him, and after much ceremony he proceeds to whoop again for the warriors to come and join him and sanctify themselves for success against the common enemy, according to their ancient religious law. A number soon join him in his winter house, where they live separate from all others, and purify themselves for the space of three days and three nights, exclusive of the first broken day. On each day they observe a strict fast till sunset, watching the young men very narrowly (who have not been initiated in war titles), lest unusual hunger should tempt them to violate it, to the supposed danger of all their lives in the war, by destroying the power of their purifying, beloved physic, which they drink plentifully during that time."—*The Ten Tribes*, pp. 127, 128.

Gatschet describes the winter house of the Creeks as a building circular in shape and about twenty-five or thirty feet in diameter. Around the wall was a broad, circular seat, and in the middle, on an elevated bit of ground, was built the fire. From its high temperature it was called the "hot house," and here the braves came to take their religious sweats. The preparation for war consisted in drinking war-physic, made from snakeroot, and singing war and charm songs, under the leadership of conjurers, who, they claimed, thus gave them power over their enemies.

The children of Israel, before going to battle, were wont to consult Jehovah through their prophets and the Urim and Thummim, offer sacrifices and prepare themselves by fasting and prayer; but we are not informed that they assembled their armies with the war-whoop, drank war-physic, went through a religious sweat or learned charm-songs. So much for this analogy

ARK OF THE COVENANT.

Elder Stebbins has taken the following description of the Indian "ark of the covenant" from Haines' "American Indian": "It is also insisted by many, as further evidence showing the Jewish origin of the American Indian, that they have had their imitation of the ark of the covenant in ancient Israel. Rev. Ethan Smith says that different travelers, and from different regions, unite in this, and he refers to the fact that Mr. Adair is full in his account of it. He describes it as a small square box, made convenient to carry on the back; that the Indians never set it on the ground, but on rocks (logs?) in low ground, where stones were not to be had, and on stones where they are to be found."—*Lectures*, p. 248.

Adair, in his description of this ark,¹ tells us that it was covered with "drest deer skin and placed on a couple of short blocks." He states that a certain gentleman of his acquaintance saw a very importunate stranger who was very anxious to view the contents, when the Indian "centinel" drew his bow and would have shot him through had he not suddenly withdrawn. When this gentleman asked the interpreter what this box contained, he told him that there was nothing in it but a "bundle of conjuring traps." This ark, then, turns out to be only a so-called "medicine-box." It also seems that the cane boxes in which some tribes carried the bones of their dead were mistaken for arks. Brinton says: "Instead of interring the bones, were they those of some distinguished chieftain, they were deposited in the temples or the council-houses, usually in small chests of cane or splints. Such were the charnel-houses which the historians of De Soto's expedition so often mentioned, and these are the 'arks'

¹ "Nineteenth Rept. Bu. Am. Ethno.," p. 503.

which Adair and other authors, who have sought to trace the descent of the Indians from the Jews, have likened to that which the ancient Israelites bore with them on their migrations."—*Myths of the New World*, p. 296. Comment is unnecessary.

SANCTUM SANCTORUM.

"As the Jews had a sanctum sanctorum, or the most holy place, in their tabernacle and temple, so have all the Indian nations, particularly the Muskogee nation. It is partitioned off by a mud wall, about breast high, between the white seat which always stands on the left of the red painted war-seat. There they deposit their consecrated vessels and supposed holy utensils, none of the laity daring to approach the sacred place for fear of particular damage to themselves, and a general hurt to the people, from the supposed divinity of the place."—*The Ten Tribes*, p. 149.

Gatschet ("A Migration Legend of the Creeks," Vol. I., pp. 171-174) gives a very good description of this "sanctum sanctorum" of the Creeks, made up from the accounts of Swan, Milfort and Hawkins, and from him I draw the following facts, leaving the reader to decide whether or not the sacred place of this tribe bears any resemblance whatever to the Holy of Holies of the Jews. Their great house, *tchuku lako*, was formed by four shed-like buildings opening inward and placed so as to form an inclosed square. Each building faced one of the cardinal points of the compass and was divided into three apartments, or cabins, by low clay partitions. In each apartment there were three seats, or platforms, rising one above another, the first being two feet above the ground, the second eight feet above the first, and the third eight feet above the second. Over these were

thrown mats of cane and each would seat from forty to sixty persons. Hawkins says that the northern building was for the warriors; the eastern, for the young people; the southern, for the beloved men; and the western, for the chiefs and people of high rank. The last was also their sanctum sanctorum, and here, according to both Swan and Jenkins, they made their war-physic, black-drink and kept their chaplets, eagle-tails, pipe of peace and stored lumber. In the center of the inclosed area, which was known as consecrated ground, a perpetual fire was kept burning, fed by four logs and attended by men specially appointed for that purpose.

The Jewish tabernacle was a rectangular structure 45 feet long, 15 feet wide and 15 feet high, sided with boards of acacia wood. One-third of the inclosed space on the west end was called the Holy of Holies, the other two-thirds the Holy Place. A veil separated the two apartments. Within the inner sanctuary was the ark of the covenant containing the tables of the covenant, and here, on the tenth day of the seventh month, the high priest appeared with the blood of the sacrifice which he "offered for himself and for the sins of the people." It requires an eye long trained by a determination to prove the Jewish theory to observe in the great house of the Muskogee Indians any similarity whatever to the tabernacle of the children of Israel.

BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

On the manner of burial among the American Indians, and its resemblance to the Jewish, Jenkins says: "If any one dies at a distance and they are not pursued by an enemy, they place the corpse on a scaffold, secured from wild beasts and fowls of prey. When they imagine the flesh is consumed, and the bones dried, they return

to the place, bring them home and inter them in a very solemn manner. The Hebrews, in like manner, carefully buried their dead, but, on any accident, they gathered their bones, and laid them in the tombs of their forefathers."—*The Ten Tribes*, p. 133.

He then cites the burial of the bones of Joseph which were brought by the Israelites from the land of Egypt.

But there are but very few particular resemblances to the Jewish in the burial customs of the American Indians. It was a practice with a number of tribes to inter their dead temporarily, until after the flesh had decayed away, when the bones were gathered, carefully scraped and placed in the "bone house" until it was full, when they were all buried in a common sepulchre. The Jesuits observed this custom among the tribes of Canada, and it was practiced by the Choctaws and other southern tribes. This is the practice that is cited as a Jewish analogy.

Dr. H. C. Yarrow, in his excellent paper, "Study of the Mortuary Customs of the North American Indians," in the "First Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology," gives seven general methods pursued by the American Indians in disposing of their dead, none of them similar exclusively to the Jewish.

"1. By inhumation in pits, graves or holes in the ground, stone graves or cists, in mounds, beneath or in cabins, wigwams, houses or lodges, or in caves.

"2. By embalment or a process of mummifying, the remains being afterwards placed in the earth, caves, mounds, boxes on scaffolds or in charnel-houses.

"3. By deposition of remains in urns.

"4. By surface burial, the remains being placed in hollow trees or logs, pens, or simply covered with earth, or bark, or rocks, forming cairns.

"5. By cremation, or partial burning, generally on the surface of the earth, occasionally beneath, the resulting bones or ashes being placed in pits in the ground, in boxes placed on scaffolds or trees, in urns, sometimes scattered.

"6. By aerial sepulture, the bodies being left in lodges, houses, cabins, tents, deposited on scaffolds or trees, in boxes or canoes, the two latter receptacles supported on scaffolds or posts, or placed on the ground. Occasionally baskets have been used to contain the remains of children, these being hung to trees.

"7. By aquatic burial, beneath the water, or in canoes, which were turned adrift."

Among the Jews the burial usually took place the same day that the person died. The common manner of burial was in vaults, natural or artificial excavations in the earth or rock. Such methods of disposing of the dead as by cremation, or by depositing them on scaffolds, in hollow logs or by setting them adrift in canoes, were not practiced by the people of Palestine. The usual posture in which the Indian buried his dead was the squatting; in Palestine the body was usually laid upon its back.

Reader, these are the analogies cited by Mormon writers to prove that the American Indians are descendants of the children of Israel. Mr. Stebbins, after giving them all, either in his own or in the language of another, says: "Many more evidences might be presented, but it seems needless; for enough proof has been given to satisfy all just demands for evidence that the native Americans were descendants from the Hebrew tribes."—*Lectures*, p. 256. Some people are easily satisfied.

Out of the entire number of analogies cited, there are but two that are sufficiently close to cause any comment.

These are the custom of the separation of women and the institution of the "peace town," which bear a somewhat close similarity to a practice and an institution among the Jews. The rest, when carefully followed out, which the Mormons dare not do in their works, turn out to be so slight that most of them need a good deal of touching up to make the supposed Hebrew features apparent. But what do the two analogies mentioned prove? Nothing; for more than to counterbalance them we have the native peculiarities in physique, religion, custom, habit and belief which can not be harmonized with this theory of descent. Therefore we must look upon them as purely natural coincidences which count for nothing and prove nothing.

The importance of these so-called analogies as evidence vanishes when we come to consider that there are as many points of resemblance between the Indians and other peoples as there are between them and the children of Israel. And this shows that by this argument they can be connected with almost every race under the sun. Bradford devotes an entire chapter (Chapter X.) of his work, "American Antiquities," to these analogies, and cites a great number between the American Indians and the Celts, inhabitants of Madagascar, Etrurians, Egyptians, Hindoos, Mongols, Chinese and Malays.

The inhabitants of Madagascar, he says, are physically approximated to the red race; they are divided into tribes; they trace their descent in the female line (a custom so distinctly American that it exceeds in importance and force any analogy that the advocates of the Jewish theory have ever cited); they revere the dead; they scrape the flesh from the bones of the corpse; they bury the weapons of war and the wealth of the deceased with him; they erect tumuli over their graves; they sur-

round their towns with embankments; they attribute disease to the agency of evil spirits, and they practice divination.

The Mongols, like the Americans, are fond of dancing; use the bow; girdle trees; practice polygamy; purchase their wives; suspend their dead from the branches of trees or place them on scaffolds; tattoo; wear moccasins; are fond of smoking; shave their heads, with the exception of the scalplock; practice scalping; sacrifice dogs; use the vapor bath; bury their dead in a sitting posture; wear plumes; store corn in the ground; use the fire-drill; make use of the quippu; prohibit the marriage of persons of the same clan, and preserve the skulls of their enemies.

And the Malays, like the Americans, use the quippu; tattoo; compress the heads of their infants; bury their dead in a sitting posture; embalm and exsiccate the body; preserve skulls; have amulets and charms; wear masks in their religious ceremonies; use poisoned arrows, and put to death the relatives of the deceased.

These analogies are as striking as any that have been pointed out between the Indians and the Jews, and if the Jewish analogies prove a Jewish descent, the Madagascaran, Mongolian and Malayan analogies prove a Madagascaran, Mongolian and Malayan descent. And this would be fatal to the theory of the Book of Mormon.

A number of forceful objections may also be raised against the opinion that the American Indians are of Jewish descent.

1. There is positively no physical likeness between the two peoples. They are unlike in the form of their skulls, generally speaking, in physiognomy, in complexion and in color and texture of hair. Says Bradford: "Moreover, the physical types of the two races are essentially

different, and we know of no effect of climate by which the Hebrew could have been transformed into the red and beardless American."—*American Antiquities*, p. 240.

2. The American tribes from the Arctic to the Antarctic possess no traces of a former belief in one God or a monotheistic worship, all reports to the contrary being false, as proved by the researches of such critical ethnologists as Gallatin, Tylor, Parkman, Brinton and Powell. The highest form of theism in America was polytheism, the more civilized nations all having extensive pantheons.

3. Israelitish society, in its structure, was radically different from American society. In Palestine the social unit was the family; in America it was the gens or clan. A gens is defined by Powell to be "an organized body of consanguineal kindred in the female line." A clan was such a body tracing descent in the male line. Descent, however, in the female line was far more common, and Brinton mentions the Algonkins, Iroquois, Cherokees, Chata Muskokis, Catawbas, Natchez, Mandans, Minnetarees and Kolosch as practicing it. Frequently a number of gentes made up a phratry, or brotherhood, and a number of these composed the tribe, as with the Wyandots, who were divided into eleven gentes, composing four phratries, and the whole constituting the tribe.¹ This social peculiarity is radical and fundamental and is hard to be accounted for if the Indians are of Israel. Why they should have lost all traces of a former Jewish social polity and should have retained a number of unimportant customs is inexplicable.

4. The American languages have no affinity whatever with the Hebrew. They belong to an entirely different

¹ "The American Race," p. 45.

linguistic group. Besides, their diversity is so great as positively to preclude the possibility of a derivation from that source at least at as recent a date as 600 B. C.

5. No authentic Hebrew relics have ever been found in America. The "Newark Tablet," with its Hebrew inscription and its "truculent likeness" of Moses, which created such a stir in archæological circles forty years ago, is proved to be a fraud, perpetrated by David Wyrick, a half-crazed surveyor of Newark, Ohio, who, disappointed at not finding evidence of the Jewish origin of the American Indians, determined to manufacture some. Although the fraudulent character of this tablet has been unquestionably established, Mormon writers and speakers persist in referring to it as though its character had never been questioned.¹

6. There is no evidence by which to prove that the American nations ever reached the culture status of the Hebrews. They did not use either iron or steel and they were wholly unacquainted with the use of the plummet.²

7. It is certain that the builders of the ancient cities of Central America and Mexico and the mounds of the United States did not have the horse and other domestic animals mentioned in the Book of Mormon, for their remains have never been found among any of the antiquities, neither have their forms been etched or carved on any relic so far discovered. That the horse was an inhabitant of the New World before Columbus I do not deny, for its remains have been found in the deposits of the earlier ages, but that it was here during the time that the cities of Central America and the mounds of the Mis-

¹"Joseph the Seer," pp. 155-160. "The Book Unsealed," pp. 28-31. "Truth Defended," pp. 130, 131. "Book of Mormon Lectures," pp. 255, 256. "Parsons' Text-book," pp. 25, 26.

²"Essays of an Americanist," p. 442.

issippi Valley were being built I deny, as there is no evidence whatever to sustain it.

8. The aboriginal arts, customs, habits, ceremonies and institutions of the American race bear the marks of utter barbarism and of their indigenous development. The slight similarities to the arts, customs, habits, ceremonies and institutions of the Old World which appear fade away before a careful, scientific comparison. They are found to have no connection with each other and are to be explained as purely natural coincidences.

9. The myths and traditions of the Americans that have come down to us are so different from those of Hebrew lore that no student of to-day assigns to them a Hebrew origin. Let the reader consult Brinton's "Myths of the New World," and the truthfulness of this assertion will be observed.

In the light of these facts, I contend that it can not be maintained that the American Indians are of Jewish descent, as claimed in the Book of Mormon.