

## CHAPTER IX.

Have the Indian Languages Been Derived from the Hebrew and the Egyptian?—Supposed Hebrew Words in the American Languages—Comparisons Between Indian Words and the Words of Other Languages—American Languages Not a Wreck, but a Development—The Structure of the American Languages—The Diversity of the American Languages—Supposed Book of Mormon Words in American Nomenclature.

As the philologist looks out over the broad field of human speech a number of questions naturally suggest themselves to him. What is the origin of these multifarious forms? What is their antiquity? Through what mutations have they passed? What relation do they bear to one another? These are questions that have perplexed, and will doubtless always perplex, the student of human philology.

Various theories, some of which have been fully refuted and given up, have been advanced to account for the origin of human speech. The main hypotheses are three: That human speech is a direct and completed gift from the Creator; that it is wholly a human invention; and that it is an evolution from a natural germ. According to Sleicher, primordial language was simply an organism of vocal gestures. Gould Brown held that language is partly natural and partly artificial. Adam Smith and Dugald Stewart advocated that human speech is both a human creation and a human development by man's own artificial invention. According to Wedgewood human language originated in the efforts of man to imitate the cries of nature, while Plato conceived

language to be the invention of the gods and by them given to man.<sup>1</sup> Is it unreasonable to believe that language is both a gift and a development, given by the great Creator to man in the beginning in germinal form and developed since by human genius into the highly inflected tongues of the Aryan and Semitic races?

The number of languages throughout the world has been differently estimated. According to one estimate there are 3,538, of which 987 are found in Asia, 587 in Europe, 300 in Africa, and 1,664 in America.<sup>2</sup> These various languages, according to certain structural peculiarities, are grouped together in three grand divisions or classes, the monosyllabic, polysynthetic and inflectional. Monosyllabic languages are those in which the "roots, or sounds expressive only of the material or substantial parts of things, are used." Polysynthetic languages are those in which "a modifying termination, significant of the relations of ideas or things to each other, is affixed or glued to the root," while inflected languages are those in which the parts of speech are varied by declension or conjugation. The languages of the Chinese, Tibetans and, perhaps, the Japanese, belong to the monosyllabic group; those of the Americans and Turanians to the polysynthetic group, and those of the Aryans and Semites to the inflectional group.<sup>3</sup>

But few people are aware of the exceeding diversity and richness of the American tongues. The common opinion is that if an individual can speak "Indian," he can converse with any tribe on the continent, but this is not true. Every tribe has its own particular vocabulary and set of grammatical forms which distinguish its

<sup>1</sup> Bancroft, III: 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Homiletic Review*, Jan., 1885, p. 349.

<sup>3</sup> Bancroft, III: 8, 9.

tongue from the tongues of the other tribes around it. So great is the diversity that exists that some philologists have despaired utterly of ever tracing the various Indian languages back to a common point of divergence, but Brinton mentions three characteristics which seem to be a common bond binding them together into one great linguistic body by themselves, distinct from all the other languages of the earth. These characteristics are: First, the prominence of pronouns and pronominal forms, exceeding in this respect even the Greek, from which they are called pronominal languages. Secondly, polysynthesis, or the power of running several words together, dropping the unimportant parts and retaining only those that are significant. And, thirdly, incorporation, by which the object and manner of action are included in the verb or verbal expression. These characteristics, he thinks, constitute the American tongues a distinct body by themselves.<sup>1</sup>

At first the American languages were studied chiefly for two reasons: that certain political, trading and business interests might be subserved, and that the tribes speaking them might be made acquainted with the gospel of Jesus Christ. Later they were taken up and studied purely for scientific reasons, and so important have they been found as throwing light upon the psychology, relationship, antiquity and migrations of the American tribes that they have come to have a strong influence in governing the speculations of Americanists. Among the earlier students of the American languages, who carried on their investigations for purely scientific reasons, were Humboldt, Duponceau and Gallatin. In the writings of these philologists we do not find the crude absurdities

<sup>1</sup> "Essays of an Americanist," pp. 320, 321.

that appear in the pages of Adair, Boudinot and Priest, the Mormon "authorities." They came to the American tongues, not with a theory to prove, but for the sake of getting out of them only what they contained. Among later students of American philology none stand higher than Major J. W. Powell and Dr. D. G. Brinton. Powell's excellent paper, "On the Evolution of Language," in the "First Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology," and Brinton's interesting chapters on American philology in his "Essays of an Americanist," are the sources from which I have obtained my information for this chapter on the structure of the American tongues.

According to the Book of Mormon, the civilized ancestors of the American Indians spoke and wrote two Old World languages—the Hebrew and the Egyptian—both of which, in course of time, became altered or changed. The Egyptian, in its changed or altered form, was called the "Reformed Egyptian." Moroni says of these languages: "And now, behold, we have written this record [Book of Mormon] according to our knowledge in the characters, which are called among us the reformed Egyptian, being handed down and altered by us, according to our manner of speech. And if our plates had been sufficiently large, we should have written in Hebrew; but the Hebrew hath been altered by us also; and if we could have written in Hebrew, behold, ye would have had no imperfection in our record."—*Mormon* 4:8. From this Mormon writers claim that the Indian languages are perversions of and variations and deviations from the Egyptian and the Hebrew, and that they still retain certain features in their etymology and syntax by which this relationship may be proved.

In this chapter I expect to show that the American languages are not only devoid of any important resem-

blances to the Hebrew and the Egyptian, but that, considering their structure and diversity, it would be an impossibility for them to have been derived from these languages no longer ago than 600 B. C.

SUPPOSED HEBREW WORDS IN THE AMERICAN LANGUAGES.

To prove their claim that the American Indians are of Jewish descent, Mormon writers quote the statements of a number of the older authors relative to the similarity of the Hebrew and American tongues.

Priest says: "Hebrew words are found among the American Indians in considerable variety."—*The Book Unsealed*, p. 32.

Boudinot says: "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.

Adair says: "The Indian language and dialects appear to have the very idiom and genius of the Hebrew. Their words and sentences are expressive, concise, emphatical, sonorous and bold; and often, both in letters and signification, synonymous with the Hebrew language."—*Talmdage's Two Lectures*, p. 46.

And Mr. Stebbins says that in June, 1868, he heard an educated Seneca lecture in Van Buren County, Michigan, who said that "he could refer his hearers to 150 words in the Seneca language which closely resembled the Hebrew."—*Book of Mormon Lectures*, p. 246.

These quotations, which also appear in other Mormon works, are accepted by the Mormons as perfectly trustworthy, and are looked upon as confirmatory of their

claim. But while Priest was probably a very good harness-maker, Boudinot a very excellent gentleman, Adair a shrewd Indian trader, and the educated Seneca a well-meaning man, none of them were sufficiently well acquainted with the Indian languages as a body to speak authoritatively, and their opinions are directly at variance with those of Humboldt, Duponceau, Gallatin, Brinton and Powell, men who have been experts in American philology. It might be true that there are 150 words in the Seneca language resembling Hebrew words, and yet not prove that that language was derived from the Hebrew. It takes something more than a few verbal resemblances to prove lingual relationship.

The following is a list of comparisons, between supposed Indian and Hebrew words, compiled by Adair,<sup>1</sup> who was a trader among the Creeks and neighboring tribes for forty years, and presented by the Latter-day Saints as evidence of the truthfulness of their claim that the American Indian is a descendant of the Jew. These comparisons, with others, are found in such Mormon works as Phillips' "Book of Mormon Verified," Stebbins' "Book of Mormon Lectures," and Etzenhouser's "Book Unsealed," the last named being the work from which I have taken this list.

English.	Indian.	Hebrew or Chaldee.
Jehovah,	Yohewah,*	Jahoveh.
God,	Ale,*	Ale, Aleim.
Jah,	Yah or Wah,	Jah.
Shiloh,	Shilu,	Shiloh.
Heavens,	Chemim,†	Shemim.
Father,	Abba,*	Abba.
Man,	Ish,† Ishte,*	Ish.
Woman,	Ishto,†	Ishto.
Wife,	Awah,*	Ewah, Eve.
Thou,	Keah,†	Ka.
His wife,	Liani,†	Lihene.
This man,	Uwuh,†	Huah.
Nose,	Nichiri,†	Neheri.
Roof of a house,	Taubana-ora,†	Debonaou.
Winter,	Kora,*	Korah.

<sup>1</sup> "The Ten Tribes," p. 69.

English.	Indian.	Hebrew or Chaldee.
Canaan,	Canaai,*	Canaan.
To pray, <sup>1</sup>	Phale,*	Phalace.
Now,	Na,*	Na.
Hind parts,	Kesh,*	Kish.
Do,	Jennais,*	Jannon.
To blow,	Phaubac,†	Phauhe.
Rushing wind,	Rowah,	Ruach.
Ararat, or high mountain,	Ararat,‡	Ararat.
Assembly,	Kurbet,†	Grabit.
My skin,	Nora,†	Ourni.
Very hot,	Heru hara or ha'.,*	Hara hara.
Praise to the first Cause,	Hallehuwah,*	Hallelujah.

While this list has been repeatedly used by the Mormons, one thing is very noticeable: they have always been very careful not to betray the names of the tribes from whose languages these supposed Hebrew words are said to come. Can it be that they are fearful lest an investigation expose the inaccuracy of these comparisons? However, by consulting "The Ten Tribes of Israel," pp. 73-75, by Mr. Timothy Jenkins, I find that those words marked with a \* are said to be Creek, those marked with a † are said to be Caribbee, and those marked with a ‡ are said to belong to the languages of the Mohegans and kindred tribes.

That there may be a slight similarity between some of the words in the Hebrew and Indian languages I do not deny, but these similarities, if they exist, are so insignificant that they must be considered purely accidental and can have no weight whatever in determining the origin of the American Indian, especially when the structure of his languages is so very different from the structure of the Hebrew. Theorists have too often yielded to the temptation, in finding an Indian word identical, or nearly so, with a Hebrew word in meaning, and more or less closely resembling it in sound, to add a sound or omit a syllable in order to make the resemblance closer. This

<sup>1</sup> Mt. Etzenhouser has "to pay," but this is incorrect.

very thing has been done in the case of many of the above-given comparisons, as I shall show. Says George Bancroft: "The ingenious scholar may find analogies in language, customs, institutions and religions between the aborigines of America and any nation whatever of the Old World; the pious curiosity of Christendom, and not a peculiar coincidence, has created a special disposition to discover a connection between them and the Hebrews." —*History of the United States*, Vol. III., pp. 211, 212.

Where Adair, Boudinot and Priest could find a great many words among a few tribes resembling the words of only one Old World language, the Hebrew, Squier, a man without a theory to prove and a careful investigator, asserts that in all the tongues of North and South America he could find only 187 common to foreign languages. Out of this number 104 occur in the languages of Asia and Australia, forty-three in those of Europe, and forty in those of Africa.<sup>1</sup>

I now invite the reader's attention to the Hebrew or Chaldee words in Mr. Etzenhouser's list of comparisons. While some of them are undoubtedly correct, in others the spelling does not exactly represent the sound of the real Hebrew words, while still others I fail to find at all.

English.	Hebrew (Etzenhouser).	Hebrew.	Chaldee. <sup>2</sup>
Jehovah,	Jahoveh,	Jehovah or Jahu,	Jahveh.
God,	Ale, Aleim,	El, Elohim,	Elah.
Shiloh,	Shiloh,	Shiloh,	Shelam.
Heavens,	Shemim,	Shamayim,	Shemayin.
Father,	Abba,	Ab,	Abba.
Man,	Ish,	Ish,	Enash.
Woman,	Ishto,	Ishshah,	Ittah.
Wife,	Ewah, Eve,	Ishshah,	Shegal.
Thou,	Ka,	Att, attah, (ka mas. gend. suffix only),	Ant.
His wife,	Lihene,	Ishto,	Sheglohi.

<sup>1</sup> "Types of Mankind," p. 281.

<sup>2</sup> For assistance in compiling these Hebrew and Chaldee lists I am greatly indebted to my friend, Rev. J. S. Howk, D.D., of Jeffersonville, Ind.

English.	Hebrew.	Hebrew.	Chaldee.
This man,	Huah,	Haish hazeh, ha hu,	Haden.
Nose,	Neheri,	Aph, nechirim,	Anpin.
Roof,	Debonaou(r),	Gag,	Gaggah.
Winter,	Korah,	Choreph,	Chereph.
Canaan,	Canaan,	Canaan,	Canaan.
To pray,	Phalac(e),	Palal,	Beah.
Now,	Na,	Na,	Kean.
Hind parts,	Kish,	Achor,	Achorah.
Do,	Jannon,	Abad, asah,	Abad.
To blow,	Phauhe,	Puach,	Guach.
Rushing wind,	Ruach,	Ruach,	Ruach.
Assembly,	Grabit,	Moed, miqra,	Kenashah.
My skin,	Ourni,	Ori,	Gildi.
Very hot,	Hara hara,	Charah,	Azah.

It is not claimed that the Hebrew and Chaldee words in the third and fourth columns are the only equivalents of the English words given, but that they come the nearest to the Hebrew-Chaldee terms given by Mr. Etzenhouser, or are the ones which more frequently occur and were more commonly used.

In Mr. Etzenhouser's list the words *Shiloh*, *abba*, *ish*, *ka*, *Canaan*, *na* and *ruach* are spelled correctly; *ale* correctly represents the sounds of *el*; while *Jahoveh*, in the vowels of its first and last syllables, differs from *Jehovah*. Of the rest, *lihene*, *debonaou*, *kish*, *jannon* and *grabit* I have not been able to find; while *Aleim* is evidently a corruption of *Elohim*, *shemim* of *shamayim*, *ishto* of *ishshah*, *huah* of *ha hu* (from *ha*, the article, and *hu*, the personal pronoun), *neheri* of *nechirim*, *korah* of *choreph*, *phalace* of *palal*, *phauhe* of *puach*, *ourni* of *ori* and *hara hara* of *charah*.

As much liberty has been taken with the Indian words. According to Jenkins, *Yohewah*, *ale*, *abba*, *ishte*, *awah*, *kora*, *Canaai*, *phale*, *na*, *kesh*, *jennais*, *heru hara* or *hala* and *halleluwah* are Creek; the rest are either Caribbee or Mohegan words or words from the languages of northern tribes. As I have not been able to obtain a grammar or definer of either the Caribbee or Mohegan tongues, the words from these languages will

be passed unnoticed, except those for "man," "woman" and "nose," which, fortunately, I have found in a Caribbee vocabulary in Brinton's "The American Race," pp. 351, 352.

I have been, however, more fortunate in obtaining vocabularies of the Creek, furnished by Mr. Charles Gibson, of Eufaula; Mr. Jeff D. Ward, of Atoka, and Mrs. A. E. W. Robertson, of Muskogee, Indian Territory. Mr. Ward also kindly obtained for me vocabularies of both the Choctaw and the Cherokee.

Having seen the name of Mr. Charles Gibson, the Creek fable writer, in a magazine, I wrote to him the following letter, which explains itself:

BUCHANAN, Michigan, Aug. 6, 1903.

MR. CHARLES GIBSON, Eufaula, Indian Territory.

Dear Sir—Will you kindly give me information in regard to the following? I have a work entitled "The Ten Tribes of Israel," in which a comparison is made between certain words in the Hebrew and Indian tongues, some of them said to be Creek, as follows:

English.	Creek.	Hebrew.
God,	Ale,	Ale.
Father,	Abba,	Abba.
Wife,	Awah,	Eve, Eweh.
Winter,	Kora,	Cora.
Very hot,	Heru, hara or hala,	Hara hara.
Now,	Na,	Na.
Hind parts,	Kesh,	Kish.
To pray,	Phale,	Phalac.
Man or chief,	Ishte,	Ish.

Will you kindly inform me if these comparisons are correct? If they are not, will you give me the correct Creek word for each? Thanking you for your courtesy and hoping to hear from you, I am,  
Yours truly,  
CHARLES A. SHOOK.

Mr. Gibson is perhaps as good an authority on his language as can be found in the Indian Territory. Of him the *Twin Territories* for July, 1903, says: "Nearly every one who knows anything of Indian Territory, or the Creek tribe of Indians, has heard of Charles Gibson."

His fables, published at sometime or other in nearly every paper of Oklahoma or Indian Territory, together with 'Gibson's Rifle Shots,' have made for him a name that could scarcely be obtained by any other achievement."

To my letter Mr. Gibson sent the following reply:

EUFULA, Indian Territory, Aug. 9, 1903.

MR. CHARLES A. SHOOK, Buchanan, Michigan.

Dear Sir—Yours of the 6th inst. to hand, and I will answer your letter, etc., etc., to the best of my ability. First, the definitions to list of words in your list.

English.	Creek.
God,	Hi-sak-ita-missee.
Father,	Chuth-kee.
Wife,	Chi-hi-wa.
Winter,	Thlof-foo.
Very hot,	Hi-ye-ta.
Now,	Hi-yome.
Hind parts,	Sook-so.
To pray,	Eme-ko-sar-pi-ta.
Man,	Ho-non-wa.
Chief,	Micco.

Now, it is almost an impossibility to pronounce these words right by the way they are spelled by the English letters. They use the English alphabet, but have sounds that are not English—say the letter C is sounded *chee*, R is *hle*, V is *ah*, W is *we*, etc., etc. Therefore it is a hard matter to sound Creek words with the English letters, but you can see by the names or the interpretations of the words I send you that they are very different from yours. This is the Creek, but understand the Choctaw, Chickasaw and Cherokee languages are very different from my language; but there is very little resemblance in the others, as I understand a few words of these other tribes. Now, the Choctaw, when he mentions God, says *Abba Pinky*; when he speaks of a certain part of the hind parts of anything, he says *Iskish*. These are as near as I can come to your words. . . .

Yours, CHAS. GIBSON.

The reader can readily see that the Creek words as given by Mr. Gibson are very different from those said to be Creek which I sent to him, and which appear in Mormon works. To verify these comparisons I obtained, through Mr. Jeff D. Ward, another list of the Creek and

also lists of the Cherokee and Choctaw. I have reasoned that, as Adair was a trader among all these tribes for forty years, some of these words said to be Creek, but which are not Creek, may be corruptions from these other tongues. Mr. Ward's Cherokee and Choctaw lists prove that in at least two instances my reasoning has been correct. His comparisons are as follows:

English.	Creek.	Cherokee.	Choctaw.
God,	Hesaketamessie,	Oo-neh-lah-ner-he,	Che-ho-wa.
Father,	Chuthke,	Eh-dor-der,	Ank-ki.
Wife,	Hiwa,	Oo-dah-lee (hi s wife),	Tek-chi.
Winter,	Thluffo,	Goh-ler,	On-na-fa.
Very hot,	Hiyehethle,	Oo-de-leh-ger,	Lash-pa feh-na.
Now,	Mucher,	Nah-qwoo,	Him-ak.
Hind parts,	Yupa futcher,	Oh-ne-de-dler,	Ha-pul-lo.
To pray,	Emekosupeta,	E-dar-dar-dor-le- ster,	Im-mil-bush-sha.
Man,	Honunwa,	Ah-skar-yah,	Hat-tak.
Chief,	Mikko,	Oo-ger-we-yu-he,	Min-ko.

The Creek words in this list agree very well with those furnished by Mr. Gibson. The words for "God," "father," "winter," "to pray," "man" and "chief" are practically the same. The word for "wife," as given by Mr. Ward, is *hiwa*; as given by Mr. Gibson it is *chihirwa*, which according to Mrs. Robertson means "your wife." Mrs. Robertson also informs me that *hiyeta* and *hiyehethle* "express the same meaning." According to her list, *hiyome*, or *hiyomat*, and *mucher*, or *mucu*, are both equivalents of the English word "now." "*Suksu*," she says, "is given as 'the hip' in Loughridge's lexicon. *Yupu* means behind, and *fuccu* towards."

It seems certain that some of the words in the Mormon list, said to be Creek, are not Creek at all; others are corruptions of real Creek words; and still others are introductions from the English tongue. *Ale* is not the Creek word for "God," which is *Isakita immissi*, as given by Gatschet,<sup>1</sup> or *Esaugetuh Emissie*, as given by Brin-

<sup>1</sup>"Migration Legend of the Creeks," Vol. I., p. 215.

ton,<sup>1</sup> which is the same word with a broader pronunciation. Both Messrs. Ward and Gibson spell it differently. The Cherokee word also has no resemblance to *ale*; neither have the two Choctaw words for "God," *Chitokaka* and *Chihowa*. The word for "father," *abba*, does not occur in any of these tongues, but Gibson says that the Choctaw title for divinity is *abba pinky*. I have carefully looked Watkins' "Complete Choctaw Definer" through and fail to find it, but Brinton gives the Choctaw title for divinity *yuba paik*, which, he says, means, "Our Father Above."<sup>2</sup> By consulting the "Definer," I find that this title is from *uba* (pronounced with a short u), "above," and *piki*, "Our Father." It is altogether probable that Adair's *awah* comes from *hiwa*. Neither the Creek nor the Choctaw words for "winter" sound like *kora*, but the Cherokee word, *gohler*, slightly resembles it in sound, and Jenkins says that "*korah* is their word for winter with the Cherokee Indians, as it is with the Hebrews."—*The Ten Tribes*, p. 119. The words *heru*, *hara* or *hala* have evidently been derived from *hiyehethle*, for Mrs. Robertson says that *here*, pronounced *hehle*, "after a word adds the force of very." The word *na*, said to be Creek, is probably the first syllable of the Cherokee *nahqwoo*, or *naquo*, as Mrs. Robertson spells it. Gibson says that the Choctaw word for "hind parts" is *iskish*; Watkins gives *ishkish* as the Choctaw equivalent of our word "rump." *Kish*, in Hebrew, means "bow or power;" *achor* is the correct word for "hind parts." The words for "to pray" bear no resemblance to *phale*. Jenkins gives *ishte* as the Creek word for "man" or "chief;" this is, without doubt, from *isti*,<sup>3</sup> which is a

<sup>1</sup> "Myths," p. 67.

<sup>2</sup> "Myths," p. 65, Footnote.

<sup>3</sup> "Migration Legend," Vol. I., p. 203.

generic term meaning person, into which the sound of *h* has been inserted to make it more closely resemble the Hebrew word *ish*. *Isti* means a person, man, woman or child; *ish* means a male. Latter-day Saints tell us further that the Indians were in the habit of using the sacred ejaculation, "Hallelujah," and Jenkins says: "In the Choctaw nation they often sing 'Halleluyah,' intermixed with their lamentations."—*The Ten Tribes*, p. 132. Elsewhere (p. 144) he informs us that both the Choctaw and Cherokee tribes use the word. The Creeks had a sacred chant, *hi-yo-yu* or *hay-ay-al-gi*.<sup>1</sup> The Cherokees employed the sacred, but meaningless, chant, *ha-wi-ye-e-hi*, in their "Groundhog Dance;" *he-e! hay-u-ya han-iwa*, etc., was employed by their bear-hunters to attract the bear; while *ha-wi-ye-hy-u-we* was a part of one of their baby songs.<sup>2</sup> *Hayuya* falling on the ears of an Englishman might be mistaken for "hallelujah." Lastly, the words for "Jehovah" (*Yohewah* in the Cherokee, *Chehowa* in the Choctaw, and *Chihufa* in the Creek) are not original words at all, and the same may be said for *Shiloh*, *Canaan* and other Old Testament names, but are simply the efforts of these tribes to pronounce our Scriptural terms. In reply to my request that she give me her opinion on the origin of these Indian equivalents of "Jehovah," Mrs. Robertson, under date of June 24, 1904, writes: "I have not the least idea that *Yehowa* is anything else than our English word adapted to the Cherokee sounds, just as are the Creek and Choctaw, for I think the Choctaw *Chehowa* was derived in the same way." This is proved further by the fact that the word "Jehovah" is a title of modern invention, dating no further back than the seventeenth century. In the con-

<sup>1</sup> "Myths," p. 95, Footnote.

<sup>2</sup> "Nineteenth Rept. Bu. Am. Ethno.," pp. 279, 401.

sonantal writing of the Hebrews the word stands J-h-v-h, into which a scholar proposed inserting the vowels e, o and a from *edonai*, the word for "Lord." Aramaic papyri, discovered near Assuan in Egypt a few years ago and dating from the fifth century B. C., gives the name of the Hebrew God as "Jahu," and, as this is the name found in certain Babylonian business documents of that period, it is probable that it is the ancient name in place of "Jehovah." This makes it positively impossible for *Yohewah*, *Chihowa* and *Chihufa* to be original Indian words derived from the Hebrew, for "Jehovah" itself is now only about three centuries old.<sup>1</sup> The Creek word for panther or catamount is *katsa*,<sup>2</sup> why not argue their German origin because it so very closely resembles the German word for cat, *katze*, both in sound and signification?

A number of the supposed Indian words in Mr. Etzenhouser's list are declared by Jenkins to come from the Caribbee or Carib language. These are *chemim*, *ish*, *ishto*, *liani*, *nichiri*, *taubana-ora*, *phaubac*, *kurbet* and *nora*, the words for "heavens," "man," "woman," "his wife," "nose," "roof," "to blow," "assembly" and "my skin." As I have not been able to obtain a Caribbee definer, all of these words will have to be passed unnoticed with the exception of three. In Brinton's "The American Race," pp. 351, 354, I have found the original words for "man," "woman" and "nose" in eight of the Carib dialects. These dialects are: Bakairi, Motilone, Gauque, Tamanaca, Roucouyenne, Macuchi, Maquiritare and Cumanagoto. Of these dialects the Bakairi has the best claims to antiquity. Brinton remarks: "The oldest existing forms of the Carib stock are believed by Von

<sup>1</sup> See "Fresh Lights from the Ancient Monuments," p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> "Migration Legend," Vol. I., p. 155.

den Steinen to be preserved in the Bakairi, which I have accordingly placed first in the vocabularies of this family." This being true, if Hebrew words are found in the Carib language at all, we shall be more likely to find them in this dialect, but here we look in vain. The Carib words for "man," "woman" and "nose" are:

	<i>Bakairi,</i>	<i>Motilone,</i>	<i>Guaque,</i>	<i>Tamanaca,</i>
Man,	uguruto,	yakano,	guire,	nuani,
Woman,	pekoto,	esate,	guerechi,	aica,
Nose,	kchandai,	ona,	onari,	
	<i>Roucouyenne,</i>	<i>Macuchi,</i>	<i>Maquiritare,</i>	<i>Cumanagoto.</i>
Man,	okiri,	uratae,	rahuwari,	guarayto.
Woman,	oli,	nery,	wiri,	guariche.
Nose,	yemna,	yuna,	yonari,	ona.

Of the words for "man," not one bears the faintest similarity in sound to *ish*; *esate*, to one desperately determined to prove his theory, might suggest *ishto*; while *nichiri* is undoubtedly a corruption of *onari* or *yonari*.

Thus, as the reader can see, by a system of inexcusable orthographical jugglery, Adair and his followers have made a number of comparisons which, under close investigation, are shown to be erroneous, but which are confidently held up by the Mormons as proof of their claim that the American Indians are descendants of the Jews.

#### COMPARISONS BETWEEN INDIAN WORDS AND THE WORDS OF OTHER LANGUAGES.

But even if it were proved beyond a doubt that certain words in the Indian languages agree with certain Hebrew words both in sound and meaning, it would no more prove their Hebrew origin than the Chinese, Assyrian and Welsh words prove their descent from the languages of the Chinese, Assyrians and Welsh.

Dr. Le Plongeon is reported as saying: "The Maya language seems to be one of the oldest tongues spoken by man, since it contains words and expressions of all, or



nearly all, of the known polished languages of the earth."  
—*Ruins Revisited*, pp. 177, 178.

The reader should remember that the slight resemblances which exist are not claimed by philologists to be the result of ethnical descent, but rather are looked upon as purely accidental. This is the opinion of most of those who have made the American languages a special study.

On the similarity between the Maya and the Greek, Le Plongeon says: "One-third of the tongue is pure Greek." There is also a marked similarity between the names of five cities in Asia Minor, of 140 A. D., and a corresponding number in Central America.

*Armenian Cities.*

Chol,  
Colua,  
Zuivana,  
Cholima,  
Zalissa,

*Central American Localities.*

Chol-ula.  
Colua-can.  
Zuivan.  
Colima.  
Xalisco.

—*Atlantis*, p. 178.

Analogies between the American and Chinese languages are numerous. "Analogies have been found, or thought to exist, between the languages of several of the American tribes and that of the Chinese. . . . The similarity between the Otomi and the Chinese has been remarked by several writers."—*Native Races*, Vol. V., p. 39.

In 1857 Henley, a Chinese scholar, "published a list of words in the Chinese and Indian languages to show that they were of the same origin." Here is the list:

*Indian.*

Nanga,  
Yisoo,  
Keoka,  
Aekasoo,  
Yueta,  
Yeeta,  
Utyta,  
Leelum,  
Hoyapa,  
Apa,  
Ama,

*Chinese.*

Nang,  
Soa,  
Keok,  
Soo,  
Yuet,  
Yat,  
Hoto,  
Eelung,  
Hoah,  
Ape,  
Ama,

*English.*

Man.  
Hand.  
Foot.  
Beard.  
Moon.  
Sun.  
Much.  
Deafness.  
Good.  
Father.  
Mother.

*Indian.*

Kole,  
Kochae,  
Nagam,  
Koolae,  
Koochue,  
Chookoo,

*Chinese.*

Ako,  
Tochae,  
Yam,  
Kukay,  
Chuekoo,  
Kowchi,

*English.*

Brother.  
Thanks.  
Drunk.  
Her.  
Hog.  
Dog.

—*North Americans of Antiquity*, p. 203.

In "Atlantis," p. 435, Donnelly also gives a list of comparisons between the Otomi and the Chinese, many of which are as striking as any found in the Hebrew-Indian lists of Adair, Boudinot and the Latter-day Saints.

Says Bancroft: "Bossu found some similarity between the language of the Natchez of Louisiana and the Chinese."—*Native Races*, Vol. V., p. 39.

He says of Warden: "The last-mentioned author also quotes a long list of analogies between the written language of the Chinese and the gesture language of the northern Indians."—*Ibid.*

He quotes Taylor: "The Chinese accent can be traced throughout the Indian (Digger) language."

Bradford says: "It is perhaps somewhat more than an accidental coincidence that the Mexican particle *tzin*, which was usually added to the names of their kings, is identical with the Chinese *tsin*, and the Indo-Chinese *asyang*, an affix signifying *Lord*."—*American Antiquities*, p. 311.

I am satisfied that more words can be found in our American tongues approaching Chinese words in both sound and meaning than can be found approaching the Hebrew, yet it would be the height of absurdity to use this item of evidence as proof of their Mongolian origin.

Analogies are said to exist between the Welsh and the dialects of certain tribes. Bancroft gives the following incident: "A certain Lieutenant Roberts states that in 1801 he met an Indian chief at Washington who spoke

Welsh 'as fluently as if he had been born and brought up in the vicinity of Snowdon.' He said it was the language of his nation, the Asguaws, who lived eight hundred miles northwest of Philadelphia."—*Native Races*, Vol. V., pp. 119, 120.

Following this, he mentions another instance where Welshmen freely conversed with the natives in Welsh. "Another officer, one Captain Davies, relates that while stationed at a trading-post, among the Illinois Indians, he was surprised to find that several Welshmen who belonged to his company could converse readily with the aborigines in Welsh."—*Ibid*, p. 120.

Donnelly gives several comparisons between words of the Mandan and Welsh languages:

<i>English.</i>	<i>Mandan.</i>	<i>Welsh.</i>
I,	Me,	Mi.
You,	Ne,	Chwi.
He,	E,	A.
She,	Ea,	E.
It,	Qunt,	Hwynt.
We,	Noo,	Ni.
They,	Eonah,	Hona (fem.).
No (or there is not),	Megosh,	Nagoes.
No,		Na.
Head,	Pan,	Pen.
The Great Spirit,	Maho Peneta,	Mawr Penathir.

On Scandinavian traces Bancroft says: "Brasseur de Bourbourg has found many words in the languages of Central America which bear, he thinks, marked Scandinavian traces; little can be proven by this, however, since he finds as many other words that as strongly resemble Latin, Greek, English, French, and many other languages."—*Native Races*, Vol. V., p. 115.

But, what is more surprising still, our modern English bears a similarity to the Maya in some few of its words. Dellenbaugh says: "Brinton has shown that a number of Maya words resemble our English words of the same meanings, as bateel and battle, hol and hole, hun and one, lum and loam, pol and poll (head), potum

and pot, pul and pull, and so on; but nobody has yet ventured to deduce from this that the Mayas are first cousins of the English."—*North Americans of Yesterday*, pp. 25, 26.

I might carry these comparisons out to greater length, but I believe that these are sufficient to show the absurdity of trying to link the American Indians to the Jews by the words that they utter. The words that are alike in both languages are exceedingly few, on account of which they must be considered purely accidental. If this argument proves anything, it proves that the American Indians are descendants of about every nation under the face of the sun.

Dellenbaugh says: "Because of certain similarities of physique, of words, or of myths, or of customs, however slight, the Amerinds have been identified with almost every people under the sun. These similarities are only such as might occur where similar organisms are continuously subjected to similar conditions, and the really remarkable fact is that there are not more and even closer resemblances."—*North Americans of Yesterday*, p. 25.

And Foster says: "As the human voice articulates not more than twenty distinct sounds, whatever resemblances there may be in the particular words of different languages are of no ethnic value, but it is upon this test that many American writers have undertaken to trace the origin of the red man."—*Prehistoric Races*, p. 319.

THE AMERICAN LANGUAGES NOT A WRECK, BUT A  
DEVELOPMENT.

It will hardly be denied that in point of structure the American tongues are inferior to the Hebrew, so if they have come from that language it must have been by a

process of degeneration and not development. But the American tongues are not wrecks; they are primitive forms that have passed through various changes and stages of development without succeeding in disenthral-ling themselves from nature.

Foster says: "The language of the American Indian throws no light upon his origin, except that that origin was so far remote that all attempts, by this clue, to establish a common center of human creation are utterly futile."—*Prehistoric Races*, p. 318.

George Bancroft says: "It has been asked if our Indians were not the wrecks of more civilized nations. Their language refutes the hypothesis; every one of its forms is a witness that their ancestors were, like themselves, not yet disenthralled from nature."—*History of the United States*, Vol. III., p. 265.

Gallatin says that "they bear the impress of primitive languages, and assumed their form from natural causes, and afford no proof of their being derived from a nation in a more advanced state of civilization, and that they attest the antiquity of the population—an antiquity the earliest we are permitted to assume."—*Prehistoric Races*, p. 321.

Hayden says: "No theories of derivation from the Old World have stood the test of grammatical construction. All traces of the fugitive tribes of Israel, supposed to be found here, are again lost."—*Ibid*, p. 319.

And Dellenbaugh says: "Furthermore, no authentic trace of any Old World language thus far has been found on this continent, and the only Asiatic language now known to be allied to an American is that of a branch of the Eskimo family which crossed from this side within the last three hundred years."—*North Americans of Yesterday*, pp. 428, 429.

These declarations place the theory that the American languages are wrecks of the Hebrew and the Egyptian in no very good light.

#### THE STRUCTURE OF THE AMERICAN LANGUAGES.

The languages of America possess certain structural peculiarities which distinguish them from the languages of all the rest of the earth. Bancroft writes: "The researches of the few philologists who have given American languages their study have brought to light the following facts. First, that a relationship exists among all the tongues of the northern and southern continents; and that while certain characteristics are found in common throughout all the languages of America, these languages are as a whole sufficiently peculiar to be distinguishable from the speech of all the other races of the world."—*Native Races*, Vol. III., p. 553.

Chief among these peculiarities is the power to express an entire thought in a word of sometimes fifteen or twenty syllables, known as a "bunch word," the principle of which is called polysynthesis, agglutination or incorporation. Peter Stephen Duponceau, who was among the first to remark upon this peculiarity, defines polysynthesis in the following words: "A *polysynthetic* or *syntactic* construction of language is that in which the greatest number of ideas are comprised in the least number of words."—*Essays of an Americanist*, p. 352.

As an illustration of this principle, we have the Cherokee word, *winitawitigeginaliskarlungtanawnelitisesti*, given by Bancroft, which translated into English means "they will by that time have nearly finished granting favors from a distance to thee and me."<sup>1</sup> In this single

<sup>1</sup> Bancroft, III: 555.

word of forty-one letters is expressed a thought which requires a sentence of seventeen English words to express.

Of all the Old World tongues, the Basque of France comes the nearest to the American languages in this polysynthetic peculiarity. In the Basque, however, it is limited to a few parts of speech, while in the American languages it extends to all. Says Dellenbaugh: "While the Basque more nearly resembles the Amerind languages than does any other Old World tongue, it stops short of the incorporating power of that of the Amerinds. In Basque this is restricted to the verb and some pronominal elements, but in the Amerind it embraces all parts of speech."—*North Americans of Yesterday*, p. 32.

Bancroft mentions certain other peculiarities of the Indian languages, such as the repetition of a syllable to form a plural; the use of frequentatives and duals; gender applied to the third person of the verb; the conversion of nouns into verbs, and the classification of things into animate and inanimate classes.<sup>1</sup> To these may be added still others, as given by Brinton, such as the utter absence of both conjunctions and relative pronouns; the want of tense forms; the paucity of adjectives; the rarity of prepositions and the absence of articles.<sup>2</sup>

In the Indian languages nouns are connotive; they do not simply denote the name of an object, but also some quality or characteristic of the object. Thus, in many tribes there is no distinct word for "father," but words signifying "my father," "your father" and "his father." Powell says that "a simply denotive name is rarely found." Frequently the verb is used for the noun, as in Ute the word for bear means "he seizes" or "the hugger."

"Pronouns are only to a limited extent independent

<sup>1</sup> Bancroft, III: 556.

<sup>2</sup> "Essays of an Americanist," pp. 404, 405.

words."—*Powell*. Of free pronouns there are two kinds, personal and demonstrative, of which the latter is more frequently used. Thus the Indian more often says "that man" than "he." Pronouns occur to a large extent with verbs as prefixes, infixes and suffixes. These are termed article pronouns; have singular, dual and plural forms, and are an important consideration in the conjugation of the verb, pointing out gender, person and number. Relative pronouns and conjunctions do not occur. In speaking of these, Brinton says: "You will be surprised to hear that there is no American language, none that I know, which possesses either of these parts of speech."

Adjectives occur but rarely. "Few American tongues have any adjectives, the Cree, for instance, not a dozen in all."—*Brinton*. Usually, as has been mentioned, the qualities or characteristics of a thing are implied or designated in the name of the thing.

"Prepositions are equally rare, and articles are not found."—*Brinton*.

The verb often includes within itself meanings which in English would be expressed by adverbs or adverbial phrases or clauses. Adjectives, adverbs, prepositions and nouns are often made to serve the purpose of intransitive verbs. "Equally foreign to primitive speech was any expression of *time* in connection with verbal forms; in other words, there was no such thing as tenses."—*Brinton*. Relative time is indicated by the use of adverbs or time particles added to or incorporated in the verb. The American tongues reveal the fact that at one time in their history they had but one tense which served to express action, being or state as past, present or future. To illustrate: I go (present); I go yesterday (past); I go to-morrow (future).

There are many moods in the Indian languages.

Powell gives several and says that they "are of great number." Among them are the indicative, the mood of simple declaration; the dubitative, the mood of doubt; the quotative, the mood of hearsay; the imperative, the mood of command; the implorative, the mood of imploration; the permissive, the mood of permission; the negative, the mood of negation; the simulative, the mood of simultaneous action; the desiderative, the mood of desire; the obligative, the mood of obligation; the frequentative, the mood of repetition; the causative, the mood of cause, etc.

Gender in the Indian tongues does not express a distinction in sex, but a classification of things into animate and inanimate classes. "The animate may again be divided into male and female, but this is rarely the case." —*Powell*. Both classes may be subdivided into the standing, the sitting and the lying; or the watery, the mushy, the earthy, the stony, etc.

Powell says: "In all these particulars it is seen that the Indian tongues belong to a very low type of organization."

The Hebrew language differs structurally from the Indian languages in the following respects: (1) It is highly inflected. (2) Its nouns are denotive. (3) It is rich in adjectives. (4) It has two tenses, the preterite and future. (5) It possesses conjunctions, a relative pronoun and an article. (6) Its genders do not divide things into animate and inanimate classes. (7) It employs the dual but sparingly. (8) It does not form its plurals by reduplication. And (9) it does not possess frequentatives. These differences show plainly that there is not the remotest relationship between the Hebrew and the tongues of America. Professor Russell remarks: "As the American languages have no affinity with the

Teutonic or Semitic stocks, it is evident that the source or sources from which they came far antedate the birth of the oldest people of which history takes cognizance. Man must therefore have set foot on American soil before the sprouting of the linguistic twig which, after millenniums, produced the cuneiform inscriptions of ancient Persia and Assyria."—*North America*, p. 360.

The Egyptian differs from the Indian languages: (1) In being an inflected language. (2) In possessing denotive nouns. (3) In its great number of adjectives. (4) In its conjunctions, relative pronouns, prepositions and articles. And undoubtedly in a number of other respects which my lack of information prevents me giving.<sup>1</sup>

#### THE DIVERSITY OF THE AMERICAN LANGUAGES.

According to the Book of Mormon, the Nephites understood two languages, the Egyptian and the Hebrew, and from these we are asked to believe the great multitude of American dialects have all come since Lehi left Jerusalem in 600 B. C. On the contrary, science shows that there are at least twelve hundred dialects in the two Americas, and that the American languages have changed slowly, because of which far more than twenty-five centuries must be demanded to account for the great diversity that exists among the tongues of the American tribes.

Gallatin, at the beginning of the last century, estimated the number of American languages at one hundred. Squier increased the number to four hundred, while Ameghino found eight hundred in South America alone. Others have estimated thirteen hundred for both continents, six hundred of which Bancroft found north

<sup>1</sup> See "Egyptian Language," by Budge.

of the Isthmus of Panama. And Dellenbaugh gives a list of eighteen hundred stocks, sub-stocks and tribes in the northern continent alone, but as he mentions several more than once under different names, the list would shrink much smaller, but Bancroft's estimate is certainly small enough. Brinton finds 180 linguistic stocks in the New World, 100 of them in South America. Dellenbaugh places the number in North America no lower than sixty-five, and says: "At least sixty-five of the separate stock languages are distinguished in North America, which appear so radically separated from each other that it is believed impossible that they ever should have sprung from the same parent, unless it may have been at a time so remote as to be beyond the scope of present investigation."—*North Americans of Yesterday*, p. 20.

Some of the dialects of a single stock differ from one another as much as the German differs from the English. "Even where a group of Amerinds speak related languages, or dialects," says Dellenbaugh, "there are, and were, such wide variations that the one is not understood by those speaking the other."—*Ibid*, p. 19. He informs us that within the limits of the present State of California alone twenty or thirty tribes would find it impossible to understand one another; while, in a limited area in Arizona, a Californian dialect would be unintelligible to four tribes. This has been a difficulty that our Indian missionaries have encountered, finding that the dialect of one tribe was unintelligible among its neighbors.

To illustrate this, I here give a number of common terms from the various Indian languages of North America. In Algonkin the word for the supernatural is *manito* or *oki*; in Iroquois it is *otkon*; in Hidatsa, *hopa*; in

Dakota, *wakan*; in Aztec, *teotl*; and in Maya, *ku*. The word for "man" with the Algonkin is *innini*; with the Iroquois, *onwi*; with the Eskimo, *inuk*; with the Apache, *ailee*; with the Zuni, *oatse*; and with the Mohave, *ipah*. With the Klamath the word for "woman" is *snawats*; with the Zuni it is *ocare*; with the Shoshone, *wep̄ee*; with the Choctaw, *ohoyo*; and with the Creek, *hokti*. The word for "fire" with the Apache is *kou*; with the Choctaw, *luak*; with the Creek, *tutka*; with the Mohawk, *otsira*; and with the Algonkin, *scota*. "Water," with the Apache, is *toah*; with the Klamath, *ampo*; with the Aztec, *atl*; with the Choctaw, *oka*; with the Cherokee, *awa*; and with the Algonkin, *bish* or *waboo*. These comparisons are sufficient to give the reader some idea of the diversity in words that exists among the various tribes. By both their structure and roots the languages of the New World are separated from those of the Old; by certain minor structural differences and by their roots, stock is separated from stock; and by their words, tribe from tribe.

Languages change slowly. George Bancroft writes: "Nothing is so indelible as speech: sounds that, in ages of unknown antiquity, were spoken among the nations of Hindostan, still live in their significance in the language which we daily utter."—*U. S. History*, Vol. III., p. 313.

Nott and Gliddon ascribe to the Chinese and Coptic an age of five thousand years. The Basque and Iberian are said to be three thousand years old, while the Welsh and Erse are known to possess an antiquity of two thousand years and are probably much older.

Coming to the New World, we find tribes using words and grammatical constructions employed by their ancestors in remote antiquity. Dr. Stohl estimates that

"the difference which is presented between the Cakchiquel and Maya dialects could not have arisen in less than two thousand years."—*Essays of an Americanist*, p. 35. These are dialects of the same language, the Mayan, and if it took two thousand years to create the difference that exists between them how much more time must have been necessary to create the difference that exists between the Maya and the Algonkin.

Dellenbaugh says: "Thus it seems probable that the Amerind languages extant have been spoken nearly as we know them to-day for a great many centuries, and that modifications crept in slowly; so slowly that the language roots and grammatical construction of the various stocks are so distinct that they form the safest guide now available in the classification of the various branches of the Amerind race; and, furthermore, that, judged by these tests, these languages have no relationship to any other group."—*North Americans of Yesterday*, pp. 24, 25.

Squier writes: "It is the length of time which this prodigious subdivision of languages in America must have required, making every allowance for the greater changes to which unwritten languages are liable, and for the necessary breaking up of nations in a hunter state into separate communities. For these changes, Mr. Galatin claims, we must have the very longest time we are permitted to assume; and, if it is considered necessary to derive the American races from the other continent, that the migration must have taken place at the earliest assignable period."—*Types of Mankind*, p. 281.

And Russell says: "It is a warrantable inference, therefore, that the marvelous diversity in speech present in America could only have arisen by a process of evolution involving a very long period of time."—*North America*, p. 360.

And yet, with this prodigious diversity of the American languages and dialects, and the additional fact that languages change their structure and roots slowly, before us, we are asked to believe that all these American tongues originated not more than twenty-five hundred years ago in two languages brought over from the Old World to which they bear no analogies in construction and but few resemblances in words!

SUPPOSED BOOK OF MORMON WORDS IN AMERICAN  
NOMENCLATURE.

A favorite argument against the authenticity of the Book of Mormon has been that none of the names of men, places and countries mentioned therein have come down to us in the nomenclature of the American tribes. Indeed, it seems that the orthographical principles underlying the spelling of American names are not those underlying the spelling of the names in the Book of Mormon.

From time to time, however, Mormon writers have tried to answer this objection by citing the names of individuals, cities and places in America which more or less closely correspond with those of the Book of Mormon, pleading time, change and apostasy as the reasons why more and closer correspondences are not found. On this point I quote from the "Manual of the Young (Mormon) Men's Mutual Improvement Associations," for 1905-1906, p. 543: "One recognizes here a real difficulty, and one for which it is quite hard to account. It must be remembered, however, that from the close of the Nephite period, 420 A. D., to the coming of the Spaniards in the sixteenth century, we have a period of over one thousand years; and we have the triumph also of the Lamanites over the Nephites bent on the destruction of

every vestige of Nephite traditions and institutions. May it not be that they recognized as one of the means of achieving such destruction the abrogation of the old, familiar names of things and persons? Besides, there is the probable influx of other tribes and peoples into America in that one thousand years whose names may have largely taken the place of Nephite and Lamanite names."

This explanation, however, is by no means satisfactory. It would require far more than one thousand years to blot out the names of so widespread a race as the Nephites, when a remnant of them escaped destruction at Cumorah and when many of their names were in common use among the Lamanites. Again, many of the names in the Book of Mormon are Lamanite names, and though a people might attempt to blot out the language of their enemies, it is not at all likely that they would try to blot out their own. If the Indians are Lamanites, why have Lamanite names not passed down to us? Lastly, the supposition that foreign tribes and peoples may have migrated to America and may have supplanted Nephite and Lamanite names with those of their own languages, is nullified by every line of evidence which we have. If such influxes of immigration have occurred since 420 A. D., they have not been sufficient to tinge the stock, let alone affect the language.

The American names which the author of the foregoing extract thinks have come from the Book of Mormon vocabulary are Nahuas from Nephites, Hohgates from Hagoth, Amazon from Ammon and Andes from Anti-Nephi-Lehi, Anti-Omno, Anti-Pas or Anti-Parah. But the resemblance between these various names is so slight that, without comment, I give to the writer all that he can prove by it. It requires the fervid imagination of

a visionary to see in these American names even the slightest suggestion of those given in the Book of Mormon.

In the *Saints' Herald* of April 4, 1906, under the heading, "For the Wisdom of Their Wise Men Shall Perish" (Isa. 29:14), appears an article on Book of Mormon names in American nomenclature, in which the following list of comparisons is given:

*Book of Mormon, 1830.*

Nephites,  
Laman,  
Manti,  
Cumeni,  
Moroni,  
David,  
Sam,  
Mulek,  
Moron,  
Desolation,

*Latently Found.*

Neophites.  
Laman.  
Manti.  
Cumeni.  
Morona, Maroni, Marroni.  
David.  
Sami.  
Muluc.  
Moron.  
Desaldo (the Spanish name  
for desolation).

The writer of this article finds these supposed Book of Mormon names in works on geography, history and American ethnology. But the erroneousness of most of them is detected with little research, while the difficulty connected with the rest is that the defenders of the Book of Mormon are not able to prove that they are due to inheritance and are not accidental. Of the names in the first column taken from the Book of Mormon, Nephites is the name of a people; Laman, the name of an individual, one of the sons of Lehi; Manti, the name of a city in the land of Zarahemla, the present country of Colombia; Cumeni, also the name of a city in the land of Zarahemla; Moroni, the name of the Nephite who is said to have deposited the Book of Mormon in Hill Cumorah; David, a city in the land of David, the southern part of Nicaragua; Sam, a brother of Nephi; Mulek, one of the sons of Zedekiah and the leader of the second colony that came from Jerusalem; Moron, the capital of the Jaredites; and Desolation, the name of a Nephite



land comprising most of the present states of Nicaragua and Costa Rica. These names the author of the article mentioned claims he has found, some more or less corrupted, in America.

1. On Neophites, which he gives as the equivalent of Nephites, he says: "See Bancroft, *Native Races*, Vol. I., p. 450, edition 1882, 'Neophites,' an Indian tribe." But by consulting Bancroft I find that a ludicrous blunder has been made. The passage which is referred to reads: "Tame Indians or Neophites: Lakisumne, Shonomne, Fawalomnes, Mukeemnes, Cosumne." If our author had consulted Webster he would have found that "neophites" is not an original Indian word at all, but is simply the English word "neophytes" incorrectly spelled. This word is not the name of an Indian tribe at all, but is a term meaning "new converts or proselytes." The tribes mentioned are some of the Christianized tribes living near, or upon, the Pacific Coast. If some of our Mormon friends would only bound their zeal with a little judgment and practical information, they would often save themselves much cruel mortification over such inexcusable blunders.

2. On the existence of the name Laman in America he cites Stamford's "Compendium of Geography of Central and South America," Vol. II., p. 23, edition of London, 1901:

"Mexican and Central American Stock Races and Languages. Ethnical and Historical Relations.

<i>Stock.</i>	<i>Main Division.</i>	<i>Location.</i>
Chontal,	LAMAN,	Nicaragua. Honduras. Costa Rica."

Now, I do not deny the genuineness of the above reference, but the classification is certainly erroneous.

No such stock as the Chontal exists. Brinton gives this definition of the term: "No such family exists. The word *chontalli* in the Nahuatl language means simply 'stranger,' and was applied by the Nahuas to any people other than their own."—*The American Race*, p. 147. Bancroft is of the same opinion, and says: "I am therefore of the opinion that no such nations as Chontals or Popolucas exist, but that these names were employed by the more civilized nations to designate people speaking other and barbarous tongues."—*Native Races*, Vol. III., p. 783. The name Lamans is the name of a small tribe in the eastern part of Nicaragua. It is so insignificant that it is not even mentioned in the ethnographical lists of Bancroft, Brinton and Dellenbaugh. On its derivation I am not able to speak, as I have not found more than its mere mention.

3. The name Manti Mormons have found in the *American Antiquarian*, Vol. XXII., No. 2, March and April, 1900, p. 129, in the account of the finding of certain archæological remains in Ecuador.

"Near Manti, Ecuador, is a remarkable archæological relic, one of the most interesting monuments in South America of an unknown and extinct civilization. Upon a platform of massive blocks of stone, upon a summit of a low hill in a natural amphitheater and arranged in a perfect circle, are thirty enormous stone chairs, evidently 'The Seats of the Mighty.' Each chair is a monolith, cut from a solid block of granite, and they are all fine specimens of stone carving. The seat rests upon the back of a crouching sphinx, which has a decidedly Egyptian appearance. There are no backs to the chairs, but two broad arms. This is supposed to have been a place of meeting—an open-air council of the chiefs of the several tribes that made up the prehistoric nation, which

was subdued by the Incas of Peru several hundred years before the Spanish invasion."

I carefully looked through several directories and gazetteers, besides Rand-McNally's "Indexed Pocket Map of Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia," for this place, but to no avail. The nearest that I was able to come to it was in Manta, the name of a city in Ecuador in the province of Manabi on the Pacific Coast. I then wrote to Rev. S. D. Peet, editor of the *American Antiquarian*, asking him if it were not possible that in the above description a mistake had been made, and that it should read Manta in place of Manti. To this letter of inquiry I received the following reply, dated at Chicago, February 22, 1908:

"In reply to yours of the 11th inst., in regard to the name 'Manti,' or 'Manta,' occurring in my *American Antiquarian*, Vol. XXII., No. 2, p. 129, let me say that the word must have been misspelt, and it should have been 'Manta.' Truly, there is no 'Manti' in Ecuador, and 'Manta' is correct."

This settles the matter, then, of the spelling of the name of this place. But Manta is not an original American name at all, but is of Spanish derivation, meaning, according to the "Century Dictionary," an enormous devil-fish or sea-devil, an eagle-ray of the family *Cera-  
topteridoe*. Brinton also mentions a tribe of Indians called Mantas who lived in this locality.<sup>1</sup>

4. The next Book of Mormon name which this writer claims he has found in a corrupted state in America is Cuemani for Cumeni. He says: "See Rand, McNally & Co.'s Index Atlas of the World, revised edition, page 351, map of Colombia, 'M. 10.' Near the equator

<sup>1</sup> "The American Race," p. 207.

you will find the city of *Cuemani*. Compare with our Archæological Committee's Report on the Book of Mormon, map of the Land of Zarahemla, Map No. 14, and you will find that Rand, McNally & Co. find Cuemani just where Book of Mormon map locates Cumeni."

I have not been able to find a city by the name of Cuemani on the Rand-McNally map of Columbia, but I have found the Cuemani River at "M. 10." This is not, however, "just where the Book of Mormon map locates Cumeni," but about three hundred miles to the southeast of where that city is located. On the derivation of this name I am not certain, but I am strongly of the opinion that it is a Spanish-American term and that it is pronounced either Koo-a-man-ee or Koo-a-man-ee, c before u, in Spanish, having the sound of k, u the sound of oo, e the sound of long a, a the sound of a in father, and i the sound of long e.

5. Our author finds Moroni in America under the various spellings of Maroni, Marroni and Morona. Maroni is the name of a river which divides French and Dutch Guiana and is pronounced Ma-ro-nee. Marroni is the name of a people, pronunciation unknown. Marona is the name of a river in Ecuador and is pronounced like Moroni, but this does not signify that it is a corrupted Nephite word. In fact, I am of the opinion that this word, too, comes from the Romance languages.

6. On the location of a supposed modern city of David our author says: "See Columbian Atlas of the World, map of South America. In the northern extremity of Colombia (Central America) you will find the city of David. Compare this with Book of Mormon Map No. 5. Location is remarkably close."

As no such city is given on the Rand-McNally map of Colombia, and as it is not mentioned in their list of

Colombian towns and cities, I very much doubt if such a city exists, but if it does there is absolutely no doubt that its name dates from this side of the beginning of the Spanish occupation of that region.

7. The Book of Mormon name Sam he discovers in the "Nineteenth Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology," Part II., pp. 605, 625 and 628, in the form Sami. He says: "Professor Thomas, of the United States Bureau of Ethnology, tells us this name was found among an ancient tribe, one who preserved their language and customs from contamination with foreign tribes or people."

I have followed up his references and find that Sami is the name of an individual in the Tenya clan, and also in the Antelope Society at Walpi, Arizona. But how does he know that this name is a corruption of Sam? He is welcome to all that it proves for the historical credibility of the Book of Mormon.

8. Muluc, which he thinks is a corruption of Mulek, the leader of the Mulekites, he finds in the nomenclature of the calendar system of Central America. Other Mormon writers have pointed out the similarity of these words before. Apostle Kelley writes: "There is something of marked significance in a statement found on page 425 of 'North Americans of Antiquity,' in regard to the word 'Mulek.' The 'Book of Mormon' affirms that at the time the Jews were taken captive to Babylon, 'Mulek,' one of the sons of Zedekiah, came over, with others, to this continent, and settled in Central America; and in the account above referred to the statement is made that, 'By means of Landa's key, Mr. Bollaert translated some of the hieroglyphics found in Yucatan, and the word 'Mulek' or 'Muluc,' as written by Short, was deciphered, and was found to mean 'to unite,' 'reunion.'

Considering that historical statement in the 'Book of Mormon,' that there was a union formed, or federation between the Nephites and Mulekites in Central America, in primeval times, and it goes far to prove that there was something more than fancy and guesswork, the emanations from the brains of mere men, that inspired the revelation of the 'Book of Mormon.'"—*Presidency and Priesthood*, p. 288.

But, in the first place, it is only a gratuitous assumption that Muluc is a corrupted form of Mulek. In the second, the words are only similar and not identical in either spelling or pronunciation. In the third place, Muluc is the name of one of the twenty days in the Maya calendar and not the name of a personage in their mythology. In the fourth, the Book of Mormon character, Mulek, was dead and buried over three hundred years before the people of Zarahemla and the Nephites united, therefore Muluc, which means "to unite" or "reunion," if it is a corruption of Mulek, could not have derived its significance from that event. In the fifth, the word Muluc is found in the language of a people who lived over eight hundred miles from the region where the union between the Nephites and Zarahemlites is said to have taken place, and whose language, traditions and architecture show that they came from the opposite direction. And, lastly, the root of this word, *mol* or *mul*, is not Hebrew, but is pure Maya, meaning "a coming together, or piling up."<sup>1</sup>

9. The name Moron the discoverer of these comparisons finds in South America. He says: "See Bradley's Atlas of the World, edition 1895, Argentine Republic, 'J. 19,' *Moron*." But this name is pure Spanish and is

<sup>1</sup> "Mayan Primer," p. 111.

the name of a city in Spain. As the population of the Argentine Republic are chiefly of Spanish descent, it is very probable that they named this city after that in their fatherland. It is pronounced Mo-rown.

The last comparison I omit, as it is wholly absurd and only shows to what extremes some men will go in order to prove a false theory.

If the names of the Book of Mormon prove anything, they prove that it is a base imposture, unworthy of our respect and belief, for a large proportion of them were known to the world long before the book appeared. Not a few of the names of men and of places mentioned in the book have been taken from the Old and New Testaments. Of the 360-odd names given in the Josephite "Book of Mormon Vocabulary," I counted over one hundred which appear in our Bible, while many more are but variations of these. Mormons explain the occurrence of these Bible names by the claim that the Nephites were Jews and had the greater part of the Old Testament Scriptures, hence that it would be only natural that they should use Bible names. This explanation may appear plausible, but how can they account for the occurrence of the Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish and Yankee names which appear? Did the Jaredites and Nephites understand these languages also? Moron, the name of a Jaredite city and country, is the name of a city in Spain. Nephi, the name of the leader of the Nephites, is Greek, from *nephei*, third person, singular number of *nepho*, "to be sober." Sam, the name of the brother of Nephi, is the Yankee nickname for Samuel. Alma, the name of one of the Nephite judges, is the Latin word for "benign." Antipas is an abbreviation of Antipater. Angola is the name of a region in Africa. Moroni, the name of the last of the Nephites of royal blood, is the name of an

Italian painter, Giovanni Battista Moroni, who was born in 1525 and died in 1578. While even the word Mormon, although Mormons deny it, is undoubtedly a corruption of the Greek *mormo*, which means "a bugbear, a monster used by nurses to frighten children."

Joseph Smith, however, in denying this, gives the following explanation of its origin: "We say from the Saxon, *good*; the Dane, *god*; the Goth, *goda*; the German, *gut*; the Dutch, *goed*; the Latin, *bonus*; the Greek, *kalos*; the Hebrew, *tob*; and the Egyptian, *mon*. Hence, with the addition of 'more,' or the contraction *mor*, we have the word Mormon, which means, literally, more good."

But stop for a moment and consider the ridiculousness of this claim. "More" is good Anglo-Saxon; *mon*, I presume, is Reformed Egyptian, for it is certainly not Egyptian, the word for good in which is *nefer*.<sup>1</sup> But how could the Nephites obtain the first syllable of this interesting hybrid, being wholly ignorant of the existence of such a people as the Anglo-Saxons and being separated from them by miles of water? Here is another problem for Mormon ingenuity to solve.

<sup>1</sup>"Egyptian Language," p. 113. "Essays of an Americanist," p. 216.