STAPLES

Origin of the Names of the States of the Union.

ORIGIN OF THE NAMES

OF THE

STATES OF THE UNION.

BY

HAMILTON B. STAPLES.

ORIGIN OF THE NAMES OF THE STATES.

ORIGIN OF THE NAMES

OF THE

STATES OF THE UNION.

BY

HAMILTON B. STAPLES.

A Paper read at the Regular Meeting of the American Antiquarian Society, October 21st, 1881, and published in its Proceedings.

Worcester, Mass.:
PRESS OF CHAS. HAMILTON,
311 Main Street.
1882.

ORIGIN OF THE NAMES OF THE STATES OF THE UNION.

I HAVE the honor to lay before the Society a series of notes, the result of a limited research, upon the origin of the names of the States of the Union. I was led to suppose the subject might prove interesting from the circumstance that, some time ago, it had attracted the attention of the Society as a fit subject of investigation, but for some reason no definite inquiry has been prosecuted. I regret that in respect to the origin of the names of several States, my paper will simply present an array of conflicting authorities. I have to acknowledge my indebtedness to the acting-librarian of the Society, and to Mr. Green, the accomplished librarian of the Free Public Library of Worcester, for the means to prosecute these inquiries.

In considering the subject, it will be convenient to divide the States into groups, starting with the original thirteen States, as the first group, and in respect to this group, to refer to the States in the order of the coast line from North to South.

The origin of the name of New Hampshire is very simple. The original territory conveyed by patent of the Plymouth Company to John Mason in 1629, was named by him after Hampshire County in England.

The life of Massachusetts, as an autonomic State, begins with the charter of 1691, which merged into one province the Plymouth and the Massachusetts Bay jurisdictions and also the Province of Maine. The present name of the State is derived from the Bay of that name. In fact, the word "Bay" was a part of the name of the younger colony which alone had received a charter from the Crown, and was retained in the name of the new province, and afterwards in the name of the State, till the Constitution of 1780 went into operation. The Massachusetts Bay received its name from the Massachusetts Indians who peopled its shores at the time of John Smith's visit in 1614. The word Massachusetts is an Anglicized plural of Massachusett, meaning "at or near the great hills," "at or near the great hill country," from massa "great," wadchu (in composition) adchu—plural wadchuash "mountains" or "hills," and the suffix et "at or near." This analysis of the name is that given by Dr. Trumbull in his learned treatise on Indian names.

The origin of the name of Rhode Island is quite obscure. A writer in the Providence *Journal*, over twenty years ago, in regard to the Aquetneck Island afterwards Rhode Island, from which the State derived its name, says—

"How and for what reason it received the name Rhode Island is a disputed and obscure question. Some ancient authors write the name Island of Rhodes. * * * Some have believed that the name was to be derived from the Dutch Roode Eylandt, which signifies Red Island, and which the first Dutch explorers of the Bay sometimes gave to the Island. * * * Others have written the name Rod Island. Perhaps it could also be Road Island (the Island of

the Roadstead or harbor island), because the real and authentic origin and beginning of the name appears to be so uncertain. I also find that in the early history of the State, persons of the family name Rhodes are also mentioned. Could not one Mr. Rhodes have been among the first English settlers?" Mr. Schoolcraft in his history of the Indian Tribes, adopts the Dutch origin of the name. Mr. Arnold in a note to his valuable History of Rhode Island says, "The derivation of this name has given rise to much discussion; by what strange fancy this Island was ever supposed to resemble that of Rhodes on the coast of Asia Minor, is difficult to imagine, and it is equally strange that the tradition that it was named from such resemblance should be transmitted or be believed unless indeed because it is easier to adopt a geographical absurdity than to investigate an historical point." Mr. Arnold then goes on to say that the celebrated Dutch navigator, Adrian Block, who gave his name to Block Island, sailed into Narragansett Bay "where he commemorated the fiery aspect of the place, caused by the red clay in some portion of its shores, by giving it the name of Roode Eylandt, the Red Island, and by easy transposition, Rhode Island." In support of the theory that the State *was* named after the island in the Mediterranean Sea, we have the authority of Peterson's History of Rhode Island. We have also the commanding authority of the public act by which the name was given. From Vol. I., p. 127, of the Rhode Island Colonial Records we make this extract: "At the Generall Court of Election held at Nuport 13. Jan. 1644. It is ordered by this Court that the ysland commonly called Aquethneck shall be from henceforth called the Isle of Rhodes or Rhode Island." The

form of this vote introducing the Isle of Rhodes first is opposed to all the theories of the origin of the name except that which refers it to the island in the Mediterranean. It is stated by Mr. Hildreth that the name as given to the island by the purchasers was the Isle of Rhodes and that it was afterwards called Rhode Island. When we consider that Sir Henry Vane was instrumental in the purchase of the island from the Indians, we are at no loss to account for a name which displays an historical imagination.

The name Connecticut spelled Quin-neh-tukqut signifies "land on a long tidal river." The name is so spelled in Cotton's Vocabulary, and in the Cambridge Records it appears as Quinetuckquet. This explanation rests upon the authority of Dr. Trumbull.

The territory of the imperial State of New York was comprised in the royal grant to the Duke of York in 1664, of all the land "from the west side of the Connecticut river to the east side of the Delaware Bay." In 1664, the Duke fitted out an expedition which took possession of New Amsterdam, and the place was thereafter called New York, in honor of the Duke. The same name was applied to the State. By a strange caprice of history the greatest State in the Union bears the name of the last and the most tyrannical of the Stuarts.

The State of New Jersey, granted by the Duke of York to Sir George Carteret and Lord Berkeley in 1664, received its name in the grant in commemoration of the brave defence of the Isle of Jersey by Carteret, its Governor, against the Parliamentary forces in the great Civil War.

Pennsylvania owes its name to its founder, William Penn. The name given by Penn himself was Sylvania, but King Charles II. insisted that the name of Penn should be prefixed. It is the only State in the Union named after its founder.

The counties of Newcastle, Kent and Sussex "upon Delaware," granted by the Duke of York to Penn in 1682, were known as the territories of Pennsylvania. In 1701, Penn granted them a certain autonomy. The State was named after the bay of that name, and the bay after Lord De-la-war who explored it. It has been claimed that the bay and the river were named after the Delaware Indians, who in 1600 dwelt upon their shores. This claim is unfounded. The Delaware name for the river was Lenapehittuk, meaning Lenape river.

Maryland was settled under a charter granted in 1632 by King Charles I. to Lord Baltimore. The State was named after Queen Henrietta Maria. In the charter the country is called "*Terra Mariæ*, Anglice, Maryland."

The first step in the colonization of America by England was the charter granted in 1584 by Queen Elizabeth to Sir Walter Raleigh. Under this charter Raleigh took possession of the country west of the Roanoke, and called it Virginia in honor of the Virgin Queen. This is the only State in the Union whose name appears in literature, associated with the royal title. Spenser dedicated the Faerie Queene to "Elizabeth, by the Grace of God, Queene of England, France and Ireland and of Virginia." The nearest approach to this in a public act is the order of the English Privy Council to the Virginia Colony after the Revolu-

tion of 1688 to proclaim William and Mary as "Lord and Lady of Virginia."

The name of West Virginia, a new State formed within the jurisdiction of Virginia, needs no separate consideration.

North Carolina and South Carolina may be considered under one head. Allen in his History of Kentucky ascribes the origin of the name Carolina to the French settlers of Port Royal, who named it after Charles the Ninth of France. This is the popular impression, but there is reason to question its accuracy. In the charter of Carolina granted to the Lords Proprietors by Charles II. in 1663, the name of Carolina is recognized. More than thirty years before Charles I. had granted a tract of territory south of the Chesapeake to Sir Robert Heath, naming it Carolana after himself. This grant became forfeited by non-user. The name, however, so given to the territory was doubtless revived in the new charter of 1663. It would not be a pleasant reflection that two States of the Union derived their name from the king who commanded the massacre of St. Bartholomew.

The name of Georgia, after King George II., was by the terms of the charter conferred upon the territory granted to the company organized by Oglethorpe in 1732.

We now come to a group of States which at the time of the Revolution were outlying districts, belonging to certain States. These districts were Maine, belonging to Massachusetts; Vermont, claimed both by New York and by New Hampshire; Kentucky, belonging to Virginia, and Ten-

nessee, belonging to North Carolina. The origin of the names of these States will now be considered.

Maine owes its name to its being supposed to be the main or chief portion of the New England territory. The origin of the name is disclosed in an extract from the grant of Charles I. to Sir Fernando Gorges, in 1639, confirmatory of a patent given by the Plymouth Company in 1622, which grant the grandson of Gorges, through John Usher, assigned to the Massachusetts Bay Colony "all that Parte, Purparte and Porcon of the Mayne Lande of New England aforesaid, beginning att the entrance of Pascatway Harbor" (then follows the description), "all which said Part, Purpart or Porcon of the Mayne Lande and all and every the premises hereinbefore named wee doe for us, our heires and successors create and incorporate into one Province or Countie. And we doe name, ordeyne, and appoynt that the Porcon of the Mayne Lande and Premises aforesaide shall forever hereafter bee called and named The Province or Countie of Mayne."

The territory of Vermont was so named from the French words verd mont, "Green Mountain," the "d" being dropped in composition. The legal history of the name is a curious one. At a convention of the people held at Westminster January 15, 1777, it was declared that the district was a State "to be forever hereafter called, known and distinguished by the name of New Connecticut alias Vermont." The convention met by adjournment July 2d, 1777, and having, in the meantime, ascertained that the name of New Connecticut had been already applied to a district on the banks of the Susquehanna it was declared that instead of

New Connecticut, the State should "ever be known by the name of Vermont." Hall in his "Early History of Vermont," appendix No. 9, claims that the words "alias Vermont" did not belong in the name as adopted in January and that they must have been inconsiderately added to the journal, or an early copy of it, by way of explanation after the name Vermont had been adopted in lieu of New Connecticut and afterwards in transcribing, erroneously taken as a part of the original." Mr. Hall gives various reasons in support of this claim. One is the improbability, not to say the absurdity, that the convention should have given two names to the State. But is there not a strong presumption in favor of the correctness of public records, and against the mutilation of the journal? Another reason adduced by Mr. Hall, is, that in the remainder of the journal the new State is twice called New Connecticut alone. This reason seems to possess very little force. Another reason given is that Ira Allen, a member of the January convention, in his history inserts what purports to be the first named declaration with the name of New Connecticut only. This might well be in a history written after the name Vermont was resolved on and giving only the substance of the first name. In opposition to Mr. Hall's theory the words are found in Slade's State Papers, page 70, in Williams' History of Vermont, and in a manuscript copy of the journal of the convention, the original being lost, in the possession of James H. Phelps. Further, all accounts concur that the name of Vermont was given to the State by Dr. Thomas Young, and we find a letter of his dated 11 April, 1777, addressed to "the inhabitants of Vermont, a free and independent State," which implies that at that date the State

had already received its name of Vermont, although under an alias.

In respect to the name of Kentucky there is ample room for controversy. Allen in his History of Kentucky says it was named "from its principal river which is an Indian name for 'dark and bloody ground.'" Moulton in his History of New York says "Kentuckee signifies 'river of blood.'" In Hayward's History of Tennessee, General Clark is the authority for the assertion that in the Indian language, Kentuke signifies "River of blood." Ramsey in his History of Tennessee alludes to the name of Kentucky as signifying "the dark and bloody land." In Johnson's Cyclopædia the name is given as signifying "the dark and bloody ground." In opposition to all this it appears from Johnson's "Account of the present state of the Indian tribes of Ohio"—Transactions American Antiquarian Society, vol. I., page 271—that Kentucky is a Shawanoese or Shawnoese word signifying "at the head of a river," that the Kentucky river was in former times often used by the Shawanoese in their migrations north and south, and hence the whole country took its name. This theory of the name is quoted approvingly in Gallatin's Synopsis of Indian tribes.—Transactions American Antiquarian Society, vol. II. Mr. Higginson in his Young Folks' History says, the name first applied to the river means "the Long River." It lessens the weight of the authorities first cited that some of them connect the evil signification of the word with land, and some with water. It is also highly improbable that a name clothed with associations of terror should be adopted as the civic designation of a people. On the whole it may be

safely asserted that the weight of the evidence is in favor of the more peaceful origin of the name.

Tennessee formed a part of the grant of the Carolinas. Its name is derived from its principal river though formerly the name Tennessee did not apply to the main river, but to one of the small southerly branches thereof. There is authority for saying that the name of the river was derived from the village of Tanasse, the chief village of the Cherokee tribe, and situated on its bank. Hayward, in his "Natural and Aboriginal History of Tennessee," attempts to trace the origin of the name Tanasse as an Indian river name to the ancient river Tänais, and on this discovery, as well as on other similar resemblances, he founds the argument that the ancient Cherokees migrated from the western part of Asia. Mr. Allen claims that the name is derived from an Indian name signifying "a curved spoon," and there is authority for still another derivation from an Indian word signifying "a bend in the river," in allusion to the course of the river. I am not aware that in either case the Indian word has been given, nor is it believed that any such word exists.

There is a third group of States, comprising Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin, wholly formed from the territory of New France, ceded by France to England in 1763, relinquished by England to the United States by the treaty of 1783 and finally ceded by Virginia, which had acquired it by right of conquest in the Revolution, to the United States in 1783. The origin of the names of these States will now be considered.

Ohio is named after the beautiful river, its southern boundary. From Johnson's Account of the Indian Tribes, the word Ohio as applied to the river in the Wyandot language is O-he-zuh, signifying "something great." The name was called by the Senecas, dwelling on the shores of Lake Erie, the Ohèo. Mr. Schoolcraft observes that the termination io in Ohio implies admiration. On the old French maps the name is sometimes "the Ochio," and sometimes "the Oyo."

Indiana derives its name from one of the old ante-Revolutionary land companies which had claims in that region.

The State of Illinois is named from its principal river, the Illinois. The river is named from the confederacy of Indian tribes called the Illinois Confederacy which had its seat in the central part of the State. Gallatin gives the definition of the word Illinois, "real men," "superior men," from the Delaware word, Leno, Leni, Illin, Illini, as it is variously written. The termination ois is that by which the French softened the local inflexion when they adopted an Indian word.

Lanman, in his "Red Book of Michigan," derives the name of that State from the Indian word Michsaugyegan, signifying Lake Country. Johnson's Cyclopædia derives the name from the Indian words Mitchi, Saugyegan, meaning Lake Country. I regard this as a questionable derivation. There are good reasons for supposing that the State derived its name from Lake Michigan, and not from its being nearly enclosed by lakes. If the word Michigan signifies Lake Country, why should it have been applied to the Lake at all? In support of the theory that the name Michigan

was descriptive, signifying "great lake," and was first given to the lake, I call attention to the fact that on the earliest maps the lake bears the name, while the peninsula, both upper and lower, has no name whatever.

Besides, the name as applied to the lake, has a simple Indian derivation. The Algonquin races, at the head of which was the Chippewa tribe, dwelt on the northwestern shores of the lake. In the old Algonquin language the syllable "gan" meant lake. In the Chippewa language, "mitcha" meant great. In this connection let me quote a passage from an article in the North American Review, vol. XXII., on Indian Language. "This word Meesee or Meechee (which has been before explained to mean great), for it is differently pronounced in different places, is found in Michigan, Missouri, and in many other names."

Wisconsin was named after its principal river. Until quite a recent period the river was called the Ouisconsin, which is said to mean "westward flowing." Ouis is evidently shortened from the French "ouest." Mr. Schoolcraft says, that "locality was given in the Algonquin by 'ing,' meaning at, in, or by, — as Wiscons-ing." The name is probably of mixed origin.

There is a group of States formed entirely out of the territory ceded by France to the United States in 1803. These are Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri and Iowa.

The name of Louisiana, now confined to a State of the Union, was originally given to the entire French possessions on the west bank of the Mississippi, by La Salle, in 1682, in honor of Louis XIV.

The State of Arkansas takes its name from its principal river; the river from the tribe of Indians formerly living near its mouth. Till quite a recent period the river was called the Akansas, and the tribe the Akansas tribe.

Mr. Schoolcraft says that both the names Arkansas and Missouri embrace aboriginal roots, but we hear the sounds as modified by French orthoepy and enunciation. The same author farther relates that there is a species of acacia found in Arkansas, from which the Indians, on the arrival of the French, made for themselves bows. It is light yellow, solid and flexible. "This is thought to have led to the appellation of Arc or Bow Indians." As they belonged to the Kansa race, and had lately separated from them, that term would naturally be adopted by the French as the generic name.

In the Contributors' Club of the Atlantic Monthly, May, 1881, in reference to the name Arkansas, occurs this curious passage, "Does not the name come from the arc-en-sang of the early French traders, its likeness to Kansas being accidental? Whether the bloody bow was a special weapon like the medicine bow that gave its name to a creek, mountain range, and railway station, in Wyoming, or the bloody bows were a band like the Sans Arcs, cannot now be determined."

The State of Missouri was named from the river of that name, and the river itself from the Missouris, a tribe once living near its mouth, and afterwards driven into the interior. There is another theory in respect to the name of the river that it is descriptive. Col. Higginson in his Young Folks'

History, says, Missouri means "muddy water." The Dacotahs called the Missouri Minneshoshay, "muddy water," a word which might easily become Missouri. In an article on Indian Migrations, by Lewis H. Morgan, in the North American Review, vol. CX., it is stated as a matter of tradition that the Kansas Indians were formerly established on the banks of the Mississippi, above the Missouri, and that they called the Missouri Ne-sho-ja "the muddy river," a name in which the present name can be traced.

The State of Iowa is named from the river of that name, and the river from the Ioway Indians, who after many migrations settled on its banks. In the same article in the Atlantic Monthly to which I have already alluded, it is intimated that the name Ioway is contracted from Ah-hee-ooba, meaning "sleepers," which perhaps explains why the Sioux nearly extirpated them.

The State of Texas formerly Spanish territory, then Mexican, and later an independent State is the only State acquired by annexation. There is a conflict of opinion as to the origin of its name. Johnson's Cyclopœdia, article Texas, states that "it is now proved conclusively to be of Indian derivation, the generic title of numerous tribes known to La Salle on his visit in 1685." On Seale's map, 1750, the centre of the territory is occupied by Indians called the Tecas which may be the generic title referred to. But Mr. Bryant in his History of the United States, vol. II., page 518, note, says "It is supposed that the name Texas is from the Spanish Tejas in allusion to the covered houses" found by La Salle on his visit in 1685. In Morphis' History of Texas, the name is given as of doubtful origin. He

states in substance that some refer the name to the capital village of the Nassonite tribe, others refer it to the Spanish word "tejer" to weave, in reference to placing the grass over the cottages, others derive it from "tejas" meaning "cobwebs," the account being that the Spaniards encamped in an expedition into the country, and one morning the commander seeing many spider webs between himself and the rising sun exclaimed "Mira las tejas!" and named the land Texas. It will be observed that this author in respect to one explanation of the name, lends support to Mr. Bryant's supposition. The cobweb theory may well be dismissed as legendary.

There are two States of the Union formed of territory ceded to the United States by Spain in 1819. By this treaty the United States ceded to Spain the part of what is now Kansas, lying south of the Arkansas river and west of the one hundredth degree of west longitude, also the part of what is now Colorado, lying south of the same river and west of a line drawn from its source due north to the forty-second degree of north latitude, also the territory lying south of the said parallel of latitude as extended from the end of the said north line west to the Pacific Ocean, and the United States acquired Florida and all the Spanish territory north and east of the above described lines. Thus the United States acquired the Spanish title to Oregon founded on its discovery by that power about thirty-five years before Sir Francis Drake sailed up the Pacific Coast.

The origin of the name of Florida is a matter of general agreement among historians. The story of Ponce de Leon sailing to the West in 1512 in search of the

fountain of youth, seeing land on Pascua Florida or "Flowery Easter" and on account of its profusion of flowers naming it Florida is familiar to all.

The name of Oregon was at first applied to the Columbia river, then to the territory and lastly to the State. The origin of the name is conjectural. The earliest printed mention of it is in Carver's travels in 1763. Carver explored the sources of the Mississippi river, and states that by his residence among the Indians, especially the Sioux, he obtained a general knowledge of the situation of the river Oregon or "the river of the West that falls into the Pacific Ocean at the Straits of Anian." By that which he calls the Oregon the sources of which he placed not far from the head waters of the Missouri, he may have referred to some one of the sources of the Missouri or to one of the two rivers which, rising in the Rocky Mountains, formed the principal eastern tributaries of the Oregon. Carver was misled as to the locality of the river of the West and the supposed sources of it he may have confounded with the sources of the Missouri or of one of the tributaries in question. But this much the publication of his travels accomplished, the establishment of a belief in the existence of a great river emptying into the Pacific Ocean. He designated by the name Oregon a great river flowing into the Pacific and when in after times such a river was discovered the name was ready at hand.

To illustrate the obscurity of our knowledge on this point we quote a passage from an article in the North American Review, vol. XLVIII., on "Nautical discovery in the Northwest." The writer says:

"We wish that Mr. Worcester, or Mr. Bradford or

some scholar in the Western States, distinguished like those gentlemen for geographical science, would explain the origin of this word Oregon, which so far as we know is not satisfactorily settled. Mr. Darby in his Gazetteer traces the name to the Spanish Orégan for the 'sweet marjoram' growing on the banks of the river. But to this is a serious objection that the name Oregon does not seem so far as we remember to have been in use among the Spaniards. And as there are and have been no settlers of that nation upon the river, how should their word for wild marjoram come to designate the river? Humboldt speaks of 'le mot indien Orégan.' Of what Indian is it the word? Not of those living on the Columbia. Humboldt also talks of the Orégan de MacKenzie, but MacKenzie did not introduce the word. We find it in Carver's travels, 1763, and that is the oldest authority for it which has met our eye."

Perhaps it is vain in the languages of the Indians of the Upper Mississippi to search for the source of this name. Like other Indian names, it is doubtless descriptive of a river of which those Indians had received distant and perhaps fabulous accounts.

There are two States of the Union, California and Nevada, formed wholly of territory originally Spanish and acquired from Mexico by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. The name of California appears to have been taken from a Spanish romance, Las Sergus de Esplandian, in which is described "the great island of California where a great abundance of gold and precious stones is found." This worthless romance was published in 1510, and generally read. Probably the name of California engaged the fancy of some of the officers of Cortes, and was given by them to the

country discovered by him in 1535. It is strange that the name accidentally given should have proved so exactly descriptive. The origin of the name is the subject of a very attractive paper by Rev. Dr. Hale in vol. IV., Transactions of this Society.

The State of Nevada takes its name from the Sierra Nevada Mountains, which line its western frontier, the mountains in their turn being named from the Sierra Nevadas of Granada which they are said to resemble in the serrated line of their summits.

There remains a group of States of a composite origin. Minnesota, formed in part from the northwest territory, ceded by Virginia, and in part from the Louisiana cession; Nebraska, acquired in part by the French cession of 1803, and in part by the Spanish treaty of 1819, confirmed by the Mexican treaty of 1848; Kansas, ceded in part by France, in part by Spain and in part by Texas; Colorado, ceded in part by Spain, in part by Mexico and in part by Texas; Alabama, ceded to the United States by South Carolina, by Georgia and by Spain, and Mississippi, ceded to the United States by Georgia except a small southern portion successively occupied by France, Spain and Great Britain and at last taken possession of by the United States. The origin of the names of these States claims a brief notice.

Minnesota is named from the Minnesota or St. Peter's river, the principal tributary to the Mississippi within its limits. The Indian word is Mini-sotah, signyifying "slightly turbid water," or as the Minnesota historian more fancifully puts it, "sky-tinted water."

Nebraska is named from the Nebraska river. A writer in the North American Review, vol. LXXXVII., on "the Missouri Valley" says the word is Indian and is compounded of nee, "river," and braska, "shallow." Morgan in his article on Indian Migrations, North American Review, vol. CIX., says "the name of the Platte river in the Kaw dialect is Ne-blas-ka, signifying 'over-spreading flats with shallow water.'" Dr. Hale says the name undoubtedly refers to the flatness of the country.

The State of Kansas is named from its principal river. The latter is named from the tribe of Indians, called the Konzas, who lived upon its shores. Mr. Schoolcraft uses the name Kasas to designate the tribe. De Soto marched southerly from the northern limit of his expedition in search of a rich province, called Cayas. This points to the original name of the tribe, the Kaws. The present name has therefore an Indian root varied by French orthoepy.

Colorado is named after the great Rio Colorado which rises in the Rocky Mountains and falls into the Gulf of California. The name signifies in Spanish "ruddy," "blood red," in a secondary sense "colored," in allusion to the color of its waters. The river is not within the limits of the State, and only belongs to it by some of its tributaries.

The State of Mississippi is named after the great river. Mr. Atwater, a member of this Society, gives the Indian name of the river Meesyseepee, "the great water." That the Indian word signifies the "father of waters" is clearly erroneous. According to Mr. Gallatin's synopsis of Indian tribes, "Missi" never means "father," but "all"—

"whole." The word "sipi" means in the Chippewa "river." Thus the words united mean "the whole river," because many streams unite to form it.

In considering the name of Alabama we go back to the expedition of De Soto in 1541. His last battle was at Alibamo on the Yazoo river. This was the famous fortress of the brave tribe sometimes called the Alibamons, and sometimes the Alabamas. Le Clerc who resided in the Creek nation twenty years and wrote a history published in Paris in 1802, says that the Alabamos came to the Yazoo from the north part of Mexico, and that after the battle with De Soto they removed to the river which now bears their name, that they are the same people as the Alibamos who fought De Soto. Pickett in his History of Alabama states that "from these people, the river, and state took their names." Allen's History of Kentucky says Alabama is an Indian name signifying "here we rest." Mr. Schoolcraft says cautiously that the name has been interpreted "here we rest." We have not been able to discover anything very restful in the history of the Alabamos, which is one of migrations. Mr. Meeks, a good authority in that State, thinks that the word Alaba is only the name Hillaba the Ullibahallee of De Soto, a theory at variance with that of Le Clerc and referring the origin of the name to a different tribe.

In Mr. Pinkerton's Geography in 1804 occurs this striking passage: "The great country of Louisiana, now ceded to the United States, will doubtless at no very distant period, be divided into several distinct States, and in giving names to these the Americans will have an

opportunity of manifesting their veneration for, and their gratitude to, some of the illustrious men who first discovered the countries of the new world, or have contributed to its freedom and happiness." It is not pleasant to reflect that so far this opportunity has been lost and this hope disappointed. There is no State of the Union which bears the name of Cabot, or of Coronado, or of De Soto, or of La Salle. And there is Father Marquette whose form rises before us, dazzling and immortal as we open the pages of our early history. We recall the poetic rendering of his last words, which sum up his glorious life, as he expires in a lonely hovel on the shores of Lake Michigan:

> "As God shall will, what matters where
> A true man's cross shall stand
> So heaven be o'er it, here as there
> In pleasant Norman land.
>
> 'Urbs Sion mystica' I see
> Its mansions passing fair
> Condita coelo, let me be
> Dear Lord a dweller there."

Was there no State to feel itself honored, to be called after his name? But the wrong may yet be righted. In the naming of the new States which yet remain to be formed from our Western domain, the last opportunity will be given to do justice to these great discoverers, and it would be a graceful and appropriate office of this Society, as cases arise, to exert its influence by correspondence with the local authorities, and by memorial to Congress in favor of rendering to them even at this late day this exalted tribute.