SOME MORE ABOUT VIRGINIA NAMES

By WILLIAM WALLACE TOOKER

In regard to Mr William R. Gerard's last article, in the AMER-ICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST for April–June, 1905, written in answer to mine in the issue for October–December, 1904, I here reiterate the statements in my former essay.   I cannot, owing to the limited space at my disposal in this final word, heed all his allegations and mistakes, so will call attention to only a few, which will give some indication of the character of the remainder.

In the first name, *Winauk*, discussed by Mr Gerard, he makes eight blunders : (1) In rejecting Trumbull's derivation.   (2) Both Smith and Archer call it Point *Wynauk*, or *Weanocke*, as a rule rather than the contrary.   (3) Archer never called it "Careless point."   (4) Careless point was on the opposite side of the river. (5) He does not quote Archer correctly, who says (Smith, p. li) : "We crossed over the water to a sharpe point, which is a parte of *Winauk* [i. e., under that jurisdiction] on Salisbury syde (this I call careless point)."   "Salisbury side" was the south side of James river, while Wynauk was on the north or "Popham side."   (6) His remarks as to dialect and the quotation from Trumbull in the foot-note are erroneous, as if the Powhatan and Massachusett did not belong to the same language.   (7) *Wean-ohke* can be used without the preposition -*ut* or -*it*, as many place-names show.   (8) No Indian would have called the place *Winach*, 'sassafras' or 'sweet wood,' without a locative of some sort, as Algonquian nomenclature requires.

Chickahominy. — Mr Gerard cannot find a single reference to a town called "*Tshikĕhāmĕn*."[1]   The verb could not be used in this form as a place name, because it does not imply a fixed location. It would be as appropriate to apply to a place the English verb "to

---

[1] *Manosquosick* was the first town on the river visited by Smith, but not named on his map, for *Meyascosic* of the map is not the same town.   The proof of this is very positive.

sweep." My notes, made more than ten years ago, when I wrote the results of my study of " Chickahominy," show that I rejected this verb, along with others, in a better application, viz., *Tschik-ham-aney-os*, ' they sweep the path,' which I thought at the time might allude to their warlike habits when on a trail, for the words " lustie and daring people " were applied to the Indians of the river collectively, not to the inhabitants of any one town.[1]

Werowacomaco. — Mr Gerard greatly confuses the derivation of this name. He does not accept Strachey's[2] and Trumbull's inter-pretation, ' a king's house,' but says it means ' fertile land,' and adds some remarkable information which is inapplicable. He does not believe in searching the Natick for the meaning of Powhatan names, but goes there for his altered *Wenauohkomuk* (Cotton); *Weenauoh-komuk* (Eliot) = *weenau-ohke-muk*, 'where the land is fat, rich, good,' which he gives as the cognate of *Werowacomaco*, which it is not, in root, prefix, suffix, or anything else. The termination *-muk* is the third person singular of the present conditional passive, ' when or where a thing is,' — a termination of common use by Eliot, who also gives *matohkomuk* (= *mat-ohke-muk*), ' where the land is lean, poor,' thus proving the etymology.[3] *Comaco* appears in several Powhatan names, and is the cognate of the Natick *komuk* = Narr. *commock*, ' a house,' ' a place enclosed.'[4] He further remarks : " The name for a native ruler among the Virginians, variously written *wiróans, werowance, weroance*, and *wyroaunce*, means ' he is rich.' " This also is contrary to fact, as likewise is the statement that it is from the same stem as *weenau*, as it really comes from another verb found in (Narr.) *wauóntakick*, ' wise men,' ' counsellors,' (Lenape) *wewóátank*, ' the learned ' or ' the wise,' whence (Lenape) *wewóánsu* (= Powhatan *werówanse*), ' he is wise.' Smith remarks (p. 377) :

---

[1] Some of my reasons for rejecting the verb were : (1) Strachey has it in *tsekehica*, ' to sweep,' which led me to believe that he never recognized any sounds in the word *tseke*, belonging to *Chickahominy*. (2) *Tseke* is a root formed by onomatopœia to rep-resent the action of a harsh instrument in rubbing up dust or dirt, likewise the hair of animals and the scales of fish.

[2] The name was probably translated for him by Kemps, the Indian who gave him most of his Powhatan names.

[3] Eliot's constructive forms are mostly omitted from Trumbull's *Natick Dictionary*.

[4] In a note Mr Gerard says : " *Winomin*, ' the grape,' means ' prolific fruit,' " whereas it really means ' vine berry.'

" But this word *Werowance*, which we call and construe for a king, is a common word, whereby they call commanders." Thus we have *Werowacomaco*, ' the king's house.' [1]

Pocohiquara, Powcohicora. — Algonquian names of places and objects are all descriptive and admit of no ambiguity or inference ; yet Mr Gerard's translation of this term as ' it is brayed,' when modified by nothing, is decidedly ambiguous, as it does not inform us what was ' brayed,' hence such a translation might refer to almost anything except " milk made of walnuts," to which the name was actually applied.   My interpretation supplied the missing link, as it furnished an etymology descriptive of how the " milk " was " made of broken shells, skins, or bodies," leaving nothing for supposition. The second element, *-hiquara* or *-hicora* = (Natick) *-hogk8nie*, (Lenape) *-hackeney* or *-hocquina*, is from a root of common use meaning ' to cover,' ' to clothe,' as ' skin,' ' body,' ' shell,' ' husk,' ' scales ' (of fish), etc. ; hence the " milk " was " made of broken or pounded shells." [2]

Moëkanneu. — There are insurmountable objections to Mr Ger- ard's etymology and translation (' he eats bones ') of this term. First, Algonquian substantives in the plural must have their verbs in the plural.   Second, the word for ' bone ' in all Algonquian dialects is classed as an inanimate noun, hence it could not be used with the Algonquian verb ' to eat ' something animate, which in the Lenape has the form *mohoan* ' to eat'; *mohoeu* ' he eats '; *mohowak* ' they eat.'   In the same dialect, things inanimate have their plural in *-all*, (Natick) *-ash*, hence ' they eat bones ' would be rendered inani- mately *mitzowak wochganall*, which Eliot (Zeph., III, 3) gives us correctly, and in the inanimate form *meechuog wuskonash*, ' they

---

[1] Mr Gerard does not quote Smith correctly. It was not *Werowacomaco* that was in breadth two miles, but the water (Purtons bay). Smith (p. 21) writes : " *Wera- ocomaco* is vpon salt water in bredth two myles, and so [the river] keepeth his course without any tarrying."

[2] Heckewelder (*History*, p. 194) gives us the best account of the process : "They pound the nuts in a block or mortar, pouring a little warm water on them, and gradually a little more as they become dry, until at last, there is sufficient quantity of water, so that by stirring up the pounded nuts the broken shells separate from the liquor, which from the pounded kernels assume the appearance of milk. If the broken shells do not freely separate by swimming on the top or sinking to the bottom, the liquor is strained through a clean cloth, before it is put into the kettle."

gnaw (eat) bones."[1]   So Zeisberger could not by any possibility
have written *moëkanneu* for *mohowak wochganall*, for the combina-
tion would have been grammatically wrong.   The radical *-kan*, in
Cree and other dialects, when coalesced with the verb indicates some-
thing made of bone.   My etymology describes the traits of a ' wolf'
dog, as noted by many visitors to Indian villages, viz : *moëkanneu* =
(Natick) *maü-konáeu*, (Narr.) *moü-kanew*, ' he cries or mourns by
night,' from *maü* ' he cries,' ' he mourns,' *nukonáeu* or *nokanew*, ' by
night ' or ' in the night,' as in composition the prefix is discarded.[2]
The correctness of this etymology, no matter how " extraordinary "
it may seem to Mr Gerard, is substantiated by the adverbial termi-
nation *-eu*, which does not belong to the verb, for that is already in
the third person singular, but to the adverb that governs the verb.
To quote Mr Gerard : " All this is simple, and of so very elemen-
tary a character that it did not occur to me to furnish an analysis of
the word ' *Moëkanau* ' in my article."

Mr Gerard's article indicates his lack of critical analysis of the
Algonquian language, and he is so hasty in his conclusions that his
etymologies are rendered worthless.   This is conspicuously shown
by his statement : " In Narragansett, by incorporating the word
ättóku ' deer ' we have *moättókweu*, ' he eats deer,' and, by chang-
ing the intransitive to a verbal adjective suffix we have *moattókwus*,
' deer eater,' a name for the black wolf, called also deer wolf."
Now, the Narragansett word " *moattóqus*,[3] a black wolf," is simply
from *mówi* ' black,' and *nattóqus* ' a wolf '; *nattóqussuog* ' wolves,'
i. e., ' they seek their prey,' which describes their chief character-
istic.   Therefore there is nothing whatever in the name indicating
' eating ' or ' a deer,' consequently there can be no such changes in
grammar as he asserts.

Wunnauanounuck. — He says further : " What may be stated
as absolutely certain is that *wunnau* does not mean ' hollow ves-
sel,' and that *anounau* does not mean ' to carry.' "

Consulting Roger Williams' Key, we find : " *Wunnauanoûnuck*,
a shallop.   *Wunnauanoûnuckquese*, a skiff.   Obs : Although them-

---

[1] Eliot almost always writes it ' *wuskonash* ' (3d pers. sing.), his bones.

[2] See Zeisberger's *Grammar* for ' one night,' etc.

[3] Compare *móaskug*, ' black snake,' in same chapter.

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST [N. S., 7, 1905]

selves have neither, yet they give them such names, which in their language signifieth carrying vessels." Can this translation by Williams be ignored, when we learn that *wunnàug* is a 'shallow vessel,' like a 'tray' or 'dish,' and that -*anounau* = (Natick) *konunaü* 'he carries or bears,' *kóunuk* 'when it carries' as a carriage or anything that bears burdens ?

I could extend my observations on Mr Gerard's article, but "why multiply examples?" [1]

SAG HARBOR,
NEW YORK.

---

[1] Mr Gerard's remarks on the grammar of the language are seemingly his own ideas, and are not based on any authority on the subject. For instance, under *Attaangwassuwk* he is contradicted by Eliot, who has (Job, XXXI, 2) *nanepaushadt wosumoe* 'the moon is bright, shining'; *nepauz wohsum* (Cotton) 'the sun shines,' and so we can have *anogkus wohsumuk* 'he appears shining.' His remarks under other words are equally erroneous. He seemingly does not hesitate to make any change in any notation, whether it be Williams', Eliot's, or Zeisberger's. Brinton's remarks will apply : "Zeisberger showed the Delaware as it actually was spoken, though perhaps not as scientific linguists think it ought to have been spoken."

This content downloaded from 2.95.236.44 on Tue, 14 Jun 2016 18:22:51 UTC
All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms