

Alan C. Miner

November 26, 2004

A Chronology of LDS Thought on Polynesian Origins

A Reflection on Book of Mormon Geography

1981 -----> Present

Copyright 2003 by Alan C. Miner. All rights reserved

Statements by Church Authorities

Significant *Books*, "Articles," & Events

[Significant Theoretical or Illustrated Models, or Illustrations Related to Book of Mormon Geography]

Notes*

YEAR1 PERSON PRIMARY SOURCE2

Note 1: The mark ^ after the year is purely a research tool indicating that a copy of the article or book is on file in the author's personal library.

Note 2: The year (listed on the left) for the event or quote is not always the same as the date of the primary source (listed on the right) from which the information was taken. If the source information (the

Who are the Lamanites? The term Lamanite includes all Indians and Indian mixtures, such as the Polynesians, the Guatemalan, the Peruvians, as well as the Sioux, the Apache, the Mohawk, the Navajo, and others. It is a large group of great people . . .

Lamanites share a royal heritage. I should like to address my remarks to you, our kinsmen of the isles of the sea and the Americas. . . . There are probably sixty million of you on the two continents and on the Pacific Islands, all related by blood ties.

1983^ Jerry Loveland "Polynesian Origins and Migrations," in *Mormon Pacific Historical*

(Polynesians) *Society Proceedings*, Fourth Annual Conference, Mormon History in the Pacific, April 30, 1983, Brigham Young University Hawaii Campus, Laie, Hawaii.

While this paper contains much of the same material found in Loveland's 1976 article (see notation), he projects a decidedly more negative tone in regards to any traditional LDS evidences regarding the Polynesian origins verses modern science. He then proposes that "evidence" in support of the Hagoth tradition and the Book of Mormon does not matter. He writes:

Hagoth has been presumed by some to be the Hawaii Loa of Hawaiian traditions, and a Book of Mormon and American ancestor of the Polynesian people. Moreover, more modern authorities, that is authorities of the Church, have cited Hagoth as an ancestor of the Polynesians. Patriarchal blessings that are conferred upon faithful Latter-day Saints have declared that Polynesians are of the house of Manasseh, one of the children of Joseph. . . .

So much for the position of the Church. Now, what does modern science have to say about the migration patterns of the people of Polynesia? Generally speaking, scholars are agreed that here is a New World influence in Polynesia. The question is: how significant is this contact? . . .

Biological evidence used to be thought to be more conclusive about defining origins and migrations of people than it is presently. Contemporary physical anthropologists tell us that things are not so simple as they once appeared to be. The Polynesians are apparently of at least two racial groups, the origins of which are not entirely obvious. Polynesians do share blood-group affinities with American Indians, but the significance of this may be less than it once appeared to be. There are stronger biological affinities between Polynesians and American Indians than any other racial groups, but the close affinity between

Polynesians and any other racial groups is with a people who live in the interior of Indonesia! In any event, serologists advise us to use blood typing with caution. . . .

The strongest single piece of evidence linking Polynesians with aboriginal Americans is the sweet potato, which ethno-botanists declare to be a plant of South American origin. However, some scientists insist that it is just as likely that a group left Polynesia, sailed to the Americas, picked up a load of sweet potatoes, and returned back to the Pacific Islands as it is that people migrated from the American Continent into the Pacific bringing with them the sweet potato. . . .

The linguistic evidence in Polynesia is not too supportive of the proposition that the portion of Polynesian culture has its origins in the Americas. There are very few Polynesian language-American Indian language cognates. . . .it appears very obvious that the Polynesians shared the original language that they spoke with other people who spoke the Austronesians language, which is actually a family of languages. Austronesian speaking people extend from the island of Madagascar off the coast of Africa, through the Indian Ocean into Malaya, Indonesia, the Philippines and across the Pacific as far as Easter Island. Austronesian speakers are also found in China and Taiwan. . . .

After citing many of the same legends that he did in his 1976 paper, Loveland writes:

A problem with these traditional accounts is that they were recorded in the post-European period. Some of them were actually not written until almost a century after the arrival of the first Europeans. . . . The fact, of course, that these legendary accounts are under suspicion does not mean that they are therefore false or that they do not have some relationship with genuine traditions which had its origins in a common tradition carried by people initially from Jerusalem to the Americas and then to the Pacific. What we are simply saying here is that all of these things, perhaps, are not to be taken at face value.

Current explanations of Polynesian origins and migrations suggest, as has been said, that the bulk of the people and of the cultures have their origins somewhere in Asia, but that for a certainty there was a South American contact. Archaeological evidence suggests that Western Polynesia, that is Fiji, Tonga, Samoa, were the first settled areas of Polynesia. Fiji seems to have been peopled by at least 1300 B.C., Samoa and Tonga by 1100 B.C. There appears then to have been migration from Western Polynesia into the Marquesas islands and from thence to Eastern Polynesia in about A.D. 300. From here, according to the evidence we have to this date, Easter Islands was inhabited by A.D. 400, Hawaii by A.D. 500, the Society Islands by A.D. 600, and New Zealand by A.D. 800. These dates, of course, are tentative, and as more archaeological evidence is obtained it may indicate an even earlier settling of these areas.

Conclusion: For Mormons the relationship of the Polynesian peoples with the house of Israel is an unquestioned fact. It is, however, based upon faith, and not upon the wisdom of man. To rely upon questionable evidence from questionable sources to support, by scientific evidence, that the peoples of Polynesia came from the Americas is perhaps unwise. Such information is better based upon faith. To utilize the reasoning of man to support one's position in this connection means that we must play the game by a different set of rules. At the moment the winners in the game are not those who support the settlement of Polynesia by a Book of Mormon people. It is unlikely that science can either prove or disprove LDS beliefs about a Book of Mormon people settling in Polynesia. May I suggest, in concluding, that it does not matter. We have our faith, and what is most important, is not where the peoples of Polynesia came from but, rather, where they are going.

Note* I disagree. From my perspective, "where they are going" relies to a great extent on "where the peoples of Polynesia came from." Information is not "better based upon faith," but rather better understood through faith.

1984^ John L. Hart "Children of Promise," in the Church News, February 26, 1984, p. 3

(Polynesians)

In a 1984 article entitled "Children of Promise," Church News staff writer John L. Hart would write the following:

Among the great body of peoples numbering about 177 million who are considered children of Lehi, most live unaware of the promise that one day they shall "blossom as the rose."

Of that total, North American Indians comprise less than a million. Hispanics of the United States and Latin America add up to about 108 million. Pure-blooded Indians south of the U.S. border make up about 60 million, while Polynesians in their native countries and emigrants number about 7.5 million.

Distant as the "blossoming prophecy" seems from many of these millions, it is being fulfilled, say Church leaders. An estimated 900,000 children of Lehi are now Church members and thousands more are being baptized every month, according the Church membership statistics. Most of the progress is occurring in Latin America. . . .

Despite differences between cultures, Elder Cook [of the First Quorum of the Seventy] noted traits of many children of Lehi: "If you start talking about love, faith, charity, humility, temperance, patience and brotherly kindness, many of them already know anything you can teach, and in the end, those are things that really matter. . . .

The blossoming has spread in Polynesia, particularly among the Tongan members. Tevita Ka'ili, regional representative, said Tonga has about 30,000 members, about 30 percent of the population of the island kingdom.

[1984 Illustration: Children of Lehi--Where are they?* Population estimates taken from census figures indicate that Lehi's vast posterity now numbers about 177 million. Map by Warren Noyce. John L. Hart, "Children of Promise," in the *Church News*, February 26, 1984, p. 3]

1984^ Owen C. Bennion "Father Lehi's Family Tree," in the Church News, February 26, 1984,

(Polynesians)

p. 4, 7.

In a 1984 *Church News* article entitled "Father Lehi's Family Tree," Owen C. Bennion, Assistant professor in the Multicultural Department of Brigham Young University writes the following:

The term Lamanites has been used to encompass all Polynesians, North and South American native peoples and subsequent mixtures. A better term might be children of Lehi or even Western Israelites.

Children of Lehi are usually considered any people descended from Lehi. Although many have been referred to as Lamanites and considered descendants of Laman and Lemuel, they are also descended from Lehi's other sons: Nephi, Sam, Jacob and Joseph, who were promised their seed would not be annihilated.

Descendants of Zoram, the servant of Laban who came with Lehi's family to the Promised Land, and the descendants of the Mulekites, led to America by Mulek, the sons of King Zedekiah, are also included in this group. (Hel. 8:21)

According to the Book of Mormon, Jacob considered the Promised Land an isle of the sea and explained that many groups were led from the house of Israel "to the isles of the sea." "Great are the promises of the Lord unto them who are upon the isles of the sea; wherefore as it says isles, there must needs be more than this, and they are inhabited also by our brethren" (2 Ne. 10:21)

Today these people are scattered throughout the Western Hemisphere from Tierra del Fuego at the tip of South America to Canada, and to the islands of the Pacific. . . .

The main body of Lehi's descendants live south of the border. Tarahumaras and Mexicans represent many tribes from Mexico. Mayans have come from Central America. From South America have come Quechuans and many others.

Polynesians, from Hawaii, Tonga, Samoa, New Zealand, the Cook Islands, Tahiti and many other smaller islands, are thought to be descendants of followers of Hagoth, a Nephite shipbuilder of 55 B.C. (See Alma 63:5-8).

1984^ Gerry Avant "Prophecies for Children of Lehi Are Being Fulfilled," in the *Church News*,

(Polynesians) February 26, 1984, p. 10

Gerry Avant, a staff writer for the Church News would write:

By the time Columbus "discovered" America, its inhabitants--a remnant of the House of Israel were in the throes of living prophecy. Columbus called them "Indians," but they and their Polynesian kin are actually descendants of Lehi, of whom much has been prophesied."

In an October 1959 general conference address, Elder Spencer W. Kimball, then of the Council of the Twelve, spoke of the nobility of this people: "You came from Jerusalem in its days of tribulation. You are of royal blood, a loved people of the Lord."

Much of the Book of Mormon is prophecy concerning the descendants of Lehi. And many teachings of the restored gospel pertain to them. . . .

"The predictions concerning the scattering of the early American were fulfilled to the letter," President Kimball said in an April 1947 conference address. "It has been thought by many people that they (Hagoth and his colonies) went to the Pacific islands. (Alma 63:5-8) Elder (Matthew) Cowley and I visited some of these peoples on the 'isles of the sea' and found them doing very well. But we are not so fortunate here at home in the United States. There are some bad conditions (for the descendants of Lehi) in our own nation and continent." . . .

President Kimball, in an area conference in Mexico on Feb. 20, 1977, spoke of what he, in 1946, saw in the future for the Lamanites: "Now, this is precisely what I dreamed; this was my vision for the people of the Lamanites," he said:

As I looked into the future, I saw the Lamanites from the isles of the sea and the Americas rise to a great destiny. I saw great numbers of Lamanites and Nephites in beautiful homes that have all the comforts that science can afford. I could see you children of Lehi with your herds and flocks on a thousand hills, and instead of working for others I could see you getting the management of the positions of responsibility. I saw you the owners of many farms and ranches and homes and gardens.

1984^ Gerry Avant "Temples Are a Fulfillment of Prophecy," in the *Church News*,

February 26, 1984, pp. 8-9, 13

Gerry Avant, a staff writer for the Church News would write:

"I feel the Lord has touched His prophets to bring into play those processes by which He is remembering ancient covenants concerning the descendants of Lehi," reported President Gordon B. Hinckley. Speaking at the fifth dedicatory session of the Mexico City Temple last December, President Hinckley, second counselor in the First Presidency, said, "All those who love Him feel deeply grateful this day has come. This year (1983) has been a year of miracles for the descendants of Father Lehi." He said Six temples were dedicated during the year, but "were unplanned in terms of a particular prophecy, but most of them have been built to serve the descendants of Lehi."

Three of these temples are in the South Pacific--the "isles of the sea"--Samoa, Tonga and Tahiti, with the other two in Chile and Mexico. Temples in Hawaii, New Zealand and Brazil have been available to Lehi's sons and daughters for some time. Other temples to serve the descendants of Lehi are under construction or in the planning stage in Guatemala, Argentina, Peru and Ecuador. These temples, said President Hinckley, are a fulfillment of an ancient prophecy that the Lord in the latter days would remember the descendants of Lehi. . . .

[1984 Illustration: Temples are a fulfillment of prophecy. Photos by Dell Van Orden, John Hart, Gerald Silver and Eldon Linschoten. Design by Warren Noyce. Gerry Avant, "Temples Are a Fulfillment of Prophecy," in the *Church News*, February 26, 1984, pp. 8-9]

1984 (LDS Construction Manager) Tongan Temple Dedication, *LDS Quarterly Reports*,

(pol) Nuku'alofa and Salt Lake City, 1984

In a Ph.D dissertation concerning the dynamics of Mormonism among the Tongan people, Tamar Gordon writes:

In its contemporary usage, the Lamanite identity serves a variety of ends in Tonga. Lamanite history serves as a vocabulary of motives for the implementation of high level Church policies within Tonga, such as the building of the Temple, as legitimation derives from the metaphorical linkage of biblical and contemporary events. The following, carefully prepared remarks of the American manager of the Utah Construction Company at the Tongan Temple Dedication invokes the Lamanites while rendering *fakahekeheke* (flattery to ranked superiors) to the King who legitimated the proceedings with his presence. . . :

In the beginning of the fourth century, the small country of Israel was in line for a change. King David died and his son Solomon was given the throne. Even though he was a young man he accepted the responsibility and became known as a wise king. Under his reign, a Temple to God was built. Now, 2933 years later in another small country, a kingdom, led by another wise king, another Temple to God has been built. This king, who is a descendent of King Solomon of Israel has assisted, has given his sanction and we appreciate his help in the building of this beautiful building. (Excerpts of the speech which had been prepared in advance appeared in the LDS Mission Quarterly Reports, Nuku'alofa and Salt Lake City 1984)

Source: ^Tamar G. Gordon, "Inventing Mormon Identity in Tonga," Ph.D diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1988, Gordon, pp. 132-133.

1985^ John L. Sorenson *An Ancient American Setting For the Book of Mormon*, SLC: Deseret Book

(Hagoth) Company and Provo: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies,

1985, pp. 268-269.

Sorenson writes:

The "ship" of Hagoth, if it was like craft known later on the Pacific coast, was either a very large dugout canoe with built-up sides or a log raft with sails. Whatever its form, it could hardly have been a complex planked vessel at all resembling European ships. There is no evidence so far that such ships were constructed or used in the New World until after the Spanish conquest, and it seems unlikely that so important a technological item would have left no evidence, even in art. Still, the large dugout canoe sighted by Columbus on one of his voyages off the coast of Yucatan was of very respectable size, capable of carrying scores of people for days at a time. And with so much cultural evidence of coastal voyaging between South America and Mesoamerica, we may yet find that the large sea-going rafts known off Ecuador or Peru, and which were able to reach the Galapagos Islands off South America, were also made and used off Mexico, although this has not yet been demonstrated.

What about the LDS tradition that Hagoth, the Nephite shipbuilder who failed to return home, was an ancestor of the Polynesians? Years ago I compiled a large body of shared culture traits that indeed suggest historical links between those islands and various parts of the Americas [see his 1952 notation], and this has been supplemented by others. Yet the evidence does not allow our pinning down any single time or place for a migration of trade that would persuasively explain the similarities. It remains impossible to demonstrate any clearcut connection between the two areas, although debate continues. Having been a missionary in Polynesia, I am well aware of the Hagoth theme in LDS tradition, but the evidence available does not support it as historically based fact. Neither can we rule out the possibility of a rare voyage between the mainland and the islands. Most of the evidence cited one way or the other is either weak or unclear. Those who choose to believe that Hagoth reached Polynesia must rely mainly on faith rather than on reliable evidence. The Book of Mormon itself, of course, says only that the man and his mates disappeared from the knowledge of the people in Zarahemla. For all they knew he might have died at a ripe old age on the west Mexican coast without a suitable vessel in which to make the return voyage. And neither do we know.

Note* See the 1952 Sorenson notation.

1986[^] R. Lanier Britsch *Unto the Islands of the Sea; A History of the Latter-day Saints in the Pacific,*

(Polynesians) Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1986.

R. Lanier Britsch was a professor of history at Brigham Young University, having received his bachelor's and master's degrees from B.Y.U. and his Ph.D. from Claremont Graduate School. He had served a full-time mission to Hawaii. In this 584-page history of the Latter-day Saints in the Pacific he writes concerning the beginnings of missionary work:

On May 11, 1843, Joseph Smith called Addison Pratt on a mission to the Pacific Islands, the first mission of the Church to that area. Elder Pratt was a reasonable choice, for when he was a young man he had sailed the Pacific Ocean and had at one time spent several months in the Sandwich Islands (Hawaii). The call to serve had come from the Prophet, and Brigham Young had ordained Addison a seventy and given him power over the elements. When Brother Young set him apart, he told Elder Pratt to avoid haste and passion, to see goodness in all. These were good words for one who would spend most of the next nine years serving the Lord among people who were greatly different from any with whom Latter-day Saint missionaries had worked. . . .

It is not clear from the missionary records whether these elders were called to Hawaii or simply to any appropriate place in the Pacific. When they reached New Bedford, Massachusetts, Brother Pratt tried to find a ship going to Hawaii. Failing this, he booked passage on the *Timoleon*, a whaling ship bound for the Society Islands. It sailed on October 10, 1843. . . . More than six months passed before the *Timoleon* hove to in sight of the missionaries' first stopping place, Tubauai, in the southeast Pacific. . . .

Tubauai lies 350 miles due south of Tahiti. It is a fertile island that produces a fine variety of fruits and vegetables. When the *Timoleon* dropped anchor, the first priority of all on board was to stock up on food and fresh water. President Rogers went ashore with the first boats, and a day later Pratt and Grouard followed. The Church had arrived on Polynesian soil. The three missionaries were well received by the people of Tubauai, who urged them to stay and teach the gospel. Pratt, whom they came to call "Paraita," was their evident favorite because he could communicate with them a little by using the Hawaiian language.

Elder Pratt's decision to stay, however, was not easy. His first intention had been to teach the gospel in Hawaii and then in well known Tahiti. He was not sure he would be usefully serving by remaining on an almost unknown island, a mere three-by-six-mile oval with a small population. He sought the Lord in prayer, and when the answer came he not only felt that he should stay but he was convinced that if he left he would be running away from duty. (pp. 3-4)

[See the Britsch notation for 1989]

1987^ **John W. Welch, Gary Gillum** ***Comprehensive Bibliography of the Book of Mormon:***

Dee Ann Hofer *Arranged Alphabetically by Author*, Provo, Utah: FARMS,

1987.

As the name implies, this work listed many articles and books published on the Book of Mormon.

1988^ **Tamar G. Gordon** **"Inventing Mormon Identity in Tonga,"** Ph.D diss., University of

(pol) (non-LDS) California, Berkeley, 1988

In trying to understand the Mormon phenomenon among the Tongans, Tamar Gordon has "borrowed Roy Wagner's term 'invention' to indicate a dual reality that informs Tongan Mormons as they interpret one cultural system in light of another," or in other words that Mormonism among the Tongans cannot be

viewed entirely in the Mormon ideology it has received, but rather in a much larger cultural process. As part of explaining this historical process he refers to and quotes a number of authoritative statements regarding Polynesians and their status as "Lamanites."

1989^ R. Lanier Britsch *Moramona: The Mormons in Hawaii*. Laie, Hawaii: The Institute for (Polynesians) Polynesian Studies, 1989, pp. 114-116.

In 1989 R. Lanier Britsch would publish a comprehensive history of the Mormons in Hawaii. This project was funded by the Polynesian Cultural Center at Brigham Young University--Hawaii. Portions of this book had appeared in slightly different form in a book by Britsch, *Unto the Islands of the Sea; A History of the Latter-day Saints in the Pacific*, previously published in 1986 by Deseret Book. Most importantly, it contains a detailed description of the beginnings of missionary work and the beginnings of how the Polynesians came to be thought of as literal descendants of the house of Israel. Britsch writes:

The fiftieth anniversary of the arrival of the first ten LDS Missionaries in the Hawaiian Islands, 12 December 1900, began a four-day celebration. . . . The Jubilee committee hoped that President George Q. Cannon, first counselor in the First Presidency and the real leader of the first missionaries, would be able to attend. . . . President Cannon, his family, William W. Cluff, and others arrived on the evening of 10 December 1900.

The next four days were a whirlwind of meetings and receptions. Six meetings were held at the Orpheum Theatre on Honolulu's Fort Street on 12 and 13 December. Cannon spoke at each session. . . .

Two men stand out above all others during the first fifty years of the mission: Joseph F. Smith and George Q. Cannon. Joseph F. Smith had returned to Hawaii in 1864-1865, again in 1885-1887, and had visited as recently as 1899. In addition to visits in 1909, 1916, and 1917, he would return again to dedicate the site for the Laie temple in 1915. But President Cannon had not returned to Hawaii since the 1850s. A great tradition had grown concerning the works of Pukuniahia, as he was called in Hawaii, and local Saints almost worshiped his name. . . .

Three significant revelatory experiences occurred while Cannon was in the islands. On Sunday, 23 December, he spoke to the Saints at Laie branch concerning the blessings [of Temple covenants] the Lord still held in store for them. . . . The second revelatory clarification occurred at Lahaina, Maui. O the morning of 27 December, Cannon, in company with Woolley, Cluff, and some others, started out to find the place where Nalimanui had lived when she offered him food and shelter. Cannon journalized as follows:

I wanted to find the site of this house and the garden where I sought the Lord in secret prayer and where He condescended to commune with me, for I heard His voice more than once as one man speaks with another, encouraging me and showing me the work which should be done among this people if I would follow the dictates of His Spirit, Glory to God in the highest that He has permitted me to live to behold the fulfillment of His words. (George Q. Cannon, *Journal of Travels to the Hawaiian Mission Jubilee*, 17 December 1900, p. 14; see also Samuel E. Woolley, *Journal*, 27 December 1900)

The third experience took place at Waikapu, Maui. It concerned the LDS doctrine that the island peoples are descendants of Abraham through Lehi and are heirs to all the blessings of Abraham and his posterity. This doctrine had been accepted by Latter-day Saints ever since the time of Cannon's first mission, but the fact that it had its inception through him was not known until Cannon explained this to the Saints at Waikapu on 28 December 1900. President Woolley wrote that President Cannon "told them they were of the seed of Abraham, he knew it because the Lord told him so at Lahaina." (Samuel E. Woolley, Journal, 28 December 1900)

Note* See the 1850-1854 Cannon notation and the 1900 Hawaiian Mission Jubilee notation.

1989^ Church Education System Book of Mormon Student Manual: Religion 121 and 122, SLC:
The

(Polynesians) Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1989, p. 104.

Under the heading, "Alma 63:4-10. Journey to the Land Northward" we find the following:

Speaking of Hagoth and his party, President Spencer W. Kimball said: "President Joseph F. Smith, the president of the Church reported, 'You brethren and sisters from New Zealand, I want you to know that you are from the people of Hagoth.' For New Zealand Saints, that was that. A prophet of the Lord had spoken" (in New Zealand Area Conference Report, 20-22 Feb. 1976, p. 3)

1989^ **Joseph L. Allen** **Exploring the Lands of the Book of Mormon**, Orem: S. A.
Publishers,

(Polynesians) Inc., 1989, p. 105.

In 1989, Joseph Allen, one of the foremost proponents of a Limited Mesoamerican view of Book of Mormon geography would publish his ideas. In regards to his interpretation on the Hagoth migrations into the land northward described in Alma 63:4-9, he would write the following:

[Concerning Alma 63:4] the Land Which Was Northward is proposed as the Valley of Mexico. The City of Teotihuacan may have been one of the cities to which the 55 BC Nephites migrated [from Tehuantepec] . . .

[Concerning Alma 63:5-6] I prefer the route from [Tehuantepec to] Acapulco to Mexico City over either the route from Tehuantepec to Oaxaca to Mexico City or from Tehuantepec to Veracruz to Mexico City. . . .

[Concerning Alma 63:7-8] We are informed that two ships were lost. Mormon tradition suggests that at least one of these ships ended up in the Hawaiian Islands, thus accounting for the similarity in culture and traditions between the Polynesians and the people of Mesoamerica. Communication apparently occurred between the Nephites in the Land of Zarahemla and those who traveled by boat to the Land Which Was Northward or to the Land Northward. The people knew which ships arrived and which ships did not arrive.

...

[Illustrated Map: Possible ocean route of 55 BC Nephite migration. Joseph L. Allen, *Exploring the Lands of the Book of Mormon*, Orem: S. A. Publishers, Inc., 1989, p. 106.]

1990^ John L. Sorenson *Pre-Columbian Contact with the Americas across the Oceans: An Annotated*

Martin H. Raish *Bibliography*, 2 Volumes. Provo, Utah: Research Press, 1990.

[See the 1996 notation]

1990 Ian G. Barber "Mormonism among the Tangata Whenua." Paper delivered
(Polynesians) at the annual Mormon History Association Conference, Hawaii,
June 1990.

At a 1990 Mormon History Association meeting held in Hawaii, the linking together of these people with the people of Hagoth was treated:

The Israelite descent of the Polynesians is more difficult to trace in Mormon doctrine. Indeed, there is no evidence that Joseph Smith or the first Mormon missionaries sent to Polynesia in the 1840's ever made the connection. As far as is known, the doctrine was first preached publicly by Tahitian LDS missionary Louisa Pratt who identified the Nephites as "the ancient fathers of the Tahitians" at a meeting in 1851.

Source: Quoted in Robert E. Parsons, "Hagoth and the Polynesians," in *The Book of Mormon: Alma, The Testimony of The Word*, Provo: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1992, p. 257.

1990 Addison Pratt *The Journals of Addison Pratt: Being a Narrative of Yankee Whaling in the Eighteen*

Twenties, a Mormon Mission to the Society Islands, and of Early California and Utah in the Eighteen Forties and Fifties, ed. S. George Ellsorth. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1990.

1992^ Robert E. Parsons Robert E. Parsons, "Hagoth and the Polynesians," in *The Book of (Polynesians) Mormon: Alma, The Testimony of The Word*, Provo: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1992, p. 260.

After making a review of some of the literature regarding authoritative LDS statements concerning the lineage of the Polynesians, Robert Parsons concludes with the following:

It seems fair to state that although the Church has no official, published declaration on the origin of the Polynesians, there have been enough semi-official statements by prophets of the Lord to leave little doubt that the Church believes that the Polynesians are direct blood relatives of Lehi's colony and that Hagoth's lost ships provide at least one connection between the Americas and Polynesia. This is further supported by patriarchal blessings given to the members of the Church among these people and by oral traditions.

Note* There is a big difference in telling people that they came from Hagoth as opposed to telling them that they descended from the Nephites or Lamanites. One statement is specific to time and place, the other is general.

1992^ Eric B. Shumway "Polynesians," in *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, edited by Daniel H. Ludlow, (Polynesians) 3:1110-12. 5 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1992.

In a semi-official article on the "Polynesians" in the 1992 *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, Eric Shumway writes the following:

Polynesia is most frequently identified as those Pacific islands lying within an enormous triangle extending from New Zealand in the south to Hawaii in the north and the Easter Islands in the extreme east. The major Polynesian ethnic groups include Hawaiians, New Zealand Maoris, Samoans, Tongans, and Tahitians.

A basic view held in the Church is that Polynesians have ancestral connections with the Book of Mormon people who were descendants of Abraham and that among them are heirs to the blessings promised Abraham's descendants. Since 1843, the Church has undertaken extensive missionary efforts in the Pacific islands, and large numbers of Polynesians have joined the Church.

The belief that Polynesian ancestry includes Book of Mormon people can be traced back at least to 1851, when George Q. Cannon taught it as a missionary in Hawaii (he was later a counselor in the First Presidency). President Brigham Young detailed the belief in a letter to King Kamehameha V in 1865. Other Church leaders have since affirmed the belief, some indicating that among Polynesian ancestors were the people of Hagoth, who set sail from Nephite lands in approximately 54 B.C. (cf. Alma 63:5-8). [President Joseph F. Smith's 1913 comments are cited] . . .

Among scholars, the exact ancestry of the Polynesian peoples is a matter of debate. While some non-LDS scientists have insisted on their Western Hemisphere origins, the prevailing scientific opinion from anthropological, archaeological, and linguistic evidence argues a west-to-east migratory movement from Southeast Asia that began as early as 1200 B.C.

What seems clear from the long-standing debate is that considerable interaction was maintained over the centuries from many directions. The island peoples had both the vessels and the skill to sail with or against ocean currents. It would be as difficult to say that no group could have migrated from east to west as to argue the opposite in absolute terms. Church leaders, who have attested to Polynesian roots in the Nephite peoples, have not elaborated on the likelihood of other migrating groups in the Pacific or of social mixing and inter-marriage. . . .

Note* Shumway cites a bibliography that includes the following:

W.A. Cole and E. W. Jensen, *Israel in the Pacific*, 1961

Jerry Loveland, "Hagoth and the Polynesian Tradition" in *BYU Studies*, Autumn 1976.

Russell T. Clement, "Polynesian Origins . . . ", in *Dialogue*, Winter 1980

R. Lanier Britsch, *Moramona*, 1989

In order to assess Shumway's article, the reader is referred to the notations for the above cited references (as well as all the other notations) for details that Shumway might have failed to include.

1994^ E. L. Peay *The Lands of Zarahemla: Volume Two: Nephi's Land of Promise,*

(Hagoth) Provo: Author, 1994, p. 93.

Those Book of Mormon geography theorists who propose first a Limited Mesoamerican setting and second, a Yucatan setting for the land of Zarahemla, are put in a geographical bind when it comes to connecting the Polynesians with Hagoth (see the map below). In his 1994 book, E. L. Peay has Hagoth traveling from the west coast of Yucatan northward up the mouth of the Mississippi river into the Mississippi Valley area. He writes:

Near this time when the Book of Mormon peoples left the land of Zarahemla (50 B.C.), a group of white people settled in the Mississippi Valley area. Some claim they came from Mexico or Central America area. Archaeologists call them the Temple Mound Builders. They have been identified in the Mississippi and Ohio Valleys. Their mode of building is similar to that of the Maya of Central America prior to the time of Christ (America's Fascinating Indian heritage, 1992, Reader's Digest, pp. 68-73)

[1994 Illustrated Map: Proposed Route of Hagoth's Ships. E. L. Peay, *The Lands of Zarahemla: Volume Two: Nephi's Land of Promise*, Provo: Author, 1994, p. 93.]

1996^ Donald W. Parry, Jeanette W. Miller *A Comprehensive Annotated Book of Mormon*

Sandra A. Thorne *Bibliography*, Provo, Utah: Research Press, 1996.

(Polynesians)

In the Introduction to this 643-page work we find the following:

The primary goal of the *Annotated Bibliography of the Book of Mormon* is to produce a comprehensive, annotated, bibliographic listing of published items on the book. As with any bibliography, this work was created to assist scholars and students with their research. It was designed to facilitate research by placing in the hands of researchers a comprehensive listing of published items on the Book of Mormon listed both by author as well as by subject. . . .

The following are a few examples of the various pertinent indexed references:

Hagoth = 16 references

Polynesian origins = 30 references

Transoceanic crossings = 52

1996^ John L. Sorenson *Pre-Columbian Contact with the Americas across the Oceans: An Annotated*

Martin H. Raish *Bibliography*, Second Edition, Revised, 2 Volumes. Provo, Utah: Research (Polynesians) Press, 1996.

This is a monumental work comprising over 5,100 citations, plus several hundred other references to reprints, new editions, translations and reviews contained within the main entries. Although this two-volume, 1200-page work was first published in 1990, some major changes were accomplished in the second edition making it more useful. Over 1250 of the 5613 references in the first edition were deleted and more than 600 new items added, with 900 additional abstracts. In the Introduction we find the following:

We see merit in all possible lines of inquiry concerning transoceanic contacts between the hemispheres. We trust that this bibliographic instrument will facilitate expanded, open-minded research by a wide range of scholars.

Only comprehensive study of the problem of transoceanic contacts is likely to gain ground. . . . all types of issues are covered herein. We are concerned with the limitations and capabilities of ancient vessels and other operation, with technologically simple (i.e., modern experimental and ethnographically known) boats, with actually or purportedly historical maps or traditions indicating that American lands may have been known in pre-Columbian times to inhabitants of the Old World, and with comparative cultural patterns (beliefs, rites, technology, architecture, art motifs, folklore), language linkages, human biological characteristics including genetics and diseases, shared cultigens, and on and on.

The coverage, however, must and does involve much more than diffusionist assertions or even objective studies that seek to demonstrate diffusion. The antidiffusion literature must also be known to a comprehensive researcher. No scholar worth the name wishes to know "one side" of an issue, or even "both sides," when there may be a dozen "sides" or facets to the problem. For example Andrew Sharp's view that Polynesian voyagers did not make purposeful voyages is as important to know as the belief of polynesiaphiles that surely they did make such journeys. And one needs to know the hows and whys of those positions, as well as alternative positions, not just that they exist. Whether Polynesians reached America can hardly be discussed adequately without acquaintance with the entire literature on their voyaging capabilities and history, pro and con (and more often ambiguous).

All oceans bordering the Americas and all time periods are considered. . . .One special relationship that may strike some as not "transoceanic" was included in the first edition as an enlightening comparative case--sea movements between Mesoamerica and Ecuador or Peru. Since those voyages are now commonly supposed to have stretched as much as 2000 miles, and may have sailed hundreds of miles out of sight of land, researchers may be instructed . . . by our opening this case literature to general view. . . . The topic still deserves consideration, even though the references have been omitted from this second edition for the sake of brevity, as mentioned above.

The following are a few examples of the various pertinent indexed references:

boat, Polynesia: 48 references

Easter Island: 84 references

Hawaii: 19 references

Hebrew: 32 references

Heyerdahl, Thor: 99 references

Israel: 17 references

Maori: 19 references

Marquesas: 19 references

Book of Mormon: 20 references

myth, Polynesia/Oceania: 30 references

Polynesia: 209 references

Tahiti: 28 references

1996^ Church Education System *Book of Mormon Student Manual: Religion 121 and 122*, SLC:
The

(Polynesians) Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1996 revised edition,

p. 104.

Under the heading, "Alma 63:4-10. Journey to the Land Northward" we find the following:

Speaking of Hagoth and his party, President Spencer W. Kimball said: "President Joseph F. Smith, the president of the Church reported, 'You brethren and sisters from New Zealand, I want you to know that you are from the people of Hagoth.' For New Zealand Saints, that was that. A prophet of the Lord had spoken" (in New Zealand Area Conference Report, 20-22 Feb. 1976, p. 3)

1997 Scott G. Kenney "Mormons and the Smallpox Epidemic of 1853," *The Hawaiian Journal*

of History 31:1-26.

1998^ Duane R. Aston *Return to Cumorah*, Sacramento: American River Publications, 1998.

(Hagoth)

In Duane Aston's 1998 book *Return to Cumorah*, there is a map on the inside cover by which the reader can easily see that the only route for Hagoth's ships was into the Great Lakes. Those who propose a Limited Great Lakes model for Book of Mormon geography become excluded from any connection between Hagoth and the Polynesians.

[**Illustrated Map: Map A. Proposed Geographical Setting for The Book of Mormon.** Duane R. Aston, *Return to Cumorah*, Sacramento: American River Publications, 1998, inside cover.]

1998^ Scott Lowe "News of the Church," in the *Ensign*, January 1998, p. 77.

(Polynesians)

Scott Lowe writes:

For five days in October, Latter-day Saints from as far away as Papua New Guinea, where the Church is less than two decades old; French Polynesia, where the gospel was first preached four years before the pioneers entered the Salt Lake Valley; and other islands throughout the Pacific joined together to celebrate their faith in a climate of testimony and scholarship. President Gordon B. Hinckley delivered the keynote address to some 8,000 listeners on the final day of the conference (see story on page 74). . . .

Following are the years when the Church first entered these Pacific islands:

French Polynesia--1843

Hawaii--1846

New Zealand--1854

Samoa--1863

Tonga--1891

Cook Islands--1899

Niue--1952

Fiji--1954

Guam--1955

New Caledonia--1961

Vanuatu--1973

Kiribati--1975

Northern Mariana Islands--1975

Marshall Islands--1977

Federated States of Micronesia--1977

Palau--1978

Papua New Guinea--1979

Easter Island--1980

Solomon Islands

2000^ Walter F. Gonzalez Church News, January 1, 2000, p. 6

(Polynesians)

Walter Gonzalez writes:

The message of the Book of Mormon has had much appeal to the children of Lehi in the Americas and the Pacific Islands. The descendants of Lehi, Mulek and the Jaredites are spread all over the Americas. . . The Americas, from as far north as Alaska and as far south as La Patagonia, have the blessing of

being inhabited by some of the children of Lehi who are many times referred to as Lamanites by the members of the Church.

He then quotes the 1971 Spencer W. Kimball statement (see notation) and then notes: "On a certain occasion, an angel said to Nephi that in our days, we would have 'the mixture of thy seed' in the Americas. (1 Ne. 13:30)"

2000^ Grant Underwood "Introduction," in *Voyages of Faith: Explorations in Mormon Pacific History*, ed.

(Polynesians) Grant Underwood, Provo: BYU Studies and the Joseph Fielding Smith

Institute for Latter-day Saint History, 2000.

In the foreword to this book, Kenneth Baldrige writes that in the early 1980's Jerry Loveland, chair of the Behavioral and Social Sciences Division at Brigham Young University--Hawai'i and he were talking over ways to advance the study of local history. After a number of meetings and contacts, the Mormon Pacific Historical Society (MPHS) was born. In the years that followed more than 160 papers were presented. He writes that "The compilation of this collection has been a challenging task, for which Grant Underwood is to be commended." noting the many "gut-wrenching decisions about what papers should be included."

The following articles are more pertinent to this paper:

Foreword (Kenneth W. Baldrige)

"New Wine and Old Bottles: Latter-day Saint Missionary Work in French Polynesia, 1844-1852" (S. George Ellsworth) pp. 13-22

"The First Mormon Missionary Women in the Pacific, 1850-1852" (Maria S. Ellsworth) pp. 33-48.

"Mormonism and the Shaping of Maori Religious Identity," (Grant Underwood) pp. 107-128.

"Founding the LDS Church in Melanesia and Micronesia" (R. Lanier Britsch) pp. 267-288.

2000 Grant Underwood "Mormonism, the Maori and Cultural Authenticity," *Journal of Pacific History* 35:133-46.

2000^ John L. Sorenson "New Light: Genetics Indicates that Polynesians Were Connected

to Ancient America," in *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*

Vol. 9. Provo: FARMS, p. 1

2001^ Bruce S. Sutton *Lehi, Father of Polynesia: Polynesians are Nephites*, Orem: Hawaiki
(Polynesians) Publishing, 2001.

Although Bruce Sutton borrows heavily from the writings of William Cole and Elwin Jensen (*Israel in the Pacific*, SLC: Genealogical Society, 1961) to establish a basis for information concerning Polynesian traditions, history, genealogies, customs, etc., he does present and defend his own theories concerning the origins of the Polynesians and how they relate to the histories chronicled in the Book of Mormon. Bruce Sutton puts forth the theory that the Polynesians were basically Nephites who left the western coasts of America for the islands of the Pacific and who maintained the worship of the Nephite' god as their legends and traditions claim. He further states the following:

From available genealogical and traditional sources, there is conclusive evidence that the Polynesian peoples descended from the following three major recognized progenitors: Hawaii-loa, Hotu Matua (Tane or Opukahonua) and Machaa (Atea or Lalokona). . . .

HAWAII-LOA: Hawaii-loa came across to Hawaii by ship, leaving the Gulf of Tehuantepec in southern Mexico for northern California, arriving near the Humbolt/Crescent City region. He, then, sailed by way of the California Current, connecting into the Pacific North Equatorial Current and sailed to the Hawaiian Islands. This occurred about 55 B.C. . . . This author believes that Hawaii-loa was Corianton, son of Alma and was the religious leader on the ship that sailed to Hawaii.

Hawaii-loa and his people were fair-skinned Nephites whose social, religious, and cultural background emanated from the Nephite nation of Mesoamerica. They . . . carried on the traditions taught by their forefathers. They learned and followed the religious teachings contained and preserved on the Plates of Brass which Lehi brought with him to Mesoamerica from Jerusalem. The Hawaiians were a very religious people, and as such were visited by Jesus Christ after he had been crucified and had ascended to heaven.

MACHAA: Machaa (Lalakona or Atea) came westward across the pacific, by ship, leaving the South American coast from southern Peru. He went by way of the Peru (Humboldt) Current, connecting into the

Mentor Current, and dropping south to Rapa Nui (Easter Island). This took place sometime around 220 B.C. . . . Traditions teach that Machaa was a descendant of Noah. His genealogy came through the Olmec (Jaredite) lineage. Machaa and his people had previously assimilated the religious and social culture of the Nephites through the teachings of Hotu Matua's family, who were the pre-Inca lords. Machaa's people stayed briefly in Rapa Nui (Easter Island) before setting out for the Tuamotu Islands, Marquesas Islands, and other areas of what is now known as French Polynesia and the South Pacific.

HOTU MATUA: Hotu Matua (Opukahonua or Tane) came across the Pacific, by ship from the South American Coast to Rapa Nui (Easter Island) . . . shortly after the arrival of Machaa. Hotu Matua and his people were Nephites, who originally came from Mesoamerica, whose descriptions match those of "the Long Ears," with red hair, blue eyes and white or fair skin. They were described as such, by the Quechua Indians of Peru. The people of Rapa Nui called their ancestors, the Indians of Peru. After Hotu Matua settled Rapa Nui, some of his people returned again to their ships and moved farther west, settling among the people of Machaa (Jaredites) in the Tuamotu Islands, the Marquesas Islands, and other areas of the present French Polynesia and the South Pacific.

The Land of Uru: A Marquesan legend maintains that Atea (Machaa) and Tane (Hotu Matua) were brothers. Hotu Matua was [in reality], the nephew of Tupa Inca Yupanqui Capac, tenth king of the pre-Inca empire during the Paracas Period (about 500 B.C. to A.D. 100). Machaa was [in reality] the local chieftain over the people of Uru who were living in the southern extremity of the pre-Inca Empire at the south end of Lake Titicaca. They were brothers in the sense that they followed the same religious and social traditions taught by the Inca family, and their close association with each other in warfare against the Araucans. . . . As a result of the many wars against the Araucans, Machaa had it revealed to him from God (known as Make-Make) that he should depart into the great ocean in the direction of the setting sun and would come to lonely islands where his people could rest. [Apparently Hotu Matua followed] (pages 1-2)

About 490 B.C. a group of Nephites under the leadership of Manco Capac left the present day lands of Guatemala and settled in Peru, and built the pre-Inca Empire. By 220 B.C., Hotu Matua (a Nephite) and Machaa (a Jaredite) set sail into the Pacific Ocean settling the Eastern and Southern Pacific. (p. 62)

[Illustrated Map: Migrations to the Western Hemisphere and Polynesia. Bruce S. Sutton, *Lehi, Father of Polynesia: Polynesians are Nephites*, Orem: Hawaiki Publishing, 2001, p. 52]

2002 Edwin Goble and Wayne May *This Land: Zarahemla and the Nephite Nation.* Published by Ancient

American Archaeology Foundation. Printed by Hayriver Press,

Colfax, Wisconsin, March 2002, pp. 79-84.

Edwin Goble and Wayne May add to the evolution of the Limited North America model of Book of Mormon geography with some novel ideas, especially when it comes to Hagoth and the Polynesians. As I noted before, those proposing the Limited Great Lakes Model had worked themselves into a corner. On the one hand they quoted numerous authoritative statements regarding the United States as the Promised Land--the site of the New Jerusalem, yet what were they to do about the numerous authoritative statements relative to Hagoth and the Polynesians? If Hagoth launched his ship into the west sea, and if the west sea was part of the Great Lakes, how would Hagoth get to the Polynesian islands? Goble and May provide their answer:

Because the Niagara Falls was an impasse, they were forced to land on one side and port all the goods to the other side. Can there be any doubt that that is what the city of Lib spoken of in Ether 10:20 was for? It was a port city because of the need to use the Niagara Peninsula as a portage. [Alma 63:5 is quoted]

The Narrow Neck was near the West Sea, by the place where the sea divides the land. That is where Hagoth launched the ships from. The Great Lakes system (i.e. not just one lake, but all of them) is the West Sea. Hagoth launched into Lake Ontario. [Alma 63:6-8 is quoted]

They kept going further north from there, so apparently they followed the St. Lawrence River out to sea. Note again that the Book of Mormon says that they went northward, and on our map, (page 75) the St. Lawrence River flows to our northeast. After Hagoth's group left, the Nephites never knew what happened to them. But apparently, modern prophets may have received revelation about where they went. We read:

I would like, in making reference to these wonderful people from New Zealand--especially the Maori folks here today--to turn to Alma 53:5-8. . . [The] narrow neck of land leading into the land northward . . . in a great gathering of Polynesians held right in Salt Lake City just prior to 1915, a prophet of the Lord, President Joseph F. Smith . . . made the statement that without a doubt this man Hagoth and his company were the progenitors of the Polynesian races, and that this migration was the beginning of the Polynesian population in the South Pacific. Now the Maoris [i.e. the people from New Zealand] . . . all have the same answer to the questions, "Where did your people come from? Where did you originate? The answer is always the same: "I haere mai matou i tawhiti cui, i tawhiti roe, i tawhiti pamamau i tehono i te wai e rua." ("We came from a great distance, from a still greater distance, from a very, very great distance, from the joining place of two great waters") . . . This is Maori tradition and I want to tell you that those who have joined the Church believe without reservation, that these things I have told you are part and parcel of Mormon doctrine. (Simpson, Robert L., 1962, *BYU Speeches*, April 4, pp. 6-7).

If anyone travels great distances, it is the Polynesians. Could it be that they got that tradition from Hagoth, their progenitor? And there is even more evidence. Remember from the internal evidence from the Book of Mormon, Bountiful was not too far from the Narrow Neck: "The Wyandot name Toh-roohn-toe [Toronto] was said to mean plenty or abundance. It has also been interpreted to mean a place of meeting or simply meeting place". (Rydjord, John, 1968, *Indian Place-Names*, Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, p. 283). So we see that Toronto has two meanings. One of them is Bountiful (Abundance). The other is "a place of meeting" or joining place. The joining place of two great waters. This Native American place-name has been preserved in Polynesian tradition to this day.

Further support for this point of view comes from the tradition of Hawaii-Loa which was preserved by the Hawaiians:

From the time of Newenewe to Aniani-Ku their children had spread to the easternmost shores of the land. In the time of Aniani ka Lani, son of Aniani-Ku, this race had got far from the original homeland. He is quoted in both Tahitian and Hawaiian legends as a progenitor of their nations.

His son was Hawaii Loa, or Ke Kowa I Hawaii. He was one of the four children of Aniani ka Lani. Hawaii and his brothers were born on the east coast of a country called the land of the yellow or handsome sea. In his time the race arrived at these (Hawaiian) islands, and Hawaii Loa was the ancestor of the Hawaiian family. He was a distinguished man and noted for his fishing excursions which would occupy sometimes months, sometimes a whole year, during which time he would roam about the ocean in his ship, with his crew and people. One time they had been long out on the ocean, and steering their course by the Eastern Star they arrived at the easternmost island. They went ashore and found the country fertile and pleasant, and Hawaii Loa, the chief, called the land after his own name. Here they dwelt a long time, and when their vessel was filled with food and with fish, they returned to their native country with the firm intention to come back to Hawaii-nei which they preferred to their own country. they had left their wives and children at home: therefore they returned to fetch them. And when they arrived at their own country and among their relations, they were detained a long time before they set out again for Hawaii. At last Hawaii Loa started again, accompanied by his wife and his children and dwelt in Hawaii and gave up all thought of ever returning to his native land. He was accompanied also in this voyage by a great multitude of people. hawaii Loa was chief of all this people. . . ." (Bennett, Joshua Moses, *The Gospel of the Great Spirit*, 1990, SLC UT, Morning Star Publishing, p. 99-100).

The account of Hawaii Loa tells us that the people had ventured far from their original country, and had spread all the way to the east coast of the country they lived in. Further we are told that Hawaii Loa himself was born on that east coast. He then set out from that area, following the Eastern Star, and arrived at the easternmost island, which received the place name of Hawaii. This shows that where he set out from was near the east coast of the land that he left. The island was named after this man who was the chief of his people that he led there, which is most certainly a Book of Mormon custom:

Now, it was the custom of the people of Nephi to call their lands, and their cities, and their villages, yea, even all their small villages, after the name of him who first possessed them . . . (Alma 8:7)

Since this man was the progenitor of his race, which we know as the Polynesians, and the prophets said their progenitor was Hagoth, then Hawaii Loa and Hagoth could very well be the same person. Therefore, hawaii is a corruption of the name hagoth, which is certainly no stretch either. The particle "ii" (i'i) in the name in some Polynesian languages is sounded with a harder sound, as "iki". For example, the place name in the traditions of the Maori in New Zealand is Hawa-iki, the land of their forefathers. Iki or i'i stands for the "island", because of its volcano. So it is the "island of Hawa". So as we see in the case of i'i", as in many others, as time goes by, there is a softening of the original sound in certain dialects.

For example, in English, the word "war" is spelled with a W, while the cognate in Spanish is "guerra". And the G is certainly a harder sound than the W, yet the two can be seen as interchangeable. The same goes for L and R in certain languages. In Chinese, the word Liu-Kiu (the island chain that includes the island of Okinawa) is Ryu-Kyu in Japanese. Therefore, it is no stretch whatsoever to see that Hawaii is the "island of Haga", a corruption of the name of the man who first settled it, following Nephtite custom.

According to the Book of Mormon, Hagoth launched into the west sea and went northward. The only explanation that can account for him going east an exceedingly long distance to get to Hawaii is the

following. He launched from Lake Ontario, and went northward, up the St. Lawrence. Then he went out to the Atlantic, and then down, around the tip of Africa, and then kept going eastward "an exceedingly great distance". We see that hawaii-Loa launched from the east coast of the land he launched from, just as Hagoth launched from the eastern part of the North American continent. This is no mistake. There can be no doubt as to why the Maori "pa" or forts are exactly the same as Nephite forts.

Further Research to do:

Obtain the book *Moramona* : called Pioneer Book & they have ordered it in. 377-1272.

Have Dennis Moe copy the following articles from *The Saints Herald*:

"Ancient Polynesian traditions and the Hebrew scriptures" F. Edward Butterworth vol. 117-8:49 (1971?)

"Polynesian anthropology" (NWC), vol. 120-2:6 (1974?)

"Issue devoted to, March 1977, v. 124, #3, Pages 3, 6-13" vol. 124:131-143 (1978?)

"Cover:" wreath commemorating first missionaries to Tubuai, F. P. 141:323 (1995?)

"News--French Polynesian Church celebrates sesquicentennial-pic 141:345

"President Smith visits islands" 141:349.

Copy Nettie Hunt Rencher, *The First Pacific Islands Missionary*, Pratt papers, microfilm, Church Historians Office. (searched, couldn't find: July 25, 2003)

Find & copy n.d. Raymond Mecham "Origin of the Polynesians," (n. d.) Collection: Cheesman)

Contact R. Lanier Britsch (Orem) abt. McKay quote (1955?) [called--on mission, will not return till December]

Cannon--presumed acquaintance with Addison Pratt--See Cannon Journal pp. 3, 21. (add to 1851 Louisa Pratt notation)

Obtain the following primary sources for the source files:

1831 A Revelation through Joseph Smith History of the Church 1: 229-34.

(Polynesians)

1913 **Stuart Meha & Elwin W. Jensen** "The Personal Testimony of Stuart Meha," Waipawa, H.

(abt. Joseph F. Smith & Polynesians) B., New Zealand. A signed manuscript, recorded May

20, 1937, in the *Missionary Journal, First Mission*, Elder

Elwin W. Jensen, Salt Lake City. See also Te Karere, vol. 32,

p. 275, New Zealand Mission, Auckland, New Zealand.

1929 **Rufus K. Hardy** *Te Karere, New Zealand Mission Magazine*, 21 August, 1929

1953 Spencer W. Kimball "The Lamanite," in *BYU Speeches of the Year*, Provo: Brigham
Young

University Press, 1953 April 15.

[Is this the same speech as "The Lamanite" in the *Improvement Era* 518 (1955 April), pp. 226-228, 246, 258?]

1955? David O. McKay ???

Note* I can't locate the source or the quote right now, but apparently David O. McKay made a statement to the effect that Fijians, part of the island group classified as "Melanesians" for their dark skin coloring, are negroid but not from the seed of Cain; therefore they can receive the priesthood. David Cummings refers to this statement as follows:

When President David O. McKay declared that they were a branch of the house of Israel and should receive the gospel, Fiji was added to the Samoan mission, two missionaries were dispatched to labor there and in 1956 the decision was made to build a chapel in Suva.

1956 Hugh B. Brown Prayer at the Laying of the Cornerstone: New Zealand Temple,
December

1956

1962 Mark E. Petersen Mark E. Petersen, "New Evidence for the Book of Mormon,"

(Polynesians) Improvement Era (June 1962) 65: 456-59; also in Conference
Report (April 8 1962) 111-115. Later published separately as Polynesians
Came From America," Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1962.

See if *Polynesians Came From America* has footnotes or documentation.

1976 Spencer W. Kimball Remarks delivered February 13, 1976 at BYU-Hawaii Campus

(Polynesians)

1976 Spencer W. Kimball Official Report of the Samoa Area Conference Held in Pago Pago and
Apia.

Samoa, February 15, 16, 17, 18, 1976 (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1977), p. 15.

1976 Spencer W. Kimball Official Report of the New Zealand Area Conference Held at Church College

(Polynesians) at Temple View, New Zealand, February 20, 21, and 22, 1976 (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1977) p. 3

1976 Spencer W. Kimball Official Report of the Tonga Area Conference Held in the Liahona High

School in Nuku'alofa, Tonga, February 24 and 25, 1976 (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1977) p. 3

1977 Elwin W. Jensen **"Polynesians Descend from Lehi, According to Statements of the (Polynesians) Prophets,"** (1977). (Collection: LDS Archives)

1990 Ian G. Barber **"Mormonism among the Tangata Whenua."** Paper delivered (Polynesians) at the annual Mormon History Association Conference, Hawaii, June 1990.

Can't find this article in Special Collections.