

Senecas. One of the arguments urged in favor of this identity is based on the similarity of name, the Senecas being called "*Sonontoerrhonons*" by the Hurons. But the latter called the Onondagas "*Onontaerrhonons*," which bears quite as strong a resemblance to *Entouhonorons* as the name they applied to the Senecas. It may be stated here that O'Callaghan, Parkman, Ferland, and Laverdière, each called the tribe in question "*Entouhonorons*," whereas, Champlain, in all the editions of his works, refers to them invariably as "*Entouhonorons*." He never calls them "*Entouhonorons*" in his *text*. On the *map* annexed to the edition of 1632, they are named "*Antouororons*," but in the *index* to the map, "*Antouhonorons*."¹ It must, therefore, have been from the map, and not from the text, that the word "*Entouhonorons*" was derived. The other name, as uniformly given by Champlain in his text, we must assume to be correct, in preference to the solitary entry on the map.²

It is supposed by some that the edition of 1632, which contains the map, and is composed of his previous publications, was not the work of Champlain, and never passed

¹ Laverdière's Champlain, Vol. 2, p. 1392.

² If it be assumed that the terminations "*ronons*" and "*norons*" are identical, and mere suffixes, signifying, in the Huron language, "people," see Father Bruya's Mohawk Dictionary, p. 18, then, if those terminations are dropped from each of the three words, they will respectively become "*sonontoe*," "*onontae*," and "*entouho*," and represent the names of the *places* where those nations resided. Now it cannot be said that there is any stronger resemblance between *sonontoe* and *entouho*, than between *onontae* and *entouho*.