

its Unami character is attested by the two forms pointed out above: *k'/wis'w'/uûn-* and *wîshi-*.

But most essential of all, this line proves beyond doubt that Rafinesque's text of the *Walam Olum*, far from being a forgery, was written by him as heard from the lips of an Unami informant. Had he compiled it from the Moravians' word lists available to him, as charged by insufficiently informed critics, Rafinesque would hardly have split a perfectly intelligible Unami compound, *kiwiswunand*, into two senseless halves, also dividing it in the wrong place and then trying to translate the resulting nonsense as separate units. Nevertheless, it is remarkable how much closer his translation came to the intended meaning of the phrase than did Brinton's or Voegelin's.

There is only one possible explanation for this: Rafinesque had correctly heard the Delaware phrase and had understood its general meaning, but had blundered in writing it down. He failed to identify *wis'w'/uûn-* as the Unami parallel to Munsee *wis'w'/oâkan* "fatness," which he may have known from a Zeisberger word list. In contrast to Brinton and Voegelin, however, Rafinesque was on the right track in identifying *ki-* (*k'-*) in *kiwiswunand* as a proclitic second-person prefix, as is evident from his translation, "thou being a good god," cited above.

AUGUST C. MAHR, *The Ohio State University*

REFERENCES CITED

BRINTON, D. G.

1885 The Lenâpé and their legends. Philadelphia.

BRINTON, D. G. and A. S. ANTHONY

1889 A Lenâpé-English dictionary. Philadelphia.

VOEGELIN, C. F., with ELI LILLY, ERMINIE VOEGELIN, JOE E. PIERCE, PAUL WEER, GLENN A. BLACK, and GEORG K. NEUMANN

1954 *Walam Olum or Red Score: the migration legend of the Lenni Lenape or Delaware Indians*, Indianapolis, Indiana Historical Society.

ZEISBERGER, D.

1887 *Zeisberger's Indian dictionary*. Cambridge, John Wilson and Son, University Press.

MESCALISM AND PEYOTISM

The article by James H. Howard, "The Mescal Bean Cult of the Central and Southern Plains: An Ancestor of the Peyote Cult?" (AA 59:75-87) requires some comment on its method and its conclusions.

In discussing my summary of the "mescal bean" pharmacology, he writes: Quoting T. A. Henry (1924:395) [there is no quoting of this authority, only citation and summarizing] he states [if he is quoting, how can it be La Barre who "states"?] that the mescal bean resembles nicotine in physiological action, and that the contents of one bean are capable of causing nausea, convulsions, and even death by asphyxiation.

The original says "are said to," "Havard, quoting one Bellanger, says," and "according to Dr. Rothrock's informant." It points out that "in any case, a rupture of the hard, leathery coat of the bean would be required for the release of the alkaloid in the bean-flesh"—an important consideration, since any num-

ber of whole beans might be swallowed with impunity if the hard covering should remain intact.

In refutation of T. A. Henry, *The Plant Alkaloids*, a recognized authority though now possibly a dated one, Howard adduces the secondhand statement of one Ojibwa about another and concludes that "Clearly, there is need for further pharmacological study of the mescal bean." No doubt there is, but not on these grounds; a more immediate need is discrimination between controlled pharmacological studies and one native secondhand informant. Indeed, Howard later (p. 84) quotes Dorsey on

... a small red bean, which produced a violent spasm, and finally unconsciousness, this condition being indicated by the inability of the novitiate to suffer pain when the jaw of a gar-pike was drawn over his naked body.

Sophorine (= cytisine = ulexine = baptitoxine) has long been synthesized and its pharmacodynamics have been studied sufficiently to indicate that it is a violent and dangerous substance, a conclusion not to be dismissed on the grounds of one Ojibwa's report of another's alleged experience.

Later in his discussion, Howard quotes (p. 77) "A curious and slightly garbled note in La Barre . . ." Garbled it may be, but in quoting one short paragraph Howard manages to leave out two question marks, change the spelling three times and the punctuation once, give incorrect pagination and, gratuitously I think, correct Voegelin's field notes. Then he remarks mollifyingly (p. 77) that "The collection of tribes listed by Mrs. Voegelin may seem odd but it is actually quite typical of Quapaw gatherings, which are attended by individuals from many Oklahoma tribes." There seems no occasion for remarking on a fact known to all students of peyotism. Mrs. Voegelin needs no extenuation, if I still do, inasmuch as her data are thoroughly in accord with well known peyote practice. Howard continues (p. 77):

This paragraph deserves some comment in the present context. For one thing, "mescalism" and "Delaware 'shooting' ceremonies" are parts of the same phenomenon, the mescal bean ceremony.

This may well be the case in the present instance, but it is misleading. Not all "shooting" ceremonies of the Delaware, and certainly not of all Algonkins and others, are necessarily mescal bean shooting; nor are all mescal shooting ceremonies necessarily fully patterned mescal eating rites. What Howard would establish in his categorical statement is precisely what he is under the necessity of demonstrating.

Howard writes (p. 75) that

In his study of peyotism, La Barre (1938:105-109; 126-127) notes the presence of this [mescal bean] cult and cites many of the principal sources but, perhaps because his primary interest was in peyotism, he has overlooked many of the readily available sources.

In the 22 appendices to the original dissertation (now on file at Yale University), of which nine were published in condensed form and edited by other

hands, these and other matters are voluminously discussed; Howard's attention is directed to this source.

Howard's basic thesis that the ritual form of peyotism is derived from an earlier mescal bean ceremony is a good one. We do not know the origins of the ritual form of peyotism, except that it was first well established and codified in the southern Plains. However, it is to be hoped that the mescalism-peyotism thesis may be better established in the forthcoming Howard-Jones monograph on the red bean cult than by basing it on the frankly hearsay evidence of one Ponca informant, Louis McDonald, since this is a critical issue and deserves better documentation.

The Plains Siouans are recipient tribes in peyotism, so the hypothesis that the Siouan red bean cult seriously affected the original form of the rite is a weak one, especially since the peyote rite was formulated in the southern Plains (Kiowa-Comanche) before the Siouans borrowed it. It is even less probable that the Central Algonkin "shooting ceremonies" of the Midewewin type shaped the form of peyotism, since on the whole the Algonkins received peyotism still later than did the Siouans. Furthermore, the natural range of *Sophora secundiflora* (the "mescal bean") and *Lophophora williamsii* (the "peyote button," the name peyote coming from Aztekan) lies in Texas, the Southwest, and northern Mexico. It would therefore seem more reasonable at the moment to look southward for origins, rather than to the Siouans or the central Algonkins. However, it is probable that the thesis is still essentially right: a prior red bean cult (from Texas? southwestern Athapaskans? Mexico?) paved the way and even shaped the form of the peyote ritual. That is, the use of the red bean spread from south to north (whence, unfortunately, the bulk of present ethnographic knowledge comes), in much the same way as the Peyote Cult seems later to have spread. The theory is an excellent one.

But again we find ourselves critical of Howard's method. First of all, on his comparative trait list (p. 86) the "Use of narcotic" is not a critical resemblance in the New World, inasmuch as many narcotics are used ritually in America, especially from the southern United States south into Amazonia. Moreover, the use of narcotic drugs may in fact have an inner consistency with basic New World religion at large (and even paleoasiatic shamanism?). Again, how can the traits of "Only shamans admitted," "First fruits ceremony," "Shooting of mescal bean," "Deer symbolism," "Use of fox skins," and "Use of white paint" establish any common origins when Howard lists them as absent in peyotism and largely present in the red bean cult? Furthermore, what weight of critical specificity for this general area can be laid on such traits as "Use of drum," "Movement of musicians," "Meeting held in tipi," "Central fire," "Dancing" and "Magical performances"? And to adduce the use of feathers, of whatever species of bird, in any American Indian context is feeble evidence for specific historical connections of mescalism and peyotism.

There are still other methodological flaws in Howard's table of traits. He lists "First fruits ceremony" as being absent from the Plains peyote rite though present in three red bean cults, so this trait also proves nothing. What

he means by this ceremony is unclear, but historically the ritual peyote meal was explicitly involved with first fruits ceremonies in Mexico. The meal consisted of boneless meat, parched or popped corn in sugar water, and fruit—traits which are retained everywhere in classical Plains peyotism. He correctly lists "Deer symbolism" as being absent from the Plains peyote rite—but at his methodological peril, since in Mexican peyotism deer meat, deer hoof-prints, and the peyote plant itself are all specifically equated.

In brief, it would seem that Howard has advanced the interesting possibility of the connection between mescalism and peyotism but little beyond the point where I left it nearly two decades ago as an auxiliary hypothesis; worse, his ethnological direction is wrong.

The southern Athapaskans may eventually prove to be less of a primary influence on Plains peyotism than was formerly supposed, though well documented evidence (ground altar, water drum, and other peyotist traits) still supports their claim. But for other compelling reasons, such as the botanical provenience of the red bean and peyote, we should still look southward—probably to Texas, the eastern Southwest, or northeastern Mexico—for the shaping of the well-defined southern Plains peyote ritual, rather than to Algonkin Midewewin or the as yet largely Siouan Red Bean Cult. This seems all the more probable since the red bean has been found archeologically in Cave No. 1 at Site 2 in San Saba County, Texas, and on a Basketmaker horizon at Rio Fuente in Chihuahua.¹

WESTON LA BARRE, *Duke University*

¹ Wendell C. Bennett and Robert M. Zingg, *The Tarahumara*. Chicago, 1935, p. 358; see also A. T. Jackson, in University of Texas Publications, Anthropological Papers, vol. III, no. 1, 1938, p. 69.

RESIN-GLAZED POTTERY IN THE CHIN HILLS, BURMA

George M. Foster's recent note on resin-glazing in the Philippines (AA 58: 732f), calls to mind a similar occurrence in the Chin Hills of Western Burma. My observations, made in the course of a brief linguistic survey in 1954, are, at the suggestion of Dr. Foster, briefly detailed here.

In the Falam subdivision of the Northern Chin Hills, I spent a week in the village of Lente, from which pots are exported widely through the surrounding villages. Indeed, for domestic use pottery at Lente seems largely to have replaced many of the wooden vessels so plentiful in other Chin villages. Almost every day of my visit saw several women, laden with baskets of clay, coming in procession from a deposit above the village. Each woman seems to work her own clay, and sheds in the house compounds often shelter a number of vessels in various stages of completion. I have not myself observed the early stages of construction, and hence cannot say whether an aplastic is added to the natural clay. However, four pots from Lente exhibit coarse, soft, angular fragments which seem both too large and too abundant to be a natural inclusion in the deposit.