for mammals, birds, and for trees and shrubs seem relatively complete and are furnished with scientific names (some of the scientific names are eccentric or out of date but the usual synonymies should yield the correct species). The other lists are smaller and only have common names.

Each of the 122 check lists then gives the names in Indian languages for each of the species. This does not add up to a list for each of 122 separate groups because a few groups have two lists, one each from two consultants. One hundred twelve of the lists are from California groups, and there are seven from Nevada and one each from Arizona, Oregon, and Idaho. A few of the lists are fragmentary, but most appear to be relatively complete given that the species do not all occur in all areas. The native words are transcribed in Merriam’s awkward but useable orthography.

In addition to the words there is a series of notes appended which include translations, a few ethnographic facts, and alternative names. The notes are fairly copious for some, near nonexistent for others. Overall, they are a slight but useful addition to California ethnography.

I would judge that this volume may turn out to be important philologically. The complex linguistic situation of aboriginal California has been analyzed historically but only in rather broad terms. It may be that this really comprehensive listing of native terms for plants and animals will provide material for the linguists to give us more detailed hints than they have into the question of prehistoric migrations (like Siebert and Proto-Algonkian, 1967). The important thing about these lists is that there are many names for many many species. One problem with the lists is apparent. When a list is rich and full, not fragmentary, it will be tempting to assume that where items are omitted the native names didn’t exist (or at least the informant didn’t know them). Whether we will be justified in that assumption is unclear. That problem will have to be left to the philologists.

Ballena Press is to be congratulated for bringing out one more in the Merriam series.
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The founder and first director of the Budapest Zoo and Botanical Gardens, John (János) Xántus, was born in Hungary in 1825, came to North America in 1851, and became one of the outstanding naturalists of his day. The many specimens which he collected for the Smithsonian Institution have made his name familiar to biologists down to the present. Two books on North America were published during Xántus’s lifetime, both in Hungarian;
but only in recent years have these been translated in their entirety. The first work, Levelei Ejszamerikából (Pest, 1858), dealt with Xántus’s travels before arriving in California in 1857; it was translated by the Schoenmans and published as Letters from North America (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1975). The second, Utazás Kalifornia Délí Részeiben (Pest, 1860), is devoted mainly to Xántus’s stay at Fort Tejon, in the Tehachapi Mountains, from 1857 to 1859, and with the beginning of his experience in Baja California, which lasted from 1859 to 1861. This second volume has also now appeared in the Schoenmans’ translation.

After T. Schoenman’s introduction and Xántus’s preface, the body of the book begins with “Part I, From Los Angeles to Tejon” (pp. 25-63); this includes a report of contact with a group of Mohave Indians. “Part II, Tejon and the Tejon Indians” (pp. 64-88) purports to describe the local Indian population in some detail, and includes a wordlist of over 100 items. Finally, “Part III, The California Peninsula” (pp. 89-192) describes travels in the Southern portion of Baja California, with occasional references to Indian groups. The book ends with postscripts, footnotes, and index.

One might expect that such a work, made fully available in a Western European language for the first time after over a century, would offer many riches. When I first heard of the book, I was especially eager to see the Tejon wordlist, because of my interest in California Indian languages, and because there has been considerable uncertainty about linguistic and ethnic identifications in the Tejon area. It has been clear for some time that the native languages in the area included extinct dialects of Yokuts, Chumash, and the Uto-Aztecan Kitanemuk; but in addition there has been evidence of groups labeled Alliklik and Tataviam. Some fragments of Tataviam linguistic data are available, but have resisted attempts at classification.

When I finally saw Xántus’s Tejon wordlist (pp 83-85), I became excited: it was clearly not Yokuts, or Chumash, or Uto-Aztecan of any kind. Could it be Tataviam? I couldn’t say yes or no: there was no overlap with the few Tataviam words previously known. At first glance, however, it seemed that Xántus had provided data not only on a new language in the Tejon area, but also a new linguistic family. The numerals, above all, looked like nothing known from California: 1 nást, 2 nish, 3 nah, 4 nev, 5 nohu, etc.

As I further inspected Xántus’s account, an increasing number of oddities began to appear. The Tejon wordlist includes words for “pearl” and “pineapple”—surely rare commodities at Fort Tejon in 1857-59. Could this, I wondered, be a vocabulary collected by Xántus in Baja California, and somehow dislocated? Checking of data from the Peninsula and from Sonora—Yuman, Cochimi, Guaycura, Pericú, Seri, Papago, Yaqui—still yielded nothing similar to the words given by Xántus.

At the same time, I found that other parts of Xántus’s book yielded further marvels. Traveling between Los Angeles and Fort Tejon, Xántus climbs to an elevation of “over 13,000 feet” (p. 51): the translator notes, “Possible misprint in original text.” The Tejon Indians, says Xántus, “can put 3,000 mounted warriors in the field” (p. 66; again, “Possible misprint”). Indeed, “The Tejons were the objects of fear and terror in Mexico and New Mexico for almost a century and a half . . . Not long ago I saw a prayer book printed in La Paz [Baja California] in 1802. Every paragraph of the litany ended with ‘Save us oh Lord from the Tejon’ . . .” (p. 79). It was hard for me to reconcile these statements with anything previously known of Indians in the Tehachapi Mountains; and the more I read, the more my puzzlement grew.
The key to these mysteries turned out to be in another book: Xántus, Hungarian Naturalist in the Pioneer West, by Henry Miller Madden (Palo Alto, 1949). This extremely detailed biography, based on a wealth of archival as well as published material, preserved both in the U.S. and in Hungary, recognizes that Xántus “put the natural history of America permanently in his debt,” but at the same time “wove...a veil of romance about his life” (p. 15). The full meaning of this is revealed in Madden’s Chapter 8, “Xántus as an Author” (pp. 211-50); here it is shown in great detail that Xántus’s reports were characterized by “palpable falsehoods,” “haphazard inventions”—and, especially in his second book, by plagiarism. Specifically, most of the description of the Tejon Indians turns out to be copied from Jonathan Letterman, “Sketch of the Navajo Tribe of Indians,” Annual Report of the Board of Regents, Smithsonian Institution (Washington, 1895, pp. 283-297); the reference to “3,000 mounted warriors” is specifically Letterman’s. Xántus has, of course, changed the word “Navajo” throughout to “Tejon.” However, Xántus’s “Tejon wordlist” is from another source; it is actually Cheyenne. It was copied from J. J. Abert, who recorded it at Bent’s Fort, Colorado, in 1846, and published it on pp. 427-430 of the “Report...of his Examination of New Mexico,” contained in Lt. Col. W. H. Emory’s Notes of a Military Reconnaissance from Fort Leavenworth, in Missouri, to San Diego, in California... (Washington, 1848). Xántus has made some capricious changes; e.g., Abert’s “pomme blanche” becomes an “orange.” It turns out that Xántus’s “pearl” was originally the Cheyenne for “bead,” while “pineapple” was, inexplicably, the Cheyenne for “rib.” Finally, it is curious to note that Xántus did not copy the last word of Abert’s list, which is “young badger, tehon”—evidently Spanish tejón.

Similarly, Madden shows (p. 227 ff.) that Xántus’s account of Baja California was “drawn indiscriminately from Emory and Abert, whose narratives describe the Indians, cliff-dwellings, and ruins of New Mexico.” Even Xántus’s lithographic plates, supposedly drawn by himself, are plagiarisms; thus a picture claiming to show “San Marco” in Baja California—situated on an amazingly high mesa—turns out to be based on Abert’s drawing of Acoma Pueblo.

So one set of mysteries is solved; but another type of question remains. T. Schoenman’s introduction to his translation of Xántus refers to Madden’s book as “a circumstantial and critical account of the career of this remarkable explorer-adventurer, who was an extraordinary combination of rare scientific ability and quite unaffected exaggeration, even braggadocio” (p. 18). Schoenman goes on to admit that Xántus was sometimes led “to invent circumstances...Such traits repeatedly appear in Madden’s otherwise sympathetic account.” Yet the edition prepared by the Schoenmans makes no mention of plagiarism, and presents Xántus’s text “straight,” as if it were a genuine record of the Californias in the mid-19th century—albeit with footnotes suggesting “misprints.” The question, then, is why. Since the Schoenmans were acquainted with Madden’s exposé, why did they think they could salvage Xántus’s reputation by ignoring well-documented facts? Why should they want to revive a hoax perpetrated on Hungarian readers in 1860, perpetrating it afresh on American readers in 1976? And what scholars in Californian history or ethnography advised Wayne State University Press to publish such a book?

Xántus was unquestionably a gifted naturalist and a lively personality. At this distance in time, it is hard to be anything but amused at his fraudulence. But the sad part of the story is this: Xántus did live for many months at Tejon and at Cabo San Lucas; he could have transcribed genuine data from tribes now long extinct—the Tataviam, perhaps the Pericú.
The human sciences today are the poorer, not because of what Xántus did, but because of what he failed to do.
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The story of Ishi, the last Yahi Indian, who was discovered in northern California in 1911, has been told many times. Besides scholarly works on the subject, the public’s interest has been kindled by presentations on television, by a conference devoted entirely to Ishi and his unique situation, and particularly by Theodora Kroeber’s fascinating biography Ishi in Two Worlds. It is somewhat surprising, therefore, to see yet another volume on Ishi which appears to cover the same ground. The purpose of this recent work is to present “a collection of nearly forty original documents that concern Ishi.” Several of the earlier articles reprinted here provide information on the Yana and Yahi Indians and a few appeared many years after Ishi’s death. About half of the articles were originally published in newspapers and magazines and follow his discovery and subsequent years in civilization until his death in 1916. There are five maps to assist the reader in understanding Yana territory (of which the Yahi were a part), language distributions, and Ishi’s understanding of his own region as translated on paper. A number of good quality photographs accompany the text; most of these are of Ishi, the Mill Creek area where he lived, and artifacts owned or made by him.

Had this book not been preceded by Theodora Kroeber’s previous work, Ishi the Last Yahi would have been a particularly informative effort. However, most if not all the sources are referenced in the earlier biography; many of the photographs and maps are the same. While the documents reprinted in Ishi the Last Yahi are not commonly found, they are certainly available in public and academic libraries. Considering the substantial earlier literature on Ishi, and Theodora Kroeber’s thorough biography, there seems to have been little purpose for the publication of this volume.


Reviewed by DAVID HURST THOMAS
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Barry Fell has really done it this time! When he published America B.C. (Fell 1976), I took a pass. Of course, there are profound difficulties with Fell’s elephantine thesis that the ancient Celts overran the New World three thousand years ago, but after all, Fell’s sites were in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, and Vermont. And he only discussed the eastern tribes, like the Algonquins and the Iroquois. It seemed sufficient at the time to leave the repudiation of such obvious drivel to our colleagues in the eastern United States and the Old World. I will admit, however, to a certain gratification when these colleagues demolished Fell’s silly proposals (see Ross and Reynolds 1978 and McKusick 1979 for references).

But Fell’s newest effort, Saga America, invades our own territory. I was first attracted