

UC Merced

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology

Title

Evans-Wentz: *Cuchama and Sacred Mountains*

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3v07k07m>

Journal

Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology, 5(2)

ISSN

0191-3557

Author

Shipek, Florence C.

Publication Date

1983-07-01

Peer reviewed

rounded this site. Her conclusion regarding "the effect of classifying the Tule Lake rock art in the Great Basin style is to disassociate the rock art from its proper cultural context" is well taken. Her restudy points out the difficulties in defining elements and the need for standardization, at least in an areal perspective. Much is discussed in the article. Her hypothesis that Modoc rock art is associated with mythology, the quest for personal power, and related to ceremonial activities centered on food (not big game animals) acquisition seems reasonable.

In looking at the volume as a whole it is well-illustrated with 26 pages of photographs and 41 pages of line drawings, two of the latter in color. There are seven tables. The volume itself is attractive and well-printed, and the text is easy to follow. There are only a dozen or so typographic errors. One of the biggest faults I found is in the bibliography. Over a dozen references are missing and some are given incorrectly.

In many respects the papers reflect student work. I believe some of the authors should have better covered the literature, and I found certain discussions a bit extraneous or certain interpretations too far-reaching. But overall this is a very worthwhile compendium of studies with implications for rock art work far beyond the borders of California.

REFERENCES

- Payen, Louis A.
1966 Prehistoric Rock Art in the Northern Sierra Nevada, California. M.A. thesis, Sacramento State University.
- Thomas, Trudy
1976 Petroglyph Distribution and the Hunting Hypothesis in the Central Great Basin. *Tebwa* 18(2):65-75.

Cuchama and Sacred Mountains. W. Y. Evans-Wentz, Frank Waters and Charles L. Adams, editors, Chicago: University of Ohio Swallow Press, 1981, 196 pp., \$22.95 (cloth).

Reviewed by FLORENCE C. SHIPEK
Univ. of Wisconsin-Parkside
Kenosha, WI 53141

In the eyes of all "true believers," followers of "gurus," "the Children of the Great Mystery," and *all* psychical extrasensory phenomena, I shall be the evil reviewer of this book which mimics comparative anthropological methods but uses superficial, inaccurate data in regard to American Indian, especially southern California, religious beliefs and linguistic data. In his discussion (p. 7) of Kumeyaay (Diegueño) creation myths and sand paintings, Evans-Wentz identifies Cuchama (*Kuuchamaa*), also known as Mt. Tecate, with "the mountain of creation." Unfortunately the literature (Waterman 1909: 52, 1910: 302, 303, 338-340; Dubois 1905:627, 1908) identifies *Wikami*, or *Wikamee* or *Avikwama* in Mohave territory as the Kumeyaay mountain of creation. Nowhere does this literature identify a mountain in the Mt. Tecate location. Nowhere does the literature describe Kumeyaay myth as stating that *Kuuchamaa* was an original peak above water during the creation of the earth. Kumeyaay religious elders have denied that any flood myths were associated with *Kuuchamaa*.

Another example, in searching for a linguistic derivation of the name *Kuuchamaa*, Evans-Wentz does not examine the language of the people in whose territory the mountain was centrally located, and to whom it was most sacred, but looks at the language of their neighbors, the Quechan, who speak a related Hokan language. Then he goes further afield to totally unrelated languages such as the Mexican, Uto-Aztec Aztec, and to the South American Incan. Dr. Margaret Langdon



has commented on his derivation (p. 16) from the word "Quechan" (*kwtsa:n*) plus the word for "high," (*maay* Kumeyaay form, *me:* Quechan, not "ma"), and indicates that his derivations do not stand linguistic analysis. (His derivation of the alternate name, Tecate, is equally as farfetched linguistically.) Further, his attempt to connect *Kuuchamaa* with "Cochimi" indicates that he did not understand the meaning of that word which Del Barco (Leon-Portilla 1973:173) stated meant "the people to the north" in the language of those south of them, the Pericue. (While Evans-Wentz cannot be faulted for not reading Del Barco, his editors can. Also, all should have been aware that, more often than not, the name assigned a people by explorers and others is not the people's name for themselves, but the term some neighbor applies to them, and may extend from a directional term to "the enemy.")

Only once did Evans-Wentz interview one elderly Kumeyaay originally from San Diego Mission Valley, Manteca (misidentifying him as a Cochimi), using a Quechan as interpreter. Due to the Kumeyaay strictures of secrecy relating to the inner meanings of their religion and *Kuuchamaa*, it is doubtful that sufficient trust was established for meaningful answers to be obtained even without the problems of interpretation through a third language. Certainly, neither Evans-Wentz's nor Staniford's (n.d., 1977; Winkler 1980) fantasy interpretations of the meaning of the mountain, and why this particular mountain was sacred, bear any relation to information presented by the Kumeyaay religious elders (Shipek 1983) in order to preserve the mountain and have it nominated to the National Register of Historic Places.

I must also present the response of the Kumeyaay to this misinterpretation of the Kumeyaay sacred mountain. As they have become aware of the material published about their religion and beliefs, they have expressed

their dismay. (They have no objections to the technical descriptions by Waterman and Dubois.) The result was the presentation to me of much more data concerning their beliefs with the request that I publish and refute this type of fantasy misinterpretation. They were also dismayed by the desecration of the pretended religious use of their sacred mountain without asking Kumeyaay religious leaders for permission to enter a Kumeyaay sacred area, nor discovering the proper procedures, nor the proper interpretation and religiously acceptable use of the mountain. In the past, non-Kumeyaay came to the mountain only when called and invited by the appropriate Kumeyaay *Kusiyaay* (priest) in charge of the mountain.

I do not feel competent to discuss Evans-Wentz's interpretations of Tibetan religious beliefs and of sacred mountains in other parts of the world, therefore I leave that chore to specialists in other religious areas.

Serious students of American Indian cultures and religions should not waste their money or time on this book. It is a shame that a university press wasted its resources without review by serious researchers on the southern California scene.

REFERENCES

- Dubois, Constance G.
 1905 Religious Ceremonies of Mission Indians. *American Anthropologist* 7:620-629.
 1908 The Religion of the Luiseño Indians of Southern California. Berkeley: University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 8:69-186.
- Leon-Portilla, Miguel
 1973 Miguel Del Barco: Historia Natural y Cronica de la Antigua California. Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico Instituto de Investigaciones Historicas.
- Shipek, Florence C.
 1983 *Kuuchamaa: The Kumeyaay Sacred Mountain*. Paper presented at the Central States

Anthropological Society Meeting, Cincinnati, March, 1983.

Staniford, Philip S.

n.d. Evans-Wentz and Cuchama, A Sacred Mountain of California: A Tribute on the Eve of His 100th Birthday, Sept. 29, 1978. Manuscript submitted to Journal of Philosophical Research Society.

1977 Inside Out: Anthropological Communication of Alternate Realities. Phoenix 1(1):36-46.

Waterman, T. T.

1909 Analysis of the Mission Indian Creation Story. American Anthropologist 11:41-55.

1910 The Religious Practices of the Diegueño Indians. Berkeley: University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 8:271-358.

Winkler, Ken

1980 The Man Who Bought Cuchama: Evans-Wentz and the Holy Mountain. San Diego Reader 9(25):1, 10-13.



Medicinal Uses of Plants by Indian Tribes of Nevada. Percy Train, James R. Henrichs, and W. Andrew Archer. Lawrence, Massachusetts: Quarterman Publications, Inc. Reproduction of revised edition of 1957, 139 pp., \$25.00 (cloth).

Reviewed by MAURICE L. ZIGMOND
140 Dalton Road
Belmont, MA 02178

This volume offers impressive testimony to the substantial contribution that the Works Project Administration of more than forty years ago made in certain neglected areas. First appearing in 1941 in the form of three unbound fasciculi, the work was later issued as a book which came out in a revised edition in 1957. The present publication is a facsimile reproduction of the 1957 edition. The three authors, neither anthropologists nor linguists,

pursued their assignment conscientiously. Their stated objectives were three: to secure "data directly from the Nevada Indians regarding their medicinal uses of the native plants," to collect "adequate quantities of dried material of these same plants for use in pharmacological tests and studies," and to accumulate "herbarium specimens of the general flora of the State to supplement the first part of the undertaking." The thoroughness of their research is indicated by the fact that "there were interviewed 275 Indians from every community in the State" and that "103 reports containing 575 pages of data were sent in from the field."

Perhaps it was inevitable that the results are uneven. The third objective falls outside the scope of this publication. An "abstract of pharmacological research" (second objective) is presented, but the chemical analysis of the plant materials does not prove them to be exceptionally effective. "Generally speaking, the research indicated that although most of the plants had little or no clinical significance, yet some of them did have medicinal value as reported by the Indians."

The bulk of the volume is devoted to an alphabetical listing of some 180 plants reported by the Indians to serve therapeutic functions together with their names in four languages, Paiute (with Moapa Paiute considered separately), Shoshone, Washoe, and English, and the ways in which the plants are used as medicine. As to the transcription of native words, the authors anticipate that "anthropologists and ethnobotanists" may protest "when they discover that their phonetical method has not been used in recording pronunciation of Indian plant names." The writers believe that "a better service will be rendered by using the older phonetical method understood by the reader for whom this publication is intended." This assumption, however, is not convincing. The Indian words are spelled out in syllables but, since no key is