I have read with much interest Prof. Setchell’s article in the *American Anthropologist*, vol. 23, no. 4, on “Aboriginal Tobaccos,” but I should like to reply to some of the statements and arguments of Prof. Setchell in that article. To that end I will take them in order, beginning with that at the bottom of page 402, in which he says “tobacco seed from the Winnebago Indians of Minnesota, furnished by Dr. Melvin R. Gilmore, yielded *Nicotiana rustica*, on being grown.” The seed was from the Winnebago Indians of Nebraska, not Minnesota. The Winnebagos of the present time are divided, part of them being still in their old home country in Wisconsin, and part are settled as forced immigrants on a reservation in Nebraska, not Minnesota. It was from a Winnebago in Nebraska that I obtained the seed mentioned, and he told me that he had it originally from their people in Wisconsin. Next I would say that it would have been surprising if the said seed had not “yielded *Nicotiana rustica* on being grown,” for it was seed of that species which I sent Prof. Setchell, as I informed him at the time I sent it.

At the bottom of page 406 and top of page 407 he mentions that I sent him seed of *Nicotiana quadrivalvis* grown from seed which I obtained originally from a Hidatsa Indian. The seed of *Nicotiana quadrivalvis* which I had did happen to have come from an Hidatsa, but it could just as well have come from a Mandan or an Arikara, for that species is grown by all three of these tribes, who have been for a long time very closely associated, and much cultural borrowing has occurred. But in my opinion, and from all evidence which I have, the Mandan and Hidatsa both obtained it from the Arikara, who had originally brought it with them in their northward migration from the southern Plains.

In reference to the statement on page 408, paragraph 2, I beg to say that what I said was not that my “definite knowledge was of the Hidatsa tobacco only,” but that the seed that I had obtained was from a man of the Hidatsa tribe, and numerous other tribes of the Plains area had the same. In my “Uses of Plants by Indians of the Missouri River Region,” *Thirty-third Annual Report of the Bureau*
of American Ethnology, page 114, I quoted Nuttall as having said that *Nicotiana quadrivalvis* was cultivated by all the tribes along the Missouri River. That statement from Nuttall would imply, what was doubtless a fact, that *Nicotiana quadrivalvis* was the species cultivated by all the tribes along the lower course of the Missouri, and as far along the upper course of that river as he had traveled, which was up to the country of the Mandans.

Again, on page 408, second paragraph, Prof. Setchell says “It seems fully as probable that the Nebraska tribes, being nomads [italics mine], may not have cultivated tobacco, but probably obtained it by trade.” First of all I wish to say most emphatically that the tribes of Nebraska were not nomads. They were all agricultural tribes, living in settled, permanent villages, their agricultural products being their main dependence for living.

And, as Prof. Setchell says on page 408, I did write “as if they (i.e., all the tribes of the Missouri River region) all used *Nicotiana quadrivalvis.*” I certainly meant to say most clearly that very thing, for that was the information I had from all the tribes of that region from whom I had any information on the subject of tobacco. My information from all these tribes was to the effect that *Nicotiana quadrivalvis* was the species cultivated by all the tribes of the Plains from Texas to and including the country of the Mandans in what is now North Dakota.

**Melvin R. Gilmore**

**An Essay on Geographic Names in the State of Washington**

The derivation and meaning of geographical names of Indian origin is always a matter of interest. An essay dealing among other things with Indian names, by Edmund S. Meany, is now being printed in installments in a publication known as the *Washington Historical Quarterly*, issued, according to the title page, by “The Washington University State Historical Society.” Acquaintance with the region in which this publication appears indicates that “Washington University” means in this case the University of Washington. The essay began with volume 8 of this quarterly (1917), and with the issue of January of 1922 extends as far as the letter S.

Every effort to account for the origin and history of geographic names is a move in the right direction and is to be received with due thanksgiving. This is especially the case in the Northwest, which is