

A DISCOURSE CONTRADICTION IN CLACKAMAS CHINOOK:
VICTORIA HOWARD'S 'COTYOTE MADE THE LAND GOOD'

Dell Hymes

University of Pennsylvania

Old texts, transcribed by hand, are static. New texts, tape-recorded, are dynamic. If one wants material that shows the active working of the narrative mind, shows negotiation of what is said, what was written down long ago will not do. Or so it seems from much of the current work in discourse.

Chinookan tellings of myths about Salmon show that old texts may still sometimes answer new questions. Close examination of linguistic detail shows the shaping and reshaping of performance in relation to tensions bound up in the figure of Salmon himself.

THE CONTEXT IN CULTEE

This paper focusses on a Clackamas myth told by Victoria Howard to Melville Jacobs in 1930 (Jacobs 1958: 75-80, text #8 (from field notebook 16). Its context is a paper presented to this conference two years ago (Hymes 1984) in which two tellings of 'Salmon's myth' in Kathlamet Chinook were compared.¹ The two tellings, both by Charles Cultee to Franz Boas, one in 1891, one in 1894, contrast in poetic form, especially in their second acts. The contrast can not be explained by, indeed, would not be noticed by, analysis in terms of ingredients of content, whether of the kind traditional in folklore or of the kind developed by Levi-Strauss. The one kind of form can not be reduced to the other. Close attention to linguistic detail, including selection of verbs of saying, presence or absence of ironic questions, and contrasting treatment of memory slips, showed Cultee to have paced the two tellings differently. In both cases his concern was to reassert in the second

act the authority of Salmon, and the male domain of fish, after a first act in which Salmon was shown acknowledging the claims of the women's domain of plants. In 1891 he hurries to the second act, and begins it with an immediate reassertion of Salmon's authority, expressed in what for Chinookan is a marked pattern, pairing. In 1894 the second act employs throughout a patterning that for Chinookan is unmarked, a grouping of verses in sets of three and five. Salmon himself is not noted until some way into the act. There are no ironic questions. All this goes together with the fact that Cultee has an ace (one might say, a fish) up his sleeve.

The context of the myth is mutual dependence and reciprocity. The salient food source of the Kathlamet, like so many other Northwest Coast peoples, was salmon. The arrival of the Chinook salmon in the spring heralded a beginning of a new cycle of fresh foods of all kinds. It signaled an end to winter months in which survival depended on supplies saved from the spring-summer-autumn of the year before, together with what little plant and animal food could be garnered in winter. But this myth of salmon does not tell of the community's celebration of salmon's arrival with a special call and first fruit rites. It tells of young spring salmon travelling up river with a party, only to be accosted with anal insults by five roots in turn; each tells him that without it his people would have died (in the months before his coming). Salmon is told the name of the root in question, and that it is an aunt or uncle (as the case may be). He takes his party ashore, presents the root with gifts (which become part of its appearance), places it where it will be found, in some cases pronounces as to its future use in trade, and continues upriver. All this is Act I. The salient male domain of fish is shown accepting insult and offering service with regard to the female domain of

roots. (And through its good offices with regard to the roots, validating as it were the service of the roots to the people).

This bespeaks a world of beings which cooperate in sustaining human life, and in which the interdependence of the two genders and their domains is affirmed. But the texts show cultural ideology to be one thing, the attitudes of narrators something else. In Cultee's Salmon myth the first act does affirm the ideology of the culture, but the second reinstates the dominance of men. In each telling the second act has Salmon and his party encounter a trio coming down river. The person in the center of their canoe, Crow, speaks in an upriver dialect that has to be interpreted by her spokesman, Bluejay. Crow's words do indicate dealings with roots on the part of her party; the first of the three nouns names the button-camas. Bluejay informs Salmon's party that the trio have already gone as far upriver as the Cascades and in just one day. This claim mocks both reality (it takes five days to travel upriver to the Cascades) and Salmon's step-by-step journey. Salmon causes the heads of each of the three to be twisted, and, in 1891, the true time it takes to reach the Cascades is twice declared. In 1894, each of the three is placed in the world to come as well. The order of the three is reversed. In 1891 it was Flounder (the one whose physical form no doubt motivates the head-twisting), Crow, Bluejay (the one most expressive of insult to chiefs). In 1894 it is Bluejay, Crow, Flounder. And whereas Bluejay and Crow are punished by being thrown away from the river and its fish, Flounder is told to go down river and to be there.

In each telling Salmon's authority is reasserted. In 1891 Cultee hurries to do so. One of Salmon's recurrent lines is omitted in the fifth and last encounter with a root, and Cultee goes right on. In 1894 he does not. A recurrent line is passed over and Cultee pauses to reinstate it, out of order,

at the end of the speech in question. (Boas' field notebooks show this to have happened). In 1891 Cultee hurries to reassert Salmon's authority at the very outset of the second act, marking it by paired verses of demand and response, as indicated above. In 1894 Salmon's authority is reaffirmed, as against Act I, not in interactive and poetic form, but by bringing the myth to a conclusion that inverts the very premise of Act I. In the winter months before his return Salmon's people are no longer to be dependent for fresh food on the domain of roots alone. In the river there will be also something from Salmon's domain.

THE CRUX IN MRS. HOWARD'S TELLING

Part of the point of the Kathlamet myth appears to be an assertion not only of a masculine domain, but of the Kathlamet domain as well. When Crow is thrown away from the river at the end of Cultee's 1894 telling, she is ordered also never to speak 'the Wasco language' again. And the first word said by Crow is in fact the name of button-root camas in Clackamas, close linguistic kin of Wasco. Indeed the term 'Wasco' very likely served the Kathlamet for all the varieties of Chinookan upriver from them, including that from which Crow and her companions have come.² And in this upriver territory a line of women narrators appear also to have found in this myth of reciprocity a source of ambivalence, and to have made it a contested terrain. Victoria Howard, like Cultee, tells of the provision of the foods on which the people depend. Like Cultee, she finds the figure who encounters the foods problematic. As we have seen, Cultee has a second act which reasserts the authority of the male figure, Salmon, and, in 1894, a partial lack of dependence on the domain of women. Victoria Howard has a second part which does away with Salmon, altogether. Indeed, the process of eliminating Salmon occurs, as it were, before our very eyes.

Mrs. Howard unfolds a series of plants, birds and fish in sets of three. At the outset she indicated to Jacobs that the one who encounters the foods is a fish person, maybe Salmon. The fifth set is the second for fish. Mrs. Howard reaches the point at which the third of the set is to be named. The obvious culminating name of the series would be a salmon. No name is given. The narrative is broken off. Metanarrative commentary takes its place. A sort of close is given to the accounting for fish, acknowledging incompleteness; what her authorities for myth, her mother's mother and her mother-in-law, had said is recalled, particularly that her mother's mother said that the one who made the foods good was Coyote; a myth of Coyote encountering berries is sketched, with a bit of quoted speech, what each berry would say to him, including his special name, *Štan̓kiya*; the dictation ends with further quotation of her mother's mother as to the theme of the myth, the making (provision) of food for the people.

The narrative is broken off because the very course of its telling has brought forth an unresolved contradiction: is 'salmon' a food or announcer of foods? Of course to Chinookans salmon was both. In Cultee's tellings, however, the importance of the spring run of salmon as food is background knowledge; it is Salmon as eponymous figure who is named and strides the stage in full symbolic vitality. In Mrs. Howard's telling the issue of background or foreground is not resolved in the story itself. The word for 'salmon' does not occur in either role. The identity of the myth figure is indicated only outside the narrative itself; the sudden prospect of naming the food brings narrative to a close.

CONTINUITY AND TRANSFORMATION

Behind this crux is a transformation not quite complete. The pattern followed by Cultee in his first acts has been recast, and the identity of the

announcer of foods put in dispute. Mrs. Howard's mother's mother, from whom she said she heard the myth, opted for an identity which links it, somewhat incongruously, with another myth involving the Coyote named *Štan̓kiya*; so, at the crux, does Mrs. Howard. Evidently there were those for whom the identity of the announcer of foods remained Salmon, and Mrs. Howard begins with that identity in mind. In the tradition as she transmits it, perspective and sequence of incident have changed, but some of the language and the casting of the most prominent role remain those of an older tradition.

To understand this contradiction, emergent in performance, and the changes that lie behind it, we need first to consider what links Mrs. Howard's narrative with those of Cultee, and what contrasts them. The examination involves a retranslation of the Clackamas text--some details of the published translation are incorrect, and some pose puzzles. The examination depends also on analysis of the text into the lines and groups of lines of which it is composed. Both the translation and the Clackamas are given at the end of the paper. Most of all, the examination and ultimate interpretation depend on close comparison of linguistic detail and variation in rhetorical pattern. Some of this enters the body of the paper, while much is given in notes keyed to the lines of the translation.

A scene from Cultee. Let me give here the first scene of Cultee's 1894 telling (Hymes 1985: 403-4). It will be useful for reference.

The Spring Salmon was going upriver.

First he came,

and he was going upriver.

Now a person is standing:

"At last my brother's son does arrive,

"the one with maggots in his buttocks.
 "If I were not a person,
 "then your people would have died."

He said:

"Who is it who talks that way?" 10
 "Ahh, your father's brother, Skunk Cabbage,
 "he is talking."

"Quick, let us go ashore."

Salmon landed.

He (the plant) was given an elkskin armor, 15
 five elkskin armors were given to Skunk Cabbage.

Under his blanket was put a club,

beside his arm,

and beside his (other) arm,

another one, 20

a bone-war-club.

He was carried inland,

he was put in the midst of willows."

Linkage. There is evidence that the Kathlamet narratives lie behind the Clackamas. The first formulaic line of each food in the Clackamas narrative is a frozen, incomplete version of a corresponding line in Kathlamet. In Mrs. Howard's text the lines (7-9) with which the first food hails the announcer are (in Clackamas):

Gatakim:

"Adi:::! Kimkšt̥x náyka.

"Nagalgát adáʔutk.

"Idm̥s̥lxam á::ng̥a Wakádaču Ikduúina."

The second word is a frozen form of the construction which begins line 7 of the Kathlamet, **Qe: ne:kšt̥x náfka Im̥əx̥əŋ ngoaʔé:lx** 'If not I I-became I-person'. **nikšt̥x** is not otherwise known in these Clackamas texts, nor is a conditional element **ki-**. Mrs. Howard indeed replaces this construction once with a productive Clackamas equivalent, **gama nešq̓l**. (scene III, line 36).

Inconsistencies in translation of the first line of this formulaic speech indicate that what it says was in conflict with what Mrs. Howard took to be the actual point of view of the myth. (See discussion below under 'Travel')

There is another lexical link which suggests awareness of Clackamas tradition. The first root named in Mrs. Howard's text, the button camas, is **it-kálaʔiya**. (The word is the same in Wasco as well). This is the first word spoken in Cultee's texts (there rendered **ʔa(their)-q̓alakiawa**, but untranslated. One can imagine that to put this word first in Crow's recital, as she comes downriver past the mouth of the Willamette on which the Clackamas lived, shows awareness that an upriver version of the myth might start with this name.

Patterning of incident. The connection, and at the same time contrast, between the tellings by Cultee and Mrs. Howard is illuminated by the patterning of incident in each encounter with a food. In Cultee's narratives the invariant part of narrative competence in each of the five encounters with a root consists of seven incidents, grouped in three stanzas. (The grouping is marked after the first scene in each telling by the initial particle pair, 'Now again').

- (1) Travel upriver
- (2) Hailing ("If I were not")
- (3) Question ("Who?")

- (4) Answer ("Name, your father's aunt/uncle")
- (5) Command ("Go ashore")
- (6) Gifting (including pronouncement with the two Arrowroots)
- (7) Placing (1894 telling only)

Mrs. Howard's narrative shows only the core of colloquy:

- (2) Hailing ("If I were not")
- (3) Questions ("Who, what is it like?")
- (4) Answer ("Like")
- (6) Pronouncement ((a) "It is a person"
- (b) "Name"/"Use"
- (c) "Use"/"Name")
- (8) Response ("Indeed") (scenes B, C, J, L only)

The shared core of turns at talk is essentially fourfold; a food declares itself, hailing the announcer and appointer of foods; it is asked about; identification is made; the announcer responds. But whereas Cultee's narratives have the framework of a journey, recognizing reciprocal obligations among kin and communities, Mrs. Howard's narrative has the framework of a pedagogic panorama, identifying persons in a common world.

With Cultee the root refers to the announcer with a kin term (nephew); with Mrs. Howard the reference is generic ('your people'). With Cultee there is one question, who is talking; with Mrs. Howard there are two questions, who is talking, what does it look like? With Cultee the answer is a kin term and a name; with Mrs. Howard the answer is a description. With Cultee the turn at talk that follows is a command to go ashore to change the root (as to what it looks like and as to where it is to be found). With Mrs. Howard the turn at talk that follows resembles a brief entry in an ethnological dictionary.

With Mrs. Howard there is no explicit statement of travel from one point to another between scenes (Cultee's (1)) or within them (Cultee's (5) 'Go ashore') and (7) placing the roots)). With Cultee there is no account of what foods look like, framed as such; the only explicit statement as to their future use has to do not with bodily ingestion (eating, medicine) but external trade (the two arrowhead roots).

There is something of an inverse movement as between the two. Cultee's telling moves from present relationship to future appearance. Mrs. Howard's narrative moves from present appearance to future relationship. The Cultee tellings are more in the common mythical mode of making the world, while Mrs. Howard's narrative is more in the mode of recognizing and announcing a world that is.

The contrast can be sharpened by considering the tellings from the standpoint of a child. Hearing Mrs. Howard's narrative, a child could in principle learn of any food, and of ways of obtaining and preparing them. And not only of foods, but of things that might be mistaken as food--a plant that is a bitter medicine, a fish not good to eat. It would learn an inventory of a world. Hearing Cultee's narrative, a child would learn of the obligations of nephews to aunts and uncles, of ritual exchange, and of acting like a chief. On the one hand, an expansible natural history; on the other, social structure.

Patterning of verse, scene and act. In Cultee's narratives the invariant part of narrative competence in each of the five encounters with a root groups its seven incidents into three stanzas. The number of verses (and sub-verses, or versicles) overall may vary, but not the number of stanzas. The first stanza consists of the verse stating travel, and the second of the three verses that introduce and identify the root. Each stanza is usually marked by the initial particle pair, 'Now again'. The third stanza consists of

the final three incidents, Salmon's command that initiates change of location (going ashore) (the fourth standard turn at talk), and whatever occurs of gifting and placing.

In Mrs. Howard's narrative the invariant part of narrative competence consists of just four turns at talk. The core of talk is only occasionally mapped into a pattern that fits the usual Chinookan grouping into sets of three or five. Only the first verse of a scene is marked by initial particles, and that marking distinguishes the scene as a whole. It is the status of being a turn at talk that distinguishes verse. Most scenes have four such internal units, not three or five. Mrs. Howard does have five units within a scene some five times. This is accomplished once by having the four turns at talk follow the introductory frame (I); once by adding a metanarrative comment, 'All done' (IV); and three times by adding a verbal acknowledgement, 'Indeed' (II, X, XII).

Clearly it is the talk that is remembered, or wanted, and it is in terms of additional talk that a conventional pattern of grouping is sometimes realized. (The initial frame itself is stated in terms of quoted speech. Cf also Mrs. Howard's summary references, once to fish and once to berries, in terms of speech: 'all spoke like that' (200), 'all those things told him like that' (224).

Could not the four turns of talk be themselves an expression of a conventional pattern? It is possible for pairing to serve intensification. Where it does, however, as in the second act of Cultee's 1891 telling, it occurs within the usual kind of patterning. Thus, the pairing that intensifies the opening of Act II in Cultee's 1891 telling consists of three sets of pairs). And to argue that Mrs. Howard's narrative shows intensification in terms of pairs of pairs, one would have to judge that the few scenes which have five verses

//

contrast by not being marked for intensity or importance. These few scenes are, of course, essentially the same as the others. If anything, it is they who could be considered marked, against the background of the others. Scene (I) is obviously important as a frame. The next two scenes to have five-part patterning are within the series that can be taken to be favored, roots--scene (II) continues the pattern framed by scene (I) and scene (IV) initiates the second trio of roots. All are feminine in gender, whereas the remaining roots are not. In scene (X) the fifth verse, the concluding acknowledgement, can be taken as underscoring the importance of knowing that the fish is not a food. In that it is parallel to the metanarrative comment that makes a fifth verse at the end of the scene with the root that is not a food (IV). The fifth instance comes with the one fish of feminine gender, Trout (XII). It may be significant that the two acts without five-verse stanzas are that for the major fish, all masculine (V), and the intermediate act for birds (III).

This placement of the five scenes with five parts does suggest some attention to distribution across the five sets of foods and would-be foods, although imperfectly. To sum up, five-verse scenes are found at the outset (I, II); at the beginning of the second set (IV); and at the beginning (and end) of the fourth (X, XII).

Relations between scenes and groups of scenes are another matter. Each food or would-be food is part of a set of three. There are five such sets: 3 camas, 3 other roots, 3 birds, 3 minor fish, 3 major fish. The narrative is clearly conceived in terms of such patterning, and it is the presence of such patterning that pinpoints the final scene of the final set as a culmination and crux. And when that crux arrives, the lines that follow in a metanarrative epilogue are, if less overtly marked, still part of a sequence of five stanzas.

/2

Here is a table of these relationships.

Roots

| | | |
|-----|------------|--------------------|
| i | prologue + | 4 turns |
| ii | | 4 turns + 'Indeed' |
| iii | | 4 turns |

Other Roots

| | | |
|----|--|----------------------|
| iv | | 4 turns + 'All done' |
| v | | 4 turns |
| vi | | 4 turns |

Birds

| | | |
|------|--|---------|
| vii | | 4 turns |
| viii | | 4 turns |
| ix | | 4 turns |

Fish

| | | |
|-----|--|--------------------|
| x | | 4 turns + 'Indeed' |
| xi | | 4 turns |
| xii | | 4 turns + 'Indeed' |

Fish (II)

| | | |
|------|--|---------|
| xiii | | 4 turns |
| xiv | | 4 turns |
| xv | | 4 turns |

It would seem that the organization of the narrative in terms of the foods and would-be foods themselves was clear and consistent to Mrs. Howard, and that at the larger level the usual conventions of grouping were maintained both before and after the crux at the end of the main narrative. Within the main narrative, however, dialogue is all, and mostly at the expense of expected form.

Pedagogy. To be sure, there is more congruence between the tellings by Cultee and Mrs. Howard than might at first appear. The instruction made verbally explicit by question, answer and pronouncement in Mrs. Howard's text, as to the appearance and use of foods, is conveyed through reported action in Cultee's. Each gift to a root establishes physical features by which it henceforth will be recognized, and each placement indicates where it is to be found. Thus, the elkskin armor and bone-war-club given to Skunk Cabbage become the yellow-brown bract and elongated stalk of that plant in its spring pride. To place Skunk Cabbage inland among willows is to teach a listener where to look for it.

Travel. Conversely, travel is not wholly absent from the Clackamas text. Mrs. Howard begins, like Cultee, speaking of something arriving in the spring--only it is a root (button camas), not an announcer (whether Salmon or *Stankiya*). Each subsequent scene begins with two or more particles (usually the pair, 'Soon now' (*Kwala aqa*)) which express passage of time and may imply change of location, as if the party of the announcer were coming upon one after another of the foods of the Clackamas world. The common particle pair indeed almost exactly parallels the first words of each root in Kathlamet, *Koala 33áqa*, translated there by Boas 'At last'.³ But 'soon now' in Clackamas begins a line that says, not that someone travelled, but that someone spoke. The one possible exception reinforces the point. When the series of fish is begun, 'someone spoke' is the second line (122). The first line says 'Now again soon they are' (121) (cf. note (b) to line 154). The line may imply that they (the party of the announcer) have come to a new location, wherein the next individual now speaks; if so, a word of motion or travel is avoided for a word of state. Again, the first spoken line in each scene says that someone is to be seen (see note to line 18 of the translation).

This also implies arrival, a change of location by the party of the announcer. But again, that is implicit in Clackamas, while in Kathlamet the first words say 'he has arrived'. A further indication of travel is the fact the specific use mentioned of a second kind of wild carrots is a use not practiced by the Clackamas themselves, but by people upriver, from whom the Clackamas obtained the cakes in question. One can readily imagine a Clackamas audience taking the myth to have moved upriver into the territory of those carrot-cake trading neighbors (see note to line 86 of the translation). But again, the indication of travel is implicit--one might almost say suppressed--in favor of an ecological inventory.

Mrs. Howard's narrative has transformed the role of travel. In Cultee's narrative the relation between the other foods and Salmon is a relation between winter and spring, recognition of the roots of the women's domain that sustain the people in winter before the arrival of the salmon (and other fish) in spring. In Mrs. Howard's narrative it is almost all spring.

There are indeed two kinds of arrival, that of 'things in the ground coming out' (line 2) and other foods and would-be foods, and that of Salmon. It is only the first of the things in the ground, button camas, that is spoken of explicitly as having arrived. The foods to be surveyed are not specifically winter foods at all, but foods of all seasons.

In suppressing Salmon's travel, Mrs. Howard both suppresses the dramatic image of his long awaited return each spring, and denies its unique importance. Chinookan men, like modern ethnologists, may think first of salmon when they think of what made the peoples of the Northwest Coast so remarkably prosperous for peoples without cultivation of plants. Mrs. Howard's narrative makes salmon but one of many foods (even if left in the role of announcer/recognizer of the others). Each of the others announces

15

that without it the people would have died--and not just in winter. Cultee in 1894 subverted the proposition that the people would have died in winter without roots (women's domain), by having the second act end with provision of a fish in winter as well. Mrs. Howard subverts the proposition that in waiting for spring the people were waiting for salmon by having the myth begin with them waiting for things in the ground.

One can indeed find in the text indications that its perspective is that of the arrival of all the main kinds of food, birds and fish as well as plants. The male grouse is the first bird, and with it the statement 'He is to be seen' is followed in the translation by the parenthetic remark '(about April)' (line 88). The remark evidently derives from Mrs. Howard. The reference to appearance is parallel to the statement in the narrative about things in the ground. Again, the first fish is Mudfish, and the verb in the initial line can be taken to refer to their appearance ('being there'). As Mrs. Howard recalls further what her mother's mother said about Coyote and berries, she concludes with lines about arrival that are very much like those with which the series of roots begins: 'Things will ripen, the berries/ Now she will tell me at that time...' (229-230). All this indicates a pervasive orientation to the arrival of the several kinds of foods.

That Mrs. Howard indeed saw the narrative from the standpoint of it being the foods and would-be foods which arrive is indicated as well by the puzzling ways in which the first line of opening formula of each scene are translated. With the medicine of scene (iv) the printed translation is explicitly from the standpoint of the would-be food, 'Now I am...'. With the staple camas (iii) the translation refers in the third person, 'she is', to the root, not the announcer. Yet the Clackamas expression in these cases and throughout is in fact not 'I' or 'she' but 'he' (see note to line 18). And

16

although the translation in the rest of the scenes which contain the expression are with 'he' or 'it', all those for roots and birds, except (iv), which has 'I am' in the main text, have '(I am)' inserted.

The stimulus for the insertions of '(I am)' probably comes from Mrs. Howard. The regularity of the insertion throughout scenes (ii-ix), followed by the regularity of complete absence (x-xy), may be due to Mrs. Howard ceasing to indicate in the course of the translation that for her the perspective was that of the food or would-be food. Perhaps the unceasing march of the formulaic lines themselves affected her. After scene (iv) in which 'Now I am' is given, she settled on third person pronouns to render the lines. Perhaps by scene (x) and the advent of the series of fish, the lines themselves have convinced her of their perspective, or discouraged her from insisting on her own.

All this underscores the status of the opening lines of each scene as indeed, for Mrs. Howard, formulaic lines, perhaps incompletely recalled. It underscores the presence of two perspectives in the narration itself. In the dominant perspective the arrivals that frame the story are those of foods. Remembered words recall a perspective in which the arrivals are those of someone else. (These paragraphs are adapted from the conclusion of the detailed analysis in notes (b) and (c) to line 154).

Person. The congruence and contrast in the category of person are in keeping with all this. Each time a root is reached in Cultee's narrative it is identified as a person at the outset, before speech begins (e.g., 'Now a person is standing' in line 2 of the scene quoted above; in the first scene of 1891 Skunk Cabbage is named (and thereby identified as a person at the outset; in the second scene of 1894 Small Arrowhead Root is identified as a woman (and therefore person)). The spoken question is 'Who'? and the answer the

name of a root and a kin term, aunt or uncle. The question, in the event, is inclusion in the rights and duties of kinship relation.

In Mrs. Howard's narrative a food is referred to as a person only after speaking (speech evidently entitles it to that generic status), and then only occasionally (Button-Camas (A, l. 11), Wild Carrot (E, l. 71), Wild Carrot (2) (F, l. 80), the unnamed last fish (O, l. 193). The spoken question is 'Who' and the answer a description. Only then is it stated whether or not the speaker is a definite person (singular noun with gender prefix)⁴ and then only if it is a food. The unnamed medicine (D) is not so identified; neither is Mudfish (J), which is not food, nor the Chub (K), which some will eat and some will not. (The omission of the identification for Eel (M) seems an accident, but in keeping with Mrs. Howard's depreciation of the fish series (see below)). Whether or not the speaker is within the category of person, in the sense of being a participant together with the people in the maintenance of their common world is at issue. (On such an Indian conception of person, see Hallowell 1960).

There is in fact an expressive gradation in form of the stem for 'person' itself. When a food is being asked about as a person, the form (with indefinite prefix *li-*) is *-gwəfilx*. When a food is declared to be a person, the form (with feminine or masculine gender prefix *a-/i-*) is *gwá:filx*. (See discussion of these forms and their translation in note to lines 11, 14). The schwa under stress is a reduced form of phonemic /a/, while the long /a:/ under stress is expressively emphatic: 'person indeed'.

Master-servant. For such persons, participants, to be useful to human beings is a reward 9 (see note to line 11). A variety of myths embody this theme, and many myths tell how the world has been changed from a previous state for the benefit of the Indian people who are near and about to

arrive. It will be their part to respect and observe the ways of their new world and to realize that they depend on its powers for their own survival. It is to this fundamental level of reciprocity that Mrs. Howard takes the myth. In neither Cultee's narrative nor hers is the announcer a creator in the sense of a creator *ex nihilo*. In both the announcer is more a Moses, recognizing and establishing for the people ways already inherent in the nature of things. But in Cultee's narrative, as we have seen, the assumption of reciprocity between beings underlies a tension with regard to reciprocity between genders of which Salmon is a focus. Salmon is first servant, then master. The tradition in which Mrs. Howard's narrative stands has eliminated the master-servant dialectic.

This elimination goes together with the absence in Clackamas of the Kathlamet insult with which Salmon is hailed in Kathlamet ('maggots in his buttocks'). The insult might seem agreeable to anyone wishing to diminish Salmon as dominant symbol, but it alludes to another myth (also told by Mrs. Howard) in which Salmon is dominant male par excellence. He survives his father's death as an egg from his father's body without feminine participation; he avenges his father's death; he kills his mother's new husbands while forcing them to drink from beneath her legs; when he sleeps as she paddles him to their home, and she takes fright at maggots that appear on him (spring salmon indeed spoil easily), thus mistaking appearance for true worth, he throws her up on a cliff to die alone. (Later he does restore her). (Cf. Hymes 1985: 422-3). The absence of the insult is an absence of the heroic figure who is insulted.

There seems to be another and pertinent allusion to that other myth of Salmon. Mrs. Howard's telling of that myth has the infant salmon egg found and tended by grandmotherly Crows. In Cultee's telling of the myth in

question here Crow is the central figure of the trio presented as parodying and pretending to supplant Salmon. That seems a change of the relationship from one of dependence for survival to one of contest for dominance. Salmon's twisting of Crow and (in the second telling) throwing of her away from the river seems a rejection of the dependence that the other myth relates and assertion of dominance. Once past the aunts of Act I, women figures either serve (Flounder) or are expelled (Crow). All this seems further expression of the violence associated with Salmon as symbol of gender tension, and further indication of what Mrs. Howard's narrative has eliminated.

Gender balance. It is not that all trace of concern with relations between genders has been eliminated. The fundamental changes in the conception of the myth as a whole remove a heroic conception of a male protagonist. And certain details of the narrative show sensitivity to gender.

(a) There is a gender-linked polarity in the sequence of foods and would-be foods, as disclosed in the pronouncement at the end of each scene. The sequence is: Roots: she, she, she; Other Roots: she, he, he; Birds: he, she, he, Fish: he, he, she; Fish (2): he, he, he. The polar sets are the most valued roots (camas) and the most valued fish (eels, sturgeon, [salmon]); the one is entirely feminine, the other entirely masculine.

(b) The choice of initial particles for each scene reflects a polarity as well. The standard sequence within both the series of roots and the series of fish is Kwála aya tšúnax 'Soon now another (spoke)'. This is case for all five of the roots after the first (except that the sixth adds wífax 'again' after 'now') and for all five of the fish after the first. The first root has no initial particles, being embedded within the initial frame of the myth; the

first fish is specially marked with Aya wí'ax kwála 'Now again soon (they are there)/ someone spoke'.

The birds that come between the roots and the fish are disparately marked. The first bird has an expectable 'Soon now (someone spoke)'; the absence of 'another' goes together with being the start of a new set. The second bird has 'another', indeed, but extra initial marking as well: 'Now again soon another (spoke)'. The third bird lacks 'another' and also has 'now again', but in a different order: 'Soon now again (someone spoke)'. The marking of the second bird, the one feminine bird, seems special attention to it. The diversity of marking for the birds as a set seems to show an individuation of interest in them, and a lack of attention to them as a set. The roots and fish are treated, I would venture to say, as opposed sets.

(c) Recall the observations on the distribution of five-verse scenes in the section above on Patterning of verse, scene, and incident.

(d) The order of the three key elements of the final pronouncement in each scene changes, as between the series of roots and the series of fish.

Here is a chart to show the relationships.

Camas

| | | | |
|-------|---------------------|-------|-----------------------|
| (i) | person; | name; | eat |
| (ii) | person, speak truth | name; | dig, eat, bake |
| (iii) | person | name | eat: boil, bake, cook |

Other roots

| | | | |
|------|--------|----------|------------------------|
| (iv) | --- | medicine | name is ? |
| (v) | person | name | speak truth |
| (vi) | person | name | eat: boil, mashed cake |

Birds

| | | | |
|-------|--------|------|-----------|
| (vii) | person | name | eat: soup |
|-------|--------|------|-----------|

(viii) person eat, eggs, all sorts name

(ix) person name eat

Fish(I)

(x) just says so not food name

(xi) --- eat/not eat name

(xii) person food: soup name

Fish (II)

(xiii) --- food: roast, smoke-dry, eat name

(xiv) person food: boil, smoke-dry, eat name

(xv) person food; all sorts ---

All roots which are foods are named, and then their use is given. (With regard to (iv), which is a medicine, it may be that the position for a name is held to last in hopes of remembering it). All fish which are foods have their use given, then their name. The first and third (male) birds agree with the roots: name, use. The second (female) bird agrees with the fish: use, name. (It is exceptional in regard to its initial markers as well; see below). Clearly there is a contrast, and the main break is between the fish and the rest.

(e) The chart just above further shows that all six of the roots have uses, five as foods and one (iv) as medicine. All three birds are foods. Only among the fish are there beings without use. The first fish pretends to be a food but is not (and therefore not declared a person); the second fish may be eaten by some, but not by others (and therefore is not declared a person). The fourth fish, Eels, is a food, and in the culture a quite desirable one, as the elaboration of its use (parallel to that for Sturgeon next) shows; but Mrs. Howard omits to say that it is a person.

These details seem to show attention to gender and some diminution of the foods that are linguistically and culturally masculine.

Young man/Grandfather. The authority of the announcer in Cultee's tellings is that of the young leader of a party travelling. He must learn. He knows how long it takes to travel to the Cascades, but not at first some of his own senior relatives. The authority of the announcer in Mrs. Howard's narrative is that of someone with knowledge. It is an authority that in the culture increases with age. The announcer asks for information, and, receiving it, identifies and explains. In pronouncing names and uses he teaches what children should learn. Of course all the myths were told with the assumption that children should hear them. But in Cultee's tellings, as in many myths, action is foremost, pedagogy implicit. In Mrs. Howard's narrative the pedagogic function dominates; movement and action are only implied. Both announcers affect the world to come in which the Indian people will be present. Cultee's announcer does so as a young man who accosts and shapes the world. Mrs. Howard's announcer is an older man who discriminates and instructs. He is in effect a grandfather. A relation between genders has become a relation between generations.

OVERVIEW

The several aspects of continuity and transformation, as between Cultee's versions and that of Mrs. Howard, indicate that a considerable transformation had already occurred. The frame of the myth is that of an arrival in the spring, but the point of view, or theme, has changed from that of the arrival of the announcer of foods to that of the arrival of foods themselves. Associated with this change of theme are a number of ways in which the scenes are recast, both as to patterning and details: the foods encountered are not foods of winter, but of spring (and summer and fall); travel is subordinated, pedagogy foregrounded; the relationship between the announcer and the foods is not that of kinship, but of fellow beings, persons,

in the world; dominance and subordination are replaced by a concern with participant maintenance; gender conflict is replaced by a more muted gender preference (except that one should not forget the great fact that Salmon, symbol of maleness, loses out almost altogether in Mrs. Howard's version); announcer as assertive young chief is replaced by announcer as knowledgeable grandfather.

Three aspects of the transformation did remain unresolved.

- (1) Who is said to arrive? the announcer of foods or the foods themselves?
- (2) Is it Salmon the announcer or salmon the food?
- (3) Is the announcer Salmon or Coyote?

Each of these unresolved aspects is latent and emerges at a different point in the collaboration between Mrs. Howard and Jacobs: the second at the end of performance; the third in the aftermath of performance; the first, most latent of all, in the process of translation. Let me review the first and complete the consideration of the second and third.

(1) Who is said to arrive? the announcer of foods or the foods themselves?

Mrs. Howard's version sees the myth from the standpoint of the latter, as stated in her opening frame (1) and the parallel passage in her aftermath account of the berries (lines 229-230), and as indicated in details and inconsistencies in translation (details that Jacobs has invaluable recorded and published). But the opening formulaic lines preserve a point of view in which it is the announcer who arrives. This inconsistency does not effect the narration itself. It turns out to pose a problem for Mrs. Howard in the process of translation.

(2) Is it Salmon the announcer or salmon the food? The narrative is begun with the first in mind, and arrives at a point at which the second is required

As we have seen, a parenthetical explanation in the first scene reports that the announcer is 'a fish person, maybe Salmon, which also appears at the same time of year' (Jacobs 1958: 75), and the name 'Salmon' continues to be supplied as the identity of the announcer in subsequent passages (Jacobs' numbered sections 2, 4, 5 (twice), 6, 7, 9, 11). But then comes scene (xv). The scene is foregrounded by its rhetorical position as a culmination, third of a set of three, its set the fifth such set, preceded by two other major fish (eels, sturgeon); its actor is foregrounded by doubled pronouns at the outset ('another, / he too' (187-8)), and by praise otherwise accorded only the one feminine fish, trout ('a good-looking person' (193)); and as the pronouncement that ends a scene unfolds, it is precisely the third element, the name, that is missing: 'He is a person. / He is food. / They will make all sorts of things with him' (194-6). It is then the narrative breaks off. If the third fish of this set is salmon, the announcer who names it cannot also be Salmon. If the announcer is Salmon, then some other fish, important as food, but subordinate to the chinook salmon, could be named. But evidently the logic of the narrative had been to lead to chinook salmon, Salmon par excellence). Another name, say 'blueback salmon' (watsúliha), would not do. That she knows the name of chinook salmon, a common name, the generic name for 'fish', is evident from other of her texts. Mrs. Howard does not attempt a name and leave the line incomplete, as in (iv) (line 65). She leaves the pronouncement without any token of its third element, a name, the only time in which this happens. To name here would be to make the latent contradiction explicit.

It is with regard to the names of fish, indeed, that Mrs. Howard claims (feigns?) ignorance in the five lines of epilogue that begin the metanarrative aftermath (198-9).

The remark at the end of this close itself implies a specific omission. Remarks at the end of a myth that there is more that the narrator does not know are in themselves conventional (cf. Hymes 1981a: 323-7, 330-1). Such a remark conveys the point that the one myth is now complete, but not the world of myth. The wording in line 210, however, includes the demonstrative pronoun *yáymayx* 'only'. Without it, the other three words 'that-far now I-recall' would be a conventional close of the sort just discussed. The inclusion of this form for 'only' signals here, as it does at the end of 'Seal and her younger brother lived there' (cf. Hymes 1981a: 331) that something specific is not recalled.

Notice that if Mrs. Howard had had Coyote in mind as announcer at this point, she would not have had a difficulty. She could have named salmon as the third fish. Her behavior at this point indicates that she had not yet thought of Coyote, but still thought of Salmon.

(3) Is the announcer Salmon or Coyote? How can one account for the fact that Mrs. Howard initially identifies the announcer with Salmon, although she counted herself as having learned it only from her mother's mother (Jacobs 1958: 274, n. 63), whom she quotes in the aftermath as specifying the announcer as Coyote? The likely answer is the existence of a community tradition in which the announcer continued to be taken to be Salmon, a tradition which Mrs. Howard's mother-in-law possibly shared.

Throughout her sessions with Jacobs Mrs. Howard identified specifically only her mother's mother and mother-in-law as sources (sometimes one of them, sometimes both). In regard to the other myth of Salmon, however, Jacobs observed. (1959: 371-2): Mrs. Howard's omission of mention as to who told her this myth allows the safe inference that many Clackamas related it." And the one other myth not identified as being from

either her mother's mother, her mother-in-law, or both, is one that almost every Clackamas would have heard, the story of Coyote's travels around the world. Both these myths for whom no specific source is named were known throughout Chinookan territory, were common property, and the myth in question here would seem a candidate for such commonality as well. It seems likely that Mrs. Howard began her telling of the myth with recollection of a community tradition continuous with that of Cultee, identifying the announcer as Salmon.

Mrs. Howard's mother-in-law, who was from the Columbia river somewhat to the east of the Willamette (toward the Cascades) might have (also) been a source of such a recollection. Mrs. Howard reports her mother-in-law as not recalling the details of the foods (205-7), and thus by implication as not having performed ('made') the myth to her. But the fact that the mother-in-law spoke explicitly of the state of her knowledge of the myth implies that she discussed the myth; such discussion could have included her understanding of it as being about a fish person. Moreover, Mrs. Howard's return, after quoting her mother-in-law, to her mother's mother's statement seems more than the filling out of a three-part rhetorical form. It seems a reassertion of her mother's mother's identification of the announcer as Coyote, as mention of her mother-in-law implicitly put that identification in question.

Certainly it is unlikely that Mrs. Howard's mother's mother had continued to identify the announcer as a fish person, maybe Salmon, given the repeated insistence with which Mrs. Howard quotes her as saying that it was Coyote (203-4, 209, 232). The closing lines of the last two stanzas (231-3, 234-9) seem clearly to show Mrs. Howard attesting that her mother's mother told not only of the Coyote named *Štámkíya* in relation to berries,

but in relation to 'all the things that were made good' (236). And the special name for this manifestation of Coyote in such a role is in keeping with a special name, *Tánaḡiya*, for the Coyote who travels around the land in the major cycle mentioned above. The two names, indeed, seem related in form. (Individuation by a name occurs in one other Clackamas myth, *Sasáylaxam* (Jacobs 1958, myth 4). Other myths use the common name, *Íčálapas* (myths 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 30)).

At the same time the mother's mother's myth of *Tánaḡiya* is quite distinct from the preceding narrative. Coyote explicitly travels, 'went past' (210, 231), and evidently on land. The announcer and the food in question address each other directly in the vocative; there is no description, no third person reference, implying an audience to whom identity and use are being explained. There is no mention of being a person. The point of the interaction is not recognition, but transformation; Coyote counters the challenge of the berry by plucking it and telling it what's to be what, that it is to be food because our Indian-people are near. The implication of the challenge from the berries is that in that period they were dangerous or at least capable of mounting a serious obstacle to being used: 'I am going to stab you'. The characteristic hunger of Coyote is suggested.

All this indicates a myth which in narrative form had not at all been integrated with the preceding myth. To be sure, it provides a sequel with comic tones in the character of Coyote, parallel to the burlesque element in the second act of Cultee's tellings, and something is set right in both. There might have been some sense of generic appropriateness. But as we have seen, the framing and patterning of talk are quite different (whereas in the Kathlamet myth the second act is cast in the same broad pattern of travel, colloquy, and three part action (go to them, shape, place), as the first).

Moreover, Mrs. Howard's recollection in lines 229-233, 'Things will ripen, the berries, now she will tell me at that time', seems an opening parallel and rival to that of the preceding myth, which specifies 'things in the ground are coming out'.

The best judgment would seem to be that a pervasive transformation of the preceding myth, quite thinning out the role of the announcer, has opened the way to association of the identity of the announcer with someone other than Salmon. The myth of Coyote and berries appears to show certain traits common to Clackamas conception of the arrival of foods in spring. It seems to provide separate testimony to a frame in which it is not the announcer who arrives, but the foods, whether things in the ground, or berries. The note of common identification between berries and announcer struck in 'our Indian people are near' (215) fits the perspective of participant maintenance in the myth of roots, birds, and fish.

And Coyote would be preferable to a line of women sensitive to the gender implications of Salmon. Coyote does parallel Salmon by entering first a feminine domain. (Although the plural noun-prefixes to the berry names do not reveal gender, the berry mentioned first, the strawberry, is precisely what a girl would be told to go seek after a myth recital, according to Jacobs' notebooks (a boy would be told to go seek a grouse. Both instructions, like many closing formulae for myths, anticipate the arrival of spring.) But as a male counterpart to a domain of women, Coyote has none of the standing of a figure such as Salmon. The one is a rascal, the other a chief. The substitution is characterologically far more favorable to women.

The myth of Coyote and the berries seems to have been somewhat marginal to Mrs. Howard's tradition. She is not sure that her mother's mother made the (whole) myth to her (227), nor that she remembers all

(228). She initially generalizes the account of the interaction between a berry and Coyote to 'they' (211). The identity of the announcer, 'Coyote', occurs to her first with his common name, *Ičálaḡas* (203, 209); the special name comes to mind with the recollection of quoted speech (212, 225). She lists the berries, rather than enact their interactions, repeating of each the one remembered remark of what each would say. The opening (229-33) occurs to her last. There is no close of the kind appropriate to myths.

Much of this, to be sure, is a function of the circumstance of recollection at the end of another myth. The main point appears to be a working through of her conviction that the identity is indeed that of Coyote, and, specifically, the Coyote named *Štanḡiya*. Note the parallel between the use of the generic name, *Ičálaḡas*, in lines 203, 209) and the emphatic final placement of *Štanḡiya* in lines 232-3. The name and the certainty of identification seem to come together in the course of a postscript.

It must have been at the end of the dictation that Jacobs asked Mrs. Howard for a title. The published title is *Štanḡiya gačətuḡ tčəkdí dānmaḡ*, 'Coyote he-made-them the-good things', but as we have just seen, the identification with *Štanḡiya* emerges after the main story is over. Last thoughts have redefined first thoughts.

As we have seen, Mrs. Howard's mother's mother evidently identified the announcer of all foods, not just berries, as Coyote. It seems quite unlikely that she integrated the myth of the arrival of roots, birds and fishes with the myth of the arrival of berries. She might have told one after the other, but the myth of the arrival of roots, birds and fishes maintained a distinct form, a form compatible with identification of the announcer as a transformed, grandfatherly Salmon, a form not at all suggestive of Coyote. Insistence that the announcer was Coyote must have been a minority

opinion, perhaps the opinion of a minority of one. Yet the mother's mother must have told the myth in such a way that salmon was already to be counted among the fish. That is how the text came back to Mrs. Howard in her telling of it. The further step in the merging of the two myths, represented by the identification in the title, may have come about for the first time in Oregon City, when Mrs. Howard performed the myth to Jacobs toward the end of their work together.

¹ Part of a revision of that paper has been published as Hymes (1985).

² This territory is evidently on either side of where the Willamette flows into the Columbia, just above the present site of the city of Portland. Its westernmost point presumably is the upriver boundary of Kathlamet territory, at about Rainier, Oregon, or just above, for Salmon and his party are said to encounter the trio at what is now St. Helens (just downriver from Portland). Its easternmost point presumably is the Cascades, which the trio claim to have reached in a day, some fifty-odd miles upriver from Portland. The Clackamas lived just south of what is now Portland with a hinterland perhaps extending to the Cascades. This area is poorly known linguistically, but evidently its various communities spoke a variety of Chinookan generally intelligible with that of the Wasco and Wishram further upriver, though recognizably distinct. The Clackamas and Wasco both refer to their language by the same name, *kik̓t̓*. It is sufficiently distinct from Kathlamet to lead us to judge the two to have been different languages.

³ The proposed Kathlamet element, *šč-*, is not otherwise attested. A phonesthematic hunch is that it is an intensifier.

⁴ The one exception is the last. In (O) the last fish of the second series is

introduced with two lines, instead of the usual one, marked by doubling

of pronoun ('another', 'he too'). The initial tense prefix changes from the remote past *ga-* to the generic past *a-*, and the person-marker prefix is not indefinite *ʔ-* but masculine singular *i-*. There follows the usual sequence of description with indefinite prefix plus 'person', and response by the announcer with number-gender prefix plus 'person' (193-4). The unusual opening (two lines, generic past, definite pronoun) mark the climax and crux.

References

- Boas, Franz. 1901. Kathlamet texts. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 26. Washington, D. C.: Bureau of American Ethnology.
- Hallowell, A. I. 1964. Ojibwa ontology, behavior and world view. Primitive views of the world, ed. S. Diamond, pp. 49-82. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hymes, Dell. 1975. From space to time in tenses in Kiksht. International Journal of American Linguistics 41: 313-29.
- . 1981. 'In vain I tried to tell you': Essays in Native American ethnopoetics. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- . 1984. Language, memory and selective performance: Cultee's 'Salmon's myth' as twice told to Boas. Journal of American Folklore 98 (390): 391-434.
- Jacobs, Melville. 1958. Clackamas Chinook Texts I. (Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics, Publication 8; International Journal of American Linguistics 24(1), Part II). Bloomington, Indiana.
- . 1959a. Clackamas Chinook Texts II. (Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics, Publication 11; International Journal of American Linguistics 25(2), Part II). Bloomington, Indiana.
- . 1960. The people are coming soon. Analyses of Clackamas Chinook myths and tales. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Jefferson, Gail. 1985. On the interactional unpacking of a 'gloss'. Language in Society 14: 435-66.

Štánkíva gačétux tčúkdi dánmax

[ONE] [Announcing foods]

[I] [Camas]

(i) (Button camas)

| | |
|---|----|
| Nugagím̃x t̃gá dáyaxbt, | 1 |
| "Aḡa dánmax wíl̃x̃ba díq̃ol̃pxix. | 2 |
| túxwan dāvax wakáyim, | 3 |
| túxwan agúnax alát̃x̃-ida, | 4 |
| tá::niwa it̃kálakíya t̃dímamt." | 5 |
| Gačəkim: | 6 |
| "Adí::! Kíníkšt̃x náyka. | 7 |
| "Nagól̃gát adát̃utk. | 8 |
| "Idmíl̃xam á::nḡa wakádaču ikdúdina." | 9 |
| Gačəkim: | 10 |
| "Á:w. Qá atál̃g̃-ll̃ it̃g̃-étil̃x t̃xól̃p̃alawala?" | 11 |
| Nugákim: | 12 |
| "Qát̃gi p̃ál̃q̃iq̃ it̃át̃kabumit." | 13 |
| [--]"Áw. Ag-á:til̃x. | 14 |
| "Ičáḡliw Akálakíya. | 15 |
| "Áḡka aluḡimúxma." | 16 |

(ii) (Cat Ear camas)

| | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| K-álá aḡa t̃gúnax gačəkim: | 17 |
| "Íyaḡikl̃ igíxux. | 18 |
| "Kíníkšt̃x náyka. | 19 |
| "Nagól̃gat adát̃utk. | 20 |
| "Á::nḡa Wakádaču pu ikdúdina." | 21 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| Nugákim: | 22 |
| "tán txolpalawola?" | 23 |
| "Qá Hálq-li?" | 24 |
| Nugákim: | 25 |
| "ô:. Mánkčxa gúhqt wálex pálqiq." | 26 |
| [--]"Áw. Agráhlx, | 27 |
| "áqanwi aqúla. | 28 |
| "Ičáxlw Wáqaptn. | 29 |
| "Áxka aqúlaba, | 30 |
| "áqaxəlmúxma, | 31 |
| "áxka wíłax aqušiya." | 32 |
| [--]"Áw." | 33 |

(iii) (Staple Camas)

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| K-álá aya tgunax gačəkim. | 34 |
| "Iyaqiki igíxux. | 35 |
| "Qáma néšqi náyka, | 36 |
| "Ánəa akádaču ikdúdina idmílxam." | 37 |
| [--]"Ū:. tán txolpalawola?" | 38 |
| "Qá Hálqiglim?" | 39 |
| Gaqúlaxam: | 40 |
| "ô:. Qátgi dalúwluw Hálqakstaq." | 41 |
| [--]"Áw. Agráhlx. | 42 |
| "Ičáxlw Ámúyuq-it. | 43 |
| "Kánawi tán alačəlmúxma. | 44 |
| "Áxka aqušəpəa, | 45 |
| "áxka aqušiya, | 46 |
| "áxka aqaylútgayaxdixa." | 47 |

[II] [Other Roots]

(iv) [2]

| | |
|------------------------------------|----|
| K-álá aya tgunax gačəkim: | 48 |
| "Iyaqiki igíxux. | 49 |
| "Kiníktə náyka. | 50 |
| "Nagəlgát adáəutk." | 51 |
| [--]"Áw. tán txolpalawola?" | 52 |
| [--]"ô:. Qátgi dalé: Hətaqəu. | 53 |
| "tkbíčəgawəlx. | 54 |
| "Həpəəv." | 55 |
| [--]"Ū: Qánaəa aqúla, | 56 |
| "né:šqi aqaxəlmúxma, | 57 |
| "Ičáəxamam. | 58 |
| "Imáylutk imíktəxat, | 59 |
| "imgəmquq. | 60 |
| "Qánaəa apəəx. | 61 |
| "tíxtməxíx Həəhlx Hálčəmam ačəúəa, | 62 |
| "əəa áxka k'mənk'mə əqúəa, | 63 |
| "Həkašə ačətušəməda. | 64 |
| "Ičáxlw" | 65 |
| Sá:č. | 66 |

(v) (Wild Carrot)

| | |
|--|----|
| K-álá aya tgunax gačəkim. | 67 |
| "Iyaqiki igíxux. | 68 |
| "Kiníktə náyka, | 69 |
| "nagəlgát adáəutk idmílxam." | 70 |
| [--]"Ū: Qá Hálq-li Həəhlx txolpalawola?" | 71 |
| [--]"Qátgi ktúhqt." | 72 |

| | |
|---------------------|----|
| [--]"Á::. Ig-áHilx. | 73 |
| "Íyaɣiliv l'úlkaw. | 74 |
| "Áyanwi l'xúla." | 75 |

(vi) (Wild Carrot (2))

| | |
|---|----|
| K-álá aya wíɬax ɣúnax ɣatəkim: | 76 |
| "Íyaɣikl igíxux. | 77 |
| "Kínikštɣ náyka, | 78 |
| "nagəlgát adə́tutk idməlxam." | 79 |
| [--]"Ů::. Qá Hálɣ-ll Hɣ-əHilx tɣə́lɣalawəla?" | 80 |
| [--]"Ů::. Idə́hɣdax idHə́ɣ-it." | 81 |
| [--]"Áw. Ů::. Tɣ-əHilxt. | 82 |
| "Idə́ɣiliv idə́hɣax. | 83 |
| "Dáɣka aqaximúxma, | 84 |
| "aqdučxamáya, | 85 |
| "dáɣka id'ínax aqdúɣa." | 86 |

[III] [Birds]

(vii) (Male Grouse)

| | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| K-álá aya ɣatəkim: | 87 |
| "Íyaɣikl igíxux. | 88 |
| "Kínikštɣ náyka, | 89 |
| "nagəlgát adə́tutk idməlxam." | 90 |
| [--]"Á:w. tən tɣə́lɣalawəla?" | 91 |
| "Qá Hə́ɣigiliv?" | 92 |
| CaqHə́lxam: | 93 |
| "Ů::. Qátɣi šbá:q Hə́ɣigiliv." | 94 |
| [--]"Áw. Ig-áHilx. | 95 |
| "Íyaɣiliv lə́múdmət." | 96 |

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| "Yáɣka aqixə́lmúxma, | 97 |
| "Hə́čɣmam l'ə́'a aqHə́ɣa, | 98 |
| "táɣka ałktə́ɣúmsda." | 99 |

(viii) (Female Grouse)

| | |
|--|-----|
| Áya wíɬax k-álá ɣúnax ɣatəkim: | 100 |
| "Íyaɣikl igíxux." | 101 |
| [--]"Áw. tən tɣə́lɣalawəla?" | 102 |
| "Qá Hə́ɣigiliv?" | 103 |
| [--]"Ů::. K-ə́hɣ wíɬax." | 104 |
| [--]"Ů::. Áɣ-əHilx. | 105 |
| "Áɣka aqaxə́lmúxma, | 106 |
| "áɣka wíɬax Hə́ɣə́ɣlawlawks aqHə́lmúxma, | 107 |
| "kə́nawi dən ałúkdi. | 108 |
| "l'ə́ɣiliv ə́smúdmət." | 109 |

(ix) (Quail)

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| K-álá aya wíɬax ɣatəkim: | 110 |
| "Íyaɣikl igíxux. | 111 |
| "Kínikštɣ náyka, | 112 |
| "nagəlgát adə́tutk idməlxam." | 113 |
| [--]"Ů::. tən tɣə́lɣalawəla?" | 114 |
| [--]"Qátɣi dāngi Hə́ɣə́nxát, | 115 |
| "Hə́ktɣ-fla Hə́qakstaqba. | 116 |
| "kHə́kayts Hɣ-əHilx." | 117 |
| [--]"Á:w. Ig-áHilx. | 118 |
| "Íyaɣiliv lə́xə́bwala. | 119 |
| "Yáɣka aqixə́lmúxma." | 120 |

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| "Išdāxliw išgāk-al." | 172 |
| (xiv) (Sturgeon) | |
| K-álá aṣa ṭṭúnax gaṭákim: | 173 |
| "Íyaṣiki išíxux. | 174 |
| "Kinikštx náyka, | 175 |
| "nagəlgát adátutk idmšlxam." | 176 |
| [--]"Ū:. Éán ṭxəlpəláwəla? | 177 |
| "Qá Išəgigliw?" | 178 |
| [--]"Ō:. Kṭúqbəyḥ, | 179 |
| "ṭkúp ṭəṭq." | 180 |
| [--]"Áw. Ig-əṭliw. | 181 |
| "ṭxəlm, | 182 |
| "əqyug-əppə; | 183 |
| "wíṭax yáxka əqixšámida. | 184 |
| "yáxka əqixəlmáxma. | 185 |
| "Íyaṣliw ináṣun." | 186 |
| (O) (?) | |
| K-álá aṣa ṭṭúnax, | 187 |
| yáxṭax níkim: | 188 |
| "Íyaṣiki išíxux. | 189 |
| "Kinikštx náyka, | 190 |
| "nagəlgát adátutk." | 191 |
| [--]"Áw. Éán ṭxəlpəláwəla?" | 192 |
| [--]"Ō:. Išúkdí ṭṭəṭliw. | 193 |
| [--]"Áw. Ig-əṭliw. | 194 |
| "ṭxəlm. | 195 |
| "Kánawi dán əqyúxə." | 196 |

[TWO] [Epilogue]

(A) [Close for fish]

| | |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| Ká::navi dán k-əḥqí išəṭəṭaga, | 197 |
| níšqi nədúkl itgáxliw, | 198 |
| ṭúx-an qámax itgáxliwmax. | 199 |
| Kánawi k-əḥqí nug-ákim. | 200 |
| ṭúx-an k-əḥt yáyməy aṣa inxəlutkt. | 201 |

(B) [Mother's mother, mother-in-law]

| | |
|---|-----|
| Agəškix nagímə, | 202 |
| "Išálapas k-əḥqí níxux, | 203 |
| ká::navi dán dadáx dəḥṭiláx." | 204 |
| Yáxa wákšdi nagímə, | 205 |
| "Níšqi dənṭəlutkt | 206 |
| "dán dadáx gačəṭux ṭúkdí qəḥiláx." | 207 |
| Agəškix əgnulxáma: | 208 |
| "Išálapas dadáx k-əḥqí gačəṭux dánmax." | 209 |

(C) [Štənkíya and berries]

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| Gayáwiya kánawi dán kduxənxát. | 210 |
| Gəṭgyúlaxam: | 211 |
| "Ayaxáməlgamida, Štənkíya!" | 212 |
| k-əṭ gačyúxəx. | 213 |
| "ə:. Máyka əmṭúṭliw! | 214 |
| "Aṣa qwáp əlxədídánwi." | 215 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| žániwa ižqíya, | 216 |
| aqa žaxžax ižkamukš, | 217 |
| ižgúvi, | 218 |
| imičqan, | 219 |
| idunáyax, | 220 |
| idámštiv, | 221 |
| ižmúwinax, | 222 |
| itxáxan, | 223 |
| kánawi dán k'ážqí gatgyúlcam, | 224 |
| "Ayaxámalgamida, Štánkiya!" | 225 |
| (D) [Mother's mother. Štánkiya. berries] | |
| Yáymayx k'ážqí agnuxáma. | 226 |
| žux'an gaginlúxax ižáni, | 227 |
| néžqi ižxólutkt sáq. | 228 |
| Dánmax atgáksda kdux'anxát, | 229 |
| aqa agnuxáma k'ábdix, | 230 |
| "Áqa gayáwiya, | 231 |
| "Dánmax ižxólm gačótux, | 232 |
| "Štánkiya." | 233 |
| (E) [Final theme] | |
| K-álá ižáni gyuxúla, | 236 |
| aqa alagíma, | 237 |
| "Kánawi dán dáyxax ižúkti gačótux, | 238 |
| "daxka dadax dāžilāx. | 239 |
| "Yaxa dāx gidámlamax néžqi ižxólm, | 240 |
| "daxka nížqi dāžilāx." | 241 |

Coyote made things good

[ONE] [Announcing foods]

[I] [Camas]

(i) (Button camas)

| | |
|---|----|
| This must be when they would say, | 1 |
| "Now things in the ground are coming out, | 2 |
| perhaps this moon, | 3 |
| perhaps the next will stand, | 4 |
| the <u>first</u> button camas will have arrived." | 5 |
| Someone spoke: | 6 |
| "Goodness! If I were not. | 7 |
| "I hold their breath. | 8 |
| "Your people, <u>long</u> ago, Starvation had killed them." | 9 |
| Someone said: | 10 |
| "Indeed. What does the person talking look like?" | 11 |
| They said: | 12 |
| "Sort of flat, greyish-white." | 13 |
| [--]"Indeed. She is a person. | 14 |
| "Her name is Button Camas. | 15 |
| "They will eat her." | 16 |
| (ii) (Cat Ear camas) | |
| Soon now another spoke: | 17 |
| "He is to be seen. | 18 |
| "If I were not, | 19 |
| "I hold their breath, | 20 |
| " <u>Long</u> ago Starvation would have killed them." | 21 |

They said: 22
 "Who is talking? 23
 "What does it look like?" 24
 They said: 25
 "To be sure. Seems to be long-faced, flat." 26
 [--]"Indeed. She is a person, 27
 "She speaks the truth. 28
 "Her name is Cat-Ear (camas). 29
 "She will be dug out, 30
 "she will be eaten (raw), 31
 "she also will be baked in ashes." 32
 [--]"Indeed." 33
 (iii) (Camas [staple type]) 34
 Soon now another spoke: 35
 "He is to be seen. 36
 "If I were not, 37
 "Long ago Starvation had killed your people." 38
 [--]"Ohh. Who is talking? 39
 "What is its appearance?" 40
 Someone was told: 41
 "To be sure. Her head is sort of round." 42
 [--]"Indeed. She is a person. 43
 "Her name is Camas. 44
 "Everyone will eat her. 45
 "She will be boiled (with hot rocks), 46
 "she will be baked, 47
 "she will be cooked (on hot rocks underground)." 48

(iv) [?] (ii) [Other Roots]
 Soon now another spoke: 48
 "He is to be seen. 49
 "If I were not , 50
 "I hold their breath. 51
 [--]"Indeed. Who is talking?" 52
 [--]"To be sure. Its hair is sort of black, 53
 "It's tied in a bunch on top, 54
 "It's a widow." 55
 [--]"Ohh! She is just saying that, 56
 "she will not be eaten, 57
 "she's bitter. 58
 "You put her down your mouth, 59
 "you vomit. 60
 "She is just medicine. 61
 "Sometimes a person will become ill, 62
 "now she will be mashed, 63
 "they will drink her juice. 64
 "Her name is ..." 65
 All done. 66
 (v) (Wild Carrot)
 Soon now another spoke: 67
 "He is to be seen. 68
 "If I were not, 69
 "I hold your people's breath." 70
 [--]"Ohh. What does the person talking look like?" 71
 [--]"Sort of lengthened." 72

| | |
|--|----|
| [--]"Ahh. He is a person. | 73 |
| "His name is Wild Carrot. | 74 |
| "He speaks the truth." | 75 |
| (vi) (Wild Carrot (2)) | |
| Soon now again another spoke: | 76 |
| "(Now) he is to be seen. | 77 |
| "If I were not, | 78 |
| "I hold your people's breath." | 79 |
| [--]"Ohh. What does the person talking look like?" | 80 |
| [--]"To be sure. Their legs are long." | 81 |
| [--]"Indeed. To be sure. They are persons. | 82 |
| "Their name is [another] Wild Carrot. | 83 |
| "They will be eaten, | 84 |
| "they will be boiled, | 85 |
| "they will be made into boiled mash-cakes." | 86 |
| [III](Birds) | |
| (vii) (Male Grouse) | |
| Soon now someone spoke: | 87 |
| "He is to be seen. | 88 |
| "If I were not, | 89 |
| "I hold your people's breath." | 90 |
| [--]"Indeed. Who is talking?" | 91 |
| "What is its appearance?" | 92 |
| The one was told: | 93 |
| "To be sure. Its appearance is sort of grey." | 94 |
| [--]"Indeed. He is a person. | 95 |
| "His name is (Male) Grouse. | 96 |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----|
| "He will be eaten, | 97 |
| "Soup for a sick person will be made, | 98 |
| "That one will drink it." | 99 |
| (viii) (Female Grouse) | |
| Now again soon another spoke: | 100 |
| "(Now) he is to be seen." | 101 |
| [--]"Indeed. Who is talking?" | 102 |
| "What is its appearance?" | 103 |
| [--]"To be sure. That way again." | 104 |
| [--]"Ohh. She is a person. | 105 |
| "She will be eaten, | 106 |
| "she also will have her eggs eaten, | 107 |
| "all sorts of things she's good for. | 108 |
| "Her name is (Female) Grouse." | 109 |
| (ix) (Quail) | |
| Soon now again someone spoke: | 110 |
| "He is to be seen." | 111 |
| "If I were not, | 112 |
| "I hold your people's breath." | 113 |
| [--]"Ohh. Who is talking?" | 114 |
| [--]"Something sort of stretched out, | 115 |
| "It is standing on its head. | 116 |
| "It's a small person." | 117 |
| [--]"Indeed. He is a person. | 118 |
| "His name is Quail. | 119 |
| "He will be eaten." | 120 |

[IV] [Fish]**(x) (Mudfish)**

| | |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| Now again soon they are (there). | 121 |
| Someone spoke: | 122 |
| "He is to be seen. | 123 |
| "If I were not, | 124 |
| "Long ago Hunger had killed them." | 125 |
| [--]"Indeed. Who is talking? | 126 |
| "What is its appearance? | 127 |
| [--]"To be sure. It is small, | 128 |
| "Its head is very large." | 129 |
| [--]"Ahhh. He just says so. | 130 |
| "It's not food. | 131 |
| "His name is Mudfish." | 132 |
| [--]"Indeed." | 133 |

(xi) (Chub)

| | |
|--|-----|
| Soon now another spoke: | 134 |
| "He is to be seen. | 135 |
| "If I were not, | 136 |
| "I hold your people's breath, | 137 |
| "Long ago Hunger had killed them." | 138 |
| [--]"Who is talking? | 139 |
| "What is its appearance?" | 140 |
| [--]"To be sure. Its mouth is small, sharp." | 141 |
| [--]"Indeed. To be sure. | 142 |
| "Sometimes they will think they will eat it, | 143 |
| "but others will not eat it. | 144 |
| "His name is Chub." | 145 |

(xii) (Trout)

| | |
|--|-----|
| Soon now another spoke: | 146 |
| "He is to be seen. | 147 |
| "If I were not. | 148 |
| "I hold your people's breath." | 149 |
| [--]"Indeed. What is its appearance? | 150 |
| [--]"To be sure. Its mouth is sort of sharp. | 151 |
| "It has a handsome appearance." | 152 |
| [--]"To be sure. She is a person. | 153 |
| "She is food, | 154 |
| "They will boil her soup for a sick person, | 155 |
| "he will drink it. | 156 |
| "Her name is Trout." | 157 |
| [--]"Indeed." | 158 |

[V] [Fish II]**(xiii) (Eel)**

| | |
|---|-----|
| Soon now another spoke: | 159 |
| "He is to be seen. | 160 |
| "If we were not. | 161 |
| "We hold your people's breath." | 162 |
| [--]"Indeed. Who is talking? | 163 |
| "What is its appearance?" | 164 |
| [--]"To be sure. They are long, | 165 |
| "Sort of blackish people." | 166 |
| [--]"To be sure. He is food. | 167 |
| "It will be gotten, | 168 |
| "it will be roasted (on spits beside the fire), | 169 |
| "it will be smoke-dried, | 170 |
| "they will eat him. | 171 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| "His name is Eel." | 172 |
| (xiv) (Sturgeon) | |
| Soon now another spoke: | 173 |
| "He is to be seen." | 174 |
| "If I were not." | 175 |
| "I hold your people's breath." | 176 |
| [--]"Ohh. Who is talking?" | 177 |
| "What is its appearance?" | 178 |
| [--]"To be sure. It is very large," | 179 |
| "Its body is white." | 180 |
| [--]"Indeed. He is a person." | 181 |
| "He is food." | 182 |
| "he will be boiled," | 183 |
| "also that one will be smoke-dried," | 184 |
| "that one will be eaten." | 185 |
| "His name is Sturgeon." | 186 |
| (O) [2] | |
| Soon now another, | 187 |
| he too said: | 188 |
| "He is to be seen." | 189 |
| "If I were not." | 190 |
| "I hold their breath." | 191 |
| [--]"Indeed. Who is talking?" | 192 |
| [--]"To be <u>sure</u> . A good-looking person." | 193 |
| [--]"Indeed. He is a person." | 194 |
| "He is food." | 195 |
| "They will make all sorts of things with him." | 196 |

[TWO][Epilogue]

| | |
|--|-----|
| (A) [Close on Fish] | |
| <u>All</u> sorts of things in the water like that, | 197 |
| I do not know their names, | 198 |
| I can't think how they go, their various names. | 199 |
| All spoke like that. | 200 |
| I think now I remember only that far. | 201 |
| (B) [Mother's mother, mother-in-law] | |
| My mother's mother would say, | 202 |
| "Coyote did like that," | 203 |
| " <u>All</u> those things that feed us." | 204 |
| But my mother-in-law would say, | 205 |
| "I don't remember them," | 206 |
| "those things he made good to be eaten." | 207 |
| My mother's mother will tell me: | 208 |
| "Coyote made those things like that." | 209 |
| (C) [Štanđiya and berries] | |
| He went past all the things (that are) berries | 210 |
| They told him: | 211 |
| "I am going to stab you, Štanđiya!" | 212 |
| He would pluck it: | 213 |
| "To be sure. You are good eating!" | 214 |
| "Now our Indian-people are near." | 215 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| First wild strawberries, | 216 |
| now these blackberries, | 217 |
| raspberries, | 218 |
| grey huckleberry, | 219 |
| mountain huckleberries, | 220 |
| serviceberries, | 221 |
| crabapples, | 222 |
| chokecherries, | 223 |
| all these things like that told him, | 224 |
| "I am going to stab you, Štanŋiya!" | 225 |
| (D) [Mother's mother, Štanŋiya, berries] | |
| That is the only way she will tell me. | 226 |
| I don't know (that) she made the (whole) myth to me; | 227 |
| I do not remember it all. | 228 |
| Things will ripen, the berries, | 229 |
|]now she will tell me at that time, 230 | |
| "Now he went past, | 231 |
| "He made the things food, | 232 |
| "Štanŋiya." | 233 |
| (E) [Final theme] | |
| Soon she is telling the myth, | 234 |
| now she will say, | 235 |
| "All the things that were made good, | 236 |
| "It is those that feed us. | 237 |
| "But these bad things that are not food, | 238 |
| "those do not feed us." | 239 |

Notes

5: Jacobs notes parenthetically '(flat like buttons)'. The same camas figures significantly in the myth of Tongue (Jacobs 1959: 370). Jacobs comments (1958, n. 64): 'Spier and Sapir (*Wishram Ethnography*, p. 162) refer to this root as a large wild onion, and on the next page describe it as a flat bulb of a plant with small grayish flowers.' The comment confuses two stems, -ŋláuwaitk 'wild onion' (p. 162) and -kálakia (p. 163).

6: I follow Jacobs in translating the first occurrence of -kim in each stanza as 'spoke', although other occurrences are translated 'said'. 'spoke' (suggesting 'spoke up') seems apt for the initiating speech act of each scene.

-kim is intransitive and can have the sense of speaking broadcast; it is the root of the term for a 'crier' or 'announcer'. Here it would seem to have the sense of announcing to the world.

8: 'breath', equivalent to 'spirit, life'.

9: Capitalized 'Starvation', because the idiom is in fact wa- (feminine singular prefix)-Starvation immediate past-she-them-kill. The pattern is found also with 'Hunger', Wa-lu (see lines 127, 140). Cf. the unidentified transitive feminine agent g-/k- discussed in regard to lines 119 et al.

10: The omission of the name of the announcer here and throughout part I is probably because Mrs. Howard was not sure what name to use. Jacobs identifies the announcer in parentheses at line 6: "It (this camas) said (to a fish person, maybe Salmon, which also appears at the same time of year)..." (1958: 75). The information that the addressee is a fish person must have come from Mrs. Howard. Jacobs eschews any cross-reference to Kathlamet materials in the volumes of texts from Mrs. Howard. And had he identified this addressee with the protagonist of Cultee's myth, he would

have simply said 'Salmon', adding a reference note to give his reason. (Cf. the reference note cited with line 5 above). Jacobs regularly provides two kinds of parenthetical information in these texts: substantive information that must derive from Mrs. Howard in the course of going over the dictation for translation, and clarifying words, supplying referents for pronouns and occasional amplifications (e.g., a copula in a nominal sentence). Thus line 10 is printed as 'He (Salmon) said'. Mrs. Howard probably provided all the parenthetical information quoted above; 'maybe' is her idiom, not that of Jacobs.

In sum, the reservation at this point is as to which fish person it is. That it is a fish person is taken to be the case. Coyote is not in question. Salmon is the only specific suggestion. In confirmation, note Jacobs' third parenthetical clarification when Mrs. Howard turns to recollection of her sources at lines 202-4 (1958: 79, paragraph 21): 'My mother's mother would say, "Coyote (the Coyote named *Štan̄kiya*) did (named creatures) like that (not Salmon as indicated), to absolutely everything we eat here."

11.14: Jacobs translates 'person' when the stem occurs in the form *-tgr̄at̄ilx* in the announcer's question, as in line 11 here, and lines 71, 80, 194. (Also in line 62). He translates 'poor fellow' or 'poor thing' when it occurs in the form *-gwá:t̄ilx* in the culminating pronouncement (lines 14, 27, 42, 73, 82, 95, 105, 118, 153, 181, 194). The stem can have the meaning of '(mere) person' in ordinary speech, hence someone 'poor', but the structure of the discourse rules this out. Jacobs himself shows awareness of a different force (1960: 60): 'I am uncertain whether the denotation is specifically 'pitiable' or 'person-to-be-pitied because he will be eaten and used', or whether the comment implies essentially gratitude, or merely hails him so that the apt translation would be 'good fellow' or 'generous fellow!'

55

The status of the thing as a person at all is initially in question each time, then its nature as a definite and known kind of person. The announcer's use of *-gwá:t̄ilx* is an ontological affirmation. As a number of myths show, to be eaten and used is not to be pitiable, but a reward in the terms of the culture Jacobs indicates this himself a few lines later on the page just cited (1960: 60): 'Foods wished to become people even as people wished for foods'. The participants in the cultural world, Indian and others, are persons all. In these pronouncements the context of the word is not a matter of social hierarchy but of ontology. (Cf. A. I. Hallowell's analysis of Ojibwa ontology (1960)). I translate the term as 'person' in both contexts. Cf. note to line 23 and discussion in the text.

18: Literally, 'his' plus a nominalization of the stem 'to see' followed by 'he-has-become'. Jacobs translates variously: 'It is (I am) visible now here' (18); 'She is (I am visible) now' (35); 'Now I am visible' (49); 'It is is visible now (I am visible)' (68); 'He has become (I am now) visible' (77); 'He is (I am) visible (about April)' (88); 'He is (I am) to be seen now' (101); 'He is (I am) visible' (111); 'He is to be seen' (123); 'He is to be seen' (135); 'He is to be seen' (147); 'It is visible' (160); 'It is visible' (174); 'He is visible' (189).

If the intention had been to express 'I am visible, my seeing', that could easily have been done (*i-ĭ-ŋikl*). If the expression referred to each of the foods in turn in the third person, it would vary with their gender and be feminine in the case of the three camas, female grouse, trout (*-ga-*), and show concord with a dual prefix in the case of eel (*-šda-*), rather than be constantly masculine (*-ya-*). Evidently the expression does not identify the one speaking, but the one addressed, the leader of those who encounter the foods. The sense could be either 'he can be/is seen' (by the food), or 'he

56

can/does see it' ('his seeing by others' or 'of others'). The former is by far the most likely, and addition of the continuative suffix -im makes the expression refer to 'his appearance' (see 40). Either in any case implies the other, Chinookan being pervaded by mutual relationships between two poles (cf. Hymes 1975). One might render the expression 'He can be seen', or better, I think, with the phrase used sometimes by Jacobs, 'He is to be seen'.

23: ʔam 'who, what', indefinite, as distinct from ʕam, 'who', definite and only in regard to persons. The foods are sometimes referred to as a person before being fully identified, but that is always with the indefinite gender marked by ʔ-. A full sequence develops to a close in which the leader typically announces three things: that the food is a person (assigned a male or female identity through gender), its name (containing gender marking), and its mode of use. This is in keeping with the fact that the leader makes things good, not in the sense of bringing them into existence, but in the sense of performing an act that confirms their natures. Like a creator shaping a world from material that already exists, the leader recognizes the properties that roots, birds, and fish already have, once they are described to him. In announcing their personhood, he confers or confirms their status as participants in the mutual reciprocity and maintenance of the world. (cf. note to lines 11, 14)

24: qa 'what, how', interrogative of manner.

39: Literally, 'what its-seeing' with continuative -im of steady state or process.

45, 47: The verbs in these lines specify the ways of cooking that are indicated in the parentheses.

60: The tense is aorist, immediate past continuing into the present.

You (have just) put her down your mouth, you (have just) vomited'.

65(a): Jacobs reports (1958, n. 65) that 'Mrs. Howard never recalled the name of this emetic root.'

65(b): In the culminating announcement all of the edible plants (1-vi) begin with a statement as to status as Person. (I take the remark 'he just says so' in iv (58) to be a negation of 'He speaks the truth' (cf. ii (28) and thus a part of the person component). Five (ABCEF) have altogether the order Person, Name, Use. Thus it may be structurally significant here that the one case in which the description of use precedes the name (iv), is something not eaten. But it may also be that the position for a name is withheld in hopes of remembering it.

Notice that among the birds, two of the three (vii, ix) have the order that the plants do, while Female Grouse (viii) again has the order Person, Use, Name. This order, inverting that for Name and Use found with plants, is the constant order for all six fish (x-xv), although person element is missing (xi, xiii) or not clearly present (x) in three of them.

72: Jacobs records q-ʔ-u-ʔqʔ 'she-it-longs (makes long)' (cf. the constructions with Starvation and Hunger in the note to line 9). This is possible, in that the initial q- could be the impersonal transitive marker, but it is far more likely that the initial element is the third person feminine transitive marker k-/g- found in the Starvation and Hunger constructions.

Jacobs writes q- the first three times this construction occurs (72, 117, 128), but then k- (141 165). It is likely that the later recordings represent more accurate perception. Again, g-y-u-qbayʔ 'she-it-makes big (with augmentative qb- for unmarked ʔ)' occurs in line 128 and it is impossible to imagine Jacobs mistaking q- as g-. Nor indeed does the impersonal marker q- ever enter into voiceless-voiced alternation. Cf. note to lines 210, 229.

75: A third element, describing use, evidently is missing here. The last line, 'He speaks the truth', is part of the first component in regard to Cat-ear camas (28), and also, in its negation, in regard to the medicine (56) and Mudfish (130). Thus its occurrence last here seems out of place and a substitution for failure to remember what to say about use.

86: Jacobs reports (1958, n. 66) that the Clackamas did not make these hard cakes of mashed boiled carrots, which had to be soaked in water before eating, but obtained them from Chinookans upriver. Thus the unstated location of perceiving this kind of wild carrot probably is not in Clackamas territory, but up the Columbia also. This strongly suggests that this version of the myth derives from one in which the sequence of foods involved a sequence of travel. Upriver, however, the name (cf. *id-* 'inxt in Sapir, *Wishram Texts* 78:6 and n. 1) has a different reference: This is an Indian stew made of two roots (*a-dwaq* 'wild carrot' and *a-mumal* 'wild potato') to which dried fish was sometimes added."

88: Note the parenthesis at the end of the printed translation of this line (Jacob s 1958: 77): 'He is (I am) visible (about April).'

115-116: Jacobs (1958, n. 67) reports of the verb in the first line: 'This word has the same meaning, 'it is standing', as the following word. Mrs. Howard indicated her preference for the second of the two.' In fact, the root *-nxa* has the sense 'to stretch, extend', and only the root in the second line, *-tx-*, has the sense 'to stand'.

119: Jacobs (1958, n. 68) reports that 'Mrs. Howard then said that for 'quail' her grandmother said *idálxg-l*. Her mother-in-law said *idsúxwawala* (the term used in Wasco).'

154: Jacobs (1958, n. 69) comments at this point: 'I deduce that by the time Mrs. Howard got this far in each successive paragraph, she

anticipated consciously the gender prefix to be used for the food she was about to name [*a-* feminine, *i-* masculine]. Hence the inconsistent employment and translation of 'he' and 'she'."

(a) There is in fact no inconsistency 'this far' within a scene--that is, with in the concluding turn at talk, pronouncement, in the correlation in both Clackamas and English of 'he' or 'she' on the term 'person' or 'food' with the corresponding gender prefix on a name that follows. There is some anticipatory inconsistency of translation in the preceding turn at talk, that of the one who reports the appearance of the plant, bird or fish. In the case of the second grouse (viii) the report on appearance is 'same again'. In the case of eels (xiii), whose gender-number prefix is dual, the report of appearance uses a plural person-marker prefix to refer to them. In all the other thirteen cases the person-marked prefix used to refer to the being in question is the indefinite singular (*ʔ-*, *ʔa-*). There is no pronominal translation in (ii), and '(He is)' appears to be supplied by Jacobs in (v). In the eleven cases in which there is a pronominal translation it is 'it' in only one (x). Here the use of 'it' may be in anticipation of the outcome that Mudfish's claim to be a food for the people will be denied, no status as a person granted. The translation is 'his' in (xii), although the gender and name in the pronouncement to follow is feminine. That is perhaps because the fish are usually masculine. In the nine remaining cases, a large majority of the eleven in which a pronominal translation of the indefinite prefix is given, it is gendered in translation, and the gender anticipates the gender to be marked in the pronouncement: 'she', 'her', 'her' and 'she' in (i, iii, iv); 'he', 'he', 'his', 'his', 'he' and 'his', 'he' in (vi, vii, ix, xi, xiv, xv).

It seems likely that it was this phenomenon which Jacobs had in mind in his note, and that in typing the texts for publication (they were printed from

his typing) the footnote number was simply inappropriately placed.

(b) There is to be sure a phenomenon of inconsistency in pronominal translation at the beginning of scenes, one addressed in part in notes to lines 11 and 14. In (iii) the printed translation is 'She is (I am) visible (now)'; the name at the end will be feminine in gender, but the term translated at the outset as 'she' is the masculine possessive prefix. Similarly, in (iv) the printed translation is 'Now I am visible', and the being at the end will be feminine, but the Clackamas word at the outset again has the masculine prefix. The scene (xii) to which Jacobs appends his note 69 accurately translates 'he is' at the outset, although the eventual name ('grouse', 'trout') is feminine. But the expression 'got this far' in Jacobs' note rules out reference to these beginning lines. If the use of 'she' in translation at the outset of (iii), or 'I am' at the outset of (iv), instead of 'he', is due to Mrs. Howard, Jacobs does not tell us. Mrs. Howard may have been uncertain of perspective and interpretation herself early on. In the first scene Button-camas (i) does not have 'he is to be seen' at all; that, however, may indicate that the camas, whose arrival has just been stated, is brought on the scene with status equal, both temporally and culturally, to that of the announcer. The second scene (ii) has 'It is' and with (v) the printed translation settles on use of 'It is' (ii, v, vi, xiii, xiv) or 'He is' (vii, viii, ix, x, xi, xii, xv). The use of 'It' may reflect the uncertain, indefinite identity of the announcer.

In Cultee's tellings each root initially greets Salmon with third person expressions, 'At last my brother's son does arrive, / the one with maggots in his buttocks', before turning to 'I' and 'thine'. The 'he' and 'it' on which Mrs. Howard settles are parallel.

In sum, the initial variation in pronominal translation is most likely due to Mrs. Howard. We seem to see Mrs. Howard initially unsure in

translation of the relationship between participants and words within the speech event, of the initial deictic perspective, one might say, but settling, in translation at least, on one consistent with Cultee's.

(c) There remains one further puzzle, a revealing one. After the first root, with which 'to be seen' does not occur, all the roots (ii-vi) and all the birds (vii-ix) have a parenthetic '(I am)' in the printed translation (e.g., as in the note to line 88 above). None of the fish (x-xv) do. The invariance throughout the roots and birds, alongside variation in the English translation, suggests the hand of the editor, Jacobs. But why then stop? Why not continue throughout the rest of the sequence with the fish? If Jacobs had himself decided that the perspective of the myth is that of the appearance of the roots, birds and fish (appearance in a double sense, generic (becoming visible) and specific (looking like what?)), there is no apparent reason for him not to have continued inserting '(I am)'.

Could it be that Mrs. Howard took the fish as not being seen, because in the water? But they must be seen in order to be described in the turn at talk that follows. The additional line at the beginning of the set of fish, 'Now again soon they are (there)' probably refers to the being, existence of the fish in the water.

There is an additional bit of information. With the male grouse the statement 'He is to be seen' is followed in the translation by the parenthetic remark '(about April)' (line 88). The remark evidently derives from Mrs. Howard. Her first stanza has framed the myth in terms of the time at which things in the ground arrive. Following the roots, male grouse is the first bird, and a reference to its appearance would be parallel. Again, the first fish is Mudfish, and as just said above, the initial line can be taken to refer to their appearance ('being there'). As Mrs. Howard recalls further

what her mother's mother said about Coyote and berries, she concludes with lines about arrival that are very much like those with which the series of roots begins: 'Things will ripen, the berries/ Now she will tell me at that time...' (229-230).

All this indicates a pervasive orientation to the arrival of the several kinds of foods. The stimulus for the insertions of '(I am)' probably thus comes from Mrs. Howard. The regularity of the insertion throughout scenes (ii-ix), followed by the regularity of complete absence, may be due to Mrs. Howard ceasing to indicate in the course of the translation that for her the perspective was that of the food or would-be food. Perhaps the unceasing march of the formulaic lines themselves affected her. As we have seen, she settled on third person pronouns to render the lines, past scene (iv) in which 'Now I am' is given. Perhaps by scene (x) and the advent of the series of fish, the lines themselves have convinced her of their perspective, or discouraged her from insisting on her own.

All this underscores the status of the opening lines of each scene as indeed, for Mrs. Howard, formulaic lines, perhaps incompletely recalled.

It underscores the presence of two perspectives in the narration itself. In the dominant perspective the arrivals that frame the story are those of foods. But remembered words recall a perspective in which the arrivals are those of someone else.

187-8: The doubling of pronouns creates two lines instead of the usual one at the outset of the scene. In addition, the verb is not marked with the usual remote past prefix, *ga-* and the indefinite person marker *ʔ-*, but with the generic past prefix *ni-* and masculine singular *i-*. The generic past prefix has a generalizing quality; note its use in lines 200, 202, 203, 205 in what follows. There seems to be particularly a parallel to its use in 203, 'Coyote like-that he-did (in relation to himself)', where the

scope is the entire myth. This suggests a perhaps unconscious sense in line 188 that the scope of the entire myth is involved with the actor of this scene. The unique use here of a definite gendered person-marker, rather than the indefinite hitherto used invariably, further indicates anticipation of the identity that is to constitute a narrative crux. We seem to see the recognition emerge with the emergence of a second line. Not 'Soon now someone(ʔ)-other remote past-someone(ʔ)-said' in one line, but 'Soon now someone other / he-too (*y-áxʔax*) generic past-he (i)-said'

193: In this culminating scene we find the one speaking reported in the expression 'it is a good person' ('He is a good person' in the printed translation). The report, of course, has the role of a description of appearance. And in fact the stem in question is used not only of conduct, but also of appearance. To say that a man or woman is 'good-looking', 'handsome' or 'beautiful', one uses this term. Hence the translation here 'A good-looking person'. Cf. line 152, where Jacobs did render *i-ʔukdi i-ʔá-gigliw* as 'He is good-looking'.

194: The printed text shows only a single turn at talk for lines 193-6. The general structure of the interaction shows 193 to be the description offered in response to the query of 192, and 194-6 to be the announcer's response to that description. The particle of recognition and assent with which 194 begins is regularly the beginning of a turn at talk in this text. For *â* as the beginning of the reported description, and *âw* as the beginning of the pronouncement, cf. lines 26 : 27 (ii), 41 : 42 (iii), 81 : 82 (vi), 94 : 95 (vii), 141 : 142 (xi).

201: Cf. the closing words of Mrs. Howard's narration of 'Seal and her younger brother lived there', discussed in relation to closings in general in Hymes 1981: 330-1. The presence of the pronoun *yáymayx* 'that-only'

expresses specific forgetting, lack of completeness. Without the pronoun, the rest of the phrase would indicate only that the actors may have other adventures in a myth world that is open beyond any one person's knowledge.

204, 207, 237, 239: the word in 204, 237, 239 is *d-l(x)-xi-lax* 'they-us (inclusive)-in relation to-is eaten, feeds'. In 207 it is *q-u-xi-lax* 'impersonal transitive', i. e., 'it is eaten, feeds', or in this context, '(they are) good to-be-eaten'. The stem *-ixalm* used in the nouns for 'it, he or she is a food' also is in basis a verb 'to eat, eating', and commonly translated by Jacobs in this text as 'edible'. I have rendered it always as 'food', and the first construction always with 'eat', thus keeping the two distinct. (Jacobs gives the first as 'our foods' in 237, as 'we eat' in 239).

205-7: The printed text translates 'On the other hand my mother-in-law would say, /I do not recall/ who made the things that were good to eat here.' If the Clackamas indicated 'who', it would have a singular pronoun initial to the verb (*ʔ-* or *l-*) followed by *ʔan* or *ʂan* (indefinite or definite). In fact the Clackamas verb has initial *d-* followed by *ʔan*. The construction is (not) 'they-I-in relation to myself-recall what/thing those past-he-them-make they-good eaten'. In Clackamas at least the mother-in-law is not disclaiming knowledge of the announcer, but of the proper list of foods.

208, 226: 'will' reflects the use of the future text in Clackamas. This future probably is a 'perfective' future of certainty, as in Wasco (cf. Hymes 1975).

210, 229: *k-d-u-ʔanxa-t* 'she-them-weave?-s'. In Kathlamet *-k'anxa-ti* is the noun-stem for 'gill net', and in Wasco the stem for 'weaving material'. It is a nominalization by *-k'a-* of the root *-nxa* 'to

stretch, extend' (cf. note to lines 117-8). As a generic term for berries, it is attested only here. Apart from a term or two, for 'wild animal' and 'quadruped', the Chinookan practice is to let the chief instance of a category, the category par excellence, stand for the set, as in the use of 'eagle' for 'bird' and of 'Chinookan salmon' for 'fish'. Perhaps this Clackamas term, drawing attention to the uses of the plants apart from eating, highlights Coyote's accomplishment in making them available as well for food.

214ff: The printed text encloses 214-223 in a single set of quotation marks. The quoted speech seems actually to consist of lines 214-5. 'Now our Indian-people are near' is a frequent remark at the end of a myth (see note to line 215 just below). Lines 216-7 begin a distinct concern, a sequence that implies ripening (cf. 229): 'first..., now...' (strawberries do precede raspberries in Oregon). The sequence appears to lead into its summing up by 'all those things' in line 224. These ten lines (216-225) are a sketch of the myth in question here, an expansion of the gloss in lines 210-2 (cf. Jefferson 1985; here not only is a gloss followed by a fuller account, but the fuller account followed by another gloss (231-233)).

215: Notice that the noun for (Indian) people, the people proper who are to enter and possess the land, is not 'the people', 'my people', or 'our people' in exclusive form (*nʂa-*), but 'our people' (*lʔa-*) in a form that includes those spoken to, the berries. A pronominal expression of the conception of participant maintenance. The implication is that it is time for the participants in the world to come to take the form they are to have in it. Cf. Jacobs 1960, where this recurrent expression is the title of a book commenting upon most of Mrs. Howard's narratives, including this one (pp. 58-64).

216, 221, 223: The inclusion of 'wild' in the English implies recognition of

the cultivated strawberries introduced by whites. Cf. 'wild carrot' (v. vi).

224: *k-ááqí* 'like that' is taken as going with *kánawí dán* 'all things', as in line 197 ('all things like that in the water'), rather than with the verb. (Not, that is, 'they told him like that').

227: Jacobs inserts 'entire' where I insert '(whole)'. Neither gloss is an expansion of the meaning, but a way of expressing in English the sense of the Chinookan expression 'to make (-x-) a myth'. Mrs. Howard's remarks in lines 227-8, and elsewhere, indicate that 'to make a myth' is to make (tell) a myth completely. Otherwise it is not, as such, 'made'.

228: The form of the negative particle here is emphatic *néšqí* as distinct from *níšqí* in line 198.

THE STORY OF BAX^wBAK^wALANUSIWA

as Told by

Kitlope Elder Gordon Robertson

Neville J. Lincoln, Simon Fraser University

John C. Rath, Heiltsuk Cultural Education Centre

Evelyn Windsor, Heiltsuk Cultural Education Centre

I. INTRODUCTION

This text presentation serves three goals: (1) to open to inspection the main one of the precious few Haisla texts we have recorded; (2) to illustrate the function of the first and second sentential connective moods in Haisla (see the editorial notes to follow); (3) to support Franz Boas' thesis that, at least in the North Wakashan speaking area, there was a stock of relatively well-defined mythical themes but that it varied from one local group to another which themes combined into a story and in which order (Boas 1932: ix-x). In the present story, three themes are combined which occur in separate stories among the Oowekeno, namely (a) persecution by Bax^wbak^walanusiwa, (b) the Blind Archer, (c) creating salmon out of alder wood (Walkus 1982:37-38, 47ff, 100ff, 159-160).

The text, in Haisla Wakashan, was tape-recorded in 1983 at the Vancouver residence of the narrator, Mr. Gordon Robertson. Although living off-reserve most of the time, Mr. Robertson is one of the main cultural and linguistic resource people for the Haisla-speaking area. He grew up in the remote village of Kitlope at the head of Gardner Canal, not far from the Heiltsuk Wakashan and Bella Coola Salishan speaking areas. The text is Mr. Robertson's response to our specific request for information on Bax^wbak^walanusiwa, an entity the nature of which has always remained as intriguing as the etymology of its name (see Hilton and Rath 1982:98-105). Specifically, the elicitation procedure was to read to Mr. Robertson, in Oowekyala language, the myth of this entity as told by the late Oowekeno elder Simon Walkus Sr. Mr. Robertson and Walkus used to know each other; they fished together. After listening to the text, Mr. Robertson said "Yes, that is their story. Ours is different" and remained in thought for a while. Then he began telling the story that follows. His text was transcribed in 1983 and checked twice line by line and word by word with him.