Alan Dundes wrote *The Morphology of North American Indian Folktales* to combat the notion that Indian narratives have no perceivable structure. As a corrective to the view that episodes in a story are combined at the whim of the storyteller, Dundes proposed the idea that plots of most stories could be analyzed in terms of three “motif sequence” which could occur singly or in combination: Lack/Lack Liquidated, Task/Task Accomplished, and Interdiction/Violation/Consequence/Attempted Escape. What had hidden these sequences from the eyes of his predecessors, he felt, was that in their discussions of story patterns they could not separate content from form. Content is infinitely variable; form is not. Dundes’ proposed formal unit, the motifeme, is like Propp’s “function” in that it is a statement of the role a given episode plays in a plot, and the slots for actor, action, setting and so on can be filled in a variety of ways. The term “motifeme” protests against the confusing and inconsistent use by other critics of such terms as incident, episode, element, theme and motif to define the building blocks of narrative, a confusion still obtaining twenty years after the publication of Dundes’ book.

For those of us accustomed to thinking of narratives as having a beginning, a middle and an end — or, in terms more recent than Aristotle’s, a situation, a turning point (this being either an action or the establishment of a motivation for an action) and a new status quo — it is unsettling to see a morphological model composed of only two parts, such as Lack/Lack Liquidated. Is Lack Liquidated the action by which the Lack is redeemed or the situation that obtains afterwards, or some combination of the two?

*People on the Columbia had no eyes or mouths. They ate by smelling the sturgeon. Coyote opened their eyes and mouths.*

This is the whole of Sample Text I, analyzed by Dundes as Lack/Lack Liquidated (Dundes 1964:12). Yet it is possible here to see Lack/Lack Liquidated as the frame for a story, the middle part of which might be Task/Task Accomplished. In this model (L/T/TA/LL) T is the motivation; TA is the action by which the Lack is remitted; and Lack Liquidated is the new status quo. (T is the unstated “They wanted to eat”; TA is “Coyote opened their eyes and mouths; and LL is the unstated “They could now eat.”) Dundes freely admits that some elements of a motifeme sequence can be considered present though suppressed. He discusses the Star Husband story in terms of the sequence Interdiction/Violation, though no one in the story ever tells the girls not to make fun of the stars (1964:86–89).

There is another way in which Sample Text I and its analysis fail to satisfy: if you were to ask someone to tell you a story and she responded with Sample Text I, you would feel cheated, because it is not a story. It has no literary values at all. It is only a plot outline. If Sample Text I provides Dundes with enough material for an analysis, then his analysis is not of a story, but only of a plot. Dundes himself acknowledges this by referring to his motifeme sequences as “plot structures.”

Obviously, there is more to a story than its plot. There are character, setting and theme; such narrative colors as irony, sarcasm, caricature, pathos, burlesque, suspense, ambiguity, etc.; the personal style of the narrator; devices such as parallelism, rhyme, etc. All of these Dundes would term non-structural elements. But since we often define the form of a piece by reference to its color — as a burlesque, a tragedy, a suspense story — we have to contend that though these elements may be non-structural, they certainly are not non-formal. A morphology should therefore include them.

If narrative colors are non-structural but are formal, then there must be a difference between form and structure. Dundes uses these terms almost interchangeably, preferring “structure” when he is discussing motifsic analysis and reverting to “form” when distinguishing between form and content (1964:67). If a morphological analysis is an analysis of form and form is something distinct from content, then a morphological analysis should not turn out to be an abstraction of content. Yet it seems to me that Lack/Lack Liquidated and the rest are, at however abstract a level, ultimately brief references to content.

Dundes resists the idea that there are stories which seem to be made up of two sub-tales between which the relationship is not reducible to a motifeme sequence. There are no examples of such refractory narratives in his study, and yet such narratives do exist. One such is the story that Susie Sampson Peter tells that begins:

J. ti shu'asalill i al ti'is' tseledl'.

These royal people lived at Utsaladdy.2

The story goes on to say that Bluejay is a chatterbox; Magpie warns her not to be so noisy because when the Takla warriors come they will find her and enslave her. Bluejay claims that she can scare the warriors off by flying up into a tree and barking like a dog. When the warriors arrive, this is what she does, saving her people from enslavement. Magpie apologizes, and Bluejay sings her new spirit power song: “Woof, woof, woof!” The story continues. Bobot, Magpie’s grandson, now makes himself look as if he is covered in sores. The people despise him. He makes the daughter of an important man pregnant by supernatural means, and the villagers move away, leaving him, the woman and the child to starve. Magpie manages to leave some food behind for them. It turns out that Bobot has a spirit power that enables him to get large quantities of game. Later, when the villagers are starving, he saves their lives.

This story is called by Vi Hilbert, its transcriber and translator, “Grandchildren of Magpie.” To an earlier version she gave the title “Nobility at Utsaladdy,” echoing a note made by her collector, Leon McAliff, in his catalogue of tape recordings. “Grandchildren of Magpie” runs about 1300 lines, of which 69 have to do with the episode of Bluejay and the warriors. Yet, years ago, when Vi Hilbert asked Susie Sampson Peter, “What do you call this story? Mrs. Peter replied, “The Bluejay Story,” of course.” The conclusion to be drawn here is that Mrs. Peter felt that the short episode informed the narrative as a whole. Many people who read the story — or hear it — only once come away with the impression that Bluejay plays no further part in it after she frightens the warriors. In fact, she does make one more appearance, when the people of Utsaladdy decide to abandon Bobot and his family:

230. 'asab tal'is' adad.

Magpie was come for.

231. 'asab tal'is' kaway.

Bluejay was come for.

232. su'uk i quaw.

Raven loaded his canoes.

233. tsi' i hata' ti su'ux'is'.

There he goes first.

239. sq'axa' tal'is' kaway.

Bluejay flew now.
235. Talutax swatix' ted.
   She put herself in a tree.
236. "Tu tu' Talcot Ted smatix' ted.
   "Oh, I'll put myself up in a tree.
237. tu'sal k' 1 ku'daf', tu'sal.
   That's where I will be."
238. qileb tal'sa' tadad.
   Magpie loaded her canoe.

story goes on to say how Magpie, who is unhappy at leaving her grandson, decides to est. Her grandson persuades her to go in order to save her life, but she has a chance to leave food and firestones for him.

The sudden irruption of Bluejay into the story and up into the tree in a signal. We remember that her spirit power is strong when she is up in a tree. (There may be a pun here: Talun may recall Talun, to go on a spirit power quest.) We see by the repetitious speech in 235-237 that she is still the same chatterbox that she was when she was despised the way Bobcat is now despised. We note that Magpie is identified with her old friend (parallel structure of lines 230-231) but also in part identified with the disappointing majority of villagers (parallel structure of lines 232 and 238). Under the birds-eye view of Bluejay, however, Magpie's strength grows until she can defy Raven and the rest and do right by her grandson, as she has previously done right by Bluejay. Quite simply, Bluejay's reappearance here is a thematic marker designed to recall for us at just this point the episode with which the story began.

A careful look at the beginning of that episode reveals Mrs. Peter's intentions for it.

1. habu'.
   (signal that a story is beginning)
2. habu' k'al six' g'al 'astalil ti dabat'sa'.
   Indeed, it seems people lived there who belonged to royalty.
3. ti soka' 'astalil ti tiil 'asaladi'.
   Royalty lived at Utsaladdy.
4. 'astalil ti'sa' soka'.
   Royalty lived there.
5. 'astalil ti'sa' pahab.
   Bobcat lived there.
6. 'astalil ti'sa' kekay.
   Bluejay lived there.
7. 'ibao' 'a tal'sa' adad ti'pahab.
   Bobcat was the grandson of Magpie.
8. 'ibao'.
   Her grandson.
9. 'a' g' al tus'ubedi' ti'pahab.
   There was Bobcat and he was a hunter.

10. lu'uk' k' lu'uk' 3'uk'.
    He would hunt, he would hunt.
11. g' a'l lu'uk' sada' ted tal'sa' kekay.
    And Bluejay would talk.
12. lu'uk' sada' Ted, lu'uk' sada' Ted.
    She would talk, she would talk.

Lines 2-3 state three times that the people who live at Utsaladdy are of high status and have been for generations. The variation of word order in these lines is probably not just ornamental but conveys some indication of the storyteller's attitude. Line 4, the last line of this group, is also the first line of the next group of three lines which share a pattern. In this group, the pattern parallels with one word variable. In order to construct this parallelism, Mrs. Peter has changed the ti ska' of lines 2 and 3 to ti ska' in line 4, a closing-in of focus from "the" to "this." The parallel structure of lines 4-6 emphasizes for us the fact that both Bobcat and Bluejay are of high rank and that they are of equal rank with each other. Lines 7 and 8 introduce Magpie in her relation to Bobcat. Lines 9-12 return to Bluejay and Bobcat; and, while the parallelism is not perfect, we are aware of an A-B, A-B pattern: A consists of k' al plus apocope (lu', lu') plus hallmark action of subject (not parallel parts of speech in this case) plus t(g)'a' plus name; B consists of lu' plus hallmark verb, lu' plus hallmark verb. These lines equate hunting and talking. At first, this seems an unlikely equation, and I suspect these lines made Mrs. Peter's audience smile. But later on, we realize that successful hunting and successful vocalism are the manifestations of the spirit powers of Bobcat and Bluejay. Lines 13 ff. revert to the subject of lines 7 and 8 -- Magpie, this time in relation to her friend, Bluejay.

It seems clear that the patterning in lines 1-12 has as its purpose the signalling to us that our understanding of Bluejay's story is to serve as a guide to our interpretation of Bobcat's; Bluejay's story is a prologue to Bobcat's. There is no structural (plot expression of the relationship between the two stories; it is not reducible to a metadiscourse sequence. The function of Bluejay's story is conveyed by formal means: the patterning of the first lines; the recurrence of the word g' al (to go from a multistress state into activity, whether it be fly away, jump up, running off) at key points in the story when people are manifesting their spirit powers or receiving the benefits of others' spirit powers; the strategic reappearance of Bluejay in Bobcat's story; and the similar endings of both stories, when Bluejay and Bobcat sing burlesque spirit songs.

From this one example, we may abstract a definition of "prologue," though with the understanding that there may be other types. A prologue is any narrative which comes before the main narrative in a story. The prologue's protagonist is a member of an older generation than the one to which the protagonist of the main story belongs. The situations of both narratives are related at an abstract level (a person despised by the rest of the villagers turns out to have spirit power which enables her to be of benefit to the very people who despised her). There is no plot link between the prologue and the main story. Characters who are major in the prologue are minor in the main story, and vice versa. Treatment of these is burlesque in the prologue, serious in the main story. The thematic relation between prologue and main story is conveyed by formal and stylistic means. Can this definition in any way be said to be a contribution toward the morphology of prologue? In Dundes' terms, no. Our definition concerns itself wholly with function and relationship, which Dundes holds are separate from morphology.

Bluejay's story and Bobcat's are detachable from one another; each can stand on its own. Is there any sense in which Bluejay's story can be said to add something to the main story which the main story would lack altogether without a prologue? By the time Bobcat is pretending to be covered in sores, we know that he lives among people whose pretensions lead them to despise the foolish and unfortunate. His reaction to this social climate,
Indeed, may be unstated motivation for Bobcat's pretense. Further, the prologue provides a context for Magpie's enlightened behavior--the villagers abandon Bobcat. With the prologue behind her, she is a three-dimensional character in the main story, not just a walk-on. Characterization, then, seems to be a task carried out for the main story by the prologue. If we wish to describe the form of "Grandchildren of Magpie," it seems to be that we will have to talk about it as a whole, as parts different in size and opposite in tone, with the larger a thematic mirror of the smaller.

Using the definition of prologue above as a basis, we can posit a definition of what an epilogue might be like. We might expect an epilogue to concentrate on the adventures of characters in the next generation younger to that of the characters in the main story. We would expect the same themes to be handled in both narratives, but in different tones. There would be no plot connection between the two narratives, but there would be formal signals of a thematic connection. Since it comes after the main story, we cannot expect the epilogue to provide characterization in the story as a whole; perhaps its contribution will be some refinement of them. Although the two examples I am about to discuss do not conform exactly to this abstract, I think the concept of "epilogue" satisfactorily accounts for the presence of these episodes in the stories in which they are found.

Victoria Howard's "Fire and His Son's Son" tells how one of Fire's grandson's two wives deserts her husband and baby boy and returns to the village in which her brother is headman. Fire's grandson follows her and is taken prisoner by the brother; the pursued wife denies that she was ever married, and there is a hint that she is too fond of her brother. Meanwhile, Fire's grandson's two boys (one by each wife) grow up. To convey this information, Mrs. Howard uses a familiar device, the hunting-growing up-finding out bridge passage. A boy gets his first weapon, kills a small animal and brings it home. As he grows up, he gets larger weapons and brings home larger game. One day, he returns early or leaves late and overhears something; when he reaches a certain age, he is prohibited from hunting in a certain direction. These last two elements can occur in any order, and sometimes only one is present. As a result of what he has overheard and/or of the prohibition, the boy does something which symbolizes the main themes of the story: he keeps himself apart. As Mrs. Howard uses this stock device, the two boys bring home at first small things and so are gone all day. As their game gets larger, they arrive home earlier and finally see that their mother (in one case, step-mother) and grandfather have been lying. Finally, they find out the reason for the weeping: the captivity of their father. It is to be noted that the prohibition part of the sequence ("Do not hunt in that direction") is not used here at this time. The boys go into training in order to obtain spirit power, and when they are ready they set off to find their father. At the village, the younger boy's mother denies she has ever had a child. The boys defeat the brother, kill most of the villagers (including, inevitably, some relatives) and rescue their father.

But the story does not end here. It continues:

Now they lived there. He himself (Fire) did nothing. Only the youths hunted. After some time they said to their mother: [the other], "There are no more deer where we have been going (when we hunt)." "Indeed," she replied to them. "Do not go in that other direction." (Howard 1959/30 per Jacobs 1959/42)

The boys hunt in the proscribed direction, see two women who are in seclusion in a menstrual hut and also with them. The local villagers kill the youths. Their mother arrives and tells the villagers who the boys were. It turns out that one of the women in the menstrual hut was the younger brother's maternal aunt. The relatives of the younger brother take revenge on the other villagers. Finally, everyone is changed into an animal or a star.

The portion of the story that begins, "Now they lived there" is an epilogue. In this case, however, there is a connection with the main story that is reducible to a motifeme sequence: Interdiction/Violation/Consequence. The interdiction, never stated,
But when an epilogue introduces a new character, one who does not already live there, this method will not work. Students of Susie Sampson Peter's "Starchild" have commented on the difficulty. Mrs. Peter seems to have had in introducing the story of Mink into the narrative; they have also wondered why Mink's story was introduced.

Mink's story fits our definition of epilogue rather well; in fact, one of the ways of appreciating his role is to take note of Mink's playfulness of Mrs. Peter's fulfilling of the requirements of epilogue form. "Starchild" is the story of two young men who are (one rather indirectly) the sons of a powerful star. They live on earth, because one has been kidnapped as a baby and the other enslaved, they are not aware of their parentage and cannot assume their proper roles in the order of things. Their troubles have been brought about by their parents' marital difficulties. Just before Mink's entrance into the story, the two boys have come into their own, assuming the roles of sun and moon. The older brother has received the younger brother's assistance in making a marriage which is, in contrast to their mother's prudent, and he is preparing to take his wife away with him into the sky. The concerns of the main story have been paternity, marriage and status. The epilogue is a burlesque treatment of these themes. In contrast to the brothers, who seek to know their true paternity, Mink is an impostor when he claims to be Diaper Child's son. In contrast to the success of the brothers, who on repeated trips to the sky carefully adjust the expression of their powers until they are just right, Mink's attempt to play the sun result in partial and total eclipse. Instead of finding his place in the sky, Mink gets lost in the Milky Way. And precisely because Diaper Child has been the embodiment of prudence in marriage, it is to his wife that Mink expresses bogus surprise at not finding his "mother" at Diaper Child's house. Mrs. Peter prefaced her story of Mink with the statement that he always lies, so we are never in any doubt about the validity of his claims; the momentary discomfiture of Diaper Child's new wife, whose thoughts are expressed by the narrator, is comic.

The concept of epilogue form helps us to accept the legitimacy of Mink's story as part of "Starchild"; but, although it is an epilogue, it does not occur at the very end of the narrative. It occurs at the end of the plot, after all the problems surrounding paternity, marriage and status have been resolved, but of "Starchild" as a whole there is . . . to come the documentary portion, the list of names that the brothers give to places and peoples. Mink's story is actually an insertion into the summary narration of Starchild's preparations for his wedding journey into the sky:

525. k'wadat t'il'a' s'ay'wa's.
He took his wife.

526. k'wadatb 'a t'il'a' t'a'j 'a' t'a'k-wa'w. tadak'w assay'w.
His little blanket was taken; thus it is that t'il'a' wális 'a t'il shu'w'lab (x'ususax'w) 'a t'il shu'w'lab.
Mink's story is to his new wife.

527. xi'dak'w 'a t'il'a' 'a k'li' dax'cuts g'at lastiw'sa'w'ax'w.
When it comes to the time, as he said, then he warms his back.

528. wu'm t'spítik'w x'ajagat t'il'a' sswat'w'atul'k'm, rinnnnnnnnn
Diaper Child went lighting the world. . . .

529. x'ul buusá t'il'a' su'uy's g'at s'il t'il'a' bát'bá.b.
He had gone just four times when Mink arrived.

(Mink's story)

599. 'u'atšádab x'ul'a' cutáb t'il'a' bát'bá.b.
"Maybe he died," they said about Mink.
The first three lines of each of these episodes are speeches and constitute a scene; the second and third are summary narration. In Pheasant's story, a second group of three lines is initiated by hue 'Itbasam', and this line also marks the transition between scenes and summary narration in Raven's story. Like Pheasant, who addresses his wife, Pheasant repeats the word 'luba' six times, modifying it with 'kala' (worthless) to indicate lack of specific destination, when the milder 'kala' (only, merely) is more common. The vagueness and repetitiveness of Pheasant's speech indicate unease of mind, and the tone of his sentences (redundancy in 'Itbasam' and indication by Pheasant trudging around, not motion directed toward a goal) echoes the circularity of his thoughts. Indeed, the last sentence of the summary narration voices his thought, as though all his footsteps had been worries. It is very clear that in telling what he said and what he did, Mrs. LaMont's main agenda has been to depict Pheasant's state of mind. In going into the mountains, he is making himself open to whatever may present itself to him in his need; he is not hunting.

Raven's speech to his wife begins abruptly. It is syntactically muscular where Pheasant's is astrophic; it states a definite purpose where Pheasant's is vague. We notice Raven's emphatic 'osa (I myself), which replaces Pheasant's uncolored 'sad (I), and Raven's complete 'Itbasam (I'm going, which replaces the expective 'Itbasam (I'm going to go) of Pheasant. Raven's progress toward his destination is stated briefly; contrast 'Bluey' with line 5 of Pheasant's story. Raven is not a suppliant in the landscape; he has designs on it. So far, the correspondences between lines 1 through 5 of these two stories have been close and inverted, and the parallelism has been visible in the text as verbal, syntactical and proportional. What corresponds in Raven's story to Pheasant's thoughts about his hungry family (line 6) is not a thought of Raven's, instead, it is the picture of Pheasant's generosity with the food he has been given. Along with the textual parallels, it seems that Mrs. LaMont is managing a conceptual or allegorical system of corresponding ones. Because we have had parallelism both visible (audible) and conceptual in the first five lines of these episodes we expect that the sixth lines will also correspond. Where there is no visible correspondence, our experience of the form of the episodes so far leads us to look for conceptual parallelism (or its inversion). What does it mean that in place of Raven's thoughts, line 6 in his story gives us Pheasant's feasting? It means that Raven spares no thought for his family and so probably will not succeed in feeding his family as Pheasant has.

A much briefer survey of the other five episodes in the travel narratives will suffice to demonstrate that Mrs. LaMont carries this system of conceptual correspondences right through. In the second episode, Pheasant meets the hunters by chance. When he calls them, the dogs are not his, they ask him where he is from. He says, "I'm going tu'labay salat" twice and then mentions that he is worried about his children. When Pheasant denies that the elk is his, Mrs. LaMont points out that the hunters think well of him for this. They tell Pheasant to sit down nearby, as they are going to butcher the elk for him. Raven's story contrasts with this not just in outline, but in particular. Instead of wandering around, Raven goes straight to the hunters. Instead of having to ask him who he is (and thereby elicit his worries about his family), the hunters exclaim, "m'it" (Abai) when he approaches, because they know him of old (and he is not thinking about his family). In a line verbally parallel to the one in Pheasant's story, they ask him to call his dogs. When the dogs pay no attention to Raven, Mrs. LaMont enters the story to point out that Raven, unlike Pheasant, is a liar. When the hunters begin to butcher the elk, Raven claims he is his; they do not invite him to sit down, but in a line to be echoed later by Pheasant's children when they talk to the little Ravens, they tell him, "Ilooki!" (Get away) twice.

The fourth element in Pheasant's story begins with his profuse thanks to the hunters on behalf of his family. Raven's story, however, shows Raven busy gulping down all the scraps. As Mrs. LaMont tells how the hunters prepare the bundle of meat for Pheasant, she goes into some detail about how the cedar ropes were made. In other Shagit stories, a character's association with technical expertise means he is virtuous or spiritually

The mountain narratives consist of six episodes each: 1) announcement to one's wife of one's intention to travel; travelling; 2) the hunters' dogs; 3) whose game is it? 4) butchering and wrapping the game; 5) instructions and trip home; 6) arrival.

Each episode in Raven's trip is told in such a way as to answer the corresponding one in Pheasant's. There are variations in emphasis and pace between the two narratives, but Mrs. LaMont keeps a firm grip on the correspondences between individual elements.

Let us examine the first episodes of each trip in some detail to see how this works:

**Pheasant's trip**

1. huy 'Itbasam to ʔi'sa e'g'elalub. 1b. cun'acax ʔa'sa ʔa'g'mass; Now Pheasant took a walk. He said to his wife:
2. "tu'labay ʔkö, tu'labay, palaax ʔad tu'w tu'labay.
   "I am going to walk upland. I am just going for a walk without any special destination in mind."
3. tu'labay ḋa, tu'w ʔaxt xax'talat." I am going for a walk. I am going toward the mountains."
4. huy 'Itbasam to ʔa'g'malub. Pheasant now travelled.
5. 1'aa, 'Itbasam ʔax'ad. palaax tu'labay. Yes, he wandered aimlessly. He just wandered.
6. ʔa ʔa tu'atsegax ḋalaxa. They seem usually to be hungry.

**Raven's trip**

1. ti'labay ʔunati. Then he said:
2. "ti'labay taa 'osa ganeximam'ad ʔa'x ʔi, qa'q'axqay ʔa'x a'qaaOml. Would it not be too, Ganeximam'ad, who could find the hunters?
3. 'a kisax ḋa. I am going to climb up towards them, Qalaqalakרח.
4. "a ʔa'ma ḋa. I am going to travel."
5. huy 'Itbasax. Then he travelled.
6. ʔubaxa. He climbed.
7. ha'licutax ʔa'x ʔi'sa e'g'elalub tu'ubilax ʔad ʔa tu ʔi'sad [...]
Pheasant pleased himself as he generously gave food to his friends and relatives...
In the fifth element of his story, Pheasant is told not to look at his pack if he stops to rest. He thanks the hunters again. In Raven's story, when the hunters give him the meat, they tell him it is for his wife and children. Raven replies, "a'suam can" ("I am the hunter"). Pheasant has to rest several times and this way he has never looked at the pack. Raven looks the first time he stops to rest. When Pheasant gets home, the whole family unwraps the pack, and everyone eats. When Raven gets home, he sends his wife out to unwrap the pack. She reports that it is full of rotten wood, and he vomits.

Raven's story is intelligible as an inversion of Pheasant's. The contrasts are sharpened by presenting an element in summary narration in one story and in dramatic narration in the other. The comparable particulars are kept track of in almost call-and-replay fashion, despite the fact that the travel narratives are not told back and back, but with another part of the story intervening. Mrs. LaMont has taken pains to make the parallelism of the narratives the vehicle of the moral of the story. The other (subsidiary) portions of her story are not so carefully told, but this does not seem to lessen the impact of "Pheasant and Raven" as a whole. Apart from the parallel travel narratives, the story consists of a brief introduction of Pheasant, Raven and their families and two episodes in which the children of Raven try to trick Pheasant's children out of their food. There are three other Skagit versions of "Pheasant and Raven" among the stories collected by Sally Snyder in the early 1950's. At this writing, I have not been able to get permission to quote from these versions. But if I could quote from these, the point I would illustrate is this: each of these versions provides more detail and/or a more intelligible order of events for the subsidiary narrative, but none of them keeps track of the parallelism of the travel narratives the way Mrs. LaMont does. In these other versions, elements may be present in one travel narrative and lacking in the other, or the order of events may be interrupted. The result is that while Mrs. LaMont has drawn the moral of the story very clearly by the time Raven's trip is over, the story-tellers in Dr. Snyder's collection, where the parallelism is not maintained, all feel the end of their versions that the moral has not been sufficiently pointed. They feel it necessary to append an explanation of what the story means. Content is not the vehicle of meaning: form is.

At this point it may be useful to try to distinguish structure from form. As Dundes has seen content as the specific filling-in of the outlines of a motifs sequence, we may call this specific fleshing-out of a form "structure." The structure of "Pheasant and Raven" is this: A good character sees the reward and undertakes a similar journey in hopes of a similar reward. But his way of doing things and thinking about things is opposite to that of the good character, and he fails. He is left without his reward. Insofar as we are talking about A as a good character or the vehicle of the parallelism as a six-element journey or the comparison between characters as comic, we are no longer talking about form only, but about how the form is made to function to bring meaning to a specific group of content elements. The functioning of form in a specific context is structure.

One wonders, after all of this, whether the concept of form, as opposed to structure, had any value for storytellers in the tradition. Information concerning their thoughts on their work is almost impossible to find. We hear, however, two statements often of (the storytellers of lore in Skagit tradition: first, that they could lengthen or shorten a story at will; and second, that they never pointed a moral at the end. I suspect that these two statements are an instance of defining a medium in terms of its best practitioners and that there were always storytellers who went on too long or who felt unsatisfied with their performance and attempted a retell to be a form of a sermon at the end. Yet if a situation arose in which Martha LaMont felt the need to shorten a performance of "Pheasant and Raven," it is easy to see what she would do: she would eliminate the subsidiary sections; she might even subtract one or more pairs of elements from the parallel sections. What we are sure she would not do is to interfere in any way with the formal relation between the two journeys. And no matter how truncated her version turned out to be, she would never feel the need (nor would the audience) for a pointed moral. Such mastery of a story comes about only as a result of a firm grasp of its form.

FOOTNOTES
1. Deceit/Deception may be considered a variation of Task/Task Accomplished.

2. Line numbers are from a transcription and translation in progress by Vi Hilbert. I have silently normalized spelling, deleted false starts and made a few minor changes in the translation for the sake of consistency.

3. Transcription, interlinear translation and line numbering are from an unpublished ms. by Vi Hilbert dated 12-20-84.

4. Transcription and translation from an unpublished ms. by Vi Hilbert dated October 1980. The "line" numbers are mine and are assigned only for convenience in referring to comparable elements in the two narratives.
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