

A THRICE-TOLD TILLAMOOK NARRATIVE¹

Dell Hymes

I

The Tillamook language is little known, and what can be known, thanks to the dedication of a few researchers, notably Larry and Terry Thompson, and William Seaburg, is not yet generally available. Many tasks, few hands. The texts so far published are in English translation (Boas 1898, 1923) or themselves English performances (E. Jacobs 1959, 1990). Yet it is possible to discover native patterns of narrative organization, and to suggest that Tillamook will have a significant place in the understanding of Native American verbal art.

There are three reasons to expect this. First, the fact that the same narrator, Clara Pearson, dictated extensive bodies of material twice, once in Tillamook (to May Mandelbaum Edel), and once again in English (to Elizabeth Derr Jacobs), will make it possible to scrutinize the consequences of successive performance, and of choice of language. Tillamook indeed helps demonstrate that performances in a second language can contribute to knowledge of traditional aesthetic form. Second, alternatives of form in Tillamook narrative are linked both to gender and occasion, and their analysis will deepen what can be grasped generally of narrative competence. Third, Tillamook narratives intersect those of other peoples of the Coast, and of the Columbia River and Willamette Valley as well. Analysis of Tillamook informs the analysis of the others. Given limited information from any one tradition, understanding depends in important part upon comparison. That is the only way to infer the possibilities of incident, theme and form, likely to have been known to a narrator in the region (likely to have travelled, likely to have been multilingual), possibilities out of which a given narrative represents a motivated choice.

The story focussed upon in this paper, "Split-His-(Own)-Head", bears on all three points.

II

The potential richness of "Split-His-(Own)-Head" involves actually three performances. There are something more than three, indeed, if the translations of the two in Tillamook are partly restatements.² The versions are:

- (1) Telling in Tillamook to May Edel (1931)
- (2) Translation into English
- (3) Telling in English to Elizabeth Jacobs (1934)
- (4) Telling in Tillamook to Melville Jacobs (1934)
- (5) Translation of the telling to Melville Jacobs (1934).

Of these five versions it is the telling to Elizabeth Jacobs that has been published. Thanks to

William Seaburg, I am able to examine the translation of the telling to May Edel. The Tillamook original remains published (in the Library of the American Philosophical Society), as do the rest of the texts and translations obtained by Edel. The telling in Tillamook to Melville Jacobs is in the Jacobs Collection of the Archives of the University of Washington, as is the translation. Seaburg has been able to discover translation of only the first twelve lines, and the remainder may not have been translated.³

Only completion of the work undertaken by Larry and Terry Thompson to provide a Tillamook dictionary will make possible a thorough understanding of these versions. For the present, however, it is possible to infer and compare the organization of the tellings to May Edel and Bess Jacobs. The organization of the telling to May Edel, as indicated by its translation, confirms the presence of traditional organization in the telling to Bess Jacobs. It sheds light as well on the question of stability between performances, the question that is the focus of the article published by Edel (1944). In brief, Clara Pearson uses the same principles of form in both tellings, but realizes them differently, partly, it would seem because of uncertain memory in the first telling in Tillamook. Linguistic competence (in a narrow sense) and narrative competence did not go hand in hand. The version in English (the second told) is fuller than the version in Tillamook. All this is in keeping with the observations by Edel in her paper, and by Bess Jacobs as well (1959: viii).

Let me present the two versions in the sequence in which they were told, discussing the analysis of each in turn, and then take up comparison.

III

The Edel translation has been analyzed without consulting the analysis already made of the English version told Bess Jacobs. The details of the latter were not in mind. Several alternatives were considered for the first scene of the Edel version, as reported in the excursus following the text.

Edel's translation begins with the Tillamook name, transcribed as ots'āqəosút. Melville Jacobs wrote the name as úq'q'éwsát (E. Jacobs 1959, Glossary, p. 208). Probably it occurred in the title, or in the text, of the version dictated to Bess Jacobs, as well as to him. He reports that in editing the volume he deleted Tillamook words from the running text (they would have required phonetic symbols) and put them in the glossary. Edel gives 'Split-His-Head' as title, Jacobs 'Split-His-(Own)-Head'. I keep each for each.

In reading the presentations, a linguist of course will look for features that participate in marking units and their relations. One should read also for what the critic Kenneth Burke has called, 'arousal and satisfying of expectation'. Three-part relations are not only a division into three, but also a particular arc of movement from onset through mediating point to outcome. Two part relations have a different rhythm, rather this, than that. The sense of such rhythm, such relation between content and form, is at the heart of what analysis seeks to disclose.

SPLIT-HIS-HEAD

Split-His-Head's sister said, "Oh, I am tired.
 "I always walk when I go to get camas."
 She said, "Make a boat,
 "Even though it be a boat of rotten wood."
 Then he made a boat of rotten wood. 5
 It was a nice boat.
 The woman went down. (B)
 She threw in her digging-stick.
 Oh! There it went,
 right through the boat. 10
 She said, "It is bad."
 She went back. (C)
 "Why did you make it of rotten wood?"
 He said, "It was you, my sister, who said
 I should make a rotten wood boat." 15
 [---] "Oh," she said,
 "No, no," she said.
 "Take good cedar and build a boat,
 "Not a rotten wood boat."
 [---] "Ah," he said, 20
 "Yes, yes, sister.
 "I will make a nice boat.
 "I am determined to do it."
 Again he made a boat.
 It was nice. 25
 Then finally she said, "Oh, we are very poor. (ii) [Don't eat too much]
 "We have no food.
 "Save the food.
 "Do not eat it,
 "Not all at once at any rate." 30
 [---] "I am sick,
 "I am sick," he said.
 [---] "Why are you sick?"
 He said, "My sister, you said I should not eat too much."
 She said, "Oh, no, I told you not to eat all, 35
 "to eat little bites."

He said, "You said I should hit the sun.
 "My arm aches."
 [iii] [Hit the sun]
 [iv] [Digging-suck]
 (A)
 Soon this woman said, "Oh my digging-stick is bad.
 "Go split your face," she said. 40
 He went and did it.
 Then he came back. (B-1)
 She said, "What is the matter with you?"
 [---] "A---", he said,
 "My head is split open." 45
 She said, "Why?" (B-2)
 He said, "You -- you said I should split my face."
 She said, "No, no. Look for spruce limbs,
 and then split them."
 He said, "You said I should split my face." 50 (B-3)
 She said, "No, you must split the spruce limb."
 He said, "I did not know."
 He came back. (C)
 "Here is your digging stick.
 "It is good." 55
 [v] [Whale-meat]
 (A)
 Soon he said, "O, they found whale-meat there."
 She gave him beads.
 She said,
 "Now you go buy oil.
 "Go along with those people when they go. 60
 "Try to lie down under the straw.
 "Give them to the old lady, who urinates."
 [---] "Ah," he said,
 "I will go indeed.
 "I will do it." 65
 Soon he got into a canoe. (B-1)
 Shortly, "Uh uh."
 [---] "What is that grunting?"

Soon they found Split-His-Head underneath. (B-2)
 These people said, "Get up, 70
 come out,
 sit up.
 "I suppose your sister told you to do that!"
 He said, "Yes. She said I should lie under the straw."

These people said, "Ah, never mind what she said. 75 (B-3)
 "Now come out.
 "Sit down and paddle."
 Split-the-Head got up.
 He sat down and helped paddle.

Finally they arrived at the place where the whale was. 80 (C-1)
 He saw an old person urinate.
 He followed this old lady.
 He went to this old lady.
 She sat down and urinated.
 He threw in the beads. 85
 He said, "I buy urine."
 They said, "He threw his beads to this old lady." (C-2)
 This old lady said, "Why do you do it?"
 She said, "I urinated on those beads."
 He said, "Yes." 90
 He said, "My sister said I should throw them on an old lady.
 "I was to buy urine."
 This old lady said, "What do you want?" (C-3)
 He said, "Oil."
 [---] "Ah," she said, "why did you do that to me? 95
 "Why throw them at me?"
 He said, "My sister said I should."
 Then he went and brought⁴ oil.

[vi] [Dead person]
 Split-His-Head came back. (A)
 Soon his sister said, "Ah, now I am getting tired of you. 100
 "Ya ah--go on,
 try someone, even a dead person,
 and marry her.
 "Ha, get married." ⁵

[---] "Very well, I will go do it." 105
 He went.

Soon it was night. (B)
 His sister slept.
 He came back.
 He lay down. 110
 Soon he⁶ said, "A--".
 He said, "She is sticking me with her scratching stick."
 Soon she thought, "Oh, it is a maiden,
 "no doubt he has taken her."

Next day Split-His-Head had no wife. 115 (C)
 His sister said, "Where is your wife?"
 He said, "She is lying in bed."
 A dead person lay there. }
 "Ah," she said, "why, he brought a dead person.
 "Take it back where you got it." 120
 She said, "Even an old woman who is ready to die is better." } (Cr)/[vii] (A)
 [vii] [Old woman]
 (A)

[---] "I will go,
 nobody will stop me, sister.
 I will do it."
 Soon Split-His-Head came back. 125 (B)
 His sister woke up.
 Soon this old lady, oh, she went out.
 She had walking sticks
 and she grunted.
 The sister saw her. 130
 She said, "Where does that old lady come from?" (C)
 He said, "You told me to get an old lady
 and marry her."
 She said, "No, take this old lady back. 135 [Cc]
 "Bring a baby.
 "You will marry a child."
 [viii] [Baby]

Soon Split-His-Head's sister woke up. (B)
 Oh, Split-His-Head was singing.

He said, "A--a-- my wife, my wife."
 He went and found a child. 140
 And the child was crying.

Soon Split-His-Head's sister said, "Why is the baby crying?" (C)
 He said, "It is my wife." ?
 She said, "No. Where did you get it?"
 [---] "I took it, cradle and all." 145
 [---] "Bah!" she said. "Put it back."
 [---] "Yes, I will do it."

[ix][Maiden]

She said, "Oh, you go get a maiden.
 "A maiden, not an old lady, nor a baby."
 Then he said, "I will go get a maiden, 150
 "I will do it."
 Again Split-His-Head came back.
 This time he brought back a maiden with him.
 Then his sister was glad.

Excursus on Edel scene [i]

One value of an excursus such as this is that it shows the kind of consideration that enter into weighing alternatives in such a case.

In interpreting a visual record, without auditory cues, it often seems appropriate to set the words spoken by an actor on separate lines, so as to foreground their role in the action, and reveal the relations among them. The first lines of Edel's translation would be:

Split-His-Head's sister said,
 "Oh, I am tired.
 "I always walk when I go to get camas."

In this text there are parallelisms and proportions that make it seem right to put the first line of quoted speech on the same line as words of saying.

Split-His-Head's sister said, "Oh, I am tired.
 "I always walk when I go to get camas."

Extra indentation of the second line of speech helps to foreground the spoken words and the turn at talk of which they are part.

The three verses of the first stanza seem to have a parallelism that such placement on the page brings out.

The second stanza seems to have five elements, which such a placement also displays.

Alternative relationships are conceivable: 'Soon', 'Then' and 'Finally' occur in places that seem to mark the start of groups of verses (stanzas).

'Again' at the start of the last verse of this first scene might indicate a new stanza, but there appears to be an implicit rhetoric, or logic, of action, which makes it the outcome of the five verses of a third scene.

The verses of the first scene might be grouped in more than one way.

(a) One might start from the series of actions. This might lead one to expect five groups, corresponding to each of five moments in the scene: the initial instruction, the making of a boat, the discovery of the mistaken outcome, the new instructions, the successful outcome. This interpretation is supported by the fact that, after the first group, each of the succeeding four is marked initially by a particle or a change of location: 'Then', 'She went down', 'She went back', 'Again'. Moreover, the sequence fits nicely a logic often found in the region. A sequence of three actions has as its outcome a unit that is at the same time the onset of a second sequence of three actions.

If this expectation is correct, then there is apparently no regular relation between stanzas and the number of verses of which they consist. The verses of the scene would be distributed 2, 1, 1, 4, 1. Before the stanza of clarification, it would be like this:

(a)

Split-His-Head's sister said, "Oh, I am tired. (A)
 "I always walk when I go to get camas."
 She said,
 "Make a boat,
 "Even though it be a boat of rotten wood."
 Then he made a boat of rotten wood. (B)
 It was a nice boat.
 The woman went down. (C)
 She threw in her digging-stick.
 Oh! There it went,
 right through the boat.
 She said, "It is bad."

(b) One might start from an expectation of some regular relation between stanzas and the number of verses of which they consist. The one possibility in this scene appears to be that of a relation in terms of groups of three and five. The first stanza would have 3 verses, with a sequence of action of onset, ongoing, outcome (the first making of a boat). The second stanza would have one verse of five lines. The third stanza would have five verses, with a sequence of the sort described above: the first outcome is the sister's explanation of what was intended, which stands also as onset to the second outcome, the making of the kind of boat intended.

Overall, the scene would group verses as 3, 1, 5. Before the stanza of clarification, it would be like this:

(b)

Split-His-Head's sister said, "Oh, I am tired. (A)
 "I always walk when I go to get camas."
 She said,
 "Make a boat,
 "Even though it be a boat of rotten wood."
 Then he made a boat of rotten wood.
 It was a nice boat.
 The woman went down. (B)
 She threw in her digging-stick.
 Oh! There it went,
 right through the boat.
 She said, "It is bad."

(c) A third and fourth alternative exist. They arise from the possibility of taking 'She went back' and the following line of quoted speech as two verses, not one. The quoted speech can be seen as separate. There is then a stanza of clarification which itself has 5 verses. The ensuing verse of final outcome would be a separate stanza.

What then about the preceding verses? If there is to be regularity, they could be taken as 3 stanzas, having 2, 1, and 1 verse, respectively, as in possibility (a) canvassed above. This third possibility (c) is in fact the same as (a), except that the longest stanza has a different number of verses. Its 5 verses are consistent with the pattern number of the stanzas (5). Overall, the scene would group verses as 2, 1, 1, 5, 1. So far as the part before the stanza of clarification is concerned, it would be the same as (a).

(d) Alternatively, the verses that precede the clarification could be taken as a single stanza. The first outcome is that of going to make the boat (of rotten wood), and the second is that of discovery that it is bad. For this possibility, a different choice could be made as to the number and relations of the lines in which the sister discovers that the boat is rotten. They could consist of two verses, not one:

The woman went down.
 She threw in her digging-stick.
 Oh! There it went, right through the boat.
 She said,
 "It is bad."

That is, the discovery would be the outcome of one verse ('Oh! There it went, right through the boat') and the spoken observation, the turn at talk, a separate verse. There would then be five

verses in this first scene. These lines before the stanza of clarification would be:

(d)

Split-His-Head's sister said, (A)
 "Oh, I am tired.
 "I always walk when I go to get camas."
 She said,
 "Make a boat,
 "Even though it be a boat of rotten wood."
 Then he made a boat of rotten wood.
 It was a nice boat.
 The woman went down.
 She threw in her digging-stick.
 Oh! There it went, right through the boat.
 She said,
 "It is bad."

One version eventually has been settled upon, because, as has been said, each of the three stanzas so identified comes round at the end to the nature of the boat. As it turns out, this does partly correspond to the analysis arrived at for the Jacobs version.

Scenes [iv] and [v], and the transition to the second part. One striking feature of this telling is the enlargement of scale in scenes [iv] and [v]. I have called this 'amplification' (Hymes 1985a: 412). In scene [iv] the three groups of verses identified as (B-1, B-2, B-3) could be taken as separate stanzas. The scene would have five stanzas, rather than three. A sense that the middle three go together comes from the three part frame of action of the first scene, such that the sister instructs and the brother goes (A), his mistake is discovered (B), the instruction and mistake are corrected (C). But the second scene has such a frame of action distributed over five verses: (a), (bcd) (e). The fourth scene might be taken to have it distributed over five stanzas (A) (BCD) (E). (Granted that in [iii] only the instruction is corrected in the fifth unit (e), and that in [iii] the instruction is corrected in the fourth unit (D or B-3)).

With the fifth scene the matter is different. One has the equivalent of seven stanzas. The first is again one in which the sister instructs and the brother undertakes to do what she says. But the next three recount a journey (in which one mistake is discovered and corrected), and the remaining three what happens after arrival (in which a second mistake is discovered and corrected). The last line perhaps indicates a return ('Then he went and brought oil'), but the sister has no part in the discoveries and corrections. Travelling companions (B) and the people they reach (C) do that.

Within the framework of a scene for each of the sister's misunderstood instructions, five in all, it seems necessary to treat all of this as a single, concluding scene. The amplification of the second and third sections of such a scene is perhaps analogous to the amplification within a morphological position, such as the positions of person-markers in the Chinookan verb. These positions have significant relations with the other positions in the verb. At the same time, they are internally complex. Their components themselves have an order of elements (e.g., n-, n-t-, n-s-, first person singular, dual and plural, respectively).

This amplified conclusion of the first set of scenes, doubling as it does the correction of the younger brother by others, may be more than the taking of pleasure in the adventure itself. It may signal a step in socialization and maturity, from a relation only with an older sister, to relations with other members of the community, and other communities altogether. In this respect, it may prepare for the set of scenes in which the brother is to marry.

These considerations apply to the telling to Bess Jacobs, but with a different manifestation. The journey for whale meat is used twice, and described as completed twice, but the first time (scene [iii]) focusses on the dealings with the urinating old lady, while the second (scene [v]) focusses on the journey itself. Third and fifth position are of course each culminating, and to put the journey in each gives it a double sense of culmination. Perhaps Mrs. Pearson entertained the possibility of concluding the first part of the story with the third scene, then went on with the fourth and came back to the journey for whale meat again. Alternatively, or equally, she may have chosen her placement of the two aspects of the journey. She puts first the involvement with an old lady, a feminine instructor like her sister, and puts last the involvement with people in the canoe, many or all of them presumably men.

Notice that the transitions to the second part differ. When the first part ends with the old woman, the sister expresses disgust ("I am getting tired of you", with "Ah", "Ya ah", "Ha"). When the first part ends with the journey itself, not the old woman, the sister states a matter of fact ("You are getting grown now").

Such details suggest that some of the differences between the two tellings have to do with the taking of a different stance toward the action of the story, the putting forward of a somewhat different interpretation through selection of detail.

Discussion of analysis of scenes [vi-ix]

The patterning of this part of the telling involves several dimensions.

The beginning and ending of the part have stanzas with three and five verses, pointing to three and five part patterning throughout. The first stanza of scene [vi] has three verses: the younger brother comes back, his sister tells him to get married, he agrees and goes. That the next verse is a new stanza is clear from double marking by 'Soon' and the temporal expression, 'it was night'. That a new stanza begins after five more verses is indicated by the temporal expression 'Next day'. At the end of the part, the second and third stanzas in scene [viii], each beginning with 'Soon', have evidently five verses. And the one stanza of the last scene [ix] has five verses, each marked (quoted speech, Then and quoted speech, Again, This time, Then).

'Soon' does not always mark the start of a stanza, however (cf. the second verse of scene [vi] (A) and [vii] (B)). In these scenes, as often elsewhere, one needs to discover the frame of repeated action that informs the sequence. Here the frame of repeated action appears to have three paired elements.

- (1) Go get a wife (of a certain kind); I will go
- (2) Return with wife; behavior of the wife
- (3) Sister discovers what kind of wife (and asks about her);
she says to take the wife back.

The initial instruction is of course misunderstood, and can be symbolized as -I (for Instruction); the initial action is mistaken (-A). At the end there is repair or correction of the instruction (+I), and repair or correction of the action (+A). In between comes evidence and discovery of the mistake, sometimes with the sister being at first deceived (scene [vi], 111-4). In each scene, after the wife has acted in some way, the sister questions her brother.

The frame of repeated action helps make sense of a complex relation between form and content in the first three scenes in this part [vi, vii, viii]. Between [vi] and [vii], and between [vii] and [viii], one and the same turn at talk contains the ending of one scene and the beginning of another.

In lines 119-20 the sister states discovery of her brother's mistake and tells him to correct it. These lines fit a patterning for stanza (C) of five verses. But with indication of change other than another 'She said', in the next line (121) she makes the remark that sets off the next scene ("She said, Even an old woman who is ready to die is better"). This line could easily be taken as completing the preceding remark, and as entering into a pattern for stanza (C) of three pairs of verses (ab) (cd) (ef) = (115, 116); (117, 118); (119-20, 121).

In lines 134-6 the sister tells her brother to correct his mistake and bring a child (ironically intended). Without an intervening additional 'she said', one and the same turn at talk appears to count as the third verse of stanza C of scene [vii], and as the opening verse and stanza of scene [viii].

Such structural intersection is something I have not seen in other narratives. One might call these instances those of a 'Janus-faced' verse.⁸

Profile

The organization inferred for the Edel version can be inspected in a profile, which indicates directly the relations among scenes, stanzas, verses, and lines, and attempts to point out features that enter into the marking of these relationships. ("-" indicates quoted speech).

Profile (May Edel)

[scene]	[stanza/verse]	[line]	[features]
[i] [Canoe]			
A	abc	1-2, 3-4, 5-6	"-", "-", Then
B	a	7-11	--Oh!--" (O3-O5)
C	abcde	12-3, 14-5, 16-9, 20-3, 24-5	return+ "-", "-", "-", "-", Again
[ii] [Save the food]			
A	abcde	26-30, 31-2, 33, 34, 35-6	"-", "-", "-", "-", "
[iii] [?]			
A	a	37-38	
[iv] [Go split your face]			
A	abc	39, 40, 41	"-", "-", go
B-1	abc	42, 43, 44-5	Then+return, "-", "
B-2	abc	46, 47, 48-9	"-", "-", "
B-3	abc	50, 51, 52	"-", "-", "
C	a	53-55	return + "-"
[v] [Give them to the old lady who urinates]			
A	abc	56, 57-62, 63-5	Soon + "-", "-", "
B-1	abc	66, 67, 68	Soon, "-", "
B-2	abc	69, 70-3, 74	Soon, "-", "
B-3	abc	75-7, 78, 79	"-",
C-1	abc	80, 81-3, 84-6	Finally arrive, ..., "
C-2	abc	87, 88, 89, 90, 91-2	"-", "-", "-", "-", "
C-3	abc	93, 94, 95-6, 97, 98	"-", "-", "-", "-", Then

[vi] [Get married (even a dead person)]

A	abc	99, 100-4, 105-6	return, Soon "-", "
B	abcde	107-8, 109-110, 111, 112, 113-4	Soon, return, Soon, "-", Soon "-"
C	abcde(f)	115, 116; 117, 118; 119-20, (121)	Next day, "-", "-", ..., "-", ("")

[vii] [an old woman ready to die is better]

A	a/(vi Cf)	(121), 122-4	(""), "-"
B	abc	125-6, 127-9, 130	Soon+return, Soon, ...
C	ab(c)	131, 132-3, 134(5-6)	"-", "-", "

[viii] [Bring a baby]

A	a/(vii Cc)	(134-)135-6	
B	abcde	137, 138, 139, 140, 141	Soon, Oh[singing], "-", go, And [crying]
C	ab; cd; ef	142, 143; 144, 145; 146, 147	"-", "-", "-", "-", "

[ix] [Go get a maiden]

abcde	148-9, 150-1, 152, 153, 154	"-", Then "-", Again, This time, Then
-------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------------

IV

This analysis of the telling of the story to Bess Jacobs has twice been modified from the version presented in 1988 (see n. 1), first to serve as an appendix to the republication of the Jacobs monograph (1990), and the in the course of preparing this paper.⁹ The originally published version is text no. 37 in Jacobs (1959): 118-20.

SPLIT-HIS-OWN-HEAD

Split-his-own-head was living with his older sister.	[i] [Canoe]
They had no mother or father.	(A)
One day she told him,	
"Oh, I am tired.	
I am getting so tired of it.	5
I go on foot all the time to dig yetska roots.	

Why do you not make a canoe for me?
 Even one of rotten wood would be better than walking all the time."
 "Ha!"
 he said. 10
 "Your brother certainly can do that.
 Nothing will stop me from making a canoe."
 He made a canoe for her. (B)
 That canoe was quickly finished.
 It was very fine looking. 15
 She made preparations to go digging roots.
 She threw her root digger into the canoe.
 That stick went right through the bottom of that canoe,
 because that canoe was made of rotten wood.
 She became angry.
 She came back in the house. (C)
 "Oh goodness, you made a canoe of rotten wood."
 "Well, sister, you told me to do that."
 "Oh, I did not really mean rotten wood.
 I just said it that way, 25
 because I meant
 why on earth can you not make a canoe for me."
 She started out on foot then to go for roots. (D)
 Before she left, she said
 "You must make a canoe out of a good cedar log." 30
 "Oh, indeed, nothing will stop me."
 When she came home,
 he had it already finished,
 another canoe made from a good cedar log.
 One day she said, (ii) [Digging Stick]
 "My digging stick is becoming worthless.
 Go split that head end."
 He understood her to say,
 "Go split your face."
 She should have said, 40
 "Go split that head end of a spruce limb". 10

"All right,"
 he told her,
 "I can do that."
 He went. 45
 Presently he returned with his head all wrapped up. (B)
 She noticed,
 "Your head is all wrapped up.
 What for?"
 He replied, 50
 "Oh, I nearly died.
 You told me to go split my face."
 She scolded, (C)
 "No! I told you to hunt up spruce limbs,
 split one, 55
 and make a root digger for me."
 "Why, you did not tell me that, sister.
 You told me to split my face."
 She told him,
 "You should have known that I did not mean that." 60
 He went, (D)
 obtained a spruce limb,
 brought it home,
 he made a root digger for her.
 That was all right then, 65
 he had done it right.
 One morning she sent him, (iii) [Whale meat]
 "You go along. (A)
 Some people are going to buy whale meat,
 You go with them. 70
 In some manner you can fasten yourself in the stern of the canoe.
 If the boat is crowded,
 you can hang on to the stern."
 "All right, sister."
 She gave him some dentalia. 75
 "Maybe you can take these money beads,

and remember,
 throw your money beads on any old woman's privates".
 [By that expression the native would understand,
 "Buy whale meat from anyone
 who gives you a good trade.
 Do not just trade with some special one."]

They went in that canoe. (B)
 Those people were paddling along.
 They noticed that the stern of the canoe seemed to drag. 85
 They looked,
 there he was in the water, hanging on to the canoe.
 They said,
 "Oh, I suppose your sister told you to do that.
 Get into the canoe." 90
 He got in.

When they got there where that whale was, (C)
 Split-His-Own-Head did not attempt to buy any.
 He just stood about watching the old women.
 One went outdoors, 95
 he followed her.
 He watched her squat down,
 he sneaked up close to her
 and threw those money beads between her legs.
 "Why did you throw your money 100
 where I would urinate on it?"
 she asked.

He replied,
 "I came to buy whale meat."
 "Oh, I suppose your sister told you to do it that way." 105

After that he bought whale meat (D)
 and they all went home.

[iv] [Dried Salmon]
 (A)
 His sister gave him a dried salmon,
 saying,
 "We are nearly out of dried salmon now." 110
 She did not tell him not to eat it all at once.

But she said,
 "Today you will throw rocks at the sun all day."
 [By that was meant,
 "Do not eat it all at once,
 save some for your supper."]

He was gone all day.
 In the evening he returned,
 saying,
 "Goodness, I am all sore and lame." 120
 "Why?"
 she asked.
 "Where are you so sore?"
 "My arm is almost worn out
 from throwing rocks at the sun all day,
 like you said." 125

She told him,
 "You are very foolish.
 "I did not tell you to throw rocks,
 "I told you to save some fish for summer 130
 "because we have not very much left to eat."
 [v] [Whale meat]

Again some people were preparing to go buy whale meat.
 She told him,
 "You can sit on a mat or blanket on the floor of the canoe."
 He answered, 135
 "I can certainly do that."

People got in the canoe, (B)
 they sat down to paddle.
 They sat on him,
 they did not see him 140
 because he was under those ferns that were in the canoe to sit on.
 He became tired.
 He grunted
 and attempted to change position.
 The people said, 145
 "Why, it feels as if someone were underneath us."

They looked,
 there he was.
 "Oh get up!
 Sit up and help paddle!
 I suppose your sister told you to do that!"
 "Yes, she told me,"
 the little fool answered.

They arrived at that [market] place.
 They all purchased some whale meat
 and returned home.

[vi] [Wife: dead woman]

Later on his sister said to him,
 "You are getting grown now,
 you should hunt a woman for yourself.
 You are old enough to get married.
 Any old thing, a dead person, is perhaps better than no wife at all."
 "Huh! I can do that all right, sister."
 He went to look for a wife.

He returned late at night.
 His sister was already in bed
 and did not see him.

Presently she heard him say,
 "Oh! My wife is sticking me with her scratcher." ¹¹

His sister thought,
 "Why, he must have found a maiden bathing after her first
 menstruation."

Daylight came.
 The sister arose
 and built the fire. }

Split-His-Own-Head got up,
 he had no wife.
 "Where is your wife?"
 his sister asked. }

"In bed."
 "Is she not going to get up?" }

19

He told her,
 "No. You told me to obtain a dead person for a wife.
 That is a dead women I went and got."
 She said to him,
 "Now you take that dead body
 and put it right back where you found it." }

He took it back.

[vii] [Wife: old woman]
 (A)

Then she said to him,
 "I told you to get a live person.
 I meant to marry a live person,
 no matter if she were old".
 "All right, sister."
 He took that body
 and went.

That evening he brought home an old, old woman with a walking cane, 195(B)
 nearly blind,
 who could scarcely stand.

His sister objected,
 "Why, that old woman might drop dead any minute!
 What are you going to do with her?
 An old woman ready to die!
 You go take her home."
 He made preparations to take the old woman home.

[viii] [Wife: baby]
 (A)

His sister emphasized,
 "Young! Young!
 A young girl, a youngster,
 that is what you want to get for yourself."
 "All right, sister, I can do that."
 He went.
 He waited till late at night.
 Then he went
 and stole a woman's baby.

He arrived home during the night.
 Soon that baby cried.

20

He got up
and tossed that cradle.
"Oh, my wife! My wife! Keep still, my wife!"
His sister thought,
"Perhaps he has gotten a widow with a baby."

She asked him,
"Have you a woman with a baby?"
"No, sister.
This baby herself is my wife!"
"Oh goodness!
You take that baby right back
where you got it."

He arose,
dressed,
took that baby back to her mother.

[ix] [Wife: young woman]
Then his sister knew
she must explain carefully.
She said,
"I told you
a young woman, a young girl,
not an old woman, not a baby."

"All right,"
he said.
He went.

He found a young woman in her basket cap.
He brought her home.
He had done all right then.

That is ended.

21

Here is a profile of 'Split-His-Own-Head'

Scene	Stanza	Verse	Lines
i [canoe]	A	abc	1-2, 3-8, 9-12
	B	abc	13-15, 16-19, 20
	C	abc	21-22, 23, 24-27
	D	abc	28-30, 31, 32-34
ii [stick]	A	abcde	35-37, 38-39, 40-41, 42-44, 45
	B	abc	46, 47-49, 50-52
	C	abc	53-56, 57-58, 59-60
	D	abc	61-62, 63-64, 65-66
iii [whale]	A	abc [d]	67-73, 74, 75-78 [79-82]
	B	abc	83-87, 88-90, 91
	C	abcde	92-4, 95-9, 100-2, 103-4, 105
	D	a	106-7
iv [salmon]	A	abc [d]	108-110, 111, 112-113 [114-116]
	B	abcde	117, 118-20, 121-3, 124-6, 127-31
v [whale]	A	abc	132, 133-134, 135-136
	B	abcde	137-41, 142-4, 145-6, 147-51, 152-3
	C	a	154-156
vi [dead woman]	A	abc	158-162, 163, 164
	B	abc	165-167, 168-169, 170-171
	C	{ab}{cd}	{172, 173-4}, {175-6, 177-8},
	{er}{gh}	{179, 180}, {181-3, 184-6}	
	D	a	187
vii [old]	A	abc	188-91, 192, 193-194
	B	abc	195-197, 198-202, 203
viii [baby]	A	abcde	204-207, 208, 209, 210, 211-212
	B	abcde	213, 214, 215-6, 217, 218-9
	C	abc	220-1, 222-3, 224-6
	D	a	227-229

[ix] [young] A	abc	230-235, 236-237, 238
B	a(bc)	239-241

Close 242

Organization of the Bess Jacobs version

In this version, as in the version told to Edel, there is a pattern of action that suggests the kinds of structural relationship identified by Dundes (1964). One finds what Dundes would have called a four-part 'motifeme' sequence (one part to each stanza): misinterpretation of an instruction : wrong action : correction of interpretation : correct action. (Formulaically, -I : -A :: +I : +A).

In scene [i] the first stanza gives the instruction and its acceptance; the second stanza gives the mistaken action and its discovery; the third confronts the sister and brother over the mistake, correcting the instruction; the fourth includes further correction for the instruction, and correct action.

In scene [ii] the mistaken action is implicit, the second stanza giving just discovery of it, presented through confrontation; the third corrects the instruction; the fourth corrects the action.

In scene [iii] the first stanza establishes two instructions, where to be in the canoe, and what to do with the dentalla. The second stanza has a wrong action, correction of interpretation(?--"Oh, I suppose your sister told you to do that") and remedial action for the first instruction. The third stanza gives a wrong action, the fourth a correction of interpretation(?), and remedial action for the second instruction. (Recall what was said about this scene in connection with Edel's text).

In scene [iv] the first stanza gives the instruction, and a second stanza has a [report of] wrong action, and correction of interpretation. [The error, eating all the fish, admits of no correction]

In scene [v] the first two stanzas parallel the first two stanzas of scene [iii] in that there is instruction as where to be in the canoe in (A), wrong action, correction of interpretation, and implied remedial action in (B).

There is a further parallel between scenes iii and v in the last stanza of each: they buy whale meat and return home. But scene v has no intervening third stanza. The pairing of the instruction and its outcome in the two stanzas seems simply to be given a coda or epilogue.

In the second part of the story, concerned with getting a wife, the same dimensions of interpretation and action continue, but there is a difference with regard to the fourth element. In each of these three scenes [vi-viii] there is misinterpretation (-I), wrong action (-A), correction of interpretation (+I); but the correct action (+A) that ensues is not that of doing what

should have been done. It is repair of the mistaken action. The younger brother does not yet get a wife of the sort his sister had intended; he takes back the mistaken one.

This difference between the first and second parts probably is due to narrative necessity. Each of the first five scenes has a distinct object. Having succeeded in making a canoe, the younger brother still can fail with digging stick and whale meat. Each of the next three scenes has a distinct object, but each is a variant of an object of the same kind. To do it right would end the story. The first three efforts to get a wife must fail if there is to be a fourth. In effect, the first part has five things one can do wrong, and the second part has three ways to go wrong about the same thing.

The sixth and eighth scenes express the 'motifeme' in four stanzas, the seventh and ninth in two. In the sixth the first stanza has the instruction and its acceptance; the second has the return and behavior in this instance misunderstood by the sister herself (a comic twist); the third has discovery of the mistake and corrected instruction; the fourth has corrective action. The eighth scene follows the same model. (Notice that the second stanza in both [vi] and [viii] ends with the sister's mistaken thought).

In the seventh scene the first stanza again has the instruction and its acceptance; the second has all the rest, wrong action, correction of interpretation, correction of action. In the ninth scene there is again instruction and its acceptance in the first scene, while the second has all the rest. But here the instruction and action are correct, there is no need for discovery or repair. The short final scene abandons and transcends the convention on which previous elaboration, and indeed all eight scenes of the story so far has been based, the younger brother's failure to understand the ironic speech of his older sister:

"Then his sister knew/ she must explain carefully" (230-231).

The commedia dell'arte-like, characters dissolve. The sister assumes responsibility for making the brother understand. No more Mr. Numskull. The younger brother brings home a proper wife. There may even come to be children and a continuation of their line.

Explanations. Notice that two interpolated explanations ([79-82], [114-16]) stand outside the grouping of verses into stanzas--each is fourth to a sequence of three within a series consistently of one, three and five. Nothing about gender or foregrounding motivates a departure. On the other hand, the explanation of what the sister should have said (lines 40-1) is integrated into the five verse pattern of its stanza. Perhaps the difference has to do with position within a stanza versus position at the end of (after) a stanza.

Edel commented twice on such explanations. At one point she wrote: "her explanatory expansions, a feature of her English tales, were deliberately parenthetical" (117), and at another: "Some of these additions were explicitly parenthetical; others were incorporated as part of the tale" (125). Poetic form shows which is which.

The organization of 172-186 stands apart. There are four pairs of verses, not three, in the stanza. Clearly the eight verses belong together. The preceding verse ends a preceding

stanza with 'His sister thought', just as does the corresponding stanza (B) of scene viii. Moreover, its first verse, 'Daylight came', is just the sort, a change in time, and indeed specifically this change in temporal location, that begins sequences again and again the literatures of the region. The following verse constitutes a fourth stanza (D), having to do with a fourth moment, one of movement, taking back, just as does the last verse of viii. The verses between what precedes and follow are linked by interaction between brother and sister. (The preceding and following verses are not). The relationship throughout the four pairs of verses is one of response on the part of the sister. Daylight comes, she arises and builds the fire. Her brother gets up without a wife, she asks where the wife is.¹² Told the wife is in bed, she asks will she not get up. Told he has a dead woman, she tells him to take it back.

V

Let me take up again the three kinds of significance that further work in Tillamook will have. The first begins with the concern of both May Edel and Bess Jacobs for stability and consistency among tellings at different times, in different languages, to different hearers. Today one could phrase the concern in terms of a relation between narrative competence and occasions of performance.

Stability and competence. Bess Jacobs wrote in her preface (viii):

"Early in the work I suspected that Mrs. Pearson, while telling the stories in English, was doing so by means of a rapid and close translation from the native into English. She had certainly learned all the tales in the medium of the Tillamook language. As a check on the closeness and precision of her translation I asked Dr. [Melville] Jacobs to record in phonetic transcription the story, "Split-His-Own-Head," after she had dictated it in English. The fact that the two accounts were almost identical for this tale does not prove that Mrs. Pearson always held so closely to the native original. But this experiment strengthened my constant feeling that, in the case of Mrs. Pearson, there was a minimal amount of distortion of content and style in a procedure where a literature was being noted in the inadequate and frustrating terms of another language. Dr. May M. Edel, who recorded texts from Mrs. Pearson about three years before, in 1931, has discussed some of the factors responsible for the few features of difference in her recordings and the dictations that were offered to me in English."¹³

Edel indeed affirmed that 'the actual style differences appear startlingly slight' (126). Her examples indicate that she was considering differences in the handling of incident, especially dialogue, its wording and elaboration. It may be possible to establish that in respect to Tillamook tradition the narrative competence of Clara Pearson was constant across two languages in fundamental principles of form.

While Edel focuses on stability in Clara Pearson's tellings, she also remarks on 'a greater [explanatory] expansiveness in the English version' obtained by Bess Jacobs, and that 'Some new episodes are included...without affecting the order, point, or treatment of other episodes'

(1944: 116). The new episodes are explained as due to the fact that "Mrs. Pearson's recollection was obviously improving. She remembered omitted episodes just as she remembered a number of whole tales she had not been able to think of three summers before" (*idem*). The same reason perhaps enters into the explanatory expansion in the English versions, 'the more explicit statements of motivation and explanation of the unusual' (126). Improved recollection might also enter into the fact that "There is also a greater richness in details of conversation and the delineation of character" (in the English versions).

Dr. Edel considers that "The relative thinness of the [Tillamook] texts is in part due to the slow and repetitious telling which the Tillamook recording involved" (*idem*). Another factor may be that Mrs. Pearson was not accustomed to telling the stories in Tillamook. She "had never been a raconteur, though she did have a genuine flair for story-telling. She had told the stories occasionally before, but in English, to white neighbors" (117).

In sum, Bess Jacobs' work in 1934 appears to have benefited from the stimulus to memory of the work of May Edel in 1931, from the stimulus to explanation that telling Tillamook stories in English may bring, and from the fact that Mrs. Pearson's previous practice in telling the stories had been in English. Obtaining the same stories, a second time, in a second language, was not redundant, but enriching.

Discussion of the two tellings in terms of lines and groups of lines, of poetic (or rhetorical) form, has indicated that there are a variety of differences, and that the question of stability or variation is partly independent of memory and practice. Some differences may express a different attitude or interpretation, as with the differences in the handling of the journey for whale meat at the end of the first part, and the way of giving the instruction to search for a wife. Mrs. Pearson's narrative competence included a constant conception of the story as a sequence of five and four scenes. It also evidently comprised a variety of devices and strategies, making possible a choice as to how to interpret and present the story. The two tellings considered here indicate that. Analysis of the Tillamook original of the telling to May Edel, and of the Tillamook dictated to Melville Jacobs, should add to this understanding. Eventual analysis of all the Tillamook narratives should make possible a rich understanding of her narrative skills indeed.

Yet another reason for difference, independent of language or practice, is remarked upon by Edel (125):

"Mrs. Pearson always had a very protective attitude toward me.

This unfortunately led to a very strict censorship of all the tales

she told me, so that many sexual references which occur in the English series are omitted from the tales she told me. As he later explained to Miss Langdon (Mrs. Melville Jacobs), "You're a married woman, but she was only a young girl and I couldn't." ¹⁴

As suggested below, this difference appears to manifest itself in formal organization itself.

Gender and design. Bess Jacobs observes (116, n. 21): "Note that four is the pattern number of feminine contexts, five of masculine contexts, in Tillamook folklore". Her immediate

reference is to the number of siblings in a set, not to number of verses and stanzas. Still, the number of siblings, and associated repetitions of incident, in a tradition commonly is the same as the larger pattern number for discourse units (e.g., five in Chinookan and Sahaptin, four in Takelma and Kwakwaka). And both tellings of "Split-His (-Own)-Head" demonstrate this gender distinction at the level of poetic form. One set of scenes has as focus activities for which a woman might depend upon a man, and there are five. A second set of scenes have as focus a proper wife, and there are four.

This contrast in number of scenes, five for male, four for female, holds, as we have seen, so strongly that in the telling to Bess Jacobs the journey for whale meat is divided and repeated in order to complete the male five. (If the motivation is not to make up for forgetting of another scene, but an alternative interpretation, the expressive importance of a sequence of five is all the more evident).

At the next level of organization, that of stanzas within scenes, the two tellings stand in contrast. Three part relations run through the telling in Tillamook to May Edel. Four and two part relations run through the telling in English to Bess Jacobs. The difference can not be due to the language. American English narratives pervasively use three and five part relationships. If the difference were due to the fact that Mrs. Pearson told the story to Bess Jacobs in English, that would be the version with relationships of three and five. The opposite is the case.

Among the Karok of the Klamath River one woman narrator may make use of three and five part patterning, another of two and four, for the same story; the same woman make use of three and five for one story, two and four for another (see Hymes 1985b). Perhaps there is data to indicate that the same woman might tell the same story at one time in one kind of patterning, at another in the other. Kroeber and others have versions of Karok in English from some of the same narrators from whom William Bright obtained them in Karok; if two and four patterns can be found in some of the English versions, then one would have a parallel to the Tillamook case.

With Tillamook there is at least a possible explanation. Since both recorders were women, the difference can not lie there. But recall that Mrs. Pearson said she could be more open about sexuality to the older, and married, Mrs. Jacobs. Since English does not explain the four part relations in the story told Bess Jacobs, perhaps maturity does. Perhaps Mrs. Pearson felt the telling to Bess Jacobs to involve shared womanhood, and four the pattern instinctively appropriate.

It may be possible to test this hypothesis, by analysis of the version Mrs. Pearson dictated in Tillamook to Melville Jacobs. If its patterning is in terms of two and four, that might reflect having so recently told the story to Bess Jacobs with such patterning. If the version is organized in terms of three and five, that would indicate that having a mature woman as auditor was decisive.

In general, it appears that Mrs. Pearson's narrative competence, and perhaps that of other Tillamook narrators, included ability to choose either of two principles for the organization of scenes into acts, or parts, of a myth, and for the organization of stanzas within scenes. The

choice of principle for organization of scenes within an act depended on the focus of the scenes. The choice of principle for organization of stanzas within scenes appears to depend on the auditor, to be a matter of 'audience design' (Bell 1984).

Intertextuality. Finally, there is mutual clarification among traditions in the region. 'Split-His-(Own)-Head', has value beyond Tillamook. It clarifies a Clackamas Chinook story, 'Bluejay and his older sister' (Jacobs 1959: 366-9, no. 41). This story was one of the very first that Victoria Howard told Melville Jacobs. The details of the last part of Mrs. Howard's telling story are somewhat incomplete and obscure; Clara Pearson's telling makes them clear.

Clara Pearson's telling also puts into relief the significance of Mrs. Howard's story as part of a series of several stories involving the same consanguineal trio, a mother, daughter, and younger brother. It is a series that makes use of the figure of Seal (as mother, as older sister) to reflect, through narrative, on cultural catastrophe. Mrs. Pearson ends with the younger brother's quest for a wife, and makes its success the culmination. Like Mrs. Pearson, Mrs. Howard starts with a younger brother's quest for a wife leading to a corpse. But that is the only quest for a wife, it is just the first of the things the younger brother comically does wrong. Moreover, Mrs. Howard frames the quest for a wife the same way she frames the tragedy of 'Seal and her younger brother lived there'. (See Hymes 1981, chs. 8, 9). There also a daughter discovers something wrong about her uncle's wife, and reports it, but is shushed. This remains the relation between mother and daughter in 'Seal and her younger brother lived there', and the brother dies. In 'Blue Jay and his elder sister', the mother acts when the daughter tells her a second time, and sets things right.

Both Mrs. Pearson and Mrs. Howard, then, use a scene of a younger brother mistakenly taking a corpse as wife to initiate a contrast. For Mrs. Pearson, the scene initiates a series of mistakes which will end with explicit instruction and success, standing in contrast with all the mistakes in mens' affairs that have preceded. A social relationship is at last established. For Mrs. Howard, the scene initiates a series of mistakes which remain a comedy of errors, standing in contrast to an analogue in another myth in which a mother fails to respond, death ensues, and the one remaining relationship, that between mother and daughter, dissolves.

Further study of Tillamook will lead to many further insights.

References

- Bell, Alan. 1984. Language style as audience design. *Language in Society* 13: 145-204.
 Boas, F. 1898. Traditions of the Tillamook Indians. *Journal of American Folklore* 11: 23-38, 133-50.
 ---. 1923. Notes on the Tillamook. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 20: 13-16.
 Dundes, Alan. 1964. *The morphology of North American Indian folktales*. (FF Communications No. 195). Helsinki.

- Edel, May M. 1944. Stability in Tillamook Folklore. Journal of American Folklore 57: 116-27.
- Goffman, Erving. 1976. Replies and responses. Language in Society 5: 257-313. (Reprinted in his Forms of talk (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981, ch. 1).
- Hymes, Dell. 1981. 'In vain I tried to tell you'. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- . 1985a. Language, memory, and selective performance: Cultee's 'Salmon's myth' as twice told to Boas. Journal of American Folklore 98:391-434.
- . 1985b. Some subtleties of measured verse. Proceedings 1985, ed. June Iris Hesch, 13-57. (15th Spring Conference, Niagara Linguistics Society). Buffalo, New York: The Niagara Linguistics Society.
- Jacobs, Elizabeth Derr. 1959. Nehalem Tillamook tales. Edited by Melville Jacobs. Eugene: University of Oregon Books.
- . 1990. Nehalem Tillamook tales. Edited by Melville Jacobs. (Northwest Reprints). Corvallis: Oregon State University Press.
- Jacobs, Melville. 1959. Clackamas Chinook Texts, Part 2. (Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics, Publication 11; International Journal of American Linguistics 25 (2), Part II). Bloomington, Indiana.
- Kinkade, M. Dale. 1987. 'Bluejay and his sister.' In Recovering the word Essays on Native American literature, ed. Brian Swann and Arnold Krupat, 255-98. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Ramsey, Jarold. 1983. 'Uncursing the misbegotten in a Tillamook incest story'. Reading the fire. Essays in the traditional Indian literatures of the Far West, ch. 6, pp. 96-120. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.
- . 1990. Introduction. To E. Jacobs (1990), pp. xi-xxxi.

29

- 1 This paper is revised and enlarged from one of the same title prepared for the working papers of the 23rd International Conference on Salish & Neighboring Languages (Eugene, Oregon, 11-13 August 1988), compiled by Jay Miller, and issued in the Occasional Papers Series of the Newberry Library, Center for the History of the American Indian (pp. 35-49). The account of the version told to May Mandelbaum Edel, the comparison between the two tellings, and the observations on a text recorded by Boas, are new. The parentheses in the title reflect the difference in the form of title given by Edel ("Split-His-Head") and Jacobs ("Split-His-Own-Head")
- 2 Study of a portion of 'Xilgo, the witch', shows that the version published in 1898 is distinct in some details from the Tillamook and interlinear English of the original notebooks (now in the Library of the American Philosophical Society ["Tillamook and Siletz folkloristic texts", 497.3/B63c/S4.2]. The opening of the published version of the scene (1898: 36) in which the sister brings her brother to bed with her, step by step, has a fact not recoverable from the Tillamook and interlinear English, namely, that the place to which they came was Clatsop. The notebook version has a fact not present in the published version, that at night it rained.
Again, where the boy and girl are first to lie is declared by the boy in the published version, but in the interlinear English and Tillamook there is no quoted speech, simply a report. In the published version the girl speaks four times ("It is dripping here"), but in the notebook only once. Further, while there are five steps in each version, the realization differs. The published version is built of pairs, augmented the fifth time by a third element. The notebook version is built of threes, diminished the fourth time to two.
All this suggests that the published English is a distinct, and in this case more fully performed, version.
- 3 I am indebted to to Jarold Ramsey for information about the Edel translation.
- 4 Perhaps the word should be 'bought' (DH)
- 5 Three initial vocatives, 'Ah', 'Ya ah', 'Ha'. This expressive marking points up a peripety, the onset of concern, not with food, but wife.
- 6 Edel typed "Soon he said, "A--" he said, "she is sticking me with her scratching stick." Soon he thought, "Oh..." Each 'he' is corrected by hand to 'she'. The telling to Bess Jacobs has 'Presently she [the sister]

heard him say, 'Oh! My wife is sticking me with her scratcher.' His sister thought...." (line 166). This fits the situation. Presumably the three changes in Edel's manuscript to 'she said' are an overcorrection of a single mistake.

- 7 Closing braces (}) indicated that the two preceding units go together as a pair. Three and five pairs of verses are a common feature in the traditions of the region.
- 8 Virginia Hymes has encountered instances in her own work. As she points out, there is something analogous in five-unit sequences in Chinookan and Sahaptin (and some other languages). The third element often is a completion of an initial sequence of three (abc), while at the same time initiating a second sequence of three (cde).
- 9 I am indebted to Jarold Ramsey for the invitation to contribute the appendix, and for discussion of the Tillamook material.
- 10 The term 'head end', not followed by anything else, led him to understand that she meant 'of yours'. Notice that this explanation is integrated into the organization of the story.
- 11 During her first mensis ceremonial period a girl used a body scratcher.
- 12 A nice example of Goffman's point (1976, 1981) that the first thing that is said may not be the first thing that happens.
- 13 The footnote identifies Edel 1944.
- 14 May Edel's husband, Abraham Edel, mentioned this to me years later in a letter: "I recall May telling me that Bess had told her ... that the informant said to Bess she had held back with May, who was a young girl, but didn't with Bess, who was a married woman." (personal communication, January 22, 1978). I am indebted to Professor Edel for a copy of the issue of the Journal of American Folklore in which his late wife's article appeared.