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Franz Boas' 1897 monograph, The Social Organization and the Secret Societies of the Kwakiutl Indians (SOSSKWI), was Boas' first major publication to include Kwak'wala linguistic and ethnolinguistic materials, and it remains his primary statement on the connections between Kwakwaka'wakw myths and other aspects of 19th-century culture, particularly the material culture of the winter ceremonial.1 The unpublished materials in Boas' papers have steadily expanded understanding of the magnitude of George Hunt's contribution to Boas' publications on the Kwakwaka'wakw ceremony and it remains his primary statement on the connections between

George Hunt's contributions to SOSSKWI.

The title page of SOSSKWI states, "Based on personal observations and on notes made by Mr. George Hunt." In the preface to the volume, Boas goes further:

The great body of facts presented here were observed and recorded by Mr. George Hunt, of Fort Rupert, British Columbia, who takes deep interest in everything pertaining to the ethnology of the Kwakiutl Indians and to whom I am under great obligations. I am indebted to him also for explanations of ceremonial witnessed by myself, but the

1 This paper is a revised and somewhat shorter version of a section of a larger discussion of Boas' unpublished ethnographic and linguistic materials (Berman, forthcoming a).

2 Several orthographies are used here to transcribe Kwak'wala words. In quotes from Boas or Hunt, words are spelled as they wrote them. Commonly used names of social groups, such as "Kwakwaka'wakw," are given in the orthography of the U'mista Cultural Centre of Alert Bay, BC. All other words are spelled in an orthography that is essentially the same as that used in Lincoln and Rath (1980), with, however, the retention of non-phonemic schwa (/o/) for ease of reading.

purport of which was difficult to understand, and for finding the Indians who were able to give explanations on certain points (1897:315).

These acknowledgements, while generous, do not supply a complete picture of Hunt's contributions to the volume. Hunt played an important role in at least three areas that Boas does not address directly. First, Hunt was a crucial figure in the acquisition of several collections of Kwakwaka'wakw ceremonial objects that are illustrated and discussed in the book, including the one used most extensively -- that of Johan Adrian Jacobsen. Jacobsen made the collection with Hunt's assistance in 1881-2 for the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde, then the Royal Ethnological Museum (Berman, forthcoming a; Cole 1985:60-7; Jacknis 1991:181).

Secondly, Hunt made possible in all ways Boas' "personal observations" of the 1895 ceremonial (Berman, forthcoming; Rohner ed. 1969: 177-87). Hunt fed and housed Boas during the ceremonial; he advised Boas how to go about his work; he searched out and purchased objects for the collections Boas was making; he took Boas around to feasts that were occurring at all times of the day and night; and he explained and interpreted for Boas constantly.

The third area in which Hunt made a major unacknowledged contribution to this volume is in the actual writing of it, a role that goes far beyond what we would today understand by the making of "notes" or the recording of "facts." Hunt, for example, provided much if not all of the myth material (KM 1:31-67; 100-110, 180-9, 212-224; HAR: G.Hunt/F.Boas 3/20/95, 4/23/95, 7/9/95, 10/21/95, 1/15/95). This is not surprising given Hunt's subsequent labors on behalf of Kwakwaka'wakw oral literature.

What is less expected is that Hunt's English-language manuscripts, including his transcriptions of Kwak'wala words and names, functioned as the first draft of the chapter of the book that purports to present Boas' personal observations of the 1894-5 winter ceremonial (Boas 1897: 544-606). Boas, in fact, prefaces this chapter by saying, "I will describe the ceremonial as it actually took place and so far as I witnessed it" (1897:544-5). Now, Boas did indeed witness these events. The descriptions we have,

3 Boas writes that the winter ceremonial occurred in 1895-6. His letters home from the field (Rohner ed. 1969), subsequent correspondence with Hunt and others, and his own list of field expenses (BPO, HAR) show that this date is erroneous.
however, are largely from Hunt. Hunt made use of notes that Boas supplied to him, but he elaborated on and expanded them greatly; in one place he states that he wrote out 15 pages for a single page from Boas (BPC: GH/PB 2/16/1896, 3/9/1896).

Hunt's first drafts of this chapter of SOSTHI survive only as fragments scattered through one of the manuscript collections under Boas' name at the APS (KM I, XI). The pages, when brought together, prove to consist of two sections of text. The first one, 12 pages in length, bears Hunt's page numbers 18-29 (KM I, VI). There is some difficulty with the page numbering of the second section, but it appears to consist of Hunt's pages 35-56, minus pages 51-2, a total of 20 pages in length.

These materials are not to be found on any published or unpublished list of Hunt manuscripts (Boas 1921:1469-73; LKM; KM I:[1-11, 1-6]; KM II: 1-2; KTT). The handwriting and transcription practices clearly date them to the mid-1890s. The style of handwriting, somewhat uneven and looking relatively unpracticed, is clearly similar to that of Hunt's letters that date to the mid-1890s, and quite different from the very regular penmanship Hunt was already evolving by 1900. The features of Hunt's earliest transcription practices (based in part upon Boas' first orthography for Kwak'wala) include the following: o or a as any back labialized stop or fricative; the combination e as either the voiced affricate dz or the voiceless glottalized affricate ts; the character t as, interchangeably, the voiced, voiceless or glottalized lateral affricate, or, with a bar above it, the lateral fricative; a lack of distinction between s and z; and the frequent use of a length diacritic above every vowel. Hunt's manuscripts produced after his work with Boas in 1897 have already abandoned every one of these features except the continued use of t for all lateral affricates. For example, for the word ḥagk̑, “red-dyed cedar bark [for the winter ceremonial],” Hunt wrote “hagk̑” in 1895, but Ḥagkw by 1898 (H/B 11/5/1895, 5/25/1898). Boas would have printed this as Ḥagkw.

The Boas-Hunt correspondence provides more precise clues to the date of the manuscripts. They are most likely those referred to by Hunt in letters sent during the course of 1896. Hunt writes, “now I am writing out the Dances you[v] [sic] seen while you was here” (KM VI: H/B 1/4/1896; see also BPC: H/B 2/16/1896, 3/9/1896, 4/30/1896, 7/9/1896).

The first set of pages, Hunt's page numbers 18-29, corresponds closely with pages 577-581 of SOSTHI. The second set of 24 pages has an error in the page numbering: it begins at page 41, but switches several pages later to page 34 and runs from there to page 56. The first seven pages (pp. 41-47) correspond with pages 586-89 of SOSTHI. The rest recount in detail an episode of the winter ceremonial that was not reproduced in SOSTHI, but appears in a later volume (Boas and Hunt 1905:484-91). The episode is partially summed up in one sentence in the third paragraph on page 589: "In the evening a feast was given, the blankets were distributed, and shortly after the beginning of the feast the Hänat's Yáyúj came in and danced three times..."

That pages are missing from the Hunt manuscripts is obvious from the gaps in page numbering (which are pages 1-19, 30-40, probably, and 51-2). Judging from the correspondence, several other sections of manuscript are missing as well. On the last page of extant manuscript (page 56), Hunt writes, "now after this I will write about what the Koskimo Done on the 25th of Nov" (KM VI). In Boas' published version, those events are described in 12 pages of typeset prose (1897: 589-600). Another six published pages describe the final events of the 1894 winter ceremonial. This would equal at least another 40 pages of Hunt manuscript. The part of the chapter that precedes what we do have from Hunt comprises another 33 printed pages, or about 66 manuscript pages. In other words, around 100 pages of Hunt's draft of this chapter are missing.

Comparison of an extended section of Hunt manuscript with Boas' published version shows how closely Boas followed Hunt's first draft. Hunt wrote:

all the time the new Hämôte [sic; i.e., Hamats'a] Was Dancing. Ḥagkw Holding a copper in his Hand and a woman came out With a strip of calico about 40 yards in length this woman name is Ḥagkw, she toked the calico all Round the fire. and the Hämôte Danced Between the fire and the calico. he Wore the Balsam Pine Branch and Danced the two first song with it on. and after the singers sang the two songs. then he Ḥagkw came foward and asked Ḥagkw to come and make a speach and he Ḥagkw came and stand up at the Rear End of the House. and he said. yes you my children yes I for I am your Box you mind for I Keep all the old sayings in my Head and I have seen thing in my young Days that you young men never have Heard of
and seen. and it is good to have one old man to show you all this things. now i am going to this hámats'a and ondress, the dress that was put on him by the baxbålqanoxs'tiwf for i am he, said he the old man. and he walked up to the hámada and took the head ring off first and next he take off the neck ring and off the arms and legs ring. then he gave the rings of balsam pine branch to lamn'a and he the old man asked nhuk'tamis to bring the blanket and the red cedar bark, then he nhuk'tamis went back into a bedroom for about one minute and he brought all that the old man ask for, and he nhuk'tamis gave the blue blanket first to the old man. and he put the blanket on to the hámats'a and again the old man took the neck ring and put it on to the neck of the hámats'a and again the old man took the apron and put that on and next the arms and legs ring all of red cedar bark rings then last of all he took the eagles down and put it on to the red cedar bark dress of the hámats'a. then the old man hámats'a step in front of the hámats'a and said it is all done (KM i:24-5).

for this passage, boas has:

after this song lókapakw u arose in the rear of the house, holding a copper, and a woman named ayaya, brought a strip of calico about 40 yards long, which was unrolled and spread in a circle around the fire.

then the singers began the second song: ...

the hámats'a were dancing between the calico and the fire in a squatting position. their attendants tried to pacify them with cries of "hód," and the women danced for them. then alabala stepped forward and asked the singers to wait before beginning the third song. he called his speaker, tóqoamalis, who took his position in the rear of the house, and addressed the people as follows:

"yes, my children, i am the storage box of your thoughts, for i remember all the old tales, and in my young days i have seen things which you young people never heard of. it is good that there is one old man who can show you all these things. now i will go to this hámats'a and take off the dress that baxbålqanoxs'tiw put on him." he stepped up to the hámats'a, who was standing in the rear of the house, and took off his head ring first, then his neck ring. he cut off the arm rings and anklets and gave them to lamn'a. then he asked nau'aqala to bring blankets and ornaments made of red cedar bark. nau'aqala went to fetch them from his bedroom, and when he had returned, tóqoamalis proceeded to dress the hámats'a. he put the blue blanket over his back and cedar bark ornaments on his head, his neck, his arms, and around his ankles. he also tied a dancing apron around his waist and strewed eagle down on his head. then he said, "it is done" (boas 1897:578-79).

there are, of course, differences in these two passages. boas made revisions to hunt's kwak'wala transcription, and, as is obvious, he altered hunt's english spelling, grammar, and often, his wording. boas also changed the sequence of some elements in his version. for example, while hunt grouped the hámats'a's four songs in an earlier place in the text, boas scattered the songs throughout, with one occurring in this very passage (omitted at ellipsis).

finally, boas sometimes omits or misconstrues information in hunt's text. hunt, for example, quotes "tóqoamalis" as saying, "now i am going to this hámátogá and ondress, the dress that was put on him by the baxbålqanoxs'tiwf for i am he." the old man, for that moment, is assuming the role of baxbålqanoxs'tiwf, the hámats'a's initiating spirit. boas leaves this identification out. in another passage in this chapter, hunt writes about a man who angrily tears up a blanket, which he deems an insulting gift, and throws it in the fire. then the man says, "now you that set on the fire take good care to keep you warm" (km i:28-9). the insulted man is referring to raxala, the "one-sitting-on-the-fire," a being to whom food and prayers were given at kwakwaka'wakw feasts (boas 1921:1332). boas had probably not learned about this being at the time he altered hunt's words to, "now you who saw it in the fire take good care to keep it warm" (1897:580).

despite the numerous minor differences, the overall similarity of these passages is clear. more of these early manuscript pages may yet be found among boas' papers. to determine the total portion of the volume drafted by hunt from boas' notes may no longer be possible at this date, but his role was clearly much greater than has been thought.

hunt's revisions and corrections to sosswi

hunt's involvement with sosswi did not end with its publication, or even with the appearance several years later of the corrected kwak'wala texts
of a number of the winter ceremonial songs, and the Kwak'wala portion of several myth and historical narratives in the volume (Boas and Hunt 1905:247-9, 271-8, 354-5, 418-24, 447-84). Over twenty years later Hunt wrote to Boas, saying, "now about the Book with the many illustrations [i.e., SOSSKwI], there are so many mistakes ... that I think should Be Put to Rights Before one of us Die" (BPC: H/B 6/7/1920). Boas replied that he was "very anxious" to have the mistakes corrected, and asked Hunt to begin (BPC: B/H 7/22/1930; see also H/B 2/4/1920, 5/21/1920; RMC).

Hunt began to produce the corrections to SOSSKwI in August or September of 1920, consulting with Kwak'waka'wakw elders in order to do so (H/B 9/25/1920, 10/14/1920; LKM:2-3). He generated two batches of revisions to the volume, 109 pages during 1920-1 and another 54 pages in 1924, and then laid the task aside for seven years (BPC: H/B 1/14/21, 4/25/21, 1/15/24, 5/31/24; KM III:1679; LKM: 3-5).

In early 1931, at Boas' request, Hunt took it up once again (BPC: H/B 2/17/31). From that point until Hunt's death in September 1933, Hunt was entirely occupied with the revisions (BPC: J. Cadwallader/B 9/6/1933). He produced over 670 pages of additional corrections and comments on the volume during this period (BPC: H/B 2/17/31; KM VI: H/B 7/27/33; J. Hunt/B 9/26/33). Altogether Hunt's revisions to SOSSKwI amount to well over 800 pages of manuscript, which today are to be found in one of the unindexed masses of Boas' Kwak'waka'wakw papers at the American Philosophical Society (KM).

These revisions were produced by a method that differed from what was typical of the Boas-Hunt collaboration. Here, Boas did not prompt Hunt with specific questions. Rather, he told Hunt to "simply mark the page [of the published volume] and then say what you want to say about it" (BPC: H/B 7/22/1920). Hunt corrected and added to the text at his own initiative. As he stated, "I see that I got to go all through the Book. To do it Rightly, some times I got to write some other story that Belong to it, to Explain the meaning of it" (H/B 2/17/31). In consequence, Boas' own research agenda has less of an imprint here than elsewhere in Hunt's work. This renders these materials perhaps more heterogeneous, but perhaps even more interesting.

Many of the revisions are in fact corrections to the Kwak'wala of SOSSKwI. As much as a third of the total number of manuscript pages were copied from the original text with the addition only of new transcriptions of Kwak'wala names and other words. Boas discarded those pages while preserving a record of the corrections.

Hunt also revised songs and texts in the volume according to the vastly improved standards he and Boas had achieved by the later decades of their collaboration. (Interestingly, Hunt produced two or more slightly different corrected versions of some songs and texts.) There remained, however, continuing problems with Hunt's notation of glottalized versus non-glottalized sonorants (see Berman 1994: 494). Boas generally corrected these as he compiled Hunt's new transcriptions.

Most of Hunt's revisions, though, are to the ethnographic content of the volume. These revisions, largely in English, include correction and addition of numerous points of ethnographic and ethnohistorical detail. The very first corrections Hunt transmitted were to the identifications of the objects illustrating SOSSKwI. As Boas stated in an unpublished article,

The explanations of these specimens given at that time [1894] were based upon information given to me by the Indians from whom I purchased the specimens, in part corroborated by inquiries among others, although these were difficult on account of secrecy involved in the purchase of the masks. The specimens collected by Mr. Jacobsen were explained on the basis of illustrations which Prof. Albert Grünwald of Berlin had the kindness to make for me and which I showed to the Indians. I did not succeed always in finding the owner of the objects in question, so that there remained some uncertainty in regard to the right interpretation of the objects.

... I requested [George Hunt] particularly to find the owners of the specimens illustrated in my report and to obtain further information in regard to the objects. In some cases his information differs from the explanation previously given, while in other cases it is more specific than what I was able to present in my previous report (RMC: 1-2).

Hunt made a kind of catalogue of the illustrations of the volume giving "the right name of the masks on the Book and who there Belong to," with the page and figure number from SOSSKwI and a paragraph or more of English description mixed with Kwak'wala words and names. The catalogue of nearly 50 manuscript pages covers most of the illustrations of Kwak'waka'wakw material in the book (KM III: 1877-93, 1904-20, 1927-39). "[T]his is all that I know," said Hunt, "and what I Dont Know I pass them" (KM III:1239).
Hunt's later batches of revisions included more extended commentary on some of the masks and dancers. One example is Hunt's statement about the nunfam, a type of dancer. In the original, Boas wrote:

The nōx'nlemala (pl. of nōx'mal) or "fool dancers" . . . are initiated by a fabulous people, the Klax'mik, who are believed to live near a lake inland from Lxsewsa'. Their village is believed to be on an island floating on the lake. In olden times a man went beaver hunting and fell in with these people. He came back exhausted and "crazy." ... From him the nōx'nlemala are said to derive their origin (Boas 1897: 468).

Hunt's comment on this passage was as follows:

...the Klaxsmk or Back of the woods living tribe... use to live at xwtes which are called xuyalas, and the gosgemox tribe use to live at gosje on the south of cape sotc. and the gosgemox tribe went to war against the xuyalas tribe. and the gosgemox on the second war drove the xuyalas in [to] the wood... and from that time the gosgemox tribe lived at xwtes, so the xuyalas is not a spirit But a common People who use to come and Halibut fishing at Place called aikes or Patch on the Beach... about one Mile and Half East of Lxsewsa'. and as soon as the Klaxsmk People sees a strangers canoe coming then they Paddle ashore and Run away to their Home at a inland from L1x·sewe. which supposed to Have floating Island with their Houses built on it. these what the Kwagul tribes calls Klaxsmk. Are Really the xuyalas. and I was told that they are the first People that the wolves give the nunfam or all turn craze Dance to... and from the xuyalas tribe. the gosgemox got the Dance and from the gosgemox the osgemox got it. and from them the Lxsemars got the nunfam Dance. and from the [time of the] wolves the nunfam. and nuxEnem, or fool dance. was always kept together (KM V: 5601-2).

There are a number of interesting points in Hunt's commentary. Among other things, it both agrees with and adds to the scanty information available about the xuyalas division of the Kwagul, a group that was already extinct by the time of Boas' first fieldwork, and not even mentioned in his comprehensive list of Kwagul divisions and descent groups.

(1966:38-41, see also 44). Hunt's account also gives a fuller version of the historical spread of the nunfam dance ceremonial than is to be found elsewhere (Boas 1966:400-401).

Another point of interest is the nature of the disagreement between Boas' and Hunt's versions of the origin of the nunfam dance. To assume that Hunt's identification of the "xlichesm" as the xuyalas division is historically correct does not require that we reject Boas' identification of the same as a population of spirits. One of the characteristics of 19th-century Kwagul ceremonialism was the possession by each descent group of a myth that, among other things, specified the origin of the ceremonies owned by that descent group's noble lines. These origin myths, while distinct in many details of content, are formally quite similar, and Boas' brief synopsis of the origin of the fool dancers is in consonance with the general pattern (see Berman 1991). The relationship between Hunt's account and Boas' version (which Boas may even have obtained through Hunt) might also therefore count as evidence for how historical knowledge both coexisted with, and was assimilated into, the formal patterns of myth and ceremony.

Hunt's revisions to SosskwI contain not just additions of detail to the ethnographic record, but also commentary that, especially in conjunction with other Hunt materials, suggests broader reinterpretations of the winter ceremonial and other aspects of 19th-century Kwagul cosmology and culture. For example, on page 418 of SosskwI Boas discusses the descent-group ancestors' acquisition of winter dances in myth. Hunt's amplifications place those events within the larger framework of Kwagul cosmogony.

Hunt states that the very first winter dance, an event of major cosmogonic implications, was held by Raven and Mink and their party of the "myth People," who "were Birds and animals [sic] yet they can talk to Each other and understand Each other. these are called the myth People or nuxEnem" (KM VI:4969). In order to perform the ceremonial, the myth people (or "Histrie People" as Hunt more often called them) took off their animal shapes. Some of them dressed in their animal masks afterward while others remained in human form (Boas and Hunt 1905: 489; also Boas 1966:258). This event was the beginning of the separation between the human realm and the spirit realm of the animals.

The first winter dances performed by humanity were based upon the animal natures of the primordial generation:
and what Ever kind of Bird a man Belongs to his Dance will Be as he was Before he was turned into a man and [for those who were] the animals [it is] the same (KM VI: 4969).

Hunt lists "some of the Da[n]ces. of the myth people," which include the Wolf Dancer, the Fool Dancer (for Deer), the Grizzly Bear Dancer, the Raven Dancer, Thunderbird Dancer, and others. In his cosmology these archaic dances pre-date those acquired in the age of myth proper (nuüm), when the children and grandchildren of the first generation of transformed, secularized beings grew to human adulthood, ventured into the deep forest or out to sea, acquired spiritual wealth and founded descent groups (KM VI: 4969, III: 4624).

...these spirits appears to the first man of each one clan or nEmemot and tells him what to Do. what kind of Dances he will use. [But] that is after the myth People Past (KM VI: 4969).

In his discussions of myth and the winter ceremonial, Boas did not ignore the varieties of acquisition story. He treated them, though, as story types of equal significance, co-existing, as it were, in ethnoliterary time and space. In these late unpublished manuscripts, Hunt places not just the dances but also the stories about their origins within the framework of a developing, transforming universe. The winter ceremonial of his day, Hunt argues in these pages, evolved through a series of accretions, beginning first with the dances in which one imitates one's ancestral spirit nature, and passing on to dances such as the Tu[md] and Hamsham'ac acquired from spirits by the early generations of humanity, and ending, in the historic period, with acquisition of the Hamats'a complex through marriage and war from the northern neighbors of the Kwakwągį'awkw.4

Further, in Hunt's view, acquisition stories belong to a range of ethnoliterary genres that correspond to the developmental stages of the cosmos. As Hunt states elsewhere in Boas' papers, the eponymous "nułm'temem" (nułm'temem) are stories told about the primordial beings; following this are nuwem, stories concerning the first generations after the first winter dance; then come "qayola" (qayola), "tales about the forefathers" that occurred after the end of the myth age, within the historical memory of latter-day humans; and finally there are "qayola" (qayola [?]), a person "telling what he have seen and what he Heard his Friends talking about" (KM III: 4624).

Hunt's focus on the History People and their transformation suggests that the key to the underlying meaning of the winter ceremonial should be sought there, in the story of its origin, and not just in the elaboration of the hereditary prerogatives that are the actual dances. (Boas published two versions of the story, called "Mink and the Wolves"; Boas and Hunt 1906: 103-13; Boas 1930:57-86; see Berman 1991:698-702.) It is hard to say whether the emergence of this cosmogonic framework is the result of Hunt's greater freedom to set his own agenda in these revisions, or whether it is due in some measure to the time he spent in the late 1920s learning what the winter ceremonial's hereditary officers had previously kept "strictly secret" (R/B 6/15/26). Either way, it offers a tantalizing glimpse of a Kwakwągį'awkw cosmological order, an order for which anthropologists have hitherto been able to search only indirectly through complicated interpretive operations (Berman 1991, Goldman 1976, Walens 1981).

As elsewhere in Boas' unpublished papers, Hunt's revisions to SOS5KVI also contain rich nuggets of ethnographic and ethnohistorical information about other peoples on the coast. In several places he discusses the movement and transfer of dances and dance elements from group to group. Hunt does not seem to be just responding to Boas' interest in diffusion; he was clearly fascinated with the topic. He himself had seen much change in the winter dances since his youth, when he danced for seven chiefs of the old-time Kwaągį (Boas 1966:256). "[S]ince they [the dances] got mixed in with the [dances of the] Heiltsuq [Heiltsuk] and the ?aweklenox [Oowekeeno] there lots of change in the way they dance now" (KM VI: 4971-2).

One way in which dances had spread north all the way to the Tsimsian and Tlingit was through warfare (e.g., KM VII: 5051-9). Hunt's discussion of the topic also reveals some interesting details about the indigenous slave trade on the north Pacific coast during the 19th century.

According to Hunt, it was common practice to question war captives in

---

4 Hunt was aware of variation and elaboration in this developmental sequence among various divisions of the Kwakwągį'awkw, but was most concerned with the four Kwaągį divisions of Fort Rupert.
detail about the ceremonials into which they had been initiated during the
days of their freedom. "[T]he northern People learn about the winter dance
... from their slaves" (KM V: 5420). Hunt tells the following story about
"Sf'maks the great warrior of the gedawał [Kitkatla] tribe" (KM V: 5418-20; BPC:
H/B 12/14/21). Some time during the 1850s, Sf'maks (A'mneys, probably the
Tsimshian name Haimas) killed a Kwaguł chief and took the chief's sisters
prisoner. Seven or eight years later, one of the women who had been captured
returned to Fort Rupert, probably after having been bought and freed by a
Hudson's Bay Company factor at Fort Simpson. She told the Kwaguł how she and
her sisters had been interrogated by their captors. First they were asked

if they were chiefs Daughters or sisters. and she said yes I am
sister of... the head chief of the Kwakw'ak'wum clan. said she. and then the
man... ask what kind of Dance you have in the winter. and she say we
[isletska] [the major Kwakw'akw winter ceremonial] ...my Elder sister is
mey' Dancer... and ...tamer Dancer. and lots of other kind of other
dances. and the man said the slave we took Before you said that also you
have the Hamatsle [a much higher-ranking dance] and the liokm [Ghost] Dance
also. yes she said true about the Hamatsla... but the liokm [or] ...
nonem... Dance Dont Belong to the Kwaguł. it Belongst to the Llnaksewqala
[and other northern Kwakw'akw divisions]. ... So by the slaves they
try to learn all they can, about the names and the ... dances. and Even
their ... son[g]s. and Sf'maks never keep lot of slaves. for he sells them.
.further up north... and when their sold. the new owner ask [sic] the same
Questions (KM V:5419-20).

The information from the Fort Rupert woman evidently motivated A'mneys to
go to war against the northern divisions of the Kwakw'akw. Once more he
took prisoners and interrogated them about their dances, and this time he
learned all about the Nonem Dance as well. He eventually sold these latter
prisoners to a Tongass Tlingit man, and as a boy Hunt met them at DaasaxákW,
the home town of his Tlingit great-uncle.

Not all of Hunt's ethnohistoric commentary in these revisions concerns
dances and ceremonials. For example, he also discusses trade in mundane
items:
What, if anything, did Boas do with these hundreds of pages of manuscript? In the early 1920s, he put together a short article based closely on Hunt's first batch of revisions to SOSSKWI, the list of corrections to the illustrations (RMC). Boas hoped that the National Museum of Natural History would publish it as it had the original, but he was unable to excite any interest in that quarter (J.R. Swanton/6/18/1924 in RMC).

Boas incorporated other revisions into the manuscript that was published posthumously as Kwakiutl Ethnography (Boas 1966). The revisions appear primarily in the two chapters on the winter ceremonial (1966:171-98). The first of these chapters consists largely of material taken from the original of SOSSKWI (chiefly from 1897:544-605); the corrected Kwak'wala transcriptions are just about the only additions. The second chapter is heterogeneous, being a compilation of English paraphrase from published Hunt texts (Boas 1930:57-131) that is interpolated with material from both the original text of SOSSKWI and Hunt's later commentary on that text. Some, but by no means all, of Hunt's revisions are credited to him.

The portion of the revisions that Boas saw to print is only a small piece of whole. Their scope is such that any evaluation of the original monograph, or any reinterpretation of the Kwakwak'wakw winter ceremonial, for that matter, should not be made without them.
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