

CULTEE'S KATHLAMET "SALMON'S MYTH" AS TWICE-TOLD TO BOAS:  
LANGUAGE, MEMORY AND SELECTIVE PERFORMANCE <sup>1</sup>

Dell Hymes  
University of Pennsylvania

I want to make a point about ethno-poetics in relation to a methodological approach I shall call 'practical structuralism'. The point has emerged from philology, philology in its broad sense, the establishment of the language of texts and their interpretation as well, and so I must begin with the context of the text.

In 1890 Franz Boas, seeking to rescue knowledge of languages and traditions in the Pacific Northwest, could find on the Oregon coast no one who could dictate texts in the language of the Chinook who had dominated that very place at the beginning of the century, hosting Lewis and Clark. Referred to Bay Center, Washington, there he found three other survivors, one of whom, Charles Cultee, proved 'a veritable storehouse of information' (1901: 5). Cultee quickly grasped Boas' purposes, even though their only medium of communication was the Chinook Jargon, and enabled him to understand the structure of the language. Boas made three trips in all, 1890, 1891 and December 1894. On the last trip he sought to test the accuracy and validity of his Kathlamet data, as he himself explains:

"...Cultee was my only informant (for Kathlamet). This is unfortunate, as he told me also Chinook texts, and is, therefore, the only source for two dialects of the Chinookan stock. In order to ascertain the accuracy of his mode of telling, I had two stories which he had told in the summer of 1891 repeated three and a half years later, in December 1894. ...They show great similarity and corroborate the opinion which I formed from internal evidence that the language of the texts is fairly good and represents the dialect in a comparatively pure state. Cultee lived for a considerable number of years at Cathlamet, on the south side of the Columbia river, a few miles above Astoria, where he acquired this dialect. His mother's mother was a Kathlamet..."

This is all that Boas ever published about the 'great similarity' of the two tellings of the two stories.

Sixty years later Boas' finding about the state of the dialect was abundantly confirmed. His texts provided the basis for an account of Kathlamet phonology, morphology and lexicon (Hymes 1955). Until now nothing has been said about the state of the tradition expressed in the texts. Indeed, we can now ask not only about its content but also about its organization. Chinookan narratives, and many other American Indian narrative traditions, have been found to show an organization in terms of lines and groups of lines (Hymes 1981, 1985; an initial sketch of the Kathlamet 'Sun's myth' in English translation is given at the end of Hymes 1975). Narrative competence of this kind can shine through a text both brief and dialectally somewhat garbled (Hymes 1982a). What about Cultee's two repeated tellings?

Cultee's narratives do show the general Chinookan patterns of organization. When closely compared, they show details that bear on the stability of tradition over time and that can be taken to have to do with memory and its refreshment. They also show details that are a matter of selective performance, of focus on one rather than another aspect of the tradition of a myth. These details come to view as a result of analysis of ethno-poetic form. Once pointed out, they are perhaps obvious, yet it is my experience that they are not visible in texts as usually published. My own interpretation of the meaning of the two texts came only as an answer to the problem posed by the discovery that they are not the same in form. Without the verse analysis I would have been able to say only that Cultee remembered an additional ingredient in 1894. I would not have been able to see that he had shaped the telling to different effect in each case.

This conclusion must emerge from the presentation of the two texts and consideration of the evidence for the form each is taken to have. <sup>2</sup> (The other pair of texts, 'The War of the Ghosts', also has something of interest about stability of tradition and selective performance, but to include it here would make the article too long). Let me insert here some methodological reflections.

## "PRACTICAL" STRUCTURALISM

Current discussion in ethno-poetics sometimes loses sight of the basic question of descriptive method. Whatever else 'ethno-poetics' may be, it is first of all continuous with the description of other aspects of language. Its starting point must be what might be called 'practical structuralism'. The term 'structuralism' here does not refer to what has been made of linguistic analysis in anthropology, semiotics, and the like. The term here refers to the elementary task of discovering the relevant features and relationships of a language and its texts. One should think of Kenneth Pike and Eugene Nida and H. A. Gleason, Jr., rather than of Claude Levi-Strauss and Roland Barthes. That is the kind of work which is continuous with Boas' establishing of a certain essential level of adequacy and accuracy earlier on, and the kind of work from which 'structuralism' as a theory is an abstraction. If Zellig Harris had not decided to change the name of his 1951 book from 'Methods in Descriptive Linguistics' to 'Methods in Structural Linguistics', his student Chomsky might not have taken 'structural' as an epithet for everything preceding him that he rejected, and the lineage of practical work might be clearer today.

'Practical structuralism', then, or 'descriptive structuralism', has to do with the elementary task that Hockett (1955) called 'gathering', as distinct from 'collation'. Linguistic controversy today usually presupposes the results of 'gathering'. The argument is not about what exists (in one sense at least) as it is about how what exists is to be understood in terms of a model or general theory. Of course a theory directs attention to some facts and away from others. Transformational generative grammar has directed attention away from the prosodic facts that are vital to discourse and narrative patterning, whenever they can be ascertained. But there is a large area of presupposed agreement. Linguists have not disagreed as to the fact that /p/ and /b/ contrast initially in English words ('pill' : 'bill'), and do not contrast after /s/ and before vowels; there is a labial stop in that position, which we write with 'p' in 'spoon', but only one. Argument has been about the way in which to relate the facts about initial position to the fact about occurrence of labial stop after s-. (Is it p? is it b? is it common core? is it part of a sequence of dental fricative and labial stop that is voiceless (sp) or voiced (zb) as in 'asbestos', as a whole?)

The situation in ethno-poetic analysis is parallel. It is not difficult to recognize lines and local groups of lines. In Chinookan, at least, and some other languages, each predicate phrase is distinct as a line. Certain other constructions show, through predicate import or parallelism, that they can be

regarded as lines. Certain sets of lines are readily recognizable as belonging together: they share content, show verbal repetition, contrast with what precedes and follows them. In some styles, such as that of Louis Simpson in the Wishram-Wasco texts recorded by Sapir (1909; cf. ch. 4 of Hymes 1971), an initial particle pair, translatable as 'Now then', consistently marks a unit at a level above that of line, which can be called the verse. (Other particles sometimes substitute, notably 'Now again'). In other styles, such as that of Charles Cultee, initial particles do occur and when they do, do mark larger units, but do not occur initially with every unit larger than a line. To be sure, certain other kinds of word turn out to be consistent signs of demarcation: temporal words, such as statements of season, time of day, or the passage of time, notably are such. A turn at talk; a change of location by the movement of the actor focussed upon; a new actor, commonly are signals of units. Beyond such indications of individual units is the matter of relations among units.

Some local relations are recurrent and consistent evidence that the lines showing them belong to a common unit: three, or five, lines in a common sequence of travel, such as 'he went, he went on, he arrived'; a sequence of two actions leading to something perceived as a third element and outcome.

Beyond these immediate relations<sup>are</sup>/relations of longer scope. Here patterns of repetition and parallelism play an essential part. On the one hand, there is the known Chinookan principle of grouping actions in sequences of three and five. On the other hand, there is the way in which this flexible principle has been implemented in a particular case. Sometimes the boundary of a larger grouping is indicated by an accumulation of initial markers: particles, time words, a turn at talk, even a change in tense-aspect; but often not. There can be some room for uncertainty and disagreement at this level. My experience with Chinookan leads me to have confidence in demarcating lines, verses and some local groupings of verses. That is equivalent to what Hockett called 'gathering', to establishing the elements that occur with contrastive significance in a position, in the paradigmatic set within a slot. Larger relations depend in important part upon accumulated intimacy with a text and the rhythm it seems itself to have; and they inevitably depend in part on criteria of consistency and, sometimes, on an inference as to expressive intention. (As mentioned, in the texts in this article, expressive intention was inferred from patterning already established, but the 'spiral', or dialectical back-and-forth, between both kinds of inference is often unavoidable).

The local relationships usually can be simply noticed and presented. The larger relationships must sometimes be argued. Alternatives must be explored in a quasi-experimental fashion. The choice will be that larger patterning which best accounts for all the data, best fits the covariation of form and meaning present in the text. In this respect, 'texts fight back' (to put quotes around what I should like to seek taken as a slogan). Formally feasible patterning may do violence to content; one among formally feasible patterns may bring out an aspect of content otherwise missed.

These kinds of consideration are familiar, and I have mostly mentioned them before myself (see Hymes 1981, esp. pp. 150-2, 176-7, 192-3, 318-20). Yet if they were obvious and compelling, the landscape of debate and activity in ethnopoetics and with American Indian texts would be, one should think, rather different. On the one hand, there are those whose concern with prosodic phenomena in and of themselves, or for prosodic phenomena as a dimension of linguistic structure, seems to lead them to neglect its interdependence with content. The basic principle of 'practical structuralism', after all, has always been that of contrast and repetition, the use of form/meaning covariation to establish what counts as the same and what as different. In a single performance one can not be sure what features of pause and contour are accidental, what conventional in the style of the one narrator, what conventional in the community. What contrasts in the sense of covarying with a difference in significance? What counts as repetition, as the same, despite the observer's ability to detect physical difference?

On the other hand, a great deal of work informed by structural principles uses as its units content elements abstracted from the actual text. I yield to no one in my admiration of Levi-Strauss for having discovered relationships of inversion, of transformation, in narrative. Still, 'practical structuralism' requires that one start from the actual text and account for it as a whole. It requires that one arrive at a 'grammar' of the local tradition, before proceeding to interpret a text from that tradition by comparison with findings from elsewhere.

'Practical structuralism', and the principle of form/meaning covariation, has to regard both kinds of work as inadequate. It has to see the main task before us as a descriptive task. We simply do not have very many instances of American Indian narratives analyzed and presented in an adequate way. The elements, devices, patterns, relationships and meanings present in these texts are still to a significant extent to be discovered. We have only begun to give grounding to models of what the narrators were up to, so to speak.

Such local theories and models are the point of intersection between theories and models of grammar and discourse, on the onehand, and theories and models of narrative structure, on the other.

A way to make clear what is entailed is implicit in the presentation of what I have called a 'profile' of a text. (Cf. 1980: 46-47; 1981a: 225, 227, 232-3, 238; 1983: 134-5). Such a profile commits one. It expresses an analysis of the entire text, thus answering to the linguistic criterion of 'total accountability' at this discourse level. It states all the relationships and units found in the text, from lines to acts and major parts. Such a profile is a check on the adequacy of one's own analysis for oneself and a concise statement for purposes of alternative analysis and of comparison.

In previous presentations of profiles, I have shown mostly the 'form', as it were, in the sense of the lines and groups of lines. Content has been indicated chiefly in labels for sections, if at all. It is easy enough to include indications of content at every level, and to do so makes the form/meaning covariation that underlies the analysis much more evident. Of course the indications do not touch all that there is to be found and said about meaning. They represent a very minimal abstraction from the content, a low-order labeling of it.

Such a profile permits precision in statements of difference and similarity, whether between alternative analyses, between performances, between different narratives. I have suggested some conventions for tagging points of alternative analysis (1981, ch. 5) and mentioned this contribution of verse analysis to comparison (1981b) with regard to a Clackamas and Kalapuya version of 'The news about Coyote'. Here I give such a profile, incorporating form/meaning relationships through, for the first time.

Notice that the fact of presentation in lines itself facilitates alternative analysis and comparison. Cumbersome phrasings, duplicated footnoting, and the like can be avoided. One need simply cite the line numbers in to identify the data in question.

With such a profile and the analysis that underlies it, one can show precisely what is at issue in arriving at an analysis of the overall patterning of a text; one can specify what is invariant in the style of a narrator or a story; one can hope to lay the basis for systematic comparative understanding of American Indian narratives. A motif-index, the ingredients of Boas' 1916 Tsimshian Mythology, the analyses of Levi-Strauss, garner insights and aspects

of the truth. Yet in the light of verse analysis, they come to seem as partial in the light they shed as a grammar of one of the languages encased in a Latin model. The true inner 'economy' is missing. Most strikingly of all, perhaps, no such comparative method, basing itself on translation and content alone, has ever, so far as I know, brought to attention the speech acts, the verbal genres, and the finer dramatic devices of these narratives. The 'speech of remonstrance' that figures in Victoria Howard's 'Seal and her younger brother lived there' (Hymes 1981, chs. 8, 9); the extraposition of a final element that underlies the foregrounding of an entire scene in Louis Simpson's 'The Deserted Boy' (Hymes 1982b, 1980, 1981: ch. 4), and that recurs in Chehalis Salish, Zuni and Tonkawa in Tonkawa; the pattern of arrival on a scene that is shared between Pima-Papago texts of a certain genre, certain Tonkawa Coyote myths, and one Takelma myth (Hymes 1980)--such devices and their meanings, cannot be seen except in an analysis that liberates a narrative into its verses and lines. As a result, the artistry involved in their deployment cannot be appreciated. Personal voice cannot be discerned, one cannot cross the distance between performance, personal voice, and comparative analysis.

#### PROFILE, TRANSLATION, AND TEXT (1891)

Here, then, is the profile for the 1891 telling of the myth. The profile embodies the analysis finally arrived at, but the presentations of the translation and the text do not. They are keyed to each other by line numbers, so that even someone quite unacquainted with Chinookan can see something of the verbal recurrence and placement of the performance. One can read either without a commitment to the larger patterns of relationship arrived at in the analysis. The placement on the page does embody a commitment to lines and local groupings of lines, but this is the level I take to be one that can be agreed upon. A tape recording might change something, if one had been possible, but by and large it would not effect the form/meaning relationships discoverable in the words themselves. Whatever tone of voice, intonational contour, or distribution of pauses might occur, these relationships would still obtain. Very likely Cultee's voice would be found to reinforce some relationships, clarify others, play off against still others. Possibly his voice would demonstrate the pace at which Boas instructed him to dictate and little else. In any case, the text we have still permits inference to what he meant.

#### MYTH OF THE SALMON I (told 1891)

Act/Scene	Strophe/Verse	Incident	Markers	Lines				
I	i	A	Myth people hunger	Scene/agent frame set of 5 names, 3 vbs	1-6			
		B	a	Upriver (1)	Season word, now, travel (1)	7-8		
			b	Upriver (2)	Ordinal, travel (2)	9-10		
			c	'If I were not'	Loc., travel (3), now turn at talk	11-15		
		C	a	d	'Who?'	turn at talk	16-17	
				e	'Your Fa's sibling'	turn at talk	18-19	
				Ashore	Turn at talk, lex. rep. (3)	20-22		
				b	Giftng (1, 2)	pentastich(2; 3)	23-27	
				c	Placing	distich	28-29	
				ii	A	Upriver	'Now again', travel	30
				B	a	'If I were not'	'Now again', turn	31-35
				b	'Who?'	turn	36-37	
				c	'Your Fa's sibling'	turn	38	
				C	a	Giftng (1, 2)	tristich (1; 2)	39-41
				iii	A	Upriver	travel	42-43
B	a			'If I were not'	'Now again', turn	44-48		
		b	'Who?'	turn	49-50			
		c	'Fa's sibling'	turn	51-52			
		C	a	Ashore	turn	53		
		b	Giftng		54-55			
		c	Placing	(C = pentastich)	56-57			
		iv	A	Upriver	'Now again', travel	58-59		
		B	a	'If I were not'	'Now again', turn	60-64		
		b	'Who?'	turn	65-66			
		c	'Fa's sibling'	turn	67			
		C	a	Ashore	turn	68-69		
		b	Giftng		70-71			
		c	Placing	(C = pentastich)	72			
		v	A	Upriver	'Now again', travel	73		
		B	a	'If I were not'	Loc, 'Now again', turn	74-79		
		b	'Who?', ashore	turn	80-81			
		c	'Fa's sibling'	turn	82-83			
		C	a	Giftng, placing	distich	84-85		

II	A a	Upriver, ask	"Now", travel, turn	86-89
	b	Answer	turn (3 + 3)	90-95
	B c	"What?"	turn	96-97
	d	Answer	turn ("Now" (3x))	98-104
	C e	Alongside (1)	turn	105-107
	f	Alongside (2)	change of loc.?	108-109
	D g	Twisting (1)	Loc, name (Flounder)	110-114
	h	Twisting (2)	pentastich	
	h	Twisting (2)	name (Crow), tristich	115-117
	i	Twisting (3)	name (Bluejay)	118-121
	E j	Pronouncement (1)	turn	122-123
	k	Pronouncement (2)	turn	124-125

Not all indications of structural units can be included in the column for Markers. Repetition of incidents in a consistent pattern itself establishes expectations and structural relevance, as in the 3 recurrent incidents in strophe C: going ashore, gifting, placing. As often happens, the first sequence is elaborated (strophe C in scene i, establishing it, and successors are briefer.

Abbreviations include; Fa : 'father'; lex. rep. = lexical repetition; loc. = locative or locational word; vb. = verb. 'Turn' replaces the fuller phrase 'turn at talk'.

'Strophe' is used because it suggests flexibility of form more than does 'stanza'. 'To gift' is used as a transitive verb by Indians in the region, hence 'gifting' for the recurrent incident in strophe C of each scene.

## MYTH OF THE SALMON I (told 1891)

I ("If I were not")

i (Skunk Cabbage)

The people of myth times died of Hunger.	1
Large arrowhead root was all they had to eat,	2
and small arrowhead root,	3
and skunk cabbage,	4
and tqanapSupSu root they would have to eat,	5
and rush-root.	6
Spring came,	7
now Salmon went up river.	8
First Salmon would arrive,	9
the companion of many.	10
Somewhere he arrived,	11
now Skunk Cabbage said:	12
"At last my brother's son does arrive.	13
"If I were not,	14
"Then your people would have died."	15
Salmon said:	16
"Who is it who talks that way?"	17
"Ahh, Skunk Cabbage,	18
"he talks that way."	19
"Let us go ashore.	20
"Let us go ashore.	21
They went ashore.	22
He was given an elkskin armor,	23
five elkskin armors were given him.	24
Under his blanket was put a club,	25
and one was put under his blanket the other side of his body,	26
two bone-war-clubs were put under his blanket.	27
He was carried inland,	28
he was put in the midst of willows.	29

(ii. Small Arrowhead Root)

Now again Salmon and his party went upriver. 30  
 Now again another person spoke; 31  
 "At last my brother's son does arrive, 32  
 "the one with maggots in his buttocks. 33  
 "If I were not a person, 34  
 "then your people had died." 35  
 "Who is it who talks that way?" 36  
 he said. 37  
 "Ahh, your father's sister Small Arrowhead Root." 38  
 He put small dentalia at her buttocks, 39  
 he gave her a woodchuck blanket, 40  
 he gave her three woodchuck blankets. 41

(iii. Large Arrowhead Root)

They left her, 42  
 they went a little distance. 43  
 Now again another person spoke: 44  
 "At last my brother's son does arrive, 45  
 "the one with maggots in his buttocks. 46  
 "If I were not a person, 47  
 "then your people would have died." 48  
 Salmon said: 49  
 "Who is it who talks that way?" 50  
 "Ahh, your father's sister Large Arrowhead Root, 51  
 "she talks that way." 52  
 "Let us go ashore!" 53  
 He put long dentalia at her buttocks. 54  
 Five woodchuck blankets he gave her. 55  
 He carried her to mud. 56  
 He put her down. 57

(iv. Rush-root)

Now again they went upriver. 58  
 They arrived some distance. 59  
 Now again a person spoke: 60  
 "At last my brother's son does arrive, 61  
 "the one with maggots in his buttocks. 62  
 "If I were not a person, 63  
 "then your people would have died." 64  
 He said: 65  
 "Who is it who talks that way?" 66  
 "Ahh, your father's brother Rush-root." 67  
 "Let us go ashore," 68  
 said Salmon. 69  
 He was given an elkskin shirt. 70  
 Feathered head regalia were given him. 71  
 He was put down in soft ground. 72

(v. TqanapSupSu)

Now again they went upriver. 73  
 Where they arrived, 74  
 now again a person spoke: 75  
 "At last my brother's son does arrive, 76  
 "the one with maggots in his buttocks. 77  
 "If I were not a person, 78  
 "then your people would have died." 79  
 "Let us go ashore. 80  
 "Who is it who talks that way?" 81  
 "Ahh, TqanapSupSu, your father's brother, 82  
 "he talks that way." 83  
 Five raccoon blankets were given to him. 84  
 He is set down at the shore-line. 85

II. (Bluejay, Crow, Flounder)

Now they went upriver up above. 86  
 They met a canoe. 87  
 Salmon said: 88  
 "Ask that canoe." 89  
 In the canoe were three people. 90  
 A man was steersman (in the stern). 91  
 The one put in the middle spoke: 92  
 "Laq'alaki:awa:, 93  
 "Laq'amo:Sq'amo:S, 94  
 "Laq'apa:wapawa." 95  
 Salmon said: 96  
 "What is that woman talking about?" 97  
 That steersman said: 98  
 "Ahh, she is saying, 99  
 "it was floodtide, 100  
 "now they went upriver, 101  
 "they arrived at the Cascades, 102  
 "now it was ebb-tide, 103  
 "now again they came downriver." 104  
 "Stop their canoe. 105  
 "Why then does a Lie always move her? 106  
 "How long should they (take to) return, 107  
 those going to the Dalles?" 108  
 They stopped their canoe. 108  
 They were reached. 109

In the bow was Flounder. 110  
 Her head was taken. 111  
 Her (throat) was twisted underneath, 112  
 her face was turned round this way, 113  
 her mouth is crosswise this way. 114  
 Crow was taken. 115  
 Her (head) was stretched out, 116  
 her face was turned round. 117  
 Bluejay was taken. 118  
 His (head) was stretched out, 119  
 his neck was twisted underneath, 120  
 his face was turned round. 121  
 They told them: 122  
 "How long should they (take to) return 123  
 going to the Cascades?" 124  
 They were left. 124  
 "Future generations shall camp over five times, 125  
 "And then they shall arrive at the Cascades." 126



## Notes on translation:

- 1, 106: a noun (Hunger, Lie) is personalized transitive subject, and the person affected is object.
- 2, 51: This root is variously rendered as 'sagittaria root', 'large sagittaria root', and in 1894, as 'Indian potato'. "Indian potato" is applied to a number of roots for which English speakers lack a name. 'Arrowhead root' is used for plants of the Sagittaria genus, and only those. Thus it seems the best term to use here, differentiated by the distinction in size. Notice that the large one gets long dentalia, the small one small.
- 3, 38: See above for (2, 51). It is variously rendered as 'small sagittaria root' and 'sagittaria root'. The nominal stem includes a verbal root -lm(a), 'to stab, spear'.
- 3, 18: Haskin (1967: 7) cites this myth with fond approval for its imagery of the golden cloak and club for the spathe and flowers crowded in a fleshy, club-shaped spadix of *Lysichitum americanum*, rank when crushed. Like Levi-Strauss (fn. 3), he mistakes the meaning as referring to a time when there was no salmon and the salmon came for the first time ever. T'otsnix in Kathlamet clearly refers to 'firstness' in a series or context, as in a season (48.7) or even the first moment in the birth of a child (49.7). This is a myth of the annual cycle, not unilinear time.
- 5, 82: No translation is known for T-qanapSupSu. It may contain -pSu 'to hide, conceal. The salt-and-pepper fur of the raccoon may be a clue.
- 6, 67: Possibly the rice root (*Fritillaria lanceolata* Pursh) whose -s could be -sh in Kathlamet. Its large bulbs are covered with plump, white rice-like scales; it is sometimes called 'chocolate' or 'brown' lily from its color and markings; and 'mission' and 'bronze' bells from its graceful shape. These perceptions may agree with the Kathlamet association of it with elkskin and feathered head regalia. The season is right: it blooms from March to May (Haskin 1967: 23)
- 30: The stem -Xelawe:- is unique in Kathlamet, and the distributive plural -maX is unusual with terms for people, which usually take collective plural -kS, -tikS, or -nana (relatives). It may be connected with the stem -Xilalak 'skilfulness, quickness' (the skilful, quick ones), 'lively' in Clackamas, all presumably containing root -la of vigorous motion. Salmon's partners may be described as skilful, capable, picked, adept ones, and also of varied gifts.
- 90: stem-initial k'a- itself indicates 'in a canoe'.
- 104: the initial s- of the stem, as in -su-wulx, means motion or travel on water; with -tso 'down', 'downriver' and with -wulx 'up', 'upriver.'
- 100, 103: With stem -wiCk 'to dance', apparently in the construction in which water (L-) dances them, surges them; ig-i-L-Xe(t)-t-akua, literally, it (i-) moves about, returns (t-akua) from there to here (t-) its (Xe) water (L).
- 112, 120: The verb translated 'twisted underneath' apparently is a verb theme with invariant object prefix a-, implying a-mugui 'throat', following the impersonal subject q-, and preceding indirect object and relational prefix -i-l, with i- implying i-q'aqstaq 'head' (112) and i-tuk 'neck' (120). The root -tk 'to place, put down' apparently requires a bipolar interpretation here, 'from above to below'. Altogether, then, 'someone puts it (throat) from above to below in regard to it (head, neck).
- 116, 119: someone (q) extends, stretches (stem -kte:) it (L-, presumably in relation to head) out (n) in regard to her (116) or him (119). Relational n- is usually translated 'into, inward', but must be inherently bipolar and in this context to be taken as 'out, outward'.
- 125: al-u-xuma-pa-ya is a verb, presumably 'they (u) will go out (-pa) beside each other (-xu-ma)'. The predicate of the line has the root -qoy(a), literally, 'sleep'.

It is necessary always to work through a translation with an eye on consistency, accuracy, and appropriateness.

I have retranslated the entire text in each case with reference to my study of the grammar and lexicon (Hymes 1955). The running English translation published by Boas sometimes conflates Kathlamet lines, thus missing some of their content and something of the structure of which they are part. Chinookan is a language with complex word morphology, and the connection between an English gloss and the structure of the Kathlamet word is sometimes not apparent. I have rethought each word in terms of its Kathlamet structure, where this seemed advisable, as in the case of the verbs for the disposition of the three met in another canoe in the second act. Of course it is not always possible to express in reasonable English all the elements of meaning of the original. The occasional awkwardness in this translation is a result of pressing in that direction as far as seemed practicable.

#### Notes on orthography

The orthography used here keeps close to the phonetic values recorded by Boas. Capitals are substituted for phonetic symbols in certain cases because of the limitations of the typewriter. Thus, C = the affricate spelled 'ch' in English; L = voiceless lateral fricative of Welsh 'Llewellyn' (ł); S = the shibilant spelled 'sh' in English; X = voiceless velar fricative (as in German *ach*). Other symbols have the usual phonetic values, but these observations should be made: length is not phonemic in Chinookan, but is retained here as written by Boas, marked by colon following the vowel. The i with a circumflex is retained usually when it occurs under stress next to a shibilant (C, S), where it is a non-significant variant of schwa. Schwa itself (upside down e) is obscure in quality, and not phonemically significant. It serves to indicate syllabification of words and to carry word-stress between consonants. The o with a circumflex is written in Chinookan by both Sapir and Boas for a low back vowel that is sometimes equivalent to a raised and backed /a/, but in this text is typically equivalent to a lowered /u/, occurring as it does for the directional prefix of verbs /u/ between reflexive X- and the factotum verb stem -X. The e with hatchcheck is equivalent to epsilon and the vowel of English 'bet'. The a with umlaut is like the German vowel of the same shape, equivalent to low front vowel in English 'bat'. In Kathlamet it is an expressive variant of /i/. Stress in Chinookan is normally penultimate, and where Boas did not write it, as on words such as aga 'now' and yaxi 'he, that' sometimes, one can safely assume that the first syllable carries stress. Polysyllabic words have lesser degrees of stress on alternate vowels.

Boas' transcription is not always morphologically exact. I have corrected it in a few cases in order to show the separate status as words of certain elements. The most notable example is in the case of the repeated line, "your people would have died". It contains the particle qi, partner of occurrence of the same particle in the preceding line (there expressed ge:). In effect, the two lines express a pair of contrary-to-fact conditions: Condition not I became person, then condition they died your-people. The presence of qi in the second line is obscured by the fact that it is written as if initial consonant of the following verb. No doubt it sounded like that, because the following verb begins with the same vowel as that with which qi ends, and adjacent identical vowels in Chinookan coalesce. Again, in what is now line 11 of the 1891 telling, the particle Lq 'maybe' is printed with the L attached to a preceding word and the q attached to a following word. Its elements are reunited here.

## IGUNAT IA:K'ANE: I (told 1891)

182

I ("If I were not")

(i. Skunk cabbage)

Igxuá:Lait wálo: ts'ak'á:nix.

Tá:ema tsq'e:mé:mix qatoxoe:mó:XmX

k'a Lmq'á:emaX

k'a Lqalpo:

k'a tqaná:pSupSu qatoXoe:mó:XumX

k'a LpónXaLx.

Cá:goaix igé:XoXix,

aqa ió:suwulx Igúnat.

T'ó:tsnix qayó:yamX Igúnat,

Lgá:platikS iLá:Sge:wai.

Qá:Xpa Lq ió:yam,

aqa igé:kim Éqalpo:-

"Koala SCá:qa qayó:yamX iCá:wulx.

"Qe: niS naíka inXOX,

"pa:n q(i) igo:xaá:Lait tmé:lxam."

Igé:kim Igúnat:

"La:n Laxi á:koa LXó:la?"

"A:, É:qalpo: yaxi á:kua ixó:la."

"AlXé:gelaix,

"alXé:gelaix."

ILXé:gelaix.

Iqé:lot e:xt igé:luqte:,

qohm tge:luqte: iqté:lo:t.

Iqaigmo:lx ae:xt atá:mq'al

kat iqaigmo:lx igo:n e:nat é:yalq.

MokSt Ltá:mq'al. iqligmo:lx.

Iqé:yukL LXé:le:ux.

Iqe:yó:txamit ká:Cak e:lá:itkpa.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18-19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

(Myth of the Salmon I)

183

(ii. Arrowhead root)

Aqa wit'aX iLó:suwulx Igúnat k'a tiá:Xelawe:maX.

Aqa wi Lgó:naX iLá:XLCo: LgoLé:lx:

"Koala SCá:qa qayó:yamX iCítke:u,

iá:po:C gá:yama.

"Qe: niS naíka inXOX ngoLé:lx,

pa:n oguxoa:Lait tmé:lxam."

"La:n Laxi á:kua LXó:la?"

igé:kim,

"A:, amé:Lak ALmq'á:emaX."

ICalgá:mit akupkup ICá:poCpa.

iCíSalte: Sq'ula,

Lo:n iCíSalte: Lq'olá.

(iii. Indian potato)

IlqáluqLQ,

klá:ix mank iLó:ya.

Aqa wi Lgó:naX iLá:XLCo: LgoLé:lx:

"Koala SCá:qa qayó:yamX iCítkeu,

iá:poC gá:yama.

"Qe: ne:kStX naíka inXOX ngoLé:lx,

pa:n q(i) igoxuá:Lait tmé:lxam."

Igé:kim Igúnat:

"La:n Laxi á:kua LXó:la?"

"A:, amé:Lak Atsq'eme:mix wuxi á:koa aXó:la."

"AlXé:gelaix!"

ICilgá:mit iqawik'e:Le: iCá:po:Cpa.

Qohma tq'ulá:maX iCítalte:.

iCó:kl é:tl'uwktL'uwkpa.

iCuLá:etamit.

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51-52

53

54

55

56

57

(Myth of the Salmon I)	184
(iv. Rush root)	
Aqa wit'aX iLó:suwulx.	58
Klá:ix iLó:yam.	59
Aqa wi iLáXlCu LgoaLé:lx:	60
"Koala SCa:qa qayó:yamX iCÓ:wulx,	61
iá:po:C gá:yamoá.	62
"Qe: ne:kStX náika ináXóX ngoaLé:lx,	63
pa:n q(i) igoxuá:Lait tmé:lxam."	64
Igé:kim:	65
"La:n Laxi á:kua LXó:la?"	66
"A:, ené:mot ip'á'nXaLx."	67
"ALXé:gelaiX,"	68
igé:kim Igunat.	69
Iqé:lte: e:xt igé:luqte:.	70
Tiá:k'e:Skla iqté:loX.	71
Iqiu:txmitam tL'mantL'mán é:lxpa.	72
(v. TqanapSupSu)	
Aqa wi iLó:suwulx.	73
Qá:Xpa iLó:yam,	74
aqa wit'aX iLáXalCu LgoaLé:lx:	75
"Koala SCa:qa qayó:yamX iCÓ:wulx,	76
iá:po:C gá:yamoá.	77
"Qa nHkStX náika ináXóX ngoaLé:lx,	78
pa:n q(i) igoxuá:Lait tmé:lxam."	79
"Alxé:gelaiX.	80
"La:n Laxi á:kua LXó:la?"	81
"A:, Tqaná:pSupSu ime:mo:t yaxi á:kua iXó:la."	82-83
Quínm iqé:lte: tqamó:qoakS.	84
QiuLá:etmitam tkmá:epa.	85

(Myth of the Salmon I)	185
II. (Bluejay, Crow, Flounder)	
Aqa iLó:suwulx Sa:Xalix.	86
Lq'a:p iLgi:yóX ikónim.	87
Ige:kim Igunat:	88
"AnSgiqámCXo:gua yaxi ikónim."	89
Tá:k'aLo:nikS taiCi télxam.	90
Lákala Lóqe:yamit.	91
iLáXalCo: Laxi ká:Cak qLá:guXt:	92
"Laq'a:laki:awa:,"	93
"Laq'amo:Sq'amo:S,	94
"Laq'apa:wapawa."	95
Ige:kim Igunat:	96
"Qa: (a) iglXoXó:la wuxi aqage'lak?"	97
Ilákim Laxi Lóqe:yamit:	98
"A:, aXó:lal,	99
"iLtó:wíCk,	100
"aqá iLó:sowulx,	101
"iLó:yam ike:SaCk,	102
"aqá igiLXé:takua,	103
"aqá wi iLá:stso:."	104
"Lq'up mSge:LXoXix.	105
"Qa:Cqe: itL'wé:muat Co:XtX?"	106
"Qantsí:x po: muwata:kam taiCi ike:SaCk qtge:x?"	107
Lq'up iqé:LXoXix.	108
IqLgó:qoam.	109

Á:k'amitx Apké'Sx.	110
Iqé:glga iCa:q'akStak.	111
Iqayílo:tk;	112
é:wa iStiktáqoxuitix sga'Xo:st,	113
é:wa iuC'é:qlkoit iCa:k <sup>u</sup> Sxat.	114
Iqá:glga At'á:ntsa.	115
IqLá:nxukte:,	116
iStiktáqoxuitix sga'Xo:st.	117
Iqé:glga Iqé:sqé:s.	118
IqLé:nxukte:,	119
iqayílo:tk iá:tuk,	120
iStiktáqoxuitix sí:aXost.	121
IqLó:lxam:	122
"QanChX po: nuxuatá:koam ike'SaCk qtgé:iX."	123
IqLgé:lo:qLq:	124
"Aluxumapá:ya télxam qohmix atilqó:ya yaxtix,	125
"Cxua atgé:yama ike'SaCk."	126

## PROFILE, TRANSLATION AND TEXT (1894)

Here is the profile for the 1894 telling, accompanied by a fresh translation and the text that underlies both. The basis of the profile of both texts will be discussed in the next section, as will the nature and significance of the differences between them.

As with the 1891 telling, letters are assigned to stanzas and verses in Act II on a different basis than in Act I. In Act I the series of letters for stanzas (ABC...) begins anew in each scene (i, ii, iii...). The series of letters for verses (abc...) begins anew in each stanza. That practice is consistent with the usual practice in plays and other literary texts. The line numbers remain available for identification of a particular point whenever they are more convenient for the purpose.

In Act II of both tellings the letters are assigned to verses in a continuous series throughout the act (a-q). This is done because the relationship among the verses is in question. Discussion of alternative patterns of relationship among the verses is facilitated, and prejudice to one or another alternative pattern is avoided.

In Act II of both tellings the letters are assigned to stanzas in a continuous series as well. There is no apparent difference in Act II of 1891, since there are five stanzas, and the series ABCDE would be a normal pattern. In Act II of 1894 there are nine stanzas, and they are identified as A through I.

Were it not for the analytical purpose being served, the stanza and verse lettering in Act II of 1891 might be presented as A ab; B ab; C ab; D ab; E ab. The stanza and verse lettering in Act II of 1894 might be presented as i A; B; C abcde; ii A B C; iii A abc; B; C abc. (There would be no need to assign lower case letters to those verses which are the only verse in a stanza).

## MYTH OF THE SALMON II (told 1894)

Act/Scene	Strophe/Verse	Incident	Markings	Lines
I i	A	Upriver	3 vbs of travel	1-3
	B a	"If I were not"	"Now, turn	4-8
	b	"Who?"	turn	9-10
	c	"Fa's sibling"	turn	11-12
	C a, b	Ashore	turn, change of loc.	13-14
	c, d	Giftng (1,2)	distich, pentastich	15-16, 17-21
	e	Placing	distich	22-23
ii	A	Upriver	"Now again", travel	24
	B a	"If I were not"	"Now again, turn	25-30
	b	"Who?"	turn	31-32
	c	"Fa's sibling"	turn	33
	C a	Ashore	"Now", turn	34-35
	b	Giftng (1)	distich	36-37
	c	Giftng (2)		38
	d	Pronouncement	turn	39-41
	e	Placing	distich	42-43
iii	A	Upriver	"Now again", travel	44
	B a	"If I were not"	"Now again", turn	45-49
	b	"Who?"	turn	50-51
	c	"Fa's sibling"	turn	52-53
	C	Giftng	distich	54-55
iv	A	Upriver	"Now again", travel	56
	B a	"If I were not"	"Now again", turn	57-61
	b	"Who?"	turn	62-63
	c	"Fa's sibling"	turn	64-65
	C a, b	Ashore	turn, "Now"	66-67
	c, d	Giftng (1, 2)	distich, distich	68-69, 70-71
	e	Pronouncement	turn	72-74
	f	Placing	distich	75-76
v	A	Upriver	"Now again", travel	77-78
	B a	"If I were not"	"Now again", turn	79-84
	b	"Who?"	turn	85-86
	c	"Fa's sibling"	turn	87-88
	C	Ashore, giftng, placing	turn	89-91

II i	A a	Upriver	3 vbs of travel, "Now"	92-94
	B b	Canoe met	pentastich	95-99
	C c, d	Canoe asked(1)	turn, implied turn	100-102
	e, f	Canoe asked(2)	implied turn (1, 2) "Again", "Twice"	103-104
	g	Answer	"Now", turn	105-109
ii	D h	"What?"	turn	110-111
	E i	Answer	turn ("Now" 3times)	112-117
	F j	"Alongside"	turn (pentastich)	118-123
iii	G k	Twisting (1)	"Now", name (Bluejay)	124-126
	l	Twisting (2)	Name (Crow)	127-129
	m	Twisting (3)	Name (Flounder)	130-131
	H n	Pronouncement	turn	132
	I o	Placing (1)	Name (Bluejay)	133
	p	Placing (2), Pronouncement	Name (Crow), turn	134-136
	q	Placing (3), Pronouncement	Name (Flounder), turn	137-141

As before, expectations based on parallel repetition of incident affect the patterning beyond what can be indicated in the column of Markers. Not all groupings of lines in sets of three and five have been noted (especially in act II, scene iii. Notice also that the number of pronouncements in this last scene comes to three, and that the last sequence of three incidents, the three placings, builds from one line through a tristich to a concluding pentastich with the most important, Flounder.

## MYTH OF THE SALMON II (told 1894)

I ("If I were not")  
i (Skunk Cabbage)  
 The Spring Salmon was going upriver. 1  
     First he came, 2  
         and he was going upriver. 3  
 Now a person is standing: 4  
     "At last my brother's son does arrive, 5  
     "the one with maggots in his buttocks. 6  
     "If I were not a person, 7  
     "then your people would have died." 8  
 He said: 9  
     "Who is it who talks that way?" 10  
 "Ahh, your father's brother, Skunk Cabbage, 11  
     he is talking." 12  
 "Quick, let us go ashore." 13  
     Salmon landed (out of the canoe). 14  
 He was given an elkskin armor, 15  
     five elkskin armors were given to Skunk Cabbage. 16  
 Under his blanket was put a club, 17  
     beside his arm, 18  
         and beside his (other) arm 19  
         another one, 20  
             a bone-war-club. 21  
 He was carried inland, 22  
     he was put in the midst of willows. 23  
ii. (Small Arrowhead Root)  
 Now again they were going upriver. 24  
 Now again a woman was seen, 25  
     standing: 26  
     "At last my brother's son does arrive, 27  
     "the one with maggots in his buttocks. 28  
     "If I were not a person, 29  
     "then your people would have died." 30  
 He said: 31  
     "Who is it who talks that way?" 32  
 "Ahh, that is your father's sister, Small Arrowhead Root." 33

## (Myth of the Salmon II)

Now: 34  
     "Quick, we go ashore." 35  
 A double deerskin blanket was given her, 36  
     two deerskin blankets were given her. 37  
 Small dentalia were put at her buttocks. 38  
 "Later on you will be bought, 39  
     "you will wait for small dentalia, 40  
     "you will be exchanged for them." 41  
 She was carried inland to mud. 42  
     She was set down. 43  
  
(iii. Rush root)  
 Now again they were going upriver. 44  
 Now again a person was seen 45:  
     "At last my brother's son does arrive, 46  
     "the one with maggots in his buttocks. 47  
     "If I were not a person, 48  
     "then your people would have died." 49  
 Salmon said: 50  
     "Who is it who talks that way?" 51  
 "Ahh, that is your father's brother Rush-root, 52  
     "he talks that way." 53  
 A buckskin was given to him, 54  
     two buckskins were given to him. 55  
  
(iv. Indian potato)  
 Now again they were going upriver. 56  
 Now again another person was seen: 57  
     "At last my brother's son does arrive, 58  
     "the one with maggots in his buttocks. 59  
     "If I were not a person, 60  
     "then your people would have died." 61  
 Salmon said: 62  
     "Who is it who talks that way?" 63  
 "Ahh--that--is your father's sister Indian potato, 64  
     "talking that way." 65

(Myth of the Salmon II)

"Quick, let us go ashore."	66
Now they went ashore.	67
A woodchuck blanket was given her,	68
three woodchuck blankets were given her.	69
Long dentalia were put on her,	70
they were put at her buttocks.	71
"When you will be bought.	72
"you will wait for long dentalia,	73
"you will be put up for woodchuck blankets."	74
She was carried to mud,	75
she was put down.	76
(v. <u>Tq'anapSupSu</u> )	
Now again they were going upriver.	77
They went some distance.	78
Now again they reached someone,	79
there is a person.	80
"At last my brother's son does arrive,	81
"the one with maggots in his buttocks.	82
"If I were not a person,	83
"then your people would have died."	84
"Who is it who talks that way?"	85
Salmon said.	86
"Ahh, your father's brother TqanapSupSu,	87
"he talks that way."	88
"Quick, let us go ashore."	89
Five raccoon blankets were given to him,	90
He was set down near the water.	91

(Myth of the Salmon II)

(II. Bluejay, Crow, Flounder)(i. Encounter)

They were going upriver,	92
now they went up above.	93
They arrived at St. Helens.	94
A canoe was seen coming downriver.	95
The canoe came near.	96
Ahh, Bluejay (is one of) those coming downriver,	97
and Crow,	98
and Flounder in the bow.	99
"Ahh, from where have you come?"	100
they were asked.	101
They did not speak.	102
Again they were asked,	103
twice they were asked.	104
Now Crow spoke,	105
she said:	106
"Laq'ala:kiwa:,"	107
"Laq'amo:Sq'amo:S,	108
"Laq'apa!wapawa."	109
(ii. <u>Interpretation</u> )	
Salmon said:	110
"what did she say?"	111
One person said:	112
"It was flood-tide early,	113
"now they were going upriver,	114
"They arrived at the Cascades,	115
"now it was ebb-tide,	116
"now again they came downriver."	117
"Crow's lies.	118
"A canoe never returned from the Cascades (in one day).	119
"A canoe sleeps over five times	120
"(as) it goes upriver,	121
"then it can arrive at the Cascades.	122
"Quick, let us go alongside."	123

I ("If I were not")

(i. Skunk cabbage)

Ió:suwulxt Igunat.	1
T'o:tsnix igite:mam	2
ka ió:suwulxt.	3
Aqa Lo:txué:la LgoaLé:lx.	4
"Koala SCaqa qayo:yamX iCo:wilx,	5
ia:puC goa:yamo.	6
"Qe: ne:kStX naika inXoX ngoaLé:lx,	7
pa:n q(i) igoxua:Lait tme:lxam."	8
Ige:kim:	9
"La:n Laxi a:koa LXo:la?"	10
"A, ime:mut ia:xau: E:qalpo:, wati iXo:la."	11
yaxi iXo:la."	12
"Ayaq amSXe:gelaiX."	13
Iyaqálo:LX Igunat.	14
Iqé:lte: igé:luqte:,	15
qoim igé:luqte: iqé:lte: E:qalpo:.	16
Iqaigmo:lx ata:muq'aL,	17
é:nata é:yaXo:	18
kada é:nata é:yaXo:/ago:n a:e:xt/ata:muq'aL.	19-20-21
Iqé:yukL LXá:le:ux.	22
Iqeyó:txamit ka:Cak e:lá:itkpa.	23
(ii. Arrowhead root)	
Aqa wi iLo:suwulxt.	24
Aqa wi iqaLqkl Lqagé:lak,	25
Lo:txué:la.	26
"Koala SCá:qa qayo:yamX iCítke:u,	27
ia:po:C goa:yamo.	28
"Qe: ne:kStX naika inXoX ngoaLé:lx,	29
pa:n q(i) igo:xua:Lait tme:lxam."	30
Ige:kim:	31
"La:n Laxi a:koa LXo:la?"	32
"A: a:Xka ame:Lak Almq'a:emaX."	33

(iii) (Outcome)

Now they went alongside Bluejay.	124
Bluejay's head was stretched out.	125
His face was turned round this way.	126
Crow was taken,	127
her (head) was stretched out,	128
her face was turned round.	129
Flounder in the bow was stretched out (at the head).	130
Her mouth is made crossways this way.	131
"Future generations will never return in one day from the Cascades."	132
Bluejay was thrown inland.	133
There Crow was thrown inland.	134
"Your name is Crow,	135
"You shall never speak the Wasco language."	136
Flounder was thrown in the water,	137
Flounder was told:	138
"Go down river to the beach.	139
"You shall put your face down in there (=lie down flat)".	140
"Your name is Flounder."	141



## (Myth of the Salmon II)

## II. (Bluejay, Crow, Flounder)

## (i) (Encounter)

ILO:suwulxt,	92
aqa Sa:Xalix iLO:ya.	93
iLO:yam Na:yago:goixpa.	94
IqiLge:qlkl ik'ni:m e:stsx.	95
Q'oa:p igi:yoX yaxi ik'anim.	96
A:, Iqe:sqe:s LaLa:iC Le:stsx	97
k'a At'a:ntsa,	98
k'a Apke:Sx a:k'amitx.	99
"A: qa:mte:wa amSté:mam?"	100
iqLo:qunCXo:kua.	101
NhSt iL'XlCo:.	102
We:t'aX iqLo:qunCXo:kua.	103
MkStix iqLo:qunCXo:kua.	104
Aqa iga:XalCo At'a:ntsa,	105
iga:kim:	106
"Laq'a:lakiawa:,"	107
"Laq'amo:Sq'amo:S,	108
"Laq'apá:wapawa."	109
(ii. Interpretation)	
Ige:kim Igunat:	110
"QayaX iga:kim?"	111
Ilakim Lexa:t LgoaLe:lx:	112
"ILwiCk kawix,	113
"aqá iLosuwulxt.	114
"iLO:yam ike:SaCk,	115
"aqá igiLXe:takoa,	116
"aqá wi iL'stso:."	117
"ICa:tL'me:maut At'a:ntsa.	118
"NiSt qantsix nixta:kuaX ik'anim ike:SaCkpa.	119
"Quinmix qayoqó:iX ik'anim/qayo:suwulxmx,	120, 121
"Cxwa q(i) iyo:yam ike:SaCk.	122
"Ayaq, alXge:Lqamla."	123

## (Myth of the Salmon II)

## II

## (iii) (Outcome)

Aqa iLge:Lqamla Iqe:sqe:s.	124
IqLe:nXukte: Iqe:sqe:s.	125
E:wa iStiktáqoxuitix si:aXóst.	126
Iqa:glga At'a:ntsa,	127
iqLa:nXukte:.	128
iStiktáqoxuitix sgá:Xost.	129
IqLa:nXukte: Apke:Sx a:k'amitX.	130
E:wa: iuk'ula:txit iCa:k <sup>u</sup> Sxat.	131
"Alo:Xoa:xa tElxam nhSt qantsiX aluxoata:koa e:xt we:koa ike:SaCkpa."	132
Iqe:Xe:ma Iqe:sqe:s LXóle:ux.	133
Io:koa iqaXe:ma At'a:ntsa LXóle:ux.	134
"At'a:ntsa ime:Xale:u,	135
"ne:St qantsix LuXole:mat amXlCuwa:ya."	136
Iqale:maLX Apke:Sx,	137
iqó:lxam Apke:Sx:	138
"Me:ya qa:e:qamix Lkamila:lqpa.	139
"Amsinq'oya:yayaXtix.	140
"Apke:Sx ime:Xale:u."	141

The profile for each version of the myth shows the organization into act, scene, strophe, verse, and line. Between the indication of verses and lines is shown the semantic character of the verse (or strophe, if there is only one verse in the strophe), as well as the salient linguistic markers.

Even a casual reading makes clear the presence of two acts. It is the same with the scenes of the first act. Salmon and his companions reach each of five plants in turn. What requires closer attention and analysis is the organization within each scene into verses. An essential parallelism between each of the five scenes is clear. Analysis of form/meaning covariation shows its structure.

The recurrent elements of content need almost only to be 'liberated' from paragraph format and displayed to be seen. Salmon and his companions go upriver. A person speaks, Salmon asks who has spoken, and is told. He and his companions go ashore, give gifts to the speaker, and place it where it will be found by the people yet to come. The three turns at talk that follow the travelling up river in each scene (person, Salmon, explanation) are pretty much identical. There is more variation in the preceding account of travelling and the following account of going ashore, gifting, and placing.

In discovering the relations and grouping, we can take account of the conventions of Chinookan narrative, which make change of location, change of speaker for a turn at talk, and introduction of a line by particles such as "Now" and "Now again" signals of a unit. In addition, Chinookan narrative competence organizes units at all levels again and again in sequences of three and five. Five is the ritual number of the culture. Three is its functional associate in narrative organization. The same association holds for neighboring groups, whose ritual number is five; Sahaptin, Kalapuya, Columbia River Salish. Their narratives also show this dual use of three and five. The patterning is more than numerical. Typically, it shows units to have a relationship of meaningful sequence as well as form, a relationship which can be glossed as 'onset, ongoing, outcome'. In a sequence of five members, the middle unit is a pivot, completing the first three part sequence as its outcome, and initiating the second as its onset.

These conventions, and parallelism among scenes, show the five scenes of the first act to be organized in three strophes. In the 1891 telling the core strophe, the middle one, is very heavily established in the first and fifth scenes, and more normally marked in the intervening scenes, simply by a particle pair, "Now then." In the first scene the first strophe is a typical statement of a set of people in a certain location or condition. (There is a serious pun in the fact that the initial verb has an etymological partner that commonly introduces narratives with the meaning 'they lived (stayed, remained) there'. The stem -Lait also has that

sense, but with the preceding reflexive element, -Xua-, is a verbal theme with the meaning 'to die'). Then follows a seasonal time word, the first of a set of three locational words (Spring, first, somewhere). Each locational word is associated with a word of a triplet of travel; he went up river, he would arrive, he arrived. And the first and third of these groups have 'Now' (aqa) as well. This accumulation of marking introduces three turns at talk. In the fifth strophe, the three turns at talk are introduced with a lighter accumulation, but still a notable one; where, arrived, and 'now again', with 'again' in its full form (wi-t'aX, as against wi alone).

This marking and the principle of three part grouping make the middle strophe evident throughout the act. After the first scene, the element of travel is not part of the middle strophe, but is initial, usually marked itself by 'Now again'.

Comparison shows that the remaining part of each strophe is a third part, composed in principle of three elements: ashore, gifting, placing. This third strophe varies, in marking and content, suggesting either a touch of uncertainty or a certain variation in interest and recollection.

In the first scene the third strophe is established by repetition (uniquely) of Salmon's spoken call to change location: 'Let us go ashore!' and a complement stating that they went ashore. This pairing is repeated in the giving of first elkskin armor, then bone-war-clubs. The elkskin armor is given in a distich, or couplet, in which the same triplet of words is maintained, while word order is varied. The bone-war-club is given in a tristich in which the verb 'to put near him (under his blanket)' recurs in each of three lines, together with the series 'one, another, 'two'; with 'bone-war-club' itself enclosing the three in the first and third lines. The third element of the strophe again has two constituents, carrying inland and being put amidst willows. Such an organization of units into a threefold set of pairs is not uncommon. In these texts it occurs again in the same strophe in the 1894 telling, suggesting that it serves to establish a general matrix of understood action the first time round in each version.

This initial establishment presumably helped an audience, as it helps us, recognize the place, organizationally, of the semantic contents of gifting and placing as they variously occur in couplets and single lines in the remaining scenes without initial marker. (Notice that the first element, 'Ashore', is displaced into the middle stanza in scene v).

The first act of the 1894 telling does not show the same initial elaboration as the 1891 telling, perhaps because Cultee remembered (or was reminded) that he had told the story before. The first verse and stanza of the first scene does have three lines, a triplet of travel, almost a brief abstract and formal filler. The remaining scenes all mark the first stanza, that of travel upriver, with 'Now again'. The first scene marks the middle stanza with 'Now', and all of the remaining four scenes mark it with 'Now again'. As mentioned just above, the first scene elaborates the third stanza. It begins here and in all the remaining scenes except the third with quoted speech, 'Ashore.' The second and fourth scenes elaborate the middle element, the gifting, into three parts: two gifts and quoted speech pronouncing about them in relation to the future. Both these scenes also mark the first element, going ashore, with 'Now', the fourth scene placing it after the quoted speech so as to make two verses of the unit. In between the third scene is perfunctory, having only two lines for a single gift. The fifth and final scene of the act has the simple skeleton: 'Ashore', a gift, a placing.

Where the scenes of the first act are evidently essentially the same in both tellings, those of the second act are not. It is necessary to test alternative hypotheses as to what Cultee is doing in the second act in each case. There are reasons of form for doing so, and, as will be seen, reasons of meaning.

Although the second act has a new cast of characters, three persons met in a canoe instead of a series of five plants, there are parallels in content between the two acts. And it is to units of content that we must give attention in Act II, because overt marking by initial particles is almost non-existent. In the 1891 telling, the act as a whole begins with 'Now', but no further unit within the act. Turns of speaking and verbal parallelism do make clear the grouping of lines into verses throughout; but the grouping of verses into larger units depends upon a hypothesis as to how their relations as actions fits within the possibilities of Chinookan narrative patterning. The case with the 1894 telling is the same. 'Now' introduces one turn at talk (Crow's) and one self-evident sequence (that of twisting), but otherwise turns of speaking and verbal parallelism are what make clear the grouping of lines into verses, and larger units again depend upon a hypothesis as to their interrelations as actions within the general Chinookan conventions.

The essential elements of act I have each a counterpart in act II, as can be seen in the following chart:

I	II
A upriver	upriver
Ba "(Identification)"	"(identification)"
b "Who?"	"What?"
c "(explanation)"	"(explanation)"
Ca "Ashore"	"Stop"/"Alongside"
b Gifting	Twisting
c Placing	Placing

Act II is in fact in one sense the burlesque that follows serious drama. Salmon and his companions have journeyed, one stop at a time, with some distance between stops. One can assume that each stop represents a journey of a day, five days in all. In the course of the days (five being the proper number for the repetition of a ritual act) they learn and establish fundamental relationships, part of the general relation of participant maintenance that governs the world: foods available in winter and the rest of the year; foods from the water and from land; foods obtained typically by men and foods obtained typically by women; together with respect and reciprocal gifting. Continuing up river, beyond Kathlamet territory (as indicated in at least the 1894 version, the site of St. Helens, Oregon being Chinookan but beyond the last upriver Kathlamet settlements), they encounter a canoe which answers with three words unintelligible to Salmon. The first word is in fact intelligible as a Clackamas-Wasco plant name, and the other two presumably are plant names as well. Thus the mission of Salmon and his companions is invoked, though we cannot be sure as to who in the story or audience was to know. The form of word certainly would have been immediately recognizable as Chinookan, on a model indeed familiar as the basis of group names. ('Clackamas' is from La-q'imas 'their vine-maple; 'Clatsop' is from La-tsap 'their dried huckleberry and salmon', etc.). Since the group is met coming from upriver, presumably upriver Chinookan was easily inferrable as the source of the words, whether or not their referents were known.

Not only is the mission invoked, but when Salmon asks for interpretation, he is told that the upriver canoe has gone and come back in a day, mocking the day-by-day progress of Salmon himself. He is told this by the steersman, Bluejay, well known in the mythology as a misinterpreter of the words of

women (cf. 'Bluejay and Ioi' in Chinook Texts, 'Bluejay and his elder sister' in the Clackamas Texts), and as one who makes chiefs unhappy. Justice is summary, punishment condign. The authority of Salmon as a pronouncer of the way the world will be when human beings come is maintained. Bluejay, who elsewhere in Chinookan mythology plays the part of bungling host, failing in an attempt to emulate a being who can provide food from his own kind without loss, here plays the part of a self-appointed enactor and celebrant of the basic reciprocity basic to food and life. The result is twisting instead of gifting, and, in the 1894 version, placing that is not desirable. The plants in the first act are placed where they will be found, and used, by human beings, and to be of use to human beings is consistently treated as a reward in the myths. In being thrown inland, Bluejay and Crow are being thrown away from the river, away from the river's fish, and that is a punishment. (Cf. the fate of 'Cock Robin' (varied thrush) in myth 31 in Clackamas Chinook Texts). That Crow will never speak the Wasco language is in keeping with a widespread theme of the transformation of Crow's voice or speech; here it seems to mean simply that she will never mislead by the use of a human language again. Flounder's fate seems simply the appropriate disposition of what will now be only the fish, Flounder, no longer a myth-age being.

In short, the theme of the establishment of basic reciprocal relations is reinforced by doubling. It is shown being properly enacted, five times, and then others are shown being punished for mocking it.

Within this common matrix both versions of Act II share a core that proceeds in almost identical sequence, from "(identification)" through twisting and pronouncement. Yet the form of Act II is different from the form of Act I in each version, and different also as between versions.

Act II in the shape of Act I?

If the verses of Act II in the 1891 telling are grouped together so as to parallel the organization of Act I, the result would be as follows:

*Scene <u>i</u> :	a	(upriver)
*Scene <u>ii</u> :	b	(identification)
	c	(what?)
	d	(explanation)
*Scene <u>iii</u> :	e	
	f	("Stop", stop)
	g	(Twisting)
	h	"
	i	"
	j	(Pronouncement)
	k	

Such a grouping could be imposed, but it quite ignores, one might say it violates, the relationships and proportions that Act II itself suggests. There is evident a pairing of initiation and response. In (a) the canoe is asked, and in (b) it responds. In (c) Salmon asks for explanation, and in (d) explanation is given. In (e) Salmon calls for the other canoe to be stopped, and (f) it is stopped. After the three verses that deal with the disposition of each of the three persons in the canoe, the pronouncement that closes the myth is presented in two quoted statements, each paired with an action. The evidence of pairing as a principle of organization overall, except where content dictates a three-part grouping (ghi), seems compelling, and, as will be seen, seems to go together with an intended meaning. The set of five stanzas fits neatly the recurrent rhetorical logic in Chinookan, the third group (ef) being outcome to the two preceding pairs, and onset of the remaining two stanzas. (The putative three scene-organization that would match the organization of scenes in act I could be imposed, but the fit to the rhetorical logic would be gross, much farther removed from the actual action of the narrative).

If the verses of Act II in the 1894 telling are grouped together so as to parallel the organization of Act I, the result would be as follows.

*Scene <u>i</u> :	a	(upriver)
*Scene <u>ii</u> :	b	(encounter, lines 95-99)
	c-d	(questioning, lines 100-2)
	e-f	(questioning, lines 103-4)
	g	(identification, lines 105-9)
	h	(what?)
	i	(explanation)
*Scene <u>iii</u> :	j	(alongside)
	k	(Twisting)
	l	"
	m	"
	n	(Pronouncement)
	o	(Placing)
	p	"
	q	"

Such a grouping could be imposed, but it would violate the general Chinookan pattern. This set of three scenes would entail a middle scene with four stanzas, rather than three or five. The sequence of verses c-d, e-f, g is an evident five-fold group within the scene: ask, no answer; ask again, ask twice; answer. The units that precede and follow are evidently self-contained, the former as a five-line unit of approaching travel and a resulting object of perception, the latter as two turns at talk. Again, the third scene would have four stanzas, rather than four or five: j; k-l-m; n; o-p-q. (The internal unity of each is evident)

Why not, one might think, assign (j) to the preceding scene, and solve both problems at once? Now there are five stanzas in scene ii and three in scene iii. In one respect that is precisely the right answer. The third and final scene contains the three ingredients of outcome: twisting, pronouncement, placing. But the displacement of (j) means that we are no longer following the patterning of Act I exactly. And since there is not formal marking, let alone heavy establishment, of a new major section after the first verse, as there is initially in Act I, the relations among the verses that open the act depend upon, not abstract parallelism, but close connections in terms of the pervasive rhetorical logic of Chinookan narrative. In this respect it is difficult not to find (cdefg) as an outcome of (a, b). Unlike the first speech by another in Act I, here such speech is in response to questioning. That underlies the unity of (cdefg); and (cdefg) as a whole is in response to the encounter of (a,b).

An alternative grouping, indeed, consistent with the rhetorical logic, would be into five units, such that (cd) is outcome to (a), (b) and onset to (ef), (g).

Notice that the final verses of the first two scenes, so grouped, (a; b; c-d; e-f; g) and (h; i; j), are now parallel. The first ends with what Crow says, and the second ends with Salmon's denial of what Crow is said to have said: 'Crow's lies'. Indeed, Crow's speech is a focus of concern three times in the act: Crow's words; Salmon's statement, "Crow lies"; and the pronouncement, "Your name is Crow. You shall never speak the Wasco language". What has been learned about the way these stories work strongly suggests that a focus of attention that recurs three times should be placed in each of three coordinate units, preferably at or near an ending-point of each, for the sake of the emphasis thus provided. The placing of Crow's speech and Salmon's response to it in each of three scenes in this act does just this. The organization of the act into scenes that goes with this satisfies a basic principle of such stories, called by Kenneth Burke in his essay, 'The psychology of the audience' (1931), 'the arousal and satisfaction of expectation.'

The two acts, then, share elements of content, but differ in overall form, both in 1891 and in 1894. If Act II is distinct from Act I in each telling, is it still perhaps the same in overall form across tellings? The answer to this hypothesis also appears to be negative.

In the 1891 telling the verses have been found to be related to each other essentially as pairs (within an overall five-part pattern). In the 1894 telling the verses have been found to be related to each other essentially as part of three-part sequences.

### Second telling in the shape of the first?

The principle of pairing could be applied to act II of the 1894 version, but with the following result:

*Aa	travel upriver (3 steps)	(92-94)
b	Canoe encountered	(95-99)
*Ba	Ask	(100-1)
b	No response	(102)
*Ca	Ask	(103-4)
b	Response	(105-9)
*Da	"What?!"	(110-1)
b	"----"	(112-7)
*Ea	"Alongside"	(118-123)
b	Twisting (BJ)	(124-6)
*Fa	Twisting (Crow)	(127-9)
b	Twisting (Flounder)	(130-1)
*Ga	Pronouncement	(132)
b	Throwing inland (BJ)	(133)
*Ha	" "	(C) (134-6)
b	" "	(F) (137-141)

One has eight sets of pairs, which do not conform to pervasive patterning in Chinookan, and for whose exceptionality there is no intrinsic motivation. The first four pairs do proceed in a possible 'this, then that' manner (A-D), but then one has the three-part twisting of each of the parties in the other canoe disjointed (EF). The three-part placing inland of each is similarly disjointed (GH). The concluding part of the act is clearly enough a matter of three parts twisting, one pronouncement, three parts throwing inland, for a total of 3 steps in the outcome. This three part patterning in fact is in keeping with the rhythmic expectations that the act establishes at the outset. The first three lines are a three-part travelling sequence of a recurrent pattern: go upriver, go up above, arrive. The next lines form a set of five, with an internal three-part logic: canoe coming; came near; ah, Bluejay, Crow and Flounder. The asking and answering is distributed into five parts: a turn at talk (100-1), no response, again, twice, now response. (104 seems something of a placeholder for the fourth element in the five part sequence).

The next three turns at talk seem to go together, linked as the explicit participation of Salmon in speaking, as against pairing Salmon's response (118-123) with the first twisting, thus disrupting the unity of the twisting sequence.

First telling in the shape of the second?

The principle of three-part patterning, found in Act II of the 1894 version, could be applied to the 1891 version as well, but with the following result:

- \*i A a, b Ask, response
- B c, d "What?", "---"
- C e, f "Stop, lie", stop
- \*ii g, h, i Twisting (Flounder, Crow, Bluejay)
- \*iii i, k Pronouncement (told them, left)

Such an organization does not differ from a five part organization at the level of verses themselves. It differs only in taking the first three pairs of verses together as a scene. Is there a reason for doing this? The implication would be to find the three scenes as equivalent: encounter (i); transformation (ii); pronouncement (iii). That in itself is plausible, but the internal balance of the act as a whole is against it. Of course the three verses of transformation belong together in any case (g, h, i). The pronouncement is singled out by itself in Act II of the 1894 version, but even so, only within a scene, as a single line between two series of transformation sequences. To override the evident internal balance of the act in the 1891 version, proceeding pair by pair, one would need to appeal to some known structure of content, such as prevails throughout the scenes of Act I. Both versions agree in the structure for scenes in act I. A comparison of the two versions of Act II, however, points quite the other way.

If we align the two versions, we see the following:

1891	1894	
a	A	<u>i</u>
	B	
	Ca	
b	Cb, c, d, e	
c	A	<u>ii</u>
d	B	
e	C	
f	---	
g, h, i	A a, b, c	<u>iii</u>
j, k	B	
---	C a, b, c	

The entire first scene, one third of the act, of the 1894 version is encompassed in the first two verses of the 1891 version. This comparison makes clear that

the two tellings are organized differently at this point: 1891 in terms of pairing, 1894 in terms of threes. The same conclusion follows from comparing the parallel contents of the next part. 1891 has two pairs of paired verses (c, d; e, f), while 1894 has three clear stanzas in its scene ii (h, i, j). The same conclusion also follows from comparing the contents of the final part. 1891 has two groups of verses, one of outcome, one of pronouncement, while 1894 has three groups, the two transformational outcomes separated by a line of pronouncement.

In sum, the 1891 version treats the initial encounter and its question and answer pairwise, the 1894 version in three (or five) groups. The 1891 version treats the subsequent exchange, involving question, interpretation, and evaluation, in terms of two sets of pairs, the 1894 version in three groups. The 1891 version treats the transformation and pronouncement in two parts, the 1894 version in three.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Cultee intentionally organized Act II into pairwise groupings in 1891 and into three-unit groupings in 1894.

Can a meaning be given to this difference? It may be possible to infer a conventional meaning or connotation for these two alternatives, or options, within the general logic of three and five part patterning, once all Cultee's texts have been analyzed in terms of line and verse. Recurrent relations between this aspect of form and meanings in the places in which it is used may appear. As of now, one can observe that close attention to form/meaning covariation does permit individual differences among texts to emerge. Texts do fight back. It is worth noting that an approach to structure which dealt only with content would find the two tellings to be almost identical. The element of placing at the end of the 1894 telling would seem a fuller version, perhaps.

When structure is understood in terms of verbal form as well as content, covariation of form and content, the differences just established can be discovered, and meanings for them sought. In fact, the differences do seem to involve differences in focus. Both tellings of Act II present Salmon as authority, but in different ways and to somewhat different effect. These differences can best be assessed in the light of a general assessment of the differences between the two tellings of the myth.

What factors account for the differences between the two performances?

Insofar as Boas sought the second telling as a check on the linguistic competence and consistency of Cultee in Kathlamet, he should have been satisfied. There is no evident linguistic inconsistency or variation. Even the three unintelligible words uttered by Crow are repeated word-perfect.

What of differences in another kind of competence, knowledge of the content of tradition? There do seem to be some differences of this kind. By and large they point to fuller command of the content of tradition in the second narration. One can guess that Boas' earlier visits (1890, 1891) had activated memory of the story in Cultee's mind, and that the last visit (1894) may have found it more to the fore. Such an explanation fits several differences.

(1) The appellation, 'the one with maggots in his buttocks', is missing only in the first scene in the first telling of 1891. The inference would seem to be that Cultee did not recall it until after the pertinent moment in the first scene of that first telling, but never forgot it afterwards.

(2) Most of this speech by the person encountered is identical throughout both tellings. The only other difference is that the speaker says, literally, 'If not I I-became I-person' in all five scenes in 1894, and in all but the first scene in 1891. Again the implication would seem to be that the word did not come to Cultee until after that point in the first scene of the first telling, but was not forgotten afterwards.

Each of these points is more than a matter of memorization of a word. Each has to do with the moral and spiritual import of the story. That Salmon is said to have maggots in his buttocks is an allusion with two referents. First, it refers to the scene and season of the myth itself, the spring after winter, when only stored salmon would have been available, and when salmon would last have been seen in the river in late fall, many of them 'white salmon', fading and likely to be rotting, after having fertilized eggs. Second, there is a reference to a dramatic myth of Salmon, recorded in Chinook proper from Cultee, and in Clackamas and Wishram-Wasco. In the myth young Salmon avenges his father's death. (He has come from an egg from his father's body, underlining the respect in which he represents the male principle *per se*). Having taken his father's wife from those who had captured her, he is asleep in their canoe, when she reacts with fright or disgust to maggots appearing on him. In retaliation he flings her up on a bluff. (Later, reminded of her by birds, he has her rescued by them and restores her beauty). Apart from the implication that a man may have inner worth a woman fails to see, the maggots, like the plot of which they are a part, reflect the cyclical death and rejuvenation of the fish on whose annual return the Indians of the Columbia were especially dependent.

(Notice that this young Salmon would need to have his father's relatives named).

The reference to 'person' involves a sense of 'person' as 'being', and as the kind of 'being in the world' in which power may be found. The word can be used in ordinary discourse as an unmarked word for 'human person', having a minimal sense that may be translated 'poor, poor fellow'--someone with nothing to be said about them, no status as kin or chief or hunter or whatever, except personal existence itself. In this myth the unmarked sense is doing ontological duty. (This point is missed in the translation of the Clackamas Chinook version (for which see below). Where Salmon, responding to a description of the one who speaks, is taken in the published translation to be saying 'Oh poor fellow', he actually is conveying 'Oh--a person' (that is, one of the beings whose powers matter in the world).

(3) The same set of persons appear in each telling, but the order is reversed at one point. Large Arrowhead Root ('Indian Potato') is third, Rush-root fourth in 1891. The reverse is true in 1894. If there is a significance to the difference, it appears to lie in the fact that the 1894 ordering has a regular alternation of gender: male, female, male, female, male (uncle, aunt, uncle, aunt, uncle).

(4) The gifts given each person are partly the same, partly different as between the two tellings. In both the first and fifth persons receive the same gifts: elkskin armors and bone-war-clubs to the first, Skunk Cabbage, and in the same number: one, then five armors, one then a second club; the fifth gets five raccoon blankets in each telling. In both versions Large Arrowhead Root gets long dentalia and woodchuck blankets, but the order is reversed. The same is true for Small Arrowhead Root, who gets small dentalia before blankets in 1891, and after blankets in 1894. In sum, dentalia is first for both in 1891, blankets are first for both in 1894. If there is a significance, it is that having blankets and the like first is consistent throughout the 1894 telling, being the first or only type of gift in all five scenes. That may suggest a more controlled performance. So does the fuller individuation of gifts in 1894. In 1891 Small Arrowhead Root is given woodchuck blankets and so is Large Arrowhead Root. In 1894 Small Arrowhead Root is given deerskin blankets, thus being differentiated. Similarly, in 1891 Rush-root gets elkskin, as had Skunk Cabbage, but in 1894 gets buckskin, also a differentiation in the later telling.

In these respects the 1894 performance seems more fully articulated. This inference is strengthened by the fact that it is only in the 1894 telling that the presentation of gifts includes a speech of pronouncement (to Small and Large Arrowhead Root).

One detail that falls the other way is the mention of feathered regalia (a symbol of power) being given to Rushroot in 1891, but not in 1894. One might take the explicit mention of the initial state of hunger in 1891 to be the same. This state is presupposed by the entire act, though, and may not have had to be said.

(5) The two tellings are like in that the placing of each of the five persons is omitted for one of them: Arrowhead Root in 1891, Rush-root in 1894. Where named in both versions, the placings are the same: willows for Skunk Cabbage, mud for Indian Potato, shoreline or water for TqanapSupSu

(6) The 1894 telling adds a sequence at the end in which the three people encountered in a canoe on the river are placed, paralleling the placements at the end of each scene in act I.

In sum, some details do seem to point to differences in recollection, and almost entirely point toward the second telling as more complete, more fully performed.

The overall structure of the first act in both tellings is constant. Indeed, one can extract a formulation of the narrative competence involved, a formulation that presumably would have underlain any telling of the act. We can say that the traditional performer of act I, if sharing Cultee's tradition for the myth, would have known and performed a telling with the following characteristics:

5 scenes; 3 stanzas in each scene; first stanza in each scene framing it in terms of Salmon and his companions going upriver; second stanza comprising 3 turns at talk: a plant announcing its worth (same words each time); Salmon asking who is talking that way; an explanation of the plant's relation to Salmon as sibling of his father; third stanza comprising in principle 3 elements, the first <sup>involving</sup> quoted speech: going ashore, gifting the plant, placing the plant where it would henceforth be.

It seems appropriate that this half of the myth would be so nearly fixed in form as well as content. It expresses strongly a ritual relationship as between food of the water and food of the land; between a male leader and a group at least partly female (and plants would be essentially a woman's domain); between junior and elder kin. Salmon, hero and dominator of women in another myth, here is partly apprentice, learning identities that enter into the bonds of reciprocity underlying the maintenance of the world for those who must eat to exist in it.

The differences in the second act seem not to be differences in detail due to recollection, but almost entirely to be differences due to intention. As we have seen, the second act is a complement of the first in elements of content, in both versions, and the two versions agree in main elements of content between themselves (except for the absence of the placing of the trio at the end in 1891). But each version has its own shape, a shape that resists being pressed into the mold of either the preceding act or the other telling.

In the 1891 version the authority of Salmon as leader and chief is paramount at the outset. What others do in each of the first three pairs of verses is in response to Salmon. He is named as the speaker in each of the first two pairs. In contrast, the party in the other canoe is asked impersonally in the 1894 telling, and only a little later on. Again, in the 1891 version Salmon is the only one named throughout the first three pairs of verses. In contrast, the party in the other canoe is not questioned until all three of its members have been recognized by name in the 1894 telling, and when Crow speaks, she is named as the one so doing. (In the 1891 telling the speaker is identified only by position in the canoe). Once past the establishment of Salmon's authority as initiator in the first three pairs of verses, the other trio are named in the course of being disposed of, from bow to stern, and the myth is ended with the two-part pronouncement. The trio is simply told this and is left. The use of questions to evaluate Crow's initial statement, as interpreted by Bluejay, in 1891 may express chiefly irony and condescension.

In the 1894 version the trio in the other canoe is given far more prominence and attention. The fact of being named, and where and when an actor is named, as noted, is important evidence. In 1894 the trio are named three times: on first encounter, on twisting, on placing, but in 1891 only once. Attention is diverted from Salmon, initially, to them; they are named and he is not. The naming of the site of St. Helens at the outset seems not a remembered detail, but an emphasis, one that goes with the specification at the end that Crow will not speak Wasco. Salmon's party have gone beyond Kathlamet territory a fair bit, and something about boundaries is being expressed. (Wasco was spoken in the vicinity of the Cascades and above).

Attention to the trio is shown in dramatizing their appearance on the scene: as against 'they met a canoe' in 1891, here a canoe is seen coming, comes near, ah: Bluejay, Crow, Flounder, a full five-part verse. Again, the initial exchange of speech is not direct question and answer, as in 1891. The trio must be asked three times (in verse pattern, if not literally in words). Whatever else may be

indicated by the reticence, it holds attention on the trio for another stanza.

The doubling of verses beginning with 'stop' of 1891 is not repeated in 1894. Rather, Salmon's evaluation of the facts of the matter ends with instruction to go alongside in a single line, and the doing so is not in tandem, but part of a line that introduces Bluejay by name.

The pronouncement as to travel time that is doubled in 1891, and ends the myth, here is inserted as a single line between two sequences of the disposition of the trio. True, its sudden occurrence rings like the offstage trumpet in the Leonore overture, but in position and proportion it has been denoted. The ending of the 1894 version reinforces the complementary structure of the myth as a whole, by having a final sequence of placement, paralleling the respectful placement of plants in the first act. In doing so, it also, as noted, adds attention to the trio.

In sum, the 1894 version gives much more attention to the trio in the other canoe. Attention is diverted from Salmon to the parallel in outcomes for the five plants and the trio (gifting : twisting; placing for both). The paired verse structure of the 1891 telling, the 'this, then that' of initiation and response, seems well suited to establishing the authoritative role of Salmon at the outset. The three-part structuring of the 1894 telling seems suited, even essential, to focus on the three in the other canoe. That three-ness necessarily breaks through in the fourth group of verses in 1891. It informs the conceptualization of the entire act in 1894.

There remains a further step of interpretation. It has to do with placement rather than naming. The two tellings differ in the order in which the trio are transformed. In 1891 the order is Flounder, Crow, Bluejay. In effect the order is from bow to stern of the canoe: we had been told that the only man was steersman (in the stern, and that the speaker, Crow, was in the middle. In 1894 the three are introduced by name with Flounder explicitly last in the bow--in other words, from stern to bow. This order is maintained in the twisting and the placing. Why? The reason, presumably, is to end the myth with the disposition of Flounder. In the placing sequence, Bluejay is disposed of in one line, Crow in three (with direct speech), Flounder in five (with one more line of direct speech than Crow). The placement and length indicate importance. The nature of the importance is expressed in the direction of disposition

and its nature as a speech act. Direction has to do with an implication of boundary maintenance, on the one hand, and male : female relations, on the other. The nature of the speech act, as a pronouncement, has especially to do with this last.

Recall that Bluejay is thrown inland in a line; Crow is thrown inland with a speech that she shall not speak Wasco; Flounder is told to go downriver to the beach, that is, into the territory of Salmon and his companions, from which they have just come further up river. Flounder, of course, is a fish intrinsically, and is now to assume that nature permanently, as a food for the people to come. Salmon, of course, is the leader of the fish. Thus this version ends with Salmon asserting control over two women, the two of the other canoe who are women, one with regard to <sup>external</sup> territory (Crow is go away from the river and not to speak the other variety of Chinookan), and other with regard to internal territory and food. Where the first act repeatedly announced the dependence of his people for food on plants, a woman's domain, the 1894 version ends with Salmon himself, as the final outcome of his travel, providing a food of his own kind for his people. ✓  
Insofar as flounder can be found year round, its provision matches the warranted statements of the five plants in the first act. It offsets the truth that in Salmon's absence his people depend on them. ✓

These factors of boundary and gender acquire resonance when the one other version of this myth known to us, recorded in Clackamas Chinook, is considered. Like the Kathlamet myth, it begins with plants, who state their worth. Its configuration is different, proceeding through five sets of foods, grouped in threes: two sets of plants, one set of birds, and two sets of fish. And in an addendum Victoria Howard recalls her mother telling of Coyote passing berries, one kind at a time, in different vein: the berries offer to stab him; he pulls it, announces that it is edible, and refers to the people coming soon (Jacobs 1958: 79-80). The Clackamas version thus does come round to fish, as does the Kathlamet, but without a change of plot; and the core of speech acts exchanged with the foods encountered is significantly different. Here is the first and the beginning of the second:

They would say perhaps at this time,  
 now things in the ground are coming out,  
 perhaps this moon,  
 perhaps (when) the next is standing,  
 the very first button camas will have arrived.

It said:  
 "Goodness! Were it not for me,  
 "I hold their breath,  
 "long ago starvation had killed your people."  
 He said:  
 "Indeed. What does the person talking look like?"  
 They said:  
 "Sort of flat and greyish-white"  
 "Indeed. She is a person.  
 "Her name (is to be) Button Camas.  
 "They will eat her."  
 Soon now another said:  
 "It has become visible.  
 "Were it not for me,  
 "I hold their breath,  
 "Long ago starvation would have killed them."  
 They said:  
 "Who is talking?  
 "What does it look like?"

.....

Notice first that there is a verbal continuity which suggests a Kathlamet origin. The first two lines of the assertion seem formulaic and incomplete. Moreover, the first line contains 'kinikStX nayka', where the second word is 'I' and the first appears to be a frozen form of the Kathlamet construction with *qe*: 'condition' and *ne:kStX* 'negative'. Mrs. Howard actually replaces this construction once with a Clackamas equivalent, *qama neSqi* (1958: 76, line 3); and *-nikStX* is not otherwise known in these Clackamas texts.

Notice next that there is a verbal link which suggests a reciprocal Kathlamet awareness of Clackamas tradition. The first plant named in the Clackamas text, the button camas, is *IL-k'alak'iya* (the word is the same in Wasco as well). This is of course the stem of the word first announced by Crow in the Kathlamet text, there rendered *La-(their)-q'alakiawa*, but untranslated. It is hard not to imagine that the Kathlamet who put this word first in Crow's recital, as she came downriver from the Cascades past the mouth of the river on which the Clackamas lived were aware that upriver versions of the myth might start with the same name. (That the second and third names in the Kathlamet text are not identifiable from what we know of Clackamas and Wasco suggests that they were plant names in a somewhat dis- version and local dialect).

These indications of mutual verbal awareness make more resonant the fact that Salmon loses out, so to speak, in Clackamas territory. Until the end of her sequence of 15 foods, Mrs. Howard translated to Jacobs so as to indicate that the announcer was a fish person, maybe Salmon (cf. 1958: 75). Then she told Jacobs (in Clackamas) that her mother's mother, from whom she knew the story, would say that it was the Coyote named *Stank'iya* who did that to everything they eat. Her other known source of stories, her mother-in-law, would say she did not recall who made the things that are good to eat here. The inference would seem to be that Mrs. Howard recalled a general tradition identifying the announcer as Salmon. This is inkeeping with Jacobs' observation in the first footnote to the other Clackamas myth of Salmon (#5, 'Coyote and his son's son'): 'Mrs. Howard's omission of mention as to who told her this myth allows the safe inference that many Clackamas related it' (1958: 270, n. 25). That these two myths of Salmon are in the same category in this respect as the general myth of Coyote's travels around the world (#6), and almost alone in this regard--almost every other myth in the collection is identified by Mrs. Howard as having been heard from her mother's mother, her mother-in-law, or both--suggests their special place as general knowledge. In her immediate family tradition, though, Salmon has been either forgotten or replaced.

This 'losing out' may be enacted in the very dictation we have. When Mrs. Howard reaches the fifteenth and last food in her series, it goes unnamed. The last fish person is said to be simply good and of many uses. It comes after trout, eel, and sturgeon. The natural culmination of such a series would be a salmon. Perhaps latent conflict between a tradition remembered as identifying the announcer as Salmon, and a tradition in which salmon is textually the culminating food among fish, breaks through at this point. At that point, at least, Mrs. Howard ends the series, generalizes about all the things in the water, and reports what her mother's mother would say, naming Coyote as the announcer. (No name has been given the announcer in the Clackamas dictation until this point). And Mrs. Howard stays with that view, giving the text itself a title with the name of one of the Coyotes, Stank'iya (cf. Tānaq'iya, the name of the Coyote who went around the land (p. 80)). We seem to glimpse here the intersection, or transformation, of a ceremonial progress with an inventory that can end with Coyote byplay.

In any case, the Clackamas text lacks the ritual relations of the Kathlamet. It is not a ritual enactment, but a pedagogical rehearsal. As the words of Mrs. Howard's grandmother indicate, any and all foods could be accommodated, and, with a change in the nature of the interaction, berries were. (Perhaps there was a distinct narrative of Coyote and berries, threatening to stab him, instead of announcing themselves or being described, which is the source of the intersection with the Salmon myth). What is learned about each food is not a kin-tie to Salmon, but a visual appearance. Given the appearance as described, the announcer identifies the food, pronouncing its name and future usefulness. To be useful to the people is of course a reward in myths, but not the same as a ritual prestation of blankets, dentalia, and the like. The child first hearing the Kathlamet version would have an image of plants being valued by the chief of fish in the way that kin are valued in the obligatory ritual exchanges that mark each major social relationship, including marriage, birth and death. The child first hearing the Clackamas version would have an image of a plant or bird or fish, a salient visual trait or two, and then the name that goes with those traits and something of what they are useful for. In Kathlamet sometimes details are given as to the role the plant will play in trade. In the Clackamas text details are sometimes given as to the particular part or mode of preparation that results in food. And two negative instances are given, a plant that is only a bitter medicine, not a food, and a fish that is no good to eat at all. The Kathlamet

tradition is ritual enactment, the Clackamas an expansible natural history. (For another instance of Mrs. Howard's pleasure in a child acquiring the name for something described, see Jacobs 1959a: 371-2).

To be sure, the Clackamas text does underscore the common ontological point about 'person'. In line 11, when asked about as a (mere) person, the entity is referred to with the form *il-gwáLilx*. In line 14, when the announcer responds to the description of the entity, the form is *a-gwáLilx*. *IL-* is indefinite gender, *a-* is feminine. The schwa under stress in line 11 may be phonologically /a/, but the long *a:* under stress in line 14 is an expressively emphatic alternant: person indeed.

Whether or not the difference of the Clackamas text is due in part to the fact that it comes from a line of women is hard to say. Perhaps in act II of Cultee's tellings Salmon is asserting not only a Kathlamet as against an upriver text, but also a male text as against a female version or meaning. Certainly the Clackamas version is far removed from the journey on which the Kathlamet tradition is modelled, that of Salmon upriver in the spring. Travel from one place to another is not even mentioned, although it is to be inferred, since in the supplement at the end Coyote is said to pass all the berries, and in the other Clackamas myths in which a series of plants and creatures are assigned their place in the period to come, the person doing so (Coyote, Grizzly Woman, etc.) travels. In Kathlamet the underlying journey seems not something inferrable, but something just below the surface. By underlying journey I mean that public event in which the arrival of the first salmon of spring is heralded with a special cry and special rites by the community as a whole. That underlying journey is suppressed in the text. Instead, Salmon, who should be hailed as its eagerly awaited hero, does respectful service to aunts and uncles who have referred to him in an insulting way. He subordinates any sense of chiefly embarrassment or dishonor silently. Keeping in mind that the plant foods represent the domain of women, recall also that in the other Salmon myth young Salmon threw away to starve and perhaps die the woman he had just rescued in a similar situation. Embarrassment and humor connected with things anal are strong among Chinookans. Having rescued his father's widow and made her his wife, young Salmon had laid his head in her lap as she paddled them to his home. When maggots appear on him, she brushes them aside and pushes him away, awakening him. Never mind that the maggots may represent a stage of death and rebirth, be the outward sign of an inward change. Earlier the egg from which young Salmon had come had been found and cared for by two old women, Crows, who had tended its growth and eventually told him of his history (and thus implicit)

duty). The appearance of maggots now may indicate that he is to change now in his own right from young avenger, nurtured and advised, to autonomous protector and chief. The woman's aversion brings immediate punishment. It seems quite likely that in the other myth, the one we are analyzing, Salmon must suppress feelings that the mention of maggots and his buttocks arouse in order to maintain the respect and ritual honor that the text shows him to display. (If the plants had wished to convey respect in alluding to the other story, they could have said that he was the one who had avenged his father, punished Coyote and Skunk, punished the wolves.)

These considerations may explain the presence of Crow in the Kathlamet tradition. She represents upriver speech, as the 1894 telling states, in cancelling the connection. She represents as well, perhaps, the other myth of Salmon, and in it the dependency of the egg left by the murdered father on two old women Crows for survival and instruction. Crow's transformation here may be a cancelling of that dependency as well.

In sum, I suspect that the energy with which the second act of the story bursts forth in the 1891 telling reflects a feeling that things essential to the character and identity of Salmon have been suppressed and should be asserted. And I suspect that the handling of the second act in 1894 is a more considered, ultimately more telling, expression of the same feeling about Salmon as symbol of male worth.

In this regard we have to consider a certain consistency of placement as between the two tellings. The 1891 telling seems to weight each act at its beginning, and the 1894 telling to weight each act more toward its end. Recall that the 1891 telling begins with a statement of the situation of the myth people, together with a naming of each of the five plants who are to figure in what follows. Salmon's own arrival on the scene is next established elaborately. Act II begins with the assertion of Salmon's leadership in swift sequence. In contrast, the 1894 telling lacks both preparations at the beginning of Act I; Salmon is simply going upriver. And Act II does not bring Salmon into play by name and action at first. In contrast the concluding stanzas in each scene in Act I include not only gifting and placing, but two speeches of pronouncement on Salmon's part; and the second act ends not only with twisting, but also with placing, which again includes two pronouncements (in addition to the pronouncement about time of travel).

The consistency of these differences in weighting suggests that a consistent difference in focus is involved. It could of course be just a stylistic choice.

I think it may be a choice that expresses a considered meaning.

The authority of Salmon at the outset of each act in 1891 is that of being first, of being the initiator of action (if only by his arrival on the scene in act I). The authority of Salmon at the end of each act in 1891 is more profound. That 1891 begins by framing what is to happen first in terms of the five plants, and 1894 does not; that 1894 ends with Salmon a female bird a place and linguistic destiny, and a female fish a place in his territory as source of food, now seem consistent facts. If memory alone were the explanation, why in 1894 forget a splendid beginning that had come immediately to mind the first time round three years before? The omission of feather regalia among the gifts the second time, then, seems not an accident of memory either. As we have seen, the 1894 telling otherwise seems to show refreshed memory in these stanzas. The omission of feather regalia seems a withholding from the domain of plants of the one gift that bespeaks spirit power.

In sum, both tellings agree in using the second act to reassert the authority of the male Salmon. In 1891 Salmon immediately reasserts his authority and the action unfolds in response to him. Here he is chief and head of his companions. His concluding action is to punish a burlesque of his ritual journey, and in so doing to establish the true time of travel to a major point upriver. In 1894 Salmon is not seen or heard at first in the second act, and attention is focussed on the named trio his people encounter, specified as beyond their own, Kathlamet, territory. At the end, however, Salmon is shown in a role more profound than that of chief and headman, the role of shaper of the world to come, as a provider of food of his own kind in his own right. In both tellings he and his people determine the physical shape of the encountered trio. In the telling of 1894 a linguistic boundary is implied and the myth ends with a provision of food. Fish after, and over, plants, after all, one might think.

It is possible that the differences can be assigned to memory and stylistic set. I do not think so. I think that the way in which speech acts, placement, and proportion are handled shows consistency as between the two tellings, a consistency that may indicate reflection inbetween tellings, but intention in each. Analysis of the texts in terms of form/meaning covariation in line and verse makes it possible to pose such a question. Analysis of the configuration of the larger relationships of lines and verses provides, I think, an answer.

In eliciting the story a second time, Boas obtained documentation of three things at once: consistency of language, somewhat refreshed memory of tradition, and selective use of tradition as well. The two texts provide evidence of Kathlamet as a language; of the Kathlamet tradition of the myth of Salmon's journey upriver; and of what the telling of the myth may have meant on two occasions to Charles Cultee.

## FOOTNOTES

- 1 Presented at the 19th International Conference on Salish and neighboring languages, University of Victoria, Victoria, B. C.
- 2 The two texts and their translations are on pp. 50-53 (1891 version) and 54-57 (1894 version) in Boas 1901.
- 3 Not, however, in regard to the Kathlamet (and Clackamas) myth discussed here. Only the Kathlamet texts had been recorded at the time Boas undertook his massive comparative study (1916); the particular text is not included. See the reference list to Kathlamet texts (1916: 1015). Levi-Strauss (1981: 569) does refer to the Kathlamet text in the following words:
 

"...skunk-cabbage; this foul-smelling aracea, which is still closer to the category of the rotten, is the first plant to flower in the spring, even before the snow has finished melting. At that time of year, it was often the only food the Indians have to save them from famine, and the Kathlamet say in one of their myths (M794; Gunther 3, pp. 22-3) that before discovering salmon, humans lived almost entirely on skunk cabbage..."

The Gunther reference is to her Ethnobotany of Western Washington (University of Washington Publications in Anthropology 10 (1) (1945). M794 identifies the myth in Levi-Strauss' own index of myths analyzed. On p. 726 M794 is listed with the title: "Kathlamet, 'Humanity's first food'". By the end of this article it should be clear how misled would be someone who knew of the myth only by this substituted title and the observation as to what it says. My own interpretation makes use of insights Levi-Strauss himself has developed, as to the dialectic of opposition between myths (and parts of myths; but here structuralism has abandoned the text.
- 4 On personal meaning evolving in relation to a story, cf. Krauss 1982. On the evolution of work in the region, see Maud 1982.

## FOOTNOTES (continued)

- 5 Presumably the starry flounder (*Platichthys stellatus* (Pallas)):  
 "Flounders are marine flatfish that have both eyes on the same side of the head and are white on the "blind" ventral side... It usually does not venture far from the head of tidewater, but occasionally goes further upstream, and has been reported as far as 75 miles up the Columbia River...The starry flounder can tolerate the full range of salinities from completely fresh water to sea water...In shallow estuaries it moves onto flats during high tide and returns to the river channel as the tide recedes and exposes the flats...Starry flounders may reach a length of 3 feet and a weight of 20 pounds...Females generally are reported to grow faster than males and to be heavier at a given length... The spawning season in California is from late November through February." (Wydoski and Whitney 1979: 167-8). Thus the flounder can be found the length of Kathlamet territory; the female is the more useful, which fits the feminine gender (a-); and is present in winter months.
- 6 That the first Act is thought of as involving the domain of women, despite the fact that the genders of three of the plant foods are masculine, is suggested by the order in which the five plants are named at the very beginning of Act I in the 1891 telling. The order is not random, as it might seem in relation to the sequence in which the plants occur in the following scenes. The two plants which are feminine in gender are named first. The presence of the feminine gender prefix a- is obscured by the fact that identical vowels in Chinookan coalesce into a single vowel, notably when the end of one word and the beginning of another is involved. Here the conjunction 'and' (k'a) ends in /a/, and Boas heard the single occurrence of a sound /a/ as part of the conjunction. When the rules of combination of sounds are taken into account, there is also an /a/ at the beginning of the word that follows k'a in lines 2 and 3.

## REFERENCES

- BOAS, FRANZ. 1894. Chinook texts. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 20. Washington, D. C.
- . 1901. Kathlamet texts. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 26. Washington, D. C.
- . 1911. Chinook. Handbook of American Indian languages, ed. F. Boas, 559-667. Washington, D. C.
- . 1916. Tsimshian mythology, based on texts recorded by Henry W. Tate. Bureau of American Ethnology, Annual Report 31 (1909-1910), 26-1037. Washington, D. C.
- BURKE, KENNETH. 1931. Counter-statement. New York: Harcourt, Brace. (4th ed., Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968).
- CURTIS, EDWARD S. 1911. The North American Indian, vol. 8. Boston. (Reprinted, New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1970).
- HASKIN, LESLIE. 1967. Wild flowers of the Pacific Coast. Portland: Binsford and Mort.
- HOCKETT, C. F. 1955. A manual of phonology. Indiana University Publications in Anthropology and Linguistics; Memoirs of the International Journal of American Linguistics, 11. Bloomington.
- HYMES, DELL. 1955. The language of the Kathlamet Chinook. Indiana University dissertation. Bloomington.
- . 1975. Folklore's nature and the sun's myth. Journal of American Folklore 88: 345-69.
- . 1980. Tonkawa poetics: John Rush Buffalo's 'Coyote and Eagle's daughter'. On linguistic anthropology: Essays in honor of Harry Hoijer 1979, ed. Jacques Maquet, 33-87. Malibu: Undena Publications, for the UCLA Department of Anthropology.
- . 1981a. 'In Vain I Tried to Tell You': Essays in Native American ethnopoetics. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- . 1981b. Comments. Journal of the Folklore Institute 18 (2-3): 144-50.
- . 1982b. The earliest Clackamas text. Working papers for the 17th International Conference on Salish and neighboring languages, 9-11 August 1982 (compiled by Wayne Suttles et al.), 145-77. Portland: Portland State University. (To appear in International Journal of American Linguistics).
- . 1982b. Narrative form as a 'grammar' of experience: Native American and a glimpse of English. Journal of Education 164(2): 121-142. Boston.
- . 1983. Victoria Howard's 'Gitskux and his older brother': A Clackamas

Chinook myth. Smoothing the ground: Essays on Native American Oral Literature, ed. Brian Swann, 129-170. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

JACOBS, MELVILLE. 1958, 1959a. Clackamas Chinook Texts, Parts I, II.

Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore and Linguistics, Publications 8, 11. Bloomington, Indiana. Distributed as Part 2 of International Journal of American Linguistics 24(1) and 25(2).

---. 1959b. The content and style of an oral literature. (Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology, 26). New York.

---. 1960. The people are coming soon. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

KRAUSS, MICHAEL E. 1982. In honor of Eyak; The art of Anna Nelson Harry. Fairbanks; University of Alaska, Alaska Native Language Center.

LEVI-STRAUSS, CLAUDE. 1981. The naked man. (Introduction to a Science of Mythology, 4). New York; Harper and Row. Translated from L'Homme nu (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1971).

MAUD, RALPH. 1982. A guide to B. C. Indian myth and legend. A short history of myth-collecting and a survey of published texts. Vancouver, B. C.: Talon Books.

SAPIR, EDWARD. 1909. Wishram texts. (Publications of the American Ethnological Society, 2). Leiden.

WYDOSKI, RICHARD S. and RICHARD R. WHITNEY. 1979. Inland fishes of Washington. Seattle: University of Washington Press.