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Abstract

In considering Dell Hymes’s pioneering work on Native American texts—itself grounded in fieldwork with speakers of Kiksht (Wasco-Wishram dialect of Upper Chinookan) in the 1950s—the article documents an encounter with a Kiksht language teacher, activist, and entrepreneur, an occasion of oral literary history and criticism whose ostensible purpose is to introduce a correction into the printed record. The discourse that results—ranging across specific observations of the text at hand to more general observations about Kiksht storytelling practices and about collaborative work in “salvage” linguistics—incorporates bits and pieces of the story along the way, providing a rich opportunity to revisit a fundamental tension in the ethnopoetic work of Hymes and others: between a view grounded in folkloristic study that sees language forms-in-text as important genre characteristics, and a view (seen also in “the ethnography of communication”) that concentrates on the event-bound functionalities of discursive (and transcribable) linguistic features.
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1. Introduction

Returning to a text laid down on some prior occasion in order to introduce a correction or emendation is an activity that is emblematic of philology construed in the broadest sense as a form of European scholarly engagement with language(s).

Ethnopoetics as exemplified in the work of Dell Hymes (e.g., 1981, 2003) has from its inception aspired to be a corrective and restorative intervention into practices and forms of textual representation—hence,
philological in this broad sense (Hymes 1965). Revisiting oral narratives
taken down via dictation in the earlier decades of the twentieth century
from American Indian people and printed in prose paragraphs, ethnopoetic re-analysis uncovers the lineaments of poetic patterning that were
“there all the time,” but that an earlier philology, “applied” in the format
of published text collections of Boas, Sapir, and others, had obscured.

In a recent review article assessing Hymes’s work, for example, Blom-
maert (2006: 231) stresses the value of ethnopoetics as “a tactic for restor-
ing, reconstructing and repatriating the functions of narratives.” In most
cases, an original spoken narration represented in a transcript and pro-
vided with one or more translations (e.g., interlinear, facing-page,
“free”) is subsequently reinterpreted and reformatted in an ethnopoetic
presentation that renders features of poetic patterning—chiefly parallel-
ism and repetition in denotational text—patently obvious on the printed
page.

I will not rehearse the specific techniques of Hymesian verse analysis—
fulsomely illustrated in a series of detailed expositions by Hymes himself
(e.g., 1981, 2003, and references therein) and again with admirable comp-
actness and lucidity by Collins in this issue—nor will I revisit the ten-
sions within ethnopoetics between the pause-based approach of Tedlock
(e.g., 1972, 1982) and the measured-verse approach of Hymes.¹

My main purpose here is to revisit some fundamental questions about
the status of text as a central organizing concept in ethnopoetics: What is
the ontological status of text in the nonliterate verbal traditions with
which ethnopoetics concerns itself? What epistemological commitments
licensed the presentation of these narratives as prose by earlier genera-
tions of linguistic anthropologists, and the re-presentation of them as
poetry by Hymes and others since the 1970s?

In order to address these and related questions, I will draw upon my
own field materials on narrative speech genres in Kiksht (Wasco-
Wishram dialect of Upper Chinookan)—the same American Indian ver-
bal tradition that has had such a central place in Hymes’s own work. The
specific focus here will be the corrigenda proposed by the late Mrs. Alice
Florendo of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation (Oregon) to rectify a
text she had narrated in English some years before called “Raccoon and
his Grandmother,” a story that had been published twice under her name
(Ramsey 1970, 1977). I will present first the received text of “Raccoon
and his Grandmother” (Ramsey 1970), and then Mrs. Florendo’s “cor-
rections,” the latter in the form of a transcript of a discussion that she
and I, at her instigation, held at her home in September 1984.

In the transcript of our September 1984 conversation, presented below,
Mrs. Florendo re-narrates some relevant sections of “Raccoon and his
Grandmother” in Kiksht and in English, repeatedly stepping out of the role of narrator to offer a running commentary on the process we were engaging in, while we were engaging in it. Along the way she offers corrections not only of the received (published, English) version of the text, but also of her own still-unfolding narrative. Her punctiliousness and concern to “get it right” are on display throughout, as she enlists my help in retrieving words and offers digressions upon the narrative techniques employed by storytellers she remembered from childhood.

Mrs. Florendo, as will become clear, was far from the folkloric stereotype of an unreflective “tradition bearer”: active in reservation politics, an entrepreneur (owner/operator of “Alice’s Restaurant” for much of the 1960s and 1970s), at first an anthropological “consultant” but more usually a participant-observer and colleague in later years, she was quite fully literate in Kiksht, and taught classes in the language both on the reservation and off; she favored “Western” styles of dress and hairstyles, and drove a late-model car. She first met Dell Hymes—roughly her peer in age—in 1952.

As can be seen, the material to be discussed is rather deeply embedded in a set of intertextual, interpersonal, and interdisciplinary contexts: a long history of ethnographic and field linguistic interlocution involving several generations of speakers of Kiksht in their relationships both to each other (e.g., as grandmother to grandchild) and to several generations of Euro-American students, including Hymes himself—at around the midpoint of a history of salvage-anthropological encounter that began with Boas and Sapir—and the present author.

The encounters discussed here—all centering on a well-known traditional story usually entitled “Raccoon and his Grandmother”—need to be understood on a number of levels that must be distinguished at the outset, so that we can clearly observe the ways they are brought into a kind of dialogue with each other over the course of the fieldwork conversation discussed here.

First, we can identify “Raccoon and his Grandmother” as a metadiscursive concept, abstracted from the intertextually linked chain of tellings and re-tellings that constitute the story as “traditional.” But it is not just this metadiscursive conception of the story that renders it nameable and discussable. An important point of reference in the Hymesian oeuvre is centrally important here: Kenneth Burke’s (1962 [1956]) concept of “entitlement.” Hymes’s own fieldwork with speakers of Kiksht caused him to recognize that, in the local (“oral”) literary tradition, what folklorists had been terming myth “titles” were really maximally compressed, i.e., minimally elaborated, conventions governing the mention rather than the use (performance) of myth materials—highly conventionalized ways of
giving a plot summary *cum* dramatis personae. There is even, as Hymes showed in early work (1959), an internal textual structure to “titles” in this sense. This adds richness to the notion that Sapir in his fieldwork gathered and later published both a one-paragraph and a multi-page version (transmitted via post) of “Raccoon and his Grandmother.”

Second, “Raccoon and his Grandmother” may refer to any particular narratively entextualized iteration of the story—two of these are of primary significance here. Such specific narrative acts, of course, may also become objects of reference and evaluation, within the same speech event or at a later time, which is exactly what happens below.

Third, “Raccoon and his Grandmother” may refer to a recording or inscription of a specific telling, what Silverstein and Urban (1996) call the text artifact, a materialized intersemiotic transposition of an instance of oral narration. As with the other two senses, the text artifact may become an object of reference, critical commentary, etc.—and does here.

Finally, insofar as a specific telling of “Raccoon and his Grandmother”—and/or a text artifact produced from such a telling—becomes an object of reference in a subsequent discussion, the discourse may well incorporate bits from the narrative itself, by way of ostensive exemplification, quotation, metonymic reference, or some other mode of indexical reference. To observe that such references often carry with them some of the formal features of narrative performance is not necessarily to argue for the presence of “full, authoritative performance” (Hymes 1981 [1971]; Bauman 1977) in these materials.

Indeed, the encounter is essentially an occasion of oral literary history and criticism, which ranges across general observations about the story tradition of “Raccoon and his Grandmother,” Kiksht storytelling in general, Kiksht oral poetics, recollections of Mrs. Florendo’s grandmother and her storytelling, further recollections of Mrs. Florendo’s engagements with Jarold Ramsey, Dell Hymes, and others, metalinguistic observations on the Kiksht and English languages, translations from the former into the latter, and more. While the conversation incorporates various formally marked, “entextualized” bits of the “story,” this is much more a conversation about what the story of “Raccoon and his Grandmother” might be like, were one to tell (perform) it, than an actual telling (performance).

More than that, the passages offered as samples of what (a) narration of “Raccoon” might be like were one to undertake it are offered only in a comprehensively hedged, partial, and tentative fashion, ring-fenced by caveats of various sorts and marked with hesitations and self-corrections. As she herself insists repeatedly, Mrs. Florendo’s Kiksht, purely at the lexical and grammatical level, was imperfectly remembered and only
partially realized—and only then with effort—as the transcript shows. Beyond the obvious—the rather fragile quality of Mrs. Florendo’s active fluency—this shows the degree to which she herself had become involved in the project of “salvage ethnography”: she is plagued with a sense of responsibility to sources, a sense of the need to be punctilious in her attention to linguistic detail, given the scholarly project to hand of introducing a philological correction into the printed record. There is no doubt that she assumed that my recording of her corrections would eventually be transcribed and presented to an audience of scholars including, of course, Hymes himself.

But rather than descending further into the thicket of a complex discursive field filled with criss-crossing “references” and intertextual resonances for the sake of understanding it in its own terms—or for its interest to the historiography of anthropological linguistics or ethnopoetics—my purpose is to point to a fundamental tension in Hymes’s work between two lines of argumentation about the relationship between performance and text, a tension perhaps not yet resolved satisfactorily within his own oeuvre.

On the one hand, Hymes’s work on Native American texts shows a strong continuity with a long tradition of folkloristic work (influenced by linguistically focused studies of “stylistics” in literature), in which linguistic features have long been seen as critically important “genre” characteristics. The presumption of a perfectable narrative form (a normative and shared set of “aesthetic” principles of narration) still lurks in Hymes’s work, perhaps even more so as he has moved from working from his own field materials to working with already printed materials gathered by others.

On the other hand, there is continuity with the work of Hymes’s colleagues—John Gumperz, Allen Grimshaw, and others—on the “ethnography of speaking (or communication),” in which the *event-bound functionalities* of discursive (and transcribable) linguistic features comprise the center of the analytic enterprise. The purpose of this paper is to present material that forces a confrontation between these two sides of Hymes’s work on Native American texts.

For most of the 1970s and 1980s, as Mattina (1987) and others have shown, the main proponents in the then-emerging (sub-) field of ethnopoetics mostly talked past each other, across exactly this divide, with Dennis Tedlock and his followers attuned to the interactional immediacy and event-shaping performativity of linguistic and paralinguistic features of narrative performance, and Hymes and his followers attuned to the “balanced symmetries and anti-symmetries” (Jakobson 1960) of denotational linguistic form, the “rhetorical architecture” of text.2
These issues are now perhaps so much water under the bridge of disciplinary history. Insofar as more recent work (e.g., Cowell 2002; Sarris 1993) has moved on to consider storytelling in Native American traditions within a broader framework of imagination that requires neither a sustained examination of linguistic structure nor a rigorous analysis of the microsociology of the storytelling encounter, the unresolved tension identified here as hanging over the work of Hymes remains of critical importance. Why this should be the case is an issue I treat very briefly in the conclusion below.

2. Text, context, and performance

These are not new questions. Jakobson, for example, long ago pointed out that “a performance is an event, but the poem itself, if there is a poem, must be some kind of enduring object” (Jakobson 1960: 365; emphasis in original). These issues, moreover, have been central to the development of Hymes’s own work.

Addressing an audience of folklorists in “Breakthrough into performance,” an essay written prior to the emergence of his work on verse analysis, Hymes asserted:

My major purpose is to argue for the systematic study of variation in performance. To think of performance constraints in terms of eliminating inadequacies and obtaining ideal conditions is to perpetrate the same error as the linguist who thinks of performance as something that can be ignored when adequate, something to be noted only when it interferes. On such terms, performance is but a means to an end. But especially in an oral tradition performance is a mode of existence and realization that is partly constitutive of what the tradition is. The tradition itself exists partly for the sake of performance; performance is itself partly an end. And while there are cases analogous to the prima donna who cannot go on if any detail is not right, more often the performers of tradition are masters of adaptation to situation. There is no more an “Ur-performance” than there is an “Ur-text.” Only the systematic study of performance can disclose the true structure. (Hymes 1981 [1971]: 86; emphasis in original)

The question is: where is the “enduring object”? Reading the passage above, it seems that the enduring object (“the true structure”) may not be the text(s) at all, but the tradition, construed as something that is “realized” in and through performance(s), and therefore separate from them, quite as a grammatical system (langue) is separate from the utterances (parole) that instantiate it. More to the point of the present paper, what to do about the evident “mastery of adaptation to situation” displayed by narrators?
In the conclusion to the same essay, Hymes argues that a perspective that “treat[s] tradition as something known independent of its existence as something done ... tends to falsify traditions,” causing us to miss “something essential to the peoples who shaped the traditions, the shaping of the performances in which tradition was made manifest, through which it was communicated and made part of human lives” (Hymes 1981 [1971]: 132)—a statement with obvious political implications.

The story of “Raccoon and his Grandmother” discussed here is particularly well-suited to exploring these issues: already in Sapir’s 1909 *Wishram Texts* one finds two versions of this story side by side, one a mere “abstract” in a single brief paragraph (1909: 152.11–152.17), the other an incredibly drawn-out and elaborate recounting (1909: 152.18–164.22) taken down in dictation by Peter McGuﬀ over two sittings (1909: fn 2 at 160–161). It is an example that Hymes, in the same essay, pointed to in passing by way of emphasizing the fact that Chinookan narrative traditions have always been

not only multifiliar, but also “context-sensitive” (to use a linguistic term), “performance-sensitive,” differentially realized according to audience, performer, and setting. Clearly the narratives were not necessarily memorized and recited from memory, but rather, as with Yugoslav epics, the performer worked with a knowledge of the structure of the whole and of appropriate incident and style. There is a straightforward case within *Wishram Texts* itself, the relation between the short sketch of the Raccoon story recorded in the field from Louis Simpson by Sapir and the full version later written down and forwarded by Sapir’s interpreter, Pete McGuﬀ. (Hymes 1981 [1971]: 131)

The fundamental issue has to do with the “differential realization” of Chinookan verbal traditions in different situations, and with Chinookan narrators’ mastery of “adaptation to situation” in presenting the material. What place, if any, do these have in an analysis focused on the poetic organization of transcribable text? When Hymes says—reasonably enough—that narrators “worked with a knowledge of the structure of the whole and of appropriate incident and style,” is he gesturing toward plot content (summarizable in “abstracts” like those that formed the basis for the vast scholarly edifices constructed by Stith Thompson or Lévi-Strauss), or to the “rhetorical architecture” that would later move to the center of his discussions of verse analysis? I will return to these issues in the conclusion.

3. “Raccoon and his Grandmother”: the received text

The text of “Raccoon and his Grandmother” which Alice Florendo and I revisited—not for the first time—on 6 September 1984, was one she had
narrated in English in 1969 for Jarold Ramsey, a Professor of English at Rochester University who had grown up on a ranch near Warm Springs to which he returned most summers. Ramsey, a literature scholar and published poet with a long interest in American Indian folklore and literature, published her version of the story along with two others first in a brief communication in the journal *Western Folklore* (Ramsey 1970), and later reprinted them in his widely read anthology of Indian tales from the Northwest, *Coyote Was Going There* (Ramsey 1977), still in print with University of Washington Press thirty years later.

The publication of “Raccoon and his Grandmother” in *Western Folklore* appeared in the journal’s recurring section of *Collectanea* (“As contributions to this section, the Editors welcome small collections of traditional material with a minimum of discussion and annotation”). Here are Ramsey’s prefatory remarks:

(1) (Ramsey 1970: 116)

The following stories were recorded in August 1969 on the Warm Springs Reservation in Central Oregon. The informant, Mrs. James Florendo, who is fluent in both Wasco and Warm Springs [Sahaptin] dialects, told the stories in English; she was unsure whether they were properly Wasco or Warm Springs materials, but remembered hearing versions of them in both dialects. The tale of “Little Raccoon and his Grandmother” was evidently very popular among the major Columbia River tribes; versions of it have been recorded by Melville Jacobs and Edward Sapir among others. The Wasco–Warm Springs version presented here is perhaps the simplest and most dramatically conceived of all. According to the informant, the story was usually told with little moralistic embellishments, about the Grandmother’s excessive pampering of Raccoon, about his finickyness and his inability to escape his bad reputation, and so on. She remembers being told as a child to wait on her own grandmother with alacrity—“If you’re poky, your Grandmother might turn into a bluejay!”

Note well Ramsey’s report that, according to Alice Florendo, “the story was usually told with little moralistic embellishments.”

Below is the received text exactly as published in *Western Folklore*; I will interrupt the text when we reach the points that Mrs. Florendo thought required emendation and correction, reserving the use of endnotes to introduce a few very minor corrections of my own (the material in square brackets below represents Ramsey’s interpolations, preserved here as they appeared in the original).
Little Raccoon lived with his grandmother; he was her kitch [paternal grandson], and she spoiled him. They were gathering acorns over the mountains, and one day she asked Raccoon what he wanted to eat for dinner. “Would you like some wapato [Indian potato, sagittaria latifolia]?” she asked, and Raccoon answered, “No, I’m tired of wapato.” “Some jerky, then?” “No, I’m tired of jerky.” “How about some fish-eyes?” “I don’t like fish-eyes!” So Raccoon’s grandmother grew angry and told him to just go out and find his own dinner. “But stay out of the acorns!” she told him.

Well, after a while Raccoon came to the five pits where his grandmother was storing her winter’s acorns. “I’m so hungry!” he said to himself, and after a while he said, “Grandmother surely won’t miss just one acorn.” So he reached into the pit, under the dirt covering, and took out one acorn to eat—and then another, and then another, until pretty soon the pit was empty!

“How about some fish-eyes?” “I don’t like fish-eyes!” So Raccoon’s grandmother grew angry and told him to just go out and find his own dinner. “But stay out of the acorns!” she told him.

Well, after a while Raccoon came to the five pits where his grandmother was storing her winter’s acorns. “I’m so hungry!” he said to himself, and after a while he said, “Grandmother surely won’t miss just one acorn.” So he reached into the pit, under the dirt covering, and took out one acorn to eat—and then another, and then another, until pretty soon the pit was empty!

“Now what shall I do?” he said, “Grandmother will be very angry.” So he crapped once for every acorn in the pit, and then covered it all up.

Here is the detail that Mrs. Florendo identified many times to me and to others as an inaccuracy that warranted correction. Raccoon, according to Mrs. Florendo, did not defecate “once for every acorn in the pit” until it was filled with hard, pellet-like feces. Rather, he defecated only once in each pit, filling each pit with runny, diarrhea-like feces before replacing the cover, a detail that will become important later in the story. Resuming the text now as received:

But he was still very hungry, and he went to the second pit. “Well, maybe I’ll just take one more acorn,” he said, but after a while that pit was empty too, and so he filled it up, too, with his dung. Well, Raccoon just seemed to get hungrier and hungrier, and before long he had eaten every acorn in each of the five pits, and replaced every one with his dung.

After a while his grandmother went out to get some acorns for their supper. But when she reached into the first pit all she felt were little pieces of dung! “Somebody has been messing around here!” she said. So she went on to the second pit, and felt the same thing—and so on through all five pits. She was getting angrier and angrier. “I’ll bet it was that Little Raccoon!” she yelled, and when she found him by the fire she grabbed a fire-stick [braided willow wands to carry
live coals in] and whipped him from his nose to his tail. That is why raccoons have those stripes across their backs (A2413).  

Little Raccoon ran away then; he thought he would go live with some friends in a village nearby. But when he arrived there everybody came out and jeered at him: “Ha, ha, here comes that Little Raccoon; he stole all his grandmother’s acorns and replaced them with his dung!” So Raccoon felt silly and went on to another village, but there again all the people ran out and ridiculed him, “Ha, ha, here’s that Little Raccoon, we’ve heard how you pilfered your grandmother’s acorns and left her only dung, and she beat you!” He was ashamed, and went on to three more villages, but every time he arrived the people would come out and make fun of him. So Raccoon learned how stories about the mean things you do travel ahead of you, and he went off by himself into the woods.

Now about this time his old grandmother began to feel badly about whipping her little kitch; she felt sorry for him. So she set out to find him, but when she came to the first village, they told her that Raccoon had gone on to the next village, and so on, until she had visited all five villages without finding him. She was feeling pretty bad. Now Raccoon was up in a service-berry bush, eating berries, and he heard his grandmother coming up the hill, crying “O my little kitch, my little Raccoon, where are you?” Raccoon yelled, “Here I am, grandmother, eating service-berries.” Pretty soon she came up, nearly blind from crying so much, and she said “My kitch, I’m so hungry, throw me some berries.”

Now that his grandmother had found him, Raccoon was feeling mischievous again, so he threw down a whole handful of berries, leaves, and twigs right down her throat, and she began to choke. “Kak-kak,” she cried, “my kitch, I’m choking; here, take my basket-hat and get me some water!” So Raccoon climbed down, took the hat, and ran to a creek and filled it up, but he was feeling mean again so he poked a hole in the hat and by the time he got back he had only a little water. “Kak-kak,” cried the grandmother, “get me some more water!” So Raccoon went to fetch her water again, but he poked another hole, and brought even less water this time. He was obeying her, but not really. Each time he went he poked another hole, and brought back a little less, and a little less, until the fifth time, when the grandmother could hardly talk, he brought her only one drop of water. And just as he handed her the basket-hat this time, she cried “Kak-kak-kak-kak” once more—and turned into a blue-jay and flew off, scolding the way blue jays do. Little Raccoon just sat down and cried, it was all his fault.
This story was immensely popular in Native mythologies of the Northwest. In addition to the two versions in *Wishram Texts* (and the two in this paper), versions are attested in every Chinookan language, with dozens, possibly hundreds more variants in text collections of other Indian languages across the Plateau and Northwest Coast (see Lévi-Strauss 1990 [1971]: 163–192).

4. Transcription format

The transcription format used below (and in Moore 1993) arranges the discourse into three tiers or columns of indented type in an attempt to render visually patent the fact that there seem to be (minimally) three distinct speech-event modalities constantly in play in the transcript: (i) a bilingual conversation between Mrs. Florendo and me about stories in general and about linguistic and other details of the story at hand; (ii) Mrs. Florendo’s narration of the plot events of “Raccoon and his Grandmother” in the third person; and (iii) her use of directly quoted speech to present the utterances of the characters in the story. A brief passage from the transcript below illustrates this:

160 AF: I’m trying to say how he [Raccoon] pouted now.
161 kwapt q’usni galixwəx:
   [Then he pouted:]
162 ‘akk’ts iganwəq! akk’ts iganwəq!
   [“My grandmother fought me! My grandmother fought me!”]

The leftmost column or tier of transcription, then, represents INTERLOCUTORY speech deictically grounded in the immediate event of speaking (E₃ in the notation of Jakobson 1957); included here are the responses and reactions of the ethnographer, the “audience”-like reactions provided by the narrator herself, and various “asides,” excurses, and metanarrative comments directed to me as Mrs. Florendo’s interlocutor and co-conversationalist. Interlocutory speech, virtually always in English, is presented as if it were prose, running flush-left to flush-right in the transcript. The second column represents NARRATIVE discourse given in the third person (and usually in the past tense)—description of characters’ movements, actions, and behaviors, and so on, including verba dicendi and other methods used by the narrator to frame the directly quoted utterances of the story’s characters (E₇). The third column from left contains only the DIRECTLY QUOTED speech of characters (E₅). In the second (narrative) and third (quoted) columns, line breaks roughly represent pauses in speech, though no systematic attempt has been made to capture
subtle differences in pause length. In Goffman’s (1981) terms, Mrs. Florendo is the Animator, Author, and Principal of all interlocutory speech given in the first (leftmost) column; she is the Animator and Principal of (non-quoted narrative) speech given in the second (middle) column; in the third (rightmost) column of directly quoted character speech, Mrs. Florendo functions only as the Animator—the character whose speech is presented is the Author and Principal.

The purpose of the transcription format adopted here is to emphasize how these three footings or speech-event modalities are kept formally distinct at some points, and formally merge with one another at other points, but in an orderly way. Choosing to organize the transcript in this way, of course, inevitably means that other important features of transcribable text may be less obvious on the page—not only such “oral performance” features as loudness, tempo, intonational contours, and so on, but also such poetic patternings of denotational text as lexical, syntactic, and other parallelisms.

Clear expression on the page of the poetic patterning of denotational text, then, is sacrificed in the interest of capturing instead Mrs. Florendo’s shifts across these different footings or speech-event modalities. The three-column format is not perfect, rather it is a fairly blunt—even, heuristic—intervention. But it does at least have the virtues of its shortcomings: the problematic “borderline” cases, where the boundary between speech-event modalities is blurred, yield an interesting residue of Bakhtinian “double-voiced” utterances (see, e.g., lines 26, 81, 107, 117, 120, 130, 144, and especially 154–155 below). The format is also revelatory in relation to Mrs. Florendo’s narrative code switching: interlocutory speech directed to me as addressee is always given in English; directly quoted character speech is almost always presented in Kiksht, with or without a directly quoted English “translation” equivalent; narrative speech is given variously in Kiksht or in English. Mrs. Florendo’s alternation between languages, then, is clearly only one among several “contextualization cues” (Gumperz 1982) pointing to her alternation among a number of different “footings” or speech-event modalities. It should be added that the overall pattern of interaction between code switching and alternation among speech-event modalities observed here is characteristic also of narrations recorded since the 1980s from other speakers of Kiksht (see Moore 1993).

Goffman long ago observed that “the texts that folklorists and sociolinguists provide of everyday stories often systematically omit the narrative frame-breaks that very likely occurred during the original tellings,” a fact he interpreted as evidence that “the student of stories has tactfully accepted the teller’s injunction that the shift in footing required to introduce
a correction or some other out-of-frame comment be omitted from the official record’’ (Goffman 1981: 152). Since in the present case the teller’s express purpose was to introduce a correction into the published record—and to use a (partial, off-again, on-again) narration as the point of departure for a freewheeling discussion of narrative technique—I have accepted her explicit injunction to keep this material in.

5. Corrigenda to ‘‘Raccoon and his Grandmother’’

I turn now to the transcript from 6 September 1984 that records part of a discussion that began in late afternoon and stretched into the evening. As the transcript begins we are in the middle of a brief digression about the version of ‘‘Raccoon and his Grandmother’’ published by Jarold Ramsey, and the error contained there; in order to get to the section of the story needing emendation Mrs. Florendo has hurried through the first two scenes, the dialogue between Raccoon and his Grandmother in which he rebuffs her offers of food until she allows him to have an acorn, and his trip out to the storage pits, where he consumes all the acorns and ‘‘replaces’’ them with his runny feces before re-covering each pit.

The tape recorder is turned on as she is reporting on a conversation she had had with Jarold (herein, ‘‘Jerry’’) Ramsey some time before. It seems that Ramsey, having acquiesced to Mrs. Florendo’s demand for a printed correction, has asked her whether he should continue to identify her by name as the story’s source in subsequent editions.

(4) Alice Florendo, ‘‘Raccoon and his Grandmother,’’ 6 September 1984. [tape begins]

AF: […] We didn’t have no radios, or TVs; the only recreation we had was storytelling, or maybe some certain games.

RM: mhm, and it was education in it, too.

AF: uh-huh, yeah. And he [Jarold Ramsey] knows that.

RM: mhm. But he did kinda mess that up though, with that—

AF: —but he felt really bad, I mean, he says, ‘‘Well, one of these days I’m gonna have to do you justice by saying so in one of my books.’’

RM: mhm

AF: And so. But he’s really—he’s—but I said I—but later on, I told him, ‘‘Go ahead!’’—‘‘Okay.’’ ‘‘My—’’ After I thought it over I said ‘‘My grandkid’ll say ‘Oh, that’s my grandma!’’’

RM: Sure!

AF: So he, he thought it was pretty good.
Sensing at the end of this “side sequence” an opportunity to restart the narrative, I prompt Mrs. Florendo by repeating (in line 14) the last line of Kiksht she had uttered in her re-narration of the story (before taping began)—we pick up the plot as Raccoon has realized that he has eaten all of the acorns, and tries to decide what to do next. But no sooner than she resumes fluently narrating, she interrupts herself (at line 32) to mention discussions of ethnopoetics that had taken place at the 1984 meeting of the International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages (referred to in line 36 as “the symposium”), which she had attended a few weeks before, at which Dell and Virginia were Hymes were also present.

(5)
[silence: ca. 2 secs]
14 RM: \(k'w^w a^w š^w k^w apt gali\text{c}xux\).  
[Scared—He (Raccoon) got scared then.]
15 AF: \(k'w^w a^w š^w k^w apt gali\text{c}xux\).  
[He got scared then.]

And that’s just after he ate all the acorns, after he left.

RM: [prompting; Raccoon asks himself:]  
“\(q\text{õngi} ḥga pu n\text{c}x\text{c}x\)?”  
[“What should I do now?”]

AF:  
“\(q\text{õngi}—q\text{õngi} ḥga pu \ldots ?\)”  
[“What should—?”]

[ silence: ca. 5 secs]
20 AF: Yeah,  
“\(q\text{õngi}—q\text{õngi} ḥga pu \ldots ?\)”  
[“What should—?”]

“Now what should I do?”  
“I ate all the acorns out of this \(k'\text{wayat}\)”

I figure he got scared—after all, five of them got emptied.

25 RM: mhm
AF: So he—that’s howcome he went back and start, uh,  
\(i\text{xtba n\text{á}wit a\text{p}\text{w}λ\text{p}λ \text{gali\text{c}lk}^w\text{i\text{c}x}a\).  
[He defecated in one (acorn-pit), right away it was full (of his runny feces).]
\(k^w apt a\text{t}\text{am\text{á}k}^w \text{štba gayu}\text{u}x;\)  
[Then he went to the second one;]
\(\text{dauka gali\text{c}xux;\)  
[he did the same;]
30 \(\text{p}λ\text{p}λ \text{galilglk}^w\text{i\text{c}x}a.\)  
[crapped it full.]
Oh! These were the things they said—they were trying to decide: How people phase their stories, in threes, in fives, or twos, or sevens, or whatever. But I can think of threes, I can think of fives, I can think of sevens. And they wondered why they done this.

35 RM: Who’s this? Jerry [Ramsey]?
AF: [impatiently:] No, no, no! At the symposium! [i.e., the 1984 Salish Conference]
RM: Oh!
AF: You know, they were thinking about how they refer, like this has fives, five k’wayats, and five times he [Raccoon] done something: Five times he—five, five pits he emptied, five, five k’wayats, five pits he filled; or, five pits he ate all of. Five, y’know, all the way.

40 RM: mhm
AF: But in between all this, all that drama that goes into it.
RM: right
AF: And,

\[pʰaɬɪpʰaɬ\]
[full.]
\[wɪt’a gayuix,\]
[again he went,]
\[galɪxə—\]
[he—]

oh,

\[qɪmən kə pu k’aya ɪgixɪmuxəmxə.\]
[as if he hadn’t just eaten it all up.]
I’m still having trouble.

[silence: ca. 6.5 secs]
Trouble with ‘cover’.

[silence: ca. 8.0 secs]
If I could just think of these words it would be easy!
RM: [stumped]: ‘cover’.

[silence: ca. 6.0 secs]
55 AF: I know ‘em but I just lose it sometimes, just right quick I can’t think of it.
RM: uh, uh, uh, ʃəlb—
AF: ʃʷəbwámət—uxʷəbwámət, or—
RM: or ʃɨbwáyiə, or
As the word for ‘close’ swims slowly back into Mrs. Florendo’s memory, I switch into “elicitation” mode in line 67, trying to get a firm attestation of the lexical form from her—an effort she rebuffs, not allowing it to distract her. After this, her confidence seems to grow, and she moves into more fluent narration (with “rhetorical” vowel lengthening in line 73):

(6)  
AF:  
ixabwámat.  
[it (msc.) is closed.]  
RM:  
ixabwámat.  
[it is closed.]  
AF:  
Uh-huh.  
RM:  Okay—is that the one, is that the one you were—  
AF:  Yes, I’m trying to say how it goes together now.  
[ silence: ca. 4 secs ]  
AF:  [ slowly ]  

gac̄ux̄abú.  
[ He closed it up.  
[ silence: ca. 4.6 secs ]  
70  
qimank dan k’aya gadi̱x̄hmux̄omx̄ saw̄águl.  
[ As if he hadn’t eaten up all the acorns.  
wit’a gayuix,  
[ Again he went.  
dauka galí—gac̄ux̄aw—gac̄ux̄abú, ’gamak̄štba.  
[ The same way he—he did—he closed it up, at the second one.  
73  
wit’a gayu::ix.  
[ Again he went::nt.  
tahínba dauka.  
[ At the third one, same way.  
75  
á:ga galíx̄lk̄i:x̄a, wit’a dauka gaˇc̄ux̄abu,  
[ Now he crapped, again the same way he closed it up, ]  
qimank dan k’aya gadi̱x̄hmux̄águl.  
[ as if he hadn’t eaten up the acorns.  

You see, you can say anything as long as it refers to the same thing.

RM: mhm

AF: Like, he went and done the same thing into the other, as if he didn’t eat any of the acorns:

80 țalaktba dāuka galixɔx,

[At the fourth one he did the same,]

You could say he done the same thing in the second one.

RM: mhm

AF: And if you wanted to make it shorter you could go all the way through, uh, you’ll explain the first one, what he did, and

85 wița dauka,

[again the same,]

and

kʷapt țamakʷšiba;

[then at the second one;]

wița țaunftba dāuka galixɔx;

[again at the third one he did the same;]

țalaktba dāuka galixɔx;

[at the fourth one he did the same;]

89 wița țağʷonmaix dāuka galixɔx;

[again at the fifth one he did the same;]

gacχwʻabu kana:nawa,

[He closed up all of them,]

qimank dan kʻaya gadišltmuxɔmx.

[as if he hadn’t eaten them all up.]

kʷapt kʷaš galixɔxʷaŋ, kʷáiška kʷaš ikiax.

[Then he got afraid, right away he’s scared.]

gayuíx, galiñɔpsut išdaqʷšiba, wačilx itšdąqʷli.

[He went, he hid himself in their house, their winter house.]
between two major segments of the narrative. The scene of the action now shifts back into the house, and the focus shifts to the other character, the Grandmother, who leaves the house to go looking for her grandson:

(7) AF: 

\[
\begin{align*}
&k^{''}apt \, gala:\check{\check{\text{t}}}ux^{''}ait \, aiak'i\check{s}, \\
&[\text{Then his grandmother thought to herself,}]
&\quad 'O:h, q\check{\text{ongisk}}\check{\text{a}} \ldots ndi\check{\text{xu}}xt \ldots \text{agul}\check{\text{ul}}? \\
&\quad [\text{''Oh, what ever \ldots are we-two doing \ldots} \\
&\quad \text{acorns?}]
&\quad 'k'aya \, \check{\text{lug}} \, i\check{\text{xatxam}}.\
&\quad [\text{''He hasn't returned.'']} \\
&\quad inax\check{\text{ldix}} \, galuix.
&[\text{She went outdoors.}]
&\quad ''aniu\check{\text{k}}\check{\text{a}}xta \, q\check{\text{ongiska}} \, k'aya \, dika.''
&\quad [\text{''I'm going to see why he's not here.''}]
&\quad galu::ix.
&[\text{She we::nt.}]
&\quad k'\check{\text{aya}} \, gagi\check{\text{g}}\check{\text{kl}}\check{\text{a}}x \, k^{''}ayatba.
&[\text{She didn't see him at the storage-pit.}]
&\quad ''k'aya \, \check{\text{lux}}^{''}an \, igi\text{xtkia}x.''
&\quad [\text{''I guess he wasn't here.''}]
&\quad ''I guess he wasn't here.''
&\quad So she decided she'll get him one of the acorns that he craved.
&\quad k^{''}apt \, dala:\check{\check{\text{t}}}ax \, d\check{\text{x}}i \, \text{agab}\check{\text{en}} \, dnu \, \text{daya}.
&[\text{Then perhaps (she took) a rootdigger.}]
&\quad So.
&gagu\check{\text{xwalaq}}, \, gagi\check{\text{xwala}}—
&[\text{She opened it (fem.), she opened it (msc.)—}]
&\quad I don't know [laughing]—
&\quad gagi\check{\text{xwalaq}} \, ixt \, ik^{''}\text{ayat}.
&[\text{She opened the first storage-pit.}]
&\quad k^{''}apt—
&[\text{Then—}]
&\quad Now I'm havin' trouble again.
&\quad k^{''}apt \, i\check{\text{gak}}\check{\text{sm}} \, da\check{\text{txn}}\check{\text{txn}} \, i\check{\text{tiak}}^{''} \text{icxaba}.
&[\text{Then her hands, goopy in his feces,}]
&[\text{laughs}]
&\quad stuck her hand in there, \text{da\check{\text{txn}}\check{\text{txn}}, \, da\check{\text{txn}}\check{\text{txn}},}
&[\text{goopy, goopy,}]
&\quad \text{in his, whatever, mess.}
Here, finally, Mrs. Florendo introduces the most important of her corrigenda to the text, centered on a “phonaesthetic” particle form functioning adverbially to convey the sensory experience of sticking one’s fingers into a goopy liquid: \textit{da}txn\texttimes nxn. The form occurs first in line 115 above, and recurs twice in line 116, and again in lines 127, 132, and 140 below. In this next passage, Mrs. Florendo explicitly discusses issues of composition-in-performance:

(8) 
\begin{quote}
AF: \textit{táya xøb galaxáilux}.  
[She got good and angry with him.]  
galaxáilux,  
[She got (angry) with him.]
\end{quote}

120 She just got really angry  
\textit{k"apt galaxáilux"ait},  
[Then she thought,]  
\textquote{\text{"ağa wít'ax ïxt ik""ayat dauka."}}  
[\textquote{“Now again one storage-pit is the same way.”}]  

Then you could say the same thing over,  
daúka galaxáمخ.  
[She did the same thing.]

125 Or else you can explain, in a lot of detail, to make the story longer, that she opened the pit, and she stuck her hand in there  
\textit{da}txn\texttimes nxn wíta dá:uka,  
[Goopy again in the same way.]  
\textquote{\text{"ání::!"}}  
[\textquote{“Dear oh dear!”}]  
mänk yaxat \textit{k"apt galaxailux}.  
[Then she got even angrier.]

130 Then she got much angrier.  
And she went to \textit{wíta láhünba galuix},  
[again to the third one she went.]  
dáuka gágìux \textit{da}txn\texttimes nxn wíta ilgakšin.  
[In the same way she did her hands, all goopy again.]  
\textquote{\text{"ání::!"}}  
[\textquote{“Dear oh dear!”}]  
mänk wáنتاج \textit{k"apt galaxailux}. [laughing]  
[Now she was even more angry.]
Here is another pivotal change of scene, as Grandmother realizes what Raccoon has done, and leaves the storage-pit area to return to the house, where the first of their violent confrontations will take place. Mrs. Flor-endo pauses for several seconds (after line 140 above), and seems to truncate a fifth repetition of Grandmother’s putting her hands into an acorn pit (at 141); then between line 141 and 142, she again heaves a heavy sigh—again, a nonlinguistic boundary signal whose placement reinforces an ethnopoetic segmentation that could have been arrived at independently on the basis of denotational text and plot content.

(9)

141 AF: And wi'ta qi—
[And again———]
[sighs]

142 xab galaṅxā.x.
[She got angry.]
gagīunaḵlam ichickian.
[She went looking for her grandson.]
She was so angry she went lookin’ for her grandson.

145 ičaːgiön iq’alalas.
[Her gra::ndson, Raccoon.]
galaṅ—qušťa galaṅpšut.
[She—lo and behold, he was hiding.]
gagiľkl.
[She saw him.]
kīnwa, kīnwa gayuŋʷapx.
[In vain he tried to run out (of the house)]
gagiľgaṅxa dauia iː—
[She grabbed this one———]

150 Now I’m having trouble again.
[long pause]
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ik'amunaq#wn[i] wa'tulba gagiglgax,  
[She grabbed a stick from the fire.]
gagiug"lxl iagričba, kanawi na:wit aiaičba.  
[She struck him on his nose, all (the way) right (down) to his tail.]

153 quстиαxα qidau galičξx iq'alalas iak' inułmax.  
[Lo and behold, that’s how the raccoon got his stripes.]
154 See, that’s the way the Raccoon got his 'k'inułmax.  
[stripes]
155 She hit him on his nose, iagričba, na:wit aiaič.  
[on his nose, right (down to) his tail.]
156 And that could be the end of that one.
157 And then again you can—if everybody’s still awake, if everybody’s still alert and alight,
158 then she goes,
159 k"wapt—  
[Then—]

In lines 153 and 154, Mrs. Florendo delivers the classic ‘‘explanatory element’’ (Waterman 1914) tagged as A2413 in the Motif Index of Folk Literature (see Note 5), first in Kiksht (line 153), then in a precise English equivalent (line 154). Of course a ‘‘traditional’’ feature of the story, is this ‘‘explanatory element’’ presented here as an ‘‘aside’’? Are all such ‘‘explanatory elements,’’ when present in a narration, ‘‘asides’’ to interlocutors in the event of performance?

Having departed from the event-frame of narration to deliver the explanatory element, she continues telling me what ‘‘you can do’’ as a narrator who has the freedom to expand and contract the amount of narrative detail—especially in the handling of fivefold ritual-like repetitions of action—depending on the immediate context of narration, something she has done repeatedly already (compare lines 77, 81, 83–84, 123, 125–126 above).

In lines 157 and 158, however, as she references the traditional setting of myth narrations—at home, during winter nights—a new participant comes suddenly, fleetingly into view: who is the ‘‘she’’ mentioned in line 158 above? It is not, of course, Raccoon’s grandmother, who will not reappear until the very end of the story (not included in this transcript). It is, rather, I believe, Mrs. Florendo’s own maternal grandmother, whose narrations Mrs. Florendo’s is remembering (again) in this transcript; she is the (implied) Goffmanian ‘‘author’’ (Goffman 1981).
I'm trying to say how he pouted now, 

\[ k'\text{apt } q'\text{usni gali}x\text{x}^{\text{w}}'\text{ax:} \]

[Then he pouted:]

``akk'iš iganwa:q! akk'iš iganwa:q!
[``My grandmother fought me! My grandmother fought me!]``

``akk'iš iganwa:q! akk'iš iganwa:q!''
[``My grandmother fought me! My grandmother fought me!]``

He went out crying, saying

``My grandmother, my k'iš fought me!
``My k'iš fought me!''

And he tried to go down the road and he met up with—

Grandfather Bear, maybe, and he tried to,

``nak'iš iganwa:q! nak'iš iganwa:q!''
[``My grandmother fought me! My grandmother fought me!]``

You know, usually five times, however many times, whichever.

And he [GB] laughed, he said, uh,

``k'aya qadağı igamwaq,
[``It's not for nothing she fought you,]``

``saq'^{w}saq'^{w} quštiax'a itk'^{w}áyat itğulul idmxlmux,``
[``You ate up absolutely all the acorns (in) the storage pit,]``

``imdu— . . . ''
[``You— . . .'']``

I can't even say 'steal' now.\(^\text{13}\)

The trouble recovering the word for 'steal' leads Mrs. Florendo to another aside. The immediate impetus for our session of 6 September 1984 was Mrs. Florendo's realization that she had misplaced a version of "Raccoon and his Grandmother" that she had written out for herself, in Kiksht, some time before:

\[ 316 \text{ Robert E. Moore} \]
more and more I’m doing it, I’m thinking of more words that belong in there, that I didn’t put in.

180 RM: mhm
AF: galíkčaḵ,  
[He burst out crying,]
galíkčaḵ,  
[he burst out crying,]
he cried,  
he cried and went down the road tryin’ to get everybody’s symp[athy]—

185  
kinwaː gayuix,  
[In vain he went (on),]
kinwaː gayuix,  
[in vain he went (on),]
galíkčaḵ.  
[he burst out crying.]
kinwaː şan ač’ulxama,  
[In vain he tried to tell somebody,]
“igaːnwaq łkk’iš!  
[“My grandmother fought me!”]

190  
nagnk’iš iganwaq!”  
[“My grandmother fought me!”]
He tried, ‘n they’d just laugh in his face, and tell him that  
“You stole all the acorns—”  
“You didn’t get whipped for nothing, you stole all the acorns.”

I can’t think of the right words.

195 RM: qadaği—  
[Not] for nothing—
AF: “k’aya qadaği igmwaq;  
[“Not for nothing did whip you;]
“igmwaq ağa saq”saq’w”—  
[“she whipped you now, all”—]

RM: itgulul—  
[acorns—]
AF: “saq” itgulul na—”  
[“All the acorns—”]

200 I’m trying to—Or, well, you could say  
“nadmxılmuxima”  
[“You ate them all up”]
that’s not right,
“You ate up all the acorns.”

Well, you could say that, too, but you could say the ‘stealing’ part too, and I’m trying to think of ‘steal’.

‘imigüliu’ is ‘you stole’, but then it—there’s a different way of saying it.

RM: imigüliu?

[‘you (are) a thief’; ‘you are a rat’]

AF: [no resp.; pauses]

There’s a certain way of saying it, I can’t say it.

‘saq’ ‘saq’

[‘All’]

I don’t know, “You ate up all the acorns.”

Or I should say,

“You stole all of ‘em, the acorns, you ate them all up.”

Can’t find the right words right now.

[pause]

Struggling again to “find the right words,” Mrs. Florendo breaks out of “oral performance” yet again, this time to extol the virtues of proof-reading:

(12)

AF: And it used to come to me so easy, to just speak right out, but like I say it’s coming back now, I’m able to do it a little bit better, more and more as I go along. I can remember when I was talking to Jerry [Ramsey], I used to just do it to him in English, and I’d try to remember it the best way I know how, and I never thought about proofing, I never thought about anything like that, but later on when I learned a little bit more, I said, “Oh, we should have proofed it,” when I saw that in the book [= Ramsey 1977]. Then I told him about it and he said “Well, one of these days we’ve gotta justify that and put it in—refer to that in a book, so that’ll be corrected.” [laughs]

[long pause]

īgüliu is just like a rat, a stealing rat, y’know; but it doesn’t mean the same thing I wanted to say. There’s a word for it. I’ll think of it sometime.

[pause]
Now we are making the transition into the final, climactic confrontation between Raccoon and his Grandmother, and here, rather than heaving a sigh, Mrs. Florendo looks around her in the now dark living room and takes note of a change in the weather: winter is approaching (line 228). A transition point in the narrated event frame of the story is thus linked to a seasonal transition in the event frame of narration that is itself indexed by the earlier-than-usual darkness falling around us in the room as our conversation continues. According to tradition, myths can only be performed during winter nights; to tell a myth in summer might bring snow (Hymes 1966). The unnamed narrator I take to be her maternal grandmother makes a second fleeting appearance in the text at line 233:

(13)

AF: And he just goes on and on, down to uh—

228 It’s gettin’ colder, I guess it’s gettin’ a little bit better to tell stories.
Uh, well,

230 šan kinwa gačůlxam,
[Vainly he tried to tell someone,]
aga gayuíx kʷábaix,
[now he went someplace or other.]
kʷap̓t dalaʔax qušťaʔa wimaʔ yamdix yuit.
[then perhaps, lo and behold, he’s headed for the Columbia River.]

233 Maybe he went down to the—towards the Columbia River, y’know, she couldn’t say he got where.

235 gayuíx,
[He went,]
aga walu gagiůx̌a.
[now he got hungry.]
I still haven’t—that’s—
walu gagiůx.
[He got hungry.]

In Mrs. Florendo’s versions of “Raccoon and his Grandmother”—and presumably also in her grandmother’s renditions—the final scene takes place at or near the town of Simnasho in the northerly part of the reservation, in an area settled almost entirely by Sahaptins (who are sometimes identified, and identify themselves, as “Northenders” in local Reservation English). Or, to be precise, it always takes place perhaps at Simnasho (she couldn’t say . . . where [lines 233 and 234]).15 Continuing to struggle for words, Mrs. Florendo in line 245 turns to me and
repeats—now as a humorous aside—her own code-mixed sentence just uttered in line 244:

(14)

AF: That was several days now, it took days and days long time ago, you just walked.

*ağa quştıa xa dalaʔax Simnasho-ba.*

[Now, lo and behold, perhaps at Simnasho.]

*aslawaitk gaçağkl.*

[He saw a hawthorn tree.]

*kʷapt galiχ—*

[Then he—]

Now I’m losing it.

*aslawaitkba* he climbed up.

[in the hawthorn tree]

[laughs]

245 *“aslawaitkba* he climbed up”!

But there’s some way of saying it,

*galiχ—*

[He—]

6. Conclusion

We will leave Mrs. Florendo hanging in mid-word. The material presented above, I think, allows us to revisit the questions raised in the introduction to this paper, which I will try to (re-) formulate here as succinctly as I can.

First, where is the text? Is it only in those utterances of Mrs. Florendo’s that directly narrate the plot of “Raccoon and his Grandmother,” and not in her many digressions, excurses, self-corrections, and asides to her interlocutor? Recall Jakobson’s dictum that “a performance is an event, but the poem itself, if there is a poem, must be some kind of enduring object” (Jakobson 1960: 365; emphasis in original). If, for example, we wished to rearrange this transcript to highlight the organization of the discourse in terms of ethnopoetic principles of verse analysis, where would we begin? What would we have to leave out?

Ethnopoetics in both its Hymesian and Tedlockian incarnations has always acknowledged the existence of variation across versions of “the same” story by different narrators, and by a single narrator on different occasions; it has also acknowledged the ability of skilled narrators to adapt their performances to particular occasions. But while the facts
of variability are routinely acknowledged, and skillful narrators’ ability to “adapt” the material to different contexts celebrated, in much of the ethnopoetics literature the center of the artistry or “literariness” of the tradition seems to lie elsewhere.

In retrospect, it is slightly odd that ideas from the work of the Soviet literary scholar Mikhail Bakhtin and his “circle”—available in English at least since the 1973 translation of Marxism and the Philosophy of Language (Volosinov 1973 [1927]) and surely also through informal word-of-mouth at that time—should have had so little apparent impact on the development of Hymes’s work on American Indian texts, and on ethnopoetics during the 1970s and 1980s more generally, since those ideas would seem to offer a straightforward way out of the impasse with which we began. At the very time that Hymes was moving from ethnography of communication into philologically recuperative ethnopoetic reanalyses, this other enduring legacy of Roman Jakobson’s influence on linguistic anthropology was taking shape, influencing many of Hymes’s students, if not Hymes himself in any detectable way.

Discerning in the material presented here structures of “voicing” that gesture from the 1984 interaction with the author via interdiscursivity to earlier ones with Ramsey, Hymes, and Mrs. Florendo’s maternal grandmother and beyond, we can see the event in which Mrs. Florendo presented (and I recorded) her “corrections” to “Raccoon and his Grandmother” as one in which multiple cultural views of what “text(uality)” is all about—including Hymes’s own—are brought into contact.

Notes

* I am indebted to three referees whose comments, criticisms and suggestions on an earlier version of this article were extremely valuable, and resulted in many improvements. Jan Blommaert and Srikant Sarangi are thanked for editorial forebearance above and beyond the call of their respective duties.

1. It would be hard to improve upon Mattina’s (1987) gimlet-eyed survey of these issues.

2. In this sense the ethnopoetics literature played out a broader tension in postwar literary theory, where the foundational texts are Charles Olson’s (1966 [1950]) essay on “Projective verse”—a kind of manifesto summoning poets to the project of establishing in the realm of print an analogue to “action painting,” in which the finished work is appreciated mostly as a record of its own production (Tedlock)—and the texts of New Criticism (e.g., Brooks and Warren 1949), in which the internal structures of finished works are the focus of attention.

3. The correct transcription of the stem form of the kin-term would be -k’iš.

4. Sagittaria latifolia Willd.; the term wapato is from Chinook Jargon.

5. In the other versions of this story that I recorded from Mrs. Florendo, she presented this scene as one in which the Grandmother offers Raccoon first one and then another delicacy, each of which he refuses, finally offering him acorns and receiving an enthusi-
astic response. This telling may simply have been divergent in this and other respects from other versions by Mrs. Florendo.

6. A2413 is the number of the relevant entry in the Motif-Index of Folk Literature: Origin of animal’s stripes.

7. In most versions known to me, Raccoon climbs up into a black hawthorn tree, *Crataegus douglasii* Lindl. (Rosaceae), known as *aslawaitk* in Kiksht, *ašumnaš* in Warm Springs Sahaptin; it is a tree that grows to approximately 25 feet in height when mature, and has large (approx. 1") thorns; serviceberries (*Amelanchier alnifolia* Nutt.) grow on low deciduous shrubs.

8. In other versions from Mrs. Florendo and in the version published by Sapir (1909: 160.21), the Grandmother transforms herself into a grouse or pheasant (*ašmudmut*); other avian species appear here in the many variants of this story found in other Chinookan dialects and in neighboring languages (notably Salishan) all over the region; space does not permit the elaborate comparative textual criticism that would be required to chart this (see, e.g., Lévi-Strauss 1990 [1971], who discusses a large set of these, including “Raccoon and his Grandmother”).

9. English speech is given in standard orthography; Chinookan speech is given in a standard Americanist orthography; a reasonably close English translation is provided in square brackets beneath each line of Chinookan transcription. Notation of stress accent and rhetorical vowel lengthening, the latter marked with a colon ( : ), is provided for speech in both languages.

10. Questions about the Go¤manian Author-ship of nonquoted narrative discourse will be taken up in the discussion below.

11. Goffman (1981: 152) adds that “Often omitted, too, is any appreciation of the frequency with which hearers change footing and inject in passing their own contribution to the tale”—another feature prominently included in the transcript below.

12. The Kiksht verb that Mrs. Florendo and I are searching for in lines 51–63 is probably a verb theme *[ ]2-[ ]4*a*-p bu*[ ]2 close up *[ ]4*, whose root shows an “ablaut” form -*p bu* in the future tense (lines 57, 58); the ordinary Kiksht noun for ‘door’ (lines 60, 61), *a3qa-budit*, is a deverbative nominalization on this theme, the -*x*(_a_)-p bu-* sequence of the verbal form becoming -*qa-bu-* in the noun stem; -*dit* is an instrumental suffix, hence the noun for ‘door’ can be etymologically glossed as ‘closer’. So it does all “relate.”

13. The verb Mrs. Florendo is probably searching for in line 175 is ga-čˇ-utˇ3-xtga-lal ‘he2 stole them3’.

14. A remarkable instance in which the style of Boasian “interlinear” word-by-word glossing is realized as off-the-cuff discourse in English.

15. The place-name *Simnasho* is itself an Anglicized version of the Sahaptin term denoting the black hawthorn tree, *Crataegus douglasii* Lindl. (Rosaceae): *ašumnaš*. The same species is known in Kiksht as *aslawaitk* (see Note 6 above; cf. Sapir 1909: 158, fn 1).
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