ence as well. On the Colorado River at Moab, some 200 miles southeast of Utah Lake, Alice Hunt found both Shoshonean and Hopi artifacts of the late prehistoric period. This was in an area of previous Fremont culture occupation (Hunt 1953:16-18). Localized adaptation models may thus be untrustworthy in this area.

3. The assumption that the Escalante Expedition found essentially pre-contact conditions in the late eighteenth century is improbable. Ute-Spanish interactions associated with horse use, warfare, trading, and slaving began on a substantial scale early in the seventeenth century, and were greatly accelerated by the great Pueblo Revolt of 1680. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, Ute, Southern Paiute, Shoshone, and Comanche shared an important loan vocabulary reflecting widespread trade with European cultures (Shimkin 1980). Clearly, very extensive networks were in being then, which consequently differentiated the horse-owning dominant groups from the exploited, often enslaved, pedestrian peoples. The long-range military expeditions of the Ute chief Walkera in the 1850s were terminated only by Mormon settlement (see Bailey 1954). These complexities must be kept in mind in reconstructive ethnographies.

4. It has been disappointing to note in this study no evidence of recent ethnographic field work. Very likely, there are still informants with significant information about Utah Lake on the Uintah Reservation. They can illuminate much. I discovered this with Judith Vander’s work on the naraya, or Ghost Dance cult on the Wind River Reservation, a cult that we thought had disappeared before World War II.
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Donald M. Hines is a folklorist who has “read widely in the oral literature of Indians of the Pacific Northwest.” His present work, The Forgotten Tribes, is one in a series exploiting the McWhorter collection for previously unpublished narratives. Subtitled “Oral Tales of the Tenino and Adjacent Mid-Columbia River Indian Nations,” Hines endeavors to place the narrator in his aboriginal cultural setting through a generous borrowing from anthropology, combined with on-site visits and descriptions. The narratives were told to longtime friend and defender of Indian rights Mr. L. V. McWhorter, who died in 1944. His museum-quality ethnographic collection was placed at then Washington
State College, and is now curated in the Anthropology Museum of Washington State University (WSU). Across the mall, his letters and papers are competently archived at the Holland Library.

Apparently, Hines has mined his way through much of the 300,000-piece collection using the "Ault Calendar" (so named for the distinguished Professor of English who developed the chronological guidebook to the collection) and has set a rather ambitious agenda for selective publication of stories and legends contained therein. A flyer with this book says we can expect more on the Nez Perce and Yakima soon. The cultural backdrop for the tales at hand is provided by liberal quotations from the work of Spier and Sapir (1930) and ubiquitous smatterings from Vem Ray, George Murdock, and others.

Hines' thesis that Mid-Columbia Indian "tribes" are forgotten may be wishful thinking to the Columbia River Gorge Commission and the groups poised in opposition to Indian fishing. The integrity of the village groups mentioned in "Forgotten Tribes" is long gone to be sure (note the McWhorter reference to the destruction of the main Wishram village by the U.S. Army). The connections to the landscape are not. The descendants of the river villages are represented by the governments of the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and the Fourteen Tribes and Bands of the Yakima Indian Nation on the Washington side of "N-CHi-Wana" (Hines’ orthography). These governments sponsor language and oral history programs and are desperately trying to gain control of their cultural resource base, on the reservation and on areas ceded to the Federal Government. The disaffection of these people from areas along the mainstem Columbia came about through organized governmental and private actions involving harassment, treaty abrogation, and eventually hydroelectric projects. Through all this the languages have survived, perhaps Upper Chinookan notwithstanding.

Recently, in a roundtable luncheon meeting sponsored by the Yakima Nation Heritage Committee, conversation centered mainly on repatriation issues and archaeological collections. A spiritual leader of the Yakima Nation, descended directly from the Upper Chinookan folks, who in part, are the subject of Hines’ brief discourse, spoke at length on his ties to the river, his sorrow at the idea of ever having to reclaim, indeed "to prove" his descendancy by coughing up his genealogy for scrutiny. Choking up at one point he spoke softly, saying the thought of such an ordeal ruined his appetite. This listener was struck with the description of the Wasco-Wishram as a community divided by a river.

Throughout his comments, my thoughts turned to the Hines’ book. What about orally-transmitted stories and tales such as these? Does the Social Scientist have any obligation to descendants of these storytellers? Why doesn’t Hines, as a folklorist certainly should, "check it out with the locals?" His visits to the area are photodocumented but—curiously—no interviews with the indigenous peoples appear, no visits with the descendants regarding oral tradition. Were contacts forgotten or avoided, in this do we sense an urgency to claim the tales with a preemptive strike? On this point we can only guess.

Considerable oral tradition still is remembered and shared. I asked Johnson Meninick to review a list of stories and legends that Jose Vargas of WSU Special Collections had compiled from the McWhorter Collection. He recognized most, if not all, the stories, and added a variant of several. In addition, storytellers of the 14 Tribes and Bands of the Yakima Nation share their oral tradition on local television, one lady speaking in her own Sahaptin dialect. Another recent program presented grandmothers telling stories to a group of youngsters. This part of the culture is not forgotten.
and stories are still part of the winter tradition. A distinct advantage of “checking with the locals” (not to be confused with formal consultation under federal regulations) is the bilingual expertise many traditionalists have today.

One can only imagine the difficulties McWhorter (1986) might have encountered (he listed 15 interpreters in chronological order for “Yellow Wolf: His Own Story”) as he struggled to make crosscultural sense, even injecting a “gist” to a story where one might not be readily apparent. Sometimes a nuance is lost, sometimes a funny story is not so funny, but some inkling, some fraction of what was lost or gained in tradition, might still be well within the grasp of the folklorist. My scholarly ineptitude disallows a digression into the methodology of such pursuits at this time. Suffice it that in his elaborate appendices, Hines tips his hat to the Folklorists (whoever they may be) by including an “index of motifs” (smallest element of a folk tale having the power to persist in tradition), “comparative notes to other plateau Indian tales,” “list of informants,” and “notes to the narratives.” His “comparative notes” do link these stories in a wider “culture area” context and here too in the appendices we find some of McWhorter’s elaborations.

So what does Hines’ work amount to? It is something more than a popular work, something less than an academic work plowing new ground. What it does offer is a sense of cultural diversity of the Middle Columbia area prior to the great onslaught of white settlement. The photographic portraits (14 or so) borrowed from Curtis, Dixon, Moorehouse et al. are not ones often seen and add some nice viewing. One could nitpick over an occasional misspelling in the text, or missed reference in the bibliography, which is really quite useful (if unexpected), organized as it is into “Boasian” partitions and academic topics. But current indigenous practitioners of the storytelling art, the keepers of the flame of tradition, find no place in Hines’ work.
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Those with an interest in the Indians of northwestern California are indebted to Heyday Books and its publisher Malcolm Margolin for making available a new edition of one of the hardest-to-get items concerning Native Californians. As a reviewer of this edition, I feel a burden lifted from my shoulders. It was some 16 years ago that William Bright, linguist and scholar of the Karuk, asked me to join him in preparing a second edition of To the American Indian. Both of us were aware of the need to make this 1916 work available to a present-day audience. Over 15 years ago, I spent field time collecting details concerning Lucy Thompson, her family, her husband “Jim” Thompson and his family. However, I lacked the carry-through to complete my thoughts about and annotations of Lucy Thompson’s book. Let me apologize for allowing myself to be distracted.