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.
How faithful is Heyday's reprinting of the 1916 edition? This work is not a facsimile reprint. In his foreword, Palmquist (p. xi) states:

Editing of this reprint has pretty much been limited to corrections of spelling errors, repunctuation and recapitalizing in order to untangle sentences that were so involved and impacted as to be virtually incomprehensible. Consistent spellings of proper names have been introduced. (Note that an extensive index has been created which retains these variant spellings as well as providing a quick access to topics.)

To understand how much alteration has been introduced in the 1991 edition, I compared it with the original 1916 edition. My sample covered pages 90 through 105 of the 1991 version; it included 71 Yurok words and phrases. There were only three changes in spellings, and in these instances the 1991 spelling was a correction to the most common 1916 spelling. As for the presence of the spelling variants in the index, as noted in the passage above, none of the three spelling variants dropped to produce spelling consistence appears in the index. In fact, a review of the index gives no sign that there are any spelling variants preserved there.

However, the English text shows considerably more change than in the Yurok words. I do not find the corrections offensive; if anything they are useful. Among the changes are instances where in the 1916 original the subject and verb lacked agreement (compare 1916:71, line 4 with 1991:91, line 8 from bottom).

I encountered only one change in the 1991 edition that I found inappropriate. In the 1916 version (p. 74, line 5) the word “satan” was not capitalized; while the 1991 passage (p. 95, line 9 from bottom) capitalizes the word as “Satan.” I would further note that an apparently garbled passage in the original (1916:90, line 4) appeared unaltered in the 1991 version (p. 69, line 4 from bottom); it still reads: “We count ten, and ten tens for one thousand.”

Palmquist, in the Foreword (p. xiii), states that a copy of the “full-length . . . handwritten manuscript” of the 1916 edition survives at the Beinecke Library, Yale University. He notes “[t]he original manuscript . . . [was] handwritten, misspelled, and ungrammatical” (p. x). I have not been in a position to check how much error was introduced by the 1916 typesetter and/or house editor, if any. Neither Palmquist nor the 1991 editor seems to have settled into such a task of comparison.

The 1991 edition starts with a Foreword by Peter E. Palmquist that records many details about the original 1916 edition, including that its publication was underwritten by “Mrs. Amelia Carson, a daughter-in-law of a local lumber baron” (p. x). The next item in the 1991 edition is an Introduction by Julian Lang, a Native American ethnohistorian of the Karuk Tribe. The two-page Preface from the 1916 edition also is included.

A summary of the contents of Chapter 1 gives some idea of the rambling style of Lucy Thompson’s book. A history of the old store at Johnson’s (pp. 1-23) is followed by an account of Yurok wedding and marriage patterns, including the uxorialocal custom of being “half-married” (pp. 24-25); Yurok slavery (p. 26); doctors and their cures (pp. 26-28, 30); infanticide of one of the same-sex twins (p. 27); use of hazel sticks as basketry material (pp. 31-32); use of acorns for food (pp. 32-33); burning to keep uplands grass-covered (p. 33); uses of redwood (pp. 33-34); building a redwood house and life in it (pp. 35-41); sweat houses (pp. 38, 40); tobacco (pp. 41-42); training of doctors (pp. 42, 45-50); mid-wives (p. 50); male doctors and their settlement of troubles before the Deerskin Dance (pp. 51-53); the Kepel fish dam (pp. 53-65); and phrases that Yurok consider derogatory (p. 66).

Chapter 2 is an origin account. Chapter 3 (see also pp. 175-176) is one of the most important; it is here that scholars may read about the Yurok “talth” and their Karuk equivalent, the
near mythic super-aristocrats of the past, the ancient high priests, and their teachings.

Chapter 4 again is a potpourri of topics: the ancient Wa-gas or “white race” of the Yurok (pp. 81-84); the history of Reading Rock at sea off Orick (pp. 85-86); earthquakes and tsunamis (p. 86); and ancient epidemics (pp. 86-87). Chapter 5 recounts beliefs concerning death and after-life, including notes on the length of time a name stayed in taboo before it could be taken by another.

Later chapters deal with burial practices (pp. 123-127), the White Deerskin Dance (pp. 135-144); the Pecwan Jump Dance (pp. 145-149, 151-157); the Kepel fish dam (pp. 277-280); marriage patterns (pp. 189-194, 197-200); slaves (pp. 239-241); the major Yurok mythic figure Wah-pec-wah-mow (pp. 159-162); and other aspects of Yurok traditions (pp. 243-284). For those of us who will use To the American Indian, the index will be invaluable.

This work was not prepared as an ethnography. As its subtitle states, it is the reminiscences of a specific Yurok woman. I am presently slowly working on the taped reminiscences of my late, close friend Princess Lowana Brantner; I find in Mrs. Brantner’s account many of the same types of digression and rambling that I find frustrating in the Thompson account. There is also the classic “All is Trouble along the Klamath” (Waterman 1922), reflecting the same oral style.

Another characteristic of Yurok oral tradition demonstrated in Lucy Thompson’s book (as well as in my tapes from Mrs. Brantner) is the tendency of the raconteur to skew data so that she is portrayed more favorably than the memories of others would support. For instance, Mrs. Thompson declares that her father and herself were “‘Talth.’” My informants over the years have stated that neither Mrs. Thompson nor her father had claim to be “‘Talth.’” Indeed, another family line, one related to the old Blue Creek villages, was considered by most to be the closest approximation of the “‘Talth.’” But there is another aspect of Yurok oral tradition that is relevant: Yurok rather openly attempt to belittle others.

One of the reasons that the appearance of the 1991 edition may, just possibly, mark a watershed in scholarship on northwestern California is the previous lack of attention paid to this obscure work. ‘‘World Renewal’’ (Kroeber and Gifford 1948:82-85, 88-90), is the only previous monograph to draw heavily upon data from Thompson’s book. However, the summaries in that work retain almost nothing of the 1916 wording; all is “condensed and reworded” (Kroeber and Gifford 1948:82).

My own 1978 overview of the Yurok barely noted (pp. 143, 151, 154) the existence of the 1916 Thompson volume; while my recent discussion of Yurok aristocracy (Pilling 1989) neither cited the 1916 work, nor discussed “‘Talth’”—an omission that clearly would be difficult to defend now that the new edition of Thompson has appeared.

Before discussing Lucy’s life, it is necessary to note a guideline long in use in the U.S. Social Security system. Lacking any birth certificate, the birth date given in the earliest written record concerning a person is to be considered his/her most accurate birth date. Palmquist has not followed this guideline in his research into the lives of Lucy and her husband, but has relied heavily for his conclusions on the apparently very inaccurate 1910 census. The 1870 and 1880 censuses lack entries for Lucy Thompson, her parents, her sister Nora, and Milton J. Thompson (Walters 1870a-c; Bohall 1880; Carr 1880a-c).

The earliest record of Lucy Thompson’s age occurs on the certificate of marriage between her and Milton J. Thompson; there Lucy’s age was given as 36 (Humboldt County 1896), suggesting a birth year of 1860. The 1900 census (Gent 1900:Sheet 2A, line 46) stated that Lucy Thompson was born during February 1860. The 1910
census entry for Lucy (Merritt 1910:Sheet 1A, line 2) stated that Lucy was 52, suggesting that she was born in 1857 or 1858. Lucy Thompson’s death certificate (Humboldt County 1932) stated that she was born in 1853; Fred R. Wilder, the informant for the death certificate, is not known to have any close tie to Lucy Thompson, and may have just been the part-Indian most available in Eureka at the time of Lucy’s death. Lucy Thompson’s place of birth was the Yurok village of Pecwan (pp. xxix, 136, 223; Humboldt County 1932), the home of her father (p. 14).

When Lucy was about eight, her father and his brother became involved in a feud that led to the killing of Lucy’s father’s brother (p. 14). Fear of further retaliation in this feud caused Lucy’s father and family to move to “Ser-e-goin” (sregon) and then to Hoopa (p. 15). While in Hoopa, Lucy was employed by the agent (p. 15).

Our next data concerning Lucy relate to her tie to her husband “Jim.” Palmquist (p. xii) states that Jim and Lucy were married about 1875, an assertion apparently derived from the 1910 census. This allegation is quite inconsistent with accounts given by Lucy’s fellow Yurok; my best Yurok data come from Queen James (1968) born in 1888 (Snyder 1900:Sheet 24B, line 35) at sregon, a village where Lucy stated she lived briefly as a young girl. The 1900 census (Gent 1900:Sheet 2A, line 48) said Bertha Thompson was born during June 1886. The 1910 census (Merritt 1910:Sheet 1A, line 3) gave Bertha’s age as 23, an age consistent with a birth in June of 1886.

Reference to the 1900 census entry for Nora, the first wife of Jim, hints at a rather complex relationship between Nora, Jim, and Lucy. Nora was stated, in 1900, to have been married to one Pecwan John for 15 years (Snyder 1900: Sheet 26A, line 1). If this were actually the case, Nora would have abandoned Jim, then age 53, and moved in with full-blood Pecwan John, then age 44 (Snyder 1900:Sheet 25B, line 40), before she conceived Bertha. That is, Bertha may have been the product of a brief reconciliation between Nora and Jim, after Nora abandoned Jim the first time.

Jim retained both children of his unions with Nora; and Lucy moved in to be Jim’s housekeeper (James 1968) about 1886 (Gent 1900: Sheet 2A, lines 24-25). Jim (Milton J.) and Lucy Thompson were formally married under “white man’s” law on June 15, 1896 (Humboldt County 1896). The 1900 census (Gent 1900: Sheet 2A, lines 45-46) gave Jim’s occupation as “Farmer.” Lucy and Jim continued to live at
their ranch above Pecwan until the early years of the twentieth century. Then they moved to a home at 1557 Myrtle Avenue, Eureka. *To the American Indian* documents that by 1916 Lucy and Jim had come to have a rather close and tender relationship (p. xxx). At that time, Lucy stated that her father was living and "past the century mark several years" (p. 74); the 1910 census (McDonald 1910:Sheet 3B, lines 37 and 38) estimates the age of her father "Wech-wawa" and his wife as 87 and 85 respectively, suggesting that they were about 93 and 91, when their daughter's book was published.

The Thompsons continued to live at the Myrtle Avenue address until death had taken them both. "Jim" died on December 18, 1930 (Humboldt County 1930). Lucy died on February 23, 1932 (Humboldt County 1932).

One feature of Jim Thompson's life is relevant to anyone using Lucy's book. Lucy (p. 142) refers to "my husband being a Free and Accepted Mason." I, as well as Milton's niece, have never been able to track down to what variety of Free Masonry Milton belonged. His death certificate (Humboldt County 1930) makes no reference to his Masonic affiliation. Suffice it to say, Jim's exposure to Masonry seems to have influenced the content of *To the American Indian*. There is reference to the "Lodge Dance" (pp. 145-158), the Talth Lodge (p. 193); and the Wa-gas Lodge (p. 82), all being instances where I suspect the term "lodge" would be difficult to defend. Few of us today are Free Masons or know much of their beliefs and practices. Without such data available, it is difficult to be certain how much of Lucy's book is heavily impacted by Jim's Masonry. Similarly, the use of "God" and "Almighty" (p. 131) is troubling. What concepts were dictated by Lucy? What was added or rephrased by Jim? We probably shall never know.

One issue concerning *To the American Indian* relates to Lucy's authorship of the work. The surviving manuscript from which type was apparently set is in Milton's hand (p. xiii). The 1900 census (Gent 1900:Sheet 2A, line 46) stated that Lucy Thompson could neither read nor write. Informants confirmed this. There is even the possibly apocryphal account of Lucy sitting one evening "reading" the newspaper; her lack of literacy meant that she was known, upon occasion, to hold the print the wrong way up. Palmquist (p. xiii; see Merritt 1910:Sheet 1A, line 2) noted that the 1910 census listed Lucy as literate; however, I do not know what was meant by such a response to the 1910 census. Did it mean more than the ability to recognize and sign one's name?

During March of 1992, I had a chance to talk to a few Yurok about the new edition of *To the American Indian*. Negative comments had four foci: Palmquist is not an expert on northwestern California Indians; Lang is a Kamk, not a Yurok; the book contains many photographs of non-Yurok; and many of the newly-added illustrations have been poorly or incorrectly labelled.

The choice of Lang as the second present-day introducer of Thompson's book is a somewhat complex issue. Some Yurok criticize the choice of Lang, stating that this book is about the Yurok. It was suggested that the volume would have been much better introduced by one of the several college-graduate Yurok.

A close look at *To the American Indian* shows references to the Talth of the Upper Klamath, or Kamk (pp. 146, 176). The original edition of Thompson's book contained a photograph of Sugarloaf Mountain at Somes Bar in Karuk territory (p. 9). Lucy Thompson seems to have seen a somewhat less sharp boundary between the Yurok and the Karuk than at least some present-day Yurok.

The issue of what photographs have been added to the second edition has been criticized by some Yurok readers. Why are Karuk and non-Yurok photographs included? Why is a view (p. 43) of the Orleans Deerskin Dance
included? This choice should be put in perspective. No photograph of a Yurok Deerskin Dance is known; I recorded an account of how Bessie Lord, a teacher of Weitchpec, raised around Orleans, was forced to destroy the only view ever known to have been taken of a Yurok Deerskin Dance. If there is to be an image of a northwestern California Deerskin Dance, it must be a shot of either a Karuk or a Hoopa ceremony.

A more difficult issue relates to the photograph (p. 166, top) that is identified as Karuk Sandy Bar Bob. The same illustration has already been published in scholarly sources twice (Palmquist 1986:31-32; Wallace 1978:646), properly identified as Yurok Captain Jack of Requa.

The 1991 edition includes many photographs of Hoopa Valley. Today, and even in Lucy Thompson’s day, there were significant Yurok ties to Hoopa Valley; Lucy and her family lived in the Hoopa Valley, probably in the late 1860s or early 1870s (p. 15). To exclude Hoopa data is falsely to cut apart Indian life in northwestern California, as it was lived in Lucy Thompson’s day, as well as it operates today. I probably should stress that Yurok criticized the use of “Karuk” images and images not from the Yurok, but I heard no one specifically criticize the inclusion of Hoopa Valley photographs.

In closing, let me note the unfortunate loss of data relating to many of the photographs used in the 1991 edition. Captions for most of the images taken by Ruth Roberts (pp. 10, 72, 80 top and bottom, 92, 97, 98, 149, 150, 166 top, 196, and 243 top and bottom) and held at Humboldt State University had been published by Palmquist (1986); apparently neither Margolin nor Lang knew of this easily available scholarly work. I might note that one error in Palmquist’s 1986 paper is a mistake on my part; the boy shown in the photograph of Susie Crutchfield (p. 80, lower; Palmquist 1986:17) is not the son of Susie, Ed Crutchfield, but Victor Crutchfield, Susie’s daughter’s son, whom Susie adopted after her daughter’s death.

Margolin has promised me that he will publish a third edition of To the American Indian, with the captions in the illustrations corrected. Hopefully, Margolin will again show his carry-through by producing such a third edition.
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