

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

The Porcupine Hunter and Other Stories: The Original Tsimshian Texts of Henry Tate. Transcribed and annotated by Ralph Maud.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0z46w4ph>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 20(3)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Phillips, Bethany

Publication Date

1996-06-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

But, keeping in mind the intended audience of this publication, this is a minor criticism. Perhaps the type of naiveté that allows a suspension of disbelief on the reader's part is conducive to a fuller enjoyment of Kane's work. Kane's words, translated by the authors into a contemporary idiom and viewed in conjunction with his visual images, conjure up such a fascinating and compelling picture that we want to dispense with any need to apply a more critical eye to the work.

Jennifer McLerran
University of Washington

The Porcupine Hunter and Other Stories: The Original Tsimshian Texts of Henry Tate. Transcribed and annotated by Ralph Maud. Vancouver: Talonbooks, 1993. 163 pages. \$12.95 paper.

Henry Tate served as Franz Boas's primary source of information about the Tsimshian myths that appear in Boas's monumental work *Tsimshian Mythology*. What was unique about Tate's manuscripts was that he provided Boas with interlinear translations of the myths that he collected, apparently writing them first in English and then translating them into Tsimshian. In *The Porcupine Hunter*, Ralph Maud used Tate's original manuscripts as the basis of his text because he felt "the acute dissatisfaction one experiences with Boas's published texts after one has seen Tate's actual manuscript pages. . . . [T]he aim is to present the interested reader with the best of Tate's texts as found in the original manuscripts" (p. viii). If Maud had adhered to this intent, the results would have proven more valuable to the reader. Unfortunately, several of Maud's editorial choices create even more interference than Boas's infamous literal translation.

One of Maud's editorial choices was to retain the majority of Tate's syntax and his misspellings of English words. Although the retention of the syntax was important in conveying a strong sense of how the myths are told, the misspelled words serve only to interrupt the flow of the text, causing the reader to pause and attempt to decipher them. Maud states that his intent was to slow the reader down so that he or she does not "skim along the surface of these texts" (p. ix); however, the result proves more of a distraction than an addition to one's understanding of the text.

Perhaps the most intrusive of Maud's editorial choices was the adoption of a pseudo-Hymesian structure in arranging the myths on the page. Maud does not really follow Hymes's methodology; rather his choices are based on "an instinctive response to perceived dramatic requirements within the text" (p. x). To whose instincts and perceptions was Maud catering? If he relied on his own instincts, as he implies, then the myths are paced according to Maud's sensibilities and not those of the Tsimshian. Since Maud provides no explanation as to the basis for these "instinctive responses," the assumption is that he did not utilize any resources of traditional Tsimshian storytelling.

Maud's other problematic choices were to provide an alternate title for each of the myths and then to organize them into "appropriate" genre types. He furnished the additional titles because he found some of Tate's choices curious at times and perhaps not reflective (to Maud) of the subjects of the myths. Maud then organized the myths under the headings "Animals & Humans," "Fables," "Cosmology," "Moral Tales," "Mythic History," and "The Raven Cycle." There is no evidence that the Tsimshian would organize these myths under such headings or even, except perhaps for the Raven cycle, under any generalized headings. Other than to organize and orient the myths in a more Anglo-European manner, Maud does not appear to have had any logical reason to indulge in either of these preferences.

Maud's analysis of the "meaning" of each myth is often simplistic and reductionist. He also displays a distinct lack of cultural knowledge about the Tsimshian. One example is his conclusion that the essence of the myth "The Story of Porcupine Hunter" was to provide good advice—in this instance, how to remove porcupine quills. He ignores the possible relationship between the myth and Tsimshian attitudes toward names: In Tsimshian culture names in and of themselves are given rank, and knowledge of who possesses the name or names and the rank of each name is of great importance. Nor does Maud intimate that the myth may serve to examine the Tsimshian belief in the necessity of showing proper respect toward the animals that sacrifice themselves to provide sustenance to the people, and the possible consequences of ignoring such considerations.

Maud's poor scholarship again becomes evident in his statement that, other than the fact that Tate could write in passable English, the only other information we have about him is that he followed the traditional fishing migrations like other Tsimshian

and that he was adopted by Arthur Wellington. However, in *Thomas Crosby and the Tsimshian*, Clarence Bolt notes that a Henry Tate was one of the members of the Band of Christian Workers that went out to preach to other tribes in 1894; a photograph of Tate, along with the mission schoolchildren, indicates that he was an interpreter and an assistant teacher. The time frame and the fact that Bolt's Henry Tate functioned as an interpreter leave little doubt that this was Boas's informant. This knowledge is important to any examination of Tate's translations, because his Christianity influenced not only what he chose to include in the myths he sent to Boas, but how he translated them. Maud's only acknowledgment of Tate's religious background comes in his introduction to the Raven cycle, wherein he notes that when Boas requested the Raven myth, Tate complied but noted that "Raven does 'very bad things' and 'we are a live [sic] in the Christian life'" (p. 122). Maud does not establish any sort of context for the effects of Tate's Christianity on his rendering of the other myths in the collection.

Although Maud's editorial choices and annotations prove to be more of an encumbrance than an asset, his book does provide a collection of the manuscripts still extant and may serve as a springboard for another, better-edited version of Tate's work. As noted earlier, Tate's transcriptions were the foundation of Boas's work on the Tsimshian. Since the originals are written in English, we are afforded a unique opportunity to place Tate's originals in comparison to Boas.

In a cursory examination of the two versions, what becomes immediately apparent is that Boas's reputation as a literalist was well deserved. In fact, since Tate's myths were already in English, Boas seems to have functioned more as an editor himself than a transcriber. One exception is in the myth "The History of Sun and Moon." Tate's Christian orientation becomes apparent in his version, which utilizes phrases such as *the Lord in heaven*, which Boas chooses to modify to *the chief in heaven*, in an obvious effort to mitigate any Christian influence.

The value in providing a collection of Tate's original manuscripts is obvious. However, Maud's heavy-handed editing makes utilization of this text very problematic. Although Maud provides the reader with the opportunity to examine Tate free of the Boasian editorial overlay, in his own way he has proven to be just as much of an interference as he perceived Boas to be.

Bethany Phillips