

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

The Whole Past In a Yavapai Mythology

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3kn7s0pm>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 5(2)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Bahr, Donald M.

**Publication Date**

1981-03-01

**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/>

Peer reviewed

# The Whole Past In a Yavapai Mythology

DONALD M. BAHR

---

---

## INTRODUCTION

This paper stems from two concerns with a long history in Americanist anthropology, one the study of how individuals shape the intellectual life of their community, the other the study of myth "as history." They come together in the particular definition of "mythology" adopted for this paper, namely "all the texts that one narrator tells; his entire corpus of texts." We will discuss a corpus of 24 texts collected from the Yavapai Jim Stacey by E. W. Gifford in 1930 (Gifford, 1933: 349-401). We will be primarily interested in how a narrative unit extending beyond the individual myth text, called the "cycle" by Gifford, articulates the whole of Stacey's myth corpus and puts it into temporal order.

It appears that the whole mythology was too large ever to be told at one time (Gifford, 1933:347), so the cyclic units were factors more in Stacey's reflections on the past than in any single recitation strictly for Yavapais that he is known to have given. When this paper is read through its Appendix, it will be seen how Stacey adjusted nine myths, covering better than two thirds of the total pages of the mythology, to the system of cycles. The demonstration need not stop at that point, but that much will cover the key myths in the cycles and will show how Stacey's versions of those myths differ from the versions of other Yavapai narrators.

---

Donald M. Bahr is a professor in the Department of Anthropology, Arizona State University. His main studies have been on the Pima and Papago, peoples immediately to the south of the Yavapai who are the subject of this essay. Besides Pima and Papago mythology, Professor Bahr has written about songs, ritual oratory, and theory of sickness.

The differences are not matters of style or paraphrasing but of substance, that is, of who did what to whom and why at key points in the mythic past. In Stacey's case these differences are explained by his use of a system of cycles so as to make substantial portions of the past echo or repeat each other. It will be seen in the Appendix that other Yavapai narrators are like Stacey in having a concept of the whole mythic past, but they are unlike him in the size of their mythologies and in the extent of cyclic repetition. Stacey's shaping of his people's intellectual life therefore has two aspects. He told a larger mythology than his companions of record, and he placed more organization—specifically cyclic organization—on that large mass of myth.

By studying myth as history, I mean studying the total view of the past developed in a myth corpus, and its relation to the stories a narrator tells which tie events to the present via dating expressions such as "200 years ago," or "in the time of my great grandfather." This is the familiar question of how myth and history articulate. On the mythic side, which is where this paper concentrates, it seems self evident that one cannot get a sense of the total past from one myth, at least in the Southwest where individual myths tend to be short, e.g., an hour's telling time or less. Thus one question is whether one can obtain a sense of the total mythic past by studying the internal organization of a corpus. In Stacey's case, the answer is yes. The second question is whether this corpus leads up to and into the present or recent past. Again the answer is yes, both in Stacey's case and in the other multi-text Yavapai mythologies of record. We will not deal as extensively with this question as with the first one due to a scarcity of narrative materials covering what I term the "recent" as opposed to the "ancient" past, so the "yes" will be tentative. It is emphasized that both questions are deferred to late in this paper whose bulk is taken up with the intricacies of Stacey's myth cycles.

## THE DOCUMENT AND ITS TRUSTWORTHINESS

This descriptive and "modeling" study of Stacey's mythology will take no position on the historicity of his stories, that is, on whether or not they could be true. The only problem is to describe how Stacey thought of the past. It is a problem because the mythology is known to us only in English. It was taken down by Gifford with the aid of Stacey's bilingual son, Johnson. (Stacey

apparently was monolingual and was an old man in 1930.) His dialect of Yavapai has come under careful study since the mid 1960s primarily through the work of Martha Kendall who has published a grammar on it (1976 a) and two Yavapai language versions of part of the myth that makes up Stacey's cycle two (1976 b).

No analysis of Yavapai language narrative discourse *per se* has been published and none will be attempted here. As a token in that direction I will simply note certain points about Yavapai sentence syntax which indicate that the language encodes linear conceptions of time. By lineal I mean conceiving of events as earlier than, later than, or simultaneous with other events. If a language did not do this, I cannot imagine studying a myth or mythology in it as history. (I personally suppose that all languages enable lineal thinking, but I wish to assuage any reader who thinks, "Indian languages don't do this, only European ones do".)

First there is a class of Yavapai conjunctions, *wiñek*, *yuñek*, and *iñek*, which carries the idea of the temporal or causal priority of one referred-to event over another. Thus, as I read Kendall's exposition, *wiñek* is used in a sentence translated as "Potatoes I peeled and fried," implying that the peeling preceded the frying, but the verb order in this *wiñek* construction cannot be changed to "Potatoes I fried and peeled" because the use of *wiñek* requires that the first verb refer to an event which preceded or caused the event referred to by the second verb (1976a:162). This class of conjunctions (and perhaps others in Yavapai) pertains to one aspect of the linear conceptualization of events, namely the classification of events as earlier or later than each other. The other aspect, that events may be seen or grouped as simultaneous, is attested to by the Yavapai conjunction *-ne* which "signifies that actions are performed at the same point in time or at roughly the same point in time (Kendall, 1976a:165)."

Those conjunctions only scratch the surface of temporality in Yavapai sentences and say nothing about how time is treated in multi-sentence discourse. I have one more token assurance to offer the reader before commencing our translation-based interpretation of Stacey's view of the past, namely that the free translations which Kendall offered as the best available glosses of a prior morpheme by morpheme analysis of myth texts, include the expressions "among the first made people," she lived in the beginning," and "this twelve year old virgin," all in the first five sentences or multi-sentence groups of the first version of the story (1976b: 68-69). These are the types of expression that will be at issue in our

English-only version of Stacey. I conclude on our present knowledge of Yavapai, that they represent notions attributable to native language narratives.

The mythology consists of 24 stories covering 52 printed pages. It was collected over a three week period. Although Stacey conveyed to Gifford that these were all the myths he knew (1933:347), it is not clear why a story was classified as a myth or even whether Stacey had one Yavapai cover term for all such stories. The fact that they are finite in number suggests that he had some method to classify them as distinct, for example, from another group of stories which he told to Gifford about raiding between Yavapais and their Indian neighbors in the years immediately before Anglo-American settlement in the region. The method apparently was the system of cycles. Each story was assigned to a cycle and by virtue of that fact became a *myth* (as we will call them) in his *mythology*.

Table 1 gives the name and cycle assignment of each myth, an assignment that was made by Stacey, not by Gifford (e.g., p. 364, note 1). It is seen that the cycles do not evenly divide the myths. One myth runs for two cycles and the other two cycles have the remaining myths. The myths are of different lengths and, as will be seen, some are directly articulated to the cycles while others seem simply to have been inserted between the cycle starting and cycle stopping myths. Of the 52 printed pages of the total mythology, 27 pages are taken up by "cycle turning" myths of which there are just four: Origin Story, Scurf Boy, The Burning of the World, and The Human Bear. Thus in sheer arithmetic terms, 1/6 of Stacey's stories and a little more than 1/2 of his total mythic discourse is directly articulated by the system of cycles. Five additional midcycle myths will be related to the cycle system in the course of this paper. This raises the "exposed" part of the mythology to a third of the stories and two thirds of the page bulk.

The five midcycle myths are a minority of all the myths in mid-cycle position. The reader should not expect everything in the mythology to be exposed as if by a magic wand. In my present opinion, many of the midcycle myths might be shuffled around, either within a cycle or even between cycles three and four.

To gauge the extent of the demonstrable ordering in Stacey against other mythologies of the region, and in advance of considering the cyclic mechanism *per se*, I would say that every mythology has one story which represents the oldest events that a narrator claims knowledge of. Sometimes the story is called (by the collector) the Origin Myth, sometimes the Creation Story,

TABLE 1  
STORIES AS ASSIGNED TO CYCLES

Story	Cycle	Story	Cycle
Origin Story	1, 2	The Toothed Vagina	4
Scurf Boy	3	The Giantess	4
The Human Deer	3	The Origin of Red "Parrots"	4
Coyote Ressurrects Mountain Lion	3	The Bungling Host (2)	4
Coyote Juggles His Eyes	3	The Bungling Host (3)	4
Bat's Wives	3	Raven's Children	4
The Laughing Wives	3	Mourning Dove's Mother	4
The Burning of the World	3	Tortoise and Badger	4
The Human Bear	4	Coyote Commits Adultery	4
The Constellation <i>amuu</i>	4	Coyote Commits Incest	4
The Bungling Host (1)	4	Coyote Wounds Himself	4
Wilkilhaya and his Grandson	4	Bullsnake Penis	4

sometimes the Tribal Genesis. I call it the *first text*, meaning first in temporal order in the narrator's view of the past. I do not think a narrator will be found who does not impose at least that much linear, temporal order on his mythology.<sup>1</sup> With his cycles Stacey does more.

The reason why several names are given to first texts is that they differ in what they narrate, e.g., whether the world itself was created, whether the tribal ancestors, whether any other races, whether the sun and moon, etc. Such differences have long been noted.<sup>2</sup> This paper's contributions towards understanding first text creations are, first, to show how Stacey's first text creations are echoed later in the mythology; and second to show how an aspect of the traditional creation myth subject matter, namely creation modeled on human reproduction, is combined with other first text plot elements to form a sequence which recurs later in the mythology. I call the sequence "Stacey's ideal myth plot." Its occurrence, intact in the first text and discontinuously later, marks the turning of Stacey's cycles. The comparative Yavapai evidence developed in the Appendix persuades me that this ideal plot was an operative factor in Stacey's mind and is not an artifact of my analysis.

The *actions* of Stacey's "ideal myth plot" come in the following sequence: a passage to another place, a new birth or creation, a murder, an act of snatching, a cannibalism, and a cataclysm. Most of these actions are widespread in Southwest Indian first texts. The *characters* of Stacey's sequence are a family patriarch generally in human form, his daughter, and an unrelated male, either human or Coyote. Such characters are also widespread. First text manifestations of the patriarch commonly are called The Creator and first text manifestations of the human unrelated male commonly are called The Culture Hero. The daughter is more difficult to typify. While it is clear that Stacey's cycle turning elements are of the stuff of regional mythologies (and are different I would say from the narrative elements that turn cycles in the song and chanted literatures of the region), I wish to be excused from predicting the prevalence of cyclic mythologies in the region. I am convinced there is some organization to most narrators' "headsfull" of stories, but I am skeptical whether this organization will prove to be cyclic either in the manner of Stacey (built on a recurrent ideal myth plot) or in some other manner. I wish to hold open all the meanings that "cyclic" might carry in mythological analysis.

## THE CYCLES

This section and the next will discuss the cycles in principle. Then we will take up the textual evidence. Returning to Table 1, it is recalled that each myth classifies as to cycle but that no reason can be given for the assignment of many myths to midcycle position. There is a far more fundamental problem on the information given on cycles by Gifford, namely it was unclear to Gifford where cycle two ends and cycle three begins. In effect the problem is whether cycle two ends with the last scene of the Origin Story and whether the first scene of Scurf Boy represents the start of cycle three. This is an issue which the present paper hopes to clarify and is the key to the rest of what we will do. Let us quote all that Gifford said about the beginning and ending of cycles in the mythology—in fact all he said about the cycles at all except for footnoting certain myths in cycle three to indicate that Stacey assigned them to that cycle. Since the word "cycle" never appears in a narrative, this paragraph by Gifford is all that we have on the theory of cycles.

Northeastern Yavapai mythology manifests a certain systematization. Time was divided into four cycles, or generations or creations, as the interpreter called them, the fourth being the present. Cycle 1 was that in which people emerged from the underground. It terminated with a world flood, caused by waters welling up from the underworld. Cycle 2 was the time of the goddess Komwidapokuwia, who survived the flood, and her grandson the monster slayer. The informant did not know what event terminated this cycle. Cycle 3 was ended by a world fire. The name Wikute (Granite Peak, near Prescott) was said to have come from the third cycle. These cycles are suggestive of the four creations of Yuma mythology (1933:347).

We see that the term "cycle" is not securely tied to Stacey's subdivisions. From Gifford's statement it is not clear whether Johnson Stacey ever spoke this English word or whether he preferred the English expressions "generation" and "creation." Johnson Stacey's terms imply something specific and limited on the nature of recurrences so I will continue to use the word "cycle" for its non-committal stance on just what or how many things recur. Let us now go point for point through Gifford's statements on where cycles start and stop.

Scanning Gifford's paragraph we see him more certain on where cycles stop than where they start. The first and third cycles end with world cataclysms, he says, and the last cycle, being the present, logically would not have ended. This leaves us with the single task of finding something like a world cataclysm at the end of the second cycle. On my reading, defended against the texts below, every cycle ending has four events in succession: the slaying of a family patriarch, the snatching of an internal organ from his mostly destroyed body, the eating of a part of his body, and a resulting large or small scale cataclysm. The sequence of the middle two events may switch and the cannibalized part of the body may be *only* the organ or *all the flesh* excluding the organ or there may only be the *intention* to eat the organ. I consider these shifts as variations on one basic cycle ending string. The key characters in the string are the patriarch, his daughter, and an unrelated male. The latter two characters divide the actions of killing, snatching, and cannibalizing differently from cycle to cycle.

Turning to the cataclysms, the destruction in the second cycle is not a world cataclysm, but an exploding stomach whose effects are quite local. World cataclysm actually is a misnomer for the other destructions because the mythology provides fresh, healthy, un-



related characters at the start of a new cycle—and indeed at the start of each new myth. If we assume these cycles and myths pertain to events in the same world, which they manifestly do because places in the present Yavapai known world are referred to throughout them, then no cataclysm in Stacey is ever more than local. This is especially clear in the transition from the “world flood” of the first cycle into the start of the second cycle, for although just one woman of the doomed local group survived that flood, she and her new family encountered many characters who must have been elsewhere when the flood occurred.

Concerning the cycle endings, then, my contribution is to posit a sequence of four actions which occur three times in the mythology, making a total of 12 “facts” against the two that Gifford identified. His two are subsumed under the fourth position action, “cataclysm.” (I call this an action although no one character “does” it.) These remarks are meant as an elaboration of Gifford’s commentary, not a rejection of it.

We turn to the cycle beginnings where Gifford’s comments are also sketchy. He mentions an emergence in cycle one and a grandmother in cycle two who survived the flood. In cycle three he says a mountain got its name. Nothing that could pertain to cycle beginnings is said about cycle four. We cannot use the statement about mountain naming because no myth in cycle three as published mentions the mountain Wikute. A long myth published in the fourth cycle, Wilkihaya and his Grandson, mentions it and I assume this is the myth that Gifford meant. We will discuss it later. For the present I will only say that I do not see this myth as starting or stopping any cycle because those functions are discharged by other myths and because this myth is only remotely like the ones that turn the cycles.

The useful clues on cycle starting in Gifford’s paragraph are on emergence, flood, and grandmotherhood. The first two are subsumable under the general heading of *passage*, the passage of a group from the underworld to the earth’s surface and the passage of a victim through a flood. The third clue is in keeping with Johnson Stacey’s concept of “generations” or “creations” as cycle designations. In cycle two there are two generational events in quick succession soon after the flood episode. Komwidapokuwia has a daughter by the Sun and Water, then the daughter has a son by the same two fathers. No such event, which I will term *new birth or creation*, occurs at the start of cycle one, so this element is not uniformly present at the start of Stacey’s cycles.

There are new births or creations of characters both in Scurf Boy and in The Human Bear, and there is just one additional myth in the entire corpus which has such an event, the hard to assign myth of Wilkilhaya and his Grandson. Because of the rarity and importance of birth/creation, Wilkilhaya and his Grandson will be examined in regard to the entire sequence definitive of the "ideal myth plot."

Scurf Boy opens with a new birth or creation but it lacks a *passage* to the creation scene. In this respect it is the opposite of the start of cycle one which has a passage but no subsequent act of creation. The Human Bear has its act of creation at the end of the story following a passage of the creator to the spot. Earlier in the story there is an act of cannibalism which again raises the question of the presence of erstwhile cycle defining elements in myths where no cycle change is recognized. We will compare the plot of this myth with the "ideal myth" plot.

Table 2 summarizes all of the above and shows the "ideal myth plot" to be fully represented only in cycle two. This table also sets the agenda for the remainder of the paper. Besides documenting the various elements, we will try to illuminate the absence of a birth/creation in cycle one, the absence of a passage at the onset of cycle three, the presence of cycle ending elements in Scurf Boy and The Human Bear, and the resemblance of Wilkilhaya and his Grandson to the cycle turning myths. I may add that two additional Stacey myths will be brought into view in the conclusion of this paper, and two further ones in the Appendix.

TABLE 2  
CYCLES AND ELEMENTS

Myth	Cycle	Passage	Birth/ Creation	Kill	Snatch	Eat	Cataclysm
Origin Story	1	+	-	+	+	+	+
	2	+	+	+	+	+	+
Scurf Boy	3	-	+	+	+	-	-
Burning of World	3	-	-	+	+	-	+
Human Bear	4	+	+	+	-	+	-
Wilkilhaya	?	+	+	+	+	-	-

## IDEAL MYTH PLOT AND THE PROBLEMS OF REITERATION AND CONTINUITY

In my opinion, the five element sequence from *new birth/creation* to *cataclysm* defines Stacey's ideal myth plot. The additional element, *passage*, bridges between such ideal myths. One can imagine a mythology consisting solely of those sequences plus *passages* carrying the survivors from one cataclysm myth to another. It would be a dismal and reiterative mythology. Stacey's mythology approximates this condition in its first text with nearly perfect cycles bridged by the *passage* of a linking character. The passage into cycle one is in effect from "beyond myth" since the mythology says nothing about where the characters came from or why they left. The lack of a *passage* between cycles two and three indicates that the beginners of the new birth/creation have no connection with the characters in the narrative spotlight at the end of cycle two. The mythology becomes discontinuous at the end of the first text (cycle two) and stays that way the rest of its 23 texts.

The ending of *Scurf Boy* as we will see is not completely different from the ending of the ideal plot, but it is different enough not to have been considered by Stacey as the end of a cycle. To him the cycle did not end until *The Burning of the World* several myths after *Scurf Boy* with no *passages* establishing continuity of characters across those myths.

It happens that cycle four begins with a *passage* statement, namely, "After the burning of the world, new people came, but we do not know from whence" (1933:377). This tells us no more than the passage into cycle one, in fact less. It is a passage without continuity. As the myth continues and its characters acquire a history, albeit a short one, we come to the passage mentioned above where the hero goes to the spot where he will make his new creation. Again this myth resembles the ideal plot, especially in having a cannibalism, but it is not the same.

The ideal myth plot defined above must not be taken as theory on how Stacey's myths came into being, for example from a hypothetical underlying myth which generated the entire 24 text mythology. As the discussion in the Appendix shows, other narrators' versions exist of several of Stacey's cycle turning myths. These versions lack features of the ideal myth's sequence of actions and characters. One can only suppose that Stacey or an unknown predecessor made pre-existing myths conform to the ideal sequence. The sequence is an imposition onto a folkloric background, not a

formative principle of that background.<sup>3</sup> It is Stacey's ethnohistoriographic "signature."

A further observation is in order on continuity and its absence. A lack of *passages* signifies discontinuity of individual characters across myths. There is another aspect of continuity in myth, namely from generation to generation. Table 3 gives all the new births or creations narrated in the mythology. The table describes these events in terms of who the father is, who the mother is, and in regard to any "irregularity" in the event. By "irregularity" I mean any departure from the norm of a human male copulating with a human female followed in nine months by the birth of a baby or two from the female. In classifying certain seemingly inanimate objects as father or mother I have simply placed those objects in the parental category opposite to the demonstrably human parent. I don't claim that those objects are intrinsically male or female, but would say that they are connoted as such by their pairing with a sexed human parent in each particular case. (Water, it can be seen, falls on both sides.)

There are seven birth/creation episodes in all, three in the first text, four beyond it, and only one in a non-cycle turning myth (Wilkihaya). Six of the seven events are irregular in some respect. Each observation is important. That there are only seven such events in 24 stories indicates that this motif receives special handling in the mythology, a fact that might escape one while simply reading the stories because *kinspeople* are mentioned throughout. Kinspeople are mentioned, but concrete events of conception and birth are not, not even in the one word Biblical manner of "begat." The mythology is profoundly ungenealogical beneath its surface of endless varieties of family doings. It is discontinuous in that sense. The other side of the coin is that the mythology is profoundly creational in the few new births that it narrates. This latter trait is testified to by the preponderance of "irregular" episodes. That three of the total seven occur in the first text indicates that the term "creation story" is not inappropriate for Stacey's first text. That four of the seven are beyond the first text indicates that the whole mythology partakes in creations—or, more exactly, that the whole mythology as formed by cycles partakes in them. More exactly still, the mythic cycles partake in one *sort* of creation, namely "irregular" versions of human reproduction. The sun as we will see is "created" in its present form by an act of dismemberment at the end of cycle three. This is a creation of a different sort from those we are concerned with.

TABLE 3 BIRTHS AND CREATIONS

	"Mother" is:	"Father" is:	Issue is:	Irregularity is:
Cycle 1				
Cycle 2	Human (Komwidapokuwia)	Sun and Water	Human	Two fathers, neither lies with mother to copulate but both impregnate her from a distance.
	Human (K's daughter)	Sun and Water	Skaatakaamcha	Same as above.
	Rock (with heat added)	Human (Skaatakaamcha)	Enemies	No copulation, birth instantaneous with S's breaking of rocks.
Cycle 3	Rock and Water (with scurf added)	Human (Esthatelputba)	Scurf Boy	No copulation, child born a few days after E placed his scurf under rock in running water.
	Human (unnamed)	Human (Scurf Boy)	Scurf Boy's son	None
Cycle 4	Hut (with bones added)	Human (Miamatkahuwa)	Whites	No copulation, multitudinous birth of Europeans and horses after four days.
	Human (Wilkihaya's daughter)	Quail	Quail / babies	Not one child but "a litter of many babies" (like quails).

## TEXT AND DISCUSSION

We will proceed by quoting relevant portions of the mythology, making comments cycle by cycle. Dots ("...") indicate deletions in the lineal flow of the published mythology. The order of quoted passages is always the order as published.

### Cycle One.

#### Passage.

The people of the first generation (or "creation") came from under the ground. They were originally at the bottom of a great hole in the Redrock country. In the hole grew a "dog-tail" tree (kasarrwehe, a white pine-like tree which grows high in the mountains) and over it grew grapevines. The underground people climbed up this tree to the surface of the world. Their leader (bamulva) was Hanyiko' (Frog).

#### New Birth or Creation.

Absent.

#### Slaying the Patriarch.

Hanyiko sickened and lay on the earthen floor of his hut. His daughter, a shaman, disliked him because he was not good to her. She made him sick.

#### Snatching the Organ and Cannibalism.

... The sick man said to the people: "When I die, burn my body. Burn it well; keep turning it so it burns thoroughly. Burn it till it is all gone. Note where my heart burns on the ground. Get fresh dirt and pile it on the spot where my heart burns."

... After he said all this he died. They prepared his body for the pyre. Coyote (kasar'ahana), a bad man, was there and the people feared he would steal the corpse. So an old man shot a fire drill with a bow far away to a mountain in the east... Coyote ran toward the fire which started where the drill struck.

... When the man's body was burning, Coyote, on his way east, looked back and saw the fire. ... He said to himself: "Maybe they are burning the dead man's body."

The corpse had been burned except for the torso. ... Coyote came to the people. "Where shall I stand?" he asked, as he ran around the ring of people. Nowhere could he find a hole.

Badger, a short man, was in the circle. Coyote jumped over him, ran up to the fire, seized the chest of the corpse, jumped back over Badger's head, and made off with it. . . . Far away he went and ate the heart.

### **Cataclysm.**

. . . The people heard something making a noise underground. "Perhaps it is water coming from underground," they said. They looked into the great hole from which they had come forth. They saw the water rising in it. The water was coming because Coyote had stolen Hanyiko's heart.

. . . The people . . . talked about getting a big log and hollowing it. They gathered all kinds of seeds to put in the log. They told one young woman (Komwidapokuwia): "You enter the log and sit inside of it. The water is coming and we shall drown, but you will be saved. . . ." . . . The water rose and drowned all living things.

### **Discussion.**

The primoridal household of Stacey's mythology was in existence at the start of the Origin Story and consisted of a mixed group of humans and animals. While the primoridal group clearly is styled as a household, only one actual kinship relation is given, that between Hanyiko and an unnamed daughter who killed him. The transitional character into the next cycle, Komwidapokuwia, is described as a young human woman, but she is not said to be anybody's kinswoman. It sounds as if she was of the same generation as Hanyiko's daughter, giving the Origin Story to this point a two generation span, but as far as the mythology is concerned, she was simply on scene when the curtain rose. Nor is Coyote said to be kin to anyone else in the primordial household.

We will take up the question of the missing birth or creation in discussing the next cycle, and will compare the ending sequences at that point.

### **Cycle 2.**

#### **Passage.**

The woman felt the water lifting her log and bumping against the mountain sides. For a long time it was in motion. Then it lay still. . . . The land was damp. She went out.

### First Birth.

... She traveled around, but was lonesome. ... She saw a place where water was dripping. She lay under the dripping spring. Water dripped into her vagina. The next morning she did the same, every morning the same, opening her legs toward the sun. After a time she bore a daughter. The girl grew up very quickly. (No one knows her name.)

### Second Birth.

... Her mother took her to the dripping spring, but the water would not drip because it saw it was its daughter. So the mother lay on top of the girl; when the water dripped, not seeing the girl, the mother slid off and water entered her vagina. The sun did not come up properly as the girl lay there, because he saw she was his daughter. So the mother lay on top of the girl and as the sun came up properly the mother slid off and the daughter was impregnated.

After some days the girl bore a son, who was named Skaata-kaamcha (Kaamcha, traveling) by his grandmother as she put him in the cradle she had made. The boy grew rapidly.

### Slaying the Patriarch.

... His grandmother told him there was a man lying by a rock in the Redrock country. That man was killing people. The boy wanted to go and see. He went over there and saw that man lying right there on the big rock. The man's name was I'ilapato'homai, Cliff-person-kick-down. His wife's name was Yuvempakitskwandja, Daughter's-eyes-kill-people.

The boy came to where the man was laying. He brought with him a small blue fox (kokor'). ... He put the fox near the man where he could not see it. When the fox did get in view the man tried to kick it down the cliff but missed it. ... The boy said, "All right," and he pulled his stone axe from his belt. "I'm going to cut you loose and throw you down the cliff." Then he chopped the man loose and shoved him over the cliff.

### Cannibalism, Snatching the Organ and Cataclysm.

The boy went around to get to the bottom of the cliff. When he came to the place he saw that other people lived there. He came to six or seven women. ... The women were looking at the boy. After a bit he got a pain in the face. They were trying to kill him. He saw the remains of the man who had fallen off the cliff. The women had eaten all the flesh. ... He saw the fire where they had cooked his flesh. A little bit was left, namely the stomach. He picked up the stomach and threw it in the fire. ... The stomach burst. The con-



tents flew into the eyes of the women. They held their hands over their eyes and went around in a circle. The boy pulled out his stone axe and killed the women. The women had been accustomed to eat the flesh of the people whom the man kicked over the cliff.

### Discussion

Komwidapokuwia extends the genealogical run of the Origin Story by having a daughter who has a son in turn. The son's parentage is irregular because he had two cosmic fathers and his mother did too, making him a child of incest. The large middle part of the myth has not been quoted but deals with the boy's efforts to learn who his fathers were, a fact which his grandmother had withheld from him and which his mother couldn't tell because she was abducted and killed by an eagle. The story is discussed elsewhere by Morris (1974) and Bahr (n.d.) and much of it is presented in Yavapai by Kendall (1976b).

Stacey's myth continues through a fifth generation in an episode which follows the cannibalism and destruction and which is included in Table 3. A small boy resident in the cannibals' household escaped destruction and was inadvertently "cloned" by the hero Skaatakaamcha as the latter madly heated a succession of stones in an unsuccessful attempt to track the survivor down. Just as with Komwidapokuwia and her household in cycle one, there is no connection of blood between the new "cloned" race and its "father" Skaatakaamcha. Stacey gives us a continuous story *line* through five generations, but the genealogical continuity is broken twice and confounded by incest in the interim, making it anything but a normal family tree.

Concerning the final act of creation, it is a classic Southwest creation-of-people scene of a male god making people from inanimate materials, only the mood is unusual because the god Skaatakaamcha was angry at the time and the creation was against his will. The episode is out of place in terms of the theory of cycles. Cycle two has had its birth/creations in the genesis of Skaatakaamcha. I view this creation as making up for the one missing from cycle one. What should have been at the beginning of the first text is moved to the very end. In moving the episode, the objects of creation are changed from tribal ancestors or mankind in general, which might be considered the normal createes in the first text, to a people hostile to their creator. Stacey identifies these people as "enemies" (1933:363). Another Yavapai narrator identi-

fies them specifically as the Pimas, historic enemies of the Yavapais (see Appendix, John Williams). Stacey never gives a creation of tribal ancestors or of mankind in general and neither do four of the five whole or partial Yavapai mythologies discussed in the Appendix. I do not believe this omission is through an error in collecting, but I have no explanation of why most Yavapai narrators omit such a creation. I can only show where it would "go" in Stacey's first text according to the notion of the ideal myth plot.

We turn to the cannibalism and cataclysm. There are three interpersonal acts in the two cannibalism episodes:

1. The killing of the patriarch.
2. The snatching of an internal organ from the patriarch's already mostly destroyed body (his heart or stomach).
3. The cannibalising of the patriarch (the snatched organ or his whole corpse exclusive of the snatched organ).

The acts devolve onto three basic characters.

1. The patriarch (a single character in both episodes).
2. His daughter (singular in the first episode, plural in the second).
3. An unrelated male (Coyote in the first episode—an unrelated canine male coresident with the patriarch; Skaatakaamcha and his pet blue fox in the second episode—a pair unrelated to the patriarch and not co-resident with him either).

We see that a basic character can split into a plurality. The case of Skaatakaamcha and his pet is interesting because the pet clearly is not an independent character, but is an appendage of Skaatakaamcha who fills the slot of the unrelated male. It is fortunate that the appendage is a wild canine—otherwise it would be harder to show that Skaatakaamcha is a stand-in for Coyote. What they share is their maleness, their non-kinship with the other two key characters, and the snatching function.

TABLE 4

CHARACTERS AND ACTIONS  
IN THE FIRST TWO CANNIBALISMS

	Cycle 1	Cycle 2
Patriarch	victim	victim
Daughter	killer	cannibal
Unrelated male	snatcher, cannibal	killer, snatcher

Table 4 shows the constancies and reshufflings of actions among the basic characters. Essentially the outside male keeps the act of snatching but there is an exchange of the other two actions between him and the character, *daughter*: She who was the killer is now she (plural) the cannibal, and he who was the cannibal is now he (plural)—Skaatakaamcha and blue fox) the killer. It may be added that the unrelated male (singular or plural) is responsible for the cataclysm both times, whether of "world wide" scale (the flood) or of local scale (the exploding stomach).

### Cycle 3

**Passage.**

Absent.

#### First Birth (from Scurf Boy)

Esthatelputba lived with his family near the Agua Fria river near Mayer. He massaged his right temple and rubbed off much scurf, which he put in a pile in the river with a rock on top of it. Next morning he told his wife to go over to the river and listen, then come home and tell him what she heard, as he had put something in the river.

Next morning . . . next morning . . . next morning . . . next morning . . . next morning . . . next morning . . . next morning . . . he told her to go back and get the boy out of the water. He was a good-looking boy of about 15 or 16 years of age.

#### Slaying the Patriarch (from The Burning of the World).

Two families lived to the east of Mayer. One man was Sun (*inya*), the other was Coyote. These two men played the hoop-and-pole game. Sun won all sorts of things from Coyote: buckskin, boots, leggings, hides, pots, baskets, dolls, deer meat, shell beads, etc.

The last time Coyote bet his son and daughter and lost to Sun. Then he bet his wife and lost. Then he bet one of his legs and lost. Sun cut Coyote's leg off. Coyote made a wooden leg for himself. Then he went away.

. . . Coyote told Squirrel: "I want you and your people to go over there and play the hoop and pole with Sun."

. . . Sometime later all went over to Sun's house.

. . . Sun bet his loyal helpers, wife, and daughters, too. He lost.

. . . Sun said: "I have lost again. This is the end of my life." Squirrel picked up a little stone axe. He hit Sun on the temple with it. He struck again and again to kill him. Sun died.

### Snatching the Organ, (almost) Cannibalism, and Cataclysm.

Then Squirrel pulled off Sun's arm. "Sun is not staying in this world any more." He threw the arm in the air and it encircled the sky. It has done so ever since, as the sun.

... They cut the skin from Sun's body like flaying an animal. Squirrel said: "Don't drop a particle on the ground. Keep it good."

All the people cut off pieces of Sun's body. Coyote got a piece of Sun's stomach. He put it on a rock pile. Many of the people returned to Squirrel's place. As they went they looked back towards Sun's place and saw the smoke coming out.

The people said: "We knew that Coyote left some of the body over there." The people asked Coyote: "Did you leave anything over there?" "Oh my! I left a little piece of stomach over there. I put it on top of the rock, but I forgot it," Coyote said.

The fire started from the stomach. It spread and became larger and larger. The fire was burning everything. The people said: "How are we going to save our lives?" They were in a broad valley. The fire spread over there and the ground was burning. It was burning the world. It killed all kinds of people and animals and everything. All the people burned up. They turned to red ants. Coyote had made trouble again.

### Discussion.

Here we have a cycle starting myth which lacks the element *passage* and has some characteristic cycle ending elements (Table 2); and a myth discontinuous with it with a proper cannibalistic ending. We will take up Scurf Boy first. We have already noted a lack of continuity between this myth and the first text. In fact, Scurf Boy is as much a creation story as the other text. The hero's origin is as miraculous as any and his fate is not unrelated to the fates of the first text characters.

(Abstract: Scurf Boy left his natal home. He married two sisters at a camp with a Coyote. Coyote grew to dislike him for no stated reason. Besides siring a son [the one normal birth in the mythology] Scurf Boy supplied the entire camp with deer, mountain sheep, and antelope. [It is not said that he was the first meat hunter the camp had known, but it appears that this is what Coyote did not like about Scurf Boy. At least, it is all that is said about the hero during the period when Coyote developed his dislike]. Coyote urged that the boy be killed. The boy's father-in-law resisted this suggestion but Coyote eventually had his way and Hawk decapitated the boy by dive-bombing him. Meanwhile Scurf Boy told his son to return to Scurf Boy's people and organize a raid in vengeance. The boy

obeyed and saw his father's people wipe out his mother's people with clubs. The orphan and his grandfather, who insisted on being called uncle [and had instructed Scurf Boy to call him brother], stayed together at the scene of the slaughter "and he supplied his nephew with many things" . . . 1933:367).

There is no cannibalism in this story but rather the release from it in the form of the regular supply of hunted big game animals. It is the first mention of that diet in the mythology. It is also the first mention of intergroup warfare. Can we see the story as a modified version of the ideal myth plot with the cannibalism changed to hunting, murder, and war? Let us try. The unrelated male's supplying proper meat food to his father-in-law and wives (who correspond to the patriarch and his daughters of the standard ending) causes Coyote (also an unrelated male from the patriarch's standpoint) to have the boy murdered by head snatching. In retaliation the entire camp is wiped out, not by a cataclysm but by conventional warfare. The plot is felt to be sufficiently different from the ideal so that Scurf Boy only starts but does not end a cycle. We will have a similar case in *The Human Bear*.

We now take up the cannibalism of *The Burning of the World*. The characters are the patriarch (Sun), a plurality of daughters, and a split *unrelated male* (Coyote and Squirrel). The patriarch is analogous to Cliff-person-kick-down of cycle two in posing a threat to the continued existence of society as it was then known. Sun's threat was not to kill people for his daughters' food as in the previous cycle ending, but to carry betting too far. He bet not just for alienable property which presumably was normal, but for Coyote's family members and finally for parts of Coyote's own body.

The role of the patriarch's daughters in this story is split as in cycle two, but they are removed from the crucial events. The unrelated male role has Coyote restored in the functions of organ snatcher and (prospective) cannibal but Squirrel does the killing. In short the unrelated male role here takes on all three key actions.

Reviewing the three cycle endings, the two constant character and action associations are the patriarch as victim and the unrelated male as organ snatcher. Of those two, Coyote stands out since he is present first and last under the same name while the manifest character of the patriarch changes each time, from Hanyiko to Cliff-person-kick-down to Sun. There is a sense then in which Coyote is *the* central character of the cycle endings and

the nominal Yavapai culture hero Skaatakaamcha is his stand-in. I mention this because the reader of the Origin Story alone (cycles one and two) would not come to this conclusion due to the total absence of a character called Coyote in cycle two. His absence is now understood as a replacement by the culture hero (while Coyote retains a "proxy" in the blue fox). Another instance of shifting between Coyote and the human culture hero is given in the Appendix.

## CYCLE 4

### Passage and (unexplained) Birth or Creation.

After the burning of the world, new people came, but we do not know from whence. This was the fourth generation or creation. Miamatkahuwa . . . began this world. Miamatkahuwa had several brothers and sisters, Coyote was the friend of Miamatkahuwa, one of whose sisters married Coyote.

Miamatkahuwa was the youngest.

(Abstract: The brothers killed Coyote by pushing him over a cliff. The sister then started secretly killing people from other camps. She returned home with pieces of arrow in her as signs. The sister killed people by becoming a bear while outside of camp. Knowing it would come to them while out hunting, the brothers told Miamatkahuwa to stay in camp and hide in a hole while they went to be killed and eaten. The boy did as he was told. The sister returned in human form, didn't eat him, and urged him to stay home. He followed her, was warned of her true nature by birds, and was urged to use a fire heated flint knife to stab the heart that she left behind in the process of transforming herself in to an unkillable bear).

### Killing

. . . He took the red hot knife and cut her heart. She shouted: "Don't cut my heart, little brother."

. . . He cut the heart in two. Bear fell dead. After that he walked inside his house, all alone.

### Passage.

. . . Next morning he followed his brothers' tracks. He followed them where they climbed mountains, to the other side of the mountains. He found their bones, some with flesh on. . . In the center of the clearing he built a hut. He made a door on the east side.

### New Birth or Creation.

He put their bones inside the house and closed it. Some distance away he built another house. He lay in that himself.

...He heard noises all day in the bone house. ...The people were walking around inside the house. They had horses inside the house. He stood by the door and he saw people making saddles, leggings, and shirts. He went back to his own house. Next day, he heard the noise of hammering. He went over to the bone house to see. He saw a rifle inside the house. Someone inside had a hat like a white person's. He entered to talk to the people.

"I want you people to make horses." They paid no attention to him. He said: "I want a rifle made for me." They paid no attention to him.

...They scattered to all different places.

### Discussion

The myth starts with a minimal *passage* statement of new people coming "we do not know from where." Like Scurf Boy, the myth is a kind of creation story. Again our task is to see how close the myth as a whole comes to the ideal plot. Essentially it reverses the ideal order by putting cannibalism ahead of the narrated act of creation. *Creation* stands where *cataclysm* normally does: the boy takes (corresponds to *snatches*) cannibalized remains and creates a new race from them. Meanwhile the local group decimating aspect of the typical *cataclysm* has moved ahead and been assimilated to the act of eating; the reason the camp was nearly wiped out is because the mens' sister ate them.

There is no patriarch in the story but Coyote is present as the sole unrelated male, this time disposed of before the cannibalism occurs and said to be root cause for it. If he hadn't been killed, his wife wouldn't have become a man eating bear. Coyote was killed because he lounged around camp all day while his brothers-in-law hunted. This is the reverse of why Scurf Boy was killed at Coyote's insistence at the start of cycle two.

At the most general level we can say that all Stacey's cycle turning myths involve disruptions over meat eating. The sequence is:

(1) Unrelated male (Coyote) causes flood by eating human patriarch.

(2) Unrelated male (Skaatakaamcha) destroys population who live off humans.

(3) Unrelated male (Scurf Boy) killed for efficiency in hunting game animals; war results.

(4) Unrelated male (Coyote) causes fire by trying to eat incendiary "human" meat.

(5) Unrelated male (Coyote) killed for neglect of hunting game animals; cannibalism results; creation results after that.

Myths (1), (2), and (4) as cycle ends simply are more like each other, that is more reiterative in action sequence and character deployment, than they are like (3) and (5). This is shown in the table below where reiteration is shown by the boxed entries in columns. Only the cycle ending myths are reiterated. (It is also seen that *all* the reiterations are of the form "patriarch by unrelated male," and every such entry is reiterated in another myth. That is clearly Stacey's key relationship which would suggest on the surface that this is not an oedipal mythology, but an "affinal" one.)

	Kill	Snatch	Eat	Cataclysm
(1)	Patriarch by Daughter	Patriarch by unrelated male	Patriarch by unrelated male	Flood
(2)	Patriarch by unrelated male	Patriarch by unrelated male	Patriarch by daughter	Explosion
(3)	Unrelated male by Hawk	Unrelated male by Hawk		War
(4)	Patriarch by unrelated male	Patriarch by unrelated male	Patriarch by unrelated male	Fire
(5)	Unrelated male by brother-in-law Brothers by sister	Brothers by brother	Brothers by sister	Creaton

### WILKILHAYA AND HIS GRANDSON

It remains to discuss this cyclically unplaced story with maximum brevity. Its importance lies in having a birth/creation, which puts it in the league of the five myths just considered. My abstract of it follows:

A young woman left her father and a hanger-on, Coyote, living near Wikute Mountain, because Coyote made it seem that she was menstruating when she wasn't and called her attention to the fact.



She went to a new camp and married Quail in preference to the local Coyote. She bore many children but chose to raise only one who set out one day to see his grandfather by Wikute. On the way he met four women, residents of neither of the above camps, and killed them while they slept. He tied their heads in a tree top and butchered their bodies to appear like deer meat.

He went to their home camp and lied that he had left deer meat behind which the residents could have. Their local Coyote went and exposed the lie by detecting the heads. The boy escaped and neared the Wikute camp. He killed a deer on the way and also his grandfather's pet white dog. On arriving on the scene the grandfather restored the dog to life and the two of them carried the deer meat to the grandfather's camp.

The original Coyote and the grandfather went hunting and killed a deer which returned to life. They followed it into a hostile people's territory. The people killed Coyote. The grandfather returned home with the people in pursuit. The boy met them and killed all the hostile people with one arrow. The boy, the dog, and the grandfather lived together.

If we align this myth with the previous food disruption list, centered on the unrelated male, we obtain:

(6) Unrelated male (Wilkilhaya's grandson) angers population by tempting them to cannibalism, then kills a whole (other?) population who chase the grandfather who couldn't kill a deer.

It is understood that "unrelated male" means "unrelated from the point of view of the affected population." The boy was related to persons in his natal camp and to his grandfather at his camp, but was unrelated to the people mentioned above.

If we align the myth to the standard cycle ending sequence we obtain:

	Kill	Snatch	Eat	Catacylsm
(6)	Women by unrelated male	Women by unrelated male (removing their heads)	0	War (?)

The story fits neither rubric very well, which is to say it is the most different of the myths discussed so far. That is sufficient for our purpose which is to show why it failed to start or stop a cycle notwithstanding its creational credentials and slight brush with cannibalism.

## CONCLUSIONS

The questions which prompted this paper were how an individual shapes the intellectual life of his tribe and how a mythology articulates with history. The materials bearing on the first question are Stacey's cycles which we have viewed as embodying an ideal myth plot and as carrying Stacey's personal "signature." The textual information has been given and it remains for the Appendix to complete the demonstration by comparing his mythology against others.

I must point out that the discussion of Stacey's cycles has answered the question, "What does a story have to have to qualify as a Stacey cycle turning myth." "It has not answered the question, "What does a story have to have to qualify as a Stacey myth *per se*." Many of Stacey's myths do not come close to the ideal myth formula. Abstracter plot formulae (such as are used by Dundes, 1962) or resorts to broad themes (such as meat eating, menstruation, and procreation) might show factors common to more Stacey myths, even to all of them, but I cannot vouch for that nor can I project whether such common denominators would carry a unique "Stacey signature." Thus the paper ends with certain things unknown. The merit of what we have done is not that it is exhaustive but that it concentrates on an organizing principle that we know Stacey used, namely the cycles. While we are not sure what Yavapai term he used for them, it is certain that Stacey recognized the cycles and used them to classify his separate myths.

We turn now to the second prompting question, that on the relation between a mythology and history. To answer the question in regard to Stacey's view of the total past, we must see how the sequentially ordered contents of his mythology are tied to the present. The published materials bearing on this question are scant and the answer must be sketchy.

I propose that there are two zones in Stacey's view of the total past. One zone is the *ancient* or mythic past as told in the mythology and as dated by cycles. (Dating in this context means, for example, "When did it happen?" "In the second cycle.") The other zone is the *recent* past as told in other, non-myth categories of story and as dated by "years ago" expressions or by genealogical connections to known Yavapais. As will be seen below and in the Appendix, the cyclic and the other methods of dating are kept separate by and large so a given story will fall into one or the other zone and will find its proper place according to the sequencing

principles used for that zone. Interestingly, there is just one story type which bridges between zones, that is, which receives a "years ago" date in some instances and which could be included in a cyclic mythology in other instances. This story has the potential of tying the whole past together.

Only one collection of "recent past" narratives was obtained from Stacey. These stories pertain to warfare between Yavapai and other tribes just prior to White settlement in the region (Gifford, 1936:324-39). It happens that none of the texts is year dated, but all are tied to known local groups, normally through the chiefs or war leaders of those groups. We must turn to a text from an unknown Yavapai narrator, probably not Stacey, for a year dated text that bridges between the ancient past as articulated in mythology and the recent past as represented by war stories. The text is given below exactly as Gifford published it, presumably from jottings in a field notebook:

"About 200 years ago" SE Yavapai and Pima were living close together as friends. They exchanged visits, made dances, and intermarried. Many SE Yavapai lived in Pima communities where they had married and were cultivating land. At least for a time, some Pima lived in mts. of SE Yavapai territory. After many years of friendly relations, some Apache visited the SE Yavapai living in Pima land. They stayed, feasted, cultivated foods, then went home. Later in the same year, they came again. In mts. of SE Yavapai land old Pima man was felling timber by burning trees (there were no axes) and cutting them into proper lengths. The Apache passed him and descended to Pima farms to feast with Yavapai-Pima mixed bloods. On their way back, laden with produce, they clubbed old man and threw his body aside. Old man's relatives found his body and told Pima, who came to burn it. Pima saw tracks, decided that SE Yavapai living among them must be the murderers, returned home and killed them, including those married to Pima. However, some SE Yavapai escaped and told mountaineer brethren, whom Pima also attacked (Gifford 1933:340).

The text gives the origin of hostilities between the Yavapais and another tribe. It differs from Stacey's war stories which give accounts of particular raids without stating the origin of hostilities. On the basis of this and another origin text treated in the Appendix (Ichesa's mythology), I suggest that "200 years ago" marked a standard end point of the ancient past and beginning of the recent period in Yavapai culture. As will be clarified below, the ancient past is not dated by the passage of years. Insofar as it is organized

into a cyclic or cumulative mythology, this mythology simply leads up to the earliest year dated text. From the look of the presently available Yavapai record, that earliest year dated text is likely to be an Origin of Hostilities story and may be viewed as the *last text* of a mythology or the first text of the recent past (Toulmin's and many Christian historians' "present dispensation" —Toulmin and Goodfield, 1965:30). The era of myth in short ended 200 years ago, a figure which I venture is in line with the past sense of most Southwest tribes.

Turning to Stacey's mythology, we see an ancient past narrative which seems to extend beyond the point indicated by the above quoted Origin of Hostilities story, which is why I suggest the story is not from Stacey. It is recalled that he placed the origin of enemies (unnamed as to tribe) at the end of cycle two and gave his first account of organized warfare (again between unnamed populations of people/animals) at the start of cycle three. He has a war story with Pimas in cycle four (Mourning Dove's Mother—1933:395-97). This tale presupposes an origin of hostilities. It also has miraculous elements which might qualify it as "ancient" or "mythic" rather than "recent," but my present method of classifying it as ancient is simply that it lacks a "years ago" statement or a genealogical connection to any known Yavapai.

Following that story comes Tortoise and Badger (1933:397) which deserves mention because its protagonist Tortoise rides a horse, which beast is given its origin at the start of cycle four and which figures fairly prominently in Stacey's recent past war stories. It is thus seen that those two stories belong near the end of an unfolding record of the ancient past and that Stacey's cycles are not just repetitive but cumulative. The details of the cumulation will not be treated in this paper. It is only shown that whole mythologies *can* build towards a bridge into the recent past. As will be seen in the Appendix, different Yavapai narrators did this differently, but all multi-text mythologies did something of the sort.

Our final point is on the absence of years in Stacey's myth corpus. The word "year" is extremely rare in the mythology as published. Its sole use is in statements such as the one about the maturation of Scurf Boy, that in a certain number of days he grew as large as a present day fifteen-year-old boy. This statement times nothing in the myth in terms of years. Rather it times a person's physical growth in days and compares that rate with growth today as measured in years. Specifically lacking in the mythology are

statements that the events of a given myth required a number of years to transpire, and therefore lacking are statements that a given "run" of myths, e.g., a cycle, required a given number of years. It seems typical of Southwest myths (and probably far more myths than Southwestern) that while the stories convey a "tangible" time sense ("in four days," "he traveled quickly," etc.), the apparent running time of a given myth or a whole mythology is very short. Thus, if one wanted to base a motion picture on all the narrated events of Stacey's mythology, scene by scene and acted at "normal" rates of movement, it is my guess that the resulting film would require hours, not days, to show; and that the explicitly announced time lapses between narrated scenes ("next day he went," etc.) would raise the narrative time span to weeks or months, not years. It is as if the whole mythology *might* have been played out in a single summer.

While I can't confirm this, it seems unlikely that the semantics of time is different between ancient and recent past Yavapai narratives, that is, unlikely that a special vocabulary, morphology, or syntax are used for temporality in myth texts. Nothing in Kendall's work suggests this (1976b), nor have I seen that case documented for any Southwest Indian language. I conclude that Stacey told his myths in ordinary Yavapai and years, while speakable, were not spoken about in those stories.

## APPENDIX. OTHER YAVAPAI MYTHOLOGIES

Here we compare other Yavapai mythologies with Stacey's. His is by far the longest, but it is not the only one which shows an overall organization. This proves that he was not an oddity and should give heart to those who would make similar studies on other tribes. It is understood that I am comparing the other mythologies against Stacey with the aims of highlighting his organization and of showing how it affected the details of his myths, i.e., molded the intellectual life of his people. There may be more intra and inter myth organization in the other mythologies than I will describe. There are three main groups of Yavapais, Northeastern, Southeastern, and Western (Gifford, 1932:178-79). Stacey was a Northeastern.

*Mike Burns, Southeastern Yavapai* (Gifford, 1932:243-47); and *Dale Quill and Grace Mitchell, Northeastern Yavapai* (Kendall and Sloane 1976:68-83).

There are just four myths in the Burns corpus. Two of them correspond to Stacey's cycles one and two, but are published in reverse order with no *passage* between them. The other two are very short. One of them, Coyote Limits Life, is incorporated as a parenthetical remark or aside in Stacey's cycle one; the last, Badger and Desert Tortoise, stands as a separate mythlet in Stacey's cycle four and was mentioned in the Conclusion.

Burn's cycle one equivalent, called The Dying God, differs from Stacey in that no cataclysm follows the eating of the patriarch's heart, and no person is identified as the cause of his death (the daughter in Stacey). The cycle two equivalent, called Origin Tale, starts with an underworld emergence that merges into a flood *passage*, but no reason is given for the flood. Also this myth lacks Stacey's cycle ending sequence (the Cliff-person-kick-down episode). Burns' myth ends with an episode that Stacey also includes in his cycle two in which the hero kills an eagle that had cannibalized his mother. Kendall's two texts, also cycle two equivalents, also end at this point, and we can see that the point is not inappropriate from Stacey's perspective: the eagle is a patriarch, but is a cannibal in the weakest sense so far encountered: an animal eater of non-coresident people. The "cannibal" is killed by an unrelated human male. There is no act of snatching and no cataclysm in this episode. In sum, Stacey's Cliff-person-kick-down sequence is more reiterative of his other cycle endings than is the eagle killing episode. In extending his myth to include the Cliff-person-kick-down episode, Stacey gave *more* biography to the myth's principal character, Skaatakaamcha, and brought this biography in tune with the rest of the mythology.

Short as it is, the Burns corpus is an organized mythology. Besides a first text (corresponding to Stacey's cycle two), it has an appropriate *last text* in Tortoise and Badger. It is recalled that Stacey has a text of that name in cycle four where the protagonist rides a horse.

(Abstract) Tortoise came upon Badger who pulled him off his horse to wrestle. As both were famous wrestlers, partisans of each gathered to watch. Because both were strong, enduring, and low slung, it was difficult to say who won. Tortoise finally resumed his journey while the onlookers argued angrily. (1933:397).

Burns' version lacks the horse and emphasizes the argument. "Then ensued a fight between the two groups of spectators. Since then all living things have been scattered, both desert animals and

people" (1932:247). This is the same outcome as the year-dated text of unknown origin quoted in the Conclusion and is an appropriate last text, not in the sense of ending a Stacey cycle, but in the sense of establishing the present world's dispersed pluralism.<sup>4</sup>

*Sam Ichesa, Western Yavapai* (Gifford, 1933:401-15).

This corpus has four myths: Origin Story (corresponding to Stacey's cycles one and two), Coyote as Marplot (closest correspondent is to Stacey's Coyote Resurrects Mountain Lion in the midst of cycle three), Origin of the Constellation <sup>a</sup>Muu (corresponding to a myth by that name in Stacey's cycle four), and Origin of Yavapai Wars (corresponding to the stone cloning episode at the very end of Stacey's cycle two). While it has the same number of myths as the Burns corpus, Ichesa's myths include more material because Burn's two longest myths are formed into a single Origin Story by Ichesa as well as by Stacey, and because Burns' third myth is included in Stacey's Origin Story (not, however, in Ichesa's).

Of special interest is the presence of births/creations in three of the four myths, and the presence of something very like this in the other story (Coyote as Marplot). This qualifies the myths as cycle starters by Stacey's system: it is just that Ichesa's cycles contain one myth each. Missing in the Ichesa mythology is the systematic recurrence of Stacey's cycle ending scheme.

I take the recurrent births/creations as strong evidence that the corpus is an organized whole, a mythology, not just a congeries of texts. In pressing the Origin of the Constellation <sup>a</sup>Muu into service as a cycle starter, Ichesa (or his predecessor) provided it with a birth/creation lacking in Stacey's version. Furthermore, Ichesa's one myth with no literal birth/creation concentrates on Coyote's release of big game animals from an enclosed condition in the mountains (twice) by inserting his penis in the enclosure. This scene is not far removed from the birth/creation act: Coyote liberates animals rather than actually engendering them. Stacey has no version of this same story. His "Coyote Resurrects Mountain Lion" really is a different myth, with Coyote in the role of killer of an old Bear woman, not the liberator of deer. Yet there are deer and bears in both stories, plus other key characters. The myths would repay study as transformations of each other. The point for us is that Stacey's version has transformed birth/creation "out" and Ichesa's has transformed it "in," as both should do, keeping with the requirements of cycle starting stories.

Finally, Ichessa's placing the stone cloning episode at the end of the mythology, and his letting it stand as a separate geopolitical origin story, uses this episode precisely as the model of the two pasts given in the Conclusion this paper would predict. Here is an erstwhile "myth" at the end of a corpus where it explains hostilities among tribes as they existed in the mid-nineteenth century. The story begins with the phrase "about two hundred years ago," a date which apparently served Yavapais as the maximum reach backwards of the year-counted or recent past. We may say that Ichessa connected those two pasts, while Stacey didn't, or we may say that Ichessa's mythology has three cycles and this fourth myth-like story commences the realm of history.

Ichessa's corpus is significantly larger than Burns' but far smaller than Stacey's. It also lacks the latter's reiterative cycle endings. I will simply review how his myths end. Ichessa gives a Stacey-like cycle one cannibalism but no cataclysm results from it. He places this cannibalism in the underworld and has the primordial household (minus the patriarch) pass from the underworld prior to a flood that ushers in the equivalent to Stacey's cycle two. The flood is attributed to the patriarch's daughters as a second expression of their dislike for what the patriarch had done to them. Stacey is mute on the wrongdoing; Ichessa identifies it as incest. We saw that Stacey's blaming of the flood on the unrelated male conforms to his later cycle endings. Ichessa's mythology lacks that systematization or "shaping."

Ichessa's ending of the Skaatakaamcha story (equivalent to Stacey's cycle two) has the hero meet and become reconciled with one of his fathers (Sun): no cannibalism. His second myth ends with the restoration of good deer hunting (no cannibalism), his third with Coyote having an old man shoot Coyote's born/created daughters (they were then stars), his fourth myth ends with the Maricopa tribe cloned from a hard-to-kill boy, and styled as the principal enemies of the Yavapais: no cannibalism.

#### **John Williams, Southeastern Yavapai (Khera, n.d., 1-16)**

This is a single text corresponding to Stacey's cycles one and two. It is similar therefore to the first text in Ichessa's four myth mythology. It differs from Ichessa's myth and equates with Stacey's in having a cannibalistic Cliff-person-kick-down episode and in following that episode with a people-cloning from stone (Pimas).



Williams has the closest equivalent to Stacey's cycle two of any non-Stacey text.

Williams does not end his myth there, however. The story goes into a world burning episode comparable to the end of Stacey's cycle three, only with the hero Skaatakaamcha seeking reconciliation with his father rather than with Coyote seeking vengeance. We have earlier noted how Coyote and Skaatakaamcha change places in Stacey's cycle endings; this is a piece of that phenomenon only with the balance going to the *human* culture hero rather than to Coyote. In this version Skaatakaamcha is killed and butchered by the Sun patriarch (his own father), then reassembled and brought back to life by his other father, Cloud. Accordingly there is no cannibalism. A world fire preceeds rather than follows the butchering in this myth. The fire is caused by a fly blowing coals as opposed to Stacey's derivation of the fire from a piece of Sun snatched by Coyote.

The final event in Williams' long myth is the only creation of tribal ancestors in any Yavapai myth known to me. It is appropriately placed after a *passage* at the start of what would be another cycle. After the creation Williams gives a very Biblical Garden of Eden story which connects his one myth mythology to the dawn of year counted Christian history (it is recalled that generations of Christian scholars have set the date of Creation by year counts internal to the Bible).

While covering ground familiar from Stacey's mythology, Williams' cycle endings are not as reiterative as the other's (Table 5), nor do the first and third cycle-equivalent cataclysms result from cannibalism. In the equivalent to cycle three there *is* no cannibalism, in cycle one the flood is attributed to the daughter's ill will as in Ichesa, not to Coyote's act. Thus Stacey's cycle endings are more consistent and his past is more "shaped."

TABLE 5

## Williams' Cycle Equivalent Endings

CYCLE	KILL	SNATCH	EAT	CATAclySM
1	Patriarch by daughter	Patriarch by unrelated male	Patriarch by unrelated male	Flood
2	Patriarch by unrelated male	Patriarch by unrelated male	Unstated	Explosion
3	Patriarch by son	0	0	Fire

## NOTES

1. I would also argue that a linear time sequence operates within every myth text such that its episodes are considered to be earlier than, later than, or simultaneous with each other. I would not say that every episode in every text is assignable in that fashion; for example, some myths insert stories into stories, sometimes by back referencing and sometimes not. This insertion or embedding process is a non-cyclic way of building order into a mythology, for example, when the first text is the object in which the other stories are embedded. Many Pima-Papago narrators use this method although it has not been described as such.

2. The literature on varieties of North American Indian creation stories is immense in the sense that nearly everyone who has written on Indian myth has said something about first texts. Typological studies of first texts are few. In my opinion, the benchmark comparative study is Rooth's short paper (1957:497-508). On the assumption that most serious studies since then would take her work into consideration, I consulted the Social Science Citation Index on Rooth and found only one citation between 1967 and 1979. I conclude there was little typological study on the continental level during that time period and indeed I am not aware of any. Nor am I aware of such study for the subarea of the Southwest.

Rooth defined "creation myth" as "about the beginning, creation, or formation of the world or earth." She identified nearly 300 such myths and classified about 250 into one of eight types (most of the remaining ones were felt to be unclassifiable due to their fragmentary condition): Earth Diver, World Parents, Emergence, Spider as Creator, Creation of the World Through Struggle or Robbery, Ymir Type Creation (creation from a corpse), Two Creators (male), and Blind Brother. My comments are:

1. Certain of the myth types presuppose the existence of the earth and deal in fact with the creation of people, animals, mountains, etc., e.g., the World Parents type (Earth Mother and Sky Father). Thus the generic myth definition is not as closed as it looks.

2. Although she defines the eight subtypes by typical sequences of elements (called detail-motifs), it seems that the subtypes are fundamentally defined by single elements, e.g., the act of emergence or the combination of Earth Mother and Sky Father "parents." There is scant attention to the nature of these motif sequences, e.g., no analytical separation of actors from actions. Some such attention has been part of virtually every so-called "structural" study of myth, although the right way to proceed in this matter, even the right terminology to use, is still much at issue. The present paper's concept of "ideal myth plot" contributes to that general effort, my special emphasis being the comparison of texts within a corpus rather than the comparison of texts across narrators.

I made one more brief foray into the comparative literature, namely to check the state of the art in the most recently published book on the subject known to me, by Coffey (1978). Coffey doesn't cite Rooth. He essentially considers that all Indian creation myths are legitimately different. He is more interested in the grounds for believing in special creations than in the variety of special creations narrated in North American myth.

3. Note this dilemma: a mythology might grind out each of its myths according to a canonical cyclic formula in which case the mythology is caught in a vicious circle, or it might let the cycles arch over myths in which case the mythology is discontinuous. The latter horn of the dilemma occurs insofar as each successive myth involves a complete change of characters. Stacey falls on both sides of the dilemma, making his first text (one myth) run for two cycles, then making his later cycles arch over several myths.

4. Stacey's last text, *Bullsnake Penis*, has no dispersion. Bullsnake Penis was a man with a long penis wrapped around his waist. A woman mistook this for venison, asked for some, and ended ill with a broken piece of penis in her vagina. At home she pretended her head was sick, but Bullsnake Penis was finally found out by the shaman Ring Tailed Cat. The penis was extracted with an arrow. The culprit was chased across a river and became a bullsnake (1933:401). We may speculate that Stacey put this myth at the end because the woman's mistake would have been cannibalism and the consequence of her mistake was a failed birth/creation.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bahr, D.  
 n.d. Southwest Indian Dispersion Myths. Typescript on file at Arizona State University, Department of Anthropology.
- Coffey, W.  
 1978 *Spirits of the Sacred Mountain: Creation Stories of North American Indians*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Dundes, A.  
 1962 From Etic to Emic Units in the Structural Study of Folktales. *Journal of American Folklore*: 75:95-105
- Gifford, E.W.  
 1932 The Southwestern Yavapai. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology*: 29:177-252.  
 1933 Northeastern and Western Yavapai Myths. *Journal of American Folklore*: 46:347-415.  
 1936 The Northeastern and Western Yavapai. *University of California Publications in American Archeology and Ethnology*: 34:247-354.
- Kendall, M.  
 1976a *Selected Problems in Yavapai Syntax*. New York: Garland.  
 1976b (with E. Sloane) Skara K'a-mca: The Lofty Wanderer. *International Journal of American Linguistics Native American Texts Series* Vol. 1, no. 3:68-83.
- Khera, S.  
 n.d. When Everything Began. Typescript on file at Arizona State University, Department of Anthropology.

Morris, C.

- 1974 *An Analysis of Upland Yuman Myths with the Dying God and Monster Slayer Stories*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation on file at Arizona State University, Department of Anthropology.

Rooth, A.

- 1957 Creation Myths of North American Indians. *Anthropos*: 52:497-508.

Toulmin, S. and J. Goodfield.

- 1965 *The Discovery of Time*, New York: Harper and Row.