

Þór or Christ?
Object at the National
Museum of Iceland.



How authentic is ‘authentic’?

Rosalind Kerven

authentic, adjective

- of undisputed origin; genuine
- made or done in the traditional or original way, or in a way that faithfully resembles an original
- based on facts; accurate or reliable: an authentic depiction of the situation.

The New Oxford Dictionary of English

If you've ever studied fairy tales on a serious level, you are no doubt aware of the following arguments. Firstly, the versions which most of us initially discover as children are different from those once told orally, in earlier times, to an audience of mixed ages; the children's versions are sanitised and sometimes also simplified. Secondly, the best-known tales, churned out over and over again, represent just a very small selection from the total material available; and these selections are still based on those made by Victorian publishers with particular social and moral agendas. Taking this even further, we should be mindful that the oldest collections compiled by the likes of the Grimm Brothers and Perrault, though based on oral tradition, inevitably bore the stamps of the collectors' own personalities, approaches and narrative styles. For example, fairy-tale expert Maria Tatar says of the Grimm Brothers:

Wilhelm Grimm re-wrote the tales so extensively and went so far in the direction of eliminating off-colour episodes that he can be credited with sanitising folktales . . . Recent scholarship has shown that they actually relied on sources at least one remove from peasant culture[, receiving] versions of the tales that had already been dramatically revised . . . [Also they] altered the texture of the tales narrated to them . . . they could not resist the temptation to improve on what they heard.¹

Looking beyond the familiar fairy tales, how widely do these measures of authenticity apply? Can there even be such a thing as an 'authentic' traditional story? I've been collecting and retelling world myths, legends and folktales for over thirty years, and with every book I work on, this question is very much uppermost in my mind. This article, based on my recent work with three very different types of story, will explore some of the issues involved. However, instead of providing easy answers, it may tantalise you with many further questions.

Let's start with something most of you are aware of: Arthurian legends. I've written two books on this theme. The first, a retelling of the central King Arthur story for children, was published by Dorling Kindersley using their house style of concise text designed to fit into double-page spreads around copious illustrations.² The second was a collection of the best subsidiary tales about Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table for an adult readership, with a much longer word limit and extensive notes on each story.³ In both cases, I was eager to produce an 'authentic' retelling of centuries-old Arthurian storytelling traditions.

My starting point was to study the 21 books of Sir Thomas Malory's *Le Morte d'Arthur*,⁴ dating from 1485. This is generally held to be the standard medieval work on the subject, bringing together numerous Arthurian stories of both British and European provenance. I complemented this by background reading on the historical King Arthur – if, indeed, such a person really even existed. Having finished that, I was confronted by two major challenges.

Firstly, Malory depicted Arthur as a typical medieval king. His knights displayed the ritual chivalry typical of the Middle Ages; and romantic affairs within the story followed the medieval conventions of 'courtly love'.⁵ This is the Arthur that most people know through modern literature, films, etc. However, the possible 'real' King Arthur, hesitatingly identified by some historians, appears to have been a Romano-British warlord, who died in battle early in the sixth century A.D., in the period known as the Dark Ages. This Arthur's heroic reputation was based not on chivalry and tournaments but on important military triumphs against invaders from northern Europe and Ireland.⁶ Clearly there is a huge difference between these two personas. Which is more 'authentic' to the reteller working today: the literary convention or the (only possibly real) historical figure?

Malory himself hints that his version of the old legends was based on people and events from a long departed age. For example, he says (my emphasis): 'Right so fareth love nowadays, soon hot, soon cold: there is no stability. But *the old love* was not so... *then* was love, truth and faithfulness: and lo in likewise was used *love in King Arthur's days*.'⁷ Indeed, the earliest sources of Arthurian legend actually pre-date Malory by up to 900 years. Most significant is a 13th-century manuscript called *Y Goddodin*, which is supposedly a true record of a Welsh heroic poem first recited by one Aneirin in the late sixth century⁸ (though, frustratingly, some scholars suggest this poem may have been altered by later scribes).⁹ Amidst long and gloriously gory descriptions of various battles, there is a single cryptic reference to a man with such a legendary reputation that other warriors were compared with him:

He brought black crows to a fort's
Wall, though he was not Arthur.¹⁰

'Not Arthur'? Should that be a salutary motto for *all* retellings?

Another very old source, *Historia Brittonum* (*History of the Britons*)¹¹ is widely attributed to a ninth-century Welsh monk called Nennius (although again, authenticity disputers point

out that it survives only in a copied 12th-century manuscript).¹² This contains several references seeming to confirm the historical Arthur as a charismatic and invincible war-leader with exceptional powers, for example:

Then it was, that the magnanimous Arthur, with all the kings and military force of Britain, fought against the Saxons . . . he was twelve times chosen their commander, and was as often conqueror . . .

So: a legendary warrior, certainly – but neither of these most ancient sources refers to Arthur as ‘King’.

The oldest extant *King Arthur* story is *Culhwch and Olwen*, whose origins have been traced back possibly to the 10th century.¹³ Today it is usually read in a 19th-century collection of eleven stories called *The Mabinogion*,¹⁴ which reproduces tales from two medieval Welsh manuscripts.¹⁵ Although some of the *Mabinogion* stories have a very medieval feel, *Culhwch and Olwen* itself bears the mark of much older oral traditions. For example, the structure of the plot is somewhat rambling, and it uses devices such as repetitive phrases that the audience might have joined in with. It evokes the pure British roots of Arthurian legend, a remote Dark Age world in which Arthur’s men were heroic warriors rather than courtly knights. Moreover, it has a very different flavour from the mainstream Arthurian stories, being more of a fairy tale than a quasi-historical legend; and it is not mentioned in *Le Morte d’Arthur*. It tells of the Arthurian court helping a young hero on a quest to obtain some magic objects from an enchanted wild boar that will enable him to marry a giant’s daughter. Is this apparently very old Welsh tale more ‘authentic’ than the later medieval legends? Or are they *both* authentic to their time and place?

My second challenge was to choose an authentic mood and voice for retelling the Arthurian canon. Scholarly commentaries tend to discuss all the old texts with much gravity, no doubt led by the tone of impending tragedy that imbues *Le Morte d’Arthur*. So it comes as a surprise, when exploring certain lesser-known Arthurian sources, that some included a good deal of farce and even bawdiness. For example in the 13th-century French romance *Lancelot of the Lake* there is a scene in which King Arthur himself ‘had lain with his ladylove for a long while and done as he wished’ when forty fully armed knights force open the door of his chamber ‘and the king sprung up as best he could, for he had only his breeches.’¹⁶ In Chrétien de Troyes’ melodramatic Arthurian romance, *Le Chevalier de la Charrette*, Sir Lancelot cuts his fingertips whilst breaking through the iron bars of a window when making an illicit visit to the Queen, then gives himself away as a cuckold by leaving blood from this wound in the Queen’s marital bed; the next day she tries to cover her guilt by pretending it was caused by her own nose bleeding.¹⁷ For purists who feel that French sources are not authentic to a British hero, Sir Gawain – one of Arthur’s most prominent knights – stars in England’s *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (late 14th century), in which a noblewoman titillatingly attempts to seduce him in a parody of courtly love.¹⁸

Then there is the tale of *Tristram and Isolde*, in which the hero, and the young woman he is escorting to marry a king, unwittingly drink a love potion which causes them to begin an adulterous affair. The oldest version I unearthed, Beroul's Anglo-Norman manuscript of the 12th century, *The Romance of Tristan*,¹⁹ emphasises the outrageousness and comedy of the story that thus unfolds. In contrast, Malory's retelling is much more serious and he uses it to draw a symbolic parallel with the tragic adultery of Sir Lancelot and Queen Guinevere. Which is more correct? Or could it be that both are right, because a story is a story and it's up to the reteller to treat it as they will? For my own retelling, I decided to go for a more light-hearted approach.

More recently, I've written a book called *Viking Myths & Sagas, retold from ancient Norse texts*,²⁰ aimed at the general adult reader, but written in consultation with leading academics in the field. Despite this, for certain scholarly critics, the 'is it authentic?' issue begins as soon as they read the title. The problem for these good people is the very name 'Viking'. Although it is widely claimed that the Norse stories I've retold here originally circulated by word of mouth during the Viking Age (late 8th – late 11th centuries), the oldest surviving source books were not written until some two hundred years later. An American academic publisher summed up the problem thus: 'There's much that's controversial in Scandinavian studies — not least the extent to which these stories were orally transmitted and how much the technology of writing influenced their development.'²¹

From the reader's point of view, it's much more appealing to call them 'Viking' stories than 'Norse' ones, because the concept of Vikings has a glamorous, adventurous ring to it, whereas 'Norse'... well what exactly is *that*? So should one stand accused of using this terminology illegitimately, perhaps merely as a commercial ploy? Certainly not. The original sagas that I've retold were mostly written during the 13th century, but claim to tell of real Viking Age people. Indeed, at least two substantial academic tomes have painstakingly traced how they developed from genuinely documented historic events and real people.²² As for the more fantastical myths and heroic legends in my book, archaeological finds prove that these were current during the Viking Age. For example in Sweden, the 11th-century Altuna Rune Stone shows the god Thor fishing up the World Serpent,²³ and a pre-Christian picture stone depicts the god Odin's eight-legged horse,²⁴ whilst a 10th-century cross in the Isle of Man shows scenes from the legend about Sigurd, Fafnir the dragon and Gunnar in the snakepit.²⁵

So that's that sorted ... Except that even archaeology is not immune to uncertainty and misinterpretation. There's a very famous statuette from c.1000 A.D. in the National Museum of Iceland that appears in many illustrated books about the Viking Age, claiming that it shows the god Thor holding his hammer. However, the Museum website states that some scholars now believe this is *not* Thor – but Christ, holding a cross.²⁶ Does this mean that the other Viking-era carvings also may not genuinely illustrate the myths and legends that we think they do?

The main source book for the Norse myths and heroic legends is the early 13th-century *Prose Edda* by Snorri Sturluson²⁷ (usually known simply as Snorri). This scholarly

but very readable work was written by a man whose mission was to preserve for posterity his country's unique heritage of ancient oral narratives. It uses an innovative style to present the pagan myths to a Christian medieval readership. Snorri cleverly recounts them as stories within a story, in which a disguised king visits the gods and interviews three of them, thus obtaining much detailed information about the mythological cosmos. This is followed by an imagined dialogue between another god and a giant, revealing more tales of the deities' exploits. Snorri seems to have taken great pains to accurately transcribe the time-honoured tales, even quoting mystical oral verses from antiquity which purport to throw further light on the old beliefs. As proof of his academic credentials, he devotes half the book to a treatise on the complex conventions of Old Norse poetry. However, there's one aspect of the *Prose Edda* that rings loud alarm bells on authenticity: Snorri claims that Norse gods such as Odin were originally real-life kings from antiquity, who became 'deified' as the result of their great achievements. This is presumably because Snorri, as a Christian, could not bring himself to view the pagan gods as genuinely divine. But if that was his perspective, how can we be sure he didn't tamper with other aspects of the myths he recounts, to fit in with his own religious ideology?

A parallel source book is the slightly later *Poetic Edda*,²⁸ a collection of very mysterious poems. Many have a mythical theme, telling of gods and goddesses, giants and giantesses, valkyries, dwarfs, and the creation and the prophesied end of the world. Others are about great legendary heroes and heroines. Little is known about how the *Poetic Edda* came to be written; most of its content was discovered in a ninety-page Icelandic manuscript known as *Codex Regius* (*The Royal Manuscript*) compiled by an anonymous scribe; modern editions often supplement this with several other related poems of similar date from other manuscripts. The poems are difficult to read, even in translation, and there is something very exciting about ploughing through their verses and trying to make sense of them, as if they provide a direct link to the oral poets of the Viking Age itself. But are they really as old as that? Some scholars have worked out that certain of the poems could be dated to 'the period when Old Norse was spoken in England, say ca. 900-1050', whilst others might include certain 'ancient cores which have been re-worked'.²⁹

One example which raised my suspicions is a poem called *Lokasenna*, in which the trickster god Loki initiates a ribald exchange of insults with the other deities. I had assumed this must be a Christian-era parody of the pagan beliefs: surely the Vikings feared and respected their gods and goddesses rather than mocking them? But when I queried this with experts in Norse mythology, one pointed out that

the reverential nature of Christian devotional poetry should not lead us to assume that is the only possible form and tone of poetry about divine beings; the *Lokasenna* seems to be an ancient indigenous genre ... These poems make sense of the power dynamics among the gods and also expose their

anxieties... in a vivid way that many scholars believe is expressive of the mythology of the pre-Christian period.³⁰

So that turned my worry about authenticity right on its head: could it be that the elements that don't appear to be authentic actually are, and vice versa? Of course, soon someone may come up with new research and perspectives that change that conclusion too!

In the end, with this particular book I decided to have faith in the wonderful stories themselves, and to interpret them for 21st-century readers ... Which after all, is exactly what Snorri did for his 13th-century readers. For as an anonymous 14th-century Saga author put it, 'One man's tale is only half a tale.'³¹

My current 'work in progress' is a major book of myths from a totally different cultural tradition, Native American and Canadian First Nations, concentrating on stories collected in the field in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Since these stories were all sourced first-hand from the cultures to which they belonged, and transcribed immediately into publications which still can be accessed easily today, you might think there is no real problem with authenticity. Wrong again.

Firstly, by the time that teams of ethnologists travelled around the US and Canada to collect these tales, the cultures to which they belonged had already been suppressed or almost completely destroyed. For example, when stories from the Great Plains were recorded, the buffalo upon which the people's whole existence depended – and which thus feature in many of their myths – had been almost entirely wiped out by white settlers. These once splendid tribes were not just socially broken, but also forced to abandon their ancestral beliefs and adopt Christianity. They were largely illiterate, but still carried the old mythologies in their heads and were willing to share them with sympathetic whites. However, given the ethos of the time, they took care not to credit the central characters with powers that their Christian masters might consider blasphemous. For example, an important character in numerous Blackfoot myths is a divine trickster called Old Man, an enigmatic character with complimentary sacred and profane aspects. Although a few brief surviving stories recall his divine role as the Creator, even citing brief quotes of ancient prayers to him,³² in most of the surviving stories he is ridiculed and portrayed as malevolent, foolish, greedy and lewd.

For several decades at least, the Blackfoot have considered the Old Man as an evil character, in most respects, trivial... Whenever the writer asked if the Old Man was ever prayed to, the absurdity of the question provoked merriment. The usual reply was, that no one had enough confidence in him to make such an appeal. In daily conversation his name is often used as a synonym for immorality.³³

This is a sad example of how something once deemed to be an authentic truth was forcibly modified into an opposite new 'truth' due to the changing social and political context.

Ethnologists seem to have regarded some areas of North America as too remote for much serious study of narrative tradition. One such was the region known as the Subarctic, which comprises the largest swathe of interior Canada. Most of the stories here were not collected by experts in the field, but by interested and well-meaning people doing other jobs in the area, who sought to make use of their indigenous contacts to contribute to knowledge. Their intentions were no doubt genuine, but their work may not be entirely accurate. For example a short collection of Loucheux (Gwich'in) tales from 1905 was written by a geologist called Charles Camsell who was working for the Geological Survey of Canada at Fort MacPherson, near the Mackenzie River delta.

Mr. Camsell's informant was Peter Ross, a Loucheux of over forty-five years of age. . . . One night while he was making a net in his camp, Ross spent many hours telling Loucheux tales in fluent English to Mr. Camsell, *who the next day wrote them down from memory.*³⁴ [Emphasis added.]

Despite Camsell's best efforts, it is unlikely that he would have recalled exactly all the finer details of many different stories after the passing of long hours and the interruption of sleep; his recounts are minimalist; and his untrained approach may have missed certain subtleties intrinsic to the stories' meanings.

During this period, many Native American people still used their own mother-tongues. Some ethnologists initially recorded their tales in these indigenous languages, then painstakingly translated them, line by line. Anyone who has ever tried to literally translate a complex foreign text full of idioms and dialogue into English will realise this was a very difficult task, and the end result is often difficult to make sense of. The translations were accompanied by brief synopses of each story; but can we be confident that they had reworked the literal translations in a way that was sympathetic to their original intent?

On the other hand, quite a number of Native Americans had received a basic education and become literate themselves, and a handful of these wrote their own books of the old stories. Would it be more reliable, then, to use their accounts? One early 20th-century book of this kind is *To The American Indian*, by a Klamath woman called Mrs Lucy Thompson (Che-na-wah Weitch-ah-wah),³⁵ which opens with this very promising statement:

I am a pure full blooded Klamath river woman . . . My father . . . took me at a very early age and began training me in all of the mysteries and laws of my people. It took me years to learn . . . Therefore I feel that I am in a better position than any other person to tell the true facts of the religion and the

meaning of the many things that we used to commemorate the events of the past. In this book I will endeavor to tell all in a plain and truthful way without the least coloring of the facts.³⁶

However, her language is that of a Victorian lady; some of her characters have incongruous modern titles such as 'Dr. Bear and Mrs. Skunk'; and she disparages one of her tales with this unfortunate disclaimer:

Any Indian will tell his white brother this story as a true part to their religion, as calmly and seriously as if it was the truth and perhaps some of the lower class really believe it, yet it is only a fairy tale.³⁷

In the same vein, a collection of *Pima and Papago Legends* comprises accounts by indigenous children at the Industrial School in Tucson, Arizona, 'printed here without any change'. It includes a myth about a man who transforms into an eagle written by a seventh-grader called Johnson Azul, which sadly, concludes with this poignant note:

These legends are no longer believed, as the Indians are coming out of their superstition into a better knowledge.³⁸

When they deprecate their traditional beliefs in this way, is it fair to claim that these sources are more reliable than stories recorded by outsiders who respected the original cultures?

With all these doubts and queries, how can a reteller of old tales like myself make any claim that my work is authentic – particularly when dealing with stories from a distant historical period or a totally different culture? Is there really only one valid form of a story? Let me answer that with two quotes.

The first comes from an ethnologist who worked with the Blackfoot people in the early 20th century. He says,

Myths are told by a few individuals, who take pride in their ability and knowledge, and usually impress their own individuality upon the form of the narrative ... Once when discussing this matter with a Blood Indian, the venerable old man pulled up a common ragweed, saying, "The parts of this weed all branch off from the stem. They go different ways, but all come from the same root. So it is with the different versions of a myth." Hence, to say that any one version of these myths is correct would be preposterous, because they have not now, and probably never did have, an absolutely fixed form.³⁹

For the final word, let's listen to someone from yet another narrative heritage. The African-American author Julius Lester introduces his wonderful children's book *The Tales of Uncle Remus* without claiming any exclusive right to his people's stories. Instead he makes this inspiring statement which has guided me through many years of working in the genre:

Primarily, retelling the tales was a matter of finding the language that would allow the stories to live as the wonderful creations they have always been . . .

I have been asked many times whether it is all right for a white person to tell black folktales. "I can't tell them the way you do" is the inevitable complaint. Of course not, but why should that be a consideration? Undoubtedly a black person with roots in the southern black tradition will bring an added dimension to the telling of these tales to which most whites do not have access. That does not bar whites from telling them.

The most important element in telling these tales, or any folk tale, is do you love the tale? After all, what is a tale except a means of expressing love for this experience we call being human. If you love the tale, and tell it with love, the tale will communicate . . . Tell the tale as you would, not I, and believe in the tale. It will communicate its riches and its wonders, regardless of who you are. Trust the tale. Trust your love for the tale. That is all any good storyteller can do.⁴⁰

'Trust' ... 'love' ... 'finding the language that would allow the stories to live'. Truly, isn't that what passing on valuable narrative heritage is all about? What could be more authentic than that?

.....

Rosalind Kerven

Notes

1. Maria Tatar, *The Hard Facts of the Grimms' Fairy Tales* (Princeton University Press, 2003), 24-6.
2. Rosalind Kerven, *King Arthur* (Dorling Kindersley, 1998).
3. Rosalind Kerven, *Arthurian Legends* (Anova Books for the National Trust, 2011).
4. Sir Thomas Malory, *Le Morte D'Arthur*, volumes I and II (first published by William Caxton 1485. London: Penguin 1969, 1986).
5. A highly ritualised convention of love between a young single knight and an older married noblewoman, widely featuring in medieval literature. It typically featured the knight willing to do anything for the lady of his passion, even to the extent of humiliating himself; but the relationship was usually unconsummated.
6. Leslie Alcock, *Arthur's Britain* (Penguin Press, 1971, Pelican, 1973), 359 ff.
7. Malory, Book XVIII, chap. 25.

8. Leslie Alcock, *Arthur's Britain*, 15. <http://facultyarts.ubc.ca/sechard/492godo.htm> (accessed 14 July 2016).
9. See Alan Lupack, *The Oxford Guide to Arthurian Literature and Legend* (Oxford University Press, 2005), 13.
10. Y Goddodin, trans. Joseph Clancy, reproduced at <http://www.maryjones.us/ctxts/a01b.html> (accessed 14 July 2016).
11. Nennius, *Historia Brittonum (History of the Britons)*, translated from the medieval Welsh text by J.A. Giles (London: J. Bohn, 1841, reproduced at www.gutenberg.org/files/1972/1972.txt; accessed 14 July 2016).
12. Norris J. Lacy (ed.), *The Arthurian Encyclopedia* (Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1986, 1988), 404; Alcock, *Arthur's Britain*, 29-30.
13. 'The likeliest date for the [Mabinogion stories] would appear to be early in the second half of the eleventh century; *Culhwch and Olwen* is earlier still – its orthography, glosses, vocabulary and syntax, and its glimpses of a more primitive social code, take parts of it back another hundred years.' Gwyn and Thomas Jones, *The Mabinogion* (J.M. Dent, 1949, 1974), Introduction, ix.
14. *The Mabinogion*, trans. Sioned Davies from the medieval Welsh manuscripts (Oxford University Press, 2007).
15. *The White Book of Rhydderch* (mid-14th century) and *The Red Book of Hergest* (late 14th/early 15th century).
16. Corin Corley (trans.), *Lancelot of the Lake* (Oxford University Press, 1989), 379.
17. Chrétien de Troyes, *Arthurian Romances*, translated from the 12th-century French by W.W. Comfort (London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1914), 329 ff.
18. *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, edited by J.A. Burrow (Penguin, 1972). *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, translated by Brian Stone (Penguin, 1959, revised 1974).
19. Beroul, *The Romance of Tristan: The Tale of Tristan's Madness*, translated from the 12th-century Anglo-Norman text by Alan S. Fedrick (Penguin Books, 1970).
20. Rosalind Kerven, *Viking Myths & Sagas retold from ancient Norse texts* (Talking Stone, 2015).
21. Private correspondence with editor from University of California Press, 2016.
22. Gisli Sigurdsson, *The Medieval Icelandic Saga and Oral Tradition – A Discourse on Method*, translated from the Icelandic by Nicholas Jones (The Milman Parry Collection of Oral Literature, Harvard University Press, 2004).
23. Knut Liestøl, *The Origin of the Icelandic Family Sagas*, translated from the Norwegian by A.G. Jayne (Oslo, Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning, H. Aschehoug & Co. (W. Nygaard), 1930).
24. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Altuna_Runestone (accessed 14 July 2016).
25. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tjängvide_image_stone#/media/File:Tjängvide.jpg (accessed 14 July 2016).
26. <http://www.iomguide.com/crosses/andreas/no121.php> (accessed 14 July 2016).
27. <http://www.thjodminjasafn.is/english/permanent-exhibition/key-objects/nr/2470> (accessed 14 July 2016).
28. Snorri Sturluson, *Edda*, trans. Anthony Faulkes (J.M. Dent, 1987).
29. *Elder Edda: A Book of Viking Lore*, trans. Andy Orchard (Penguin Books, 2011).
30. Private correspondence with Professor John McKinnell, Durham University, May 2014.
31. Private correspondence with Dr Judy Quinn, Cambridge University, July 2014.
32. *Grettir's Saga*, trans. Denton Fox and Hermann Palsson (University of Toronto Press, 1974), Chapter XLVI.
33. For example, 'Listen, Old Man, pity us! . . . Let us survive, pity us! Let us survive.' Quoted in George Bird Grinnell, *Blackfeet Lodge Tales* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1892), 281.
34. Clark Wissler and D. Duvall, *Mythology of the Blackfoot Indians* (New York, American Museum of Natural History, 1908; 2nd Edition, University of Nebraska Press, 1995), 9.
35. Charles Camsell and C. M. Barbeau, *Loucheux Myths*, collected in 1905 (Journal of American Folklore, 1915).
36. Lucy Thompson (Che-na-wah Weitch-ah-wah), *To the American Indian* (California: Eureka, 1916).
37. Thompson, *American Indian*, preface.
38. Thompson, *American Indian*, 212.
39. Mary L. Neff, *Pima and Papago Legends* (Journal of American Folk-Lore, 1912).
40. Wissler and Duvall, *Mythology of the Blackfoot Indians*, 5.
41. Julius Lester, *The Tales of Uncle Remus: The Adventures of Brer Rabbit* (The Bodley Head, 1987), xix-xxi.