

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

This Is What They Say: Stories by François Mandeville.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/72d778zc>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 34(4)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Wellburn, Ron

Publication Date

2010-09-01

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/>

Keeping in practice with this theory of weaving in diverse elements, Sahwny includes Beidler and Connie Jacobs's collection of memorable character analyses. In attempting to determine "a combined single assessment of what makes Erdrich's characters so memorable," we, along with the editors, discover a diverse range of perspectives and therefore gain deeper insight into and understanding of these characters through somebody else's eyes (243). In doing so, these character sketches and the collection as a whole reveal the value of diverse perspectives by promoting tolerance for differences and honoring epistemological elasticity: we all bring something new to our communal understanding. The collection provides timely and valuable discussion about Erdrich's newest and least-discussed works balanced with appropriate attention to her most well-known work. The essays add to an ongoing discussion regarding Erdrich's literature specifically and the study of Native American literature more generally.

Leah Sneider

University of New Mexico

This Is What They Say: Stories by François Mandeville. Translated from Chipewyan by Ron Scollon. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2009. 288 pages. \$25.00 paper.

One can say with justification that the collection of narratives, *This Is What They Say: Stories by François Mandeville*, was eighty years in the making. Then too, with an appreciation for the interest and cooperation by Mandeville as the original teller of its contents, the period of gestation is pushed back more than a century, revealing an enigmatic series of relationships and orthographic renditions presented in this publication. The book represents the evolution of a narrative ethnography told by François Mandeville, born the son of a Métis interpreter in the Northwest Territories (1878–1952), and two non-Native scholars, Li Fang-kuei (1902–87), who interviewed Mandeville in 1928, and Ron Scollon (1939–2009), Li's student and collaborator for *Chipewyan Texts*, published in China in 1976. Li handed the torch to Scollon for this linguistic concentration, and Scollon "reanalyzed the Chipewyan stories from the point of view of narrative structure as developed by [Melville] Jacobs" (15). The Chinese-born Li, the brilliant student of University of Chicago linguist Edward Sapir (who would forge his own reputation in Na-Dené as well as in the language families of Chinese and southeastern Asia's Tai), came to the United States able to read and write English better than speak it, became the renowned figure in Chipewyan linguistics, and shares with Mandeville a central place in a truly remarkable legacy.

These three men whose lives overlapped brought considerable care to these Chipewyan narratives, with Robert Bringhurst in his foreword and, especially, the preface and commentary by Scollon describing the detailed methodological process that produced this ethnopoetics. *This Is What They Say* has three parts. In part 1, "The Stories," are sixteen of Mandeville's narratives

from what could be called the Chipewyan mythic tradition, including stories about the discoveries of copper and iron, for example, “The Cheating Gambler,” “The Man Who Became a Wolf,” and two Wise Man stories. Part 2 consists of five accounts Li elicited from Mandeville expressing his thoughts about tribal education, “About Fish,” making a canoe, tanning a moose hide, and hunting a beaver. Scollon’s “The Narrative Ethnography of François Mandeville” informs readers of Li’s meticulous translations and describes the ethnopoetic arrangement provided in the appendix, “Four States of an Oral Text.” The material contained here affirms the value of the book, for in it Scollon illustrates a section of “The Man Who Became a Wolf” from facsimile pages found in the American Philosophical Library of Mandeville’s narration written down phonemically by Li with Li’s translation beneath each line. It also includes corresponding digital facsimiles from *Chipewyan Texts*, Li’s orthographic structural rendition with Scollon’s retranslation on facing pages, and the text portion in the Chipewyan syllabics Li learned from Mandeville.

Scollon paid strict attention to verse and stanza format for transcribing Mandeville’s stories; by comparison, the translations in the recent collection edited by Brian Swann, *Algonquian Spirit* (2005), are rendered in either prose or in the simplified verse form followed by Li. Scollon adheres more closely to the format used by Dell Hymes in *“In vain I tried to tell you”: Essays in Native American Ethnopoetics* (1981), especially his essays on exemplary Chinkookan and Clackamas texts (246–51, 356–70). Scollon admits his interest in clause-based “line turnings” in structuring his own retranslations (in literary poetics these would be known as clause enjambments). But he does follow, while deploying his own minor adjustments, Hymes’s attention to the terminology of acts and scenes (Hymes acknowledged rhetorician Kenneth Burke for these), stanzas, verses, and lines. From Hymes and a few acknowledged others, like Dennis Tedlock and Nora and Richard Dauenhauer, and by intuitively following Mandeville’s “internal logic of the narrative,” Scollon based his examples “on explicit markers of discourse structure” (240). He is not unaware of other Hymes categories like quotation, prologue, and epilogue. Whether structural divisions and performance terminology appropriated from Euro-Western dramaturgy—rendering a section of a narrative as “Act I, Scene I,” for instance—can be applicable to indigenous cultural oral traditions may stimulate reactions on various levels, one being the amusement with which some Indians regard the practice of ethnopoetics.

To be sure, Mandeville and Li’s collaboration seems to have been distinguished by the objectives each pursued. Identifying an older approach by linguists that continues today, “the content of the stories which they collected were generally felt to be of little interest. Stories were merely a way to get words spoken in a meaningful context,” and thus Li’s 2,800 lexical file slips were more important to him (234). Meanwhile, Mandeville used the six weeks of that 1928 summer working with Li to learn to write Chipewyan “using Li’s phonetic-phonemic orthography” and to produce a reliable group of stories from his culture, and he paid “close attention to the stories he was telling” (235–36).

Pointing out the aspect character of the Chipewyan verbs in contrast to Indo-European verbs being marked for tense, Scollon underscores how important these are respectively to reckonings of action in time. His comments about Mandeville's goals nevertheless do not engage the issue of language retention and cultural preservation, betraying a conventional, Western, clinical approach to aboriginal linguistics. Today we are more vocal about cultural preservation and look for practical methods that can revitalize a language, record the oral traditions of a culture threatened by modern technology, and have some means to perpetuate cultural attributes. Perhaps because of this, indigenous community people and scholars resort to processes instigated by Euro-Western forms of literacy in order to make practical applications of what languages hold for their people in meaning and spirit. Scholarly decision can otherwise be a disruptive factor. Scollon explains at modest length that Mandeville deferred to a friend, Forcier, to tell the "His Grandmother Raised Him" story to Li because he knew Forcier would give a better telling. But Li and Scollon, wanting *Chipewyan Texts* to be just Mandeville's stories and because Forcier's narration was very succinct and allegedly inferior in quality, omitted it, having then to explain their omission to the people of Fort Chipewyan (237). Still, Scollon was smart enough to realize that Forcier may have been among other reasons intentionally reticent about sharing that story, but he seems to have acquired this revelation much later (258). Scholars and professionals, then, may need to include community input regarding their lexical choices.

The title of this book is taken from a principal structural marker in Mandeville's telling of many stories, and Scollon renders these in separate lines in order to punctuate a narrative at an emphatic point in an episode or to bring closure to a story. Scollon leaves to readers what the phrase signifies, but he or certainly Bringham might have made the phrase usage less opaque for less-experienced readers despite that being somewhat obvious. Scollon includes a modest bibliography, but there is no index. In general, with the narrations in the main body of the collection easy to follow, readers will enjoy the twenty-one stories that make up *This Is What They Say*. Speakers and students of Athabaskan languages will be eager to engage Scollon's technical descriptions of his and Li's respective and collaborative work. Meanwhile, those familiar with the Cree syllabary are sure to have fun with the syllabic symbols for Chipewyan.

Ron Welburn

University of Massachusetts–Amherst

The War in Words: Reading the Dakota Conflict through the Captivity Literature. By Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2009. 398 pages. \$60.00 cloth.

The American Indian captivity narrative occupies a contested space in Native American and American literature. Many American literature scholars believe that the production of the captivity narrative marked the beginning