

**UCLA**

**American Indian Culture and Research Journal**

**Title**

Native American Oral Traditions: Collaboration and Interpretation. Edited by Larry Evers and Barre Toelken.

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2qx6m44c>

**Journal**

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 26(1)

**ISSN**

0161-6463

**Author**

Kozak, David

**Publication Date**

2002

**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/>

While Isernhagen does not make the connections between place and tribal identity or realize that Momaday speaks authoritatively only about the Kiowa, the information is there in his answer for the reader who does not bring any preconceived, generalized notions of Indians to the reading.

The three interviews offer useful insights not only for the writings of Momaday, Vizenor, and Armstrong but also for American Indian literatures in general. Despite Isernhagen's predetermined notions about indigenous writings, the three authors' responses reinforce Armstrong's statement that there are "many different cultures producing different kinds of literatures, and particularly different kinds of literatures as a result of contact with different kinds of peoples from Europe and from other parts of the world" (pp. 135–136).

*Patrice Hollrah*

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

**Native American Oral Traditions: Collaboration and Interpretation.** Edited by Larry Evers and Barre Toelken. Logan: Utah State University Press, 2001. 256 pages. \$39.95 cloth; \$19.95 paper.

In 1992 the editors of *Native American Oral Traditions* invited scholars to make submissions on collaborative translation of Native American oral traditions. The result was originally published in the journal *Oral Tradition* in 1998, and it has now been rereleased in book form by the Utah State University Press. This collection brings together an impressive roster of scholars, both Native and non-Native. The articles offer several solid examples of and good reasons for pursuing collaborative translation and interpretation. As a series of general questions and organizing principles it appears that the various contributions variously address such questions as, What are the rationales for and examples of doing collaborative texting of traditional oral literatures? What roles do the Native and the non-Native collaborators play in the process of interpretation? and What larger values do collaborative productions offer? They are certainly important questions, and they are questions that the contributors to this volume do a fine job in answering. I suspect, however, that these may be questions that we generally know the answers to or that are at the very least accepted as methodologically and politically sound. And while I believe that the book does not strike out into new territory, this does not mean that the book should be ignored. *Native American Oral Traditions* offers interested students of anthropology, history, and Native studies a nice compilation of examples as to the work of collaborative texting.

The book is divided into seven chapters plus an introduction and a foreword. The texts draw on an interesting variety of cultures but offer a limited range of oral traditions/genres. The cultures discussed are the Yaqui of Arizona, Tlingit of the Northwest Coast, Lushootseed of Washington, Tohono O'odham of Arizona, Atsuge-Wi of California, Coos and Coquelle of Washington, and Yupik of Alaska. Oral genres examined include the sermon, fairy tale, and animal (including a bedtrick tale). The O'odham chapter is the

only one that is not about an oral tradition or oral genre per se, but rather is peripherally about the sociolinguistic phenomenon of “female breathy speech.” While an interesting subject, it is not an oral tradition or genre, and I was a bit puzzled as to its inclusion in this volume on traditional oral texting. I found nothing in the book to be particularly or potentially sensitive in the genre selections in the volume. In fact the editors and the contributors seem to have played it safe in their selections of oral literary genre. In some ways I was more surprised by what was absent than by what was included in the collection.

Each chapter is a competent contribution and each, for the most part, could serve as a methodological model for future research. One chapter stood out as exemplary. The collaboration between Nora Marks Dauenhauer and Richard I. Dauenhauer, a husband-and-wife team, offers a model to be learned from. Their collaborative efforts track, translate, and analyze an obscure Tlingit “bedtrick” (my designation) story with roots as a Russian fairy tale. The Dauenhauers used the story of Yuwaan Gageets, a fairytale and moral story of human-animal marriage, to examine how a foreign folktale entered into this community’s oral tradition and to explain why this tale had such a limited acceptance among the Tlingit. It is a story that was accepted by the storytellers of one extended family. The authors not only offer a quality translation and interpretation, but they also do a fine job of contextualizing it. I also appreciated how the team presented their collaborative efforts: they didn’t emphasize or valorize the collaborative method, but focused on the story, its telling, and its local significance. One of my criticisms of collaborative texting is that such work often dwells too self-reflectively on the interpersonal process rather than on the reason for and product of the collaboration. The Dauenhauer collaboration avoids this problem.

One wishes for this volume to have gone beyond the rehashing of why collaborative translation is desirable and useful. Collaborative texting is desirable for various reasons, the most obvious being that two heads are often better than one. But the question of whether “collaboration” is now a sufficient organizing principle for a book such as this arises because collaborative texting is now a widely accepted and perhaps expected methodology in Native studies. Over the past ten to fifteen years work in the area of Native studies (including the disciplines of anthropology, culture studies, folklore, and literary studies, among others) point to a trend of collaborative transcription, translation, and interpretation between Native insiders and interested non-Native outsiders. But it also seems to me that collaborative work, including many of the contributions in the book under review, has not moved very far beyond the method’s original intentions and insights. What we read in *Native American Oral Tradition* is a party-line position in that the book does not challenge or move us beyond the comforts of collaboration as accepted methodology.

Given the book’s title I expected something that failed to materialize. For instance, I would have liked to have seen a volume such as this grapple with questions related to the politics of being a so-called “culture-bearer” (an interesting and problematic neologism for this kind of work) and how this affects the quality of the texting process; of providing a method for evaluating the insider’s contribution; of developing a criteria for what constitutes a good or

poor translation and interpretation; and of developing a criteria for how to judge a good from a poor collaboration. What appears to be implicit in collaborative texting these days is that any translation or interpretation is deemed “good” if it is generated by a Native–non-Native collaboration. It is a kind of resting-on-one’s-laurels attitude. I would rather read about how or what kinds of methods could be used to evaluate collaboration and its results rather than read about the biography of the collaboration itself. Thus I’d rather know how to evaluate the quality of the texting than the quality of collaboration. My sense is that learning is maximized in the former rather than in the latter.

In my opinion the collaborative texting community is coming dangerously close to essentializing the insider, the Native half of the collaborative partnership, while relegating the outsider’s contribution as ancillary and only slightly better than a necessary evil. This emphasis can be viewed as an attempt to correct some of the “sins” of anthropological and folkloristic method in relation to oral-text collection and interpretation. We are now beginning to see a situation where the omniscience of the outside expert is being exchanged for its twin of the omniscient inside expert. Neither are tenable positions. And as collaboration is intended to overcome the problems arising from the outsider’s interpretive or explanatory omniscience, this is a rather ironic situation. In collaboration, sharing the work of text creation means that at least two, if not more, partners are engaged in the texting process.

I found most of the contributions in *Native American Oral Traditions* to be interesting and of high quality and I recommend the book to those interested in the subject. To the question, does *Native American Oral Tradition* advance our method, theory, or understanding of the collaborative method, I would have to say that it does not. We are at a point in collaborative methodology to push beyond the comforts as found in the present volume. To the question, does *Native American Oral Tradition* provide interesting and solid examples of the collaborative method, I conclude that it does.

*David Kozak*  
Fort Lewis College

**Native American Voices: A Reader. Second Edition.** Edited by Susan Lobo and Steve Talbot. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2001. 583 pages. \$42.67 paper.

Anyone who has assembled—or attempted to assemble—a basic reader to introduce undergraduates to the multifarious and burgeoning field of Native American Studies knows it is a daunting task. Indeed, in a field like Native American studies, which aims not only to navigate but also to negotiate the varied histories, epistemologies, and realities of indigenous America, what are the basics? What does one include in such a reader? What does one exclude? What issues, what themes, does one organize the reader around? Above all, what will make an introductory reader in Native American Studies *Native*?